REDUPLICATING PARTICLES IN HUNGARIAN

GYÖRGY RÁKOSI
http://hungram.unideb.hu
http://ieas.unideb.hu/rakosi

"Comprehensive grammar resources: Hungarian"

(OTKA NK 100804) Conference

10/11/2012, Szeged

1

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Reduplicating particle verb constructions (RPVC)

(1) *Rá*   *ugrottál*   *az*   *asztal-ra*.*
     onto.3   jumped.2SG   the   table-onto
     'You jumped onto the table.'

        particle   associate oblique

        PV: *particle + verb complex*

* *Diverging from standard spelling, I spell the particle and the following verb as two separate orthographic units.*

1.2.   INTRODUCTION

➤ Sizeable literature on RPVCs, see a.o.:

Ackerman (1987, 1990 & 2003), Ackerman & Webelhuth (1993), Hegedűs (in prep.), É. Kiss (1998, 2002), Kálmán & Trón (1999), Rákosi-Laczkó (2011), Surányi (2009a,b,c), Ürögdi (2003).

➤ Major issues:

- o the nature of the P-V combination, its locus of creation
- o the nature of the dependency between the particle and the oblique associate
- o the exact grammatical type of the reduplicating particle

3

1.3. INTRODUCTION

➢ What is the grammatical feature content of the particle in (1), especially in comparison to (2)?

(1)   *Rá*   *ugrottál*   *az*   *asztal-ra*.
          onto.3   jumped.2SG   the   table-onto
          'You jumped onto the table.'

(2)   *Rá*   *ugrottál*.
          onto.3   jumped.2SG
          'You jumped onto it.'

➢ Aims:

- o study variation in the form and content of the particle,

- o and argue that the RPVC is essentially a lexically governed construction.

- o An LFG analysis based on Rákosi-Laczkó (2011).

4

1.4. INTRODUCTION: STRUCTURE OF THE PAPER

5

2.1. BASIC FACTS

➤ Reduplicating particles, like other particles in Hungarian

  ○ occupy an immediately preverbal position in neutral clauses,

  ○ can be separated from the verb in non-neutral clauses,

  ○ affect the aspectual properties of the verb (most telicize it),

  ○ are semantically/thematically restricted: goal, path and sometimes even (stative) locative; but not source or orientation of trajectory (see É. Kiss 1998, 2002; Surányi 2009a,b,c)

  ○ can change the subcategorization properties or the argument structure of the base verb,

  ○ and frequently form totally non-compositional units with the verb.

6

2.2. BASIC FACTS

Reduplicating particles (varying degrees of productivity):

- *bele* 'into (it)'
- *benne* 'in (it)'
- *érte* 'for (it)'
- *hozzá* 'to (it)'
- *neki* 'to/against (it)' (dative case)
- *rá* 'onto (it)'
- *rajta* 'on (it)'
- *vele* 'with (it)'

7

2.3. BASIC FACTS

➤ Obligatory *pro*-drop:

(3)　　(*Ő-)*Rá*　　*ugrottál*　　*János-ra*.
　　　　he-onto.3　jumped.2SG　John-onto
　　　　'You jumped onto John.'

(4)　　(*Ő*-)*Rá*　　*ugrottál*.
　　　　he-onto.3　jumped.2SG
　　　　'You jumped onto him.'

➤ Not simply (morpho)phonological doubling:

(5)　　*Rajta*　*felejtettem*　*a*　*könyvet*　*az*　*asztal-on*.
　　　　on.3　forgot.1SG　the book.ACC the table-on
　　　　'I forgot the book on the table.'

2.4. THE LITERATURE ON REDUPLICATING PARTICLES

The particle is a full pronoun

➢ É. Kiss's (2002: 196) apposition analysis

(6)   *Rá*   *ugrottál*   *János-ra*.
         onto.3   jumped.2SG   John-onto
         'You jumped onto John.'

      pronominal argument   adjunct associate
        of the verb

○ an explanation for the doubling effect
○ an explanation for the assumed impossibility of pronominal associates (↔ Section 5)

9

2.5. THE LITERATURE ON REDUPLICATING PARTICLES

The particle is a reduced element

➤ The particle is reduced in the lexicon

- ○ É. Kiss (1998): individually selected *verbal prefixes*
- ○ Ackerman (1987 … 2003): *incorporated pronoun*
- ○ Kálmán & Trón (1999): *agreement construction*
- ○ Rákosi & Laczkó (2011): an LFG-based analysis and implementation along the agreement line

➤ Direct syntactic encoding: the particle is a reduced copy of its associate, with which it forms a purely syntactic dependency

- ○ Ürögdi (2003)
- ○ Surányi (2009a,b,c)

2.6. THE LITERATURE ON REDUPLICATING PARTICLES

(6)   *Rá*   *ugrottál*   *János-ra*.
       onto.3   jumped.2SG   John-onto
       'You jumped onto John.'

- Ürögdi (2003):

  Only the agreement features move, the particle is an *expletive spellout*.

- Surányi (2009a,b,c):

  The particle represents a reduced copy in the chain.

  Morphosyntactic reanalysis takes place in the VM position, and a semantic complex predicate is formed.

11

3.1. CONSTRUCTIONAL RESTRICTIONS

➢ Under the direct syntactic encoding approach, we would expect relatively free variation between the RPVC and "only oblique" and "only pronominal particle" constructions. So if (7a), then (7b) and (7c) too:

(7) a. Particle   V   Oblique
    b.   V   Oblique
    c. Particle   V

➢ But in fact, we often find scenarios (8a) and (8b), and even (8c) sometimes:

(8) a. *(Particle) V_i Oblique
    b. (*Particle) V_j Oblique
    c.   Particle V_k (*Oblique)

3.2. CONSTRUCTIONAL RESTRICTIONS

(9)　　*Nem jövök　　*(rá)　　a　　megoldás-ra.* → (8a)
　　　　not　come.1SG　onto.3　the　solution-onto
　　　　'I cannot figure the solution out.'

(10)　*Nem　　tartozik　(*rá)　　Kati-ra.* 　　　　→ (8b)
　　　　not　　belongs　onto.3　Kate-onto
　　　　'This does not concern Kate.'

(11)　*Ez　még　rá　　ér.* 　　　　　　→ (8c)
　　　　this　still　onto.3　reach.3SG
　　　　'This can still wait.'

➢ The pattern represented by (9) is frequent with each reduplicating particle, and it is indicative of the particle's derivational flavour.

13

3.3. CONSTRUCTIONAL RESTRICTIONS

➢ The importance of these constructional restrictions is emphasized in Kálmán & Trón (1999), Rákosi & Laczkó (2011) and Hegedűs (in prep.).

   Surányi (2009a,b): these do not represent decisive arguments against the syntactic account.

➢ It is true that the idiomatic cases usually have the expected aspetual structure. But exceptions can be found even in that respect. Consider (12), which contains an atelic PV:

(12)   *A   leírás   rá   illik   János-ra.*
       the   description   onto.3   fits   John-onto
       'The description fits John.'

4.1. 3PL REDUPLICATING PARTICLES

➢ In the standard, the particle takes a default "3SG" form even with plural lexical associates (13a). For a subset of speakers, however, a plural form is also an option (13b).

(13) a. *Rá néztem János-ra / a gyerekek-re*.
      onto.3   looked.1SG   John-onto / the kids-onto
      'I looked at/after the kids.'

   b. %*Rájuk néztem a gyerekek-re*.
      onto.3PL looked.1SG the kids-onto
      'I looked at/after the kids.'

➢ Varying judgements concerning (13b): É. Kiss (1998), Kálmán & Trón (1999), and Hegedűs (in. Prep) do not accept this construction; É. Kiss (2002) and Surányi (2009a,b) do.

➢ Forthcoming judgements are wrt the dialect where (13b) is allowed.

4.2. 3PL REDUPLICATING PARTICLES

➢ Surányi (2009a,b) notes that the plural is best if the PV is non-idiomatic and the lexical associate has a +human referent.

➢ Beyond that, Surányi (2009a,b) and É. Kiss (2002) agree that the difference between the two particle forms is only that *rá* (13a) is not specified for number, whereas *rájuk* (13b) has a plural number feature.

↔ The difference is not only in terms of number:

the plural form is a pronominal, whereas the default form of the particle is not.

4.3.   3PL REDUPLICATING PARTICLES

The +human restriction

(14)   *Rájuk   néztem   a   gyerekek-re*.
         onto.3PL   looked.1SG   the kids-onto
         'I looked at the kids.'

(15) ??*Rájuk   néztem   a   székek-re*.
         onto.3PL   looked.1SG   the kids-onto
         'I looked at the chairs.'

(16)   *Rájuk   néztem*.   (neutral clause)
         onto.3PL   looked.1SG
         'I looked at them.'   √ +human   √ -human

   [cf. The *weak pronoun* / *strong pronoun* distinction of
   Cardinaletti & Starke 1999)]

17

4.4. 3PL REDUPLICATING PARTICLES

The *reduced* PP-with-DP construction

Context: The room is suddenly being flooded. The teacher tells the young children to jump on their parents, who are also in the room.

(17)   *Rá   a   szülők-re*!
       onto.3   the parents-onto
       'Up onto your parents!'

(18)   **Rájuk   a   szülők-re*!
       onto.3PL   the parents-onto
       'Up onto your parents!'

(19)   (**Ő-*)*Rá   az   apád-ra*!
       he-onto.3   the your.father-onto
       'Up onto your father!'

4.5. 3PL REDUPLICATING PARTICLES

Binding

(20)   *A gyerekek rá   néztek   egymás-ra.*
       the kids   onto.3   looked.3PL   each.other-onto
       'The kids looked at each other.'

(21)   **A gyerekek rájuk   néztek   (egymás-ra).*
       the kids   onto.3PL   looked.3PL   each.other-onto
       'The kids looked at each other.'

⇒ The plural reduplicating particle is in fact a pronoun, and
   it stands in an appositive relation with its associate.

⇒ The non-plural reduplicating pronoun is a default form,
   and it does not participate an appositive relation.

19

4.6. 3PL REDUPLICATING PARTICLES

➢ Some evidence for the appositive construction: availability of notional agreement (contra Surányi 2009b).

(22)   *Rájuk*   *néztem*   *néhányuk-ra.*
         onto.3PL   looked.1SG   some.of.them-onto
         'I looked at some of them.'

(23)   *Néhányuk*   *eljött*   */ *eljöttek.*
         some.of.them came.3SG   came.3PL
         'Some of them came.'

20

5.1. PARTICLES AND PRONOMINAL ASSOCIATES

➤ There are conflicting views in the literature on whether reduplicating particles can take pronominal associates:

  o É. Kiss (1998, 2002):   it is not possible
  o Kálmán & Trón (1999): it is unpredictably possible
  o Surányi (2009a,b,c):   it is predictably possible

➤ I argue here that

  o 3rd person pronominal associates are generally acceptable

  o 1st and 2nd person pronominal associates are marked. Two strategies to save the construction:

    1. Delete the *3rd person* feature of the default particle form.

    2. *Particle*ize the relevant pronoun.

5.2. PARTICLES AND PRONOMINAL ASSOCIATES

(24)   *Én   Ő-RÁ   rivalltam   rá*.
       I   he-onto.3SG   yelled.1SG   onto.3
       'It is HIM that I yelled at.'

(25) a.*%Én   TE-RÁD   rivalltam   rá*.
       I   you-onto.2SG   yelled.1SG   onto
       'It is YOU that I yelled at.'

      b. *%Én TE-RÁD   rivalltam   rád*.
          I   you-onto.2SG   yelled.1SG   onto.2SG
          'It is YOU that I yelled at.'

22

5.3. PARTICLES AND PRONOMINAL ASSOCIATES

(26)   *Én   rá   rivalltam   ő-rá   is.*
        I   onto.3   yelled.1SG   he-onto.3SG   too
        'I yelled at him, too.'

(27) a.*%Én   rá   rivalltam   te-rád   is.*
        I   onto   yelled.1SG   you-onto.2SG   too
        'I yelled at you, too.'

      b.*%Én   rád   rivalltam   te-rád   is.*
        I   onto.2SG   yelled.1SG you-onto.2SG too
        'I yelled at you, too.'

6.1.   AN LFG ANALYSIS

➢ The data observed in Section 3-5 can be treated adequately if we assume that reduplicating particles are paired up lexically with their verbs, and particles can vary in terms of their feature content.

⇒ explaining dialectel/idiolectal variation, and the concomitant constructional variation

⇒ providing a plausible model for the diachronic development of these particles

➢ The analysis is based on Rákosi & Laczkó (2011, in prep.), and has been implemented on the LFG-based XLE platform of grammar development.
See also Forst, King & Laczkó (2010) for a description of the CONCAT device used in the analysis.

24

6.2. AN LFG ANALYSIS

(28) *Én   rá   rivalltam.*
      I   onto.3   yelled.1SG
      'I yelled at him.'

(29) *rivall*$_1$: V   ($\uparrow$PRED)= 'yell<($\uparrow$SUBJ) ($\uparrow$OBL)>'
                        ($\uparrow$OBL CASE) =c sublative

(30) *rá*$_1$:   Pron ($\uparrow$PRED)= 'pro'
                        ($\uparrow$CASE)= sublative
                        ($\uparrow$PERS)= 3
                        ($\uparrow$NUM)= SG

[NB: In this analysis, case markers are not predicative
   - unlike postpostions -, but can nevertheless be
   semantically interpretable. Nothing crucial hinges on this.]

6.3. AN LFG ANALYSIS

(31)   *Én   rá   rivalltam   János-ra.*
         I   onto.3   yelled.1SG   John-onto
         'I yelled at him.'

(32)   *rivall*$_2$: V   ($\uparrow$PRED)= 'yell <($\uparrow$SUBJ) ($\uparrow$OBL)>'
                                 ($\uparrow$OBL CASE)=c sublative
                                 ($\uparrow$CHECK _PRT-VERB)= +
                                 ($\uparrow$PRT-FORM)=c rá
                                 @(CONCAT ($\uparrow$PRT-FORM) '# %stem %FN)

(33)   *rá*$_2$:   PRT   ($\uparrow$PRT-FORM)= rá
                             ($\uparrow$OBL PERS)=c 3
                             ($\uparrow$OBL CASE)=c sublative
                             ($\uparrow$ASPECT TELIC)= +
                             ($\uparrow$ CHECK _PRT-VERB)=c +

6.4. AN LFG ANALYSIS

Dialectal variation 1

(25) a.*%Én TE-RÁD rivalltam rá.*
       I   you-onto.2SG yelled.1SG onto
    'It is YOU that I yelled at.'

    b. *%Én TE-RÁD rivalltam rád.*
      I   you-onto.2SG yelled.1SG   onto.2SG
    'It is YOU that I yelled at.'

6.5. AN LFG ANALYSIS

Dialectal variation 1

(34) **rá₃**:   PRT   (↑PRT-FORM)= rá   ⇒ (25a)
                     (↑~~OBL PERS)=c 3~~
                     (↑OBL CASE)=c sublative
                     (↑ASPECT TELIC)= +
                     (↑ CHECK _PRT-VERB)=c +

(35) **rád₂**: PRT   (↑PRT-FORM)= rád   ⇒ (25b)
                     (↑OBL PERS)=c 2
                     (↑OBL NUM)=c SG
                     (↑OBL CASE)=c sublative
                     (↑ASPECT TELIC)= +
                     (↑ CHECK _PRT-VERB)=c +

                     [~~(↑PRED)= 'pro'~~]

6.6. AN LFG ANALYSIS

Dialectal variation 2

(14)   *Rájuk   néztem   a   gyerekek-re*.
            onto.3PL looked.1SG   the kids-onto
            'I looked at the kids.'

(36)   *néz$_1$*: V   (↑PRED)= 'look at<(↑SUBJ) (↑OBL)>'

(37)   *rájuk$_1$*: Pron (↑PRED)= 'pro'
                        (↑CASE)= sublative
                        (↑PERS)= 3
                        (↑NUM)= PL

⇒ No special lexical assumptions are needed if the appositional analysis is right for this construction. Interspeaker variation is caused by the varying acceptance of this kind of apposition.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

30

8.1. REFERENCES

Ackerman, Farrell. 1987. Pronominal incorporation: the case of prefixal preverbs. In Kenesei, István ed. *Approaches to Hungarian 2*. Szeged: JATE. 213-260.

Ackerman, Farrell. 1990. The morphological blocking principle and oblique pronominal incorporation in Hungarian. In K. Dziwirek et. al. eds. *Grammatical Relations: A Cross-Theoretical Perspective.* Stanford: CSLI Publications, 1-19.

Ackerman, Farrell. 2003. Lexeme derivation and multiword predicates in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 50 (1-2). 7-32.

Ackerman, Farrell & Gert Webelhuth. 1993. The composition of (dis)continuous predicates: lexical or syntactic? *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 44. 317-340.

Cardinaletti, Anna & Michal Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of three classes of pronouns. In Henk C. Riemsdijk ed. *Clitics in the languages of Europe. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 145–233.

Forst, Martin, King, Tracy H. & Laczkó, Tibor. 2010. Particle verbs in computational LFGs: Issues from English, German, and Hungarian. In: Miriam Butt & Tracy H. King. eds. *Proceedings of the LFG '10 Conference*. Ottawa: Carleton University. On-line publication: CSLI Publications.

Hegedűs, Veronika. In prep. *Predicative PPs and particles*. Chapter 4 of PhD dissertation in preparation.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 1998. Verbal prefixes or postpositions? Postpositional aspectualizers in Hungarian. In C. de Groot and Kenesei, I. eds. *Approaches to Hungarian 6*. Szeged: JATE.

É. Kiss, Katalin 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: CUP.

Kálmán, László & Trón, Viktor. 1999. A magyar igekötő egyeztetése. In Büky, László & Maleczki, Márta eds*. A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei IV*. Szeged: SZTE, Általános Nyelvészeti Tanszék. 203-211.

8.2. REFERENCES

Laczkó, Tibor & Rákosi, György. 2011. On particularly predicative particles in Hungarian. Butt, Miriam & King, Tracy H. eds. In *Proceedings of the LFG '11 Conference*. M. Butt and T. H. King eds. CSLI Publications. 299-319.

Rákosi, György & Laczkó, Tibor. 2011. Inflecting spatial particles and shadows of the past in Hungarian. In *Proceedings of the LFG '11 Conference*. M. Butt and T. H. King eds. CSLI Publications. 440-460.

Rákosi, György & Laczkó, Tibor. In prep. Locative particles dependencies in Hungarian. To be submitted to a special issue of *Studia Linguistica*.

Surányi, Balázs. 2009a. Locative particle and adverbial incorporation at the interfaces. In É. Kiss, Katalin eds. *Adverbs and adverbial adjuncts at the interfaces*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 39-74.

Surányi, Balázs. 2009b. Adpositional preverbs, chain reduction, and phases. In M. den Dikken & R. Vago eds. *Approaches to Hungarian 11*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 217-250.

Surányi, Balázs. 2009c. Verbal particles inside and outside vP. In *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 56 (2-3). 201-249.

Toivonen, Ida. 2001. *The phrase-structure of non-projecting words*. PhD dissertation. Stanford University.

Ürögdi, Barbara. 2003. Feature doubling, aspectual structure, and expletives. In Kadowaki, Makato & Kawahara, Shigeto eds. *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 33*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA. 425-444.