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1.1. INTRODUCTION

Reduplicating particle verb constructions (RPVC)

(1) \textit{Rá ugrottál az asztal-ra.*}\textsuperscript{onto.3 jumped.2sg the table-onto}  
‘You jumped onto the table.’

\begin{align*}
\text{particle} & \quad \text{associate oblique} \\
\text{PV: particle + verb complex}
\end{align*}

* 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.:
  

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

- study variation in the form and content of the particle,
- and argue that the RPVC is essentially a lexically governed construction.
- An LFG analysis based on Rákosi-Laczkó (2011).
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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.
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)’
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.’

- an explanation for the doubling effect
- an explanation for the assumed impossibility of pronominal associates (\( \leftrightarrow \) Section 5)
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
  - Surányi (2009a,b,c)
2.6. THE LITERATURE ON REDUPLICATING PARTICLES

(6) \textit{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 \textit{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.
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.
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.  
ontō.3 looked.1SG John-onto / the kids-onto  
‘I looked at/after the kids.’

b. %Rájuk néztem a gyerekek-re.  
ontō.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 \( \text{rá} \) (13a) is not specified for number, whereas \( \text{rájuk} \) (13b) has a plural number feature.

\[ \leftrightarrow \] 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)  \textit{Rájuk néztem a gyerekek-re.}

\begin{tabular}{lll}
onto.3PL & looked.1SG & the kids-onto \\
\end{tabular}

‘I looked at the kids.’

(15) ??\textit{Rájuk néztem a székek-re.}

\begin{tabular}{lll}
onto.3PL & looked.1SG & the kids-onto \\
\end{tabular}

‘I looked at the chairs.’

(16)  \textit{Rájuk néztem.}  \textit{(neutral clause)}

\begin{tabular}{lll}
onto.3PL & looked.1SG \\
\end{tabular}

‘I looked at them.’  \textit{√ +human  √ -human}

[ cf. The \textit{weak pronoun / strong pronoun} distinction of Cardinaletti & Starke 1999) ]
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.
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.’
5.1. PARTICLES AND PRONOMINAL ASSOCIATES

- There are conflicting views in the literature on whether reduplicating particles can take pronominal associates:
  - É. Kiss (1998, 2002): it is not possible
  - Kálmán & Trón (1999): it is unpredictably possible
  - Surányi (2009a,b,c): it is predictably possible

- I argue here that
  - 3rd person pronominal associates are generally acceptable
  - 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. *Particleize* 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.’
5.3. PARTICLES AND PRONOMINAL ASSOCIATES

(26) Én rá rivalltam ō-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/idioclectal 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.
6.2. AN LFG ANALYSIS

(28) Én rá rivalltam.
I onto.3 yelled.1sg
‘I yelled at him.’

(29) rivall₁: V (↑PRED)= ‘yell<(↑SUBJ) (↑OBL)>’
(↑OBL CASE) =c sublative

(30) rá₁: Pron (↑PRED)= ‘pro’
(↑CASE)= sublative
(↑PERS)= 3
(↑NUM)= sg

[NB: In this analysis, case markers are not predicative - unlike postpositions -, 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\text{PRED})= ‘yell <(\(\uparrow\text{SUBJ}) (\(\uparrow\text{OBL})>’\)
(\(\uparrow\text{OBL CASE})=c\text{ sublative}
(\(\uparrow\text{CHECK } \_\text{PRT-VERB})= +
(\(\uparrow\text{PRT-FORM})=c\text{ rá}
@((\text{CONCAT} (\(\uparrow\text{PRT-FORM}) ’#\text{ %stem %FN})

(33) rá$^2$: PRT
(\(\uparrow\text{PRT-FORM})= \text{rá}
(\(\uparrow\text{OBL PERS})=c\text{ 3}
(\(\uparrow\text{OBL CASE})=c\text{ sublative}
(\(\uparrow\text{ASPECT TELIC})= +
(\(\uparrow\text{CHECK } \_\text{PRT-VERB})=c\text{ +}
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) \( r\acute{a}_3 \): PRT \((\uparrow\text{PRT-FORM}) = \acute{r}a\) (25a)
    \((\uparrow\text{OBL PERS}) = c \ 3\)
    \((\uparrow\text{OBL CASE}) = c \ \text{sublative}\)
    \((\uparrow\text{ASPECT TELIC}) = +\)
    \((\uparrow\text{CHECK } _{\text{PRT-VERB}}) = c +\)

(35) \( r\acute{a}d_2 \): PRT \((\uparrow\text{PRT-FORM}) = \acute{r}ad\) (25b)
    \((\uparrow\text{OBL PERS}) = c \ 2\)
    \((\uparrow\text{OBL NUM}) = c \ \text{SG}\)
    \((\uparrow\text{OBL CASE}) = c \ \text{sublative}\)
    \((\uparrow\text{ASPECT TELIC}) = +\)
    \((\uparrow\text{CHECK } _{\text{PRT-VERB}}) = c +\)

\[ (\uparrow\text{PRED}) = 'pro' \]
6.6. AN LFG ANALYSIS

Dialectal variation 2

(14) \textit{Rájuk} néztem a gyerekek-re. \\
o onto.3PL looked.1SG the kids-onto \\
‘I looked at the kids.’

(36) \textit{néz}$_1$: V (↑PRED)= ‘look at<(^↑SUBJ) (↑OBL)>’

(37) \textit{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.
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