Annamária Bene
University of Novi Sad
Hungarian Language Teacher–training Faculty
annamaria.bene@eunet.rs

What is really the function of the verbal particle in Hungarian*

In my paper I am discussing the newest analysis of verbal particles (É. Kiss, Katalin 2006. The function and the syntax of the verbal particle. In É. Kiss, Katalin ed., 2006. *Event structure and the Left Periphery*. Dordrecht: Springer.) which suggest that these function morphemes are to be analyzed as secondary predicates. My goal is to show, this approach should be revisited: by examining the verbal particles with regard to Hungarian secondary resultative predication we see that the role assigned to the verbal particle is not secondary predication, but mere delimitation. Further, it will become obvious that resultative phrases are not the phrasal counterparts of verbal particles.

1. Introduction

The verbal particle[1] represent perhaps the biggest riddle of Hungarian grammar. A section of this riddle is maintained for the question regarding the function of the verbal particle.

---

1 The verbal particle in Hungarian is a small, usually monosyllabic prefix which behavior resembles most of all the behavior of verbal particles in Mansi language; this is actually not surprising, given that Mansi, along with Hungarian, comprise the Ugric branch of the Finn–Ugric languages (Hajdú 1981).
In Mansi language verbal particles modify the meaning of the verb in both concrete and abstract ways. For example, with Mansi verbal particle эл(а) (read: el(a)) the verb мина (read: mina; 'go') turns элмина (read: elmina; 'go away') – this looks a lot like Hungarian verbal particle *el* and the verb *megy* 'go', where *elmegy* is 'to go away' (compare it with (ib))! Or

with the verbal particle *xom* (read: χot; 'direction away from something and action intensity')
the verb *poxm* (read: roχt, 'to be frightened') becomes *xompoxm* (read: χotroχt 'to take fright
suddenly') – this, in turn, resembles Hungarian verb *meg–ijed* 'to get frightened'.
The Hungarian verbal particle is capable of conveying the following functions:
* adding additional information about how an event expressed by a verb is executed: the
  Hungarian verbal particle can provide additional information which specify the manner of
  execution of the event expressed by the verb; compare:
  (i) a. Péter ment a   szomszédba.
        Peter went the neighborhood–in
        Peter went to the neighbors.
     b. Péter el/át–ment   a   szomszédba.
        Peter PRT/PRT–went the neighborhood–in
        Peter has gone over to the neighbors.
     c. Péter ki–ment a   kertbe.
        Peter PRT–went the garden–in
        Peter has gone out into the garden.
* Completeness of an action: this function holds for verbal particles *ki, el, meg,* because they
  can express that the action expressed by the verb has been finished:
  (ii) a. Mari olvasta a könyvet.
         Mary read the book–ACC
         Mary was reading the book.
      b. Mari ki/el–olvasta a   könyvet.
         Mary PRT/PRT–read the book–ACC
         Mary has read (finished) the book
* There is single verbal particle, *meg* (Kiefer 2006), which definitely can change the mean-
  ing of the verb in a way that is very similar to changing the aspect of an English verb.
  However, since it is basically impossible to give accurate English translations of the fol-
  lowing examples regarding aspect shift, I am comparing them with English past continu-
  ous and past simple tenses this being the best way to express the existing difference:
  (iii) a. állt ~ 's/he was standing'   meg–állt ~ 's/he stood'
          stood   PRT–stood
       b. írt ~ 's/he was writing'   meg–írt ~ 's/he wrote'
          wrote   PRT–wrote
* Idiomatic meaning: the verbal particle can change the meaning of the verb into something
  more idiomatic:
  (iv) a. ad   ki–ad
          give   PRT–give
                          publish, spend, extradite
       b. szól   el–szólja magát
          tell   PRT–tells her/himself
                          to drop a brick

The verbal particle in Hungarian immediately precedes the verb or infinitive it belongs to
only in neutral sentences (va) and when it is emphasised, i. e. focused (vb), otherwise it sepa-
rates from the verb or infinitive (vi):
  (v) a. Péter <u>fel–nézett</u> az ablakra.
         Peter PRT–looked the window–on
         Peter has looked up to the window.
      b. Péter **FEL**–<u>nézett</u> az ablakra.
         Peter PRT–looked the window–on
         Up to the window, John has looked.
  (vi) a. Tegnap nem <u>mosogattam</u> pro <u>el</u> az edényeket.
          yesterday no washed up   PRT the dishes–ACC
          I haven't washed up yesterday.
       b. <u>Meg</u> tudták pro <u>javítani</u> az autót.
          PRT knew   repair–to the car–ACC
          They have managed to repair the car.

Few years ago a new and pretty much disputable analysis (É. Kiss 2006) of these morphemes came to light. According to one of the main claims formulated in this analysis, the verbal particle is a secondary predicate predicated of the theme argument (in what follows, theme equals to underlying direct internal argument). The main objective of this paper is to clarify precisely this finding.

I will examine the verbal particle with regard to Hungarian secondary resultative predication. Such approach allows me to demonstrate that the function assigned to the verbal particle by É. Kiss (2006) is not secondary predication, but mere delimitation. Additionally, I am going to discuss the status of resultative phrases in order to show, it is not justified to identify them as phrasal counterparts of verbal particles (É. Kiss 2006).

For correctness' sake, the following clarification is desirable: Hungarian secondary resultative predication manifests itself in syntax in the form of a resultative construction, thus occasionally, if required, I will use this term as well.

This paper is organized as follows: section 2 gives a brief summary of the analysis of É. Kiss (2006). Section 3 and 3.1 sum up the main properties of resultatives and secondary resultative predication: section 3 is the summary of common features, whereas section 3.1 reviews the Hungarian resultatives and secondary resultative predication. Section 4 is the analysis: the verbal particle is investigated in section 4.1 and the Hungarian resultative phrase in 4.2.

2. A quick overview of É. Kiss (2006) analysis of verbal particles

É. Kiss's syntactic analysis treats the verbal particle as a secondary predicate predicated of the underlying direct internal argument. Built upon sentence–pairs similar to those under (1–2) her claim is that (i) the function of the verbal particle *fel* in (1a) is similar to that of the resultative phrase (case–marked NP) *szelet–re* 'slice–to' in (1b): it shows that the cake has been cut into pieces. Further, the verbal particle *meg* in (2a) has essentially the same function as the case–marked adjective in (2b): it means that the meat has attained the required state as a consequence of cooking. Of course, as she says, (ii) there is a difference between verbal particles and their phrasal counterparts: verbal particles lack a descriptive content; hence they mean that the individual affected by the given change has been totally affected, and it has attained the new state.

(1) a.   Mari fel–szeletelte[2] a   tortát.
        Mary PRT–cut   the cake–ACC
        Mary has cut up the cake.

     b.   Mari tíz [szelet–re] vágta a   tortát.
        Mary ten slice–to   cut   the cake–ACC
        Mary cut the cake into ten peaces.

---

2   I separate the [verbal particle + V] complex (Komlósy 1992, Ackerman–Webelhuth 1998) for explanatory purposes only.

(2) a. A hús meg–főtt.
   the meat–NOM PRT–cooked
   The meat has cooked.

b.   A hús [puhá–ra] főtt.
   the meat–NOM tender–to cooked
   The meat cooked tender.

In É. Kiss's view, the resultative phrases in (1b) and (2b) clearly represent secondary predicates predicated of the underlying direct internal argument. She also claims that this property applies to the verbal particles in (1a) and (1b) too; consequently there is good reason to assume that they also function as secondary predicate predicated of the underlying direct internal argument. In my paper, I wish to discuss these very postulations.

In the course of my analysis I shall look into the nature of the verbal particle and the resultative phrase in relation to secondary resultative predication, as both of them are pieces of Hungarian secondary resultativity puzzle.

Since my approach to the problem is from the side of secondary resultative predication, prior to the analysis I give a brief summary of it.

3. Some facts on secondary resultative predication

Verbs which denote activity or state may be combined with a particular constituent to render resultative construction and secondary resultative predication (in further text: [+R]):

(3) a. The gardener watered the flowers [flat].
 b. John painted the fence [red].
 c. The dog licked his plate [clean].

(4) a. The door swung [open].
 b. The window broke [open].

(5) a. Peter laughed [himself] helpless.
 b. The child screamed [itself] hoarse.

Secondary resultative predication triggers type–shifting operation on activities or states. During this operation activities or states shift to accomplishment reading through insertion of a delimiter which determines the endpoint (or culmination; as of Dowty 1979: *culmination–of–the–e–marker*) of an accomplishment. The culmination (endpoint) of an accomplishment is determined by what happens to the underlying direct internal argument.

(6)   The gardener watered the flowers [flat].: the event of watering of the flowers culminates when the endpoint of the event is reached: in other words, the result is achieved when the property of the flatness of the flowers is achieved

The endpoint (culmination) of the event must be overtly denoted in order to obtain secondary resultative predication; compare (6) with (7).

(7) The gardener watered the flowers.: no culmination of the event, no resultative reading (in further text: [–R])

The fact that secondary resultative predication triggers shifting from activity or state reading to accomplishment reading implies that secondary resultative predication must involve underlying direct internal argument. This must be the case simply because accomplishments involve processes, and processes aim at the underlying direct internal argument. The explanation for this is simple: the underlying direct internal argument is the only argument that can be affected by the action expressed by the verb, or the action expressed by the verb is directed at this particular argument only.

The assumption that the underlying direct internal argument is essential for obtaining secondary resultative predication is certainly consonant with Levin–Rappaport Hovav's Direct Object Restriction, which states that result XPs are invariably predicated of NPs in direct object position (Levin–Rappaport Hovav 1995). However, this restriction is far too strong, because on the one hand resultative constructions can be built up from unergatives too, that is, verbs with no underlying direct internal arguments (5), on the other hand, as example (7) illustrates the underlying direct internal argument on its own is not sufficient for obtaining such construction.

Hence, it is obvious that there exist two very distinct types of secondary resultative predication; in order to distinguish them I will apply the terms used by Rothstein (2004), with minor modifications though.

The first class is the class of object–oriented resultative constructions (Rothstein 2004: *object–oriented resultatives*). They express the real secondary resultative predication, as object–oriented resultative constructions exhibit predication which aims at incremental themes (where theme equals underlying direct internal argument): they express the result state of the underlying direct internal argument of the verb.

Notice, I am talking about underlying direct internal argument. It is important to emphasize this particular property given that object–oriented resultative constructions can be derived from either transitives (3, 8) or unaccusatives, i. e. intransitives (4, 9). The fact that resultative constructions derived from unaccusatives contain no honorary objects (they in part correspond with *fake objects* introduced by Simpson 1983: 145.), which allow the same entity to act as agent and patient simultaneously, proves that it is the underlying position of the given argument that counts, not the surface position; compare (3–4) with (5, 10).

Thus, object–oriented resultative constructions can be derived only from verbs whose underlying structure contains direct internal argument. The underlying direct internal argument of the transitive verb surfaces as (direct) object, whilst the underlying direct internal argument of the unaccusative surfaces as subject, in accordance with Burzio's Generalization (Burzio 1986).

(8) a. Peter smashed the vase$_i$ [into peaces]$_i$.

    b. The cold weather froze the lake$_i$ [solid]$_i$.

(9)   The window$_i$ swung [open]$_i$.

The second class is the class of subject–oriented resultative constructions (Rothstein 2004: *subject–oriented resultatives*, Rappaport Hovav–Levin 2001, Verspoor 1997, Wechsler 1997). These are *indirect* resultative constructions as the predication expressed by them aims not at incremental themes (i. e. underlying direct internal arguments) but at external argument, i. e. agent (5, 10).

(10) a. The girls$_i$ talked themselves [hoarse]$_i$.
     b. Mary$_i$ danced herself [dizzy]$_i$.

Subject–oriented resultative constructions are derived from unergatives, consequently they are valencyincreasing constructions. This is so, because unergatives are monadic verbs, which means, the underlying structure assigned to them contains only an external argument. Normally, this argument being agentive cannot undergo change, hence cannot function as the argument of the culmination of the event expressed by the verb. The escape hatch here is expanding: inserting an honorary object (e. g. *themselves* in (10a), *herself* in (10b)) in the underlying structure of the verb. As I mentioned before, the inserted honorary object allows the same entity expressed by external argument (agent) to function as external argument (agent) and underlying direct internal argument (patient) at once, thus, it makes composing of the subject–oriented resultative construction possible.

3.1. About secondary resultative predication in Hungarian

As has been demonstrated (Laczkó 1995, Alberti 1997, Bene 2005) the unaccusative–unergative distinction is present in Hungarian grammar, and has important syntactic and morphosyntactic consequences. One of these consequences is connected to the Hungarian resultative constructions; this particular outcome of unaccusative–unergative distinction has not been accounted up to now.

Even though there is not much research done on Hungarian resultative constructions, given that it is proven, there are two verb classes with underlying direct internal argument in Hungarian, and a third, which lacks underlying direct internal argument; it is plausible to assume that Hungarian also distinguishes between object–oriented (11–12) and subject–oriented resultative constructions (13).

(11) Mari ki–vasalta az inget.
      Mary PRT–ironed the shirt–ACC
      Mari has ironed the shirt.

(12) A virág ki–nyílt.
      the flower PRT–opened
      The flower has blossomed.

(13) a. Mari ki–kiabálta magát.
         Mary PRT–shouted herself
         Mary shouted herself.
     b. Mari ki–sírta a szemét.
         Mary PRT–cried the eyes–ACC
         Mary cried her eyes out.

The existence of subject–oriented resultative constructions in Hungarian questions É. Kiss's claim that verbal particles function as secondary predicates predicated of the underlying direct internal argument, simply because this type of resultative construction (i) is derived from unergatives, which are verbs with no underlying direct internal arguments; at the same time (ii) it contains verbal particles.

Nevertheless as shown in (13), Hungarian subject–oriented resultative constructions obviously contain NP_{acc} too, which at first sight confirms É. Kiss's assumption. These accusative case–marked NPs though are not real, but honorary objects. The reflexive pronoun *magát* 'her/himself' in (13a) is not the surfaced underlying direct internal argument: it is the reflex of the subject or external argument. It marks via accusative case that the subject is not only the causer, but also the bearer of the result state; in other words, it indicates that the action of the subject is directed towards the subject self. Similarly, in (13b) the NP_{acc} *szemét* 'eyes–ACC' is neither underlying direct internal argument: its role is to define which part of the subject is affected, and subsequent upon behaves as (direct) object. The accusative case serves as designator in this particular process.

As seen in (7), the presence of the direct internal argument does not necessarily call forth secondary resultative predication; it just implies that the underlying direct internal argument is a necessary, but not sufficient element of the process that results in secondary resultative predication. This presumption holds for Hungarian as well (compare (14) and (15)):

(14) a.   Mari vasalta az inget.   [–R]
          Mary ironed the shirt–ACC
          Mari was ironing the shirt.

     b.   Mari ki–vasalta az inget.   [+R]
          Mary PRT–ironed the shirt–ACC
          Mari has ironed the shirt.

(15) a.   A kalács sült.   [–R]
          the cake baked
          The cake was baking.

     b.   A kalács meg–sült.   [+R]
          the cake PRT–baked
          The cake has baked.

Thus, if it is not the underlying direct internal argument, what is the necessary and sufficient component of resultative constructions? I would say it is the delimiter. Delimiters are the key elements of resultative constructions in general, because their function is to overtly denote the endpoint or end state of the event. Overt delimitation is essential for obtaining secondary resultative predication, because secondary resultative predication indicates the new endpoint or new end state resulting from the completion of the event expressed by the verb.

213

An additional objective of mine is to determine, which constituent plays the role of determiner in Hungarian secondary resultative predication: the verbal particle (11–13), (14b, 15b) or the resultative phrase (1b, 2b).

4. The analysis

4.1. The verbal particle: secondary predicate or perhaps delimiter?

The main goal of this paper is to show that the claim formulated in É. Kiss (2006) according to which the verbal particle is secondary predicate predicated of the underlying direct internal argument should be revisited.

In order to demonstrate, the cited claim is to strong, I intend to check some relevant constructions against the definition of secondary predication (16), and to test them with those secondary predication tests, which are applicable on Hungarian.

The definition of secondary predication I am applying in my analysis reads as follows:

(16) Une phrase P contient une predication secondaire si elle peut être paraphrasée par deux predications P1 et P2 telle que la seconde predication P2 exprime une predication qui est indépendente de la predication de la première P1. (Gouesse–Kiefer (to appear), following Goddard 2006)

If we apply this definition on Hungarian examples with verbal particles, we immediately see that É. Kiss's theory is not working properly.

While observing, keep in mind that examples (17) and (19) are constructions with verbal particles, consequently the events expressed by them should be composed of two subevents, among which the subevent P2 is supposed to be the secondary resultative predication. However, in these cases it is impossible to formulate the two necessary predications. To be more precise, it is impossible to determine the secondary resultative predication (P2), despite the fact that the constructions contain both (direct) object and verbal particle; N. B. the presence of these two components should, according to É. Kiss (2006), yield secondary resultative predication.

(17)   Péter meg–nézte   az előadást.
        Peter PRT–watched the play–ACC
        Peter has watched the play.

(18) a. P1:   Péter meg–nézte az előadást.
              Peter has watched the play.
     b. P2:   ////

(19)   János el–dobta   a labdát.
        John PRT–threw the ball–ACC
        John has thrown the ball.

(20) a. P1:   János el–dobta a labdát.
              John has thrown the ball.
     b. P2:   ////

I must add though, that for many native speakers of Hungarian the event expressed in (21) is actually composed of two subevents. For them the event expressed by the verb (22a) implicates the result of the event (22b), i. e., the result state of the fence. But this alleged result state arises not because the predicate *befestette a kerítést* 'has painted the fence' contains a verbal particle, but because the transitive verb *fest* 'paint' expresses an inherently directed event/motion (contrary to transitives *néz* 'look, watch', *dob* 'throw', *érint* 'touch', *lát* 'see', *hall* 'hear', *csóvál* 'frisk', *kapar* 'scrape', *énekel* 'sing' etc.); the verbal particle itself is there only to mark the ending of the event.

(21)　　Péter be–festette　a kerítést.
　　　　Peter PRT–painted the fence–ACC
　　　　Peter has painted the fence.

(22) a. P1:　Péter be–festette a kerítést.
　　　　　　Peter has painted the fence.
　　　b. P2:　?? A kerítés festett.
　　　　　　The fence is painted.

Thus, examples with verbal particles heavily weaken the assumption that the verbal particle is a secondary predicate.

Now, let us turn to the secondary predication tests (Rothstein 2004).

In order to be recognized as secondary predicate, a constituent must meet a range of syntactic criteria; I will check the verbal particle against those which are functional in Hungarian.

(i)　　Secondary predicates are optional: verbal particles are not optional constituents; omission of the verbal particle causes radical change in the meaning of the phrase:

(23) a.　　Mari el–énekelte a　verset.
　　　　　Mary PRT–sang the song–ACC
　　　　　Mary has sung the song.
　　　b.　　Mari énekelte a　verset.
　　　　　Mary sung the song–ACC
　　　　　Mary was singing the song.

(24) a.　　A baba el–aludt.
　　　　　the baby PRT–slept
　　　　　The baby has fallen asleep.
　　　b.　　A baba aludt.
　　　　　the baby slept
　　　　　The baby was sleeping.

(ii)　　Secondary predicates can be stacked: verbal particles cannot be stacked:

(25) a.　　*Mari meg–le–át–írta　a levelet.
　　　　　Mary PRT–PRT–PRT–wrote the letter–ACC
　　　b.　　*A kalács　meg–ki–át–sült.
　　　　　the cake–NOM PRT–PRT–PRT–baked

215

(iii) Secondary predicates always introduce some kind of eventuality: É. Kiss (2006) states that verbal particles have little or no descriptive content (latter being the most common case); they merely mean that the individual affected by the given change has been totally affected, and it has attained the new state following the given change. The problem with this is following: if verbal particles have little or no descriptive content, they cannot express that something is totally affected, or that something has attained the new state, in other words, they cannot introduce a new eventuality. This is in fact the explanation for the missing second predication (P2), i. e. secondary resultative predication in examples (19) and (21).

It can be seen that the verbal particle cannot be recognized as secondary predicate. It not only failed to meet any of these criteria, but it didn't even meet the requirements of the definition of secondary predication (16).

What is then the verbal particle? If we look closer at following examples and compare their meanings, we see that the sentences with bare verbs express continuous events: (26a) describes an action (cutting) continued in the past period of time; (27a) describes a process (cooking of meat) continued in the past period of time. Contrarily, sentences with [verbal particle + V] complexes express merely an action or process that has been completed with respect to the present: (26b) expresses that the action of cutting came to an end, whilst (27b) indicates that the cooking process reached its end point.

The difference between these two sets of examples stems from the presence or absence of verbal particles; hence I claim that the function assigned to the verbal particles is marking the mere endpoint of the event. For this reason I refer to verbal particles as mere delimiters.

(26) a. Mari szeletelte a tortát.
Mary cut the cake–ACC
Mary was cutting the cake.

b. Mari fel–szeletelte a tortát. (=1b)
Mary PRT–cut the cake–ACC
Mary has cut the cake.

(27) a. A hús főtt. (=2b)
the meat cooked
The meat was cooking.

b. A hús meg–főtt.
the meat PRT–cooked
The meat has cooked.

4.2. The Hungarian resultative phrase: perhaps secondary predicate and delimiter?

I turn now to the Hungarian resultative phrase (case–marked adjective or sometimes case–marked NP) and allege that the Hungarian resultative phrase is indeed secondary predicate. To prove this I will follow the procedure I applied earlier, while checking the status of the verbal particle.

First, I examine whether the definition of secondary predication (16) (rephrasing of the phrase P into predications P1 and P2), holds for constructions with resultative phrase.

Rephrasing is possible in example (28). (28) expresses an event which is composed from two subevents: the first is expressed by the verb, and is formulated in P1 (29a), whilst the second is expressed by the case–marked adjective, and is formulated in P2 (29b). As can be seen, the predication P2 expresses the new state (greenness) of the fence, which arose from the event of painting (P1) expressed by the verb. The examples (30) and (32) can be rephrased in a similar manner, therefore we can say that examples (28), (30) and (32) are cases of secondary predication, or to be even more precise, they are cases of secondary resultative predication.

Further, it proves that É. Kiss is right when she claims that resultative phrases are predicated of the underlying direct internal arguments; and let me add, sometimes honorary objects, since the predication P2 always expresses the new state of this particular constituent.

(28)   Péter zöld–re festette a kerítést.
        Peter green–to painted the fence–ACC
        Peter painted the fence green.

(29) a. P1: Péter festette a kerítést.
            Peter has painted the fence.
     b. P2: A kerítés zöld.
             The fence is green.

(30)   Ágnes tisztá–ra mosta a lepedőt.
        Agnes clean–to washed the sheet–ACC
        Agnes washed the sheet clean.

(31) a. P1:   Ágnes mosta a lepedőt.
              Agnes has washed the sheet.
        P2:   A lepedő tiszta.
              The sheet is clean.

(32)   Mari piros–ra sírta a szemét.
        Mary red–to cried the eye–ACC
        Mary cried her eyes red.

(33) a. P1:   Mari sírt.
              Mary cried
              Mary has cried.
     b. P2:   Mari szeme piros.
              Mary–POSS eye red
              Mary's eyes are red.

The next step is testing with secondary predication tests.

(i)   Hungarian resultative phrases are not optional constituents: by leaving them aside the speaker alters the meaning of the structure significantly; thus with respect to verbal particles resultative phrases behave alike:

(34) a.   Mari simá–ra vasalta az inget.   [+R]
          Mary plain–to ironed the shirt
          Mary has ironed the shirt even.
     b.   Mari vasalta az inget.   [–R]
          Mary ironed the shirt–ACC
          Mary was ironing the shirt.
(35) a.   A kalács piros–ra sült.   [+R]
          the cake red–to baked
          The cake has baked golden brown.
     b.   A kalács sült.   [–R]
          the cake baked
          The cake was baking.

(ii)   Secondary predicates can be stacked: this criterion holds for Hungarian resultative phrases:
(36)   A kalács piros–ra, ropogós–ra és   ízletes–re sült.
       the cake   red–to   chrisp–to   and savory–to baked
       The cake has baked golden brown, frizzle, and savory.

(iii) Secondary predicates introduce some kind of eventuality: this is also true for Hungarian resultative phrases, because they express the new end state of the patient–like argument which arises when this particular argument is entirely affected. For example, in the sentence (37) the resultative phrase (case–marked adjective) *száraz–ra* 'dry–to' expresses the new end state of the loin (dryness) which came up as the result of the cook's frying; the case–marked adjective in (38) *puhá–ra* 'tender–to' expresses the new end state, i. e. tenderness that came up as the result of the completion of the event of cooking.
(37)   A szakács száraz–ra   sütötte a bélszínt.
       the cook   dry–to   fried the loin–ACC
       The cook fried the loin dry.
(38)   A hús   puhá–ra főtt.
       the meat tender–to cooked
       The meat has cooked tender.

These tests also show that the resultative phrase is in fact secondary predicate.

The last question to answer is, whether the resultative phrase is not only a secondary predicate but also a delimiter?

To answer this question, we are supposed to look at any of examples with resultative phrases cited in this paper (e. g. (28), (30), (32), (34–38)). By examining them we will see that in each case the resultative phrase expresses the *new state* in which the underlying direct internal argument, and occasionally the honorary object gets into when the event expressed by the verb is accomplished. This in effect indicates that resultative phrases in Hungarian are delimiters by nature, as they delimit by means of expressing the consequence of the event; this consequence can only come into existence when the event ex-

pressed by the verb comes to an end. Because of this, resultative phrases may well be identified as inherent delimiters.

In sum, as we have seen in this section, the differences between verbal participles and resultative phrases are so striking, that there is no reason to assume, the resultative phrase is the phrasal counterpart of the verbal particle.

5. Conclusion

This paper has argued that the analysis of verbal particles formulated in É. Kiss (2006) need some modifications.

The main goal was to see, whether the verbal particle is indeed a secondary predicate predicated of underlying direct internal argument, eventually honorary object. An additional goal was to check the status of resultative phrase to be able to judge, if it is really the phrasal counterpart of the verbal particle.

The analysis showed that the verbal particle cannot be recognized as secondary predicate: (i) it does not meet the requirements of the definition of secondary predication, i. e. constructions with verbal particles cannot be rephrased into predications P1 and P2. (ii) The verbal particle did not meet any of syntactic criteria a constituent has to meet in order to be accepted as secondary predicate. However, it became clear that the verbal particle marks the sheer endpoint of the event expressed by the verb, thus it is to be regarded as mere delimiter.

The analysis of resultative phrase (case–marked adjective or case–marked NP) led to the conclusion that this phrase is both secondary predicate and delimiter. (i) Every construction with resultative phrase can be rephrased in a manner described above: predication P1 always expresses the event described by the verb, whereas predication P2 formulates the new state of the underlying direct internal argument or eventually the honorary object. This means that the Hungarian resultative phrase is a secondary predicate, or more precisely it is a secondary resultative predicate. This claim is supported by secondary predication tests as well.

Additionally, the analysis showed that resultative phrases are inherent delimiters, given that they express the newly generated state in which the underlying direct internal argument and rarely the honorary object gets into, when the event expressed by the verb is accomplished.

References

Ackerman, Farrell–Gert Webelhuth 1998. *The theory of predicates*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Alberti, Gábor 1997. *Argument selection*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Bene, Annamária 2005. *Az igék bennható–mediális–tranzitív felosztásának alkalmazhatósága magyar szintaktikai és morfológiai sajátosságok magyarázatában*. PhD dissertation. Budapest: Loránd Eötvös University.

Burzio, Luigi 1986. *Italian syntax: a government–binding approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Dowty, David 1979. *Word meaning and Montague grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

É. Kiss, Katalin 2006. The function and the syntax of the verbal particle. In É. Kiss, Katalin ed., 2006. *Event structure and the Left Periphery*. Dordrecht: Springer. http://www.nytud.hu/oszt/elmnyelv/ekiss/publ/The%20function%20and%20the%20syntax%20of%20the%20verbal%20particle.pdf

Goddard, Daniéle 2006. Predicat secondaire. In Daniéle Goddard–Laurent Roussarie–Francis Hajdú, Péter 1981. *Az uráli nyelvészet alapkérdései*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.

Corblin éd., 2006. *Sémanticloplédie: dictionnaire de sémantique*. GDR Sémantique & Modélisation, CNRS. http://www.semantique–gdr.net/dico/

Gouesse, Marie–Josephe–Kiefer, Ferenc. La prédication secondaire en français et en hongrois. To appear in *Cahiers d'etudes hongroises*.

Kiefer, Ferenc 2006. *Aspektus és akcióminoség különös tekintettel a magyar nyelvre*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Komlósy, András 1992. Régensek és vonzatok. In Kiefer, Ferenc ed., 1992. *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan 1. Mondattan*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 299–527.

Laczkó, Tibor 1995. *The syntax of Hungarian noun phrases. A lexical–functional approach*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Levin, Beth–Malka Rappaport Hovav 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the syntax–lexical semantics interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka–Beth Levin 2001. An event structure account of English resultatives. *Language* 77: 766–797.

Rothstein, Susan 2004. *Structuring events*. London: Blackwell.

Simpson, Jane 1983. Resultatives. In Lori Levin–Malka Rappaport–Annie Zaenen eds., 1983. *Papers in lexical–functional grammar*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club. 143–157.

Verspoor, Cornelia M. 1997. *Contextuality dependent lexical semantics*. PhD dissertation. Edinburgh, UK: University of Edinburgh.

Wechsler, Stephen 1997. Resultative predicates and control. *Texas Linguistics Forum* 38: 307–321.

Koja je prava funkcija glagolskih prefikasa u mađarskom jeziku

U radu se razmatra najnovija analiza glagolskih prefikasa u mađarskome, prema kojoj je glagolski prefiks sekundarni predikat koji pripada izravnom unutarnjem argumentu.

Ispitivanjem glagolskog prefiksa s obzirom na mađarsku sekundarnu rezultativnu predikaciju pokazat ćemo da treba preispitati funkciju koju je navedena analiza pripisala ovomu morfemu. Nadalje, također ćemo pokazati da rezultativna fraza nije frazni pandan glagolskog prefiksa.

Glagolski prefiks ne može se smatrati sekundarnim predikatom jer ne zadovoljava uvjete za sekundarni predikat: konstrukcije s glagolskim prefiksima ne mogu se pretvoriti u predikacije P1 i P2. Međutim, jasno je da glagolski prefiks u mađarskome označava tek krajnju točku događaja izraženog glagolom te ga treba smatrati samo označiteljem krajnje točke glagolske radnje.

Analiza rezultativnih fraza dovodi do zaključka da je taj tip fraze istovremeno i sekundarni predikat i označitelj krajnje točke glagolske radnje. Točnije, svaka konstrukcija s rezultativnom frazom može se izraziti i na gore navedeni način: predikacija P1 uvijek izražava događaj kako ga opisuje glagol, dok predikacija P2 formulira novo stanje izravnog unutarnjeg argumenta ili pseudoobjekta. To znači da je mađarska rezultativna fraza sekundarni predikat, ili preciznije, sekundarni rezultativni predikat.

Također smo pokazali da su rezultativne fraze inherentni označitelji krajnje točke glagolske radnje, pod uvjetom da izražavaju novonastalo stanje u kojem se nalaze izravni unutarnji argument, rjeđe pseudoobjekt, kada je događaj iskazan glagolom ostvaren.

Key words: verbal particle, delimiter, resultative phrase, secondary predication
Ključne riječi: glagolski prefiks, označitelj krajnje točke glagolske radnje, rezultativna fraza, sekundarna predikacija