Word order variation in Hungarian PPs

Aims and claims: In this talk we focus on Hungarian postpositions (Ps) that take an oblique-marked (PP) complement. We show that while the literature makes claims about the class as a whole, there are important, so far unnoticed differences between the word order possibilities of different Ps as well as the word order possibilities of different readings of the same element. Furthermore, we show that there are so far unnoticed correlations between different types of extraction out of the PP. We claim that the differences within the class can be accounted for by assuming (i) that all Ps are generated within a PP extended with a functional projection (which we call pP), and (ii) that particles are in fact functional adpositions, generated in the p head.

Previous claims: Hungarian has two types of postpositions. 'Dressed'/agreeing Ps take morphologically unmarked (DP) complements that they always immediately follow, while 'naked'/non-agreeing Ps take oblique marked (PP) complements and their word order is freer. As for possible word orders, the literature claims that apart from the default DP > P order, non-agreeing Ps also allow (i) the order P > DP, (ii) the order DP > degree modifier > P, and (iii) P-stranding. Additionally, (iv) the same elements may act as verbal particles (Marácz 1986, Asbury 2008, among others), and (v) have an intransitive use. However, none of these properties characterize all non-agreeing Ps, and the differences can be given a syntactic account.

Analysis: We propose a structure for PPs that includes positions for Ps denoting place and path, and a functional position p for adpositions with oblique complements and for particles (for cross-linguistic proposals cf. Van Riemsdijk 1990, Cinque and Rizzi 2010, etc.). The elements in p are the ones with freer word order properties, and they can be separated from their complement (PathP/PlaceP). This derives the differences we observe within the class of adpositions.

(1) $[_{pP}$ particle/non-agreeing P $[_{PathP}$ Path $[_{PlaceP}$ Place DP $]\,]\,]$

Differences wrt complements: Most non-agreeing Ps can occur without an overt complement indeed, cf. (2), but we show that this is not true for all of them, cf. (3).

(2)   A   bolt szemben van.
     the store opposite be.3SG
     'The store is opposite (to here).'

(3)   *A   bolt innen   van.
     the store this.side.of be.3SG
     'The store is on this side.'

The literature takes uses like (2) to be an intransitive use. We claim that the Figure is always located with respect to an implicit Ground *here/there*, the spatial center of deixis of the discourse. On the basis of this semantic evidence, we argue that non-agreeing Ps always have a complement, and in examples like (2) the Ground is a phonologically null *here/there* (cf. Kayne 2005): $[_{pP}$ non-agreeing P $[_{PlaceP/PathP}$ (~~here/there~~) $]$. It is those non-agreeing Ps that allow an overt *here/there* complement that also allow the 'intransitive' use. However, a few Ps do not allow an overt *here/there* complement, and these do not allow the 'intransitive' use either. This provides syntactic evidence for our proposal that the 'intransitive' use in fact involves a phonologically null *here/there* complement.

Differences wrt PP-internal orderings: In their most neutral PP-internal position, adpositions immediately follow their complement. It has been claimed that non-agreeing Ps also allow the DP > degree modifier > P order and they may occur in the P > DP order. We demonstrate, however, that the latter order is much more restricted than the

former: some non-agreeing Ps reject the P-initial order entirely (e.g. (7)), while the DP > degree modifier > P order is mostly grammatical. There is a correlation between the P > DP order and the the DP > degree modifier > PP order: the prepositional order is either as good as or is worse than the separated postpositional order.

(4) az út-on teljesen végig
    the road-sup all along
    'all along the road'

(5) végig az út-on
    along the road-sup
    'all along the road'

(6) a vonal-on közvetlenül alul
    the line-sup immediately below
    'right below the line'

(7) *alul a vonal-on
    below the line-sup
    'below the line'

Differences wrt separability in the clause: It has also been claimed that non-agreeing Ps are separable from their complement: (i) they can act as verbal modifiers (i.e. occur in the immediately preverbal position, with the complement being topicalized/focused or postverbal), and (ii) they can be stranded when the complement is wh-moved. We show, however, that non-agreeing Ps are not uniform in this respect either; separation produces degraded or ungrammatical expressions for some of them. At the same time, there is no significant asymmetry between the two kinds of separation (verbal modifier position or P-stranding); those Ps that allow the one also allow the other. We propose that separable adpositions are generated in the functional p head, and their complement (PathP/PlaceP) can be extracted, while the DP complement of Path and Place cannot.

(8) János át-ment a híd-on
    John throught-went the bridge-sup
    'John crossed the bridge.'

(9) Mi-n ment át János?
    what-sup went through John
    'What did John cross?'

(10) *A ház túl van a folyó-n.
     the house over be.3sg the river-sup
     'The house is across the river.'

(11) *Mi-n van túl a híd?
     what-sup be over the bridge
     What is the bridge across?

Separability also correlates with the possibility of P > DP order, and this is also explained if the adposition is generated in a higher head in prepositional structures.

Extensions: It is known that even if a P is separable from its complement on a spatial reading, it is never separable from it on the temporal reading (Marácz 1984). We will give an account for this difference as well. Furthermore, we will show that there exists another, so far unnoticed semantic restriction: some non-agreeing Ps are more easily separable on abstract readings than on spatial readings (e.g. *túl van valamin* 'be over sth', *kívül esik valamin* 'fall outside of sth').

References: Asbury, A. 2008. The morphosyntax of case and adpositions. PhD thesis, University of Utrecht. ● Cinque G. and L. Rizzi (eds.) *Mapping Spatial PPs*. Oxford: OUP. ● Kayne, R. 2005. *Here* and *there*. In: *Movement and silence*, 65–84. New York: OUP. ● Marácz, L. 1984. Postposition stranding in Hungarian. In W. Abraham and S. de Meij (eds.): *Groninger arbeiten zur germanistischen linguistik* 24, 127–161. Groningen: University of Groningen. ● Marácz, L. 1986. Dressed or naked: the case of the PP in Hungarian. In: W. Abraham and S. de Meij (eds.): *Topic, focus, and configurationality*, 223–252. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. ● Riemsdijk, Henk van. 1990. Functional prepositions. In H. Pinkster and I. Genee (eds.) *Unity in diversity: papers presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50th birthday*. 229–241. Dordrecht: Foris.