Revisiting non-parting verbal particles in Hungarian

Chenchen (Julio) Song
Gonville & Caius College, University of Cambridge

In Modern Hungarian, verbal particles are normally left behind by finite verbs in non-neutral (i.e. focused, negated, interrogative) sentences, as in (1). (1a) is a neutral sentence, where the particle *el* precedes the finite verb *olvasta* "read"; (1b) is a non-neutral sentence with sentential negation, and the same particle follows the verb. Particle inversion is a basic pattern in the language.

(1) a. *János **el**-olvas-ta a könyv-et.*　　　　　　　　(neutral, PRT>V)
　　　 John　 PRT-read-PST　the book-ACC
　　　 "John read through the book."

　　 b. *János nem olvas-ta **el** a könyv-et.*　　　　　　(non-neutral, V>PRT)
　　　 John　 not　 read-PST　 PRT　the book-ACC
　　　 "John didn't read through the book."

However, there are cases where particle verbs systematically do not invert. First, inversion does not happen in infinitive clauses (É. Kiss 2002, Bródy 1990), as in (2a). Second, inversion does not happen in some derived verbs (Dékány & Hegedűs 2015), as in (2b).

(2) a. *Nem tudtam kit **meg**-hív-ni /*hív-ni meg.*　　　(*wh*-infinitive, PRT>V)
　　　 not　 knew-I　whom　PRT-invite-INF
　　　 "I did't know whom to invite."

　　 b. *János nem **fel**-vételiz-ett/*vételiz-ett fel az egyetem-re.*　(negation, PRT>V)
　　　 John　 not　PRT-take entrance exam-PST　 the　university-to
　　　 "John didn't take the entrance exam."

(2a) has an embedded infinitive *wh*-clause, but the particle precedes the base verb. In (2b), *felvételizik*_V "take entrance exam" is derived from *felvételi*_N "entrance exam"; in the presence of negation, *fel* precedes *vételizett* (NB *vételizik* is not an independent verb).

　　　 Third, there is also no particle inversion when the particle is in the frequentative form, i.e. the reduplicated form (Ackerman & LeSourd 1997, Piñon 1991), as in (3).

(3) a. *János nem ?**ki-ki**-néz-ett/*néz-ett ki-ki az ablak-on.*　　(negation, ?PRT>V)
　　　 John　 not　PRT-PRT-look-PST　　　　 the window-on
　　　 "John didn't keep looking out of the window."

　　 b. *JÁNOS ?**ki-ki**-néz-ett/*néz-ett ki-ki az ablak-on.*　　　(focus, ?PRT>V)
　　　 John　　PRT-PRT-look-PST　　　　 the window-on
　　　 "It was John that kept looking out of the window."

Note that for native speakers even the non-inverted orders in (3) sound bad. In our survey, we got the following alternative expressions instead, where the speakers fix the sentences by extraposition.

(4) a. *Nem igaz, hogy János **ki-ki**-néz-ett az ablak-on.*　　(extraposed Neg, PRT>V)
　　　 not true that John PRT-PRT-look-PST the window-on
　　　 "It is not true that John kept looking out of the window."

　　 b. *JÁNOS volt az, aki **ki-ki**-néz-ett az ablak-on.*　　(extraposed Foc, PRT>V)
　　　 John　was that who PRT-PRT-look-PST the window-on
　　　 "John was the one who kept looking out of the window."

There has been no comparative study of the three scenarios altogether, so we will propose one. We notice a similarity between infinitive and derived particle verbs that differentiate them from reduplicated particles: though infinitive and derived particle verbs do not invert, they can still be moved as a whole (5a-b); the same is not true for reduplicated particles (5c).

(5) a. *János **MEG**-HÍV-NI szeretné Mari-t.*　　　(infinitive moved to FocP)

　　　 John　 PRT-invite-INF would love Mary-ACC
　　　 "John would love to *invite* (not anything other action) Mary."

b. ***Fel***-*vételiz-z*   *az egyetem-re.*   (derived verb moved to CP)
    PRT-take entrance exam-IMP the university-to
    "Take an entrance exam!"

c. ****Ki-ki***-*néz-z*   *az ablak-on.*   (reduplicated particle verb)
    PRT-PRT-look-IMP the window-on
    "Intended: Keep looking out of the window!"

In (5a), the infinitive particle verb is focalized and so moved into FocP; in (5b), the derived particle verb is used imperatively, which is also a function of the C-domain. In (5c), by contrast, the reduplicated particle verb cannot be used imperatively. Thus, we can generalize that reduplicated particle verbs are immobile and only grammatical in situ. This explains why speakers prefer (4); it is because the particle verb remains in situ in (4) but not (3), despite their identical non-inverted order.

    We adopt É. Kiss' analysis for infinitive and Dékány & Hegedűs' analysis for derived particle verbs, which have separate motivations but both identify categorial change as the reason for the non-parting behavior of these particles: the infinitive suffix *-ni* is also a nominalizer which "recategorizes" the V into N, and derived particle verbs are "recategorized" from Ns into Vs, as in (6).

(6) a. [[*meg-hív*]$_V$-*ni*]$_N$ b. [[*fel-vételi*]$_N$-*z(ik)*]$_V$

Since categorizers are phase heads (Marantz 2001), verbal particles are "frozen" in the phase domain together with the verb roots, but since the recategorized N/V are simple nodes on the clausal spine, as in (7) (based on (2)), they can still be moved as a whole, e.g. to the C-domain.

(7) a. [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ *tudtam*] [$_{XP}$ [$_N$ *meghívni*]…]] b. [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ *felvételizett*] [$_{PP}$ *az egyetemre*]]

    Reduplicated particle verbs do not have category-changing suffixes (which are generally overt in Hungarian) and therefore do not involve recategorization as depicted above. Since reduplicated particles denote the frequentative aspect, we treat their peculiar syntactic behavior as a derivational byproduct. More specifically, we assume this reduplication to be morphosyntactic where the relevant formal features are doubled (cf. Inkelas & Zoll 2005). Assuming (8a) to be the minimal structure for particle verb (cf. É. Kiss 2008), reduplication would bring in i.a. another verbalizer (8b).

(8) a. [$_{PredP}$ [Prt] [$_{PredP}$ Pred [$_V$ √-*v*]]]   b. …[$_{VP}$ √-*v* [$_{PredP}$ [Prt] [$_{PredP}$ Pred [$_V$ √-*v*]]]]

Though this is not for the sake of recategorization, the phasehood of the verbalizer duplicate is still effective, which blocks the particle verb from further movement. NB while the base verb is spelled out only once (presumably because there can be only one non-coordinated finite inflecting verb in a sentence), the particle must be phonologically doubled, for a null reduplication is unlearnable. This predicts that simple verbs without particles cannot be reduplicated for frequentative. Indeed, the frequentative aspect of simple verbs can only be formed via a dedicated suffix *-gAt* (9), which presumably occupies an Inner Aspect (cf. Travis 2010) position within VoiceP (Kratzer 1996).

(9) *beszél* "speak", *beszél-beszél "speak repeatedly", *beszélget* "speak repeatedly; chat"

The above analysis bears out two further empirical facts. First, the particle duplicate modifies neither the base particle nor the particle verb, e.g. *ki-ki-néz* "out-out-look" means neither "[look [out out]]" nor "[[look out] out]", but "keep looking out", as the frequentativity is not yielded by modification, but by feature reduplication. Second, since frequentativity relies on formal reduplication, the doubled features must be in a local relation, i.e. not only the base verb, but the entire reduplication, is blocked in situ, so in *ki-ki-néz* none of *néz*, *ki-néz*, and *ki-ki-néz* is mobile.

    In sum, the non-parting verbal particles in all the three scenarios are essentially phase effect of the categorizers. Infinitive and derived particle verbs are recategorized, while reduplicated particle verbs are blocked. We attribute this distinction to two ways to merge a categorizer. A root or chunk adjoined to a categorizer is (re)categorized and no longer interacts with the main derivational plane (Chomsky 2001), while a complement of it remains in the main plane and bears the "side effects".