1. INTRODUCTION
This talk is concerned with the syntactic representation of event/inner aspect in Hungarian. Although there is a sizeable literature on some Hungarian aspectual markers (i.e. verbal particles and result/goal-denoting predicates), there is no consensus on the right analysis regarding their syntactic behaviour.

In this talk, our main goal is to attribute the aspectual (event-structural) interpretations associated with the different telicity-marking elements to the syntactic configuration characterizing these elements.

There are two main claims that we will be arguing for:

(i) In line with previous literature on the syntax of event aspect (see, for example, Ritter & Rosen 2005; MacDonald 2008; Travis 2010), we propose that Hungarian also has an aspectual functional projection (Asp₁P) within the verbal domain sandwiched between VP and vP, which is directly responsible for the aspectual interpretations that we refer to as weak telicity effects, induced by subcategorized measuring-out objects (Tenny 1994) of creation/consumption predicates (CCOs) and non-subcategorized pseudo-objects (POs).

(ii) In addition, we also argue for a second inner aspectual functional projection (Asp₂P_MAX_E) above vP, which is directly responsible for strong telicity effects induced by verbal particles (VPrtTs) and result/goal-denoting predicates (RPs).¹
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In this research we aim to provide further evidence for the articulated VP-structure assumed in Ritter & Rosen (2005), MacDonald (2008), Travis (2010), among others. More specifically, we would like to propose a theory of inner aspect/telicity in Hungarian.

¹ The two-way distinction between weak telicity and strong telicity is not a novel idea. Filip (2014), for example, proposes this distinction on the basis of a semantic difference between predicates that she associates with weak telicity and those characterized by strong telicity. She claims that this distinction boils down to the fact that the latter express monotonic changes of state and thus entail telicity, whereas the former are not characterized by a monotonic relation and so telicity in the case of such predicates is just an implicature. In this talk we explore the syntactic representation of weak and strong telicity.
In Section 2 we provide a quick introduction to aspectual markers in Hungarian: we begin with some important generalizations about these marking elements and then we move on to some previous proposals as to the syntax of these elements.

In Section 3 we illustrate the divide between grammatical and situation aspect in Hungarian and also review the most important characteristics of the VP-structure assumed in this work.

In Section 4 we propose a phrase structure representation of telicity markers in Hungarian.

In Section 5 we discuss some consequences of the theory.

Section 6 concludes.

2. PREVIOUS LITERATURE ON HUNGARIAN ASPECTUAL MARKERS

2.1 Some important generalizations

Grammatical aspect (perfectivity) has long been at the forefront of attention in the literature on Hungarian (see Wacha 1989, 2001; Kiefer 1992, 1994, 2006; É. Kiss 2002; Alberti 2004; among others), but the study of inner aspect is relatively new in Hungarian aspectology (see, for example, É. Kiss 2004, 2005, 2008; Csirmaz 2008a, 2008b; Kardos 2012, 2016).

In this section we summarize some important generalizations that have been made about event aspectual markers in the literature.

(i) Telic interpretations can arise in the presence of:

(a) verbal particles (2) and result/goal-denoting predicates (3) (cf. Csirmaz 2008a; É. Kiss 2008; Kardos 2012, 2016)
(b) subcategorized created-consumed objects (4) (cf. Wacha 1978; Kiefer 1992, 2006; Maleczki 1995, 2008; É. Kiss 2005, 2008; Csirmaz 2008a; Piñón 2008)
(c) non-subcategorized pseudo-objects (5) (cf. Piñón 2001; Csirmaz 2008b; Farkas 2017a, 2017b).

(2) a. János egy órá-ig/*egy óra alatt vasalt.  (atelic)
   János an hour-for/*an hour under ironed
   ‘János ironed for an hour.’

b. János egy óra alatt/*egy órá-ig ki-vasalt.  (telic)
   János an hour under/*an hour-for PRT-ironed
   ‘János ironed all the things that had to be ironed in an hour.’

(3) a. Péter 10 perc-ig/10 perc alatt kalapált egy vaslemezt.  (atelic/telic)
   Péter 10 min-for 10 min under hammered an iron sheet. ACC
   ‘Péter hammered an iron sheet for 10 minutes.’

b. Péter 10 perc alatt/10 perc-ig lapos-ra kalapált egy vaslemezt.  (telic)
   Péter 10 min under 10 min-for flat-into hammered an iron sheet. ACC
   ‘Péter hammered an iron sheet flat in 10 minutes.’

(4) a. Mari 10 perc alatt/10 perc-ig ivott egy sört.  (atelic/telic)
   Mari 10 min under 10 min-for drank a beer. ACC
   ‘Mari drank a beer in/for 10 minutes.’

b. Mari egy óra alatt/egy órá-ig sütött egy kalácsot.  (atelic/telic)
   Mari an hour under/ an hour-for baked a sweet bread. ACC
   ‘Mari baked a loaf of sweet bread in an hour/for an hour.’

(5) a. Mari táncolt.  (atelic)
   Mari danced
   ‘Mari danced.’

b. Mari táncolt egyet /egy jót /egy nagyot.  (telic)
   Mari danced one. ACC one good. ACC one big. ACC
   ‘Mari performed a dancing event/had a nice dancing experience/performed a good amount of dance.’
The first two strategies of telicity marking are well-known from English:

(6) a. John wiped the table for/in 10 minutes.  
b. John wiped the table **clean** in/*for 10 minutes.  

(7) a. Peter ate **apples** for/*in 10 minutes.  
b. Peter ate the apple (**up**) in/*? for 10 minutes.  

The third strategy is more difficult to illustrate with examples from other languages. Regarding its semantic properties, a somewhat similar telicizing element is the prefix *po-* in Polish and other Slavic languages (cf. Piñón 1994, Kozlowska-MacGregor 2005, Zinova & Osswald 2018).

(8) a. Irenka **czytała** wczoraj gazetę.  
Irenka read yesterday newspaper.**ACC**  
‘Irenka was reading the newspaper yesterday.’  
b. Irenka **prze-czytała** wczoraj gazetę.  
Irenka **prze-read** yesterday newspaper.**ACC**  
‘Irenka read the newspaper yesterday.’  
c. Irenka **po-czytała** wczoraj gazetę.  
Irenka **po-read** yesterday newspaper.**ACC**  
‘Irenka read the newspaper (for a while) yesterday.’  
(adapted from Piñón 1994: 341, (1a)-(1c))

Piñón (1994) uses a number of diagnostics to show that pofective verbs exhibit features of both perfectives and imperfectives. He also argues that *po-* has the meaning of a durative adverbial with a contextual parameter and that given the analysis of *po-* as a derived measure function, pofective verbs are associated with quantized reference, similarly to perfective verbs.

The subsequent discussion will reveal that Hungarian verbal predicates containing pseudo-objects like *egyet* ‘one.**ACC**’ also have quantized reference, similarly to predicates containing verbal particles or result predicates (Kardos 2012, 2016) and their interpretation is also contingent on context, in which respect they contrast with particle verbs.

But pofective verbs are also different from Hungarian *egyet*-type expressions in that the former allow *for*-adverbials and disallow the adverbial *prawie* ‘almost’, while the latter disallow *for*-adverbials and can co-occur with the adverbial *majdnem* ‘almost’.

(ii) In neutral sentences (affirmatives without narrow focus, negation, etc.) particles and result predicates must appear with specific themes (É. Kiss 2008; Kardos 2012, 2016).

(9) a. *Péter le-festett kerítéseket.  
Péter PRT-painted fences.**ACC**  
‘Péter painted fences.’  
b. Péter le-festett egy/három kerítést.  
Péter PRT-painted an/three fences.**ACC**  
‘Péter painted a fence/three fences.’  

Slavic languages also show this behaviour, as has been pointed out by numerous scholars including Wierzbicka (1967), Forsyth (1970), Filip (1999, 2008) and Slabakova (2004). Here we illustrate this with Russian examples from Slabakova (2004) and Polish examples from Filip (2008).
(10) a. ja yel gruši /tort (Russian)
    I eat-PAST.1sg pears.ACC cake.ACC
    ‘I was eating (some) pears/cake.’

b. ja s-yel gruši /tort (telic)
    I PERF-eat-PAST.1sg pears.ACC cake.ACC
    ‘I ate all the pears/the whole cake.’

(Slabakova 2004: 128, (4) and (5))

(11) a. On jadł kaszę / oliwki. (Polish)
    he.NOM ate porridge.SG.ACC olives.PL.ACC
i. He was eating (some/∅/the) porridge/olives.
    ‘He was eating some of the porridge/olives.’

ii. He ate (some/∅/the) porridge/olives.’

b. On zjadł kaszę / oliwki. (telic)
    he.NOM PREF.ate porridge.SG.ACC olives.PL.ACC
    ‘He ate (up) (all) the porridge / olives.’

(Filip 2008: 250, (38b) and (38a))

(iii) Events that have an inherent endpoint must be overtly marked (Kardos 2012, 2016). This is evidenced by the fact that achievements and degree verbs associated with closed scales (Wechsler 2005) must contain a verbal predicate or a result predicate (Komlósy 1994; Szili 2001; É. Kiss 2005, 2008; Dékány 2008; Kardos 2012, 2016; Hegedűs 2017).

(12) János *(meg)-halt. (achievements)
    János PRT-died
    ‘János died.’

(13) János *(ki)-ürítette a hűtőt. (degree verb associated with closed scale)
    János PRT-emptied the fridge.ACC
    ‘János emptied the fridge.’

That situation aspect/telicity must be marked overtly is not unique to Hungarian. For example, as shown in Rice (2000) and Travis (2010), specific situation markers must appear in the sentence in Slave and Navajo for strict telicity to obtain. Vietnamese (Fukoda 2007) and Malagasy (Travis 2005, 2010) have also been shown to overtly mark event-boundedness.

(iv) The class of telicity markers is heterogeneous. Whereas verbal particles, result predicates and pseudo-objects ensure strict telicity with respect to the verbal predicate, created/consumed objects give rise to aspectual variability (Kardos 2012, 2016).

(14) a. János 10 perc alatt/*10 perc-ig meg-evett egy almát.
    János 10 min under/10 min-for PRT-ate an apple.ACC
    ‘János ate an apple in 10 minutes.’

b. János 10 perc-ig/10 perc alatt evett egy almát.
    János 10 min-for/10 min under ate an apple.ACC
    ‘János ate an apple in 10 minutes/for 10 minutes.’
2.2 More recent claims as to the syntax of event aspectual markers

The syntax of verbal particles

- It is verbal particles and result predicates that have generated the most amount of research in the past few decades regarding aspectualizers in Hungarian. According to the most influential analysis, the verbal particle is a secondary predicate that merges in the postverbal domain of the Hungarian sentence and, in a one-step derivation, moves to the specifier position of PredP, situated above VP, to check the predicative feature of the head (É. Kiss 2004, 2008), whereas the V moves to Pred in the course of the derivation. The telicizing effect of the particle is a direct consequence of its lexical semantics.

     János PRT-read the newspaper.ACC

b. János [PredP el [Pred olvasta [VP V az újságot ]]]

- Surányi (2009) proposes a two-step derivation of verbal particles and result predicates whereby they first move from their base-generated postverbal position to [Spec, PredP] sandwiched between VP and vP and then to [Spec, TP] to check the EPP feature of T.

- Hegedűs & Dékány (2015) argue for multiple classes of particles: they take regular particles/ result predicates to be small clause predicates in the complement zone of V and also propose that inseparable particles are merged in a specifier position ([Spec, PredP]) in the extended vP.

- More recently, Hegedűs (2017) provided a preliminary syntactic account of result/end-point encoding elements in Hungarian. Her main concern is the structural characterization of the cross-linguistic variation between verb-framed and satellite-framed languages (Talmy 1985, 2000).²

On this view, particles appear as p heads in the syntax, where pPs are complements of V and the internal argument occupies the specifier of this complement.


The syntax of pseudo-objects

- Similarly to particles, pseudo-objects like egyet ‘one.ACC’, egy jót ‘one good.ACC’, egy nagyot ‘one big.ACC’ have been argued to merge within vP and move to [Spec, PredP] when they precede the verb. The telicity of predicates containing such pseudo-objects has been regarded as a matter of semantics (Csirmaz 2008b).

2.3 Why propose a novel analysis?

- The analyses briefly discussed above mostly address particles in isolation focusing on their syntactic distribution and they generally do not devote much attention to various co-occurrence restrictions and the event-structural effects that the different aspectual markers are associated with. Thus a theory of telicity in Hungarian is lacking.

- To fill this void, in this research we propose a syntactic analysis of the three classes of aspectual markers identified so far, where we pay special attention to how the event structural effects characterizing these elements are to be represented in the structure of the Hungarian sentence.

² Hungarian differs from V-framed languages (e.g. Spanish) and also from English, a weak S-framed language, in that results/goal points must be separately instantiated in this language. Particles never incorporate into the V head, and there is no N incorporation into Ps, which in turn incorporate into Vs (see Hale & Keyser 2002 on denominal verbs like shelf).
3. THE FRAMEWORK IN A NUTSHELL
Main assumptions regarding aspectual categories and the structure of the verb phrase

3.1 Viewpoint/grammatical/outer aspect versus situation/lexical/inner aspect
- Following Smith (1991, 1997), we distinguish between viewpoint/grammatical/outer and situation/lexical/inner aspect in this work. Evidence for these distinct, albeit related, aspectual categories with respect to Hungarian has been provided by Csirmaz (2008a). Here we only illustrate the perfective-imperfective distinction with the examples in (17), where inner aspect is kept constant; both sentences contain a telic predicate.

(17) a. Kati fel-mászott a fá-ra.          (perfective, telic)
    Kati PRT-climbed the tree-onto
    ‘Kati climbed the tree.’

b. Kati ’mászott ’fel a ’fá-ra,   amikor … (progressive, telic)
    Kati climbed PRT the tree-onto,  when …
    ‘Kati was climbing up the tree when …’

The perfective-imperfective contrast is reflected in word order differences. Whereas in (17a) the particle fel precedes the verb, in (17b) it follows it. Grammatical aspectual differences are also reflected in the prosody of the Hungarian sentence. Consider (18).

(18) a. János ivott egy limonádét.
    János drank a lemonade.ACC
    ‘János drank a lemonade.’

b. János ’ivott egy ’limonádét,   amikor …
    János drank a lemonade.ACC,  when …
    ‘János was drinking a lemonade, when …’

The sentences in (18a) and (18b), and also in (17a) and (17b), are different regarding the stress pattern they are associated with. The sign ’ indicates primary stress in the (b) sentences.

In what follows we will keep grammatical aspect constant, as the analysis of this aspectual category is beyond the scope of this paper. The Hungarian examples in the rest of the paper are meant to receive a perfective interpretation.

3.2 The structure of the VP
- As far as the structure of the verb phrase is concerned, we follow Ritter & Rosen (2005), MacDonald (2008) and Travis (2010) in assuming two VP shells (Larson 1988) and in claiming that there is an inflectional aspectual category sandwiched between these VPs (called Asp₁P in this paper).
- The lower V is responsible for introducing the internal argument and the upper v introduces the external argument.
- There are multiple positions in the articulated VP that have been claimed to figure into the calculation of inner aspectual interpretations. Travis (2010) argues for three positions that languages can utilize in different ways:

  (i) X, the head of the complement of the lower V (where X is often an A or a P in English, and XP is a result predicate or a goal PP)
  (ii) Asp₁ (expressed by morphemes in Malagasy and Chinese) and the derived object position in [Spec, Asp₁P], which is one possible landing site for DP movement within the VP; this specifier position is occupied by incremental themes
  (iii) the upper v head, which is a light verb corresponding to CAUSE. This position is argued by Slabakova (1997) to be occupied by Slavic (more specifically, Bulgarian) perfective prefixes.
The different positions have important consequences with respect to the interpretation of the theme DP in the verbal predicate. For example, telicity-marking elements in the upper v impose semantic restrictions on the theme DP such that it must be specific by virtue of having this DP in their c-commanding domain.

4. THE PROPOSAL
In this section we provide arguments for two positions directly responsible for telic interpretations in the structure of the Hungarian sentence:

(i) the derived object position in [Spec, Asp₁P], where created/consumed objects and pseudo-objects exert their telicizing function

(ii) [Spec, Asp₂P_{MAX}], where particles and result predicates exert their telicizing function

4.1 Created-consumed objects
CCOs in Hungarian, similarly to English, German, Dutch and Spanish, can measure out events (Tenny 1994) when associated with quantized reference (Wacha 1978; Kiefer 1992, 2006; Maleczki 1995, 2008; É. Kiss 2005, 2008; Csirmaz 2008a; Piñón 2008). Crucially, however, these objects can just as easily give rise to atelic interpretations, as shown in (20).

(20) Mari 10 perc alatt /10 perc-ig ivott egy limonádét. Mary 10 min under 10 min-for drank a lemonade.ACC ‘Mary drank a lemonade in/for 10 minutes.’

Kardos (2012, ms) argues that it is the unique homomorphic relation that obtains between the part structure of the scalar argument of creation/consumption predicates and that of the theme that gives rise to aspectual variability effects. In the case of non-creation/non-consumption predicates, where the scale encoded in the head verb is independent of the theme, as in (21), predicates containing a quantized theme and a base verb are obligatorily atelic.

(21) a. A munkások egy év-ig/*egy év alatt szélesítettek egy utat. the workers a year-for/a year under widened a road.ACC ‘The workers widened a road for a year.’

b. A pincér 10 perc-ig/??10 perc alatt melegített egy tányért. the server 10 min-for/10 min under warmed a plate.ACC ‘The server warmed a plate for 10 minutes.’
• We propose that, as subcategorized, thematic and referential internal arguments, CCOs merge in the canonical direct object position inside VP and move from this base-generated logical object position to the derived object position ([Spec, Asp₁P]) when they delimit the event of the verb. This optional one-stage derivation is characterized by the verb undergoing head movement from V to (at least) v:

\[ \ldots TP \]
\[ T \quad Asp₂P \]
\[ \quad Asp₂P \]
\[ \quad vP \]
\[ \quad v' \]
\[ \quad v-V \quad Asp₁P \]
\[ \quad CCO \quad Asp₁' \]
\[ \quad Asp₁ \quad VP \]
\[ \quad \Psi \quad CCO \]

• That atelic interpretations are also available with objects whose quantity is known is in line with recent analyses in the literature, according to which aspectual markers merged lower in the syntactic structure are associated with a cancellable telicity (Travis 2010).

• Once a particle appears in the predicate, however, which, as we argue below, occupies a higher position, telicity is not cancellable (Kardos 2016).

(23) Mari 10 perc alatt/*10 perc-ig meg-ivott egy limonádét.
Mari 10 min under/*10 min-for PRT-drunk a lemonade.ACC
‘Mari drank a lemonade in 10 minutes.’

Recall the data from Polish, where a telic reading is available (but cancellable) with imperfective verbs, and a telic reading is required with perfective verbs (Filip 2008: 250-251).

(11) a. On jadł¹ kaszę /oliwki. (Polish)
he.NOM ate porridge.SG.ACC olives.PL.ACC
i. He was eating (some/∅/the) porridge/olives.
‘He was eating some of the porridge/olives.’
ii. He ate (some/∅/the) porridge/olives.’

b. On zjadł² kaszę /oliwki.
he.NOM Pref.ate porridge.SG.ACC olives.PL.ACC
‘He ate (up) (all) the porridge / olives.’ (Filip 2008: 250, (38b) and (38a))

• But why is it that the English counterpart of (20) is preferably telic?

Travis (2010: 261-262) argues that the telicity of English predicates like drink a lemonade is due to a zero telicity marker in the complement of the lower VP.

This position can also be filled, as in (24).

(24) The children hammered the nail flat (in/*for three minutes). (Travis 2010: 262, (43b))
Another property that characterizes Hungarian predicates whose telicity is calculated low in the structure is that they are associated with a simple event structure, as evidenced by their non-ambiguous counterfactual reading when they appear with the adverb majdnem ‘almost’ (Piñón 2008). Piñón refers to this class of predicates as weak accomplishments.

(25) Rebeka majdnem festett egy képet.
Rebecca almost painted a picture.\text{ACC}

‘Rebecca almost painted a picture.’
counterfactual: Rebecca did not begin painting a picture. (no scalar interpretation)
(Piñón 2008: 92, (9b))

In English, this is different. As Piñón (2008: 91) observes, the example below is ambiguous: it has a counterfactual reading and a scalar reading.

(26) Rebecca almost painted a picture.

counterfactual: Rebecca did not begin painting a picture.
scalar: Rebecca did not finish painting a picture. \text{(Piñón 2008: 91, (5a))}

If we take event structural complexity to be reflected in the syntax, the data in (25) can be regarded as evidence for a more complex structure associated with these predicates. This is good news for analyses assuming a zero telicity marking element in examples like paint a picture.

4.2 Pseudo-objects

POs like egyet ‘one.\text{ACC}’, egy jót ‘one good.\text{ACC}’, egy nagyot ‘one big.\text{ACC}’ or nagyokat ‘big.\text{PL.ACC}’, are non-subcategorized and non-thematic accusative constituents with no referential value.\textsuperscript{3}

(27) Mari aludt/táncolt/futott egyet /egy jót /egy nagyot.
Mary slept/danced/ran one.\text{ACC} one good.\text{ACC} one big.\text{ACC}

‘Mary performed a (nice) sleeping/dancing/running event/performed a good amount of sleep/dance.’

They are situation delimiters (Csirmaz 2008b) turning atelic predicates into unambiguously telic ones, as evidenced by the conjunction test in (28).

(28) Mari délelőtt is és délután is aludt egyet.
Mary morning too and afternoon too slept one.\text{ACC}

‘Mari slept some both in the morning and in the afternoon.’

The sentence in (28) can only be interpreted to describe two distinct sleeping events, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. This kind of semantics is associated with telic event descriptions (Kiefer 1992; Verkuyl 1993; Csirmaz 2008b). Conjoined atelic event descriptions, on the other hand, can also be interpreted as expressing a single eventuality, as evidenced by (29), where the sleeping eventuality holds during both temporal intervals as a single eventuality. This diagnoses atelicity.

\textsuperscript{3} That pseudo-objects are not subcategorized for by the verb is evidenced by the fact that they cannot be passivized, pronominalized or focused, unlike subcategorized internal arguments. For more on this, see Farkas & Kardos (2018: 374-375). In addition, we believe that these POs are not Measure Phrases the way sokat ‘a lot.\text{ACC}’, kicsit ‘small.\text{ACC}’ or keveset ‘little.\text{ACC}’ can be considered such phrases. Proof of this comes from the difference in their distribution (these MeasPs can occur with stative verbs or even particle verbs used in a transitive configuration as in kicsit megütöttem magam ‘I hit myself a bit’) and, in addition, also from the fact that whereas the answer to a question such as Mennyit futottál? ‘How much did you run?’ can be sokat ‘a lot’ or keveset ‘a little’, nagyot ‘a big one’ would sound (very) odd.
(29) Mari délelőtt is és délután is aludt.
Mari morning too and afternoon too slept
‘Mari slept in the morning and in the afternoon.’

- Farkas & Kardos (2018) argue that POs encode an aspectual operator that picks out a contextually specified non-maximal subpart of the events in the denotation of the verbal predicate.

(30) Anna szárított egyet a haján, de még lehet rajta szárítni.
Anne dried one.ACC the on.his.hair but still possible on.it to.dry
‘Anne gave her hair a quick dry, but there is more drying she can possibly do on his hair.’

The non-maximality requirement is evidenced by the fact that the event expressed by the verbal predicate in the first clause in (30) can still be continued.

- However, there is a minimum amount of hair-drying/sleeping/dancing/running etc. that needs to occur for the truth of sentences like those in (27). This is illustrated below:

Context: John goes for a run in the forest but after 10 meters he stops running and dies of a heart attack.

(31) János futott egyet, aztán meghalt. FALSE
János ran one.ACC then died
‘János performed a running event and then he died.’

(32) János futott, aztán meghalt. TRUE
János ran then died.
‘János ran and then he died.’

Any amount of running will not satisfy the truth conditions of (31). No such restriction is observable in (32).

- That maximality is not associated with egyet ‘one.ACC’ is also evidenced by its incompatibility with adverbials like teljesen ‘completely’ (Farkas & Kardos 2018). Consider (33).

(33) #Anna teljesen szárított egyet a hajá-n.
Anna completely dried one.ACC the her.hair-on

- In addition, in line with the non-maximality requirement, egyet-expressions are not associated with a prominent result state or telos, unlike verbal particles or resultative predicates. Thus, clauses containing egyet ‘one.ACC’ are compatible with continuations that express that no specific endpoint has been reached at the termination of the event described by the verbal predicate.

(34) Futott egyet anélkül, hogy elért volna valahova.
she/he.ran one.ACC without that s/he.reached would somewhere
‘S/he performed a running event without reaching a goal.’

Alternatively, the predicate futott egyet ‘ran one.ACC’ can also be augmented with a PP, which is responsible for specifically naming the telos.

(35) Futott egyet az egyetem-ig.
s/he.ran one.ACC the university-to
‘S/he performed a running event to the university.’
Furthermore, predicates encoding an open scale can appear with *egyet ‘one.ACC’, but those encoding a closed scale – where maximality is encoded in the verb – cannot (Farkas & Kardos 2018); cf (36).

(36) a. Szélesítettek egyet a híd-on. (V encodes an open-scale)
    they.widened one.ACC the bridge-on
    ‘They widened the bridge to some contextually specified extent.’
    b. *Ürített egyet a szobá-n. (V encodes a closed-scale)
    s/he.emptied one.ACC the room-on

Finally, *egyet ‘one.ACC’ cannot appear with achievements, which are associated with maximal events (see also Csirmaz 2008b: 179).

(37) a. *János érkezett egyet.
    János arrived one.ACC
    ‘János arrived.’
    b. János meg-érkezett.
    János PRT-arrived.
    ‘János arrived.’

Overall, then, it is clear that *egyet-type pseudo-objects are responsible for non-maximal event delimitation and in this respect they contrast with verbal particles and and result predicates, which are event-maximalizing elements, as discussed below.

- In sharp contrast to subcategorized, thematic and referential internal arguments affecting the structure of the event of V, which are merged inside VP but move to a higher specifier position ([Spec, Asp₁P]) (see above) if they delimit the event of the verb; these POs are claimed to be base-generated in the [Spec, Asp₁P] position, with the main verb undergoing head movement (at least) from V to v, and giving rise to the postverbal position of these pseudo-objects. The base-generation of POs in this specifier position generates the *weak telicity* that PO structures are associated with.

(38) … TP
    T
    Asp₂MAXE
    Asp₁MAXE
    vP
    v’
    v-V Asp₁P PO
    Asp₁’
    Asp₁’
    VP
    V

- As expected, based on their syntactic position, PO structures have a simple event structure similarly to predicates containing CCOs. This is evidenced by the non-ambiguous counterfactual reading of sentences with *almost ‘majdnem’* (Farkas & Kardos 2018), which makes these structures similar to what (Piñón 2008) refers to as *weak accomplishments*.

(39) Majdnem ettem egy jót a lakodalom-ban.
    almost I.ate one good.ACC the wedding-in
    Counterfactual reading: I didn’t begin eating at the wedding. (no scalar interpretation)
4.3 Verbal particles/result predicates

Hungarian VPrts and RPs appear in the immediately preverbal position in neutral sentences (i.e. affirmatives without progressive aspect, negation or narrow focus) and have a telicizing function (É. Kiss 2008; Csirmaz 2008):

(40) Mari 10 perc alatt/*10 perc-ig pirosr-a/le-festett egy kerítést /*kerítéseket.
Mary 10 minute under/10 minute-for red-into/PRT-painted a fence.ACC fences.ACC

‘Mary painted a fence in 10 minutes./Mary painted a fence red in 10 minutes.’

- RPs like pirosr-a ‘(lit.) into red’ and VPrts like le have been shown to encode an event-maximizing operator \( MAX_E \) (Filip & Rothstein 2006) that is applied to a partially ordered set of events, from which they pick out the unique largest event at a given situation, thereby ensuring that the resulting predicates have quantized reference, and thus they are interpreted strictly telically (cf. the temporal adverbal test) (Kardos 2012, 2016).

- Contrary to previous proposals (É. Kiss 2008; Surányi 2009), we argue that VPrts and RPs exert their event-maximalizing function in [Spec, Asp\(_2\)P\(_{MAX.E}\)]. More precisely, we also argue that the base-generated position of these elements is in the postverbal domain, but, contrary to (Surányi 2009), we claim that their first intermediate landing site is [Spec, Asp\(_1\)P] and not [Spec, PredP] and, in addition, there is a second intermediate landing position in [Spec, Asp\(_2\)P\(_{MAX.E}\)]. It is this latter specifier position that generates the strong telicity that particle structures and result constructions are associated with. In addition, the final landing site of VPrts and RPs in [Spec, TP] assures that they are in a preverbal position (in neutral sentences); cf. also (Surányi 2009).\(^4\)

\(41\) … TP

\[ \text{VPrtr/RP} \]

\[ \text{T'} \]

\[ \text{T} \]

\[ \text{Asp}_{2\text{MAX.E}} \]

\[ \text{VPrt/RP} \]

\[ \text{Asp}_{2\text{MAX.E}}' \]

\[ \text{Asp}_{2\text{MAX.E}} \]

\[ \text{vP} \]

\[ \text{DP} \]

\[ \text{v} \]

\[ \text{Asp}_{1\text{P}} \]

\[ \text{VPrtr/RP} \]

\[ \text{Asp}_{1\text{'}} \]

\[ \text{Asp}_{1} \]

\[ \text{VP} \]

\[ \text{DP} \]

\[ \text{V'} \]

\[ \text{V} \]

\[ \text{VPrtr/RP} \]

- The derivation of structures containing VPrts and RPs is also characterized by the V’s movement to \( v \) and then to \( \text{Asp}_{2\text{MAX.E}} \) and T which is supported by coordination facts (É. Kiss 2002, 2008). Without V-to-Pred movement (on É. Kiss’s analysis), we cannot explain the ungrammaticality of (42).

\(^4\) Lipták and Saab (2019) also assume that Hungarian verbal particles are directly responsible for situation aspect and they move to the specifier position of an AspF projection above PredP. Their main concern is, however, particle reduplication in Hungarian, which we do not discuss in this work.
(42) *János [P_{predP} MEG [VP ette a pörköltet] és [VP itta a bort]]

John PRT ate the stew and drank the wine (É. Kiss 2008: 49, (93a))

- That the surface position of particles is a vP-external position is, for example, evidenced by VP ellipsis (Surányi 2009).

(43) a. János hozzá-éríttet egy műszert a vezeték-hez.
János PRT-touched an instrument ACC the wire-to
‘János touched an instrument to the wire.’

b. Mari is hozzá-éríttet [egy műszert (a vezeték-hez)].
Mari too PRT-touched an instrument ACC the wire-to
‘Mari did too.’ (Surányi 2009: 2008, (6a) and 213, (13))

As pointed out by Surányi (2009: 213), (43b) can be a continuation of (43a). VP-ellipsis deletes elements to the right of the verb but strand the verbal particle and the verb.

- An important consequence of event maximalizing elements in [Spec, Asp\_P\_MAX\_E] is that they impose semantic constraints over their theme in their c-command domain such that it must be specific. For more on the semantics of event maximalization, see Filip & Rothstein (2006), Kardos (2012, 2016).

(44) a. Kati meg-evett egy/három almát.
Kati PRT-ate an/three apple ACC
‘Kati ate three apples.’

b. *Kati meg-evett almákat.
Kati PRT-ate apples ACC

It is not clear whether such an effect characterizes preverbs in Dutch and German, which are generally argued to be generated lower in the VP (Hoekstra 1988; Folli & Harley 2005).\(^5\)

- Travis (2010: 243) also claims that the Asp head and the upper v can host telicity markers expressing beginning points in addition to endpoints in contrast to the telicity markers in the complement of the lower V, which can only create natural endpoints. She provides examples from Bulgarian:

(45) na-mraz-ja
PV-hate-1SG
‘to start hating someone’

(46) Toj za-tancuva vals mnogo dobre
he pv-danced-aor waltz very well
‘He began waltzing well.’ or ‘He learned to waltz well.’ (Travis 2010: 249, (12) and (13))

In Hungarian, verbal particles can also create natural endpoints or beginning points. Beginning points are illustrated below:

(47) a. János értette a feladat-ot.
János understood the task ACC
‘János understood the task.’

\(^5\) As noted by Kardos (ms.), there are different judgements in the literature regarding the co-occurrence of particle verbs and themes with cumulative reference in languages like Dutch and German. Travis (2010: 248), for example, marks the German sentence Ich habe zwei Stunden lang Weinflaschen ausgetrunken ‘I drank up wine bottles for two hours’ with a single question mark, whereas for Fleischhauer and Czardybon (2016) the sentence Der Mann hat Äpfel aufgegessen ‘The man ate up apples’ is clearly ungrammatical. The latter datum suggests that German \textit{auf} is similar to Hungarian \textit{meg} in that it has an event-maximalizing function in the sentence.
b. János meg-értette a feladat-ot.
János PRT-understood the task-ACC
‘János came to understand the task.’ (Kardos & Pethő 2019: 122, (10))

- Finally, as expected, unlike predicates containing POs and CCOs attached lower in the syntactic structure, predicates containing VPrts and RPs are associated with a complex event structure, which is shown by their ambiguous (counterfactual and scalar) interpretations in the presence of the adverbial majdnem ‘almost’ (Piñón 2008). Piñón refers to this class of predicates as strong accomplishments.

(48) Rebeka majdnem meg-festett egy képet.
Rebecca almost PRT-painted a picture.ACC
Rebecca almost painted a picture.
counterfactual: Rebecca did not begin painting a picture.
scalar: Rebecca did not finish painting a picture. (Piñón 2008: 93, (13b))

5. CONSEQUENCES OF THE ANALYSIS

- First, an important prediction of our analysis is that POs and CCOs cannot co-occur in the same verbal predicate because they compete for the same syntactic position in the Hungarian sentence, with [Spec, Asp\_1P] being the launching site of the PO and the same position being the (possible) landing site of the CCO. This is why the example in (49) below is ungrammatical:

(49) *Kati evett egyet /egy jót /egy almát.
Kati ate one.ACC one good.ACC an apple.ACC

However, this may also be related to case-assigning properties, as POs are equally incompatible with internal arguments that do not delimit the event of the verb (and hence which do not undergo movement to the specifier of this functional phrase), such as the one in (50) below:

(50) *Péter vezetett egyet /egy jót egy autót.
Peter drive one.ACC one good.ACC a car.ACC

- Second, there is a semantic incompatibility between POs, which are associated with a non-maximal semantics, and VPrts and RPs, which are associated with maximal events. This is shown in the following example; see also Csirmaz (2008: 180, (54)).

(51) *János el-futott egyet /egy jót /egy nagyot.
János PRT-ran one.ACC one good.ACC one big.ACC

Translated into syntactic terms, the particle starts out from its base-generated postverbal position (cf. also É. Kiss 2008; Surányi 2009), moves first to [Spec, Asp\_1P] (Surányi’s [Spec, PredP]) and then to [Spec, Asp\_2P\_MAX E]. In this case, however, the first stage of the movement is blocked by the presence of the PO base-generated in [Spec, Asp\_1P].

- Third, VPrts and CCOs can co-occur in the same verbal predicate. In this case, it is only the verbal particle that undergoes movement from its base-generated postverbal position first to [Spec, Asp\_1P] and then to [Spec, Asp\_2P\_MAX E] and [Spec, TP], and it is this element that ensures strong telicity. We assume that the postverbal CCO remains in its original position inside VP (its movement to [Spec, Asp\_1P] would be blocked by the particle, and even if it could move to this specifier position, it would give rise to weak telicity, and we would be faced with a semantic incompatibility, contrary to fact).
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