

Locating adpositions

Veronika Hegedűs

The aim of this paper is to show that Hungarian particles originate in extended projections of PPs, and the structure of the PP involves projections for place and for path denoting elements. Previous research on the structure of Hungarian PPs has concluded that two groups have to be distinguished within the class of postpositions, depending on whether they take caseless/nominative complements or oblique case marked complements. I will show that on the basis of their syntactic behavior, elements of the latter group are to be classified with particles. The class of postpositions, however, should include spatial case suffixes as well, because they share syntactic properties. The extended projection of the PP, on the other hand, includes all these spatial elements.

1. Introduction

This paper aims at showing that an analysis along the lines proposed in various places in the literature that adpositional phrases (PPs) have a structure that involves a range of projections hosting place and path denoting elements (cf. Koopman 2000; Den Dikken 2003; Svenonius 2004; Van Riemsdijk & Huijbregts to appear; among others) can be fruitfully used to analyze Hungarian PPs as well. Hungarian provides evidence for distinguishing between place/location and path/direction among the projections of the PP, as the two can morphologically appear next to each other, and then path is further away from the complement (Ground) DP, that is, it is higher in the structure than place.

I will first look at an early analysis arguing for functional projections within German PPs (Van Riemsdijk 1990), and then I will examine Hungarian PPs and suggest that they are parallel to German. Before turning to extended PPs in Hungarian, I will also show that postpositions have many properties in common with case markers, which has already made people consider them as realizations of the same category (cf. É. Kiss 2002, Asbury 2005), while those elements that are most often taken to be postpositions with an oblique case marked complement ('naked' Ps, as dubbed by Marácz 1986) share few properties with the other postpositions, but rather behave like particles syntactically. Section 4 discusses the structural properties of Hungarian spatial PPs, and provides evidence that particles are part of these phrases. In section 5, I will draw another set of data into the discussion: cases where the particle is morphologically the same as the suffix in the postverbal PP.

2. German circumpositional phrases

Van Riemsdijk (1990) gives an analysis of German PPs and argues for positing a functional projection on top of the lexical PP in German circumpositional phrases, hosting postpositional elements. Van Riemsdijk calls this projection pP on analogy to vP and other functional extensions of lexical phrases. In German, this projection hosts elements expressing direction, orientation or proximity. This is illustrated in the examples in (1) taken from Van Riemsdijk (1990).

- | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----------------------------|-----|
| (1) | auf den Berg herauf | (on the mountain up(+P)) | acc |
| | auf mich zu | (towards me to) | acc |
| | unter der Brücke durch | (under the bridge through) | dat |
- (Van Riemsdijk, 1990:233)

The postpositional element in these phrases is the functional P. This postpositional element is separable from the PP, sometimes it gets incorporated into the verb in the clause. As the example in (2b) shows, the postposition can be incorporated into the main verb of the clause, and then it does not form a constituent with the rest of the pP (as opposed to the sentence in (2a)).

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| (2) | a. | ...dass er auf den Berg hinauf hat steigen wollen |
| | | ...that he onto the mountain up has climb wanted |
| | b. | ...dass er auf den Berg hat hinaufsteigen wollen |
| | | ...that he onto the mountain has up-climb wanted |
- (Van Riemsdijk, 1990:234)

Since the postposition often does not form a constituent with the PP and since it behaves as a particle, the question arises if they really do form a pP in the first place. Van Riemsdijk (1990) uses various constituency tests to show that the postposition/particle belongs to the PP: the circumpositional phrase can be complement/adjunct to nominals (as shown in (3)), it can be a complement to prepositions (like in (4)), and the whole phrase can move together (see the topicalization example in (5)).

- | | |
|-----|--|
| (3) | der Weg [ins Tal hinunter] |
| | the way into-the valley down |
| (4) | bis [in die Niederungen hinunter] |
| | until in the lowlands down |
| (5) | [Auf dem Turm oben] steht ein grosses Kreuz. |
| | on the tower up stands a large cross |
- (Van Riemsdijk, 1990:234–235)

That is, the constituency of the pP can be tested. As for the word order, the lexical PP is head initial in German, while pP is head-final. The surface order is assumed to be the base generated order in Van Riemsdijk (1990), but it is a derived order in Den Dikken (2003) from an underlying head-initial structure.

This analysis was an early proposal for adpositional phrases being analyzed in terms of functional projections on top of the lexical PP. Since then, much work has been devoted to giving a fine-grained analysis for the structure of spatial PPs based on data from various languages. Analyses of PPs following this line of thought distinguish between separate projections for at least Location/Place and Direction/Path, like Svenonius (2004) or Van Riemsdijk & Huijbregts (to appear), but sometimes a range of additional functional structure is proposed, like in Koopman (2000) or Den Dikken (2003).

3. Hungarian postpositions¹

Hungarian has postpositional elements, and many of them have spatial meanings. Besides postpositions, oblique case suffixes are also used to express spatial relations. Diachronically, most of the postpositions and oblique case suffixes originated in possessive constructions, where the possessum developed into a postposition, and then some of the postpositions lost their morphological independence and became suffixes (Kiss & Pusztai 2003). This change is illustrated in (6): in the first stage, the possessum is a case-marked nominal, which later develops into a postposition. At the stage when it becomes a postposition, the original case marking is no longer transparent, but the postposition itself has a spatial meaning. In the final stage, the postposition becomes a suffixal element, its form is phonetically reduced (it is mostly monosyllabic) and it also participates in vowel harmony.

(6)	ház	bele-n	>	ház	ben	>	ház-ban
	house	inside-at		house	in		house-INE
	'at (the) inside of (the) house'			>>			'in (the) house'

An important property of these spatial elements is that they often have three related forms corresponding to locative ('at'), lative ('to') and ablative ('from') meanings. This goes back to their nominal origin, when the nouns were bearing locative case markers expressing these relations. The three forms are illustrated in (7) where the first one of each pair contains a postposition and the second a case suffix.²

(7)	a.	a	ház	mellett	a.'	a	ház-ban
		the	house	beside.at		the	house-INE
		'beside the house'				'in the house'	
	b.	a	ház	mellé	b.'	a	ház - ba
		the	house	beside.to'		the	house-ILL
		'(to) beside the house'				'into the house'	
	c.	a	ház	mellől	c.'	a	ház - ból
		the	house	beside.from		the	house-ELA
		'from beside the house'				'out of the house'	

¹ The abbreviations used in the examples are the following: ACC = accusative; ADE = adessive ('at'); ALL = allative ('to'); DAT = dative; ELA = elative ('out of'); ILL = illative ('into'); INE = inessive ('in'); INSTR = instrumental ('with'); SUB = sublative ('onto'); and SUP = superessive case ('on'); PRT stands for particle.

² In those examples where the distinction seems important, I will gloss postpositions in a way that it indicates which one of the three forms they are, but it is important to note that they are synchronically no longer decomposable into the nominal stem and locative suffix that these glosses suggest.

Some of the space-denoting elements became verbal particles through history. In neutral sentences, we find particles in the preverbal position in the clause, where they form a complex predicate with the verb in order to express complex events (É. Kiss 2004).³ Their semantic contribution is most often telicizing. This is what led linguists to treat them as aspectual elements that have to occupy some aspectual position in the clause (É. Kiss 1998, 2002). É. Kiss (2004), however, modifies her earlier analysis by hypothesizing a predicative head where particles, as well as other predicative phrases (for example non-referential bare nouns and focused phrases), move, and thus, she derives their aspectual semantic contribution from the telicizing effect of resultative predicates.

Postpositions have been argued to be of two types ('dressed' and 'naked', see the discussion below) and to be a distinct category from case suffixes. Moreover, though the particles have been related to postpositions (both historically and semantically), their syntactic relations have not been discussed much in the literature (but see Kiefer and Ladányi 2000 or É. Kiss 2002). In this section, I will discuss the main topics that have been around related to PPs and the classification of spatial elements, and propose that 'naked' Ps should be treated on a par with particles, while postpositions and locative case suffixes behave very similarly, both of them are of category P.

3.1. 'Dressed' versus 'naked' Ps

Marác (1985, 1986, 1989) distinguishes between 'dressed' Ps and 'naked' Ps in Hungarian: 'dressed' Ps are those that take a nominative (Marác 1989)/caseless (É. Kiss 2002) complement, while 'naked' Ps appear with oblique case-marked complements.⁴ In fact, the distinction between these two types is older (cf. Sebestyén 1965 for discussion and references), but the systematic study in modern linguistic terms and the names of the two groups are due to Marác (1985, 1986). The examples in (8) illustrate the two types of postpositions.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---------------------|----------|---------------|
| (8) | a. | a | híd | alatt | ('dressed' P) |
| | | the | bridge | under.at | |
| | | | 'under the bridge' | | |
| | b. | a | híd – on | át | ('naked' P) |
| | | the | bridge-SUP | across | |
| | | | 'across the bridge' | | |

There are further differences between the two groups: 'dressed' Ps got their name because they bear an agreement marker (Marác 1985, 1986), that is, they are inflected for number and person, when their complement is pronominal (cf. (9a)). 'Naked' Ps, however, never show agreement. Instead, the case marker on their complement is the agreeing element (as (9b) shows). The pronominal complement can be a *pro* in both cases.

³ Sentences with flat prosody comprise neutral sentences, as opposed to non-neutral sentences, which contain a constituent (focus, wh-phrase, negation) bearing extra stress and thus eradicating other main stress in the clause (cf. Kálmán, 1985).

⁴ Since Marác (1989) assumes that Ps are case-assigners, he takes 'dressed' Ps to assign nominative case (which is morphologically zero in Hungarian). É. Kiss (2002), however, relates Ps to case markers, thus she considers the complements of 'dressed' Ps to be caseless.

- (9) a. (én)mögött –em (‘dressed’ P)
 I behind.at-1sg
 ‘behind me’
- b. (én)vel -em szemben (‘naked’ P)
 I INSTR-1sg opposite
 ‘opposite me’

It seems then that in this respect, it is rather the ‘dressed’ P and the oblique case marker on the complement of the ‘naked’ P that behave similarly and not the two types of Ps. I will return to this point when discussing case suffixes and postpositions.

Another difference between ‘dressed’ Ps and ‘naked’ Ps lies in their ordering possibilities with respect to their complements. ‘Dressed’ Ps must always immediately follow their complement, but ‘naked’ Ps may also precede it, as can be seen in the contrast between (10a) and (10b).

- (10) a. *alatt a híd (‘dressed’ P)
 under.at the bridge
- b. át a híd- on (‘naked’ P)
 across the bridge-SUP

Also, when there is a modifier in the PP, it cannot appear between the complement and a ‘dressed’ P, but it may be between a ‘naked’ P and its complement. As (11a) shows, the modifier has to precede the complement in the case of ‘dressed’ Ps but it can appear both before and after the complement as can be seen in (11b).

- (11) a. (egyenesen) a híd (*egyenesen) alá (‘dressed’) P
 straight the bridge straight under.to
 ‘straight (to) under the bridge’
- b. (egyenesen) a híd-on (egyenesen) át (‘naked’ P)
 straight the bridge-SUP straight across
 ‘straight across the bridge’

As Marácz (1986) already noted, all and only ‘naked’ Ps seem to be able to appear without a nominal complement, but in these cases we are dealing with particles according to Marácz (1989) and not with postpositions. Marácz (1989) analyzes those cases where it seems that the ‘naked’ P has been separated from its complement (or where it has no complement) and is in the verb modifier position as structures involving particles, which is a different category. That is, the preverbal element is a particle; and the particle and the verb together govern the oblique case marked argument in (12b)

- (12) a. János át ment.
 John across went
 ‘John went across/over.’
- b. János át ment a híd -on.
 John across went the bridge-SUP
 ‘John went across the bridge.’

Thus, on the basis of their behavior, we can conclude that ‘naked’ Ps are rather different from ‘dressed’ Ps.⁵ É. Kiss (1999, 2002) argues for making the class of Ps more homogeneous, and eliminates most of the group of ‘naked’ Ps by assigning the members to various other classes (particles, adverbs, participles) on the basis of their different behavior. I will follow this line of thought and propose that it is worth extending the proposal that ‘naked’ Ps are sometimes particles (proposed by Marác 1989) to all cases, that is, to say that there are no ‘naked’ Ps; these elements – at least the spatial ones – are particles.⁶ In fact, in the light of the proposal below related to the structure of extended PPs in Hungarian, this seems to be a logical move. In section 4, I will argue that in examples like (10b), *át* ‘across’ is a particle, but contrary to general assumptions, it does form a constituent with the postverbal PP at some point during the derivation.

Before turning to the particles, however, I will first discuss another class of elements and their relationship to postpositions, and this is the class of spatial suffixes in Hungarian.

3.2. Postpositions and case suffixes

As has already been mentioned, Hungarian oblique case suffixes developed from postpositions. Arguments for their different grammatical status mostly mention that suffixes take part in vowel harmony, they cannot take further inflections, and they behave differently in elliptical co-ordination structures. These differences led Marác (1989) to consider postpositions and case suffixes to be fundamentally different categories with P being a case-assigning category. On the other hand, there are various properties that case suffixes share with ‘dressed’ Ps, which makes it hard to distinguish between the two classes of elements. This was already pointed out in the structuralist literature by Antal (1961), and was recently also argued for in É. Kiss (2002) and Asbury (2005).

I will follow É. Kiss (2002) and Asbury (2005) in assuming that the differences between oblique case suffixes and postpositional elements result from the suffixal nature of some of the elements and the morphologically slightly more independent behavior of others, but ultimately, postpositions and case suffixes are instantiations of the same category, which I take to be the category of adpositions.

First of all, they share semantic properties in that both case suffixes and postpositions can express spatial relations, and whether a certain meaning is encoded by a suffixal element or by a postposition seems purely accidental. Also, they share the property of having three related forms corresponding to locative, lative and ablative meanings, as illustrated in the examples in (7).

Syntactically, ‘dressed’ postpositions and case suffixes behave in the same way. Their order with respect to the complement is equally fixed: they always immediately follow their complement and can never precede it (in this respect, they are both different from ‘naked’ postpositions, see the discussion related to (10) in section 3.1.).

- (13) a. *alatt a híd
 under.at the bridge
 ‘under the bridge

⁵ It is not so surprising given that their historical origins are also different as many of them developed in appositive structures and not in possessive constructions (cf. Kiss & Pusztai 2003).

⁶ That ‘naked’ Ps are more like particles was also suggested by Den Dikken (2004). The claim that they are all particles, however, has certain predictions about their distribution that still needs to be tested.

- b. *ra a híd
 SUB the bridge
 ‘onto the bridge’

Moreover, their forms next to pronominal complements look the same as well. We have already seen in the examples in (9) that ‘dressed’ and ‘naked’ Ps behave differently, and it is the case marker in the complement of ‘naked’ Ps that is similar to ‘dressed’ Ps. What we can observe is that the pronominal form is created by adding an agreement suffix to the postposition / case marker. This is again illustrated in (14).

- (14) a. (én)mögött-em
 I behind.at-1sg
 ‘behind me’
 b. (én)nál-am
 I ADE-1sg
 ‘at me’

‘Dressed’ Ps and case suffixes also exhibit the same structure in demonstrative constructions: both of them are ‘reduplicated’ on the demonstrative pronoun, as illustrated in (15).

- (15) a. az alatt a híd alatt
 that under the bridge under
 ‘under that bridge’
 b. az -on a híd-on
 that-SUP the bridge-SUP
 ‘on that bridge’

As is expected, in the case of ‘naked’ Ps, the oblique suffix reduplicates on the demonstrative, supporting further the view to take postpositional elements and case suffixes as instantiations of the same category, and to treat ‘naked’ Ps as different from the other two.

- (16) az - on a híd-on át
 that-SUP the bridge-SUP across
 ‘across that bridge’

Eventually, every syntactic account of PPs has to be able to deal with this phenomenon of P-reduplication on the demonstrative, but this is beyond the scope of this paper. What these examples are meant to emphasize is that when it comes to syntactic properties, postpositions and case suffixes behave very much alike. This gives an additional argument for treating these two on a par, and not ‘dressed’ and ‘naked’ Ps, since ‘naked’ Ps show none of these properties but share properties with particles. I will turn to these elements now.

3.3. Postpositions and particles

Many of the particles in Hungarian are spatial, but some of them seem to have lost their original spatial meaning and now function purely as telicizers (Kiefer 1992). Spatial particles

are directional or locative, and although the locative ones are not always classified as particles (but as adverbs), they show similar behavior as directional ones.

Particles are most often in the preverbal position in neutral sentences. They move there in order to form a complex predicate with the verb. In É. Kiss' (2004) analysis, particles (just like other predicative elements and focused constituents) move to a Predicate Phrase on top of the VP.

- (17) a. A könyv le- esett.
 the book down fell
 'The book fell down.'
- b. Mari fel-olvasta a level-et.
 Mary up-read the letter-ACC
 'Mary read out the letter.'
- c. Mari fel-mászott a hegy-re.
 Mary up-climbed the hill-SUB
 'Mary climbed up the hill.'

As can be seen in the examples in (17), particles can be used in similar contexts in Hungarian as in English. However, we find not only a directional particle in (17c), but also a (suffixal) postposition that expresses a spatial relation.

Sentences that contain a particle and a spatial PP have been mostly regarded as cases where the complex verb formed by the particle and the verb take a PP/oblique DP (cf. Kiefer 1992). Below, I will argue that in these cases, the particle actually originates in the postverbal pP.

4. Hungarian pPs

As in German, it is also often the case in Hungarian that the PP in the clause is somehow associated with a particle in the preverbal position.

- (18) Az egér be-szaladt az ágy alá.
 the mouse into-ran the bed under.to
 'The mouse ran under the bed.' (directional)

These structures are quite similar to the German ones (cf. the examples in (2)). It seems to be the case that the original structure is also like in German in that the particle does originate in the extended PP, but is moved out. That is to say, Hungarian also exhibits pPs, and the structure of the pP is very similar to the German ones, but the order is the mirror image, as can be seen in (19) and (20).

- (19) [_{pP} [_{PP} unter der Brücke] durch]
 under the bridge through

- (20) [_{pP} át [_{PP} a híd alatt]]
 through the bridge under.at

There is a prepositional pP, and a postpositional PP; the functional projection expresses orientation, directionality, and/or proximity. This is illustrated in the following examples.

- (21) a. lent a völgy-ben
 down the valley-INE
 ‘down in the valley’
 b. be az ágy alá
 into the bed under.to
 ‘(to) under the bed’
 c. ide hoz-zám
 here ALL-1sg
 ‘here to me’

Again, constituency tests can be used to show that the particle and the PP do form a constituent: the pP can appear next to nominals as in (22), it can move as a constituent for example as contrastive topic (cf. (23)), it can be used as an answer (see (24)), and it can be used as the first constituent in the *PP-with-DP* construction (as in (25)), which is an environment where we only find directional PPs.

- (22) a csatorna [lent a város alatt]
 the tunnel down the city under.at
 ‘the tunnel under the city’
- (23) [Lent a pincé-ben] nem maradt már semmi.
 down the cellar-INE not remained yet nothing.
 ‘Down in the cellar, nothing is left.’
- (24) Hová szaladt az egér?
 where ran the mouse
 ‘Where did the mouse run?’
 [Be az ágy alá.]
 into the bed under.to
 ‘Under the bed.’
- (25) [Le a pincé-be] az üres üvegek-kel!
 down the cellar-ILL the empty bottles-INSTR
 ‘Down to the cellar with the empty bottles!’

The tests show that spatial particles start out forming a constituent with the PPs. This, however, is often concealed by the fact that the particles obligatorily move to the preverbal position during the derivation, as we saw earlier.

However, when the pP is an adjunct, the movement to the preverbal position does not have to take place, and we attest a lot of cases where the particle and the rest of the PP form a constituent. This is the case in (26), where the adjunct pP is focus, or in (27), where it remains in postverbal position.

- (26) A kedvenc lemezem-et [csak fent a padlás-on] talált-am meg.
 the favorite record-ACC only up the attic-SUP found-1sg PRT
 ‘I only found my favorite record (up) in the attic.’
- (27) János gyakorolta a tolatás-t [ki a garázs-ból]
 John practised the reversing-ACC out the garage-ELA
 és [be a ház mögé].
 and into the house behind.to
 ‘John practised reversing out of the garage and (to) behind the house.’

Thus, these examples and the tests support the claim that the particles originate in pPs in Hungarian. This means that the structure suggested for other languages where we find several projections within the PP applies for Hungarian as well: that is, we expect to find locative and directional PPs, which we have already seen to be the case. It is also the case that when location/place and direction/path appear together in one phrase, direction/path is higher in the structure. This can be seen in the following example, where the locative postposition bears a directional suffix.⁷

- (28) a a ház mögött -re
 the house behind.at-SUB
 ‘(to) behind the house’
- b. [PathP [PlaceP [DP a ház] mögött] –re]

That is, it is not enough to posit that particles are a part of the extended PP and head their own (functional) projection, we further have to distinguish between locative and directional projections within this extended PP. This can be done in the way illustrated in (28b) by splitting the PP into PlaceP and PathP. It implies, then, that apart from the pP layer in the structure (hosting particles), we have to postulate a richer structure in the PP part of Van Riemsdijk’s (1990) structure as well. Whether the structure in (28b) is enough to derive all ordering possibilities in Hungarian is not clear at the moment. Providing a detailed analysis of the actual structure of Hungarian spatial PPs is left for future research.

5. More pPs in Hungarian?

The sentences discussed so far contained a preverbal particle and a related PP (generally in the postverbal part of the clause). I was claiming that in these cases the particle originates in the extended pP. Another construction that seems obviously related is the one in (29):

⁷ These examples are not so frequent, however, because there is a competing form to express the same directional meaning and that is with the use of the directional form of the postposition as in (i).

(i) a ház mögé
 the house behind.to
 ‘(to) behind the house’

In (i), the lative form of the postposition is used instead of the locative one (with an additional sublative suffix), and this is the more frequent way of expressing the relevant meaning. The phrase in (24) has a bit of a special meaning in that the spatial meaning of the postposition is more transparent, and thus, the phrase means rather something like ‘to the space behind the house’.

- (29) a. János bel- e –ugrott a medencé-be.
 John into-agr-jumped the pool - ILL
 ‘John jumped into the pool.’
- b. Mari hoz-zá- vágta a tányér-t a fal-hoz.
 Mary to-agr-threw the plate-ACC the wall-ALL
 ‘Mary threw the plate at the wall.’

These sentences also contain a directional particle and a postverbal PP, where it seems to be important that the P is realized by a suffix. The difference is that the preverbal particle is morphologically the ‘reduplication’ of the suffix, that is, contrary to the examples discussed in the previous sections, the particle seems to express exactly the same meaning as the suffixal P. Furthermore, the particle bears an agreement marker that on first sight seems to express agreement with the complement of the postverbal P-suffix.

É. Kiss (2002) considers the possibility that the particle in these sentences is derivationally related to the PP (with the complement extracted and the particle subsequently moved to the preverbal position) to account for the agreement, but then rejects this option and analyzes these cases as involving a preverbal PP co-indexed with a postverbal PP. It is the co-indexation between the two PPs that is responsible for the reduplicative property and for the apparent possessive agreement marking as well.

The problem with this analysis is that despite the apparent agreement marker on the preverbal particle, it is not possible to have plural agreement when the complement of the postverbal PP is plural (as also pointed out by É. Kiss 1998). That is, examples like (30) are ungrammatical.

- (30) a. *János belé-jük ugrott a medencék-be.
 John into-3pl jumped the pools-ILL
 ‘John jumped into the pools.’
- b. *Mari hozzá-juk vágta a tányérok-at a többiek-hez.
 Mary to - 3pl threw the plates-ACC the others-ALL
 ‘Mary threw the plates at the others.’

If the particle were co-indexed with the postverbal PP and thus showed agreement with its complement, it should be possible to mark it for the plural. But it is not, and I believe this is because the two are not in the relationship that is assumed by É. Kiss (2002).

I assume that we are faced with the same construction here as in the previous section. É. Kiss’s (1998) earlier analysis also takes the preverbal elements to be genuine particles, but I would also like to extend the analysis along the lines of extended PPs to these constructions, that is, to say that these particles also originate in the postverbal PP. It is not so easy, however, to prove this point. While in the previous examples we could find various constituency tests to show that the particle and the PP form a constituent, here the only constituency test that seems to work is the *PP-with-DP* construction. As can be seen in (31), even these constructions are not always fully grammatical, or at least they feel awkward and rather redundant.

- (31) a. ?[Bel-e a medencé-be] a gyerekek-kel!
 into-agr the pool – ILL the children-INSTR
 ‘Into the pool with the children!’

- b. [Nek-i a ház-nak] a bulldózer-rel!
 to-agr the house-DAT the bulldozer-INSTR
 ‘Into the house with the bulldozer!’

It is still necessary to test the grammaticality of these constructions with all the possible particles and see what may be behind the difference in acceptability among these sentences, but the fact that the examples in (27) are not ungrammatical seems to suggest that we are really dealing with the same kind of structure as in the cases where the particle does not have an agreement marker, that is, the particle originates in the PP.

6. Conclusions

I have shown in this paper that Hungarian PPs can be fruitfully analyzed in terms of extended structures involving projections that host particles. Various constituency tests support the claim that in sentences where a preverbal particle is semantically related to a PP in Hungarian, the particle actually forms a constituent with the PP at some stage of the derivation.

I also discussed the problems related to the classification of various spatial elements in Hungarian, and showed that some earlier assumptions should be abandoned. On the one hand, the distinction between ‘dressed’ and ‘naked’ postpositions reflects a difference between postpositions and particles, since they show rather different syntactic behavior, and ‘naked’ Ps behave more like particles. On the other hand, ‘dressed’ Ps share various properties with spatial case suffixes, so these two categories should be treated as instantiations of the same underlying category, they are both postpositions.

Veronika Hegedűs
 Tilburg University
v.hegedus@uvt.nl

References

- Antal, L. (1961). *A magyar esetrendszer*. [The Hungarian Case System], Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Asbury, A. (2005). Adpositions as case realizations. In Salzmann M. & L. Vicente (eds.) *Leiden Papers in Linguistics*. pp. 69-92.
- den Dikken, M. (2003). On the syntax of locative and directional adpositional phrases. Ms.
- den Dikken, M. (2004). The syntax of adpositional phrases. LOT Winter School course 2004, Amsterdam.
- É. Kiss, K. (1998) Verbal Prefixes or Postpositions? Postpositional Aspectualizers in Hungarian. In Kenesei I. (ed.) *Approaches to Hungarian Vol. 6. Papers from the Amsterdam Conference*. JATE, Szeged, pp. 123-148.
- É. Kiss, K. (1999). Mi tartozik a névutók osztályába? [What belongs to the class of postpositions?] *Magyar nyelvjárások* 37, pp. 167-172.
- É. Kiss, K. (2002). *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- É. Kiss, K. (2004). Egy igekötőelmélet vázlatja. [Outline of a theory of the verbal particle] *Magyar nyelv* 50, pp. 15-43.
- Kálmán, L. (1985). Word Order in Neutral Sentences. In Kenesei I. (ed.) *Approaches to Hungarian 1*. JATE, Szeged, pp. 13-23.
- Kiefer, F. (1992). Az aspektus és a mondat szerkezete. [Aspect and the structure of the clause] In Kiefer, F. (ed.) *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan 1. Mondattan* [Structural Hungarian Grammar 1. Syntax], Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, pp. 797-886.
- Kiefer, F. & Ladányi, M. (2000). Az igekötők. [Particles] In Kiefer, F. (ed.) *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan 3. Morfológia* [Structural Hungarian Grammar 3. Morphology], Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, pp. 453-518.
- Kiss, J. & Pusztai, F. eds. (2003). *Magyar nyelvtörténet*. [Hungarian language history] Osiris Kiadó, Budapest.

- Koopman, H. (2000). 'Prepositions, postpositions, circumpositions, and particles. The structure of Dutch PPs'. In Koopman H. (ed.) *The Syntax of Specifiers and Heads*. Routledge, London, pp. 204-260.
- Marác, L. (1985). A magyar névutós csoportról. [On the Hungarian Postpositional Phrase] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 87, pp. 173-180.
- Marác, L. (1986). Dressed or Naked: The Case of the PP in Hungarian. In Abraham, W. & S. de Meij (eds.) *Topic, Focus and Configurationality*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 227-252.
- Marác, L. (1989). *Asymmetries in Hungarian*. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen: PhD dissertation.
- Riemsdijk, H. C. van. (1990). Functional prepositions. In Pinkster, H. & I. Genee (eds.) *Unity in diversity: papers presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50th birthday*. Foris, Dordrecht, pp. 229-241.
- Riemsdijk, Henk C. van, & Huijbregts, R. (to appear). Location and Locality. In: Festschrift to Joseph Emonds. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sebestyén, Á. (1965). *A magyar nyelv névutórendszeréről*. [The system of postpositions in the Hungarian language] Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Svenonius, P. (2004). 'Spatial prepositions in English'. Ms. University of Tromsø; available at <http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000001>.