The aims of this paper are (i) to add to the discussion on verb-framed/satellite-framed languages (e.g. Talmy 2000) by including data from Hungarian showing that this language always expresses complex events with a separately lexicalized result P, which is either a particle or a postposition; and (ii) to discuss intra-linguistic variation between particles and directional postpositions in the lexicalization of result, which may shed light on the possible difference between their properties in a language that has both of them available lexically.

The distinction between so-called verb-framed languages and satellite-framed languages in terms of the expression of complex events has been established relatively well in the literature. It has been mapped onto syntactic structure e.g. in a decomposed argument structure, where the difference between verb-framed Spanish and satellite-framed English is whether P incorporates into V or not (Mateu 2012) or put differently, whether the verb lexicalizes P+V (Ramchand 2008). In some cases, English has also been claimed to have incorporation of P (and N), namely, in the case of denominal verbs like saddle (the horse), shelve (the books) (Hale & Keyser 2002, cf. also Haugen 2009). This means that these English transitive verbs can incorporate or lexicalize result as well.

Hungarian exhibits properties which make it a more strictly satellite-framed language than English in that incorporation of result does not seem to be an option at all. Denominal verbs such as the ones in (1)-(2) always require a particle in their telic uses (although the object is licensed without there being a particle, the event is just atelic in those cases). This inability for verbs to express result/goal has been formulated by É. Kiss (2006) as a lexical/semantic property of Hungarian verbs, which are said to be inherently atelic and in need of another telicizer to express events that have an end-point.

(1) fel-nyerg-el-i a lov-at       (2) be-doboz-ol-ja a könyv-ek-et
  up-saddle-VRB-3SG.DEF the horse-ACC  into-box-VRB-3SG.DEF the book-PL-ACC
  ‘saddle the horse’               ‘box the books’

I propose that the variation in the encoding of result/goal in complex events is fully structural, and a parametric variation in the lexicalization of P in a decomposed argument structure, (e.g. Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002; Borer 2005; Mateu 2012, Acedo-Mattelán & Mateu 2014) can account for the cross-linguistic variation. Hungarian never incorporates P into the V head; it has to be lexicalized separately in complex events. Hungarian always lexicalizes the result component as a particle with this class of denominal verbs.

Regular directional PPs may also express end-point, e.g. with motion verbs, where we find examples with a particle, (3), and without one as well, (4).

(3) János el-ment a bolt-ba       (4) János a bolt-ba ment.
  John away-went the shop-ILL      John the shop-ILL went
  ‘John went to the shop’

Decomposing the PP in the complement of V, makes it possible to further distinguish particles and other P heads structurally (namely, at least Path and Place heads, Koopman 2000). The internal argument is introduced in the specifier position of the complement pP (Svenonius 2003 etc.), where p is the syntactic position of particles. Directional/goal-denoting adpositions can fill the Path head, relevant in the discussion of telic events.

(5) [VP [V [pP INT-ARG [ p [PathP Path PlaceP]]]]]

Hungarian telic predicates always lexicalize p or Path, that is, there is always an adposition in the argument structure. In various cases, a PP without a particle can provide a (bounded) goal reading for the complex event, however, a particle often seems necessary where the complex event either needs a directed motion that has an explicit bounded goal, or if the event just needs a clear boundary even if it has no spatial semantics.

There is an interesting case of intra-linguistic variation as to the presence of a particle: a group of directional case suffixes may be “reduplicated” by a morphologically corresponding particle. The particles that take part in it are all relatively new, and are not even always analyzed as regular
(grammaticalized) particles (e.g. Surányi 2009). I will propose that they are on a grammaticalization path, which in syntactic terms means that they can fill the p head in the structure of a complex event.