

Aspectual Cognate Objects in Hungarian

Imola-Agnes Farkas (*farkas_imola_agnes@yahoo.com, farkas.imola.agnes@gmail.com*)

Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Aims and claims: The aim of the talk is to argue for the idea that the Hungarian pseudo-object (PO) *egy* ‘one.ACC’ and its adjectivized versions such as (*egy*) *jót* ‘(one) good.ACC’, *jókat* ‘good.PL.ACC’, (*egy*) *nagyot* ‘(one) big.ACC’, *egy jó nagyot* ‘one good big.ACC’, *nagyokat* ‘big.PL.ACC’ and *hatalmasakat* ‘huge.PL.ACC’, following unergative verbs in VPs such as (1a) and (1b), are (light) aspectual cognate objects (ACOs):

- (1) a. Mari aludt egyet. b. Mari sétált egy nagyot.
Mary sleep.3SG.PST one.ACC Mary walk.3SG.PST one big.ACC
‘Mary got some sleep.’ ‘Mary took a long walk.’

They share the properties of ACOs in other languages (Horrocks & Stavrou 2010; Lavidas 2013, 2018) as (i) they are non-referential; (ii) occur with intransitive verbs; (iii) disallow passivization; (iv) cannot be replaced by similar nouns/hyponyms/synonyms; and (v) their main function is the expression of a limited event with beginning and end. We claim that members of this closed class of POs – similarly to light nouns in light noun constructions (Simone & Masini 2014) – have a weakened referentiality, their lexical content is bleached and they assume a more grammatical (i.e. aspectual) meaning.

Puzzle: There is a conceptual similarity and, more importantly, a cross-linguistic correlation between resultative constructions (RCs) (where an activity verb is followed by an AP result predicate as in *hammer the metal flat*) and goal-of-motion structures (GMs) (where a manner-of-motion verb is followed by a Path PP as in *run into the classroom*) (Gruber 1965; Dowty 1979; Talmy 1991; Snyder & Beck 2001; Mateu 2002; Horrocks & Stavrou 2003; McIntyre 2004) and, to a lesser degree, between these telicity-marking strategies and ACOs (e.g. *sigh a weary sigh*) (Massam 1988; Tenny 1994; Felser & Wanner 2001; Horrocks & Stavrou 2006, 2010; Puigdollers Real 2008). What is puzzling is that the wide variety of RCs and GMs show a striking contrast with the (complete) absence of ACOs in this strong satellite-framed language (Hegedűs 2017, 2018), where the result/endpoint of an event is always encoded by the satellite (i.e. result predicate, adposition, cognate object), which does not incorporate into the V but is lexicalized separately (Hale & Keyser 2002); cf. **hangos kacagást kacag* ‘laugh a loud laugh’ or **ásít egy nagy ásítást* ‘yawn a big yawn’. In this respect, although Csirmaz (2008: 191–192) believes that an account of these POs in terms of CO ellipsis seems viable, she argues against their CO analysis.

Solutions: The first solution to this conundrum is to claim that this generalization does not hold as Hungarian is a clear counterexample to it. The only cognate patterns that we find in this language are the ones that are also found in verb-framed languages lacking both RCs and GMs:

- (i) COs in the *with*-pattern (cf. Melloni & Masini 2017), which resemble manner adverbs (*igaz ítélettel ítélnetek* ‘judge with true judgement/judge correctly’, John 7:24)
- (ii) MeasPs with the suffix *-nyi*, which are only semantically cognate to the verb (*nem alszik egy szemhunyásnyit sem* ‘not sleep a wink’)
- (iii) emphatic adverbial modifiers (*vágyva vágytam* ‘I have eagerly desired’, Luke 22:15)

What is more, the non-cognate counterpart of these Hungarian VPs is very often a light verb construction (*álmodt lát* ‘have a dream’ instead of *álmodt álmodik* ‘dream a dream’) or a VP where the premodifier is replaced by its corresponding manner adverb and the CO is dropped (*hangosan kacag* ‘laugh loudly’ instead of **hangos kacagást kacag* ‘laugh a loud laugh’). In addition to the examples built on the verbs *to die*, *to live* (Csirmaz 2008) and *to fight* (*harcold a jó harcot* ‘fight the good fight/fight the battle well’, 1 Timothy 1:18), there are some other VPs built on verbs of creation (*to draw*, *to paint*, *to build*) and re-creation (*to play*, *to sing*, *to dance*). As argued in the literature (Mittwoch 1998; de Swart 2009; Horrocks & Stavrou 2010; Lavidas 2013), in these VPs – which are found in verb-framed languages as well – the postverbal DPs are, accidentally, morphologically COs of transitive verbs, but they do not denote events. Moreover, they do not share the aforementioned properties of ACOs.

The second solution is to claim that Hungarian is not a counterexample to this correlation as *egy* ‘one.ACC’ and its adjectivized versions, albeit ‘light’ in the sense discussed above, are ACOs. The purpose of the present talk is to bring arguments in favour of this statement. By analyzing the class of these and similar POs as ACOs, we aim to fill a typologically unexpected gap, considering that Hungarian is a (strong) satellite-framed language (see also above).

Analysis: Hungarian POs share many of the syntactic properties of (English) ACOs (cf. Jones 1988; Moltmann 1989; Massam 1990; Macfarland 1994; Matsumoto 1996; Kuno & Takami 2004; Puigdollers Real 2008; Horrocks & Stavrou 2010). In this respect, (i) they cannot be passivized; (ii) cannot be topicalized; (iii) cannot be resumed with a (referential) pronoun; (iv) cannot be modified by a restrictive relative clause; (v)

cannot constitute the answer to a *wh*-question; (vi) are indefinite and trigger ‘subjective’ inflection on the verb; and (vii) are non-thematic. All these features can be explained by their non-referential (i.e. eventive) status. Their aspectual contribution (Tenny 1994; MacFarland 1994, 1995; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995; Horrocks & Stavrou 2006, 2010; Melloni & Masini 2017) is also the same: *egyét* ‘one.ACC’ delimits the event denoted by the verb (Csirmaz 2008; Farkas & Kardos 2018) despite its questionable compatibility with frame adverbials (Piñón 2001; Kiefer 2006; Csirmaz 2008; Farkas 2017).

Besides the non-syntactic difference concerning register (less formal register and sometimes a ‘casual’ interpretation in Hungarian; formal and literary register, and stylistic distribution in English), the most obvious difference is that in Hungarian modification is not obligatory. This is explained by the fact that *egyét* ‘one.ACC’ and its adjectivized versions are ‘only’ light COs, and do not morphologically repeat the verb, hence there is no tautology or redundancy. Another remark is that the modified PO does not have an adverbial interpretation; cf. the difference in meaning between (2) and (3):

- (2) Mari jót táncolt.
 Mary good.ACC dance.3SG.PST
 ‘Mary had a good dancing experience.’
- (3) Mari jól táncolt
 Mary well dance.3SG.PST
 ‘Mary danced well/with talent.’

Proof of this comes from the fact that we can insert either a manner adverb with a meaning opposite to the one denoted by the adverbial counterpart of the adjective the PO is built on (Puigdollers Real 2008) (cf. (4)) or other manner adverbs as well (cf. (5)):

- (4) Mari jót/ *jól táncolt, de rosszul.
 Mary good.ACC well dance.3SG.PST but badly
 ‘Mary had a good dancing experience but she did not dance well.’
- (5) Mari önfeledten táncolt egy jót/ *jól.
 Mary enthusiastically dance.3SG.PST one good.ACC well
 ‘Mary enthusiastically had a good dancing experience.’

With respect to the debate on e-nominals vs. r-nominals (Grimshaw 1990; Szabolcsi & Laczkó 1992; Laczkó 2000; Melloni 2011; Borer 2013), we remark that Hungarian POs have an ambiguous event-result interpretation (cf. also Melloni & Masini 2017). On the one hand, their eventive behaviour – which can be completed with É. Kiss’s (2004: 34) observation that PO structures are associated with the ‘introduction/ generation-of-an-event’ interpretation – is reflected in (i) the possibility of introducing a benefactive double object, with a benefactive reading built with an applicative head that relates an event to an individual (cf. (6)) (Marantz 2005); and (ii) the interpretation triggered by the modified PO primarily in denominal VPs, where what the A modifies is not an already-introduced referential entity (subject or incorporated object) but the event itself (cf. (7)):

- (6) Mari kacsintott egyet valakinek.
 Mary wink.3SG.PST one.ACC somebody.to
 ‘Mary gave somebody a wink.’
- (7) Mari fagyizott egy jót.
 Mary eat.icecream.3SG.PST one good.ACC
 ‘Mary had a good ice-cream eating experience.’

On the other hand, the non-eventive behaviour is shown in (i) the lack of adverbial interpretation of the modified PO (c.f. above); and (ii) the possibility of pluralizing the object (e.g. *jókat* ‘good.PL.ACC’ or *nagyokat* ‘big.PL.ACC’).

Conclusion: Hungarian POs are COs sharing most of the syntactic properties of ACOs. The few differences we have identified stem from the fact that they are light ACOs. Also, these objects have an ambiguous event-result interpretation.

Selected references: Csirmaz, A. 2008. Accusative Case and Aspect. In K. É. Kiss (ed.), *Event Structure and the Left Periphery*, 159-200, Dordrecht: Springer. É. Kiss, K. 2004. Egy igező elmélet vázlatja. *Magyar Nyelv* 100: 15-42. Horrocks, G. & M. Stavrou. 2010. Morphological Aspect and the Function and Distribution of Cognate Objects across Languages. In M. Rappaport Hovav et al. (eds.), *Lexical Semantics, Syntax and Event Structure*, 284-308, Oxford: Oxford University Press. Melloni, C. & F. Masini. 2017. Cognate constructions in Italian and beyond. In L. Hellan et al. (eds.), *Contrastive studies in verbal valency*, 219-250, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.