Imola-Ágnes Farkas*

Aspectual cognate objects in Hungarian

https://doi.org/10.1515/flin-2021-2009
Received March 16, 2020; accepted January 7, 2021; published online May 31, 2021

Abstract: This paper examines aspectual cognate objects in Hungarian. Its main contribution lies in the syntactic and semantic analysis of three classes of accusative pseudo-objects, which are literally not cognate with the prototypical unergative verb they accompany but are demonstrated to be non-subcategorized and non-thematic elements that have the same role and the same syntactic and semantic properties as aspectual cognate objects in languages where these nominals are both semantically and morphologically related to the verb. In addition, the paper fills a typologically unexpected gap, considering that Hungarian, as a strong satellite-framed language, is predicted to have aspectual cognate object constructions.

Keywords: aspectual cognate object; event; Hungarian; pseudo-object; result; satellite-framed language; unergative

1 Introduction

There is a relatively rich literature on various accusative elements in Hungarian such as thematic direct objects (with special focus on created/consumed objects), non-subcategorized pseudo-objects (POs) or measure phrases, which contributes to our better understanding of their distribution, syntactic behaviour or aspectual role (see, for instance, Alberti 1997; Csirmaz 2008; den Dikken 2018; É. Kiss 1994, 2002, 2004; Farkas 2017; Farkas and Kardos 2018, 2019a, 2019b; Farkas and de Swart 2003; Halm 2012; Kardos 2016, 2019; Kiefer 1992, 1994, 2006; Komlósy 1994; Maleczki 2001; Piñón 2001; Schvarcz 2017). However, very little attention has been devoted to cognate objects (COs)/cognate object constructions (COCs) in general and aspectual cognate objects (ACOs)/aspectual cognate object constructions (ACOCs) in particular. This is all the more relevant because these objects and constructions have been the focus of much generative and cognitive grammar research in languages such as English (Höche 2009; Horita 1996; Horrocks and

***Corresponding author: Imola-Ágnes Farkas**, Department of English Language and Literature, Babeş-Bolyai University, Mihail Kogălniceanu 1, 400084 Cluj-Napoca, Romania, E-mail: imola.farkas@ubbcluj.ro. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6126-8874

Stavrou 2003, 2006, 2010; Jones 1988; Kitahara 2010; Kuno and Takami 2004; Levin 1993; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Macfarland 1994, 1995; Massam 1990; Matsumoto 1996; Mittwoch 1998; Moltmann 1989; Nakajima 2006; Real Puigdollers 2008; Sailer 2010; de Swart 2007; Tenny 1994), German (Moltmann 1989), Greek (Horrocks and Stavrou 2003, 2006, 2010; Lavidas 2013a, 2013b, 2014, 2018), Hebrew (Horrocks and Stavrou 2010; Mittwoch 1998; Pereltsvaig 1999a, 2002), French (Macfarland 1995; Serrano 2004), Italian (Melloni and Masini 2017), Romanian (Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2013), Russian (Pereltsvaig 1999a, 1999b), Japanese (Matsumoto 1996), Chinese (Hong 1999) or Vietnamese (Pereltsvaig 1999a; Pham 1999). The present paper proposes to fill this void by offering a syntactic and semantic investigation into Hungarian ACOs and ACOCs.

There are two main claims that I argue for. First, knowing that Hungarian restricts the co-occurrence of ACOs with prototypical unergative verbs, I claim and demonstrate that Hungarian non-subcategorized POs fulfil the function of the ACO in the language, and I propose that they be divided into the following three classes:

a) the – very frequently used – PO with reduced lexical content *egyet* 'one.ACC'
b) a small and closed class of – frequently used – POs with more lexical content (i.e., augmentative or dimensional meaning) such as *(egy) jót* '(one) good.ACC', *(egy) nagyot* '(one) big.ACC', *(egy) hatalmasat* '(one) huge.ACC' and *(egy) óriásit* '(one) gigantic.ACC', as well as their pluralized version
c) a large and open class of – less frequently used – POs with lexical content such as *(egy) széleset* '(one) wide.ACC', *(egy) mélyet* '(one) deep.ACC', *(egy) isteneset* '(one) thorough.ACC', *(egy) félelmeteset* '(one) dreadful.ACC', *(egy) szelídet* '(one) tender.ACC', *(egy) hangosat* '(one) loud.ACC', *(egy) vidámat* '(one) joyful.ACC', *(egy) gyorsat* '(one) quick.ACC', *(egy) hirtelent* '(one) sudden.ACC', *(egy) intenzívet* '(one) intensive.ACC', *(egy) öregeset* '(one) elderly.ACC', *(egy) hosszút* '(one) long.ACC', *(egy) bájosat* '(one) charming.ACC', *(egy) kellemeset* '(one) pleasant.ACC' and many others, as well as their pluralized version[1]

Although POs of class (a) and (b) have received a limited amount of syntactic and semantic attention in the literature (cf. Csirmaz 2008; É. Kiss 2004; Farkas 2017; Farkas and Kardos 2018, 2019a, 2019b; Halm 2012; Kiefer 1992, 1994, 2006; Piñón 2001), they have not been analysed as nominals that have the role of the ACO in the language. More importantly, POs of class (c) have consistently been overlooked in

1 POs of class (b) and (c) may appear either as indefinite nouns (e.g. *egy nagyot* 'one big.ACC' and *egy széleset* 'one wide.ACC') or as bare nouns (e.g. *nagyot* 'big.ACC' and *széleset* 'wide.ACC'). The variation between the presence and absence of *egy* is shown in the following way: *(egy) nagyot* '(one) big.ACC' and *(egy) széleset* '(one) wide.ACC'. For more details, see Section 2.3.

the literature on Hungarian. By integrating them into my discussion on ACOs, I show that the class of such Hungarian POs is richer than previously believed.

In the absence of ACOs that can co-occur with a prototypical unergative verb, the counterpart of the English canonical ACOC in (1) is not the example in (2a) but the sentence in (2b):

(1) *Mary smiled a wide smile.*

(2) a. **Mari mosolygott egy széles mosoly-t.*[2]
Mary smile.PST.3SG one wide smile-ACC
'Mary smiled a wide smile.'
b. *Mari mosolygott egy széles-et.*
Mary smile.PST.3SG one wide-ACC
'Mary smiled a wide smile.'

The motivation behind the above ternary division – instead of a binary one, which merges the POs of class (b) and (c) into one single class – is supported by syntactic evidence. I show that although members of the three classes of POs exhibit uniform behaviour with respect to most canonical tests (e.g. passivization, quantification with a strong determiner, theta-role assignment, pronominalization, indefiniteness restriction, restrictive relative clause modification, *mit* 'what.ACC' type of questioning and aspectual contribution), they behave differently with respect to some other diagnostics (e.g. contrastive topicalization, focusing and adverbial interpretation).

Second, I claim that Hungarian POs fulfilling the function of the ACO in the language can refer either to the event itself or to the entity that results from the verbal event. More precisely, in addition to their eventive interpretation, they can also denote resultant objects whose referents are 'produced' by the action expressed by the verb.

The aim of this paper is twofold. On the one hand, I wish to contribute to the vast literature on ACOs by putting forth a novel, syntactic and semantic analysis of the above three classes of POs, which are literally not cognate with the prototypical unergative verb they accompany but are demonstrated to be elements that have the same role as ACOs in languages where these objects are semantically and morphologically related to the verb. Although the primary focus is on Hungarian, I indirectly show that members of the three classes of POs, as non-subcategorized

2 Such and similar verb–cognate object combinations may exceptionally appear in poetry or literary texts, as illustrated by the following example taken from the poem *Az ősök ritmusa* by Árpád Tóth: *Mosolyognék egy boldog, új mosolyt* 'I would smile a happy, new smile' (Papp 2006: 188).

and non-thematic elements, share most of the properties of ACOs, hence they uniformly fail the canonical tests of subcategorized and thematic objects. My second aim is to fill a typologically unexpected gap, considering the fact that in Hungarian, where Path/result is always expressed by the satellite, the three telic constructions – i.e., goal-of-motion structures, strong resultative constructions and ACOCs – are predicted to be equally available.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 offers a bird's-eye view of Hungarian accusative elements such as thematic direct objects, cognate objects, pseudo-objects and measure phrases. Section 3 presents the cross-linguistic correlation between goal-of-motion structures, strong resultative constructions and ACOCs. Section 4 summarizes the previous literature on these Hungarian POs (especially *egyet* 'one.ACC' and POs of class [b]) and brings arguments against Csirmaz's (2008) proposal. Section 5 demonstrates, through a large number of tests, that members of the three classes of POs have the role of the ACO in the language and draws attention to some fine-grained distinctions between them. Section 6 elaborates on the event versus result interpretation of Hungarian PO constructions. Section 7 concludes.

2 Accusative elements in Hungarian

This section offers a bird's-eye view of different accusative case-marked (*-t*) elements in Hungarian in an effort to emphasize the similarities and dissimilarities between them from the perspective of POs. The focus is on thematic direct objects (Section 2.1), cognate objects (Section 2.2), pseudo-objects (Section 2.3) and measure phrases (Section 2.4) (for more details on some of these nominals, see Alberti 1997; Csirmaz 2008; É. Kiss 1994, 2002, 2004; Farkas 2017; Farkas and Kardos 2018, 2019a, 2019b; Farkas and de Swart 2003; Kiefer 1992, 1994, 2006; Komlósy 1994; Maleczki 2001; Schvarcz 2017).

2.1 Thematic direct objects

The Hungarian sentence is divided into a topic part and a predicate part. As an action or state can be predicated about any of its participants, either the grammatical subject or the grammatical object can occupy the position associated with the topic function. In the former case, as shown below, the accusative object remains in the predicate part and appears postverbally in the neutral sentence (i.e., in a declarative without progressive aspect, negation or narrow focus):

(3) *János fel-hívta Mari-t. Mari-t fel-hívta János.*[3]
John PRT-call.PST.3SG Mary-ACC Mary-ACC PRT-call.PST.3SG John
'John called up Mary. Mary was called up by John.'
(adapted after É. Kiss 2002: 3)

The preverbal section of the predicate phrase contains operator positions, which can be occupied, for instance, by a focus constituent expressing exhaustive identification. Crucially, if the preverbal operator field contains such an element, the non-neutral sentence triggers the postverbal position of the verbal particle:

(4) *János MARI-T hívta fel.*[4]
John Mary-ACC call.PST.3SG PRT
'As for John, it was Mary that he called up.'

The question of an element being in a preverbal versus postverbal position is an essential feature of the Hungarian sentence: whereas the preverbal position is reserved for non-referential (that is, predicative) elements such as verbal particles, resultative and goal-denoting predicates or bare nouns, the postverbal (argument) position is reserved for referential elements. As such, Hungarian (singular and plural) bare nominals immediately precede the finite verb in neutral sentences while they are postverbal in non-neutral sentences. That they cannot stand postverbally (in an argument position) in a neutral sentence but can only survive in a preverbal position as an aspectual operator, a focus or a distributive quantifier (with *is* 'also') is shown in the following pair of sentences:

(5) a. **Mari táncolt keringő-t.*
Mary dance.PST.3SG waltz-ACC
'Mary danced a waltz.'

b. *Mari keringő-t táncolt/ KERINGŐ-T táncolt/*
Mary waltz-ACC dance.PST.3SG waltz-ACC dance.PST.3SG
keringő-t is táncolt.
waltz-ACC also dance.PST.3SG
'Mary danced a waltz/it is a waltz that Mary danced/Mary also danced a waltz.'
(adapted after É. Kiss 2002: 29)

3 Although the particle and the lexical verb are generally spelled solid when the particle is immediately before the verb, they are spelled with a hyphen in the case of both numbered and in-text examples in order to express that they represent two separate syntactic constituents.

4 Following the well-established tradition, in the present article small capitals in the numbered (Hungarian) examples mark the phonological prominence of the focus.

Interestingly, (5a) improves in grammaticality if a preverbal or verbal focus is introduced, as shown below:

(6) *MARI* *táncolt* *keringő-t.* *Mari* *TÁNCOLT* *keringő-t.*
Mary dance.PST.3SG waltz-ACC Mary dance.PST.3SG waltz-ACC
'It is Mary who danced a waltz./Mary has danced a waltz (at least once).'

In such a case the postverbal bare nominal can be interpreted as a focus *in situ*, given that a preverbal focus also licenses postverbal foci (É. Kiss 2002: 29).

In addition, the Hungarian verb agrees not only with the subject but also with the direct object. In a nutshell, whereas a definite object triggers the definite conjugation on the verb (see the verb form *táncolta* in [7a]), an indefinite object triggers the indefinite conjugation on the same verb (see the verb form *táncolt* in [7b]). As shown below, the same indefinite agreement marker appears on the verb when it is used either with a bare noun (singular or plural) or in an intransitive configuration:

(7) a. *Mari* *táncolta* *a* *keringő-t.*
Mary dance.PST.3SG the waltz-ACC
'Mary danced/was dancing the waltz.'
b. *Mari* *táncolt* *egy keringő-t/ keringő-(ke)-t táncolt/*
Mary dance.PST.3SG a waltz-ACC waltz-(PL)-ACC dance.PST.3SG
táncolt.
dance.PST.3SG
'Mary danced a waltz/danced waltz(es)/danced.'

As for their syntax, Hungarian bare nominals have been shown to be base-generated postverbally in VP but, as non-referential elements, they are preposed from this phrase into a position in the preverbal section of the predicate, more precisely into the specifier of a functional phrase. This is either aspect phrase (AspP), as in É. Kiss (2002), or predicate phrase (PredP), subsumed by AspP, among others, as in É. Kiss (2008). Furthermore, they trigger verb raising to Asp or Pred, respectively (whereas in the former account the bare noun is raised to the specifier of AspP and the verb in Asp eventually merges with the bare nominal, in the latter account the functional phrase to which the bare noun moves cannot be AspP as demonstrated by the lack of the aspectual operator role of these nominals as a bare nominal–V complex is usually interpreted as atelic). As bare object nominals are predicative elements just like verbal particles and result or goal-denoting predicates, and the (above) specifier position can only host one element, they are mutually exclusive – at least in neutral sentences – and are subject to severe co-occurrence restrictions.

2.2 Cognate objects

In a COC a verb takes an object expressed by a DP, the head noun of which is a nominalization of the verb stem. In other words, the CO is a semantic and morphological 'copy' of the verb. According to their most recent classification (Horrocks and Stavrou 2010; Lavidas 2013a, 2013b, 2014, 2018), these constructions can be transitive, transitivizing or aspectual.

Transitive COCs are built on transitive verbs, which select a subject and obligatorily an object as well. This object can be either a regular direct object or a cognate object. In addition, these objects have a concrete meaning, they can be singular or plural, and they can freely be passivized. Two relevant Hungarian examples are:

(8) a. *Ez az ígéret, amely-et ő ígért nekünk*
this the promise that-ACC he promise.PST.3SG we.DAT
'this is the promise that he hath promised us'
(1 John 2,25; SzJ 2007: 1360)

b. *negatív gondolat-ok-at gondol-ni*
negative thought-PL-ACC think-INF
'to think negative thoughts'

Similarly to the Biblical texts of Hebrew (Horrocks and Stavrou 2010; Mittwoch 1998; Pereltsvaig 2002), Greek (Gianollo and Lavidas 2013) or Early Modern English (Lavidas 2018), Biblical Hungarian has a wide variety of transitive (and, as shown below, transitivizing) COCs, which are frequently associated with a stylistic choice and are claimed to have an emphatic function. They reflect the influence of the source texts, as they copy the pleonastic structures occurring in the corresponding Greek or Hebrew verses (see [8a]). Furthermore, in everyday speech the CO can exhibit all the syntactic properties of a non-cognate thematic object (see [8b]).

Transitivizing COCs are built on so-called derived unergative verbs, which take a subject and, optionally, an object as well, which can be a cognate or a non-cognate object (e.g. synonym or hyponym). As argued in Mittwoch (1998), Pereltsvaig (2002), de Swart (2007), Horrocks and Stavrou (2010) or Lavidas (2013a), in the former case the objects are only accidentally morphological COs of the verb: they do not denote events, they are fully referential arguments, hence they do not share the properties of ACOs. I give two canonical examples built on verbs of (re-) creation taken from Biblical Hungarian (9a) and everyday speech (9b):

(9) a. *Énekeljetek az Úr-nak új ének-et*
sing.IMP.PRS.2PL the Lord-DAT new song-ACC
'sing to the Lord a new song'
(Isa 42,10; SzJ 2007: 807)

b. *Mari gyönyörű/ három rajz-ot rajzolt.*
Mary beautiful three drawing-ACC draw.PST.3SG
'Mary drew a beautiful/three drawing(s).'

Again, the CO has all the syntactic properties of a non-cognate thematic object: in (9b) it appears as a premodified (NP/NumP) bare noun occupying the preverbal position and triggering the indefinite conjugation of the verb (cf. the verb forms *rajzolt* versus *rajzolta*).

Aspectual COCs are built on so-called prototypical unergative verbs, which require only a subject and, exceptionally, also an accusative nominal, which is exclusively a cognate object. The most important features of these constructions and these objects are the following: the CO is not a referential object and cannot be treated as a subcategorized (internal) argument, hence it fails the canonical tests that apply to referential objects; it cannot be replaced by a similar noun (e.g. synonym or hyponym); and the main function of the entire construction is the expression of a limited event with beginning and end (hence the term 'aspectual'). We may find such constructions in diverse translations of the Holy Bible (10a), where, again, they reflect the translator's fidelity to the source text, but not in everyday speech (10b):

(10) a. *minden munká-m-at is, mely-et munkálkodom a nap alatt*
every labour-1SG.POSS-ACC also that-ACC labour.PRS.1SG the sun under
'all my labour wherein I labour under the sun'
(Ecc 2,19; KG 1990 [1908]: 650)

b. **Mari mosolygott egy széles mosoly-t.*
Mary smile.PST.3SG one wide smile-ACC
'Mary smiled a wide smile.'

As for their syntax, Hungarian objects that are literally cognate with the (transitive or derived unergative) verb they accompany can be claimed to share the properties of non-cognate accusative nominals: bare cognate nouns are base-generated in VP but move to [Spec, AspP]/[Spec, PredP] and trigger V-to-Asp/Pred movement. Moreover, when the CO is preverbally expressed by a bare nominal, its co-occurrence with another predicative element such as a verbal particle or a result/goal-denoting predicate is excluded since they would compete for the same syntactic position.

In sum, this language has transitive and transitivizing COCs both in Biblical texts and in everyday speech. But crucially, with the exception of some Biblical examples, in Hungarian there are no ACOCs in the sense defined in Horrocks and Stavrou (2010) or Lavidas (2013a, 2013b, 2014, 2018). Instead, as argued in this paper, Hungarian has POs that fulfil the function of the ACO in the language.

One important caveat is in order here: in this paper I only analyse the subclass of POs I have briefly presented above. However, there is another subclass of pseudo-objects, found in resultative constructions but not discussed in this paper, which includes reflexives such as *magát* 'himself.ACC' in *álomba sírta magát* '(he) cried himself to sleep' and nominals denoting body parts such as *a szemét* 'his eyes.ACC' in *kisírta a szemét* '(he) cried his eyes out'. For more details on these and similar pseudo-objects in Hungarian, see Csirmaz (2008).

2.3 Pseudo-objects

The PO *egyet* 'one.ACC' is formally the accusative-marked (*-t*) numeral or indefinite article *egy* 'one/a(n)', with *-e-* being the link vowel on the stem ending with a consonant, in accordance with the vowel harmony characteristic of this language.[5] In standard, present-day Hungarian, it follows the intransitive activity verb and it is compatible with a wide variety of intransitive(ly used) verbs:[6,7]

5 In several languages, the form of the indefinite article and the numeral *one* is the same. In Hungarian, when the cardinal number *egy* 'one' is unstressed, it is interpreted as an indefinite article. In generative linguistics, it has also been argued that *egy* is only a numeral, and the indefinite counterpart of the definite article *a(z)* 'the' is a phonetically empty element (see É. Kiss 2002 or Szabolcsi and Laczkó 1992).

6 Hungarian POs can occur not only with intransitive activity verbs such as *mosolyog* 'smile', syntactically treated as unergative, but also with semelfactive verbs such as *kattan* 'click', syntactically treated as unaccusative (Csirmaz 2008), unergative (den Dikken 2018) or as exhibiting both unaccusative and unergative behaviour (Halm 2012). As shown in Section 4.2, POs behave differently with activity and semelfactive verbs. For instance, *egyet* 'one.ACC' can also precede the semelfactive verb.

7 The intransitive(ly used) verb can be either a derived unergative verb (e.g. *rajzol egyet* '(lit.) draw one.ACC', where *egyet* is not interpreted as a thematic elliptic nominal such as *egy házat* 'one house.ACC') or a prototypical unergative verb (e.g. *nevet egyet* '(lit.) laugh one.ACC'). Crucially, the PO accompanying either of these two verbs has the exact same syntactic and semantic behaviour (see Sections 5 and 6).

(11) *Mari mosolygott/ ásított/ sóhajtott/ aludt/*
Mary smile.PST.3SG yawn.PST.3SG sigh.PST.3SG sleep.PST.3SG
sétált/ futott/
walk.PST.3SG run.PST.3SG
kacagott/ beszélgetett/ vitázott/ bulizott/ olvasott egy-et.
laugh.PST.3SG talk.PST.3SG argue.PST.3SG party.PST.3SG read.PST.3SG one-ACC
'Mary smiled a smile/yawned a yawn/sighed a sigh/slept a sleep/walked a walk/ran a run/laughed a laugh/had a talk/had an argument/had a party/ did some reading.'

POs of class (b) and (c), also called accusative adjectives (Csirmaz 2008), are built from adjectives (such as *jó* 'good' or *harsány* 'uproarious') and not adverbs (such as *jól* 'well' or *harsányan* 'uproariously', derived from the corresponding adjectives by means of a manner adverbial suffix), and are literally not cognate with the prototypical unergative verb they accompany. They can take intensifiers as premodifiers (12a), and comparative (12b) or superlative morphemes (12c):

(12) a. *Mari nagyon harsány-at kacagott.*
Mary very uproarious-ACC laugh.PST.3SG
'Mary laughed a very uproarious laugh.'
b. *Mari harsány-abb-at kacagott, mint Péter.*
Mary uproarious-COMP-ACC laugh.PST.3SG than Peter
'Mary laughed a more uproarious laugh than Peter.'
c. *Mari kacagta a leg-harsány-abb-at.*
Mary laugh.PST.3SG the most-uproarious-COMP-ACC
'Mary laughed the most uproarious laugh.'

As expected, in the last case the definite object triggers the definite conjugation on the verb, as shown by the verb forms *kacagott* in (12a) and (12b) but *kacagta* in (12c).

In addition, they can be supplied with a plural marker *-k* (and an additional linking vowel), which makes them similar to elliptic adjectives (rather than adverbs), where, in the absence of the head noun, the plural and accusative markers are attached directly to the adjective.[8]

8 The same pluralized and accusative-marked adjective appears as a thematic (elliptic) adjective in a sentence such as *Mari a kicsi almákat szereti, Péter a nagyokat* 'Mary likes the small apples, and Peter, the big ones.' In such a case, the elliptic adjective *nagyokat* 'big.PL.ACC' has all the properties of a subcategorized and referential nominal, and shows a striking contrast with the syntactic behaviour of the PO *nagyokat* big.PL.ACC', for instance regarding the diagnostics presented in Section 5. In this paper, I exclude all situations and contexts where POs are interpreted thematically.

(13) *Mari nagy-ok-at kacagott.*
Mary big-PL-ACC laugh.PST.3SG
'Mary repeatedly laughed big laughs.'

While POs of class (b) are compatible with a wide variety of intransitive(ly used) verbs, POs of class (c) may impose severe s-selectional restrictions on the verb they accompany, as shown by the infelicitous VP below. This property is related to the adverbial interpretation of these latter POs (see Section 5.3).

(14) *Mari kellemes-et beszélgetett/ #kellemes-et balesetezett.*
Mary pleasant-ACC talk.PST.3SG pleasant-ACC have.an.accident.PST.3SG
'Mary had a pleasant talk (with somebody)/had a pleasant accident.'

Whereas singular POs accompanied by *egy* 'one/a(n)' have the distribution of indefinite singular objects as they can appear either preverbally or postverbally (cf. [15a]), singular (and plural) POs not accompanied by *egy* 'one/a(n)' mirror the position and distribution of Hungarian bare nominals as they immediately precede the finite verb in neutral sentences (cf. [15b]); see also Kiefer (2006):

(15) a. *Mari egy széles-et mosolygott/ mosolygott egy széles-et.*
Mary one wide-ACC smile.PST.3SG smile.PST.3SG one wide-ACC
'Mary smiled a wide smile.'
b. *Mari széles-et mosolygott/ *mosolygott széles-et.*
Mary wide-ACC smile.PST.3SG smile.PST.3SG wide-ACC
'Mary smiled a wide smile.'

More precisely, POs of class (b) and (c) may either appear preverbally or postverbally, and in both cases they can occur either as an indefinite or as a bare noun but in the latter case they must occur in a non-neutral sentence. As such, similarly to a preverbal or verbal focus licensing a thematic bare nominal postverbally (see [6] above), such a focus can also license a (singular or plural) PO in the same postverbal position, as in (16):

(16) *MARI mosolygott széles-et./ Mari MOSOLYGOTT széles-et.*
Mary smile.PST.3SG wide-ACC Mary smile.PST.3SG wide-ACC
'It was Mary who smiled a wide smile./Mary has smiled a wide smile (at least once).'

Irrespective of their position, POs – as indefinite or (singular/plural) bare nominals – trigger the indefinite conjugation of the verb. This is strongly connected to the indefinite restriction on ACOs more generally, which states that these objects are generally indefinite (see Section 5).

The following examples illustrate the co-occurrence restrictions of POs with a subcategorized (non-cognate or cognate) object (17a), a verbal particle (17b) or a stative verb (17c).

(17) a. **János ivott egy-et egy teá-t/ egy ital-t.*
John drink.PST.3SG one-ACC a tea-ACC a drink-ACC
'(lit.) John drank a tea a drinking/a drink a drinking.'

b. **János el-futott egy jó-t.*
John PRT-run.PST.3SG one good-ACC
'(lit.) John ran away a good run.'

c. **János félt egy nagy-ot a pók-tól.*
John be.afraid.PST.3SG one big-ACC the spider-ABL
'(lit.) John was afraid a big fright of the spider.'

With respect to their syntax, Csirmaz (2008) argues that when the PO accompanies an (unergative) activity verb, it functions as an argument, it takes the vacant direct object position and merges inside the VP. However, when it modifies an (unaccusative) semelfactive verb, it functions as an adjunct and must adjoin PredP. In addition, it moves to [Spec, PredP] when it precedes the (semelfactive) verb.

The starting point for Farkas and Kardos (2018) is the articulated VP structure, with an aspectual phrase (AspP) between *v*P and VP implicated in the aspectual interpretation of the predicate and determining a domain of aspectual interpretation (cf. also MacDonald 2008 or Travis 2010). The authors claim that POs, as non-subcategorized and non-thematic nominals, are base-generated in [Spec, AspP], with the verb undergoing V-Asp-*v*-T head movement.

Connecting the above restrictions with these syntactic accounts, I rely on Travis (2010), who claims that subcategorized and thematic internal arguments affecting the structure of the event of V are merged inside the VP but undergo movement to the specifier of AspP if they delimit the event of the verb. In addition, one may also argue that the same restriction in (17a) has to do with accusative POs banning accusative DP arguments but, instead, allowing non-accusative (e.g. elative) DP elements as in *ivott egyet egy teából* '(lit.) drank one.ACC a tea.ELA'. In addition, as verbal particles are claimed to be base-generated in a postverbal position, from which they move first to [Spec, AspP] and then to a *v*P-external position (Surányi ms), the co-occurrence restriction in (17b) receives syntactic support: POs and verbal particles compete for the same – base versus derived – syntactic position (for more on the claim that the verb-internal position is AspP and not PredP, as in É. Kiss 2008 or Surányi 2009, see Surányi ms). Moreover, according to Farkas and Kardos (2019a, 2019b), verbal particles and POs encode different (semantic) operators, and although they both derive a telic VP, they are associated with a different telic interpretation and they mutually exclude each other. Last, the restriction on stative verbs is a general property of ACOs cross-

linguistically, which can be explained by the fact that COCs describe a wide range of (physical, mental or perceptual) actions involving temporal processes; therefore, they exclude states. The last two restrictions receive further semantic support: as POs introduce and modify a result (Section 6.2), they are incompatible with both delimited events (i.e., particle verbs) and states (cf. also Kiefer 2006 or Csirmaz 2008).

2.4 Measure phrases

Hungarian has a wide variety of accusative-marked temporal (18a) and spatial measure phrases (18b), measure phrases formed with the suffix *-nyi* (18c) as well as other measure phrases (18d):

(18) a. *János két órá-t futott.*
John two hour-ACC run.PST.3SG
'John ran for two hours.'
b. *János két kilométer-t futott.*
John two kilometer-ACC run.PST.3SG
'John ran two kilometers.'
c. *János futott egy iramodás-nyi-t.*
John run.PST.3SG one pace-*nyi*-ACC
'John ran a sudden, vigorous and quick run.'
d. *János kicsi-t/ sok-at/ eleg-et futott.*
John little-ACC a lot-ACC enough-ACC run.PST.3SG
'John ran a little/a lot/enough.'

They differ from the POs under consideration here not only because of the lack of their co-occurrence restrictions with another subcategorized (thematic) object (19a), a verbal particle (19b) or a stative verb (19c), but also because they can be definite and trigger the definite conjugation of the verb, as shown by the verb form *futotta* (versus the indefinite conjugation on *futott*) (20):

(19) a. *János két órá-t futott egy maraton-t.*
John two hour-ACC run.PST.3SG a marathon-ACC
'John ran a marathon in two hours.'
b. *János le-futott két kilométer-t.*
John PRT-run.PST.3SG two kilometer-ACC
'John ran two kilometers.'
c. *János kicsi-t félt a pók-tól.*
John little-ACC be.afraid.PST.3SG the spider-ABL
'John was a little afraid of the spider.'

(20) *János le-futotta a két kilométer-t.*
John PRT-run.PST.3SG the two kilometer-ACC
'John ran the (alotted) two kilometers.'
(Csirmaz 2008: 176)

Such and similar sentences are perfectly acceptable because measure phrases express temporal/spatial duration, degree or extent. Also, since they do not impose any restriction on the argument structure of the predicate and do not have the properties of an argument, they do not merge as direct objects of the verb but are considered to be structurally case-marked adjuncts of the predicate. More precisely, due to restrictions on case-feature checking, temporal and spatial measure phrases are claimed to merge within *v*P, along with arguments and certain adjuncts. In case they appear preverbally, they move to a low preverbal functional projection above PredP (Csirmaz 2008). Hence, they can co-occur with verbal particles, situated in [Spec, PredP] (or even thematic objects) because they do not compete for the same syntactic position.

In sum, Hungarian POs under consideration in this paper differ both from thematic and cognate objects as well as accusative measure phrases.

With these preliminaries established, I turn to describing Hungarian as a strong satellite-framed language. This discussion is relevant as such a language is predicted to have ACOCs.

3 Hungarian as a strong satellite-framed language

According to the literature (Acedo-Matellán 2010; Beck and Snyder 2001; Goldberg 1995; Horrocks and Stavrou 2003; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Mateu 2002; McIntyre 2004; Snyder 2001; Talmy 1985; Zubizarreta and Oh 2007, *inter alia*), there is a conceptual similarity and cross-linguistic correlation between complex event constructions such as goal-of-motion structures (see [21a]), and strong (Washio 1997) or true (Rapoport 1999) resultative constructions (see [21b]):

(21) a. *The child walked into the house.*
b. *John hammered the metal flat.*

The best-known formalization of this correlation is Talmy (1985), who argues that in satellite-framed languages such as English a process of conflation of Manner and Motion is active in the verb root, with Path/result being expressed by the satellite. To put it differently, the possibility of encoding Path/result in the satellite is what explains the availability of these two constructions in such languages,

where an atelic verb combines with a goal PP complement and an AP result predicate, respectively, and generates a telic VP.

Although the Talmian typological classification of complex event constructions does not extend to aspectual cognate constructions *per se*, it seems that, to a lesser degree, there is a conceptual similarity and cross-linguistic correlation between the two above-mentioned telic constructions and ACOCs (see [22]), as claimed in Massam (1990), Tenny (1994), Felser and Wanner (2001), Horrocks and Stavrou (2006, 2010), Real Puigdollers (2008) or Kitahara (2010).

(22) *Mary smiled a wide smile.*

In such a construction, an atelic verb combines with a (modified) ACO, which is both semantically and morphologically related to the verb, and generates a telic VP.

The generalization is that in satellite-framed languages, where Path/result is lexicalized by the satellite – that is, the goal PP complement, the AP result predicate or the ACO – all three telic constructions should equally be available; and, conversely, in verb-framed languages, where Path/result is not expressed by the satellite, all three constructions should equally be unavailable (on the result interpretation of ACOs, see Section 6.2). Hungarian is a strong satellite-framed language (Acedo-Matellán 2016), where Path/result is always encoded by the satellite (Hegedűs 2017). The following data shows that, not unexpectedly, this language has both goal-of-motion structures (23a) and strong resultative constructions (23b). But, quite unexpectedly, it lacks canonical ACOCs, as already shown in (2a) and (10b), repeated here as (23c):

(23) a. *A gyerek be-sétált a ház-ba.*
the child PRT-walk.PST.3SG the house-ILL
'The child walked into the house.'

b. *János lapos-ra kalapálta a fém-et.*
John flat-SUB hammer.PST.3SG the metal-ACC
'John hammered the metal flat.'

c. **Mari mosolygott egy széles mosoly-t.*
Mary smile.PST.3SG one wide smile-ACC
'Mary smiled a wide smile.'

Due to the discrepancy in the availability of goal-of-motion structures and strong resultative constructions, on the one hand, and ACOCs, on the other hand, at first sight Hungarian is a clear counterexample to the above generalization.[9] But if I

9 This generalization does not refer to those cognate constructions where the object is both morphologically and semantically related to the verb but is nested into a PP adjunct as in *örvendeni kezdtek igen nagy örömmel* 'they rejoiced with exceeding great joy' (Mt 2,10; SzJ 2007: 1105) or where it is only semantically related to the verb as in *krokodilkönnyeket sír* 'cry crocodile tears'.

demonstrate that Hungarian POs under discussion in this paper fulfil the function of the ACO, I not only fill a typologically unexpected gap but I also lend further support to the validity of this generalization. Again, (23c), as the exact counterpart of (22), is ungrammatical in Hungarian but its counterpart where the same atelic verb is followed by an accusative PO such as *egyet* 'one.ACC' or *egy széleset* 'one wide.ACC' is acceptable.

With this cross-linguistic correlation in mind, I briefly present the previous literature on Hungarian POs.

4 Previous literature

This section summarizes the generalizations made about *egyet* 'one.ACC' and the POs of class (b) (Section 4.1) and takes a closer look at Csirmaz (2008), who addresses and rejects an account of these POs in terms of CO ellipsis (Section 4.2).

4.1 Previous proposals

Kiefer (1992, 1994, 2006) gives a general overview of the distribution, aspectual role and co-occurrence restrictions of the POs of class (a) and (b), and observes that they are not completely grammatical with the *alatt* 'in' time adverbial.

Piñón (2001), focusing mostly on *egyet* 'one.ACC', gives a semantic analysis of Hungarian POs. As for its denotation, *egyet* 'one.ACC' is argued to modify an event e of type R the runtime of which is a proper part of some time interval t, where t is contextually determined. Crucially, there is no other event e' within t that is larger than or distinct from e. These two conditions ensure that event descriptions containing this PO are telic.

É. Kiss (2004) points out that the PO is a non-specific indefinite noun, which cannot be interpreted as the passive participant (Patient/Theme or Undergoer) of the event of the verb. She also emphasizes that what these constructions express is that the referent of the nominal in the syntactic subject position (i.e., the Agent) creates a realization or instantiation of the given event.

Csirmaz (2008) argues that these POs are situation delimiters. She points out that two telicizing elements – such as a PO and a telicizing verbal particle – generate a doubly delimited VP and hence violate Tenny's (1994) Single Delimiting Constraint. This explains the ungrammaticality of **a fény fel-villant egyet* '(lit.) the light PRT-flashed one.ACC'. Moreover, the presence of the PO excludes all other, non-telicizing verbal particles as well, as in **János el-mélázott egyet* '(lit.) John PRT-

mused one.ACC', where the ungrammaticality is explained by the fact that particles require a specific object but the PO is non-specific.

Halm (2012) observes that there is no clear borderline between unaccusative and unergative verbs in Hungarian. More precisely, the fact that these verbs can appear with a verbal particle (e.g. *a fény fel-villant* '(lit.) the light PRT-flashed', behaviour typical of unaccusative verbs) but are also compatible with these POs (e.g. *a fény villant egyet* '(lit.) the light flashed one.ACC', behaviour typical of unergative verbs) cannot be considered as an argument for the adjunct status of POs and, consequently, for the unambiguous unaccusative behaviour of semelfactives but rather for their ambiguous unaccusative–unergative behaviour, which lends further support to Sorace's (2000) unaccusative–unergative continuum.

Farkas and Kardos (2018) argue that the base-generated position of these POs is the specifier of a functional phrase in the verbal domain (AspP). Moreover, Farkas and Kardos (2019a, 2019b) claim that – in sharp contrast to verbal particles, result predicates and goal PPs – POs encode an aspectual operator that picks out a contextually specified, non-maximal subpart of the event in the denotation of the verbal predicate.

These prior works share two significant properties: they address only the POs of class (a) and (b), and they do not describe them as nominals fulfilling the function of the ACO in the language. Thus, an analysis of Hungarian POs as ACOs is still lacking.

4.2 A closer look at Csirmaz (2008)

Before articulating my proposal, I take a closer look at one of the previous studies, which addresses and rejects an account of these Hungarian POs in terms of CO ellipsis. Csirmaz (2008) assumes that the same result-based account can be invoked for English COs as well as for Hungarian *egyet* 'one.ACC' and the POs of class (b), which introduce and modify a result. Later the author claims that, although some of their properties are similar, their distribution is different; therefore, an account of these POs in terms of CO ellipsis seems viable, but she argues against their CO analysis based on the following arguments: COs cannot always be elided in Hungarian, as shown in (24a); COs cannot always be added to a (modified) PO, as illustrated in (24b); and POs can also modify unaccusative semelfactives, as shown in (24c):

(24) a. *János hősi halál-t / *hősi-t halt.*
John heroic death-ACC heroic-ACC die.PST.3SG
'John died a heroic death.'
(adapted after Csirmaz 2008: 191)

b. *Mari sétált egy nagy-ot/ *egy nagy sétá-t.*
Mary walk.PST.3SG one big-ACC one big walk-ACC
'Mary walked a big walk.'
(adapted after Csirmaz 2008: 192)

c. *A zár kattant egy-et.*
the lock click.PST.3SG one-ACC
'The lock clicked one click/once.'

In addition, whenever a CO can alternate with a PO, it is assumed that the former is elided, as in (25):

(25) *Mari három lépés-t/ hárm-at lépett előre.*
Mary three step-ACC three-ACC step.PST.3SG forward
'Mary made three steps forward.'
(adapted after Csirmaz 2008: 192)

Since this example involves ellipsis, it is not considered an instance of a PO construction.

With respect to the first argument, I believe that any analysis of Hungarian objects faces the analysis of the verbs *hal* 'die' and *él* 'live' and their COs as being exceptional in one sense or another.[10] More precisely, these two verbs take a full (premodified) cognate nominal and not an accusative PO. Crucially, as an achievement verb associated with an inherent endpoint, *hal* 'die' cannot take any type of PO (see [26]) but either a verbal particle as in *János meg-halt* '(lit.) John PRT-died', where the particle overtly marks the inherent endpoint of the event, or a premodified CO as in *János hősi halált halt* 'John died a heroic death' (see also [24a]), where the CO cannot have the result interpretation and instead receives that of a manner adverb related to the modifying adjective (e.g. *hősiesen* 'heroically'):

(26) **János halt egy-et/ egy nagy-ot/ egy hirtelen-t.*
John die.PST.3SG one-ACC one big-ACC one sudden-ACC
'John died a death/a big death/a sudden death.'

10 Similarly, it has been shown that any analysis of the English COCs with the verbs *die* and *live* must be treated as exceptional in one way or another. In this respect, although many studies have treated the VP *die a death* as being exactly the same as any canonical COC involving an unergative verb such as *smile* in *smile a broad smile*, diachronic analyses emphasize the necessity to distinguish them and recognize that they have historically different derivational processes (see Kuno and Takami 2004, among others). What is intriguing is that the verbs *die* and *live* can take a semantic and morphological CO expressed by an object DP – and not an adjunct PP – even in Romance languages, which, as verb-framed languages, generally block ACOCs (cf. Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2013; Melloni and Masini 2017; Real Puigdollers 2008).

COCs built with the verbs *die* and *live* are among the very few cognate constructions that are exceptionally found cross-linguistically, even in languages that lack canonical ACOCs such as Hungarian. I maintain my position that Hungarian VPs built with these two verbs should be treated as somehow exceptional; therefore, I believe that the argument based on (24a), according to which COs cannot always be elided in Hungarian, does not provide a solid foundation for rejecting the CO (ellipsis) analysis of Hungarian POs more generally.[11]

As for the second argument, I stress the idea that it is possible for COs to be added to an accusative adjective but only in the case of (transitive and) transitivizing COCs (cf. [27]). In such a case, the accusative adjective, denoting a subcategorized and thematic entity, is not an instance of a PO occurring in an ACOC and it does not share the syntactic properties of POs presented in Section 5 (e.g. as opposed to a PO, *gyönyörűt* 'beautiful.ACC' can constitute the answer to a *mit* 'what.ACC' question):

(27) *Mari gyönyörű-t/ gyönyörű rajz-ot rajzolt.*
Mary beautiful-ACC *beautiful drawing*-ACC *draw*.PST.3SG
'Mary drew a beautiful drawing.'

Such and similar instances involve ellipsis: in the absence of the CO *rajzot* 'drawing.ACC', the accusative case marking appears on the adjective; see also Csirmaz (2008: 197).

When it comes to ACOCs, it is indeed true that, generally speaking, there is no free variation between the (modified) PO and the overt (modified) cognate nominal, and it is not the case that an overt cognate nominal is possible whenever a (modified) PO accompanies the prototypical unergative verb. In other words, I agree with Csirmaz (2008) that POs do not arise as a result of cognate nominal ellipsis as this type of approach is indeed untenable. But this does not mean that the cognate object analysis itself cannot be maintained. The approach I take here on POs is not in terms of ACO ellipsis but in terms of their being nominals that fulfil the function of the ACO in the language. The generalization that I make in this paper is that in Hungarian there are two COC patterns. On the one hand, there is the canonical – mostly transitive and transitivizing – COC pattern, also known from languages such as English, where the DP object is a semantic and morphological 'copy' of the verb. On the other hand, there is the non-canonical – mostly aspectual – COC pattern, not known from languages such as English, where the CO is

11 The verb *él* 'live', which can also appear in an intransitive configuration or take non-cognate objects as in *nehéz időket él* 'live in difficult times' or *gyermekkorát külföldön éli* 'live abroad in one's youth', is also exceptional in that its CO *élet* 'life' does not show the behaviour characteristic of ACOs, and the VP exhibits the properties of a transitivizing COC.

expressed by *egyet* 'one.ACC' or an accusative adjective. Whereas in the former case it is precisely the presence of the CO that defines the construction (which can exceptionally be elided as in [27] above), in the second case it is precisely the obligatory absence of the same type of object that defines the construction. It is this latter property that sets Hungarian apart from English and other languages that have canonical ACOCs, where the object is both semantically and morphologically related to the prototypical unergative verb it accompanies. In my opinion, a unified analysis of these two types of constructions does not and cannot lead to correct results and conclusions in Hungarian.

Three observations are related to the last argument, which is considered problematic because the single argument of unaccusative verbs behaves like the internal direct object argument of verbs used in a transitive configuration, hence it is difficult to account for the presence and syntactic position of the PO. From one perspective, these POs behave differently with (unaccusative or unergative) semelfactive and (unergative) activity verbs (see Piñón 2001). For instance, *hányat* 'how.many.ACC' is acceptable with the former but not the latter verb type. In addition, *egyet* 'one.ACC' can also precede the semelfactive verb and it can also be focalized or contrasted with another lexical element in a corrective focus position, implying its exclusion (e.g. an accusative numeral such as *kettőt* 'two.ACC'). All these facts can be explained by a possible lexical ambiguity of the PO, but I leave a deeper explanation for these facts to future work.

From a different perspective, the compatibility of semelfactive verbs with a PO sheds light on their ambiguous unaccusative–unergative behaviour (Halm 2012). Put differently, when a semelfactive takes a PO, it exhibits unergative behaviour, hence the PO should not be analysed as an adjunct but can occupy the vacant object position.

In addition, contrary to the traditional view (Hale and Keyser 1993; Levin 1993; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995), a cross-linguistic perspective on ACOs reveals that these objects can occur not only with unergative verbs but also with unaccusative, transitive or even ditransitive verbs in languages such as Modern Hebrew, Russian, Vietnamese or Arabic. The following unaccusative example from Modern Hebrew serves as illustration:

(28) *hu* *nafal* *nefila* *kaša*
he fall.PST.3SG falling hard
'He had a heavy fall.'
(adapted after Mittwoch 1998: 314)

Hence, the co-occurrence of Hungarian POs with unaccusative semelfactive verbs should not be taken as an argument against the CO (ellipsis) approach *per se*.

In sum, although I agree with Csirmaz (2008) that the CO ellipsis analysis is untenable, I defend my position, through the strong counterarguments to her first and last claim, that the CO analysis itself – where POs are viewed as accusative elements that fulfil the function of the ACO – is justifiable. This is what the next section demonstrates.

5 Syntactic features: evidence for three classes of POs

This section examines the most representative syntactic features characterizing the members of the three classes of POs, which share most of the properties of ACOs found in languages where these objects are literally cognate with the prototypical unergative verb they accompany. This is because ACOs and these Hungarian POs are non-subcategorized and non-thematic accusative nominals. The diagnostics that I outline here are the following: passivization, quantification with a strong determiner, theta-role assignment, pronominalization, indefiniteness restriction, restrictive relative clause modification, *mit* 'what.ACC' type of questioning, aspectual contribution, contrastive topicalization, focusing and adverbial interpretation. Section 5.1 discusses *egyet* 'one.ACC', Section 5.2 focuses on the POs of class (b) and Section 5.3 takes a close look at the POs of class (c). Section 5.4 is dedicated to an interim summary.

5.1 The PO of class (a)

As the PO *egyet* 'one.ACC' is not a subcategorized internal argument and does not denote a thematic entity that could be interpreted as being directly affected by the event of the verb (i.e., it is not the passive participant semantically labelled as Patient/Theme or Undergoer), it cannot appear in the derived subject position of a passive structure:

(29) *Mari oda ütött egy-et. *Egy oda volt ütve.*
Mary there hit.PST.3SG one-ACC one there be.PST.3SG hit
'Mary gave it a hit. One was hit there.'
(adapted after Csirmaz 2008: 167)

One of the first definitions of affectedness, given by Bolinger (1975), proposes the following constraint on passives with transitive verbs: the subject in a passive construction is considered to be a true patient, i.e., to be genuinely affected by the

action of the verb, where affectedness is understood as a persistent change in the respective event participant (see also Beavers 2011). If the grammatical object in the active construction is not conceived as a true patient, there will be no corresponding passive structure. It is clear that in the above passive example *egy* 'one' cannot be construed as a true patient as it is not affected by the action of the verb.

Moreover, as noted by Doron (1983, 1986), among others, nominals appearing in non-referential positions are different from those that appear in referential and argument positions in that the latter can but the former cannot be quantified with strong determiners. As such, *egyet* 'one.ACC' cannot occur with a strong determiner such as *ez* 'this', *mindegyik* 'each', *a legtöbb* 'most' or *minden* 'every', as illustrated below:

(30) **Mari kacagta ez-t a/ mindegyik/ a legtöbb/ minden egyet.*
Mary laugh.PST.3SG this-ACC the each the most every one-ACC
'(lit.) Mary laughed this/each/the most/every laugh(s).'

The incompatibility with strong determiners is one of the characteristic properties of predicative (that is, non-referential) nominals (Doron 1986).

As a non-thematic nominal, the PO is not assigned any theta-role by the verb; thus it does not have any semantic interpretation. Recall from Section 2.1 that Hungarian bare nominals, as predicative elements more generally, are considered to be non-referential. Hence, in the following example the essential difference between *könyvet* 'book.ACC' and *egyet* 'one.ACC' consists not in their being (non-) referential but in their being (non-)thematic. As such, the former is non-referential and thematic (Theme), and the latter is non-referential and non-thematic; therefore, they are not of the same thematic category:

(31) *Mari könyv-et olvasott/ olvasott egy-et.*
Mary book-ACC read.PST.3SG read.PST.3SG one-ACC
'Mary read a book/did some reading.'

In addition, the non-argument property of *egyet* 'one.ACC' predicts that it cannot be pronominalized (Doron 1983). This prediction is borne out by the example below: although the demonstrative *azt* 'that.ACC' has a [+/-specific] feature and can also refer back to a predicative constituent, even to predicates in copular sentences (cf. É. Kiss 2019), in the second sentence the demonstratives *ezt* 'this.ACC' and *azt* 'that.ACC' cannot stand for the PO *egyet* 'one.ACC':

(32) *Mari olvasott egy-et. *Mari olvasott ez-t/ az-t.*
Mary read.PST.3SG one-ACC Mary read.PST.3SG this-ACC that-ACC
'Mary did some reading. Mary read this/that.'

Interestingly, when the demonstratives refer back to a non-referential element, the verb is in the indefinite conjugation (cf. the verb form *olvasott*), the type of conjugation triggered by bare nouns and the indefinite PO *egyet* 'one.ACC' (and other POs in general), as shown in (31) above. This is strongly connected to the indefiniteness restriction on ACOs more generally. However, when the same pronouns refer back to a referential argument, the verb is in the definite conjugation (cf. the verb form *olvasta*), the type of conjugation expected with definite objects in general as shown in (33):

(33) *Mari a könyv-et olvasta. Mari ez-t/ az-t olvasta.*
Mary the book-ACC read.PST.3SG Mary this-ACC that-ACC read.PST.3SG
'Mary was reading the book. Mary was reading this/that.'

Furthermore, *egyet* 'one.ACC' cannot be modified by a restrictive relative clause (34a) and it cannot constitute the answer to a *mit* 'what.ACC' question (34b).

(34) a. **Mari az-t az egy-et kacagta, amely-et tegnap is*
Mary that-ACC the one-ACC laugh.PST.3SG that-ACC yesterday also
kacag-ni szeretett volna.
laugh-INF would like have
'(lit.) Mary laughed that laugh that she would have liked to laugh yesterday as well.'

b. **Mi-t kacagott Mari? Egy-et.*
what-ACC laugh.PST.3SG Mary one-ACC
'(lit.) What did Mary laugh? A laugh.'

With respect to its aspectual contribution, it has been noted that, similarly to English ACOs (see de Swart 2007; Horrocks and Stavrou 2006, 2010; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Macfarland 1994, 1995; Melloni and Masini 2017; Pereltsvaig 2002; Real Puigdollers 2008; Tenny 1994), *egyet* 'one.ACC' effects a shift of aspectual character with respect to the corresponding unergative verb used on its own but it is not fully compatible with the *alatt* 'in' time adverbial; cf. also Kiefer (1992, 1994, 2006), Piñón (2001), Csirmaz (2008) or Farkas (2017):

(35) ??/**Mari húsz perc alatt aludt egy-et.*
Mary twenty minute under sleep.PST.3SG one-ACC
'Mary slept a sleep in twenty minutes.'

It has been remarked in É. Kiss (2004) and Csirmaz (2008) that these constructions are not completely unacceptable with the *alatt* 'in' adverbial (see [36a]) and they are also compatible with the *belül* 'within' time adverbial (see [36b]). Moreover, if a (silent) Measure Phrase expressing a well-known distance is supplied contextually

or is understood from the context (Dowty 1979; Zucchi 1998), the sentence becomes acceptable (see [36c]):

(36) a. *Tíz perc alatt fürödtem egy-et.*
ten minute under have.a.bath.PST.1SG one-ACC
'I had a bath in ten minutes.'
(É. Kiss, p.c.)

b. *Mari két órá-n belül futott egy-et.*
Mary two hour-SUP within run.PST.3SG one-ACC
'Mary ran a run (with)in two hours.'
(adapted after Csirmaz 2008: 178)

c. *Ma reggel Mari fél óra alatt futott egy-et.*
today morning Mary half hour under run.PST.3SG one-ACC
'This morning Mary ran a run in half an hour.'
(Kardos, p.c.)

As the temporal adverbial test cannot be reliably used to diagnose the telicity of the verbal predicate with a PO, another standard telicity test is used to probe for (a)telicity in the case of this and other similar VPs. The conjunction test below shows that the sentence in (37) can only be interpreted to describe two eventualities, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. This kind of semantics is associated with telic event descriptions.

(37) *Juli délelőtt is és délután is pihent egy-et.*
Juli morning too and afternoon too rest.PST.3SG one-ACC
'Juli rested in the morning and she also rested in the afternoon.' (two eventualities)
*'Juli rested in the morning and in the afternoon too.' (single eventuality)
(adapted after Csirmaz 2008: 179)

Conjoined atelic event descriptions, on the other hand, can also be interpreted as expressing a single eventuality, where the eventuality holds during both temporal intervals as one single eventuality, as shown below:

(38) *Juli délelőtt is és délután is pihent.*
Juli morning too and afternoon too rest.PST.3SG
'Juli rested in the morning and in the afternoon, too.'
(adapted after Csirmaz 2008: 179)

As the PO *egyet* 'one.ACC' is not the accusative numeral *egy* 'one' but a nominal with a reduced form and meaning as in a grammaticalization process, it has no alternative it can be contrasted with. Therefore, it can be neither (contrastively) topicalized nor focalized or contrasted with another lexical element in a corrective

focus position, implying its exclusion (e.g. an accusative numeral such as *kettőt* 'two.ACC'). In addition, as this PO does not have an adverbial counterpart, the discussion on its (possible) adverbial interpretation is irrelevant.

5.2 POs of class (b)

Similarly to *egyet* 'one.ACC', members of this small and closed class of POs cannot appear in the derived subject position of a passive structure, as in (39):

(39) *Mari oda ütött egy nagy-ot. *Egy nagy oda volt ütve.*
Mary there hit.PST.3SG one big-ACC one big there be.PST.3SG hit
'Mary gave it a big hit. One big was hit there.'

In addition, as non-referential nominals, they cannot occur with a strong determiner (40):

(40) **Mari kacagta ez-t a/ mindegyik/ a legtöbb/ minden jó-t.*
Mary laugh.PST.3SG this-ACC the each the most every good-ACC
'(lit.) Mary laughed this/each/the most/every good laugh(s).'

As shown in the following sentence, both the bare noun *pirítóst* 'toast.ACC' and the PO *jót* 'good.ACC' occupy a preverbal position, they are both non-referential and trigger the indefinite conjugation of the verb (as per the indefiniteness restriction on ACOs more generally) as illustrated by the verb form *reggelizett* (versus the definite conjugation in *reggelizte*). However, in sharp contrast to the former, which is semantically interpreted as Theme, the latter is not interpreted as a theta-marked nominal:

(41) *Mari pirítós-t reggelizett/ jó-t reggelizett.*
Mary toast-ACC breakfast.PST.3SG good-ACC breakfast.PST.3SG
'Mary breakfasted on toast/participated in a good breakfast-eating event.'

Since the verb *reggelizik* 'breakfast', as a derived unergative verb, can also appear without an internal argument, the PO does not satisfy the argument structure properties of the verb, which would include getting a theta-role from it.

As predicate nominals in general cannot be pronominalized (Doron 1983, 1986), I predict that when these POs are replaced by a pronominal, they yield an unacceptable sentence. This prediction is borne out, as shown in (42), where the demonstratives should refer back to the PO:

(42) *Mari jó-t reggelizett.* **Mari ez-t / az-t reggelizett.*
Mary good-ACC breakfast.PST.3SG Mary this-ACC that-ACC breakfast.PST.3SG
'Mary participated in a good breakfast-eating event. Mary breakfasted on this/that.'

Although POs of class (b) cannot be replaced by a (demonstrative) pronoun, in case of event anaphora – that is, anaphoric reference to events – the use of such and similar pronouns is, exceptionally, allowed (see also Mittwoch 1998; Real Puigdollers 2008 or Horrocks and Stavrou 2010). In such a case, the pronoun refers back neither to a referential and thematic nominal nor to the (pluralized) PO but to the entire (repeated) event expressed by the VP (on the event interpretation of the PO, see Section 6.1). In this respect, (43b) can follow (43a):

(43) a. *Reggel-ente Mari jó-k-at reggelizett.*
morning-DISTR Mary good-PL-ACC breakfast.PST.3SG
'In the mornings, Mary repeatedly participated in good breakfast-eating events.'
b. *Ez akkor történt, amikor …*
this then happen.PST.3SG when
'This happened when …'

In such a case there is no contradiction between the singular pronoun *ez* 'this' in (43b) and the pluralized PO *jókat* 'good.PL.ACC' in (43a). This is because the pronoun refers back not to a single (breakfast-eating) event but to the sum of repeatedly performed (breakfast-eating) events.

Similarly to *egyet* 'one.ACC', POs of class (b) cannot be modified by a restrictive relative clause (44a), they cannot constitute the answer to a *mit* 'what.ACC' type of question (44b) and they give rise to a VP which is slightly ungrammatical with the *alatt* 'in' adverbial (44c):

(44) a. **Mari az-t a jó-t bulizta, amely-et tegnap is*
Mary that-ACC the good-ACC party.PST.3SG that-ACC yesterday also
buliz-ni szeretett volna.
party-INF would like have
'(lit.) Mary partied that good party that she would have liked to party yesterday as well.'
b. **Mi-t bulizott Mari? Egy jó-t.*
what-ACC party.PST.3SG Mary one good-ACC
'(lit.) What did Mary party? A good party.'
c. ??/**Mari két óra alatt bulizott egy jó-t.*
Mary two hour under party.PST.3SG one good-ACC
'Mary had a good party in two hours.'

Although these few POs are treated as having some lexical content, they can be neither inserted in a sentence with contrastive topic (45a) nor focalized and contrasted with their direct antonym pair (45b):

(45) a. **Egy jó-t JÁNOS futott, egy rossz-at pedig MARI.*
one good-ACC John run.PST.3SG one bad-ACC however Mary
'(lit.) It is John who ran a good run but it is Mary who ran a bad run.'
b. **Mari JÓ-T sétált nem pedig rossz-at.*
Mary good-ACC walk.PST.3SG not however bad-ACC
'(lit.) As for Mary, she walked a good walk and not a bad one.'

Crucially, if the PO *(egy) jót* '(one) good.ACC' appears not with its direct antonym pair but one of the POs of class (c), for instance, the above sentences improve in felicity:

(46) a. *?Egy jó-t JÁNOS futott, egy hosszú-t pedig MARI.*
one good-ACC John run.PST.3SG one long-ACC however Mary
'It is John who ran a good run but it is Mary who ran a long run.'
b. *?Mari JÓ-T sétált nem pedig hosszú-t.*
Mary good-ACC walk.PST.3SG not however long-ACC
'As for Mary, she walked a good walk and not a long one.'

Next, if I look at the manner adverbial interpretation of these POs, I notice that they are not equivalent to (and hence cannot be replaced with) their adverbial counterpart. This is illustrated below, where the translations make it obvious that (47a) is not equivalent to (47b).

(47) a. *Mari jó-t táncolt.*
Mary good-ACC dance.PST.3SG
'Mary participated in a good dancing event.'
b. *Mari jól táncolt.*
Mary well dance.PST.3SG
'Mary danced well/with talent.'

Although the adverbial counterparts of the adjectives *hatalmas* 'huge' (i.e., *hatalmasan* 'in a huge way') and *óriási* 'gigantic' (i.e., *óriásin* 'in a gigantic manner') sound odd, the adverbial counterpart of the last remaining PO of class (b) has the same behaviour as *jól* 'well' above: the PO-sentence in (48a) is not (necessarily) equivalent to the adverbial sentence in (48b):

(48) a. *Mari nagy-ot táncolt.*
Mary big-ACC dance.PST.3SG
'Mary participated in a big dancing event.'

b. *Mari* *nagyon* *táncolt.*
Mary very much dance.PST.3SG
'Mary danced exceedingly/in an exaggerated, extravagant or exorbitant manner.'

That the PO *jót* 'good.ACC' is not equivalent to the manner adverb *jól* 'well' is supported by the fact that the PO can co-occur with its adverbial counterpart within one and the same sentence:

(49) *Mari* *jól* *táncolt* *egy* *jó-t.*
Mary well dance.PST.3SG one good-ACC
'Mary participated in a good dancing event while dancing with talent.'

As the PO *jót* 'good.ACC' and the adverb *jól* 'well' fulfil different functions in the sentence, they do not display co-occurrence restrictions of any type.

This is further supported by the following sentence, where I want to test whether it is possible to insert a manner adverb with a meaning opposite to the meaning denoted by the adverbial counterpart of the adjective that the PO is built on (Real Puigdollers 2008). What I notice is that, as the PO *jót* 'good.ACC' is not equivalent to the manner adverb *jól* 'well', the insertion of the manner adverb *rosszul* 'badly' does not lead to contradiction. Notice that in (50) the PO and the adverb appear in two distinct clauses and the second clause is introduced by the conjunction *but* (the sentence where the two appear in the same clause as in *Mari rosszul táncolt egy jót* '(lit.) Mary badly danced one good.ACC' may sound less natural in the language):

(50) *Mari* *jó-t* *táncolt,* *de* *rosszul.*
Mary good-ACC dance.PST.3SG but badly
'Mary participated in a good dancing event but she did not dance well/with talent.'

There is no contradiction in saying that Mary had a good dancing experience but she did not dance with talent.

Furthermore, the accusative PO *jót* 'good.ACC' and the adverb *jól* 'well' can also be coordinated, as shown below:

(51) *A* *gyerek-ek* *jó-t* *és* *jól* *fociztak.*
the child-PL good-ACC and well play.football.PST.3PL
'The children participated in a good football-playing event and they also played well.'

At first sight, as coordination connects two (or more) conjuncts of the same syntactic category or semantic function, the grammaticality of this sentence might seem

surprising. Although *jót* 'good.ACC' and *jól* 'well' belong to two distinct word classes and differ not only in their morphological shape and meaning but also in distribution, the grammaticality of this sentence can be explained by assuming not the coordination of these two lexical items but the coordination of two clauses (É. Kiss, p.c.).

This section has shown that the syntactic properties of the POs of class (b) are similar to the behaviour of *egyet* 'one.ACC' in the case of most syntactic tests but they also differ with respect to some other diagnostics.

5.3 POs of class (c)

Members of this large and open class of POs, as non-subcategorized, non-referential and non-thematic nominals, share most of the properties of the other POs. As such, they cannot appear in the derived subject position of passive structures:

(52) *Mari oda ütött egy istenes-et. *Egy istenes oda*
Mary there hit.PST.3SG one thorough-ACC one thorough there
volt ütve.
be.PST.3SG hit
'Mary gave it a thorough hit. One thorough was hit there.'

In addition, they cannot co-occur with a strong determiner:

(53) **Mari kacagta ez-t a/ mindegyik/ a legtöbb/minden*
Mary laugh.PST.3SG this-ACC the each the most every
harsány-at.
uproarious-ACC
'(lit.) Mary laughed this/each/the most/every uproarious laugh(s).'

(54) shows that although *pirítóst* 'toast.ACC' and *gyorsat* 'quick.ACC', as bare singular nouns, share several properties (e.g. preverbal position, non-referentiality, indefinite conjugation triggered on the verb), they differ in at least one respect, namely in thematic properties, with the former being thematic and the latter, non-thematic.

(54) *Mari pirítós-t reggelizett/ gyors-at reggelizett.*
Mary toast-ACC breakfast.PST.3SG quick-ACC breakfast.PST.3SG
'Mary breakfasted on toast/participated in a quick breakfast-eating event.'

As predicate nominals in general cannot be pronominalized (Doron 1983, 1986), I expect that when the POs of class (c) are replaced by a pronominal, they yield an unacceptable sentence. This prediction is borne out, as shown in (55), where the demonstratives are meant to refer back to the PO:

(55) *Mari gyors-at reggelizett.* **Mari ez-t/ az-t reggelizett.*
Mary quick-ACC breakfast.PST.3SG Mary this-ACC that-ACC breakfast.PST.3SG
'Mary participated in a quick breakfast-eating event. Mary breakfasted on this/that.'

Although POs of class (c) cannot be replaced by a (demonstrative) pronoun, in case of event anaphora the use of such a pronoun is, exceptionally, allowed. Again, the pronoun in (56b) refers back to the entire (repeated) event expressed by the VP in (56a).

(56) a. *Reggel-ente Mari gyors-ak-at reggelizett.*
morning-DISTR Mary quick-PL-ACC breakfast.PST.3SG
'In the mornings, Mary repeatedly participated in quick breakfast-eating events.'
b. *Ez akkor történt, amikor …*
this then happen.PST.3SG when
'This happened when …'

In addition, these POs cannot be modified by a restrictive relative clause (57a), they cannot constitute the answer to a *mit* 'what.ACC' type of question (57b) and, with the *in*-time adverbial, they give rise to a sentence that is judged to be (slightly) ungrammatical (57c).

(57) a. **Mari az-t a mély-et aludta, amely-et*
Mary that-ACC the sound-ACC sleep.PST.3SG that-ACC
tegnap is alud-ni szeretett volna.
yesterday also sleep-INF would like have
'(lit.) Mary slept that sound sleep that she would have liked to sleep yesterday as well.'
b. **Mi-t aludt Mari? Egy mély-et.*
what-ACC sleep.PST.3SG Mary one sound-ACC
'(lit.) What did Mary sleep? A sound sleep.'
c. ??/**Mari két óra alatt aludt egy mély-et.*
Mary two hour under sleep.PST.3SG one sound-ACC
'Mary slept a sound sleep in two hours.'

The tests of contrastive topicalization and focusing cast light on some differences between the PO *egyet* 'one.ACC' and the POs of class (b), on the one hand, and the POs of class (c), on the other. The following two sentences are both felicitous:

(58) a. *Egy hangos-at JÁNOS sóhajtott, egy öreges-et pedig MARI.*
one loud-ACC John sigh.PST.3SG one elderly-ACC however Mary
'It is John who sighed a loud sigh but it is Mary who sighed an elderly sigh.'

b. *János HANGOS-AT sóhajtott nem pedig öreges-et.*
John loud-ACC sigh.PST.3SG not however elderly-ACC
'As for John, he sighed a loud sigh and not an elderly one.'

As for the test of the adverbial interpretation, I remark that, in sharp contrast to the POs of class (b), which are not equivalent to their manner adverbial counterpart, the ones belonging to class (c) can be replaced with their adverbial correspondent.[12] This is shown below, where the two sentences are semantically equivalent.

(59) a. *A politikus-ok szelíd-et vitáztak.*
the politician-PL gentle-ACC debate.PST.3PL
'The politicians had a gentle debate.'

b. *A politikus-ok szelíden vitáztak.*
the politician-PL gently debate.PST.3PL
'The politicians debated gently.'

The semantic equivalence of the PO *szelídet* 'gentle.ACC' and the adverb *szelíden* 'gently' is supported by the fact that they cannot co-occur within one and the same sentence:

(60) *#A politikus-ok szelíden vitáztak egy szelíd-et.*
the politician-PL gently debate.PST.3PL one gentle-ACC
'The politicians gently had a gentle debate.'

As the PO and the adverb have more or less the same function (i.e., the PO contributes information about the manner in which the action denoted by the verb takes place), they mutually exclude each other.

This is further supported by the following pair of sentences, where I want to test whether it is possible to insert a manner adverb with a meaning opposite to the one denoted by the adverbial counterpart of the adjective that the PO is built on (Real Puigdollers 2008). What I notice is that, as the PO *szelídet* 'gentle.ACC' is (or can be) equivalent to the adverb *szelíden* 'gently', the insertion of the adverb *hevesen* 'heatedly' leads to contradiction. Again, as shown below in (61), the PO and the adverb appear in two distinct clauses and the second clause is introduced

12 Not all PO constructions can semantically be equated with an intransitive sentence that contains the adverbial counterpart of the PO. One relevant example is *Mari nehezet edzett* 'Mary was (involved) in a difficult training (session)' and *Mari nehezen edzett* 'Mary worked out with difficulty'.

by the conjunction *but* (the sentence where the two appear in the same clause as in *A politikusok hevesen vitáztak egy szelídet* '(lit.) The politicians heatedly debated one gentle.ACC' sounds grammatical in the language but it is as contradictory and pragmatically infelicitous as [61]):

(61) #*A politikus-ok szelíd-et vitáztak, de hevesen.*
the politician-PL gentle-ACC debate.PST.3PL but heatedly
'The politicians had a gentle debate but they debated heatedly.'

To put it simply, there is a contradiction in saying that the politicians debated gently but in a heated manner.

Furthermore, the PO and its adverbial counterpart cannot be coordinated, as shown below:

(62) **A politikus-ok szelíd-et és szelíden vitáztak.*
the politician-PL gentle-ACC and gently debate.PST.3PL
'The politicians had a gentle debate and they also debated in a gentle manner.'

This can be explained neither by the coordination of two lexical items nor by the coordination of two clauses. From this, I conclude once again that the PO and the adverb are subject to severe co-occurrence restrictions.[13]

This section has shown that the syntactic properties of the POs of class (c) are similar to the behaviour of *egyet* 'one.ACC' and that of the POs of class (b) in the case of most syntactic tests but they also differ with respect to some other tests.

5.4 Interim summary

Members of the three classes of POs share most of the properties of ACOs found in languages where they are semantically and morphologically related to the prototypical unergative verb they accompany. This is because ACOs and these POs are

13 An anonymous reviewer wonders how the adverbial nature of POs of class (c) may be connected to their being less frequently used in spoken language, considering that the opposite would be more expected. This might be related to their diachrony (Farkas 2020): while *egyet* 'one.ACC' appears in the Middle Hungarian period, POs of class (b) are first identified in diverse texts belonging to the Early Modern Hungarian period and the first (but very rare) occurrences of POs of class (c) date to the middle of the nineteenth century. In other words, the (beginning of the) Modern Hungarian period is characterized not only by the emergence of the POs of class (c) but, after a gradual numerical increase during the Early Modern Hungarian period, also by a (very) high frequency in use of the POs of class (a) and (b). In addition, there might be individual, frequency-related distinctions within class (c), with some POs being more frequent than others. I do not have a satisfactory answer to the generalization behind this difference.

non-subcategorized, non-referential and non-thematic accusative nominals. The features common to the members of the three classes are reflected in the tests of passivization, quantification with a strong determiner, theta-role assignment, pronominalization, indefiniteness restriction, restrictive relative clause modification, *mit* 'what.ACC' type of questioning and aspectual contribution. More importantly, the tests of contrastive topicalization, focusing and adverbial interpretation shed light on the most essential differences between them. All these syntactic features are summarized below:[14]

Table 1: Syntactic features of Hungarian POs.

Syntactic features	Class (a)	Class (b)	Class (c)
Passivization	*	*	*
Quantification with a strong determiner	*	*	*
Theta-role assignment	*	*	*
Pronominalization	*	*	*
Indefiniteness restriction	✓	✓	✓
Restrictive relative clause modification	*	*	*
mit 'what.ACC' type of questioning	*	*	*
Aspectual contribution	?	?	?
Contrastive topicalization	N/A	?	✓
Focusing	N/A	?	✓
Adverbial interpretation	N/A	*	✓

As summarized in Table 1, the motivation behind the ternary division of Hungarian POs – instead of a binary one, which merges the POs of class (b) and (c) – is supported by syntactic evidence.

6 ACOs as events and results

There has been a long-standing debate in the literature on the precise semantic status of the ACO, which (in English) has been viewed either as an eventive object or as a result/effected object. More recently, it has been proposed that both event and effected object readings can be attested in the ACOCs of one language. With regard to Hungarian, É. Kiss (2004) argues that VPs with a PO express the creation

14 If quantification with a strong determiner and indefiniteness restriction are considered to be two sides of the same coin, they give the same information about the restrictions in opposite ways: whereas POs cannot be quantified with a strong determiner, they are indefinite and trigger the indefinite conjugation on the verb.

or induction of an event; more precisely, the referent of the nominal in the syntactic subject position (i.e., the Agent) creates a realization or instantiation of the given event. More recently, Csirmaz (2008) claims that Hungarian POs introduce and modify a result, which may be a sound or a more abstract result of the event expressed by the verb. It is this interpretation that explains why delimited events (achievements or particle verbs) and states cannot take a PO (see also Section 2.3). In my proposal, Hungarian POs fulfilling the function of the ACO in the language can refer either to the event itself (Section 6.1) or to the entity that results from the verbal event (Section 6.2).[15]

Before I dig deeper into the analysis, let me make an important remark: Hungarian nominals can carry a special suffix with an eventive interpretation (cf. Laczkó 2009 or Szabolcsi and Laczkó 1992). In this respect, there is a difference between the morphologically simple noun *mosoly* 'smile' and the morphologically complex, event-denoting noun *mosolygás* 'smiling', which is formed from the above underived noun by means of the suffix *-ás*. This remark will be relevant to my discussion on POs as resultant objects.

6.1 ACOs as events

According to Sailer (2010), the first empirical test for the event reading of a CO is the availability of a manner paraphrase. Relying on event variables to model the particular event reading of COCs (cf. Mittwoch 1998; Moltmann 1989; Parsons 1990), I illustrate the semantic representation of (63a), which is roughly equivalent to the corresponding intransitive sentence including the adverbial *szelíden* 'gently', in (63b):

(63) a. *A politikus-ok szelíd-et vitáztak.*
the politician-PL gentle-ACC debate.PST.3PL
'The politicians had a gentle debate.'

b. $\exists e(\textbf{vitázni}\ (e) \wedge \textbf{szelíd}\ (e) \wedge \textbf{Arg}_1\ (e, \textbf{politikus}))$
(adapted after Sailer 2010: 197)

15 A question that arises here is how the event–result interpretation of Hungarian POs can be derived from a structural analysis of the constructions under examination. Crucially, POs denoting an event and POs denoting a resultant object have the same syntactic behaviour *vis-à-vis* the most essential syntactic tests considered in Section 5 (provided they belong to the same class). Therefore, there are no reasons to assume that they are associated with different syntactic structures or are merged in different positions. Together with Farkas and Kardos (2018), I can claim that they are merged in the specifier position of AspP (see Section 2.3). Whether POs belonging to different classes and exhibiting different syntactic behaviour (Section 5) occupy different syntactic positions or not is a task that will be left for further research.

This representation, which does not include tense or plural markings, expresses the proposition that there is an event *e* which is a debating-event; this event has the property of being gentle and the politicians are the participants of the event.

In addition, Mittwoch (1998) argues that (Hebrew) COs are neither thematic arguments of their predicates nor adjuncts but are realizations of the (non-thematic) Davidsonian event argument of the main predicate. I claim that (modified) POs in Hungarian are event arguments, which do not introduce an entity into the discourse and do not modify an already introduced entity but the event itself. I present my arguments with VPs built on unergative denominal verbs, with the object argument incorporated into V (Hale and Keyser 1993), as in *fagyizik* (<*fagyi* 'icecream') 'eat an icecream' or *biciklizik* (<*bicikli* 'bicycle') 'ride a bicycle'. In such a case, the adjective on which the PO is built (e.g. *jó* 'good') modifies neither the referent of the nominal occupying the syntactic subject position nor the referent of the nominal in the syntactic object position (incorporated into the verb) but the event itself: the event of eating an icecream. This is sustained by the meaning of a sentence such as the following:

(64) *A gyerek-ek fagyiztak egy jó-t.*
the child-PL eat.icecream.PST.3PL one good-ACC
'The children participated in a good icecream-eating event.'

Proof of this comes from the fact that the scope of an inserted negative operator (*nem* 'not') can be the same adjective modifying either the subject or the incorporated object, without yielding semantic contradiction, but not the event itself. This is illustrated in (65):

(65) *A gyerek-ek fagyiztak egy jó-t,*
the child-PL eat.icecream.PST.3PL one good-ACC
bár ők maguk nem voltak jó-k/
although they themselves not be.PST.3PL good-PL
bár maga a fagyi nem volt jó/
although itself the icecream not be.PST.3SG good
≠bár maga a fagyizás nem volt jó.
although itself the icecream-eating event not be.PST.3SG good
'The children participated in a good icecream-eating event but they themselves were not good or did not behave well/but the icecream itself was not good/but the icecream-eating event itself was not good.'

This is further supported by the following non-pleonastic sentence, where the idea expressed by the linearly first clause does not entail the idea expressed by the linearly second clause:

(66) *A gyerek-ek fagyiztak egy jó-t és ráadásul*
the child-PL eat.icecream.PST.3PL one good-ACC and in addition
még a fagyi is jó volt.
even the icecream also good be.PST.3SG
'The children participated in a good icecream-eating event and, in addition, even the icecream was good.'

The next evidence for the event interpretation of Hungarian POs comes from the reduplication of *egyet* 'one.ACC'. It is a well-known fact that in Hungarian verbal particle reduplication such as *fel-fel* 'up-up' in a sentence like *János fel-fel dobta az érmét* '(lit.) John up-up threw the coin.ACC' expresses the repetition of the event of the verb (cf. Lipták and Saab 2019). Similarly, *egyet* 'one.ACC' can also be reduplicated as in *egyet-egyet* 'one.ACC-one.ACC' and in that case it signals the iteration of the event of the verb, i.e., that the event re-occurred an unspecified number of times during a certain time interval.

(67) *A gyerek-ek bicikliztek egy-et- egy-et.*
the child-PL bike.PST.3PL one-ACC one-ACC
'The children biked from time to time.'

Without reduplication, the above verb refers to a single event, and with reduplication it refers to a series of (repeated) events.

POs of class (b) and (c) cannot be reduplicated but they can be pluralized. In such a case, the plural marking refers not to the plurality of an already introduced entity but to the plurality (or repetition) of the event itself. Proof of this comes from the fact that such a PO can also accompany a verb that takes a singular nominal as its syntactic subject and/or incorporated direct object (also lexicalized in the following example):

(68) *A gyerek nagy-ok-at/fantasztikus-ak-at biciklizett az-on a*
the child big-PL-ACC/fantastic-PL-ACC bike.PST.3SG that-LOC the
bicikli-n.
bicycle-LOC
'The child repeatedly participated in big/fantastic bike-riding events on that bicycle.'

In such a case, PO pluralization has semantic scope over the denotation of the verb and the PO, and not just the PO itself. In other words, pluralization results in quantification over the event itself (i.e., event iteration as above) and not in

quantification over the (quality of the) resulting state of the event (as in *'The child participated in an extremely big/fantastic bike-riding event').

6.2 ACOs as results

In addition to their eventive interpretation, Hungarian POs can also denote resultant objects whose referents are 'produced' by the actions expressed by the verb. In this case, the verb describes first what kind of action is performed by the subject referent, and then the PO describes what was produced by this action or, more precisely, describes the 'product' resulting from the performed action. As such, the PO accompanying an emission verb has a polysemous interpretation: it not only refers to the event itself but it also identifies its result (i.e., a concrete manifestation); hence it can denote an emitted sound or a (bodily) substance. Also, as an effected entity, it manifests the interesting property of being co-extensive with the event of the verb: such nominals refer to entities which come into existence through the unfolding of the event but they cease to exist with the end of the same event (cf. Horita 1996).

First, with emission verbs – where the term 'emission' is taken in a larger sense and thus may refer to 'emission' of facial expression as in *mosolyog* 'smile', emission of sound as in *kiált* 'shout' or emission of sound and bodily substance as in *tüsszent* 'sneeze' – the PO denotes, first and foremost, an effected entity as evidenced by the interpretation of the following sentence:

(69) *Mari* *mosolygott* *egy* *széles-et.*
Mary smile.PST.3SG one wide-ACC
'Mary smiled a wide smile.'

(69) can roughly be paraphrased by a sentence with the morphologically simple nominal *mosoly* 'smile', which refers to a particular constellation of the facial muscles ('Mary smiled, which resulted in a wide smile') and not by a sentence with the morphologically complex, event-denoting *-ás* noun *mosolygás* 'smiling', which refers to the action of smiling ('≠Mary smiled, which resulted in a wide smiling event').

Second, as POs have an 'introduction/generation-of-an-event' interpretation (É. Kiss 2004), they are incompatible with creation verbs, which have a 'generation-of-a-referential-entity' interpretation (cf. also Marantz 2005). To put it in more formal terms, ACOs are often characterized as objects of result or effected objects, that is, they do not denote pre-existing 'entities' affected by the action denoted by the verb; rather, they are 'entities' created by the action of the verb. That is, the object in this case is interpreted as if it were linked to some event, similar to an

event of creation. This is exactly why they are not compatible with verbs of creation, which in their basic sense involve an effected entity, which is syntactically analysed as a subcategorized internal argument. This explains the ungrammaticality of (70):

(70) **Főztünk egy-et a hétvégé-n.*
cook.PST.1PL one-ACC the weekend-SUP
'We participated in a cooking event in the weekend.'

However, if the creation meaning is backgrounded and the event interpretation is foregrounded by the insertion of some suffixes, the verb becomes compatible with the PO:

(71) *Főzöcskéztünk egy-et a hétvégé-n.*
cook.DIM.PST.1PL one-ACC the weekend-SUP
'We participated in a cooking event in the weekend.'
(Farkas 2017: 124)

In sum, Hungarian POs can also denote resultant objects whose referents are 'produced' by the actions expressed by the verb. I have demonstrated this with emission and creation verbs.

This section has presented clear evidence in favour of the idea that Hungarian POs can refer either to the event (and have an eventive interpretation) or to the entity that results from the verbal event (and have an effected object interpretation). In sum, both event and effected object readings are attested in the PO constructions of this language.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, I contributed to the vast literature on ACOs by putting forth a novel, syntactic and semantic analysis of Hungarian. On the one hand, I proposed that there are three distinct classes of POs and demonstrated that, as Hungarian restricts the co-occurrence of ACOs and prototypical unergative verbs, they fulfil the function of the ACO in this language. Although the focus was on Hungarian, it was indirectly shown that POs share most of the syntactic properties of ACOs in languages where these objects are semantically and morphologically related to the prototypical unergative verb they accompany. These properties stem from the fact that ACOs and these Hungarian POs are non-subcategorized and non-thematic nominals, hence they uniformly fail the canonical tests of subcategorized and thematic objects. Crucially, their non-uniform behaviour with respect to some other syntactic tests motivated their ternary division. On the other hand, some

important observations were made about the semantics of POs in terms of their interpretation as event or result. The analysis also allowed me to fill a typologically unexpected gap, considering that Hungarian, as a strong satellite-framed language, is predicted to have ACOCs.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
COMP	comparative
DAT	dative
DIM	diminutive
DISTR	distributive
ELA	elative
ILL	illative
IMP	imperative
INF	infinitive
LOC	locative
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PRS	present
PRT	particle
PST	past
SG	singular
SUB	sublative
SUP	superessive

Acknowledgements: I thank the two anonymous reviewers and editors of *Folia Linguistica* along with the participants of the *3rd Budapest Linguistics Conference* (Budapest, 2019); the *52nd Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea* (Leipzig, 2019) and *Events and Event Structure at the Limits of Grammar* (Oxford/online, 2020) conferences for their observations and feedback on earlier versions and different parts of this study. Financial support for this research was partially provided by *Domus Hungarica Scientiarum et Artium*. The publication of this article was supported by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Sources

KG = Károli, Gáspár. 1990 [1908]. *Szent Biblia, azaz Istennek Ó és Új Testamentomában foglaltatott egész Szent Írás* [The Holy Bible: God's entire holy scripture in the Old and New Testament]. Budapest: Magyar Biblia-tanács.

Papp, Csaba (ed.). 2006. *Tóth Árpád összegyűjtött versei és versfordításai* [The collected poems and poem translations of Árpád Tóth]. Budapest: Osiris.
SzJ = *Ó- és Újszövetségi Szentírás a Neovulgáta alapján* [The Old and New Testament based on Neovulgata]. 2007. Budapest: Szent Jeromos Katolikus Bibliatársulat.

References

Acedo-Matellán, Víctor. 2010. *Argument structure and the syntax-morphology interface: A case study in Latin and other languages*. Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona dissertation.
Acedo-Matellán, Víctor. 2016. *The morphosyntax of transitions: A case study in Latin and other languages* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 62). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Alberti, Gábor. 1997. Restrictions on the degree of referentiality of arguments in Hungarian sentences. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 44(3–4). 341–362.
Beavers, John. 2011. On affectedness. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29(2). 335–370.
Beck, Sigrid & William Snyder. 2001. Complex predicates and goal PP's: Evidence for a semantic parameter. In Anna H.-J. Do, Laura Domínguez & Aimee Johansen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, Vol. 1, 114–122. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
Bolinger, Dwight. 1975. On the passive in English. In Adam Makkai & Valerie Becker Makkai (eds.), *The first LACUS Forum 1974*, 57–77. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.
Csirmaz, Anikó. 2008. Accusative case and aspect. In Katalin É. Kiss (ed.), *Event structure and the left periphery: Studies on Hungarian* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 68), 159–200. Dordrecht: Springer.
den Dikken, Marcel. 2018. *Dependency and directionality* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 154). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Doron, Edit. 1983. *Verbless predicates in Hebrew*. Austin: University of Texas at Austin dissertation.
Doron, Edit. 1986. The pronominal 'copula' as agreement clitic. In Hagit Borer (ed.), *The syntax of pronominal clitics* (Syntax and Semantics 19), 313–332. New York: Academic Press.
Dowty, David. 1979. *Word meaning and Montague Grammar: The semantics of verbs and times in generative semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
Dragomirescu, Adina & Alexandru Nicolae. 2013. L'objet interne en roumain: description, évolution et comparaison entre les langues romanes. In Emili Casanova Herrero & Cesáreo Calvo Rigual (eds.), *Actas del XXVI Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y de Filología Románicas*, Vol. 2, 147–158. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
É. Kiss, Katalin 1994. Sentence structure and word order. In Ferenc Kiefer & Katalin É. Kiss (eds.), *Syntax and semantics 27: The syntactic structure of Hungarian*, 1–90. San Diego: Academic Press.
É. Kiss, Katalin 2002. *The syntax of Hungarian* (Cambridge Syntax Guides). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
É. Kiss, Katalin 2004. Egy igekötőelmélet vázlata [An outline of a theory of verbal particles]. *Magyar Nyelv* C(1). 15–42.

É. Kiss, Katalin 2008. The function and the syntax of the verbal particle. In Katalin É. Kiss (ed.), *Event structure and the left periphery: Studies on Hungarian* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 68), 17–55. Dordrecht: Springer.

É. Kiss, Katalin 2019. A mutató, személyes és rejtett névmások megoszlásáról – Elekfi László megállapításai nyomán [On the distribution of demonstrative, personal and hidden pronouns – Based on Elekfi László's statements]. *Magyar Nyelvor* 143(4). 405–417.

Farkas, Imola-Ágnes. 2017. Miért nem tud Mari két óra alatt sétálni egyet? Az ige + *egyet* szerkezet és az *alatt* határpontos időmódosító összeférhetetlenségéről [Why can't Mary take a walk in two hours? On the incompatibility between the verb + *egyet* 'one.acc' construction and the delimiting *alatt* 'in' time adverbial]. *Nyelv-és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* LXI(2). 119–138.

Farkas, Imola-Ágnes. 2020. Az *egyet* áltárgy diakróniájáról [On the diachrony of the pseudo- object *egyet* 'one.acc']. In Katalin Balogné Bérces, Attila Hegedűs & Lilla Pintér (eds.), *Nyelvelmélet és diakrónia 4* [Linguistic theory and diachrony 4], 87–113. Budapest & Piliscsaba: Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kar, Elméleti Nyelvészeti Tanszék – Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék.

Farkas, Imola-Ágnes & Éva Kardos. 2018. Non-maximal event delimitation in Hungarian. *Argumentum* 14. 368–382.

Farkas, Imola-Ágnes & Éva Kardos. 2019a. A végpontosság mint szituációs aspektuális jegy jelölése a magyar nyelvben [Marking telicity as a situation aspectual property in Hungarian]. Part 1. *Magyar Nyelv* 115(2). 176–185.

Farkas, Imola-Ágnes & Éva Kardos. 2019b. A végpontosság mint szituációs aspektuális jegy jelölése a magyar nyelvben [Marking telicity as a situation aspectual property in Hungarian]. Part 2. *Magyar Nyelv* 115(3). 298–308.

Farkas, Donka & Henriëtte de Swart. 2003. *The semantics of incorporation: From argument structure to discourse transparency*. Stanford: CSLI.

Felser, Claudia & Anja Wanner. 2001. The syntax of cognate and other unselected objects. In Nicole Dehé & Anja Wanner (eds.), *Structural aspects of semantically complex verbs*, 105–130. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Gianollo, Chiara & Nikolaos Lavidas. 2013. Cognate adverbials and case in the history of Greek. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 33. 61–75.

Goldberg, Adele. 1995. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure* (Cognitive Theory of Language and Culture Series). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hale, Kenneth & Samuel Jay Keyser. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In Ken Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.), *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger* (Current Studies in Linguistics Series 24), 53–109. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Halm, Tamás. 2012. Unergative and/or unaccusative: On the argument structure, semantics and syntax of semelfactives in Hungarian. In Balázs Surányi & Diána Varga (eds.), *Proceedings of the First Central European Conference in Linguistics for Postgraduate Students*, 104–117. Budapest: Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem.

Hegedűs, Veronika. 2017. P heads in Hungarian complex events. Paper presented at the 2nd Budapest Linguistics Conference. Eötvös Loránd University, 1–3 June.

Höche, Silke. 2009. *Cognate object constructions in English: A cognitive-linguistic account* (Language in Performance 41). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Hong, Zhou. 1999. Cognate objects in Chinese. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 17. 263–284.

Horita, Yuko. 1996. English cognate object constructions and their transitivity. *English Linguistics* 13. 221–247.

Horrocks, Geoffrey & Melita Stavrou. 2003. Actions and their results in Greek and English: The complementarity of morphologically encoded (viewpoint) aspect and syntactic resultative predication. *Journal of Semantics* 20(3). 297–327.

Horrocks, Geoffrey & Melita Stavrou. 2006. The role and status of cognate objects across languages. Paper presented at the 29th GLOW Colloquium of Generative Grammar. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 6–8 April.

Horrocks, Geoffrey & Melita Stavrou. 2010. Morphological aspect and the function and distribution of cognate objects across languages. In Malka Rappaport Hovav, Edit Doron & Ivy Sichel (eds.), *Lexical semantics, syntax, and event structure* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 27), 284–308. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, Michael Allan. 1988. Cognate objects and the case-filter. *Journal of Linguistics* 24(1). 89–110.

Kardos, Éva. 2016. Telicity marking in Hungarian. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 1(1). 41.

Kardos, Éva. 2019. Situation aspectual properties of creation/consumption predicates. *Acta Linguistica Academica* 66(4). 491–525.

Kiefer, Ferenc. 1992. Az aspektus és a mondat szerkezete [Aspect and the structure of the sentence]. In Ferenc Kiefer (ed.), *Strukturális Magyar Nyelvtan I. Mondattan* [A structural grammar of Hungarian I. Syntax], 797–886. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Kiefer, Ferenc. 1994. Aspect and syntactic structure. In Ferenc Kiefer & Katalin É. Kiss (eds.), *Syntax and semantics 27: The syntactic structure of Hungarian*, 415–463. San Diego: Academic Press.

Kiefer, Ferenc. 2006. *Aspektus és akcióminőség. Különös tekintettel a magyar nyelvre* [Aspect and aktionsart. With special attention to the Hungarian language]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Kitahara, Ken-ichi. 2010. *English cognate object constructions and related phenomena: A lexical-constructional approach*. Tsukuba: University of Tsukuba dissertation.

Komlósy, András. 1994. Complements and adjuncts. In Ferenc Kiefer & Katalin É. Kiss (eds.), *Syntax and semantics 27: The syntactic structure of Hungarian*, 91–178. San Diego: Academic Press.

Kuno, Susumu & Ken-ichi Takami. 2004. *Functional constraints in grammar: On the unergative–unaccusative distinction* (Constructional Approaches to Language 1). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Laczkó, Tibor. 2009. On the *-Ás* suffix: Word formation in the syntax? *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 56(1). 23–114.

Lavidas, Nikolaos. 2013a. Null and cognate objects and changes in (in)transitivity: Evidence from the history of English. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 60(1). 69–106.

Lavidas, Nikolaos. 2013b. Unaccusativity and the diachrony of null and cognate objects in Greek. In Elly van Gelderen, Jóhanna Barðdal & Michela Cennamo (eds.), *Argument structure in flux: The Naples-Capri Papers* (Studies in Language Companion Series 131), 307–341. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lavidas, Nikolaos. 2014. Cognate arguments and the transitivity requirement in the history of English. *Lingua Posnaniensis* LVI(2). 41–59.

Lavidas, Nikolaos. 2018. Cognate noun constructions in Early Modern English: The case of Tyndale's New Testament. In Hubert Cuyckens, Hendrik De Smet, Liesbet Heyvaert & Charlotte Maekelberghe (eds.), *Explorations in English historical syntax* (Studies in Language Companion Series 198), 51–76. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Levin, Beth. 1993. *English verb classes and alternations: A preliminary investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the syntax-lexical semantics interface* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 26). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Lipták, Anikó & Andrés Saab. 2019. Hungarian particle reduplication as local doubling. *Acta Linguistica Academica* 66(4). 527–574.
MacDonald, Jonathan E. 2008. *The syntactic nature of inner aspect: A minimalist perspective* (Linguistics Today 133). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Macfarland, Talke. 1994. Event arguments: Insights from cognate objects. Paper presented at the 68th annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America. Sheraton Boston Hotel, 6–9 January.
Macfarland, Talke. 1995. *Cognate objects and the argument/adjunct distinction in English*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University dissertation.
Maleczki, Márta. 2001. Indefinite arguments in Hungarian. In István Kenesei (ed.), *Argument structure in Hungarian*, 157–199. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Marantz, Alec. 2005. Objects out of the lexicon: Objects as events. Paper presented at the University of Vienna, 11 June.
Massam, Diane. 1990. Cognate objects as thematic objects. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 35(2). 161–190.
Mateu, Jaume. 2002. *Argument structure: Relational construal at the syntax-semantics interface*. Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona dissertation.
Matsumoto, Masumi. 1996. The syntax and semantics of the cognate object construction. *English Linguistics* 13. 199–220.
McIntyre, Andrew. 2004. Event paths, conflation, argument structure and VP shells. *Linguistics* 42(3). 523–571.
Melloni, Chiara & Francesca Masini. 2017. Cognate constructions in Italian and beyond. In Lars Hellan, Andrej Malchukov & Michela Cennamo (eds.), *Contrastive studies in verbal valency* (Linguistics Today 237), 219–250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Mittwoch, Anita. 1998. Cognate objects as reflections of davidsonian event arguments. In Susan Rothstein (ed.), *Events and grammar* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 70), 309–332. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Moltmann, Fredericke. 1989. Nominal and clausal event predicates. *Chicago Linguistic Society* (*CLS*) 25. 300–314.
Nakajima, Heizo. 2006. Adverbial cognate objects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37(4). 674–684.
Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the semantics of English: A study in subatomic semantics* (Current Studies in Linguistics Series 19). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Pereltsvaig, Asya. 1999a. Two classes of cognate objects. *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* (*WCCFL*) 17. 537–551.
Pereltsvaig, Asya. 1999b. Cognate objects in Russian: Is the notion "cognate" relevant for syntax? *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 44(3). 267–291.
Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2002. Cognate objects in Modern and Biblical Hebrew. In Jamal Ouhalla & Ur Shlonsky (eds.), *Themes in Arabic and Hebrew syntax* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 53), 106–136. Dordrecht: Springer.
Pham, Andrea Hoa. 1999. Cognate objects in Vietnamese transitive verbs. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 17. 227–246.
Piñón, Christopher. 2001. Töprengtem egyet: azon, hogy mit jelent az *egyet* [I did some thinking: About the meaning of *egyet* 'one.acc']. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Zoltán Bánréti &

Katalin É. Kiss (eds.), *Újabb tanulmányok a strukturális magyar nyelvtan és a nyelvtörténet köréből* [New studies on the structural grammar of Hungarian and historical linguistics], 182–198. Budapest: Osiris.

Rapoport, Tova. R. 1999. Structure, aspect, and the predicate. *Language* 75(4). 653–677.

Real Puigdollers, Cristina. 2008. The nature of cognate objects: A syntactic approach. In Sylvia Blaho, Camelia Constantinescu & Bert Le Bruyn (eds.), *Proceedings of ConSOLE XVI*, 157–178. Paris.

Sailer, Manfred. 2010. The family of English cognate object constructions. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, 191–211. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publication.

Schvarcz, Brigitta R. 2017. Measure constructions in Hungarian and the semantics of the *-nyi* suffix. In Harry van der Hulst & Anikó Lipták (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian 15: Papers from the 2015 Leiden Conference*, 157–181. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Serrano, Laura Pino. 2004. L'objet interne existe-t-il? *La linguistique* 40(2). 53–64.

Snyder, William. 2001. On the nature of syntactic variation: Evidence from complex predicates and complex word-formation. *Language* 77(2). 324–342.

Sorace, Antonella. 2000. Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs. *Language* 76(4). 859–890.

Surányi, Balázs. 2009. Verbal particles inside and outside *v*P. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 56(2–3). 201–249.

Surányi, Balázs. ms. Structural government in pseudo-incorporation in Hungarian: Pseudo-incorporation by vP-internal phrase-movement. Unpublished manuscript.

de Swart, Peter. 2007. *Cross-linguistic variation in object marking*. Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit dissertation.

Szabolcsi, Anna & Tibor Laczkó. 1992. A főnévi csoport szerkezete [The structure of the noun phrase]. In Ferenc Kiefer (ed.), *Strukturális Magyar Nyelvtan I. Mondattan* [A structural grammar of Hungarian I. Syntax], 179–298. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Talmy, Leonard. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 3: *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, 57–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tenny, Carol. 1994. *Aspectual roles and the syntax-semantics interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Travis, Lisa de Mena. 2010. *Inner aspect: The articulation of VP* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 80). Dordrecht: Springer.

Washio, Ryuichi. 1997. Resultatives, compositionality and language variation. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6(1). 1–49.

Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa & Eunjeong Oh. 2007. *On the syntactic composition of manner and motion* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 48). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Zucchi, Sandro. 1998. Aspect shift. In Susan Rothstein (ed.), *Events and grammar* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 70), 349–370. Dordrecht: Kluwer.