Chapter 6

PPs used as obligatory adjuncts

Katalin É. Kiss

6.1.	Introduction	356
6.2.	Definiteness Effect verbs	357
6.2.1.	<i>Verbs of coming-into-being and creation</i>	357
6.2.2.	<i>Change-of-state counterparts of verbs of coming-into-being and creation</i>	359
6.3.	Types of internal arguments blocked by the Definiteness Effect	361
6.4.	Definiteness Effect and aspect	364
6.4.1.	<i>Verbs of creation and coming-into-being are accomplishment predicates</i>	364
6.4.2.	<i>Weak versus strong accomplishments</i>	365
6.5.	Neutralizing the Definiteness Effect by a focused adjunct	366
6.6.	Summary	369
6.7.	Bibliographical notes	370

6.1. Introduction

A large set of verbs require the presence of a PP adjunct if their internal argument is a definite or specific indefinite DP. Interestingly, these verbs impose no constraint on the thematic role of the adjunct that they need; they accept temporal, locative, instrumental, manner, cause, purpose, etc. adverbials alike. The obligatory adjunct occupies the preverbal focus position (the focus is marked by small capitals). For example:

- (1) a. *Van a pénz.
is the money
'There is the money.'
- b. HONNAN van a pénz?
where.from is the money
'Where is the money from?'
- c. A pénz KÖLCSÖN-BŐL van.
the money loan-Ela is
'The money is from a loan.'
- d. A pénz A FIÓK-BAN van.
the money the drawer-Ine is
'The money is in the drawer.'
- e. A pénz A LAKODALOM-RA van.
the money the wedding-Sub is
'The money is for the wedding.'
- f. A pénz NEK-ED van.
the money Dat-2Sg is
'The money is for you.'
- (2) a. *A baba született.
the baby was_born
'The baby was born.'
- b. A baba TEGNAP született.
the baby yesterday was_born
'The baby was born yesterday.'
- c. A baba IDŐ-RE született.
the baby time-Sub was_born
'The baby was born on time.'
- d. A baba a Szent István Kórház-ban született.
the baby the Saint Stephen Hospital-Ine was_born
'The baby was born in the Saint Stephen hospital.'
- e. A baba FOGÓ-VAL született.
the baby forceps-Ins was_born
'The baby was born with forceps.'

- f. A baba CSÁSZÁRMETSZÉS-SEL született.
 the baby C-section-Ins was_born
 'The baby was born by C-section.'
- g. A baba GAZDAG CSALÁD-BA született.
 the baby rich family-III was_born
 'The baby was born into a rich family.'
- h. A baba hormon-kezelés eredmény-e-képpen született.
 the baby hormone-therapy result-Poss-FoE was-born
 'The baby was born as a result of a hormone therapy.'

These adverbial adjuncts are free in the sense that they are thematically independent of the verb, and they are obligatory in the sense that their absence renders the sentence ungrammatical.

This section shows that the need for an obligatory adjunct arises in contexts displaying the so-called Definiteness Effect. Section 6.2 describes the types of verbs, whereas Section 6.3 describes the types of internal arguments that 'conspire' to require the presence of an obligatory adjunct. Section 6.4 discusses the correlation between the presence of an obligatory adjunct and the aspectual value of the clause. Section 6.5 demonstrates that a focus (other than the internal argument) neutralizes the Definiteness Effect, and an obligatory adjunct is needed in Definiteness Effect contexts to serve as a focus.

6.2. Definiteness Effect verbs

6.2.1. Verbs of coming-into-being and creation

A large set of verbs, those expressing the existence of their subject, such as *van* 'be' and *akad* 'occur', or its coming into being, such as *születik* 'be born', *keletkezik* 'arise', *támad* 'arise', *alakul* 'be formed', *létrejön* 'come into being', *készül* 'be prepared', and *épül* 'be built', or its appearance, such as *érkezik* 'arrive', do not allow a definite subject. These verbs can take either a subject with an indefinite determiner such as *egy* 'a, one', *két* 'two', *három* 'three', ..., *néhány* 'some', *pár* 'a couple of', *sok* 'many, much', *rengeteg* 'a lot of', etc. (4), or a bare singular or bare plural subject (5):

- (3) a. *Az énekkar alakult.
 the choir formed
 'The choir was formed.'
- b. *Alakult az énekkar.
 formed the choir
 'The choir was formed.'
- (4) a. Alakult egy/két/három énekkar.
 formed a / two / three choir
 'A choir was formed.' / 'Two/three choirs were formed.'

- b. Alakult néhány / pár / sok / rengeteg énekkar.
 formed some / couple / many / lot choir
 'Some / [a couple of] / many / [a lot of] choirs were formed.'

- (5) a. Énekkar alakult.
 choir formed
 'A choir was formed.'
- b. Énekkar-ok alakultak.
 choir-s formed
 'Choirs were formed.'

Remark 1. Verbs expressing coming into being or creation have the Definiteness Effect only in the perfective aspect. If they occur in the progressive aspect, the definiteness/specificity feature of their internal argument is not constrained – see (i) and the discussion in 6.4.

- (i) Már alakult a hipotézis a fejében.
 already formed the hypothesis the head.Poss.3Sg.Ine
 'The hypothesis was already forming in his head.'

The definiteness constraint imposed by these verbs on their internal argument is a consequence of their meaning. They mean 'exist' like *van* 'be' and *akad* 'occur', or 'come to exist' like *születik* 'be born', *keletkezik* 'arise', or 'come to exist in the domain of discourse' like *érkezik* 'arrive', i.e., they all contain an EXIST meaning component. They assert the existence of the referent of their subject, whose existence therefore cannot be presupposed. Definite noun phrases carry an existential presupposition; they refer to an individual already present in the universe of discourse. Asserting the existence of an individual presupposed to exist would be a tautology, and is not tolerated by the language (Szabolcsi 1986).

The Definiteness Effect is displayed not only by unaccusative verbs meaning the existence or coming into being of the referent of their subject, but also by transitive verbs meaning the creation of the referent of their object. Creation verbs include achievement verbs like *talál* 'find', *kap* 'get', and accomplishment verbs like *épít* 'build', *varr* 'sew', *főz* 'cook', *készít* 'prepare', e.g.:

- (6) a. *Találtuk a pénzt.
 find.Past.DefObj.1Pl the money.Acc
 'We found the money.'
- b. Találtunk egy csomó pénzt.
 find.Past.1Pl a lot money.Acc
 'We found a lot of money.'
- c. Pénzt találtunk.
 money.Acc find.Past.1Pl
 'We found some money.'

Remark 2. As will be explained in 6.5, the contrastive focusing of the verb in (6a) can save the sentence.

- (7) a. *Kaptam Mari kinőtt ruháját.
 receive.Past.DefObj.1Sg Mari outgrown dress.Poss.Acc
 'I received Mari's outgrown dress.'
- b. Kaptam egy új ruhát.
 receive.Past.1Sg a new dress.Acc
 'I received a new dress.'
- c. Új ruhát kaptam.
 new dress.Acc receive.Past.1Sg
 'I received a new dress.'

The transitive verbs in (6)-(7) can be regarded as causative coming-into-being verbs. They, too, contain an EXIST meaning component; they mean that *x* causes *y* to come to exist in a particular way. What the meanings of e.g. *varr* 'sew' and *épít* 'build', or *kap* 'get' and *talál* 'find' differ in is the specific way in which the referent of their internal argument is caused to come to exist (in the domain of discourse). These verbs cannot cooccur with a definite object because asserting the coming-into-being of the referent of the object and presupposing its existence would be tautologous (cf. Piñón 2006a).

The set of creation verbs is practically open. Almost any verb denoting an activity as a result of which a particular individual appears in the domain of discourse can behave as a creation verb, requiring an indefinite internal argument (cf. Wacha 1976). For example, (8b) describes the creation of an ironed shirt, and (9b) describes the creation of some wine in the domain of discourse:

- (8) a. ?*Vasaltam naked ezt az inget.
 iron.Past.DefObj.1Sg Dat.2Sg this.Acc the shirt.Acc
 'I have ironed this shirt for you.'
- b. Vasaltam naked egy inget.
 iron.Past.1Sg Dat.2Sg a shirt.Acc
 'I have ironed a shirt for you.'
- (9) a. ??Hoztuk a bort.
 bring.Past.DefObj.1Pl the wine.Acc
 'We have brought the wine.'
- b. Hoztunk bort.
 bring.Past.1Pl wine.Acc
 'We have brought some wine.'

The elicitation of the intended 'creation' interpretation is often supported by naming the beneficiary of the creation event – see *naked* 'for you' in (8b).

6.2.2. Change-of-state counterparts of verbs of coming-into-being and creation

Many Definiteness Effect verbs can be supplied with a lexically selected telicizing verbal particle, e.g.: *születik – meg-születik* 'be born', *alakul – meg-alakul* 'be formed', *támad – fel-támad* 'arise', *van – meg-van* 'be'. The particle verb versions do not behave as Definiteness Effect verbs; what they mean is not existence or

coming into being but a change of state. Their particle is a resultative element expressing that the change of state has been, or will be, completed. These particle verbs presuppose the existence of the referent of their subject, hence they require a definite (10b), (11b) or a specific indefinite (12b) subject:

- (10) a. *Gyerekek meg-születtek.

children Perf-were_born
'Children were born.'

- b. Mari gyereke meg-született.

Mari child.Poss Perf-was_born
'Mari's child was born.'

- (11) a. *Szél fel-támadt.

wind up-rose
'A wind rose.'

- b. A szél fel-támadt.

the wind up-rose
'The wind rose.'

- (12) a. *Meg-van pénz.

Perf-is money
'There is money.'

- b. Meg-van a pénz.

Perf-is the money
'[I/We] have the money/the money has been obtained.'

Remark 3. (9b) has a version which apparently contradicts the generalization that particle verbs do not show the Definiteness Effect :

- (i) Hoztunk fel bort.
bring.Past.1Pl up wine.Acc
'We brought up some wine.'

However, this *fel* 'up', whose presence is optional in (i), does not behave as a telicizing secondary predicate. It does not occupy the preverbal position, the default position of predicative PPs, where they form a complex predicate with the verb. It behaves as a directional adjunct, i.e., it can be analyzed as an adverb independent of the verb – as discussed in connection with examples (75)-(77) in Chapter 4.

The verbal particle also turns a verb of creation into a change-of-state verb, which presupposes the existence of its object, and is consequently immune from the Definiteness Effect. Compare the interpretations of the creation verb in (13a) and the change-of-state verbs in (13b-c). (13a) expresses the finding of an unexpected, unknown item, whereas (13b-c) express the reemerging of a lost object, whose existence was known previously to the participants of the discourse.

- (13) a. Találtam egy gyűrűt.

find.Past.1Sg a ring.Acc
'I found a ring.'

- b. Meg-találtam a gyűrűt.
Perf-find.Past.DefObj.1Sg the ring.Acc
'I found the ring.'
- c. Meg-találtam egy gyűrűt.
Perf-find.Past.1Sg a ring.Acc
'I found a ring [of the missing objects].'

The meaning difference between minimal pairs like (14a,b) and (15a,b) can be delicate (Kálmán 1995; Maleczki 1995; Bende-Farkas 2001):

- (14) a. Péter szervezett egy konferenciát.
Péter organized a conference.Acc
'Péter organized a conference.'
- b. Péter meg-szervezett egy konferenciát.
Péter Perf-organized a conference.Acc
'Péter organized a conference.'
- (15) a. Írtam egy verset.
write.Past.1Sg a poem.Acc
'I wrote a poem.'
- b. Meg-írtam egy verset.
Perf-write.Past.1Sg a poem.Acc
'I wrote a poem.'

In (14a) and (15a), the objects introduce completely new individuals. In the case of (14b) and (15b), on the contrary, the objects are assumed to have existed as a plan prior to the organizing and writing events. Thus (14a) or (15a) could well represent the initial sentence of a discourse, whereas (14b) and (15b) require some preceding context. In (16), for example, *egy konferenciát* 'a conference.Acc' is understood as one of the tasks mentioned in the preceding sentence:

- (16) Minden feladatot én végeztem. Meg-szerveztem egy konferenciát.
every task.Acc I perform.Past.1Sg Perf-organize.Past.1Sg a conference.Acc
'It was me who performed every task. I organized a conference.'

6.3. Types of internal arguments blocked by the Definiteness Effect

The types of internal arguments that Definiteness Effect verbs do not allow include definite noun phrases (17a), proper names (17b), definite pronouns (17c), possessive constructions (17d), and universally quantified noun phrases (17e):

- (17) a. *A vendég érkezett.
the guest arrived
- b. *Mari született.
Mari was_born
- c. *Én születtem.
I was_born

- d. *Mari gyereke született.
 Mari child.Poss was_born
 'Mari's child was born.'
- e. *Minden énekkar alakult.
 every choir was_formed

The quantifier *valamennyi* 'x-many' is potentially ambiguous between the interpretations 'all' and 'some', as illustrated by (18). (The two interpretations have different intonation patterns; *valamennyi* 'all' is pronounced as a regular quantifier bearing a pitch accent with a falling tone, whereas *valamennyi* 'some' is destressed, and it requires the fall-rise intonation of contrastive topics.) If *valamennyi* determines the internal argument of a Definiteness Effect verb, the pitch accent and the universal interpretation of *valamennyi* are blocked, as shown by (19).

- (18) ⁽ⁿ⁾Vala-mennyi énekkar "fel-lépett.
 x-many choir up-performed
 a. 'All the choirs performed.'
 b. 'Some choirs performed.'
- (19) Vala-mennyi énekkar "alakult.
 x-many choir was_formed
 'Some choirs were formed.'

In Hungarian, definiteness has a morphological test: definite objects elicit verbal agreement (in other words, they elicit the definite conjugation), as illustrated by the contrast in (20a,b). Noun phrases containing the universal quantifier *minden* do not elicit the definite conjugation – see (20c):

- (20) a. Ismer-ek egy nyelvészt.
 know-1Sg a linguist.Acc
 'I know a linguist.'
- b. Ismer-em azt a nyelvészt.
 know-DefObj.1Sg that.Acc the linguist.Acc
 'I know that linguist.'
- c. Ismer-ek minden nyelvészt.
 know-1Sg every linguist.Acc
 'I know every linguist.'

Definiteness Effect verbs do not allow either a definite, or a universally quantified indefinite object, hence what they do not tolerate cannot be the definiteness of their internal argument. In fact, they do allow an internal argument modified by *mindenféle* 'all kinds':

- (21) a. Érkezett minden-féle vendég.
 arrived all-kind guest
 'All kinds of guests arrived.'

- b. Alakult minden-féle egyesület.
 formed all-kind association
 'All kinds of associations were formed.'

The prohibition that the internal arguments of Definiteness Effect verbs must observe is a prohibition against specificity/familiarity; the referent of the internal argument cannot exist prior to the coming-into-being or creation event described in the sentence. A definite internal argument is always specific, and so is a universally quantified internal argument (unless its quantifier is *mindenféle* 'all kinds'), hence they are ruled out by this constraint. An indefinite cannot occur as the internal argument of a Definiteness Effect verb if it refers to an element of a previously introduced set. Observe the second clause in (22a), containing a creation verb with an indefinite object. The object cannot be interpreted specifically, i.e. its referent cannot represent a subset of the referent of the subject of the previous clause. Hence the complex sentence is incoherent. This is not the case in (22b), where the particle verb of the second clause requires the specific, i.e., familiar interpretation of the object:

- (22) a. [#]Kett-en el-tévedtek, de hamar találtunk egy lányt.
 two-Adv away-get.lost.Past.3Pl but soon find.Past.1Pl a girl.Acc
 'Two persons got lost but we soon found a girl.'
- b. Kett-en el-tévedtek, de egy lányt hamar meg-találtunk.
 two-Adv away-get.lost.Past.3Pl but a girl.Acc soon Perf-find.Past.1Pl
 'Two persons got lost but we have soon found a girl [of them].'

Another piece of evidence testifying to the non-specificity of the indefinite internal argument of Definiteness Effect verbs is that it cannot take scope over negation; it must be in the scope of negation. An indefinite in the scope of negation is obligatorily accompanied by the minimizing particle *sem* in Hungarian.

- (23) a. *János nem írt egy verset.
 János not wrote a poem.Acc
 'János did not write a poem.'
- b. János nem írt egy verset sem.
 János not wrote a poem.Acc Min
 'János did not write any poem.'

At the same time, the internal arguments of coming-into-being and creation verbs can be referred to by a definite pronoun in the subsequent discourse (see (24)), therefore, they are said to be post-specific.

- (24) János írt egy verset. Azt olvasták fel az ünnepély-en.
 János wrote.3Sg a poem.Acc that.Acc read.Past.3Pl up the ceremony-Sup
 'János wrote a poem. It was read out at the ceremony.'

6.4. Definiteness Effect and aspect

6.4.1. Verbs of creation and coming-into-being are accomplishment predicates

Verbs eliciting the Definiteness Effect include a couple of stative verbs expressing existence (e.g. *van* ‘be’), and a large number of accomplishment and achievement verbs expressing coming into being (e.g. *készül* ‘be prepared’) or creation (e.g. *készít* ‘prepare’).

In Hungarian, situation aspect is marked by a verbal particle. Accomplishment and achievement predicates are verbal complexes consisting of a verb and a preverbal resultative secondary predicate (usually a verbal particle) in the default case (25b) – see Chapter 4 Section 4.3, whereas stative and activity predicates are bare verbs (25a). Compare:

- (25) a. János [*✓*egész délután] / [**fél nap alatt*] *festette* a kerítést.
 János whole afternoon / half day during painted the fence.Acc
 ‘János was painting the fence [the whole afternoon] / [**in half a day*].’
- b. János [**egész délután*] / [*✓fél nap alatt*] *be-festette* a kerítést.
 János whole afternoon / half day during in-painted the fence.Acc
 ‘János painted the fence [**the whole afternoon*] / [in half a day].’

The bare verb in (25a) can only be understood to denote an activity in progress, whereas the particle verb in (25b) can only be understood to represent a completed event. Accordingly, (25a) is only compatible with a durative time adverbial, whereas (25b) is only compatible with a delimiting time adverbial.

Verbs of coming into being and verbs of creation are exceptions to the above generalization; they describe accomplishments and achievements, i.e., completed events, without a verbal particle:

- (26) a. János fél nap alatt festett egy képet.
 János half day during painted a picture.Acc
 ‘János painted a picture in half a day.’
- b. [*Fél órán belül*] / *Öt-kor kaptam egy emailt.*
 half hour within / five-Tmp receive.Past.1Sg an email.Acc
 ‘I received an email [within half an hour] / [at five].’

If an achievement predicate, like *meg-kap* ‘get’, occurs without a verbal particle, it is an achievement which expresses coming into being or creation and evokes the Definiteness Effect. Being an achievement verb, it cannot occur with a durative time adverbial (27a), and being a creation predicate, it does not allow a definite object (27b).

- (27) a. **Fél óra hosszát egy emailt kaptam.*
 half hour long an email.Acc receive.Past.1Sg
 Intended meaning: ‘I was receiving an email for half an hour.’
- b. **Fél órán belül az emailt kaptam.*
 half hour within the email.Acc receive.Past.DefObj.1Sg
 Intended meaning: ‘I received the email in half an hour.’

Unlike achievement verbs, accomplishment verbs without a verbal particle can also be understood as activities denoting a change of state or change of location, in which case they can take a durative time adverbial (28a), and elicit no Definiteness Effect (28b) (cf. Peredy 2008):

- (28) a. János (egész délután) festett egy képet.
 János whole afternoon paint.Past.3Sg a picture.Acc
 'János was painting a picture the whole afternoon.'
- b. János (fél óra hosszat) festette a képet.
 János half hour long paint.Past.DefObj.3Sg the picture.Acc
 'János was painting the picture for half an hour.'

The activity described in (28), and activities in general affect an existing object, hence they are not predicates of coming into being or creation. Verbs predicating the coming into being or the appearance or the creation of a new individual are always accomplishments or achievements.

Remark 4. In the case of *eszik* 'eat', *iszik* 'drink', and *fogyaszt* 'consume', it is not quite clear why they behave syntactically as Definiteness Effect verbs. If these verbs take an indefinite object, they can be understood as accomplishments; if they take a definite object, they are understood as activities in progress (see (i)–(ii); cf. also (iii)).

- (i) a. János evett egy pörköltet.
 John ate.3Sg a stew.Acc
 'János ate/has eaten a stew.'
- b. János ette a pörköltet.
 John ate.DefObj.3Sg the stew.Acc
 'János was eating the stew.'
- (ii) a. János ivott egy sört.
 János drank.3Sg a beer.Acc
 'János drank/has drunk a beer.'
- b. János itta a sört.
 János drank.DefObj.3Sg the beer.Acc
 'János was drinking the beer.'
- (iii) a. János meg-ivott egy sört.
 János Perf-drunk.3Sg a beer.Acc
 'János drank a beer.'
- b. János meg-itta a sört.
 János Perf-drunk.DefObj.3Sg the beer.Acc
 'János drank the beer.'

It is perhaps the meaning component that they share with *szerez* 'obtain', meaning 'cause to come to exist in the domain of discourse', that licenses their creation-verb-like behavior.

6.4.2. Weak versus strong accomplishments

Accomplishment verbs predicating the coming into being or the creation of a new individual represent a special type of accomplishments, called weak accomplishments (Piñón 2006b). Strong accomplishments denoted by particle verbs describe complex events consisting of an activity and the resultant state of the internal argument affected by the activity. Weak accomplishments, on the contrary, cannot be divided into two subevents; the result of the activity is not a new state of the internal argument but the internal argument itself. This difference can be

highlighted by two tests. A strong accomplishment modified by *almost* is ambiguous: it has a scalar and a counterfactual interpretation. In the case of a weak accomplishment, only the counterfactual interpretation is present. Compare:

- (29) János majdnem be-festette a kerítést.
 János almost in-paint.Past.DefObj.3Sg the fence.Acc
 a. 'János almost painted the fence [but he did not start it].'
 b. 'János almost painted the fence [but he did not complete it].'
- (30) János majdnem festett egy képet.
 János almost paint.Past.3Sg a picture.Acc
 'János almost painted a picture [but he did not start it].'

If we negate a strong accomplishment, negation can apply either to the resultant state of the internal argument or to the whole event. In the case of weak accomplishments, negation always applies to the whole event.

- (31) János nem festette be a kerítést.
 János not paint.Past.DefObj.3Sg in the fence.Acc
 a. 'János did not paint the fence [he did not start it].'
 b. 'János did not paint the fence [he did not complete it].'
- (32) János nem festett egy képet sem.
 János not paint.Past.3Sg a picture.Acc Min
 'János did not paint any picture [he did not start any].'

In sum: when we talk about verbs of coming into being and verbs of creation, we mean particleless verbs with an accomplishment or achievement interpretation that elicit the Definiteness Effect. Verbs which are homophonous with verbs of coming into being and creation but are interpreted as activities in progress are not Definiteness Effect verbs.

6.5. Neutralizing the Definiteness Effect by a focused adjunct

The Definiteness Effect elicited by verbs of existence, coming into being, and creation is neutralized if the sentence contains a preverbal focus constituent other than the internal argument:

- (33) A gyerek MÁJUS-BAN született.
 the baby May-Ine was_born
 'The baby was born in May.'

If the sentence in (33) contains no focus constituent, in which case the main stress falls on the verb (34a), or if the preverbal focus is the internal argument (34b), the sentence is unacceptable:

- (34) a. *A gyerek "született."
 the baby was_born
 b. *A "GYEREK" született.

The explanation of the disappearance of the Definiteness Effect in the presence of a focus is that in a focus construction, the non-focus section of the sentence is presupposed (É. Kiss 1995). (35), for example, does not assert the coming-into-being of a child anymore; it asserts that the familiar event of the child being born took place in May. Since the event of the child being born is known to have taken place, the indefiniteness, more precisely, the non-specificity requirement associated with the internal argument, is void:

- (35) [Ez a gyerek]/ Jancsi/ [A család minden gyereke] MÁJUS-BAN született.
 this the child / Jancsi / the family every child.Poss May-Ine was_born
 'This child / Jancsi / [Every child of the family] was born in May.'

What we achieve by the introduction of a focus is that the internal argument becomes part of the presupposition. In sentences of existence and coming into being, the internal argument is the only argument, hence it can be (part of) the presupposition if either the verb or an adjunct is focused. Since a focused verb remains in situ, and it does not involve any stress shift (the default phrasal stress also falls on the verb), its focus function can only become apparent if it is set into an explicit contrast, which is not always possible. For example, the verb *talál* 'find' can easily be contrasted with *lop* 'steal', but it is unclear what alternative the verb *születik* 'be born' could be contrasted with; hence (36) is grammatical, whereas (34a) was uninterpretable:

- (36) A pénzt "találtam, nem loptam.
 the money.Acc found.DefObj.1Sg not stole.DefObj.1Sg
 'I found the money; I didn't steal it.'

Adverbial adjuncts expressing the time, place, instrument, source, purpose, etc. of the action are focused by movement into preverbal position, i.e. they require no explicit contrast for the focus interpretation to arise. Furthermore, alternative times, places, instruments, etc., which facilitate the focus interpretation pragmatically, are easy to accommodate.

Thus an adverbial adjunct is obligatory if a verb of existence or coming-into-being, or a verb of creation cooccurs with a definite or specific indefinite internal argument. It is obligatory in the sense that if it is omitted, the sentence becomes either ungrammatical ((37b) and (38b)), or ungrammatical under a perfective interpretation (39b), though acceptable in the progressive:

- (37) a. A ZSEB-EM-BEN van [a pénz] / [János pénze].
 the pocket-Poss.1Sg-Ine is the money / János money.Poss
 '[The money] / [János's money] is in my pocket.'
- b. *"Van [a pénz] / [János pénze].
 is the money / János money.Poss
 '[The money] / [János's money] is.' / 'There is [the money] / [János's money].'
- (38) a. A vonat ÖT-KOR / [AZ ELSŐ VÁGÁNY-RA] / IDŐ-BEN érkezett.
 the train five-Tmp / the first platform-Sub / time-Ine arrived
 'The train arrived [at five] / [on platform one] / [in time].'

- b. *A vonat "érkezett.
the train arrived
- (39) a. A ruha [KÉT NAP ALATT] / SELYEM-BŐL / KÉZ-ZEL készült.
the dress two day under / silk-Del / hand-Ins was_made
'The dress was made [in two days] / [from silk] / [by hand].'
- b. #A ruha "készült.
the dress was_made
'The dress was made.'

In the case of transitive verbs of creation, the subject is also a potential focus, i.e., either a focused subject or a focused adverbial adjunct (or a focused verb) is needed to license the definite or specific indefinite subject:

- (40) a. #A házat "építette János.
the house.Acc built.DefObj.3Sg János.Nom
'János built the house.'
- b. A házat JÁNOS építette.
the house.Acc János.Nom built.DefObj.3Sg
'The house was built by JÁNOS.'
- c. A házat TAVALY / KŐ-BŐL / VÍZPART-ON / [KÉT ÉV ALATT] /
the house.Acc last.year / stone-Del / waterfront-Sup / two year during /
KÖLCSÖN-BŐL / SAJÁT-KEZ-Ű-LEG építette János.
loan-Del / own-hand-Adj-Adv built.DefObj.3Sg János.Nom
'János built the house [last year] / [from stone] / [on the waterfront] / [in two years] / [from loan] / [on his own].'

In some cases, the Definiteness Effect appears to be neutralized by the focusing of the internal argument itself, which would be unexpected if the purpose of focusing is the relegation of the internal argument to the presupposed sentence part. In fact, such sentences are reactions to a preceding sentence where a constituent other than the internal argument is focused, i.e., where the internal argument has already become the part of the presupposition. For example:

- (41) – A kislány "TEGNAP született.
the little.girl yesterday was_born
'It was yesterday that the little girl was born.'
- Nem. A "KISFIÚ született 'tegnap.
no the little_boy was_born yesterday
'No. It is the little boy who was born yesterday.'

The second sentence in (41) involves the correction of the presupposition of the previous sentence.

An adverbial adjunct can save the definite internal argument of a verb of existence, coming-into-being, and creation if it is semantically compatible with the given predicate, i.e. if it denotes a circumstance (e.g. place, time, purpose, cause, instrument, etc.) of the coming-into-being or creation event. It must also be

focusable; thus sentence adverbials, e.g. speech act adverbs such as *frankly*, or modal adverbs such as *probably*, which cannot be focused, cannot function as obligatory adjuncts:

- (42) *"*Szerencsére* van a pénz.
 luckily is the money
 ‘Luckily, the money is.’/‘Luckily, there is the money.’

The question arises why verbal particles neutralizing the Definiteness Effect, discussed above in Section 6.2.2 are not assimilated to preverbal foci – after all, they are also of the category PP, and they also occupy the immediately preverbal position. In other respects, however, particles and foci act differently both from a syntactic and a semantic point of view. It has been demonstrated (first by Brody 1990) that a preverbal focus and a preverbal verbal particle occupy different positions. The focus surfaces preverbally because it attracts the verb from behind the particle as discussed in connection with the examples in (88) in Chapter 4 Section 4.5.2. Their different syntactic positions are most apparent under negation: whereas a negated focus construction involves the order ‘negative particle, focus, verb’, a negated particle verb displays the order ‘negative particle, verb, verbal particle’:

- (43) a. A gyerek *nem* MÁJUS-BAN született.
 the child not May-Ine was_born.3Sg
 ‘It wasn’t in May that the child was born.’
 b. A gyerek még *nem* született *meg*.
 the child yet not was_born Perf
 ‘The child has not been born yet.’

Particles and foci also differ semantically. In a focus construction, everything but the focus is presupposed, whereas a particle verb only requires its internal argument to be presuppositional. Its presuppositionality/specificity, however, is obligatory (44a). A focus construction, on the contrary, allows both a specific and a non-specific internal argument (44b).

- (44) a. *Meg-született gyerek.
 Perf-was_born child
 b. A SZABÓ CSALÁD-BAN született gyerek.
 the Szabó family-Ine was_born child
 ‘It is the Szabó family where a child was born.’

6.6. Summary

Adverbial adjuncts – whether PPs or adverbs – can be obligatory constituents of the clause also when they are not selected arguments of the verb. This happens when the verb means existence, coming into being/appearance or creation, i.e., when the sentence asserts the existence, the coming into being/appearance, or the creation of the referent of its internal argument. In this clause type, the internal argument cannot be represented by a syntactic category associated with an existential

presupposition, i.e. it cannot be a name, a definite pronoun, a definite or a specific indefinite noun phrase, or a possessive construction. (A verb of coming into being/appearance or creation can be homophonous with an activity verb denoting the change of state or change of location of an existing internal argument. However, the two verbs differ aspectually; whereas the activity verb is atelic, describing a change in progress, the verb of coming into being is a telic accomplishment or achievement, describing a completed event.) The prohibition against the definiteness of the internal argument of verbs of existence, coming into being/appearance and creation, the so-called Definiteness Effect, is neutralized by the presence of a focus. An adjunct is obligatory when it serves as the focus licensing the definite internal argument of a Definiteness Effect verb. In the case of an unaccusative Definiteness Effect verb, a definite or a specific indefinite internal argument can be licensed by the focusing of an adjunct, or, if pragmatics allows, by the focusing of the verb. The definite or specific indefinite internal argument of a transitive verb of creation can be saved by the focusing of either an adjunct or the subject (or, in special pragmatic conditions, by the focusing of the verb).

6.7. Bibliographical notes

The special syntactic and aspectual properties of verbs of creation was first noticed by Wacha (1976). It was Szabolcsi (1986) who discovered that this large set of verbs display the semantically motivated syntactic behavior known as the Definiteness Effect, observed in connection with the English *there is* construction. É. Kiss (1995) supplemented Szabolcsi's theory by deriving the role of obligatory adjuncts in the neutralization of the Definiteness Effect from the focus–presupposition structure that they create. Kálmán (1995) and Maleczki (1995) proposed alternative semantic explanations of Szabolcsi's observations. Bende-Farkas (2001) studied the Definiteness Effect in the framework of Discourse Representation Theory. Peredy (2008) investigated the aspectual role of obligatory adjuncts neutralizing the Definiteness Effect. Piñón (2006a,b) gave a formal semantic analysis of the properties of Definiteness Effect constructions.