Hasta as a goal marker parallels *hasta* as a scalar additive particle in Spanish

Hasta has two seemingly distinct uses in Spanish: as a scalar additive particle (*hasta$_S$*), as in (1a), and a goal-marking P (*hasta$_P$*), as in (1b): ([ ]$_F$ indicates the focal-stress bearing element)

(1)   a. *Juan vino **hasta**$_S$ [a la fiesta]$_F$ con nosotros*
         Juan came even   at the party   with us
         'Juan even came [to the party]$_F$ with us.'

   b. *Juan vino **hasta**$_P$ la fiesta con nosotros.*
         Juan came until   the party with us
         'Juan came up to the party with us.'

I propose that despite the superficially radical differences between the two functions they have a single unified core. Following the analysis of English *even* in Rooth (1985) within the theory of alternative semantics for focus, *hasta$_S$* can be analyzed as a presupposition trigger that introduces contextually relevant alternatives related to its corresponding syntactic complement. Such alternatives and its argument are placed on a scale of (un)likelihood with respect to one another. I argue that the same analysis can be applied to *hasta$_P$* to account for some of its unusual properties.

In Rooth's framework, the propositional semantic argument of *even* (a.k.a. *prejacent*, Guerzoni 2003) is contextually less likely than any other contextually relevant alternative of the same semantic type. In Spanish, *hasta$_S$*, as in (1a), must mark the most extreme value on the pragmatic scale in question (Schwenter & Vasishth 2000). I claim that four properties are at play: scalarity, (un)likelihood, maximality and complexity. In particular, *hasta$_S$* situates the prejacent at the most unlikely point along a scale of (un)likelihood with respect to contextually relevant alternatives of the same semantic type and such a scale cannot be non-gradable, i.e. there is always one alternative other than *nothing happened*. Following this, the domain of the scale in (1a) is potential paths of the form 'Juan came [to X] with us', where there must be at least one alternative in which X≠'party', and the scalar presupposition triggered is that out of all the places where Juan could have come with us, coming to the party was the least likely.

Regarding *hasta$_P$*, as in (1b), Beavers (2008) suggested that *hasta*, as a goal marker, constrains a path of motion in a movement event such that its complement is the endpoint of such a path. Furthermore, the use of *hasta* in motion constructions seems to be subject to a constraint of complexity of the path (otherwise, Spanish may resort to *hacia* 'towards', or sometimes *a* 'at'), as its unacceptability in (2a) shows. However, examples like (2b) may represent a seeming problem for Beavers (2008), where the acceptability of *hasta$_P$* improves even when the path is superficially not long, acquiring a *manage*-type reading.

(2)   a. **[Juan is standing right next to the chair]**
         ??Juan fue   hasta la silla (caminando).
           Juan went until the chair walking
         'Juan walked up to the chair.'

   b. **[Juan is 1 km away] or [Juan, totally drunk, is standing right next to the chair]**
         Juan fue   hasta la silla (caminando).
         Juan went until the chair walking
         'Juan walked up to the chair' or 'Juan *managed* to walk up to the chair.'

As an alternative to Beavers (2008), I propose that the constraints on $hasta_P$ are essentially those of $hasta_S$. In particular in (1b), the alternatives are narrowly fixed to be events of Juan reaching all of the various points on the path of motion from Juan's initial point to the party, i.e. alternatives of the form 'Juan came to [X] with us' for all X along a single path. This is different from $hasta_S$ in (1a), where the locations X can be along different paths or divergent paths. The relative likelihood ranking derives automatically from facts about the physical world: on any path it is always true that you are less likely to get to a further point than a nearer point since you have to pass the nearer point to even get to the further point.

Such an analysis is now able to explain certain properties of $hasta_P$. It predicts that $hasta_P$ requires picking out the largest event compatible with the entire predicate, i.e. the goal must be the furthest point reached (maximality). E.g. in a context in which Juan came to a bar with us after the party, (1b) is infelicitous. It also accounts for the complexity associated with the use of $hasta_P$. E.g. in (2a), the scale may be conceptualized as non-gradable, i.e. from not moving to moving to the chair (complexity violation). Finally, a *manage*-type reading may derive from our understanding of likelihood, even when the path is superficially short. When there are other impediments, our understanding of likelihood might cause us to view the path to the goal as longer than we otherwise would, e.g. drunkenness in (2b), (Krifka 1998 & Beavers 2012).

All in all, following Rooth's framework for *even*, I have proposed a unified account of $hasta_S$ and $hasta_P$ in terms of (un)likelihood that is able to explain some unusual constraints on $hasta_P$ on the basis of four core properties: scalarity, unlikelihood, maximality and complexity.

References

Beavers, John. 2008. On the nature of goal marking and delimitation: Evidence from Japanese. *Journal of Linguistics* 44, 283316.

—. 2012. Lexical aspect and multiple incremental themes. *Telicity and Change of State in Natural Language: Implications for Event Structure*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.

Guerzoni, Elena. 2003. *Why Even Ask?*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Krifka, Manfred. 1998. The origins of telicity. *Events and grammar*. Springer Netherlands, 197-235.

Rooth, Mats. 1985. *Association with Focus*. PhD thesis, GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Schwarz, Bernhard. 2005. Scalar additive particles in negative contexts. *Natural Language Semantics* 13.2 (2005): 125-168.

Schwenter, Scott A., and Shravan Vasishth. 2000. Absolute and relative scalar particles in Spanish and Hindi. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Vol. 26. No. 1.