

BOOK REVIEW

Approaches to Hungarian 14: Papers from the 2013 Piliscsaba Conference (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2015, 296 pages)

Julia Bacskai-Atkari

The volume, edited by Katalin É. Kiss, Balázs Surányi and Éva Dékány, contains selected papers from the 11th International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian (ICSH11), held in Piliscsaba in 2013. The volume contains 11 papers altogether, while, as pointed out by the editorial Introduction, there were 34 papers (either in the form of talks or posters) presented at the conference itself, and 16 papers submitted (p. 4). This translates to a 68.75% acceptance rate, which is fair, especially when taking into consideration that the presented papers had already been pre-selected for the conference. In line with the general nature of the ICSH conference, the papers cover a wide range of topics related to the structure of Hungarian, and the authors apply various frameworks, too. As seems to be generally true for the ATOH series (as well as ICSH), papers on syntax dominate the volume; nevertheless, several papers are concerned with issues related to the interfaces, and there are some purely phonological investigations as well. While the main subject language is of course Hungarian, it is a pleasure to see many of the papers applying a contrastive, cross-linguistic analysis, thereby establishing a very dynamic and lively discourse with the more general field.

Since there is no overarching topic other than the subject language being Hungarian, nor is more or less the same issue addressed by several authors, the articles are simply listed alphabetically by author. I am also going to follow this method in the discussion of the individual articles below.

The first article presents joint work by **Gábor Alberti, Judit Farkas and Veronika Szabó**, who show that a Hungarian nominal head may, contrary to previous assumptions (such as that of Szabolcsi & Laczkó 1992), have a phonologically non-empty complement zone, provided that certain conditions are met. A standard argument against the possibility of complements following nominal heads is the unavailability of “noun + complement” strings in a focus position (based on p. 9, ex. 6a):¹

- (1) *[*A kalapja Péternek*] *veszett el.*
the hat.POSS.3SG Peter.DAT lost away
‘It is Peter’s hat that has been lost.’

The standard assumption is that the bracketed string in (1) cannot form a constituent because it is not licensed to appear in the focus position, which is a single, non-iterable position that may accommodate one constituent only. As demonstrated very convincingly by Alberti, Farkas and Szabó, such a stance is not tenable since it results from a logical fallacy: while it is certainly true that a string occupying the focus position

¹ Abbreviations: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, ACC = accusative, DAT = dative, INSTR = instrumental, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, PRT = particle, REL = relative, SG = singular, SUBJ = subjective conjugation, SUP = superessive.

must form a constituent, it is not true vice versa, that is, not all constituents are licensed to appear in the focus position. They show that right branching phrases in general are not permitted in the focus position, such as nominal heads together with relative clauses or non-finite clauses.

Given the unsuitability of focus as a constituent test, they propose two alternatives. On the one hand, nouns with complements are licensed as titles (e.g. *Death in Venice*, p. 20, ex. 17a), and the entire title behaves as a single constituent in a clause: the complement cannot be separated from the noun head, and case suffixes are thus attached to the end of the entire title. However, as the authors themselves note (p. 21), titles are indeed special and should be accompanied by other constituency tests. It is worth mentioning at this point that the authors seem to be oblivious to the fact that titles generally behave like a single nominal constituent (as they denote a book, short story etc.), even though they are underlyingly not nominal. Consider for instance the title *Légy jó mindhalálig* ‘Be Faithful Unto Death’ (Zsigmond Móricz), which is an entire clause, hence making it into a title inevitably involves some kind of (abstract) nominalisation. An even better example is perhaps Søren Kierkegaard’s *Enten – Eller* ‘Either/Or’ (Hungarian: *Vagy-vagy*), where the elements would not normally be string-adjacent, while they can clearly function as a constituent as parts of a title. This may indicate that titles probably turn almost any string into a syntactic constituent.

On the other hand, the authors propose a second constituency test, which is related to contrastive topics, as opposed to foci: that is, the answer to a *wh*-question is not exhaustive, but merely names an example. It is possible for the bracketed constituent in (1) to undergo left dislocation: the constituent is preceded by a clause-initial (*na*) *például* ‘(well) for instance’, and immediately followed by the resumptive pronoun *az* ‘that’. The contrastive topic position is similar to the focus position in that it may host only a single constituent: however, it also tolerates right-branching constituents, as opposed to the latter. The introduction of this test is justly considered by the authors to be the most important contribution of the paper, and subsequent research will hopefully recognise its merits, too.

Finally, the authors provide an explanation for the ban on right-branching constituents in the focus position: the focus projection is a volume-sensitive phrase, which does not license a *big* syntactic constituent (e.g. an XP with a visible head and complement) in its prehead (specifier) position. This restriction follows from a modified version of Hinterhölzl’s (2010) weight condition, and the authors point out a crucial cross-linguistic difference between Germanic and Hungarian: while the Germanic pattern can be explained by weight, Hungarian cannot, chiefly because weight is connected to stress, and stress falls regularly on the right in Germanic and on the left in Hungarian. Hence the weight condition in itself could not rule out the appearance of a stressed, big XP in a prehead position in Hungarian.

András Bárány’s article addresses the issue of the presence/absence of agreement with personal pronouns in the Hungarian objective paradigm. The problem has long been known in the literature: while personal pronouns are assumed to be definite, the objective paradigm (associated with definite direct objects) does not uniformly arise with pronominal direct objects in Hungarian (based on pp. 37–39, exx. 1 and 6):

- (2) *Látsz* *egy kutyát* / *engem.*
 see.2SG.SUBJ a dog.ACC I.ACC
 ‘You see a dog / me.’

While third person pronouns do trigger the objective paradigm, first person pronouns do not: as shown in (2), the grammatical configuration is the subjective paradigm, which hence patterns with indefinite nominal expressions.

Second person pronouns show the same behaviour with third-person subjects: however, with a first person singular subject the agreement morpheme on the verb is exceptionally *-lak/-lek*, hence different from the first person singular subjective (*-V \acute{k}*) and objective (*-V m*) in its morpho-phonological form. The potentially ambiguous status of the *-lak/-lek* suffix has led many previous analyses to assume that it is part of the subjective paradigm (e.g. Coppock 2013, Coppock & Wechsler 2010). This is complemented by the fact that the morpheme is divisible into an *-l-* second person marker and the regular *-V \acute{k}* first person singular ending in the subjective paradigm, as pointed out by Den Dikken (2006). Bárányi argues that the morphological structure is irrelevant as far as the synchronic system on the syntactic level is concerned; it is not (or, rather, no longer) transparent for the speakers. Bárányi's analysis at this point hence avoids the common fallacy of previous analyses, namely the assumption that morphological divisibility implies transparency for the speakers: transparency is not the same as linguistic analysis. Hence there is no reason to assume that *-lak/-lek* belongs to the subjective paradigm synchronically, and Bárányi successfully shows that treating it as part of the objective paradigm has clear advantages, in that it makes the system simpler (and hence more transparent for the language learner).

The divisibility of the *-lak/-lek* morpheme still implies that historically it was either part of the subjective paradigm, or the relation between the two paradigms was different. While I do agree that diachronic concerns should not be used as arguments for (or against) a synchronic system, I do not think the problem that the *-lak/-lek* morphemes seem to be a remnant of a previous system should be overlooked. In other words, if Bárányi assumes that this morpheme has undergone reinterpretation in its status, not only the original system but also the mechanism and the reasons driving this change should be addressed. This is especially relevant because the change in question should follow from more general properties of the language, which would bring us closer to answering why the present-day Hungarian system is as it is. Providing an answer to these questions is truly not the task of Bárányi's present article, but some of the questions related to diachronic change should at least have been raised, as the article otherwise indeed provides fundamentally important conclusions for further research.

The main point of the analysis is that the subjective paradigm with personal pronouns is the result of inverse agreement. The verb as a probe agrees with its object first, and if it has unchecked features, the same probe agrees with the subject: this gives rise to the objective paradigm, where the subject has more features than the object. However, if the subject has fewer features, which arises when its number is higher than that of the object, there is no unchecked feature left on the probe: therefore, a second probe has to be inserted. Since (Modern) Hungarian is a language that spells out the second (higher) probe, the verbal morphology will make reference only to the subject, as opposed to the objective paradigm. Bárányi here makes use of Béjar & Rezac's (2009) analysis, providing an appropriate cross-linguistic context for the Hungarian system, and contributing to the general study of verbal agreement paradigms.

The third article was written by **Zsuzsanna Bárkányi and Zoltán G. Kiss**, and it is devoted to the issue of voicing assimilation before sonorants in Hungarian and Slovak. The observation is that word-final voiceless obstruents, such as /t/, are not voiced before a sonorant, such as /m/ or /l/, in Hungarian, but they are in Slovak, as in (3) below (based on p. 72, ex. 7b):

- (3) a. /tm/ → [tm]: *két mag* ‘two seeds’ (Hungarian)
 b. /tm/ → [dm]: *brat má* ‘brother has’ (Slovak)

This difference is supposed to correlate with the cross-linguistic observation that sonorants can voice a preceding word-final obstruent if obstruents are otherwise devoiced in a word-final position, which is the case in Slovak but not in Hungarian. The authors not only present experimental evidence for this claim but their results also allow for some fine-tuning of the data, and point to further research questions that future experiments should address.

The experimental results show that in an utterance-final position, Hungarian exhibits a clear voicing duration contrast between the obstruents /t/ and /d/ but not between the fricatives /s/ and /z/: an utterance-final /z/ is hence phonetically devoiced, contrary to previous assumptions (e.g. Siptár & Törkenczy 2000). This does not mean the loss of a phonological contrast, though, as other cues (such as consonant duration, vowel duration, and the ratio of the two) are maintained. However, it indicates the first step of a process that diachronically may lead to the word-final consonant becoming targetless, which process has already taken place in Slovak (p. 89). Regarding obstruents, Hungarian has clearly not neutralised the underlying voicing properties, hence word-final voiceless obstruents are actively devoiced: as such, they resist coarticulatory assimilation from a following sonorant, which is passively voiced. Bárkányi and G. Kiss argue that sonorants are passively (and not actively) voiced in Slovak as well: however, word-final voiceless obstruents are targetless with respect to voicing, and hence they may undergo coarticulatory assimilation. The authors claim that this assimilation is not effected by the sonorant following the obstruent but rather by the vowel preceding it (p. 88). The argumentation is a little cryptic at this point, but it seems to be the case that phonetic assimilation comes from the vowel, whereas it is phonologically interpreted as regressive assimilation initiated by the sonorant, on a par with regressive assimilation processes induced by obstruents.

While the experiments show various significant differences with respect to the acoustic properties of voiced and voiceless obstruents (and fricatives) in various contexts, it can still be concluded that regressive voicing assimilation is a fully phonologised process in both languages under scrutiny, precisely because various acoustic cues are responsible for encoding a phonological property or contrast. In Hungarian, pre-sonorant voicing does not pattern with either pre-voiced or pre-voiceless obstruent voicing but it does not constitute an intermediate category either: the sonorant has simply no phonological effect on the voicing of the preceding consonant. In Slovak, pre-sonorant voicing patterns with pre-voiced obstruent voicing, hence it again does not constitute an intermediate category. Pre-sonorant voicing may be an intermediate category in other languages, and the fact that it is not the case in Hungarian and Slovak follows from general properties of these languages.

The experiments were carried out on a relatively low number of participants (6 speakers for each language), and as Bárkányi and G. Kiss note, individual differences may cause statistically more significant differences than they would with a higher number of speakers. Nevertheless, the findings still appear very robust, which would not be the case if the acoustic differences in questions were less clear, hence the authors’ conclusions are convincing. Apart from pointing out the necessity of counter-checking the results with more speakers, they also very precisely pinpoint the research questions that perception

experiments should address, which seems to be a very exciting and promising continuation of their present investigation.

Éva Dékány and Veronika Hegedűs examine the issue of variation in word order and extraction properties of P elements. Hungarian postpositions are traditionally classified into two major groups: ones that take morphologically unmarked complements and ones that take oblique-marked complements, as in (4a) and (4b), respectively (pp. 95–96, exx. 1 and 2):

- (4) a. *a patak mellett*
 the brook next.to
 ‘next to the brook’
 b. *a patak-on túl*
 the brook-SUP beyond
 ‘beyond the brook’

Postpositions like *mellett* ‘next to’ resemble case suffixes in that they must always immediately follow the noun. Postpositions like *túl* ‘beyond’, however, may strand the complement by moving to a verbal modifier position, and they may also be stranded if the complement moves to the left periphery of the clause; furthermore, such P elements may appear in a prepositional position. Dékány and Hegedűs refine these long-established generalisations by showing that while suffix-like postpositions indeed do not show word order variation, case-assigning Ps may but do not necessarily take part in movement operations leading to surface word order variation. In particular, they show that a P element has to be case-assigning in order to have a particle use or undergo P-stranding, but case assignment is not a sufficient condition in itself, as many case-assigning Ps do not take part in the relevant operations. In turn, it is argued that the ability to be used as a particle and to be stranded is a prerequisite for the prepositional use, which is again not a shared property of all the P elements that may be used as particles or undergo stranding.

Case-assigning Ps seem to represent a closed class, and by carefully examining the behaviour of each element, the authors avoid the fallacy of previous accounts, which assumed that all members of this class behave in the same way. Yet the data so far are exclusively based on the authors’ own judgements, as previous studies conducted by Dér (2012, 2013) involving both a corpus and a questionnaire survey did not examine all the word order variations under scrutiny. Since the judgements are not always categorical either, and the authors themselves indicate that there might be some dialectal and/or idiolectal variation, it would have been vital to run at least an acceptability experiment. The authors’ judgements seem to match their own predictions perfectly, and while the predictions are indeed sensible, some bias in the judgements still cannot be excluded, which is impossible to check for the non-Hungarian reader. It is also left unclear whether future experiments are planned.

Dékány and Hegedűs convincingly argue that the differences in the behaviour of Ps stem from the differences in syntactic positions. Suffix-like Ps, see (4a), are generated in K, which is the head immediately above the DP, and subsequently they move to Place/Path, hence they have both suffix-like and postposition-like properties. While this at first suggests that true case suffixes do not undergo movement to Place/Path (p. 106), the authors later assume (p. 109) that case suffixes also undergo this movement. This is unfortunately left unexplained, raising the question what the difference between true case suffixes and Ps generated in K are. Apart from the fact that the authors seem to assume

that there is a difference between the two, the data in the article suggest that only true case suffixes may remain in K and tolerate base-generated Place/Path heads above them, while case-like Ps do not. Case-assigning Ps are either base-generated in Place/Path or in a higher projection, the head of pP: in the latter case, extraction patterns are allowed, since the minimal unit that can be extracted is PlaceP/PathP. A subset of P elements generated in p may even move to the topmost projection, the head of CP_{PP}, which is the only head-initial projection in the PP-domain: these elements can appear as prepositions. The distinction between Place/Path and p heads is also tied to general grammaticalisation processes, and the fact that some P elements are between the two categories in terms of their behaviour can be explained by the gradient nature of syntactic change.

Marcel den Dikken investigates the issue of marking inalienable and alienable possession in the Hungarian noun phrase. He focuses on a systemic morphological difference that certain nouns show with inalienable (5a) and alienable (5b) possession (based on p. 132, ex. 13 and p. 139, ex. 21):

- (5) a. *a szoba ablak-a*
 the room window-POSS
 ‘the room’s window’
 b. *Mari ablak-ja*
 Mary window-POSS
 ‘Mary’s window’

As demonstrated, nouns like *ablak* ‘window’ may take both the simple form of the possessive marker *-a/-e* (the choice of the vowel depending on whether the stem has palatal or velar vowels), or the more complex *-ja/-je*. The choice is not entirely free, though: Den Dikken argues that *-a/-e* is used in inalienable possession, while the *-j-* forms occur in alienable possession. This matches the descriptive, typological generalisation of Haspelmath (2008), according to which always the morphologically simple form (possibly even zero) is associated with inalienable possession, if a language has an adnominal alienability split. In Den Dikken’s analysis, the difference in the presence/absence of the *-j-* element lies in an underlying syntactic difference: the *-j-* element is analysed as a separate morpheme, which heads a functional projection, and serves as a LINKER.

The analysis heavily relies on Den Dikken’s (2006) theory, according to which all predication relations are generated in a Relator Phrase (RP): in canonical predication, the subject is the specifier and the predicate is the complement, while in reverse predication, the subject is the complement of the R head and the predicate is the specifier. Canonical predication may yield the same predicate–subject surface word order as reverse predication if an additional layer (FP) is generated: the predicate moves to the specifier of FP, and the F head is filled either by the relator moving up or by a separate F head that is joined by the upward movement of the R head. In possessive constructions, the possessor is the predicate and the possessum is the subject: inalienable possession demonstrates the reverse predication order, while alienable possession is associated with the canonical order (and the projection of the FP layer).

In Hungarian, the vowel portion of the possessive marker (*-a/-e*) is taken to be the R head and the *-j-* as a linker. Den Dikken convincingly argues that this kind of split has ample cross-linguistic support, yet it is also true that some languages demonstrate this split far more clearly than Hungarian does. In particular, the appearance/absence of *-j-* is largely phonologically conditioned, as Den Dikken himself acknowledges, and hence in

many cases *-j-* is not morphemic: the analysis only applies to a particular subset of nouns that do show alternation with *-j-*. However, alternation does not always strictly follow the pattern predicted by the theory: as Den Dikken notes, the noun *kar* ‘arm’ takes the *-j-* form even in inalienable possession, and the *-j-*-less form appears only in the lexicalised case when referring to a faculty of a university (and actually a few others, e.g. *angyalok kara* ‘the chorus of angels’). Moreover, there seem to be alternations that show the same split but with different ways of distinction: for instance, *ajtó* ‘door’ is *ajta-ja* in inalienable possession (e.g. the door of a house) and *ajtó-ja* in alienable possession (e.g. Mary’s window). Both forms contain *-j-*, possibly for purely phonological reasons, yet there is distinction in the final vowel of the stem: the vowel *-ó* is preserved with alienable possession, and it changes to *-a* in inalienable possession. The latter may be some sort of lexicalisation, raising the question whether inalienable possession is more prone to lexicalisation than alienable possessive forms, which are also more productive. These questions should have been addressed in order to provide a fuller picture of what is really going on in the Hungarian possessive paradigm of the type under scrutiny.

Mária Gósy and Péter Siptár examine the phonetic properties of the Hungarian vowel /a:/, which is the lowest vowel in the Hungarian vowel system, and traditionally considered to be a back vowel as far as its phonological status is concerned. Its status within the Hungarian vowel system (phonological) can be determined by two major points. On the one hand, /a:/ is the long pair of /ɔ/, a back unrounded vowel, as in (6a); on the other hand, /a:/ is the back vowel pair of /e:/, a front vowel, as in (6b) below (based on pp. 149–150, exx. 1 and 2):

- (6) a. *nyár* /a:/ ‘summer’ – *nyarak* /ɔ/ ‘summers’
 b. *fej-nél* /e:/ ‘at head’ – *láb-nál* /a:/ ‘at foot’

The long–short alternation demonstrated in (6a) regularly involves a length difference between the two members of such pairs and possibly also a difference in height, but a front–back difference is not attested in any other pair. Hence treating /a:/ as a front vowel as opposed to its short counterpart /ɔ/ would be a serious problem for the phonological system. On the other hand, suffixes like *-nál/-nél* ‘at’ in (6b) obey vowel harmony rules when attaching to the stem, and this comes in a back–front fashion. While it is possible for certain suffixes to have a rounded–unrounded distinction in the front vowel on top of the basic back–front distinction (as in *-on* vs. *-en/-ön* ‘on’), it is not attested in any of the suffixes that there is no back vowel counterpart at all. Hence treating /a:/ as a front vowel would seriously affect an otherwise regular system.

Hence there seems to be good reason to treat /a:/ a back vowel phonologically; the reason why the question arises at all is that regarding its phonetic status, /a:/ has long been claimed to be realised more to the front of the oral cavity (Bolla 1995, Szende 1999, Kovács 2004 among others). While the findings of previous studies may appear to be robust, Gósy and Siptár point out (p. 152) that a more careful investigation is needed in order to arrive at conclusive evidence. In particular, more recent studies typically concentrate on the speech production of female speakers only and all realisations of /a:/ are involved, including atypical (e.g. reduced) realisations. As far as investigations from the 20th century are concerned, the methodology is even more problematic since these studies involve only one or two speakers and read speech.

Gósy and Siptár have therefore carried out an empirical study to gain a more accurate picture. Their methodology can only be praised: they chose a high number of

speakers (n = 28), both females and males (14 and 14 each), all of them belonging to approximately the same age range (22–28, which is an ideally small range). The produced speech was spontaneous, and altogether over 600 realisations of [a:] were examined in each gender group. Moreover, special care was taken to select only typical occurrences of [a:], hence not ones that may be reduced, and only first or second syllable occurrences of the vowel were involved.

Given all this, the results are especially convincing. The absolute second formant values for the female speakers are actually higher than what was established in previous studies, suggesting even stronger evidence that [a:] is phonetically a front vowel (at least for females). However, what really matters is how the second formant values of [a:] relate to that of the vowels [ɛ] and [ɔ]: it is found that females' [a:] vowels are close to their realisations of [ɛ], while males' [a:] vowels are closer to [ɔ]. In short, phonetically [a:] is a front vowel for female speakers and a central vowel for males: at the same time, both genders show considerable inter-speaker variation (4 groups of speakers can be identified for females and 3 for males). At any rate, the authors conclude that /a:/ is phonetically changing from a back into a front vowel, while it is phonologically still best treated as a back vowel: this also increases the abstractness of the phonological system of Hungarian vowels, since the phonological status of /a:/ is increasingly not matched by its phonetic status.

The seventh paper in the volume was written by **Tamás Halm**, and it investigates the relationship between the distribution of Hungarian free choice items (FCIs) and aspect, in particular elements located in an AspP such as verbal particles. Hungarian regularly exhibits the following difference (based on p. 198, ex. 1):

- (7) a. **Bármit olvasok.*
 anything.ACC read.1SG
 'I read anything.'
- b. *Bármit el-olvasok.*
 anything.ACC PRT-read.1SG
 'I read anything.' (telic)

While the episodic sentence in (7a) is a hostile environment for FCIs (cross-linguistically), the presence of the verbal particle *el* in (7b) makes the sentence perfectly acceptable. Regarding the morphological structure of the FCI itself, it is made up of the element *bár* 'even though' and a *wh*-element (such as *mi* 'what'); furthermore, *bár* can be substituted by the element *akár* 'even', without causing any change in the distribution of the FCI.

Halm addresses the question of what the exact contribution of the verbal particle is, and he provides an overview of all the contexts that do or do not license FCIs. While in many respects Hungarian FCIs pattern with their well-known cross-linguistic counterparts (e.g. English *any*), it is shown that Hungarian FCIs are not licensed in generic contexts (at least not without the presence of a verbal particle). Halm adopts the view that in characterising sentences, genericity is achieved by the presence of a generic quantifier, which is either an adverb (such as *usually*) or a phonologically null GEN operator. Under the dependent indefinite analysis adopted here (Giannakidou 1997, 2001, Giannakidou & Quer 2013), FCIs are bound and hence licensed in generics by a generic quantifier. Halm argues that the difference between English (and several other languages such as Greek) on the one hand and Hungarian on the other stems from a difference that is essentially lexical in nature: while the languages belonging to the former

group all have a silent GEN operator, Hungarian does not, and hence (7a) is ruled out since the FCI cannot be licensed.

Unfortunately, Halm does not even consider the question of what happens if a generic adverb such as *általában* ‘usually’ is used in constructions like (7a): if genericity can indeed be encoded by an overt adverb, it should also be able to license the FCI. This is true even if one adopts the view that genericity is primarily pragmatic in Hungarian because the adverb should overwrite the episodic interpretation. The contrast seems to be valid if the sentence is in the past tense and a verbal particle is present (p. 173): Halm argues that the variant without the adverb is ambiguous between an episodic and a generic reading, while the variant with an adverb such as *gyerekkoromban* ‘as a child’ (lit. ‘in my child age’) unambiguously triggers a generic reading. Interestingly, the difference in terms of available readings is also paired up with an acceptability difference: the ambiguous variant is degraded, while the one where only the generic interpretation is licensed is fully acceptable. Since this difference is not shown to hold in any tense other than the past, it remains unclear whether and to what extent tense has an effect here. This would have been interesting especially because Halm otherwise shows that the presence/absence of the verbal particle in itself is not directly related to tense: one can find minimal pairs for all tenses where the presence of the verbal particle is needed to license the FCI. Related to this, Halm convincingly argues that while genericity is clearly governed by pragmatic factors in the absence of a verbal particle, the presence of a verbal particle is associated with genericity by way of the particle carrying a generic operator; in turn, the generic operator can license an FCI represented as an intensional indefinite.

Anikó Lipták presents new results concerning the issue of sluicing in Hungarian relative clauses, a phenomenon that seems to be a unique property of Hungarian, yet may help in understanding the exact conditions on sluicing better. Relative sluicing is illustrated in (8) below (based on p. 189, ex. 5):

- (8) *Ismerőssel* *eggyel* *találkozott, mulatságosnak találta, hogy*
 acquaintance.INSTR one.INSTR met.3SG funny.DAT found.3SG that
éppen azzal, [_{RC} *akivel* ~~*találkozott*~~].
 just that.INSTR REL.who.INSTR met.3SG
 ‘Acquaintances, (s)he met only one, and (s)he found it funny that (s)he met whoever (s)he did.’

The sole remnant of the relative clause is the relative pronoun itself, which also bears nuclear stress in this case; the rest of the clause undergoes ellipsis. The full clause would also be grammatical, but then nuclear stress falls on another element than the relative pronoun, in this case the verb. Lipták convincingly shows that the surface structure of (8) can indeed be derived only from ellipsis: the string of a demonstrative + relative pronoun is not attested as a constituent in any independent environment, and the two may be discontinuous: for instance, a lexical verb may appear in between the two. In addition, relative sluicing shows the availability of distributive readings and the traits of antecedent-contained deletion, which can only be explained if one adopts an underlyingly clausal structure.

Apart from relying on native judgements, Lipták has carried out an extensive corpus search (using the Hungarian National Corpus), and most of her examples are taken from there. Using corpus examples is advantageous in itself, and it is actually vital regarding the structure under scrutiny: the corpus results clearly show that relative sluicing is indeed a productive phenomenon in Hungarian. In other words, providing an

answer to the question why constructions like (8) exist is not merely an issue of a marginal possibility in the language, but it rather concerns a phenomenon that can be regarded as established as sluicing generally is.

The importance of Lipták's findings can easily be recognised when considering the general literature on sluicing. The established view is that sluicing happens in *wh*-interrogatives, leaving a *wh*-element as a remnant, as in Merchant (2001). That this cannot be the full picture was already shown by Van Craenenbroeck & Lipták (2006): they found that Hungarian and several other languages permit remnants other than *wh*-phrases, such as focussed constituents or quantificational expressions. They argued that the [E] feature responsible for sluicing is not universally equipped with a [+wh,+Q] feature but there are languages where sluicing is associated with a more general operator feature, call it [+Op]. What qualifies as operator movement is subject to cross-linguistic variation. The novelty of Lipták's paper is that relative operators may also be sluiced remnants: while this may not seem surprising as relative operators also undergo operator movement, note that Hungarian relative operators move higher in the clause (to the Spec of a CP) than all other operators that may be sluiced remnants. Lipták argues that the syntactic licensing of sluicing is precisely this similarity of operators, which is satisfied in Hungarian and in Gungbe. In addition, she shows that there is also a prosodic licensing: the remnant has to bear stress, and this is possible in sluicing constructions only if it is attested in certain non-sluiced clauses, which is satisfied in Hungarian but not in other languages. (Gungbe is a tone language, where the stressed/unstressed distinction is not applicable this way.) The uniqueness of Hungarian relative sluicing hence falls out naturally from the system of independent, more general criteria that hold cross-linguistically. Considering all this, it can only be hoped that Lipták's contribution will be appropriately recognised by future research.

The ninth paper, written by **Valéria Molnár**, compares instances of cataphoric propositional pronoun insertion (CPPI) in complex sentences in Hungarian and German, and argues that the insertion or the absence of the cataphoric pronoun cannot be fully determined by the matrix verbal predicate. In neutral contexts (that is, in sentences that answer a question like *What happened?*), Hungarian demonstrates the following pattern (based on p. 211, exx. 3 and 4):

- (9) a. Péter **azt** mondta, hogy gyakran találkoznak munka után.
 Peter it.ACC said.3SG that often meet.3PL work after
 'Peter said that they often meet up after work'.
 b. Péter (***azt**) bánja, hogy elfogadta a meghívást.
 Peter it.ACC regrets that accepted.3SG the invitation.ACC
 'Peter regrets that he has accepted the invitation'.

The cataphoric propositional pronoun *azt* 'it/that' in Hungarian is licensed if the matrix verb is assertive, as *mond* 'say' in (9a), but not when the matrix verb is factive, as *bán* 'regret' in (9b). By contrast, the same neutral contexts in German result in the opposite pattern: the cataphoric propositional pronoun *es* 'it' is not licensed with assertive matrix verbs like *behaupten* 'claim', while factive verbs such as *bedauern* 'regret' license it.

Molnár follows Lipták (1998) in assuming that the cataphoric propositional pronoun is base-generated in the [Spec,CP] position of the subclause: this position is available if there is an edge feature (EF) in the subclause. In turn, the edge feature in Hungarian is present if the subclause is predicative, which is satisfied in the case of assertives, which select for a predicative clause as a complement. On the other hand, if

the subclause is focussed or it contains a focussed constituent, it becomes predicational, as focussing is associated with predication. This explains why the difference between (9a) and (9b) does not carry over to non-neutral cases. The differences among various clause types with respect to predicativity are also supported by ample evidence from extraction patterns.

In German, the EF (and the corresponding [Spec,CP] position) is available in evaluable clauses; following Brandtler (2012), Molnár assumes that evaluability is a notion that involves both assertivity and factivity. Hence, the German version of both (9a) and (9b) involve an EF: however, this does not guarantee that the pronoun *es* ‘that’ is licensed to get lexicalised in both cases and it is only factives that allow *es* to be overt. This explains why the pattern in German is exactly the mirror image of the Hungarian one regarding neutral contexts. In non-neutral contexts, the focussing of (or in) the subclause makes *es* ungrammatical, while the backgrounding of the subclause always licenses an overt *es*. Molnár argues that the *es* appearing in these latter cases is anaphoric, as opposed to the cataphoric *es* used in cases like (9b): the two pronouns are only morphophonologically identical. This is perhaps the most important finding of Molnár’s paper: the distribution of German *es* would otherwise be almost impossible to account for in a principled way, while separating the two pronouns is not only theoretically advantageous but can also be supported by independent arguments. Arguments come not only from German but can be supported cross-linguistically, since the Hungarian instances of anaphoric *azt* ‘it/that’ behave in a similar way.

The differences with respect to (9) between the two languages are hence more complex than constituting simply mirror patterns, and the questions that arise on both sides are quite different, rendering Molnár’s presentation and analysis sometimes a bit dense. Nevertheless, the mechanisms underlying the various patterns are comparable and the results are altogether convincing.

György Rákosi examines the behaviour of certain psych verbs in Hungarian, and provides evidence from binding patterns that the two arguments of such verbs are merged freely in the structure, rather than conforming to a strict hierarchy of arguments. In particular, he examines stative object experiencer verbs, such as *aggaszt* ‘worry’ and dative experiencer verbs, such as *tetszik* ‘appeals to’. The special properties of experiencer predicates has been known in the literature since Postal (1971), and it has been found that forward binding patterns (e.g. ^{??}*John appeals to himself*) are ungrammatical or at least seriously degraded in English, the reason behind which is that target/subject matter arguments are generated lower than the experiencer argument, and the binding configuration where the experiencer is bound by the target/subject matter is degraded. The mirror backward binding configuration is impossible to test in English as reflexives are not licensed as nominatives (e.g. **Himself appeals to John*), which is a criterion holding independently of experiencer constructions.

Hungarian offers a good comparison, since reflexive pronouns are fully available in the nominative, too. Previous findings (e.g. É. Kiss 1994) all point to the conclusion that there is some asymmetry attested with experiencer verbs, in that backward binding is always acceptable, while forward binding may range from acceptable to ungrammatical, depending on the speaker and the particular verb. As Rákosi shows, however, this is rather the result of a methodological problem. If one considers examples with reciprocals (such as *egymást* ‘each other’), the judgements clearly improve for forward binding, resulting in full acceptability for most speakers. Reciprocals are not different from reflexives as far as their strict syntactic structure is concerned; the difference affects rather interpretation, in that the reciprocal anaphor can be referentially identical to the

subject argument, that is, they both refer to the same real-world individuals. While this is generally not the case with reflexives appearing out of context, Rákosi demonstrates convincingly that examples such as (10) may indeed converge (p. 259, ex. 25):

- (10) a. *Mindenki aggasztja önmagát.*
 everyone.NOM worries himself-ACC
 ‘Everyone worries himself.’
 b. *Mindenki-t aggaszt önmaga.*
 everyone-ACC worries himself.NOM
 ‘His own self worries everyone.’

Examples like (10) are available in contexts where different aspects of the same individual are discussed (for instance, a person X as an average human being versus the same person X in his profession). Rákosi’s judgements here are backed up with corpus data (with the relevant context), hence examples like (10) are not merely the results of theoretical papers but are in fact used by speakers. It is a pity, though, that the URL does not work anymore.

Rákosi shows that the availability of both the forward binding order, (10a), and the backward binding order, (10b), is restricted to object experiencer and dative experiencer verbs, but not if the verb is transitive, such as *lát* ‘see’, where the experiencer subject is generated externally, rendering only the forward binding pattern possible. Hence, there seems to be ample evidence that the experiencer verbs in question have a structurally different argument structure, whereby the arguments (both generated internally) may merge in either of the two possible orders. The findings modify the picture of base-generation in the Hungarian VP in that even though hierarchical generation still remains the norm (as opposed to German, see Fanselow 2001, 2003), a subset of verbs should rather be analysed as involving free generation.

In the last paper, **Irene Vogel, Angeliki Athanasopoulou and Nadya Pincus** present the results of their cross-linguistic study regarding Hungarian, and provide empirical evidence for the exact acoustic properties of prominence at both the lexical and the sentential level. The importance of their findings lies primarily in the fact that previous studies made assumptions about Hungarian word stress and focal stress based purely or predominantly on impressionistic assessments (see also Blaho & Szeredi 2011).

The main hypothesis of Vogel, Athanasopoulou and Pincus is the Functional Load Hypothesis (FLH), which predicts that a certain property used for making phonological contrasts will not be a decisive factor in marking stress on either the lexical or the sentential level. Regarding Hungarian, the prediction is that since duration (length) is a distinctive feature for vowels (and consonants), word stress and focus will not be determined by length, as it would blur the contrast established by length otherwise. This hypothesis is confirmed by the results of the experimental study, which also shows that the primary cue for marking stress is pitch, hence F0.

Vogel, Athanasopoulou and Pincus also hypothesised that the primary cue for lexical stress and for sentential stress are different. A common fallacy of previous studies was exactly the confounding of the two, that is, word stress was frequently tested in focus positions. In order to tell the two kinds of stress apart, the authors examined stressed and unstressed syllables (containing either short or long vowels) in focused and non-focused positions as well. The Hungarian stimuli that the participants had to read out fall into four target types (based on p. 273, Table 1):

- (11) a. C[́]VCVCV /katona/ 'soldier'
 b. CVC[́]CV /babuka/ 'little baby'
 c. C[́]:CVCV /ku:pokat/ 'cones.ACC'
 d. CVC[́]:CV /lazi:tok/ 'I relax'

Each target was presented both in a focused and in a non-focused position, yielding altogether 8 types of environments for a single vowel that can be realised both as short and long. All the target items conform more or less to a strict CVCVCV structure, and the vowel under scrutiny was always in an open syllable. Word stress falls predictably on the first syllable in Hungarian, and word stress is assumed to be binary (stressed vs. unstressed), hence the second syllables can be considered unstressed.

Regarding previous research on Hungarian, the main finding of the study presented by Vogel, Athanasopoulou and Pincus is that F0 is the most important factor in marking stress both on the lexical and on the sentential level. At first, this seems to be a contradiction to the initial hypothesis, according to which the two kinds of stress should be distinct. However, the authors show very convincingly that pitch plays a crucial role in a different way in each case. While it is true that the pitch of the vowel of the first syllable is regularly higher than the pitch of the vowel of the second syllable, comparing the pitch pattern in focused and non-focused positions reveals a contour difference. In non-focused conditions, the contour is essentially flat, that is, the pitch of the first vowel is only slightly higher than that of the second. By contrast, in focused conditions, there is a clear falling contour, hence the first vowel is higher in pitch than the second one, and measuring the contour within the individual vowels also shows a clearly falling contour. This is achieved by the first vowel having a higher pitch on average in focused than in non-focused conditions, and the second vowel having slightly lower average pitch in focused than in non-focused conditions. Cross-linguistically, the overall relatively slight differences between stressed and unstressed vowels is tied to the observation that the occurrence of stressed syllables is predictable in Hungarian, as opposed to Spanish, for instance.

In sum, volume 14 of the *Approaches to Hungarian* series presents a nice collection of interesting studies that are relevant both for scholars working (or planning to work) on Hungarian and for ones who would like to gain some cross-linguistic insight into particular research questions. Apart from the individual papers being generally well written, the quality of the publication is satisfactory, even if not without some imperfections. There are few typos and mistakes, distributed quite unevenly, which suggests that proofreading was not carried out in a fully professional way and the responsibility of the authors was higher than would be optimal. Some inconsistencies should have been eliminated, the burden of which lies not only with the editors but also with the publisher. For instance, the affiliation is provided for some of the authors but not for others; equally disturbing is the placement of acknowledgements, which is the first (starred) footnote for some of the papers, whilst it is placed at the very end of the article for others. The bibliographies were not checked carefully either: there seems to have been no consensus on which words to be capitalized in English titles, and whether to provide a translation for book titles in other languages (for instance, Hungarian). Some of the examples (and occasionally tables) are split at page breaks in a most unfortunate way.

Apart from such issues, however, the book is an important contribution to linguistics and to several subfields thereof, and overall it was a very enjoyable, good read.

References

- Béjar, Susana & Rezac, Milan. 2009. Cyclic agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(1). 35–73.
- Blaho, Sylvia & Szeredi, Dániel. 2011. (The non-existence of) secondary stress in Hungarian. In Tibor Laczkó & Catherine O. Ringen (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian 12*, 39–62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bolla, Kálmán. 1995. *Magyar fonetikai atlasz: A szegmentális hangszerkezet elemei*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
- Brandtler, Johan. 2012. *The evaluability hypothesis: The syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of polarity item licensing in Swedish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Coppock, Elizabeth. 2013. A semantic solution to the problem of Hungarian object agreement. *Natural Language Semantics* 21. 345–371.
- Coppock, Elizabeth & Wechsler, Stephen. 2010. Less-travelled paths from pronoun to agreement: The case of the Uralic object conjugations. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG10 conference*, 165–185. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Craenenbroeck, Jeroen van & Lipták, Anikó. 2006. The cross-linguistic syntax of sluicing: Evidence from Hungarian relatives. *Syntax* 9. 248–274.
- Dér, Csilla. 2012. Mennyire (prototipikus) névutók a ragvonzó névutók a magyarban? In Gábor Tolcsvai Nagy & Szilárd Tátrai (eds.), *Konstrukció és jelentés*, 11–29. Budapest: ELTE BTK.
- Dér, Csilla. 2013. A kontextus szerepe a magyar ragvonzó névutók viselkedésében. In Márta Csepregi et al. (eds.), *Grammatika és kontextus: Új szempontok az uráli nyelvek kutatásában III*, 9–19. Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 2006. *Relators and linkers: The syntax of predication, predicate inversion, and copulas*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 1994. Scrambling as the base generation of random complement order. In Norbert Corver & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Studies on scrambling: Movement and non-movement approaches to free-word-order phenomena*, 221–256. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2001. Features, θ -roles, and free constituent order. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(3). 405–437.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2003. Free constituent order: A minimalist interface account. *Folia Linguistica* XXXVII(1–2). 191–231.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1997. *The landscape of polarity items*. PhD dissertation. Groningen: University of Groningen.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2001. The meaning of free choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24. 659–735.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia & Quer, Josep. 2012. *Against universal free choice: Free choice and referentially vague indefinites in Greek, Catalan, and Spanish*. Ms under submission.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. *Syntactic universals and usage frequency 3: Alienable vs. inalienable possessive constructions*. Handout, Leipzig Spring School on Linguistic Diversity.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland. 2010. Collapsing the Head Final Filter and the Head Complement Parameter. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 20. 35–65.
- Kovács, Magdolna. 2004. Pros and cons about Hungarian [a:]. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 62. 65–75.
- Lipták, Anikó. 1998. A magyar fókuszemelések egy minimalista elemzése. In László Büky & Márta Maleczki (eds.), *A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei III*, 93–116. Szeged: JATE.

- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Postal, Paul M. 1971. *Cross-over phenomena*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Siptár, Péter & Törkenczy, Miklós. 2000. *The phonology of Hungarian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Szabolcsi, Anna & Laczkó, Tibor. 1992. A főnévi csoport szerkezete. In Ferenc Kiefer (ed.), *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan I.: Mondattan*, 179–298. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Szende, Tamás. 1999. Hungarian. In *Handbook of the International Phonetic Association*, 104–107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Julia Bacskai-Atkari
University of Potsdam
julia.bacskai-atkari@uni-potsdam.de