

BOOK REVIEWS

Katalin É. Kiss: *The syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002, 278 pp.

The book represents a systematic study of Hungarian sentence structure. Throughout the book É. Kiss uses a large amount of results from several linguists. Yet, it appears to repeat the basic proposal made already in the seventies by É. Kiss, namely, that the Hungarian sentence consists of a topic and a predicate. The predicate is a head initial verb phrase, and it can be preceded by focused elements and quantifiers.

The results of other researchers on Hungarian syntax are adopted or rather adapted to this basic premise. This results in several cases in analyses where the flat VP structure is retained and the proposals of other authors are slightly altered in order to fit É. Kiss's general framework.

The book under review has the following structure. Chapter 1 is an introductory chapter that presents the necessary background assumptions and some information about Hungarian in general, its distribution, genealogy and an overview of syntactic and morphosyntactic features. A short summary of the next chapters is also included in the introduction which helps to guide the reader. Chapters 2 to 6 are devoted to operator positions that are projected above the flat VP projection. Chapter 2 discusses the topic phrase, the function of topics and the operation of topicalization. Chapter 3 deals with the predicate phrase itself and examines the relation of arguments within the VP and the properties of the verbal modifier (VM). Chapter 4 describes the semantic and syntactic properties of the focused element. Chapter 5 investigates quantifier phrases, their position, scope and interpretation. Chapter 6 deals with negative phrases, negation and negative concord. Chapter 7 deals with the structure of the noun phrase. It is claimed that the inner structure of the various types of complements parallels the inner structure of the extended verb phrase. The noun phrase also consists of a lexical kernel and it is further extended by operator and morphosyntactic projections like AgrP. Chapter 8 discusses the structure of the postpositional phrase

and Chapter 9 is devoted to non-finite verbal projections. Non-finite verbal projections are shown to be also extended by morphosyntactic and operator projections. The parallels between finite and non-finite verbal projections are emphasized throughout the chapter. The last chapter is dedicated to the internal structure of subordinate clauses which is claimed to be basically identical to the structure of matrix clauses.

In each chapter the reader is led through detailed argumentations, a wealth of data and presentations of several previous analyses with their merits and shortcomings discussed. In those cases where É. Kiss adopts analyses from other researchers the source and the motives are clearly stated although sometimes the presentation of the adopted analysis is rather concise.

Chapter 2 deals with the topic phrase and the properties of the topic. First, É. Kiss gives a definition of the topic function: "The topic foregrounds an individual from among those present in the universe of discourse as the subject of the subsequent predication." The formal features of a topic constituent are examined and it is concluded that the topic constituent must be referential and specific. É. Kiss then examines how the topic-predicate boundary can be located. The most obvious clue is stress, since in Hungarian the obligatory stress falls on the first major constituent of the predicate phrase. Therefore the topic cannot bear major stress. Sentence adverbials can precede or follow the topic, but can never enter the predicate phrase. After presenting the empirical data about Hungarian sentences with a topic phrase, É. Kiss proposes to analyze the topic constituent as an argument of the verb that has been preposed from the VP and binds an argument position in it. The topic constituent moves to a functional projection called topic phrase (TopP). This TopP can be iterated. Topicless sentences are also examined in this chapter and it is claimed that a sentence can be topicless if it involves a logical propositional operator. Such sentences can be both stative and eventive.

A rather extensive chapter, Chapter 3, is dedicated to the structure of the minimal predicate. It consists of a VP, extended by morphosyntactic projections such as modality, tense, mood and agreement and further extended into an aspectual phrase.

A very long subsection of Chapter 3 deals with the morphosyntactic projections that extend the core VP. Hungarian is an agglutinative language, its tense, mood and agreement morphemes appearing as suffixes on the verb. In this section É. Kiss basically adopts the analysis of Bartos (1999). Bartos analyzes these morphosyntactic suffixes as independent syntactic constituents occupying head positions of functional projections. Bartos extends the verb phrase with five further functional projections.

The final issue dealt with in Chapter 3 is the category and structural position of a particle-like adverbial element traditionally called the verbal prefix. The analysis of the verbal prefix presents several difficult questions. First, the prefix + verb combination shows characteristics of a lexical unit that should be treated as a compound with deleted inner brackets. At the same time, however, the verbal prefix has syntactic properties that are characteristic of independent syntactic units, such as the possibility of movement into a position outside the VP and even outside a subordinate clause. Given these properties, É. Kiss analyzes the verbal prefix as an independent syntactic unit that is selected lexically by the verb. The second question that should be answered is whether it should be characterized as a phrase or a head since once again some facts suggest phrasal properties while other facts support head-like properties. Such contradictory evidence is resolved in this book by analyzing the verbal prefix as a

phrasal constituent consisting of a mere head. As such it is a projection that is both minimal and maximal and is capable of acting both as a phrase and as a head.

In Chapter 4 É. Kiss examines the semantic and syntactic properties of the preverbal focus constituent in Hungarian. Semantically focus is defined as the element that expresses exhaustive identification from among a set of alternatives. This exhaustive identification in Hungarian is the function of the immediately preverbal focus constituent. É. Kiss lists several semantic tests discussed in Szabolcsi (1981b) that show the exhaustive identification function of focusing.

The most conspicuous constraint on the flexible word order of the Hungarian sentence is the obligatory “focus V VM” word order in sentences containing a focus constituent. There have been several proposals in the literature to account for this reversal of the unmarked “VM V” word order. É. Kiss rejects on empirical grounds the analyses where the complementary distribution of the focus constituent and the VM is accounted for by assuming that they occupy the same preverbal position. Instead she adopts Brody’s (1990) analysis of focus generating a focus projection, the specifier of which is obligatorily occupied by the focus constituent. She does, however, slightly modify Brody’s original account and does not assume verb movement into the focus head. On the basis of empirical arguments she proposes that the FP is an alternative to the AspP. In other words, the VP is extended either into an AspP in neutral sentences or into an FP in sentences containing focus. In this way it automatically follows that the VM in sentences containing a focus can stand anywhere behind the verb since it stays in its base generated position in the verb phrase.

Wh-questions are also discussed in this chapter since *wh*-phrases are analyzed as obligatorily focused elements with a [+focus] feature. Two types of multiple questions are dealt with. One associated with a pair-list answer and the other one requiring a singular answer. It is claimed that the two types of questions involve different syntactic structures. In questions requiring a singular answer, one of the *wh*-phrases occupies Spec,FP while the other one remains in situ inside the VP. As mentioned earlier, *wh*-questions involving *wh*-movement to Spec,FP do not exhibit superiority condition effects since all arguments of the verb are at an equal distance from Spec,FP. *Wh*-questions that trigger a pair-list answer have a different structure. É. Kiss claims that in these sentences only one of the *wh*-phrases is an interrogative operator occupying the Spec,FP position while the other *wh*-phrase is a distributive quantifier occupying the position of distributive quantifiers above Spec,FP.

Chapter 5 deals with the leftmost position of the predicate phrase which is occupied by distributive quantifiers. Since in Hungarian the Nuclear Stress Rule assigns phrasal stress on the left edge of phrases, in the intonation phrase represented by the predicate each maximal projection is assigned phrasal stress. Therefore distributive phrases bear heavy stress. É. Kiss examines the set of quantifiers that can occur in quantifier position. This set can be divided into two groups. There is a set of quantifiers that can only appear in quantifier position. This includes universal quantifiers and phrases modified by the additive particle *is* which means ‘also’, or modified by *még... is* ‘even’. She claims that they are restricted to the quantifier position because they inherently have the feature [+distributive]. The other set of quantifiers can occur in quantifier position but they can also appear in focus position, in topic position and postverbally. These include positive existential quantifiers and numeral phrases. É. Kiss assumes that distributive quantifiers occupy the specifier slot of a DistP projection which dominates either FP if the sentence contains a focus phrase or

AspP. The DistP projection—just like the TopP projection—can have more than one specifier. The scope principle, which says that an operator must c-command its scope, is observed in Hungarian in visible syntax, at surface structure.

Negation is discussed in Chapter 6. Negation is performed by the negative particle *nem*, which can appear either before the verb or before the focus or before the universal quantifier. Preverbal negation and negation preceding the focus exhibit parallel behavior. Several syntactic, phonological and semantic facts support the analysis that the VP negating particle and the FP negating particle both project a NegP and the negative particle sits in the Neg head of this projection. The adjacency of the VP negating particle and the verb is accounted for by assuming that in such a sentence no AspP is projected above the VP and thus NegP is not an extension of AspP but an alternative to it. Semantic considerations support this claim since negation does in fact neutralize aspect.

Negation of the universal quantifier, however, is of a different kind. It represents constituent negation with the negative particle *nem* adjoined to the quantified noun phrase. Hungarian exhibits the phenomenon known in the literature as Negative Concord, meaning that several instances of negative pronouns (*se*-phrases) can occur together with the negative particle, yet multiple negative pronouns do not yield multiple negation semantically. É. Kiss makes the following two assumptions: (1) a *se*-phrase has the feature [+negative,+distributive], (2) the functional heads Neg and Dist, instantiating these features, can fuse, projecting a joint DistNegP. The *se*-phrases occupy the specifier position of this joint DistNegP and this specifier position can be iterated.

From Chapter 7 on, the book deals with the inner structure of various types of verb complements. Chapter 7 discusses the structure of the Hungarian noun phrase starting by introducing the basic syntactic layers of the noun phrase. É. Kiss assumes that the NP kernel can be extended to a numeral phrase (NumP) which can host the plural marker. This can further be extended into a quantifier phrase (QP) and finally into a definite noun phrase (DP). NPs, NumPs, QPs and DPs have different distribution across sentence positions. One of the most challenging and interesting areas of Hungarian syntax is the structure of the possessive construction. In Hungarian the possessive relation is marked on the possessed noun with a suffix indicating possessiveness and also an agreement marker which agrees in person and number with the possessor. The structure of the possessive construction was first elaborated on by Szabolcsi (1981a; 1983; 1994) and in this book É. Kiss gives a detailed summary of this “traditional” or “standard” analysis of possessive constructions, discussing the merits and shortcomings of Szabolcsi’s claims. In Hungarian the possessive relation can be expressed in three different ways. One construction involves a caseless possessor, another construction has a dative marked possessor internal to the extended projection of the possessed noun and there is a so called cleft construction where the dative marked possessor is moved out of the extended projection of the possessed noun. The relation between the possessor and the possession is identical in all three constructions and therefore it is commonly accepted that the three constructions should have the same underlying structure. É. Kiss gives several pieces of empirical evidence that Szabolcsi’s claim that the dative marked possessor is derived from the nominative marked possessor cannot be maintained. Instead, for É. Kiss—following den Dikken (1999) and Bartos (1999)—the primary variant of the possessive construction is that containing the dative marked possessor. The caseless possessor is claimed to be in the specifier position of the DP projection.

The topic of Chapter 8 is the formal properties and syntactic structure of postpositions in Hungarian. É. Kiss assumes that postpositions are similar to Cases in Hungarian and that they are functional heads which extend the noun phrase into a prepositional phrase. This prepositional phrase is syntactically head initial which means that the prepositional head turns into a postposition only in the morphological component due to the fact that the P has a [+suffix] feature. This feature forces the obligatory adjacency of the noun phrase complement and the postposition. É. Kiss discusses the difference between postpositions taking a noun phrase complement and postpositions taking a pronominal complement. In the latter case, the PP must be extended into an AgrP and the agreement morphemes appearing on the postposition are identical to those that appear on the possessed noun in the case of a pronominal possessor. An interesting property of postpositions discussed in this chapter is that they can be assigned the feature [+verb modifier] if their complement has been extracted. The remnant PP exhibits all the properties of a verb modifier. In neutral sentences it immediately precedes the verb and acts as an aspectualizer.

Chapter 9 provides an analysis of three types of non-finite phrases in Hungarian: infinitival phrases, adverbial participial phrases and adjectival participial phrases. All three types of non-finite phrases can merge with the same types of operator phrases that can appear in finite clauses. A non-finite VP can be extended by AspP, NegP, FP, DistP and TopP. The movement possibilities of constituents are determined by exactly the same constraints as those valid in finite verb projections. However, non-finite clauses do not have a Case assigner that could assign nominative Case to the subject, therefore the subject of non-finite clauses is represented by PRO (except for inflected infinitival phrases discussed below). PRO can be controlled by the subject or the object of a matrix predicate. Inflected infinitives represent a rather unique property of Hungarian. The agreeing infinitive bears the same agreement marker that appears in possessive constructions on the possessed noun and the subject of the infinitive can be a Case-marked lexical noun phrase or a pronominal or *pro*. Partially basing her analysis on Tóth (2000a), a monograph devoted to inflected infinitives, É. Kiss provides an analysis that tries to account for the presence of the agreement marker that is sometimes obligatory and sometimes optional. She claims that the source of dative Case in inflected infinitives is the *-a/-e* suffix on the infinitive which is argued in section 7 to be a dative Case assigner.

Whereas in subject and object control constructions the infinitival verb has its own theta-role to assign and the whole infinitival phrase is the argument of the matrix verb, there are other constructions where the matrix verb and the infinitival verb form a complex predicate and they together assign a theta-role to the arguments. Verbs participating in this complex predicate formation are auxiliaries and semi-auxiliaries. The properties of these complex predicates have inspired a great amount of work, much of which is included in a monograph (É. Kiss – van Riemsdijk 2004). É. Kiss briefly discusses the two main structures that verbal complexes can have. One is the so-called straight verbal complex and the other one is the inverse verbal complex. In a straight verbal complex the surface order of the elements corresponds to the underlying order. In non-neutral sentences, however, when a focus or a negative particle precedes the finite verb, the non-finite elements of the verbal complex can appear in an inverse order. In the inverse order the verbal elements must be strictly adjacent. É. Kiss assumes that the inverse order is the result of cyclic incorporation of the infinitival

elements of the verbal complex. There are, however, opposing views, see for instance Koopman – Szabolcsi (2000).

If the extended VP is merged with the adverbial suffix *-va/-ve*, then the resulting non-finite phrase functions either as an adverbial of manner or time or it can also function as a secondary predicate. É. Kiss discusses the previous analyses of adverbial participle phrases that have been proposed in the literature (see Komlósy 1994; Laczkó 1995; Alberti 1998 and Tóth 2000b). The main debate concerns whether the fact that the subject argument is suppressed in a predicative adverbial participle indicates syntactic passivisation or a passive stem is already present in the lexicon. Although É. Kiss does not take an unambiguous stand on which analysis to adopt or support, she seems to favour Alberti's claim that, in Hungarian predicative adverbial phrases, a kind of passivisation takes place which prefers the patient. The suppression of the agent is a corollary of this patient preference.

The last chapter of the book presents the internal structure of subordinate clauses: the position of the subordinate clause in a matrix sentence, the properties of relative clauses and finally two interesting phenomena: long operator movement and the licensing of parasitic gaps. In Hungarian, subordinate clauses are associated with either a pronominal or a lexical head. This pronominal or lexical head plays two roles. First, it picks up the Case that is assigned to the subordinate clause by the matrix verb. Second, it can represent the embedded clause in those matrix operator positions where a clausal complement cannot appear. Such positions are Spec,AspP; Spec,DistP; Spec,FP and Spec,TopP. A further constraint on the position of an embedded clause is that a *that*-clause in Hungarian cannot be internal to a lexical projection. The relation between the pronominal or lexical head and the embedded clause coindexed with it has been a matter of debate in the literature. In this book É. Kiss mentions three alternative analyses: one proposed by Kenesei (1992), where the clause and the pronoun form an expletive-associate chain; one proposed by Lipták (1998), where the pronoun is generated in Spec,CP of the embedded clause; and finally an account given in É. Kiss (1987) where the pronoun and the clause constitute a complex noun phrase. In the section discussing long operator movement, É. Kiss examines how these three alternative analyses fare in view of the empirical facts and the reader gets the impression that Lipták's approach solves the largest part of the problems connected to long operator movement.

As the above discussion suggests, this book provides a detailed investigation of a wide range of phenomena in Hungarian syntax and gives possible accounts based on analyses that have been proposed in the literature and on previous work by É. Kiss herself. It is both an invaluable summary of the results of contemporary syntactic research on Hungarian and an original work in all senses of the word. I recommend this book to anyone who is interested in issues concerning the structure of Hungarian.

Ildikó Tóth

References

- Alberti, Gábor 1998. On passivization in Hungarian. In: Casper de Groot – István Kenesei (eds): *Approaches to Hungarian 6* (Papers from the Amsterdam conference), 103–22. JATEPress, Szeged.

- Bartos, Huba 1999. Morfoszintaxis és interpretáció: a magyar inflexiós jelenségek szintaktikai háttere [Morphosyntax and interpretation: The syntactic background of Hungarian inflectional phenomena]. Doctoral dissertation, Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE), Budapest.
- Brody, Michael 1990. Remarks on the order of elements in the Hungarian focus field. In: István Kenesei (ed.): *Approaches to Hungarian 3 (Structures and arguments)*, 95–121. JATE, Szeged.
- Dikken, Marcel den 1999. On the structural representation of possession and agreement: The case of (anti-)agreement in Hungarian possessed nominal phrases. In: István Kenesei (ed.): *Crossing boundaries: Advances in the theory of Central and Eastern European languages*, 137–78. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- É. Kiss, Katalin 1987. *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- É. Kiss, Katalin – Ferenc Kiefer (eds) 1994. *The syntactic structure of Hungarian (Syntax and Semantics 27)*. Academic Press, New York.
- É. Kiss, Katalin – Henk van Riemsdijk (eds) 2004. *Verb clusters. A Study of Hungarian, German and Dutch*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.
- Kenesei, István 1992. Az alárendelt mondatok szerkezete [The structure of subordinate clauses]. In: Ferenc Kiefer (ed.): *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan 1. Mondattan [A structural grammar of Hungarian, Vol. 1: Syntax]*, 531–713. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Komlósy, András 1994. Complements and adjuncts. In: É. Kiss – Kiefer (1994, 91–178).
- Koopman, Hilda – Anna Szabolcsi 2000. *Verbal complexes*. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Laczó, Tibor 1995. On the status of *való* in adjectivalized constituents in noun phrases. In: István Kenesei (ed.): *Approaches to Hungarian 5 (Levels and structures)*, 125–52. JATEPress, Szeged.
- Lipták, Anikó 1998. A magyar fókuszemelések egy minimalista elemzése [A minimalist analysis of focus raising in Hungarian]. In: László Büky – Márta Maleczki (eds): *A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei III [Recent methods in the description of contemporary Hungarian 3]*, 93–115. JATEPress, Szeged.
- Szabolcsi, Anna 1981a. The possessive construction in Hungarian: A configurational category in a nonconfigurational language. In: *Acta Linguistica Hungarica 31*: 261–289.
- Szabolcsi, Anna 1981b. The semantics of topic–focus articulation. In: Jan Groenendijk – Theo Janssen – Martin Stokhof (eds): *Formal methods in the study of language*, 513–41. Matematisch Centrum, Amsterdam.
- Szabolcsi, Anna 1983. The possessor that ran away from home. In: *The Linguistic Review 3*: 216–89.
- Szabolcsi, Anna 1994. The Noun Phrase. In: É. Kiss – Kiefer (1994, 179–274).
- Tóth, Ildikó 2000a. *Inflected infinitives in Hungarian*. Doctoral dissertation, Tilburg University.
- Tóth, Ildikó 2000b. *-va and -ván participles in Hungarian*. In: Gábor Alberti – István Kenesei (eds): *Approaches to Hungarian 7 (Papers from the Pécs conference)*, 237–58. JATEPress, Szeged.

Jacqueline Guéron–Jacqueline Lecarme (eds): The syntax of time (Current Studies in Linguistics 37). MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2004, 760 pp.

This volume contains the updated versions of talks presented at the *International Round Table on the Syntax of Tense and Aspect*, held at the Université Paris 7, in November 2000. The 23 articles in the book are between 14 and 44 pages. The contributors to the volume (in the order of the articles, which corresponds to the alphabetical order of the (first) authors) are Dorit Abusch, Mario Barra-Jover, Alexandra Cornilescu, Denis Delfitto, Hamida Demirdache, Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria, Yves D’hulst, Mürvet Enç, Nomi Erteschik-Schir, Tova Rapoport, Abdelkader Fassi Fehri, Alessandra Giorgi, Fabio Pianesi, Jacqueline Guéron, James Higginbotham, Michela Ippolito, Angelika Kratzer, Brenda Laca, Jacqueline Lecarme, Beth Levin, Malka Rappaport Hovav, David Pesetsky, Esther Torrego, Susan Rothstein, Philippe Schlenker, Carlota S. Smith, Tim Stowell, and Karen Zagana.

The editors, Guéron and Lecarme, survey the range of questions and problems discussed in the book in the 25 page long Introduction, and to some extent I will follow their classification. The range of the linguistic problems included in the volume is fairly large, and in many cases exceeds the domain of pure syntax. We can find morphological, semantic or pragmatic analyses in several articles. A few major research topics recur in a number of chapters: (i) models of tense construal (Reichenbachian and other approaches), (ii) dependency of tense on context, (iii) anchoring of tense, (iv) sequence of tense (SOT) phenomena and temporal ambiguity in embedded clauses or infinitival complements (double access reading, DAR), (v) problems in distinguishing aspect from Aktionsart, (vi) the characteristics of imperfective tenses, (vii) licensing of arguments (i.e., the relations between the argument structure of a sentence and its temporal properties), and, last but not least, the presence of tense in the nominal domain. Because of lack of space, rather than attempting to review the volume by grouping the linguistic problems into the topics mentioned above (which is what Guéron and Lecarme do in their Introduction), I will survey the content of the book by arranging the articles in four thematic classes as follows. (1) Telicity and argument structure (Erteschik-Schir and Rapoport, Levin and Rappaport-Hovav, Guéron, Kratzer, Rothstein, Higginbotham, Pesetsky and Torrego, Lecarme, and Cornilescu); (2) SOT and DAR phenomena (Enç, Schlenker, Zagana, Barra-Jover, and Abusch); (3) imperfective tense (Delfitto, Ippolito, Giorgi and Pianesi, and Fassi Fehri); (4) and finally a fourth group, which contains the remaining chapters, that investigate specific topics (Laca, D’hulst, Smith, Stowell, Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria). Of course, this is only a rough classification, and none of the articles can be considered to be as homogeneous as suggested by it.

The topics examined in the first group “**telicity and argument structure**” are quite heterogeneous: differences among Vendler-classes, problems of Aktionsart, tense chain in the nominal domain, and the analysis of structural cases by means of temporal features.

Cornilescu examines the Romanian infinitive (INF) and supine (SUP) nominalisations. She claims that while the behaviour of Romanian INF-nominals fit into the earlier analyses of Romance nominalisations by Kupferman and Alexiadou, the SUP-nominals contradict them. She concludes that it is necessary to make several modifications on Kupferman’s and Alexiadou’s theories. The author analyses two characteristics of Romanian SUP-nominals: (i) in the [nominal+subject] structures they behave like E(vent)-nominals, and not like R(esult)-nominals, (ii) they can license zero objects.

Cornilescu's explanation—based on Borer's (1994) theory—suggests that the differences between the Romanian INF- and SUP-nominals are due to an aspectual contrast between the two morphemes: the INF-suffix has a [+telic] feature, so it requires an overt object, while the SUP-suffix can have [+/-telic] features, as well.

Erteschik-Schir and Rapoport present a theory of structure projection of verbs, that determines thematic and aspectual interpretation, too. They suppose that syntactic structure is projected from the meaning components of the verb. They make use of three such meaning components ("bound semantic morphemes"): M (manner/means/instrument), S (state), L (location). In this analysis a verb is transitive just in case it has two such meaning components, and furthermore a verb with only one meaning component (e.g., *laugh*) can also become transitive when merged, for example, with a prepositional phrase. Following Hale and Keyser (1991) the authors claim that each pattern of the meaning components (and the syntactic structures derivable from these patterns) has a specific interpretation (e.g., activity, change-of-state achievement, etc.). A further characteristic of the theory is that theta-roles are not primitives, but derived.

Levin and Rappaport-Hovav's paper is closely related to Erteschik-Schir and Rapoport's analysis just mentioned, for Levin and Rappaport-Hovav also make the distinction among telic and atelic predicates on the basis of "event complexity" (they use this term). However, this concept cannot be unequivocally aligned with the above-mentioned "number of meaning components". Levin and Rappaport-Hovav think that the impact of traditionally recognised aspectual properties (e.g., telicity, boundedness) is overestimated, and they introduce the notion of event complexity instead. The Argument-per-Subevent Condition requires verbs expressing complex events to have objects. The authors claim that the classes of telic and complex events do not coincide. Complex events have the property that the authors call "lack of temporal dependence," i.e., the two subevents need not necessarily unfold together temporally. This is what we find, for example, in the case of reflexive resultatives and lexical causatives. For instance, the sentence *Sam has sung himself hoarse* is compatible with the following context: Sam sang yesterday enthusiastically during the class play, and when he woke up today, he was hoarse. By using this criterion the authors point out that the so-called verbs of consumption (e.g., *eat*), albeit being telic, are not complex events.

Rothstein examines two constructions in which accomplishment VPs are derived from nonaccomplishment heads: (i) progressive achievements, and (ii) resultative constructions with activity verbs. Rothstein assumes that in both cases type-shifting operations take place, since (i) achievement verbs express near-instantaneous changes-of-state (and so they are not compatible with the progressive) on the one hand, and, on the other hand, (ii) activity verbs do not have a culmination subevent (which is necessary for a resultative construction). In the author's view the possibility of transforming achievement and activity verbs to accomplishment predicates is based on the fact that the class of accomplishments bears similarities to both of the other classes: they extend over time (like activity verbs) and have inherently determined endpoints (like achievements). However, there are also differences between the derived accomplishments and lexical accomplishments: in the case of the former, the relation between verbal head and direct object is not gradual or incremental, but holistic.

Higginbotham modifies the treatments of Parsons (1990) and Landman (1992) in his analysis of the English progressive. Higginbotham's major innovation over Parsons and Landman consists in his representation of accomplishments and achievements, which directly and explicitly includes the telos part. While Parsons states that ac-

accomplishment verbs in English can only turn into a culminated event by adding the simple past tense morpheme to them, Higginbotham argues (following Zucchi 1999) that a verb actually can be an accomplishment verb even when the culmination is not attained. We can find a similar analysis in Erteschik-Schir and Rapoport's paper, who maintain that achievement and accomplishment verbs can actually be telic or atelic, as they may describe a single, final change of state, as well as the increments of that change.

Kratzer's article investigates the relation between telicity and the accusative case (ACC) in English and German. Following Pesetsky and Torrego's theory (see below), she assumes that verbal inflectional features might be the interpretable counterparts of uninterpretable case features, and that the relation between ACC case and telicity is agreement. Kratzer also makes use of a widespread analysis according to which events described by transitive verbs culminate with respect to the direct object referent. Direct objects in Finnish can bear two kinds of cases: ACC expresses the telicity of an event, while in case of atelic events the object has partitive (PART) case. The fact that in English and German ACC can appear also with atelic verbs complicates the picture. That is why Kratzer writes that German is like Finnish without PART-case. On the analogy of the morphologically overt imperfective (IMP) operator found in Russian, Kratzer suggests that in German there is a covert IMP-operator, and it occasionally neutralises the effect of the [telic] feature that is necessary to check ACC-case.

Guéron continues her earlier investigations in the area of tense construal. She posits that lexical items and grammatical morphemes both have [+/-ext(ended)] Aktionsart features. The value of the (spatial) Aktionsart depends on the inherent Aktionsart features of the lexical items inside the vP, and on the other hand it determines the value of the (temporal) aspect, i.e., a spatially extended ([+ext]) configuration in vP is construed as a temporally extended event at the level of Tense Phrase (TP). Furthermore, a sentence also needs a Tense Controller in [Spec,TP], which in the majority of cases is a subject with a [+human] feature. Its role is to license the temporal extension internal to an event, and at the same time the continuity between the temporality internal to, and the temporality external to, the event. According to Guéron, certain nouns (DPs) in the sentence possess an internal temporality (so-called biography), and in the time construal of the sentence the event the vP denotes is placed within the subject's time (biography). The subject's role is even more complicated: verbs with [+ext] Aktionsart feature select a "spatial subject", and its spatial contours delimit the configuration denoted by the vP. The object is also a kind of measure: it delimits the number of gestures the subject needs to perform in order to achieve the spatial configuration. In Guéron's opinion achievement verbs, for instance, have [-ext] features, while accomplishments are of [+ext]. Besides, auxiliaries in this theory also have content (as opposed to Chomsky's analysis), and this content is exactly a [+/-ext] feature. When an auxiliary raises to Tense (T), its Aktionsart feature combines with T and is construed as imperfective or punctual aspect.

There are two articles left in the group referred to here as "telicity and argument structure": one by Pesetsky and Torrego, and one by Lecarme, which is to a very large extent based on their theory.

Pesetsky and Torrego further develop their earlier theory in Pesetsky and Torrego (2001). Relying on Chomsky (1995), they argued there that an essential ingredient (and trigger) of movement is an Agree relation between an uninterpretable feature (*uF*) of a so-called probe category and a corresponding feature of a so-called goal

category. Nominative case (NOM) is considered to be an instance of an uninterpretable Tense feature (uT) on the head of a DP category, and subject agreement on the verb reflects uninterpretable ϕ -features ($u\phi$) on Tense (T). Furthermore, there is an Agree relation between the uT on D and $u\phi$ on T. In their present article the authors extend this analysis, claiming that all instances of structural case are instances of uT on D. Pesetsky and Torrego investigate several phenomena on the basis of this hypothesis, of which I will only sketch two: (1) the *that*-trace effect, and (2) the accusative (ACC) case. In the case of the first of these, the authors suggest that the word *that* in English is actually not a complementizer, but a realization of T moved to C (i.e., the Complementizer position). English C is then phonologically null, and may trigger either T-to-C movement (with the word *that*) or subject movement to Spec, CP (without *that*). The treatment of ACC is analogous to NOM: in the case of verbal predicates the authors stipulate the presence of a second occurrence of T, which they label $T_{O(=object)}$. The fact that adjectival and nominal predicates cannot have DP complements in English is not given a unified answer. In their opinion, in the case of adjectival predicates T_O is absolutely absent, but nominals do have a defective T_O (nominal T_O requires complements with interpretable T-features, e.g., PPs). Pesetsky and Torrego claim that this is because nominals lack a full tense system.

Lecarme examines the Tense features in the Somali DPs. She uses the theory of Pesetsky and Torrego (2001) as theoretical background, but goes beyond it in two important respects. First, according to her analysis in Somali the tense/event structures of nominals and clauses do not differ, i.e., the chain Op_i, T_i, e_i is available in both of them (C-T-V and D-T-N). Morphological parallels among the verbal and the nominal domain provide evidence. Second, structural genitive is a reflex of the D-T relation, analogously to the NOM, which is the reflex of the C-T chain according to Pesetsky and Torrego (2001).

I begin the introduction of the group of articles labelled **SOT and DAR phenomena** with the chapter by **Enç**. Enç finds it necessary to revise her earlier analysis (Enç 1987), according to which all occurrences of surface past tense behave like a past tense. This time the author extends her so-called Anchoring Conditions from T-nodes to inflectional nodes (I): assuming that each I must be temporally anchored, and that each I carries two temporal indices (evaluation index and referential index). An I is temporally anchored if (i) it is bound by a local c-commanding I, (ii) its evaluation time is bound by a local c-commanding I, or if (iii) its evaluation time is fixed as the speech time. Only I's with the feature [+past] can bind another I. If a past tense is embedded under a future-shifting modal, it shifts back from the future time. Furthermore, if a nonfinite I is embedded under an I having [+past] feature, the former inherits the feature [+past], and in this way it becomes capable to bind another I.

Barra-Jover's article deals with the differences between the syntax of French and English direct quotations. He points out that the introductory statements behave differently in sentence-initial and in noninitial positions. According to the Anchoring Conditions for tense established by Enç (1987), if a C does not have a governing category, it is anchored if and only if it denotes the speech time. Barra-Jover weakens this Anchoring Condition by claiming that if C does not have a governing category, it is anchored just in case it denotes the speech time or if there exists an accessible antecedent denoting the speech time. Besides, the author states that in simplex sentences tense (T) is specified in case it is [+E] and [+S] at the same time, i.e., it refers to the event time and to the speech time, too. He distinguishes between two sorts of underspecified

tense: (1) subjunctive is $[-E][-S]$, while (2) quotations are $[+E][-S]$, i.e., the speech situation of the sentence cannot be identified with that of the speaker. The weakened version of the Anchoring Condition can be used in the latter case: in direct quotations it is necessary to postulate an operator (OpT) in C having an accessible antecedent. The antecedent can be either lexical (i.e., initial introductory statement), or nonlexical (time of the preceding series of narrative events).

Schlenker analyses SOT and DAR phenomena not only in the temporal domain, but in connection to pronouns and moods, too. According to him, the semantics of pronouns, tenses and moods are similar: pronominal, temporal and modal features are presuppositions on the values of individual, time and world variables, respectively. The sequence of tense (SOT) means that tense features of a T_2 embedded under a T_1 are eliminated, and T_2 inherits the tense features of the upper T_1 . Similar phenomena can be encountered in the two other domains, too: for instance, when the [+masculine] feature of an embedded pronoun is deleted, or when the indicative mood features of an embedded predicate are ignored in the interpretation. Schlenker treats all these phenomena in a unified fashion: by stipulating purely morphological rules of agreement. He borrows the idea from Heim (1994), who observed that in some cases a pronoun embedded under an attitude verb cannot be literally interpreted as coreferential with an argument of the superordinate clause, and suggested that there are only purely morphological rules of agreement at work. Schlenker generalises the idea by claiming that context variables embedded under attitude verbs inherit the features of the individual, time, and world arguments of the embedding verb.

Zagona's article deals with double access readings (DAR) in Italian and Spanish. She follows Giorgi and Pianesi's (2000) analysis in assuming two complementizer positions in Italian: an upper (standard) C, and a lower one. Zagona states that verbs of communicative behavior select the upper C, and as a result they never display complementizer deletion. Attitude verbs in Italian, in turn, select the lower C, resulting in the possibility of complementizer deletion and this blocks DAR. The author claims that in the background of the differences between the two matrix verb classes there is an aspectual contrast: verbs of communicative behavior are processes, while verbs of pure attitude are states. Zagona draws a comparison between verbs of attitude, and adjectival predicates selecting a CP-complement: both classes are stative predicates, and neither of them shows the DAR. Besides, we can also see an important difference between Zagona's and Giorgi and Pianesi's points of view: according to the latter, a T in AgrP position is anchored to the matrix event, while a T raised to C is anchored to the speech time. In contrast, in Zagona's opinion the T raised to C is anchored to the matrix event, and T-to-C movement is triggered by the aspectual properties of the matrix verb: nonstative matrix verbs (e.g., verbs of communicative behavior) select the upper C, which in turn triggers T-to-C movement in the embedded clause.

The last among articles on SOT and DAR phenomena to be discussed here is by **Abusch**. It investigates the logical form of English *to*-complements. Using the presence (or lack) of simultaneous and future oriented interpretations in *to*-complements as a criterion, Abusch classifies verbs selecting *to*-complements in three groups. (1) The so-called B-verbs (e.g., *believe*) permit only simultaneous interpretation in their complement, while (2) the so-called F-verbs (e.g., *forecast*) license both simultaneous and future oriented interpretations of their complement. (3) Besides, there exist a few verbs the *to*-complements of which can obtain only futurate readings (e.g., *hope*). In her analysis of future-oriented infinitives Abusch uses the semantics of the future aux-

iliary *will* as a model: in her view, the core meaning of *will* is a temporal substitution operator, locating the eventualities corresponding to the main verb in the interval (t, ∞) , i.e., positive infinity, where t is a time variable. The author assumes that the representation of future oriented infinitives does also contain this temporal substitution operator, and in case of sentences permitting both simultaneous and futurate readings, she uses the interval $[t, \infty)$, including the left boundary t .

We find four articles in the book dealing primarily with **imperfective tense**. Three of them investigate the Italian imperfective tense, while the fourth one sets out to answer the question of whether or not Arabic is an “aspect language”.

Delfitto argues that imperfective tenses (IMP) are uniformly mapped into subject-predicate logical formats, and in Germanic and Romance languages grammatical aspect is the locus where the distinction between categorial and thetical sentences is grammatically encoded. Although traces of displaced arguments are usually not interpreted as predicational traces, this is exactly what the IMP marking is supposed to do according to Delfitto: IMP tenses encode the information that one of the verb’s arguments has to be interpreted predicationally. Technically speaking, in the case of IMP marked verbs the author stipulates a functional projection PredP, and assumes that one of the arguments has to be displaced to Spec, PredP. In Romance many of the sentences involving left-dislocated topics receive a thetical interpretation: in these cases topics undergo VP-internal “logical” reconstruction. The role of IMP is to encode that one of the verb’s arguments is not allowed to reconstruct. So while perfective (PERF) marking indicates that the VP is viewed as a fully saturated expression, the IMP marking refers to subject-predicate logical format. The subject of predication does not always coincide with the grammatical subject: for instance, in the case of the progressive reading of IMP the logical subject is the evaluation time t .

Giorgi and Pianesi follow earlier work by Delfitto and Bertinetto (2000) in treating TP as an argument of the verb, and they also acknowledge the generalization that IMP needs a temporal topic. The authors argue that tenses behave as shiftable indexicals, i.e., in many cases they refer to the temporal coordinates of the attitude’s subject rather than picking out that of the speaker’s. The temporal topic of an embedded clause is identified with the event time of the matrix clause, and there are also cases (e.g., dream contexts) in which anchoring is not enforced. Following others, Giorgi and Pianesi assume that if a clause expresses the content of a propositional attitude of a subject, then its “interpreted logical form” contains his/her egocentric coordinates. In embedded clauses the attitude by a subject is often distinct from that of the speaker’s. Furthermore, IMP is not evaluated with respect to the speaker’s actual coordinates in matrix clauses either: instead, it expresses past expectations concerning a tenseless proposition.

The third article in the volume on the Italian IMP is **Ippolito**’s. She investigates modal and conditional uses of the imperfect. Since in modal uses of the IMP (in contrast to the aspectual readings) the relevant eventualities are not necessarily understood as past, Ippolito argues that in such cases the function of IMP is the restriction of an accessibility relation, rather than locating the event in the past. This accessibility relation is a binary relation between a world-time pair and a set of worlds compatible with it. A sentence with the IMP is true just in case the proposition is true in all the worlds that were accessible to the speaker in the actual world at a time prior to the utterance time. This is what Giorgi and Pianesi call past expectations of the speaker. Ippolito also analyses the uses of the Italian IMP in conditionals in detail. She

points out that while in subjunctive conditionals the implicature that the antecedent is false seems to be in general cancellable, in case of IMP conditionals this implicature is noncancellable. The author suggests that the meaning that “the speaker believes that not-*p*” found in IMP conditionals can be derived by scalar implicature from the more fundamental meaning “the speaker does not know that *p*” in modal uses of IMP.

Fassi Fehri's analysis of Arabic can be placed in the context of the longstanding debate on whether Semitic are “aspect languages”, i.e., whether the category of tense is really absent in them or not. In Arabic the same inflected verbal form can express Past (Non-Past) and Perfective (Imperfective) senses, i.e., there is no morphological distinction between Agr₁ and Agr₂, or between T₁ and T₂. In spite of these facts, the author denies the existence of verbal Aspect as a (discrete) grammatical category in Arabic and considers the Past/Present tense opposition to be the primary function of the relevant morphological tools. This analysis contradicts the traditional Western grammars on Arabic, but harmonises with the standpoint of the traditional Arabic grammarians, and with that of Kuryłowicz (1972).

The articles in the **fourth group** are those whose topics do not really fit in the previous three classes, but this does not mean that the five articles left do not have many connections to those surveyed previously.

Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria integrate time adverbs into their earlier analysis of Tense and Aspect. In their earlier work tenses and aspects are dyadic predicates of spatiotemporal ordering. (Giorgi and Pianesi 1997 have a similar analysis, replacing the Reichenbachian ternary relation of reference time (R), speech time (S) and event time (E) by two binary relations: S-R (T₁), R-E (T₂.) Time adverbs are considered to be semantically and syntactically restrictive modifiers of the temporal arguments projected by Tense and Aspect. Tense and Aspect as being dyadic predicates relate their temporal arguments on the basis of a unique basic semantic opposition: [+/-central coincidence] between the location of the figure and that of the ground (cf. Hale 1984). The feature [+centr.co.] expresses F(igure) WITHIN G(round), while [-centr.co.] expresses F BEFORE/AFTER G. Time adverb phrases are also headed by a two-place predicate of spatiotemporal ordering. This head can be either overt in syntax (PP adverbs) or covert (e.g., *last year*). In the sense of this analysis temporal adjunct clauses (*when*-clauses) are also headed by a covert preposition, and silent prepositions always express [+centr.co.].

D'hulst investigates the historical development of synthetic conditional tenses in Western Romance on the basis of Roberts' (1992) view on the grammaticalization process of Romance synthetic futures. In most of the Romance languages conditional morphology is based on the Vulgar Latin periphrastic construction using imperfect morphology on *habere* ‘have’. However, in Italian the actual conditional has developed from the Vulgar Latin forms with perfect tense on *habere*. The author gives the following explanation for the origin of ‘future-in-the-past’ meaning in the case of the conditional forms mentioned: the originally biclausal periphrastic structure changed into a monoclausal construction by the embedded verb climbing up to the matrix clause, ending in the reanalysis of lexical *habere* as an auxiliary. Therefore in the new picture a past tense auxiliary dominates an infinitive expressing future, and this is exactly what is required in order to express future in the past. As a result of this process, the future on the INF was reanalysed as T₂ of the earlier matrix clause. Still later the future value of T₂ shifted to T₁, opening the way to the development of composed future forms (having participle forms in T₂).

Laca also examines the Romance languages, but from the point of view of another problem: she investigates the so-called aspectual periphrases (e.g., French *aller à + INF* ‘to be going to + V’). She disagrees with the treatment of Cinque (1999), who proposed that the higher/finite verbs in these constructions are “functional” verbs, because this approach ends in a proliferation of functional heads. Instead, Laca claims that such finite verbs distribute over two levels of structure: (i) a lower level containing verbs encoding Aktionsart, and (ii) an upper level with verbs encoding syntactic aspect.

Stowell poses the question of whether English modals (e.g., *could, might*) should really be considered to involve a morphosyntactic combination of tense with a modal verbal head, as the present/past alternation is semantically neutralised for these verbs in many contexts. (For instance, Eng in this volume states that in the case of *would, could, might, etc.* past shows up on the morpheme for historical reasons.) Modal verbs can in general have two readings: in the epistemic uses they may not fall under the logical scope of tenses, while in the root modal uses they are free to do so. The evaluation time of *might, ought* can be in the past, when they are governed by an intensional verb in a past tense main clause (SOT). However, in the same environment *may* and *must* require a double access reading (DAR). Stowell states that this contrast suggests that epistemic modals like *might, should, ought to do* in fact involve an occurrence of the morphological past tense.

The last article to discuss in this review is **Smith’s** on tense interpretation in various genres of discourse (or in her term discourse modes). She investigates five discourse modes (Narrative, Description, Argument, Report, and Information) in the theoretic background of DRT. The two questions she posits about each discourse mode are: (i) what type of entity is introduced into the universe of discourse, and (ii) what principle of advancement organises tense interpretation? There is a strong correlation to be found between the discourse modes and the types of entities (e.g., eventualities, generic statements, propositions, etc.) in them. Advancement in so-called temporally organised modes (i.e., Narrative, Description, Report) takes place with respect to location changes in time or space, whereas in case of atemporal modes (i.e., Argument and Information) with respect to metaphorical location and motion. In the case of the Narrative the author follows directly the analysis of Kamp and Reyle (1993), but in other cases (e.g., Description) she modifies it.

This review could only sketch part of the problems and ideas that can be read about in the volume. An essential merit of the book *The syntax of time* is that it provides not only an exhaustive enumeration of phenomena currently investigated in the domain of tense and aspect, but it also presents a number of theories as well. The linguistic data covered in the articles are also of considerable richness: a total of 27 languages from several language families are listed in the integrated Index of languages, subjects, and authors, a customary feature of books published by the MIT Press, though in this case the Index could have been more carefully compiled, since some of the crucial terms discussed in important papers do not figure, such as *achievement* and *accomplishment* in Higginbotham’s article. Another thing missing in the book is a unified bibliography, as references are listed at the end of the individual articles. But these minor shortcomings hardly diminish the overall value of this excellent book.

Balázs Szilárd

References

- Borer, Hagit 1994. On the projection of arguments. In: Elena E. Benedicto–Jeffrey T. Runner (eds): *Functional projections* (University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 17), 19–47. University of Massachusetts, GLSA, Amherst.
- Chomsky, Noam 1995. *The minimalist program*. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Cinque, Guglielmo 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Delfitto, Denis–Pier Marco Bertinetto 2000. Word order and quantification over times. In: James Higginbotham–Fabio Pianesi–Achille Varzi (eds): *Speaking of events*, 207–43. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Eng, Mürvet 1987. Anchoring conditions for tense. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 633–657.
- Giorgi, Alessandra–Fabio Pianesi 1997. *Tense and aspect: From semantics to morphosyntax*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Giorgi, Alessandra–Fabio Pianesi 2000. Sequence of tense phenomena in Italian. In: *Probus* 12: 1–32.
- Hale, Kenneth 1984. Notes on world view and semantic categories: Some Walpiri examples. In: Pieter Muysken–Henk van Riemsdijk (eds): *Features and projections*, 233–54. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Hale, Kenneth–Samual Jay Keyser 1991. On the syntax of argument structure. *Lexicon project working paper 34*. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Heim, Irene 1994. Puzzling reflexive pronouns in de se reports. Handout, Bielefeld Conference, March 1994.
- Kamp, Hans–Uwe Reyle 1993. *From discourse to logic*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy 1972. *Studies in Semitic grammar and metrics*. Curzon Press, London.
- Landman, Fred 1992. The progressive. In: *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 1–32.
- Parsons, Terence 1990. *Events in the semantics of English: A study in subatomic semantics*. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Pesetsky, David–Esther Torrego 2001. T-to-C movement: Causes and consequences. In: Michael Kenstowicz (ed.): *Ken Hale: A life in language* (Current Studies in Linguistics 36), 355–426. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Roberts, Ian 1992. A formal account of grammaticalisation in the history of Romance futures. In: *Folia Linguistica Historica* 13: 219–58.
- Zucchi, Alessandro 1999. Incomplete events, intensionality, and imperfective aspect. In: *Natural Language Semantics* 7: 179–215.

Ken Safir: The syntax of (in)dependence (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 44). MIT Press, Cambridge MA 2002, xvi + 194 pp.

Ken Safir's aim is to reformulate one of the fundamental building blocks of post-*Aspect* generative grammar, Binding Theory, in simpler and more general terms. His ambitious project is to be realized in three instalments, the first two of which have already been published as Safir (2004) and the book under review here, with the third

one in the making. The book is divided into five chapters and an Appendix. Chapter One is an introduction to Safir's objectives and an overview of the relevant precursors including Safir (2004). He proposes to fuse as well as supersede Binding Principles B and C, which regulate the coreferential properties of pronominals and r-expressions (or names) by his Form to Interpretation Principle (FTIP), which has the form in (1), as based on the competing principles in (2) and (3):

- (1) If x c-commands y and z is not the most dependent form in position y with respect to x , then y cannot be directly dependent on x .
- (2) INDEPENDENCE PRINCIPLE (INP)
If x depends on y , then x cannot c-command y .
- (3) C-COMMAND LICENSING PRINCIPLE (CLP)
If x depends on y , then y must c-command x .

The FTIP is applied relative to a "Most dependent hierarchy", in which anaphors are more dependent than pronominals, which in turn are more dependent than names (r-expressions). Incidentally, this picture of gradual dependency puts Safir's proposal in the neighborhood of Optimality Theory, where such a progression is more easily coped with than in the Principles and Parameters Theory of Chomskyan (mainstream?) generative grammar. The INP and the CLP differ in the domains of their applications, as transpires from Chapter Two, "The distribution of dependency", which lists examples and arguments in favor of the INP, and endorses Fox's (1998) Rule H, which acts as a locality constraint in a c-command chain, in which the closest c-commanding item is taken as an antecedent. Chapter Three bears the title "Deriving crossover": it offers a unified treatment of crossover phenomena as subsumed under the INP with an extension to include dependency relations relative to quantifiers, called Quantifier Dependency Condition (QDC). Chapter Four, "Reconstruction and dependent readings", argues for the copy theory of movement. It is here that (in)famous examples containing so-called "picture-nominals" (e.g., *Which picture of **Bill** was **he** afraid that **Hillary** would be thinking of?*) and problems of late adjunction are discussed at length (i.e., the difference between complement clauses and relative clauses with respect to the coreferential behavior of pronominals in them). The last chapter, "The Independence Principle in the architecture of Universal Grammar", concludes that the place where the relevant principles are at work is the Logical Form, and since it is an interpretive mechanism, it has to make a case against a movement analysis of the interpretation of dependent nominals, as proposed by Hornstein (2001) and Kayne (2002), supported by crucial examples from weak crossover and the necessity for both to make reference to Binding Principle A. Recall that Safir makes do without the Binding Principle, since his INP, FTIP, Rule H, and QDC are sufficient to cover all cases of quantifier-pronominal interpretation as well as familiar cases of binding. The ten-page Appendix is an attempt to accommodate data from Hindi/Urdu that shows extensive scrambling.

Along the way a number of side issues receive adequate treatment or at least some attention, such as the problem of "proxy terms", as the pronoun in *Marlene thought **her** nose was too long*, where bolded items are "coconstrued"—to use Safir's term, or the intriguing behavior of PRO in weak crossover, cf. *Who did [**PRO** shaving **himself**] convince **t** to grow a beard?* vs. **Who did [**PRO** shaving **himself**] convince Mary to*

trust t?, which show that PRO is immune to weak crossover effects under conditions similar to quantifier-pronominal dependencies, or “vehicle change”, as in *Mary loves John and John admits she does (love him/*John), too*, in which the name has to give way to the pronoun in the grammatical version underlying the elliptical form.

The book is well-organized and well-argued. Although it is not always an easy read, for some of the arguments rely on quite complex data, almost exclusively from English (discounting the Appendix), it is a must for anyone interested in the thorny problems of binding and quantifier-variable interpretation and in the debate on whether binding phenomena can be handled by means of a Probe-and-Agree type analysis as suggested by recent developments in the Minimalist Program or by a set of general enough principles ultimately (also) based on lexical characterizations. As is usual with the MIT Press, the book is neatly produced, although I missed some of the terms in the Index, e.g., the DSV (= definition of syntactic variable) approach, or QDC (= Quantifier Dependency Condition). The only typo I have noticed is hardly of significance: the page numbers of Chomsky and Lasnik (1995) in the References fit the article that follows it in the book, *The minimalist papers*.

István Kenesei

References

- Fox, Danny 1998. Locality in variable binding. In: Pilar Barbosa – Danny Fox – Paul Hagstrom – Martha McGinnis – David Pesetsky (eds): *Is the best good enough? Optimality and competition in syntax*, 129–55. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Hornstein, Norbert 2001. *Move! A minimalist theory of construal*. Blackwell, Malden MA & Oxford.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2002. Pronouns and their antecedents. In: Samuel David Epstein – Daniel T. Seely (eds): *Derivation and explanation in the Minimalist Program*, 133–66. Blackwell, Malden MA & Oxford.
- Safir, Ken 2004. *The syntax of anaphora*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.