Acta Linguistica Hungarica, Vol. 58 (4), pp. 467–480 (2011)
DOI: 10.1556/ALing.58.2011.4.5

BOOK REVIEW

Marcel den Dikken – Robert M. Vago (eds): Approaches to Hungarian, Volume 11: Papers from the 2007 New York Conference. John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, 2009. pp ix + 280.

The present collection of articles includes ten papers from those presented at the 8th International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian held in New York in 2007. The volume—in a way—presents a cross-section of modern linguistic research on Hungarian, although, of course, by far not an exhaustive one. Given the diversity of the topics and the frameworks of the articles, separate sections will be devoted below to each of them.[1]

The formatting and type-setting of the book is nice and renders it easy to read. There is, nonetheless, a small number of typographical errors, some of which make the processing of the text more difficult. For instance, due to a typesetting error, figures 1 and 2 of the first article are not in the form intended by the authors and are difficult to process. The correct versions of these appear in the errata to the book to be found on the publisher's website.

1. Bárkányi and Kiss: Hungarian *v*: Is it voiced?

The first article in the volume is a joint work by Zsuzsanna Bárkányi and Zoltán Kiss, elaborating on their previous research on the phonetic background of the voice feature of Hungarian (labiodental) fricatives. In the present study, they aimed to explore whether the loss of contrast between /f/ and /v/ in the context S__# (after a sonorant and before a word boundary) is total or partial. This line of research fits in well

[1] The authors would like to thank Beáta Gyuris for her valuable help, as well as her observant comments on the text.

1216–8076/$ 20.00

with the recent interest of contemporary literature in **incomplete neutralizations**, cases in which some acoustic cues to a relevant phonological contrast still remain while some are lost.

Bárkányi and Kiss describe the results of an acoustic study and a perception experiment, in which they examined the role of a number of phonetic cues in maintaining the /f/–/v/ contrast. The acoustic study revealed that although /f/ and /v/ are both phonetically unphonated in S__#, they differ significantly with respect to other acoustic cues. Interestingly, in Bárkányi et al. (2009), the authors inspected the role of mostly the same phonetic features—as cues to the /s/–/z/ contrast—as in the present paper and found essentially the same results in the phonetic analysis of the /s/–/z/ contrast as for the /f/–/v/ contrast (in terms of percentage of unvoiced frames and V-to-C length ratio). The question then arises what could motivate the phonological difference between /z/ and /v/ that is manifest in an idiosyncratic behaviour of the latter, but not the former, in Hungarian voicing assimilation.

In the perception experiment of the present paper, the authors aim to explore to what extent some of the phonetic correlates (notably, the various duration cues) of the /f/–/v/ contrast found in the acoustic experiment actually contribute to the perception of the contrast. They ascertained that there is **in**complete neutralisation between /f/ and /v/ in S__#, subjects being able to identify the latter about 63% of the time in non-manipulated word-final tokens. This result nicely replicates findings of perception experiments on other cases of incomplete neutralisation (see, e.g., Port–Leary 2005 on final obstruent devoicing in German).

The authors also found that listeners paid more attention to the preceding vowel than to the internal cues of the fricative: the recognition of /v/ deteriorated considerably when the vowel part was manipulated, while clipping all the fricatives to 80 ms had no effect on /v/'s recognition rates. Although the authors do not point it out, this is as it should be, as shorter fricative duration was seen to cue the voiced counterpart, rather than the voiceless one. Accordingly, this manipulation had a worse effect on the recognition rates of /f/. It might have been interesting to have another data set, in which all fricatives are **lengthened** to, say, 200 ms, which would have been more indicative of the voiceless /f/. It is possible, if not probable, that /v/'s recognition rates would not have stayed the same, but would have deteriorated in this case, showing that fricative duration might, after all, have a substantial effect in cuing the /f/–/v/ contrast. This is suggested by the fact that the recognition rates of /f/ were comparable in cases when the vowel length and in cases when the fricative length was manipulated.

2. De Cuba and Ürögdi: Sentential complements in Hungarian

In their paper Carlos de Cuba and Barbara Ürögdi (henceforth C&Ü) examine the syntax and semantics of object clauses, specifically those associated with (non-)factivity, arguing that syntactic complexity is directly mapped from semantic type, which is indicated by the phrase itself. This results in the association of factivity not with a class of verbs, but with clauses of a certain structure. Therefore the paper goes against the conclusion of Kiparsky–Kiparsky (1971) that factive verbs choose complements which are headed by a silent NP 'fact'. Its major claim can be summarized as follows. There are two syntactic objects, CP and *c*P. CPs appear with what have been traditionally categorized as factive verbs and they are referential entities denoting a proposition without illocutionary force; semantic objects encoding propositions about which the complex sentence makes an assertion. On the other hand, *c*Ps, which do not

have factivity effects like CPs, are non-referential entities denoting speech acts, and they properly contain CPs. A further claim is that if sentential objects are CPs, the semantic, syntactic and prosodic effects traditionally associated with factivity can be observed in non-factive contexts as well.

C&Ü point out (as also noted in many other places in the relevant literature) that syntactic phenomena do not divide along the semantic lines of (non-)factivity. Therefore the key concept of the proposal is that there are a large number of verbs which can select either a *c*P or a CP, while certain verbs can only select a CP; however, this restriction is not directly related to the factivity of the predicate. Instead, it is linked with the referential nature of CP, which is claimed to be associated with a number of diverse syntactic phenomena. This allows the authors to remove the factivity of the predicate as a syntactically relevant factor.

The authors use data from Hungarian to support their arguments. Some of this includes proving the existence of the two kinds of embedded clauses. This is attested by examples such as the lack of the sentential expletive *azt* 'that-acc' with factive predicates. This is taken to indicate the presence of a CP as *azt* is proposed to be generated in the specifier of *c*P. The referential nature of the CP is an important cornerstone to this theory; yet it is confirmed by evidence which C&Ü admit is "impressionistic at best". One supporting observation is that sentential complements are associated with different kinds of pro-forms, for which the authors present English and Hungarian data. Another piece of evidence is that in English both complements of factives and *it*-clefts are compatible with the *wh*-pronoun *which*.

To support the claim that CPs bring about effects associated with factives in non-factive contexts, C&Ü present a range of empirical evidence. For example, it is claimed that in these cases the information structure of the complement is analogous with neutral factive constructions without the presupposed truth of the complement. C&Ü use other evidence which points in this direction, but leave the matter open for further research.

To deal with the 'factive island' phenomena, which have been taken to support the link between factivity and syntax, C&Ü posit that such phenomena can be explained in their model by having specificity regulate the movement possibilities of the embedded *wh*-phrase. Namely, the specificity feature of the referential CP would block the extraction of *wh*-elements.

In their paper C&Ü offer convincing arguments for their theory, which we find to be on the right track. However, there remain a few problematic points. One of these is the referential nature of the *c*P–CP distinction. Since, as they themselves admit, their evidence in support of the referential CP "warrants more careful exposition", they do not develop an argument for the non-referentiality of the *c*P, other than the fact that it fits their analysis of the Hungarian data. Furthermore, with regard to CP being able to block *wh*-movement, it is not entirely clear how this effect would disappear in a *c*P since the latter properly contains the former.

3. É. Kiss: Negative quantifiers in Hungarian

In her article Katalin É. Kiss sets out to account for the grammar of *se*-pronouns by analyzing them as universal or existential expressions appearing in negative sentences. In her analysis [+specific] *se*-pronouns are universal quantifiers which undergo Q-raising to NegP. The [−specific] *se*-pronouns are Heimian indefinites bound by existential closure, and can potentially undergo focus movement.

The main problem with describing the nature of *se*-pronouns in Hungarian has to do with providing a principled answer to the position they might possibly occur in, while accounting for a diverse set of data. Preverbally the *se*-pronouns are fairly fixed, they must follow the topic and they must precede the focus. Postverbally, however, there are no such restrictions and their relative order is free. With respect to their licensing conditions, *se*-pronouns must appear with a clause-mate negative particle, but the presence of this particle alone is not enough since this particle can also co-occur with quantifiers thought to be positive parallels of *se*-pronouns.

Another peculiarity is that their interpretation is not uniform: sometimes they are interpreted existentially, sometimes they are universal, and sometimes they can be ambiguous.

É. Kiss proposes an explanation for these phenomena by claiming that the *se*-pronouns arrive in their preverbal positions through adjunction to either one of two NegP functional projections. Since É. Kiss takes adjunction to be freely linearizeable either left or right, and as noted she assumes two NegP projections, she gains enough flexibility to account for the possible occurrences of *se*-pronouns. This aspect of her proposed structure is different form what is usually proposed in the literature. Her argument for two NegP projections rests on the fact that there are three possible negating scenarios: negation of the background, the focus or both; this evidence independently supports her assumption for the added NegP. With respect to the postverbal, free word order, É. Kiss argues that the linearization of this domain is conditioned by PF mechanisms, and thus there is no need to provide a principled syntactic explanation.

É. Kiss also deals with the existential versus universal ambiguity of *se*-pronouns, attributing this effect to differences in licensing: while universals are adjoined preverbally, existentials can only occur before the verb if they are raised to the focus position.

Another particle É. Kiss deals with is *sem* which is a minimizer obligatorily cliticized to non-specific NPs in the scope of negation. The analysis of this particle is problematic because it can occur in a number of places. Notably, it can freely occur cliticized to both existential and universal *se*-pronouns, but preverbally it can only occur once, if the negative particle *nem* is absent. To solve this problem É. Kiss gives a rather descriptive solution: *sem* is only licensed if it follows the negative particle licensing it, or if it is fused with it. Although this account clearly covers the occurrences of *sem,* it fails to give a principled answer to the exact means as well as to certain ungrammatical cases.

Overall, the theory proposed by É. Kiss gives good results in terms of empirical coverage. From a theoretical viewpoint it also has its merits. For example, the elimination of covert movement, and the use of mostly independently supportable assumptions such as the proposal for two layers of NegP, can be cited as definite merits. However, in certain respects, the theory lacks an explicit mechanism. Such a point is the way in which it deals with the free word order of the postverbal domain, or with the licensing condition of the particle *sem*.

4. Farkas: Polarity particles in Hungarian

Donka Farkas's article provides an account of the semantics of *igen* 'yes', *nem* 'no' and *de* 'but', called polarity particles in Hungarian, within the elaborate Stalnakerian-style framework for discourse described in Farkas–Bruce (2010). In her analysis, both as-

sertions and (polar) questions need a responding move to resolve the issue raised by them, which can be either a **confirming** move or a **reversing** move.

Based on Farkas–Bruce (2010), the author assumes that all responding moves can be categorised along two polarity features: a responding assertion can have [*same*] or [*reverse*] relative polarity, depending on whether it accepts or denies the proposition asserted or asked, and [+] or [−] absolute polarity, depending on whether its form is assertive or negated. Farkas claims that both sets of features are ordered along a Horn-scale, [*same*] and [+] being the non-marked elements. In addition, she assumes that a question-reversal is less marked than an assertion-reversal, since the latter but not the former results in disagreement. Assuming this framework, Farkas can make cross-linguistic predictions on what polarity particles will exist.

Most of her predictions seem to be borne out, but there is one phenomenon which Farkas might have some difficulty with: in the case of the insertion of *bizony* 'certainly, sure enough' in the response sentence, all responses **except** +/− (reversal moves to a sentence with positive absolute polarity) pattern together. *Bizony* cannot be present in +/− moves, or the sentence will be strange at the least:

(1) A: (i) Józsi el-ment? (ii) Józsi nem ment el?
Joe Vpart-left.3sg Joe not left.3sg Vpart
'Has Joe left?' 'Has Joe not left?'

B: (i) Bizony, el-ment. / ??Bizony, nem ment el.
bizony Vpart-left.3sg *bizony* no left.3sg Vpart
'He sure has.' (+/+) / (intended: 'He sure has not.') (+/−)

(ii) De bizony, el-ment. / Bizony, nem ment el.
but *bizony* Vpart-left.3sg *bizony* no left.3sg Vpart
'Oh yes, he sure has.' (−/+) / 'He sure has not.' (−/−)

Based on the data, one could argue that *bizony* signals the presence of an **unmarked polarity feature** (either [*same*] or [+]). However, this would clash with the common assumption also advocated by Farkas that it is marked features or **both** marked and unmarked features that generally get to be signalled in languages, but not unmarked ones only. One way out for Farkas could be to argue that [*same*] is a kind of positive polarity (though not absolute), and *bizony* signals positive polarity, but that is also less marked than negative polarity.

Another issue which would be interesting to see how the author would choose to resolve is how this account of responsive moves could be extended to responses to questions **embedded** under epistemic attitudes in the 2nd person singular. In Hungarian, in responses to questions like the one in (2), *igen* can be used both to indicate a *same* move with respect to the **matrix** predicate, as well as the **embedded question** (2i), but when both answers are explicit, it can only be marginally used to signal confirmation of the matrix predicate when the answer to the embedded question is negative (2ii).

(2) A: Tudod, hogy Mari elment-e?
know.2sg that Mary left.3sg-whether
'Do you know if Mary left?'

B: (i) Igen, tudom. / Igen, elment.
yes know.1sg yes left.3sg
'Yes, I know. / Yes, she's gone'

(ii) Igen, tudom, elment. / ??Igen, (tudom,) nem ment el.
yes know.1sg left.3sg yes (know.1sg) no left.3sg Vpart
'Yes, I know, and she's gone.' / (intended: 'Yes (I know), she's not gone.')

A potential argumentation might follow what Farkas said about −/+ moves: those involved tension between a marked [*reverse*] and an unmarked [+] feature. Perhaps we could hypothesise that in Hungarian, the absolute polarity of the matrix and embedded sentences have to agree (as in 'Yes, I know, and she's gone') or only **one** of them can be present in the responsive assertion (2i)).

5. Hunyadi: Experimental evidence for recursion in prosody

As a starting point for his paper, Laszló Hunyadi takes the claim made by Hauser et al. (2002) that recursion is the essential component of the computational aspect of the human language faculty. He claims that recursion is not limited to syntax, but that it is also present in other linguistic and extralinguisitc components. In his approach to recursion Hunyadi assumes that the basis for creating embedded structures is a grouping process that is independent of language. However, within language, groups of elements can be of a different nature depending on the given language module. Nonetheless, properties of groups/groupings can be isolated that show common, language independent characteristics.

In the present paper the author builds on his earlier work which reported on a series of experiments, further developed by additional experiments reported in the present paper. In the first of the present experiments subjects were given visual and linguistic objects, some grouped in various ways, and were asked to react to what they saw. The results seemed to indicate that subjects grouped items even if they were not grouped when they saw them. This led Hunyadi to the conclusion that there is a grouping mechanism present in human cognition that is the basis for all linguistic and non-linguistic grouping, and further that this mechanism produces embedded structures. This assumption was taken to be supported by an experiment in which ungrouped items were arranged in groups of steadily decreasing sizes. In still further experiments Hunyadi took sets of recorded sentences which contained syntactically embedded segments and manipulated the pitch of these segments to violate basic principles of prosodic groupings that he had set up based on his initial results. Subjects were then asked to give judgements and comments on what they heard.

The results seemed to indicate that there are tonal markers that indicate segmental boundaries in prosody, and that there is always a given language module that is more prominent, thus in terms of sentence structure prosody will always play a secondary role to syntactic markers in indicating group boundaries.

Although Hunyadi's paper seems conclusive about the fact that recursion is present in prosody, there are a number of issues which question the validity of his results. It is not made entirely clear how the grouping of objects into groups of decreasing size entails hierarchical embeddedness. With regard to data gained from the experiments, Hunyadi himself acknowledges that the most prominent aspect about the judgements

is that they were very varied, thus it seems questionable what sort of conclusions can be drawn form them. Another potential problem is methodological in nature: when the tones of the sentences used in the experiments were manipulated, they were changed to a rather drastic degree, with about 50–100 Hz difference to the original. Hunyadi notes that initial tests with about 10–30 Hz manipulation failed to produce results, thus the conclusion was drawn that since the primary indicator of embedding is syntax a substantial change in prosody is needed to override the more perceivable syntactic indicators. The question arises in the reader whether or not this drastic change was perceived to be so unnatural that it resulted in negative judgements without having to break any inherent principles. This issue, however, is not addressed by Hunyadi. Still, the experiments conducted were detailed and raised interesting questions about how prosody is perceived, and what sort of internal structure it might have.

6. Polgárdi: Trochaic proper government, loose CV and vowel ∼ zero alternation in Hungarian

In this paper, Krisztina Polgárdi provides an analysis of the well-known Hungarian vowel ∼ zero alternation—exhibited by, for instance, *bokor* ∼ *bokrok* 'bush.sg∼pl'—within a non-standard CV framework. She adopts a "trochaic approach" to government, in which the traditional direction of government is reversed (i.e., government is from left to right) combined with a "loose CV" approach, which allows a C-slot word finally not to be followed by a V-slot. The loose CV approach is an interesting project in itself, combining optimality theoretic violability with government phonology-style representations.

The author adapts a previous analysis of hers on Turkish [ɨ] to the Hungarian data and presents a syncope account of the V∼∅ alternation. She argues that a standard CV account is unsatisfactory, given that the vowel in question cannot always be analysed as phonetically empty: though it is generally mid, there are a handful of examples in which it is not (e.g., *bajusz*∼*bajszok* 'moustache.sg∼pl'), and even if it is a mid vowel, it does not always obey vowel harmony (e.g., *szirom*∼*szirmok* 'petal.sg∼pl')—which cannot be accounted for in a standard CV approach, unable to make a melodic difference across empty nuclei. Polgárdi's solution is to say that alternating vowels are phonologically full, but are marked in the lexicon as properly governable.

While her analysis is descriptively adequate, it should be noted that it is unable to predict that the majority of the stem-internal alternating vowels **is**, in fact, mid and **does** obey vowel harmony, i.e., appear to be phonologically empty. One could say that these are indeed phonologically empty and do not need to be marked in the lexicon, but that move would mean giving up a unified analysis of these alternating vowels. In order to preserve a unified analysis and at the same time capture the distributional facts, one might need to employ a framework in which probability effects can be handled, such as a model to account for analogical effects or an exemplar-based model (for an overview of the latter, see, e.g., Johnson 2007).

A more theory-internal question is what the status of the vowel in the plural suffix *-Vk* is. Undoubtedly for space reasons, Polgárdi, in this paper, does not elaborate on the problem of this vowel, and simply assumes in the representations that it is a full vowel. However, it can alternate with zero when attached to vowel-final stems (as in *kapu*∼*kapuk* 'gate.sg∼pl'), and so should be an empty vowel (or marked to be

governable).[2] Then, however, there is a problem with multiply suffixed forms in which the vowel of the plural suffix is pronounced and the suffix itself is followed by another (synthetic) suffix, as in *kár* ∼ *kár-ok-at* 'damage.sg.nom∼pl.acc'. The very last vowel of the word, the vowel of the accusative suffix[3] presents no problem, since as the final V in the domain, it is not governable and is thus pronounced. However, according to the framework as it stands, the vowel of the plural suffix should now be governable by the stem-vowel *á*, and remain silent, which is not the case at all. There are no domain boundaries within the word that could provide a way out of the problem.

A final suggestion concerns Polgárdi's LAST N $\neq \emptyset$ that she claims is a highly-ranked constraint in Hungarian, which is responsible for the effect that a final empty vowel in a domain must be pronounced, if it is derived. Polgárdi would then have to explain why the vowel of the accusative suffix **can** be properly governed even if it is the final vowel of the domain, if the (non-lowering) stem ends in a sonorant, as in *kar*∼*kart* 'arm.nom∼acc', but not if it ends in an obstruent as in *láp*∼*lápot* 'marsh.nom∼acc'. Perhaps a different story is due here, like one in Dienes–Szigetvári (1999), where a vowel in a **burial domain** constituted by a C-to-C government relation can remain silent as if governed. Then the LAST N $\neq \emptyset$ constraint could be specified not to apply in burial domains or, alternatively, a higher-ranked constraint for burial domains (like Polgárdi's *ELEMENTS) could be posited.

7. Rákosi: Ablative causes in Hungarian

In his article about ablative causes in Hungarian, György Rákosi adopts a lexicalist stance to argue that ablative causes are more diverse than generally believed. To deal with this complexity Rákosi introduces the distinction between high ablative causes (HAC), which are not lexically governed and can appear with agentive predicates, and low ablative causes (LAC), which are licensed by anticausative predicates and which he analyzes as thematically specified adjuncts. Furthermore, he makes a distinction between these two on the one hand and genuine ablative arguments on the other.

The data examined by Rákosi comes from the realm of anticausative verbs, constructions that have a non-agentive subject that can be interpreted as a cause. In Hungarian these expressions are marked with ablative case:

(3) Az ablak kinyílt a [huzattól / *Jánostól].
the window.nom opened the draught.abl John.abl
'The window opened [form the draught / from John].'

Rákosi supports the HAC : LAC distinction introduced above by evidence that indicates that HACs are licensed much higher in the clause than LACs; for example, they can be licensed in the following sentence by the construction which includes the predicative adverbial and the VP:

[2] Note that full vowels do not undergo deletion, not even in a suffix, as shown by *kapuig* 'gate.termin'.

[3] It is immaterial at present that the plural suffix acts as a lowering stem for the subsequent suffix, given that the same scenario arises with lowering stems, as *farok* ∼ *farkat* 'tail.nom∼acc' shows.

(4) A gyógyszertől János *(lassan) dolgozott.
the medicine.abl John slowly worked
'The medicine made John work slowly.'

Furthermore, HACs seem to behave like a group distinct form LACs in that their insertion is facilitated by functional material and they are sensitive to certain discourse factors all of which are typical of the higher domains of the Hungarian clause structure.

With this distinction made, Rákosi moves on to account for the status of LACs as thematic adjuncts. He relies on Reinhart's (2000; 2002) Theta Theory to argue that through a reduction of features associated with thematic information verbs lose the ability to license all of their original arguments, but if their concepts contain a reference to causation, a cause PP can appear as a thematic adjunct. Since this Theta Theory also plays a role in determining the status (external vs. internal) with which an argument is merged in the structure, it can also account for the non-agentivity restriction observed with LACs, which can be seen in (3).

The three-way distinction of ablative causes as proposed by Rákosi is well supported by the data he presents. Theoretically the distinction between the three groups can be grasped on the basis of the assumption that HACs are adjuncts (in that they are optional) while argument ablative causes are arguments (in that they are thematic and are lexically constrained). LACs lie between the two domains in that they share the properties of both. Rákosi uses Reinhart's theory in a very productive way to distinguish the structures that license these different causes. In this respect his paper fills a gap in the literature, and is on a good path in terms of decomposing argument structure in general. What remains to be seen is if this theory works for other languages, as Rákosi has limited himself to data from Hungarian.

8. Siptár: Morphology or phonology? The case of Hungarian *-ni*

Péter Siptár, in his paper (partly based on Siptár 2006), explores the allomorph selection of the Hungarian infinitive suffix *-ni*, with a special focus on **inflected infinitives**, and concludes that this phenomenon belongs to the field of **morphology** and is not amenable to a morphophonological treatment with the use of rules or constraints.

An interesting case is that of inflected infinitives, such as *vár-n-om* 'wait.inf.1sg', where the vowel of the infinitive gets deleted, while the linking vowel of the personal suffix is pronounced. Siptár first poses the question why the vowel of *-ni* is **not** deleted before third person suffixes (cf. *vár-ni-a* 'wait.inf.3sg', *vár-ni-uk* 'wait.inf.3pl'), and concludes that (despite the fact, which the author acknowledges, that previous studies on these 3rd person suffixes show mixed results) these suffixes begin with a consonant. His argumentation at this point, however, appears to be a little circular: he aims to explain why the vowel of *-ni* is pronounced in these cases, and concludes that the reason for this is that the 3rd person suffixes after it begin with a consonant, while he underpins the claim that these suffixes begin with a consonant exactly with the appearance of *i* before these suffixes. We suggest that the question of whether these 3rd person suffixes begin with a consonant or not would merit a more thorough discussion, not least because their reflexes in the nominal domain, the 3rd person possessive suffixes, show a highly complex pattern in terms of whether their initial consonant is present or not (see Rebrus–Rácz 2010).

The second question relating to inflected infinitives is why it is the vowel of the infinitive that is deleted, rather than that of the personal suffix. After all, the vowel of the personal suffix is deleted after vowel-final stems in nominal possessive forms (*masni-m* 'ribbon.1sg.poss'). After reviewing a number of potential solutions in an optimality theoretic framework, Siptár concludes that two allomorphs, {*n, ni*} of the infinitive should be posited,[4] which would yield the correct result, had there not been a need to posit two allomorphs for 3rd person suffixes, as well—one with an initial consonant and one without it. To account for this final issue, the author suggests that the analogy-based account of Rebrus and Kálmán (2009) could be adapted to cater for this particular problem, as well, and thus amend his own solution.

To arrive at the correct results in the case of 3rd person suffixes, we suggest an alternative analysis, according to which these alone of the personal suffixes attach to the word with a word boundary. This could hint at an interesting account of a bizarre characteristic of the 3rd person possessive suffix: (in the standard, Budapest dialect, at least) the *-a*, but not the *-ja* form triggers the shortening of the final vowel of those stems which generally undergo such shortening before a given set of suffixes (for an overview, see Nádasdy–Siptár 1994). Thus, the standard 3sg possessive form of *madár* 'bird' is *madara*, while for some speakers, *madárja* is also acceptable (it returns 95 hits in a quick Google search), and *madára* is also accepted by some (for whom this stem does not belong to the stem-final vowel-shortening class), but **madarja* is definitely illicit.

We could then hypothesize that only the consonant-initial *-ja* form attaches to words with a word boundary (i.e., it is an **analytic** suffix), while *-a* does not (it is a **synthetic** suffix). Then the present account would predict that—as Siptár claimed—the suffix in *várnia* 'wait.inf.3sg' **does** have a consonant *j* in it, because the *i* of *-ni* is retained, which can only happen if it is followed by the analytic suffix *-ja*, for whose analyticity we now have some external motivation. It might sound strange that the very same suffix should be analytic in one form and synthetic in another. However, a parallel scenario is described in Rebrus–Törkenczy (2010) for—once again—the 3rd person singular suffix in the **verbal** paradigm: the allomorph *i* is synthetic, while *ja* is analytic.

9. Surányi: Adpositional preverbs, chain reduction and phases

In this paper the author sets out to provide an explanation for the phenomenon whereby some preverbs in Hungarian allow their verbs to combine with a phrase (PP) which appears to be an argument but which is optional. The proposed solution argues in favor of a direct dependency between the members of a chain that includes the preverb, the postverbal quasi-argument, and the possible preverbal instantiation of the PP.

Based on É. Kiss (1998; 2002) Surányi identifies two classes of directional verbal particles named U-class after *utána* 'after' and H-class after *hozzá* 'to'. These two classes behave in similar ways; however there are important differences between them.

[4] In a way, Siptár's solution is in line with the recent trend in phonological models in that rather than assuming a single and redundancy-free lexical entry to be changed or specified during derivation, it lays more burden on "memory" than on "computation" and allows lexical storage of redundant information, as well.

The differences include the possible case of the postverbal PP quasi-argument (always dative for the U-class; while in the H-class it is a PP with a range of possible adverbial suffixes depending on the preverbal element), and the availability of spell out of the full PP (U-class: the PP can only be fully realized left of the preverbal element; H-class: the PP needs to be fully realized anywhere it may appear). The possible patterns of the two classes are given below:

(5) H-class

(a) [pro hozzá] V ... [DP-hoz]
to.poss.3sg -to
(b) *[pro hozzá] V ... [DP-nak]
(c) [DP-hoz] V ... [—]
(d) [DP-hoz] ... [pro hozzá] V ...
(e) *[DP-nak] ... [pro hozzá] V ...

(6) U-class

(a) *[pro utána] V ... [DP után]
after.poss.3sg after
(b) [pro utána] V ... [DP-nak]
(c) [DP után] V ... [—]
(d) [DP után] ... [pro utána] V ...
(e) [DP-nak] ... [pro utána] V

Surányi's proposed explanation relies on a few assumptions. First, Surányi assumes that the verbal modifier PP and the verbal particle form a movement chain. Second, he assumes that this chain is subject to the Chain Reduction theory of Nunes (2004), which states that chains need to be reduced to the fewest overt copies possible, to avoid complications with respect to the asymmetric c-command relations of Kayne's LCA. The theory permits some scenarios where it is possible to spell out more than one chain link, the most relevant one for Surányi occurs when one of the links has been tampered with. In this context, Surányi takes tampering to mean morphological reanalysis, which, when applied, causes one of the links to be distinct from the other, allowing PF realization of both. Assuming this basic mechanism it is possible to derive a chain that has two distinct copies that both can be realized. This is what Surányi proposes happens in the cases of (5a), (6b), (5d) and (6d).

Surányi argues that (6a), which would be expected as grammatical on the basis of (5a), is ruled out because of the competition between it and (6b), since (6b) adheres to an economy condition which seeks to minimize redundancy in the PF representation of chains. To account for the fact that this same pattern is not available with H-preverbs Surányi claims that H-adpositions when combined with the ground argument act as suffixes, in an analogous fashion to case affixes. Surányi goes on to provide evidence which suggests that like case affixes H-adpostions cannot be deleted by themselves, and that the entire PP cannot be deleted due to reasons of recoverability, the only possible solution involves the full spell out of the base copy as in (5a).

An important aspect of Surányi's theory is that it relies on phases to mark out the domain where Chain Reduction happens. This is important when it comes to the patterns in (5d)–(5e) and (6d)–(6e). The basic argument is that the preverbal position [Spec, PredP] marks the boundary of a phase, and when this is reached by the derivation it is Transferred to PF. Chain Reduction and morphological reanalysis happen after Transfer. What Surányi argues is that the copy in [Spec, PredP] and the copy to the left of it are not in the same chain, rather they are in parallel chains, the base of which is the same. Thus a full copy of the quasi-argument is allowed to appear to the left of the preverb. This is done by assuming an edge to the phase where the full copy of the base element is moved to, where it can escape transfer unlike the preverbal copy of the parallel chain. What is not entirely clear in Surányi's

proposal is what motivates this movement. He dismisses the fact that it would be the movement of the already moved element since that element is fully saturated, thus unavailable for such an operation. What he suggests is that the availability of the preverbal element for reduction and reanalysis is what prompts the movement form the base copy. However, since the pre-PredP copy is not obligatory, there must be instances where this movement does not take place, thus a proper motivation for it needs to be established when it does occur, a point which is lacking in the present proposal.

When compared with approaches that advocate an indirect dependency approach to the same phenomena, such as É. Kiss (1998; 2002), the merit of Surányi's approach lies in the fact that he puts the emphasis on the similarity of the two constructions, while maintaining the empirical coverage necessary to deal with the differences. To explain these phenomena É. Kiss proposes two alternative mechanisms for the two classes. In the case of the U-class the ground argument of the PP is moved out of the phrase to some position in the post-verbal domain with extraposition, after this there is a remnant movement of the PP to the preverbal position where what remains of the phrase becomes the preverb. In the H-class, however, we can see a different mechanism at play. The H-preverb is generated as a complement PP which is moved to the preverbal position. The quasi-argument then may optionally appear as a co-indexed adjunct.

10. Szabolcsi: Overt nominative subjects in infinitival complements in Hungarian

The final paper in this volume is an exploration of the special construction of overt subjects in infinitival complements of subject control and subject-to-subject raising verbs in Hungarian. The author argues that what licenses these overt subjects is long-distance agreement with the finite matrix verb, and what justifies the existence of such constructions is the need to express certain readings of the sentence in which the nominative DP in this special position (if it is associated with a scope-taking operator) takes scope within the complement (which Szabolcsi calls the LO reading, as opposed to the HI reading in which the DP in question takes high scope).

A fundamental claim made by the authors that in Hungarian (as opposed to English) scope differences between the HI and LO readings are signalled by different word orders: HI requires SUBJ & operator + V + infinitive, while LO requires V + SUBJ & operator + infinitive. However, although the author points out in a footnote that a reviewer finds that a HI word order can be ambiguous with *szeretnék* 'would-like.1sg', she does not go on to reflect on the possibility that the LO word order may be ambiguous, as well; given a suitable context, even with *utálok*. But this is what is shown by a simple Google search: the sentence *Utálok én is odajárni* 'I hate to go there, too' is produced in a context when a forum member had said they hated going to a certain type of petrol station, and the speaker replied, obviously with a HI reading, that he, too, hated to go there. The HI and LO word order thus appear to be associated with the HI and LO reading, respectively, **only by default**.

A further piece of data, which would be interesting to know how the author would explain, concerns a dissimilarity between the infinitival and matrix subject position with a **focus**: the former is more lenient in that it allows **some** expressions (apparently, basically the nominal or adjectival part of a nominal/adjectival predicate) to come between the focussed subject and the verb, as shown by the following examples.

(7) (a) Csak én **vagyok magas**.
only I be.1sg tall
'Only I am tall.'

(b) *Csak én **magas vagyok**.
only I tall be.1sg
(intended: 'Only I am tall.')

(8) (a) Szeretnék csak én **lenni magas**.
would-like.1sg only I be.inf tall
'I'd like it to be the case that only I am tall.'

(b) Szeretnék csak én **magas lenni**.
would-like.1sg only I tall be.inf
'I'd like it to be the case that only I am tall.'

Finally, we would like to contend the claim made by the author that when the inflected infinitive is itself a control or raising verb, its infinitival complement **cannot** have a nominative subject, and "[a]dding dative DP would not make any difference" (269). When a dative DP in this case is used **instead** of (and not in addition to) a nominative one, we can arrive at the usual word order distinction observed by Szabolcsi, coding the HI and LO readings, as in (9) and (10), respectively.[5]

(9) Fontos volt **nekem is elkezdenem** jó szerepeket kapni.
important was.3sg I.dat too begin.inf.1sg good roles.acc get.inf
HI 'It was important that I, too, start getting good roles.'

(10) Fontos volt **elkezdenem nekem is** jó szerepeket kapni.
important was.3sg begin.inf.1sg I.dat too good roles.acc get.inf
LO 'It was important that I should start getting good roles, too.'

This, however, does not call into question the author's analysis—quite the contrary. If, as Szabolcsi says, the subject of an infinitival complement of a control or raising predicate can be overt when it agrees with that of its matrix clause, then we could add that in addition to person and number agreement, there is also case agreement going on in this construction.

11. Conclusion

The present volume is without doubt an important collection of modern theoretical linguistic work on Hungarian. The authors apply different approaches and frameworks current in theoretical linguistics (such as phonetically-based phonology, optimality theory, minimalist theory, as well as a dynamic approach to formal semantics) to describe and explain diverse phenomena in the phonology, syntax and semantics of Hungarian. The topics and the treatment thereof are interesting and inspiring to scholars working on Hungarian, and also provide insights and observations that can be of interest to theoretical linguists in general.

Zsófia Gyarmathy, Ádám Szalontai

[5] Notice that—to our intuition, at least—both sentences are ambiguous between a HI and a LO reading to the same extent that Szabolcsi's original examples are.

References

Bárkányi, Zsuzsanna – Zoltán Kiss – Katalin Mády 2009. Az /s/–/z/ oppozíció fenntartása megnyilatkozás végén [On the contrast of /s/ and /z/ in utterrance-final position in Hungarian]. Paper presented at the Beszédkutatás 2009 [Speech Research 2009] conference. Budapest, 16–17 October 2009. (http://www.budling.hu/∼cash/papers/beszkut2009-slide.pdf)

Dienes, Péter – Péter Szigetvári 1999. Repartioning the skeleton: VC Phonology. Ms., Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest. (http://ny01.nytud.hu/~szigetva/papers/vc_1.pdf.gz)

É. Kiss, Katalin 1998. Verbal prefixes or postpositions? Postpositional aspectualizers in Hungarian. In: Casper de Groot – István Kenesei (eds): Approaches to Hungarian 6: Papers from the Amsterdam Conference, 125–48. JATEPress, Szeged.

É. Kiss, Katalin 2002. The syntax of Hungarian. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Farkas, Donka F. – Kim B. Bruce 2010. On reacting to assertions and polar questions. In: Journal of Semantics 27 : 81–118.

Hauser, Marc D. – Noam Chomsky – W. Tecumseh Fitch 2002. The faculty of language: What is it, who has it, and how did it evolve? In: Science 298 : 1569–79.

Johnson, Keith 2007. Decisions and mechanisms in exemplar-based phonology. In: Marie J. Solé – Patrice S. Beddor – Manjari Ohala (eds): Experimental approaches to phonology, 25–40. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Kiparsky, Paul – Carol Kiparsky 1971. Fact. In: Manfred Bierwisch – Karl Erich Heidolph (eds): Progress in linguistics, 143–73. Mouton, The Hague.

Nádasdy, Ádám – Péter Siptár 1994. A magánhangzók [Vowels]. In: Ferenc Kiefer (ed.): Strukturális magyar nyelvtan 2: Fonológia [A structural grammar of Hungarian 2: Phonology], 42–182. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Nunes, Jairo 2004. Linearization of chains and sideward movement. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Port, Robert F. – Adam P. Leary 2005. Against formal phonology. In: Language 81 : 927–64.

Rebrus, Péter – László Kálmán 2009. Valóban megmagyarázhatatlanok a magyar infinitívusz toldalékai? [Do inflected Hungarian infinitives really defy explanation?]. In: Márta Maleczki – Enikő Németh T. (eds): A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei VII [Recent methods in the description of Hungarian 7], 153–6. SZTE Általános Nyelvészet Tanszék, Szeged.

Rebrus, Péter – Péter Rácz 2010. Complexity and distinctiveness in the possessive allomorphy of Hungarian. Paper presented at the Old World Conference in Phonology 7, Nice, 28–30 January 2010. (http://www.unice.fr/dsl/ocp7/abstracts/Racz%20&%20Rebrus.pdf)

Rebrus, Péter – Miklós Törkenczy 2010. Covert and overt defectiveness in paradigms. In: Curt Rice – Sylvia Blaho (eds): Modeling ungrammaticality in Optimality Theory, 195–234. Equinox, London.

Reinhart, Tanya 2000. The Theta System: Syntactic realization of verbal concepts (OTS Working Papers in Linguistics). Utrecht Institute for Linguistics, Utrecht.

Reinhart, Tanya 2002. The Theta System: An overview. In: Theoretical Linguistics 28 : 229–90.

Siptár, Péter 2006. Töprengések a *ni*-allomorfiáról [Reflections on the allomorphs of the infinitive marker in Hungarian]. In: László Kálmán (ed.): KB 120: A titkos kötet. Nyelvészeti tanulmányok Bánréti Zoltán és Komlósy András tiszteletére [KB 120: The secret volume. Studies in linguistics in honour of Zoltán Bánréti and András Komlósy], 179–92. MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet & Tinta Könyvkiadó, Budapest.