J. Linguistics **41** (2005), 409–435. © 2005 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S0022226705003312 Printed in the United Kingdom

REVIEW ARTICLE

Hungarian in focus[1]

ISTVÁN KENESEI

Research Institute for Linguistics, Budapest, & University of Szeged

(Received 26 November 2003; revised 31 August 2004)

Katalin É. Kiss, *The syntax of Hungarian* (Cambridge Syntax Guides). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Pp. xii + 278.

László Varga, *Intonation and stress: evidence from Hungarian*. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002. Pp. xvii + 229.

László Hunyadi, *Hungarian sentence prosody and universal grammar*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2002. Pp. 328.

It seems it's harvest time in Hungarian linguistics: a number of respectable publishers have in recent years put out books on various aspects of the Hungarian language by authors working in or outside Hungary. In addition to the monographs under review here, one can mention Szabolcsi (1997), Kenesei, Vago & Fenyvesi (1998), Koopman & Szabolcsi (2000) or Siptár & Törkenczy (2000).

For some time now, Hungarian has been a language of marked interest to linguists. It is a Finno-Ugric language, though after long cohabitation with other languages, notably Turkic, Slavic and Germanic, it has shed some of its genuine Uralic features. For example, it has intriguing exceptions to its vowel harmony, it has a prefixal preverb system not unlike that in German, and while it is a head-final language in many respects, most of its clause types do not exhibit anything like head-final structures. And, last but not least, it is a so-called topic-prominent language, with a well-defined topic–focus structure, which includes quantifiers, inducing Anna Szabolcsi to quip: 'Hungarian is a language wearing its Logical Form on its sleeve'

[1] The research underlying this review was in part supported by the NWO-OTKA Dutch–Hungarian grant N37276 on 'The syntax, semantics and phonology of the left periphery', and the Collegium Budapest – Institute for Advanced Study. My thanks are due to my graduate and undergraduate students in 2002/03, and in particular to Veronika Hegedûs and Dániel Pap. I am also indebted to three anonymous *JL* referees for their comments and advice, and to the three authors themselves for discussing some of the issues raised here. Finally, I am grateful to the *JL* copy-editor for careful reading and suggestions. All remaining errors and misanalyses are mine.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(personal communication). It is perhaps this interest in various properties of Hungarian combined with the 'coming of age' of Hungarian descriptive and theoretical linguistics that has led another three publishers to offer these books to a readership world-wide.

The three authors whose work is reviewed here belong to the 'middle generation' of modern linguists in Hungary. They have all been on the scene since the 1970s and have followed an unbroken line of career: Hunyadi is chair of the Linguistics Department at Debrecen University, Varga heads the English Linguistics Department at Eötvös University in Budapest, while É. Kiss, having served at both universities before, is now Senior Research Fellow at the Research Institute for Linguistics in Budapest. This generation was fortunate in that it grew up in an atmosphere of ideology-free linguistic environment, created by their elders, who fought often uphill battles with the hardliners in the profession and the powers that be, but won their campaign in the long run: Hungary's grammarians have been in close touch with modern linguistics since the early 1970s. And perhaps that is why Hungarian linguistics is in relatively good condition, as shown by the three books under review here.

They are, moreover, excellent representations of each author's oeuvre. Katalin É. Kiss has devoted most of her publications to uncovering problems in Hungarian syntax, László Varga has been working on Hungarian intonation for over thirty years, and László Hunyadi's interests have been developing since his 1981 dissertation on the interaction of prosody and quantification. Moreover, the books show one more positive feature of Hungarian linguistics: their authors build on one another's results, as frequent cross-references demonstrate. Both Varga and Hunyadi rely on É. Kiss's syntactic framework, which does not mean, however, that they all agree on all details. The debates add to the attraction of an already interesting linguistic scene in Hungary.

1. Katalin É. Kiss's topic–predicate structures

1.1 *Overview*

Katalin É. Kiss (henceforth KÉK) – in whose name the letter É stands not for a middle initial (of a given name), but is the abbreviation of an additional surname, Kiss being a highly frequent family name – is probably the best-known of the three authors. Since the international linguistic community welcomed her first book (É. Kiss 1987), whose basic ideas had been published in Hungarian almost a decade earlier (É. Kiss 1978), she has charted large areas of *terra incognita* in the ground of Hungarian grammar. The book under review is a laudable summary and overview of what she has achieved in the past 25 years, which has brought her world-wide recognition. Most of what she recapitulates here is based on her own research, though she gives

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ample references to the work of others who have written on the subjects of the individual chapters.

KÉK has long believed in a bifurcation of languages into subject-prominent and topic-prominent, Hungarian belonging to the latter type. It is this viewpoint that determines her argumentation in chapter 2, 'The topic–predicate articulation of the sentence'. In all likelihood, her single most important accomplishment is the change from an approach to Hungarian syntax with a subject–predicate structure to one with a topic–predicate structure. While in the earlier model the intricacies of Hungarian constituent order were, to say the least, puzzling, her simple, yet ingenious, formula appears to work seamlessly: the 'left periphery' of the Hungarian sentence contains the following items 'from left to right', in a hierarchical structure: topic(s), (negation), quantifiers, focus, (negation), verb, and the rest of the constituents. This much has been widely accepted for quite some time now. Where KÉK fares better than her rivals is in the research program she has built on the foundations of her early work on the left periphery. She shows, among other things, that topics have to be referential and specific, and provides a number of tests to justify the boundary between the constituents in the topic on the one hand and the predicate on the other. Chapter 3, 'The minimal predicate', elaborates on KÉK's view of the flat VP: this is a moot issue and I intend to discuss it in more detail in the following subsection. Chapter 4, 'Focussing', discusses focussing, the operation that places a single constituent into an immediately preverbal position. KÉK's new ideas are also given some attention below, in section 1.4. Quantification is a crucial part of the syntax of Hungarian and is afforded ample space in chapter 5, 'Quantification'. Following Anna Szabolcsi's (1997) and her collaborators' innovative approach, KÉK introduces DistP (Distributive Phrase) into the left periphery of the Hungarian sentence, which hosts universal quantifiers as well as phrases containing the Hungarian equivalents of *even* and *also*. Chapter 6, 'Negation', argues for two NegPs hierarchically arranged, one dominating VP, the other, FP (Focus Phrase). This is also where the properties of negative concord are listed and analysed in much detail. While the analysis of the Hungarian noun phrase is most often associated with Szabolcsi's (1994) work, in chapter 7, 'The noun phrase', KÉK gives a summary of her own proposals, which have shed new light on the relationship among the categories NP, which has a predicative function, NumP, which expresses quantification including indefinites, and DP, which is the locus of definiteness. She also presents her account of the possessive construction (cf. section 1.6 below). Another interesting idea is developed in chapter 8, 'The postpositional phrase', in which postpositions are related to case endings and their use in verbal prefixes is discussed. Chapter 9, 'Non-finite and semi-finite verb phrases', deals with non-finite clauses, devoting generous space to infinitives. KÉK enters into yet another debate, concerning the intriguing property of preverb-raising, analysed extensively by

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Koopman & Szabolcsi (2000). The subject of the last chapter, 'The subordinate clause', is finite subordination, a topic we will return to in section 1.7.

The book is, by and large, a transparent text, not a difficult read even – in my own experience with Hungarian students – for the interested undergraduate, though some background in the theory of grammar is a must. The organization is clear and logical, cross-references between chapters are frequent, and while no comprehensiveness, characteristic of grammars of the more traditional type, e.g. Kenesei et al. (1998), is attempted, crucial questions are discussed at length and in depth. I have no extensive list of issues or problems missing from the book, although I would have preferred a slightly different approach or distribution of weight in a few places. Perhaps the greatest merit of *The syntax of Hungarian* is its integration of KÉK's own work with the results of other researchers so that the reader does not have the impression of being abandoned in a patchwork terrain of linguistic analyses without a guide. This is another remarkable feat, considering that the number of people she gives explicit credit to in the preface for making use of their work is fifteen.

1.2 *The problems of the VP*

While KÉK's proposal for the syntax of Hungarian is quite plausible and highly popular, the arguments for it are not entirely unflawed. To begin with, there is an alternative 'tradition' going back to Kálmán (1985a, b), which maintains that Hungarian sentences come in two basic types: neutral and non-neutral. To put it simply, other things being equal, neutral sentences containing definite noun phrases are of the SVO type and non-neutral sentences are those with any other constituent order, a difference reflected in stress and prosody. This approach is compatible with derivations in which constituents in a subject–predicate structure are moved to non-argument positions (topic, quantifier or focus) in the left periphery.

KÉK has experimented with various sentences to illustrate the apparently free constituent order of Hungarian. One of her examples in earlier work was the following (É. Kiss 1987: 38):

(1) János szereti Marit.
    János likes Mary.ACC

This is a misleading example because the sentence has no unfocussed version, i.e. one of the three words must be in focus, whatever their order. The sentence she now makes use of to illustrate the variability of constituent order is the following (KÉK's example (1) from Chapter 2 (2:1)), which can have a neutral reading. (Glosses have been changed and italics added.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2) [A védő-k] *sokáig tart-ott-ák* [a vár-at] [a török-ök
the defender-PL long hold-PAST-3PL the fort-ACC the Turk-PL
ellen].
against
'The defenders held the fort against the Turks for a long time.'

Here, KÉK claims, any of the bracketed phrases can be placed in front of the italicized 'verbal complex', making each variant a predication about the topicalized phrase. Note that the time adverbial *sokáig* 'long' stays in front of the verb in all versions. Clearly, a non-specific item cannot serve as topic, as KÉK noticed some time ago, but the innocent reader might query why it cannot be removed from its preverbal position when all other bracketed phrases occur in every possible place in the clause. In fact, we face the same type of problem without the time adverbial, as can be seen in connection with sentence (1), which must be a focussed (i.e. non-neutral) sentence. But (2) is also likely to be interpreted as a focussed sentence whenever anything other than the subject precedes the verb. If, for example, *sokáig* is replaced by *egy hónapig* 'for one month', the neutral interpretation is simply unavailable, even in the subject-initial version. That the sentence with *sokáig* is less likely to be interpreted as focussed is probably due precisely to the non-specificity of the adverbial: it is hard to contrast it with anything that does not last 'for a long time'. As a result, this adverbial functions as a 'verb modifier' (VM), a term introduced by KÉK in the early 1980s and analysed in detail by Komlósy (1994).

Verb modifiers are a mixed category of verbal prefixes, 'bare' (case-marked) nouns, predicate nominals, predicative (case-marked) adjectives, infinitives, etc., all preceding the inflected verb in neutral sentences, as illustrated on p. 68 of KÉK's book. Now it seems that *sokáig* can also be included in this non-definitive list of VMs. Note that SVO is the canonical order in a sentence without a VM that has a neutral reading. If the subject is moved, whether or not the object or any one of the possible adjuncts is topicalized, the sentence inevitably becomes focussed. (In (3), double primes indicate 'major stress' and single primes indicate 'minor stress', to borrow Varga's terms (see section 2.1 below), but not his symbols, for typographic reasons; the scope of focus is in italics; INE = 'inessive' case suffix.)

(3) (a) "Anna "olvassa a "könyv-et a "hálószobá-ban.
Anna reads the book-ACC the room-INE
'Anna is reading the book in the bedroom.'
(b) "*Olvassa* a 'könyv-et 'Anna a 'hálószobában.
'Anna is *reading* the book in the bedroom.'
(c) A "*könyvet* 'olvassa 'Anna a 'hálószobában.
'It's the book that Anna is reading in the bedroom.'
(d) A "könyvet "*Anna* 'olvassa a 'hálószobában.
'As for the book, it's Anna that's reading it in the bedroom,'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(e) A "*hálószobá-ban* 'olvassa a 'könyv-et 'Anna.
'It's in the bedroom that Anna is reading the book.'

Sure enough, a number of time and place adverbials (such as the equivalents of *yesterday*, *these days*, *in Europe*) can be placed sentence-initially without affecting or, rather, forcing the focus interpretation of the clause, but this may be universal (cf. Guéron (1980), from which it transpires that, as a rule, PPs of a particular class are focussed).

When KÉK claims that the Hungarian sentence has a topic–predicate structure, she follows this up by arguing that the predicate is none other but the (now extended) VP. If the predicate is the VP, however, it cannot have a subject–predicate structure inside itself. How to account, then, for the subject if it is inside this 'predicate'? KÉK has not changed her mind on this issue from the very start: the VP in Hungarian must be flat since the equivalent of the hierarchical subject–predicate construction (in other languages) is the topic–predicate structure in Hungarian (cf. É. Kiss 1978, 1987). But it is a proposal that creates more problems than it solves. First of all, it would set apart Hungarian from the rest of the world's languages, potentially leaving it ultimately in a class of its own, as more and more of the so-called non-configurational languages have been proved to have ordinary subject–predicate structures.

Secondly, the evidence in favour of the flat VP is rather meagre. KÉK has often made use of an argument based on the variability of constituents in a verb-initial sentence, such as her example (1) in chapter 3, (3:1), quoted here as (4).[2]

(4) (a) Küld-ött Péter egy level-et Máriá-nak.
send-PAST Peter a letter-ACC Mary-DAT
(b) Küld-ött Máriá-nak Péter egy level-et.
(c) Küld-ött egy level-et Péter Máriá-nak.
(d) Küld-ött Péter Máriá-nak egy level-et.

All four are translated in the book as 'Peter sent a letter to Mary'. However, that meaning corresponds to the subject-initial version, not presented in KÉK's series. The versions in (4) are either emphatic (with the verb stressed), presentative (cf. Hetzron 1975), or correspond to a peculiar narrative style, such as at the start of a long story or a joke (with the verb usually in a 'historic present' tense). What this set of sentences illustrates is the fact that whenever something is focussed in the sentence (as the verb is in this

[2] KÉK's and Varga's examples are referred to by the number of the chapter in which they occur before the colon, with the number of the example following it. I have often changed the glosses in their insufficient morphemic analyses, and will forgo KÉK's sense translations if they are at issue, as in my example (4). References to Hunyadi's examples are prefixed by his initials (LH). Unprefixed example numbers are those in this review article.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

case), the rest of the constituents are 'liberated', as it were, and are free to be placed in any order. I am ready to admit that this is a descriptive statement with no corresponding theoretical analysis of how the postverbal free orders are possible, but I also submit that concluding that the VP is therefore flat is somewhat rash, especially if the other arguments are equally weak.

KÉK's perhaps most sweeping argument for a flat VP in Hungarian comes from Binding Principle C, which requires that referential expressions be free. Her examples (3:17a)–(3:16b), given in (5a, b), are meant to illustrate that in Hungarian, in addition to subject pronouns, object pronouns can also c-command the rest of the VP, and subjects in particular. (POSS is the possessive ending on the possessed noun indicating the person and number of the possessor.)

(5) (a) *Fel-hívta a fiúk$_i$ any-ja ők-et$_i$.
VM-called the boys mother-POSS they-ACC
'The boys$_i$' mother called them$_i$.'
(b) *Fel-hívták (ők$_i$) a fiúk$_i$ any-já-t.
VM-called they the boys mother-POSS-ACC
'They$_i$ called the boys$_i$' mother.'

Although she refers to Marácz's (1991) counterexamples (and the account based on them), which show that referential DPs in similar configurations cannot co-refer, KÉK dismisses them as irrelevant. While in (5a) the pronoun cannot co-refer with the coindexed NP, in (6a) coreference between the two coindexed NPs is perfectly possible, which according to Marácz calls into question KÉK's conclusion that the VP must be flat in Hungarian.[3]

(6) (a) Fel-hívta a fiúk$_i$ any-ja a fiúkat$_i$.
'The boys$_i$' mother called the boys$_i$.'
(b) *Fel-hívták a fiúk a fiúk any-já-t.
'The boys$_i$ called the boys$_i$' mother.'

KÉK relies on Reinhart (1983) in claiming that coreference between a pronoun and an R-expression is more strictly constrained than that between two R-expressions. Be that as it may, the following examples show that even the original scenario in (5) is in need of revision. In (7a) an 'epithet' – i.e. a referential expression that co-refers with another referential expression (on condition that they do not c-command each other) – in the subject DP would have to be c-commanded by the object pronoun, as in (5a), yet the sentence is perfectly grammatical. In contrast, if we exchange the subject and the object, as in (7b), we have an unacceptable sentence.

[3] The examples in (6) are KÉK's (3:18b) and (3:19a), which represent, rather than cite, Marácz's original examples. Curiously, KÉK refers to Marácz's 1989 dissertation instead of the slightly modified published version from 1991.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(7) (a) Péter$_i$ be-lopakodott, de a kis hülye$_i$ anyuká-ja rögtön
Peter in-sneaked but the little idiot mom-POSS at-once
észre-vette (őt$_i$).
VM-saw him
'Peter sneaked in, but the little idiot$_i$'s mom saw him$_i$ at once.'

(b) *Péter$_i$ be-nézett, de (ő$_i$) nem vette észre a kis hülye$_i$
Peter in-looked but he not saw VM the little idiot
anyuká-já-t.
mom-POSS-ACC
'*Peter looked in, but he$_i$ didn't see the little idiot$_i$'s mom.'

Clearly, Reinhart's proposal cannot work here, since (non-)coreference occurs not between two R-expressions, but between a (possibly dropped) pronoun and an R-expression. Whatever the account might be of the difference between (5) and (7), (7a, b) show an asymmetry between subjects and objects similar to that observed in languages with a 'hierarchical' VP, such as English or French. Thus, the argument from Binding Principle C for a flat VP in Hungarian is untenable.

1.3 *Infl versus VP*

Another welcome change in this book from KÉK's previous standpoint is the array of functional categories spelling out Infl in chapter 3. Having taken over Bartos's (2000) comprehensive analysis of Hungarian inflectional morphology,[4] she has now abandoned her previous view of a V + Infl category, which used to signal that the verb carrying a full inflectional specification was generated in the Lexicon. Now we have instead the hierarchical arrangement in (8),

(8) AgrSP – AgrOP – MoodP – TenseP – ModP – VP

where MoodP (or MP) hosts the conditional affix *-na/ne* 'would' and ModP (Modality Phrase), the possibility marker *-hat/het* 'may'. This structure is capped by an AspP (Aspect Phrase) designed for the verbal prefix, the canonical class of verbal modifiers, providing for the following full structure.

(9) (a) [$_{AspP}$ fel [$_{AgrSP}$ -tok [$_{AgrOP}$ -á [$_{MP}$ -na [$_{TP}$ o [$_{ModP}$ -hat [$_{VP}$
up 2PL DEFOBJ COND MOD
hív …]]]]]]]
call

[4] KÉK makes reference to various published and unpublished works by Bartos (in both Hungarian and English), but she does not cite his comprehensive analysis of inflectional morphology in Bartos (2000), which she simply cannot be unaware of, and which I will refer to throughout.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(b) fel hív-hat-n-á-tok (Anná-t)
up call-MOD-COND-DEFOBJ-2PL Anna-ACC
'you could call up Anna'

However, this inflectional structure does not feature outside chapter 3. This fact makes it somewhat difficult to follow the arguments in chapter 9, which is concerned with non-finite clauses, and which returns to 'merging' the infinitival suffix with VP, as in KÉK's earlier work (É. Kiss 1987, 1994), or with the new AspP, instead of analysing it as one instantiation of Tense, that is, of [–Tense].

Note, however, that by introducing AspP as the landing site of the preverbal prefix (and the verb modifier) in neutral sentences, KÉK has, at long last, eliminated the unfortunate thesis of complementary distribution of the prefix and the focus position, which characterized her earlier work. She was much criticized for this view, since it entailed focus stress on prefixes, contrary to the facts, and ran counter to data from infinitival constructions, in which focussed constituents co-occur with preverbal prefixes.

1.4 *The new approach to focussing*

KÉK has an attractive definition of the function of focus, for which she argued in É. Kiss (1998a). It is given in (10).

(10) The focus represents a proper subset of the set of contextually or situationally given referents for which the predicate phrase can potentially hold; it is identified as the exhaustive subset of this set for which the predicate phrase actually holds. (p. 78)

The fundamental novelty of this proposal for focus semantics lies in the sets that focus is interpreted with respect to. Surprisingly, examples that would illustrate the proposal most convincingly are absent from the book. In (11) below they are cited from the original version of the proposal (É. Kiss 1998a: ex. (46)). É. Kiss (1998a) uses them to show that it is always *egy angol könyv* 'one English book' that John got as a present although the sentences differ in the sets of entities from which 'one English book' is selected. (In (11), double prime signals focus stress; the scope of focus in Hungarian and primary stress in the English translations are highlighted.)[5]

(11) (a) János "**egy angol könyvet** kapott ajándékba.
John one English book-ACC got as-present
'It was **one** English book that John got as a present.'

[5] One referee questions the use of an example not appearing in the book under review. Unfortunately, in the book KÉK omitted the examples that so tellingly illustrated her point in the article referred to.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(b) János **egy** "**angol könyvet** kapott ajándékba.
'It was one **English book** that John got as a present.'
(c) János **egy angol** "**könyvet** kapott ajándékba.
'It was one English **book** that John got as a present.'
(d) János **egy** "**angol** "**könyvet** kapott ajándékba.
'It was one **English book** that John got as a present.'

The relevant sets that the object denoted by *egy angol könyv* 'one English book' is a subset of differ in the following ways: in the case of (11a), it is the set of collections of English books of varying cardinality; in (11b), the set of books in various languages; in (11c), the set of English objects; and in (11d), it is a set of objects believed by the speaker to be known to the hearer. That is to say, É. Kiss, unlike others, including, e.g. Szabolcsi (1981) and this reviewer (Kenesei 1986), regards as focussed the items in bold, not those marked by primary stress.

The formula for the function of focus presented in the book under review differs from the 1998 version not only in that the definition is improved by making reference to PROPER SUBSETS, rather than SUBSETS, though without giving sufficient or adequate reason, but also by loosening up the requirement on complementary subsets. Focus in many languages, including Hungarian, is possible without invoking complementary sets of objects having different properties. Consider KÉK's example (4:8b), given here in (12), which she uses to argue that it is not clear what the alternative sets of 'a smart girl' are.

(12) Péter "**okos lány-t** akart feleségül venni, nem "**szép-et**.
Peter smart girl-ACC wanted as.wife to.take not beautiful-ACC
'It was a smart girl that Peter wanted to marry, not a beautiful one.'

While the example works perfectly in both Hungarian and English, KÉK lets herself be deceived by the intensional context, a phenomenon well-known in the philosophical literature. However, with an extensional verb, the sentence doesn't work as well:

(13) Péter *egy* "**okos lány-t** vett feleségül (?*nem egy "**szép-et**).
'Peter married a smart girl, not a BEAUTIFUL one.'

Note, on the one hand, that KÉK relies on the 'folk contrast' between smart and beautiful girls, clearly not supported by facts, and, on the other hand, that when two adjectives chosen from different 'semantic fields' are contrasted in this fashion, they lead to semantic anomaly, e.g. *tall* vs. *blonde*, *strong* vs. *skillful*. The sentence in (13) is focussed even without an explicit or implicit alternative set, i.e. without the phrase in parentheses. In other words, no complementary set is necessary.

Among the descriptive generalizations KÉK makes use of to accommodate less well understood phenomena, she introduces the Head-finality

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Constraint (4:28), which requires that 'a phrase in Spec,FP must be head-final'. However, the constraint is clearly mistaken in its current form: while it works in a large number of cases, it fails in others. For example, free relatives, which by definition have no (visible) heads, are perfectly capable of being focused, as (14) illustrates. This observation is present in Kenesei (1994), but not discussed in the book under review.

(14) Csak [**aki utolsó-nak lépett fel**] kapott nagy taps-ot.
Only who last-DAT performed VM got great applause-ACC
'Only he who performed last got great applause.'

Another problem with the constraint will be raised in connection with right-branching noun phrases in section 1.6 below.

1.5 *Multiple questions*

As has already been noted, this book is a welcome overview of KÉK's achievements in the area of Hungarian syntax. Although criticism takes up more space than praise in the present review article, this is due to the nature of the genre: commendable ideas can be summarized and the reader referred to the book itself, but critical remarks must be substantiated at some length.

However, there are many reasons for commending KÉK's work. For one, many a linguist has been puzzled by the curious behaviour of Hungarian multiple questions. As is well known, there is a single focus position in front of the inflected verb, which may be filled in by any one constituent in the clause, exemplified in (15a). This is the same position into which a single *wh*-phrase can move, as in (15c). A *wh*-phrase cannot be preceded by a (plain) focus, as is shown in (15d), just as no focussed XP can be preceded by another one, as in (15b), and neither can a *wh*-phrase precede a plain focus, as in (15e). (Multiple focus is possible in a different arrangement, to be reviewed below. The examples in (15) are based on (3) above.)

(15) (a) Anna **a könyvet** olvassa a hálószobában.
Anna the book-ACC reads the bedroom-INE
'It's the book that Anna is reading in the bedroom.'
(b) ***Anna a könyvet** olvassa a hálószobában.
(c) Anna **mi-t** olvas a hálószobában?
what-ACC reads the bedroom-INE
'What is Anna reading in the bedroom?'
(d) ***Anna mit** olvas a hálószobában?
(e) *Mit **Anna** olvas a hálószobában?

However, when there are two or more *wh*-phrases in one clause, one possible arrangement for them is to line up in front of the inflected verb, as if they were all in focus. (16) illustrates.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(16) (a) Ki mi-t olvas a hálószobában?
who what-ACC reading the bedroom-INE
'Who is reading what in the bedroom?'
(b) Ki hol mit olvas?
who where what-ACC reads
'Who is reading what where?'

The first account of this phenomenon was due to KÉK (1993) and it remains unchallenged. It is based on the observation that pre-focus *wh*-phrases behave as universal quantifiers, which are, incidentally, blocked from occurring in front of *wh*-phrases. Moreover, pre-focus *wh*-phrases must be specific, unlike the ones in focus, which may be non-specific. In short, then, a question such as (16b) has the approximate logical form 'for every x, x a person, for every y, y a place, for which z, z a thing, x reads z at y?' The usefulness of this approach was demonstrated in Lipták's (2001) dissertation, which, among other things, provides a comprehensive analysis of all types of multiple questions.

1.6 *Noun phrases*

The issue of noun phrase projections is also one in which KÉK has shown a remarkable resourcefulness. In her view, the Hungarian DP is a layered projection, in which predicative noun phrases (NPs), indefinite noun phrases (NumPs), or definite noun phrases (DPs) are projected, depending on the particular sentence, instead of the received view of invariable DP projections. Furthermore, she improves on Szabolcsi's proposal for possessive DPs in that she does away with the lexically merged 'N + I Phrase', which – basically for semantic reasons – contained the possessive inflection together with the head noun. KÉK's current proposal, which is again based on Bartos (2000), has the appealing structure (17a), KÉK's (7:22), which is rendered on the surface as (17b).

(17) (a) [$_{DP}$ János$_i$-nak [$_{D'}$ a [$_{AgrP}$ t_i [$_{Agr'}$ ∅ [$_{NumP}$ két [$_{PossP}$ t_i [$_{Poss}$
John-DAT the two
-a [$_{NP}$ fi]]]]]]].
POSS son
(b) János-nak a két fi-a
'John's two sons'

KÉK also affords ample space to reviewing den Dikken's (1999) alternative to the celebrated dative–nominative alternation in Hungarian possessives (which is exemplified by the alternative to the string in (17b), *János két fi-a*). However, she probably had no access to Knittel (1998), whose analysis has a number of points in common with hers, especially as regards layered projections and the difference between lexical and pronominal possessors.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

KÉK's analysis of post- and prenominal case-marked and postpositional modifiers is less plausible. First of all, she claims that 'the modifiers of nouns are typically of the category AdjP' (p. 165), and neglects a distinction between AdjPs, which can serve in various roles, including predicative and comparative functions, on the one hand, and expressions that can occur only in prenominal position, traditionally labelled as attributive, on the other hand. Postnominal modifiers are free to occur in nominative and accusative NPs/DPs – contra KÉK's Case Constraint in (7:52), which requires that case suffixes cliticize on the right edge of NPs, but forbids them to cliticize to a K or a P, i.e. a case suffix or a postposition. But this is contradicted by the well-known observation that postnominal modifiers in Hungarian are possible not only in nominative but also in accusative DPs, as (18) illustrates; (18a) has the nominative DP of KÉK's (7:62a) in the accusative.

(18) (a) A rendőrség le-hallgatta [a beszélgetés-t a
the police VM-overheard the interview-ACC the
művésznő-vel].
artist-INS
'The police overheard the interview with the artist.'

(b) Nagyra értékelték [Anna küzdelm-é-t a
highly appreciated-3PL Anna struggle-POSS-ACC the
kormány ellen].
government against
'They highly appreciated Anna's struggle against the government.'

Moreover, the DPs as bracketed above have highly doubtful status as constituents and, consequently, KÉK's proposal concerning the derivation of DPs containing prenominal modifiers from DPs with postnominal modifiers is disputable. The only constituency test available for Hungarian, as commonly agreed, is based on focussing: the focus position can take at least and at most one constituent. However, DPs containing postnominal modifiers cannot occupy the focus position, as is shown in (19a). The only viable version, given in (19b), has a prenominal modifier supplemented by *való*, which is formally the present participle of the copula, and presumably an attributivizer.

(19) (a) *A rendőrség [*a beszélgetés-t a művésznő-vel*] hallgatta le.

(b) A rendőrség [*a művésznő-vel való beszélgetés-t*]
the police the artist-INS BEING interview-ACC
hallgatta le.
overheard VM
'It's the interview with the artist that the police overheard.'

Note, finally, that the Head-finality Constraint (4:28), criticized in section 1.4 above, together with the Case Constraint, conspires to make it impossible to ascertain the constituency status of the apparently right-branching

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expressions in (18). KÉK is forced to claim that the bracketed NPs in (18) are not single constituents, although there is evidence to the contrary.[6]

1.7 *Subordinate clauses*

It is difficult to do justice to a book so rich in ideas as this one. Naturally, some of these ideas are controversial. The last issue raised here concerns subordinate clauses. While KÉK gives a reliable overview of the various positions in the literature, she forgoes reviewing the arguments supporting them. For example, she notes that Kenesei (1994) and Lipták (1998) promote an expletive–associate analysis for the relationship of the 'anticipatory' pronoun *az* and the 'that'-clause, as in (20), but maintains her own earlier DP-analysis, in which the pronoun acts as a lexical head in the DP with the clause in some kind of appositive construction.

(20) Kár volt [$_{DP}$ az] [$_{CP}$ hogy Anna beteg lett].
pity was it that Anna sick became
'It was a pity that Anna got sick.'

Kenesei argues that although there is good reason to treat these expletive clause structures as DPs when they are in oblique cases, in many instances when they are nominative or accusative arguments, they cannot be shown to be DPs, since their governing predicates do not occur with DPs as a rule, cf. (21a), in which the same nominal predicate *kár* 'pity' that takes a clausal subject in (20) cannot take a DP subject, and cf. (21b), in which no DP can occur in object position, although an expletive + clause construction is perfectly possible, as in (21c).

(21) (a) *Kár volt [a távozás].
pity was the leaving
(b) *Anna gondolta [$_{DP}$ az ötlet-et].
Anna thought the idea-ACC
(c) Anna az-t gondolta [hogy Péter beteg volt].
Anna it-ACC thought that Peter sick was
'Anna thought that Peter had been sick.'

KÉK's insistence on her own approach is all the more interesting because she explicitly refers the reader to section 10.5 of the book, in which long operator

[6] They clearly move as single constituents, and if they were not single constituents, it would remain to be seen why their 'segments' cannot occur in certain positions:

(i) [A beszélgetés-t a művésznő-vel] a rendőrség le-hallgatta.
the interview-ACC the artist-INS the police VM-overheard
'The police overheard the interview with the artist.'

(ii) *?[A beszélgetés-t]$_i$ a rendőrség [t_i a művésznő-vel] le-hallgatta.
the interview-ACC the police the artist-INS VM-overheard
'The police overheard the interview with the artist.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

movement is discussed and where she says 'further merits and disadvantages of the structures in question will become evident' (p. 235). In that very section KÉK claims that it is Lipták's (1998) analysis that is supported by the data, but recall that Lipták assumes the expletive–associate construction.

1.8 *Minor points*

Those of us who not only write papers but also publish other people's work as editors of journals or book collections are well aware that a good copy-editor is perhaps even more important than the editor him/herself. A more careful copy-editor might perhaps have caught some of the embarrassing trivial errors that have remained in the text. Items are missing in the References (e.g. Chomsky (1999), mentioned on p. 121), or given in the References but apparently not mentioned in the text, like Bartos 2000[a] or Kenesei (1989), the latter not referred to in section 3.4.3, where the work is quoted verbatim. Komlósy (1994), a reliable (and accessible) summary of his substantial work on verb modifiers, is given in the References, but is not mentioned in the relevant chapter. Nor is the Index quite complete, with, for example, the most important section on verb modifiers (pp. 67ff.) missing.

Some of the sense translations would have benefited from a conscientious copy-editor's hand, as KÉK often follows Hungarian more closely in these translations than is necessary, especially given that glosses are provided. For a sample, consider (2:29a, b), (2:30a), (3:57), (3:61), (3:62), (3:68), (3:73a, c), (3:75c, d), (3:109), (3:113a, b), (4:25a), (5:17b), (6:9a, c, d), (7:51b), (8:38a), (9:15a, b).

Correction of, or comment on, the Hungarian examples themselves is of course not the remit of a copy-editor. One would expect this from a reviewer, but although KÉK thanks an anonymous reviewer, it can only be supposed that this person was not a native Hungarian linguist, since otherwise one would have expected comment on some of the more controversial examples. To illustrate, compare the following pair on p. 197, rejected by all my students (given in my morpheme segmentation, but with KÉK's glosses and judgements).

(22) (a) János nek-ik ment a járókelők-nek.
John into-POSS.3PL went the passers-by-DAT
'John ran into the passers-by.'

(b) ??János nek-ik vágta a labdá-t az üvegtáblák-nak.
John into-POSS.3PL threw the ball the window.panes-into
'John threw the ball into the window-panes.'

Both of these sentences are totally unacceptable: the grammatical versions (*János neki ment a járókelők-nek* and *János neki vágta a labdá-t az üvegtáblák-nak*) must have singular *nek-i*, a VM actually identical to a case-marked pronoun, whose root happens to be the (harmonizing) dative affix *-nek/-nak*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

itself. Besides, the difference between the grammaticality markings of the two examples remains a mystery – unless it is due to a typo. These differences in grammaticality judgements call into question the analyses they are used to support, namely that the case-marked pronominal is an argument and the case-marked DP is an adjunct.

Other examples where my and my students' judgements differ widely from KÉK's are (4:76a), (6:9b, d), (6:2c, d), (6:fn.3), (6:23c), (6:25), (8:10c), (8:22a), (8:33a), (8:38a), (9:28a), (9:68a) and (9:72). While this is only a small fraction of the large number of often informative examples in the book, at least conflicting judgments or dialect splits ought to have been marked where appropriate and the alternative analyses supplied.

The rendering of the rich case system of Hungarian is neither consistent nor instructive. Probably in order to save the reader too much detail, cases are regularly glossed as English prepositions, without showing the Hungarian morphemes, except where postpositions and cases are in explicit contrast, as on pp. 184ff. But this practice is bound to lead to confusion, as witnessed by (22) above, in which the very same affix is glossed as both 'DAT' and 'into'.

2. László Varga's stresses and melodies

The book by László Varga (henceforth LV) is divided into two major parts, on intonation and on stress, respectively, and nine well-balanced chapters (1. Introduction; 2. Intonation, paralanguage, prosody; 3. A taxonomic analysis of Hungarian intonation; 4. An autosegmental analysis of Hungarian intonation; 5. The melodic segmentation of Hungarian utterances; 6. Stress in Hungarian words, phrases and sentences; 7. Rhythmical variation in phrasal compounds; 8. Rhythmical secondary stresses; 9. Summary and conclusions). As is customary with LV, we are given thorough, reliable and highly detailed descriptions and analyses. Perhaps the most outstanding feature of this book is its comprehensive nature, always a hallmark of LV's various enterprises, which have helped us understand the properties of the prosody of Hungarian. As a predecessor to the present book, one may recall Varga (1994), though it is accessible only to those with a command of Hungarian. As was said at the beginning of this article, LV has always worked in the field of prosody; but this book is not simply a summary of his publications so far: it is new in several proposals and analyses, which both advance our knowledge and induce debate.

2.1 *Merits and novelties*

The fundamental notion in the first part of the book is the CHARACTER CONTOUR, which is 'a discrete meaningful speech melody … able to appear on independent utterances' and with a major stress 'on the first syllable of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

phrase carrying the contour' (p. 33). Any other syllables with extra intensity but not initiating a character contour are minor-stressed, and all the rest of the syllables are zero-stressed. One important novelty in Part One is the idea of intonation defined 'from right to left' in this otherwise (mostly) left-branching language, i.e. it is the (obligatory) TERMINAL PART of the Intonation Phrase (IP) that determines the intonational interpretation of the clause.[7] The terminal part, which contains (almost) all meaningful character contours, can be preceded by two optional units: the SCALE, which is a non-final character contour, and the PREPARATORY PART, which has unstressed or maximally minor-stressed syllables (pp. 54f). These three are not prosodic constituents, of which LV recognizes the following: the accent phrase, the foot and the syllable. Accent phrases consist of major-stressed feet, while the domain of the foot is from one syllable with extra intensity to the next.

Other original features include the twelve character contours, which LV registers with precise definitions of their tonal properties and semantic interpretations, grouped into three classes and a fourth 'mixed bag', listed here for the record: (i) front-falling contours (full fall, half fall, fall-rise), (ii) sustained contours (rise, high monotone, descent), (iii) end-falling contours (rise-fall, monotone fall, descent-fall), and (iv) three further contours (the second-type descent, the stylized fall, and the appended contour). Table 3.2 in the book provides a helpful overview.

In chapter 5 LV introduces major and minor tonosyntactic blocks with various subtypes. Major blocks comprise the utterance, the highest-ranking sentence, quoting inorganic blocks (QIO), and non-quoting inorganic blocks (NQIO). To illustrate QIO and NQIO, I present (23), LV's (5:10b) and (5:13d). (Vertical lines indicate IP boundaries, stress markings are mine for typographic reasons, and LV's contour markings are omitted, also for typographic reasons.)

(23) (a) |‘"Milyen szép!’| 'suttogta 'Mari.|
how beautiful whispered Mary
‘“How beautiful!” whispered Mary.’
(b) |"Angéla, "kérsz kávét?|
Angela want-2SG coffee-ACC
‘Angela, would you like some coffee?’

(23a) has a 'descent' in the first IP and a QIO in the second one, and (23b) has a 'rise-fall' starting on the verb and a NQIO in front of it. Minor tonosyntactic blocks make up the highest-ranking sentence, i.e. the canonical major tonosyntactic block. Appositive structures, conjunctions, disjunctions and the like are all handled by minor blocks.

[7] An IP can consist of more than one 'major tonosyntactic block'. If this is the case, then each major tonosyntactic block shows this right-to-left melodic dependence.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LV builds the prosodic structure of Hungarian 'from top to bottom', as it were, contradicting a strong tradition, but making very good sense within his own model, where semantic information is also made use of in determining the prosodic structure of sentences. For compressed illustration, consider (24) below, based on LV's (5:14) and (5:15). In (24) major stresses are marked by asterisks above the words. First, the highest-ranking sentence (HRS) is assigned the dominant contour (dom) in its minor tonosyntactic block (MB), cf. line (24e). The dominant contour is then automatically transferred to the rightmost major-stressed syllable. Next the rightmost contour of the highest dependent minor block (MB_{dep}) is established, cf. lines (24d, c). When all melodies have been assigned, the remaining major-stressed syllables will receive a half-falling contour. All contours other than the half-fall determine an IP boundary, as indicated by the vertical lines in (24b).

(24) (a) Nem léphetnek egyszerre, mert összedől a híd.
not step-can-3PL simultaneously because collapses the bridge
'They can't walk in step because the bridge collapses.'

(b) * * * *
|Nem léphetnek egyszerre,| mert összedől a híd.|

(c) MB_{dep} MB_{dom} MB_{dep} MB_{dom}

(d) MB_{dep} MB_{dom}

(e) $MB_{dom} = HRS$

In a very well presented Part Two, in harmony with most researchers, LV distinguishes three degrees of stress: major, minor and zero. This is in contrast with KÉK's views, based on computing stress directly on the basis of syntactic structures and differentiating several degrees of major stress (see É. Kiss (1994) and the debate between LV and KÉK in the 1986 and 1987–88 volumes of the Hungarian journal *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*). Not only Varga's observations on possible stress types but also Hunyadi's experiments on stress and prosody (see section 3 below) contradict KÉK's long-standing conviction, expressed even in her book under review, that 'postverbal constituents of the VP are usually unstressed' (KÉK: 77).

LV suggests that function words (articles, conjunctions, pronouns, etc.) which are monosyllabic leave the lexicon with zero stress and become cliticized. Polysyllabic function words are never unstressed. They are all major-stressed when they leave the lexicon and can be de-stressed postlexically, always ending up with minor stress.

It is difficult, even in a review article such as this, to list all the strengths of LV's book, but mention must be made of the excellent analyses of phrasal compounds and rhythmic secondary stresses in chapters 7 and 8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LV makes a surprising new claim in his book. Until now everyone has agreed that a focussed item is followed by an unaccented verb, i.e. one that has zero stress. LV assigns minor stress to the post-focal verb, and assumes that a rule of Clash Deletion (LV's (6:21)) can decrease this to zero if preceded by a major- or minor-stressed syllable. (25) illustrates.

(25) (a) "János "mindig "kávé-t 'iszik a "büfé-ben. →
John always coffee-ACC drinks the bar-INE
'John always drinks coffee in the bar.'
(b) "János "mindig "kávét iszik a büfében.

In support of LV's thesis we may refer back to (23a), in which the direct speech quotation is followed by a minor-stressed verb, as is generally the case in Hungarian. Thus, it seems that quotation clauses comply with focus structures in this language in that the clause occupies the focus position followed immediately by the inflected verb, which always has a minor stress in this structure. Note that Hunyadi's more objective measurements (see below) also lend support to LV's thesis, which was based on observations and analyses of recordings and intuition.

2.2 *Problems and criticisms*

LV argues that the order in which prosodic features are assigned is this: first stress, then intonation. This makes very good sense, since intonation contours can be assigned only to syllables that are marked as accented. But this 'natural order' is contradicted by the order of presentation in the book: first intonation, then stress. As LV himself acknowledges, this results in the discussion of the degrees of stress occurring in both parts of the book. While the (descriptive) interdependence of stress and intonation is clear, and some sequence of presentation had to be chosen, LV's sole justification for his decision is quite weak: 'The reason why we are discussing melodic segmentation first is strictly methodological: stress fixing can be described more economically in Chapter 6' (chapter 5, note 1, p. 208). Had he added that stress can be dealt with in the part on intonation more concisely, the reader would be less puzzled at this point.

LV, like many others who analyse linguistic phenomena, has to accommodate his findings in a theoretical model. His is a 'modified T-model' (cf. Selkirk 1984), in which 'meaning' is linked to Phonetic Form (PF) because some 'syntax-independent contribution also has to be taken into consideration for a full semantic interpretation of the utterance' (p. 6). The popular idea behind this modification derives from the assumption that 'syntax' has nothing, or very little, to do with intonational contours, which reside, as it were, in the phonological component of the grammar and receive interpretation directly in Logical Form, or the like, whether in the classical T-model or its more recent descendant, the Minimalist Program.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This reviewer, however, has a more conservative and restrictive view. The fact that some meaning is expressed by an intonational contour should perhaps not lead us to presume that it is alien to 'syntax'. Consider, for example, matrix yes-no questions in (colloquial) English. These can be rendered either by subject–auxiliary inversion and a concomitant rising intonation, or simply by rising intonation alone. Thus, one has a 'syntactic reflex', while the other does not. But does this warrant the conclusion that one is 'generated' in syntax and the other in PF? And if one language encodes the same semantic unit 'syntactically' (cf. English or German yes-no questions), another 'prosodically' (cf. Russian or Hungarian), and another 'lexically' (cf. Chinese *ma* or Bulgarian *li*), would that affect the placement of the entities that trigger such processes, forcing a choice from among a 'syntactic' lexicon, a 'prosodic' lexicon and a 'morphological' lexicon? It is certainly theoretically more plausible to assume a single lexicon which includes complementizers for (yes-no) questions with a universal feature, e.g. [+Q], whether they are phonetically overt or not, and when overt, whether encoded as a prosodic or a segmental entity, cf. Chomsky (1995: 289ff).

Other intonational morphemes, i.e. LV's 'intonational lexicon' of twelve character contours, can be treated in a similar way. Meaning and form are two sides of the same coin, but form varies from language to language. Where one language selects a yes-no question morpheme, another has word order change, and a third one a particular intonation to mark the same content. Yes-no question markers have been argued to be accommodated in complementizers. Note that complementizers must also serve as discourse 'connectors'. I see no reason to deny this option to other intonational markers that have specific semantic characterizations. What we shall end up with is the same scenario as seen in yes-no questions: where some language has to use so many words to express surprise or disbelief, Hungarian (or, for that matter, English) can have recourse to an intonational 'morpheme', all conveniently registered, like all other 'listemes' (di Sciullo & Williams 1987), in a single lexicon of the language.

Note that we should not be deterred by the dangers of the multiple 'pragmatic' meanings of these intonational morphemes, as so carefully listed in note 6 of chapter 3 (p. 205). Their case is similar to that of various 'segmental' morphemes, such as German *doch*, whose meanings include: 'yet, however, but, nevertheless, certainly, yes', depending on context.

As a (prosodic) phonologist, LV is not in a position to argue for or against specific syntactic views. He simply adopts the most popular and wide-spread theory around, that of Katalin É. Kiss. While the choice is inevitable, the 'ready-made' garment he has selected is somewhat out of fashion. For example, KÉK has finally abandoned the position of having a single node for focussed phrases and preverbal prefixes, as was seen in section 1.3 above, but LV retains that position (cf. É. Kiss 1998b). Moreover, while KÉK has apparently ceased using the term 'non-configurational' in relation to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hungarian (e.g. in her book under review here), LV continues to do so (cf. É. Kiss 1995).

As was mentioned in section 2.1, LV's proposal that the IP (Intonation Phrase) is constructed 'from right to left' is quite convincing, since its sole obligatory portion is the terminal part. However, the IP is not defined anywhere in this work. All that LV does is provide useful characterizations, while being critical of those who try to give definitions, e.g. Selkirk (1984, 1986) and Nespor & Vogel (1986). Although on p. 85 LV refers to his section 3.6.1 as the locus of a definition of IP, what we find there is a useful description, summarized and praised at the beginning of section 2.1 above.

This problem is related to LV's view of the Strict Layer Hypothesis (SLH), which requires that each layer of prosodic structure be built up exclusively and exhaustively of constituents of the level immediately below it. LV's view, as far as I can judge, is one of qualified acceptance of the SLH insofar as he subscribes to it explicitly (see p. 59) and even goes as far as to challenge the opinion that IPs can be embedded within one another (as on p. 209), but, by positing a 'top-to-bottom' construction algorithm for prosodic constituents, he casts doubt upon his own credo. Moreover, his 'simplification' of the number of prosodic layers buys him little in terms of elegance. He dismisses Nespor & Vogel's (1986) clitic group, as well as Selkirk's (1984) and Nespor & Vogel's phonological phrase and phonological word. Although, it must be emphasized, LV is not concerned with the full prosodic structure of Hungarian, more caution with respect to the hierarchy would have been in order. As is well-known, prosodic constituents have been defined on the basis of two types of phenomena: end-based rules and domain-based rules. And if anyone is to challenge the constituents set up by means of these types of regularities, s/he had better find alternative accounts for the observations well accommodated by the (strictly hierarchical) layers established so far.

2.3 *Minor points*

There are very few typos in this book. The ones I have noted are on p. 52 (in Table 3.3, 'reding' for 'reading'), on p. 59 ('1896' for '1986'), and on p. 130, line 13 ('is' for 'in'). An index of names would have been useful, and so would a recording of the examples. Although this reviewer is a native speaker of Hungarian, he could often have made use of a recording, despite the elaborate and careful explanations provided. Admittedly, the cost of a CD-ROM addendum would have been prohibitive, but, with the permission of the publisher of the book, the Research Institute for Linguistics in Budapest has established a website with the soundfiles of the examples of the crucial chapters 3 and 5 (<http://www.nytud.hu/varga>).

Finally, I must confess that I am a lifelong enemy of endnotes: publishers should constrain their authors to short notes, which could then be included at the bottom of the relevant page, making the reading process much more

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

user-friendly. (Note that the other two books reviewed here have footnotes, to their advantage.)

3. László Hunyadi's experimental prosodic analysis

László Hunyadi (henceforth LH) did pioneering work in the early 1980s in clarifying the scope of operators and quantifiers in Hungarian (cf. e.g. Hunyadi 1981). Ever since then he has been interested in the relationship of syntax, logical representations and prosody, more recently with a marked emphasis on the measurement of prosodic factors. The book under review took shape first as a 1998 *Habilitationsschrift* at Debrecen University, then as a dissertation submitted to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 2000, before it was published in its current form.

LH relies throughout this book on his own new method for measuring intonation and intensity, i.e. stress. This is a significant development in this field, since everyone concerned (with the possible exception of Rosenthall (1992), but including KÉK and LV, as was seen above) has trusted 'subjective sense-data' in representing the prosody of Hungarian. LH's method may provide a new tool for the study of prosody, if applied with the necessary circumspection, and it has already given rise to interesting speculations as to post-focal stresses and pauses.

The novelty of the method consists not only in the unified graphs of stress and pitch used for illustration, but also in representing a chorus of speakers on a single graph. Note that the 'members' of the chorus are not recorded as a chorus, but in individual sessions, and the recordings are unified by a computer program, thus creating a 'virtual chorus'. LH describes the parameters of the instruments and the initial instructions given to the subjects who read the sample sentences and interpreted them.

The book has a structure laid out in ten chapters and two appendices (Introduction; 1. Preliminary thoughts on prosody; 2. On stress and its manifestations; 3. Stress and syntactic and semantic categories: the prosodic properties of focus, topic, and the neutral part; 4. Metrical phonology and the syntax of Hungarian; 5. The outlines of a metrical model of Hungarian syntax; 6. The underlying prosodic-communicative structure of the Hungarian sentence; 7. Complex prosodic structures and their logical interpretations; 8. Operator scope and prosody; 9. Prosody, scope, and Universal Grammar; 10. Conclusions: logical form, prosody, and universal implications; Appendix I: Generalized graphs of Hungarian sentences; Appendix II: Perception experiments). The chapters vary more in length (between 15 and 60 pages) than one would have wished, and the book is the longest of the three reviewed here, perhaps because of the author's predilection for his own illustrations and a less than strict publisher. Even so some information is still missing. It is difficult, often even for a native speaker of Hungarian, to reconstruct the spoken forms of the examples from their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

printed forms (or from the graphs accompanying them), especially since their interpretations are often not supplied. Moreover, LH does not list control sentences in appendix II, which could serve to check the interpretations of the sentences read out (or played) to the subjects who gave judgements, communicated by LH in percentages of the subjects who accepted one or the other alternative interpretation offered. Actually, I have problems accepting these percentages. Every example (except two) has only two choices of interpretation (one of which is the 'correct' or expected one, while the other has an unexpected or improbable reading), although in some cases more than two options are theoretically feasible, as in (LH:13a). Example (LH:18), which has 'equal stresses', shows a 60–40 ratio between the two choices, while the similarly accented example (LH:146) has a 100–zero ratio, which is somewhat unexpected.[8] Finally, LH does not reproduce the instructions that were used to introduce the alternative interpretations of the sample sentences. Obviously, if these instructions were not clear enough, the subjects may have had problems in making out the differences, and it would also be difficult to replicate the experiments in the absence of such information.

The novelty of the measurement can hardly be appreciated if there is no general agreement among researchers as regards semantic readings and 'prosodic interpretations', as, for example, in the case of (LH:22–23), where two examples have one and the same typographic representation, given in (26) below, but different pitch accents (as demonstrated in the graphs not reproduced here), and a single sense translation, given below, which fails to show possibly different semantic interpretations. (In (26), capitalization marks focus pitch accent, PV = preverb.)

(26) Gyere el HOLNAP!
come PV tomorrow
'Come TOMORROW!'

[8] The examples below are given in LH's notation and with his glosses, and with the choices he offered. Capitals stand for focus pitch accent, underlining for 'equal stresses'. (PV stands for preverb.)

(i) János MEG-OLDOTTA a feladatot. (LH:13a)
John PV-solved the exercise
a. 'John solved the exercise.' – 0%
b. 'As for John, he solved the exercise, the others are not known.' – 100%

(ii) Kati ment be a boltba. (LH:18a)
Kate went PV the shop-into
a. 'Kate was entering the shop.' (neutral) – 60%
b. 'It was Kate who was entering/entered the shop.' – 40%

(iii) Én csak Katit néztem. (LH:146)
I only Kate-ACC I-was-looking-at
'All I was doing was looking at Kate.'
a. 'I did nothing else.' – 100%
b. 'I did not see anything else.' – 0%

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As indicated by this single instance, in contrast to the exemplary presentation and analysis of measurements, the representations made use of in the examples are neither consistent nor unambiguous. LH ought to have realized that the method of capitalizing focussed words is cumbersome to say the least, because he frequently changes into capitalizing only the first syllable (as in the word *HOLnap* 'tomorrow' on p. 43), or has recourse to underlining the initial (and therefore capitalized), but also focussed, word of the sentence, which happens to be the monographemic pronoun *ő* 's/he', as in (LH:211) and (LH:212). But then he also underlines the first syllables of words in what he calls a neutral sentence, as in (LH:35), reproduced below in (27), without the underlining. Actually, (27) is not classified as neutral by most other researchers, who tend to regard it as having 'continuous aspect' on account of the reversed verb – preverb order (given with my stress markings; for LH's, see fn. 8).

(27) "Kati "ment "be a "bolt-ba.
Kate went in the shop-ILLATIVE
'Kate was going into the shop.'

From the examples containing both markings it transpires that capitals stand for focus stress and underlining for minor stresses, but this notation is confusing when only one of them is present. (Examples are given in LH's notations, but with my sense translations.)

(28) (a) Csak a PÉNZ nem boldogít.
only the money not makes-happy
'It's only money that doesn't make you happy.'
(b) Csak a pénz NEM boldogít.
'Money alone doesn't make you happy.'

This is not simply a notational problem: it changes quickly into an empirical problem of prosodic analysis, since most Hungarian linguists do not agree with LH in regarding the pre-focus constituents in (26) as unaccented or calling (27) neutral. Moreover, LH labels the post-focal string 'neutral part', which is totally unjustified. First of all, it is not a separate (prosodic) constituent, but forms a single unit with the focussed item, as has been demonstrated by Vogel & Kenesei (1987), Kornai & Kálmán (1989) and Kálmán & Nádasdy (1994); and it is far from neutral – being part of a focussed clause. LH's motive for calling it 'neutral' mostly comes from the fact that it is omissible. But even so, he should have refrained from making use of this particular term to avoid possible misunderstanding.

Another apparently notational problem concerns the scopes of prosodic and semantic foci. As is well-known from the literature, the two do not always coincide (recall (11) above), which is further complicated by the fact that Hungarian has a syntactic focus movement operation, creating yet a third alternative to 'focussed constituents'. Consequently, marking each in turn by a different symbol would have been very helpful.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Although LH's work was clearly available to LV, since it is in LV's bibliography, it seems that LV arrived at the observation that verbs have a post-focal (minor) stress independently of LH, whose measurements were the first to reveal this. This is certainly surprising, after so many years of Hungarian descriptive and theoretical linguistics (including this reviewer's work) which has claimed full stress reduction on the post-focal verb.

While this book is full of such eye-openers, it will be a difficult read for a linguist who is not a Hungarian (near-)native speaker. LH has made no concession to those uninitiated into the intricacies of this language, which can easily result in losing sight of the merits of his work.

The central thesis of LH's book is a direct relationship between prosody and logico-semantic representation, as specified by LH's three rules in chapter 10, given here in (29).

(29) (a) *The Thematic Precedence Principle* (p. 269)
If, within a clause, A and B are arguments and one of them is SUBJECT, the other is OBJECT, then, if A precedes B, then A = SUBJECT, and B = OBJECT.
(b) *The Logical Precedence Principle* (p. 269)
If A is an operator and B is its scope, then A precedes B.
(c) *The Stress Principle* (p. 271)
If A is an operator and B is its scope, then express this relation by prosody (stress).

In the 'configurational' English language, principles (29a, c) are at work, and in 'non-configurational' Hungarian, (29b, c) are at work – except for neutral sentences in Hungarian, in which case (29a) takes precedence over (29b). It would have been more beneficial if not only these three general principles but also the actual 'spell-out rules' had been outlined in the body of the book. Without them, the picture we face is deceptively simple, as is well-known to LH himself, who explains at length what examples and interpretations contradict (29c) in Hungarian. Nor is it clear how his principles could handle scopal ambiguities between quantifiers, like those that arise in the English example *Who did everyone meet?* versus the unambiguous *Who met everyone?* In short, syntactic structures and derivations cannot be circumvented in an account of quantifiers and their scopes, however much we may rely on prosody.

That such a prosody-based approach to the structure of Hungarian is becoming popular is shown by Szendrői's (2003) recent proposal, independent of LH (and of LV, for that matter, since neither figures in her references), computing focus structures from a nuclear stress rule, not unlike a proposal by KÉK put forward (and criticized) in the debate with LV, which was referred to in section 2.1 above.

All in all, LH's book is a worthy attempt at introducing new tools into the analysis of prosody vis-à-vis the scopes of quantifiers and operators, but certainly there is still a long way to go.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4. Summary

Hungarian is a language well-known for the interdependence of syntax, semantics and prosody. If it is indeed a topic-prominent language, as É. Kiss has argued, the dividing line between the topic and the predicate is, among other things, a matter of prosody. But this is only one of the ways in which intonation and stress, syntax and semantics interact in the language and in the works reviewed here. Others include the order and prosody of quantifiers, logical particles like *csak* 'only' (cf. (28) above) or the negative word *nem* 'not', to mention just a few of the points studied in the books under review.

It is safe to say that of the three volumes Katalin É. Kiss's will be the most popular, and thus the most saleable, for obvious reasons: its 'name recognition' is very high, and deservedly so, since its topic and the mode of exposition are indeed highly attractive. Notwithstanding the objections raised here, it is unlikely to be surpassed in breadth and depth in years to come. It is indeed an excellent showpiece of the best of Hungarian linguistics. László Varga's careful presentation and analysis will also appeal to prospective readers, although they will be fewer in number due to the subject matter of the book. Finally, László Hunyadi's interesting new method will draw the attention of specialists in phonetic measurements. Thus all three books will find audiences that will certainly appreciate their merits.

REFERENCES

Bartos, Huba (2000). Az inflexiós jelenségek szintaktikai háttere. In Kiefer, F. (ed.), *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan* 3: *Morfológia*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 653–761.
Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
den Dikken, Marcel (1999). On the structural representation of possession and agreement: the case of (anti-)agreement in Hungarian possessed nominal phrases. In Kenesei, István (ed.), *Crossing boundaries*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 137–178.
di Sciullo, Anna Maria & Williams, Edwin (1987). *On the definition of word*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
É. Kiss, Katalin (1978). A magyar mondatok egy szintaktikai modellje. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* **80**. 261–286.
É. Kiss, Katalin (1987). *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
É. Kiss, Katalin (1993). *Wh*-movement and specificity. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* **11**. 85–121.
É. Kiss, Katalin (1994). Sentence structure and word order. In Kiefer & É. Kiss (eds.), 1–90.
É. Kiss, Katalin (ed.) (1995). *Discourse configurational languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.
É. Kiss, Katalin (1998a). Identification focus versus information focus. *Language* **74**. 245–273.
É. Kiss, Katalin (1998b). Mondattan. In Kiefer, Ferenc, É. Kiss, Katalin & Siptár, Péter (eds.), *Új magyar nyelvtan*. Budapest: Osiris. 17–184.
Guéron, Jacqueline (1980). On the syntax and semantics of PP extraposition. *Linguistic Inquiry* **11**. 637–678.
Hetzron, Robert (1975). The presentative movement or why the ideal word order is V.S.O.P. In Li, Charles N. & Thompson, Sandra (eds.), *Word order and word order change*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. 346–388.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hunyadi, László (1981). Remarks on the syntax and semantics of topic and focus in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* **31**. 107–136.
Kálmán, László (1985a). Word order in neutral sentences. In Kenesei (ed.), 13–23.
Kálmán, László (1985b). Word order in non-neutral sentences. In Kenesei (ed.), 25–37.
Kálmán, László & Nádasdy, Ádám (1994). A hangsúly. In Kiefer (ed.), 393–466.
Kenesei, István (ed.) (1985). *Approaches to Hungarian* (vol. 1). Szeged: JATE.
Kenesei, István (1986). On the logic of word order in Hungarian. In Abraham, Werner & de Mey, Sjaak (eds.), *Topic, focus and configurationality*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 143–159.
Kenesei, István (1989). On pronominal binding in Hungarian. In Marácz, László K. & Muysken, Pieter (eds.), *Configurationality: the typology of asymmetries*. Dordrecht: Foris. 223–236.
Kenesei, István (1994). Subordinate clauses. In Kiefer & É. Kiss (eds.), 275–374.
Kenesei, István, Vago, Robert & Fenyvesi, Anna (1998). *Hungarian* (Routledge Descriptive Grammars). London: Routledge.
Kiefer, Ferenc (ed.) (1994). *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan* 2: *Fonológia*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Kiefer, Ferenc & É. Kiss, Katalin (eds.) (1994). *Hungarian syntax*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
Knittel, Marie-Laurence (1998). La structure morphosyntaxique des syntagmes nominaux possessivisés du hongrois. In Guéron, Jacqueline & Zribi-Hertz, Anne (eds.), *La grammaire de la possession*. Nanterre: Université Paris X – Nanterre. 83–128.
Komlósy, András (1994). Complements and adjuncts. In Kiefer & É. Kiss (eds.), 91–178.
Koopman, Hilda & Szabolcsi, Anna (2000). *Verbal complexes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Kornai, András & Kálmán, László (1989). Hungarian sentence intonation. In van der Hulst, Harry & Smith, Norval (eds.), *Autosegmental studies on pitch accent*. Dordrecht: Foris. 183–195.
Lipták, Anikó (1998). A magyar fókuszemelések egy minimalista elemzése. In Büky, László & Maleczki, Márta (eds.), *A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei III*. Szeged: JATE. 93–116.
Lipták, Anikó (2001). *On the syntax of* wh-*items in Hungarian*. Ph.D. dissertation, Universiteit Leiden.
Marácz, László Károly (1989). *Asymmetries in Hungarian*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Groningen.
Marácz, László Károly (1991). *Asymmetries in Hungarian*. San Sebastian: Diputación Foral de Gipuzkoa.
Nespor, Marina & Vogel, Irene (1986). *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Reinhart, Tania (1983). *Anaphora and semantic interpretation*. London: Croom Helm.
Rosenthall, Sam (1992). The intonation of simple sentences in Hungarian. In Stevan, Laurel Smith et al. (eds.), *Papers from the Third Annual Formal Linguistic Society of Midamerica Conference*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistic Society. 297–310.
Selkirk, Elisabeth O. (1984). *Phonology and syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Selkirk, Elisabeth O. (1986). Derived domains in sentence phonology. *Phonology Yearbook* **3**. 371–405.
Siptár, Péter & Törkenczy, Miklós (2000). *The phonology of Hungarian*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Szabolcsi, Anna (1981). Compositionality in focus. *Folia Linguistica* **15**. 141–161.
Szabolcsi, Anna (1994). The noun phrase. In Kiefer & É. Kiss (eds.), 179–274.
Szabolcsi, Anna (ed.) (1997). *Ways of scope taking*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Szendrői, Kriszta (2003). A stress-based approach to the syntax of Hungarian focus. *The Linguistic Review* **20**. 37–78.
Varga, László (1994). A hanglejtés. In Kiefer (ed.), 468–665.
Vogel, Irene & Kenesei, István (1987). The interface between phonology and other components of grammar. *Phonology* **4**. 243–263.

Author's address: *Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Benczúr u. 33, Budapest H-1068, Hungary.*
E-mail: ikenesei@nytud.hu

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003312 Published online by Cambridge University Press