

Összességében jelentős mű született: a kiváló kutatásvezető irányításával egy fiatal csapat új utat tört a magyar mondattörténet eddig feltáratlan területein. Az, hogy jelen ismertetésünkben kritizáltuk vagy vitattuk az állítások némelyikét, természetes velejárója a generatív grammatika módszerének, hiszen itt az adatok alapján elméleti jellegű magyarázatokat, feltevéseket kínálunk fel, amelyeket nemcsak lehet, de meg is kell vitatni szakmai érvek alapján. Amikor ezt tettük, nem csökkentettük az e könyvben megtestesülő kiemelkedő teljesítmény értékét: továbbgondolásra méltónak, az elkövetkezendő kutatások alapjának tekintjük a benne foglaltakat, és bízunk benne, hogy a jelen kötet szerzői és/vagy követői tovább gazdagítják majd ismereteinket a magyar nyelvtörténet mondattani fejezeteiről.

Kenesei István

**Hegedűs Veronika: Non-Verbal Predicates
and Predicate Movement in Hungarian**

LOT Publications, Utrecht, 2013. 159 pp.

The book under review here is the author's doctoral dissertation defended at Tilburg University. It is a study on Hungarian verbal modifiers, with equal interest in copular clauses and different predicative PPs. Its main part is divided into six chapters, which, through their logical connection, start from general principles and move to language-specific phenomena. The introductory chapter is preceded by Contents and Acknowledgements, and the concluding chapter is followed by Abbreviations and Bibliography.

The book opens with Chapter 1, Introduction (pp. 1–4), which follows the contents of standard introductions and hence is intended to familiarize the reader with the preliminaries to the study. This part of the book is somewhat short but very well organized. Not only does it mention the goals it hopes to attain, but it also gives the reader a theoretical background on the generative framework, and shows how the study itself is organized.

Chapter 2, Predicate Movement: Theoretical Background (pp. 5–44), is meant to set the stage for the following chapters. It opens with a discussion on the syntactic structure of Hungarian sentences more generally and the internal structure of their left periphery more specifically. Although the main focus is on Verbal Modifiers (henceforth VMs), the discussion on some properties of the left periphery seems to be relevant here, since VMs interact with the preverbal field, as they occupy a preverbal position, and are situated between the left periphery – hosting the topic, quantifiers, focus, and negation – and the main verb, which is then followed by the postverbal part of the clause.

What we learn from this chapter is that VM is an umbrella term that covers a wide variety of predicative elements, such as predicative elements in copular constructions, diverse secondary predicates, bare nominal internal arguments, infinitival complements, and VP-adverbs. This is probably the main reason why there has been much disagreement over the distribution and syntactic properties of these elements. First and foremost, there are those who are in favour of the lexicalist approach, according to which predicates (mostly particles) and matrix verbs combine pre-syntactically, in a component of grammar referred to as the lexicon. Then, there are those who adopt the syntactic approach, according to which predicates (mostly particles) and verbs enter the syntax as separate heads and form a syntactic unit. Furthermore, some argue that particles (and other modifiers) are heads and undergo head movement/incorporation into V. Others believe that most VMs recategorize atelic or aspectually ambiguous (i.e. telic-atelic) VPs into telic VPs; hence, due to the semantic role they play in determining the aspectual properties of the clause, they should end up in [Spec,AspP]. Still others argue that particles and all VMs move into a predicative position (e.g. [Spec,PredP]) in the left periphery of the clause. Finally, there are those who propose that predicates/VMs land in [Spec,VP] as a result of predicate movement – but this may very well be an intermediate position for predicates/ VMs which may end up in a higher clausal projection eventually – and this movement results in complex predicate formation.

As there are several arguments against the first directions and some cannot capture the entire distribution of VMs, the author opts for the last approach.

Then, the focus is shifted to the subject–(secondary) predicate relationship. After presenting the most important milestones in the development of our thinking about small clauses, the author turns to the alternative proposal in terms of complex predicates. And this should come as no surprise, as the real debate in the literature is indeed between these two binary structures; all the other analyses put forth so far (e.g. ternary analyses) are not compelling alternatives to them. But then what is the structure of Hungarian VM constructions? In this respect, the impossibility of assigning a uniform syntactic structure to the wide variety of predicate structures in one language or in two/more languages has led some syntacticians to propose different non-uniform analyses. One such example is Stowell (1991), which investigates the issue of mono-clausality and bi-clausality of small clauses, and tries to reconcile their syntactic properties. The author claims that the small clause structure is the underlying one, but complement small clauses undergo restructuring, their predicate moves and forms a complex predicate with the verb during the derivation. What is more, languages differ as to where (i.e. at what level) this restructuring takes place: either at LF (as in English) or in syntax proper. As far as Hungarian is concerned, Hegedűs argues that this is one of those languages that have restructuring in the Narrow Syntax. It is this approach

that is adopted in the present study. In Hungarian, thus, predicate movement to the preverbal position is the instantiation of small clause restructuring and complex predicate formation. To put it differently, the Hungarian structures under consideration are base-generated small clauses, but they undergo restructuring and their predicate forms a complex predicate with the main verb during the derivation. This has a definite advantage over its competitors, as it captures the most important intuitions that underlie both the small clause analysis and the complex predicate structure, solving the debate between them by representing their essential correctness.

Chapter 3, Copular Clauses, Existential and Locative Sentences (pp. 45–84), takes a close look at copular clauses, on the one hand, and existential and locative sentences, on the other hand. This division is based on a very straightforward feature: although all of these clauses and sentences have a small clause complement to the copula, neutral clauses belonging to the first group involve predicate movement, whereas sentences of the second group do not.

The chapter opens with some introductory remarks about the typology of copular clauses and existential constructions in English and Hungarian, and a brief literature review. Although less attention is paid to English, the very first examples shed light not only on the word order differences in the constructions of the two languages, but also on some interesting peculiarities in Hungarian as far as information structuring is concerned. In order to give a uniform account of all neutral copular clauses, the author proposes that there is always a copula (in V) in the clause irrespective of whether this is overtly or covertly realized.

Offering her readers a more comprehensive overview, the author dedicates separate subsections to nominal, adjectival, and adpositional (roughly PP) predicates. These three types of predicates all undergo movement and this results in syntactically formed complex predicates. More precisely, predicate movement in these cases involves movement of the nominal, adjectival, or adpositional predicate of the small clause complement of *be* to the preverbal position during the derivation, which gives rise to a complex predicate formed between this predicate and the copula itself. In other words, the nonverbal predicate forms a small clause with the subject in the base-generated structure, but moves to the left of the verb in neutral sentences due to complex predicate formation. The final landing site of the predicate is claimed to be [Spec,VP] and it is in this position that the predicate forms a syntactic unit with the verb. Moreover, the subject of the small clause becomes the subject of the complex predicate or even the subject of the entire clause/structure. However, if the predicate is expressed by a PP, a distinction should be made between copular clauses (1a), on the one hand, and locative (1b) and (verb-initial) existential sentences (1c), on the other hand.

- (1) a. A torta a hűtőben van.
 the cake the fridge.in is
 ‘The cake is in the fridge.’
- b. (Egy) egér van az asztal alatt.
 (a) mouse is the table under
 ‘There is (a) mouse under the table.’
- c. Van egy torta a hűtőben.
 is a cake the fridge.in
 ‘There is a cake in the fridge.’

Their different word orders can be described as follows; cf. also p. 79:

- (2) a. [_{Top} DP [_{VP} PP V]]
 b. [_{VP} NP V PP]
 c. [_{Foc} V [_{VP} ... NP (PP)]]

More importantly, they also differ in two very important ways: (i) the presence or lack of predicate movement, and (ii) the type of subject that is licensed in the sentence. More precisely, copular clauses have predicate movement and they allow non-specific indefinite, specific indefinite, as well as definite subjects; while locatives and existentials lack predicate movement (hence no complex predicate formation) and they allow only non-specific indefinite subjects. Moreover, there is a two-fold difference between locative and existential sentences. Firstly, the PP-predicate is obligatory in locatives, but optional in existentials. Secondly, existentials involve focus on the verb *be*, while locatives do not.

Chapter 4, *Predicative PPs and Particles* (pp. 85–132), describes spatial elements in Hungarian. It opens with an important caveat: the various kinds of elements used to express spatial relations in Hungarian (i.e. postpositions, oblique case suffixes, spatial particles, and certain adverbs) do not project different syntactic structures, but they all belong to the category of adpositions. Naturally, there are differences between them, but these are due to their morpho-phonological status and their syntactic position within PP.

First, based on semantic and diachronic evidence, the author discusses the similarity between postpositions and suffixes. Then, the attention is shifted to the properties of ‘dressed’ or agreeing postpositions (which are marked for person and number agreement but do not trigger case-marking on their pronominal complements), and ‘naked’ or non-agreeing postpositions (which are not marked for person and number agreement but take oblique case-marked complements).

The list of the properties they share and they differ in helps the readers to have a general overview of the described phenomena and keep track of what material has been covered. Later, the author turns to (oblique) case suffixes and compares their behaviour to postpositional elements. In spite of the differences between them, which have led some to conclude that they are fundamentally different categories, the author suggests that they are instantiations of the same category (that is, the category of adpositions), and mentions some reasons for unifying the two categories. The last subsection explores particles and adverbial elements. The author brings arguments not only for taking particles to be adpositional, but also for considering locative and directional elements to be of the same type. The basic conclusion, based on their semantic properties and syntactic distribution, is that they are best regarded as adpositions.

The next section discusses the syntax of Hungarian PPs. First, it gives a brief overview of the results of cross-linguistic studies concerning the structure of adpositional phrases, and introduces the well-known Place and Path projections (and, naturally, other functional layers). Then, it provides evidence for the proposal that particles are part of the extended projection of PP (pP > PathP > PlaceP > DP). The proposed hierarchy gives a straightforward explanation for the observed differences between dressed and naked Ps, and the similarities between naked Ps and particles.

This section of Chapter 4 extends the proposal of complex predicate formation to particles and other PP elements. The essential claim is that particle movement is an instance of leftward predicate movement and it takes place in order to create syntactic complex predicates. As expected, the landing site of the moved element is [Spec,VP]. In fact, this analysis accounts for all the instances where PP moves to the preverbal position, that is, all the cases where a full-fledged predicative PP appears preverbally or where the preverbal particle co-occurs with a postverbal PP.

The last section of the chapter extends the analysis to other secondary predicate constructions: depictives, resultatives, and *consider*-type constructions. With the exception of depictives, where the secondary predicate is always focused and thus its presence right before the verb is not the result of predicate movement, the other two structures are shown to be instances of predicate movement.

Chapter 5, Predicate Movement (pp. 133–143), deals with predicate movement. Approaches to syntactic predicate movement fall into two large groups. One approach, called the PredP approach, takes predicate movement to be an instance of semantically motivated displacement into a position designated for predicative elements. The other proposal, called the \emptyset -feature agreement approach, takes predicate movement to be a subcase of movement into an argument position (i.e. a case of A-movement) triggered by a property of the verb itself rather than a property of the moving constituent. After presenting the

drawbacks of the first approach, the author turns to the advantages of the second approach, which can derive all predicate movements based on its general assumptions about feature checking, and it also handles the (limited) variation we find in the movement of the subject or the predicate of the small clause.

Chapter 6, Conclusions (pp. 145–146), is more than just a summary of the basic arguments and the conclusions of the monograph. It also discusses the implications of the main findings.

Generally speaking, we can say that the book is very well organized. The chapters are logically connected to each other. Only after having a general overview of different predicate movements can the reader understand why predicate movement is analyzed in the way it is in the final theoretical chapter.

Though the bulk of the discussion should be accessible (and of interest) to readers with only a general knowledge of generative syntax, there are some parts where the discussion is of a rather technical nature. And this should come as no surprise, as generative syntax is very often associated with complex technical formalism.

There is only one negative aspect that I would like to mention here. Although the discussion proper is preceded by a theoretical background, in some cases the presentation lacks clarity. Furthermore, in some cases there is no clear position taken by the author. For example, on p. 112 the author claims that she assumes the base-generated order of PP elements to be Place + DP (i.e. *alatt az asztal* ‘under the table’) and derive the P-final order (i.e. *az asztal alatt* ‘the table under’) either by a syntactic or a post-syntactic process. Unfortunately, this is not the best approach to explaining the way the surface order is derived. In the same way, although in some cases the author digs deep into the problem of VMs, the analysis sometimes proves to be superficial. For instance, on the same page, the author claims that „I see no reason at this point in the case of Hungarian PPs for making a syntactic distinction between different PATHs. Thus I will use the overarching PATH category for all different paths, and label the projection PathP” (p. 112). Some argue that much like the verb phrase can be split up into vP, VP and RP (cf. Ramchand 2008), PathP can also be split up into GoalP, SourceP, RouteP, etc. What Hegedűs says here is that in Hungarian the different PathPs do not differ in their syntactic distribution, and so there is no empirical motivation internal to Hungarian to decompose PathP into smaller layers. There may be a motivation and a reasoning behind this, but in my opinion it is a pity to make no mention of the multiple smaller projections of the (Hungarian) PathP.

However, I do wish to emphasize that this shortcoming does not detract from the real value of the book, as this is an invaluable contribution to the syntactic structure of Hungarian, and for this the author is to be praised.

References:

- Ramchand, Gillian (2008), *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon. A First-Phase Syntax*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Stowell, Tim (1991), *Small Clause Restructuring*. In: Freidin, Robert (ed.), *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*. The MIT Press, Cambridge/ MA. 182–218.

Imola-Ágnes Farkas

**H. Varga Márta, Formák és funkciók
Morfoszintaktikai eszközök és grammatikai jelentések vizsgálata.**

Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kar –
Patrocinium Kiadó, Budapest, 2012. 326 o.

Ahogy az a címből is kiderül, kettős céllal készült kötetet vehetünk a kezünkbe. A „Formák és funkciók” egyrészt a felsőoktatásban szeretne segítséget nyújtani a hallgatóknak, elsősorban a 20–21. századi nyelvelméletekről szóló összegző áttekintéssel, ami az ismeretterjesztés mellett oktatási segédanyagként is felhasználható. A második és harmadik rész esettanulmányaiban pedig különféle morfoszintaktikai eszközökre (főként képzőkre), valamint általános grammatikai jelentésekre (például a redundancia, a hiány vagy a birtoklás) vonatkozó leíró elemzéseket találunk.

Az egymást követő összefüggő nyelvelméleti rendszerek vizsgálatának aktuális voltát mutatja az a kutatói tapasztalat, mely szerint: „Mintha ilyen korszakban, több évtized óta tartó folyamatos »felújítás«, »átépítés« alatt lenne a nyelv-tudomány (ma) is” (H. Varga 2012: 9). A kötet szerzője a mai nyelvelméleteket érintő átalakulások két aspektusát emeli ki: egyrészt a (más tudományfilozófiai összefüggések nyomán kialakuló) diszciplináris bővülés igényét, másrészt pedig az elméleti kutatások előtérbe kerülését, az elméletalkotás hangsúlyossá válását.

A nyelvelméleti modellek alakulását tekintve nem könnyű megállapítani, hogy a módszertani és megközelítésbeli változások mindig egyértelműen integrálhatók-e, illetve hogyan hatnak vissza az adott elmélet alapelveire. Korántsem magától értetődő például, hogy az időről időre felszínre kerülő, korábban megoldhatatlannak tűnő problémák minden esetben kezelhetők maradnak-e az elmélet eszközeivel, vagy ezek integrálása valamiféle szemléletváltást vetít előre (a nyelvtörténeti adat megítélése kapcsán vö. Dömötör 2012: 49).

A kötet első nagy fejezete nyomán („A huszadik század »legbefolyásosabb« [a szerző kiemelése] nyelvelméleti irányzatai” 17–70) jogosan vetődik fel a kérdés,