

REVIEWS

The syntax of argument structure. By LEONARD H. BABBY. (Cambridge studies in linguistics 120.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Pp. xviii, 307. ISBN 9780521182331. \$39.99.

Reviewed by SERGEI TATEVOSOV, *Moscow State University*

Leonard Babby is a scholar whose investigations into Russian and Slavic linguistics made the field what it currently is. Over the past few decades, his work has always been a source of inspiration for those who seek a better understanding of the structure of Slavic languages and for those who wish to integrate their material into linguistic theory. The book summarizes much of B's previous work on diverse topics in Russian syntax, which includes, but is not limited to, control, case, structure of adjectives, nominalizations, and verbal adjuncts. Presenting mature results of detailed reflection, however, the book introduces an entirely new perspective on how a number of apparently unrelated phenomena can be approached. B offers a novel theory of argument structure and shows how the most complicated syntactic phenomena can be successfully dealt with by reducing an explanation to argument structure considerations. The reader will benefit from acquaintance with this outstanding piece of research in at least two respects. First, this work seems to have every chance of becoming a bedside book for the next generations of Slavic linguists: so wide is its empirical coverage and deep are its observations and generalizations. Second, B uncompromisingly goes against the current reductionist trend of simplifying presyntactic, lexical computation to the absolute minimum, ideally to zero: he articulates lexical representations of argument structure and defines a number of operations on them. The reader who believes that a model with an impoverished lexicon is to be preferred on conceptual grounds will be interested to learn how far a theory can take us that assumes exactly the opposite.

Most of the book is exclusively based on Russian material. The only exception is Ch. 1, where architectural principles of the theory are established. B assumes a rich lexicon in which predicate argument structure is built up and various structure-changing operations apply. The essential theoretical construct is a DIATHESIS assigned to all lexical stems and most derivational affixes, which stores item-specific properties of argument structure. The diathesis is thought of as a pairing of two tiers, a θ -ROLE SELECTION TIER and a categorial tier, or C-SELECTION TIER. For instance, 1 is a diathesis of a ditransitive verb.

(1) Full notation	Flat notation
i j k -	$\{i^{\wedge N}\}_1 \{j^{\wedge N}\}_2 \{k^{\wedge N}\}_3 \{-^{\wedge V}\}_4$
N N N V	
1 2 3 4	

where i, j, k are θ -roles, N is a categorial noun head, V is a verb-stem head, and numbers represent a relative position of an argument in the diathesis. \wedge in the flat notation is a linking relation.

The θ -role tier represents thematic information about arguments of a stem, and the c-selection tier indicates what lexical category the argument is associated with in the syntax. Slots in the two tiers are linked pair-wise; hence an argument (e.g. $\{i^{\wedge N}\}_1$) is a pairing of a θ -role (e.g. i) and a categorial label (e.g. N). A stem can have up to three arguments, so the complete diathesis consists of the four pairs of slots, one for the stem and three for its arguments.

Diathetic representations entirely determine grammatical relations within vP , which places the theory in line with projectionist (as opposed to constructionist, e.g. Borer 2005 and Ramchand 2008) approaches to grammar. In the syntax, arguments merge one by one, left to right, so that $\{k^{\wedge N}\}_3$ appears as a complement of V ; $\{j^{\wedge N}\}_2$ is mapped to Spec, VP position; and the external argument, $\{i^{\wedge N}\}_1$, merges at Spec, vP .

The two-level organization of argument structure is the most innovative aspect of B's approach to the lexicon-syntax interface (even if superficially B's diathesis bears remote resemblance to Mel'čuk's (1974 and further work) notion of *model' upravlenija* 'valency pattern'). B's crucial argument for keeping the θ -role and c-selection tiers apart comes from the set of observations suggesting that neither properties of the former can be predicted from the properties of the latter, nor vice versa. (Nor can either of them be read off from the lexical semantics of the verb.) Empirical evidence supporting this generalization is served, in particular, by the argument structure of the so-called transitive-impersonal verbs like *tošnit'* 'nauseate'. B argues that this type of verb is indistinguishable from unaccusatives in terms of theta properties alone. While both have a theme argument, for unaccusatives, this argument appears as a nominative sentential subject, whereas transitive-impersonal verbs create a peculiar structure where the theme is case-marked like a direct object and no nominative subject is licensed. Here, B argues, the role of the c-selection tier is revealed, since it is at this tier that syntactic realization of arguments is determined, as shown in 2.

- (2) transitive-impersonal verbs: $\{\{-^{\wedge}\}_1 \{j^{\wedge}N\}_2 \{-^{\wedge}\}_3 \{-^{\wedge}V\}_4\}$
 unaccusative verbs: $\{\{-^{\wedge}N\}_1 \{j^{\wedge}\}_2 \{-^{\wedge}\}_3 \{-^{\wedge}V\}_4\}$

For transitive-impersonal verbs, the j ('theme') θ -role is linked to N, and the argument projects as a direct object. For unaccusatives, the j role is not linked to N: N appears in the external argument position in the diathesis, which lacks a θ -role. As a result, an operation of relinking is invoked to repair this double mismatch, and the j argument ends up in the external argument position: $\{\{-^{\wedge}N\}_1 \{j^{\wedge}\}_2 \dots\} \gg \{\{j^{\wedge}N\}_1 \{-^{\wedge}\}_2 \dots\}$. This derived diathesis is then syntactically projected, and the theme argument appears in the subject position. On this view, the derivation of unaccusatives is an operation on argument structure that happens prior to the syntax, hence does not involve A-movement (DP [V t]): the single argument of unaccusatives first merges in Spec, ν P, that is, in the same position as the external argument of transitives and unergatives.

Diathetic representations are subject to application of various structure-changing operations, mostly triggered by morphological affixation. The crucial assumption B makes is that affixes are associated with their own diatheses, and whenever an affix combines with the verb, the two diatheses merge. The general principle of diathetic composition assumed throughout the book is that information specified in the affix diathesis overrides that from the stem diathesis.

Specific instances of diathesis-changing operations include secondary-predicate (s-predicate) formation, causativization, passivization, and a few others. Thus, for example, the causative affix introduces the external θ -role linked to N, $\{i_c^{\wedge}N\}$, and causativization results in delinking the original external i θ -role (if there is any) from its initial position, and relinking it to the closest available θ -position. In a similar fashion, the passive induces relinking of the external θ -role to a lower position in the diathesis, but does not introduce a new θ -role. Simultaneously, the passive delinks the theme θ -role from the N position in the c-selection tier, creating a variant of derived unaccusative diathesis: $\{\{-^{\wedge}N\}_1 \{j^{\wedge}\}_2 \{-^{\wedge}\}_3 \{i^{\wedge}V\text{-pass}\}_4\}$. Affixes that produce s-predicates operate on the c-selection tier only: they delink the i θ -role from N ($\{i^{\wedge}\}_1$) with the effect that i cannot be realized by a noun phrase in the syntax and is to be 'vertically bound' (Williams 1994) from the outside.

S-predicates are central to the narrative: the distinction between s-predicates and other types of derived diatheses cuts across different categories and constructions in Russian. The so-called long form (LF) adjectives from Ch. 2 (e.g. *vkusnyj* 'tasty', as opposed to the short form (SF) adjectives like *vkusen-Ø* 'tasty'), participles and deverbal adverbs from Ch. 3, and infinitival complements in subject-control and some of the object-control configurations from Ch. 4 are all s-predicates; they all possess an external i θ -role delinked from N that needs to be vertically bound. As a consequence, all of those superficially diverse types of constituents merge as adjuncts, and similarities of their distribution follow with no additional effort.

The analysis makes a number of nontrivial predictions about constructions under investigation. In Ch. 2, B presents a diverse array of empirical evidence suggesting that LF adjectives are in-

variably adnominal modifiers. Even if an adjective appears at first glance to be occurring in the predicative position, its derivation involves a silent noun: [_{VP} V_{no} [_{V'} bylo [_{NP} vkusnoe_{LF} n]]] lit. 'The wine was a good_{LF} one'. This analysis of LF adjectives naturally extends to the three types of participles examined in Ch. 3. Yet another type of s-predicates is deverbal adverbials, as in *Nikita spal, ne razdevajas* 'Nikita was sleeping without getting undressed'. Instances of adverbial morphology are literally identical in diathetic terms to the LF adjectival suffix, which correctly predicts that they project a configuration with no external argument whatsoever.

The crucial diagnostic that allows one to detect an s-predicate or clausal status of the vast majority of structures discussed in the book is based on one of B's most fascinating empirical discoveries (made partly in his previous work) about agreement of pronominal adjectives like *sam* 'by oneself' and *odin* 'alone' as well as depictive adjectives. They all have to agree in case, number, and gender with a local c-commanding antecedent (cf. *Vasja_{M,NOM} prišel odin_{M,NOM}* 'Vasja came alone' vs. *Vale_{EDAT} ne spalos' odnoj_{EDAT}* 'Vasja could not sleep alone'). Having examined the distribution of *sam* in a wide variety of diverse configurations, including infinitival constructions and deverbal adverbials, B arrives at a simple and elegant generalization. Whenever *sam* 'by oneself' appears in the dative, there is a clause-mate dative subject that can under relevant circumstances be overt, but is most frequently realized as PRO.

Whenever *sam* 'by oneself' occurs in an environment like 3 and agrees with one of the arguments of the matrix verb, this indicates that V-aff does not project its own subject (neither overt nor PRO), and hence α is an s-predicate. This option is instantiated by subject-control configurations like *Vasja_{M,NOM} [xočet [_{inIP} ujtj [_{aP} odin_{M,NOM}]]]* 'Vasja wants to leave alone', object-control structures like *Vasja_{M,NOM} [prosil eë_{EACC} [_{inIP} ujtj [_{aP} odnu_{EACC}]]]* 'Vasja asked her to leave alone', and all deverbal adverbials like [_{gP} *Ostavšis' odin_{M,NOM}*], *Vasja_{M,NOM} zadumalsja* 'After he left on his own, Vasja started thinking'.

(3) [... Vmatrix ... [α ... V-aff ... *sam* ...] ...]

Another pattern is where *sam* appears in the fixed (dative) case. B takes this to be indicative of V-aff projecting a subject, and α being a (small) clause. The subject invariably bears the dative case and triggers agreement on *sam* no matter whether it is overt or is realized as PRO: [... Vmatrix ... [α PRO_{DAT} ... V-aff ... *sam_{DAT}* ...] ...]. Specific realizations of this option include the majority of object-control structures and subject-control structures where the projection of some head separates InfP from the matrix V. B thus proposes that, despite superficial similarity, infinitival constructions represent two radically different derivations: infinitives can head both s-predicates, which are integrated into a monoclausal configuration, and s-clauses, which lead to biclausality.

A theory that shows its strengths in providing appealing explanations for a variety of complicated phenomena seldom comes out without assumptions vulnerable to criticism. B's theory of argument structure is a perfect example of fully consistent, thorough, and thoughtful reasoning. Still, I believe it leaves certain room for further reflection on the matter.

For one, the framework based on the 4 * 2 architecture of the diathesis seems to be too restrictive to capture the recursive character of some of the valence-changing operations. Specifically, we do not expect that a ditransitive nonderived verb can be causativized more than once. Causativization of any ditransitive verb necessarily yields a diathesis where all of the four slots are filled (three initial arguments plus one introduced by the causative morpheme); since no more arguments can be added, the derived stem is predicted not to undergo further causativization. This is not so, however, even in the languages that have the same genetic affiliation as Turkish discussed in Ch. 1. In Karachay-Balkar (Lyutikova & Tatevosov 2013), there are no principled restrictions on double, triple, and even quadruple causatives. For a rigid 4 * 2 template that has space only for four arguments, this may turn out to be problematic.

By contrast, more needs to be said to make sure that the theory in its present form does not run into the danger of overgeneration. For instance, there is a diathesis of unaccusative verb stems of the form $\{\{-^{\wedge}N\}_1 \{j^{\wedge}\}_2 \{-^{\wedge}\}_3 \{-^{\wedge}V\}_4\}$ that involves a mismatch between θ -role and c-selection tiers. If this is a possible initial diathesis, the question arises of whether its mirror-image is among possible diatheses, too: $\{\{i^{\wedge}\}_1 \{-^{\wedge}N\}_2 \{-^{\wedge}\}_3 \{-^{\wedge}V\}_4\}$. If such a diathesis exists in some lan-

guage, it should ultimately yield an agentive impersonal verb by relinking *i* to N_2 . If it does not, some well-formedness conditions are called for to complement the basic 4 * 2 architecture, since it is not immediately obvious if the theory in its present form offers a simple way of excluding nonattested argument structure types.

Another area where further qualifications seem to do no harm is a typology of possible diathetic operations. Throughout the book, we see that if diatheses of a stem and of an affix are in conflict, resolution techniques are different for elements of the θ -tier and c-selection tier. When the ‘-’ specification in the c-selection tier of the affix encounters the ‘N’ specification of the stem, the latter deletes. If the same happens to the affix’s ‘-’ at the θ -tier, the offending θ -role of the stem is displaced rather than deleted. This asymmetry is especially prominent in the passive derivation, where the passive morpheme ERASES N_2 , but RELINKS the *i* θ -role. Some asymmetric relation between the tiers thus seems to underlie the difference, and specifying it explicitly would definitely result in a lot of advantages.

Finally, some operations may look construction-specific. B discusses two types of passive in Russian, the verbal *sja*-passive and participial *en*-passive. Both passive affixes have the same diathesis, but results of their application differ. When the former is attached, the external θ -role obligatorily relinks, while with the latter it EITHER relinks OR is deleted. On this analysis, the difference between the two types of passives is not fully determined by the diathesis, but is rather built directly into the rules of diathetic composition.

It should be emphasized, however, that complications, if any, do not appear to be artifacts of the theory; in the vast majority of cases, they reflect genuine complexity of the material. B offers a stimulating and inspiring perspective on the issues discussed, and it is particularly for this reason that his book will be exceptionally useful for practicing Slavic linguistics.

REFERENCES

- BORER, HAGIT. 2005. *Structuring sense*. Vols. 1–2. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LYUTIKOVA, EKATERINA, and SERGEI TATEVOSOV. 2013. Causativization and event structure. *Causation in grammatical structures*, ed. by Bridget Copley and Fabienne Martin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, to appear.
- MEL’ČUK, IGOR. 1974. *Opyt teorii lingvističeskix modelej ‘Smysl—Text’*. Moscow: Nauka.
- RAMCHAND, GILLIAN. 2008. *Verb meaning and the lexicon: A first phase syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WILLIAMS, EDWIN. 1994. *Thematic structure in syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics
Lomonosov Moscow State University
1, Leninskije Gory
Moscow 119899, Russia
[Tatevos@philol.msu.ru]

Topic and discourse structure in West Greenlandic agreement constructions. By ANNA BERGE. (Studies in the native languages of the Americas.) Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press (in cooperation with the American Indian Studies Research Institute, Indiana University, Bloomington), 2011. Pp. xviii, 446. ISBN 9780803216457. \$75 (Hb).

Reviewed by LOUIS-JACQUES DORAIS, *Université Laval*

This book is a reworked version of the author’s Ph.D. dissertation completed in 1997. It won the Mary R. Haas Award presented by the Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas (SSILA), but unfortunately, it had been held up in review for an unusually long period of time. Its publication is, thus, especially welcome.

Anna Berge's objective is to provide readers with an analysis of West Greenlandic agreement constructions based on the structure of discourse rather than on a traditional syntactic approach, by stressing the primacy of topic over the roles of subject and object. Her motivation for so doing stems from two factors: (i) the inadequacy of a purely syntactic analysis for describing ergative languages such as West Greenlandic (the Inuit dialect spoken on the western coast of Greenland), and (ii) the fact that studying syntax through decontextualized sentences entails various problems, including a high number of exceptions that the theory cannot explain without having recourse to nonsyntactic elements (e.g. information flow, 'psychological subject').

The study uses spoken West Greenlandic texts as raw materials—totaling more than 600 clauses—that B collected in the field by interviewing two local consultants in their native language, and by asking two more to talk freely about their personal recollections. All of the data appear in the appendix at the end of the book, with their morphological analyses and English translations. Data analysis is generally correct, except for a small number of errors that do not impair the validity of the study.

The book is divided into five chapters. It opens with an introduction discussing West Greenlandic grammar, its role (and that of other Inuit dialects) in syntactic theory, approaches to the study of discourse, and their application to discourse structure in West Greenlandic. This is followed by three core chapters that deal respectively with topic and theme as discourse roles, ergativity as a reflection of topic status, and a discussion of the relevance of switch-reference vs. thematic coherence and topic continuity. Each of these core chapters starts by positioning the chapter's matter within general linguistic theory, before describing in detail what West Greenlandic data analysis has to tell us about the topic under examination. The book ends with a conclusion summarizing its findings and hinting at some more general extrapolations that stem from West Greenlandic discourse analysis.

The author's core argument is that in West Greenlandic, the chief factor governing agreement marking is not strictly syntactic, because studies of the language, whether dealing with ergativity, transitivity, or the difference between the ergative and antipassive verbal voices, must always involve nonsyntactic elements in their explanation. This suggests that discourse is particularly important in grammatical analysis. If discourse can predictably affect syntactic constructions, it must possess predictable structural components—as syntax and semantics do—that are necessary to an adequate description of linguistic structure. Several theories have been used in studying West Greenlandic, but without a comprehensive description of what is needed to speak the language, and this at all levels of linguistic complexity (including semantics, discourse, pragmatics, and sociolinguistics), a linguist's analysis risks being tributary to the theory to which he or she adheres.

According to B, in order to be satisfactory, the study of discourse must consider central issues such as its effect on syntax, the patterns of information flow, and the thematic development of a text, as well as the sociocultural context within which a text is produced. The central premise of her study is that certain constructions that mark textual cohesion in West Greenlandic can best be understood by assuming that discourse roles such as topic—rather than syntactic roles such as subject or object—are the most relevant structural items. This means that discourse must be viewed as a structure, rather than, for example, in terms of textual cohesiveness and pragmatics. Discourse units or roles must be defined, so that discourse structure is studied in a way comparable to the study of other levels of comparative analysis.

The author's analysis of West Greenlandic agreement constructions rests on two discourse units: topic and theme. Topic is defined as a nominal entity with prominence across a continuous stretch of discourse (47), while theme is the result of a complex of information associated with processes and actions across more than one clause (57–58). In this way, the basic opposition between noun and verb, or argument and predicate, can be extended to discourse structure.

In West Greenlandic, the examination of the assignment of absolutive (i.e. nonmarked) case in a study of ergativity, and of coreference and noncoreference in a study of switch-reference in subordinate clauses, shows apparent anomalies in the assignment of agreement when agreement is interpreted with traditional theories about the circumstances of this assignment. B's data analysis shows that 'anomalous' agreement patterns are better explained by assuming agreement with a

topic—a discourse role—rather than with a subject or an object—two syntactic roles. Moreover, one must assume the existence of a dichotomy between topic and theme, analogous to the syntactic dichotomy between noun phrases and verb phrases.

More concretely, this means that in West Greenlandic (and other Inuit dialects), absolutive objects are not random definite noun phrases, as suggested by a majority of existing studies. They may rather be considered discourse items that show continuity and prominence throughout a part of the text; that is, they can be defined as topics. Conversely, demoted objects are not random indefinite noun phrases, but noun phrases with no continuity or prominence. Moreover, when in context, coreferent pronominal inflections on the verb are consistently found in cases where the topic of a previous clause or piece of text is continued—and noncoreferent inflections are found where the topic is not continued.

This form of grammatical analysis through discourse explains most (but not all) problematic cases not readily explainable in purely syntactic terms. This supposes that discourse has a structure, like syntax. The terms and methods used to describe syntactic structures can, thus, be extended to describe discourse-level structures. This does not mean that syntactic analysis (e.g. subject/object) is not relevant. It may work well with some languages like English, but much less so with others (such as West Greenlandic) where discourse analysis (in terms of topicality) is more efficient.

These findings allow the author to conclude with a few generalizations. Languages vary greatly within each of a number of broad categories of their grammars. Thus, there is no a priori reason why a language should not have the means to formally distinguish the topic, regardless of the syntactic or semantic character of this topic (e.g. its status as subject/object, agent/patient, animate/inanimate). As a consequence, it is methodologically important to study discourse within the context of discourse. The linguistic analysis of discourse cannot be based on the study of decontextualized clauses. If a language has grammaticalized discourse roles, studying clauses and sentences in isolation will only result in inadequate and, perhaps, faulty descriptions. Finally, any functional approach to linguistic description should take context into account. One should explain the choices that a speaker has in indicating information status in discourse, rather than speaking about more or less abstract and decontextualized grammatical constraints.

Anna Berge's book is important. Based on an excellent knowledge of Eskimo-Aleut and general linguistic literature, as well as on a meticulous, detailed, and generally flawless analysis of West Greenlandic oral texts, her book answers old questions in a novel way: in an ergative language like West Greenlandic, why can the absolutive, nonmarked, nominal case express either a subject or an object noun phrase, depending on the type (ergative or antipassive) of verbal clause?; what semantic or other principle governs the choice of this or that type of clause? B's application of formal discourse analysis to West Greenlandic grammar (and that of other Inuit dialects) allows for a much better understanding of linguistic processes whose explanation had, until now, largely been left to intuition.

Université Laval
 Department of Anthropology
 1030 avenue des Sciences Humaines
 Québec, QC, Canada G1V 0A6
 [louis-jacques.dorais@ant.ulaval.ca]

Discourse-related features and functional projections. By SILVIO CRUSCHINA. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. Pp. xv, 251. ISBN 9780199759606. \$45.

Reviewed by MANUEL LEONETTI, *Universidad de Alcalá*

Sicilian, together with Sardinian, stands out among Romance languages for certain peculiarities in word-order patterns. In Sicilian the marked pattern usually known as focus fronting (FF) can express contrastive focus, like in other Romance varieties, but also noncontrastive, informa-

tional focus. A speaker may answer a question like *Who is it?* by resorting to FF, as in *Montalbano sono* ‘It’s Montalbano’. This makes Sicilian a very interesting source of data for recent theories on focus and information structure. In *Discourse-related features and functional projections*, originally his doctoral dissertation at Cambridge University, Silvio Cruschina investigates marked word-order patterns in Sicilian and Romance from the perspective of modern cartographic approaches to clausal structure. The book, released in March 2012, consists of six chapters plus three indices. It is clearly written and very well organized, so that even the most technical sections are quite accessible to the reader. Though it focuses on syntax, rich and detailed observations on interpretive matters and the role of pragmatics can be found in every section.

Ch. 1 begins with a useful review of the basic notions of topic, information focus, and contrastive focus, and their implementation in syntax as formal features. It also contains a presentation of the cartographic project in current generative grammar, with particular attention to Rizzi’s (1997) proposals. The cartographic approach is characterized by the prominent role of functional projections in determining both semantic interpretation and crosslinguistic variation. Movement is feature-driven: it is triggered by syntactic features situated in functional heads such as topic and focus, associated with specific discourse-related interpretive effects (discourse-related features). A family of principles called CRITERIA in Rizzi 1997 and subsequent work ensures that, if a feature appears on a head, there must be local agreement between the head and a phrase endowed with the same feature in the corresponding specifier. As the author explicitly states, ‘the primary purpose of the volume is to provide additional empirical evidence in favor of a feature-driven approach, and specifically Rizzian Criteria approach’ (31). It is not among my goals here to discuss the pros and cons of C’s theoretical framework: I simply assume that it is worth exploring its possibilities and consequences for the study of word order and information structure.

Once the theoretical framework has been established, Ch. 2 presents a detailed description of Sicilian word-order variation and how it corresponds to information structure. According to C, Sicilian is a discourse-configurational language in which a bundle of discourse-related features fully determines word order. The first salient property of Sicilian is that nonfocal constituents must be obligatorily dislocated and linked to resumptive clitics, as stated by the principle of SYNTACTIC EXTRAPOSITION (22; perhaps DISLOCATION could have been a more appropriate term). A comparison between Sicilian and Italian shows that Italian exhibits a weaker version of the condition on extraposition, allowing for in-situ distressed constituents (marginalization) and left dislocation of prepositional phrases without resumption (simple preposing), which are excluded in Sicilian. The second salient property of Sicilian, shared with Sardinian, is that FF is not exclusively related to contrastive focus, but involves informational focus as well, as in the following examples.

- (1) a. **A frevi** aju.
 the fever have.PRES.1SG
 ‘I have a temperature.’
 b. Sissi, **cuntenti** sugnu!
 yes glad be.PRES.1SG
 ‘Yes indeed, I am glad!’

This kind of noncontrastive FF, usually unavailable in other Romance varieties, is possible in different sentence types and with different categories. It is mostly used in yes-no questions, in exclamatives, and in answers to questions. As an optional syntactic strategy, it conveys extra interpretive effects that are absent from its counterparts without fronting. C globally characterizes such effects as ‘emphasis’. They vary from anger, concern, or fright to surprise, incredulity, and unexpectedness. FF in fact counts as a mark of mirativity in many cases, even in sentences that express wide focus (70–71), which, incidentally, seems to be incompatible with the very notion of FF. C addresses the natural question that such variety of contextual values raises—that is, what is behind them?—and suggests a solution in terms of ‘relevance’: if the relevance of a piece of information is related to the range of contextual effects that its processing produces, then it is possible to claim that the function of Sicilian FF is that of marking fronted constituents as relevant

common properties, C presents some significant syntactic differences: adjacency requirements with respect to the verb (strong with WH-phrases, much weaker with FF, at least in Italian) and extraction across weak islands (where argumental WH-phrases must be D-linked, but FF does not require D-linking). The parallelism is restored, however, by means of the distinction between CFoc and IFoc. C claims that WH-phrases behave essentially like IFoc, CFoc being a different phenomenon. Given that IFoc and CFoc represent two different functional projections, WH-movement should target the lower position, IFocP. The distinction in the domain of focus finds a natural counterpart in the interrogative domain: IFoc corresponds to non-D-linked WH-phrases, and CFoc corresponds to D-linked WH-phrases. The feature underlying such a system of distinctions is [contrast], and it is contrast that CFoc and D-linked interrogatives have in common. C assumes, relying on syntactic evidence from Italian and Romanian, that D-linked and non-D-linked WH-phrases target different functional positions, just like FF. This direct correspondence between two types of focus and two types of interrogative phrase is the major contribution of Ch. 4. Once the correlation between focus and WH-phrases is thus established on new grounds, C exploits the technical tools of the cartographic approach to explain what still represents an asymmetry: languages like Italian have in-situ informational focus, but lack in-situ WH-phrases. A formal solution is proposed based on the role of substantive and formal features in checking mechanisms, and on the assumption that a lower, clause-internal, FocP is available at the edge of vP (cf. Belletti 2004) to which informational focus raises in languages like Italian, in addition to the two higher, clause-external, FocPs. In this way, C shows how a cartographic approach built on discourse-related features is able to deal with crosslinguistic variation in marked word-order patterns. His proposal is certainly well articulated and attractive. It is not clear to me, however, that casting the interpretive notion of D-linking in a strictly syntactic mold is a promising strategy, especially in view of examples where D-linking seems to be an aspect of interpretation that speakers pragmatically infer to 'rescue' WH-phrases in certain 'hostile environments'.

Finally, the role of information structure in yes-no questions, in particular the association of focus and the interrogative operator with special attention to Sicilian, is investigated in Ch. 5. C first analyzes the Sicilian interrogative particle *chi* as the overt realization of the interrogative complementizer in the head of an interrogative projection (and not as a standard complementizer), on the basis of the relative order of *chi* with respect to topics and fronted foci. In the rest of the chapter, C offers a detailed study of word order in Romance yes-no questions, comparing the grammar of Sicilian *chi* with the behavior of other particles, such as Catalan *que*, Sardinian *a*, and *che* in central and southern Italian dialects. Most word-order patterns in yes-no questions are motivated by the requirement that the interrogative operator take scope over the focus constituent.

C's book is a highly valuable contribution both to Romance linguistics and to syntactic theory. It provides us with an in-depth study of information structure in Sicilian and with new empirical data that will play a prominent role in future research on the grammar of focus and on Romance comparative syntax. Furthermore, it succeeds in showing the possibilities of the cartographic approach for investigating crosslinguistic variation. In fact, it offers very stimulating analyses also for those readers who are not committed to the cartographic model and may be looking for alternative solutions based on a different view of the syntax-information structure interface. C provides us with a truly outstanding piece of research, and a useful tool for anyone interested in Romance syntax.

REFERENCES

- BELLETTI, ADRIANA. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. *Structures and strategies*, 161–91. New York: Routledge.
- BRUNETTI, LISA. 2009. On the pragmatics of post-focal material in Italian. *Les linguistiques du détachement*, ed. by Denis Apothéloz, Bernard Combettes, and Franck Neveu, 151–62. Bern: Peter Lang.
- LEONETTI, MANUEL, and VICTORIA ESCANDELL-VIDAL. 2009. Fronting and verum focus in Romance. *Focus and background in Romance languages*, ed. by Andreas Dufer and Daniel Jacob, 155–204. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- RIZZI, LUIGI. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Departamento de Filología—Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
 Universidad de Alcalá
 c/ Trinidad, 5
 28801 Alcalá de Henares
 Madrid, Spain
 [manuel.leonetti@uah.es]

Objects and information structure. By MARY DALRYMPLE and IRINA NIKOLAEVA. (Cambridge studies in linguistics 131.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Pp. 248. ISBN 9780521199858. \$90 (Hb).

Reviewed by HELEN DE HOOP, *Radboud University Nijmegen*

Topics are usually pragmatically defined as what sentences are about. Usually, what is being talked about in a sentence are people, that is, what they do, how they behave, and why. Hence, the philosophical saying ‘Small people talk about people, average people talk about events, and great people talk about ideas’ has been challenged by linguists, who instead say: ‘All people talk about people’. Corpus studies of spoken language have indeed shown that the subject of most sentences is human, or at least animate, and psycholinguistic research has revealed that in many languages there is a preference both in production and comprehension for constructions that start with an animate noun phrase (see van Bergen 2011). This principle has also been proposed in functional typology to account for crosslinguistic, canonical word-order patterns. Topics are what sentences are about, which explains why they often occur sentence-initially. Topics are often the subject of a sentence, or the other way around, the grammatical subject of a sentence is often the topic. Since topics are usually subjects and subjects are often agents, it is not surprising that topics are often agents, too. Brunetti (2009) argues for Spanish and Italian that the argument with the most proto-agent properties gets selected as the sentence-initial topic, and she shows that this approach can explain why topics are often, but not always, subjects.

Subjects are often prominent or salient in the discourse: agentive, animate, and definite, but of course objects can be prominent and salient in the discourse, animate, and definite, too. Often, when a language shows differential object marking (DOM)—the phenomenon that some objects in a language trigger case marking or agreement on the verb while others do not—the marked objects are in fact these prominent or salient, animate, and/or definite objects. Dalrymple and Nikolaeva link this to the notion of topic in information structure. In their book they show that marked objects in DOM languages are often topical, while unmarked objects are nontopical. I believe this is an important insight. In their view a sentence is not simply divided into a topic and a comment, by which the object automatically ends up as part of the comment when the subject is the topic. D&N note that more than one referent can be under discussion at the time of an utterance, and hence, an utterance can have more than one topic, at least two. The two topics are not equally important, however, and that is why D&N dub them ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ topics. Clearly, subjects are more often topical than objects, and even in contexts where objects are topical, subjects do not have to be less topical. D&N note that, although there is no one-to-one mapping between grammatical functions and information-structure roles, there are strong crosslinguistic tendencies. They propose that while subjects can be viewed as grammaticalized primary topics, grammatically marked objects can be viewed as grammaticalized secondary topics. The difference between primary and secondary topics is very important for their line of argumentation. If one assumes there is only one topic per sentence, the marking of objects could not easily be understood as topic marking, due to the presence of an often more topical subject. When an object is marked as a secondary topic, however, it immediately follows that there must be a primary topic (often the subject) in the sentence as well.

I turn now to a discussion of the book’s main claim on the basis of Chs. 6–10. Ch. 6 discusses the main evidence for the relevance of topicality in the grammatical marking of nonsubjects. Chs.

7 and 8 present languages in which topical objects receive special (case or agreement) marking while nontopical objects remain unmarked. In Ch. 9 this general approach is extended to ditransitive constructions in languages with differential object marking, while Ch. 10 sketches a historical approach to differential object marking as grammaticalized secondary topic marking.

Ch. 6, 'Topical marking on nonsubjects', discusses the grammatical marking of nonsubjects. The Persian postposition *rā* is argued to be a marker of objects that are either topical (topical indefinite objects) or just 'topic-worthy' (all definite objects). The latter can be viewed as grammaticalized topicality marking that is independent of the actual discourse in which the definite object can be a secondary topic or not. Tariana is another language that marks topical nonsubjects, but in this language the marker *naku/-naku* can mark primary as well as secondary topics (as long as they are not subjects). In Itelmen, in a context like 'Where is my knife? Who did I give it to?', the secondary topic, the direct object 'knife', triggers secondary agreement on the verb 'give', while the same verb shows secondary agreement with the indirect object 'brother' in a context like 'My brother left. What did I give to him?'. The final language that exhibits topical nonsubject agreement discussed in this chapter is Tabassaran. The conclusion of the chapter is that topichood of nonsubject elements can be indicated by case marking or agreement, which provides evidence for the relevance of topicality in grammatical marking of nonsubjects.

Ch. 7, 'Topicality and DOM', discusses three languages in which topical objects are marked, giving rise to differential object marking. The first language discussed is Tundra Nenets. If the object in this language is topical, the verb shows object agreement—also when there is no subject topic. If the object is a secondary topic, object agreement is obligatory, but indefinite objects cannot trigger agreement, and neither do first- and second-person pronouns, no matter whether they are topical or not. D&N note that in some varieties of Nenets, third-person pronouns do not trigger agreement either. In Tigre and Dolakha Newar, case-marked objects are topical whereas unmarked objects are not. The conclusion is that in the languages examined in this chapter, differential object marking is governed by topicality, sometimes in combination with semantic features.

In Ch. 8, 'Primary and secondary objecthood and DOM', it is shown that in other languages the marked object of transitive verbs has different grammatical properties from the unmarked object. Although secondary agreement in Ostyak and object case marking in Mongolian, Chatino, and Hindi are determined by topicality, this is actually a side effect of the strong relation between information structure and grammatical function. The conclusion is that objects have two unmarked information-structure functions: focus and secondary topic. Marked topical objects are the grammatically primary objects in the languages under examination in this chapter, while unmarked focused objects are considered secondary objects.

Ch. 9, 'Multiple objects and grammatical alignment', offers a review of the properties of multiple object constructions in DOM languages. It shows that topical direct objects often have characteristics similar to those of recipient arguments in ditransitive constructions and that these characteristics may lead to similar marking (case or agreement) or even extend to similar grammatical functions. For example, in Hindi and Chatino, the recipient argument of a ditransitive verb is the primary object, which gets case-marked, while the theme argument is the secondary object, which remains unmarked, independently of their topicality. The conclusion of the chapter is that data from a variety of languages reinforce the claim that objects, in particular primary objects, are inherently associated with secondary topicality.

Ch. 10, 'Semantic features, topicality and grammaticalisation', argues how semantic patterns of differential object marking arise as a result of different paths of grammaticalization of topical marking on objects. The topicality of a referent is speaker-dependent: whether an object gets marked as a secondary topic depends on the speaker's estimation of the topicality of the referent in the context. The fact that some languages show differential object marking dependent on inherent semantic or syntactic features of the object rather than on its topicality can be explained as the result of (grammaticalized) frequency, in line with Haspelmath 2004. If certain types of objects, such as animate or definite objects, are very often secondary topics in the discourse, the language may develop a pattern of marking such objects without looking any more at the actual topicality of the object in context. This is reminiscent of de Swart's (2007) account in terms of

prominence, which can be based on either prominence in a given discourse or prominence on the basis of inherent properties such as animacy and definiteness. D&N argue that in some languages differential object marking first emerges as a secondary topic marking device, while only later does it come to depend partially or totally on inherent referential features of the object.

The link between object marking and (secondary) topicality is convincingly argued for in this book. Of course, some discussion points can be raised and some issues are worth further investigation. The fact that differential object marking is predominantly found in nominative-accusative languages, and that not only asymmetric DOM patterns (case or no case) exist but also symmetric ones (two different types of case) will need to be addressed in more detail (cf. de Hoop & Malchukov 2007, 2008). Similarly, one might wonder whether the analysis developed by D&N can be applied to the study of the more heterogeneous domain of differential subject marking too (cf. de Hoop & de Swart 2009). Also, although the notion of secondary topic is intuitively clear, it is not always clear why this notion is sometimes restricted to certain types of objects and not to others. For example, does the fact that local pronouns (first- and second-person pronouns) are known to be very frequently subjects relate to the fact that they resist object agreement, that is, secondary topic marking, in Tundra Nenets, as shown in Ch. 7? I expect this book will provide a source of inspiration for studies on specific instantiations of differential object marking in the future.

REFERENCES

- BRUNETTI, LISA. 2009. On the semantic and contextual factors that determine topic selection in Italian and Spanish. *The Linguistic Review* 26.261–89.
- DE HOOP, HELEN, and PETER DE SWART (eds.) 2009. *Differential subject marking*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- DE HOOP, HELEN, and ANDREJ L. MALCHUKOV. 2007. On fluid differential case marking: A bidirectional OT approach. *Lingua* 117.1636–56.
- DE HOOP, HELEN, and ANDREJ L. MALCHUKOV. 2008. Case-marking strategies. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39.565–87.
- DE SWART, PETER. 2007. *Cross-linguistic variation in object marking*. Nijmegen: Radboud University Nijmegen dissertation.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 2004. Explaining the ditransitive person-role constraint: A usage-based approach. *Constructions* 2. Online: <http://elanguage.net/journals/constructions/article/view/3073>.
- VAN BERGEN, GEERTJE. 2011. *Who's first and what's next: Animacy and word order variation in Dutch language production*. Nijmegen: Radboud University Nijmegen dissertation.

Department of Linguistics
Radboud University Nijmegen
P.O. Box 9103
6500 HD Nijmegen, The Netherlands
[h.dehoop@let.ru.nl]

The syntax and semantics of a determiner system: A case study of Mauritian Creole.

By DIANA GUILLEMIN. (Creole language library 38.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011. Pp. xv, 310. ISBN 9789027252609. \$158 (Hb).

Reviewed by ANNA SZABOLCSI, *New York University*

Mauritian Creole (MC) is a French lexifier creole with Kwa and Bantu substrate languages. In the early nineteenth century MC lost the French determiners *le/la* ‘the’ and *du* (partitive ‘some’), often incorporating them into the noun stems, and became, in stark contrast to French, a language that allows bare count and mass nouns in argument positions. Diana Guillemin’s book is dedicated to the documentation and theoretical analysis of that change, as well as the new system of determiners and quantifiers that subsequently emerged in MC. G is a native speaker of MC, but the study is primarily corpus-based, with over eighty text sources, ranging from eighteenth-century documents to Baissac’s (1880, 1888) collections to recent internet posts. The analysis is carried out using current formal semantic and generative syntactic theories.

The interest of the work is manifold. One of the highlights is the study of specificity vs. definiteness in a language that lacks an overt definite article. MC diverges from its lexifier and resembles its substrate languages, which have been observed to mark specificity, rather than definiteness. To illustrate, consider the example in 1 (simplified from ex. 22 on p. 125): bare count nouns may be interpreted either as indefinite or as definite by virtue of uniqueness, but postnominal *là* serves to encode anaphoric definiteness, which G qualifies as [+definite, +specific]. As G notes, ‘The use of *là* serves to recall the topic, and once it is established that *lacorde* is the subject of the discourse, a bare noun can be used again’ (125).

- (1) Alle çace to lacorde, ... Baleine amarre **lacorde** dans ... so laquée ...
 go fetch 2SG.POSS rope whale tie rope in 3SG.POSS tail
Lacorde là vine raide ... **Lacorde** pête éne coup!
 rope SP become stiff rope snap one time
 ‘Go fetch your rope, ... Whale ties the rope to its tail ... The rope stiffens ... The rope suddenly snaps!’

Ch. 1, ‘Sources of Mauritian Creole’, is a brief introduction to the origins of MC and an outline of the work. Ch. 2, ‘Introduction’, introduces the early changes from French to MC and the new determiner system. In addition to the above-mentioned loss or incorporation of the French determiners, MC lost the French copula and the case-assigning prepositions *à* ‘to, for’ and *de* ‘of’, giving rise to a massive [+/-definite] and [+/-plural] ambiguity in argumental bare nouns. The new determiner system includes the indefinite singular marker *enn*, the postnominal specificity marker *là*, the old demonstrative *sa* that is now in combination with *là*, the plural marker *bann* (from *bande* ‘group’) that is in complementary distribution with numerals, the phonetically null definite article notated as δ , and *so*, a possessive pronoun reanalyzed as an emphatic determiner, equivalent to the English and French definite articles in associative anaphoric contexts in terms of Hawkins 1978. The chapter situates the study within the minimalist program and the hypothesis of universal grammar, and points to its specific syntactic and semantic backgrounds.

Ch. 3, ‘Syntactic framework’, provides a general introduction to the assumptions broadly underlying minimalist syntax and lays out the architecture of the MC noun phrase. Following Chierchia’s (1998) argumental vs. predicative parameter for initial noun denotations, the major change in MC that enabled the occurrence of bare nouns in argument positions is a parametric switch from predicative to kind-denoting, argumental nouns. The noun phrase is assigned the following multilayered structure, from the bottom up: NP, NumP (headed by [+count] and hosting *enn*, *bann*, or numerals in its specifier), DemP (headed by [+deictic] and hosting *sa* in its specifier), PossP, DefP (with the null head δ), and finally, SpP (headed by [+specific] \emptyset or *là*). Head movements (N-to-Num in count noun phrases, and N-to-Def in mass ones) will be followed by the phrasal movement of NumP or DefP to the specifier of SpP, giving rise to the postnominal position of *là*. DefP and SpP are phases, paralleling the clause-level phases ν P and CP.

Ch. 4, ‘Semantics: Definitions and formalism’, first reviews theories of definiteness, familiarity, and specificity. SpP in MC encodes the presupposition of existence, or indefinite specificity, when headed by \emptyset , and anaphoricity, or definite specificity, when headed by *là*. Laying the groundwork for the claim that MC nouns are lexically stored as kinds, not as properties, the second part of the chapter reviews theories of kinds, the mass/count or bounded/internally structured distinction, and plurality, and goes on to introduce Partee’s (1986) theory of type shifting between entity, predicate, and generalized quantifier type denotations.

Ch. 5, ‘Early changes: From French to creole’, and Ch. 6, ‘The emergence of a new determiner system’, lay out the early changes and the emergence of the new determiner system. Ch. 7, ‘The modern MC determiner system’, continues with a rich, informal description of the distribution and interpretation of modern MC bare nouns and determiners. Each of chapters 5, 6, and 7 is beautifully documented in terms of multiple sources and systematic examination of all relevant grammatical environments, as well as the presentation of the individual examples. In each case G provides the MC example, its source, glosses, an idiomatic translation into English, and the French equivalent for comparison, and supplements the data with helpful tables. If readers so wish, they can go ahead and build their own grammar of MC noun phrases, based on these chapters.

Among other things, Ch. 7 observes that bare count nouns occur as singular definite subjects only if they function as proper nouns or have a unique referent in the context, but they occur with either definite or indefinite interpretations in direct and prepositional object positions; bare mass nouns can be either definite or indefinite even in subject position. The gap in the case of bare count nouns points to a semantically conditioned but ultimately syntactic issue. The specificity marker *la* that rescues count nouns in this gap then forces a singular interpretation but, unlike *enn* 'one', does not itself encode singular number: it occurs with plurals (*bann zanfan-la* 'those children', p. 177) and mass nouns (*disik-la* 'that sugar', p. 178). The default interpretation of MC bare nouns is plural, so G raises the question of why MC needs the plural marker *bann*. *Bann* forces a definite and specific reading on subject noun phrases and, unlike bare count nouns, cannot be used in a generic context.

The last third of the book, Chs. 8, 9, and 10, analyzes the data in theoretical terms. Ch. 8, 'Noun denotation and function of determiners', proposes that a strong ARG[umental] feature, analogous to clause-level Agr, forces the raising of N to Def. Mass nouns, proper nouns, and unique nouns undergo such head movement. In contrast, other count nouns raise to Num; NumP needs a determiner to function as an argument. δ , being null, must be licensed by overt *la*; G assumes that two null elements cannot form the appropriate syntactic relationship. G proposes that δ represents the type shifter **THE**, and *enn* and *bann* the type shifter **pred**, in terms of Partee 1986, the former mapping type $\langle e, t \rangle$ to $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$ and the latter $\langle e \rangle$ to $\langle e, t \rangle$. Because *enn* and *bann* apply only to count nouns, mass nouns cannot be used predicatively. The MC analogue of *This ring is gold* is ungrammatical (221). The [+specific] interpretations of indefinites are induced by tense operators or quantificational adverbs (223). Through the agency of the zero copula, an MC bare count noun can function as a predicate when it denotes a role or a profession, as in French, when the subject is a singleton (cf. the type shifter **BE**). *Pol \emptyset peser* 'Paul is a fisherman' is grammatical, but **Pol e Zak bann peser* is not; a different, demonstrative construction is required, *Pol e Zak bann peser sa \emptyset* 'Paul and Jacques are fishermen' (233–34). Ch. 9, 'The syntax of the MC noun phrase', spells out the head and phrasal movements mentioned above.

Ch. 10, 'Conclusion', formulates the conclusions and the significance for linguistic theory. It discusses the semantics of noun phrases in terms of denotation vs. reference, and highlights the distinction between definiteness and specificity and the proposal that 'At least one of two elements that enters into a syntactic operation must be overt' (290).

An exemplary feature of the book is its extremely clear (although somewhat repetitive) organization and the meticulous care with which both the data and the theoretical tools are introduced and traced to their sources. Although an original research contribution, the book can almost be used as a textbook in the relevant areas, which not only is very helpful to its current readers but also will significantly extend its shelf life. In one respect it seems to deviate from the sources. Partee's (1986) type shifters are not overt or null elements of the syntactic representation; they are operations that must be assumed in order to make sense of how certain sentences are coherent and mean what they do, despite the absence of any overt, or null but well-motivated, elements that those operations could be pinned on. It would be preferable to say that *enn*, *bann*, and their brothers have the same semantics as particular type shifters in Partee 1986, not that they are type shifters.

The data and the discussion of definiteness and specificity is an outstanding value of the book. G points to the Kwa and Bantu languages as ones that cut the cake the way MC does, but comparison with other languages that allow bare singulars to occur as arguments would also be most interesting. Some of those, such as Slavic languages, have no articles at all; others, like Hungarian and Hindi, have definite and/or indefinite articles. One hopes that the book under review will inspire a new wave of comparative studies, syntactic and semantic, in this area.

REFERENCES

- BAISSAC, CHARLES. 1880. *Etude sur le patois créole Mauricien*. Nancy: Imprimerie Berger Levrault.
 BAISSAC, CHARLES. 1888. *Le folk-lore de l'île Maurice*. Paris: G.P. Maisonneuve & Larose.
 CHERCHIA, GENNARO. 1998. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6.339–405.

- HAWKINS, JOHN. 1978. *Definiteness and indefiniteness: A study in reference and grammaticality prediction*. London: Croom Helm.
- PARTEE, BARBARA H. 1986. Noun phrase interpretation and type-shifting principles. *Studies in discourse representation theory and the theory of generalized quantifiers*, ed. by Jeroen Groenendijk, Dick de Jongh, and Martin Stokhof, 115–43. Dordrecht: Foris.

Department of Linguistics
 New York University
 New York, NY 10003
 [as109@nyu.edu]

Interpreting imperatives. By MAGDALENA KAUFMANN. (Studies in linguistics and philosophy.) Dordrecht: Springer, 2012. Pp. 280. ISBN 9789400722682. \$139 (Hb).

Reviewed by CHUNG-HYE HAN, *Simon Fraser University*

Magdalena Kaufmann starts this book by identifying three problems regarding the meaning of imperatives. First, clause types are pairs of form types and function types, and for imperative-sentence form types, ORDER is the prototypical function. Second, the imperatives of a given language are generally associated with a range of speech act types, including COMMAND, WARNING, PROHIBITION, WISH, REQUEST, ADVICE, and PERMISSION. And in many languages, they can also function on a sub-speech-act level, having a similar function to the antecedent of conditionals. Third, imperatives in many languages are associated with functions that are tied to universal quantification (COMMAND, ORDER, REQUEST, WISH) as well as functions that are tied to existential quantification (PERMISSION, CONCESSION). The goal of the book is to present a proposal for the semantics of the imperative clause type that can account for these three problems.

In Chs. 2 and 3, K argues that imperatives express propositions and therefore have truth values, ‘but come with an additional presuppositional meaning component that makes them unfit for assertive use and shield the truth value from being conversationally accessible’ (57). K makes a plausible connection between imperatives such as *Close the door!* and performative modal declaratives such as *You must/should close the door!*, and proposes that semantically, the two are equivalent. As supporting evidence that imperatives are not that different from declaratives, K notes that imperatives answer questions (Q: *Should I go to the reception?* A: *Don’t go!*), just as declaratives do (Q: *Is it raining?* A: *Yes, it is raining.*); just as one can lie with a declarative, one can make the addressee believe something that is known to the speaker to be incorrect with an imperative (saying *To go to Harlem, take the B train!* when the speaker knows that going to Harlem requires taking the A train); and just as a declarative can be turned into a question, an imperative can be turned into a question in some languages (in German, a rhetorical WH-question such as *Where is it that you should put the flower pot?* can be formed with an imperative verb). As far as I can tell, these are novel observations about the connection between imperatives and declaratives and provide strong support for the position that the semantic type of imperatives is propositional rather than property-like (cf. Portner 2007). Adopting Kratzer’s (1981) approach to the semantics of modality, K proposes that imperatives contain a necessity modal operator with two conversational background arguments—a modal base *f* and an ordering source *g*—and a temporal argument that defines the interval at which the event/state expressed by the imperative is required to hold. An imperative $\phi!$ is thus interpreted as a function that maps a world *w* to the truth value 1 if ϕ is true in all worlds returned by *f* and *g* in the defined interval.

What *f* and *g* of the imperative modal operator look like is discussed in Ch. 4. For typical imperatives that express orders, commands, and requests, K proposes that *f* is what the speaker and hearer jointly take to be possible future courses of events, the common ground, and *g* is what the speaker orders. An imperative such as *Get up!* means ‘According to what I order you to do, it is necessary that you get up now’. For imperatives expressing wishes such as *Enjoy the film*, *g* is

proposed to be what the speaker wants with f as the common ground. The presuppositional meaning component of imperatives is also discussed in this chapter. K proposes that this component consists of three presuppositions, which are termed as epistemic authority, ordering source restriction, and epistemic uncertainty. According to the epistemic authority constraint, imperatives must combine with conversational backgrounds on which the speaker has epistemic authority. By definition, a speaker has epistemic authority on the common ground, f , and also on what she orders or what she wants. The epistemic uncertainty constraint requires that the speaker believe that the content of the imperative is possible but not necessary. If the speaker is sure that ϕ will happen or will not happen, then issuing an imperative $\phi!$ is infelicitous (*#I know you won't go to confession. So go to confession!*). The ordering source restriction requires that if there is a salient decision problem in the context to which the imperative provides an answer, g is a prioritizing ordering source, and if there is not a salient decision problem, then g is a bouletic ordering source. So with a prioritizing ordering source, imperatives express orders, commands, or requests, and with a bouletic ordering source, imperatives express wishes. With these presuppositions, K derives the intuition that ORDER is a prototypical function of imperatives, because in any unmarked context, all presuppositions are met for the ordering source *what the speaker orders*. Furthermore, as these presuppositions can be met by many other conversational backgrounds, imperatives can be associated with other speech act types related to ORDER, REQUEST, and WISH, for example. It also follows from the epistemic authority requirement that uttering an imperative is self-verifying, and as such, it is always a performative.

In Ch. 5, K discusses imperatives that seem to have possibility meaning: those that express permission such as *Take an apple!*, and those that give advice such as *For example, don't buy cigarettes!* as an answer to *How could I save money?*. K argues that g of permission imperatives is what the addressee wants, and the permission reading comes about pragmatically because updating the context with a necessity proposition conveys the information that the prejacent of the imperative is compatible with what is required by the speaker. In order to account for the *for example*-advice imperatives, however, K considers decomposing the necessity modality operator of the imperative into a possibility operator and a covert exhaustifier. Exhaustified possibility is equivalent to a necessity operator, but if there is an anti-exhaustifier, such as *for example*, the exhaustification of the possibility operator is blocked, and the possibility meaning for the imperative survives. Though this accounts for the data, questions arise as to whether all necessity modals should be decomposed this way or just the ones in imperatives, and whether there is a lexical correlate for the postulated covert exhaustifier.

Ch. 6 discusses imperatives in embedded contexts. Applying tests such as referential properties of deictic elements and extractability of WH-phrases, K concludes that there is a range in the degree to which imperatives are embeddable across languages. Malagasy does not allow embedded imperatives; Ancient Greek and Middle High German allow them only in limited contexts as idiomatic or fossilized expressions; many Old Germanic languages such as Old Icelandic, Old Swedish, Old Saxon, and Old High German and Modern High German allow them as indirect speech with a requirement that the reference to the speaker and the addressee match between the matrix and the reported utterance context; and Japanese allows them as indirect speech with no such restrictions. In deriving this conclusion, K is careful to tease apart quoted speech and indirect speech, and establishes that there is no universal restriction against the embedding of imperatives. In the same chapter, K also discusses imperative-and-declarative (IaD) and imperative-or-declarative (IoD) constructions that appear to have conditional meaning. As for IaDs, K makes a distinction between Type I IaDs (*Mow the lawn, please, and I'll give you 59 euros.*) and Type II IaDs (*Be late and you'll lose your job!*), and argues that while Type I IaDs should be treated as speech act conjunction with modal subordination, Type II IaDs are truly conditional. Adopting Kratzer's (1991) treatment of conditionals as modal sentences, K proposes that in interpreting Type II IaDs, the necessary modal operator comes from the imperative, with a modal base that is restricted by the prejacent of the imperative and a stereotypical ordering source. Applying the meaning of the imperative conjunct to the meaning of the declarative conjunct results in the desired conditional meaning. Though questions remain as to what happens to the presuppositional

component of the imperative meaning and why the ordering source here is stereotypical, and not the usual prioritizing one, the proposed analysis is a well-thought-out application of the semantics of imperatives spelled out in Ch. 4. The book concludes with a brief discussion of IoD constructions such as *Don't be late or you'll miss the first slot*. Using Geurts's (2005) nonclassical treatment of disjunction, K proposes a semantic analysis of IoDs that achieves the effect that the first disjunct is used as a plain imperative and the second disjunct specifies what happens in case the imperative is not complied with.

This book has a commendable empirical coverage, comprising data from many languages ranging from Germanic to East Asian and discussions pertaining to issues ranging from the syntax to the semantics/pragmatics of imperatives. K's review and critique of previous work on the semantics of imperatives is extensive and thorough, and her exposition throughout on both formal definitions and intuitions behind them is clear and accessible. This book makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of how we should approach the meaning of imperatives as well as how clause types in general should be handled in the semantics-pragmatics interface. I would recommend it to anyone who is interested in the topic.

REFERENCES

- GEURTS, BART. 2005. Entertaining alternatives: Disjunctions as modals. *Natural Language Semantics* 13.383–410.
- KRATZER, ANGELIKA. 1981. The notional category of modality. *Words, worlds, and contexts: New approaches in word semantics*, ed. by Hans-Jürgen Eikmeyer and Hannes Rieser, 38–74. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- KRATZER, ANGELIKA. 1991. Conditionals. *Semantics: An international handbook of contemporary research*, ed. by Arnim von Stechow and Dieter Wunderlich, 651–56. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- PORTNER, PAUL. 2007. Imperatives and modals. *Natural Language Semantics* 15.351–83.

Department of Linguistics
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6, Canada
[chunghye@sfu.ca]

Grammatical categories: Variation in Romance languages. By M. RITA MANZINI and LEONARDO M. SAVOIA. (Cambridge studies in linguistics 128.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Pp. 364. ISBN 9780521765190. \$105 (Hb).

Reviewed by KNUT TARALD TARALDSEN, *University of Tromsø*

This new book by M. Rita Manzini and Leonardo M. Savoia presents a coherent picture of the authors' views on foundational questions concerning the morphosyntax of natural language. M&S's theoretical approach is best described by quoting one of the last few sentences of the book: 'Indeed, a key property in terms of which our approach differs from the others reviewed is its uncompromisingly lexicalist stance, whereby structures are projected from actual lexical terminals' (311). By this, they mean to contrast their theory with various approaches in which structures are built up from abstract functional heads with universally fixed content and possibly occurring in an invariant order across languages, as in the cartographic tradition emanating from Cinque 1999. Their book offers a large-scale reinterpretation of the conventional functional categories like complementizers, negation, auxiliaries, and case, based on a comparative study of Romance (largely Italo-Romance) and Albanian varieties. The general drift of the argumentation is that each of these functional heads is better understood as belonging to one or another of the lexical categories N, V, Q, and D. Variation is determined by the intrinsic lexical content of the items that lexicalize these categories. That is, crosslinguistic variation is reduced to differences in the lexicon. Another interesting aspect of their analysis is that the syntactic categories they postulate also occur inside units that are traditionally regarded as morphological words. The empirical ma-

terial is mostly drawn from M&S's own fieldwork as reported in a number of their other publications and most notably in the monumental Manzini & Savoia 2005.

The analysis proposed in Ch. 1, 'The structure and interpretation of (Romance) complementizers', starts out from the observation that the *k*-based complementizers, such as Standard Italian *che*, are generally also used as interrogative words; for example, Standard Italian *che* also means 'what'. Since this identity in form is widely found across the range of Romance varieties, even though the actual morpheme found in one variety is not necessarily a cognate of the morpheme used in another, M&S conclude that it is not accidental. (This is reminiscent of the argumentation in Kayne 2010.) They conclude that a *k*-complementizer is a lexical item of category N that introduces a variable that can be restricted either by a proposition (*che* as a complementizer) or by a nominal (*che* as an interrogative in *che cosa/libro* 'what/what book'). Thus, the (Romance) complementizer is not a functional head on the verbal spine, but rather a regular lexical item, a noun taking a clausal complement.

This characterization of the complementizer leads to the expectation that the complementizer, like any other N, should come with its own 'left periphery' of phrases with discourse-related interpretations. Thus, the complementizer adds a second left periphery to the left periphery associated with the verb in its complement clause. M&S argue that this provides a better understanding of the distribution of clause-initial foci and topics with respect to the *k*-complementizer. More generally, they argue against accounts based on various cartographies of the left periphery emanating from Rizzi 1997. In section 1.3.1, they raise important issues regarding the relative merits of theories in which semantic relations like focus and topic are encoded in the syntax, as in the cartographic approach, or not, as in M&S's own theory. No implementation of the idea that interpretation is directly dependent on the relative order of phrases in the left periphery (rather than encoded by features) is offered, however.

The conclusions from Ch. 1 are corroborated by the data examined in Ch. 2, 'Variation in Romance *k*-complementizer systems', which deals with the complementizer systems of Italo-Romance varieties. One of the most interesting parts of the discussion in this chapter is devoted to the varieties that have a split complementizer system. Typically, the distribution of the two distinct complementizers depends on semantic properties of the selecting verb; for example, one (often *ka*) occurs after verbs of 'saying' and 'knowing', while the other (*ke/ki*) is used with verbs of 'believing' and 'wanting'. Given the distributional profile of the subjunctive in Standard Italian, this might lead one to conclude that the choice between the two complementizers correlates with the mood of the clause. But M&S's data show that there is no such correlation. In many of the varieties studied, both complementizers appear both with the indicative and with the subjunctive.

M&S's analysis draws on the observation that when one of the two complementizer coincides with an interrogative *k*-word, it is always the *ke/ki* variant. Since interrogative *k*-words double as indefinites, this leads to the hypothesis that the *ke/ki* complementizer is indefinite, while *ka* is definite. That is, in terms of the analysis in Ch. 1, the propositional variable introduced by the complementizer and restricted by its clausal complement is bound by a definite operator in the case of *ka*, but by existential closure in the case of *ke/ki*. This provides the basis for M&S's attempt to relate the relative distribution of the two complementizers to the semantic properties of the matrix verb. They also argue that their analysis of *ke/ki* as an 'indefinite complementizer' explains why *ke/ki*, but never *ka*, also is used with the meaning of 'if' in some varieties. Moreover, there are varieties where both *ka* and *ki* also occur in relatives, but *ka* occurs only in nonrestrictive relatives, while *ke/ki* occurs in restrictive relatives.

In Ch. 3, 'Sentence negation: Adverbs', M&S present an analysis of negative adverbs in Italo-Romance varieties. Extending their account of the relation between negation and partitivity, M&S propose that the structures containing negation that cooccur with adverbs like *mai* 'never' replicate the structure of nominals. The negation itself occurs in a Q-position preceded by R-positions and followed by other Q-positions, as in 1 (M&S's ex. 52a).

- (1) [_B ben [_Q no [_{Q/Loc} semper/nkamo

The ordering Neg < 'well' corresponds to the structure in 2 (M&S's ex. 52b).

- (2) [_Q no [_{Q/Loc} semper/nkamo [_N ben

In other words, the position of the negation is fixed, but other adverbs may alternate between different structural positions, not as a function of movement, but as a result of their lexical properties being compatible with more than a single nominal category. It is not quite clear, however, exactly what it is about 'well' that makes it compatible with both Q and R, especially since it is not clear what R's properties are except that it is somehow connected with referentiality.

In Ch. 4, 'Sentential negation: Clitics', M&S extend their analysis of negative adverbs to the so-called negative clitics, such as Standard Italian *non*, which occurs in the same area of the clause as pronominal clitics. The fact that a sentence can contain multiple occurrences of the negative clitic is used by M&S as one of their arguments against the widely held view that a negative clitic originates as the Neg head inducing sentential negation whose Spec is filled by negative adverbs or quantifiers in accordance with the so-called Neg criterion (in varieties where these must cooccur with a negative clitic). M&S replace this account of negative concord (essentially Spec/head agreement) with the hypothesis that negative clitics as well as negative adverbs and quantifiers introduce free variables that end up being bound by the same negative operator introduced at LF. They back this up by pointing out that so-called negative adverbs and quantifiers cannot be inherently negative, since, like negative polarity items more generally, they also occur in questions and conditionals. But they do not address the question of why the free variables introduced by such items cannot be bound under existential closure in other contexts as well.

The claim that negative clitics are nominal elements is supported by the observation that the negative clitic may be in complementary distribution with regular subject or object clitics. M&S also note that the negative clitic in Cărcare and some other varieties actually is formally identical to the partitive clitic (Standard Italian *ne*), a fact that they argue should not be attributed to homonymy.

Ch. 5, 'The middle-passive voice: Evidence from Albanian', is a study of the medio-passive in Albanian (including the Arbëresh varieties spoken in Southern Italy). Two observations are of particular relevance to the theoretical conclusions M&S reach. On the one hand, the same morphosyntactic object (a medio-passive verb form) can be used to support a range of distinct semantic interpretations, viz. passive, reflexive, impersonal (generic/arbitrary subject), and anticausative. On the other hand, the morphosyntactic shape of the Albanian medio-passive varies considerably across different tenses and aspects and yet always gives rise to the same range of interpretations.

The first observation is similar to an observation often made about constructions with *si* (and its cognates) in Romance. The challenge in both cases is to account for the empirical fact on the basis of a unified analysis of *si*/medio-passive morphosyntax. M&S propose to meet this challenge by taking *si* and its equivalents in Albanian to introduce a free variable in all cases. The different semantic interpretations should then arise from the way this free variable is bound at LF: for example, by a subject not assigned an external theta-role in passives or anticausatives, but by a subject assigned the external theta-role in reflexives. (Actually, M&S claim that the external theta-role is unassigned both in anticausatives and in reflexives, and take the reflexive reading to be a by-product of associating intentionality with the internal argument, which seems insufficient to characterize the properties of reflexives.)

M&S's analysis is in part motivated by the fact that *si* has the same distributional properties as pronominal object clitics. Thus, the variable it introduces should presumably be associated with an internal theta-role. This works well enough for passives, reflexives, and anticausatives. But one may wonder about the extension of this analysis to impersonal sentences like Standard Italian *Si canta spesso* 'One often sings', formed from unergative verbs with *si*/medio-passive morphology. On the face of it, one would think that the free variable must be associated with the external argument, and likewise for Standard Italian *La si vede spesso* 'One sees her often' (absent from Albanian and a number of Italian varieties).

As one will have gleaned from the above, M&S's theory is a purely representational one. Thus, neither the passive nor the reflexive involves raising an internal argument to the subject position. Instead, the link between the free variable and the subject is established exclusively as part of an interpretative procedure applying at LF. The relative independence of this interpretative procedure

from the specific morphosyntactic properties of the sentence is taken to be supported by the second observation mentioned above. Although the morphosyntax of medio-passives varies considerably across tenses and aspects in Albanian, medio-passives always support exactly the same set of interpretations.

In Ch. 6, 'The auxiliary: *Have/be* alternations in the perfect', M&S discuss the use of the auxiliaries 'have' and 'be' in Italian varieties. M&S aim at isolating the independent points of parametrization in order to be able to describe more complex patterns as resulting from the aggregate of elementary parametric choices. Thus, the Soazza variety exemplifies the possibility that auxiliary selection is sensitive only to transitivity (taking unergatives to be concealed transitives), while Albanian varieties show that auxiliary selection also may be sensitive only to voice (with 'have' in the active voice and 'be' in the medio-passive, which is akin to the Romance *si*-constructions). Standard Italian, where 'be' is used both with intransitives (unaccusatives) and in all of the *si*-constructions, then emerges as the union of Soazza and Albanian.

In general, M&S argue for an approach in which apparent macroparameters emerge only as the accumulation of microparametric choices. The microparametric choices in turn exclusively reflect the selectional properties of lexical items. This view is intimately related to their analysis of 'have' and 'be' as lexical heads (main verbs) rather than verbal functional heads (auxiliaries). This in turn seems to reflect M&S's general skepticism about the proliferation of functional heads in current generative theorizing.

As regards the more detailed implementation of these basic ideas, one may detect certain technical problems. At a somewhat less technical level, there appears to be an inconsistency in their treatment of the person-based split distribution of 'have' and 'be' found in many Italian varieties. In some of these, 'be' uniformly appears in the singular with first- and second-person subjects, while 'have' appears with a third-person subject. In others, auxiliary selection groups second singular and third singular subjects together against first singular subjects. To account for this, M&S propose that the person-based split may be sensitive to one or the other of the properties in 3 (M&S's example 19, p. 212).

- (3) a. split between discourse-anchored referents and event-anchored referents
- b. pragmatic salience of speaker reference

In the plural, however, only the split separating first- and second-person subjects from third-person subjects seems to be documented. According to M&S, this is because the properties in 3 are 'not defined in the plural' (213). But then, what is the basis for the first and second person vs. third person split in the plural?

In Ch. 7, 'The noun (phrase): Agreement, case and definiteness in an Albanian variety', a detailed analysis of the morphosyntactic properties of Albanian nouns and noun phrases is used as a vehicle for introducing some of M&S's general ideas about the properties of nouns. A particularly interesting claim concerns the status of case in morphosyntactic theory. Essentially, M&S argue that there is no room for case among the primitives of the theory. This is based both on conceptual arguments, some of which are drawn from the literature, and the particular distributions of inflectional elements conventionally taken to spell out case features in Albanian.

In Ch. 8, '(Definite) denotation and case in Romance: History and variation', the conclusions reached in Ch. 7 are reused and extended in accounts of the Latin case system and its descendants in Romance. M&S begin their discussion by providing a critical assessment of the analysis of Latin case morphology in Halle & Vaux 1997. Crucially, an account of syncretisms based on underspecification is not available to M&S, whose fundamental claim is that the properties of syntactic structures are projected from actual lexical terminals.

As for the case systems found in Romance, they view these as resulting from changes in the lexicon that occurred in the transition from Latin to Romance. Some lexical items were lost, some were assigned a different lexical content, and yet others were actually retained. Thus, the *-s* occurring in the nominative singular and the accusative plural of masculine nouns in Old French is classified as essentially the same lexical item *-s* as in Latin, but with a reduced range of scopal options (no noun phrase scope, hence no genitive *-s*).

Contrasting their analysis with the accounts offered by Calabrese (1998, 2008), M&S make the important claim that the historical development follows patterns that cannot be explained in a system where the syntax and the lexicon can change independently of one another. If this is true, we obviously have a very strong argument in favor of their ‘uncompromisingly lexicalist stance’, since syntax must be exhaustively determined by the lexicon.

This book presents a wealth of interesting and original ideas as well as many intriguing facts. M&S approach the theoretical questions at a rather informal level, focusing on leading ideas. This is a strength insofar as it allows the reader to see the deep issues in abstraction from theory-internal technical detail. But it is also a weakness, since the reader is often left wondering exactly how to interpret their assertions and analyses. For example, it is not always clear on which basis lexical items are assigned to one or the other of the syntactic categories (e.g. Q, D, N, R). Nor is it clear exactly how a piece of nominal inflection, for example, the Latin *-s*, gets to have sentential scope. Proposals by Dominique Sportiche about determiners come to mind, but the issue intersects with another question that basically remains open in the reader’s mind: while M&S are explicit about postulating word-internal syntax, they also seem to differentiate between inflection and noninflectional elements, for example, in their discussion of the Romanian definite article (to them, ‘definite inflection’). So, is there a fundamental difference between word-level syntax and phrase-level syntax in spite of the fact that the same syntactic categories occur at both levels? If so, how do word-level elements get to interact with word-external categories with respect to scope-taking, for example?

The book’s exposition is very well organized. One chapter leads naturally to the next, and the writing is clear and refreshingly free of rhetoric and jargon.

REFERENCES

- CALABRESE, ANDREA. 1998. Some remarks on the Latin case system and its development in Romance. *Theoretical analyses on Romance languages*, ed. by José Lema and Esthela Treviño, 71–126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- CALABRESE, ANDREA. 2008. On absolute and contextual syncretism: Remarks on the structure of paradigms and on how to derive it. *The bases of inflectional identity*, ed. by Asaf Bachrach and Andrew Nevins, 156–205. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CINQUE, GUGLIELMO. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HALLE, MORRIS, and BERT VAUX. 1997. Theoretical aspects of Indo-European nominal morphology: The nominal declension of Latin and Armenian. *Mir Curad: Studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*, ed. by Jay Jasanoff, Craig Melchert, and Lisi Olivier, 223–40. Innsbruck: University of Innsbruck.
- KAYNE, RICHARD S. 2010. *Comparisons and contrasts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MANZINI, M. RITA, and LEONARDO M. SAVOIA. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romance: Morfosintassi generative*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- RIZZI, LUIGI. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Center for Advanced Study in Theoretical Linguistics
 University of Tromsø
 N-9037 Tromsø, Norway
 [knut.taraldsen@uit.no]