ably, studies of cognitive control include heritage speakers in their samples, and while the mind and the brain do not discriminate whether the input they are receiving is a heritage language per se, we do know that the heritage bilingual experience can tell us a lot about quantity/quality of input, language use, and sociolinguistic context. These variables and others certainly contribute to the complexity of bilingual experiences, which, in turn, can lead to differences in linguistic and cognitive behavior. Therefore, teasing apart different bilingual experiences in (neuro)cognitive studies and replications is important in order to gain a more comprehensive view of how the acquisition of heritage languages also alters cognitive functions.

REFERENCES

GROSJEAN, FRANÇOIS. 2008. *Studying bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
LAUDAN, LARRY. 1996. A problem-solving approach to scientific progress. *Beyond positivism and relativism: Theory, method, and evidence*, ed. by Larry Laudan, 77–87. Boulder, CO: Westview.
LYNCH, ANDREW. 2003. Toward a theory of heritage language acquisition: Spanish in the United States. *Mi lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States*, ed. by Ana Roca and M. Cecilia Colombi, 25–50. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
ORTEGA, LOURDES. 2013. SLA for the 21st century: Disciplinary progress, transdisciplinary relevance, and the bi/multilingual turn. *Language Learning* 63(1).1–24. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00735.x.
ROTHMAN, JASON; IANTHI MARIA TSIMPLI; and DIEGO PASCUAL Y CABO. 2016. Formal linguistic approaches to heritage language acquisition: Bridges for pedagogically oriented research. *Advances in Spanish as a heritage language*, ed. by Diego Pascual y Cabo, 13–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
TORRES, JULIO, and CRISTINA SANZ. 2015. Is there a cognitive advantage for Spanish heritage bilinguals? A first look. *Heritage Language Journal* 12(3).292–309.

Department of Spanish and Portuguese
University of California, Irvine
Humanities Hall, #322
Irvine, CA 92697
[torresju@uci.edu]

Focus-related operations at the right edge in Spanish: Subjects and ellipsis. By IVÁN ORTEGA-SANTOS. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2016. Pp. 204. ISBN 9789027258069. $143 (Hb).

Reviewed by TIMOTHY GUPTON, *University of Georgia*

Ch. 1 of IVÁN ORTEGA-SANTOS's book begins with a justification of syntactic inquiry into information structure in general and focalization processes in Spanish in particular. The fact that focalization phenomena incorporate multiple linguistic domains vis-à-vis alterations to word order, prosody, semantics, and pragmatics makes it a compelling challenge for any theoretical account of human language. O-S establishes the goals of the book: to motivate an analysis of subjects that appear at the rightmost edge of the sentence in Spanish. He suggests that right-edge subjects come to appear in this position as the result of three independent processes: (i) movement of a focused phrase to the leftmost clause edge (i.e. the left periphery) followed by topicalization movement of the remnant Tense Projection (TP), (ii) rightward movement, and (iii) absence of movement (i.e. in-situ position) for subjects of select unaccusative predicates. O-S notes that although the data set examined in the book consists primarily of intuition-based grammaticality judgments from Northern Iberian Spanish and Chilean Spanish, he also discusses experimentally gathered data and corpus data. This is largely reflective of the theoretical orientation of this work, which is formal syntactic analysis situated within Chomsky's (1995 et seq.) MINIMALIST PROGRAM and the associated advances of MULTIPLE SPELL-OUT and PHASE THEORY (see e.g. Chomsky 1998, Uriagereka 1999). Although the author briefly sketches out the theoretical assumptions associated with the analysis undertaken in this work in a clear and concise manner, the intended au-

dience of this book is professional linguists and researchers. Not surprisingly, it is assumed that the reader already has a working knowledge of many of the theoretical tools employed in current generative syntactic theorizing. Ch. 1 concludes with a summary description of the three chapters that follow.

Ch. 2 is in large part a literature review establishing the theoretical assumptions of the syntactic analysis proposed in subsequent chapters. O-S first examines neutral focus associated with sentence-level stress (1; sentence stress underlined) and then examines narrow focus (2; small capitals indicate marked prosodic stress).[1]

(1) [Context: What happened?]
    Pedro compró <u>un libro</u>.   (neutral focus)
    Pedro bought a   book
      'Pedro bought a book.'

(2) [Context: Who bought a book yesterday?]
    Ayer   compró un libro Pedro.   (narrow focus)
    yesterday bought a   book Pedro
      'Yesterday, Pedro bought a book.'

He dedicates the subsequent section to an examination of focus-fronting processes, including important notes on two related, but discursively different, phenomena: VERUM FOCUS and MIRA-TIVE FOCUS. He provides a convenient summary of the features that have been proposed to encode these types of focus. In the following subsection, he examines focus fronting, as in 3 (from p. 25, ex. 19).

(3) [Context: Little Jorge is looking at a toy car and motorcycle.]
    Dad: Cuál   quieres?
             which want.2SG
               'Which one do you want?'
    Little Jorge: EL COCHE quiero.   (fronted focus)
             the car   want.1SG
              'The car is what I want.'

O-S defends a syntactic treatment of focus fronting (based primarily on Rizzi's (1997) observation that focus is quantificational), addressing the well-known objection that postulating [+Focus] as a lexical feature violates Chomsky's (1995:Ch. 4) INCLUSIVENESS CONDITION (see e.g. Zubizarreta 1998, Szendrői 2004). He concludes that the positing of syntactic movement to a FocP position is justified in light of the Chomsky/Uriagereka conjecture that complex surface semantics have corresponding movement operations. Next, he examines well-known subject-verb 'inversion effects' resulting from WH-movement and focus fronting, making particular use of Gallego's (2007) phase-sliding proposal for Romance. Given the special properties that it attributes to T (namely phasal status), O-S notes that this possibility raises doubts about the universality of Chomsky's (1982) EXTENDED PROJECTION PRINCIPLE (EPP). In the next two sections, he examines the EPP in Spanish, considering challenges it poses for the availability of Spec, TP (Contreras 1991), as well as the suggestion that null-subject languages have an inactive or perhaps parameterized EPP (e.g. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998, Chomsky 2013). O-S concludes, in the vein of Lasnik (1989, 2003), that the EPP is active in Spanish based on null expletive data. In the remainder of the chapter, he examines the interaction of contrastively focused constituents with parasitic gap constructions, floating quantifiers, and island constructions, noting important asymmetries between in-situ and fronted focus. The interim conclusion at the close of this chapter is that fronted-focus XPs move to Spec, FocP, and that rightmost focus is the result of leftward movement to FocP, followed by topicalization of TP.

---

[1] Examples are slightly modified from O-S (p. 18, exs. 1 and 9). Neutral focus is also referred to in the literature as 'out-of-the-blue' contexts, all-focus, or thetic sentences. Narrow focus is also referred to in the literature as (new) information focus, presentational focus, or rheme.

Ch. 3 centers on the analysis of rightmost corrective focus, building on previous work (Ortega-Santos 2013). He focuses on VOS order with a corrective subject, for the main reason that it provides a departure from neutral, canonical word order and clearer evidence of syntactic movement. O-S considers three major theoretical accounts from the literature used to derive this order: (i) the presupposed object XP moves past the subject, (ii) the subject moves to the right of the object, and (iii) both subject and object XPs move in complex operations. In the ensuing four sections of the chapter, he examines data from nonrestructuring control clauses, two types of exceptional case marking (ECM) constructions (perception and small-clause ECM), causatives, and raising constructions. All of this data militate in favor of the analysis that contrastively focused XPs move to FocP, followed by movement of the remnant TP to TopP, to the left of FocP, that is, in favor of the third account. In section six, O-S considers alternative accounts of the data examined in the preceding sections; each of these fails to account for the data set examined. In the remaining section, O-S considers three remaining structures that generate subject-final clauses: unaccusative predicates, WH-questions in which the subject appears at the rightmost edge, and rightmost subjects that appear under the scope of negation. He concludes that subjects in the former two constructions remain in situ, while in the last the subject moves to a clause-internal focus position, following the proposal of Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria (2008).

Ch. 4 examines the possibility of rightward movement in Spanish focus constructions that interact with ellipsis. O-S considers data from a number of ellipsis constructions involving multiple remnants, but proposes that rightward movement applies only in three of them: WH-stripping, gapping, and multiple sluicing. Additionally, he proposes that rightward movement does not apply in nonellipsis structures or in ellipsis constructions with a single remnant. In section one, he shows that ellipsis is involved in the three multiple-remnant structures via binding possibilities (elided subjects may bind a reflexive anaphor) and via PP-selection requirements of elided antecedents. In section two, O-S reviews the properties of rightward movement—namely its clause-bounded nature and the fact that it bans P-stranding. In section three, he demonstrates the clausal locality and P-stranding properties of WH-stripping, gapping, and multiple sluicing. In the fourth section, O-S develops an analysis of why rightward movement only occurs in these constructions via an OPTIMALITY-THEORETIC (OT) account involving the interaction of four constraints: (i) EPP-Focus (FocP requires a specifier), (ii) ExpressFocus (focused constituents require an overt reflex), (iii) Stay (avoid traces), and (iv) LCA (Kayne's (1994, 2013) LINEAR CORRESPONDENCE AXIOM), which is crucial in that it posits that all syntactic movement is leftward. In the final section, O-S discusses the relevance of ellipsis and its associated spell-out or PF-deletion within phase theory and finishes by briefly considering alternative accounts such as those of Richards (2001) and Fox and Pesetsky (2005), noting Lasnik's (2014) critiques, as well as the fact that these competing accounts fall short in explaining the full range of data examined in the chapter. Ch. 5 summarizes the achievements of the book and provides an agenda for future research involving multiple remnants and rightward movement.

This book is an important contribution to the subfield of (Ibero-)Romance syntax in particular and syntactic theory in general. Readers will appreciate the derivational steps and syntactic trees that the author provides to guide them through the syntactic operations proposed. The analysis is innovative in proposing an OT account of rightward movement, a phenomenon that has proven to be stubbornly problematic for a generative, phased-based approach. I feel that the author motivates the approach well, and from there, lets the data drive the analysis. While the initial decision to seek an OT-based explanation for rightward movement may find some detractors and strike some as rather ad hoc in nature, I would like to make two remarks: (a) the OT account only resorts to rightward movement in a restricted number of multiple-ellipsis scenarios as the result of a conspiracy of constraints; (b) no alternative account can explain the full range of data adequately. In sum, apart from some very minor editing oversights, this book is well motivated, engaging, and very readable. In the end, this book's approachability is limited only by the required background in recent generative theory; the account's appeal to optimality theory may contribute to its finding a wider audience and, in turn, lead to more collaborative investigations on syntactic interfaces in the future.

REFERENCES

ALEXIADOU, ARTEMIS, and ELENA ANAGNOSTOPOULOU. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: Word order, V-movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16.491–539. DOI: 10.1023/A:10060904 32389.

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of government and binding*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1998. *Minimalist inquiries: The framework*. (MIT occasional papers in linguistics 15.) Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. [Republished in *Step by step: Essays in syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, Juan Uriagereka, and Samuel Jay Keyser, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.]

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130.33–49. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2012.12.003.

CONTRERAS, HELES. 1991. On the position of subjects. *Perspectives on phrase structure: Heads and licensing*, ed. by Susan Rothstein, 63–79. New York: Academic Press.

ETXEPARE, RICARDO, and MIRIAM URIBE-ETXEBARRIA. 2008. On negation and focus in Spanish and Basque. *Gramatika jaietan: Patxi Goenagaren omenez*, ed. by Xabier Artiagoitia and Joseba Andoni Lakarra, 287–310. Donostia: Supplements of ASJU.

FOX, DANNY, and DAVID PESETSKY. 2005. Cyclic linearization of syntactic structure. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31.1–45. DOI: 10.1515/thli.2005.31.1-2.1.

GALLEGO, ÁNGEL. 2007. *Phase theory and parametric variation*. Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona dissertation.

KAYNE, RICHARD. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

KAYNE, RICHARD. 2013. Why are there no directionality parameters? *Theoretical approaches to disharmonic word order*, ed. by Theresa Biberauer and Michelle Sheehan, 219–44. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LASNIK, HOWARD. 1989. The nature of triggering data. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 12.349–50. DOI: 10.1017/S0140525X00049025.

LASNIK, HOWARD. 2003. On the extended projection principle. *Studies in Modern Grammar* 31.1–23.

LASNIK, HOWARD. 2014. Multiple sluicing in English? *Syntax* 17.1–20. DOI: 10.1111/synt.12009.

ORTEGA-SANTOS, IVÁN. 2013. Corrective focus at the right edge in Spanish. *Lingua* 131.112–35. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2013.02.007.

RICHARDS, NORVIN. 2001. *Movement in language: Interactions and architecture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

RIZZI, LUIGI. 1997. On the fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of grammar*, ed. by Adriana Belletti and Luigi Rizzi, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

SZENDRŐI, KRISZTA. 2004. Focus and the interaction between syntax and pragmatics. *Lingua* 114.229–54. DOI: 10.1016/S0024-3841(03)00025-1.

URIAGEREKA, JUAN. 1999. Multiple spell-out. *Working minimalism*, ed. by Samuel David Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 251–82. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

ZUBIZARRETA, MARÍA LUISA. 1998. *Prosody, focus, and word order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

University of Georgia
Department of Romance Languages
210 Herty Dr.
242A Gilbert Hall
Athens, GA 30602
[gupton1@uga.edu]

Quantifying expressions in the history of German: Syntactic reanalysis and morphological change. By DORIAN ROEHRS and CHRISTOPHER SAPP. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2016. Pp. 299. ISBN 9789027257130. $149 (Hb).

Reviewed by ULRIKE DEMSKE, *Universität Potsdam*

The loss of genitive case marking in quantifying expressions throughout the history of German is widely known. While the quantified constituent bears genitive case in older stages of German