

Finally, we come to the question of philosophical outlook. Here J turns what would be a liability for other authors into a source of real richness. The book's guiding methodological principle is that a semantics for natural language should be as compositional as possible, with no intermediate languages or levels of interpretation. This means that at multiple points the text argues against other possible analyses that have weaker constraints on the syntax-semantics interface. The result is that students learn how to make solid arguments about the structure of the interface. There is no other introductory text that takes these kinds of debates as seriously, and I believe that this book will guide a new generation of semanticists to think rigorously about how syntax and semantics interact.

Department of Linguistics
PO Box 210025
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
[rhenderson@email.arizona.edu]

The Oxford handbook of derivational morphology. Ed. by ROCHELLE LIEBER and PAVOL ŠTEKAUER. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. 927. ISBN 9780199641642. \$55.

Reviewed by GEERT BOOIJ, *University of Leiden*

This handbook is the second in a series of four Oxford University Press handbooks on morphology, of which one, also edited by Lieber and Štekauer (2009), deals with COMPOUNDING, one with INFLECTION (edited by Matthew Baerman, 2015), and a fourth one (to appear in 2017) with MORPHOLOGICAL THEORY (edited by Jenny Audring and Francesca Masini). The book is divided into two parts. The first part deals with a number of concepts and issues in the analysis of derivation (understood as all types of word formation minus compounding) and contains a number of chapters on the various types of formal processes involved in derivation (twenty-four chapters in total). Part II consists of fifteen chapters on word formation in various language families, a chapter on 'Areal tendencies in derivation', and a concluding chapter on 'Universals in derivation' written by the two editors.

After an introductory chapter by the editors that specifies the scope of the handbook, we find two chapters on demarcation issues. In Ch. 2, PIUS TEN HACKEN deals with the demarcation of inflection and derivation and presents a useful survey of the debate on this distinction. He correctly points out that the choices made in the demarcation of these two domains of morphology are theory-dependent. The distinction between contextual and inherent inflection, the latter being closer to derivation than contextual inflection, is not mentioned, nor is the discussion of the intermediate cases in Andrew Spencer's monograph on *Lexical relatedness* (Spencer 2013). In Ch. 3, SUSAN OLSEN gives a fine overview of the debate on the demarcation of derivation and compounding. She presents a good summary of the gray zone between compounding and derivation, and the related issue of the gradual transition of words to affixes (that is, semi-affixes or affixoids, which are words embedded in compounds and with a specific bound meaning, as discussed in Booij & Hüning 2014). Olsen also deals with synthetic compounding and the analysis of synthetic compounds such as *powerholder*, which might be analyzed as either *power + holder* or *powerhold + er*; she opts for the first analysis and therefore assigns *powerholder* the structure of an N + N compound. She correctly points out that certain types of reduplication may also be analyzed as compounding, for instance, the contrastive reduplication of the type *salad-salad*.

Ch. 4, 'Theoretical approaches to derivation' by ROCHELLE LIEBER, focuses on the issue of how the relation between the form and meaning of complex words should be conceived. Both the conceptual level and the phonological level have a rich structure. As to the mapping between

these two levels, it would have been enlightening to relate this issue to the model of PARALLEL ARCHITECTURE (Jackendoff 2002), in which the level of morphosyntactic structure plays a mediating role between conceptual and phonological structure at the level of the word (Booij 2010). Ch. 5, written by MARK ARONOFF and MARK LINDSAY, argues that in the domain of morphology, language is not a discrete phenomenon: we have to accept that there are degrees of productivity. The authors discuss methods for measuring the degree of productivity of a word-formation process. Ch. 6, 'Methodological issues in studying derivation', also by Rochelle Lieber, mentions the potential pitfall of using intuitions in morphological research: corpus-based studies reveal that much more is possible and occurs than one might think on the basis of one's own intuitions. This is also my own experience. For the domain of English morphology, this insight has been convincingly demonstrated to be valid in Bauer et al. 2013. In addition, an experimental approach to word-formation phenomena is also important, and Lieber observes a convergence between these two methodologies in studying word formation. In the following chapter (Ch. 7), HARALD BAAAYEN gives an overview of experimental and psycholinguistic approaches to word formation. The central issue is whether and how morphological structure plays a role in the lexical processing of complex words. Baayen argues that researchers should move away from the often-used lexical-decision tasks because they may reveal more about metalinguistic judgment than about actual lexical processing, and that computational modeling is important for making progress in this area. An important theoretical point that Baayen makes is that the questionable status of the morpheme as the primary building block of morphological structure has not yet reached the psycholinguistic community (113), even though in recent word-based morphological models the word is the starting point of morphological analysis, and morphemes play only a secondary role in morphological analysis and the establishment of relations between words (Spencer 2013).

Chs. 8–12 deal with the various formal processes used in word formation: concatenative derivation (Ch. 8 by LAURIE BAUER), infixation (Ch. 9 by JULIETTE BLEVINS), conversion (Ch. 10 by SALVADOR VALERA), reduplication (Ch. 11 by SHARON INKELAS), and other nonconcatenative processes (Ch. 12 by STUART DAVIS and NATSUKO TSUJIMURA). Most of these chapters are very clear: they present first a range of relevant data, and then various issues of analysis. The only exception is the chapter on conversion, which begins with a discussion of terms, concepts, and theoretical issues before giving a brief outline of the relevant data.

Ch. 13 deals with allomorphy, in particular the variation in shapes of morphemes that do not follow from general phonological processes of the language in question, that is, suppletive allomorphy. The author, MARY PASTER, does not want to make a distinction between suppletive allomorphy and rival affixes. Phonologically conditioned suppletive allomorphy is analyzed in terms of phonological subcategorization of affixes (227). Paster rejects the OPTIMALITY-THEORETIC approach in which selection of allomorphs is performed by ranked output constraints, because it would allow for outside-in conditioning of allomorphs as well, and hence be too powerful a mechanism. This argument did not convince me, since an output-constraint approach has major advantages in expressing why a particular allomorph is chosen (Booij 1998, Rubach & Booij 2001).

The next three chapters deal with nominal, verbal, and adjectival and adverbial derivation. ARTEMIS ALEXIADOU deals with action nominalization and with English *-er*-nominals and *-ee*-nominals. In particular, she discusses the polysemy of these nominals (agent, instrument, location, etc.) and argues that the instrument interpretation follows from the idea that the *-er*-suffix binds the subject of the base verb, which can have an instrument role. In ANTONIO FÁBREGAS's well-written chapter on adjectival and adverbial derivation, more space might have been given to processes that derive specific adverbial categories. In addition, the idea that the Spanish suffix *-mente* exhibits gender agreement with the base adjective in *clara-mente* because *clara* has a feminine form seems to me to be too far-fetched, as agreement does not apply within words. The selection of the feminine form as stem reflects the origin of *mente* as the ablative form of the Latin feminine noun *mens* 'mind'.

Ch. 17, on 'Evaluative derivation' by LIVIA KÖRTVÉLYESSI, broaches an interesting topic: the way that positive and negative evaluation can be expressed by means of derivational morphology. However, this chapter suffers from the same drawback as the chapter on conversion: it starts with

discussing theoretical issues, before giving the reader an outline of the relevant phenomena. I prefer the reverse order in a handbook. The next five chapters are all well written and do give a survey of relevant phenomena. They deal with ‘Derivation and function words’ (GREGORY STUMP), ‘Polysemy in derivation’ (FRANZ RAINER), ‘Derivational paradigms’ (PAVOL ŠTEKAUER), ‘Affix ordering’ (PAULIINA SAARINEN and JENNIFER HAY), and ‘Derivation and historical change’ (CAROLA TRIPS).

Ch. 23, by Livia Körtvélyessi and Pavol Štekauer, deals with ‘Derivation in a social context’. This is an interesting topic that does deserve its own chapter, but there is no proper outline of data at the beginning of this chapter. Most sections carry the name of a linguist who has dealt with a certain phenomenon instead of indicating a topic. This makes the chapter more like a summary of certain publications than a real handbook chapter providing guidance.

In the final chapter of Part I (Ch. 24), EVE V. CLARK presents a clear summary of findings concerning the acquisition of derivational morphology, mainly for English, Dutch, and French. In particular, she discusses which types of derivational morphology are acquired at an early stage (for instance, compounding, conversion, deverbal agent nouns) and which ones much later. It is clear from this survey that the acquisition of derivational morphology is not yet complete when the child is six years old.

Part II comprises chapters on the derivational morphology of fifteen different language families, by authors who are well known for their expertise concerning these languages. Hence, this part of the handbook is an excellent reference work for morphologists. These chapters discuss intriguing questions, such as whether Chinese really is an isolating language without derivational morphology. The answer is that Chinese does make use of affixes, partially borrowed, for word formation. The following families are dealt with: Indo-European (PINGALI SAILAJA), Uralic (FERENC KIEFER and JOHANNA LAAKSO), Altaic (IRINA NIKOLAEVA), Yeniseian (EDWARD J. VAJDA), Mon-Khmer (MARK J. ALVES), Austronesian (ROBERT BLUST), Niger-Congo (DENIS CREISSELS), Afroasiatic (ERIN SHAY), Nilo-Saharan (GERRIT J. DIMMENDAAL), Sino-Tibetan (KAREN STEFFEN CHUNG, NATHAN W. HILL, and JACKSON T.-S. SUN), Pama-Nyungan (JANE SIMPSON), Athabaskan (KEREN RICE), Eskimo-Aleut (ALANA JOHNS), Uto-Aztecan (GABRIELA CABALLERO), and Mataguayan (VERÓNICA NERCESIAN). All chapters are written by linguists with solid knowledge of the language families, and these chapters provide useful guidance to the relevant phenomena and further literature. In the chapter on Indo-European, special attention is given to the Indo-Aryan subfamily and its languages, such as Hindi, that feature interesting Sprachbund phenomena as they share the Indian subcontinent with Dravidian languages.

The last two chapters of Part II are more general in nature. BERND HEINE’s Ch. 40 on ‘Areal tendencies in derivation’ focuses on the phenomenon of grammatical replication. Affixes may be borrowed: witness the Greek and Latin prefixes such as *auto-* and *re-* used in so many European languages. In grammatical replication an abstract grammatical structure is copied. For instance, the English use of *top* in compounds such as *top technology*—with the meaning ‘outstanding’—can also be found in Finnish words with the Finnish equivalent *huippu* ‘top, peak’. Ch. 41, written by the editors, deals with ‘Universals in derivation’. This short chapter provides a summary of what one can find about universals of derivation in the existing literature and databases on universals. For instance, we find the following statement: ‘There is a strong tendency for languages to use reduplication as a word-formation process’ (785). Such a statement, of course, raises the question of why this is the case, and why there are still quite a number of languages where reduplication is a marginal phenomenon. It is clear, as the authors conclude, that this domain of investigation is still very much underdeveloped. A rare and insightful example of this kind of crosslinguistic study of tendencies in word formation is the article by Haspelmath and colleagues (2014) on the coding of causal-noncausal alternations in verbs.

The book is in general well edited and has a subject index, a name index, and a language index. There are some typos, most of which can more or less easily be corrected by the reader. On p. 243, line 2 from the bottom, the word *not* should be inserted before the word *ungrammatical*; otherwise the argument remains unclear. Most chapters follow the Leipzig glossing rules for the presentation of their data, with the unfortunate exception of Ch. 17 on evaluative morphology. On

p. 448, the Dutch morpheme *aarts-* is said to be an adverb; however, it is a prefix instead, and the Dutch discontinuous affix mentioned on p. 452 is not *ge-t*, but *ge-te*.

In conclusion, this volume is a welcome addition to the growing number of morphology handbooks; it provides useful information and guidance concerning phenomena and analytical issues in the domain of derivational morphology.

REFERENCES

- BAERMAN, MATTHEW (ed.) 2015. *The Oxford handbook of inflection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BAUER, LAURIE; ROCHELLE LIEBER; and INGO PLAG. 2013. *The Oxford reference guide to English morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BOOIJ, GEERT. 1998. Prosodic output constraints in morphology. *Phonology and morphology of the Germanic languages*, ed. by Wolfgang Kehrein and Richard Wiese, 143–63. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- BOOIJ, GEERT. 2010. *Construction morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BOOIJ, GEERT, and MATTHIAS HÜNING. 2014. Affixoids and constructional idioms. *Extending the scope of construction grammar*, ed. by Ronny Boogaart, Timothy Coleman, and Gijsbert Rutten, 77–105. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN; ANDREEA CALUDE; MICHAEL SPAGNOL; HEIKO NARROG; and ELIF BAMYACI. 2014. Coding causal–noncausal verb alternations: A form–frequency correspondence explanation. *Journal of Linguistics* 50.587–625. DOI: 10.1017/S0022226714000255.
- JACKENDOFF, RAY. 2002. *Foundations of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LIEBER, ROCHELLE, and PAVOL ŠTEKAUER (eds.) 2009. *The Oxford handbook of compounding*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- RUBACH, JERZY, and GEERT BOOIJ. 2001. Allomorphy in optimality theory: Polish iotation. *Language* 77.26–60. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2001.0038.
- SPENCER, ANDREW. 2013. *Lexical relatedness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leiden University Centre for Linguistics
Postbus 9515
2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
[g.e.booi@hum.leidenuniv.nl]

Contiguity theory. By NORVIN RICHARDS. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016. Pp. 400. ISBN 9780262034425. \$38.

Reviewed by DENNIS OTT, *University of Ottawa*

This book can only be described as a tour de force. In *Contiguity theory*, Norvin Richards juggles a mind-boggling amount of data from a diverse variety of languages and develops a complex theoretical framework with far-reaching implications for the theory of grammar. The result is by no means an easy read: the theory is elaborate and unconventional, and fully appreciating the dense discussion requires proficiency in syntactic and phonological theory.

R's point of departure is the observation that current syntactic theory 'offers no real answer to the question of why ... movements are distributed as they are among languages' (1). He rejects the common practice of invoking formal features as 'triggers' of movement, which 'have no detectable properties other than their ability to trigger overt movement' (1) and hence offer little in the way of explanation. Whatever one's evaluation of the theory that unfolds over the following 300+ pages, R is to be applauded for addressing head-on this glaring gap in current theorizing, while much work in syntax—ironically self-identifying as 'minimalist' in many cases—continues to content itself with restating generalizations about surface word order in terms of ad hoc features and phrase-structural templates, with little concern for the adverse implications of this rank growth of stipulations for the theory of universal grammar (Chomsky et al. 2017).

R's book is an attempt to overcome this unsatisfying state of affairs. The central idea is that 'apparent syntactic differences between languages are always the consequence of more funda-