

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:1006090432389.
- 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.
- GALLEGRO, 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

in cases like 1a, Modern German (MG) requires the quantifier and its dependent to agree with respect to gender, number, and case (1b).

- (1) a. was doch die vrsach sei / das diese vnd dergleichen historien von meniglich **wenig beifals vnd glaubens** gegeben werde. (16th c.)¹

‘what the reason might be for many people to give these stories little approval and belief’

- b. Sie erhielten wenig Beifall/*Beifalls.

‘They got little approval.’

Despite the prominence of this change, the book under review provides the first comprehensive account of the history of quantifying expressions in German, based on an impressive corpus with data covering all of the history of German. In particular, Roehrs and Sapp (R&S) look at the development of strong and weak quantifiers and their dependent constituents, including *viel* ‘much/many’, *wenig* ‘little/few’, *all* ‘all’, *jeder* ‘each’, *jemand* ‘somebody’, and *etwas* ‘some/something’. The changes that individual quantifying expressions undergo in the history of German may affect the categorial status of the quantifying word, the form of the dependent constituent, and/or the relationship between the quantifier and its dependent. Though certain changes are shared by all quantifying expressions, other changes affect only some of them. The book’s chapters are hence dedicated to the history of individual quantifying words, including information about etymology as well as the inflectional properties of each quantifier. As regards dependent constituents, a basic distinction is drawn for each quantifier between the cardinal and the proportional constructions, allowing for the generalization that genitive marking in quantifying expressions is restricted to proportional constructions in MG, while in older stages of German dependents of quantifying words may be marked for genitive in cardinal constructions as well; see 1 above.

Ch. 1, ‘Introduction’, highlights some of the differences between the quantifying expressions under investigation, from both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. R&S argue that these morphosyntactic differences can be captured in a straightforward way when we assume that quantifiers appear in different positions in the functional structure above NP, as a result of different types of reanalysis. In particular, R&S propose four possible stages in the development of quantifying words, illustrated here with the weak quantifier *viel* ‘much/many’ and the strong quantifier *all* ‘all’. All quantifiers share the reanalysis from head to specifier (Card >> SpecCardP), which is unexpected considering current theories of grammaticalization, such as that of van Gelderen 2004. Following Kiparsky (2011), R&S assume that this instance of what they call ‘degrammaticalization’—because of the addition of inflection—is driven by analogy.

(2)	N		Card		SpecCardP		SpecDP
a.	filu	>>	vil	>>	viel		
b.			al	>>	all	>>	all

The in-depth examination of quantifying words in the history of German starts with Ch. 2, ‘Simplex quantifying word: *viel*’. Due to the wealth of available data, it is the most comprehensive study of a quantifier in the book and provides the setting for the discussion of the other quantifiers. R&S report that the quantifying word *viel* itself undergoes a number of inflectional changes, which they interpret as a categorial change from a semi-lexical noun in Old High German (OHG) to a quantifying particle in Middle High German (MHG) to a quantifying adjective in MG. They further show that the cardinal and proportional constructions developed differently. While in OHG the dependent constituents were all marked for genitive, only the proportional construction still allows genitive marking in MG. This development is taken to indicate that only the dependent in the cardinal construction is integrated into the matrix DP due to its smaller structural size (N/A vs. DP), resulting in concord. This analysis also accounts for the word-order

¹ From *Wahrhaftige Historia und Beschreibung einer Landschaft der wilden, nackten, grimmigen Menschenfresser, in der Neuen Welt Amerika gelegen*, by Hans Staden. Facsimile edition, Marburg 1557. Kassel: Thiele & Schwarz 1978.

change observed for nominal and adjectival dependents, which tended to appear before the quantifier in OHG but changed to a postquantifier position later on. Dependents in the proportional construction, by contrast, retain genitive marking because of their size. Genitive case in the proportional construction is assigned by an elided noun in the complement of Card. As regards the relationship between the quantifier and its dependent, R&S state that it starts out as a Specifier-Head relation (N – SpecNP, later Card – SpecCardP), while quantifier and dependent occupy specifier and complement positions of CardP at the end of MHG.

Ch. 3, ‘From lexical adjective to quantifying adjective: *wenig*’, is concerned with the historical development of a further weak quantifier. Like its counterpart *viel*, *wenig* is analyzed as a quantitative adjective in SpecCardP in MG, exhibiting concord with its dependent in the cardinal construction. Genitive case in the proportional construction comes again from an elided N in the complement position of the functional head Card. In contrast with *viel*, *wenig* started out as a lexical adjective meaning ‘small’ before quantificational *wenig* emerged in the course of MHG. Only then does the historical record include instances of quantifying expressions with *wenig* and a dependent marked for genitive case. According to R&S, there is a stage between *wenig*’s use as a lexical adjective in OHG and as a quantificational adjective in MG during which inflectional properties suggest that it was a quantificational particle, best analyzed as a functional head (Card) before it underwent Head-to-Specifier reanalysis.

In Ch. 4, ‘Universal quantifiers *all* and *jeder*’, R&S turn to the discussion of strong quantifiers. In contrast with other quantifiers, no changes are recorded with respect to their case-assigning properties: in MG, the dependents in the cardinal construction exhibit concord from early on (with a few exceptions), while those in the proportional construction display genitive marking only since MG, aside from concord and *von*-PP. For semantic reasons, it does not seem sensible to distinguish between the cardinal and the proportional constructions for *all* anyway. Both quantifiers, however, undergo a Spec-to-Head reanalysis (Card >> SpecCardP)—for *all* this happened in OHG, for *jeder* only in Early New High German (ENHG)—and further on a reanalysis from Specifier to Specifier (SpecCardP >> SpecDP) in the ENHG period. The latter reanalysis accounts for the observation that adjectival dependents change their inflection type; that is, strong inflection is replaced by weak inflection, as expected due to the presence of a D-element. Both universal quantifiers start their development obviously higher in the tree than the weak quantifier *viel*.

The focus of Ch. 5, ‘Complex indefinite pronouns: *jemand*, *niemand*, and *nichts*’, is on indefinite pronouns likewise attested in the cardinal and the proportional constructions. In MG, the former is restricted to nominalized adjectives in concord, whereas the latter requires a *von*-PP. The historical record shows that (i) dependents in both constructions were marked for genitive in earlier stages of German (besides *von*-PPs), and (ii) that no restrictions hold regarding the type of the dependent. R&S claim that these changes are motivated by fusing a quantificational clitic with a semi-lexical noun, that is, (*n*)*io*+*man* ‘somebody’. Like the quantifiers discussed in previous chapters, the indefinite pronouns *jemand*, *niemand*, and *nichts* are supposed to undergo Head-to-Specifier reanalysis targeting SpecCardP, while the adjectival dependent is base-generated in a right-adjoined position, triggering concord instead of genitive marking. R&S emphasize that the latter change is supported by ambiguities regarding adjectival morphology in ENHG, even if adjectives in concord are already attested in OHG. The adjective *ander* ‘other’ in particular may have served as a model for the later change.

A further indefinite pronoun provides the topic for Ch. 6, ‘A different complex indefinite pronoun: *etwas*’. In contrast with the indefinite pronouns examined in the previous chapter, *etwas* may combine with nouns in MG when it functions as a quantifier meaning ‘some’ (*etwas Wasser* ‘some water’ vs. **jemand Freund* ‘somebody friend’). R&S argue that two types of *etwas* have to be distinguished for MG, the second, pronominal, one meaning ‘something’, with only the latter instantiating the specifier position of CardP like other indefinite pronouns do. Like the other indefinite pronouns it requires an adjectival dependent. Quantificational *etwas*, however, represents the head position of CardP. From a diachronic perspective, quantifying expressions with *etwas* behave like quantifying expressions with other indefinite pronouns, allowing for all types of dependents, with the dependents being assigned genitive in the specifier position of CardP. In MG, only *von*-PPs are possible in the proportional construction, while nominal dependents are sup-

posed to exhibit concord with quantificational *etwas*, as are adjectival dependents with its pronominal counterpart in the cardinal construction.

R&S conclude their study of quantifying expressions in the history of German with a brief look at the historical development of the adjective *ander* ‘other’ (Ch. 7, ‘Exceptional adjectives: *ander*, *folgend* and *solch*’). In contrast to MG, in earlier stages of German *ander* may precede quantifying expressions such as *viel* ‘much/many’ and *alle* ‘all’, reflecting its earlier use as an ordinal number meaning ‘second’. Regarding case marking, R&S propose to distinguish two positions for the exceptional adjective *ander*, that is, occupying the specifier position of the Ordinal Phrase, a functional projection between DP and CardP, in case it exhibits concord with the quantifying expression. *Ander* may also show genitive case, suggesting SpecCardP as base position, according to other adjectives depending on quantifiers. As soon as *ander* is no longer attested with genitive case marking and loses its ordinal meaning during the ENHG period, it begins to pattern with other lexical adjectives, reflected by its position in the AgrP layer.

Ch. 8, ‘Conclusions’, conflates the historical developments of the individual quantifying words, with all of them (with the exception of *etwas* ‘some’) undergoing a head-specifier reanalysis from Card to SpecCardP. Evidence for quantifying particles developing diachronically into adjectives comes from inflectional properties of the quantifying word, as well as the emergence of modifiers. Strong quantifiers precede weak quantifiers with regard to this development, indicating that the change is semantically driven. Considering the changes affecting dependent constituents, the most prominent change is the rise of concord at the expense of genitive marking, due to structural ambiguity and economy considerations. While the genitive has disappeared within the cardinal construction, it is still attested in quantifying expressions headed by *viel*, *wenig*, *all*, and *jeder* in the proportional construction. Quantifying expressions with *jemand* and *etwas* exhibit prepositional phrases with *von* ‘of’ instead of the genitive. The remainder of the chapter is mainly devoted to a review of the different types of reanalysis observed for both the quantifying words and the dependents, with particular emphasis on the head-to-specifier reanalysis, not previously discussed in the literature.

The authors of *Quantifying expressions in the history of German* provide an in-depth empirical study of the diachronic changes affecting a representative group of quantifying words in the history of German. Some of the changes they report are well known, like the loss of genitive marking with quantifying words like *viel* and *wenig*. Historical developments of other quantifiers—that is, strong quantifiers or indefinite pronouns—have until now received only little attention. The book contains a wealth of data for each quantifying expression under investigation and for each historical period of German: future work on the diachrony of quantifying expressions will consider the present book to be an extremely valuable source of data. In addition, the study impressively shows how the multitude of small changes found in the realm of quantifying expressions in German can be accounted for in terms of a more general change triggering Head-to-Specifier reanalysis from the functional head Card to its specifier position SpecCardP. Even if one might not subscribe to each syntactic analysis R&S suggest, the overall picture, taking into account the specific development of individual quantifying expressions, presents itself as a convincing proposal for the diachrony of quantifying expressions.

REFERENCES

- KIPARSKY, PAUL. 2011. Grammaticalization as optimization. *Grammatical change: Origins, nature, outcomes*, ed. by Dianne Jonas, John Whitman, and Andrew Garrett, 15–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- VAN GELDEREN, ELLY. 2004. *Grammaticalization as economy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Institut für Germanistik
 Universität Potsdam
 Am Neuen Palais 10
 14469 Potsdam, Germany
 [udemske@uni-potsdam.de]