

RAPPAPORT HOVAV, MALKA, and BETH LEVIN. 2010. Reflections on manner/result complementarity. *Syntax, lexical semantics, and event structure*, ed. by Edit Doron, Malka Rappaport Hovav, and Ivy Sichel, 21–38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Department of Linguistics  
New York University  
10 Washington Place  
New York, NY 10003  
[itamar@nyu.edu]

**Diagnosing syntax.** Ed. by LISA LAI-SHEN CHENG and NORBERT CORVER. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. 624. ISBN 9780199602506. \$71.

Reviewed by ANDERS HOLMBERG, *Newcastle University*

This is a book about an aspect of the methodology of syntactic research, namely the use of diagnostics to establish a particular analysis or derivation, as when the linear order of a verb preceding a sentence adverb is taken as a diagnostic of verb movement.

This is an unusual topic for a book. Over the years, a methodology has evolved for syntactic research that is taught in university courses and is practiced all the time by everyone involved in syntactic research. It is described in textbooks, although hardly ever as a topic as such. Instead, the methods used in syntactic analysis and theory are taught by demonstration. One reason why methodology is not taught as a topic as such in textbooks is that the typical textbook teaches the substance of syntax as well as the methods for investigating it, the substance being the ‘facts’, the observations and generalizations that the theory tries to explain. It is convenient, and probably pedagogically sound, to teach the facts and the methods for describing and explaining them together.

*Diagnosing syntax* does that as well, to some extent. Some chapters remain purely pedagogical, reviewing and discussing the diagnostics that have been employed in the literature for a particular analysis or derivation. Other chapters supplement the review with new diagnostics, or new arguments, for a particular analysis or derivation or theoretical stance. In some chapters it is less obvious how they relate to the diagnosis theme; they present a set of arguments for a particular idea without special reference to the notion of diagnosis as such. But as noted in the introductory chapter, there is no clear borderline between argument and diagnostic. The relation between the two concepts is cleverly captured by David Pesetsky, one of the contributors, as being a matter of confidence. When we are confident enough that an argument is sound, it may be promoted to a diagnostic. Most of the chapters in *Diagnosing syntax* do, indeed, review and discuss arguments that have been tried and tested over the years, to the point where many of us are quite happy to refer to them as diagnostics.

*Diagnosing syntax* is not a textbook. It is aimed at students or scholars who already have a solid enough background in syntax. The editors have made a great effort, though, to produce a coherent volume that really addresses the issue of diagnosis in syntax. The book consists of five parts on head movement, phrasal movement, agreement, anaphora, and ellipsis, plus an introduction by the editors. Each part consists of a set of chapters, by different authors, discussing issues in relation to the topic of the section, followed by a conclusions chapter written by one of the authors, or cowritten by two authors, of the individual chapters. Most of the conclusions chapters include comments on the preceding chapters, presenting a synthesis where this seems reasonable, and noting controversial issues that remain unresolved. In one or two of the sections the conclusions chapter could have been more useful as an introduction to the section.

The book starts out with an introduction by the editors, Lisa Cheng and Norbert Corver, presenting and discussing the topic of the book, and in particular the concept of diagnosis as it is used, or ought to be used, in syntactic research. The first chapter in the section on head movement is by CHRISTER PLATZACK, who reviews the properties that are taken to be characteristic of head movement as opposed to phrasal movement and goes on to argue, on the basis of evidence from

various languages, that head movement is a PF operation. In the next chapter HEIDI HARLEY discusses the role of head movement in the derivation of affixation, comparing it with alternative theoretical devices. The assumption that there is head movement in the syntax, not just the PF component, is crucial in this chapter.

The book is not all pure syntactic argumentation. Every section contains at least one chapter discussing the section theme in the light of research on language acquisition, agrammatism, or speech processing—research that provides important, even crucial, diagnostic criteria for hypotheses generated by the theoretical research. Thus, in the section on head movement there is a chapter by NAAMA FRIEDMANN on the implications of certain syntactic deficits among Hebrew-speaking agrammatics, which can be understood in terms of deficits concerning head movement to C and/or T. The following chapter is by JOCHEN ZELLER, a comparative study of a set of Bantu languages, arguing for a particular syntactic hypothesis, which is that object markers in the verbal complex in Bantu are incorporated pronouns, derived by head movement. The issue of head movement vs. remnant VP-movement comes up in several of the chapters, including this one. The conclusions chapter, written by Harley, presents an excellent overview of the main issues in head movement, seen in the light of the preceding chapters.

Part 2 is about phrasal movement. It starts with a chapter by DAVID PESETSKY that focuses consistently on the diagnosis theme, presenting a ‘diagnostic manual’ for movement, which I think can be used as a guide for students facing the task of analyzing constructions in less well-studied languages. It also contains a good review and discussion of the history of movement in generative grammar. The next chapter is by WINFRIED LECHNER on the arguably harder task of diagnosing covert movement. The chapter contains a survey of strategies for diagnosing covert movement, but also proposes two new diagnostics for covert movement. One is based on a Duke of York analysis of pied-piping in relative clauses—which, as Lechner points out, also provides evidence against a purely representational model of grammar. The other follows as a consequence of Lechner’s ‘hybrid theory of reconstruction’, according to which there is reconstruction in the syntax, relying on copies of movement, but also in semantics.

In the following chapter HAMIDA DEMIRDACHE discusses how to tell whether, or at what stage, long-distance questions in child language are derived by long-distance movement. The discussion is based on a review of experimental studies—comprehension as well as production-eliciting experiments—and employs a battery of diagnostic tests: islands, crossover, and so on. An interesting complication, discussed in some detail, is that English as well as French children in the four-to-six-year range produced long-distance questions with so-called partial movement (*What do you think where is he?*), familiar from many languages but not English or French.

MARIA POLINSKY and ERIC POTSDAM’s paper is about covert A-movement, a less well-known phenomenon than covert A-bar movement. They discuss two potential cases, subject-to-subject raising in Adyghe and unaccusatives in Russian. With the help of a battery of diagnostic tests they show that the Adyghe construction does employ covert A-movement, but the Russian one does not. The section concludes with a detailed and helpful conclusions chapter by Lechner.

Part 3 is on agreement, with chapters by SANDRA CHUNG, ORA MATUSHANSKY, MARIA TERESA GUASTI, and JAMAL OUHALLA, and a conclusions chapter by Guasti and Matushansky. All of the papers address the question of whether, or to what extent, morphological agreement is diagnostic of syntactic agreement, or Agree, in the sense of Chomsky (2000, 2001). In the opening chapter Chung argues that morphological agreement is not coextensive with Agree, but is ‘an imperfective, unrevealing sign of Agree’ (252). The claim, based on facts from a variety of languages, particularly Chamorro, is that they are subject to different conditions, morphological agreement being less constrained than Agree. Matushansky’s chapter is about gender agreement, focusing especially on ‘mixed agreement’, that is, when a DP induces formal agreement on one predicate, but semantic agreement on another. The account of mixed agreement is embedded in a theory of agreement and phi-features that is related to, but different from, Chomsky’s (2001) theory.

Guasti’s chapter is about asymmetry between subject and object WH-questions: subject questions are ‘easier’, as is shown in processing experiments with adult normal speakers and with agrammatic speakers, as well as in language acquisition, where subject questions are typically mas-

tered earlier than object questions. She argues that the reason for this is that object movement to a position between ArgS and the subject renders object questions ungrammatical, unless some additional operation or repair is done. She shows how languages have various ways of circumventing this problem. One of them is to rely on spec-head agreement between the subject and AgrS.

While Guasti's chapter resurrects spec-head agreement as an important syntactic condition, Ouhalla's chapter argues that spec-head agreement is not involved in the notorious agreement asymmetry in Arabic between SVO (full agreement) and VSO (defective agreement), or in other agreement relations in Arabic. Instead, cases of deficient agreement are manifestations of feature impoverishment dependent on prosodic structure, following Ackema and Neeleman (2003). Guasti and Matushansky's conclusions chapter, finally, compares and discusses the partly conflicting claims made in the preceding chapters.

Part 4, on anaphora, has a slightly different structure from the other parts, because it starts out with a chapter, by ELENA ANAGNOSTOPOULOU and MARTIN EVERAERT, that is in large part an overview chapter, including an excellent, succinct literature review of approaches to anaphora in generative grammar. There is also some discussion of the notion of diagnosis in syntactic theory. The chapter also includes a case study on the Greek anaphor *ton idhio* 'the same', apparently combining properties of anaphor and bound variable. By contrast, the following chapter, by CHRISTOPHER TANCREDI, is devoted to arguing for a particular controversial claim, which is that condition B can be dispensed with from the syntax. This follows if (a) pronouns are anaphoric exclusively on elements contained in the discourse context, and (b) discourse context is so defined that an element becomes part of the discourse context only after it has 'fulfilled all its syntactic roles' (374), and (c) syntactic derivation is by phase (Chomsky 2001), but top-down instead of the usual bottom-up. The effect is that a pronoun cannot have a phase-internal antecedent.

The following chapter, by SERGEI AVRUTIN and SERGIO BAAUW, is actually about diagnosing a medical condition, namely agrammatism. They criticize what they call 'linguistic explanations' of agrammatism and instead argue for an account in terms of a processing deficit, which hampers, by slowing down, a person's syntactic performance. They argue that this can explain a wide range of superficially unrelated errors in the performance of aphasics.

NORVIN RICHARDS's chapter, finally, is a careful demonstration of the use of binding principles as diagnostics to determine the nature of two movement rules: topicalization and scrambling in Tagalog. He shows that topicalization results in new binding relations, implying movement (in fact, covert movement). Scrambling, by contrast, has effects only on principle C-type relations (like Scandinavian object shift; see Holmberg & Platzack 1995). Richards makes a valiant attempt to redraw the architecture of grammar so that scrambling, too, would be a narrow-syntactic rule. The conclusions chapter is written by Everaert.

Part 5 is on ellipsis and contains chapters by JASON MERCHANT, SUSANNE WINKLER, LYN FRAZIER, and JEROEN VAN CRAENENBROECK and ANIKÓ LIPTÁK, with a conclusions chapter by Merchant. In this section I actually recommend reading the conclusions chapter first, since it contains a succinct overview of the diagnostics of ellipsis, which is useful on its own and also as background to the other chapters. All of the chapters either argue, or take as a given, that the ellipsis site has syntactic structure. Merchant's first chapter starts with a review of the arguments that ellipsis requires syntactic identity, and then goes on to discussing the consequences this has for the interpretation of polarity items under ellipsis. The aim of Winkler's chapter is to specify the conditions on extraction out of ellipsis sites of various types. She demonstrates and discusses how contrastive focus plays a crucial role in a class of ellipsis including sluicing, gapping, pseudogapping, and stripping. The account is embedded in the 'association with focus phrase' theory of Krifka (2006).

Frazier's chapter also assumes that ellipsis sites have full structure. The aim is to distinguish properties of interpretation of ellipsis that are 'due to ellipsis per se' from those that are due to 'features of the processor and available repair mechanisms' (485). An interesting claim, substantiated by a review of experimental studies of the processing of ellipsis, is that apparent violation of island constraints under ellipsis (important also in Winkler's chapter) is due to repair strategies characteristic of processing.

Craenbroeck and Lipták's chapter is about refining the diagnostics of (types of) ellipsis. Crosslinguistic comparison has shown that ellipsis can take different shapes due to other properties of the grammar of particular languages; this needs to be taken into account when diagnosing ellipsis. The authors focus on a 'new' kind of ellipsis found in Hungarian, which they argue is sluicing, but applying in relative clauses. This means that the restriction to WH-questions, hitherto taken to be a diagnostic property of sluicing, is not that. They go on to discuss what it is about Hungarian that makes this type of sluicing possible in this language (it has to do with the focus syntax of Hungarian). They then discuss sluicing in a wider crosslinguistic perspective, including multiple WH-movement languages, and the relation between WH-movement and sluicing.

In conclusion, this volume is something other than a run-of-the-mill volume of research papers, each with its own agenda, published under a common, suitably vague title. The editors and the authors of this volume have, for the most part, made a concerted effort to address an important aspect of the methodology of syntactic research, the idea of diagnosis, and the use of diagnostic criteria in syntactic analysis and theory. At the same time the book provides a useful overview of recent research on core issues in generative syntactic theory. As already mentioned, the book is aimed at students and scholars who already have a solid background in syntax. It can definitely be useful, though, in advanced syntax classes. I can see an advanced syntax course spending a number of weeks, or even months, on head movement, for example, on the basis of Part 1 of this book, with students writing papers on head-movement-like phenomena in various languages.

#### REFERENCES

- ACKEMA, PETER, and AD NEELEMAN. 2003. Context-sensitive spell-out. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21.4.681–735. DOI: 10.1023/A:1025502221221.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, Daniel Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–156. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2001. Derivation by phase. *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1–53. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- HOLMBERG, ANDERS, and CHRISTER PLATZACK. 1995. *The role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KRIFKA, MANFRED. 2006. Association with focus phrases. *The architecture of focus* (Studies in generative grammar 82), ed. by Valeria Molnár and Susanne Winkler, 105–35. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

School of English Literature, Language, and Linguistics  
Newcastle University  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
NE1 7RU, United Kingdom  
[anders.holmberg@newcastle.ac.uk]

**A history of the Irish language:** From the Norman invasion to independence. By AIDAN DOYLE. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. Pp. 304. ISBN 9780198724766. \$82.92.

Reviewed by NILS LANGER, *University of Bristol*

When writing language histories for academic audiences, whether for teaching or research purposes, scholars still appear to follow two well-established traditions: that a language history will dedicate the majority of space to the explanation of system-INTERNAL matters, and that a language history will describe the history of only ONE language in a given geographical area. Doyle's *History of the Irish language* departs from these principles in significant and refreshing ways, without, however, ignoring them altogether. He offers a comprehensive explanation of the fate of the