Despite these quibbles, *An annotated syntax reader* is an invaluable collection of essays for students and scholars alike. The historical contextualization reminds the reader of the intellectual history of today's ideas, whereas the questions may set the stage for research in the years to come.

REFERENCES

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1986. *Knowledge of language*. New York: Praeger.
CINQUE, GUGLIELMO. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
HALLE, MORRIS, and ALEC MARANTZ. 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. *The view from Building 20: Essays in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 111–76. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
RIZZI, LUIGI. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Department of Language and Literature
NTNU
NO-7491 Trondheim, Norway
[terje.lohndal@ntnu.no]

Count and mass across languages. Ed. by DIANE MASSAM. (Oxford studies in theoretical linguistics.) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Pp. 310. ISBN 9780199654284. $65.

Reviewed by JENNY DOETJES, *Leiden University*

During the past decade there has been a growing interest in crosslinguistic variation in the domain of the count/mass distinction. Since Chierchia's influential work on parametric differentiation of the distinction in the late 1990s (Chierchia 1998a,b), a large amount of new crosslinguistic data has become available, revealing the complexity of the question as to how to characterize linguistic variation in this domain. This collection of papers addresses many of the issues that are currently at the center of interest. The scope of the volume is very broad, both in the choice of languages that are discussed and in the linguistic subfields that are represented. The result is a book that, by means of its variety, gives a good overview of phenomena that should be taken into account in order to gain a better understanding of the various linguistic reflexes of the conceptual distinction between count and mass in the languages of the world.

The book starts with a comprehensive introduction by JILA GHOMESHI and DIANE MASSAM, summarizing the contributions of the volume, while commenting on the most important issues in current research on count and mass. The authors signal in particular that even though there are no reasons to doubt that the conceptual difference between count and mass is available to all humans, the way this difference is reflected by grammars and the lexicon varies substantially across languages.

In the first paper, FRANCIS JEFFRY PELLETIER sets out the main challenges for a formalization of the count/mass distinction in English. If count and mass are encoded lexically as syntactic features of nouns, one runs into the problem that nouns are usually not exclusively mass or count (e.g. *chocolate(s)*). By contrast, if count and mass are semantic features, one runs into the problem of mismatches between the meanings of nouns and their grammatical behavior, often discussed in relation to nouns such as *furniture* (semantically count but syntactically mass) and pairs of count and mass nouns with similar reference (*baklava/brownies*, *knowledge/beliefs*). Based on this, Pelletier proposes that the lexicon is blind to the distinction between count and mass. A noun such as *chocolate* has a denotation that comprises both chocolates and portions of chocolate-stuff. The combination of count syntax and a noun activates a semantic rule that deletes the mass part

of the meaning of the noun (see p. 19). The approach avoids massive ambiguity in the lexicon, but nouns such as *furniture* still need to be treated in a special way.

ELIZABETH COWPER and DANIEL CURRIE HALL provide a possible account of these nouns, cast in the DISTRIBUTED MORPHOLOGY framework. They share Pelletier's assumption that nouns are not marked as either count or mass in the lexicon. However, *furniture* is claimed to spell out as a structure that contains both a noun and the syntactic feature '#' (which stands for [+count] in their system). The lexically driven presence of this feature in the syntactic structure makes it impossible to add the feature another time in a separate projection, thus explaining the incompatibility of *furniture* with count syntax. Crosslinguistic applications of their theory are illustrated on the basis of a few small case studies ('apparent' plural markers in Mandarin, Cantonese, and Korean, and 'apparent classifiers' in Persian).

HAIKE WIESE treats nouns such as *furniture* and *footwear* as so-called TRANSNUMERALS. A transnumeral is defined as a noun that does not need plurality for plural reference (this phenomenon is also known as 'general number' and 'number neutrality'), and in many languages this holds for all nouns. Wiese discusses several cases of transnumerality (Mandarin, Persian, Hungarian), focusing on crosslinguistic similarities. In particular, the combination of a plural marker and a transnumeral noun usually leads to special meaning effects, adding for instance a meaning component 'many' or 'varied', and the plural marker may lose its plural meaning when combined with a mass noun, yielding a 'large amount' reading.

ILEANA PAUL examines a number of potential correlations between general number (Wiese's transnumerality) and other properties of the linguistic system. Malagasy, a language with general number, lacks several properties that have been assumed to correlate with it. For instance, bare nouns, and in particular bare nouns without plural marking, usually have narrow scope. Malagasy turns out to be a language in which bare nouns with general number may have a wide-scope indefinite reading. Despite its negative conclusions, the paper offers valuable data for our understanding of general number.

Plural marking is another core issue in the discussion on count and mass. SCOTT GRIMM relates the distribution of inverse number in the Niger-Congo language Dagaare (Ghana, Burkina Faso) to individuation. In Dagaare, the same suffix *-ri* can be used both to derive a singular from a nonmarked plural form, and to derive a plural from a nonmarked singular form. Grimm convincingly shows on the basis of original fieldwork that the interpretation of *-ri* is related to the meaning of the noun. If the noun is easily perceived of as an individual, *-ri* will be a plural marker, and the unmarked form of the noun is singular. If, by contrast, the noun denotes objects that typically occur in pairs or pluralities, adding *-ri* will result in a singular being derived from an unmarked plural.

SAEED GHANIABADI discusses the Persian plural marker *-hâ*, which can be used on both count and mass nouns. When used on a count noun, the plural marker is compatible with a definite, an indefinite, and a kind reading. In the case of mass nouns, there are two possibilities. The presence of the plural marker may result in a coerced plural interpretation (definite, indefinite, or kind). But there also exists a small class of mass nouns that obtain a definite interpretation and remain mass. Ghaniabadi gives a thorough description of the facts, and offers an analysis within the distributed morphology framework.

SOLVEIGA ARMOSKAITE is the only author to discuss plurality in the verbal domain. She analyzes the suffix *-inê-* in Lithuanian, claiming that it is pluractional rather than aspectual. An important argument is that the plural reading introduced by the suffix can be licensed by the presence of a plural noun phrase. The subevents of the plural event are distributed over members of the plurality denoted by the noun phrase. Given that plurals may interfere with aspect, the data should be handled with care. I fully agree with Armoskaite, however, that aspect and verbal plurality are easily confounded and should be teased apart on the basis of this type of data (cf. Součková 2011).

Both MARTINA WILTSCHKO and ERIC MATHIEU discuss the relation between the count/mass distinction and animacy. Wiltschko makes the thought-provoking claim that the grammatical distinction between count and mass in a language such as English should be reinterpreted as a possi-

ble realization of nominal inner aspect (Rijkhoff 1991), in terms of a binary syntactic feature [±bounded]. In the languages she focuses on, Blackfoot (Algonquian) and Halkomelem (Salishan), the feature [±bounded] does not play a role. Halkomelem lacks a grammatical realization of inner aspect, while Halkomelem realizes inner aspect by means of the feature [±animate]. This explains, according to Wiltschko, why both languages lack a grammatical reflection of the count/mass distinction and why all nouns can be used with plural markers.

Mathieu offers a quite different analysis of the role of animacy in the Algonquian language Ojibwe, a language that often has been claimed to lack a count/mass distinction, based on the argument that all nouns can be pluralized. Mathieu convincingly shows, however, that 'pluralized mass nouns' are first turned into count nouns by means of a suffix marking them as animate. The plural form is then derived from this animate count noun; thus, the pluralization of mass nouns is only apparent. It does not seem to be the case that this type of reasoning can be extended to Blackfoot. Note also that the different contributions on plurals in this volume show that it is quite hard to draw immediate conclusions on the basis of the fact that 'all nouns are compatible with plurals'. In the first place, one needs to know what types of meaning changes occur (Ghaniabadi, Wiese). Second, even in a language like English, nouns usually can be interpreted in a way that makes them compatible with plural morphology (Pelletier).

The remaining contributions concern numeral classifiers and differences between languages with and without classifiers. Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng examines a number of interesting contrasts between two classifier languages. Whereas Cantonese allows for classifier reduplication, Mandarin does not. Cheng argues that reduplication is only possible if the classifier functions as a syntactic 'unit marker' that signals an individuated interpretation. Mandarin classifiers do not function as 'unit markers' (Sybesma 2008) and hence reduplication is prohibited. The paper also contains discussion of properties of classifiers that are related to degrees of individuation. Quite remarkably, count classifiers that combine with nouns such as *jiājù* 'furniture' differ from other count classifiers, showing that even classifier languages may have means to treat these collective nouns as a separate class.

According to Niina Ning Zhang, Mandarin offers evidence for a different approach to the count/mass distinction. Rather than talking about [±count], one should distinguish [±numerable] and [±dimension]. Mandarin nouns need insertion of a classifier because they lack the feature [+numerable]. They are not mass nouns, however, since they may have a feature [+dimension] explaining why they may be modified by size adjectives. The proposal actually raises an interesting question with respect to abstract nouns, a topic that receives little attention in the literature on count and mass (and this volume is not an exception). Given that abstract nouns can be count, we expect abstract size modification in the context of these nouns (cf. Constantinescu 2011, Morzycki 2009).

Alan Bale and David Barner discuss the acquisition of the count/mass distinction in a classifier language (Mandarin) and a number-marking language (English). They argue that there are several steps in acquisition of the fact that a language has a singular/plural opposition (English). First, children recognize that the plural-marked forms are used to denote groups or pluralities. Then they will be able to realize that bare forms that lack the plural marker are singulars, and that the singular interpretation is not available for the plural forms. This will make them aware of the fact that they should pay attention to, for instance, differences between quantity expressions that require count syntax (e.g. *every*) rather than to determiners selecting nouns on the basis of semantic distinctions.

The last chapter takes a psycholinguistic perspective to the count/mass distinction. Natalie Klein, Greg Carlson, Renjie Li, Florian Jaeger, and Michael Tanenhaus describe a series of eye-tracking experiments comparing English measure phrases with sortal and mensural classifiers in Mandarin. The experiments show that the presence of these expressions provokes a similar effect on finding a target picture in a set of three competing pictures. Those pictures that were clearly interfering with the target picture were typically compatible with the classifier or measure phrase. Interestingly, the effect was the strongest for the English measure phrases, and the weakest for the sortal classifiers in Mandarin.

The contributions in this volume illustrate why the count/mass distinction is so fascinating. Even though there is a large amount of crosslinguistic variation, there are also striking parallels between languages that are not or only distantly related. As indicated by Ghomeshi and Massam, the 'haunting similarities' suggest the presence of underlying unity.

REFERENCES

CHIERCHIA, GENNARO. 1998a. Plurality of mass nouns and the notion of 'semantic parameter'. *Events and grammar*, ed. by Susan Rothstein, 53–103. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
CHIERCHIA, GENNARO. 1998b. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6.339–405.
CONSTANTINESCU, CAMELIA. 2011. *Gradability in the nominal domain*. Leiden: Leiden University dissertation.
MORZYCKI, MARCIN. 2009. Degree modification of gradable nouns: Size adjectives and adnominal degree morphemes. *Natural Language Semantics* 17.175–203.
RIJKHOFF, JAN. 1991. Nominal aspect. *Journal of Semantics* 8.291–309.
SOUČKOVÁ, KATEŘINA. 2011. *Pluractionality in Hausa*. Leiden: Leiden University dissertation.
SYBESMA, RINT. 2008. Classifiers, number and countability. Leiden: Leiden University, MS.

LUCL
PO box 9515
2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
[j.doetjes@hum.leidenuniv.nl]

Sociolinguistic fieldwork. By NATALIE SCHILLING. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. 313. ISBN 9780521127974. $36.99.

Reviewed by JAMES A. WALKER, *York University*

In contrast with other subfields of linguistics that rely on native-speaker intuition, grammaticality judgments, or laboratory experiments, conducting sociolinguistic research involves venturing into the field and satisfying two (potentially conflicting) goals: recruiting a representative sample of speakers, and obtaining recordings of their speech that are as close to 'natural' as possible (see e.g. Labov 1984). These considerations raise particular methodological and practical challenges that can be daunting, especially to students engaged in their first experience of sociolinguistic research. Those students lucky enough to study at a university that offers courses in sociolinguistic fieldwork are often confronted with lists of readings culled from different sources in linguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropology, and social psychology. In this book, Schilling draws on her many years' experience in conducting sociolinguistic fieldwork in different communities in the United States, as well as her colleagues' and students' experiences in other locales, to offer a unified account of the steps involved in conducting sociolinguistic fieldwork, from research design, through speaker recruitment and data collection, to community advocacy and empowerment. Although her focus is on issues of relevance to fieldwork for the analysis of linguistic variation and change, the book is also intended to be useful for researchers in other areas of sociolinguistics. In Ch. 1, 'Introduction' (1–16), she begins by providing a brief history and overview of sociolinguistic fieldwork and outlining the structure of the book.

Ch. 2, 'Designing the study' (17–65), details the steps involved in designing a sociolinguistic research project. Because we cannot hope to include in the study every speaker in the speech community being studied, we have to develop a sample of speakers whose behavior can be generalized to the community, stratified for the locally relevant social distinctions that we want to test. As S points out, the traditional social categories (social class, sex/gender, ethnicity), in which 'objectively' measurable ('etic') categories have given way to explorations of subjective ('emic') social meaning, can create practical problems in sampling speakers. 'Real-time' studies of lan-