

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

Irish language in Irish society from the Middle Ages to Irish independence in 1922. While he provides some description of system-internal changes in phonology, morphology, and syntax, D is much more concerned with the role of Irish in the formation, retention, and suppression of individual and communal identity in Irish society or, rather, in society in Ireland. He states that the book aims to contribute to the current debate on Irish identity (272) and summarizes the success of the Irish revival since the late nineteenth century thus: 'Irish is part of Irish life' (266). What seems a trivial statement actually recognizes the vast effort that went into promoting the language, especially from the late nineteenth century, and this book lucidly explains what internal and external difficulties had to be overcome. Crucially, D's history does not speak about Irish as if the language existed in isolation. In fact, it makes the important point that writing the external history of a language 'without saying much about other languages' is 'simply not possible' (3). Instead, D devotes time and space to the correlation between the Irish and English languages, and the Irish- and English-speaking communities. He even suggests that an 'alternative title for the book might be: *A history of the Irish and English languages in Ireland*' (3). This approach not only acknowledges that the history of Irish 'is the result of a complex array of political, cultural, religious, educational, and sociological factors' (3), but also that most geographical spaces in the world are not monolingual. D's deliberate integration of multilingual dimensions—at individual, communal, and geographical levels—is in line with a new way of writing language histories. This aspect of historical sociolinguistics is still rarely found in university textbooks on many languages, and D is to be applauded for crossing disciplinary boundaries to look beyond strictly Irish philology.

Despite the title, *A history of the Irish language*, D does not cover—and does not pretend to cover—the entire textual history of the language. The subtitle, *From the Norman invasion to independence*, narrows the chronological scope to the period when Irish was joined by English, the second native language on the island. Thus the periods of Primitive Irish (before 600 AD), Old Irish (c. 600–900 AD), and Middle Irish (900–1200 AD) are given no serious attention (but for brief comment, see pp. 4ff.) As D maintains, a proper treatment of Old and Middle Irish would require a separate study (8). Instead, he begins his account with Early Modern Irish, as the end of the twelfth century 'is regarded as a defining moment in Irish history, witnessing ... the arrival of a new group of invaders, who brought with them a language that was eventually to dislodge the one spoken until then' (7).

D divides the book into eight chronologically ordered chapters but of differing lengths: Chs. 7 and 8 make up some 40% of the book and cover the period 1870–1922, focusing on the revival and the modernization of Irish respectively. The extraordinary changes to the written language during this period and the nationalist use of Irish in the struggle for independence are ample justification for this authorial decision. As with many sociolinguistic histories of European languages (this reviewer is not qualified to make similar claims about other languages), broad developments can be attested across centuries, involving similar agents, societal changes, and cultural effects. Such 'big topics' include the development of contrast between the language or linguistic variety of the ruling classes and the language or linguistic variety of the ruled classes: this distinction usually leads to the standardization and codification of the prestige variety, its use as a factor in individuals' upward social mobility, and its general dissemination through democratizing processes such as the teaching of literacy. As a further development, this divergence between high and low varieties is often followed by the romanticization of the low variety, where it is associated with particular positive connotations. An almost prototypical example of this is the use of minority language or dialects in nationalist struggles for recognition or independence. It is here that D's book on Irish becomes so useful for our understanding not just of Irish sociolinguistics specifically, but also of how language was used as THE social identifier in a 'political' struggle.

Irish was a written language for many centuries, but lost its formal written domain in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when English spread to all parts of Ireland as the language of urbanization, law, and education. Irish continued to be used for oral poetry and there are examples of its use in attempts to convert Catholics to Anglicanism until about 1700, but the general status of the language declined radically. By the eighteenth century, Irish was no longer printed (65), a fate it shared with many other regional or minority languages across Europe, such as Gali-

cian and Catalan on the Iberian peninsula, or Low German and Frisian on the Jutish peninsula. Irish was still used in nonprinted prose and poetry, but overall medial diglossia was the usual practice: ‘English was for reading and writing, Irish for speaking’ (97).

The nineteenth century saw the emergence of nationalism across Europe and with it the romantic interpretation of tradition, heritage, and language as key components of national identity. This also applied to Ireland, where, however, those opposing the political status quo were crucially divided into two groupings: those who promoted a ‘modern, internationally orientated republicanism’ (114) and those who favored ‘the old, monarchist tradition of the Gaelic world’, with a heavy emphasis on ancestral heritage, racial continuity, and loyalty to the old culture. The former type of nationalism was politically anti-English, but used English as the means of communication. The latter, by contrast, saw the Irish language as key to being Irish. Thomas Davis stated: ‘A people without a language of its own is only half a nation’ (116). Quite remarkably, however, Davis himself spoke no Irish, and the very successful newspaper he set up in 1842, *The Nation*, was published only in English. The fact that those who promoted Gaelic as a key ingredient of Irish nationalism often did not speak it themselves, as their native language, is to be found throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. By the time Irish was recognized as an important national treasure, it had already declined as a native language, both in terms of numbers of speakers and also, and more importantly, in terms of prestige. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, some 45% of the population spoke Irish, but by 1851 only about 23% spoke it and only about 8% were monolingual Irish (129). English had been the language of power for centuries and was the language of urban life; Gaelic was restricted to the poorest areas in the far west of Ireland. The language used in schools was English, and painful sanctions applied to children who spoke Irish at school (132). The nationalist urban middle classes recognized the threat to Gaelic in the nineteenth century, and much of their cause was devoted to supporting the Irish language. Numerous societies were founded throughout the nineteenth century, and in 1893 the most important one, the Gaelic League, was founded in Dublin. Its principal demand was the teaching of Irish, and by lobbying the authorities it gained permission for Irish to be taught in primary schools (1900) or to be used as the language of instruction in nonlanguage subjects (1904). The founding of the National University of Ireland was another success, since from 1909 any student registering had to know Irish. This clearly boosted general competence in the language but, more importantly, also raised the profile of Gaelic: it was a language not just of education, but of higher education.

In its endeavors the Gaelic League was hindered both by the lack of teaching aids and by the low number of native speakers among its ranks. Yet Gaelic Leaguers were undeterred in their use of Irish as the principal means of communication. D emphasizes this point: because their Gaelic was a learner variety, it differed significantly from the native Gaelic of the Gaeltacht. The striking difference between written Irish, which dates back to the seventeenth century, and spoken Irish, which varies greatly across the three main Gaeltacht areas, posed an additional difficulty for language learners. As a result, the Irish spoken outside the Gaeltacht was perceived as being rather bookish, and when Gaelic Leaguers spent their holidays as ‘language tourists’ on the west coast, looking for unspoiled Gaelic, they warned each other not to speak English to the locals so as to not corrupt the indigenous Irish with English borrowings (198). Such views were grounded in the romantic perception of Irish as the country’s ancient tongue, a pure, clear, and vigorous language that had to be protected from language contact so it would not turn into a mongrel or patois (230). By contrast, it was agreed that the lexicon of Irish required *ausbau* ‘extension’, in particular with regard to technical terms from the worlds of politics, industry, and sciences. The codification of the Irish language was undertaken by the learned members of the Gaelic League, and they were the key promoters of learning Irish. Their learner variety of Irish as spoken in Dublin became the most widely known, so much so that it forms the foundation of the modern written Irish taught in schools today. The difference—a yawning chasm (245)—between the spoken ‘native’ forms of the West and the codified written forms of the new Irish created by L2 learners of the language still poses a practical problem: ‘[T]he independence of the dialects has continued to bedevil Irish to the present day’ (229). By 1920, Irish had regained its status as a written language and become increasingly widespread as a spoken language, with respectable status but with far fewer native

speakers than before. The revival succeeded in raising the status of the language, but took place too late for a reversal of the language shift from Gaelic to English.

This book is exceptionally well written. It strikes a good balance between description and explanation and uses plenty of examples to illustrate the key issues. No knowledge of the Irish language or of linguistic terminology is presupposed, and more general cultural terms are explained in a way that is useful and nonpatronizing. D's excursus on difficulties arising from the transcription of historical documents (22) will seem peripheral to some readers, but welcome and useful to others. Similarly, his definitions of bilingualism will be too superficial for many scholars, yet on reflection will be found satisfactory for the task at hand (5f.). The book is eminently suitable for those interested in Irish or in historical sociolinguistics more generally—indeed, it provides a fascinating comparison for anyone working on other languages. It brings its descriptions to an end with Irish independence in 1922, but concludes with thought-provoking discussion of the role of languages in Irish society since then. While this reviewer understands the logistical and intellectual reasons for not adding a couple more chapters to bring the reader up to the present day, he very much hopes D will produce a second volume to close the gap. The story so far has been a fascinating treat.

School of Modern Languages
University of Bristol
BS8 1TE, United Kingdom
[nils.langer@bris.ac.uk]

Interfaces and domains of quantification. By JAVIER GUTIÉRREZ-REXACH. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2014. Pp. vii, 243. ISBN 9780814212554. \$69.95.

Reviewed by XAVIER VILLALBA, *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona**

Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach is certainly the most important Spanish semanticist. Unfortunately, most of his recent work has circulated in unpublished form, so we must congratulate him on collecting most of this cutting-edge research on Spanish quantification here. The volume inaugurates the series 'Theoretical developments in Hispanic linguistics'.

The book begins with a chapter, 'The view from the syntax-semantics interface', that argues for a syntax-semantics approach to the study of quantification, while offering an overview of the multiple approaches to quantification in modern linguistic theory. G-R's account, however, understates the contribution of Richard Montague to the analysis of quantification in general and scope ambiguities in particular (the groundbreaking *The proper treatment of quantification in ordinary English* (Montague 1974) is not mentioned).

Ch. 2, 'Scope parallelism and the interpretation of ellipsis', begins with a thorough description of the different scope restrictions on English VP ellipsis and the influential proposal by Fox (2000), who defends the interaction between a parallelism requirement for ellipsis and an economy requirement on semantic derivations: the ellipsis scope generalization (ESG). G-R convincingly argues on the basis of Spanish data that only parallelism is at stake, dismissing economy. On the theoretical side, he simply follows previous attacks on Fox's ESG as a global economy constraint, and hence as theoretically suspicious and computationally intractable. Then G-R offers clear Spanish counterexamples to Fox's analysis. The evidence is solid and adds support to previous interpretive approaches to ellipsis (Dalrymple et al. 1996, Hardt 1999, López & Winkler 2000).

In Ch. 3, 'Indefinites and sentential modality', G-R develops a solution to the role of subjunctive modality in blocking wide scope of indefinites in relative, but not in complement or adjunct, clauses. Since Spanish relatives with subjunctive mood show that purely semantic solutions are untenable, his proposal involves two syntactic ingredients: the noun-raising analysis of relatives