REVIEWS


Reviewed by SALVATORE CALOMINO, University of Wisconsin–Madison

The prospect of writing a grammar of Notker’s German has long been a goal of those involved in editing his adaptations of Latin philosophical works and school tracts. In his capacity as director of the monastery school at St. Gallen, Notker der Deutsche, or Notker Labeo, (ca. 950–1022), translated or adapted a number of Latin works derived from the philosophical traditions of late antiquity (cf. Ochsenbein 1999, Sonderegger 1970). Among these was the allegorical introduction to Martianus Capella’s De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii, a text of decided importance for the instruction of the seven liberal arts throughout the rest of the Middle Ages. The linguistic and contextual difficulties of Martianus’s work prompted various commentaries especially during the later Carolingian period. The commentary on Martianus by Remigius of Auxerre became associated with the St. Gallen monastery school and is cited by Notker at the opening of his translation of De nuptiis (cf. King 1986). Despite whatever resolution of philosophical conundrums Notker’s translation might have yielded, it is his use of German in translating the first two books of Martianus that has attracted predominant critical and editorial attention.

As the most recent of Evelyn Scherabon Firchow’s Notker transcriptions De nuptiis appears now in Georg Olms Verlag in continuation of her series begun originally through Walter de Gruyter. Previous volumes in this group have included Notker’s versions of the two Boethius translations De Interpretatione and Categoricae, both derived from works by Aristotle. As with these earlier volumes in the series, the present text of Notker’s Martianus Capella translation includes a diplomatic transcription of the manuscript, Codex Sangallensis 872, a Latin concordance, a Latin reverse concordance, an Old High German

concordance, a Old High German reverse concordance, lists of both Latin and Old High German word frequencies, as well as additional lists and data for lexical purposes. The material is presented with the transcription and Latin lists appearing in the first volume and the Old High German lists in the second.

The organization of both volumes leads to a discussion of Firchow’s several goals. The possibility of assembling a Notker dictionary or augmenting those previously published lexicons of Notker’s German (Sehrt and Legner 1955, Sehrt 1962, Köbler 1974) would seem to be well served by the multiple systems of ordering used for this and other transcriptions in the series. A further consideration is how this latest edition of Notker’s Martianus translation might contribute to a larger grammatical investigation. Indeed the editorial intentions presented in the introduction to this transcription offer the possibility that these “Textabdrucke und Konkordanzen als brauchbare Hilfsmittel für die Erstellung eines vollständigen Notkerwörterbuchs und einer ausführlichen Notkergrammatik erwiesen werden” (xii).

The guidelines forming the basis of this edition are outlined clearly in the introduction. In keeping with this background and plan, Firchow elaborates on the inception of her work with the CSg 872 during the 1970s as well as her repeated intensive use of the manuscript in the years just prior to the publication of this edition. She points to the reasons that a fully diplomatic transcription—or at least a transcription that would come as close to this objective as possible—is now a more realistic ideal; further, this transcription should be met with wider acceptance than would have been so in the earlier phases of her work. From this discussion it is clear that Firchow’s transcriptions could offer the material needed as a base for the revision of existing lexicons and grammatical studies on Notker.

Previous editions of the Martianus Capella text in Notker’s translation have also grappled with the problems of a systematic approach to rendering the text while giving an accurate representation of the unique manuscript. Although the edition published as part of Notker’s philosophical works by Paul Piper in 1882 did contain accents and some interpunctuation from the manuscript, it represented a compromise of editorial principles and was superseded by later attempts. The version edited by E. H. Sehrt and Taylor Starck (1935) included an apparatus, so that emendations could be followed, but Notker’s text was also subject to considerable normalization in this series through the Altdeutsche Textbibliothek (ATB). In the more recent ATB series of Notker editions
The possibilities of a diplomatic transcription have generally been seen as a desirable goal. The edition of Notker’s translation of Martianus Capella’s *De nuptiis* completed by King can be taken as a case in point: he describes the edition as “ein modifiziert diplomatischer Textabdruck” (King 1979:xxi). In keeping with such editorial goals King reproduces Notker’s text with page numbers and linear counts on those pages as in the manuscript CSg 872 (2–170). The treatment of some individual letters and syllabification, word division or lack of the same, the resolution of abbreviations, and the introduction of editorial corrections define the actual limitations imposed on a fully diplomatic transcription in this edition. In comparison, Firchow’s transcription of Notker’s Martianus translation attempts to give a version of the text with even less editorial intrusion, that is, one that shows as accurately as possible the state of the scribal language. Our discussion will necessarily involve additional comparisons of these latter two versions of Notker’s translation.

An examination of the merits of varying degrees of diplomatic transcription is—of necessity—bound up with questions of function and audience. Although such a transcription should represent accurately the state of one manuscript, it is useful to read individual leaves against reproductions from the original copy. In Firchow’s edition of *De nuptiis* a sample illustration was not included on grounds of both cost and principle, as explained by the editor in her introduction (xiii). Since Firchow had, however, developed this method in previous Notker volumes, where at least a single leaf was reproduced, it would be helpful in *De nuptiis* also to have a facsimile page for comparison. In lieu of this possibility, we may refer to the pages reproduced in King’s transcription (King 1979, CSg 872:57, 93) in order to gauge differing approaches to a diplomatic rendition of Notker’s text.

Both Firchow and King have attempted to give an accurate representation of the overall layout of pages in the manuscript. Both editors have thus avoided the introduction of artificial divisions in the text. In previous editorial practice topical headings had been isolated and centered; in both editions here they are simply indicated in upper case followed by a period (*Punkt*), space, or both. Notker’s text then frequently appears in run-on as part of the same line as the heading. The actual system chosen by either editor to present the text reflects individual goals and editorial philosophy, as is traditional with this material. In the present edition Firchow has chosen to give the Old High German text in bold and the Latin text in roman type. She uses italics to indicate the
resolution of scribal abbreviations. In King’s transcription the Latin text of *De nuptiis* appears regularly in italics, whereas Notker’s German and the use of Latin words in commentary are given in normal or roman type. Since the manuscript CSg 872 did not differentiate between the three possibilities, no further attempt is made to separate the layers of text on linguistic grounds (for an illustration, see King 1979:57). Here we encounter not only some of the advantages of the recent version, but also some of the contradictions of the diplomatic transcription. Firchow’s version has clearly made more accessible the isolation of Old High German text and words in this “Mischprosa” (Backes 1982:16 and commentary). For further linguistic and lexical investigations her system could be a useful tool in assembling paleographic evidence. At the same time, this method signals an intrusion, which departs from the diplomatic aims achieved in other parts of her edition.

Additional aspects of the diplomatic transcription in Firchow’s version contribute to the overall picture of scribal practice used in copying Notker’s text in the eleventh century. All scribal abbreviations that are resolved can be seen in the printed text in italics. Since the Latin abbreviations resolved (e.g., *usq*[ue], *fortit*[er], *mediu*[m]) are found frequently in the shortened form in medieval manuscripts, the resolutions were simply executed and generally not indicated in previous editions of *De nuptiis*, or other of Notker’s works. By the same token, abbreviations in Old High German words can be seen, for instance, in verbal endings that are here given in full but italicized (e.g., “hôret”). Firchow shows ligatures in both Latin and Old High German in her transcription with a sublinear arc. Further she attempts to render vocalic idiosyncrasies with characters approximating scribal practice (here, e.g., uppercase “Ü”). Given this meticulous reproduction of scribal habit it would seem fitting to render the long or shaft -s as marked in the manuscript. Firchow has, however, given this character as expected in modern script.

Under the rubric of syntactic markers Firchow proceeds with expected thoroughness. It has long been accepted that the value of the period in St. Gallen manuscripts of Notker’s works depended on its position. When suspended above the line the period seems to indicate a longer or more definite pause than its equivalent position directly level with the script. The present transcription reproduces, where determinable, the position of periods—both linear and superlinear—from the manuscript. Previous editions have approached this problem by maintaining linear periods yet indicating through spacing if an extended pause were determined. Despite Firchow’s laudable efforts to mirror scribal practice,
the system of punctuation adopted here might allow for additional cases that fall between the predominant types listed. Indeed it cannot always be determined without editorial conjecture which of the two periods was intended.

In several final considerations we confront the advantages and difficulties of a diplomatic transcription in Firchow’s version. Contrary to at least the German portion of earlier editions, scribal errors are here given as such in the body of the transcription, and a corrected reading is suggested only in the apparatus. This approach is fully in keeping with the ambitions of a diplomatic transcription, even though the resultant text may not prove as beneficial to the reader. At the same time Firchow’s introduction of arcs and additional signs to aid the reader in joining or separating words and syllables may indeed serve the intended function, but they are at once an editorial intrusion on the diplomatic nature of the text. It would seem that attempts to create a system for depicting Notker’s language, or its scribal rendition, can thwart the goals of the edition if extratextual markers are the alternative chosen.

Readers will now have the opportunity to choose between earlier editions of *De nuptiis* and Firchow’s transcription, which indeed reflects scribal method more exactly. Although a specific bibliography is not part of this edition, Firchow’s planned *Notkerbibliographie* has in the meantime appeared. Those interested in pursuing additional studies on Notker can now decide how they wish to proceed based on a wider range of editorial methods. For Notker the translator and transmitter of philosophical texts we might still consult earlier editions of his works as well as these more recent attempts. For linguistic and paleographic investigations on Notker the editions by King and now Firchow must stand clearly in the forefront. Each of these transcriptions attempts with measured success to give an accurate picture of Notker’s language in *De nuptiis*. Firchow perhaps describes the challenge most succinctly in her words, that “... auch ein peinlichst genauer Textabdruck ist in einem gewissen Sinn eine Edition” (xiii).
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Reviewed by ERIK SCHLEEF, University of Michigan

Nils Langer wrote this book with one major aim: to explore whether prescriptive grammarians influenced the formation of standard German. He does this by comparing language use and metalinguistic comments in the Early New High German period and by eliminating other factors,
including “... system-internal reasons (as illustrated by an analysis of ENHG language use), sociolinguistic identification (as illustrated by distributional patterns of language use, e.g., with regard to text type)” (4), or random variation. Langer aims to establish that certain constructions disappeared from standard-language use after prescriptive grammarians’ objections. He does not claim that grammarians are the major “creators” of standard German, but that we must assume a certain degree of influence for certain constructions, in particular when it comes to excluding features from the standard language. With this aim in mind, he investigates the use of periphrastic tun and to a lesser degree poly-negation and double perfect constructions.

The book is divided into two parts. Part one investigates the regional and functional distribution of periphrastic tun. This is to show that periphrastic tun was a frequent construction in the Early New High German period that was not yet stigmatized by grammarians. Langer first presents an overview of the distribution and function of periphrastic tun in various stages of West Germanic languages. In present-day standard German, periphrastic tun is ungrammatical with the exception of verb topicalization; however, it is widespread in all modern German dialects. In the final chapter of part one, Langer examines a new corpus of 127 Early New High German texts drawn from the Heidelberg corpus. His results show that periphrastic tun displays an even distribution when it comes to region, time and text type, that is, he could identify no meaningful variation in the distribution of periphrastic tun with respect to these three variables. Periphrastic tun was found in 50% of all texts. Therefore, he concludes that the stigmatization of periphrastic tun cannot be due to distributional restrictions of frequency of occurrence, to restrictions on certain functions inherent in only one dialect and regional distribution, nor to temporal shifts in use and text-type factors.

Langer also discusses the grammatical function of periphrastic tun and concludes that tun is “a grammatical dummy with no specific semantics or grammatical properties except those that it shares with any other auxiliary” (10). Previous literature has suggested that periphrastic tun might be polyfunctional; in contrast to that, Langer claims that the widespread distribution of periphrastic tun is not due to polyfunctionality but its “semantic vagueness or vacuity” (71). In other words, periphrastic tun does not add any predictable meaning to a sentence, and because of this property it can be used to shift the phrase order in a sentence without changing its denotational meaning. Langer further assumes that this property was partly responsible for the stigmatization of periphrastic tun,
since—as evidenced in metalinguistic comments—contemporary grammarians were aware of its semantic vacuity.

Part two of the book examines a corpus of grammatical works from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, with the aim of investigating the influence of grammarians’ metalinguistic comments on the stigmatization of periphrastic tun. An introductory chapter gives an overview of the development of standard German in general and the views on the influence of grammarians in its development. Langer points out that the ideal of a standard language changed in the Early New High German period from that of a prestigious regional variety to a prestigious variety “that was spoken nowhere and everywhere” (138–139). This view became increasingly accepted in the seventeenth century.

Before looking at periphrastic tun, Langer investigates the process of stigmatization of polynegation and double perfect, in order to compare these two features to periphrastic tun. Langer concludes that the stigmatization of periphrastic tun is indeed due to the influence of grammarians; however, the process of stigmatization of periphrastic tun evolved independently from the stigmatization of polynegation and double perfect, since it occurred in different time intervals. Langer postulates four major stages for the stigmatization of periphrastic tun in standard German: stage I (until 1640): no stigmatization, however there is evidence that the construction was much more widespread in spoken than in written German; stage II (1640–1680): stigmatization as bad poetry; stage III (1680–1740): stigmatization as bad written German and labeling as a feature of Southern German; stage IV (after 1740): general stigmatization and association with speakers of lower social status. Since the grammarians’ comments seem to be the only factors contributing to the stigmatization of periphrastic tun, Langer concludes that they were largely responsible for its ungrammaticality in standard German. A final chapter summarizes the conclusions of the book. The appendix of this book includes a list of the instances of periphrastic tun and a list of the metalinguistic comments, as well as a bibliography of all corpora and the secondary literature.

This is a useful book. Its discussion of periphrastic tun in various West Germanic languages is probably the best published overview of the material, and Langer manages successfully to contrast different views and opinions on use and functions of periphrastic tun in different language varieties. He offers an insightful selection of metalinguistic comments indicative of language stigmatization and illustrates their interesting dynamics; and he provides new evidence for the role
grammarians played in the stigmatization as well as standardization of German. Despite its many strengths, there are four issues that could be improved in future research:

1. Corpus and statistics. Langer’s analysis of periphrastic tun is based on texts from the Heidelberg corpus. Although the Heidelberg corpus is large, it is socially very limited and it is not possible to rule out idiolectal variation as an intervening factor, since multiple text samples for region and time are not included. With such a general text corpus, only general results can be obtained, which is perfectly acceptable, since Langer’s work represents the first large-scale work on periphrastic tun in Early New High German based on an extensive corpus. However, Langer submits this very broad dataset to an insufficient statistical methodology so that his statistical results are not very persuasive. Langer does not offer statistical measures of significance in his comparisons and simply divides texts into two groups, “tun positive” and “tun negative.” One instance of periphrastic tun is enough to count a text as tun-positive. Certainly, writers only use structures that are acceptable to them, but there are varying degrees of acceptability, and some speakers are more likely to use features of spoken language than others. Therefore, the percentage representations of tun (total texts divided by tun-texts) are slightly unconvincing. So when in his summary to part two Langer claims that “the stigmatization of auxiliary tun was indeed caused by the metalinguistic comments of prescriptive grammarians” (213), one feels almost obliged to contest such a broad claim, because at no point in the book is the reader confronted with sound statistical correlations between language use and metalinguistic comments. Langer does not prove cause and effect; he tries to rule out other factors to reach his conclusion.

2. The function of periphrastic tun. Although Langer’s arguments on the vacuity of periphrastic tun in Early New High German seem sound, this is certainly not the last word on the function of periphrastic tun in German. A closer look at only one modern dialect variety might uncover surprising results. Syntactic variables often involve special semantic and pragmatic circumstances, which may occur rarely or unpredictably. The function of periphrastic tun might therefore be motivated by pragmatic factors, which are most prevalent in spoken language rather than written. Investigations of tun in modern spoken dialects might therefore shed more light on its historical functions. Discourse-functional approaches to grammar might be particularly fruitful in such an endeavor.

3. Sociolinguistic theory. Language standardization is widely discussed in sociolinguistic research; however, Langer’s book appears to
lack a strong theoretical model of standardization. Langer makes no reference to the large body of work on standard language ideology, which could have provided a framework to pull together various strands of his argument by linking prescriptive grammar and changes in use to changes in a society’s beliefs about language. One may contrast this with a work such as Lippi-Green 1994, which uses sociolinguistic theory to tackle the thorny issues of cause and effect in historical sociolinguistics.

4. Behavior of syntactic variables. Another theoretical point that could have been discussed is the typical sociolinguistic behavior of syntactic variables. Recent research (Cheshire 1999) suggests that syntactic variables tend not to be sociolinguistically gradient like phonological variables; instead they form sharp patterns of social stratification, that is, they are only used by one social group but not others, and are less likely to move from lower to higher social strata in contemporary Western societies. It would have been interesting to evaluate the Early New High German data in the light of these findings.

In conclusion, this book makes available an excellent discussion of the function and development of periphrastic *tun* in West Germanic languages and of the role grammarians played in the process of standardization of German. Although Langer’s data presentation is not always sufficient to support the claims he makes when it comes to discussing links between language use and metalinguistic comments, each part of the book can stand on its own and is a useful and thought-provoking description and discussion of periphrastic *tun* and the dynamics of standardization and language stigmatization.
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Reviewed by ELLY VAN GELDEREN, Arizona State University

This book describes the word order in sentences with a modal and a main verb, with an auxiliary and a present participle, and with an auxiliary and a past participle. The term MULTIPLE PREDICATE is defined as a construction “involving two predicates, one finite and the other non-finite” (1). The data mainly come from Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies and the CD contains a list of files with the example sentences from the book. It is not clear (e.g., page 8) whether the author transcribed the text himself or used the Old English Dictionary e-text of the homilies (from page 44, it appears that he used the latter, since he uses other texts from that project).

The introductory chapter reviews the work by Barrett, Liggins, Kohonen, Koopman, and Davis. The justification Ohkado gives for another study of the topic is that not enough emphasis has been placed on the reasons behind the order of the two verbal elements. Chapter 1 provides the theoretical framework, which is a government-binding one of the late 1980s. Old English (henceforth OE) is assumed to be SOV with V(erb)-movement to I(nflection) and to C(omplementizer) in main clauses. The I follows its VP complement. Extrapo-sition and V(P)-raising are also assumed. The explanations for the word order provided later in the book, however, are not in the generative framework (e.g., elements move to check Case) but are mainly phrased functionally, in terms of phonological weight: if the modal is heavier than the main verb, it will follow the main verb and vice versa.

Chapter 2 discusses modals and their position vis-à-vis the main verb. The modals are considered verbs, and the two orders the author is concerned with, given here with Modern English forms, are the following: if you will my commands obey, which is termed head-initial, and if anyone this book transcribe will, head-final. The explanation for the different order is sought in how many syllables the modal and the nonfinite verb have (40–43): if the nonfinite has more than one syllable, Modal-Verb (MV) order is preferred. This, however, is not the entire story, because if both modal and verb have two syllables, the order is more often MV than VM. There are other factors, in particular the presence of adverbials and objects, making the VP heavy (57) and prone to rightward movement. Rightward VP movement accounts for the MV order.
Chapter 3 examines the order of auxiliaries (*beon*, *wesan*, and *weorfan*) and the present or past participle they are connected to (the order differences are abbreviated as BV or VB). The same calculations are done as in the case of modals and verbs, but here disyllabic auxiliaries carry more weight and cause a VB order even with participles that are five syllables long (71). Thus, again pure syllable weight is not sufficient, but as in the case of modals, taking objects and adverbials into consideration does lead to the right predictions. Chapter 4 considers a copula followed by a predicative adjective, and again the same questions are addressed: relative weight of the adjective and auxiliaries and the presence of additional material in the VP. The latter is again the main determinant of the order. This, however, makes an analysis difficult, since predicate adjectives are not usually seen as VPs, according to Ohkado, and therefore cannot be explained by VP-raising as in the other two cases. This is a good argument (unless, of course, the copula has moved to I and the AP is contained in the VP left behind), and it is supplemented with crosslinguistic data from Dutch and Flemish, where adjectives only precede copulas. The author, probably wisely, avoids the long debate (e.g., Mossé 1938) about whether the participle is verbal or adjectival. If participles were adjectival, the constructions of chapters 3 and 4 should get a unified analysis, not the ones in chapters 2 and 3.

Chapter 5 covers V(P)-raising. Using earlier work, the author shows that the constructions with modals and auxiliaries are different from those with adjectives (117–118) in terms of the order. A chi-square test (done by the reviewer) shows that the differences are indeed statistically significant. In his earlier work, Ohkado had argued that VP complements have two movement processes available to them and AdjP complements only one, causing “the higher frequency of head-initial patterns” (118). In the current work, he argues that the determining factor is the heaviness of the VP/AdjP. Chapter 6 examines constructions in which the VP/AdjP contains no other elements.

Chapters 7 and 8 examine the relationship between verbal order on the one hand, and extraposition and topicalization/scrambling on the other. Criticizing Koopman’s (1992) account for the rarity of object extraposition in auxiliary-final position in terms of VP-raising, Ohkado shows that VP-raising cannot be correct. The reason is again based on the similarity of adjective constructions to the modal-verb and auxiliary-participle ones. His own account is stylistically based (151).

In conclusion, Ohkado’s book provides descriptions of the different ways in which modals and auxiliaries occur in relation to nonfinite verbs.
The account for the tendencies is claimed to be the heaviness of the complement of the finite modal/auxiliary.
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Reviewed by W. A. BENWARE, University of California, Davis

One might think that after seventy-plus years of debating the phonological status of the velar versus palatal fricative in German (the “ach-Laut” and the “ich-Laut” respectively), nothing new could be said about it. The monograph under review shows why this is not the case. And nowhere will one find a more exhaustive historical overview of the various positions taken since 1929, when Daniel Jones first treated the question (he writes of it, however, as a bit of common knowledge among linguists). From Jones to the latest views from Optimality Theory, the reader is skillfully guided through the various questions this issue has raised: Is this one phoneme or two? Is morphological information included or not? Are boundary phenomena included or not? Is /x/ underlying or /ç/? Is -chen a “phonological word” or are there in fact two different suffixes? To what extent should loanwords be brought into the discussion? And there are other issues, too, which have not been raised before, especially the one posed in the title. Thus, every possible ques-
tion raised about these two sounds and every conceivable answer is given its due; this comprehensive survey makes up the whole of chapter 3. The first two chapters clear the ground for this history of the discussion: Chapter 1 deals with the issue of the definition of “Standard German,” and chapter 2 deals with the “bare facts” regarding the distribution of [x] and [ç].

So, what is valuable about this book other than the thorough historical overview?

The first is obviously Robinson’s proposed solution to the problem, which bears some resemblance to that in Hermann 1932. Basically, phonetic [ç] has two different sources or representations in the lexicon: one which is found in the suffix -chen and initially in loanwords and specified for palatality in the lexicon; the other is the [ç] after nonback vowels and consonantal sonorants, sometimes alternating with [x] in the same morpheme. Even if one does not in the end subscribe to this solution, there is a great deal about the phonological argumentation worth emulating. The author backs up his proposal in the latter two-thirds of the book with evidence for a nonautomatic [ç] (chapter 4); a discussion of the consonantal environments of [ç], in which the crucial arguments for /n l t/ as a natural class with the front vowels are laid out (chapter 5); and supporting data from regional German, especially the change of [ç] to [ç] (chapter 6). Chapter 7 gives a critical examination of the solutions of Lexical Phonology; chapter 8 does the same for Optimality Theory. Chapter 9 briefly sums up.

The second contribution of this monograph to the study of German in particular and phonological theory in general is its exemplary linguistic argumentation. This achievement is illustrated by its attention to three important issues: the nature of the database itself; the question of universal phonological patterning; and an evaluation of various theoretical approaches.

The theoretician seeking to buttress a phonological theory is obliged to consider all the available evidence from the lexicon and sift it carefully. Although this would appear to be an obvious requirement of theory building, it is not one that is consistently followed in practice, as Robinson pointedly demonstrates when discussing the distribution of [ç] and [x] in loanwords. But more is meant here by “data” than the lexicon of the standard language. The title of his monograph alludes to the fact that the net is to be cast more widely: Just what does one mean by “German”? In Robinson’s view it means more than the standard language as it is codified in the three major pronouncing dictionaries. All
varieties of German must be taken into account. Doing so has strategic advantages when it comes to making theoretical decisions. Often such data are brought into phonological argumentation to support a position, but in an informal and unsystematic fashion. In the present case, Robinson enters into a detailed discussion of the evolution of dialectal /$s$/ from earlier /$ç$/; a change which has occurred in many central German dialects. He then uses this observation to show two things: that in these dialects, [x] and [s] can alternate in the same morpheme and therefore /x/ must be the underlying or default value (since there is a nonalternating [s] as well, which cannot be derived from /x/). Since this is clearly the case in these dialects, why, then, would [ç] be the underived variant in the standard language, as has been proposed in a number of treatments of the problem? The other use of dialect information comes in specifying the feature geometry for palatal consonants: Robinson proposes that [ç] is a complex segment with association to both the coronal and the dorsal node, since both blade and dorsum are implicated in its pronunciation. Back vowels are dorsal, as is [x], which occurs after back vowels; front vowels and /n l r/ are coronal (/r/ is realized as a “frontish” central vowel before [ç]). The evolution of [ç] (coronal and dorsal) to [s] (coronal) is thus a simplification, wherein the association to the dorsal node is delinked.

This last point leads to a consideration of universal patterning. Alongside of the complexity of the feature geometry of [ç] is the fact that this sound appears relatively infrequently in the world’s languages, that is, it is marked or relatively less “natural.” This supports the case against its being considered as the underlying representation or the default variant in the phonology of German. In constraint-based approaches (e.g., Optimality Theory), where markedness plays a crucial role, this is an essential point.

Robinson’s evaluation of both Lexical Phonology and Optimality Theory indicates that each provides an adequate framework to support his thesis that [ç] has two “origins” in the phonology. As long as one accepts the notion of a peripheral phonological contrast (which applies in the present case to the initial sound in -chen, a loan suffix in the Standard, and to all loanwords with initial [ç]), then the latter is already specified in the lexicon as [coronal] and [dorsal]. The other [ç], which is underspecified as [+obstruent, +continuant, +high], receives the feature [coronal] as the result of spreading from the preceding segment. This [ç] often alternates with [x] after vowel and occurs also after the consonantal sonorants /n l r/.
Although a lexical phonological account is suitable to account for the facts regarding [x] and [ç], Optimality Theory is more flexible when it comes to including colloquial pronunciations and loanwords. By ranking two (or three) constraints (and a fourth for loanwords) in systematically different ways, all of the possible pronunciations fall out easily, including the change of [ç] to [ʃ] as well as variations in loanword pronunciation.

_Whose German?_ skillfully blends descriptive thoroughness of a modern language with all its variations and a discerning and critical use of phonological theory. If nothing else it demonstrates that only a comprehensive knowledge of both renders conclusions in phonology credible and the study of universals possible. This is a gem of a monograph that should be on the shelf of every phonologist and every specialist on the German language.
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Reviewed by ROBERT K. BLOOMER, _The State University of New York at Stony Brook_

This book is a substantial offering to Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler, the Austrian linguist who recently marked his 60th birthday. It consists of the contents (iii–vii) showing fifty-six studies, ten of which were written by two persons each; a brief foreword and afterword (both ix) with kind words for the _Jubilar_; a tabula gratulatoria (xi–xiii) listing over 100
names and institutes; Dressler’s curriculum vitae (xv–xvii), which begins in 1957 at the University of Vienna, where he has been Head of the Department of Linguistics since 1978; and his bibliography (xix–xxxiv) of over 400 works, some thirty of which were coauthored or coedited with one of twenty-one of the authors in this festschrift. Then come the alphabetically arranged articles (1–514), each limited to roughly ten pages in order to accommodate as many parties as possible. There is no index.

The editors (ix) sum up the contents of this anthology in exactly one word, stating that it reflects Dressler’s interests in linguistics: everything. What “everything” means is summarized nicely on the back cover, with a parting characterization of the book itself: “It can truly be said to encompass the widest possible range of authors and linguistic topics that is possible within a single volume.” This is impressive, especially as a tribute to one linguist, and perhaps the reason why the editors chose not to elaborate. Besides, there is a table of contents. But to decide whether to venture even this far, readers might desire an overview, one that sheds light on any commonalities among the topics. This reviewer will be glad to perform the task.

The majority of the studies deal with themes from the linguistic levels. With nearly half overall, the best represented of these is morphology, usually in connection with at least one other level. Of the twenty or so articles in the area of grammar, two are on the acquisition of noun plurals in German (Dagmer Bittner and Klaus-Michael Köpcke, 47–58; Chris Schaner-Wolles, 451–460) that I will revisit below. We also find one treatment each of modal verbs (Werner Abraham, 1–9) and the numeral classifier system in German (Christian Lehmann, 249–253), of gender assignment in Russian (Ursula Doleschal, 105–110) and Italian (Anna M. Thornton, 479–487), and of the abstracted verb HBU ‘to crawl’ in Moroccan Arabic (Jeffrey Heath, 183–193). Among the word-formational studies, two are on diminutives, in Italian (Nicola Grandi and Sergio Scalise, 133–142) and in English (Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi, 315–326), and one each on productivity and compounding in English (Ferenc Keefer, 225–231), on the “nouniness” of Hungarian adjectives (Edith A. Moravcsik, 337–346), on derivational and inflectional morphemes in Polish (Agnieszka Anna Reid and William David Marslen-Wilson, 403–412), and on wh-prefixes (leading example wäisch ‘you know’) in Swiss German (Henk van Riemsdijk, 423–431). This area can also claim one of the more clever titles in the collection: “Riesengratulationskompositum—*Kompositumgratulationsriesen or:
Why are there no complex head-initial compounds?” (Hubert Haider, 165–174).

On the level of phonology, there are some ten studies, three of which involve less common languages, that is, vowel length in Tsez (Bernard Comrie, 81–86), vocalism and prosody in Yucatec Mayan (Bernhard Hurch, 195–206), and natural classes of stops in Daghestanian (Sandro V. Kodzasov, 241–247), along with monophthongization in Viennese (Sylvia Moosmüller and Ralf Vollmann, 327–335), and word structure in Danish (Hans Basbøll, 19–26). Only two articles are syntactically oriented, one on relative clauses (Alexander Grosu, 143–152), and another on the prosodic determination of syntactic variation (Martin Prinzhorn, 375–382).

Beyond these, the volume contains some twenty studies on subjects in a variety of realms. Four of them focus primarily on language change, under the aspects of diagrammatic correspondence (Michele Loporcaro, 273–280), biuniqueness (Andrew Carstairs-McCarthy, 65–72), causality (Peter Schifko, 461–467), and direction (Wolfgang Ullrich Wurzel, 507–514). Three have to do with the role of language in society, as in Austria’s concept of self-identity (Rudolf de Cillia and Florian Menz, 73–80). Two pursue topics in text linguistics, one using a Bayesian approach (Elisabeth Leinfellner, 255–263) and the other examining Peter Handke’s *Das Spiel vom Fragen* (Oswald Panagl, 355–363). Two each are on psycholinguistics (Grzegorz Dogil, 97–103; Orsolya Thuma and Csaba Pléh, 489–497) and discourse (Eva Hajičová, 175–181; Petr Šgall, 469–474), and one is on the development of Modern Greek oxi ‘no’ (Brian D. Joseph, 207–214). Less traditional are an evaluation of talkshow genres and role assignment (Helmut Gruber and Johanna Lalouschek, 153–163), and a so-called ardhaśataka for Dressler (Rajendra Singh, 475–478), comprising fifty quotes from him on language and linguistics. Here is number 14 (475): “Perhaps contemporary linguistics uses the word ‘theory’ very generously because it really has none to offer.” Sobering as it may be, one must take it with a grain of salt, as would many of the authors here, in particular those who take up naturalness in morphology (Marianne Kilani-Schoch, 233–240) and in phonology (Katarzyna Dziubalska-Kolaczzyk, 111–119; John Rennison, 413–422), Optimality Theory (Geoffrey S. Nathan and Margaret E. Winters, 347–354), and theories in applied linguistics (Ruth Wodak, 499–505).

This range of topics and authors may not be as wide as advertised, but wide it is, with a good number of articles by linguists who them-
selves have international reputations. Most of the studies do reflect Dressler’s influence, which in many instances is acknowledged with opening notes of gratitude to him. The overview also shows an emphasis on level-based linguistics, with morphology as the most popular. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the rise of this level, especially since the 60s, is attributable in no small part to Dressler’s impetus. “Naturally!”—the first word in the title of this collection—is thus a fully justified pun.

When evaluating the studies, we find that most of them are already mature works, while some are still preliminary sketches. It would not be fair to subject the latter to criticism, since their authors exercise restraint. Nor would it be feasible to even summarize the contents of so many articles, regardless of their quality. But space is still available to draw in three studies, the first two of which go together.

As noted above, the volume contains two works on the acquisition of plural markings in German. This offers us a convenient opportunity to compare independent treatments of a topic in the same language. In one, Bittner and Köpcke (47–58) collected a longitudinal data sample from eight children, with at least six recordings of each child over the period of 1;11 to 2;10 years, resulting in 600 tokens. In the other, Chris Schaner-Wolles (451–460) conducted an experiment in which his subjects—seventy-six monolingual German-speaking children from 2;02 to 6;04 years old, with a relatively balanced distribution among the ages—participated in a picture elicitation task with forty-five items representing all of the German plural forms. In both, the authors highlight the nontarget forms that occur in their respective corpora, taking age effects into consideration. The former observe that the omission of the plural marking occurs most frequently, while the latter says this for incorrect suffixes on items of the zero-ending class. This seems to be a conflict, until one notices that Bittner and Köpcke’s children (not necessarily their own!) are at the earliest stage of acquisition, able to perceive but not yet express with those nouns what is captured by the notion of constructional iconicity. And both find that the second-densest concentration of errors involves -(e)n. We would expect this marker to rank high because it has the highest type frequency. But the agreement between the studies instills even more faith in their methodological soundness. Following analyses of their data, both lead to the same conclusion, despite divergences of the theoretical terms in which they are couched: children first store plural forms lexically, and then they begin to derive them, occasionally making overgeneralizations.
The third study may appeal to a broader spectrum of readers because of its roots in current economic life. It examines numerous linguistic aspects of the term for a recently introduced currency: euro (Hans Christian Luschützky and Liliana Madelska, 291–300). After describing manifestations of eu- in several languages of the European Union, the authors humorously comment that, if plotted onto a vowel scheme, “the contours of the various realizations of the initial diphthongs in euro look like a plate of spaghetti” (295). Turning then to Polish, they take up problems with gender (98.5% of their 200 informants did not know it), declension (unlike dolar, euro exhibits no formal exponents for case or number), pragmatics (no acceptable diminutive can be formed), compounding (euro is short and cacophonic, so speakers and writers transform it to euro-waluta ‘euro-currency’), and language change (euro follows the tendency to replace inflected forms with isolating constructions). If only half as problematic as in Polish, then I agree that “treatment of euro in languages outside Europe ... would be highly interesting” (299).

Before finishing, two other comments are in order. First, with frequent handling, the pages of this somewhat bulky book tend to become detached. A more sturdy spine and perhaps a hard cover would have gone far to avoid this. And second, like the rest of the volume, all of the articles are written in English. Although most of the authors are not native speakers of this language, their prose is very readable, which probably resulted from careful editing in a uniformly prepared text that is virtually free of formal errors.

Despite an attempt to be inclusive, a few of the authors have, unfortunately, gone without mention. And even though only a small number of studies could be looked at in any depth, enough has been said to form an opinion: this book, largely a document of recent thinking in European linguistics, is well worth the time and attention.

Reviewed by JOHN R. TE VELDE, Oklahoma State University

This study is the result of “substantial changes and revisions” (v) undertaken on an MIT dissertation completed in 1998 that brings into focus a large body of research on infinitive constructions. It consists of an introductory chapter, four core chapters, and a closing chapter with a summary and conclusion; it also includes an appendix with a sizable collection of data from German, as well as a table of verb classifications from five languages.

The point of departure taken in the study is that a simple restructuring/nonrestructuring system is insufficient for capturing the distribution of infinitival constructions in German. W claims that there are four classes made up of two types of restructuring (lexical vs. functional), as well as two grades of (non)restructuring (full vs. reduced). Because the tests that distinguish the types of infinitive constructions are to a large extent language-specific, W concentrates on German in the main body of the study, though a good deal of comparison with English occurs.

Restructuring is understood in terms of how and to what extent an infinitival complement clause is a transparent domain for syntactic phenomena that are otherwise quite local or clause-bounded. Properties used to distinguish one type from the others are 1) long object movement, 2) nonfocus scrambling, 3) nonobligatory control, 4) independent embedded tense contribution, 5) focus scrambling, 6) pronoun fronting, 7) relative clause pied-piping, 8) intraposition and 9) extraposition of infinitive, and finally 10) the IPP (infinitivus pro participio) effect. However, only some of these properties are used to determine a given type. Only the first four follow from the restructuring configuration, defined according to whether an external object is present (nonrestructuring) or absent (restructuring) in the vP or TP infinitive. Nonobligatory control and an independent tense interpretation, by contrast, require the presence of an embedded syntactic subject and an embedded TP, respectively, thus restricting them to nonrestructuring infinitives.

A basic example of how these properties are used to determine an infinitive type is given in 1 (based on W’s ex. 6, p. 19), a case of “Long” Passive:
W argues, following Höhle (1978), that case-driven A-movement found in 1 provides the strongest argument against a structural case position in restructuring infinitives. The passivization of a restructuring verb like versuchen ‘attempt’ affects the argument structure of the embedded predicate in that the embedded object is assigned nominative case and agrees with the matrix auxiliary, while the infinitive lacks passive morphology.

In chapter 1 W provides a preview of each chapter and a section on the significance of restructuring in the history of linguistics. In chapter 2, on lexical restructuring, the syntactic and semantic properties of lexical restructuring infinitives in German are outlined. This leads to the major claim that when certain verbs are used as lexical restructuring predicates, they combine with syntactically and semantically very “small” predicates. Restructuring infinitives, it is argued, consist of bare VP predicates and denote “bare events or actions,” that is, predicates that lack any kind of propositional or force properties such as tense, complementizers, and negation. Furthermore, support is provided in chapter 4 that these infinitives lack an embedded syntactic (PRO) subject. The infinitive in 1 is an example of this type. W points out that the suppression of the accusative case in favor of (nominative) agreement with the matrix subject (a form of Exceptional Case Marking [ECM]) is unexpected if it is assumed that the embedded verb projects its own argument structure such as a CP. It is predicted that this form of A-movement will occur if the infinitive is a bare VP.

Other bare VP infinitives that undergo lexical restructuring are unaccusative restructuring predicatives like weil (es) ihm gelungen ist zu fliegen ‘because he was successful at flying’, and the Easy-to-Please construction, such as Dieser Text ist schwer zu lesen ‘This text is hard to read’, in which, W argues, the infinitive is extraposed. The fact that Long Passive is restricted to restructuring infinitives, for example, it does not work with planen ‘to plan’ (*dass der Traktor zu reparieren geplant wurde ‘that they planned to repair the tractor’), but the impersonal passive does (dass den Traktor zu reparieren geplant wurde ‘that they planned to repair the tractor’), reinforces the claims made.

This chapter includes a very interesting investigation of Japanese constructions lacking an overt tense marker on the embedded verb that
correspond “by and large” to the class of restructuring verbs. The conclusion made is that restructuring is not a simple feature assigned to certain predicates, but rather the result of a number of syntactic and semantic properties that interact to license restructuring. The crucial properties are 1) the lack of a subject position, 2) the lack of tense (including a prohibition against time elements like ‘tomorrow’), due to the lack of a TP projection, and 3) the lack of an embedded structural case position, which follows from the lack of a vP projection. W presents data from Dutch and Italian in particular as evidence of the lack of a CP projection.

The claim made in Evers 1975 for Dutch and in Rizzi 1978 for Italian that verb raising occurs in restructuring infinitives is addressed in the last major section of chapter 2. W argues that the sole purpose of head movement in restructuring constructions is to unify the two clauses, that is, to derive restructuring. Since her monoclausal approach does not require any special restructuring mechanism, it can dispense with head movement such as verb raising.

In chapter 3 on functional restructuring, W defends the claim that constructions involving certain predicates that she lists in a table (137) have to be distinguished from those allowing lexical restructuring (chapter 2) because, unlike the optional nature of the latter, functional restructuring is a direct and unavoidable result of the architecture of a clause. In W’s analysis a functional restructuring construction is a simple clause with the infinitive as its main VP predicate and the restructuring verb as the head of its functional domain. The main aim of this chapter therefore involves motivating the lexical versus functional distinction and to provide an analysis that can account for the inherent restructuring nature of these predicates. Central to the motivation of this distinction is the clause structure argued to exist in German. It must have separate positions for agreement (AgrS), tense (T), two modal domains (AuxP and ModP, both nontematic), an aspectual position (v/Asp), which is both functional and thematic, and finally a purely lexical, thematic position (V). W adopts the theory of van Riemsdijk (1998) for semi-functional categories to make a three-way split in the German clause possible.

The property used to distinguish between lexical and functional predicates is extraposition. Lexical predicates like *beginnen ‘begin’ or vergessen ‘forget’ allow extraposition (*dass Hans begann den Kuchen zu essen ‘that H. began to eat the cake’), while functional predicates such as any modal do not (*dass Hans darf den Kuchen essen ‘that H. may eat...
the cake’). Semi-functional predicates like gehen ‘go’ or hören ‘hear’ also prohibit extraposition (*dass Hans geht den Kuchen essen ‘that H. goes to eat the cake’). With topicalization this split does not occur. W concludes that the impossibility of extraposition with a functional predicate cannot be related to the internal structure of the infinitive involving the presence of traces or the lack of the infinitival marker but must be a requirement of extraposition. The analysis of extraposition W adopts posits that all final functional heads of a clause form a single prosodic phrase with the main verb. Extraposition is defined over prosodic categories, while topicalization, because it affects interpretation, applies to syntactic projections. In this way the possibility versus impossibility of extraposition of infinitival complements follows from the lexical vs. functional status of the matrix verb. If it is a functional verb, it is in the same prosodic phrase as the infinitive and thus prohibits extraposition, while with a lexical matrix verb the infinitival complement is an independent prosodic phrase that may be extraposed.

W then goes on to show that lexical predicates do not display the IPP effect but (semi-)functional predicates do, and that lexical as well as semi-functional predicates prohibit weather-es ‘it’ subjects, whereas purely functional predicates allow es as an argument.

W also addresses Cinque’s (2000) approach to restructuring that takes all restructuring to be functional and makes the claims that 1) restructuring verbs cannot take internal arguments, 2) all restructuring verbs are nonthematic (raising verbs), and 3) restructuring is obligatory. W argues that all three claims are untenable, at least for German. Claim 1 is falsified by constructions like Dem Kind wurden nur Kekse zu essen erlaubt ‘The child was only allowed to eat cookies’. Regarding claim 2, W points out that the passive of the embedded predicate is possible in functional constructions, but this operation is prohibited in lexical restructuring constructions. For claim 3, Cinque argues that lexical and semi-functional restructuring predicates assign adjunct rather than true theta roles. W presents two main reasons she finds this account unsatisfactory: 1) the concept of adjunct theta roles is not motivated by any thematic or syntactic difference between the two types of theta roles, and 2) lexical and functional restructuring infinitives show a number of syntactic differences that can be related to a difference in the syntactic nature of these categories. W also argues that Cinque’s account makes exactly the opposite prediction concerning the optionality of restructuring and certain restructuring properties.
In the final section of chapter 3, W investigates different functional constructions in German in more detail and provides further support for the clausal architecture with three positions in the functional domain mentioned above. These correspond in W’s theory to the three types of modal interpretations: epistemic, root or deontic, and dynamic. Raising predicates (beginnen ‘begin’, drohen ‘threaten’, pflegen ‘used to’ scheinen ‘seem’, versprechen ‘promise’), and semi-functional predicates (gehen ‘go’, kommen ‘come’, hören ‘hear’, lassen ‘let’, and sehen ‘see’) are analyzed as functional restructuring.

Chapter 4 is devoted to the infinitival subject, specifically whether there is theory-independent evidence for the presence or absence of an infinitival (PRO) subject. The main claim made is that control infinitives fall into two classes, those that lack, and those that include a syntactic subject; the absence versus presence of a syntactic subject corresponds to the restructuring distinction. This conclusion supports the findings of the first two chapters: restructuring infinitives do not have a syntactic subject, whereas the minimal structure for nonrestructuring infinitives includes a subject position in the Spec, vP position (assumed to be the base position of the “matrix” subject also—see comment below on W’s use of “matrix”). The main argument brought against the presence of a subject in restructuring infinitives comes from binding properties of infinitival constructions like weil der Hans, sich zu rasieren versuchte ‘since H. tried to shave himself’, in which the anaphor is bound directly by the subject, not by PRO. Although either analysis is satisfactory in this construction, that is not the case when the “matrix” clause lacks a subject, as in *weil (sich) der Fisch (sich) vorsuchen versucht wurde ‘since they tried to recall the image of the fish’, or in ditransitives like weil der Hans, der Maria, sich auf dem Bild zeigte ‘since John showed Mary himself/herself in the picture’, in which anaphors cannot be bound by dative arguments.

W argues that restructuring infinitives involve obligatory control, in fact that there is a striking one-way correlation between restructuring and obligatory control: all predicates that allow Long Passive are obligatory control predicates and prohibit any form of nonobligatory control. An entire section is devoted to a discussion of what is under control. The crucial distinction between obligatory and nonobligatory control is whether the antecedent is determined lexically/semantically or syntactically. Nonobligatory control predicates do not include “instructions” for the interpretation of the embedded subject; rather, an infinitival subject is projected as part of the syntactic structure, and the antecedent is
determined purely syntactically. Obligatory control, by contrast, is determined lexically/semantically. However, the syntax/semantics mapping, W argues, is not perfect, with the result that the lack of an infinitival subject with obligatory control is itself not obligatory. The result is a mismatch that W argues results in a redundancy (too involved to outline here) that correctly predicts the licensing facts found in German.

The conclusion given for chapter 4 is that there are two basic forms of control, syntactic and semantic, which are distinguished semantically. If the interpretation of the understood subject is variable, control is determined syntactically, while the fixed interpretation of the subject is determined lexically/semantically. Syntactic control configurations are represented by a syntactic PRO subject; semantic control configurations do not involve a syntactic subject.

In chapter 5 grades of (non)restructuring are considered with the objective of elaborating further the restructuring/nonrestructuring distinction, and to provide an overview of the structure and properties of constructions that W classifies as nonrestructuring in German. W concludes that nonrestructuring infinitives come in two grades: (full clausal) nonrestructuring and reduced nonrestructuring. In the former group fall propositional and factive infinitives, represented as CP complements, and in the latter irrealis infinitives, represented as VP complements if restructuring, or as TP or vP complements if reduced nonrestructuring.

Many of the same tests are used to distinguish the two grades of (non)restructuring. These show that it is necessary to distinguish pronoun fronting and focus scrambling from Long Passive and nonfocus scrambling; only the latter properties define true restructuring, since pronoun fronting and focus scrambling are possible in restructuring and reduced nonrestructuring infinitives. Extraposition/intraposition and relative clause pied-piping are used to distinguish full nonrestructuring from reduced nonrestructuring infinitives. The former, because they have a CP projection, block Long Passive as in *dass der Traktor repariert zu haben bedauert wurde ‘that they regretted having repaired the tractor’. The same problem is created with pronoun fronting and scrambling. W points out what has been shown many times in the literature, namely, that (full) nonrestructuring infinitives allow relative clause pied-piping as in der Roman den schon gelesen zu haben der Hans bedauerte ‘the novel that John regretted having read already’. W accounts for this difference using her system of infinitival clause structure: assuming that wh-features are located in [C] and have to be checked via Spec-head
agreement with a *wh*-element, then only infinitives with a CP projection allow relative clause pied-piping.

In the final section of chapter 5, our attention is turned to the semantic classification of infinitives, specifically how the semantic category influences the syntactic structure. The conclusion reached is that both the syntax and the semantics decide whether an infinitive is restructuring or nonrestructuring. W assumes, for instance, that propositionality, like factivity, is a property of the C-domain, whereas irrealis is an aspectual property encoded in an aspect phrase lower than TP. From these assumptions it follows that reduced nonrestructuring and restructuring infinitives lack a C-domain and that propositional infinitives can only be nonrestructuring infinitives.

The sixth chapter consists, as mentioned earlier, of a summary and conclusion that outlines the construction types in a table and nicely ties together the findings.

There is no doubt that this study will advance the research on the subject of infinitives substantially, for a number of reasons: it is very thorough, comprehensive, and carefully crafted. I found, however, that the thoroughness became a bit overbearing due to excessive repetition. One weak aspect of the analysis was the use of phrase structure trees for German that cannot be linearized using standard assumptions and do not follow from minimalist assumptions about vP and movement. In 2 are typical examples adapted from p. 227:
Although these trees could, with the added CP projection and some adjustments, generate the sentence *weil Hans den Traktor zu reparieren versucht* ‘since H. is attempting to repair the tractor’, they would not, without at least some stipulated linearization rule, generate the verb-second equivalents of these. The trees in 2 represent W’s application to her account of the widely held assumption that the unmarked order of German is SOV, exemplified by subordinate/embedded clauses. To distinguish the finite from the infinitive clause, W uses the misleading term “matrix” for the finite clause, even though it is always preceded by some complementizer such as *weil* ‘since’ or *dass* ‘that’ in the examples.

These problems are related to a potentially bigger one: To what extent does W’s theory apply to verb-second clauses in German and to English? Space limitations do not allow a thorough exploration of that question here, but one example suggests further study might be needed. According to W, the extraposition test distinguishes functional and semi-functional predicates, so we get the acceptable *dass Hans begann den Kuchen zu essen* ‘that H. began to eat the cake’ with extraposition, but the unacceptable *dass Hans geht den Kuchen essen* ‘that H. goes to eat the cake’ because *gehen* ‘go’ is semi-functional. However, *gehen* is just fine in *Hans geht den Kuchen essen* ‘H. goes to eat the cake’ with verb-
second. Another way to look at this issue is from a derivation-by-phase perspective. In this approach extraposition occurs neither in the embedded nor the verb-second German clauses; rather, the matrix clause is derived first, then the VP-infinitive, whether as a separate extraction or phase. At Spell-Out the linearization in the “extraposed” configuration results from the order of the mergers. The result of this unification in effect eliminates the criterion used by W to distinguish the semi-functional from the fully functional verbs: there is no contrast between the constructions: Hans begann den Kuchen zu essen ‘H. began to eat the cake’, Hans geht den Kuchen essen ‘H. goes to eat the cake’. In the Perfekt, the extraposition test does not separate beginnen ‘begin’ from gehen ‘go’; extraposition may occur with both: Hans hat begonnen, den Kuchen zu essen ‘H. started to eat the cake’ and Hans ist hingegangen, um Kuchen zu essen ‘H. went there to eat the cake’.

My final assessment nevertheless remains the same: this study is carefully crafted, with very solid argumentation and data. The errors and glitches that occur—many more could be noted—do not take away from the overall value of this study. I highly recommend it for any linguist studying the syntax and semantics of infinitive complements, especially those in German.
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