The Locative Alternation, exemplified by the $\textit{spray/load}$ class of verbs, is a change in the argument structure of the verb, whereby the Goal argument becomes the direct object of the verb. In contrast to English, the German verb that takes the Goal complement is generally prefixed by $\textit{be}$-.

(1) (a) Er spritzte Farbe an die Wand.
    ‘He sprayed paint on the wall.’
(b) Er bespritzte die Wand mit Farbe.
    ‘He sprayed the wall with paint.’

The Locative Alternation in German is to some extent productive, but also constrained. The alternation therefore raises the problem how children can acquire a productive rule for changing the argument structure of locative verbs, while at the same time determining when the rule may not be applied. While (2b) is fine in German, its equivalent in English is ungrammatical; (3b) is ungrammatical in both German and English.

(2) (a) Er hängte Bilder an die Wand.
    ‘He hung pictures on the wall.’
(b) Er behängte die Wand mit Bildern.
    ‘He hung the wall with pictures.’

(3) (a) Er hob die Bücher auf den Tisch.
    ‘He lifted the books onto the table.’
(b) Er behob den Tisch mit den Büchern.
    ‘He lifted the table with the books.’
     *He lifted the table with the books. (intended meaning as in (3a))

In this study, a version of her 1995 Ph.D. dissertation, Brinkmann is primarily interested in the acquisition problems presented by the locative alternation. She adopts Wunderlich’s (1997) Lexical Decomposition Grammar account of lexical P-incorporation that allows the goal argument to be the verb’s direct object. In this analysis of $\textit{be}$-verbs predicate-argument structure is mapped by lambda-abstraction onto thematic structure, and by means of ‘linkers’ a hierarchy is established among the arguments. On the basis of this hierarchy morphological case is assigned in the syntax. As far as I can judge from Brinkmann’s summary, Wunderlich’s proposal is not well able, except by stipulation, to handle verbs like $\textit{gefallen}$ ‘please’ and $\textit{helfen}$ ‘help’ that take dative complements (93, footnote 13). (Nor does it capture the parallels between dative verbs like $\textit{dienen}$ ‘serve’, $\textit{folgen}$ ‘follow’ and their prefixed counterparts that take accusative case: $\textit{bedienen}$, $\textit{befolgen}$.)

The main part of Brinkmann’s work deals with two experiments conducted with groups of children (from age 6) and adults. Brinkmann proposes the Internal Structure Hypothesis, which states the conditions that are necessary for deriving the goal-object argument structure. Simplifying somewhat, these conditions have to do with the indivisibility of the theme argument, whether the theme is incremental, whether the verb describes a process. There are also topological and pragmatic requirements that must be met. The claim is, for instance, that a directional verb (e.g. $\textit{heben}$ ‘lift’) has incorporated an intransitive spatial predicate rather than a preposition, so it cannot take the goal as complement. A verb such as $\textit{rollen}$ ‘roll’ is ruled out since its theme moves along a path.

Brinkmann proposes that a critical factor in the process of learning whether a verb participates in the alternation is whether the theme may be construed as de-individuated.
Four kinds of verbs were defined by crossing the goal affected be the crucial factor, Brinkmann devised a production experiment to elicit goal-object not take an incremental theme do not participate in the alternation. the basic syntactic machinery of the alternation, they will automatically know that verbs that do mass verbs than for count verbs. It further predicts that once children have come to grips with larger, temporally unbounded event.

In order to test the Nonindividuation Hypothesis against proposals that claim affectedness to be the crucial factor, Brinkmann devised a production experiment to elicit goal-object be-verbs. Four kinds of verbs were defined by crossing the goal affected/not affected distinction with the mass verb/count verb distinction. 88 children (from age 6) and adults were shown a series of video films depicting actions and asked to describe the films to a listener.

The results certainly appear to support the predictions of the Nonindividuation Hypothesis, but not the Affectedness hypotheses: the children of the two youngest age groups used the goal-object form more often for mass than for count verbs, and were not at all influenced by affectedness. For the older children and the adults affectedness did play a more significant role, but the difference between mass and count verbs continued to influence subjects in whether they used a goal-object construction. The results indicate that children learn how to make the goal direct object of the verb without reference to affectedness, but also that the affectedness of the goal is a factor that influences adults’ decision to use a goal-object construction.

The comprehension experiment was a test of children’s interpretations of grammatical and ungrammatical be-verbs. According to Brinkmann’s Internal Structure Hypothesis, it is primarily directional verbs that cannot provide the needed locative argument in object position. The hypothesis thus predicts that children will interpret the object NP as the goal less often when an (ungrammatical) be-verb is derived from a directional verb than when it is derived from a non-directional verb. This prediction was tested by presenting 71 children, between 6 and 11 years, with questions of the format ‘Tell me some things that you can (verb)’. The questions ranged over ungrammatical be-verbs derived from a directional, a causative or an accompanied motion verb.

It does appear that children are far less likely to list a goal NP for a be-verb derived from a directional verb (e.g., *besenken ‘be_lower’) than for a be-verb derived from a causative verb (e.g., *bekümmern ‘be_wobble’) or an accompanied motion verb (e.g., *beschienen ‘be_push’). This suggests that to determine that directional verbs do not alternate, it is enough for children to know the meanings of the verbs.

The comprehension experiment provide support for the Nonindividuation Hypothesis. Here the prediction is that the child will give a goal NP less often as complement to a count be-verb than to a mass be-verb. The results in Table 10 (237), however, show only a marginal advantage for mass be-verbs.

Brinkmann’s view of the Locative Alternation is driven by verb semantics. The theoretical basis that she outlines in Chapter 3, adopted from Wunderlich (1997), seems largely irrelevant for the criteria upon which the experiments in the main part of the book are based. Thus, the book will be of interest mainly to acquisitionists and readers in the field of verb semantics, rather than morphosyntacticians.
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Reviewed by Hans Bennis, Meertens Institute

‘My basic thesis is that pronominal clitics, agreement affixes, and pronouns are epiphenomena, produced by the insertion of phi-features (their common meaning bits) into different syntactic positions’ (2).

Daniel L. Everett argues that pronouns, agreement affixes and clitics are not part of the lexicon. The lexicon contains a set of phi-features which might be configurational (i.e. inserted in a syntactic or morphological position) or inherent. Various manifestations of these bundles of phi-features – pronouns, clitics or affixes – are taken to be allomorphs, the form of which is determined by postlexical spell-out rules.

These spell-out rules are able to distinguish between the three types of phi-feature-realization on structural grounds. Pronouns are constructions in which the phi-features have been inserted in D°, the functional head of DP (the nominal phrase). Clitics are phi-features adjoined to AGR° in the verbal domain (the head of the functional projection for agreement), whereas affixes are phi-features inserted in AGR°.

Phi-features are stored in the lexicon independently of each other. They are combined through stacking. In the case of inflectional affixes, the set of phi-features is required through (morphological-)subcategorization by the lexical stem.

Let us take a simple French example, as in (1).

(1) *il* me voit
    he me sees

The subject *il* is the result of inserting the phi-features for person, gender and number in the position of D, the head of the subject DP. These features have to agree with the features that have been inserted in AGR-S° (the projection for subject agreement). These latter features, subcategorized by the verb *voir*, determine the form of the finite verb *voit* (3SG, MASC). Finally, the clitic *me* derives from the adjunction of the features for person (1) and number (SG) to the AGR-O projection (the functional projection for object agreement).

Having discussed the theoretical outline of his theory, Everett sets out to discuss a number of empirical issues that have been important in the discussion on clitics. A well-known and often discussed topic is the phenomenon of clitic doubling. The most extensive and detailed chapter of this book (chapter 3 of 70 pages) is concerned with this phenomenon.

In Spanish we find constructions such as the one in (2).

(2) *lo* vimos a *él*
    ‘(We) saw him.’

Both the clitic (*lo*) and the full pronoun (*él*) refer to the direct object. The crucial questions are:

- why do the clitic and the object pronoun coocur in some languages (e.g. Spanish, Celtic) but not in others (e.g. French, Germanic)?
- why do languages which allow doubling differ in the extension of clitic doubling (e.g. standard Spanish vs. Porteño Spanish)?
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To account for these cross-linguistic differences Everett argues that the status of clitics may vary. In some languages clitics have to be Case-marked, in other languages clitics are more like agreement affixes and don’t have to receive Case. This difference accounts for the fact that in standard Spanish some direct objects can be doubled – i.e. only in cases in which the objects are Case-marked structurally and in which the doubled NP may receive Case independently (e.g. by a in (2)) – whereas Porteño Spanish allows all direct objects to be doubled.

Another distinction is whether the clitic has the status of an argument. If theta-marking applies within VP, the clitics in Agr-projections do not receive thematic roles and are non-argumental by consequence. If theta-marking takes the extended projection (lexical projection + functional projections) into its scope, clitics receive a theta-role and receive the status of an argument. This distinction allows Everett to present an explanation for the doubling facts in Celtic languages (Irish, Breton and Welsh) as a consequence of thetamarked Agr-positions.

An extension of this theory is provided by a discussion of other languages with clitic-doubling phenomena, such as Pirahã and Yagua.

Further support for the feature-theory presented here is derived from discussions on Complex Inversion (French, Northern Italian dialects) and Romance se.

The author seems to imply that the reader of this book should be familiar with the various theoretical positions regarding clitics, agreement and pronouns, with the literature on clitics, and with Romance languages in general. This will of course not contribute to engaging with a broad linguistic audience.

Not much attention has been paid to a well-organized presentation. The theory is introduced in an unattractive fashion. Chapter 2 contains a large number of theoretical assumptions and hypotheses. These are presented without much discussion of the data. Consequently, for linguists who do not have a detailed knowledge of the discussion about clitics and pronouns, it is very difficult and unexciting to read. In order to be convincing for a wider audience this book should have been better organized. As it is now, it doesn’t pay much attention to the reader, who will probably give up before having finished chapter 2.

In so far as examples of relevant phenomena are presented, they are often not very transparent. First of all, examples from Romance languages are not glossed (except Romanian examples). Given the subject of this book it follows that more than half of the examples are taken from Romance languages. The relevance of these examples can be fully appreciated only if one is familiar with Romance languages, including Brazilian Portuguese, Northern Italian dialects, and River Plate Spanish. Moreover, it is often the case that examples are presented but not discussed. The reader is supposed to find out for himself what the relevance of these examples is.

A property that becomes somewhat irritating in the long run is the fact that the author keeps telling us that his theory is superior to other theories on clitics. This may or may not be true, but the fact that the author is telling us this on every other page makes me suspicious.

A similar remark applies to the provocative title ‘Why there are no clitics’. If the title is meant to fight the idea that there exists a (lexical) category Clitic, the author is tilting at windmills.

A final comment is that the author presents his theory as a new perspective on clitics. However, as far as I can tell not much new has been presented. The idea that clitics are the spell-out of phi-features in functional projections is far from revolutionary. The idea that Case plays an important role in clitic-doubling has been around for a long time. The same applies to other parts of this feature theory.

Why there are no clitics is an important book in so far as it discusses a broad range of languages that show clitic-like phenomena. Everett develops an interesting theory that is able to account for the amount of variation found in natural languages. However, both in presentation and in depth it fails to convince me that there are no clitics.
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Reviewed by Andrew Spencer, University of Essex

This book consists of an Introduction (by Fabri) followed by a collection of thirteen articles concerned (broadly) with inflection in relation to phonology (allomorphy), syntax, semantics and language acquisition. All are written in English except the contributions by Nübling, Wurzel and Zimmermann. The title of this book is somewhat misleading: it is neither an introduction to inflectional models nor an exploration of such models; indeed, with the exception of Wunderlich’s Minimalist Morphology, the currently dominant models of inflection are represented only sporadically or not at all. Nonetheless, a wide variety of issues are discussed. Most of the papers are written by younger scholars and the high quality of their contributions bodes very well for the future of morphology.

Fabri’s ‘Introduction’ serves both to set (some of) the articles in context and to provide a very general overview of the subject. Booij’s ‘synoptical survey’ of inflection discusses inflectional theory and particularly the distinction between derivation, inherent inflection and contextual inflection. Nübling discusses (somewhat inconclusively) the inflection/derivation distinction, but otherwise, the papers all present specific analyses of specific problems, generally taking a particular model for granted.

Phonology and morphology is treated by Ségal & Scheer, who make use of Dependency/Government Phonology elements to argue that ablaut relations universally operate in the direction i > a => u (even German strong verbs!). Neef looks at phonological determinants of German plural formation. Brown shows how Network Morphology can capture the phonological regularities in stem forms in Russian conjugation while also expressing the idea that stems are not signs. Lleo examines the proto-forms of Spanish definite articles in very early child language.

Ortmann provides a very wide-ranging and insightful typological survey of the way animacy intrudes into linguistic organization, even in languages which lack proper gender systems, and he makes a good case for arguing that animacy enjoys the highest priority in grammars even where it is other features that are grammaticalized (such as sex-based gender). Parodi, on the other hand, asks why certain clitic combinations (e.g. 1st and 2nd person) are impossible in Spanish and implicates some kind of animacy hierarchy. Gerlach defends Bybee’s ‘Relevance Hierarchy’, proposing that Universal Grammar codes a universally fixed order of exponents for verb features with respect to the verb stem: Voice < Aspect < Tense < Mood < Agreement. She proposes some ingenious reanalyses of apparent counter-examples in Ancient and Modern Greek.

Wurzel extends his model of Paradigm Structure Conditions, proposing three levels of paradigmatic structure as revealed by German noun classes. Nübling provides a very useful survey of the ‘inflecting preposition’ in standard German and the dialects, and like Wurzel and Ségal & Scheer discusses diachronic aspects of his claims. Zimmermann modifies Minimalist syntax and ties it to Bierwisch’s model of semantics to account for Dative possessor clitics in Bulgarian. Like Parodi’s paper, Zimmermann’s is essentially a syntactic account of phenomena which relate in important ways to inflectional morphology. Both Elsen and Lindner, on the other hand, deny the status of inflection, or indeed linguistics, in their defence of connectionist models of German past participles against ‘symbolist’ accounts.

Even though there is little explicit discussion of inflectional theories one is struck in this collection by the diversity of approaches to inflectional morphology, especially where papers discuss essentially the same phenomena (as with Neef and Wurzel). There are many points of contact (or friction) here which would be worth exploring. For instance, how exactly does Wurzel’s model of Paradigm Structure Conditions relate to models which deploy orthogonal inheritance, like Network Morphology? How exactly should typological markedness hierarchies (such as Animacy or Relevance) be deployed in linguistic theory – are they part of the cognitively represented grammar or are they post hoc observational statements resulting from the interaction of factors outside competence proper? This particularly applies to the papers by Parodi and Gerlach, and the same question could be asked of Ségal & Scheer’s ingenious attempt to link German apophony with that of Afro-Asiatic. The Animacy and ‘Relevance’ hierarchies are most naturally deployable in theories of inflection which treat inflectional
formatives as signs (otherwise there’d be nothing to order at the expression level), yet many if not most morphologists reject the sign-based approach to inflection. In this respect it’s a pity that there was no contribution which examined inflectional affixation from the standpoint of a realizational theory such as those of Anderson or Stump. Finally, in theories in which inflections are classical morphemes, i.e. signs and hence lexical entries, it isn’t clear to what extent inflection can be said to be other than purely epiphenomenal, though none of the papers explicitly raised this point.

The book can’t be thought of as a state of the art survey of current trends or a distillation of the major theoretical issues. Nonetheless, it brings together a variety of interesting articles dealing with a number of important empirical domains and exploring a number of theoretical models. It will amply repay anyone who has a serious interest in inflectional morphology.
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Reviewed by RANDALL HENDRICK, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

This work is a valuable study of the formatives that introduce subordinate clauses. The work is undertaken in a principles and parameters framework, although the conclusions that Haumann draws could be easily expressed in other frameworks. While the focus is principally on English, the analysis aims to contribute to an understanding of the cross-linguistic properties of these elements by appealing to the broader context of work on European languages undertaken in the principles and parameters spirit.

The book is divided into three parts. The first part surveys how complementizers were treated within generative grammar as it was practised during the 1960s and 1970s. The second part introduces functional categories and their place in a general theory of phrase structure. The third part contains Haumann’s positive contribution to how subordinators should best be analyzed.

Early attempts to introduce complementizers by transformations, or to make complementizers jibe with X-bar theory by treating S as a head with complementizers as the specifier, have been improved on, and the progress evident in this history is good to be reminded of. It is the third part, however, that will be of interest to syntacticians currently trying to extend our understanding of complementation and functional categories.

Haumann argues that there are three classes of formatives that introduce subordinate clauses. One class made up of after, before, since, until, when and while are prepositions, a lexical category. The familiar complementizers, that and if, comprise the second class; they are a functional category. The third class, labeled SUBCON, is conceived of as a mix of the first two classes, simultaneously lexical and functional. SUBCON includes although, because, unless and (conditional) if. The three classes are distinguished by their interaction with topicalization: only the second and third classes permit the clause they introduce to have fronted or topicalized phrases.

(1) Tom asked if by any chance it would be possible to stay.
(2) She said that under no circumstances would she marry him.
(3) He left early because never again does he want to end up completely drunk.
(4) To his surprise he has discovered that although never before in his life had he tried to play tennis right-handed he plays quite well.
(5) He got ill while in Italy he was on holiday.
(6) We all knew what they were up to long before last month Tom told us.

The complementizers and SUBCONS differ in that only complementizers appear in argument position. The explanation for why the lexical prepositions do not permit topicalization is built...
on thematic relations. Haumann suggests that if a head assigns a thematic relation to its complement, the specifier of that complement must, in the unmarked case, be an argument position. On the assumption that lexical categories assign thematic roles to their complements and the further assumption that the emphasized elements in (1)–(6) are in non-argument specifier positions, the unacceptability of (5)–(6) will follow. Of course this line of explanation needs to be hedged because of embedded questions that are arguments of verbs like wonder yet nevertheless seem to allow non-argument specifiers for the wh-phrase to occupy as in (7). For Haumann the examples in (5)–(6) are the normal state of affairs and (7) is the marked exception. Such exceptions are permitted only where ‘selectional properties’ of the theta-marking head require a non-argument specifier, as wonder appears to do.

(7) Jane [VP wondered [CP who + WH [she should invite to the concert]]]

Subjects crucially do not assign a thematic role to their complement; this property is attributed to the claim that they are in part functional categories. Interestingly, Subjects are claimed to assign a thematic role to their specifier, reflecting their partial prepositional character. The requirement is satisfied by the matrix clause, which is generated as the specifier of the Subject.

While the typology offered is thoughtful and well argued, I am not quite persuaded by the explanation just sketched. There appear to be structures like (8)–(9) that superficially pose significant challenges to its generality.

(8) [DP How large a fish] did you capture?
(9) Jill bought [DP less expensive a book than I did]

The bracketed DPs in these examples are complements of the verbs capture and bought respectively. Yet in each case there is a non-argument operator in the specifier of DP (cf. Hendrick 1990). Unlike the case with wonder, there is no clear way to attribute this possibility to the selectional properties of the verbs in question. Moreover, the prepositional subordinator until fails to pattern as Haumann would predict: it appears with topicalization in the subordinate clause:

(10) Jill traveled though Europe until in Italy she fell ill.

This observation might lead one to explore whether the absence of topicalization in (5)–(6) is a consequence of their semantic properties rather than their status as members of a lexical category. Notice that a sub-class of ‘prepositional’ subordinators introduces clauses that must be positive rather than negative.

(11) *We all knew what they were up to long before [Tom didn’t tell us last month]

Clefts also seem to resist appearing in these subordinate clauses.

(12) *We all knew what they were up to long before [it was last month Tom told us]

My point is that Haumann’s explanation does not explain these facts in any natural way since they do not appear to involve the specifier system of the bracketed clauses. It may be significant that until, the prepositional subordinator that allows topicalization, is also able to introduce negative clauses and, marginally, clefts. Any potential generalization here will outstrip the power of Haumann’s explanation.

(13) We drove until we couldn’t drive any longer.
(14) ?We were in the dark until it was Mary that told us all about it.

These potential problems should not detract from the value that Haumann’s work carries: it certainly repays careful and repeated study.
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This book proposes an analysis of coordination within a principles and parameters framework. The data discussed comes from more than 30 languages, although Norwegian and English are the main empirical sources that are used. The book focuses almost exclusively on two kinds of coordination ‘not previously discussed to any great extent in the literature’ (1). These are, respectively, unbalanced coordination (UC) and extraordinary balanced coordination (EBC). In UC, one of the conjuncts is of the normal kind, but the other is deviant. For instance, if there are two coordinated pronouns in the subject position of a clause, one of them has the expected nominative case, whereas the other might have accusative case (which would have been impossible in a non-coordinated structure). This is illustrated in (1), from Norwegian.

(1) [Han og meg] var sammen om det
\( \text{he.nom} \ and \ \text{me.acc} \ \text{were together about it} \)

‘He and I were in it together.’

In EBC, both conjuncts are deviant. For instance, both pronouns in a coordinated subject are in the accusative, whereas nominative is the only possibility in a corresponding non-coordinated structure, cf. (2).

(2) [Them and us] are going to the game together.

In Norwegian and English, where ordinary balanced coordination is the norm, UC and EBC are commonly regarded as marginal, but the author shows that it exists even in these languages. In certain other languages, UC is claimed to be the norm.

The UC and EBC facts are used to motivate an analysis whereby coordinated structures are analysed in X-theoretic terms, with the first conjunct as specifier and the second conjunct as complement in a structure headed by the conjunction. The coordinated structure is thus argued to constitute a conjunction phrase, called CoP. It is proposed that the conjuncts are attached to the CoP by a designated generalized transformation called \text{COORDINATE-ALPHA}, which takes CPs as input structures and triggers reduction of the CPs in accordance with certain deletion rules. Also, an operation \text{SHARE} is proposed, whereby identical material in the two CPs is rearranged into one CP. The CoP and coordinate-alpha are the basic theoretical ingredients of the analysis that is proposed.

The book contains eight chapters. After a short introductory chapter, chapter 2 presents and discusses various UC and EBC facts, the main emphasis being laid on UC. Next, chapter 3 argues that conjunctions are heads, more specifically functional heads. In chapter 4, coordination in terms of the CoP analysis is argued for. For instance, UC is explained as a consequence of the structural asymmetry between the specifier and complement conjuncts in CoP, the complement conjunct being too far away to be affected by matrix requirements. This chapter also discusses multiple coordination and so-called ‘initial conjunctions’ like \text{either, both} etc. (which are argued to be adverbs). Chapter 5 introduces the coordinate-alpha transformation, and discusses various types of reduction in coordination structures. Chapter 6 discusses extraction out of CoP. Among other things it is argued that the Across-the-Board restriction on extraction is less strict than commonly thought. Chapter 7 discusses some residual issues relevant to coordination (e.g. the relation between coordination and subordination, the origin of conjunctions, and restrictions on the semantic roles of conjuncts), and chapter 8 contains a brief conclusion.

Among the clear strengths of this book is the coverage of data, both as to the number of languages taken into account and the many different and unusual types of coordination data discussed. The book is also easy to read, with, for the most part, clearly stated objectives and analyses. Although I do not always agree with the proposals that are made, the boldness with which they are argued for is often impressive and actually makes reading this book quite entertaining. There are also many interesting observations among others the fact that it is overwhelmingly the case that the order conjunction and deviant conjunct in UC structures in a given language is the same as the order verb and complement in that language. This is taken as strong evidence for the CoP analysis.
It might be seen as a weakness that the existence of balanced coordination is in fact not directly predicted by the CoP structure that is proposed. Thus, ordinary balanced coordination is handled by a separate lexical entry for the conjunction (140), which amounts to sheer stipulation. Another weakness, in my opinion, is the analysis of coordinate-alpha. This transformation attaches CoP to any two constituents, each in its separate CP (with subsequent rearrangement of the two CPs into one). One problem with this proposal is that the specifier and complement positions of CoP may be filled with non-maximal constituents. One extreme case (that is not discussed in the book) is coordination inside words, as in (3), from Norwegian.

(3) Vi må unngå inn- og utkjøring.
we must avoid in- and outdriving
‘We must avoid driving in and out.’

Attaching CoP to inn and ut in (3) seems to require either that CoP is exceptional in allowing non-maximal specifiers and complements, or that there are maximal projections inside words. Neither option seems attractive. My last critical remark concerns the use that is made of the minimalist framework in this book. For the most part, minimalism is kept in the background, but often when it is explicitly used, it leaves more questions than answers. For instance, it is suggested that the CoP itself has its own functional Agr-projections for each (DP) conjunct (170–171), whereas it is simultaneously implied that at least the highest (DP) conjunct in UC structures is checked against the Agr-projections of the CP clause (e.g. 226–227). The computational implications of this are far from clear.

To conclude, I want to say that I very much liked Johannessen’s book. It is clearly written and fun to read, and it contains a lot of interesting data and many well-argued and bold analyses.
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Reviewed by John Lynch, University of the South Pacific

Historical linguists are often aggrieved to be asked by archaeologists to ‘summarise in twenty-five words or less’ the latest subgrouping hypotheses for a particular language family and the implications of these for prehistoric reconstruction. Historical linguists are also, however, equally guilty of asking archaeologists for similar picture-postcard summaries of the state of the art from their side of the fence. As a result, we ‘build on each others’ myths’ (Bowdler, 17, quoting Renfrew 1987: 287).

This book, which is the proceedings of an interdisciplinary conference which was held in 1991 in Darwin to explore Australia’s past, is an attempt to go beyond this mutual myth-building. The editors say (15–16) that

We have no illusions that the chapters in this book, engendered at a conference which was the first of its kind, will offer a definitive picture of Australia’s past. But by bringing together scholars whose disciplines have traditionally known little about each other ... we hope to encourage a more holistic and interesting view of Australian prehistory that accords better with the rich picture of contemporary Aboriginal culture.

In my view, they have succeeded admirably.

The book contains 22 chapters in all, most of which were presented as papers at the conference, though a couple were especially written for this publication. The first section contains an introduction by the two editors, and three papers outlining the nature, in the Australian context, of the disciplines of archaeology (Sandra Bowdler), historical linguistics (Harold Koch) and genetics (Neville White). The remaining sections are 2. ‘Perspectives from afar’, 3. ‘Culture contact’, 4. ‘Areal study and the Australian east coast’, and 5. ‘The Pama-Nyungan enigma’. I will not try to touch on all of the papers, given limitations of space, but will
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briefly discuss one or two papers in each section which would be of particular interest to a linguistic audience.

Johanna Nichols’ article in Part 2 on Sahul as a linguistic area begins with the premise that ‘the questions of greatest interest to the linguistic study of ancient Australia are by definition outside the purview of the standard comparative method’ (135), which can only reach back 10,000 years or so. She applies instead the principles of geographical linguistic comparison, sampling nine morphosyntactic and two phonological ‘markers’ in 22 Australian and 36 New Guinea languages, each from a different genetic ‘family’. She reaches a number of tentative conclusions on the basis of this comparison: (i) there were probably multiple colonisations of the Sahul area; (ii) the earlier colonisers were likely to speak languages that were dependent-marking and ergative, with few noun classes, no numeral classifiers and no tone systems, while later colonisers were likely to speak languages which were head-marking and accusative, with more complex systems of noun classes and numeral classifiers as well as more complex tone systems; and (iii) Sahul was first settled from the west, with later colonisers following predominantly coastal routes in the New Guinea area but less obviously coastal routes in Australia – environment, of course, being a primary factor here.

Part 3 contains a number of articles on language contact. Bruce Rigsby outlines a situation in the Cape York area in which there is ‘virtual morphosyntactic identity’ between a number of languages which display ‘lexical differences ranging from almost complete sharing of basic vocabulary down to less than 20% cognation (169). Personal multilingualism is pervasive in this area (as it is in much of Australia): children usually learn both parents’ languages, and often learn languages of other relatives as well, and code-switching is rife. He concludes that grammatical similarities relate to participation in a ‘more or less well-bounded social network of interaction patterns’ whereas lexical and phonological differences relate to lower-level differences within these networks (177–178).

Mark Harvey deals with the genetically diverse Top End of the Northern Territory, and evaluates two claims about language contact: Dixon’s (1980) claim that when two Australian languages come into contact they will reach an equilibrium of about 50% common vocabulary (due to borrowing between languages originally not closely related or word-tabooing between originally closely related languages), and Sutton’s (1978) claim that individual speech styles and an ideology of clan-dialect distinctiveness would create constant pressure for diversification. Harvey says that, at least in the Top End, word-tabooing is not as major a factor as Dixon claimed; but, like Rigsby, he finds that social group interaction is a major force in diffusion.

Part 4 deals with north-eastern New South Wales as a case study area. In the only really linguistic paper in this section, Terry Crowley first evaluates the traditional comparative method as it has been applied in an Australian context, and illustrates the difficulties one faces in doing this. He then does some low-level comparative work on the languages of the New England area, and on the basis of this advances hypotheses regarding the settlement of the region.

The final section is entitled ‘The Pama-Nyungan enigma’. Languages classified as Pama-Nyungan are relatively homogeneous and cover almost all the continent, with a highly diverse set of non-Pama-Nyungan languages in the north and north-west. Does this spread of Pama-Nyungan coincide with major changes in the archaeological record between five and three thousand years ago? Geoff O’Grady & Susan Fitzgerald outline some techniques for discovering cognates among these languages, which also (as mentioned above) underwent considerable lexical diffusion. Nicholas Evans & Rhys Jones review both the archaeological and linguistic evidence for Pama-Nyungan expansion. They link this expansion to the development of quartzite-flake technology, knowledge of which was imparted only in ceremonial contexts. The status of this ceremony would have attracted novices from neighbouring groups, and possibly also involved ‘payment’ in the form of novices’ daughters marrying the sons of specialists. As this tradition spread, and in the context of widely accepted multilingualism, Pama-Nyungan languages would have spread as a chain reaction into areas previously occupied by other languages.

The book is pleasantly presented. Maps and figures are clear, and typographical errors few and far between. One possible concern is that readers are assumed to know Australian geography – the Top End, the location of rivers, etc. – and this might be slightly off-putting to a reader coming from a non-Australian context. However, this collection is a major step forward, both in our knowledge of the prehistory of Australia and also in the way linguists and archaeologists can co-operate to present a unified view of a geographically-defined culture area. It could well serve as a model for other such areas.
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Reviewed by EDWARD J. VAIDA, Western Washington University

This is the latest volume in a series dedicated to providing comprehensive descriptions of the language families of the world. Much of the text represents a slightly revised translation of the original Italian edition, *Le Lingue Indoeuropee* (Società editrice Il Mulino, Bologna, 1993). While earlier volumes in this series, for example *The Slavonic Languages* (B. Comrie & G. C. Corbett, eds.), London: Routledge, 1993), contain authoritative synchronic descriptions of the individual languages within one or another modern branch of Indo-European, this book is essentially diachronic in nature and contains a general overview of Proto-Indo-European (PIE) and of the earliest attested or reconstructable forms of the various IE daughter proto-languages. The discussion is divided into 16 chapters, the first three of which are devoted to PIE origins, culture, grammatical structure, typology, and the question of whether there exist demonstrable genetic links between IE and other language families. Each of the remaining 13 chapters is devoted to an important ancient language, such as Sanskrit or Latin, or to one of the major daughter branches of the family. Poorly attested early IE languages or language groups such as Messapic, Dacian, Thracian, and Illyrian are mentioned only in passing and do not receive further treatment. Each chapter is authored by a noted specialist in the field, and the editors have deliberately made a point not to impose a single, uniform interpretation of the data in such controversial areas as the status of PIE laryngeals or the possible presence of glottalized plosives in PIE. As such, the resulting discussion truly represents a range of views gleaned from the best scholarship available on PIE linguistics. At the same time, however, the book reflects a broad consensus of opinion on most major issues and does not contain any unexpected or controversial new revelations about PIE linguistics or culture.

The first three chapters of the book are in some ways the most engaging, as they attempt to place Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans in a world context both linguistically and culturally. In chapter 1, ‘The Indo-Europeans: origins and culture’ (1–24), Enrico Campanile summarizes and evaluates two previous attempts to locate the speakers of PIE in a real, historical context. First, by appealing to the Saussurian notion that form and function do not develop in tandem, he points out the pitfalls of the 19th century lexicalist method, whereby the mere presence of particular vocabulary words in PIE was taken as proof positive that the items in question formed part of PIE everyday life. For example, the presence of an etymon meaning ‘beech’ in one language and ‘elm’ in another, or ‘lion’ in one language but ‘leopard’ in another, proves nothing definite about the original PIE significance of these words; it also says nothing about how closely the ancient distribution of plant and animal species corresponds to that presently observed. Such simplistic investigations are therefore likely to generate false conclusions in the search for a PIE homeland or in any attempt to reconstruct the PIE cultural or natural environment. Even successful reconstruction of the specific form of PIE lexical items cannot guarantee that the meanings passed down in each daughter language correlate precisely with those in the proto-language. Campanile next evaluates a more sophisticated way of reconstructing proto-culture, the ‘textual method’ employed by such scholars as Dumézil.
(1958), who posited a tripartite socio-religious value system for PIE on the basis of detailed comparative analyses of textually documented religious beliefs and practices. Campanile supports many of Dumézil’s conclusions, but argues that the tripartite PIE contrast between priests, warriors and producers originally represented a category of perception and interpretation rather than a rigid, real-life caste-like division within PIE society itself. The rest of Campanile’s chapter is devoted to an analytical survey of received knowledge on the following aspects of IE culture: religion, sacrifice, belief in an afterlife, family, marriage, tribal organization, kingship, the common man, the warrior, the poet and the question of the original IE homeland. Highlights of this discussion include the observation that only one deity name has been reconstructed for PIE, *dżeh-, a generic word for ‘god’, and the difficulty of finding evidence for PIE ethnic designations above the level of the extended family, clan or tribe. Also, an absence of the use of slaves as sacrificial victims in historically documented IE society suggests the absence of slavery as an institution in PIE culture. Textual evidence for the probable religious role of the ruler figure as an intercessor between the group and the gods is also mentioned. The discussion of the PIE Urheimat problem is very brief and includes only a few of the best-known hypotheses. Readers interested in obtaining a broader and more up-to-date account of this fascinating aspect of PIE cultural origins will have to browse through the various entries in Mallory & Adams (1997). In keeping with the book’s general conservatism, no mention is made, for example, of the potential significance to the PIE homeland problem of new evidence that a catastrophic flood inundated the Black Sea littoral during the sixth millennium BC (see Fagan 1999: 87–88). Altogether, readers are likely to find Campanile’s superbly written chapter on IE culture all too brief, although expanding it further would probably not have been warranted in a book dealing primarily with linguistics.

The second chapter, ‘Proto-Indo-European: comparison and reconstruction’ (25–73), by Calvert Watkins, returns the discussion squarely to the arena of descriptive linguistics. After briefly surveying each of the known IE daughter branches, Watkins provides a highly detailed and balanced analysis of PIE phonology, morphology and selected aspects of the syntax. The descriptions mainly follow the author’s own extensive work on PIE, with the use of laryngeals and the traditionally accepted tripartite system of obstruents (voiceless, voiced unaspirated, and voiced aspirated – the latter series being conveyed by a superscript /h/ both in this chapter and throughout the book). Mention is made of Gamkrelidze & Ivanov’s (1984) controversial glottalic theory (38), but Watkins rightly points out that, whatever the merits of this theory in suggesting a typologically more natural inventory of obstruents, the introduction of glottalized voiceless stops introduces additional complexities into the system that cancel its value in terms of “naturalness”. Watkins also deals briefly with the issue of the PIE homeland, discussing areal implications of such early dialectal differences as the centum-satem split. Although this chapter provides an excellent survey of the received knowledge on PIE linguistic structure, readers eager for novel solutions to the various perennial problems in PIE reconstruction will not find them here.

Watkins’ care to remain firmly within the internal boundaries of PIE reconstruction is nicely complemented by Bernard Comrie’s more wide-ranging discussion in the next chapter, ‘The Indo-European linguistic family: genetic and typological perspectives’. Here, Comrie discusses a variety of interesting data brought to light by proponents of a Nostratic or Eurasianic language superfamily. Rather than evaluate the implications of parallels between PIE and such families as Kartvelian, Uralic, etc., Comrie frames the discussion in a broader, typological perspective, which allows comparison of a range of existing parallels without concluding absolutely whether these parallels actually developed on a genetic rather than an areal basis. The description here is in some ways reminiscent of the ‘language mesh’ approach adopted by Fortescue (1998) in dealing with a potential explanation for the many structural affinities between Uralic and various Northeast Asian and Arctic language groups. Comrie notes that typologically unusual vowel systems consisting of one to three phonemes, such as that often reconstructed for PIE, are actually attested in nearby Northwest Caucasian and in some Semitic languages, which in addition have a rather rich and possibly PIE-like inventory of laryngeal consonants. The glottalized, or emphatic obstruents posited for PIE by Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1984) are likewise widespread throughout the Caucasus and are prominent in some branches of Afroasiatic (notably in certain languages of Ethiopia such as Amharic, though their origin there may be due to contact or local development). While its various characteristic phonological traits seem to unite PIE with language families of Southwest Asia and North Africa, morphological parallels in typology more often point toward Northern Eurasia as a source of linguistic affinity. Comrie
notes that the prevalence of pronominal forms in 1st person *m and 2nd person *t shared by IE, Uralic, Turkic, Mongolian, Tungus-Manchu, Yukagir, Chukchi-Kamchatkan, and Eskimo-Aleut is logically suggestive of a distant genetic relationship along the lines proposed by Greenberg (2000). Comrie remains non-committal on this possibility, however, in the absence of a more extensive and systematic body of evidence, and most of his chapter merely employs inter-family comparisons to delineate a more complete typological profile for PIE. A few morphological traits align PIE with Southwest Asia. For example, the fusional nature of IE, which seems to have increased over time in the various daughter branches as accumulating phonological changes obscured the boundaries between stem and grammatical affix, was also typical to some extent even of PIE. This trait seems to align PIE more with neighboring Kartvelian and Semitic than with Northern Asia. Comrie also calls attention to the interesting fact that, despite the morphological complexity of PIE, the actual number of its grammatical categories is quite small, with much of the surface complexity due to the paradigmatic effects of lexically based declensions and conjugations. This fundamentally distinguishes IE from most other Eurasian language groups, particularly Uralic and Turkic, where the number of synthetically expressed grammatical categories tends to be both larger as well as much more uniform paradigmatically. A discussion of syntactic typology closes the chapter, with PIE described as overwhelmingly dependent marking, predominantly SOV, and characterized by a general lack of adpositions (which removes from consideration the question of whether it had prepositions or postpositions). Subject-verb agreement (as opposed to polypersonal verb agreement) distinguishes PIE from most Caucasian languages, and, like most other typological measures above the phonological level, aligns it with northern and central rather than southwest Eurasia. Overall, Comrie’s chapter represents the most accessible and balanced general typological survey of PIE available in any publication.

Each of the book’s remaining 13 chapters provides a general, but in-depth description of a specific IE daughter language or language branch. The discussion is thorough enough to be of value to specialists, yet organized in such as way as to be accessible to the beginner, as well. The following topics are covered: Sanskrit (98–124, by Romano Lazzeroni), Iranian (125–153, by Nicholas Sims-Williams), Tocharian (154–168, by Werner Winter), Anatolian (169–196, by Silvia Luraghi), Armenian (197–227, by Roberto Ajello), Greek (228–260, by Henry M. Hoenigswald), Latin (261–321, by Edoardo Vinesi), Italic (322–344, by Domenico Silvestri), Celtic (345–379, by Patrick Sims-Williams), Germanic (380–414, by Paolo Ramat), Slavic (415–453, by Henning Anderson), Baltic (454–479, by William R. Schmalsteig) and Albanian (480–501, by Shaban Demiraj). Like the three introductory chapters, each of these contributions is beautifully written and expresses the general consensus of most experts on the topic. None of the contributions delve very deeply into the subsequent chronological developments that led to the eventual differentiation within each daughter branch; rather, the focus remains on tracing each individual branch back to PIE and coordinating it with other divisions in the family. There is little to criticize about the material included, though an additional chapter on Indo-Aryan languages with a focus on the origin of Nuristani and other groups outside of the Indian subcontinent proper would have been a useful companion to the chapter on Sanskrit (following the book’s parallel treatment of Latin vis-à-vis other Italic languages). (At any rate, a separate volume on contemporary Indo-Aryan languages is scheduled for publication in the near future.) Finally, a chapter summarizing in more detail all that is known about the various poorly attested IE daughter branches of early Southern and Southeastern Europe might also have made a valuable addition.

This handsome volume provides the best English-language synthesis of generally accepted scholarship on PIE and its daughter branches. Written clearly and accessibly, it will prove an extremely useful general reference to students as well as specialists and should be acquired, along with the other volumes in this excellent series, by any good linguistics library.
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Reviewed by Alessandro Capone, University of Messina

*Context and content* deals, mainly, with presuppositions, assertions and propositional attitudes. In his theory of discourse, Stalnaker gradually prepares some background assumptions for the subsequent discussion of propositional attitudes.

Stalnaker distinguishes between semantic and pragmatic presupposition. It is not clear whether he rejects semantic presupposition on logical grounds, but it is evident that he believes the pragmatic notion to be more useful. A speaker’s presupposition is, in his view, a propositional attitude. If \( p \) is presupposed, then both the speaker and the hearer are disposed to act as if they believed that \( p \).

It ought to be noted that, in this view, one can presuppose \( p \), even if no utterance has been proffered which linguistically requires the presupposition that \( p \). On the other hand, Stalnaker is aware that some linguistic expressions carry linguistic presuppositions; in other words, the use of certain words or sentences require that it be assumed that certain propositional attitudes on the part of the speaker hold. It should be noted that presuppositions, according to Stalnaker, are logically related to Grice’s maxim to the effect that a speaker should not say what is obvious. Thus, presuppositional linguistic behaviour is a consequence of the Gricean maxim of quantity.

Stalnaker is aware that certain factive expressions carry presuppositions in the sense that the speaker must be taken to believe an assumption, without the speaker’s being committed to the fact that the hearer believes that assumption too. However, once the presuppositional expression is proffered, it will be assumed that the speaker/hearer’s beliefs coincide unless the hearer challenges that statement. This process is called *accommodation*, following the terminology of Lewis. The presupposition of a statement is accommodated (presumed to be part of the hearer’s context), provided that the hearer does not exhibit an inclination to challenge that utterance. Stalnaker, however, does not discuss those linguistic expressions which do not require accommodation, being directly tied to speaker/hearer presuppositions.

Stalnaker presents notions such as conditionals and the semantics of propositional attitudes (mainly sentences expressing belief) in terms of possible world semantics. An indicative conditional, unlike a counterfactual conditional, is a function selecting the possible worlds which maximally conform to the speaker’s beliefs in \( C \) and the consequent term of the conditional has the function of distinguishing among these possible worlds. The speaker cannot assert the antecedent without committing himself to the truth of the consequent term in the possible worlds which maximally conform to the speaker’s beliefs in \( C \). Stalnaker, in his analysis, satisfactorily addresses the paradoxes of indicative conditionals and provides an alternative to Grice’s view of conditionals.

Stalnaker deals with propositional attitudes in terms of possible world semantics and disposes of the problematic assertion made by uttering the sentence *John believes that Hesperus is Mars*. He makes use of a propositional concept (a function from possible worlds to propositions) and shows how the necessarily false embedded proposition is assigned an interpretation captured by the diagonal proposition in the propositional concept:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  & i & j \\
  i & F & F \\
  j & T & T \\
\end{array}
\]
The point of the diagonal proposition is also designed to show how proper names, indexicals etc. can at the same time be rigid designators and used in ways that aptly characterise indexical belief. This is done by looking at the personal understanding of the name or indexical on the part of the person whose thoughts are being reported or characterised.

In this book there is an interesting discussion of Quine’s Ortcutt puzzle (Mary believes that Ortcutt is a spy, seeing him in a certain context, and she believes that Ortcutt is not a spy, seeing him in a different context (without any contradiction arising)). This is preceded by a preamble on the distinction between the ‘basic context’ (the context of the speaker’s beliefs) and the ‘derived context’ (the possible worlds conforming to the beliefs of the subject of the main clause). Armed with this preamble, Stalnaker attacks Quine’s puzzle and, after dismissing Quine’s and Kripke’s treatments in terms of quantification and an acquaintance relation (a condition of the type ‘the subject is acquainted with Ortcutt as I’), provides his own analysis. He distinguishes between the speaker’s beliefs about Ortcutt and the beliefs of the subject of the main clause (in terms of the basic and derived context) and he moulds this distinction in terms of different points of view. Then he claims that the beliefs are about Ortcutt and that there is a causal relationship between Ortcutt in a certain context and a particular belief about Ortcutt in that context. The relationship is context-dependent. I think this discussion is not immediately intelligible to the reader. What Stalnaker has in mind is that the basic context contains the speaker’s beliefs about Ortcutt, the derived context does not. It is clear that this analysis attributes to the speaker the belief that Ortcutt exists. Furthermore, Stalnaker assumes that the context or the situation and the particular mode of presentation of Ortcutt causally determine the beliefs of the subject of the main clause. The beliefs of the subject of the main clause are about entities which relate to Ortcutt causally and this is what prevents the contradiction from arising. Stalnaker actually says that the beliefs are about Ortcutt. Perhaps it might be less misleading (and more intelligible for the reader) to say that the beliefs are about an entity (a mental construct) that relates causally to Ortcutt (the individual identified by the speaker as Ortcutt) and to the context(s) in which he can be observed, but is not completely identical with a full recognition of Ortcutt. In any case, Stalnaker fails to note that Kripke’s acquaintance condition could be rescued by setting up some contextual parameters.

The remainder of the book is devoted to problems which are merely philosophical, dealing with the nature of belief in relation to the outside world. Putnam’s view on the issue is meticulously analysed and compared with Fodor’s. Stalnaker develops a reasonable view according to which belief is a relational notion, one that is causally related to the external world and to a man’s actions (in so far as it partially determines them). Stalnaker is an externalist about thoughts, and doubts the need for a notion of internal or narrow content.

_Context and content_ will be read with great interest by scholars interested in semantics, pragmatics and philosophy. It is a tremendously interesting, instructive and useful book in that it presents a rigorous, balanced, and well considered theory. Furthermore, it is certain that many of the ideas expounded in this book will have important and promising ramifications.
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