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Reviewed by JANET GRIJZENHOUT, Utrecht University

This book is the first general introduction to the morphology of Dutch to be published in English. It not only provides a thorough description of the morphology of Dutch, but also raises interesting theoretical issues such as the nature of word-formation processes and the interaction of morphology with syntax, phonology and semantics.

The book is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 guides the reader through some word-formation processes (affixing, compounding and paradigmatic word formation). The basic assumption is that morphological operations apply to the underlying phonological form of the stem of a word. Consider in this respect the fact that even though the verbal stem red ‘save’ ends in the voiced sound /d/, this form never surfaces in isolation. When no morpheme is attached to the stem, a phonological rule applies that devoices final obstruents and the result is the surface form [rÉt]. If a vowel-initial morpheme is added to the stem (e.g. -er, to form a noun that refers to the subject of the verb), the phonological rule mentioned above does not apply and the voiced sound appears (as in redder [rÉd] ‘one who saves, saviour’). Booij assumes that productive morphological processes (i.e. processes by which the lexicon in the language can be extended in a systematic way on the basis of patterns of relationships between existing words) have the form of templates in which the base-slot is open and to which a specific meaning is assigned. Thus, the template [V+er]N expresses the fact that there is a class of nouns of the form ‘verb stem plus -er’ that has the meaning ‘one who Vs’. Apart from affixation, chapter 1 also discusses paradigmatic word formation devices such as affix substitution, back formation and affix extraction.

Chapter 2 examines the inflectional system of Dutch. Booij distinguishes between inherent inflection – which adds morphosyntactic properties with an independent semantic value to stems – and contextual inflection – which does not add information but is required by the syntactic context. The inflectional category ‘number’ is, thus, an example of inherent inflection. There are two plural morphemes in Dutch and the author points out that the choice of the affix depends on the following output condition: ‘a plural noun ends in a trochee’ (24). For this reason, stems ending in an unstressed syllable select the plural morpheme -s, which was historically used in Germanic dialects along the North Sea coast, whereas stems ending in a stressed syllable select the more continental Germanic plural morpheme -en (cf. kánon-s ‘canons’ vs. kánon-en ‘guns’). Exceptions are stems that end in -s which have -en plural forms (cúrsus-en ‘courses’), borrowings that keep the plural form of the source language (e.g. jeep-s ‘id.’ from English and collegae ‘colleagues’ from Latin) and particular nouns that refer to persons. Moreover, it is interesting to note that nouns ending in certain suffixes may also select a specific plural ending; this is the case with the deadjectival suffix schwa (i.e. -e), for example, which selects -en rather than -s (e.g. [de [[gœl]a]-e]N-en]N vs. *de gœl-e-s ‘the good persons’). Booij proposes that in the regular cases, the choice between the plural affixes -en and -s is made on the basis of prosodic output constraints formulated within the framework of Optimality Theory (viz. the conditions that feet are maximally disyllabic and that syllables must be parsed into feet, both of which outweigh the condition that feet are minimally disyllabic).

Prenominal adjectives may have the form ‘stem+schwa’, except when the stem ends in schwa + n (cf. een blauw-e deur ‘a blue door’ vs. een open deur ‘an open door’). Booij accounts for this phenomenon by formulating a condition which says that prenominal adjectives should end in a trochee. A hypothetical form like opene (with two schwa-syllables) would violate the condition that the word should end in a trochee, and Booij provides an optimality theoretic tableau with prosodic output constraints to illustrate this point (46). However, his optimality account does not work for the examples that he himself provides, which have stems ending in schwa + r or schwa + m, which always get inflectional schwa, despite the fact that the output
conditions suggested by Booij would penalize such forms. Moreover, to the best of my knowledge, any other prenominal adjective ending in a sequence of schwa plus another consonant also gets inflectional schwa (e.g. *een verveelende jongen ‘a tiresome boy’). Thus, the condition that prenominal adjectives should end in a trochee reflects a tendency rather than a true condition and Booij’s constraint-based metrical account does not work for all prenominal adjectives in Dutch. The correct generalization is that inflectional schwa appears unless the stem ends in schwa + n (which may be attributed to the fact that this final /n/ is not pronounced, so that the word in question already ends in schwa). Booij proposes that of the two allomorphs for prenominal adjectives, viz. schwa and the null allomorph, the latter is only available after [en].

Booij also provides an analysis of the nominalizing suffix *-e (as in *de zeer rijk-e ‘the very rich one’) and of partitive constructions. The chapter ends with a detailed account of verbal inflection and a discussion of the distinction between inflection and derivation. An important observation is that certain cases of inflection may feed word formation. For example, plural nouns may be used before the derivational suffixes *-dom and *-achtig (cf. helden ‘heroes’ vs. heldendom ‘heroism’ and nominal phrases with an inflectional prenominal adjective may be part of a compound (e.g. [[blot-e]A [vrouwen]N]N [blad]N ‘nude women magazine’). The theoretical consequences of this observation for the morphology of Dutch are addressed in chapter 4.

Chapter 3 is concerned with derivation. The author shows that even though all suffixes determine the lexical category of the output word in Dutch, the Righthand Head Rule (Williams 1981) is not without exceptions for Dutch morphology, because the nominalizing prefix ge- and a number of verbalizing prefixes are category-determining (cf. dijk ‘dike’ vs. be-dijk ‘to provide with a dike’). Non-native suffixes only attach to non-native stems and native suffixes may attach to both non-native and native stems. Booij does not assume level-ordering to account for affix combinations, but proposes instead that the features [−native] and [+native] percolate from the so-called ‘category determining affixes’ to the dominating node. Consider in this respect the fact that the native prefix on- (‘un-’) does not determine the lexical category of the resulting word and, for this reason, the feature [+native] will not percolate. Hence, when this prefix is attached to the non-native adjective grammaticaal, the dominating node will still bear the feature [−native], so that it is still possible to attach the non-native nominalizing suffix -iteit to form ongrammaticaliteit ‘ungrammaticality’.

In this chapter, Booij goes on to discuss and defend the hypothesis that the meaning of a complex word is a compositional function of the meaning of its parts. The chapter ends with a discussion of conversion, i.e. the process of forming a new word without any phonological change in the base word.

Chapter 4 is concerned with Dutch nominal, adjectival, verbal and numeral compounds and it is argued that these are all right-headed. The non-head position may be taken by the stem of a lexical category, by prepositions, quantifiers or phrases. For instance, in Dutch nominal combinations, but proposes instead that the features [ro: dig] [ro. de zee] ‘similar to red’) and of partitive constructions. The chapter ends with a detailed account of verbal inflection and a discussion of the distinction between inflection and derivation. An important observation is that certain cases of inflection may feed word formation. For example, plural nouns may be used before the derivational suffixes *-dom and *-achtig (cf. helden ‘heroes’ vs. heldendom ‘heroism’ and nominal phrases with an inflectional prenominal adjective may be part of a compound (e.g. [[blot-e]A [vrouwen]N]N [blad]N ‘nude women magazine’). The theoretical consequences of this observation for the morphology of Dutch are addressed in chapter 4.

Chapter 3 is concerned with derivation. The author shows that even though all suffixes determine the lexical category of the output word in Dutch, the Righthand Head Rule (Williams 1981) is not without exceptions for Dutch morphology, because the nominalizing prefix ge- and a number of verbalizing prefixes are category-determining (cf. dijk ‘dike’ vs. be-dijk ‘to provide with a dike’). Non-native suffixes only attach to non-native stems and native suffixes may attach to both non-native and native stems. Booij does not assume level-ordering to account for affix combinations, but proposes instead that the features [−native] and [+native] percolate from the so-called ‘category determining affixes’ to the dominating node. Consider in this respect the fact that the native prefix on- (‘un-’) does not determine the lexical category of the resulting word and, for this reason, the feature [+native] will not percolate. Hence, when this prefix is attached to the non-native adjective grammaticaal, the dominating node will still bear the feature [−native], so that it is still possible to attach the non-native nominalizing suffix -iteit to form ongrammaticaliteit ‘ungrammaticality’.

In this chapter, Booij goes on to discuss and defend the hypothesis that the meaning of a complex word is a compositional function of the meaning of its parts. The chapter ends with a discussion of conversion, i.e. the process of forming a new word without any phonological change in the base word.

Chapter 4 is concerned with Dutch nominal, adjectival, verbal and numeral compounds and it is argued that these are all right-headed. The non-head position may be taken by the stem of a lexical category, by prepositions, quantifiers or phrases. For instance, in Dutch nominal combinations, the non-head can be a phrase in which an adjective is inflected (e.g. [[A]A [[N-ig]A]A ‘having one eye’) and nominal phrases with an inflectional prenominal adjective may be part of a compound (e.g. [[[N]A[N-ig]A][A]A ‘eating time’). According to Booij (146), the existence of such examples and the fact that they illustrate productive processes imply that syntactic rules such as adjectival-noun agreement must be allowed to apply within compounds, thus indicating that the morphological module, which defines the set of well-formed words, and the syntactic module, which defines the set of well-formed phrases and sentences, are unordered and apply simultaneously.

If one word-formation process presupposes another, Booij assumes a template with two open slots (e.g. [A [N-ig]A]A for [blaauw]A [[Q]N-ig]A ‘having one eye’ and [[N]V[er]s]N for houthakker ‘woodchopper’). By means of such templates, the fact that two independent word-formation patterns co-occur can be expressed without the complications that a level-ordering approach would give rise to.

Chapter 5 addresses the morphological and phonological structure of Dutch suffixed words and compounds (although the running heads mistakenly read ‘The interface of morphology and syntax’). In order to account for the phonetic realization of complex words, the author distinguishes between cohering suffixes, which form a prosodic word with their stem (e.g. -ig in rod-ig [ro:.dx] ‘reddish’), and non-cohering suffixes, which form a prosodic word of their own (e.g. *achtig in rood-achtig [ro: t][aektig] ‘similar to red’). Among other things, Booij illustrates the fact that gapping of identical material may occur in words with non-cohering suffixes and in compounds (cf. the impossible *rood- en blauwig vs. grammatical rood- en blauwachtig ‘red and
blue like’ and *ijs- en bruine bieren ‘polar bears and brown bears’). In these cases, one of two identical prosodic words – rather than grammatical words – is omitted. The chapter also has a fascinating section on allomorphy.

Chapter 6 investigates the interaction of morphology and syntax. The author discusses cases where a morphological process affects the syntactic valency of words (e.g. the verbal prefix be- creates obligatorily transitive verbs) as well as a number of word combinations with a specific meaning, which implies that they are not generated by the syntactic module, but rather by the morphological component of the grammar (e.g. [aan het [V-infinitive]] as in aan het zwemmen ‘swimming’).

Chapter 7 provides a brief overview of general conclusions concerning the architecture of the grammar that can be drawn on the basis of the discussions in the preceding chapters. Finally, there is a list of references, an index of subjects, an index of authors and an index of affixes.

The merit of the book is that it not only introduces basic concepts, explains terminology and offers a detailed description of the morphology of Dutch, but also provides interesting analyses that contribute to the ongoing discussion on morphological issues.
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Reviewed by Tore Nøset, University of Tromsø

This monograph – a revised version of Katherine Crosswhite’s 1999 UCLA dissertation – is important for two reasons. First, as suggested by the title, it provides a general theory of vowel reduction in Optimality Theory. However, it is also important in the context of Slavic linguistics because it offers an in-depth analysis of vowel reduction in Russian. The monograph consists of eight chapters followed by two copious appendices summarizing attested and predicted reduction patterns.

After a brief introductory chapter, Crosswhite presents her theory in chapter 2. Her thesis is that vowel reduction is a ‘bipartite phenomenon resulting from two different formal mechanisms’ (21). She refers to the two types as ‘prominence reduction’ and ‘contrast enhancement’. The former involves the avoidance of high-sonority vowels in unstressed syllables, while the latter amounts to the avoidance of unstressed non-peripheral vowels. The difference is illustrated by the behavior of /a/. Being highly sonorous, this vowel is disfavored by prominence reduction. With regard to contrast enhancement, however, /a/ is favored as one of the peripheral vowels. Prominence reduction is implemented in terms of prominence alignment constraints, whereas contrast enhancement is accounted for by means of licensing constraints.

The theory is put to the test in chapter 3, which contains a detailed case study of vowel reduction in standard and dialectal Russian. Of particular interest is Crosswhite’s analysis of dialects with so-called dissimilative akanie (65ff.). In dialects of this type, the quality of an unstressed vowel depends on the quality of the following stressed vowel. Thus, /sová/ ‘owl (nominative)’ is realized as [şova], whereas the accusative form /sovu/ surfaces as [savu]. Crosswhite relates the schwa ~ [a] alternation in the pretonic syllable to differences in foot structure. The highly sonorous stressed /a/ in the nominative is assumed to constitute a foot on its own, while the shorter and less sonorous stressed /u/ in the accusative builds a foot together with the
preceding syllable. These assumptions afford a very simple and elegant analysis, where the occurrence of schwa in the nominative is due to foot-external prominence reduction, while unstressed [a] results from contrast enhancement inside the foot.

The merits of Crosswhite’s insightful analysis of dissimilative akan’e notwithstanding, I would have liked to see a more extensive comparison with the traditional dissimilation-based approach. Instead, Crosswhite (65ff.) seems to dismiss dissimilation as a traditional term with no implications for the formal analysis of the relevant dialects. This is over-simplistic since there exists a tradition in which the relevant dialects are analyzed in terms of featural dissimilation (Halle 1965, Davis 1970, Suzuki 1998). The brief (but very interesting) discussion of Suzuki’s (1998) account of the irregular and poorly attested Mosal’ pattern (70ff.) does not do justice to the dissimilation-based approach as such.

One of the things that makes the book under review particularly appealing is the author’s extensive use of phonetic data to support her analysis. The account of foot structure in Russian (72ff.), for instance, is corroborated by facts about vowel duration in various dialects. In chapter 4, the role of phonetics is further clarified. While vowel reduction is motivated by phonetic universals, the ‘phonetic determinism’ hypothesis — that language-specific phonetic factors influence synchronic vowel reduction phenomena — is convincingly refuted on the basis of data from Catalan, Brazilian Portuguese, Bulgarian and Russian.

Having rejected the hypothesis of phonetic determinism, Crosswhite goes on, in chapter 5, to explore the standard Optimal Theory hypothesis that different phonological systems result from different rankings of constraints. In order to test this hypothesis, the author has generated a factorial typology of 255 predicted patterns. All the patterns that are attested in reality turn out to be predicted by the theory, but the theory overgenerates vastly: 70% of the predicted patterns are not attested in Crosswhite’s database of vowel reduction languages. After thorough discussion, however, Crosswhite concludes that all but one gap are most likely accidental. While this seems plausible, the analysis might have benefited from a more comprehensive sample of languages.

In chapter 6, Crosswhite focuses on the blocking of vowel reduction in phonotactically or morphologically defined environments, arguing that these phenomena do not pose problems for her approach. In one of her case studies, Crosswhite proposes an elegant Optimality Theory implementation of the traditional analysis whereby reduction of /o, a/ to [i] in Russian is blocked in certain inflectional endings (149ff.). Crosswhite’s analysis cannot, however, account for the reported occurrence of blocking in uninflected adverbs like segődnja ‘today’ and donêl’zja ‘in the extreme’. Furthermore, the tendency for blocking to occur in word-final position might speak for an alternative account in terms of phonologically conditioned word-final lengthening.

Some of Crosswhite’s analyses hinge on the somewhat untraditional concept of nonmoraic vowels. In a thorough discussion in chapter 7, however, this concept is shown to have phonetic grounding and crosslinguistic validity. The final chapter provides a brief, critical discussion of earlier approaches to vowel reduction, but — rather surprisingly — does not offer a conclusion summarizing the contribution of the book.

In general, the book is well written and reads easily. Typographical errors are few and are never likely to cause misunderstandings. I am not able to check the examples from all the languages discussed in the book, but the Slavic examples involve few errors. Somewhat confusing are the mismatches between the numbers in table (105) and those in the accompanying text (134f.). Table (105) also contains incorrect percentages. Tableaux (151) and (152) apparently do not yield the correct neutralization patterns for Contemporary Standard Russian, contrary to what is claimed in the text (197f.). However, problems like these are mere matters of detail and in no way compromise my favorable impression of the book. Crosswhite’s monograph provides several important contributions to the study of vowel reduction. It is warmly recommended to anybody interested in this topic.
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Reviewed by Ken Lodge, University of East Anglia, Norwich

This is the latest offering in phonology from the Cambridge Textbooks series. It is not in the tradition of Lass (1984) and cannot be seen as a replacement for it. The present book has quite a different approach and has a very obvious theoretical slant. It would be hard for anyone to live up to the promise that ‘[n]o specific theoretical doctrine/approach/theory is explicitly adopted or adhered to’ (x) and, indeed, the ‘theoretical proclivities of the present author’ (x) are obvious. Already in chapter 2 we are introduced to the melody and the skeleton, and throughout the book technical terms such as domain, licensing and association steer the reader well in the direction of Government Phonology. On the other hand, basic concepts such as contrastive/parallel and complementary distribution feature hardly at all, unlike in many recent introductions. To that extent Gussmann’s approach is quite unlike what is usually presented as appropriate for beginners in phonology. Terms like phoneme and derivation simply do not appear in the index.

There are nine chapters, which could be the basis of a semester-long course, covering sounds and segments, the melody and the skeleton, domains, the syllable, codas, segmental regularities, quantity in Icelandic, segmental double agents, and words and feet in Munster Irish. The material presented for discussion and analysis is interesting and quite challenging: it includes a range of phenomena from Irish, Polish, German, English and Icelandic.

The main drawback of the book is that it takes quite a lot for granted, even though it is explicitly intended for absolute beginners. How can a beginner assess the relevance of attacks on phoneme inventories (154–155) or on derivations (82), if she or he knows nothing about them?

The presentation of the discussion and analysis is for the most part clear; key points are repeated several times and in connection with different phenomena. Because of this clarity it is easy to find fault with some of the discussion. On the other hand, there are some salutary warnings, which could be heeded by practised phonologists too, for example, ‘phonological evidence needs to be carefully sifted before its significance can be ascertained’ (108), and Gussmann cautions against vicious circles, everyday intuitions and school training and ‘prejudices initially taken for granted’ (116). But why not shout these loudly in the introduction rather than tucking them away in the summary of chapter 5?

There are three points in particular where it seems to me that insufficient explanation and guidance is given to the beginner. Gussmann discusses aspiration in English and aspiration and preaspiration in Icelandic. He describes aspiration as ‘a puff of air … following the plosive’ (4), and goes on to claim that word-final /p t k/ in English may be aspirated or unaspirated; ‘furthermore, the aspiration may be reinforced or even replaced by the glottal stop’ (4). And we have transcriptions such as [bætʰ] ‘batter with word-internal post-tonic aspiration (5). These data (if they are intended to be representative of RP) and the description of aspiration are both suspect. Since aspiration is the delayed onset of voicing, it can only occur in relation to some following vocal cord vibration, but Gussmann’s account seems to be a confusion of aspiration and plosive release. In RP and many other accents of English aspiration occurs at the beginning of a stressed syllable and nowhere else; it does not occur, for example, after the second stop of kick it any more than in batter. In relation to the definition of aspiration, how are we to interpret the transcription of sequences such [-pʰk] in [scæpʰk] or [-pʰk] in [scærpʰk] (138) in Icelandic, where no voicing is involved? Furthermore, why is preaspiration in Icelandic to be seen as ‘the presence of the segment [h]’ (54), when onset aspiration is not? Such matters cannot be
left to beginners to sort out and it is not always appropriate (or fair) to hide behind the pedagogical technique whereby ‘some of the analyses we provide are deliberately provocative and can – or should – be challenged’ (x).

The second area of concern is the insistence that empty final nuclei are universal, so the English word *bed* is disyllabic with two onsets [b] and [d]. Indeed, all ‘monosyllables’ in all languages are disyllabic, unless they are open. Codas are only tolerated before another onset. Gussmann takes a good deal of trouble to justify this claim with material from several languages in chapters 4–7. In itself, this is a sound basis for further discussion and analysis, but the problems associated with such an approach are not discussed or even mentioned. Firstly, if all single consonants are onsets, why is allophonic distribution often based on onsets versus codas and, similarly, why do codas develop differently from onsets in the history of many languages? For instance, unreleased, glottally reinforced stops, as in English, sit uneasily in onset position of any syllable. To say that such realizations occur because the following nucleus is empty is not necessarily an advantage over saying they occur in codas. Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, how can English monosyllables such as *bed* have a non-branching open syllable (/be-/)? If stressed open syllables have to be branching (68)? Issues of this kind need to be discussed in a beginners’ book and alternatives at least considered.

The third issue is that of predictable information in lexical representations. Gussmann refers to predictability in places in relation to Irish vowel quantity (165–166) and coins the term **phonetic effect** to refer to ‘sound properties which, in some sense, are not essential or accidental’ (64), such as the palatal realization of the dorsal fricative in German (61). Beginners might expect to know in what sense, but this would require a full discussion of arbitrary versus predictable aspects of phonology. However, in two languages, Italian and Icelandic, he discusses vowel quantity variation, which is predictable, and yet the given lexical skeletal positions take quantity into account. It is not made clear why such ‘phonetic effects’ (182, in reference to example (40) from Icelandic) are reflected in the lexical skeletal structure.

There are quite a number of typographical errors, which do not matter too much in the English text, but errors in transcription and representations are troublesome for beginners. For instance, [i] is mixed up with [I] in the phonetic transcriptions on several occasions, which leads to quite a confusing discussion of German [k] (187), in which [ik/ik/i:k] are not properly differentiated; there are no fewer than four mistakes in four German words related to the root *Bild* and their phonetic transcriptions (149); and several representations are wrong.

There are many useful aspects of Gussmann’s book for use as background material for an introductory phonology course, but Gussmann’s approach to phonology, though well presented and argued for the most part, makes his book difficult to use as the main text for such a course. As an introduction to Government Phonology with, for example, Harris (1994) as a follow-up, it would be fine, but it is not a starter pack.

**REFERENCES**


*Author’s address: School of Modern Languages and European Studies, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, U.K.*

E-mail: K.lodge@uea.ac.uk

(Received 4 October 2002)

© 2003 Cambridge University Press


Reviewed by Laurie Bauer, Victoria University of Wellington

After a flood of morphology textbooks in the late 1980s and early 1990s, there has been something of a lull in more recent years, despite the ongoing research in morphology. That might in
itself be a reason for welcoming a new one: new understandings of morphology need to be passed on to our students. This book certainly does that. But more interesting is its structure, putting together elements which we might not have previously considered in the same context, and showing links between them.

Some of this innovation can be seen in the structure of the book, though a quick glance at the table of contents will make the book seem more traditional than it actually is. I will first present an outline of the book, and then take up a couple of controversial issues which the book raises. I should say at the outset that the book is well-written and well-presented; I spotted only a small number of typographical errors, none crucial. Personally, I found the spelling vocal chords (184) to be off-putting.

Chapter 1, ‘Introduction’, provides a definition of morphology, introduces the reader to notions of synthetic, analytic and polysynthetic languages, and outlines the goals of morphological analysis.

In chapter 2, ‘Basic concepts’, most of the expected fundamental notions are introduced: lexeme and word-form, inflection and derivation, paradigm and word-family, affixes, bases and roots, morpheme and allomorph, internal modification, compounding, and so on. The chapter concludes with an appendix on morpheme-by-morpheme glosses. To my mind this is the least satisfactory chapter. Figure 2.1 (16) fails to reflect the discussion in the text, some of the definitions are rather cursory and not necessarily sufficient for a beginning student, the term ‘complementary distribution’ (27) is used but not defined. There is also some unexpected terminology, such as the use of the term ‘conversion’ to link forms such as sheep (sg.) and sheep (pl.) (26), although for most writers conversion is a derivational process.

Chapter 3, ‘Lexicon and rules’, deals with productivity, introducing rules and also providing a good introduction to morpheme-less morphology, and considering morphological change.

Chapter 4, ‘Inflection and derivation’, is an excellent introduction to the vexed problem of the difference between the two branches of morphology, informed by Booij’s distinction between inherent and contextual inflection. As might be expected from Haspelmath’s earlier writing (Haspelmath 1996), change of category is rejected as a criterion for the distinction, while the discussion of productivity as a criterion is well-formulated and helpful. The label ‘new concept’ in table 4.7 (80) is unfortunate, since the +’s in the column appear to refer to a lack of new concept, but the intention of the table is clear. The notion of split morphology is introduced in this context.

Chapter 5, ‘Morphological trees’, provides an introduction to syntagmatic structure in morphology and the notion of headedness.

In chapter 6, ‘Productivity’, the view that the productivity of a derivational process is one of the things that speakers know about the morphology of their language is defended in a very nice presentation. Measures of productivity are mentioned, but are not explored in any detail.

Chapter 7, ‘Inflectional paradigms’, deals with a number of issues: paradigm structure, allomorphy, syncretism, productivity of paradigms, abstract stems, defective paradigms, deponents and periphrasis, and these lead into discussions of matters such as underspecification and rules of referral. The chapter is rather more difficult to read than earlier ones, but is insightful.

Chapter 8, ‘Words and phrases’, looks at clitics versus affixes and compounds versus phrases.

In chapter 9, ‘Word-based rules’, Haspelmath returns to the question of whether morphemes are necessary, looking at paradigmatic substitution as a means of word-formation, and treating bracketing paradoxes as instances of paradigmatic substitution. He nonetheless argues for the retention of morphemes for practical purposes.

Chapter 10, ‘Morphophonology’, provides a valuable discussion of the various types of alternation that are found, with useful tables summarising the differences between those types.

In chapters 11 (‘Morphology and valence’) and 12 (‘Frequency effects in morphology’), Haspelmath feels free to follow his own interests to a greater degree than elsewhere. Chapter 11 includes discussion of voice, causation, incorporation, V+V compounding, synthetic compounding and transpositional derivation. I found chapter 12 particularly interesting, since frequency effects are not usually dealt with together, and it is valuable to have the results of research in different areas consolidated in this way.

Each chapter ends with a brief summary, recommendations for further reading, and some exercises (to which no answers are given). There is a glossary and a language index as well as a subject index in the end matter.
Anderson (1992: 1) cites Morris Halle as having said that the linguist who wants to become famous should ‘Go forth and name things!’. Haspelmath is certainly following the spirit of the injunction in this book, with variable success. For instance, I do not think that ‘forth-formation’ (169) as the opposite of ‘back-formation’ has much chance of catching on, despite the lexical gap, but ‘cross-formation’ (169; see also Becker 1993) for the relationship between pairs such as *hedonist*/hedonism (we could add *hedonistic*) seems far more felicitous. I am not sure about ‘duplifix’ (24) for an affix whose form is partly fixed and partly determined through reduplication, but ‘integrated’ affixes (199), as the opposite of neutral affixes (so distinguishing -ity and -ness respectively in English, for example) seems to me to be an excellent term.

There are two points which I would like to take up for more detailed discussion: the first is Haspelmath’s use of the term ‘morpheme’ and the second is a more general matter of morphological data.

Haspelmath (16) defines morphemes as ‘the smallest meaningful constituents of a linguistic expression’ (bold in original). That is, morphemes are concrete items which occur in word-forms. The usage is not original, being just one of many interpretations of this much-abused term, but it is one which has been rather downplayed in recent European work. The benefit of this definition is that it avoids the awkward distinction between morph and morpheme, especially in a model where morphemes are just one type of marker of a morphological relationship (others include internal modification, subtraction, and even conversion), or where it may even be desirable to do away with morphemes entirely (as in Anderson 1992). The disadvantage emerges as soon as the topic of allomorphy arises. Haspelmath discusses this on several occasions, as one would expect. Allomorphs create the problem, since they are the concrete items which occur in word-forms and then it is not clear how these relate to morphemes. Haspelmath (31) points out the problem, and mentions the term ‘morph’, though he does not use it himself.

More generally, I would like to raise the question of the data on which morphological generalisations are based. Data is a thorny problem for the textbook writer, especially where the author has to rely on published descriptions, which are never as complete as might be wished. In a sense, therefore, the writer has to build the reader’s confidence that the data presented are appropriate and accurate enough to support the points that are being made. Anything which undermines this confidence is bad for the book. Thus a bold statement that An examination of Fido’s eyes by the vet is impossible (227) raises at least my eyebrows: Under the present circumstances, an examination of Fido’s eyes by the vet would seem to be called for seems perfectly in order. More subtly, Haspelmath (92) makes reference to the English word *sabertooth* (pl. *sabertooths*) to make the point that exocentric compounds do not behave grammatically like endocentric ones because the regular plural correlates with exocentricity. The passage is carefully worded to apply only to this lexeme, although the implication would seem to be that such differences are generalisable. For those of us in the know, the endocentric plural *Mickey Mouses* might be enough to raise questions. Because English happens not to have more exocentrics with a second element *tooth* to contradict any generalisation here, students might be led to accept the statement. But consider items with a second element *foot*, which ought to work the same way as *sabertooth*. There are compounds with *foot* which are endocentric (*clubfoot*) and others that are exocentric (*tenderfoot*); there are examples with modifiers which are marked as possessors and others with no such mark (*hare’s foot versus harefoot*); there are verb + noun exocentrics like *tanglefoot* (‘whisky’); and there are exocentrics where the denoted item resembles the item denoted by the compound (or, in another terminology, the compound is used metaphorically), as in the plant-name *goose-foot*. In the language as a whole, words used metaphorically tend to inflect like the same words used literally (though consider the verse from ‘Diamonds are a girl’s best friend’ (Leo Robin 1949): ‘He’s your guy when stocks are high / but beware when they start to descend, / it’s then that those *louses* go back to their spouses / diamonds are a girl’s best friend’ and computer *mouses* alongside *mice*). Evidence from The Oxford English dictionary on the compounds (where the OED mentions plural forms at all) seems to suggest that there is no generalisation here at all, and that plurals have to be learnt for each item. The situation with *foot* is shown in Table 1. Any students who think about such cases will have their confidence in the generalisation here at all, and that plurals have to be learnt for each item. The situation with the compounds (where the OED mentions plural forms at all) seems to suggest that there is no generalisation here at all, and that plurals have to be learnt for each item. The situation with *foot* is shown in Table 1. Any students who think about such cases will have their confidence in the reliability of the linguistic data in the book as a whole undermined.

On two occasions Haspelmath spells out what he thinks his book has to offer. It deals with ‘questions of substance rather than questions of formal description’ (34) and it ‘emphasize[s] the paradigmatic approach’ (167). In both, it is successful, though neither makes it unique. What I valued most was the light that was shed on familiar problems through a new synthesis of the
material and through the insights offered by recent research on morphology presented in a very accessible manner. I will definitely recommend it to my students.

REFERENCES


Author’s address: School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, PO Box 600, Wellington, New Zealand.

E-mail: laurie.bauer@vuw.ac.nz

(Received 6 December 2002)

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Pl. feet</th>
<th>Pl. feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endocentric</td>
<td>Poss + N</td>
<td>hare’s foot</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N + N</td>
<td>jawfoot</td>
<td>part of crustacean</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exocentric</td>
<td>A + N</td>
<td>blackfoot</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tenderfoot</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hotfoot</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arsefoot</td>
<td>bird</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N + N</td>
<td>fanfoot</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pussyfoot</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V + N</td>
<td>V + N</td>
<td>switch-foot</td>
<td>ambidextrous surfer</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exocentric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resemble/</td>
<td>poss + N</td>
<td>crow’s foot</td>
<td>wrinkle</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metaphor</td>
<td>N + N</td>
<td>fawnfoot</td>
<td>bulge in a handle</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goose-foot</td>
<td>plant</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Reviewed by Gregory D. S. Anderson, University of Manchester
The volume consists of two brief introductory chapters, a large chapter that presents most of the data, three appendices and an extensive set of references.

Chapter 1, ‘Introduction’, offers a short survey of the history of the study of grammaticalization and the basic tenets of grammaticalization theory, as well as a justification of the notational conventions and terminology used throughout the volume. Chapter 2, ‘Grammatical concepts used in this work’, is in essence a lexicon within the lexicon, offering reduced definitions of or comments on the types of grammatical terminology used throughout the main chapter of the work. The terms used are generally the standard ones, basically following the set used in the European Science Foundation project, EUROTYP.

Chapter 3, ‘Source-target lexicon’, constitutes the bulk of the work, taking up 290 pages. This presents a set of grammaticalization processes in shorthand, arranged alphabetically by the source, that is, the semantic-functional category that gave rise to the grammaticalized category. This takes the form of SOURCE > TARGET and, if more than one target is derived from a single source, the individual targets are numbered and arranged alphabetically, e.g. ABLATIVE > (1) AGENT, ABLATIVE > (2) COMPARATIVE, etc.

The three appendices are, respectively, ‘Source-target list’, essentially a brief summation of the previous chapter in tabular form, a ‘Target-source list’, a reversal of the previous appendix, again in alphabetical order, and a ‘List of languages’, giving the name and genetic affiliation of the nearly 500 languages used in the lexicon. These are followed by an extensive bibliography.

H&K’s work is a welcome addition to the growing body of literature on grammaticalization and grammatical change more generally. It is a work that belongs in any good research library and in the collection of researchers of grammaticalization or historical linguistics generally. This lexicon is not overly technical although it is thorough, so that advanced students as well as professionals will benefit from it. The references include not only works cited in the lexicon, but also certain ones that are of interest to those working on grammaticalization, and, as such, constitute an invaluable resource.

H&K attempt to restrict instances covered in the volume to only those processes that occur in more than one unrelated language family and part of the world and those with sound historical certainty as to the direction of the developments concerned. However, they do, without any apparent justification, include some unique instances of grammaticalization or some examples exhibiting potentially areally or genetically restricted distribution.

One obvious complaint that a reader might make, although one that is at least understandable when considering the specialty of the first author, is the predominance of African languages cited in the examples. In addition, while most forms have interlinear glossing, a number lack these, e.g. many Moré forms, certain forms from Aranda, Albanian, or Southern Sotho, etc.

Within appendix 3, ‘List of languages’, there are some curious decisions made about the genetic affiliation of the languages; it would have been better to leave off many of these controversial genetic claims and stick to the secure affiliations. Some particularly noteworthy problems in this regard include the somewhat random usage of Amerind, the lack of consistency in the affiliation of Abkhaz and Ubykh, the lack of Kartvelian for the family that includes Georgian and Mingrelian, the complete omission of Muskogean for Chickasaw, the inclusion of Ainu in Altaic, but not Nanay (Tungusic), the lack of clear subgroups of Mon-Khmer, like Bahnaric or Viet-Muong, the omission of Nakh-Daghestanian or Northeast Caucasian for Lezgian, etc. Some language name choices or spellings are also non-standard, e.g. Accadian (not Akkadian) or Papago for Tohono O’odham. Additionally, as in many typologically oriented works, there is no actual information on where (i.e. which country or countries) the languages in question are (or were) predominantly spoken – an especially unfortunate oversight given the authors’ stated goal (337) that this appendix is intended to aid the reader in finding the languages cited.

From a stylistic standpoint one criticism that can be offered is the at times disconcerting repetitions of summaries or footnotes with different target entries within a single source entry or even within the same target entry. These may occur on adjacent pages or even the very same page, and this strikes the reader as repetitive; for example, the identical footnotes (number 15, 16) on subsequent examples of Chinese on pages 100f. or Vietnamese (footnotes 23, 24) on pages 144f. Also, at one point in successive paragraphs, H&K use the exact same cited form to demonstrate two separate (albeit related) points; thus, on page 185, the Imonda form meaning ‘I was holding a crab’ is used to show the grammaticalization of keep/hold in a durative/intensive function and in an iterative function.
Further, while it is clear that typographic errors are likely to creep into a work of this scope, although in the text itself none were blatant, there were a few unusual or incorrect choices of representation of certain language forms. In particular, Turkish and Vietnamese were misrepresented on several occasions. Thus, Turkish forms often (e.g. pages 128, 298) show s for ş (rendered on page 217 as Ş, which approximates the symbol found in Turkish orthography) and i for orthographic un-dotted-i (132), rendered elsewhere (217) as I; a particularly egregious example, showing multiple instances of both of these, is found on page 200. In Vietnamese, the lack of tone diacritics (e.g. page 123) is especially unfortunate in the forms meaning ‘here’ and ‘there’ (173), as these are differentiated precisely by the tonal contrast. Given the resources of a press like Cambridge and the relatively well-known nature of the languages, these orthographic issues are particularly unwelcome. These typographical problems of course could be fixed in subsequent editions.

Despite the problems outlined above, the lexicon is overall a valuable contribution to the field and one I would recommend to anyone interested in grammaticalization or in processes of linguistic change generally.
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Reviewed by JOHN NEWMAN, University of Alberta

Grammaticalization defines a whole agenda of research for some linguists, while its very legitimacy, as a distinct topic of research, is questioned by others (cf. Campbell 2001). Kuteva falls well and truly into the former group. The book makes clear at the outset that what follows is based on, and represents an extension of, Heine (1993). A key feature of Kuteva’s approach is a panchronic view of the object of study, a view which encompasses both synchronic and diachronic aspects. The panchronic approach allows the author to invoke either synchronic relationships (e.g. polysemy) or diachronic relationships (e.g. change in usage of a form over time) in order to complete an account of auxiliation. And, as with any attempt to motivate polysemy or semantic extension, the orientation is necessarily one that draws upon cognitive principles, as opposed to studying language phenomena as an autonomous system, independent of cognition. Characteristically, her accounts rely upon grammaticalization chains, with the links of the chain provided by panchronic observations. The persuasiveness of the whole (usually hypothetical) chain depends upon a seamless sequencing of smaller and less controversial discrete steps drawn from panchronic observations.

Chapter 2, ‘The conceptual-semantic aspect of auxiliation’, is very much in the vein of Heine (1993) in the way Kuteva sees the recurring patterns of auxiliary developments across languages as rooted in conceptualization principles. For example, the idea that abstract notions are conceptualized as, and expressed by, concrete notions, familiar from recent work in polysemy and metaphor, is claimed to play an important role in motivating the development of auxiliary structures. To illustrate this, she considers in some detail the recent emergence of a German dialectal progressive constructed with sein ‘to be’ and the portmanteau marker am ‘on, at, + article’, as in Der Pilot ist am fliegen ‘The pilot is flying’ (with fliegen represented orthographically without a capital letter, suggesting an infinitive, rather than a gerundive). The use of the infinitive fliegen in this construction is seen as an abstract semantic extension of sein + an/am from the concrete locative use in Ich bin am Bahnhof ‘I am at the railway station’ and represents the end-point of a grammaticalization chain.
Chapter 3, ‘On “functional need” explanations in auxiliation’, deals with the emergence of aspectual markers out of erstwhile posture verbs, specifically ‘sit’, ‘stand’ and ‘lie’. Again, she argues for a particular kind of grammaticalization chain, in this case: posture verb $>$ unmarked canonical locative verb $>$ aspectual auxiliary. This chapter could be seen as further exemplification of the themes of chapter 2, demonstrating the ‘conceptual-semantic aspect’ of grammaticalization (recurring grammaticalization patterns of posture verbs across languages, pointing to common kinds of conceptualization) and a concrete-to-abstract type of extension (bodily posture extending to location). However, Kuteva does not make either of these observations about the posture-based auxiliations in chapter 3. Instead, the chapter is constructed around arguing against a particular ‘functional need’ argument as to why posture verbs should have developed into auxiliaries. Here, as elsewhere in the book, one feels that the chapter seems to have been written more as a stand-alone essay rather than as an integrated chapter of a monograph.

In chapter 4, ‘Identifying a gram in auxiliation across languages’, the author considers a little-discussed grammaticalization: past volition $>$ ... $>$ avertive, called the ‘Past Volition’ chain by Kuteva, not to be confused with the ‘Non-past Volition’ chain: non-past volition $>$ ... $>$ proximative. The avertive has a meaning along the lines of ‘was on the verge of V-ing but did not’; the proximative, on the other hand, has a meaning like ‘the temporal phase just before the V-ing commences/commenced’. Kuteva finds evidence for the ‘Past Volition’ chain in Bulgarian, as well as a further development of the avertive to a proximative, and skilfully discusses the subtle semantic nuances which are relevant to these developments.

I found chapter 5, ‘Auxiliation in discourse context’, the most original of all the chapters. Here, Kuteva selects a particular kind of speech act occurrence as a micro-historical event in which a form uttered by the speaker is subsequently given a slightly different mismatched interpretation by the hearer. The mismatch is related to ‘non-shared discourse world knowledge’, i.e. a world knowledge relating to the discourse which is differently constituted for speaker and hearer. In such individualized exchanges, Kuteva argues, we see a kind of semantic shift which can herald a change in the language system (the micro event of a speech act as activating language change, including auxiliation). Here, too, the development of the Bulgarian volitional verb into an avertive is provided as a relevant case study. A very brief chapter 6, ‘From everyday linguistic communication to grammaticalization’, reads more like an additional section of the preceding chapter, rather than as a chapter in its own right. A concluding chapter of four and a half pages summarizes the main points.

There is a high standard of scholarship evident throughout the book, with quite original discussions of auxiliation, particularly as it applies in Bulgarian. The inclusion of speech act dynamics as part of the larger discussion is an important new direction for grammaticalization research and Kuteva does an excellent job of arguing the case for the relevance of a particular kind of communicative mismatch in this type of research. As such, I consider this an important book and one that will be profitably read by all those interested in grammaticalization. An impression I was left with, however, was that the book feels more like a collection of (eloquent!) essays strung together than a monograph per se. My impression comes from the minimal cross-referencing between chapters, the way in which chapters zero in on a particular (though always interesting) point as opposed to covering many facets of a phenomenon, and a somewhat perfunctory concluding chapter. These features in no way detract from the overall high quality of the contents, but they do suggest that a sub-title like Essays on grammaticalization might have been more appropriate than An enquiry into the nature of grammaticalization.
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This volume is a product of the workshop on Balkan languages that followed the 1996 GLOW conference in Athens. With an article on general issues concerning the Balkan isoglosses, three contributions on sentential structure, two on the nominal domain and one on verb movement, it constitutes a good first effort to bring together relatively current theoretical work in comparative syntax while also familiarizing the reader with distinctive characteristics of the Balkan sprachbund.

In ‘Is Balkan comparative syntax possible?’, Brian Joseph draws our attention to the terms ‘comparative Balkan syntax’ and ‘comparative syntax of the Balkans’, which he associates with different approaches to the study of isoglosses: the former detects areal features and explores how contact-induced changes emerge, while the latter focuses on areal features with the aim of obtaining insights into the properties of Universal Grammar. The author presents a number of fascinating Balkan areal features, but expresses concern as to whether studies of the latter type are useful for current syntactic theory (mainly because of the relatively recent contact situation that gave rise to the various constructions), and he seems to believe that they do not necessarily contribute much to detecting distinctive properties and the genesis of a sprachbund either (probably true to a large extent, given their orientation). One should point out here that the tradition in microcomparative syntax (starting with Kayne 1975) has focused on synchronic differences primarily and also that recent work on creole languages (DeGraff 1999) considers contact situations in interesting ways for syntactic theory. In the final section the author ultimately concludes that there are indeed merits in doing ‘comparative syntax of the Balkan languages’, and such studies can be of use to studies in ‘comparative Balkan syntax’ as well.

The next three articles of the volume are engaged with the most prominent characteristic of Balkan languages: the subjunctive clauses that have replaced infinitives. As expected, these papers center around three concepts associated with these domains crosslinguistically: control, subject raising and subject obviation.

In ‘Head-to-head merge in Balkan subjunctives and locality’, Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin recasts in current terms her own earlier claims regarding the status of subjunctive subjects and their referential properties. She does not adhere to the PRO vs. pro distinction but adopts the notion of contextual vs. inherent anaphor instead. Subsequently, she proposes that the governing category for Balkan subjunctive subjects (which she considers contextual anaphors) is different from that in Romance or Germanic languages, and that the difference is crucially related to the subjunctive particle, which, unlike C, restructures with the rest of the Infl heads. As for the lack of obviation, the author holds that it follows from the contextual anaphor status of Balkan subjunctive subjects. The details are not immediately obvious, however, nor is it clear why only a subset of subjunctive subjects are associated with obligatory control (‘anaphoric binding’ in the author’s terms). The novelty lies in the fact that the proposed restructuring of subjunctive subjects is captured better in bare phrase structure than in GB.

In ‘Control and raising in and out of subjunctive complements’, Anna Roussou does not adhere to the PRO vs. pro distinction either and points out that the anaphoric properties of Balkan subjunctive subjects are to be found in (other) finite and infinitival complements as well. Finiteness is considered a property of C interacting with I and depends on the semantic properties of the matrix predicate (in the sense of word dependencies translated as lack of embedded Cfin), and the AgrS of the embedded clause. Control and raising clauses lack Cfin and AgrS, but differ in terms of the theta-roles associated with their subjects. When the same sentences are introduced by C, Cfin is realized and control becomes impossible. Volitionals with null C are incompatible with control because AgrS is present, while realization of C in the same type of clause triggers disjoint reference, in a way that needs to be made more precise.

Iliana Krapova’s discussion of ‘Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek’ (‘Modern’ being redundant in this context, as it is the only ‘Balkan’ stage of Greek) is ‘mainstream’, in the
sense that pro and PRO are adopted. It is argued that each type of subject aligns with each of the two types of subjunctives identified: subjunctives I and II. It is clearly demonstrated that these differ with respect to their independent (or otherwise) event and time frame, concepts which amount to an embedded Tense specified with [+T] or [−T], checking nominative or null Case, respectively. The referential properties of subjunctive subjects then follow from standard assumptions concerning pro and PRO. In brief, while the first of these three contributions attributes the behavior of Balkan subjunctive subjects to the subjunctive marker, the other two associate it with dependencies between a matrix and an embedded clause. In the former of the last two articles, these are dependencies between matrix predicate and embedded clause, also responsible for subject dependencies, while in the latter they are Tense specifications/dependencies that regulate the appearance of pro and PRO.

Dalina Kallulli’s contribution, ‘Direct object clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek’, is a condensed form of two chapters of her 1999 Ph.D. thesis and is interesting and novel but often difficult to follow. She shows that doubling of direct objects by clitics does not correlate perfectly with their being definite or indefinite (definiteness is later shown to be an epiphenomenon); referentiality is not entirely relevant either; nor is it the case that only right dislocated indefinite DPs may be doubled. Instead, what may not be doubled consistently, as the author claims, are focused elements, whilst clitics double a [−focus] DP, hence clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek is more similar to the right dislocation found in Romance. Along with Sportiche (1995), Kallulli holds that clitics are voice heads whose Spec must host a [−focus] DP by the LF stage. When the clitic is overt and the DP covert, the outcome is clitic doubling, while the reverse situation involves scrambling. Bare singulars may not be doubled or scrambled, not because they are NPs missing the + D features present in clitics, but rather because they denote properties rather than individuals, they are predicates rather than arguments. Existential bare plurals are NPs, therefore they may not be doubled or scrambled because they lack + D, while generic bare plurals are DPs and can be scrambled when [−focus]. In Greek and Albanian in particular, the D of generic plurals is overt and can be clitic doubled when [−focus].

In ‘Adjectival determiners in Albanian and Greek’, Antonia Androutsopoulou extends earlier work of hers on Greek determiner spreading (namely, multiple occurrence of determiners in DPs with adjectival modification) to Albanian. She considers the relevant structures to be reduced relatives with the adjectival determiner as the relativizer, and studies in wonderful detail a number of differences between the two languages. By virtue of the suffixal determiner, the author holds, identification between adjective and noun takes place only in a spec-head configuration under D/PP in Albanian, while theta-identification is also available in Greek, resulting in different word order possibilities for the two languages. The suffixal Albanian determiner does not trigger pied-piping of the nominal complement in pre-adjectival position, in contrast with its Greek (non-suffixal) counterpart, with the result again being different word orders. The adjectival determiner of Albanian genitives is attributed to the Albanian noun which, by virtue of bearing the definite determiner, enters a spec-head configuration with the adjectival determiner, a behavior not followed by Greek, in which the adjectival determiner is absent. However, it is not entirely obvious how this reasoning is to be reconciled with the absence of Greek adjectival determiners associated with indefinite DPs, for which it is very interestingly proposed that the indefinite agrees with a null adjectival determiner.

In the last article of the volume, ‘Last resort and V movement in Balkan languages’, María Luisa Rivero builds on her earlier work and explores how stylistic verb movement in Bulgarian seems not to obey Last Resort, as stated in Chomsky (1995: 257). She discusses the following movements to sentence-initial position: (a) Long Head Movement of nonfinite verbs, (b) movement of the finite verb in clitic-second environments and (c) movement of imperative verbs, and argues that although these are structurally similar to movement that occurs in order to enter a checking relationship with an attractor, the movement here in fact takes place in order to fulfill requirements of a higher functional head, whose phonological matrix must meet well-formedness conditions at PF. This is why, as the author claims, the above types of movement escape Last Resort but are blocked by movement that checks features in the computational system. Rivero traces instances of this type of verb movement through the history of Greek to conclude that it is now extinct, with the exception of some dialects (Cappadocian and Cypriot). In standard Greek, what appears to be similar verb movement is actually only apparently similar, since it checks a formal V feature and obeys Last Resort but is not stylistic. It may actually be Last Resort, as the author conjectures, that is responsible for the switch in type of verb movement.
SHORTER NOTICES

The brief reference to stylistic fronting in Scandinavian may initiate further interesting studies from a comparative perspective.
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Reviewed by Kersti Börjars, University of Manchester/University of Gothenburg

The phenomenon of verb-second (V2) as manifest in Germanic languages has received a tremendous amount of attention in the recent theoretical literature. Particularly in the Chomskyan tradition, where the phenomenon has been explained in terms of verb-movement to a clause-level functional projection, there are many treatments of V2. In fact, the successful analysis of many aspects of V2 has been seen as evidence that the transformational model is on the right track. In this research tradition, Sells’ Structure, alignment and optimality in Swedish makes a particularly valuable contribution because it can be said simultaneously to follow in this tradition and to break quite radically with it.

Sells provides an account of Swedish clause structure and verb second (V2) in general and of the phenomenon of weak pronoun shift in particular (the facts known as Holmberg’s generalisation). He takes as a starting point for his analysis some of the assumptions which have been made in recent transformational analyses, for instance, the idea that a finite verb is found in a functional category dominating the VP. Another assumption which Sells adopts from the transformational literature is that certain adverbials, like the negative inte, mark the left edge of the VP, so that the position of inte is used as a solid diagnostic for the position of other elements. As Sells points out (10), however, the assumption about the position of these adverbials was present in a different form in the traditional Scandinavian ‘field’ view of grammar, so it is not an assumption motivated by the theoretical machinery of transformational grammar.

In his discussion of previous analyses, Sells shows familiarity with an exceptionally broad range of work on Scandinavian (and more generally Germanic) clause structure and related issues. There is discussion and generous acknowledgement of the ideas of others, both in the transformational tradition and in other approaches.

In spite of the fact that Sells acknowledges previous analyses and follows some assumptions and generalisations made in the literature, the book is very much an original contribution and does form a departure from much of the well-established work. The most radical departure is that he argues against a movement-based analysis and instead formulates an analysis in which all elements are base-generated in their positions. The account is formulated within a parallel-correspondence theory, Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG), in which the relation between constituent structure and functional structure is assumed not to involve a one-to-one correspondence. The clause structure which Sells motivates is then achieved by a combination of the radical approach to phrase structure which is assumed in most current LFG work, and Optimality Theoretic constraints on constituent ordering.
The unorthodox, but well-defined, version of X-bar theory which Sells adopts (chapter 4, section 3) does not, for instance, require binary branching, nor does it require that specifiers and complements be maximal projections. This then allows Sells to formulate a flat analysis of clause-medial adverbials, for which he argues, and to permit non-phrasal elements in specifier positions (e.g. as topics). Though the evidence for non-phrasal specifiers is ambiguous in Swedish, there is strong evidence in other Germanic languages (pages 27–31). The further assumption that all nodes are optional unless required by some independent principle also makes for unorthodox-looking trees, for instance, those where a VP dominates a single NP node because the finite verb is found under I (where it is base-generated). In such cases, the correct functional structure is achieved through the notion of co-heads (section 4.3.2), where the V-I-C projection (the extended projection of V) forms the clausal backbone and shares one f-structure.

In most transformational analyses of Scandinavian clause structure, the finite verb is assumed always to move to C, but Sells assumes that it is base-generated in I if the initial element is a subject, making the clause an IP, but in C otherwise, resulting in a CP clause. The distinction between CP and IP clauses is argued for in chapter 2, section 2, but it is also forced by assumptions Sells makes about the association between structure and functions (based on Bresnan 2001), namely that the subject function is associated with Spec-IP (on page 16, this is said not to be specific to Swedish or even to Germanic, but on page 117, Icelandic is described as a language which may have VP-internal subjects), whereas topic or focus elements are generated in Spec-CP.

The alignment constraints are of two kinds: those which refer to the alignment of categorically defined constituents in local sub-trees (in LFG, constraints on c-structure) and those which involve functional notions like grammatical relations (constraints on f-structure). None of the ordering constraints are particular to a certain phenomenon or a certain level, but hold generally for Swedish. It is here that the differences between a transformational and a base-generated approach to shifted pronouns show up most clearly; in a transformational approach, if some ordering constraints are formulated for constructions with pronouns and full noun phrases in situ, then for the shifted pronoun constructions, there must also be separate constraints either on the movement itself or on the surface structure in order to recreate the unmoved order. In addition to these two types of general alignment constraints, there are also domination constraints, which govern the introduction and ordering of some non-projecting categories (118f.).

The book is exceptionally well-written, generous with data and clear in language and structure. The organisation of each chapter is excellent; usually a brief non-technical summary precedes a thorough review of the relevant data and the details of the analysis. Sells explains admirably the workings of the version of LFG which he assumes and provides detailed comparisons between his analysis and those proposed within other approaches, both transformational and non-transformational.

The technical complaints one might want to voice are likely to relate to the publisher rather than the author. The proofreading of the book should have been more thorough; there are quite a few typos, some of them slightly unfortunate; and the index is so brief as to be hardly useful.

All in all, this book must be obligatory literature for anyone who is going to work with Scandinavian clause structure or with V2 phenomena in general, even for those who would not normally read work by linguists not working in their own chosen framework.
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