

(see Dainow 1966–67). A book similar to this one but which compared the two systems would be very welcome.

A better understanding of the legal system, including criticism of it, is in everyone's interest. Learning about legal language and legal reasoning in schools should arguably be obligatory—and could be very successful. Books like this one are a positive step in that direction.

## REFERENCES

- ASD (Aerospace and Defence Industries Association of Europe). 2014. ASD simplified technical English. <http://www.asd-ste100.org/>, accessed June 2014.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2010. The corporate takeover of U.S. democracy. <http://www.chomsky.info/articles/20100124.htm>, accessed June 2014.
- Dainow, Joseph. 1966–67. The civil law and the common law: Some points of comparison. *American Journal of Comparative Law* 15.3, 419–35.
- Holland, James & Julian Webb. 2006. *Learning legal rules*, 6th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kaiser, Herbert. 2013. A close look at Simplified Technical English. *TCWorld*, September 2013. <http://www.tcworld.info/rss/article/a-close-look-at-simplified-technical-english/>, accessed June 2014.
- Marmor, Andrei. 2014. *The language of law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marmor, Andrei & Scott Soames (eds.). 2011. *Philosophical foundations of language in the law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Anthony. 2010. *Glanville Williams: Learning the law*, 14th edn. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
- Author's address: School of Humanities, University of Brighton,  
Falmer, Brighton BN1 9PH, UK  
r.m.salkie@brighton.ac.uk*

(Received 27 June 2014)

*J. Linguistics* 50 (2014). doi:10.1017/S0022226714000371  
© Cambridge University Press 2014

**Ora Matushansky & Alec Marantz (eds.)**, *Distributed Morphology today*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013. Pp. xiv + 259.

Reviewed by DANIEL SIDDIQI, Carleton University

*Distributed Morphology Today* is many things. The stated purpose of this volume is to be a Festschrift to celebrate the 90th birthday of Morris Halle. To this end, the volume is composed of twelve short papers from Halle's former students, several of which have taken the time in the endnotes to say very nice things about him. Indeed, in particular, the introductory chapter and Alec Marantz's chapter incorporate very pleasant and nostalgic blurbs about the authors' experiences working with Halle. Overall the volume has a distinct feeling that it was put together by its contributors to express gratitude, love, and admiration for their mentor/teacher/colleague, which is exactly, to my mind, how a Festschrift ought to feel.

However, Halle's long, extremely important career in morphological theory is not limited to his being one of the founders of the theory of Distributed

Morphology (DM). That this Festschrift chooses to focus on DM is still fitting, though, because its publication nicely aligns with the 20th anniversary of the original proposal of DM. As a result, another role this volume plays is to serve as a ‘state-of-the-theory’ volume for DM. In this role, it offers an apt snapshot of current research in DM. Most of the articles fit a fairly typical rubric found in research of DM in that they tackle a data set and then use the explanation of that data set to argue for or against a modification to the architecture of DM. Those articles that don’t as nicely fit the typical DM rubric, e.g. Matushansky’s and Marantz’s chapters, also feel like they belong in a ‘state-of-the-theory’ volume. The former presents data that has already been accounted for twice within DM, discusses those analyses within the confines of the theory, and argues for a new, preferable account within DM. The latter brings DM into a tragically understudied part of the architecture of the grammar within this framework: the interface with semantics. Indeed, this volume so much represents ‘state-of-the-theory’ that the reference section reads like a reading list for who is working in DM and what they have recently been working on.

Finally, one of the great strengths of DM (and item-and-arrangement, morpheme-based models of morphology more generally) is that it accounts for locality effects quite nicely. Because of this, it is not surprising that a persistent theme among the articles in this volume is locality effects. Indeed, outside of its function as a Festschrift and a ‘state-of-the-theory’ volume, this volume clearly also might be taken to be a volume on locality effects in morphology. It is notable, however, that quite a few of the locality effects discussed are triggered by a null morpheme, by theorized syntactic heads, and/or by phase boundaries (Embick’s chapter is a particularly good example). This has the noticeable effect of making the overall volume read not as a general volume on locality, but more on the locality that is observable if you happen to accept nearly all the underlying assumptions of DM, the Minimalist Program, and Phase Theory. For that reason, morphologists who are not practitioners of DM will likely not find the arguments to be very compelling.

Chapter 1 of *Distributed Morphology Today* is ‘Variability and allomorphy in the morphosyntax of Catalan past perfective’, by Isabel Oltra-Massuet. The central concern of this chapter is three different forms of the Catalan past perfective: a synthetic form (*purificares*), an analytic form (*vas purificar*), and a non-standard hybrid (*vares purificar*) (all forms are ‘purify.2SG.PST.PERF’). The analysis provided by the author makes for a very good chapter for this volume as it employs much of the architecture of DM. For example, Oltra-Massuet employs an impoverishment rule, dissociated morphemes, fusion, and contextual licensing of vocabulary insertion. Her chapter is also one of the set that forms a small sub-theme of the papers here that deal with the topic of root suppletion in some way.

Chapter 2, ‘Phonological and morphological interaction in Proto-Indo-European accentuation’, is Rolf Noyer’s contribution and is a noticeable exception to many of the generalizations I made above. This chapter makes almost no reference to the architecture of DM at all. Rather, it is a return to Halle’s

(1997) preliminary analysis of (the Schindler-Rix reconstruction of) PIE accentuation within the architecture of Simplified Bracketed Grid Theory (Idsardi 1992). Noyer expands upon and further develops Halle (1997) with the primary focus on generating the reconstructed accent classes and only those classes.

Martha McGinnis's Chapter 3, 'Agree and fission in Georgian plurals', is primarily concerned with the universal hierarchy of features (Harley & Ritter 2002) and the nature of feature discharge. The primary data under discussion here is the apparent double marking of plural in Georgian number agreement. McGinnis argues that what appears to be a second reflex of plural is in fact a realization of a feature she proposes: multi-speaker (a dependent of speaker, participant, and person). Perhaps the most novel of her proposals is one involving a class of features that self-delete if they are not discharged rather than causing the derivation to crash.

As I alluded to above, Ora Matushansky's Chapter 4, 'More or better: On the derivation of synthetic comparatives and superlatives in English', is a return to well known (and persistently problematic) alternation between *-er* and *more* (and *-est* and *most*) in English. Matushansky argues against the two lowering proposals extant in DM (Embick & Noyer 1999 et seq. and Bobaljik 2012) and for a head-movement analysis that is supplemented with '*much*-support'.

Chapter 5, 'Is word structure relevant for stress assignment?', by Tatjana Marvin, is a comparison of two accounts of the familiarly tricky English stress: DM and Optimality Theory (OT). Marvin proposes a DM analysis of English derivation that shows that phase-based cyclic spell-out accounts for why some affixes like the famous *-able* sometimes trigger stress shift and sometimes do not. Marvin argues that *-able* can attach both inside and outside a phase head, predicting this behavior. She compares her analysis to Burzio's (1994) analysis and concludes that the phase-based analysis is superior because such an account is not available to (non-Stratal) OT.

Marantz's contribution, Chapter 6, 'Locality domains for contextual allomorphy across the interfaces', is a special paper in this volume and as such is honestly quite a bit of fun to read. In the paper, Marantz spends a lot of time discussing the development of the theory of Distributed Morphology in a casual style. The effect is that it feels like the reader is being told stories over dinner about where DM comes from. As such, its presence in the book is wonderfully welcome. The content of the chapter is that the well-studied interface with the phonology has an analogue with the semantics interface: just as there is the familiar contextual allomorphy (a root takes on different forms in different environments), so too is there contextual ALLOSEMY (a root takes on different meanings in different environments) and both are constrained in the same ways by locality constraints that derive from phase boundaries.

Heidi Harley & Mercedes Tubino Blanco's Chapter 7, 'Cycles, vocabulary items, and stem forms in Hiaki', is primarily an analysis of the class-based context-driven allomorphy in Hiaki stems. However, it also contributes two key architectural arguments. First, the authors argue that class features are not

syntactic features (contra Embick & Halle 2005), but are rather properties of the inserted Vocabulary items (which then license readjustment rules). The second key argument found here is more evidence in support of a readjustment approach to stem allomorphy rather than a listing approach (which is assumed by the majority of the relevant papers in this volume).

Daniel Harbour's Chapter 8, "‘Not plus’ isn't ‘Not there’: Bivalence in person, number, and gender", is primarily a survey chapter that presents quite a bit of evidence strongly suggesting that features are bivalent and not privative. The evidence chiefly comes in two classes: (i) that negation of a feature and absence of a privative are fundamentally different; and (ii) that morphological operations have to make explicit reference to negative features.

David Embick's Chapter 9, 'Morphemes and morphophonological loci', presents certainly the biggest picture analysis of the papers. The goal of this paper is to add another argument in support of morpheme-based approaches to morphology (as opposed to affixless or word-based models). To this end, Embick examines several apparently nonaffixal alternations and argues that these effects are indeed conditioned by the internal morphosyntactic complexity in the words and, moreover, the effects are restricted by locality. He proposes the 'Morphological Locus Theorem' (153), which asserts that triggered morphological changes must be local to the triggering head.

Like Chapter 2, Chapter 10, 'Agreement in two steps (at least)', by Eulàlia Bonet, is a bit of an outlier in that it does not propose any revisions to the architecture of DM nor does it argue for DM. Rather, Chapter 10, in providing an account for nominal agreement systems, assumes an interface between DM and OT and focuses primarily on an OT account which proposes that agreement is the result of two steps, one syntactic (employing DM) and one post-syntactic (employing OT).

Chapter 11, 'Suspension across domains', by Jonathan Bobaljik & Susi Wurmbrand, bucks the locality theme of the volume by showing phenomena that seem to violate strict locality (e.g. suppletion in comparatives and superlatives, QR, and control/raising). Bobaljik & Wurmbrand argue that each of these cases involves what would typically be considered a phase head but in these cases do not function as phase boundaries. These phase heads are 'deficient' because they are dependent on an element higher in the tree (for example, subjunctive mood must be licensed by the superordinate clause). This deficiency gives rise to seeming penetrability of some phases and non-locality effects.

The final chapter, 'Contextual neutralization and the Elsewhere Principle', by Karlos Arregi & Andrew Nevins, argues for a subtle but radical change to the fundamental operation of DM: Vocabulary insertion. Insertion, as Arregi & Nevins point out, is constrained in three ways: underspecification of features, the Elsewhere Principle, and licensing into specific environments. These three are importantly ranked – morphosyntactic features are more important to insertion than context. This chapter argues, on the basis of several examples of context neutralization, that rather contextual specificity outranks the Elsewhere Principle.

This means that in some cases contextual licensing is more important than morphosyntactic features.

Overall, I was quite happy to read this volume. As a Festschrift, it was enjoyable to read in a way that most edited volumes containing only loosely related papers are not: it inspired the persistent feeling of nostalgia and respect for Halle's work. I also think that this volume is very representative of currently ongoing DM research. Indeed, this volume presents typical work of the most prominent practitioners of DM. This is also, though, something I perceived as a bit of a weakness of the volume. As someone who is familiar with the DM literature, almost every chapter felt very familiar. In many cases, the papers were short expansions of previous work, so while the arguments put forth here are original, they importantly did not feel *NOVEL*.

Since DM itself is a framework upon which many different theories are built, it is to be expected that this volume is not internally consistent, but it is still striking that the chapters are often not compatible with each other, sometimes on fundamental assumptions. For example, some papers crucially assume Vocabulary insertion is after linearization (Embick and Arregi & Nevins) while others (those that make reference to hierarchical structure at insertion; most of the rest of the volume) assume it is before linearization. As mentioned above, some papers require that root Vocabulary Items compete with each other while others require a readjustment approach. In addition, Bonet assumes an OT interface with the phonology while the other authors rely on a rule-based phonology.

Paradoxically, this volume also seems much more homogenous than research in DM really is. A great many of the more radical architectural proposals for DM are not represented here. For example, noticeably absent are representative models which limit DM's morphological component to insertion only, such as Trommer (1999), or models where insertion is not limited to terminal nodes, such as Radkevich (2010) or Svenonius (2011). This is probably a result of the Festschrift function of the volume. Perhaps the more radical departures from the architecture of DM simply are not especially common among Halle's former students, but, on the other hand, these other approaches would happily be included in a volume covering 'DM today' in its fullest scope.

## REFERENCES

- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2012. *Universals in comparative morphology: Suppletion, superlatives, and the structure of words*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1994. *Principles of English stress*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Embick, David & Morris Halle. 2005. On the status of stems in morphological theory. In Twan Geerts & Haïke Jacobs (eds.), *Going Romance 2003*, 59–88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Embick, David & Rolf Noyer. 1999. Locality in post-syntactic operations. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 34, 265–317.
- Halle, Morris. 1997. On stress and accent in Indo-European. *Language* 73, 275–313.
- Harley, Heidi & Elizabeth Ritter. 2002. Person and number in pronouns: A feature-geometric analysis. *Language* 78, 482–526.
- Idsardi, William. 1992. *The composition of prosody*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

- Radkevich, Nina. 2010. *On location: The structure of case and adpositions*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2011. Spanning. Ms., CASTL, University of Tromsø. [<http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/001501>]
- Trommer, Jochem. 1999. Morphology consuming syntax's resources: Generation and parsing in a Minimalist version of Distributed Morphology. In Christian Retoré & Edward Stabler (eds.), *ESSLI Workshop on Resource Logics and Minimalist Grammars*. Utrecht: Association for Logic, Language, and Information.
- Author's address: School of Linguistics and Language Studies, Carleton University,  
1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON, K1S 5B6 Canada  
daniel\_siddiqi@carleton.ca*

(Received 23 June 2014)

*J. Linguistics* 50 (2014). doi:10.1017/S0022226714000383  
© Cambridge University Press 2014

**Jürgen M. Meisel, Martin Elsig & Esther Rinke**, *Language acquisition and change: A morphosyntactic perspective*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013. Pp. xiii + 202.

Reviewed by DAVID W. LIGHTFOOT, Georgetown University

In the earliest generative work, Chomsky took linguists to be writing grammars for socially defined languages like English, Turkish, or Warlpiri (Chomsky 1957: 11). Later he postulated 'an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly' (Chomsky 1965: 3), idealizing away from individual variation.

Twenty years afterwards, in 1986, he abandoned the idealized speaker-listener and the idea of socially defined languages as having any kind of psychological reality. He embraced language variation and distinguished between external E-language and internal, individual, intensional I-languages as the proper focus of linguistic theory. In effect, he took up ideas from nineteenth-century German philologists and adopted Wilhelm von Humboldt's (1836) distinction between the languages of nations and those of individuals. Hermann Paul (1877: 325) emphasized the individual and biological view of language, noting in an early work 'dass die reelle Sprache nur im Individuum existiert' [real language exists only in individuals]. Later, he attacked the group psychology of Lazarus and Steinthal and wrote that 'Wir müssen eigentlich so viele Sprachen unterscheiden als es Individuen gibt' [we must in fact distinguish as many languages as there are individuals] (Paul 1880: 31).

Chomsky (1986) followed von Humboldt and Paul, distinguishing external E-language and internal, individual I-languages. E-language refers to language out there in the world, the kind of thing that a child might be exposed to, an amorphous, unanalyzed, mass concept. I-languages, on the other hand, refer to biological SYSTEMS that grow in children's mind/brains in the first few years of life and characterize an individual's linguistic capacity. I-languages consist of