

- Holmberg, Andreas. 1986. *Word order and syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English*. Stockholm: University of Stockholm doctoral dissertation.
- Holmberg, Andreas, & Christer Platzack. 1995. *The role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli. 1996. *Clausal architecture and case in Icelandic*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts–Amherst doctoral dissertation.
- Platzack, Christer. 1988. The emergence of word order difference in Scandinavian subordinate clauses. *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics, Special Issue on Comparative Germanic Syntax*, 215–238. Montreal: Department of Linguistics, McGill University.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 2001. Sentential negation. *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, ed. by Mark Baltin & Chris Collins, 511–535. Blackwell: Oxford.

The Pennsylvania State University  
Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures  
427 Burrowes  
University Park, PA 16802  
USA  
[mtp12@psu.edu]

***From Phonology to Syntax: Pronominal Cliticization in Otfrid's Evangelienbuch***. By Katerina Somers Wicka. (*Linguistische Arbeiten* 530.) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 2009. Pp, ix, 134. Paperback. €59.95.

doi:10.1017/S147054271000019X

Reviewed by ORRIN W. ROBINSON, *Stanford University*

This slim volume (which might perhaps more understandably bear the main title *From Syntax to Phonology*) packs a lot of claims, evidence, and argumentation into its 112 text pages. Starting with 20 well-known cases from Otfrid's *Evangelienbuch* where primary umlaut appears to operate across word boundaries (as in *nem iz* for an expected *nam iz* 'took it'), the author argues in chapter 2 (Prosodic deficiency and cliticization in Otfrid) that they indeed represent instances of cliticization, and that this cliticization is a synchronic process in the language of

Otfrid (meaning that these forms are not lexicalized as Janda (1998) would have it, but rather productively produced). This also involves recognizing primary umlaut as a productive, and indeed post-lexical, phonetic-phonological process for this language.

In order to do this, the author has to go into some detail to describe how she sees the productive process of cliticization as working. For her, the crucial environment for syllabification, cliticization, and umlaut, among a number of other processes, is the prosodic/phonological word, or *pword*, whose boundaries frequently, but not always, coincide with morphosyntactic ones. The author accordingly devotes a number of pages to the exact nature of the *pword* and its place in the prosodic hierarchy, following this up with the important question of what constitutes a minimal *pword* in Old High German. Based on work done in modern German, especially Hall 1999, but also in other old West Germanic languages (she mentions Dresher & Lahiri 1991 and Lahiri & Dresher 1999, among others), she establishes certain important principles governing the *pword* in Otfrid: A *pword* must consist of at least one foot, which necessarily comprises one stressed syllable; it is minimally bimoraic, but there is evidence that word-final CVC sequences are monomoraic; lexical words are *pwords*, but function words such as pronouns are not. Interestingly, these principles are sometimes in conflict; importantly for the author, some lexical words may appear as monosyllabic CVC, making them monomoraic, which in turn, the author argues, makes them susceptible to certain postlexical prosodic processes.

These postlexical prosodic processes lie of course at the heart of this book. Cliticization occurs, as the author sees it, when a prosodically deficient pronoun is postlexically assimilated to the *pword* formed by a (normally moraicallly challenged) lexical (or in the case of modals also function-word) host. In chapter 2, the hosts are all verbs, whether lexical or functional, and the focus is on the apparently exceptional examples of primary umlaut to be found on the host. Chapters 3 and 4 broaden the argument to other forms found in Otfrid, for which the author argues that a similar analysis is appropriate.

In chapter 3, the forms involved are *theih*, *theiz*, and *theist*, clearly related in some way to the also-attested forms *thaz ih* 'that I', *thaz iz* 'that it', and *thaz ist* 'that is'. These (similarly umlauting) forms are widely documented throughout the *Evangelienbuch*, and indeed in most cases outnumber their non-cliticized kin. Also interesting is that these

forms, or actually their descendents *deich*, *deiz*, and *deist* (*dêst*, *dest*) are documented in Middle High German, unlike the forms of chapter 2. In her analysis of these data, the author must to a certain extent wade through a number of terminological issues. Thus on p. 33 she notes Janda's characterization of forms like these as "lexicalized," which she essentially finds to be insufficiently precise. Instead, she claims that they "should likely be discussed within the framework of grammaticalization." But as a precondition for either lexicalization or grammaticalization, she finds it useful to speak of "form fossilization," which she defines as the process whereby a [host + clitic] sequence becomes lexically listed (p. 34). The question she then emphasizes in chapter 3 is whether these at least originally productively cliticized forms had by Otfrid's time already become fixed units in the lexicon, or were still phonologically derived.

In chapter 2, the author had used the argument of relatively low frequency to find that forms like *werf iz* for expected *warf iz* 'threw it' were unlikely candidates as such "fossilized" forms. As she shows in a chart on p. 35, she cannot use the same argument for *theih*, *theiz*, and *theist*, which as a group outnumber their non-cliticized counterparts (approximately 60% to 40%, though most prominently in the case of *theiz*, least for *theist*). Yet she still finds these forms to be the products of active cliticization in Otfrid, based on two other important factors arguing against fossilization: (i) the cliticized forms always appear in the same syntactic positions as their non-cliticized counterparts; (ii) one or another, or both, of the two components contributing to the cliticized forms may have multiple syntactic roles (e.g. complementizer, relative pronoun, subject demonstrative, object demonstrative, etc.). Of course, in order to demonstrate the latter the author must give some idea of the syntactic framework she is operating with. Notably, a large part of chapter 3 (pp. 36–47) is devoted to outlining the author's views on Early Germanic and OHG clause structure (the title of section 3.2). Certainly the position taken there that the Otfrid text was written in the middle of a transformation from an older Germanic TP structural type to a later CP type is interesting in and of itself, but in this book it mainly serves the function of establishing the syntactic slots that the parts of clitics fill.

The author's arguments against the fossilization of these forms is most successfully made for *theih*, which is also the least documented, vs. its non-cliticized counterpart. It is also somewhat supported for *theiz* (the

most documented vs. its non-cliticized counterpart), although here “syntactic role” depends rather more heavily on the author’s syntactic framework. *Theist*, finally, even according to her syntactic framework, shows in all respects the most evidence of fossilization. She simply notes that “we will err on the side of caution and assume that we cannot count the *theist* forms among our still large group of actively-produced clitic groups” (p. 68).

To be really cautious, I think she should probably rule out *theiz* as well. She must concede that the *thaz* part of the form is always a complementizer, and the putative syntactic heterogeneity of the *iz* part relies in part on three examples she gives of object *iz*, but primarily on the distinction she makes between ergative subjects and unaccusative subjects within her syntactic framework. Since elsewhere (p. 55, note 12) she seems to find it important that an argument does not crucially hinge on her syntactic proposals, why not here as well?

Indeed, the author herself gives even more reasons to see *theiz* as fossilized in Otfrid. It turns out that in fact, while it is not categorical, the collocation *thaz iz* or *theiz* has an ergative subject as the second component about 85% of the time, and 90% of these instances show the cliticized variant! Not so far from the situation found with the successor form *deiz* in the Middle High German *Parzival* text, to which the author appears to grant fossilization status (p. 64). To characterize the *theiz* structures in Otfrid as “close to fossilization” (also p. 64) sweeps a real question under the rug: How does one handle a continuum in a grammar that wants a yes/no answer (is *theiz* listed separately in the lexicon or not?). This is not just her problem, of course.

In chapter 4 (Elision and cliticization) the author adds to the number of cliticized forms in Otfrid a further set of phenomena that are commonly ascribed to the requirements of meter in this poetic text. Thus the later focus in this chapter is on elisions such as *wolt er* for expected *wolta er* ‘he wanted’, but first she returns to *theih*, *theiz*, and *theist*, now to answer the question as to whether their usage in place of the non-cliticized forms might be metrically rather than prosodically motivated. In the course of her argument, the author outlines and illustrates the metrical types ascribed to Otfrid by Bostock (1976), and then uses them to explore this question. Her basic finding, enunciated already on p. 77, is that “the poetic meter, to a limited extent, does influence whether the cliticized or non-cliticized variant is attested.” After the consideration of

a large number of verses, the author concludes (p. 87) that roughly half of the cliticization/non-cliticization choices might be seen as being influenced by the poetic meter. The rest, however, must be looked at prosodically.

The author makes a similar argument, with voluminous documentation, for the many examples of weak or preterite-present verbs which show, or do not show, elision of the final vowel in the preterite ending *-ta* before a function word beginning in a vowel. Roughly half of the choices made might be seen as due to the requirements of the meter, but the rest must be seen as prosodically motivated. And for the author, this clearly means cliticization as defined above. The chapter is rounded out, with similar argumentation, for other hiatus forms in which not the first, but the second vowel is deleted (*zaltaz* vs. *zalt iz* for *zalta iz* 'said it', *zell ih* vs. *zelluh* for *zellu ih* 'I say'), and the author introduces further forms, such as *brahta sa* for expected *brahta sia* 'brought her', which may show us further manifestations of cliticization.

In her concluding chapter 5, the author not only summarizes the arguments of the preceding chapters as I have outlined them above, she also devotes a number of pages to a plea for scholars to return for their data to the original manuscripts in which the Otfrid text was written (as opposed to the later normalized editions). She also points to a number of phenomena in Middle High German and Middle Dutch that could be usefully approached with the framework she employs in this book. The book concludes with three appendices giving complete citations for the forms she mentions in the body of the text, and a list of references.

Certainly the arguments presented in this book are interesting and cogent, even if sometimes open to scholarly dispute. But this volume would also have profited from a careful proofreading. Obviously it went through a number of revisions after its appearance as a Wisconsin-Madison dissertation, but unfortunately some of the earlier versions seem to have left their traces in the published product. Thus in her chart on p. 32 the author appears to have found a few more examples of cliticized *theih*, *theiz*, and *theist* in the *Evangelienbuch* (namely 193) than she asserts to have found in the prose (also p. 32) preceding the chart (namely 189). I assume this reflects a recount done in a later perusal of the manuscript; unfortunately, it's not immediately apparent which is the more accurate number.

Similar text-historical causes probably lie behind the somewhat confusing table references on p. 8, where the author twice mentions table 4 found on p. 6 (with three attestations of the *meg iz* type), but is really discussing table 5, also on p. 8, with all twenty *Evangelienbuch* attestations, of which those found in table 4 form a subset. The same could be said of her reference, on p. 69, to “(24) on page 87 of this chapter”: there is no p. 87 in the relevant chapter, and table 24 of the chapter in question gives a different percentage for the phenomenon she is talking about than the text on p. 69. Other infelicities can also be found in the text, including missing letters and words, wrong word choices, and so on. None of this is unforgivable, but it’s certainly distracting.

## REFERENCES

- Bostock, J. Knight. 1976. *A handbook on Old High German literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dresher, B. Elan, & Aditi Lahiri. 1991. The Germanic foot: Metrical coherence in Old English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22. 251–286.
- Hall, Tracy Alan. 1999. The phonological word: A review. *Studies on the phonological word*, ed. by Tracy Alan Hall & Ursula Kleinherz, 1–22. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Janda, Richard D. 1998. German umlaut: Morpholexical all the way down from OHG through NHG (Two Stützpunkte for Romance metaphony). *Rivista di Linguistica* 10. 163–232.
- Lahiri, Aditi, & B. Elan Dresher. 1999. Open syllable lengthening in West Germanic. *Language* 75. 678–719.

Department of German Studies  
 Stanford University  
 Stanford, CA 94305-2030  
 USA  
 [owr@stanford.edu]