

this volume especially useful thanks to a series of introductory elements at the beginning of the book. The supporters of this theory will finally have at their disposal a complete first-hand account of the MTT in this and the two upcoming volumes.

REFERENCES

- Apresian, Jurij D., Igor M. Boguslavsky, Leonid L. Iomdin, Alexander V. Lazursky, Vladimir Z. Sannikov, Victor G. Sizov, and Leonid L. Tsinman. 2003. ETAP-3 linguistic processor: A full-fledged NLP implementation of the MTT. In *First International Conference on Meaning–Text Theory (MIT'03)*, ed. Sylvain Kahane and Alexis Nasr, 279–288. Paris: École Normale Supérieure.
- Mel'čuk, Igor A. 1995. *The Russian language in the Meaning–Text perspective*. Moscow: Škola Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.
- Mel'čuk, Igor A. 1999. *Opyt teorii lingvističeskix modelej Smysl ↔ Tekst [Outline of a theory of linguistic Meaning–Text Models]*. Moscow: Škola Jazyki russkoj kul'tury. [1974].
- Mel'čuk, Igor A. 2001. *Communicative organization in natural language. The semantic–communicative structure of sentences*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mel'čuk, Igor A. and Nikolaj V. Pertsov. 1987. *Surface syntax of English: A formal model within the Meaning–Text framework*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mel'čuk, Igor and Alexander Zholkovskiy. 1984. *Explanatory combinatorial dictionary of modern Russian: Semantico-syntactic studies of Russian vocabulary*. Vienna: Wiener Slawistischer Almanach.
- Mel'čuk, Igor, Nadia Arbatchewsky-Jumarie, Leo Elnitsky, Lidija Iordanskaja, Adele Lessard, and Andre Clas. 1984. *Dictionnaire explicatif et combinatoire du français contemporain: Recherches lexico-sémantiques I*. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- Miličević, Jasmina. 2007. *La paraphrase: Modélisation de la paraphrase langagière*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Wanner, Leo. 2012. From meaning to text and from meaning to meaning: Transduction and transformation in the Meaning–Text Theory. In *Meanings, texts and other (exciting) things: A Festschrift to commemorate the 80th anniversary of Professor Igor A. Mel'čuk*, ed. Yuri Apresjan, Igor Boguslavsky, Marie-Claude L'Homme, Leonid Iomdin, Jasmina Miličević, Alain Polguère, and Leo Wanner, 613–626. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.

Antonio Fábregas and Sergio Scalise. 2012. *Morphology: From data to theories*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. Pp. xii + 209. £19.90 (softcover).

Reviewed by Francesco-Alessio Ursini, *Stockholms Universitet*

Morphology: From data to theories is a new morphology textbook aimed at advanced undergraduate or early graduate students in linguistics. This book has three broad pedagogical goals. Its first goal is to introduce the readers to the newest frameworks in morphological research, such as *Distributed Morphology* (DM; Harbour 2007, Harley 2012) and *Construction Grammar* (CG; Booij 2010). Its second goal is to introduce a wide range of cross-linguistic data and use these data to evaluate the empirical import of each theory. Its third overarching goal is to discuss the role of morphology within the architecture of grammar: its status and its relation with syntax, phonology, and semantics. Thus, the book presents a state-of-the-art introduction to modern morphology and current morphological theories.

Chapter 1 offers a brief summary of some basic morphological notions so that readers can engage in a discussion of the basic tenets and questions of the discipline. The chapter introduces the standard notion of *morpheme* as a minimal unit of language that pairs a meaning with a form. The broader debate between constructionist and lexicalist approaches is introduced in order to illustrate the theoretical differences among morphological theories. As explained in the chapter, constructionist approaches contend that morphological processes apply to morphemes only (DM, but also CG). Lexicalist approaches, on the other hand, contend that larger structures such as words and constructions are the main target of these processes (e.g., the “listemes” of DiSciullo and Williams 1987). Morphemes, *qua* parts of these structures, can only be indirectly involved in these processes.

Chapter 2 discusses various types of morphological units, from morphemes to constructions, and their theoretical status across theories. For each level of a stipulated morphological unit, a theory that centres on this unit is discussed. For instance, the notion of “morpheme” advocated by Aronoff (1994) (e.g., thematic vowels in Romance verbs) is considered in relation to the existence of an independent level of morphology. The chapter presents discussions of cases that are problematic for all theories in order to highlight the limits of any theoretical proposal (e.g., cranberry morphemes). Thus, chapters 1 and 2 offer a solid introduction to the topics that are further discussed in the other chapters.

Chapter 3 focuses on morphological structures and the relation between the notions of word and morpheme. For instance, the meaning of *disallow* is generally seen as being compositionally derived from the meaning of the negation prefix *dis-*, and the verb *allow*. Thus, a word such as *disallow* can be seen as involving a minimally complex morphological structure, composed of a lexical category and a prefix. Different theories of word structure are discussed, including proposals that offer arguments against the very existence of such structures, such as the “a-morphous morphology” of Anderson (1992).

Chapter 4 focuses on inflectional morphology. For each theory under discussion, the authors discuss empirical merits and shortcomings in an impartial and thorough manner. One case involves the discussion of inflectional paradigms, and the two principal types of accounts for this morphological notion. Morphological theories in the “word paradigm” tradition (Anderson 1992) suggest that words are the minimal units over which morphological rules range. Thus, they treat paradigms as primitive morphological objects: sets of correspondences between clusters of features and the words that realize each cluster. In “item and arrangement” theories (e.g., Harbour 2007), paradigms are instead derived morphological objects that emerge via the combination of words and inflectional morphemes. As discussed in the chapter, word paradigm theories seem to be better suited to analyse cases such as suppletion, since suppletion involves the realization of different words for minimally different clusters of features (e.g., *go-went*). Thus, they seem to have an empirical advantage over item and arrangement phenomena, when inflectional patterns are analysed.

Chapter 5 discusses derivational processes, such as nominalization and verbalization (e.g., *destroy-destruction*, *song-to sing*), since they change the categorial (i.e., syntactic) and semantic status of an input category. Phenomena such as

(category) conversion and appreciative morphology (e.g., diminutive adjectives in Italian) are discussed in detail as well. Since some of these derivational processes lie at the boundary between inflectional and derivational morphology, they allow for a more comprehensive discussion of the relations between morphology, syntax, and semantics.

Chapter 6 discusses compounds, focusing on the morpho-syntactic and semantic properties of several types of compounds (e.g., parasynthetic compounds such as *blue-eye-d*). The authors also carefully discuss other compounding phenomena, such as phrasal verbs (e.g., *get up*) and reduplication (e.g., *yadda yadda*). As in the previous chapters, these data are used not only to evaluate the empirical import of various theories, but also to discuss the complex relation between morphology and syntax and between morphology and semantics.

Chapters 7 and 8 conclude the book by discussing in detail, and at a more general level, the relations between morphology and phonology, on the one hand, and morphology and semantics, on the other. Chapter 7 addresses how lexicalist and constructionist approaches fare with the wealth of data examined up until this chapter (e.g., inflectional morphology in compounds, and other similar cases). Chapter 8 considers the relation between morphology and phonology first and then returns to the relation between morphology and semantics. For the relation between phonology and morphology, two approaches are discussed. The first is the “lexical strata” hypothesis (Kiparsky 1982), which suggests that morphology and phonology form a two-way flow of information in derivational processes. A second is the separation hypothesis, which suggests that morphological processes univocally determine phonological vocabulary insertion, as proposed in, for example, DM architectures (Harbour 2007). For morphology and semantics, two proposals that are comprehensively reviewed are the lexical syntax of Hale and Keyser (2002) and the conceptual semantics-driven approach of Booij and Lieber (2004). Since these proposals highlight the tight relation between conceptual/semantic content and morpho-syntactic structure, they allow for an analysis of how a systematic mapping from form to meaning can be established, one that can apply to everything from morphemes to sentences.

I now turn to a brief evaluation of the book and how successful it is in reaching its three pedagogical goals. First, the presentation and discussion of each framework and hypothesis is remarkably thorough and yet reader-friendly. Hence, students can potentially access an easy but precise understanding of how these theories work, and how they differ in their assumptions and predictions. A particular strong point is that the discussion of the broader theoretical debate between the constructionist and lexicalist positions is presented in a clear and impartial manner, as befits a balanced overview of the field. Second, the wealth and breadth of data examined in the book offers a fairly robust empirical basis, on which the strengths and weaknesses of different theories can be evaluated. Although English plays perhaps a slightly more central role than other languages, data from Spanish, Danish, Turkish, and Mandarin, among others, are discussed on a regular basis.

Third, several chapters focus on the interactions between morphology and the other components of grammar. Since lexicalist and constructionist theories take fairly different stances on these “interface” relations, the discussion of these forms of

interaction plays a key role in evaluating the theories at stake. The book also reaches its goals by offering exercises in each chapter as a training tool, which allows for the hands-on use of the notions discussed in the chapter. Brief but thorough guides to further reading are also provided after the exercises to each chapter.

Overall, the book is very successful in achieving its three pedagogical goals and is an ideal textbook for morphology. Unfortunately, as the authors observe, space constraints prevented them from discussing interesting topics, such as experimental and computational approaches to morphology. It would be interesting to see these approaches covered in a second edition of the volume. Nevertheless, in its expository rigour and excellent theoretical clarity, this textbook represents an ideal starting point for students and instructors of morphology, with all the key features of a classic in the making.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by itself*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Booij, Gert. 2010. *Construction Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Booij, Gert and Rochelle Lieber. 2004. On the paradigmatic nature of affixal semantics in English and Dutch. *Linguistics* 42:327–357.
- DiSciullo, Anne Marie and Edwin Williams. 1987. *On the definition of word*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hale, Ken and Samuel J. Keyser. 2002. *Prolegomena to a theory of argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harbour, Daniel. 2007. *Morphosemantic number*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Harley, Heidi. 2012. Semantics in Distributed Morphology. In *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning*, ed. Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Stechow, and Paul Portner, 688–709. Amsterdam: De Gruyter.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1982. Lexical phonology and morphology. *Linguistics in the morning calm: Selected papers from SICOL-1981*, ed. In-Shu Yang, 3–91. Seoul: Hanshin.

Ian Roberts. 2010. *Agreement and head movement: Clitics, incorporation, and defective goals*. In the series *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs* 59. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Pp. v + 290. US \$30.00 (softcover).

Reviewed by Joseph W. Windsor, *University of Calgary*

In this book, Ian Roberts proposes to account for head movement in the narrow syntax, arguing that head movement is simply a type of Agree.

In chapter 1, Roberts tackles what is arguably the most important argument Chomsky gives for the idea of relegating head-movement to PF—that it does not cause LF effects. Roberts shows, using evidence from various Romance languages and English, that contra Chomsky, head movement has semantic effects after all and is thus still required within narrow syntax.