

- Talmy, Leonard. 1975. Semantics and the syntax of motion. In John P. Kimball (ed.), *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 4, 181–238. New York: Academic Press.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 3: *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, 57–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Author's address: School of Foreign Languages, Taishan University,
Taishan District, Tai'an, Shandong, 271000, China
yuanxinhua@bfsu.edu.cn

(Received 11 June 2018)

J. Linguistics 54 (2018). doi:10.1017/S0022226718000208
© Cambridge University Press 2018 First published online 2 May 2018

Chungmin Lee, Ferenc Kiefer & Manfred Krifka (eds.), *Contrastiveness in information structure, alternatives and scalar implicatures* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 91). Cham: Springer, 2017. Pp. xix + 415.

Reviewed by XIAONA WANG, Shenyang Normal University

Contrastiveness in Information Structure, Alternatives and Scalar Implicatures is a collection of 19 papers including selected papers from the CIL (International Congress of Linguists) 18 workshop and symposium held in Seoul (21–26 July 2008) and invited papers contributed by Krazter & Shimoyama, Krifka & Keshet. Edited by Chungmin Lee, Ferenc Kiefer & Manfred Krifka, the 19 papers of this volume are classified into four parts.

The first part is made up of six chapters, mainly discussing related issues on information structure, such as contrastiveness in contrastive topic and contrastive focus, along with topic and focus and interpretation of some discourse particles in Hungarian and Russian.

First, contrastiveness features and implicatures in topic are discussed. Chungmin Lee in Chapter 1 explores contrastive topic (CT) and contrastive focus (CF) and their alternatives through Question Under Discussion (QUD) (Roberts 2012) (see examples (1)–(2)). At present, there are two views of CT: one takes CT as an information-structured discourse-regulating device and the other analyzes CT as a focus-sensitive operator.

- | | | | |
|-----|-----|---|------------------|
| (1) | (a) | Who ate what? | QUD |
| | (b) | What did Fred, Sue and Kim eat? | Potential topic |
| | (c) | They _{TOP} ate tofu. (answer to (1b)) | Topic |
| | (d) | Well, what about Fred? What did he eat? | Sub-Q under (1b) |
| | (e) | Fred _{CT} ate the beans. | CT |
| (2) | | Did she drink coffee _{CF} or tea _{CF} ? | CF |

Katsuhiko Yabushita in Chapter 2 argues that both views have empirical problems. Thus, Lee proposes that CT but not ‘list CT’ has unresolved sub-questions and is claimed to generate conventional scalar implicatures, which are not cancelable. In the dynamic partition semantics of questions and answers, Yabushita analyzes the implicational/presuppositional features of CT as conversational implicatures deriving from the reasons why the speaker opts to answer the sub-question instead of the QUD. Possible reasons are the speaker’s lack of information, secrecy, or specification of the positive and negative instances to an interrogative question. Robert van Rooij & Katrin Schulz in Chapter 4 argue that topical accent in CT invokes extra implicature and then can account for the scope-inversion data (Büring 1997).

Second, alternatives in CF and structural focus are explored. Yabushita in Chapter 2 argues that CF is induced by a disjunctive alternative question (ALT-Q) based on immediately relevant alternatives and has an exhaustivity condition that only one disjunct holds. CF, in parallelism to ALT-Q offers a solution to the problem of suspension of scalar implicatures in downward entailment contexts such as antecedents of conditionals.

Katalin É Kiss proposes a new theory of structural focus based on Hungarian data. It is claimed that structural focus in Hungarian is derived via focus movement for the purpose of establishing a specificational predication construction, but not for stress–focus correspondence principle or checking the exhaustive identification feature theory. In the specificational predication, the subject is an open sentence, determining a set and associated with an existential presupposition, and the predicate is the focus-moved constituent, identifying the set referentially. The referential identification of the set determines the exhaustive listing of its members. Therefore, the exhaustive feature of the focus is not asserted but entailed. Kiss further claims that the specificational predicate–subject predication does not correlate with either the new–given information division or the focus–background stress pattern of the sentence.

Third, discourse particles of Hungarian *csak* (see examples in (3)) and Russian *-to, že* and *ved’* (see examples in (4)) are investigated.

- (3) (a) **Csak** János **hívták** meg. (Hungarian)
 only János.ACC invited:3PL VM
 ‘Only János got invited.’
- (b) Mary **csak** egy **diák** volt.
 Mary only a student was
 ‘Mary was only a student.’
- (c) **CSAK** mindenki János **hívta** meg.
 CSAK everybody János:ACC invited:3SG VM
 ‘Everybody invited János after all.’

- (4) (a) Ty-**to** eë ne čital! (Russian)
 you-*to* it NEG read
 ‘As for you, you haven’t read it.’
- (b) Ty-**že** eë ne čital!
 you-*že* it NEG read
 ‘But you haven’t read it.’
- (c) Ty-**ved’** eë ne čital!
 you-*ved’* it NEG read
 ‘You haven’t read it, you know!’

Beáta Gyuris in Chapter 5 points out that the necessary and sufficient condition for the use of *csak* is the adversative context. The semantic change of *csak* from the exclusive particle to the discourse particle can be explained by semantic reanalysis due to pragmatic overload. Svetlana McCoy-Rusanova in Chapter 6 shows that *-to*, *že* and *ved’* each evokes an alternative set. The particle *-to* evokes a set of questions and the other two particles, a closed set of two propositions with exclusive polarity values. In the end, McCoy-Rusanova offers a promising analysis of how presuppositions or implicatures contributed by individual particles are combined to explain connotations which arise in utterances with multiple particles.

Part II is made up of seven chapters on problems of semantic interpretation of quantificational expression with indeterminate pronouns, polarity, licensing problems and implicatures with Japanese, Korean, French, German, English and Italian data.

Chapter 7, by Angelika Kratzer & Junko Shimoyama, addresses the quantificational system in Japanese making use of indeterminate pronouns, which take on existential, universal, interrogative, negative polarity or free-choice interpretations depending on what operator they associate with. Such systems are claimed to constitute a unified class cross-linguistically. Comparing German indefinite *irgendein* with Japanese indeterminate pronouns, Angelika Kratzer & Junko Shimoyama work to explain the semantic differences in the Hamblin semantics framework.

Chapters 8–11 discuss polarity-related issues mainly focusing on polarity-sensitive items as well as their licensing conditions. Jinyoung Choi shows that Korean polarity-sensitive items do not necessarily involve the indefinite root *amwu-*, which Choi argues to be the morphological incarnation of proper domain widening. Choi further argues that ‘domain-not-widening’ is more essential to create polarity sensitivity. The free choiceness in Korean is derived from two types of particles: the scalar focus particle *-lato* and the disjunctive particle *-na*. The two particles are different in orientations of free choiceness, quantificational force and scalarity, but similar in that their free choice effects is not cancelable. Dongsik Lim further claims that *-lato* can be decomposed into the covert exclusive particle (similar to English *merely*) and the additive particle *-to* (similar to English *also*). The difference between *-lato* and German *auch nur* or Italian

anche solo lies in that *-to* in *-lato* introduces an additive presupposition weaker than English *also*, German *auch* in *auch nur* and Italian *anche* in *anche solo*.

Chapters 9 and 11 address licensing problems in polarity items. Yoonhee Choi & Chungmin Lee explore the nature of licensing predicates in expletive negation (ExN) and the role of ExN in Korean, Japanese and French, respectively, while Mingya Liu investigates the pragmatic licensing possibility of polarity items in addition to downward monotonicity and anti-additivity. Choi & Lee argue that ExN-licensing predicates are a subcase of nonveridicality invoking polarity alternatives (p and $\sim p$) of an embedded complement. However, not all nonveridical predicates license ExN. In order to solve this overgeneration problem, Choi & Lee restrict ExN-licensing predicates to the neg-raisers or the neg-raiser holders in their lexical meaning. In terms of the undergeneration problem posed by the fact that epistemic predicates in Korean and Japanese are not veridical but can license ExN, Choi & Lee propose an analysis of veridicality-suspension by the question complementizer.

Mingya Liu argues that polarity items can be pragmatically licensed in addition to downward monotonicity and anti-additivity. Negative polarity items (NPIs) can be licensed both in and outside the focus of *only*. Liu further claims that *only* is semantically conjunctive, which can not only license NPIs by its exclusive entailment (Horn's inert entailment) but also license positive polarity items (PPIs) by its prejacent entailment. Thus, Liu argues that it is the contradictory monotonicity properties within an *only* sentence that pose a challenge for the NPI theories. As to positive polarity items, Liu argues that they can co-occur with the anti-additive quantifier 'no N' if intonation or enriched context makes it a contrastive negation or denial. In the end, Liu suggests that future research should focus on the question of how the presence of polarity items in discourse affects sentence processing and reasoning.

Chapter 12, by Uli Sauerland, and Chapter 13, by Ezra Keshet, examine the challenges against a Gricean account of implicatures due to the Hurford's constraint datum (Hurtford 1974, Gazdar 1979) and the free choice datum (Kamp 1973), and the standard Horn-Scale analysis of scalar implicatures.

The volume's third part comprises four chapters discussing quantificational expressions with implicatures such as Lawrence R. Horn on *almost* with scalar implicatures, Jae-Il Yeom on numerals, Chidori Nakamura on *-mo* and numerals with scalar implicatures, and Leah R. Paltiel-Gedalyovich & Jeannette Schaeffer on experimental study on scale and non-scale words in Hebrew child language.

Horn focuses on the proximal and polar components of *almost*, *barely* and other proximatives and proposes a combination of assertability and entailment. Yeom discusses how numerals get the meaning of 'at least' or 'at most'. Taking a pragmatic approach, Yeom shows that numerals neither constitute a semantic scale nor have the meaning of 'at least' or 'at most', just like other scalar terms. But only when a numeral is in the scope of a quantifier will the numeral get such a reading. Two kinds of scalarity are involved in interpreting numerals: the basic scalarity among numerals and the scalarity of unlikelihood. The former scalarity is relevant to the maximal numbers of elements involved and the latter scalarity

is determined by the background knowledge. In cases where there is no explicit quantification, a universal quantifier over epistemic alternatives is provided by the support conditions of a statement.

Nakamura presents how the ‘many’ and ‘few’ interpretations of numerals with Japanese focus particle *mo* are reduced to a single conventional implicature of *mo*. The ‘numeral-classifier-*mo*’ is divided into two syntactic categories: pre-case *mo* and post-case *mo*. In both cases, the scope of *mo*, which determines the increasing or decreasing monotonicity, determines an interpretation of either ‘many’ or ‘few’. Nakamura also claims that the nature of ‘unlikelihood’ given by *mo* can be explained in terms of probability and the set of alternatives of quantities.

Paltiel-Gedalyovich & Schaeffer report adult and child knowledge of the generalized scalar implicature (GCI) of disjunction, the non-scalar ‘Allover’ GCI and the particularized non-contrast implicature. The contributions of scales, generalizations and relational complexity to the developmental difficulty of phenomena at the semantic–pragmatic interface are discussed. Results show that children aged nine lack knowledge of the scalar GCI of disjunction and the non-contrast particularized scalar implicature (PCI), while children aged five understand the ‘Allover’ GCI. Therefore, Paltiel-Gedalyovich & Schaeffer draw the conclusion that the late acquisition can be explained not by the scales or the contrast of GCI and PCI but by the complexity of implicature calculation.

The fourth part of the volume comprises two chapters, written by Manfred Krifka, on negated questions as degeneration of an assertion speech act, and by Shinichiro Ishihara, on the intonation of question speech acts in Tokyo Japanese.

Krifka discusses polarity questions with high/outer negation in speech act theory. He claims that such question is actually a REQUEST operation by the speaker to refrain from performing a certain speech act, that is, the degeneration of the speech act. In contrast, Ishihara presents an experimental study on the intonation patterns of *wh*- and Yes/No-questions in Tokyo Japanese. The experimental results show that the *wh*-question exhibits a peak pitch contour realized by focal rise or an F₀-prominence on the *wh*-phrase, while the Yes/No-question displays an F₀-prominence on the verb. Ishihara further claims that both prominences are focus-oriented and the prosodic effects of focus and givenness are independent.

In sum, this volume provides readers with comprehensive and insightful viewpoints about core issues of contrastiveness in information structure, alternatives, polarity, and scalar implicatures. Besides, papers in this volume indicate that interface study on semantics and pragmatics may lead to a better understanding of information structure. Furthermore, cross-linguistic data including Korean, Russian, Hungarian, and Tokyo Japanese make a great contribution to deepen typological studies on information structure and related issues.

REFERENCES

- Büring, Daniel. 1997. The great scope inversion conspiracy. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20, 175–194.
 Gazdar, Gerald. 1979. *Pragmatics: Implicature, presupposition, and logical form*. New York: Academic Press.
 Hurlford, James R. 1974. Inclusive or exclusive disjunction. *Foundations of Language* 11, 409–411.

- Kamp, Hans. 1973. Free choice permission. *Proceeding of the Aristotelian Society, New Series* 74, 57–74.
- Roberts, Craige. 2012. Information structure: Afterword to Roberts (1996). *Semantics and Pragmatics* 5.7, 1–19.

Author's address: School of Foreign Languages, Shenyang Normal University,
Shenyang, Liaoning 110034, China
sylg2012@sina.cn

(Received 3 April 2018)

J. Linguistics 54 (2018). doi:10.1017/S0022226718000373
© Cambridge University Press 2018

Andrea Moro, *A brief history of the verb to be*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2018. Pp. xvi + 288.

Reviewed by GIOSUÈ BAGGIO, Norwegian University of Science and
Technology

Andrea Moro has devoted much of his career to the study of copular sentences. In 2010, he published a semi-popular account of his and others' work in this area in a volume in Italian, titled *Breve storia del verbo essere. Viaggio al centro della frase* (Adelphi). The MIT Press recently published a fine translation of that book into English by Bonnie McClellan-Broussard, *A Brief History of the Verb To Be*, expunging the original subtitle: that is perhaps the only unfortunate choice in an otherwise impeccable package; Moro's book really is a theoretical 'journey to the centre of the sentence', while his historical considerations, however informative, merely set the stage for the book's more ambitious undertaking.

Chapter 1 reconstructs the history of logico-linguistic analyses of the verb 'to be' in three instalments. The first examines Aristotle's ground-breaking intuition that the verb 'to be' is not a predicate but the 'name of tense'. Aristotle's focus was on declarative sentences as vehicles of truth, and on logical arguments as means for the transmission of truth. The key to truth and falsehood is the 'combination and separation' of subjects and predicates. There is no difference between 'A man is walking' and 'A man walks': in both cases, the predicate is expressed by the verb 'to walk'; when present, 'to be' only specifies the tense and aspect of the sentence. The protagonists of the second instalment are medieval scholastic philosophers, and in particular Abelard, who was among the first to talk about 'to be' as COPULA: 'the act that, by uniting, generates a new entity' (35). The verb 'to be' allows the very same terms to function as subjects or as predicates in different parts of a syllogism. The notion that the copula composes subject and predicate, generating truth and falsehood, was adopted by Arnaud and the Port-Royalists, who brought to completion the project of reduction of 'to be' to the 'name of affirmation'. The third episode in Moro's historical account is the analysis of identity statements, such as 'The evening star is the morning