J. Linguistics **36** (2000), 201–210. Printed in the United Kingdom

SHORTER NOTICES

D. N. S. Bhat, *The prominence of tense, aspect and mood* (Studies in Language Companion Series 49). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. Pp. x + 198.

Reviewed by JYH WEE SEW, University of Otago

Tense, aspect, and mood (TAM) are crucial to the study of language universals. Many languages in the world mark TAM either morphologically or syntactically. This book offers a typological classification based on TAM. To use TAM as a typological criterion in categorising languages is an interesting idea but not an easy one. While a language like Malay is A prominent, languages like English can be T and A prominent. A simple past tense in English can imply perfectivity as in *Mother Theresa died*. This event can be construed as perfective or as having happened sometime before the time of speaking, or both.

A TAM typological classification can only be based on tendencies rather than absoluteness. Bhat makes explicit in the first chapter that the book takes the differentiating rather than the universalistic approach (7). A general comparison between the two approaches is provided. While the former classifies languages based on their contrasting characteristics the latter attempts to generate linguistic principles and constraints that are applicable to all natural languages such as the relation between subject and object (1). Apart from the Nkore-Kiga and Hindi examples, the data mentioned in this review are English paraphrases of non-European languages. Interested readers should refer to the original examples in the book to appreciate the essence of their morphosyntactic distinctions.

Chapter 2 is about the category of tense. Tense is defined as an inflectional verbal marker that denotes temporal location of an event or situation (13). Bhat uses data from Kannada, a Dravidian language, to illustrate deictic and non-deictic tenses:

(1) I went home.
(2) Having gone home, I lied [sic] down.

The event of going home in the first datum uses the time of utterance as its reference point to denote the event occurred before the reference point. The reference point for the event of going home in (2) is the event of lying down which is in the past. There is a non-past version for (2):

(3) Having gone home, I will lie down.

Bhat demonstrates that a deictic tense like (1) uses the event connected with the speech time as the reference point whereas a non-deictic tense like (2) uses some other event for the same purpose. Interestingly, the category of tense can also use relative distance from a reference point as a differentiating criterion, which is found in Nkore-Kiga, a Bantu language (14).

(4) n-aa-gyenda
I-today:PAST-go
'I went today.'
(5) n-gyenzire
I-went (yesterday)
'I went yesterday.'
(6) n-ka-gyenda
I-REMOTE-go
'I went earlier yesterday.'

(5) seems to be the basic or unmarked version as (4) and (6) are modified by what Bhat calls the suffixes *aa* and *ka* respectively (14). To this reviewer, these two modifiers look like prefixes.

Chapter 3 deals with the category of aspect. Bhat writes that, 'Aspect ... indicates the temporal structure of an event, i.e. the way in which the event occurs in time (on-going or completed, beginning, continuing, or ending, iterative or semelfactive etc.)' (43). This definition is followed by two pairs of Hindi data:

(7) mai a:-ta: hû:
I come-IMPERF am
'I am coming.' (Present Imperfective)

(8) mai a:-ta: tha:
I come-IMPERF was
'I was coming' (Past Imperfective)

(9) mai a:-ya: hû:
I come-PERF am
'I have come or I am come' (Present Perfective)

(10) mai a:-ya: tha:
I come-PERF WAS
'I had come (at some past time)' (Past Perfective)

The two pairs of data contrast in aspectuality and each pair of data contrasts further in tense. The question that arises from the comparison is what is the difference between tense and aspect? No such distinction is provided until chapter 5 (93). At this point one would welcome Comrie's definition that accounts for the difference between aspect and tense:

> However, although both aspect and tense are concerned with time, they are concerned with time in very different ways...tense is a deictic category, i.e. locates situations in time, usually with reference to the present moment, though also with reference to other situations. Aspect is NOT concerned with relating the time of situation to any other time-point, but rather with the internal temporal constituency of the one situation; one could state the difference as one between situation-internal time (aspect) and situation-external time (tense).
> (Comrie 1976/1993: 5; emphasis added)

Furthermore, Bhat brings in the problematic distinction between aktionsart and aspect and claims that the former is non-deictic and the latter is deictic (45). I infer from Comrie above that aktionsart and aspect are non-deictic as they are only concerned with the internal temporal structure of a verb. While Bhat acknowledges the difficulty of maintaining the aktionsart-aspect distinction he believes that the distinction is a helpful device for a better understanding of the category of aspect (45). Aktionsart is lexical aspect pertaining to the telicity of verbs, and I suggest that aktionsart is a vacuous category because as soon as a verb is used in a sentence a viewpoint aspect surfaces. Even if we use the modification test of temporal adverbials à la Dowty (1979) we are only grappling with aspect, not aktionsart. Languages like Mundari, Santali and Mao Naga are reported to use reduplication to denote repetition and frequentative meanings (55–56). There is no mention of Abbi's work, which describes at least five types of aspectual meanings found in the reduplications of South Asian languages (1992). Bhat points out that Manipuri verbs prefix with completive markers like *pum* and *i* before they reduplicate (57). I observe a similar phenomenon in Malay where the reduplication of certain verbs occurs after prefixation, suffixation or simulfixation.

Chapter 4 describes the category of mood. The basic divide of epistemic and deontic mood is presented. Following Palmer (1986), Bhat characterises the former as knowledge-based and the latter as action-based (63). The crucial distinction in epistemic mood is realis and irrealis. An important typological differentiation mentioned here is the tendency for past and perfective events to correlate with realis events; and future and imperfective events to correlate with irrealis events (65). Irrealis in Chalcatongo Mixtec, for example, is used to express future, imperative, conterfactual, conditional etc. and it differs from the realis by tone or segmentally or both (66). The analysis of deontic markers involves three languages, namely English (*may*, *should*, *must*), Ladakhi (*thub*, *gos*, *neŋdig*, *phog* among others) and Mao Naga (*pha*, *büi*, *shie*) (76–78).

For those who are expert in TAM, the second part of this book can be read first. It begins with chapter 5, which offers the basis to a typology of TAM. Bhat explains that the TAM distinction is an idealised one because natural languages do not fall neatly into either one of the verb universals (92). It is common to find that these components overlap in natural languages and the notion of viewpoint cuts across TAM as each verb universal can be deictic or non-deictic (94). Nevertheless, Bhat proposes grammaticalisation, obligatoriness, systematicity, and pervasiveness as the four criteria to determine the prominence of a particular category of TAM (95). The logic behind Bhat's criteria is that:

> ...the category (tense, aspect or mood) which is the most grammaticalised in a given language would turn out to be the most obligatory, systematic and pervasive, and therefore the most prominent in that language (95).

Bhat admits that the chosen criteria do not yield definite findings as, for example, the distinction between lexical and grammatical elements is not sharp since lexical items lose their specificity to

become grammatical items in time. Consequently, the classification based on TAM is not expected to group the languages of the world exhaustively (97).

Chapter 6 exemplifies the categorisation of languages like Kannada, Temiar, and Muna into tense, aspect, and mood prominent languages respectively. Bhat claims that all Dravidian languages have grammaticalised tense distinctions to a very high degree (104). Bhat also points out that 'aspect and mood markers that occur in some of the modern Dravidian languages derive from earlier verbal forms that are used as auxiliaries or vectors; they have been grammaticalized rather irregularly and to different degrees in different daughter languages' (105). For aspect-prominent languages Bhat explains that aspect distinction is obligatory whereas tense and mood distinctions are indicated by specific markers when the meaning is not derivable from the context (125). The aspectual distinction in Maltese, for example, is born out by two distinct sets of personal agreement affixes (126). Muna, a Western Malayo-Polynesian language, grammaticalises irrealis mood with an infix *-um-* to the unmarked realis verbs (133).

Chapter 7 is the meat of the discussion as it pushes the hypothesis to test the existing linguistic wisdoms. That either one of the TAM components is prominent in a language contradicts Bybee's observations that lexical allomorphy for aspect is more frequent than for tense or mood, and aspect markers tend to occur closer to the verbal stem than tense and mood markers (1985: 155). Bhat explains that languages like Finnish, Havyaka (a dialect of Kannada), Chalcatongo Mixtec, Takelma and Wintu (a Penutian language spoken in Northern California) grammaticalised tense and mood markers to a greater extent than aspect markers, and tense and mood markers do occur closer to the verb than aspect markers (155–158). Bhat argues that the dispute as to whether the concept of perfect is related to tense theory or otherwise is contingent on viewing perfect from a tense-oriented viewpoint. Perfect can be teased out into three varying notions based on TAM respectively (cf. 170). Again, whether the concept of future is a temporal or modal notion depends on whether the language in question is tense or mood prominent (176). For Navajo, an aspect prominent language, future is denoted with a marker that occurs along with usitative, iterative, and optative (177). Other interesting topics discussed by Bhat include habitual meaning, negation, foregrounding of events, and paths of grammaticalisation (177 f.).

This book hypothesises that a language is prominent with only one of the TAM categories although it may have all three. One may then ask: do the languages that have all three categories of TAM grammaticalise them at a different rate so that one becomes more prominent than the other two? Is there a chain of grammaticalisation for TAM towards a certain transitional path in languages with TAM? Alternatively, since Bhat acknowledges that the notion of viewpoint cuts across TAM, is the prominence of TAM a matter of construal?

REFERENCES

Abbi, A. (1992). *Reduplication in South Asian languages: an areal, typological and historical study*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers.
Bybee, J. L. (1985). *Morphology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Comrie, B. (1976/1993). *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dowty, D. R. (1979). *Word meaning and Montague grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
Palmer, F. R. (1986). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Author's address: Linguistics Section,
School of Language, Literature and Performing Arts,
University of Otago, P.O. Box 56,
Dunedin,
New Zealand.
E-mail: sew29273@student.otago.ac.nz

(Received 20 September 1999)

Siobhan Chapman, *Accent in context: the ontological status and communicative effects of utterance accent in English*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1998. Pp. 168.

Reviewed by SUSANNE WINKLER, University of Tübingen

Accent in context is an ambitious and novel re-exploration of the complex interplay between sentence accentuation and utterance meaning in English. It argues for an essentially pragmatic approach to accent by showing that previous syntactic and argument structural approaches failed to achieve explanatory adequacy. Accent is thus not analyzed as being the physical correlate of focus, which is generally assumed in the generative tradition to be governed by grammatical processes, but as something which is entirely determined by extra-linguistic factors, such as contextual and speaker-dependent factors. Although Chapman develops a proposal of how accentuation of discourse anaphors can be computed from contextual factors, no general theoretical innovation relating to the implementation of context-influenced accent is made. Interestingly, the theoretically strongest chapters are those in which the discussion of grammatical phenomena, namely anaphoric constructions and negation, show that accent is an interface phenomenon, influenced by both grammar and pragmatics.

Chapters 1 and 2 lay out the pragmatic model (strongly influenced by Burton-Roberts) in which the analysis of accent is to be couched. Accent is a 'non-linguistic, utterance-based phenomenon' (48), 'a physical highlighting device, occurring in specific utterances in specific contexts' (37). Previous grammatical approaches, including NUCLEAR STRESS RULE-based approaches, Ladd's concept of default accent and Gussenhoven's SENTENCE ACCENT ASSIGNMENT RULE are discussed and dismissed. The claim is that accent placement is not determined by grammatical rules, but is essentially decided by the speaker. This bold claim is reminiscent of Bolinger's 1972 programmatic claim, and like him Chapman sets out to identify principles which guide the speaker in his or her choice. These principles are based on an extension of the two-dimensional given/new distinction, which allows, for example, for an analysis of so-called default accent patterns: *A: Let's go to the library. B: No, I want to BUY a book*. Leaving aside the possibility of a contrastive reading, the accentuation in B's response is explained by the assumption that the NP *book* is given by the mention of a library, and *buy* is assigned the accent because the idea of buying a book is new. The example is interesting in so far as it shows that deaccentuation does not presuppose referential identity, since the mention of the library introduces not a concrete referent but merely the concept of books. Although not discussed by Chapman, it would have been interesting for the informed reader to see how her proposal relates to the seminal work by Prince (1981) (and subsequent work) which proposes an elaborate taxonomy of given/new information showing how the different types of information status are correlated to linguistic form.

Chapman's approach, which is based on the given/new distinction paired with the assumption that accent is preferably realized on the last lexical item, will have difficulties in accounting for two very basic intonation patterns: first for all those sentences in which the accent is realized on one lexical item but in which a larger constituent (namely S) is new information: *A: What's new? B: Anna is teaching a course on Generative SEMANTICS*. Second, the proposal falls short in accounting for thetic sentences, where the accent is typically realized on the subject: these include *there*-constructions, such as *There is a BABY crying*, and sentences with an unaccusative verb, such as *The BASEMENT is flooded*. That is, any sentence in which a nonanaphoric element at the right periphery of the sentence is deaccented causes a problem for Chapman's theory, as do minimal pairs like *They bought the SHOP empty* vs. *They bought the shop EMPTY*. Finally, the question of whether Chapman's observations can be applied cross-linguistically is a serious one, since for instance in German it is not the verb which occurs sentence finally that receives the sentence accent but the argument to its left.

Chapter 3 addresses the question of the interaction between accent and the reference of NPs and pronouns. Chapman proposes five factors which affect accent placement: Is the specific element referentially new or morphologically new? Does a given element fulfill a new function, or is a new element introduced for a given function? Is the element under discussion the last lexical item? On the basis of these factors a scoring system is developed which assigns points to the NPs under consideration. The element which is assigned the highest score in the clause must be assigned an accent.

The scoring system is tested against full coordinate constructions of the following type: *John hit Bill and then GEORGE hit him*. The first coordinate clause functions as a context clause and

is not marked for intonation. The referentially and morphologically new NP *GEORGE* receives the highest score, while the pronoun *him*, which refers to *Bill*, is referentially given and therefore has a 0 score. Leaving the question of the theoretical significance of scoring systems aside, the weakness of the proposal seems to lie in the fact that the system can only explain the accentuation of NPs. A sentence such as *John hit Bill, but/George DIDN'T* couldn't be explained for various reasons. First, the accent on the polarity item is not predicted because the proposed system is limited to the accentuation of NPs. Second, the coordinate structure is in itself a syntactic construction which is subject to specific constraints on accentuation and deaccentuation. If this had been considered, then the third problem could have been avoided. This follows from the fact that accent patterns cannot be fully analyzed without also considering their interrelatedness with the concept of focus. Coordinate constructions are focus constructions. They can either occur as constructions in which sentence polarity is focused (see López & Winkler 1999), or as contrastive focus constructions (see Rooth 1992).

Chapter 4 addresses the general question of whether the notion of presupposition must be defined semantically or pragmatically. Chapman favors the pragmatic account and tries to correlate presupposition with given information in contrast to new information. Thus, the famous Lakoff example *John called Mary a Republican, and then SHE insulted HIM* is analyzed in terms of the given/new distinction, where *insult* is unaccented by virtue of being presupposed, and the accents on the pronominal elements signal a new function for given elements. Traditionally, the accent on the pronouns is analyzed as contrastive focus, a concept which is not discussed in the book.

The discussion in chapter 5 (sentence vs. utterance meaning) sets the stage for a novel reconsideration of the issue of Metalinguistic Negation (MN) in chapter 6. In essence, Chapman proposes that MN does not operate over the entire utterance, as was originally proposed by Horn (1985: 121), but rather over some quoted part of it. For example, in *John didn't MANAGE to solve the problem – it was quite easy for him to solve*, the accent on *manage* directs the hearer's attention to the speaker's use of the quoted form, signaling objection. Providing data from negative polarity items and lexically incorporated negation, she objects, like McCawley (1991), to the fact that Horn does not differentiate between MN and other types of negation which are clearly nonmetalinguistic. Further, she takes issue with Horn's diagnostic of focal stress on the item objected to and questions the general assumption that MN is associated with a characteristic accent pattern. Rather, she keeps to her original assumption on accent that 'the speaker of an utterance involving MN can place the accent where she pleases' (148). Although this may be the impression one receives with respect to the phenomenon of negation, it is the task of the linguist to sort out all the factors which play a role in accentuation. One of the major theoretical concepts which could have provided an answer to many open questions is not considered, that is, the issue of the interrelatedness of focus and accent.

In spite of the critical objections raised above, I consider Chapman's book very informative and well-structured. In addition, the clearly written style makes it easy and enjoyable to read. Because of these features, the book could be useful for teaching purposes, that is, as introductory literature for students working on related topics such as 'syntactic vs. pragmatic accounts of sentence accent', 'accent vs. focus', or 'metalinguistic negation reconsidered'. Thus, the book is recommended not only to those who are interested in the current developments in the field but also to those who are looking for good introductory teaching materials.

REFERENCES

Bolinger, D. (1972). Accent is predictable (if you are a mind-reader). *Language* **48**. 633–644.
Horn, L. R. (1985). Metalinguistic negation and pragmatic ambiguity. *Language* **61**. 121–175.
López, L. & Winkler, S. (1999). Focus and topic in VP-anaphora constructions. To appear in *Linguistics*.
McCawley, J. D. (1991). Contrastive negation and metalinguistic negation. In Dobrin, L. M., Nichols, L. & Rodrigues, R. M. (eds.), *Chicago Linguistic Society 27: The Parasession on Negation*. 189–206.
Prince, E. (1981). Toward a taxonomy of given/new information. In Cole, P. (ed.), *Radical pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press. 223–255.
Rooth, M. E. (1992). A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* **1**. 75–116.

Author's address: University of Tübingen,
Seminar für Englische Philologie,
Wilhelmstr. 50,
72074 Tübingen,
Germany.
E-mail: Susanne.Winkler@T-online.de
(Received 10 June 1999)

T. Givón (ed.), *Grammatical relations: a functionalist perspective* (Typological Studies in Language **35**). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997. Pp. viii + 349.

Reviewed by JOHN NEWMAN, Massey University

The book under review consists of eight chapters which explore difficult issues associated with grammatical relations in selected languages. A pervasive theme throughout the book is the view that grammatical relations are established by a careful and systematic consideration of diagnostics, with the final judgment about subjecthood and objecthood usually a matter of weight of evidence rather than any single criterion. It is this allowance for gradation in the degree to which a category can be considered subject or object (and the concomitant delicacy of argumentation for a grammatical relation) which gives the book its distinctive flavour.

The first chapter 'Grammatical relations: an introduction' is a revised version of chapter 5 of Givón (1995) and reviews the range of properties relevant to distinguishing grammatical relations. Givón takes the reader through a variety of data (especially data relating to serial verb constructions) illustrating the methodology of researching gradient relations. While the chapter touches on many points relevant to the content of the book, it fails to mention a number of important ideas relating to corpus-based analysis which occur in the later chapters. These include frequency counts of active, passive, inverse construction types (cf. Gildea's chapter), frequency counts relevant to anaphora phenomena and grammatical relations (cf. Brainard's and Pu's chapters), and referential distance and topic persistence measures which may be used to help distinguish grammatical relations (cf. Gildea's and Pu's chapters). These are all interesting and relatively new (Givón-inspired!) ideas which deserve at least a mention, if not an extended discussion, in the introductory chapter. Their omission may perhaps be related to the origin of this Introduction as a chapter from another book rather than a chapter written with only the present volume in mind.

While all the remaining chapters offer careful and methodical analyses of data, the chapters by Sherri Brainard ('Ergativity and grammatical relations in Karao'), Spike Gildea ('Evolution of grammatical relations in Cariban: how functional motivation precedes syntactic change'), and Ming-Ming Pu ('Zero anaphora and grammatical relations in Mandarin') strike me as particularly good in terms of the depth and originality of analysis. Brainard adopts an ergative-absolutive analysis of the Philippine language Karao, as opposed to the more usual analysis of Philippine languages in terms of 'actor focus', 'goal focus', etc., and considers the behaviour of the ergative and absolutive phrases with respect to an impressive range of structures and processes. Her conclusion: the ergative and absolutive phrases in the transitive clause can rightly be called subject and object respectively, while the absolutive phrase of the intransitive is a grammatical relation but not one which can be easily identified as either subject or object. Gildea's chapter deals, impressively, with the comparative syntax of Cariban languages (South America), focusing on a hypothesized train of events leading from verbal adjective > passive participle > inverse > active ergative. Gildea appeals to a variety of structural properties to support this evolution, though a couple of intermediate stages (agentless passive and then agentive passive) are not actually attested, only inferred. Gildea makes interesting use of typical frequency counts for construction types and agent deletion, as well as topicality measures, to support his arguments for different stages of evolution. Pu provides a thorough and convincing analysis of zero anaphora in Mandarin, firmly grounded in statistics arising from frequency counts of anaphora as well as utilizing various topicality measures. The remaining four chapters are by Marleen Haboud ('Grammaticalization, clause union and grammatical relations in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish'), Bambang Kaswanti Purwo ('The direct object in bi-transitive clauses in Indonesian'), E. K. Osam ('Serial verbs and grammatical relations in Akan'), and Noel Rude ('Dative shifting and double objects in Sahaptin'). Each of them examines some

construction type in terms of overt and behaviour-and-control properties and does so in a clear and persuasive way.

Grammatical relations is an interesting exploration of the topic, more interesting, in some ways, than either the editor's Preface or his introductory chapter would suggest. Quite a lot of the discussion in the various chapters covers fairly traditional theoretical ground (the appeals to passive, reflexivization, Equi-NP, Raising, etc.), rather like a Relational Grammar (RG) volume minus the diagrams (and the specifically RG theory). The insistence on understanding grammatical relations in terms of a clustering of properties (familiar already from Keenan's work in the 1970's) is significant, but not novel, and nor is it particularly 'functionalist'. It is the application of various quantitative measures based on corpus analysis (topic persistence measure, referential distance, frequency counts of construction types, frequency counts of zero anaphora, etc.) and close attention to the flow of information in discourse which give this volume a more functionalist flavour, compared with, say, an RG volume. Ironically, it is these very ideas which are missing from the editor's own introductory sections.

The volume would have benefited from closer proofreading to eliminate a number of stylistic infelicities, omitted words, typos, etc. which occur in some chapters. The editor seems to have taken quite a *laissez-faire* approach to the job of editing, with some variation in the style sheet used for the references section from one chapter to the next. So, for example, one finds all three possibilities for the book title: *On understanding grammar* (197), *On understanding Grammar* (81), and *On Understanding Grammar* (229). A journal title appears as *IJAL* (349), *I.J.A.L.* (83), and *International Journal of American Linguistics* (197). Some chapters explain abbreviations, some do not; some explain the abbreviations in a table at the end of the chapter, others explain them in a footnote. What counts most, I suppose, is stylistic consistency within a chapter and this is the case with the present volume. Also, as far as formatting of the text body (example sentences, etc.) is concerned there is indeed the necessary consistency across chapters. The copy of the book sent to this reviewer had an erroneous description of it on the back cover. It purports to be a description of Vol. 35 of the series, the book under review, but is in fact a description of the contents of Vol. 36, which, embarrassingly, is the reviewer's own book.

REFERENCE

Givón, T. (1995). *Functionalism and grammar*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Author's address: *Linguistics and Second Language Teaching*,
School of Language Studies,
Massey University,
Private Bag 11–222,
Palmerston North,
New Zealand.
E-mail: j.newman@massey.ac.nz

(Received 12 August 1999)

Wolfgang Kehrein & Richard Wiese (eds.), *Phonology and morphology of the Germanic languages* (Linguistische Arbeiten 386). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1998. Pp. viii + 298.

Reviewed by Thomas Klein, University of Manchester

Wolfgang Kehrein and Richard Wiese have done a significant service to the profession by editing this collection of articles on the phonology and morphology of Germanic languages. The volume demonstrates the great vitality and diversity in the study of the phonology and morphology of Germanic languages by compiling ideas from established scholars and younger voices on an impressive array of languages couched in cutting-edge theoretical frameworks.

The book is a collection of papers on phonology, prosodic morphology and morphology initially presented at a workshop of the same name at the Philipps-Universität Marburg, Germany, in August 1997. The bulk of the articles focus on German, Dutch or English, but a number of papers discuss other Germanic languages and dialects such as Icelandic (Kristján Árnason, 'Vowel shortness in Icelandic', 3–25), High Alemannic (Albert Ortmann, 'Consonant

epenthesis: its distribution and phonological specification', 51–76), mainland Scandinavian (Tomas Riad, 'Towards a Scandinavian accent typology', 77–109) and Old English (Carsten Steins, 'Against arbitrary features in inflection: Old English declension classes', 241–265). A number of papers in this volume are concerned with phonological representations, in particular the contributions by Árnason, Ortmann and Janet Grijzenhout ('The role of coronal specification in German and Dutch phonology and morphology', 27–50). The papers focusing on morphology or the morphology-syntax interface are indebted to a variety of approaches, namely, Word Design (Martin Neef, 'A case study in declarative morphology: German case inflection', 219–240), Minimalist Morphology (Steins) and Chomsky's Minimalist Program (Susi Wurmbrand, 'Heads or phrases? Particles in particular', 267–295). The papers in the Prosodic Morphology section are all written in the Optimality Theory framework and are concerned with various aspects of the interface between prosodically conditioned morphology and segmental phonology (Geert Booij, 'Phonological output constraints in morphology', 143–163; Harry van der Hulst & Jan G. Kooij, 'Prosodic choices and the Dutch nominal plural', 187–197; Ingo Plag, 'Morphological haplology in a constraint-based morpho-phonology', 199–215), the interaction between stress and morphological structure (Birgit Alber, 'Stress preservation in German loan words', 113–141) and the phonological structure of morphological roots (Chris Golston & Richard Wiese, 'The structure of the German root', 165–185).

Space limitations do not permit detailed comments on each of the articles in this volume. I have chosen three papers fairly arbitrarily for more detailed commentary below. This is not to imply that the other papers in this collection do not deserve the reader's attention. Quite to the contrary, the reader is bound to find fresh ideas for his or her own work throughout this book.

Árnason in 'Vowel shortness in Icelandic' contrasts the standard view that Icelandic vowel length is predictable with his central thesis that vowel quantity rather than consonant quantity is distinctive in Icelandic even though the distribution of long and short vowels is predictable to a considerable degree. He supports this thesis with material from historical and dialectal vowel mergers and diphthongizations and the behaviour of vowel quantity under truncation much discussed in the recent literature. To account for the quantitative behaviour of Icelandic vowels, Árnason proposes that long vowels in Icelandic are moraic whereas short vowels are nonmoraic and are lengthened as a consequence of syllable structure requirements. Unfortunately, important details of this proposal such as the moraification of the short vowels and the significant consequences of the revised vowel phonology for consonant length in Icelandic are left largely unexplored.

Grijzenhout's article 'The role of coronal specification in German and Dutch phonology and morphology' makes an important contribution to the debate concerning the specification of coronals by accounting for the distribution of consonants in clusters in German and Dutch without reference to coronal underspecification. Furthermore, the author provides good evidence that specification for the feature [Coronal] plays an important role in Dutch and German by demonstrating that coronals may condition schwa-insertion and that only coronals may appear in the syllable appendix. However, to account for the differences in the behavior of consonant clusters, Grijzenhout adopts a highly taxonomic and language-specific approach to sonority with distinct sonority values depending on place of articulation and no less than eight individual segments occupying distinct points on the sonority scales for Dutch and German. Furthermore, Grijzenhout's argument that velars are specified through the V-place feature [+high] and lack any C-Place feature is problematic in light of the German [ç]-[x] alternation, assuming with Grijzenhout that [x] is provided with vocalic place features by preceding non-low back vowels. Thus, the appearance of [x] after mid vowels as in *Loch* 'hole' is not accounted for because there is no way for [x] to receive the necessary [+high] specification from the preceding mid vowel.

The paper by Golston & Wiese, 'The structure of the German root', is perhaps the most inspiring contribution to the book. The authors apply Golston's Direct Optimality Theory framework to the phonological structure of German roots and in doing so provide a formal and easily testable approach to demonstrate that phonological shapes of roots occur more frequently if they are unmarked in terms of prosodic size requirements, sequencing of stressable and unstressable syllables, alignment of root-initial syllables, stress contour and presence of root-initial onsets and root-final codas. Along the way, new ways of representing 'floating autosegments' and lexical stress as distinctive constraint violations are suggested. Furthermore, the paper is exemplary in basing the theoretical analysis on the empirical results of a computer-assisted corpus analysis. The implications of the approach to markedness and morpheme

structure demonstrated in this paper should play a leading role in future work on the phonology–morphology interface.

The contributions in this volume are of consistently high quality. Furthermore, the editors have done a good job at keeping the contributions concise and reasonably error-free. The general value of this book lies in the significant range of Germanic languages and dialects discussed and the theoretical and empirical depth and insight displayed in many of the individual analyses. This book should be a part of any library with a collection on phonology and morphology of any Germanic language(s), and is of great interest to any scholar concerned with Germanic languages, phonology, morphology or Optimality Theory.

Author's address: *Department of Linguistics*,
University of Manchester,
Manchester M13 9PL,
U.K.
E-mail: *thomas.klein@man.ac.uk*

(Received 24 August 1999)

Ans van Kemenade & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Parameters of morphosyntactic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Pp. xi + 544.

Reviewed by David Willis, University of Manchester

This volume contains fifteen chapters dealing with various aspects of change in the morphosyntax of Germanic and Romance languages, along with three commentary chapters and an introduction by the editors in which they sketch some of the major themes in recent generative approaches to morphosyntactic change. These themes recur in the various contributions: how is the observed gradual nature of change to be incorporated into feature-based generative approaches? Can minimalism make a positive contribution to historical linguistics? In what way does language acquisition condition syntactic change? A number of the contributions also show how large-scale corpus-based work is increasingly being integrated into theoretical approaches to morphosyntactic change.

An attractive feature of the volume is the way that the same linguistic problems are discussed, often in radically divergent ways, by several of the authors. Chapters by Abraham, Philippi and Vincent consider the emergence of determiner systems; van Kemenade, Kroch & Taylor and Roberts look from rather different angles at Old and Middle English word order. The shift of elements between lexical verb and auxiliary status is dealt with in two chapters. Benincà & Poletto investigate grammaticalization of Italian *bisogna* 'it is necessary' from verb to modal auxiliary, and the concomitant appearance of restrictions on its morphology and distribution. They argue that *bisogna* lost its theta-grid and developed a high clausal position. The former led to the loss of its ability to take any kind of subject; the latter led to the loss of morphological forms associated with heads of lower functional projections. Miller examines a converse development, the loss of auxiliary status of French *faire*, on the basis of changes in the constraints on VP-ellipsis and pseudo-gapping.

Chapters by Rivero and Fontana debate the correct characterization of clitics in Romance, especially Old Spanish. Rivero categorizes clitic systems into two types: (i) C-oriented, obeying a second-position (Wackernagel) constraint; and (ii) I-oriented, where the clitic is attracted to the verb (Tobler-Mussafia Law). Old Spanish allowed both options, whereas Modern Spanish is of the I-oriented type. In Rivero's account change is 'caused' by the fact that in Old Spanish the I-oriented order was already statistically more frequent, and the fact that ambiguous cases were already analysed as I-oriented. As a synchronic analysis, Rivero's account has much to recommend it. However, from a diachronic perspective, it begs a number of questions. Why did the I-oriented system take over, when the mixed system of Old Spanish was a stable option? Why was the I-oriented system already dominant in main clauses? Fundamentally, what triggered the change? The analysis also has implications for the viability of Lightfoot's degree-0 learnability (255–258), according to which children ignore embedded clauses in acquisition. Did Old Spanish children ignore the presence of the C-oriented system in embedded clauses during the period of change?

Despite its contemporary nature, Alison Henry's chapter, based on fieldwork among 200 speakers of Belfast English (BE), will be of great interest to historical linguists. Indeed, it shows

the largely untapped potential for using contemporary fieldwork to investigate change in abstract syntactic systems. Henry shows that ongoing change in the syntax of imperatives in BE is proceeding via three distinct stages: older speakers allow unrestricted inversion in imperatives (*Sit you down*); younger speakers allow inversion with unaccusative verbs only; the youngest speakers lack inversion altogether. Henry sketches an acquisitional account of how these changes could occur. This work has important repercussions for historical linguistics, in particular for debates about gradualness and discreteness of change. The Belfast case provides a much better quality of data than is usually possible in the historical arena, and suggests that, in some cases at least, change proceeds via a 'radical shift in grammars' (296) from one generation to the next generation, with the new generation having access only to the innovative grammar.

What do we learn from this volume about the mechanisms of syntactic change? The studies of Benincà & Poletto and Henry seem to present a picture of a series of well-defined grammars, with the new grammatical system fully formed in a particular text or group of speakers. Benincà & Poletto note (115) that the change of Italian *bisogna* 'it is necessary' is from lexical to functional status, and that this change is reflected in a marked rise in its frequency in the work of Galileo (1632), suggesting a discrete category shift. On the other hand, a number of other authors (Fontana, Kroch & Taylor, Warner) work explicitly within a double-base model, where two grammars with incompatible options for some feature or parameter co-exist and 'compete' until one wins out.

Application of Minimalism to syntactic change is also apparent in a number of the contributions. Some reinterpret parameters as features of functional categories. Roberts goes further in sketching an account of changes in Old English word order in conformity with Kayne's view that all languages are head-initial, and views the loss of OV underlying order in English as the loss of overt object movement to SpecAgrOP.

The question of why children fail to learn syntactic patterns despite hearing them in their environment is also raised in different guises by several authors. Lightfoot reinterprets Kroch & Taylor's chapter in this light: he suggests that English lost V2 because of dialect mixing between a northern dialect with V2 and a southern one without. In normal circumstances, only around 30% of the sentences in V2-languages exemplify the crucial non-SVO pattern that allows children to realize that they are learning a V2-language. In areas of dialect mixture between a V2 and a non-V2 language, this figure will be lower, so low perhaps that children fail to acquire the V2 nature of their language. Although conceptually attractive, this raises two questions immediately. Even, say, 15% of main clauses is still a large number of sentences. Why is this insufficient for children to acquire V2, when a much lower absolute frequency of, say, exceptional case marked clauses is adequate for these to be acquired? It is also unclear whether the claims stand up to detailed philological examination, since Kroch & Taylor's original claim is made solely on the basis of one text.

A number of the contributions (for instance, Benincà & Poletto, Zaring & Hirschbühler) incorporate extensive corpus work within a sophisticated theoretical framework. As Tomaselli notes in her commentary (146), increased use of corpora is a desirable direction in generative historical linguistics.

To conclude, *Parameters of morphosyntactic change* is a significant contribution to current generative historical linguistics. The diversity of views contained within it bears witness to the current vitality of the field. It debates a host of current issues, and although it does not contain any definitive answers, it is a step in the right direction.

Author's address: *Department of Linguistics*,
University of Manchester,
Oxford Road,
Manchester M13 9PL,
U.K.
E-mail: *david.willis@man.ac.uk*

(Received 30 July 1999)