J. Linguistics **34** (1998), 551–560. Printed in the United Kingdom

SHORTER NOTICES

Carl Bache, *The study of tense, aspect and action: towards a theory of the semantics of grammatical categories*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995. Pp. 350.

Reviewed by PETER HARDER, English Department, University of Copenhagen

Grammatical categories have been part of the furniture since the beginning of linguistic theory, but their status in present-day linguistics is far from clear. They were the darlings of European linguists both of the traditional and structuralist variety; they became theoretically more marginal in American structuralism because of its anti-semantic orientation, and this marginalization was reinforced in generative grammar because its central interest was in the refinement of the description of complex syntagmatic relations, leaving little interest in paradigmatic contrast. Recently, grammaticalization theory has revived interest in grammatical morphemes with a focus on diachronic and universal grammar – but interest has centred explicitly on individual forms or form types, with sets of contrasting forms remaining in a doubtful position.

In this book, Carl Bache (who has a weighty list of publications on verbal categories behind him) takes it upon himself to discard all inherited assumptions and start from rock bottom in constructing a rationale for the description of grammatical categories as part of linguistic theory. This is both a strength and a weakness for the book. The weakness is that readers will get impatient with the author for the time he takes to get off the ground. But where the exercise leads to results that challenge fairly widely accepted beliefs, the preparatory motions suddenly come across as essential to continued progress. This is the case, for instance, with the argument showing that categories in universal grammar, because they are meta-categories, must be evaluated by different standards than categories postulated in specific object languages. This discussion should be obligatory reading for all linguists who are ever tempted to assume that language-specific grammatical facts can be simply and painlessly captured by assigning them to the appropriate inherited (meta-)categories such as '(past) tense' or '(perfective) aspect'.

One point where the book is especially useful is in the discussion of the nature of linguistic contrasts, an area to which little systematic reflection has been devoted since the Prague school. Bache's analysis of the general nature of linguistic choice moves from large-scale selections made by the speaker alone, towards progressively more linguistically constrained cases down to minimal formal choices such as past/present tense. He then turns the argument around, offering a typology of semantic contrasts associated with minimal formal distinctions, and argues that the most useful candidates for metalinguistic status are those semantic distinctions that provide consistent minimal semantic pairs. The contrasting items thus isolated are understood as links in a relational structure, rather than as substance elements that belong with one form only; and one form (e.g. the simple present) can then be captured as belonging simultaneously in a complex paradigmatic structure consisting of all the relevant grammatical contrasts. Instead of ignoring the complexities that minimal contrasts leave behind, Bache shows how one can get from the minimal ('definitional') level to the actual contrasts by means of a 'functional' level where the syntagmatic interaction of meanings brings about additional semantic contrast.

One point on which Bache's account differs clearly from accepted assumptions is in the area he calls 'action' (= Aktionsart). This area is often treated in a way that permits the same semantic contrasts to recur messily in descriptions of aspect, tense ('perfective past') and verb stems ('perfective verbs'). Because of the freedom granted by the explicitly metalinguistic status of the universal categories, Bache can set up a well-defined set of actional contrasts which are kept clearly distinct from basic verb meaning on the one hand and aspectual (perfective/imperfective) contrasts on the other – handling the obvious relations between the three domains by means of the 'functional' level.

However, there are some points that are not fully convincing in their present form. Universal grammar, understood as a metalinguistic tool, is allowed to diverge quite widely from object-linguistic facts; as Bache says (338), in the initial stages it is more important to have a USEFUL model than a TRUTHFUL model because the 'too strong' generalizations of the ideal metalinguistic model force the linguist to be acutely aware of those aspects of the linguistic facts that do not

fit the theory. But what happens as the linguist moves beyond the initial stages? If discrepancies in relation to actual languages can force the linguist to create more complex meta-categories that fit the object language more closely, Bache is at risk of sliding gradually into the same situation as those people who start out with less sceptical assumptions about the fit between universal and language-specific categories.

The problem also affects the status of the (revised) Chomskyan tripartition into observational, descriptive and explanatory adequacy that is used as a standard for linguistic description. Bache adapts it to his own more semantic approach, but retains the idea that explanatory adequacy is achieved by linking the object-linguistic description to the level of universal grammar. If this is to be credible, it cannot be reconciled with metalinguistic categories at the stage where they are chosen arbitrarily because they seem to be useful: a theory does not become explanatory because it ties in with assumptions that come in handy at the moment.

The only way to avoid this is to provide more firm typological foundations for metalinguistic categories. A thoroughgoing cross-linguistic investigation of those semantic domains within which linguistic categories tend to flock most densely may eventually provide a basis for making the choice of optimal grammatical metalanguage; and it is only at this final stage that explanatory adequacy can be anything but a mirage. Bache's book is useful mainly for its strong emphasis on what the ordinary working grammarian should be paying attention to when describing grammatical contrast; even if it turns out that at the universal level there may be no prototypical sets of contrasting forms but only individual forms, as envisaged by grammaticalization theory, the book will retain its usefulness for describing those familiar types of object languages where contrasts do tend to form complex systems.

Author's address: *English Department*,
University of Copenhagen,
DK-2300 Copenhagen S,
Denmark.
E-mail: *harder@coco.ihi.ku.dk*

(Received 23 October 1997)

Guiliano Bernini & Paolo Ramat, *Negative sentences in the languages of Europe: a typological approach* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 16). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996. Pp. xiii + 274.

Reviewed by LAURENCE R. HORN, Yale University

Every known human language and no known natural non-human communication system contains negative expressions; this fact, combined with the mismatch between the logical simplicity of the negation and the complexity and variety of its representation, renders it an ideal subject for typological study. Following earlier negative typologies by Jespersen, Dahl, Payne and Kahrel & van der Bergh, Bernini & Ramat provide a detailed survey of some (but not all) aspects of negation and of its expression across a wide range of European languages (and some non-IE ones as well).

The heart of the study is the compilation and discussion of data sets elicited from native speakers responding to a 38-item questionnaire. Based on the questionnaire responses and on extensive material culled from a variety of sources on diachrony and synchronic typology, Bernini & Ramat (henceforth B&R) are able to formulate significant hypotheses concerning word order (the distribution of pre-verbal, post-verbal, and French-style embracing negation), correlative negation, sentential vs. constituent negation, metalinguistic or polemic negation, and the relation of negation to the contrast between what Oswald Ducrot (in work curiously unmentioned here; cf. Horn 1989: §6.4.3) has called but_{SN} (*sino*, *sondern*) and but_{PA} (*pero*, *aber*).

A particularly rich and detailed excursus is devoted to the interaction of negation with indefinites and quantifiers, ground covered in more depth by Haspelmath (1993/1997). B&R organize their findings by polarity types (N/A/S as in *nobody*, *anybody*, *somebody* respectively), by morphosyntactic categories (nominal/determiner/adverbial as in *nobody*, *no*, *never* respectively) and by the nature of the negative incorporation involved (ranging from the opaque suppletion of Fr. *jamais*, *rien* to the transparent negative prefixation of Rus. *nikogda*, *ničto*). They detect a cline from suppletion to derivation as one moves from west to east within Europe,

a cline at least partly immune to familial bonds and thus constituting an areal or Sprachbund feature. Along the way (in §7.6) we learn that the mortal pun played by Odysseus (alias 'No-one') on the Cyclops Polyphemus ('No-one has wounded me!') could not have been pulled off if their conversation had been conducted in French, Hungarian, or any of the Slavic languages as it was in Ancient Greek or could have been in English or Italian.

The phenomenon of 'neg-raising' (the understanding of a higher-clause negative as in *I don't want to leave until midnight* as if it were situated in the lower clause) is also touched on (chapter 9), but B&R's conclusion that this is not essentially a syntactic phenomenon, while arguably correct (see Horn 1989: chapter 5), fails to follow from the arguments they present. B&R's examples and generalizations are based entirely on 'verba putandi', but as noted by others (see again Horn 1989, extending 19th century work by Kalepky and Tobler), verbs of the *think*, *believe* class are just one of several categories of predicates licensing the neg-raising relation.

B&R's focus on the languages of Europe allows the accretion of significant diachronic data, given the accessibility of written records and the independently documented histories of language contact. In particular, B&R review and exemplify the well-known 'Jespersen cycle' by which an indefinite or minimizer starts life as a reinforcer for a weak proclitic negation, only to acquire negative force itself and overtake or replace the original proclitic, as with Fr. *pas* or Ger. *nicht*. The extensive recent literature on the relation of the cycle to negative concord and polarity is virtually unacknowledged, however; Zanuttini is mentioned in passing and Fauconnier, Ladusaw, Linebarger, Laka and van der Wouden not at all. No mention is made of the significant progress over the last two decades on formal generalizing of the notion of 'negative context' as it applies to the licensing of polarity items in the scope of conditionals, universal quantification, and so on. (See van der Wouden [1994] 1996, Ladusaw 1996 and Zanuttini 1997 for discussion and references.)

These bibliographic lacunae may be ascribed partly to the authors' evident antipathy to grammatical and semantic theory and partly to the fact that this volume, while appearing in 1996, is largely a reworking of material first written a decade earlier. Thus Haspelmath's far more comprehensive and theoretically sophisticated typology of indefinites, which anticipates much of B&R's less focused discussion of the same issues, is cited exactly once (chapter 6, note 1). Generalizations and even verbatim example sentences are not consistently attributed to their originators, but often to later, secondary sources. Another puzzling practice is B&R's citation of work they do not overlook; there are multiple references to Givón's monograph on 'Negation in language' within a relatively obscure 1975 collection of working papers, although the same paper was published as a chapter in *Syntax and Semantics 9* (1978) and in Givón (1979).

More problematic is the fact that B&R accept as gospel Givón's portrayal of negation as a speech act without considering the problems for this view discussed in Horn (1989) and elsewhere. Following Givón, B&R (5) assume that negation can be felicitously used only to deny a previous positive assertion or to correct a faulty belief; hence the oddity of a decontextualized announcement that one's wife is not pregnant. But this is a property of default contexts, not of negation per se; the announcements 'The dean is conscious' or (to borrow Grice's example) 'Your wife is faithful' are more in need of contextual rescue than are their negative counterparts (Horn 1989: §3.3). Morphosyntactic negation is a typical accompaniment of, but neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for, discourse denial or rejection. The centuries-long dispute among philosophers, linguists and psychologists on the proper characterization of the discourse markedness of negative sentences is never acknowledged, much less truly engaged, by B&R.

More generally, B&R display an unfortunate ambivalence on the semantic character of negation. They endorse the oft-voiced view that 'the meaning of a negative sentence does not refer to a state of affairs but rather expresses a judgement on it (like one of its modalities)' (110). But this characterization of negation as essentially modal or subjective in nature is fatally flawed, as recognized by Frege (1919), whose seminal work is not mentioned here; Frege notes that *Christ is not mortal* cannot be regarded as any more of a second-order predication than, say, *Christ is immortal* or *Christ lives forever*, nor is $2+2 \neq 5$ any more 'modal' than $2+2=4$. (As Frege also observed, the embedded negation in, for example *If not-p then q* clearly cannot be taken to instantiate a 'negative judgment'.) But wait: two pages later the negation-as-subjective-judgment baton B&R accepted from Givón (and from the spectres of Kant and Bergson; see Horn (1989: chapters 1 and 3)) is abruptly dropped and we read instead (112) that 'the negative declarative sentence expresses a factual reality, a real state of affairs expressed negatively (*: John doesn't eat fish*)'.

The value of this work, then, lies not in its characterization of the essential properties of

negation but in its collection and presentation of the typological data. The varieties of negative expressions introduced and displayed by B&R are impressive indeed, ranging over not only the central IE families of Romance, Germanic and Slavic but Celtic, Baltic, isolates like Albanian, non-IE outliers (Basque, Hungarian, Lapp), IE-based Creoles from the Caribbean to Africa, and – where relevant – non-European languages from Telugu to Tongan.

Unfortunately, the reader's confidence in the reliability of the far-flung data may be shaken by the palpable errors that crop up closer to home. The most memorable lapse is perhaps the citation (12) of 'the substandard [sic] Eng. *don't* (*My Mama* don't *told me* in the song *That's all right mama*)' as an instance of an Estonian-style invariant NEG. There is in fact no negation here at all ('substandard' or otherwise) but rather a dialectal perfect auxiliary. The line in question is actually *My mama done tole me/When I was in pigtails*, and it is taken not from the early Elvis hit B&R invoke but from a different song altogether, 'Blues in the night' – penned, ironically enough, by Johnny Mercer, the lyricist of 'Accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative' fame.

Bernini & Ramat's study should find a place on the bookshelf of anyone interested in the forms of natural language negation, and in particular in its manifestations across a wide range of the languages of Europe. When the authors venture into the semantic realms, however, their pronouncements should be taken with the appropriate salinary dosage.

REFERENCES

Frege, G. (1919). Negation. In Geach, P. & Black, M. (eds.) (1952). *Translations from the philosophical writings of Gottlob Frege*. Oxford: Blackwell. 117–135.

Givón, T. (1979). *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.

Haspelmath, M. (1997). *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [Revised version of 1993 Ph.D. dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin, *A typological study of indefinite pronouns*.]

Horn, L. R. (1989). *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ladusaw, W. A. (1996). Negation and polarity items. In Lappin, S. (ed.), *Handbook of contemporary semantic theory*. Oxford: Blackwell. 321–341.

van der Wouden, T. (1996). *Negative contexts*. London: Routledge. [Revised version of 1994 Ph.D. dissertation, University of Groningen.]

Zanuttini, R. (1997). *Negation and clausal structure: A comparative study of Romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Author's address: *Department of Linguistics*,
P.O. Box 206823,
Yale University,
New Haven, *CT 06520–6238*,
U.S.A.
E-mail: *laurence.horn@yale.edu*

(Received 9 January 1998)

Frans van Coetsem, *Towards a typology of lexical accent: 'Stress Accent' and 'pitch accent' in a renewed perspective* (Monographien zur Sprachwissenschaft 18). Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1996. Pp. 141.

Reviewed by Joseph C. Salmons, University of Wisconsin–Madison

While the title of this volume might lead one to expect a broad crosslinguistic survey of synchronic accentual types, it primarily treats diachronic Romance and especially Germanic accentuation. The focus often shifts to sociolinguistics with a thread throughout on accentual change under language contact, building on van Coetsem's important earlier work on language contact change.

Since becoming aware of van Coetsem's suggestion of a distinction between 'dominant' (D) and 'nondominant' (ND) accents many years ago, I had hoped to see explicit treatment of this tantalizing but ill-defined notion. The D versus ND scheme divides lexical accents into those in

which prominence of a stressed syllable leads to reduction of unstressed ones versus those in which prominence does not lead to reduction of nonprominent units, a useful if undervalued way of thinking about accent.

This volume extends the distinction to argue that traditional 'stress accent' amounts to a D system and traditional 'pitch accent' is an ND system (38–39, 43, 63, 100, etc.). Van Coetsem devotes extended discussion to mixed systems showing both D and ND elements (including Scandinavian pitch accent) and establishing that D-driven reductions are different from 'efficiency-related reductions'. He then sketches a number of cases from Germanic and Romance where shifts between D and ND systems have occurred. He argues that languages and dialects readily move back and forth between the two, frequently under language contact. An 11-page excursus on Latin is the most detailed case history given. Van Coetsem limits the discussion in various ways, setting aside consideration of, for example, the distinction between fixed versus free accent (24), distinguishing tone from lexical accent (28), and the phonetic correlates of accent (32–33).

While it seems promising to extend the ND versus D analysis to replace 'stress' and 'pitch' accent, rather than treating this as a distinct accentological dimension, this move brings some significant difficulties with it. Notably, numerous classic pitch or tone languages show reductions of the type associated with D systems, e.g. Mixtec and Trique. Likewise, many languages (Spanish, Finnish, etc.) have 'stress' accent without reduction and no case is made for them having pitch accent. The traditional division, then, does not map directly to the new terms.

The two criteria for D systems are diachronic and synchronic reduction of unstressed syllables. Along with these, van Coetsem posits a 'syllable hierarchy' characteristic of D systems, with greater 'phonological interdependence' of syllables and 'prevalence of the prominent syllable at the expense of other, nonprominent syllables' (43). In addition to these definitional points, van Coetsem assumes a third test, that umlaut occurs with D and vowel harmony with ND (Preface, 84, 126, etc.) This originates in a suggestion by W. P. Lehmann and the topic was planned as an original second half of this volume but was not completed. In fact, a similar correlation of accentual types to umlaut versus vowel harmony has been suggested independently by Macken 1989.

Van Coetsem proposes that relative dominance can be captured by a ratio, E10:X/Y, where E = total energy divided into 10 units, X = amount of that energy devoted to the stressed syllable and Y = amount devoted to the unstressed. Thus, one might find an 8/2 ratio in a language with D tendencies and 6/4 in another with ND tendencies. Without recourse to well-defined phonetic manifestations or phonological behaviors, it is unclear how one should establish such ratios, however.

Given these problems, it seems that rather than building directly on previously established accentual typologies, much of the argument boils down to the observation that unstressed syllables reduce in some languages, but not in others. This is a valuable observation, but one which could be mined for more.

Two more general points warrant mention, one about sampling and one about phonological theory. First, van Coetsem restricts this typology to a few languages of western Europe, arguing, among other things, that we need more evidence on non-Indo-European languages before we can do real typological work, e.g. establishing the frequency of various accent types in the languages of the world (26). Of course, a flood of research on prosodic systems of the world is now readily available in the literature as well as in the Stress System Database at http://cogsci1.psych.ox.ac.uk/~todd/. Treating this book as a set of case studies in two western Indo-European families would have avoided raising serious concerns about sampling and universality that arise with the self-designation 'typology'.

Second, because this volume does not situate itself in current phonological or prosodic theory, some wheels get reinvented. For example, Hayes 1995, a work not cited, has explored some of the same questions more explicitly than the work at hand, with much relevant data from non-Indo-European languages. Surprisingly in a book devoted to the asymmetries between stressed and unstressed syllables, there is NO use of the technical notion of the foot, nor other insights into metrical structure that have dominated so much phonological debate over the last two decades.

Stylistically, the text is at times less clear than it might be. One wonders if the claim (125) that reduplication is 'not always distinguishable from alliteration' reflects some editing problem. Various typographical errors occur, including use of 'í' for 'í' dozens of times.

The book has no synthetic concluding discussion, but contains an appendix on rhythm,

followed by a brief chapter-by-chapter recapitulation of the main points. It closes with indices (names as well as languages and subjects).

In conclusion, this book might better be judged on terms very different from those implied by its title: it is not a theoretical treatise on accent nor is it really typological. Instead, it offers a survey of historical Germanic and Romance patterns of reduction and nonreduction of unstressed syllables with attention to sociolinguistic context.

REFERENCES

Hayes, Bruce (1995). *Metrical stress theory: principles and case studies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Macken, Marlys (1989). 'Local feature changing harmony.' *Eastern States Conference on Linguistics* (*ESCOL*). 194–206.

Author's address: German Department,
818 Van Hise Hall,
1220 Linden Dr.,
University of Wisconsin,
Madison, WI 53706,
U.S.A.
E-mail: jsalmons@facstaff.wisc.edu

(Received 6 October 1997)

Richard Larson & Gabriel Segal, *Knowledge of meaning: an introduction to semantic theory* (A Bradford Book). Cambridge, MA & London: MIT Press, 1995. Pp. xvii + 639.

Reviewed by William McClure, Queens College and The Graduate Center, City University of New York

This book is a substantial introduction to semantics for natural languages written for advanced undergraduates and post-graduate students of philosophy and linguistics. It is a highly interesting and well written work which makes explicit use of the relationship between formal syntax and semantics, philosophy, and psychology. In this it is unlike any other introductory semantics text.

Knowledge of meaning is divided into thirteen chapters each of which includes a section of exercises ranging from the mechanical to the very sophisticated. While the exercises are numerous, it is unfortunate perhaps that answers to even some of them are not included. There are substantial End Notes, References, an Author Index and a Subject Index. Chapters 1 through 3 introduce the notions of semantics, truth, meaning, and structure which the authors will assume, while verbs and basic predication are the topic of chapter 4. Chapters 5 through 9 cover the semantics of various kinds of noun phrases in great detail. These include: proper nouns (chapter 5), pronouns and demonstratives (chapter 6), quantification and quantifiers (chapters 7 and 8), and definite descriptions (chapter 9). Chapter 10 is about anaphora while chapter 11 discusses clausal complements and attitude reports. Event semantics is introduced in chapter 12, while the overall relationship between formal semantics and the general program of cognitive science is the topic of chapter 13.

With the exception of chapter 12, the book forms a coherent and well-written whole. The assumptions and methodological considerations laid out in the first two chapters are in all senses the normal and expected ones (e.g. semantic rules are compositional; they are recursive, etc.). Biconditionals of the form 'S is true if and only if *p*' are called T theories. The nature of T theories is discussed at great length, with Larson & Segal (henceforth L&S) giving sample derivations, discussing their nontriviality, and arguing for the nature of the relationship between T theories and meaning. These chapters include discussion of both the acquisition and the psychological reality of semantic knowledge. Alternative theories are also introduced where appropriate, and while the first example of such a theory is quite simple (basic compositional versus noncompositional theories), this is a technique which L&S use repeatedly and to good

effect throughout the text. Sometimes parallel, or nearly parallel accounts of the same problem exist. Other times, they modify an existing theory for illustrative purposes. In all cases, the advantages and disadvantages of the various alternatives are weighed and where possible a final decision made. Quite nicely, L&S allow the reader to see how a linguist would choose between competing theories. It is also worth noting that this introductory discussion about the nature of language and grammar is both specific and well written.

In chapter 3, basic assumptions about syntax and the relationship between syntax and semantics are laid out. The notion of STRONG COMPOSITIONALITY (79) is discussed at length and then used to choose between different analyses of conjunction. The section culminates in the explicit introduction of truth values in the final semantics for conjunction. Chapter 4 introduces predication between proper names and simple verbs. While the mechanics are straightforward, much of the chapter is actually spent discussing differences between predicates, nouns (specifically proper names), and to a lesser extent adjectives. How can one tell that a given word is a predicate or not? Again, the discussion is enlightening and relatively unusual in such a text. After determining the crucial properties of predicates (GENERAL CONDITIONS OF APPLICATION and OBJECT-INDEPENDENT CONDITIONS (127)) and showing how their version of the theory (called PC+ at this point) is consistent with these properties, L&S discuss several alternative theories where these characteristics may or may not hold. Again, the discussion illustrates how a semanticist might think about competing theories. In fact we return to these same theories at least once more in the text, and it is interesting that a choice which is dismissed at this point later proves to have possible advantages.

Knowledge of meaning continues in this way through chapter 11, with each chapter building on everything which has preceded in order to account for an increasing variety of semantic phenomena. The one real exception to this buildup is chapter 12, Events, States and Times. Suddenly we are introduced to event semantics as formulated by Parsons (1990). Topics in this chapter include events versus states, adverbial modification, θ-roles, verb decomposition, Aktionsart and simple tenses. While it is useful for this material to be found in an introductory text, the rules of the chapter are completely different from all the others. L&S no longer seem interested in compositionality and the mapping between syntax and semantics. No attempt is made to connect Parsons' event representations with the syntax which has preceded. The syntax of adverbs is not addressed. Likewise, no attempt is made to explain the nature of aspectual operators such as CUL and HOLD which refer to events which culminate or progress, respectively. These operators exist in the semantic representations of Parsons, but presumably do not occur in the syntax.

With the exception of chapter 12, however, the style and content of the book is internally consistent and easy to follow. If there is any inconsistency, it is found in the kinds of arguments which the authors make. For example, arguments based on acquisition or psychological reality are used early in the book quite extensively, but they occur almost not at all later where more complex semantic problems are addressed. No one ever uses acquisition facts to support one or another analysis of generalized quantifiers or donkey anaphora. Further, on rare occasions, L&S cite non-English data to support a theoretical claim. While there is nothing wrong with this kind of argument, I feel that it is unfair (and in some sense deceptive) to use the occasional fact from a foreign language when it happens to support a particular theory. It would be nice to have comprehensive reference to languages other than English, but I suspect that this also reflects the state of research in the entire field. The authors are generally careful to define all new concepts, although a number of terms which most linguists take for granted (SCOPE first mentioned on page 106 comes to mind) are not actually very well defined and might be confusing to the uninitiated reader. Finally, the authors claim in the preface that their introduction to truth-conditional semantics uses fewer technical tools than traditional Montague grammar. While it is true that models and lambda abstraction, for example, are missing, the topics for which these tools are crucial are also not discussed (modals, tense, and cross-categorical parallels, for example). Further, L&S do introduce their own sometimes complex set of technical tools. They also pay great attention to formal logical argumentation, and in the end, it is hard for me to agree that this book is substantially less technical than other introductions to truth-conditional semantics.

Regardless of these smaller weaknesses, however, the book is a well written introduction to the kinds of issues and arguments which characterize semantics. It is also successful at placing the subject matter within the larger linguistic enterprise, taking pains to separate semantics from both syntax and pragmatics. The book is also excellent at connecting the basic semantic topics introduced in the text to the broader body of recent semantic research. In this it is heads and

tails above any other semantics textbook that I know. Chapter 8 is a case in point. The theory of generalized quantifiers is introduced as an improvement on the non-compositional analysis of quantified expressions found in chapter 7. The theory is initially motivated by the desire to apply strong compositionality to DPs containing quantifying expressions. However, most of the chapter is actually spent discussing the relationship between the theory of generalized quantifiers and phenomena such as directional entailment, negativity polarity items, the definiteness effect, and the partitive constraint. While such correlations are now taken for granted within the field, to the uninitiated student they may seem quite extraordinary, and this discussion provides an informative and thorough introduction to the relevant literature. *Knowledge of meaning* contains numerous such references so that at every point a student can turn to the questions which have developed from the initial solutions to the basic problems. I found this to be one of the most laudable features of the text.

In sum, *Knowledge of meaning* introduces a wide range of semantic phenomena in a clear and careful way. While a teacher may wish that some topics which are omitted had been included and while some may wonder about the style of formalism developed in the text, the choices made by the authors are in general reasonable and understandable. *Knowledge of meaning* also places these facts into the larger cognitive perspective which, for me at least, is quite interesting. The real virtue of the book, however, is that it compares different possible solutions to problems allowing students to see how a semanticist might think about a particular issue, and it places all of these issues into the domain of current research in semantics. I found the book enjoyable and informative. In a classroom, it might even be exciting.

REFERENCE

Parsons, T. (1990). *Events in the semantics of English: a study in subatomic semantics*. Cambridge, MA & London: MIT Press.

Author's address: CMAL, 203 King Hall,
Queens College,
Flushing, NY 11367,
U.S.A.
E-mail: wmcclure@email.gc.cuny.edu

(Received 8 December 1997)

Shohei Yoshida, *Phonological government in Japanese* (Faculty of Asian Studies Monographs. New series; no. 20). Canberra: Australian National University, 1996. Pp. ix + 196.

Reviewed by Timothy J. Vance, Connecticut College.

This book presents analyses of a disparate collection of Japanese phonological phenomena in a theoretical framework called Government Phonology. The framework is inspired by the principles-and-parameters approach to syntax that is associated with Government and Binding theory. Yoshida explicitly contrasts his approach with 'traditional Generative Phonology' and asserts that 'A rule-based linguistic theory is arbitrary and unconstrained…' (xi). Although the machinery that Government Phonology uses to convert lexical representations into surface forms is significantly different from the familiar features and rules of traditional Generative Phonology, Yoshida does not question the abstract underlying forms that are so characteristic of the older approach. Consequently, at least in this respect, a reader who knows McCawley's venerable work on Japanese phonology will be on familiar territory. The book consists of a preface, eight chapters, a brief conclusion, and a list of references. This review will focus on details of a few of the analyses that Yoshida proposes.

At crucial points in several of his arguments, Yoshida makes phonetic claims for which he offers no evidence. For example, he says that the Japanese high back vowel 'tends to be pronounced with some lip rounding in deliberately articulated speech and when it is long' (26). Yoshida is certainly correct about lip activity (actually compression rather than rounding) being more likely in careful pronunciation, but the putative correlation with length is dubious. Since it would be theoretically convenient for Yoshida if lip activity were more likely in long /uu/ than in short /u/, a reader will suspect that theoretical desire is driving phonetic description. A more

charitable reaction would be to take Yoshida's claim as a challenge to gather relevant instrumental data. Yoshida's description of forms like /hoN+tte/ 'that the book' leaves less room for charity. He insists that the nasal is pronounced without closure unless the following stop degeminates, which means that [hoũtte] and [honte] are possible, but [hontte] is not (106–107). Native speakers will have trouble even pronouncing [hoũtte], to say nothing of accepting it as correct.

Yoshida does not come to terms with the many difficulties that recent loanwords cause for his analyses, but he occasionally mentions such loanwords in passing and makes it clear that he is not interested in trying to account for them. When it comes to the irregularities that are characteristic of morphophonemic phenomena, however, Yoshida does not even bother to comment. To cite just one example, his cursory description (30–31) of the notoriously haphazard sequential voicing alternations (e.g. /t/ ~ /d/, as in /tama/ 'ball' vs. /me+dama/ 'eyeball') attributes them to the operation of an automatic, low-level phonetic process. A reader who already knows something about Japanese phonology is left with the impression that tidy generalizations are being maintained by sweeping all the inconvenient exceptions under the rug, but of course the same criticism applies to much work in Generative Phonology as well.

In some cases, Yoshida ignores relevant data for no apparent reason. In his treatment of two-element Sino-Japanese 'compounds' he says, 'When the first element … ends with a syllable of the type *tu* and the second element begins with one of the four consonants *t, k, s, h*, the *tu* deletes and the following segment geminates' (34). An example is underlying ⟨betu+satu⟩, which surfaces as /bessatu/ 'separate volume'. The question that immediately arises is what happens when the first element ends with /ti/, /ku/ or /ki/ rather than with /tu/. Considering only the case of /ku/, the same sort of gemination occurs when the second element begins with /k/ (⟨gaku+kai⟩ → /gakkai/ 'academic society'), but not when it begins with one of the other consonants mentioned above (⟨gaku+setu⟩ → /gakusetu/ 'academic theory'). In Yoshida's account, the deletion of /tu/ in first elements like ⟨betu⟩ is initiated by severing the link between /t/ and its skeletal slot, but delinking /k/ from its skeletal slot in first elements like ⟨gaku⟩ will incorrectly trigger deletion and gemination in a huge number of words (e.g. ⟨gaku+setu⟩ → */gassetu/ instead of /gakusetu/). There is also the separate question of what prevents deletion and gemination from applying to native Japanese compounds such /matu+kasa/ 'pine cone'. All this is not to say that a more satisfactory account could not be formulated in Government Phonology, but Yoshida never even hints that anything remains to be accounted for.

Incidentally, it is not clear from Yoshida's exposition why delinking /t/ from its skeletal slot in Sino-Japanese words of the appropriate form should not count as a rule. In fact, Yoshida seems willing to stipulate what amount to rules whenever the principles and parameters of Government Phonology fail to produce the desired results. As an illustration, consider the problematic /k/ ~ /i/ alternation found in certain regular verbs (e.g. /kak+u/ 'writes', /kai+ta/ 'wrote'). Yoshida rejects a morphological treatment: 'I take the position that the … alternation is a phonological event' (132). The eventual consequence of this intransigence is an analysis in which /k/ deletes before an epenthetic /i/ but not before a lexical /i/. This solution smacks of absolute neutralization, and it makes Yoshida's characterization of traditional Generative Phonology as 'arbitrary and unconstrained' ring rather hollow.

One of Yoshida's most provocative claims is that all (C)(y)VV and (C)(y)VN sequences are disyllabic, and this claim leads to the conclusion that '… the motivation for the mora in Japanese disappears' (114). For some reason, however, Yoshida does not address the moraic status of geminate obstruents. An analysis that recognizes two-mora long syllables will syllabify a work like /mattaN/ 'end' as /mat-taN/, and the initial CVC syllable counts as two beats in traditional poetic meter just as the final CVN syllable does. Yoshida would assume a four-syllable underlying form ⟨ma-tu+ta-N⟩ for this Sino-Japanese word, and the surface geminate /tt/ would involve 'interonset structure' (33–35). In contrast, Yoshida would assume a two-syllable underlying form ⟨mat+ta⟩ for native Japanese /matta/ 'waited', and the surface geminate in this case would involve 'coda-onset structure' (33–35). Since the initial CVC in /matta/ also counts as two beats, the number of underlying syllables does not match the number of moras, and this mismatch makes Yoshida's silence very puzzling.

The criticisms sketched in this brief review have not done justice to Yoshida's book. His work is very thought-provoking, and one measure of its value is the fact that so much more remains to be said in response. The book is not comprehensive enough to serve as a text for a course on Japanese phonology, but it could be used very effectively in a course with advanced students who have already been through an introductory survey. It is marred by a number of typographical

errors in the phonetic transcriptions, but most of these – e.g. [M] for intended [ɯ] (120) – are so obvious that they are easily corrected in context.

Author's address: *Timothy J. Vance,*
Box 5617,
270 Mohegan Avenue,
New London, CT 06320-4196,
U.S.A.
E-mail: tjvan@conncoll.edu

(Received 19 November 1997)