mind, largely convincing picture of where our best science of language and mind is and should be going.

Author's address: School of Philosophy, University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, U.K.
E-mail: john.collins@uea.ac.uk
(Received 18 March 2007)

Balkız Öztürk, *Case, referentiality and phrase structure* (Linguistik Aktuell/ Linguistics Today **77**). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2005. Pp. xii + 268.

Reviewed by JAKLIN KORNFILT, Syracuse University

This book is probably the first published doctoral thesis on Turkish syntax since Erguvanlı (1984), and is thus very valuable for Turkish studies, for linguistic typology, and for theoretical syntax.

The focus of investigation includes a rather large area of Turkish syntax, given that the author addresses questions such as whether nominal phrases are Noun Phrases (NPs) or Determiner Phrases (DPs), whether the Turkish clause has a functional projection *v*P, and what the architecture of the clause is in Turkish. Some of the problems tackled are issues of long standing – for example, the fact that direct objects that are not referential cannot exhibit accusative case marking, and that similarly, subjects of embedded nominalized clauses reject the otherwise obligatory genitive case marking when they are non-referential. (This latter observation can be found in the literature much less often.)

The aims of the book in terms of coverage are thus very impressive. The question is whether the proposed edifice is quite as solid and well-founded in its entirety as claimed. My answer will be that it is not – but this is not necessarily a negative assessment; as a doctoral thesis, this is a very solid achievement, and my main criticism is directed towards the editor(s), who should have insisted on more thorough revisions of the dissertation than have been made.

The first chapter, the 'Introduction', proposes two conditions for argumenthood: (i) visibility via case marking and theta-role assignment, and (ii) the assignment of referentiality. The claim is that these conditions are not independent from each other but intimately connected, and that argumenthood and referentiality are assigned in the same domain. Configurationality is defined here as the availability of case-driven Agree. Whether a language is configurational or not is claimed to result from the interaction of case and referentiality.

The second chapter, 'Referentiality in Turkish', proposes that in Turkish, case interacts directly (i.e. not via any functional categories) with referentiality, claiming that Turkish has no evidence for a DP projection because it has no determiners. Nominal phrases in Turkish are argued to be NPs, which are predicates that can be turned into arguments by the case marker, which is thus viewed as a type shifter. The case marker is also a referentiality marker. Case and referentiality are both assigned (or licensed) by the same functional head. This holds for Turkish and other typologically similar languages, in contrast to languages where case-checking takes place in the domains of vP and Tense Phrase (TP), and where determiners express referentiality. In such languages, e.g. English, the conditions for case and referentiality are independent from each other.

The same chapter also addresses nouns devoid of overt case marking, a topic familiar in traditional, typological, and generative studies of Turkish. The author proposes that, in Turkish, case assignment cannot be carried out in the complement position of verbs, but only in higher positions where the NP is type-shifted into an argument, and that case and referentiality are assigned to that argument at the same time, as mentioned earlier. If the NP is merged in a lower position, such as the complement position, the NP cannot be type-shifted and instead forms a complex predicate with the verb. Complex predicate formation is handled via Massam's (2001) proposed pseudo-incorporation. This account, designed for direct objects by Massam, is claimed here to extend to subjects. This chapter also has an appendix on indefinites and case, which is further divided into a section on non-specific indefinites and another on specific indefinites.

The third chapter is entitled 'Case, referentiality and non-configurationality'. The author characterizes her approach to clause structure as Neo-Davidsonian. She proposes that the positions in which NPs can undergo typeshifting to arguments are those in the functional clausal domain above the Verb Phrase (VP), where both case and referentiality are assigned. She also suggests that Turkish clauses have no vP layer, and that the TP-level does not interact with case licensing, either. Consequently, there is no case-driven Agree with the heads of the functional projections of vP and TP in Turkish, nor in Japanese and Hungarian; all arguments are equidistant with respect to the verb. This results, under the proposals made, in a non-configurational phrase structure. Öztürk further claims that non-configurational languages like Turkish, Japanese and Hungarian share typological properties such as pseudo-incorporation, scrambling, argument-drop, and lack of superiority effects.

In contrast, configurational languages whose referential nominal phrases are DPs exhibit case-driven Agree with the heads of vP and TP for case purposes, as in English. Such languages do not have free word order, argument-drop, or pseudo-incorporation, but they do exhibit superiority effects. Chinese is a third type of language which combines some features of each of the

previous two types: on the one hand, it exhibits neither free word order nor pseudo-incorporation and is thus like English; on the other hand, it has argument-drop and lacks superiority effects and is thus like Turkish. Chapter 3 also has an appendix on case-driven Agree and language acquisition.

The fourth chapter, entitled 'Concluding remarks', is a summary of the results of chapters 2 and 3.

I now turn to a discussion of some specific proposals.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST DP IN TURKISH. The arguments against a DP in Turkish are central to the book. They are based largely on the claim that Turkish does not have determiners. However, Turkish does have demonstratives, and it has an indefinite article. The author denies to the morpheme *bir* 'one, a' the status of an indefinite determiner. Her main argument is based on claims made in Crisma (1997) and Longobardi (2001) that if a language has only one article, it will be a definite rather than an indefinite article. Since Turkish has no definite article, the author claims that *bir* cannot be an indefinite determiner. This reasoning is circular. Turkish is dismissed as a language having an indefinite, but no definite, article, based on cross-linguistic statistics. But in the very same statistics on which the author bases her argument that *bir* is not an indefinite article, Turkish could not appear as a counterexample, given the author's classification of *bir*. In addition, there are good reasons for characterizing *bir* as an indefinite article, because its syntactic properties as an article differ clearly from those when it is a numeral; such distinctions are to be found in any good grammar of Turkish and include differences in placement with respect to adjectives and relative clauses.

The author is right in stating that in a head-final language such as Turkish, determiners would be expected to follow the head noun if they occupy D, rather than precede the noun, as they do in Turkish. But this argues only against an analysis of these determiners as D, and is fully compatible with an analysis in which the determiners occupy the specifier position of DP.

Furthermore, the author's arguments against a DP-analysis for Turkish nominal phrases, with an abstract D-head, are invalid and inconsistent. Öztürk dismisses such an analysis, claiming that head-movement in a putative head-final DP cannot be diagnosed. However, exactly such head-movements to D have been proposed, e.g. in von Heusinger & Kornfilt (2005), for partitive phrases and other nominal phrases in Turkish. While those analyses may be faulty, they do deserve discussion before the analysis is discarded. Moreover, the author herself assumes head-movement in clauses, i.e. raising of V to higher functional heads such as T – an assumption that is crucial for the book, as it offers motivation for the author's claim that all arguments in Turkish are equidistant to the predicate. Given that clauses are head-final in Turkish, it seems to me to be an inconsistent position to assume that head-movement can be diagnosed in clauses but not in the DP domain.

RELEVANCE OF TP IN TURKISH. The author assumes that Turkish has a TP, with T housing tense features, but that T (and its specifier position) are not involved with subject case, and that therefore there is no obligatory movement to the specifier of TP (SpecTP). Contrary to this claim, I would argue that firstly, there are instances with obligatory movement, motivated by case, to (a matrix) SpecTP, and that secondly, even in the absence of such movement, T (+Agr) is important in the licensing of case.

The first point can be argued with respect to Subject Raising, considered by the author to support her claim that movement to SpecTP is an optional phenomenon. However, the following pair of examples shows that there are instances where movement to SpecTP is obligatory.

(1) (a) Sen$_i$ ban-a [t$_i$ üzül-müş] gibi görün-üyor-sun
        you I-ACC   upset-PAST as   seem-PROG-2SG
        'You seem to me to be upset.'
    (b) *ban-a [sen üzül-müş] gibi görün-üyor(-sun)
         I-ACC you upset-PAST as   seem-PROG-2SG
        Intended reading: 'To me, you seem to be upset.'

When the embedded clause lacks person and number agreement marking for the local subject, raising of that subject to matrix subject position is obligatory, as demonstrated by the ungrammaticality of (1b). This shows that raising to SpecTP can be obligatory, and also that T (+Agr) is involved in case licensing.

The second point is that even in the absence of movements to specifier positions of functional heads, case licensing could be performed within a hierarchically structured clausal architecture, by functional heads such as T(+Agr), which can function as probes. Agree via probes has been widely used to account for a number of phenomena.

PROBLEMS WITH CASE AS THE DIRECT LICENSER OF REFERENTIALITY. The first problem is linked to the unclarity of the notion of case used here, that is, whether it is a purely syntactic, abstract notion or a morphological one. When discussing the relationship between case and referentiality, the author appears to take morphological case to directly reflect syntactic case as the factor assigning referentiality to NPs. This leads us to expect that all nominal phrases with overt case should be referential. But this is so only for accusative and genitive, or, to use the terminology of Kornfilt (1984), in the two 'structural' cases. In oblique cases, there is no relationship to referentiality. Thus, in examples such as (2), the dative object CAN be generic or non-referential.

(2) Ali sinema-ya   git-ti
    Ali cinema-DAT go-PAST
    'Ali went to the movies.'

The author mentions that generic phrases can be considered referential (following Carlson 1977). However, note that a generic interpretation is also possible for bare direct objects of transitive verbs, as seen in (3).

(3) Ali dondurma sev-iyor
     Ali ice-cream   love-PROG
     'Ali loves ice-cream.'

The direct object, which is missing accusative case, is interpreted generically, just as the dative object in (2) is. Thus, if a generic interpretation is considered to be referential, then the direct object in (3) would have to be referential, too. But since it lacks accusative marking, the impact of case on the referential interpretation, claimed to be so central and direct in this book, would be negated completely. Accordingly, Öztürk's insistence on a direct link between morphological case-marking and referentiality leads to both empirical problems and inconsistencies.

NULL ARGUMENTS. In connection with the book's focus on the configurationality 'parameter' and its claim that Turkish has a non-configurational phrase structure, the author addresses the issue of null arguments, claiming that *pro* in Turkish and other non-configurational languages, in contrast to *pro* in configurational null-subject languages, does not need to be licensed by local overt agreement, as previously claimed in the literature. Two main arguments are offered. First, Öztürk argues that both empty subjects and empty objects in Turkish are pronouns and that the absence of object agreement in Turkish suggests that an object *pro* can be licensed without overt agreement. She concludes that therefore, no agreement should be necessary for an empty subject *pro* either. Secondly, she claims that the empty subjects of certain adjunct clauses without local agreement are *pro*; again, if such instances of *pro* are licensed without local agreement, then the overt agreement found with most other instances of *pro* is not needed for purposes of licensing and identification of *pro*. I am unconvinced by these arguments, and I would analyze empty objects in Turkish as silent variables, and the silent subjects of the adjunct clauses in question as instances of PRO; some argumentation and examples follow.

While the book argues against the possibility of silent object variables (although not convincingly in my opinion; see below), the possibility of PRO as a subject of certain adjunct clauses is not addressed, cf. (4).

(4) [*ec* gel-ince],   (ben) Ahmet-le   konuş-acağ-ım
        come-when   I   Ahmet-with talk-FUT-1SG
     'When s/he/I come(s), I will talk to Ahmet.'
     (Note: *ec*=empty category)

The silent subject of the adjunct clause in (4) can refer either to the matrix subject with its 1.SG features, or to the comitative phrase with its 3.SG

740

features. If we analyze this silent subject as a pragmatically controlled PRO (cf. Kornfilt 2003), these facts are accounted for. Note that this silent subject does not impose any inherent phi-feature combination, as made clear by the translation, and as opposed to clear-cut instances of *pro*, i.e. the empty subject licensed by local overt agreement. (For additional arguments distinguishing *pro* and PRO in Turkish, see Kornfilt 1996, where further arguments in favor of a configurational phrase structure in Turkish are presented, including effects of the Binding Theory conditions B and C.)

Turning to silent objects, the author claims that the ungrammaticality of (5) (Öztürk's example (211), 214) under a co-referential reading between the empty object and the subject is due to a violation of the Binding Theory condition B.

(5) Mary$_i$ *ec*$_{*i/j}$ sev-iyor
    Mary   love-PROG
    'Mary loves him/her/it/*herself.'

If condition B is violated, the empty category is *pro*, according to the author. However, the ill-formedness of the relevant reading could also be due to a condition C violation, if the silent object is a silent variable, bound by an abstract topicalization operator. There is evidence for the latter analysis, if examples are considered where condition B is irrelevant, and condition C explains ill-formedness:

(6) Mary$_i$, [Ali-nin$_j$ *ec*$_{*i/*j/k}$ sev-diğ-in]-i   söyle-di
    Mary   Ali-GEN   love-FNOM-3SG-ACC say-PAST
    'Mary$_i$ said that Ali$_j$ loves her$_{*i}$/himself$_{*j}$/him$_k$/her$_k$/it$_k$.'

The silent object in the embedded clause in (6) cannot be co-indexed with *Mary*, even though this would not give rise to a condition B violation, as *Mary* would not be a local binder of the silent object, not being its clause-mate. However, condition C would indeed be violated if the silent object is a variable, given that elements sensitive to condition C must be free everywhere, not just in their local binding domain.

Uncontroversial instances of *pro*, as in a silent embedded subject, are well-formed in similar contexts, as seen in (7).

(7) Mary$_i$, [*pro*$_i$ Ali-yi   sev-diğ-in]-i   söyle-di
    Mary   Ali-ACC love-FNOM-3SG-ACC say-PAST
    'Mary$_i$ said that she$_i$ loves Ali.'

The silent embedded subject is preferably interpreted as co-indexed with Mary (but can also be anteceded by a discourse referent). Since the silent object obviously has different syntactic properties than the silent subject, I thus continue to claim that the silent subject in (7), where it is licensed by local agreement, is an instance of *pro*, while the silent object in (6) is a silent variable. Therefore, the author's claim that local agreement is not the

licenser of silent subjects in Turkish does not go through, and one of the bases for her proposed characterization of Turkish as a non-configurational language thus is lost as well.

These points of criticism should be viewed as positive observations about this book. They illustrate the wide coverage of the book, and show how strongly it can motivate further thought, observation, and explanation. It is a very welcome addition to generative studies of Turkish syntax, and interesting reading for any syntactician.

REFERENCES

Carlson, Greg. 1977. A unified analysis of the English bare plural. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1, 413–457.
Crisma, Paola. 1997. Nominals without the article in the Germanic languages. Ms., Università di Padova. [Published version in 1999. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 24, 105–125.]
Erguvanlı, Eser Emine. 1984. *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Heusinger, Klaus von & Jaklin Kornfilt. 2005. The case of the direct object in Turkish: Semantics, syntax and morphology. *Turkic Languages* 9, 3–44.
Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1984. *Case marking, agreement and empty categories in Turkish*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1996. Turkish and configurationality. In Bengisu Rona (ed.), *Current issues in Turkish linguistics*, 111–125. Ankara: Hitit.
Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2003. Subject case in Turkish nominalized clauses. In Uwe Junghanns & Luka Szucsich (eds.), *Syntactic structures and morphological information*, 129–215. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2001. The structure of DPs: Some principles, parameters and problems. In Mark Baltin & Chris Collins (eds.), *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, 562–601. Oxford: Blackwell.
Massam, Diane. 2001. Pseudo noun incorporation in Niuean. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 19, 153–197.

Author's address: Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics, Syracuse University, 340 HBC, Syracuse, NY 13244-1160, U.S.A.
E-mail: kornfilt@syr.edu
(Received 7 March 2007)

Edgar W. Schneider, Kate Burridge, Bernd Kortmann, Rajend Mesthrie & Clive Upton (eds.), *A handbook of varieties of English: A multimedia reference tool*, vol. 1: *Phonology*, vol. 2: *Morphology and syntax* & CD-ROM. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004. Pp. xvii+1168 (vol. 1) & xvii+1226 (vol. 2).

Reviewed by DAVID BRITAIN, University of Essex

For those of us who teach courses on varieties of English, the appearance of these volumes will be very welcome indeed. Yes, there are books which already provide introductory accounts of English around the world, but they are either rather outdated or concentrate on one aspect of variation