



Project
MUSE[®]
Scholarly journals online

between different efficiency preferences, and will enable readers to see some familiar data in a new and more explanatory light.

The first of his principles is an extension of his claim of early immediate constituents (EIC), first made over a decade ago in *A performance theory of order and constituency* (Hawkins 1994). As he points out, however, MiD is a more general principle than EIC. For example, he showed some years ago that 1 would be preferred to 2.

- (1) The man waited for his son in the cold but not unpleasant wind.
- (2) The man waited in the cold but not unpleasant wind for his son.

The preposition phrase (PP) *for his son* is more easily processed after the verb, as others also have pointed out in their analyses of similar sentences (e.g. Frazier & Clifton, Jr. 1996), so H is not alone in supporting an interest in processing.

As the book proceeds, H takes in larger and larger constituents, and gives examples from more languages. He also sensibly raises questions about the ultimate causality of the performance-grammar preferences he discusses, suggesting (plausibly) that working memory load may be one factor. This is one of the relatively few places where he indicates that more may be happening than simple performance.

But H is so wedded to the (useful) belief that processing may influence grammars, and is so taken up with providing examples and statistics to support his points, that he possibly fails to give sufficient attention to the overall structure and complexity of language, particularly the general rule of thumb that languages prefer 'more of the same', in other words, are often guided by analogy. So while he may be right that formal grammars miss out on important considerations, he himself may be forgetting some of the lessons learned long ago—that languages may make grooves for themselves, and may retain these furrows, sometimes even at the expense of processing needs.

Of course, H is right to remind us that processing needs may affect language, and he provides some useful examples. But short-term processing is not the answer to everything. Languages are enormously complex amalgams, in which much more is happening simultaneously than people often realize. A variety of additional factors can affect grammar. At the very least: (i) Production and comprehension may clash: for example, speed of speech in production may delay perception, and disrupt comprehension; (ii) Language is not only used, it is also remembered, and patterns that aid memory may affect and even hinder processing; (iii) Language change takes place slowly. Even if processing requirements, in the long run, affect the grammar, it is hard to predict how long the time-lag will be: it might be decades, or even centuries; and (iv) The different levels of language alter at different speeds: sound change happens fast, morphological change moderately fast, and syntactic change slowly. 'Layering', the different meanings of the same word that is typically found in the lexicon, also affects the grammar.

In short, H has written a valuable book that must not be ignored. But his PGCH may not be the final key to understanding language, as he sometimes implies.

REFERENCES

- FRAZIER, LYN, and CHARLES R. CLIFTON, JR. 1996. *Construal*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 HAWKINS, JOHN A. 1983. *Word order universals*. New York: Academic Press.
 HAWKINS, JOHN A. 1994. *A performance theory of order and constituency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

45 Malvern Rd.
 London E8 3LP
 United Kingdom
 [jean.aitchison@worc.ox.ac.uk]

Movement and silence. By RICHARD S. KAYNE. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. Pp. xv, 376. ISBN 019517917X. \$39.95.

Reviewed by ANDREW CARNIE, *University of Arizona*

In the early to mid-1990s, as the minimalist program (MP) began to bloom, comparative syntax came into its own as a tool for investigating and explaining typological variation within

a universalist parametric approach to language. In particular, the investigation of microparametric variation tied to specific lexical items or even features became a central methodology within the framework. It would be hard to find anyone more influential in such studies than Richard Kayne.

Movement and silence is a collection of K's papers about parametric variation written between 2000 and 2005. All but one of these papers have appeared elsewhere, but some are in more difficult-to-find venues, so this volume is a welcome and accessible collocation of these works. This is K's third such collection (Kayne 1984, 2000 are older collections of articles); this one stands out, however, as the results reported in each paper are intricately tied to one another. With the exception of two papers, which are independently important, the book reads more like a tightly argued monograph than a mere collection of papers.

Running through the papers are two interrelated hypotheses, hinted at cleverly in the title of the book. First, we have the consequences of K's now-famous antisymmetry hypothesis. In particular, the book focuses on the movement operations (often massive and very abstract) that are necessary to account for word-order variation in the face of the claim that the underlying order of constituents is universally specifier-head-complement (S-H-C). Other orders require movement, often of remnant constituents, to the specifiers of a variety of functional (and occasionally lexical) projections. Because of the underlying assumptions of MP, variation among languages must be tied to the availability of these projections. This gives rise to the second hypothesis at work in the papers (but made most explicitly in the appendix to Ch. 8 and in Ch. 12), the principle of decompositionality: universal grammar imposes a maximum of one interpretable syntactic feature per lexical item. A consequence of this principle is that the range and number of categories is far richer than is typically posited. This result is compatible both with the Italian cartographic project (see, for example, Rizzi 1997, 2004, Cinque 1999, and Belletti 2004) and with the view that K and others (e.g. Koopman & Szabolcsi 2000) adopt where surface strings are derived through massive remnant movement.

The quantity and extent of the movement posited will surprise most syntacticians. Take, for example, the derivation of DP-internal prepositional phrases. Consider the derivation of the phrase *admiring a picture of John* given in Ch. 7¹ (138).

- | | |
|---|---|
| (1) admiring [John a picture] | → merger of K- <i>of</i> |
| K- <i>of</i> admiring [John a picture] | → movement of <i>John</i> to spec, K- <i>of</i> |
| John _i K- <i>of</i> admiring [t _i a picture] | → merger of <i>of</i> |
| of John _i K- <i>of</i> admiring [t _i a picture] | → movement of VP to spec, <i>of</i> [admiring |
| | [t _i a picture]] _j of John _i K- <i>of</i> t _j . |

Since everything moves out of its base position and results in a structure that seems to violate our basic understanding of constituency (note that *a picture of John* is not a constituent in this structure), it is not surprising that such derivations will be largely met with skepticism from researchers outside the antisymmetric paradigm. However, K (1998) convincingly argued that the constituency seen in the last line of 1 accounts for preposition stranding in English. One finds that similarly complex derivations are necessary in K's system to account for basic word order in Japanese (Ch. 9²), stylistic inversion in Romance (Ch. 1³), 'even/if' clauses in Irish (Ch. 2⁴), Heavy NP shift in English (Ch. 11⁵), causatives in French (Ch. 5⁶), and a wide variety of other cases.

¹ 'On some prepositions that look DP-internal: English *of* and French *de*.' *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 1.71–115, 2002.

² 'Antisymmetry and Japanese.' *English Linguistics* 20.1–40, 2003.

³ with Jean-Yves Pollock, 'New thoughts on stylistic inversion.' *Inversion in Romance*, ed. by Jean-Yves Pollock, 107–62. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

⁴ 'On the left edge in UG: A reply to McCloskey.' *Syntax* 3.44–51, 2000.

⁵ 'Some remarks on agreement and heavy-NP shift.' *Current issues in English linguistics* (Special publications of the English Linguistic Society of Japan, vol. 2), ed. by Masatimo Ukaji, Masayuki Ike-Uchi, and Yoshiki Nishimura, 75–100. Tokyo: Kaitakusha, 2003.

⁶ 'Prepositions as probes.' In Belletti, 192–212.

A similar level of abstractness is found in the other major theme in the book: the role of silent words in the syntax. K argues for a variety of null words in English, which at least partly reflect the principle of decompositionality, including PLACE, THING, AGE, YEARS, HOUR, À, K-of, OF, NUMBER, AMOUNT, MANY, MUCH, GOOD, VERY, COLOR, SIZE, CITY, STATE, -AINE⁷ and others in other languages such as French COMME, EVER, HOW. This is the topic of Chs. 4⁸, 7, 8⁹, 10¹⁰, and parts of Ch. 12. The evidence for such forms typically comes from the obligatoriness of a form in one language where such a form is absent in another. For example, the existence of a null HOURS in English is motivated by the fact that in French the equivalent word must be overt.

- (2) What time is it?
 a. It is six.
 b. Il est six *(heures).

But the range of explanation extends beyond simple comparisons between the choices of available words in a language. Take, for example, the surprising interaction of plurality with respect to the article when a quantifier such as *few* is present.

- (3) a. *a books
 b. a few books

Here it would appear as if the singular article *a* is taking the singular *few* as a complement, since *a* cannot normally be associated with plurals like *books*. At the same time, *few* is a very atypical noun, as it has comparative and superlative inflections: *fewer*, *fewest*. To solve this contradiction, K posits a null noun NUMBER, which heads the singular complement of *a*: *a few NUMBER books*.

Overall, the quantity of abstract and covert movement, coupled with the wide variety of empty categories, leads one to wonder what is NOT possible in the system K proposes. What range of variation is impossible given the availability of massive remnant movements and null words? The illusion of a lack of predictive power might seem to be devastating for the universalist antisymmetric endeavor. I think, however, that such criticism would be too hasty. At its heart, the question is not really theoretical, but empirical. The range of possible variation is determined by what we find attested crosslinguistically. For example, one might observe that the relatively robust crosslinguistic absence of discourse-neutral object-subject orders may well be a consequence of the lack of functional projections to license such objects. Similarly, while K shows that there is evidence for a silent YEARS, he claims there is no evidence in the languages he looks at for WEEKS or DAYS (Ch. 10). While differences among languages may be determined lexically (and thus may well exhibit subtle, fine-grained, and far-reaching variations), there exist universally determined limits on what items are available. Whether this turns out to be a valid argument or not turns on examining a wide range of languages. The investigative task in determining this has only just begun.

There are two chapters that do not obviously fit into the main themes of the book and a third that requires special mention. Ch. 3 is K's (2001) review of Paola Benincà's *La variazione sintattica: Studi di dialettologia romanza* (which appeared in *Romance Philology* 54.492–99). The review provides a useful English language summary of an important work on microvariation for those of us who don't read Italian. The fact that the review is replicated in this collection is entirely justified to ensure its wide distribution.

⁷ This is a nominalizing morpheme that attaches to numerals (from the French).

⁸ 'Here and there.' *Lexique, syntaxe et lexique-grammaire: Papers in honor of Maurice Gross*, ed. by Christian Leclère, Éric Laporte, Mireille Piot, and Max Silberstein, 253–75. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2004.

⁹ 'On the syntax of quantity in English.' New York: New York University, ms, 2002.

¹⁰ 'Silent years, silent hours.' *Grammar in focus: Festschrift for Christer Platzack 18 November 2003*, vol. 2, ed. by Lars-Olof Delsing, Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson, and Halldór Á. Sigurðsson, 209–26. Lund: Wallin and Dalholm, 2003.

Ch. 6¹¹, while it lies outside of the main themes of the book as articulated above, is perhaps one of the most important contributions in the book. It provides a movement-based analysis of binding relations. Pronouns and their antecedents are base-generated as a single constituent. The antecedent moves to its thematic position in a manner very similar to Ross's (1967) chopping transformations. Locality conditions in binding follow from successive cyclicity.

Ch. 12, 'Some notes on comparative syntax, with special reference to English and French', requires special mention. This paper appeared in the *Oxford handbook of comparative syntax*, which I reviewed for the *Journal of Linguistics* (Carnie 2006). I partly repeat here what I said there about this paper:

[This] is an excellent overview of the conceptual, methodological and theoretical issues that arise when addressing the question of why comparative research is so important within the generative parametric perspective. From now on I will assign the first part of this article to all my graduate students because I think it should be required reading for anyone doing comparative syntax. Kayne argues for a view where parameters are associated with particular lexical entries for functional categories. He observes that both macrocomparative work (which involves comparing divergent languages) and microcomparative work (which involves comparing closely related languages) is crucial to establishing comparative syntax as true science. Macrocomparative work will shed light on the wide range of possible variation, and microcomparative work will provide us with an understanding of what is varying and what types of variation are linked together.

While the distinction between macro- and microcomparative research is a fruitful descriptive notion, the heart of the chapter is Kayne's conjecture that all variation is ultimately controlled by microparameters, each associated with a particular functional category, and his further suggestion that perhaps EVERY functional element is the locus of some distinct parametric variation. Behind this proposal is the claim that much parametric variation has to do with the pronunciation or non-pronunciation of a wide variety of functional items. The rest of Kayne's chapter is devoted to examining a rich set of differences between French and English in precisely these terms. Starting with the observation that French, but not English, has a nominalizing morpheme (-*aine*) that attaches to numerals, Kayne shows how a variety of word order and case phenomena in English can be explained if we assume that English has an abstract, unpronounced -AINE. He then catalogues a number of unpronounced functional categories in the two languages and ties these to differences in syntactic movement, which adds rich empirical bonus to a chapter that begins with important metatheoretical considerations. (445)

I have two concerns about this important collection of papers. The first is embarrassingly trivial, as it really is just a matter of style and presentation, but it is something that frustrated me throughout the book. The detailed and intricate analyses in these papers are not presented in a user-friendly form. The book contains not a single tree; structures in complicated derivations (such as 1 above) are presented with only skeletal bracketing, if that. To work one's way through the detailed descriptions of the derivations of simple sentences, even experienced syntacticians will need access to a blackboard and a lot of patience. This problem is compounded by the fact that K rarely, if ever, provides word-by-word glosses of his foreign language examples. While literal translations of the examples are often given in brackets after the sentences, the precise meaning of individual words is totally lost to those of us whose mastery of French and Italian is poor.

This brings me to my second concern. This book contains two chapters on languages that K doesn't typically study and his treatment of the data in those chapters might best be described as unfortunate. Ch. 2 is a reply to a proposal of James McCloskey about movement in Irish. K makes extensive arguments about the nature of Irish 'even/if' clauses, but doesn't present a single Irish example. In fact, this chapter contains the jaw-dropping assertion that one can argue effectively about Irish using only examples from English. Ch. 9 is entitled 'Antisymmetry and Japanese'. It contains no examples from Japanese. In the subsection that purports to be on Japanese itself, one finds one example of German and a vague description of an analysis of some facts from central Turkic languages without the actual data itself. Given the strong view of

¹¹ 'Pronouns and their antecedents.' *Derivation and explanation in the minimalist program*, ed. by Samuel David Epstein and T. Daniel Seeley, 133–66. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

microparameterization that K is adopting here, it is not altogether surprising that he asserts ‘Evidence bearing on Japanese need not . . . come only from Japanese’ (217). Indeed, I think this is probably an accurate statement, but it does not excuse the lack of an attempt to find arguments from within the language one is discussing. This said, I am forced to admit—with my teeth gritted—that the points K makes using English and other languages about Irish and Japanese seem to be sound and reasonable analyses of my understanding of what the Irish and Japanese facts actually are, especially in the light of the particularly strong version of universal grammar assumed in this framework.

These two complaints aside, I cannot overemphasize the importance of the papers in this volume to anyone doing serious syntactic analysis. Controversial proposals like those presented in this volume challenge us all to address our underlying assumptions and help keep the syntactic endeavor interesting. These challenges, combined with the rich, detailed, and subtle analyses of (micro)parametric variation, surely mark this volume to be as important a record of K’s impressive output as his previous ones.

REFERENCES

- BELLETTI, ADRIANA (ed.) 2004. *Structures and beyond: The cartography of syntactic structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CARNIE, ANDREW. 2006. Review of *The Oxford handbook of comparative syntax*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque and Richard S. Kayne. *Journal of Linguistics* 42.444–52.
- CINQUE, GUGLIELMO. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KAYNE, RICHARD. 1984. *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- KAYNE, RICHARD. 1998. Overt vs. covert movement. *Syntax* 1.128–91.
- KAYNE, RICHARD. 2000. *Parameters and universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KOOPMAN, HILDA, and ANNA SZABOLCSI. 2000. *Verbal complexes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- RIZZI, LUIGI. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of grammar: Handbook of generative syntax*, ed. by Liliane M. Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- RIZZI, LUIGI (ed.) 2004. *The structure of CP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ROSS, JOHN R. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.

Department of Linguistics, Douglass 200E
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
[carnie@u.arizona.edu]

A grammar of Semelai. By NICOLE KRUSPE. (Cambridge grammatical descriptions.)
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pp. xxii, 493. ISBN 0521814979.
\$170 (Hb).

Reviewed by ALEXANDRA Y. AIKHENVALD, *La Trobe University*

Aslian languages, of the Mon-Khmer division of Austroasiatic, are not widely known. Most of them are in danger of disappearance, under the encroaching influence of the dominant Malay. This grammar of Semelai, by Nicole Kruspe, is the first comprehensive grammar of an Aslian language. It is based on substantial fieldwork, and cast—just like all worthwhile grammars—within basic linguistic theory.

The grammar starts with a detailed discussion of Aslian languages, their place within Mon-Khmer, and their prehistory and typological characteristics, followed by an up-to-date report on every language still spoken. In subsequent chapters, K offers readers a refined analysis of Semelai.

This is a most complex language, in just about every area. Among its most remarkable features is a nonconcatenative morphological system of prefixes and infixes (including infix reduplication), whereby affixes are attached to the left edge of the word as prefixes or as infixes depending