

a privileged role in determining what she has asserted. C&L's thesis is that what is asserted by an utterance is partly determined by how it will be reported in later contexts. In rejecting original-utterance centrism, speech act pluralism is led to a very expansive characterization of speech act content. Virtually all of C&L's opponents would dispute this metaphysics of speech act content, endorsing instead characterizations that are tied more or less tightly to the words used and the speaker's own context of utterance. Note that, although C&L do not provide an argument for their rejection of original-utterance centrism, it is clear that they are motivated by a strong commitment to taking reports about speech act content seriously.

C&L's characterization of speech act content leads to the disputed question whether the study of speech act content is tractable, that is, amenable to scientific theorizing. C&L maintain that it is not. There will never be a concrete, scientific answer to the question with which we began; and our best hope for saving semantics from the intractable swamp is to become minimalists. In contrast, many of C&L's opponents are engaged in the very project of developing scientific theories of speech act content. Arguably, this constitutes the deepest divide of all.

Authors' addresses: (Stainton)

*Department of Philosophy, University of Western Ontario,
1151 Richmond St., London, ON, N6A 3K7, Canada.
E-mail: rstainto@uwo.ca*

(Wearing)

*Department of Philosophy, Wellesley College,
106 Central Street, Wellesley, MA 02481, U.S.A.
E-mail: cwearing@wellesley.edu*

(Received 26 June 2005)

J. Linguistics 42 (2006). doi:10.1017/S0022226706223831
© 2006 Cambridge University Press

Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley & Sheila Ann Dooley (eds.), *Verb first: on the syntax of verb-initial languages* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 73). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2005. Pp. xiv + 431.

Reviewed by M. SIOBHÁN COTTELL, University of Ulster

The papers in this volume originated in a workshop in 2003 at the University of Arizona and represent a considerable body of work on the syntax of verb-initial languages. This is timely; as Kenji Oda puts it, 'recent developments in the Minimalist program ... provide an almost embarrassing wealth of possibilities for achieving V[erb]-initial order' (109), although it is to be

noted that not all the papers in this volume are Minimalist or even strictly generativist. Two interrelated questions motivate the collection:

- (i) Are the apparent typological similarities between V-initial languages derivable from some underlying property?
- (ii) Is a universal derivation of V-first order possible?

The contributions are divided into two sections: the first nine articles explore the derivation of V-initial word order, while the remaining seven consider categorical, prosodic and information structure issues.

Sandra Chung's 'What fronts? On the VP-raising account of verb-initial order' usefully sets the scene for what follows, presenting the issues that arise from a V(erb)P(hrase)-raising analysis of Verb Object Subject (VOS) word order. In particular, she shows, comparing Tongan, Tzotzil, Malagasy, Chamorro and Māori, that VOS languages do not pattern as a homogeneous group. She concludes that VP-raising is a possible, but not a necessary, solution to verb-initial order, and that much remains to be done.

Of course, one way of explaining predicate-initial order is to appeal to nonconfigurality. In 'Coordination and constituency in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish)', Henry Davis addresses this possibility. St'át'imcets has two dialects: one with canonical VOS order with a VSO alternate; the other with canonical VSO with both VOS and SVO alternates. In an intricate and engrossing exposition, Davis first shows that, with the exception of coordination, all tests argue for a hierarchical clause structure. He then evaluates a number of possibilities for deriving the alternate orders. A major section of the paper is devoted to the intractability of coordination and to ways of overcoming it.

Chung's conclusion that there is no single path to VOS order is neatly paralleled in Yuko Otsuka's contribution, entitled 'Two derivations of VSO: a comparison of Niuean and Tongan', which argues that, in spite of close genetic relatedness and superficial similarities, predicate raising in Niuean and Tongan targets different positions. This accounts for cross-linguistic differences with respect to scrambling and clitic placement. The claim is made that this difference is derivable from the featural content of the functional category Tense (T). In Niuean, T bears a [Pred(icate)] feature, while Tongan T has a [D(eterminer)] feature which must attract the subject.

Felicia Lee's 'Force first: clause-fronting and clause-typing in San Lucas Quiavini Zapotec' is the first of a number of papers which depend on the typological observation that verb-initial languages tend to have initial clause-typing particles. However, in San Lucas Quiavini Zapotec, some of these particles surface in clause-final position. Lee uses this observation to motivate an analysis of VOS order in terms of remnant VP-movement to the specifier of TP, with subsequent movement of TP to ForceP. Even in the absence of an overt particle, string-vacuous remnant VP-movement will apply if the C(omplementiser)-related features in the language are strong.

Initial particles also play an important role in Kenji Oda's article, 'V1 and *wh*-questions: a typology', which depends on the clause-typing generalisation of Cheng (1997). Allowing that V-initial order can be derived by either V-movement or VP-movement, he distinguishes the two by parametrising the EPP [Pred] feature in the C-T system. In essence, Oda argues that in a VP-movement language, a phi-related element cannot move to a C-T specifier position since C-T bears the EPP [Pred] feature. An implication of this is that Irish, which disallows clause-typing by movement, must be a VP-movement language, contrary to what is assumed in most previous analyses. The obvious objection that Irish has clause-initial *wh*-phrases is finessed by an analysis of *wh*-questions as pseudo-clefts.

Dirk Bury's paper, 'Preverbal particles in verb-initial languages', interprets the correlation between order and clause-typing particles rather differently, using it to motivate a model of syntax which defines phrase structures as sets ('treelets') which state only dominance relations. Defined thus, clause structure is 'flexible' and can be extended without cost. V-movement is a process at the Phonetic Form interface level, involving pronunciation of the verb in a derived head position which must be preceded by a specifier. In V-initial languages, where there is no preceding specifier, the verb must occur in the position of an independent element, such as the familiar clause-initial particles.

A more familiar view of Irish syntax is defended in James McCloskey's 'A note on predicates and heads in Irish clausal syntax'. By characteristically careful examination of ellipsis and coordination, he demonstrates that predicate-initial and verb-initial constructions are not a single phenomenon, and, further, that not all fronted predicates behave alike, with some predicate-initial constructions showing evidence of additional head-movement. The paper concludes with a discussion of predicate-subject order and explores the implications both of a movement analysis and of base-generating the subject in a rightward specifier.

We return to particles in 'Seediq: antisymmetry and final particles in a Formosan VOS language', in which Arthur Holmer presents an anti-symmetric analysis of a language which has VOS order and both initial and final particles, and compares the ordering of these particles to Atayal and Tongan. Holmer analyses Seediq as a predicate-raising language, which moves VP to TP. Subsequent movement pied-pipes a category dominating TP to a higher projection headed by a clausal particle, thereby deriving particle-initial order. In Tongan, however, the analogous particles surface as second-position clitics, which motivates a V-movement analysis, as in Otsuka's contribution.

Even more than in McCloskey's paper, VP-ellipsis is central to Lisa deMena Travis's argument in 'VP-internal structure in a VOS language'. Data involving ellipsis is used to compare a number of previous analyses of Malagasy, and Travis concludes that only an intraposition analysis, which

allows iterated predicate fronting, accounts for the interaction of ellipsis and adverbials. Crucially, the analysis takes Malagasy adverbs to be inflectional heads which license ellipsis, similarly to I(nflection) in English. However, while English licenses ellipsis of a complement, Malagasy elides specifiers. Thus, this paper not only addresses constituent order, but also furthers cross-linguistic understanding of ellipsis processes.

Niuean, the focus of Diane Massam's 'Lexical categories, lack of inflection, and predicate fronting in Niuean', lacks inflectional morphology. Massam analyses 'verbal' elements as nominal/participial in nature (a claim that is not new), which are thus freed from a need to check Tense or Agreement features. The category headed by such elements is available for predicate fronting, on the (universal) assumption that all clauses must involve displacement of some constituent from within ν P to a higher position. This view of predicate fronting has, of course, considerable typological and featural consequences for V-initial systems in general.

In David Gil's 'Word order without syntactic categories: how Riau Indonesian does it', the notion of underspecification is much more pervasive. Analysing Riau Indonesian as lacking any lexical, head/phrase or lexical/functional distinctions, he asks how the language comes to present many typological correlates of V-first order. The solution proposed adopts a single linearisation principle (heads precede modifiers) and principles of Iconicity (for conceptual reasons) and Information Flow (for functional reasons). Gil argues that, in combination, these principles result in superficial verb-initial order.

Another view of feature distribution is presented in Mélanie Jouisseau's 'Nominal properties of ν Ps in Breton: a hypothesis for the typology of VSO languages'. Jouisseau reduces three familiar Celtic phenomena (anti-agreement, construct states and genitive assignment to objects) to a single parameter, namely the interpretability of a [D] feature on ν . Parallels between ν Ps and DPs then follow, with V-to- ν raising as the counterpart of N-to-D raising. Complementary agreement effects are accounted for if, in addition to [D], ν P bears phi-features, in an analysis which draws on previous treatments of both incorporation and government.

Parallels between nominals and CPs are also addressed in Hilda Koopman's 'On the parallelism of DPs and clauses: evidence from Kisongo Maasai'. The claim is defended that, in Maasai, DPs that are headed by common nouns are always relative clauses, which entails that clauses and nominals have an identical substructure. In an intricate analysis of Maasai DPs, the author shows that a remnant copular constituent raises to CP. For clauses, Koopman argues for a similar movement of a predicate remnant to ForceP. In this way, clauses and nominals are shown to be maximally similar in their derivation.

In 'Ordering clitics and postverbal R-expressions in Tagalog: a unified analysis?', Loren Billings investigates whether Tagalog has VSO or VOS

order, together with the issue of whether, outside semantics, the notion 'subject' has any role in the language. The central claim is that Tagalog allows proper names to appear in clitic positions. Once this is accepted, the language has unmarked subject-final order, with the effect that subjecthood is indeed relevant. The paper leaves open, however, whether or not subject-final order is derived or base-generated.

In 'The syntax of Chalcatongo Mixtec: preverbal and postverbal', Monica Macaulay discusses two types of preverbal constituents in an otherwise VSO language. Having compared the data to the standard implicational universals (Greenberg 1966), which yields interesting and not entirely predictable results, she analyses the preverbal constituents in terms of Topic and Focus. VSO order is argued to involve movement of V to a position above IP, with postverbal subjects in the specifier of IP.

Movement to C in the derivation of predicate-initial order is also proposed in 'Accounting for verb-initial order in an Australian language' by Mary Laughren, Rob Pensalfini & Tom Mylne. Once again, Focus is involved. For the Australian language Wanyi, the authors claim that predicate-movement to the specifier of CP checks the Focus feature and, importantly, that predicates are lexical predicative phrases. Verbal and nominal predicates are analysed as complements of functional V and N, respectively. Evidence for a Focus analysis comes from the complementary distribution of these predicates with *wh*-phrases, focussed XPs and the phrasal marker expressing clausal negation.

As this brief summary shows, the answers to questions (i) and (ii) above appear to be negative, and the editors admit as much in the introduction. What emerges instead is that V-first order is a most intricate matter. This conclusion has important implications for syntactic theory more generally, since if V-first order can be derived in many different ways, verb-medial and verb-final orders may be just as diverse. Thus, this book will be of interest not only to specialists in the area, but to typologists and syntacticians more widely, and will offer both support and challenge.

Most of the papers here rely on either head-movement or XP-movement of the predicate. Neither is entirely innocent. The first depends on a process which some have argued not to be part of syntax at all (cf. Bury's article in this collection and Chomsky 2001). The second would appear in many cases to require evacuation of all phrasal constituents, including adjuncts, from *v*/VP prior to raising – a matter which is touched on by McCloskey and Massam, but not by all contributors. It remains unclear which positions these constituents eventually come to occupy, although, to be fair, V-movement analyses are also not immune from an apparent requirement of argument positions external to *v*P (cf. McCloskey 1996). However, much Minimalist work of the last decade has been devoted to eliminating such positions, although this is, ultimately, an empirical issue.

REVIEWS

Finally, there is one central and poignant fact that pervades this book. Linguistic analysis of this calibre relies crucially on the intuitions of native speakers, and written records – if they even exist – are always woefully inadequate for such finely-grained work. With so many of the languages examined here in danger of extinction, a collection such as this may be simply impossible in a couple of decades' time.

REFERENCES

- Cheng, L. (1997). *On the typology of wh-questions*. New York: Garland.
Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by phase. In Kenstowicz, M. (ed.), *Ken Hale: a life in language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 1–52.
Greenberg, J. (1966). Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In Greenberg, J. (ed.), *Universals of language* (2nd edn.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 73–113.
McCloskey, J. (1996). Subjects and subject positions in Irish. In Borsley, R. D. & Roberts, I. (eds.), *The syntax of the Celtic languages: a comparative perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 241–283.
Author's address: School of Communication, University of Ulster at Jordanstown, Shore Road, Newtownabbey, Co. Antrim BT37 0QB, Northern Ireland, U.K.
E-mail: ms.cottell@ulster.ac.uk

(Received 16 September 2005)

J. Linguistics 42 (2006). doi:10.1017/S0022226706233838
© 2006 Cambridge University Press

Laura J. Downing, T. Alan Hall & Renate Raffelsiefen (eds.), *Paradigms in phonological theory* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 8). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Pp. x + 349.

Reviewed by JEROEN VAN DE WEIJER, Leiden University

This book, which resulted from a conference held at the Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft in Berlin in March 2001, is a collection of eleven chapters, of which the first is an introduction by the editors. In this chapter, entitled 'Introduction: the role of paradigms in phonological theory', the editors first present a brief history of the role of paradigms in pre-generative work, focusing on the Neogrammarian doctrine of exceptionless sound laws. Exceptions to these laws were analysed by having recourse to analogical influence. In the period of phonology dominated by Chomsky & Halle's (1968) *The sound pattern of English*, there was no role for paradigm uniformity in any formal sense (although its effects were of course observed, as Luigi Burzio points out in his contribution). The advent of Optimality Theory brought new possibilities of incorporating paradigm uniformity into the grammar, most specifically by recognising Output–Output correspondence relations between paradigmatically related words. This line of