

Kayne, Richard S. (2005) *Movement and Silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp 376+xv.

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 Kayne'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 Kayne's third such collection (Kayne 1984 and 2000 being 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 Kayne'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 in this book (but made most explicitly in the appendix to chapter 8 and in chapter 12), the Principle of Decompositionality: UG 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 Kayne and others (e.g., Koopman and 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 chapter 7¹ (pg. 138):

- 1) *admiring* [John a picture] → merger of *K-of*
K-of *admiring* [John a picture] → movement of *John* to spec, *K-of*
John_i K-of *admiring* [*t_i* a picture] → merger of *of*
of John_i K-of *admiring* [*t_i* a picture] → movement of VP to spec, *of*
[*admiring* [*t_i* a picture]]_j *of John_i K-of t_j*.

¹ "On Some Prepositions that Look DP-internal: English *of* and French *de*." (2002)

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, Kayne (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 Kayne's system to account for basic word order in Japanese (chapter 9²), stylistic inversion in Romance (chapter 1³), even/if clauses in Irish (chapter 2⁴), Heavy NP shift in English (chapter 11⁵), causatives in French (chapter 5⁶), and a wide variety of other cases.

A similar level of abstractness is found in the other major theme in the book: the role of silent words in the syntax. Kayne 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, -AINE and others in other languages

²"Antisymmetry and Japanese" (2003) *English Linguistics*, 1-40.

³ With Jean-Yves Pollock, "New Thoughts on Stylistic Inversion" in A. Hulk and J.-Y. Pollock, eds. (2001) *Inversion in Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 107-162.

⁴ "On the Left edge in UG: A Reply to McCloskey" (2000) *Syntax* 3: 44-51.

⁵ "Some Remarks on Agreement and Heavy-NP-shift". in M. Ukaji, M. Ike-Uchi, and Y. Nishimara, eds. (2003) *Current Issues in English Linguistics*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha. 67-86.

⁶ "Prepositions of Probes" in A. Belletti ed. (2004) *Structures and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

such as French COMME, EVER, HOW. This is the topic of chapters 4⁷, 7, 8⁸, 10⁹ (and parts of 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, Kayne posits a null noun NUMBER, which heads the

⁷ "Here and There" in C. Leclère, E. Laporte, M. Piot, and M. Silberstein, eds. (2004)

Lexique Syntaxe, et Lexique-Grammaire/Syntax, Lexis and Lexicon Grammar; papers in Honor of Maurice Gross. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 253-275

⁸ "On the Syntax of Quantity in English". Listed as "to appear in a festschrift"

⁹ "Silent Years, Silent hours" in L. Delsing et al. eds. (2003) *Grammar in Focus: Festschrift for Christer Platzack*, vol. 2. Lund: Wallin and Dalholm. pp. 209-226.

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 Kayne proposes. What range of variation is impossible given the availability massive remnant movements and null words? The illusion of a lack of predictive power might seem to be devastating for the universalist antisymmetric endeavor. But I think, however, that the criticism is 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 cross-linguistic absence of discourse-neutral object-subject orders may well be a consequence of the lack of functional projections to license such objects. Similarly, while Kayne 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 (chapter 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 don't obviously fit into the main themes of the book and a third that requires special mention. Chapter 3 is a review of Benincà's *La variazione sintattica: Studi di dialettologia romanza*, which appeared in *Romance Philology* (vol. 54: 492-499). The review provides a useful English language summary of an important work on microvariation for those of us who don't speak Italian. The fact that the review is replicated in this collection is entirely justified to ensure its wide distribution.

Chapter 6¹⁰, while it lies outside the main themes of the book as I articulated them 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.

Chapter 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 will partly repeat 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

¹⁰ "Pronouns and their antecedents", originally published in S. Epstein and D. Seeley, eds. (2002) *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 133-166.

what types of variation are linked. 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 that attaches to numerals (*-aine*), 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 goes on to catalogue a number of unpronounced functional categories in the two languages and ties these to differences in syntactic movement, which adds an incredibly rich empirical bonus to a chapter that begins with important metatheoretical considerations."

I did 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's 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 bracketings, if that. To work one's way through the detailed descriptions of the derivations of simple sentences even experienced syntacticians will need access to blackboard and a lot of patience. This is compounded by the fact that Kayne rarely, if

ever, provides interlinear 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 Kayne doesn't typically study and his treatment of the data in those chapters might best be described as unfortunate. Chapter 2 is a reply to a proposal of McCloskey about movement in Irish. Kayne 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. Chapter 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 microparameterization that Kayne is adopting here it isn't altogether surprising that he asserts "Evidence bearing on Japanese need not [...] come only from Japanese" (pg. 217). Indeed, I think this is probably an accurate statement, but it doesn't excuse the lack of making an attempt to find arguments from within the language one is discussing. This said, I'm forced to admit -- with my teeth gritted -- that the points Kayne 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 can't emphasize 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 an important record of Kayne's impressive output as his previous.

References:

- Belletti, A. ed. (2004) *Structures and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Carnie, A. (2005) Review of Guglielmo Cinque & Richard S. Kayne (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative syntax*. *Journal of Linguistics* 42: 444-452.
- Cinque, G (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, R. (1984) *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht: Foris
- Kayne, R. (2000) *Parameters and Universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koopman, H. and A. Szabolcsi (2000) *Verbal Complexes*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, L. (1997) The Fine Structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (3d.) *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press. pp281-337.
- Rizzi, L. ed. (2004) *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Volume 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Department of Linguistics, Douglass 200E

University of Arizona

Tucson AZ 85721

carnie@u.arizona.edu