Principles & Parameters approach carry over to its Minimalist successor, so that the advantages of the HPSG analysis would remain intact.

In sum, I consider this book to be a highly successful combination of fine-grained empirical research on a particular language and theoretical analysis in a formal linguistic framework. One can disagree with details of the account, add more data or develop extensions of the analysis. In any case, this book will have a strong impact on the development of future accounts of negation in natural language, and is likely to encourage more research on the grammar of Welsh.

REFERENCES

Ladusaw, W. (1992). Expressing negation. In Barker, C. & Dowty, D. (eds.), *SALT II: proceedings from the Second Conference on Semantics and Linguistic Theory*. Columbus, OH: Department of Linguistics, The Ohio State University. 237–259.
Laka, I. (1990). *Negation in syntax: on the nature of functional categories and projections*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
Swart, H. de & Sag, I. (2002). Negation and negative concord in Romance. *Linguistics and Philosophy* **25**. 373–417.
Zeijlstra, H. (2004). *Sentential negation and negative concord*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Author's address: UiL-OTS/Department of French, Utrecht University,
Kromme Nieuwegracht 29, 3512 HD Utrecht,
The Netherlands.
E-mail: henriette.deswart@let.uu.nl
(Received 27 January 2006)

Guglielmo Cinque & Richard S. Kayne (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. Pp. xii+977.

Reviewed by ANDREW CARNIE, University of Arizona

Generative linguistics has long had a bad reputation of being narrowly focused on English. Indeed, some functionalist linguists refer to themselves as 'evidence-based linguists' (a definition that is meant to play on this stereotype), and many functionalists claim to be the only linguists who study language variation. While I think that generative grammar never really had the Anglocentric bias attributed to it, it is certainly the case that since the mid-1980s and the advent of parametric research, comparative work has become absolutely central to Chomskyan syntactic theory. One cannot seriously attempt to define the range of parameters without doing significant cross-linguistic work, nor can one refine the parameters without doing microcomparative work between dialects. The volume under review presents a broad spectrum of work that focuses on comparative syntax from a generative perspective. Although grounded in recent generative theories of

syntax, it will be of value to linguists who do not work within the Minimalist framework. There is a rich tapestry of data in this large book that will undoubtedly be of interest to typologists, descriptive linguists, and syntacticians who work in other frameworks.

The book begins with three chapters that, in addition to reporting specific research findings, address both methodological and 'big picture' issues. The remainder of the book consists of articles organized alphabetically by the author's last name. In this review, I will first give a brief summary and critique of the individual articles, grouping the articles thematically rather than alphabetically. I will then offer some short remarks on the structure of this book and books of its kind.

The first article in the book, Richard Kayne's 'Some notes on comparative syntax, with special reference to English and French', 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) are 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 a rich empirical bonus to a chapter that begins with important metatheoretical considerations.

If language variation reduces to differences in parameterization, it then follows that we can investigate these mental parameters from the perspective

of language acquisition and language disorders that affect the parameters. These topics are addressed in chapter 2 (Luigi Rizzi's 'On the grammatical basis of language development: a case study') and chapter 3 (Arhonto Terzi's 'Comparative syntax and language disorders'), which come to surprisingly different conclusions.

Rizzi's contribution discusses the possibility that child language consistently exhibits patterns that are attested in some adult language. He starts with the observation that the most robust parameters (such as headedness) appear to be set very early and don't exhibit maturational effects, which led to Wexler's (1998) Very Early Parameter Setting (VEPS) hypothesis, i.e. the idea that parameter setting occurs prior to the stage of multiword production. One notable exception to the VEPS hypothesis appears to be the dropping of subjects, which is present in the acquisition of both null subject languages (NSLs) and non-NSLs, and apparently needs to be 'unlearned' for non-NSLs such as English. Rizzi dismisses a processing account of this phenomenon, and instead suggests that subject omission in non-NSLs reduces to two distinct kinds of null subjects: (i) subject topics in the left periphery of the clause; and (ii) subjects of (root) infinitives. These are distinct from the subject omissions found in rich-morphology NSLs. While topic drop involves grammatical options that are also available in adult non-NSLs (cf. topic drop in English diary registers and Chinese pro-drop), subjects of root infinitives disappear when root infinitives disappear, i.e. the maturational effects of subject omission in languages like English do not correspond to a parameter setting, but reduce to the unavailability of root infinitives in later stages of child language. Thus, the overlying theme of Rizzi's paper is that child language serves as yet another 'dialect' for the purposes of investigating parameterization in Universal Grammar.

Terzi comes to the opposite conclusion in an article whose empirical domain is the positioning of clitics in the language of Cypriot Greek speakers with Specific Language Impairment. She claims that disordered speech does not, in general, correspond to an adult pattern, as it may involve significant divergences from Universal Grammar and is not necessarily similar to ANY normal language form. This conclusion is particularly striking given that Terzi assumes that Specific Language Impairment is in essence a severe developmental delay in parameter setting. Nevertheless, she notes the important role that delayed language can play in investigating phenomena that develop very quickly in early normal language.

Clitics are also discussed in the chapters by Paola Benincà & Cecilia Poletto, Jamal Ouhalla, and Eduardo Raposo & Juan Uriagereka. In 'Clitic placement, grammaticization, and reanalysis in Berber', Ouhalla discusses variation in the patterns of cliticization across different dialects of Berber, observing that this variation follows from the degree of grammaticization towards a functional category that a lexical item has undergone. Ouhalla argues that postverbal clitics are derived by left adjunction of the clitic to

some abstract functional head, followed by subsequent left adjunction of the verb. Word orders where some functional category F precedes a clitic in preverbal position (F = CL V) are the result of left adjunction to the F-head, followed by subsequent inversion of F and CL. Raposo & Uriagereka ('Clitic placement in Western Iberian: a Minimalist view') compare language varieties spoken on the western Iberian peninsula (mainly Portuguese and Galician), both with each other and with the better-known languages spoken in the central and eastern parts of Spain (Spanish and Catalan). Their analysis makes use of the fusion operation of Distributed Morphology and a series of timing principles, which interact with a syntactic component where clitics adjoin to a discourse-related functional head *f*. Finally, Benincà & Poletto ('On same descriptive generalizations in Romance') compare a wide variety of Romance forms and conclude that clitics in Romance have arisen through grammaticization of various lexical items. This grammaticization amounts to a shift from feature movement with pied piping to simple feature movement, where clitics are the overt realization of moved features.

Closely related to the topic of clitic placement is the architecture of the functional categories in the verbal projection (including the left periphery), and the linked issue of the licensing of arguments. This is the topic of several articles in the book (Aboh; Amritavalli & Jayaseelan; DeGraff; Rice & Saxon; Rigau; Munaro & Pollock; and Whitman).

In 'Object shift, verb movement, and verb reduplication', Enoch Aboh discusses Object Verb (OV) and Verb Object (VO) alternations in Gungbe. He argues that VO ordering results from object shift to the specifier of the functional category AgrO (SpecAgrOP) and subsequent movement of the verb to a higher aspectual position. By contrast, OV orders involve movement of the object from its case position (SpecAgrOP) into the specifier of an aspectual phrase (SpecAspP) in order to satisfy the Extended Projection Principle. When there is no overt noun phrase to move to this position, or when the noun phrase is a topic, the verb reduplicates in order to license a phonetically empty subject pronoun in SpecAspP. Two things surprised me about this paper. First, in early Minimalist work on agreement phrases (see, for example, Chomsky 1995), VO/OV alternation was taken to be evidence for movement of the object from the complement position of the verb to the specifier of AgrO. In Aboh's approach, both VO and OV word orders are derived by overt movement to SpecAgrOP, with OV ordering resulting from further movement. Second, while Aboh presents an interesting analysis of some unique data, it is not at all clear how this paper can be considered to be comparative syntax. There is some brief mention of the related languages Gengbe and Ewegbe, but these are relatively unimportant in the development of the analysis, which focuses on phenomena entirely within one language. I suppose the reader could be expected to compare the Gungbe data to object shift phenomena in other, more familiar languages, but this is left unsaid in the paper.

The topic of Nicola Munaro & Jean-Yves Pollock's chapter, 'Qu'est-ce-que (*qu*)-*est-ce-que*? A case study in comparative Romance interrogative syntax', is the interaction of clitics, negation, verb movement and the left periphery of the clause in *qu'est-ce-que* 'what is it that'-constructions in French and Northern Italian dialects. The variation observed in these dialects argues for two checking positions for bare *wh*-words, and suggests that dialects vary with respect to (i) whether disjunction operators are clitics or not; (ii) the parametric value determining whether disjunction operators are spelled out at PF; (iii) the parametric value determining the height of negation; and (iv) the elements that can occupy the force layer of the clause.

The book contains two papers that address the position of negation with respect to the verb. In 'Finiteness and negation in Dravidian', R. Amritavalli & K. A. Jayaseelan investigate the nature of negation in Kannada and Malayalam and conclude that at least one instance of the negative morpheme represents finiteness in the form of the head of a Mood Phrase. They argue that in Dravidian, Tense is better analyzed as Aspect, and that finiteness is represented by the presence of Mood. Differences between Malayalam and the other Dravidian languages follow from differences in agreement morphology. Given the topic of this chapter, that is, its focus on polarity and force-like elements, such as negation and finiteness, I was disappointed that this article included no discussion of Rizzi's approach to the structure of the left periphery, which is designed to address such questions.

The second paper that deals with the relative order of verb (V) and negation (Neg), John Whitman's 'Preverbal elements in Korean and Japanese', explains a variety of Neg/V orderings in the two languages by having recourse to an antisymmetric analysis which postulates movement of a remnant verb phrase. The analysis shows that negation may be realized both in an adjunct/specifier and in a head. Whitman claims that the negation patterns in Korean and Japanese represent a typical typology for verb-final languages.

Three articles in the book deal with agreement/inflectional restrictions on argument placement. In 'Comparative Athapaskan syntax: arguments and projections', Keren Rice & Leslie Saxon compare a large number of geographically diverse Athapaskan languages, focusing on the famous *y-/b-*alternation. They argue for three distinct subject positions: (i) the VP-internal subject position, (ii) the specifier of a Number Phrase (SpecNumP), and (iii) the specifier of a subject agreement (AgrSP) or Discourse Phrase (depending upon the language). They also claim that two object positions are available. The positioning of subjects and objects variously depends upon animacy, person, agency and definiteness. In 'Number agreement variation in Catalan dialects', Gemma Rigau presents an analysis of object agreement in existential clauses in two dialects of Catalan. She proposes that the variation observed between these two dialects amounts to differences as to which functional category *v* (complete *v** or weak *v*) is selected and how

uninterpretable features are valued by the probe-goal relation (Chomsky 2000). Finally, Michel DeGraff argues in 'Morphology and word order in "creolization" and beyond' that unlike either its lexifier language (French) or its substratum (Fongbè), Haitian Creole does not exhibit verb raising. Instead, it seems to leave the verb in situ. This observation is couched within the view that creoles are simply more obvious instantiations of the 're-creation' of a language each time a learner sets its parameters, and stands in stark contrast to views of creole exceptionalism.

The next major group of articles concerns the internal structure of the Determiner Phrase (DP). Jaklin Kornfilt's 'Agreement and its placement in Turkic non-subject relative clauses' centers on how agreement is realized in the structure of relative clauses in various Turkic languages. Kornfilt compares three types of relative clauses, which vary in the locus of agreement morphology. Most of this article is descriptive rather than theory-oriented, although it ends with some theoretical speculations on the source of the variation (Kornfilt proposes that agreement can be either nominal or verbal and that agreement markers can be either heads or clitics).

The nature of noun class, gender and classifiers is the topic of the three remaining papers investigating DP-structure. In 'Classifiers in four varieties of Chinese', Lisa Cheng & Rint Sybesma consider the variation found among these varieties in terms of what kinds of information are represented in classifiers (for example, whether or not the definiteness operator ɩ is realized segmentally), as well as co-occurrence restrictions between classifiers and numerals. They propose three parameters to account for this variation. Andrew Simpson addresses similar topics in his article, 'Classifiers and DP structure in Southeast Asia', but is also interested in accounting for DP-internal variation. He suggests that the different word order patterns in Southeast Asian languages stem from variation in whether there is DP- and X°-movement within the DP, and whether this movement results in lexicalization of higher functional projections inside the DP. This latter topic is addressed both synchronically and from the perspective of grammaticization. Finally, Alain Kihm's article, 'Noun class, gender, and the lexicon–syntax–morphology interfaces: a comparative study of Niger-Congo and Romance languages', takes up related issues from the perspective of Distributed Morphology. Kihm claims that classifiers are members of the functional category n (a nominalizing category akin to verbalizing v). His focus is on two empirical domains: the difference between the inflectional suffixal nature of gender systems and the agglutinative form of classifier systems, and the tight link between classifiers and numerals. The empirical facts prove to be derivable from a combination of variation in head-movement and the late-insertion property of Distributed Morphology.

The remainder of the articles in the book are comparative descriptions of the syntactic similarities and differences among some of the major language groupings of Indo-European. In an article entitled 'Continental West

Germanic languages', Jan-Wouter Zwart provides descriptions of scrambling, verb second, word order variation in root and embedded clauses, and Complementizer Phrase extraposition, as well as more detailed descriptions of the morphology (and morphosyntax) of pronominal and verbal systems in German, Dutch and closely related languages. Zwart's article is different from other articles in the book in that it contains almost no theoretical grounding and surprisingly few pointers to the theoretical literature on the topics of discussion. Moreover, the article focuses primarily on the similarities between the languages, as opposed to the differences that are the foci of so much other work in comparative syntax (although the article does contain some interesting discussion of major differences arising in Yiddish and Afrikaans).

Steven Franks's 'The Slavic languages' provides a similar, although more theoretically-directed and variation-oriented, description of the syntax of the Slavic languages. The paper covers case and agreement, the genitive-of-negation phenomenon, numerals, voice, clitics, multiple *wh*-movement, binding, aspect, and scrambling. In 'The Scandinavian languages', Anders Holmberg & Christer Platzack compare the mainland Scandinavian languages to the insular Scandinavian languages (Icelandic, Faroese), paying particular attention to adverbial positioning, transitive expletive constructions, object shift and the internal structure of noun phrases. Finally, Maggie Tallerman's contribution, entitled 'The Celtic languages', deals with empirical issues in the Celtic languages that have been influential in generative grammar. The nature of Verb Subject Object order is surveyed along with the related issues of object shift and subject placement. Tallerman also considers clefting, copular constructions, complementarity in agreement and morphologically-marked successive cyclic movement. An obvious omission from this chapter is any discussion of construct state nominals and the internal structure of the DP.

Before moving on to a general discussion of the book's organization, I would like to make one global comment about the content of the papers in the book. One trend that emerged from a large number of papers in this volume pleasantly surprised me. This was the increased emphasis on the role of grammaticization in explaining language variation. Of course this move is to be expected if, as Kayne notes, parametric variation is limited to the lexical entries of particular functional categories. Grammaticization turns lexical morphology into functional morphology; and, accordingly, variation between languages can be viewed both in a diachronic context (as parameter changing through grammatical reanalysis) and in an acquisitional context (as parameter setting through exposure to reanalyzed forms). In my opinion, this area promises to be fruitful for generative linguistics and should be pursued further.

As can be seen from the above summaries, this book is incredibly rich in both data and theoretical insights, and worth the price for that alone. Comparative syntax is a major trend in syntactic theory, and this volume

reflects this and the importance of the trend. However, I must admit that I am also a little disappointed in the volume as a whole. My concerns mainly have to do with what seems to be a very disjointed focus to the book and what I think is a significantly impaired organization.

Kayne's article, rich as it is, is not the kind of first chapter usually found in a book like this. His contribution is really a stand-alone research article rather than the introductory chapter one might expect from one of the editors of the volume. No attempt is made to establish connections between the other papers in the book, to outline the major theoretical issues in comparative syntax beyond the metatheoretical and theoretical points that Kayne himself attempts to address, or to provide a thematic guide to the organization of the book. There is only a very brief one-page preface to the book, which essentially admits (correctly) that the book is 'heterogeneous in style, in content, and in length' (v), and concedes (again quite correctly) that there is no sense in which a book like this could possibly be complete. To me, this seems like a missed opportunity: a short chapter by the editors which at least outlined some of the major findings of the papers in the volume would have been welcome indeed. The book is very large, and while it undoubtedly contains important contributions, it is hard to see how the individual articles hang together, except in the very loose sense that they all involve comparative research. I kept feeling that the book might have been better as a series of smaller and cheaper volumes that were properly thematically organized. Perhaps the whole notion of a handbook in linguistics is a strange notion to start with, as handbooks in other disciplines typically provide surveys and summaries of extant research in particular areas rather than a forum for presenting original research like many of the articles in this volume (and in similar 'handbooks' produced by Oxford University Press's competitor Blackwell – see Carnie 2004 for related criticism). It should be noted that some of the papers in the present volume do take seriously the question of providing a survey and summary of the current research in a topic (Tallerman, Holmberg & Platzack and Franks, among others), but many seem to be mainly reporting original research – a worthy goal, but not clearly in the purview of a handbook.

In addition to the absence of a proper introductory chapter, the book suffers from the fact that it is not thematically organized: while there are clear groupings of topics, the papers appear in alphabetical order. A related point is that, almost without exception, the papers do not cite each other, which is unfortunate since many of them address interconnected issues. This is particularly striking in the case of the papers on classifiers, which all take quite different approaches to similar topics. Finally, if this were truly a handbook in the sense that I understand the term, there should be greater homogeneity with respect to the scope and structure of the papers. The articles in this volume differ considerably both in their goals (which, amongst others, range from descriptions of language families and descriptions of

particular constructions to descriptions of methodological or theoretical issues) and in the role they attribute to theory. At one extreme we have the nearly theory-free articles of Zwart and Kornfilt (who are otherwise well known for their contributions to syntactic theory); and at the other extreme, we find the highly technical analyses of Rigau and Aboh. This gives the book a disjointed feel, and one must wonder if the authors were given adequate directions about the nature of the volume as a whole.

Clearer organization, clearer direction to the authors about the scope of their papers, and an initial summary chapter would have gone some way towards making this more of a handbook and less of simply a very large collection of research articles. This said, the overall caliber of the papers in this volume is excellent, as we would expect from the authors and editors involved. One cannot dismiss significant original research even if it is packaged strangely, so no doubt many *Journal of Linguistics* readers will find a great deal to value here despite the issues that I have raised.

REFERENCES

Carnie, A. (2004). Review of M. Baltin & C. Collins (eds.), *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, 2000. *General Linguistics* **42**. 182–184.
Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In Martin, R., Michaels, D. & Uriagereka, J. (eds.), *Step by step: essays on Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 89–155.
Wexler, K. (1998). Very Early Parameter Setting and the Unique Checking Constraint: a new explanation of the optional infinitive stage. *Lingua* **106**. 23–79.

Author's address: Department of Linguistics, Douglass 200E, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, U.S.A.
E-mail: carnie@u.arizona.edu
(Received 22 December 2005)

Peter W. Culicover & Andrzej Nowak, *Dynamical grammar: minimalism, acquisition and change* (Foundations of Syntax **2**). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Pp. xxii + 324.

Reviewed by HANS VAN DE KOOT, University College London

Dynamical grammar is the second part of a two-volume work entitled 'Foundations of Syntax'. Volume 1, *Syntactic nuts: hard cases, syntactic theory, and language acquisition* (Culicover 1999), investigated the properties of language itself, with the aim of establishing the boundary conditions on the learning mechanisms responsible for language acquisition. It focused especially on aspects of (syntactic) learning that do not exemplify the regular and exceptionless properties of human language, but rather the irregular, the