page 88), examples need to have their discourse context more clearly established. On the other hand, the discourse settings of examples in the “restrictif” section (pp. 91ff.) are described more fully.

More effort also could have been put into cross-referencing and indexing. For example, there is a confusing cross-reference at the bottom of page 12. A more detailed index would have been helpful. I noted these page inaccuracies in the “Index”: the entry for “caducite” lists page 98, but page 97 would be better. Under “distensif,” page 287 is cited, although the main discussion of this topic occurs on page 248.

Queixalos attempts to give a comprehensive picture of the Sikuani noun, verb, and predicate. Overall, his effort is admirable and makes available some valuable information. Queixalos has provided material on metaphorical and other aspects of predication that seems to capture the essence of the verb from the viewpoint of Sikuani speakers. The stimulating ideas suggested about nouns functioning as predicates and the spatial semantics of verbs will, I hope, be explored further in future research.

KATHERINE HALL, College of Menominee Nation, Keshena, Wisconsin
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This book looks at a broad range of languages with verb-initial word order, from Old Irish and Biblical Hebrew to their modern counterparts, along with Austronesian, Straits Salish, Mayan, and Zapotec. An excellent introduction to the theoretical problems posed by verb-initial languages is followed by 11 essays on various aspects of those issues. Most of the essays are written within the Minimalist framework, but analyses involving prosodic conditions, sentence processing, event structure, and information structure are also included.

The biggest ongoing controversy involving verb-initial languages, particularly VSO languages, has been how they are derived. A number of proposals have been made, including a flat structure without a VP, raising of the verb either to I° or to C°, and lowering of the subject into the VP. This question is re-examined in light of the proposal by Kayne (1994) that specifier-head-complement is the universal order, a claim that makes VOS order newly problematic as well.
Randall Hendrick’s paper (“Celtic Initials” [pp. 13–27]) uses the position of adverbs to argue that subjects must raise out of VP and therefore verbs must raise higher than I\( ^0 \). He proposes a universal three-tiered complementizer system consisting of subordinate, mood, and finite, based on the preverbal particles in Celtic languages. Hendrick also points out that the apparent parallelism between finite clauses and possessed nominal phrases is not predicted by the theory. To claim that the noun raises in possessed nominal phrases for feature checking is problematic, however, since adjectives follow the noun in both possessed and unpossessed nominal phrases in many VSO languages.

Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley, and Elizabeth Pyatt (“VSO Order as Raising Out of IP? Some Evidence from Old Irish” [pp. 39–59]) argue that VSO order in Old Irish is derived by V\( ^0 \) to I\( ^0 \) movement, but that V\( ^0 \) moves onto C\( ^0 \) in clauses without an overt complementizer, due to a “filled C\( ^0 \) requirement.” Modern Irish does not have this requirement, so only V\( ^0 \) to I\( ^0 \) movement takes place. Edit Doron (“VSO and Left-Conjunct Agreement: Biblical Hebrew vs. Modern Hebrew” [pp. 75–95]) posits that the verb in Biblical Hebrew does not raise beyond T\( ^0 \) unless preceded by some constituent. Doron distinguishes VSO word order from VSO clauses; the latter exhibit left-conjunct agreement. She claims that such clauses arise because T\( ^0 \) lacks the EPP feature (not defined) and that parameterization of whether a language has this feature lexically, may have it in some cases, or is incompatible with it explains the distribution of VSO clauses cross-linguistically.

Diane Massam (“VSO and VOS: Aspects of Niuean Word Order” [pp. 97–116]) claims that an Extended Projection Principle-related feature [\( \text{Pred} \)] is responsible for fronting of the predicate in verb-initial languages. Massam argues that fronting is to IP (not CP) in Niuean; her paper is one of three to propose independently that the predicate phrase, not just the head, raises. Felicia Lee (“VP Remnant Movement and VSO in Quiavini Zapotec” [pp. 143–62]) argues, based on Zapotec verbal morphology and the distribution of verbs and their interchangeability with other predicate phrases, that VSO word order is obtained by VP remnants undergoing movement through specifier positions, instead of by head movement of V\( ^0 \).

Andrea Rackowski and Lisa Travis (“V-Initial Languages: X or XP Movement and Adverbiaal Placement” [pp. 117–41]) state that Kayne’s (1994) restrictive view of phrase structure and Cinque’s (1999) universal account of adverb ordering led them to investigate questions they might not otherwise have asked for Malagasy and Niuean. The fact that adverbial elements in these languages appear in the exact opposite order from Cinque’s account forces them to propose a controversial intraposition analysis. In contrast, Ray Freeze and Carol Georgopoulos (“Locus Operandi” [pp. 163–83]) look at the empirical facts to see whether the theoretical claims are correct. Based on locatives and two new generalizations tied to word order, they conclude that verb-initial order and SVO and SOV orders are basic and underived. They specifically argue against Kayne’s approach to phrase structure in favor of parameterization of directionality.

The remaining articles look beyond Minimalism. Eithne Guilfoyle (“Tense and N-Features in Modern Irish” [pp. 61–73]) compares Modern Irish to English, agreeing with previous analyses that the word order difference can be accounted for by Irish subjects checking their N-features in the specifier of TP, whereas English subjects check theirs within AgrS. Guilfoyle proposes independent motivation for the
varying strength of the N-features of Tense and AgrS from event structure. Irish subjects must be the initiator of the event, which is closely tied to timing and tense. In contrast, English subjects only need to be a participant in the event, and referentiality is tied to AgrS. Eloise Jelinek (“Predicate Raising in Lummi, Straits Salish” [pp. 213–33]) proposes that the predicate raises to a focus position adjoined to C0 in Lummi to derive verb-initial order. She claims that information structure, which organizes the clause based on presupposed versus new information, is the key to understanding the phrase structure, since there is a strict mapping between them in pronominal argument languages.

Judith Aissen’s essay (“Prosodic Conditions on Anaphora and Clitics in Jakaltek” [pp. 185–200]) takes a new look at binding data, which was previously claimed to require a flat structure in Jakaltek. Linear precedence, not c-command, determines the distribution. This information is available in prosodic structure, thus providing support for the view that prosodic structure is both necessary and sufficient to provide communication between the phonology and the syntax. Seth Minkoff (“Animacy Hierarchies and Sentence Processing” [pp. 201–12]) contrasts Mam with English regarding the animacy relationships allowed between subjects and objects of transitive verbs. He claims that verb-medial languages do not need an animacy hierarchy because the hearer only has to process one nominal before getting to the verb, so it is clear which is the subject. In contrast, in both verb-final and verb-initial languages, the hearer must process two nominals before knowing which is the subject.

This book should be of special interest to American linguists, since a far greater percentage of languages in the Americas are verb-initial than the 10% cited for the world’s languages. Minimalists, especially, will find this book valuable, and the clearly presented data covering a broad range of languages makes it useful for others also.

**Cheryl A. Black, S.I.L. International**
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Aubery’s Abenaki dictionary is a most welcome addition to the Algonquian literature in print. It was transcribed from a copy of the original manuscript made by Father Michael O’Brien in 1898 and presented to the Maine Historical Society. It describes the vocabulary of the Abenaki spoken at the St. Francis reserve at Odanak, shortly after 1700. Moreover, the present work has been made much more usable by