and calls for more cross-linguistic data. His chapter nicely demonstrates the differences between syntactic and semantic accounts of verb learning, showing the need for a more complete semantic-syntactic-morphological account of this aspect of language.

In 'Second language acquisition: from initial to final state', Lydia White examines the different configurations of factors in L2 acquisition with regard to the L2 initial state, access to UG, the course of L2 development, and the learner’s ultimate attainment. White characterizes different theories of L2 acquisition based on two factors: the role of the L1 (full transfer, partial transfer or no transfer) and access to UG (full, partial or no access), and examines each in terms of the predictions made for L2 development and ultimate attainment.

Bonnie Schwartz & Rex Sprouse discuss the difficulties of theory-based research in light of changing syntactic theories in 'When syntactic theories evolve: consequences for L2 acquisition research'. The authors illustrate how in several instances a change in the technicalities of the syntactic theory prompted the opposite analysis than was suggested by the original theory. They argue for the need for independent evidence consisting of UG-derived poverty of stimulus proof, which is further augmented by structural evidence from at least one natural language grammar. They convincingly show how such evidence is free from the constraints of a developing theory while, at the same time, consistent with the rigors of theory-based L2 research.

The final chapter, by Gary Libben, 'Representation and processing in the second language lexicon: the Homogeneity Hypothesis', departs from the previous UG-based approaches. Libben reviews historical perspectives on lexical knowledge in monolinguals, bilinguals and L2 learners, and argues for the Homogeneity Hypothesis, which claims that the lexical knowledge of monolingual, bilingual and L2 learners 'can be represented in a single lexical architecture and there is no need to postulate individual lexicons for individual languages' (229).

This volume presents both a broad and narrow picture of the generative paradigm in L2 acquisition research and gives the reader the necessary context from which to access and assess current research in several subfields. The individual chapters pique the interest of the reader to explore the arguments raised further. However, readers unfamiliar with a particular subfield may feel slightly disadvantaged because a certain level of familiarity with technical terminology and concepts is assumed. Nevertheless, this does not greatly detract from the value and effectiveness of the text. One comes away with a sense of the common threads running through all of these areas of study.
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Reviewed by DAVID WILLIS, University of Cambridge

This volume contains twelve chapters relating to aspects of the clause structure of verb-initial languages. A wide range of languages is considered, including Arabic, Biblical Hebrew, Breton, Irish, Jakaltek, Malagasy, Niuean, Scottish Gaelic, Straits Salish, Welsh and Zapotec. The chapters raise questions about the degree to which verb-initial languages manifest common syntactic structures. Certain features – preverbal particles, the absence of a verb ‘to have’, and various agreement asymmetries – recur as characteristics of verb-initial languages. On the other hand, the variety of derivations proposed for basic clause structure may lead to the conclusion that verb-initial word order is not a unitary phenomenon at all.

The central issue of the book is how to derive verb-initial word order. Chapters by Diane Massam; Andrea Rackowski & Lisa Travis and Felicia Lee consider various versions of the proposal that some languages achieve verb-initial order through (remnant) VP-fronting rather than head movement. Massam notes parallels between verb-initial orders and other cases of predicate-initial orders (typically with clause-initial predicate nominals) in Niuean. For instance, both occupy the same position with respect to negation. In her chapter, Lee notes striking
parallels between fronted verbs and other fronted predicates in Zapotec, both hosting adverbial clitics such as 'zhya’ ‘might’. Such parallels suggest that movement targets the same position in both cases. For Massam, verb-fronting is VP-fronting to [Spec, IP], either with the object moving out of the VP before movement, resulting in remnant VP-fronting and VSO order, or with the object remaining in VP, and hence full VP-fronting and VOS order. Fronted nominal predicates also occupy [Spec, IP] on this analysis. Rackowski & Travis consider the same problem in Malagasy, and come to much the same conclusion although the details of their rather convoluted analysis of Malagasy postverbal adverbs differ significantly from Massam’s.

Remnant VP-movement seems convincing for these languages, and this raises the question of whether there are two (or perhaps more) basic types of verb-initial language: this type, and a second type, where the verb undergoes head movement to the head of a functional projection higher than the subject. This sort of analysis is assumed in the chapters on Celtic, but even in Celtic, intriguing parallels could be mentioned: Welsh and Breton have fronting of predicate nominals, adjectives and prepositional phrases in copular constructions; and Middle Welsh had topicalisation of subjects, objects and the nonfinite verb (without its object). These phenomena raise similar problems to the one addressed in these chapters, suggesting that Massam’s VP-fronting analysis has potential for extension.

Of the three Celtic chapters, the one by Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley & Elizabeth Pyatt deals with word order most directly, considering how high the verb raises in the derivation of Irish VSO. The authors argue that whereas Modern Irish has only verb-raising to I, Old Irish had both raising to C and to I, correlating with the morphological distinction between the absolute verbal form (in C) and the conjunct (in I). This analysis raises one big question, namely, how Irish lost verb-movement to C, and both this and the issue of the exact relationship between the absolute-conjunct system of Old Irish and the more or less extensive remnants of the system found in the daughter languages are left open. One synchronic problem is worth highlighting too: Old Irish had absolute particles as well as conjunct ones (that is, complementisers followed by the absolute form of the verb, for instance, mà beid ‘if it may be (absolute)’), and these do not sit easily with the authors’ analysis.

Randall Hendrick’s chapter ‘Celtic initials’ considers the structure of the left periphery of the clause and argues that the structure in (1), illustrating the relevant part of the Welsh sentence (2), provides a framework within which all modern Celtic languages can be accommodated (where SubP is subordinator phrase, MP is mood phrase and FinP is finiteness phrase).

(1)

```
SubP
  Sub
    MP
      mai
        M
          Spec
            Fi
              Spec
                Fi
                  Spec
                    Fi
                      Spec
                        Fi
                          Spec
                            Fi
                              Spec
                                Fi
                                  Spec
                                    Fi
                                      Spec
                                        Fi
                                          Fin’
                                            IP
                                              me
                                                a
                                                  PRT
                                                    'daeth
                                                      came
```

(2) Roedd e ‘n gwybod mai dim fi (a) ddaeth â ‘r anrhed.

‘He knew that it wasn’t me who brought the present.’

This analysis is broadly in line with recent treatments of the left periphery in Welsh. The most innovative aspect of the chapter is an Optimality account of microvariation in subject-verb agreement between Irish and Scottish Gaelic as against Welsh and Breton. Three constraints
apply: IDENTIFY is violated if an empty category is not identified by a head bearing its grammatical features; AVOIDPRO is violated if a pronoun is overt; AVOIDAGGR is violated by rich agreement. For Welsh and Breton, these constraints are ranked IDENTIFY > AVOIDPRO > AVOIDAGGR. As Hendrick himself concedes (31), rich agreement forms may co-occur with pronouns in Welsh and Breton ((3b) below), alongside rich agreement forms with null subjects, (3c). ((3) is adapted from Hendrick’s (70).)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IDENTIFY</th>
<th>AVOIDPRO</th>
<th>AVOIDAGGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>*V-default agreement + overt pronoun</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>V-rich agreement + overt pronoun</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>V-rich agreement + null pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option (c) violates only the lowest-ranking constraint and is therefore grammatical, but the grammaticality of (b) is problematic, since it seems to be at least as bad as ungrammatical (a).

The chapter also contains a number of data errors, the most serious in (36a), where T. Arwyn Watkins is misquoted: the source gives only the Welsh sentences ‘Ni welodd y bachgen ddyn ‘The boy didn’t see a man’, and ‘Welodd y bachgen (ddi)mo o’r dyn ‘The boy didn’t see the man’.

Eithne Guilfoyle’s paper on Irish subjects addresses a second major theme of the book, whether features of verb-initial languages can be derived from their word order. Subjects in Irish fail to appear in a number of constructions requiring non-agentive subjects, for instance, in Tú eagla oinn ‘I’m afraid’ (lit. ‘Fear is on me’), and Guilfoyle attributes this to the low structural position of subjects in VSO languages. Although this is attractive as an idea, there clearly are cases of non-agentive verbal subjects in other verb-initial languages (Welsh Dwé’n synnu ‘I’m surprised’) and the restrictions in question are common in non-VSO languages too, so the correlation is questionable.

The most successful chapter with this approach is that by Edit Doron. She notes that it is common in VSO languages for the verb to agree only with the first element of a conjoined subject, and relates this to the absence or optionality of the EPP-feature on T. If there is no movement, Agree seeks out the closest D-head for agreement, whereas if there is movement of the subject to T, Agree targets the whole DP-subject.

Chapters by Ray Freeze & Carol Georgopoulos and Seth Minkoff link verb-initial word order respectively to the absence of lexical ‘have’ and to animacy restrictions on subjects (that is, a restriction that the subject must be at least as animate as the object). Freeze & Georgopoulos’s analysis is oriented largely towards VOS languages (with, for instance, the subject in a rightward-projecting [Spec, IP]) and it is hard to see how it would generalise to any standard analysis of VSO languages, even though the same absence of ‘have’ is frequently attested there. Minkoff derives animacy restrictions from sentence processing strategies, but there are ready counterexamples from null-subject verb-initial languages (for instance, all Celtic languages) that lack the animacy restriction. The final chapter, by Eloise Jelinek, outlines Straits Salish syntax, emphasising those properties consistent with it being a ‘pronominal argument language’, that is, a language in which only pronouns or variables can serve as arguments.

The most striking fact that emerges from this book is how similar the surface syntax of the different verb-initial languages can be, and readers familiar with one language will constantly be reminded of that language in the discussion of the syntax of the others. On the other hand, the basic phrase structure of these languages seems to differ vastly, such that many of the attempts to unify these similarities meet with considerable difficulty.
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