



Project  
**MUSE**<sup>®</sup>

*Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.*

- BOŠKOVIĆ, ŽELJKO. 2007b. A note on WH-typology. *Linguistic investigations into formal description of Slavic languages: Contributions of the Sixth European Conference held at Potsdam University, 2005*, ed. by Peter Kosta and Lilia Schürcks, 159–70. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- BOŠKOVIĆ, ŽELJKO. 2008a. On successive cyclic movement and the freezing effect of feature checking. *Sounds of silence: Empty elements in syntax and phonology*, ed. by Jutta M. Hartmann, Veronika Hegedüs, and Henk van Riemsdijk, 195–233. Amsterdam: Elsevier North Holland.
- BOŠKOVIĆ, ŽELJKO. 2008b. On the operator freezing effect. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26.2.249–87.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1986. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2000. Minimalist inquiries. *Step by step: Essays on minimalism in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2008. On phases. *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*, ed. by Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 133–66. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- EPSTEIN, SAMUEL DAVID. 1992. Derivational constraints on  $\bar{A}$ -chain formation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23.2.235–59.
- FRANKS, STEVEN. 1998. Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax revisited: A minimalist retrospective. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Connecticut meeting, 1997*, ed. by Željko Bošković, Steven Franks, and William Snyder, 134–65. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- GRIMSHAW, JANE. 1979. Complement selection and the lexicon. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10.2.279–326.
- GONZALEZ, NORA. 1988. *Object raising in Spanish*. New York: Garland.
- HORNSTEIN, NORBERT. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30.1.69–96.
- HORNSTEIN, NORBERT. 2001. *Move! A minimalist theory of construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- LASNIK, HOWARD. 1999. *Minimalist analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- LÓPEZ, LUIS. 2001. On the (non)complementarity of  $\theta$ -theory and checking theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32.4.694–716.
- MCCLOSKEY, JAMES. 2000. Quantifier float and WH-movement in an Irish English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31.1.57–84.
- MÜLLER, GEREON. 1998. *Incomplete category fronting: A derivational approach to remnant movement in German*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- MÜLLER, GEREON, and WOLFGANG STERNEFELD. 1993. Improper movement and unambiguous binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24.3.461–507.
- NUNES, JAIRO. 1998. Bare X-bar theory and structures formed by movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29.1.160–68.
- NUNES, JAIRO. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- PESETSKY, DAVID, and ESTHER TORREGO. 2001. T-to-C movement: Causes and consequences. *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 355–426. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- SAITO, MAMORU. 1992. Long distance scrambling in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1.1.69–118.
- SAITO, MAMORU. 2001. Movement and  $\theta$ -roles: A case study with resultatives. Paper presented at the 2nd Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics, Tokyo.
- SCHNEIDER-ZIOGA, PATRICIA. 1995. Specifier/head agreement in Kinande. *Cahiers Linguistiques d'Ottawa* 23.67–93.
- SCHNEIDER-ZIOGA, PATRICIA. 2005. Bounded unbounded movement. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, ms.
- STATEVA, PENKA. 2002. Possessive clitics and the structure of nominal expressions. *Lingua* 112.8.647–90.
- WATANABE, AKIRA. 1999. Multiple  $\theta$ -marking: A preliminary study. *Linguistics: In search of the human mind*, ed. by Masatake Muraki and Enoch Iwamoto, 708–36. Tokyo: Kaitaku-sha.

Department of Linguistics, U-1145  
 University of Connecticut  
 Storrs, CT 06269  
 [zeljko.boskovic@uconn.edu]

**Objects and other subjects:** Grammatical functions, functional categories, and configurationality. Ed. by WILLIAM D. DAVIES and STANLEY DUBINSKY. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2001. Pp. 320. ISBN 1402000650. \$89.95.

Reviewed by JOHN MOORE, *University of California, San Diego*

This work grew out of presentations at a 1999 LSA Institute workshop, which marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of David Perlmutter and Paul Postal's 1974 LSA Institute course (where the theory of relational grammar (RG) was first presented).

While the papers in this volume all bear on the issue of GRAMMATICAL FUNCTIONS (OR GRAMMATICAL RELATIONS, henceforth GRs) in contemporary syntax, they also give a snapshot of the state of syntax around the turn of the millennium. There is a lot to like about this work: there are interesting data, large theoretical issues, subtle argumentation, and clever analyses. Why, then, do I come away feeling that the field is lacking something? Perhaps it is because the machinery of modern syntax has become quite elaborate; that is, the delta between the minimal structure demanded by the data and those proposed for largely conceptual reasons has exceeded my pain threshold. The result is a heavy burden on engineering devices whose primary task appears to be to derive more concrete structures from the abstract ones.

Relational grammar departed from standard transformational grammar by giving theoretical primacy to GRs, such as SUBJECT, OBJECT, and so on. While these notions were derived from constituent structure in Chomsky 1965, RG treated them as theoretical primitives.

As transformational grammar evolved, eventually into the minimalist program, the constituent structures became more abstract, less tied to constituency, and more transparently tied to thematic role and Case assignment (or checking). Given a rough correlation between thematic roles and initial GRs on the one hand, and abstract Case and final GRs on the other, coupled with the de-emphasis of constituency as a determining factor behind phrase structure, one is naturally led to the central question of the volume, which might be restated, somewhat uncharitably, as ‘has transformational grammar evolved into a “Rube Goldberg” version of RG?’.

The papers in Part 1 most directly focus on the central question of the volume. Davies and Dubinsky’s introduction discusses the fate of final GRs in current minimalist approaches. They note that the increase in functional projections has created analogs for relation changes (RG REVALUATIONS) for both subjects and objects: in both cases there have been arguments for movement from a VP-internal position to the specifier of a functional projection. Thus, they conclude that GRs are largely epiphenomenal in this current framework. Nevertheless, they point out that subjects (involving the TP and Agr<sub>S</sub>P projections) exhibit behaviors that are distinct from objects (involving the Agr<sub>O</sub>P projection).

Davies and Dubinsky note that there is a good deal of crosslinguistic (not to mention cross-analysis) variation with respect to whether and how movement occurs. For example, in the case of subjects, movement to Spec of TP may be motivated by the EPP. However, as has been proposed by Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998), among others, the EPP may be satisfied by head movement of the verb, leaving the VP-internal subject in situ. Davies and Dubinsky go on to suggest that the several subject properties (e.g. nominative case, verb agreement, and controllability) correlate with different structural syntactic properties—these happen to coincide in languages like English, but are dissociated in other languages. Similarly, evidence for object movement varies crosslinguistically and cross-construction types. Davies and Dubinsky propose a set of four binary parameters that defines an empirical space that is consistent with this crosslinguistic variation. While these four parameters define sixteen language types, only four of these sixteen are discussed. This may be alternatively seen as the beginning of a research program or an indication that the tools are too blunt to accurately model attested behaviors.

ALEX ALSINA’s paper examines the correlation between government binding (GB) Case and LFG grammatical functions (similar to RG final GRs). He correctly points out that GB, as exemplified by Baker (1988a,b), cannot claim to have derived GRs, as the two objects of double object constructions are distinguished by an irreducible distinction between structural and inherent Case. Hence, just like primitive GR frameworks, which distinguish these objects in terms of different GRs, these GB accounts rely on an irreducible abstract distinction. Alsina goes on to show that a cluster of properties that Baker associates with inherently Case-marked arguments in Chicheŵa applicative constructions does not extend to the inherently Case-marked arguments in Catalan double object constructions. Thus, while the structural/inherent Case distinction is just as stipulative as positing distinct primitive GRs, the distinction fails to cross-classify double object constructions crosslinguistically.

The volume’s central question is addressed head on in MARK C. BAKER’s contribution. He begins by questioning the relevance of constituency tests for establishing phrase structure. Point-

ing out problems with relying on ill-understood phenomena such as clefts and ellipsis for establishing constituency, he notes that current phrase structure is not always justified by constituency and, indeed, is better thought of as an alternative representation of GRs. He then argues that this configurational approach is conceptually superior to a relational approach because it provides a uniform vocabulary for expressing both clause-internal and cross-clausal prominence, whereas GR-based approaches require a disjunction. He concludes by showing how this prominence ('embedding prominence') may follow from aspects of lexical semantics, given an appropriately abstract representation (i.e. a generative semantics-style lexical decomposition). This last step is necessary because, as Baker points out, the structural approach may be 'also a cleverly disguised disjunction' (43). Therefore, a good deal rides on the success of the lexical decomposition approach. Not surprisingly, the appropriate lexical decomposition seems to derive the right phrase structure for English sentences in fairly simple cases (e.g. transitive accomplishment verbs), but others, such as stative psychological predicates, are not as forthcoming.

While the point that constituency tests may be problematic are well taken, I cannot help but worry that we are moving back to a universal base hypothesis, where increasingly abstract structures are motivated on grounds that are more conceptual than empirical. If so, then we may be eschewing a potentially flawed, but empirically motivated, conception of constituency in favor of a conceptually motivated one that is increasingly difficult to falsify.

FREDERICK J. NEWMAYER scrutinizes this Bakerian universal base (Ch. 2 in this volume, Baker 1993), referring to it as the DEEP ALIGNMENT HYPOTHESIS (DAH). Essential to the DAH is a one-to-one correlation between (initial) GRs, thematic roles, and phrase structure. Newmeyer presents three arguments against the DAH. One argument points to a clear similarity between the lexical decomposition structures proposed under the DAH and other lexical structures, in particular, lexical semantic structures (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995); in fact, Baker's structures look very much like syntacticized lexical semantic structures. The problem that the DAH faces is that distinct lexical conceptual structures can correspond to the same relational configuration. Newmeyer notes that, for example, some unaccusative predicates have fairly complex lexical semantic structures (e.g. *break*), whereas others are simple (e.g. *exist*). Nevertheless, both map to unaccusative structures; hence, the mapping between lexical decomposition structures and (structurally represented) grammatical relations cannot be one to one.

The tension between Baker's approach and Newmeyer's critique reflects two major approaches to deep structure. One approach is to eliminate deep structure altogether, replacing it with a more semantically motivated representation (e.g. generative semantic remote structures or Baker's neo-generative semantic representations). This has considerable conceptual appeal, but seems to inevitably lead to problems like the one described above. The other is to admit a syntactic level of representation distinct from both surface syntax and semantic representation—for example, deep structure, D-structure, A-structure, and so on. While this is less appealing from a conceptual point of view, it recognizes the seemingly unavoidable empirical feature of language that there are simply more semantic distinctions than syntactic ones. Advocates of the reductionist approaches may argue that the empirical problems are precisely challenges of the type any bold research program needs to investigate. To the extent that such issues are eventually faced, this strikes me as a good thing. The danger is that conceptual elegance may be just too blinding, leading its proponents to stubbornly cling to a program that is not easily defended on empirical grounds.

The second section of the volume considers the status of derived objects. Since the early 1990s, there have been numerous proposals regarding object shift, a process that moves objects from their base positions to a higher functional projection. Unlike subject movement, which is often apparent from the surface word order, subsequent verb movement often eliminates any obvious word-order evidence for object movement; hence, arguments in favor of or against the application of object shift are necessarily subtle.

Building on Lasnik and Saito's 1991 revival of Postal's 1974 arguments for raising to object, HOWARD LASNIK's contribution discusses how ECM subjects, as well as other objects, can display behaviors that may lead one to conclude that they end up in a position that is higher than their

base position. He then goes on to present arguments that while some objects are derived, others remain in situ. This state of affairs is attributed to the optionality of the Agr<sub>OP</sub> projection.

One set of arguments for ‘high’ behavior of objects depends on phenomena whereby the objects must outrank matrix-clause adjuncts. Assuming that the relevant notion of ‘outrank’ is asymmetric c-command, these facts argue for a relatively high surface position of objects. Another argument is based on constituency. Building on earlier work (Lasnik 1995), Lasnik argues that pseudogapping examples like 1 can be assimilated with VP-deletion if the object first moves to the specifier of a higher Agr<sub>OP</sub>.

- (1) Mary hired John, and Susan will [<sub>Agr<sub>OP</sub></sub> *Bill*<sub>*i*</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> hire *t*<sub>*i*</sub>].

It is noteworthy how these two types of arguments illustrate the tension between structure as GRs versus structure as constituency. Arguments based on c-command fit well within Baker’s structural approach to GRs, but lead to the question of whether phrase structure is the appropriate algebra for expressing GRs. Since the structural representation of GRs is often at odds with constituency, the use of both hierarchical and constituency evidence is problematic. This is why some linguists have found it necessary to represent these two domains independently (e.g. LFG’s f-structure vs. c-structure and Pesetsky’s (1995) cascade vs. layer syntax).

Finally, as Davies and Dubinsky note in their introduction, Lasnik’s proposal that Agr<sub>OP</sub> be optional in some languages effectively leads to an irreducible difference between subjects and objects which, along the lines of Alsina’s argument, leads us back to something similar to primitive GRs.

LISA DEMENA TRAVIS’s paper also examines the lack of object promotion. An interesting aspect of this paper is that while there may be an underlying assumption that subject and object promotion involves movement to functional specifiers for feature checking, the argumentation is entirely cast in terms of GRs. This underscores the potential homomorphism between structural and relational approaches. Travis claims, through tight but subtle argumentation, that applicative, raising to object, and possessor raising constructions in Malagasy do not actually involve promotion to object. The larger theoretical speculation is that languages can be predicate fronting (predicates move to check features) or argument fronting (arguments move to check features). Hence, because Malagasy is a verb-initial language that lacks object movement, it exemplifies predicate fronting. This contrasts with SVO Balinese, which does have object promotion and exhibits argument fronting. This typology is cast as a speculation intended to drive a research program. Even so, problems are noted; for example, Kimragang Dusun seems to be verb-initial, yet allows object promotion, counter to the typology’s predictions. Travis suggests this language may have covert subject movement, but acknowledges that ‘it may feel like hairs are being split very thin here’ (152). Nevertheless, Travis argues that the typology is in the service of encouraging new empirical questions that lead to the discovery of new data. While I cannot argue with this sentiment, I worry that elegant typologies like these may encourage the use of difficult-to-falsify mechanisms like covert movement in the face of apparent counterexamples. While we may acquire a wealth of new data, it may come with a good deal of theoretical baggage.

The final section of the book is dedicated to the deconstruction of the subject GR. Until relatively recently, subjects have held a primitive and absolute status in generative frameworks. Thus, the final-1 law (RG), the subject condition (LFG), and the EPP (GB, minimalism) have identified a single, obligatory subject argument in each clause and in every language. However, since the introduction of multiple functional projections between CP and VP, and since the dissociation of the Case and EPP features, the waters have become muddied. The papers in this section attempt to make sense of the chaotic status of subjects.

JAMES MCCLOSKEY’s work begins this section and argues for a deconstructed notion of subject. He notes that current analyses typically posit three ‘subject’ positions—the base VP-internal position, a position where Case is checked, and a position where the EPP is checked. As long as the EPP is universal, this last position might be associated with the concept of surface subject (even if the subject argument remains in situ in the VP; cf. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998). However, if, as McCloskey argues for Irish, EPP effects are absent, and, furthermore, different

clause types leave the highest argument in each of these three positions, we are left without a unified notion of surface subject.

One aspect of McCloskey's analysis involves a clause type where a shifted object occurs to the left of an in-situ dative subject. McCloskey notes that this configuration is incompatible with the split-VP hypothesis. Within minimalist work, there are two major theories of clause structure. In one, the functional projections associated with both subject and object movements are outside the VP (e.g. Chomsky 1993, 1995); in the other, the surface object position splits the VP (Koizumi 1995). McCloskey's data bears on this issue, but other work argues for the opposing view. At some point, one would like to see this basic architectural issue resolved. Is it possible to adopt a single universal theory of clause structure or is this an area of parameterization? If the latter, the range of analytic possibilities for the surface position of 'subjects' becomes even larger than those discussed by McCloskey.

GRANT GOODALL provides a counterpoint to McCloskey's claim that the EPP is absent in Irish. Goodall argues that Spanish, a language for which similar claims have been made, has a robust EPP. After surveying arguments for the A' status of preverbal subjects, he provides several convincing arguments against assimilating these with either fronted topic or focus phrases. By positing a set of silent locative and temporal expletives, he accounts for the postverbal position of some subjects. Through an intricate interaction between *wh*-movement and head-movement, he derives the incompatibility between *wh*-movement and preverbal subjects.

Goodall presents independent evidence, albeit indirect, for the silent locative and temporal expletives; overt counterparts do exist and display some DP-like behaviors. While Goodall's proposal goes against the recent trend away from silent pleonastics, it is refreshing to see the more traditional approach reexamined in the current minimalist atmosphere. The account of obligatory subject inversion with *wh*-movement involves a manipulation of Q features, which, while technically sound, does not seem to rise significantly above the descriptive generalization that 'subject inversion is obligatory in interrogative clauses'—a generalization that has been long recognized, but which has continued to resist an explanatory account.

DIANE MASSAM's paper argues, along with McCloskey, that there are languages that lack surface subjects. In particular, Massam proposes that Niuean subjects remain in their base position, while the predicate phrase (VP) undergoes remnant movement to the functional layer, satisfying the EPP. Hence, there is no nominal argument that satisfies the EPP—neither directly, through movement, nor indirectly by forming an expletive-associate relationship. Since both ergative subjects and absolutive objects remain inside the *v*P, Massam's account predicts their symmetrical behavior with respect to movement and other phenomena. Indeed, Niuean is famous for the fact that it allows both subjects and objects to undergo raising, the latter in apparent violation of relativized minimality. This, however, leads to the question of why other languages where predicate fronting is claimed to account for VSO clauses (e.g. Greek and Spanish under Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou's account) do not exhibit similar symmetrical behaviors.

The section ends with Davies and Dubinsky's paper on non-NP subjects. Here they provide several good arguments for treating clausal, PP, and AP subjects as DPs in English and French. They point out that this is in line with earlier transformational grammar treatments of sentential subjects. Given that the DP behaviors of non-NP subjects is not universal (e.g. they do not hold of infinitival subjects in Bulgarian, nor non-NP subjects in many verb-initial languages), they propose that the EPP (cast in terms of a D-feature on T) is not universal. Rather, following Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998, they propose that in some languages, T instead has a V-feature. The overall point is that typical subject features hold primarily in the former class of languages. The latter languages—mainly verb-initial ones—allow subjects that do not necessarily control agreement, host emphatic reflexives, and form subject islands. This typology appears to account for the contrast between English/French and verb-initial languages. It requires some fairly complex engineering for the SVO Bulgarian, however.

Where does this leave us? With respect to the basic question of the volume, I believe it is clear that current minimalist syntax is not a configurational version of RG. While under some conceptions of phrase structure, there may be some correlation between base-generated arguments

and initial RGs, the highly articulated functional structure of most minimalist approaches makes it impossible to single out a single structural correlate of final GRs. A recurrent theme of this volume, particularly the last section, suggests a typology where some languages require a syntactically prominent DP argument, while others do not. While this might be translated into the language of RG revaluations to subject, the parallel is more in spirit than in detail.

A striking aspect of this volume is the way it recalls theoretical proposals of decades past. The parallels between Baker's work and generative semantics and the universal base hypothesis are obvious, as is Davies and Dubinsky's revival of the NP-over-S account of sentential subjects. Less apparent, however, is a subtle shift from the principles-and-parameters commitment to a theory that lacks language- and construction-specific constructs, to one where the analyses are clearly both language- and construction-specific. The use of formal features to derive movement typically is done in a way that simply engineers movement where needed. Hence, I wonder if my earlier, uncharitable, question should be revised: 'has transformational grammar evolved into a 'Rube Goldberg'' version of transformational grammar?'

#### REFERENCES

- ALEXIADOU, ARTEMIS, and ELENA ANAGNOSTOPOULOU. 1998. Parameterizing ARG: Word order, V-movement, and EPP checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16.491–539.
- BAKER, MARK. 1988a. *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- BAKER, MARK. 1988b. Theta theory and the syntax of applicatives in Chichewa. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6.353–89.
- BAKER, MARK. 1993. Noun incorporation and the nature of linguistic representation. *The role of theory in language description*, ed. by William Foley, 13–44. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. *The view from Building 20: Essays in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- KOIZUMI, MASATOSHI. 1995. *Phrase structure in minimalist syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
- LASNIK, HOWARD. 1995. A note on pseudogapping. *Papers on minimalist syntax: MIT working papers in linguistics* 27.143–63. [Reprinted with minor revisions in *Minimalist analysis*, by Howard Lasnik, Oxford: Blackwell, 1999, pp. 151–74.]
- LASNIK, HOWARD, and MAMORU SAITO. 1991. On the subject of infinitives. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 27.324–43.
- LEVIN, BETH, and MALKA RAPPAPORT HOVAV. 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the syntax-lexical semantics interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- PESETSKY, DAVID. 1995. *Zero syntax: Experiencers and cascades*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- POSTAL, PAUL. 1974. *On raising: One rule of English grammar and its theoretical implications*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

University of California, San Diego  
Linguistics Department #0108  
9500 Gilman Drive  
La Jolla, CA 92093-0108  
[moorej@ucsd.edu]

**Māori: A linguistic introduction.** By RAY HARLOW. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Pp. xiv, 241. ISBN 9780521808613. \$89 (Hb).

Reviewed by WINIFRED BAUER, *Victoria University of Wellington*

In this slim volume, Ray Harlow has distilled an academic lifetime of engagement with all aspects of Māori, the language of the indigenous population of New Zealand. The size of the book belies its breadth and depth of coverage, which is achieved by focusing on those aspects