

## REVIEWS

**Advances in comparative Germanic syntax.** Ed. by ARTEMIS ALEXIADOU, JORGE HANKAMER, THOMAS MCFADDEN, JUSTIN NUGER, and FLORIAN SCHÄFER. (*Linguistics today* 141.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2009. Pp. xv, 395. ISBN 9789027255242. \$158 (Hb).

Reviewed by JEROEN VAN CRAENENBROECK,  
*CRISSP/Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel*

The Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop (CGSW) is a conference with a venerable tradition within generative linguistics. Held more or less every year since 1984, it has yielded a series of often high-quality proceedings, to which the present book forms the most recent addition. It contains a selection of papers from the twenty-first and twenty-second CGSW, held at the University of California, Santa Cruz in 2006 and the University of Stuttgart in 2007 respectively. The book contains an introduction by the editors and fourteen papers, grouped into four parts: ‘Cartography and the left periphery’ (five papers), ‘Word order and movement’ (four papers), ‘Thematic relations and NP realization’ (three papers), and ‘Finiteness and modality’ (two papers). As pointed out by the editors (vii), CGSW typically addresses both traditional themes of Germanic comparative syntax and topics pertaining to syntactic theory in general, and the twenty-first and twenty-second installments of the workshop were no exception in this respect. Accordingly, I use this bifurcation as the structuring principle for this review, starting with the general, non-Germanic-specific themes. In so doing, I adhere only partially to the structure proposed by the editors, but I return to it at the end of the review.

The first central theme of the volume concerns cartography. This research program is based on the idea that sentence structure should be represented as a template of fixed positions, each with its own syntactico-semantic specification. This template is taken to be a universal, totally ordered set of functional projections, with crosslinguistic variation being reduced to whether or not the heads and specifiers of these projections are overtly filled (be it via internal or external merge). While no one can deny that the cartographic endeavor has yielded a substantial amount of both empirically and theoretically highly relevant work (see, for example, the Oxford University Press series ‘The cartography of syntactic structures’: Cinque 2002, 2006, Belletti 2004, Rizzi 2004, Benincà & Munaro 2010, Cinque & Rizzi 2010), in recent years a growing number of problems has been raised for this approach (see the papers and references in van Craenenbroeck 2009 for discussion). The present CGSW volume presents a very interesting contribution to this debate, with three of its papers adopting the cartographic viewpoint and three others challenging it.

The cartographic centerpiece of this volume is ANNA CARDINALETTI’s paper ‘On a (WH-)moved Topic in Italian, compared to Germanic’ (3–40). She provides an analysis of resumptive preposing (RP) in Italian; she shows that Italian RP differs from clitic left dislocation (CLLD) and focalization, and shares certain properties with English topicalization. In Cardinaletti’s account, an RPed constituent moves to a high TopP, with an intermediate landing site in specFinP. The fact that RP and WH-movement do not cooccur is taken to indicate that the latter also has an intermediate landing site in specFinP, while the fact that RP is a root phenomenon follows from it targeting a very high TopP (the idea being that this projection is absent in embedded contexts). As such, this paper is a very prototypical example of a cartographic piece of work: based on distributional patterns, word-order generalizations, and cooccurrence restrictions, it maps out a particular portion of the functional sequence.

The other two cartographic papers are of a different nature. Rather than providing evidence for a particular functional sequence, the authors use results from previous cartographic work as a central ingredient in their analysis. In ‘C-agreement or something close to it: Some thoughts on the “alls-construction” ’ (41–58), MICHAEL T. PUTNAM and MARJO VAN KOPPEN focus on a previously undiscussed construction attested in Midwestern American English. In this regional varia-

tion, an *s*-ending appears on the universal quantifier *all* in pseudoclefts. Putnam and van Koppen tentatively analyze this suffix as an instance of complementizer agreement. They claim that the (non)occurrence of the agreement ending is crucially related to (i) the specific left-peripheral functional head responsible for triggering the agreement (Force<sup>o</sup> in their analysis), and to (ii) the question of whether the extended left periphery is conflated—thus yielding a local relation between the probe and the goal of the Agree-relation—or not.

JOHN R. TE VELDE makes similar use of cartographic findings in ‘A conjunction conspiracy at the West Germanic left periphery’ (119–48). He investigates cases of conjunction reduction in German and proposes as one of the well-formedness requirements on this type of construction that the antecedent and the gap occupy the same syntactic position in the left periphery. For example, a DP in specTopP can be elided only if its antecedent is also in specTopP.

The noncartographic viewpoint is also strongly present in this volume. The central contribution in this respect is JAN-WOUTER ZWART’s programmatic paper ‘Uncharted territory? Towards a non-cartographic account of Germanic syntax’ (59–84). Zwart lists a number of problems for cartographic approaches to phrase structure, and sketches the contours of an alternative, strongly derivational analysis. The problems all take the form of transitivity failures, that is, cases where the linear ordering of certain types of phrases does not respect transitivity, thus presenting counterevidence to the cartographic claim that the functional sequence is a total linear ordering. Zwart presents known transitivity failures involving the left periphery (van Craenenbroeck 2006), adverb placement (Nilsen 2003), and the interaction between adjuncts and arguments (Bobaljik 1999), also adding new data that concern attributive adjectives. In the alternative he proposes, a central role is played by movement, which he argues is not triggered by (uninterpretable features residing in) left-peripheral functional heads, but rather by an ‘inner conflict’. For example, a topic cannot reside inside a domain marked as comment and is therefore forced to move to the edge of that domain. This approach also leads to a new view on the extended projection principle (EPP), which, according to Zwart, is nothing but the requirement that an event be centered, and subject externalization out of the VP provides exactly such a center.

Criticisms against an attract-style approach to movement are also voiced in two other papers in the volume. GIBERT FANSELOW, in ‘Bootstrapping verb movement and the clausal architecture of German (and other languages)’ (85–118), defends a foot-driven movement analysis of verb second (V2). Essentially, a verb moves and reprojects whenever it bears a feature targeting that verb itself. What is also interesting about Fanselow’s paper is that he explicitly situates this analysis in a historical perspective, pointing out that both Bierwisch (1963) and Thiersch (1978) already proposed what one could anachronistically call noncartographic analyses of V2. A similar nonstandard (and noncartographic) approach to movement can be found in HANS BROEKHUIS’s contribution ‘Holmberg’s Generalization: Blocking and push up’ (219–46). Although couched in a different theoretical framework (syntactic optimality theory), his conclusions are in line with Zwart: in Icelandic double-object constructions, a focused indirect object can shift to the left of an adverb, not because it is attracted by some functional head, but because it needs to be ‘moved out of the way’ for the direct object to be able to undergo object shift.

The second major theme of this volume is the interaction between syntax and the interfaces. A central tenet of minimalist syntax is what Chomsky (2000:96) calls the strong minimalist thesis, which states that language is an optimal solution to legibility conditions. An important consequence of this principle in much current work is that the role of syntax in accounting for particular linguistic phenomena is diminished in favor of principles and filters applying at the interfaces. This tendency can be detected in the present volume as well. Its clearest instantiation is HALLDÓR ÁRMANN SIGURÐSSON’s paper ‘The No Case Generalization’ (249–80). Sigurðsson argues that case has no role to play in syntax whatsoever and instead relegates it entirely to the morphological component. Similarly, PATRIZIA NOEL AZIZ HANNA, in ‘Jespersen’s Cycle and the issue of prosodic “weakness” ’ (197–218), shows Jespersen’s cycle to be the result of the interaction between syntax and phonology: as a result of its syntactic position (prefixed to the verb in a language with an increasing tendency toward V2), the Old High German negation marker is highly

unlikely to attract rhythmic stress. Moreover, it ends in a high vowel, which is independently unlikely to receive secondary stress in this language. JENNY LEDERER shows the limits of a syntax-based binding theory in ‘Anaphoric distribution in the prepositional phrase: Similarities between Norwegian and English’ (307–24). She looks at the distribution of pronouns and anaphors inside PPs in Norwegian and English, and concludes that neither a syntactic nor a semantic approach to binding can capture all of the relevant data. Instead, she argues, one must take into account real-world information, formalized here via the notion of peri-personal space, that is, the motor space around the body in which the hands, arms, feet, and head can move freely. Finally, CAROLA TRIPS and ERIC FUB investigate ‘The syntax and semantics of the temporal anaphor “then” in Old and Middle English’ (171–96). They show that the fact that such adverbs trigger V2 in Old English should not be seen as an indication that they carry an (otherwise unmotivated) operator feature. Rather, Old English was a discourse-configurational language with specTP responsible for anchoring an utterance to the preceding discourse.

Apart from these two general themes, there are also a number of Germanic-specific topics that receive a due amount of attention in this volume. What is interesting to note in this respect is that even though some of them have been at the center of generative attention for over thirty years, the contributions collected here very often present a new perspective on these issues, both theoretically and empirically. For example, in ‘The new impersonal as a true passive’ (281–306), JÓHANNES GÍSLI JÓNSSON presents results from a new and extensive empirical survey on the so-called ‘new construction’ in Icelandic, and uses those new data to argue in favor of a passive analysis for this construction. The new theoretical perspective on verb movement offered by Zwart and Fanselow has already been discussed above, but the paper by KRISTIN M. EIDE, ‘Finiteness: The *haves* and the *have-nots*’ (357–90), can be added to that list. Eide argues that only finite verbs can be raised, and she defines the difference between finiteness and nonfiniteness as that between absolute and relative tense. Another classic is Holmberg’s generalization, which features prominently in Broekhuis’s paper.

The quality of a proceedings volume such as this one depends both on the quality of the individual papers, and on their coherence. If there is no interesting link among the various papers, there is little point in publishing them as a book rather than as individual journal publications. There are two ways in which an editor can increase the coherence of a volume. One is to group the papers into subthemes, and while the editors of the present volume have done that, it should be clear from the preceding discussion that I would have opted for a different organization. Any subdivision is of course subjective to a certain extent, but to have a part entitled ‘Finiteness and modality’ that contains one paper on finiteness and one on modality contributes little to the thematic organization of the book. The second way in which coherence can be increased is by giving the authors access to each other’s papers. As far as I can tell, this did not happen with the present volume. As a result, a couple of potentially interesting links remain unexplored. For example, te Velde discusses highly similar—sometimes even identical—data as HIRONOBU KASAI in ‘Reconsidering odd coordination in German’ (151–70) but with a different analysis. Secondly, Jónsson’s nominative-first requirement seems highly parallel to Sigurðsson’s nominative over accusative, and finally, Eide’s discussion of modals and theta roles on pp. 372–73 is nicely compatible with REMUS GERGEL and JUTTA M. HARTMANN’s discussion in ‘Experiencers with (un)willingness: A raising analysis of German “wollen” ’ (327–56). That said, these considerations should not deflect from the fact that this is an excellent volume, with a number of high-quality papers bearing not only on Germanic syntax, but on syntactic theory in general.

#### REFERENCES

- BELLETTI, ADRIANA. 2004. *Structures and beyond*. New York: Oxford University Press.  
 BENINCÀ, PAOLA, and NICOLA MUNARO. 2010. *Mapping the left periphery*. New York: Oxford University Press.  
 BIERWISCH, MANFRED. 1963. *Grammatik des deutschen Verbs*. Berlin: Akademie.  
 BOBALJIK, JONATHAN DAVID. 1999. Adverbs: The hierarchy paradox. *Glott International* 4.27–28.

- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- CINQUE, GUGLIELMO, and LUIGI RIZZI (eds.) 2010. *Mapping spatial PPs: The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 6. New York: Oxford University Press.
- CINQUE, GUGLIELMO. 2002. *Functional structure in DP and IP*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- CINQUE, GUGLIELMO. 2006. *Restructuring and functional heads*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- NILSEN, ØYSTEIN. 2003. *Eliminating positions: Syntax and semantics of sentential modification*. Utrecht: Utrecht University dissertation.
- RIZZI, LUIGI. 2004. *The structure of CP and IP*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- THIERSCH, CRAIG. 1978. *Topics in German syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
- VAN CRAENENBROECK, JEROEN. 2006. Transitivity failures in the left periphery and foot-driven movement operations. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 2006.52–64.
- VAN CRAENENBROECK, JEROEN. 2009. *Alternatives to cartography*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

CRISSP/Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel  
Koningsstraat 336  
1030 Brussels, Belgium  
[jeroen.vancaenenbroeck@hubrussel.be]