Wolfgang Schulze

A collection of reviews published on LinguistList (2002-2006)

Contents:

Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 13:05:22 +0100
From: Wolfgang Schulze W.Schulze@lrz.uni-muenchen.de
Subject: Harris (2002) Endoclitics & Origin of Udi Morphosyntax

Harris, Alice C (2002) *Endoclitics and The Origin of Udi Morphosyntax*. Oxford University Press, hardback ISBN 0-19-924633-5, xvi+299pp, USD $90.

1. General Information
The aim of Harris' monograph is to give a detailed account of a morphosyntactic (or: morphopragmatic) phenomenon that is said to be unique among languages, namely 'endoclitization'. By this term, Harris refers to the strategy to place so-called personal agreement clitics into the stem (or even root) of a verb. This phenomenon goes against standard assumption of the so-called Lexical Integrity Hypothesis according to which "words are composed according to morphological principles that differ in kind from the syntactic principles responsible for the composition of sentences" (Harris 2002:3). More concrete: "[T]he morphological composition of a word is not accessible to the rules of syntax" (ibid.). In case agreement clitics have syntactic and pragmatic properties, endoclitization of these

clitics into a verb stem/root would violate this basic hypothesis. Therefore, the existence of endoclitics has often been denied (e.g. Klavans 1979).

Harris' monograph importantly challenges such views. In order to tell the General and Theoretical Linguist more about endoclitization together with its motivation by and its impact on syntactic structures, the author has chosen Udi as her sample language. Udi is a South East Caucasian (or: Lezgian) language that is currently spoken by roughly 3.000 people in now two villages (Nizh in Azerbaijan and Okt'omberi in Georgia). Until 1989, there has been another important Udi population in the village of Vartashen (Azerbaijan). Udi has two dialectal variant (Nizh and Vartashen). Until 2001, most linguistic descriptions and analyses of Udi have relied upon data from Vartashen (together with its variant spoken in Okt'omberi). Data from Nizh were scant. This picture has changed since the appearance of a collection of Nizh Udi poems and tales published by Kechaari 2001. In addition, Udi is documented by narrative texts(both native and translations from Russian), poems, and samples of the conversational style that had been recorded over the years 1850-2002. A translation of the Gospels has been prepared at the end of the 19th century (Bežanov & Bežanov 1902, Schulze 2001). Finally, fieldwork data have been collected by Adolph Dirr (1904), by Vladimir Pančvidze (1960ies), by Alice Harris and by the author of the present review.

Typologically speaking, Udi is marked for a number of features that are alien to its sister (better: cousin) languages (such as Lezgi proper, Tabasaran, Aghul etc.). These features include the 'personalization' of the agreement system (instead of noun classification), massive presence of verb forms marked for incorporation, and the partial splitting of the relational primitives S (Subjective), A (Agentive), and O (Objective)(see Schulze 2000b for details): Basically, Udi shows an ergative case paradigm. Nevertheless, S and A can be demoted to the 'Indirect Objective' domain (S/A > IO) with verba sentiendi and to encode a potential mood. On the other hand, S can be promoted to the Agentive function (S > A) to mark a strongly controlling referent in subjective function. The Objective is marked for one of the two Dative cases in case the referent is thought to be (textually) definite. In addition, Udi is characterized by clausal subordination that (in parts) replaces the East Caucasian standard of participle and converbial subordination.

2. The book's purpose and contents

As has been said above, the main purpose of Harris' book is to provide evidence that endoclitization in a synchronically valid technique of syntactic organization. However, the book goes far beyond this synchronic issue: It aims at the explanation of why and how the endoclitization technique arose in Udi. This diachronic perspective is embedded into the general framework of Diachronic Syntax as presented in Harris & Campbell 1995. Doing so, Harris also exploits comparative evidence stemming from related languages in the Eastern Caucasus. In order to formulate the synchronic mechanisms of endoclitization, Harris makes special reference to Optimality Theory.

The book is organized as follows: A first introductory section (pp.3-19) states the basic problems dealt with in the monograph. Section Two (pp. 23-165) discusses the synchrony of the Udi agreement system both from a paradigmatic and a syntagmatic (functional) point of view. This section also includes an Optimality Approach to the phenomenon at issue (chapter 7). In section Three (which, in fact, represents the core of the book), Harris outlines a complex scenario of the emergence of endoclitization in Udi (pp. 169-284). The book concludes with a brief 'Afterword' (pp.283-4), a comprehensive bibliography and an index.

In sections One and Two, Harris introduces the grammar of Udi which makes the book more than just a comprehensive presentation of endoclitization in Udi: As the subtitle of the book suggests ('Origins of Udi Morphosyntax'), Harris is well aware of the fact that the Udi agreement system is at the core of the grammatical organization of the language: Agreement controls a wide range of syntactic and pragmatic properties (focus, verbal valence, referential tracking, 'subject' alignment etc.), just as it is controlled by such properties (functional cases, communicative and deictic reference, Tense/Mood system etc.). Consequently, Harris has to familiarize the reader with the major features of Udi grammar (including certain aspects of morphophonology), which makes the book also an introduction into the (functional) grammar of Udi as such.

In this sense, the first two chapters are compiled from a didactic perspective. This aspect comes also clear from the fact that here, interlinear glosses are given only for those forms that are under consideration. The further Harris progresses in her argumentation, the more explicit the interlinear glosses become. The depiction of the Udi grammatical system relies on both standard grammars (there are at five such grammars ranging from Schiefner 1863 to Schulze 1982) and textual data (note Harris does not make use of the corpus presented by the Gospels. The new Nizh materials (Kechaari 2001) were not yet published by the time the author had finished her manuscript). In general, Harris confirms what has been said in the grammatical sources. There is, however, one major exception: None of the grammatical treatments of the Udi agreement system did account for the functional distribution of personal clitics: These can occur both with verbs and with extra-verbal constituents as in (1). [See bottom of file for special orthographic symbols.]

(1) (a) *xinär-en gölö śum u-ne-k-sa*
girl-ERG much bread:ABS eat-3sg-$-PRES
'The girl EATs much bread.'

(b) *xinär-en gölö śum-ne uk-sa*
girl-ERG much bread:ABS-3sg eat-PRES
'The girl eats MUCH BREAD.'

(c) *gölö śum xinär-en-ne uk-sa*
much bread:ABS girl-ERG-3sg eat-PRES
'The GIRL eats much bread.'

(The symbol '$' indicates the second part of a verbal stem preceded by an endoclitic element. Capital letters indicate focused constituents). Harris is the first who relates the formal distribution of these clitics to a functional scenario. Accordingly, the placement of agreement clitics is governed by both properties of the clausal information flow (constituent or sentence (prepositional) focus) and special features of the constituents. For instance, certain particles and pronouns that are in 'natural' focus (negation, adhortative, question) always call for a personal clitic. In case these particles again have clitic properties, 'piggybacking' can take place: I use this term to describe the fact that the resulting clitic cluster behaves as a single clitic (see Schulze (forthcoming) for a detailed account of the piggybacking process):

(2) (a) *ğar-en śum-q'a-n uk-sa*
boy-ERG bread:ABS-ADH-3sg eat-PRES
'The boy should eat BREAD.'

(b) *ğar-en śum u-q'a-n-k-(e)sa*
boy-ERG bread:ABS eat-ADH-3sg-$-PRES
'The boy SHOULD EAT bread.'

Three Tense/Mood categories always call for a clitic in enclitic position: The Factitive Future (labeled Future2 by Harris), the Modal (called Subjunctive by Harris), and the Imperative (usually derived from the Modal). Harris carefully analyses the distributional patterns in question and convincingly relates them to a set of (preference) rules that allow her to give an account of these 'rules' in the framework of Optimality Theory: "[I]t is shown that this approach can account elegantly for the complex set of requirements and option for placement of the Udi PM [Personal markers, W.S.]" (Harris 2002:7).

The fact that Harris succeeded in describing a set of functional conditions for the placement of Udi agreement clitics can be safely termed a 'linguistic discovery'. Harris has opened the door to a truly 'new' perspective for the description not only of the Udi system but also of other systems that, too, show floating agreement clitics (such as some Northwest Iranian languages, e.g. Northern Talysh, see Schulze 2000b). This perspective is characterized by the linkage of syntactic and pragmatic arguments that serve as a descriptive scenario for morphological facts. By 'focusing on focus', Harris shows that the clausal organization in Udi is heavily dominated by non-categorial, but pragmatic features that bounce back on nearly every grammatical 'category'. In addition, the pragmatic domain is also present in the ontology of 'words' in Udi: In Chapter 4, Harris gives an illuminating discussion of the degree of 'wordiness' of Udi verbs. She shows that clitization and prosodic features interact to produce incorporated verb forms. As typologically expected, this process is coupled with the gradual dereferentialization of the host, compare:

(3) (a) *xinär-en aš-ne b-esa*
girl-ERG work:ABS-3sg make-PRES
'The girl does a/the WORK.'

(b) *xinär-en aš-ne-b-sa*
girl-ERG work-3sg-make>LV-PRES
'The girl WORKs.'

Harris shows that verb forms marked for incorporation structurally behave like simplex verbs: The same constraints on agreement clitics apply that are characteristic for simplex verbs. Nevertheless, Harris correctly observes that stem-internal endoclitization is blocked with incorporating verbs:

(4) (a) *xinär-en nana-xo xabar-re-aq'-sa*
girl-ERG mother-ABL news-3sg-take-PRES
'The girl asks (lit.: takes news from) mother.'

(b) **xinär-en nana-xo xabar-a-ne-q'-sa*
girl-ERG mother-ABL news-take-3sg-$-PRES

The fact that incorporated elements represent the preferred host of agreement clitics with sentential focus illustrates that agreement is not lexically determined but conditioned by pragmatic factors: Incorporated elements represent the semantic (or: lexical) 'highlight' in

complex verbal structures that then end in rather desemantisized 'light verbs' (LV) no longer accessible to endoclitics.

Both pragmatic and syntactic conditions have given rise to the fact that Udi agreement clitics in parts copy the relational properties of their 'personal' trigger: Accordingly, these clitics are 'bipolar': They identify their host as being in focus and relate it to the referential 'center' of a clause which then is subcategorized according to the feature 'person' (three persons for both singular and plural). This 'identifying' property of the agreement clitics usually is organized in an accusative way (echoed referents are in subjective/agentive function). In case these referents are demoted to the 'indirect objective' function (with verba sentiendi), the clitic echoes this process in Vartashen: Here, the 'Dative' clitics are then used instead of the S/A-clitics, compare:

(5) (a) *xinär-a śum a-t'u-k-sa*
girl-DAT bread:ABS see-3sg:IO-$-PRES
'The girl sees a bread.'

(b) *xinär-en sa śum be ʕ-ne-ğ-sa*
girl-ERG one bread:ABS look=at-3sg-$-PRES
'The girl sees (looks at) a bread.'

Harris (pp.29) calls this constructional pattern 'Inversion'. In Sections 8.2 and 11.4, she illustrates the gradual adjustment of this pattern to the standard transitive pattern claiming that in Nizh, this process has today come to its end.

The assumed 'reformulation' of this constructional pattern relates to the diachrony of Udi morphosyntax (and: morphosemantics). In fact, Harris devotes nearly the totality of Section Three to the diachrony of Udi morphosyntax in order gain an explanatory basis for her analysis. Whereas Chapter Two takes a rule-based perspective, Chapter Three interprets the data in terms of dynamic or processual features.

The explanatory section is divided into five chapters: In Chapter 8, the author gives an outline of the morphological history of those forms that are involved in the make-up of Udi clauses: Case morphemes and agreement clitics. But note that the title of Chapter 8.2 ('Inherited Case Marking') is somewhat misleading: Harris does not talk about historical morphology but illustrates the degree to which the basic case marking patterns in Udi match those of the cognate languages. Chapters 8.3 and 8.4 take a more 'morphological' perspective: Harris argues that the whole set of Udi personal clitics "developed from independent pronouns, and this is clearly correct, even though some problems remain" (p.182). In fact, this claim that reflects standard assumptions on the origin of Udi agreement markers comes true for at least the 'oblique' (Dative and Genitive) of the clitics echoing speech act participants. In addition, the same provenience must be described for the 'first person' in general. However, the claim is not easy to support for the remaining clitics. Both phonetic and morphosyntactic problems heavily weigh upon this hypothesis which is based on a perhaps too 'universal' perspective (see below and Schulze (forthcoming)).

In addition to the standard clitics, Udi knows a distinct clitic to echo a questioned third person singular referent (Q-clitic). So far, this clitic has remained unexplained. Harris is the first to propose a diachronic model that is said to have produced this morpheme (pp.183-6): Accordingly, she interprets the clitic *-a* as a reflex of the Persian conjunction *yā* meaning 'or'

used in yes/no-questions. As an analogon, Harris takes into consideration the German pattern: *Sie bleiben hier, oder?* ('Are they staying here?' < 'They stay here, or?'). To this we can add the Turkish pattern *Ahmet var ya* 'Ahmed is there, or (not)', occasionally used in the sense of yes/no-questions. However, it should be noted that neither the German nor the Turkish pattern represent morphologically marked 'questions'. Rather, we have to deal with shortened 'or' constructions that are marked for an additional prosodic pattern that produces the yes/no-question. The same is true for the rare instances, in which Udi '*ya*' (~ '*ye*') in either/or-questions. Harris' analysis is based on the assumption that here, 'ya' lost its initial element *'y-*' when following a constituent that ended in '*-i*'. In a second step, the resulting element '*-a*' would have been extended to first yes/no-questions, and later to WH-questions. Note that in contemporary Udi, '*-a*' is (longer) used with yes/no-questions. Although Harris' proposal is rather attractive, it is difficult to support both from a functional point of view and from the diachronics of Udi. For instance, the reduction of '*ya*' to '*-a*' presupposes that *-i*-final constituents were frequent enough to initiate this process. Although it has been often observed that less frequent paradigmatic types can induce reanalysis and extension, we have nevertheless to bear in mind that out of a lexical corpus of 3.856 Udi words liable to host the 'clitic' '*-ya*', only 104 are marked by final '*-i*' (= 2.7 %). In addition, Harris' proposal does not explain why the Q-clitic 'replaces' the standard third person singular clitic, as in:

(6) (a) *xinär-en śum-ne uk-sa*
girl-ERG bread:ABS-3sg eat-PRES
'The girl eats BREAD.'

(b) *xinär-en ek'a-a uk-sa?*
girl-ERG what:ABS-3sg:Q eat-PRES
'WHAT does the girl eat?'

Obviously, both clitics stand in complementary distribution (except for the fact that '*-a*' cannot occur as an endoclitic). This distribution suggests that both element ('*-ne*' and '*-a*') have a common categorial background. This hypothesis allows relating the two clitics to two different focal strategies in Proto-Lezgian (as they have, for instance, survived in Tsakhur, see Kibrik 1999). Accordingly, '*-ne*' < '*-*ni*' would have been used in so-called 'knowledge-based' (or: cognitive) focal contexts, where '*-a*' indicated a 'verificational' (or: indexal) focus (see Schulze (forthcoming) for details).

Chapters 9-12 concern the origin of the agreement pattern in Udi. In chapter 9, Harris relates the endoclitic technique to the history of Udi verbal stem formation. Harris carefully discusses possible stem types in Early Udi and in Proto-Lezgian. Here, she refers to the standard hypothesis that many of the Udi simplex verbs are marked for so-called petrified class markers: Accordingly, Udi once knew an agreement system that was based on the semantic subcategorization of a referential noun in subjective/objective function. In Udi, this technique is completely lost. Nevertheless, certain verbs such as 'bak-' 'to be(come)' probably show traces of this paradigm: Here, the first element '-b-' is seen as a reflex of the class marking strategy ('b-' = Class III (basically (grow-up) non-human animates and socially/culturally relevant objects). In addition, a verb stem could be marked by one or two local preverbs (see Harris 2002:197,218). In order to account for the 'endoclitic' slot in Udi verb stems, Harris develops four hypotheses: a) The paradigm of agreement clitics developed in situ: She dismisses this hypothesis, because she assumes that the Udi clitics "have developed from independent personal pronouns" (p.211). b) 'Trapping': According to this hypothesis, endoclisis would have resulted from the univerbation of formally distinct lexical structures

(incorporated element + verb). In order to account for root endoclisis, Harris refers to a third hypothesis: c) Simple movement of the 'Person Markers'. Here, it is claimed: "Intramorphemic positions developed as a result of the intermorphemic positions which has come about through univerbation" (p.212-3). d) The fourth hypothesis describes "person markers as the 'slot holder' of Proto-Lezgian C[lass] M[arker]s" (p.213). According to this hypothesis, Udi agreement clitics would have taken over the position of the former class markers that already occurred in endoclisis. Pp. 215-222, Harris compares the last three hypotheses by referring to the individual history of a number of Udi simplex verbs stems. She concludes that all three hypotheses "play a role in the explanation of the origins of endoclisis in Udi".

The chapters 10 to 12 interpret the emergence of the Udi agreement technique in terms of both a formal and a functional diachrony. Harris argues that constituent focus stems from older clefting strategies residues of which are said to be found in Udi sources of the 19th century. To explain this point, let me quote an example from Harris (p.237-240):

(7) *xunči-muğ-on xorag-ax-q'un häzir-b-esa*
sister-PL-ERG food-DAT2-3pl prepare-DO-PRES
'The sisters are preparing the FOOD.'

According to the Cleft Hypothesis, such a construction would have resulted from the following pattern (note that here, the past tense is used by Harris in order not to complicate the matter):

(8) **xorag* BE [*no xunči-muğ-on häzir-b-i*]
food:ABS COP it:ABS sister-pl-ERG ready-do-PAST
'It is FOOD that the sister are (read: were) preparing.'

The structure in (8) differs from that in (7) in that the 'agreement marker' (originally an anaphoric pronoun) copied the clefted constituent in just the case form that is expected by the verb in the dependent clause (Objective > Absolutive). Harris argues that the "process of reanalysis (here of (8), W.S.) (...) must have consisted of the reinterpretation of the biclausal cleft as a monoclausal structure" (p.240). In consequence, "the case of the FocC (= Focused Constituent, W.S.) changed from absolutive to that determined by its grammatical relation in the monoclausal structure.... [T]he pronoun/PM changed from agreeing with the FocC to agreeing with the subject" (p.240-1). Harris extensively dwells upon this rather problematic hypothesis that perhaps is too strongly oriented towards more general assumptions on the developments of Clefts in the languages of the world. Contrary to the preceding section of the origins of endoclitization, Harris does not consider alternative proposals to explain the focal nature of agreement clitics in Udi. This fact renders Chapter 10 somewhat suggestive. Readers familiar with Cleft typologies will probably happily refer to this chapter in order to draw more general conclusions. However, they are deprived from possible alternative perspectives which would direct their generalizations to another road (see below).

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that once Harris has taken her position, which is well formulated, theoretically well-grounded, and empirically supported by well-chosen examples, the analysis ends in a (by itself) coherent and (by itself) convincing scenario. It ends in the explanation of the positional constraints on Udi agreement clitics (Chapter 12). Here, Harris pays special attention to those Tense/Mood forms that necessarily call for a clitic and hence disallow constituent focus. The author does not relate these constraints to a single cause but

argues that different functional and morphological processes have led to the 'same' result. Most importantly, Harris is the first to suggest an explanation for the fact that the modal verb forms ('subjunctive' in her terms) are always followed by the agreement clitics. Accordingly, the modal forms stem from the reanalysis of sequences marked by a postponed clitic cluster (adhortative particle 'q'a-' + clitic). In sum, Harris arrives to describe the diachrony of all positional constraints and preferences.

All claims and arguments put forward by Harris are easy to read and to follow. In fact, the book is well organized and full of summarizing paragraphs that allow the reader to check whether (s)he has fully understood the by itself rather complicated matter. The main advantage of the book is that it (also) addresses an audience that is not familiar with East Caucasian linguistics. The careful (nearly pedagogical) way of familiarizing the reader with Udi linguistics makes the book a pleasure to read. It appeals to the analytic interest of reader and to his/her readiness to re-enact proposals to solve the puzzle of Udi morphosyntax and morphopragmatics. Harris not only tells the thrilling story of how Udi morphosyntax may have emerged, but also constantly helps the reader to locate the analyses in more general theories of language function and language change.

3. Critique

'Endoclitics' is said to "appeal to theoretical linguists, especially those interested in the interface between syntax and morphology. It will also be of considerable interest to historical linguists and students of Caucasian languages" (from the cover of the book). This quote illustrates the three basic perspectives the author has taken. It is quite natural that specialists in either of these perspectives will look differently at what Harris' analysis is built upon. In my remarks, I will take the perspective of both a Caucasianist and a Typologist and will leave the debate on whether the Optimality Theory perspective taken by Harris in Chapter 7 is appropriate or not to people more qualified than I am. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Harris' theoretical argumentation heavily relies on the correctness of the Udi data that represent the bulk of the empirical background of the book. As has been said above, the corpus exploited by Harris does not represent the totality of what is currently available for Udi. Crucially, Harris does not take into consideration the Udi Gospels (Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902). In fact, the Gospels represent more than the half of all Udi data. Although the Gospels are translated from Russian and thus have to be taken with great care, a closer look reveals that the morphosyntax of the Gospels (not necessarily its syntax) comes close to what Udi has been at the end of the 19th century. On the other hand, Harris heavily relies on the texts edited by Schiefner 1863. Most of these texts, however, have a rather obscure history. Again, the bulk of these texts is translated from Russian (and, as for the dialogs even from German (!), it seems). Contrary to what can be said for the Gospels, we cannot safely describe the degree of authenticity of these texts. As Dirr (1904:v) says, Schiefner's work has to be referred to with great caution. More concrete: "The texts are neither Udi nor Russian from which they are translated. They resemble so few to the Udi language that I could not continue working with them with my Udi teacher ..., a native from Vartashen. Frequently, he did not understand (the texts) and asked me no longer to bother him with these texts" (Dirr 1904:viii; translation W.S.). This fact is crucial because Harris assumes that Schiefner's texts "represent a slightly earlier form of the language, with diachronic change accounting for the difference" (p.134). Here, it would have been good if Harris had taken a more critical position. Only if we have additional material that stems from other authors of the same period we can judge whether Schiefner's Udi actually reflects 'true' Udi.

The fact that Harris did not consult the Gospels (which can still be processed by contemporary Udi speakers from Vartashen) has conditioned that the author sometimes arrives at problematic generalizations. For instance, she postulates a set of monoconsonantal verbs that do not allow endoclitization. Among others, Harris refers to the verb 'b-esun' 'to do, make' (stem 'b-'). On p.219, she claims that endoclitization does not occur with this verb. However, the Gospels nicely show examples like

(9) *be-z-sa*
do-1sg-$:PRES 'I do'

be-ne-sa-y
do-3sg-$:PRES-PAST
'(S)he did'

Such forms are rejected by Harris (p.219). However, Matthew 26:10, Mark 6:14, John 8:41; 7:3, 10:38 clear evince the possibility to use endoclitics with the verb '*besun*'. Also note '*be-q'un-sa*' (do-3pl-$:PRES) 'they do' in the native tale Rust'am (1888). Accordingly, 'besun' is not a monoconsonantal verb, but reflects an older stem **be-_-'-* (*-_-* is used to indicate the endoclitic slot) that again is derived from a root '**-ə'a-*' (preceded by the petrified class marker **b-*).

Some of the reconstructions proposed by Harris importantly affect her general analysis. This holds especially for the origin of the clitics themselves. As has been said above, Harris takes the position that the Udi clitics stem from independent (personal or deictic) pronouns. This hypothesis gives her the clue to establish the Cleft Hypothesis. Without alluding to the problems raised by this hypothesis itself, it must nevertheless be said that the proposal has so many phonetic and functional shortcomings that it is difficult to subscribe to it any longer. Rather, we should think of an interplay between older focal strategies based on constituent focus (Proto-Lezgian '**-ni*' ~ '*-a*') and the gradual development of personal paradigms that started with the first person (a process that is typical for a number of other Lezgian languages). This assumption allows proposing an alternative scenario that does not make use of the Cleft Hypothesis. A simple example is:

(10) *xinär-en śum-ne uk-sa*
girl-ERG bread:ABS-3sg eat-PRES
'The girl eats BREAD.'

< **xinär-en śum-ni uk-sa*
girl-ERG bread-FOC eat-PRES

According to this hypothesis, the 'local' focus marker '**-ni*' once had been used with all persons (or: impersonally). In 'egocentric' contexts (involving a first person), it became replaced by the first person pronoun whereas in the second person, the clitic '*-ni' was (later) accommodated to the phonetic shape of the corresponding pronouns (see Schulze (forthcoming) for details).

I have elaborated this point in order to show that Harris' Cleft Hypothesis takes a perhaps too narrow perspective. The critique of other hypotheses put forward by Harris is perhaps less relevant for the evaluation of the whole scenario described by the author. Nevertheless, the reader is sometimes left with the impression, that Harris has unnecessarily complicated the

matter: For instance, Harris has to describe a rather idiosyncratic sound change (*-i-q'a- > *-i-a > -ai) to account for the constraint on the modal ('subjunctive') (see above). In a second step, she has to describe a process of reanalysis (> -a-_-i) to arrive at the actual paradigm of the Udi modal. Neither the sound change, nor the metathesis can be safely described for Udi. In addition, the assumed process of reanalysis is without parallels in Udi. In fact, it is much more simple to assume that the Udi 'Past Modal' (marked by -ai and followed by agreement clitics) once represented a modal form for its one (< Conditional), which later (in parts) merged with the past variant of the standard modal in -a (which itself is taken from the Imperative). This analysis refers to the functional (or: categorial) cluster 'Epistemic < Deontic' which is crucial not only for Udi but also from the point of view of a general theory of Modality.

Finally, it should be added that Harris rarely refers to language contact as a possible clue to understand the morphosyntax of Udi. For instance, it is out of question that the paradigm of personal clitics has been both formally and functionally influenced especially by Northwest Iranian languages, but also by Old Armenian, by Georgian, and, last but not least, by the local varieties of Azeri. The same probably holds for the emergence of Fluid-O structures (also know as 'Differentiated Object Marking', DOM) the understanding of which is crucial for the discussion of focus, as Harris has convincingly shown herself.

Nevertheless, what Harris tells us is currently one of the best (and most straightforward) proposals we have at our disposal to approach the typology of endoclitization in Udi. But we should be aware of the possibility that progress in Comparative Lezgian (and Udi) linguistics may arrive at a partially or totally different picture of Early Udi morphosyntax. In this respect, we should also bear in mind that the recently discovered palympsest from Mt. Sinai that most likely contains a variant of Early Udi (5th - 7th century) will probably tell us more about the architecture of Early Udi, once the palympsest has been read (see Aleksidze/Mahé 1997, 2001, Aleksidze 1998-2000). It may well be that the language of the palympsest confirms Harris' diachronic assumptions. But it may likewise be the case that the contrary is true. Hence, Harris' should taken as what it is: A remarkable and highly professional study in the morphosyntax of Udi that reflects our knowledge of this language at the turn of the century.

The book itself is well done from a formal point of view. The bibliography refers the reader to most of the relevant literature; an index helps him/her to spot points of interest in the text. Unfortunately, the book contains a number of typographical errors that, however, normally do not affect the understanding of Harris' argumentation. In sum, we have to praise the author for having undertaken the enterprise to approach the functional and formal scope of agreement clitics from both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. This book will surely help to make typologists and theoreticians more familiar with this language, which - as shown by Harris - challenges some of the generalizations current in contemporary linguistics.

4. Bibliography

Aleksidze, Zaza & Jean-Pierre Mahé 1997. Découverte d'un texte albanien: une langue ancienne du Caucase retrouvée. CRAI 1997:517-532.

Aleksidze, Zaza 1998-2000. Remarques sur le déchriffrement de l'écriture albano-caucasienne. RArm 27:423-428.

Aleksidze, Zaza & Jean-Pierre Mahé 2001. Le déchiffrement de l'écriture des Albaniens du Caucase. CRAI 2001 [in press].

Bezhanov, Semon & Bezhanov, Mikhail 1902. Gospoda Našego Iisusa Xrista Svajtoe E.vangelie ot Matfeja, Marka, Luki i Ioanna. Tiflis: Typ. Kancelarii Glav. 1902 (Sbornik Material djla Opisanija Plemen i Mestnostej Kavkaza XXX).

Harris, Alice C. & Lyle Campbell 1995. Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistics Perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kechaari, Georgi 2001. Orayin. Bakı: Azərbaican Dövlət Nəšriyyatı.
Kibrik, Alexandr E. (red.) 1999. E.lementy caxurskogo jazyka v tipologičeskom ocveščenii. Moskva: Nasledie.
Klavans, Judith L. 1979. 'On Clitics as Words'. CLS parasession volume, 68-80.
Schiefner, Anton 1863. Versuch [ber die Sprache der Uden. Mémoires de l'Akadémie impériale de sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, VII série, vol. vi., no. 8. St. Peterburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Schulze, Wolfgang 1982. Die Sprache der Uden in Nord-Azerbaidzhan. Studien zur Synchronie und Diachronie einer süd-ostkaukasischen Sprache. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Schulze, Wolfgang 2000a. The Accusative Ergative Continuum. General Linguistics 37:71-155.
Schulze, Wolfgang 2000b. Northern Talysh. Munich: Lincom Europa.
Schulze, Wolfgang 2001. The Udi Gospels. Annotated Text, Etymological Index, Lemmatized Concordance. Munich: Lincom Europa.
Schulze, Wolfgang (forthcoming). A Functional Grammar of Udi (to appear 2007).

Date: Fri, 18 Apr 2003 13:18:32 +0200
From: W. Schulze <W.Schulze@lrz.uni-muenchen.de>
Subject: Australian Languages: Their Nature and Development

Dixon, R. M. W. (2002) Australian Languages: Their Nature and Development, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge Language Surveys.

This book was announced at http://linguistlist.org/issues/13/13-166.html

Wolfgang Schulze, University of Munich

The book under review has an interesting title ('Australian Languages' (henceforth 'AL')): It lacks what is found with most of the other volumes in the Cambridge Language Survey series, namely the definite article (compare 'The Celtic Languages' etc.). Assuming that this type of indefinite reference is chosen deliberately, one may infer from the title that Dixon's book is not just another reference book about the totality of Australian languages. In fact, Dixon's book considerable differs from the standard 'encyclopedic' presentation of a language 'group'. What Dixon aims at is to do two things at the same time: To acquaint the reader with the structural and categorial properties of the 'autochthonous' language in Australia and to both illustrate and corroborate his central thesis that the evolution of these languages cannot be accounted for in terms of simple Stammbaum models. Instead, Dixon makes extensive reference to his equilibrium model that has found its first comprehensive treatment in Dixon 1997. Consequently, Dixon's 'Australian Languages' rather is a unique study in diachronic areal linguistics rather than a simple taxonomy of 'the' languages of Australia. This fact may perhaps disappoint those readers who are primarily interested in some kind of 'check list' of Australian languages, but it turns the book into an extremely interesting and fascinating 'reading book': I had difficulties to lay aside the book once I had started to read it. It tells us a comprehensive and in parts even thrilling story about the Australian languages, but it also calls for the reader's permanent attention not to lose the thread.

Fortunately enough, the book at issue represents only one side of the albeit not fully coined medal: The other side will be a 'companion volume' ('Australian languages: a complete catalogue') that 'will consist of a short account of each of the 240-50 languages, giving tribal and dialect names, traditional territory and current situation, plus a summary of the main phonological, morphological and syntactic features. Together, the two volumes will most likely satisfy all the demands of contemporary linguistics when referring to 'the' Australian languages.

The reader should also be aware of the fact that AL does not simply represent an actualized version of Dixon's 1980 volume ('The languages of Australia' (LoA)). In the 'Preface' to AL, the author makes clear that LoA can only be seen as a preliminary approach to a methodologically and conceptually validated description of the Australian languages. Accordingly, AL represents the 'mature' version of LoA. Nevertheless, the reader should not expect that Dixon simply dresses the LoA material with a new 'robe'. In fact, Dixon rarely refers to the LoA data and thus importantly extends the data base available to non-Australianists. Doing so, Dixon naturally benefits from the enormous progress the linguistics of Australian languages has made since the 80ies. Dixon thus covers most of the important findings that have come to the public since the appearance of LoA, claiming that 'in this volume I take account of all published and unpublished materials.' But he adds that he has

only included 'bibliographical references that are strictly relevant to the overall thesis which is developed in the volume.'

Although AL introduces the reader to the specific perspective Dixon has taken, the book is nevertheless (more or less) theory-neutral with regards to the linguistic framework applied. This means that AL can be used by readers which camp so ever they have chosen. Nonetheless, it comes clear that Dixon's perspective neatly fits into the standard descriptive and analytic paradigm of Language Typology or ' to put it in Dixon's terms ' into Basic Linguistic Theory (see Dixon 1997).

The book is organized in fourteen chapters, preceded by lists of maps, of abbreviations, and of languages and language groups. At the end of the book, a comprehensive bibliography (roughly 600 entries) is followed by a language index and by a subject index (somewhat modest in seize). Most importantly, AL offers a number of highly informative and well-drawn maps (34 maps in sum) which allow the reader to graphically trace many of Dixon's observations and claims. Quite in accordance with the general goals of AL, the book does not give us a description of Australian languages 'language by language'. Instead, Dixon refers to a number of category-like features that serve as an anchor for the individual chapters. From a systematic point of view, both the choice of 'anchors' and their ordering are somewhat unconventional. For instance, there are word class related anchors (such as Chapter 6 'Verbs', chapter 7 'pronouns'), anchors related to morphology (Chapter 5 'Case and other nominal suffixes', Chapter 9 'Prefixing and fusion', and one explicit 'syntactic' anchor (Chapter 11 'Ergative/accusative morphological and syntactic profiles'). It is not always clear to me, why Dixon has chosen just these anchors (or: labels) instead of following a more 'traditional' arrangement. Nevertheless, the reader will soon get used to Dixon's way of presenting his findings, especially because it is coherent with the basic lines of his argumentation. Interestingly enough, it is the last major section of AL (Chapter 12), where we find a comprehensive description of the phonology of Australian languages. This ordering stands in the tradition of Dixon's presentation of Dyirbal (Dixon 1972) and other grammars of the 70ies. In parts, it reflects a 'top-down' argumentation (from larger to smaller units)' however in the case of AL, this line of arguments is not fully observed: The description of the syntactic profile of Australian languages is not put in the beginning, but 'in between'. In sum, AL first acquaints the reader with lexical features (Chapter 4 'Vocabulary'), then turns to Morphosyntax and Morphosemantics (Chapters 5 through 9), before coming back to semantically relevant features in Chapter 10 ('Generic nouns, classifiers, genders, and noun classes'). The chapter on the syntactic profile of Australian languages (Chapter 11) follows these lexical and morphological studies and again precedes the section of Phonology. The book ends with a section on 'Genetic subgroups and small linguistic areas' (Chapter 13) and with a brief summary given in Chapter 14.

The great number of Australian languages dealt with by Dixon has forced him to choose a special coding system for the language names. This system is introduced and explained on pages xxx-xlii (in addition, the author gives the relevant literature for each language). Although Dixon's system of classifying the totality of Australian languages is by itself extremely well-done, the convention he uses to refer to individual languages is somewhat difficult to assimilate by the reader. The abbreviations are hardly ever mnemotechnic (e.g. 'NG1' for Worrorra, North Kimberley Areal Group). As a result such phrasings like 'Languages with enclitic pronouns at Stage II include those in groups O, Q, T. W1, WGd, WI and NAB2. Prefixing languages at this stage include NB/f/g/h/i/k and ND-NK' (p.357) force the reader to again and again turn to the language list (as long as (s)he does not have

memorized the abbreviations) - a fact that may impede the pleasure of reading AL for those not used to the impressive universe of Australian languages (note that with examples from individual languages, Dixon usually gives both, the 'code' and the language name).

The main objectives of AL are described by the author as follows: 'I attempt to characterize what the indigenous languages of Australia are like, how individual languages have developed their particular structural profiles, and the ways in which the languages are related. A portrait is provided of the Australian linguistic area, which is certainly the longest-established linguistic area in the world' (p.1). This quote illustrates the three major perspectives, Dixon has taken: The book elaborates the major typological features of Australian languages in their areal and historical settings. Hence, it is both a synchronic and a diachronic study. However, the reader should not expect that these two levels of description and explanation are dealt with separately. Rather, Dixon integrates the synchronic description into a general diachronic perspective, which concentrates on the alleged dichotomy 'genetic relationship' vs. 'areal diffusion'. Accordingly, AL frequently refers to the historical setting in which the Australian languages are thought to have evolved. The reader will thus enjoy not only the wealth of linguistic data and their historical background, but also a great number of non-linguistic references towards the emergence and diffusion of Australian cultural practices. Dixon starts with a brief portrait of the 'language situation in Australia' (pp.1-19). This short chapter prepares the reader for the presentation of Dixon's Equilibrium Model in Chapter 2. It informs on the diffusion of some basic social and other non-linguistic features of Australian societies and thus illustrates the assumption that language diffusion may coincide with the diffusion of cultural practices and cultural knowledge.

In Chapter 2 ('Modelling the language situation'), the author deepens the historical perspective by introducing his concept of Equilibrium and Punctuation. The concept that has its prolegomenon in Dixon 1997 is based on the assumption that traditional stammbaum (family tree) models cannot reflect the long range history of languages, especially when they are related to a specific area. Dixon argues: 'The family tree idea is an important and useful model of one kind of linguistic relationship. It is appropriate for describing a period of population expansion and split, with concomitant split of languages. It is not, however, an appropriate model for dealing with every kind of language situation' (p.23). In fact, Dixon assumes that family tree models are especially helpful to describe periods of split that are related to his stage of punctuation. The short phases are ' according to Dixon ' conditioned by at least the following non-linguistic factors (p.33-34): Natural causes (droughts, floods etc.), material innovation, development of aggressive tendencies, and territorial expansion. The longer stages of equilibrium are characterized by a rather homogenous or contiguous cultural habitus, by the lack of dominant political structures, and by a relative high degree of interethnic mobility. After having elaborated some key arguments for this model, the author relates it to the 'Australian scenes' (pp35-40). He clearly argues in favor of an Equilibrium model to describe most of the stages of Australian history and arrives at a 'tentative scenario for the development of languages in the Australian linguistic area' (p.38-40). Accordingly, the first population of the Australian/New Guinea area would have started some 40-50,000 thousands years ago and would have been marked by a first punctuation situation. The basic topographical division of the Australia/New Guinea landmass (flat, open regions towards the Southwest, mountainous rain forests towards the Northeast, to put it into simple terms) would have caused two different types of development: The linguistic area in the flat, open regions would have been 'maintained for tens of millennia' (p.39), whereas the linguistic area in the mountainous regions would split up into more local groups. After New Guinea became separated from the Australian landmass (between 14.000 and 7.000 BC), the languages

spoken in the Australian landmass (between 14.000 and 7.000 BC), the languages spoken in the forest areas of the Northeast of Australia became part of the linguistic area of Australia, 'with Australian languages infiltrating it from both north and south' (p.39). Next, Dixon gives illuminating examples for the processes of language split and language merger, both of which can be described for Australian languages. In an appendix to Chapter 2, the author carefully discusses possible aspects of punctuation that would argue in favor of the Pama-Nyungan idea and arrives at the conclusion that 'Pama-Nyungan' cannot be supported as a genetic group (p.53).

The objective of Chapter 3 ('Overview') is to 'provide an initial perspective on the nature of Australian languages' (p.55). Although this 'overview' is very helpful to readers not acquainted with Australian languages, Dixon nevertheless warns that 'the reader will be able to get the maximum out of the survey in the chapters which follow if they have studied one or more good grammars of Australian languages' (p.56). Perhaps, Dixon's warning is too strong: AL tells its complete story at least to those readers who are used to some kind of 'typological' argumentation. True, it would have been useful if the author had provided the reader with descriptive sections on a (limited) number of Australian languages in order to tell them 'how the systems work'. However, such sections would have expanded the volume to a dimension that would have been beyond the rational. It addition, one might have wondered which language to choose viewing the fact that hardly any Australian language can serve as an etalon for the whole linguistic area.

Chapter 3 first describes three salient semantic features of Australian languages, namely the opposition between 'actual' and 'potential', the 'volitional/non-volitional' parameter, and the general 'trend' to use 'generic terms' instead of or going with specific terms. 'Genericity' turns out to be relevant for nearly all Australian languages: 'In summary we posit an original scheme whereby great use is made of a smallish number of generic nouns and verbs, with wide meanings' (p.62). After having described some basic properties of the phonology of Australian languages, Dixon turns to a number of grammatical features: He discusses word classes (hinting at the relevance of ideophones), the relational role of nouns and adjectives, the architecture of pronouns and demonstratives etc., verbs and verbal inflection, derivational strategies, marking of possession, clause structure and constituent order, aspects of modal variation (commands, negation, questions), and the organization of complex clauses. The chapter ends with a brief consideration of special speech styles such as song style, initiation styles, and avoidance, or respect styles.

Chapter 4 (pp. 96-130) deals with the 'Vocabulary' of Australian languages. Here, Dixon not enumerates the different semantic 'classes' relevant in the languages at issue (such as kin terms, generic terms, names, adjectives etc.), but also illustrates metaphorical preferences and other semantic processes. The following domains are extensively illustrated: Flora and fauna, body parts, kin terms, artefacts, other nouns, adjectives, and verbs. Dixon usually refers to a number of 'key terms' to illustrate the areal distribution and possible genetic relations. This section includes very helpful taxonomic lists, among them a list of 68 verbal stems ordered in from a semantic perspective (motion, rest, giving, affect etc.). The chapter ends with a discussion of the lexical survey from a phonological point of view.

Chapters 5 through 11 concentrate on specific grammatical issues. In Chapter 5, Dixon describes basic patterns of case marking and other paradigms related to this topic. The main purpose of this section is not to simply list the case paradigms of individual languages, but to propose a comprehensive areal typology and functional explanation of the patterns in

question. Accordingly, the first part of Chapter 5 is devoted to a portrait of case functions in Australian languages, distinguishing core clausal functions from peripheral functions, and phrasal functions from local functions. Here, Dixon adopts the descriptive and analytic framework of syntactic functions (or relational primitives) as developed in Dixon 1994. He makes a clear distinction between 'syntactic' and 'Semantic' functions and suggests that the accusative/ergative terminology should be confined to syntactic marking (p.133), whereas the semantic domain is to describe with the help of more 'semantic' terms. One might ask whether this distinction is appropriate from a cognitive point of view (see Schulze 2000): It would suggest that case markers in Australian languages are in parts homonymous (e.g. the ergative marker '((y)inggu in the Southern Kimberley subgroup which is said to have semantic rather than syntactic functions' (p. 133)). In addition, one might wonder whether it is useful to apply terms for case forms to the functional domain: For instance, Dixon uses the term 'Genitive' to indicate both the formal and the functional category. The same holds for terms like 'ergative' and 'absolutive' etc.. Nevertheless, the taxonomy of noun phrase functions as given in AL is a rather helpful tool that is applicable to languages outside the Australian area, too. This taxonomy includes the following functions: S, A, O (core), Purposive/Dative, Instrumental, Causal, Aversive (peripheral), Genitive, Comitative, Privative (phrasal), and locatives. Note that for locatives, Dixon describes the fact that '[e]very language has some grammatical marking for the three basic spatial functions (a) locative; (b) allative; and (c) ablative (p.142). Accordingly, Australian languages are marked for a basically 'triptotic' system as opposed to 'diptotic' systems that would show the merger of the locative with one of the directional functions. In the second part of Chapter 5, Dixon discusses the distribution of case forms in Australian languages. The main advantage of this section is that Dixon does not try to map the great variety of case forms onto a single set of 'proto-Australian' case markers. Instead he makes clear that there areal diffusion is crucial for the explanation of the current patterns. Nevertheless, he concludes: ' The evidence points towards there having been a small number of nominal suffixes at an earlier stage of the Australian linguistic area ' perhaps just our foundational cases (ergative, locative and purposive) plus comitative' (p.173).

The sixth chapter touches upon the relational domain ('Verbs'). Interestingly enough, Dixon also considers adverbs in this context, which makes sense from a functional point of view. In addition this section illustrates that many Australian languages are marked for Path Conflation rather than for Manner Conflation. The section starts with a brief discussion of transitivity in Australian languages. Accordingly, the (in)transitivity dichotomy is strictly observed in most languages, although there are several 'exceptional' valence types (such as ambitransitives, unusual case frames etc.). Simple verbs are marked by a 'simple verb root' to which derivational and inflectional affixes may be added (among them reflexes of the pan-Australian (!) derivational suffix *-dharri 'which may originally have had a basically semantic effect (indicating, say, that an action which is normally volitional is in this instance non-volitional)' (p.183). Complex verbs consist of one or more coverbs and one simple (often generic) verb. Dixon uses the simple/complex dichotomy to describe seven basic types (based on the question how many simple verbs, derived verbs and coverbs are present in a given language). Again this typology serves to describe the diffusion in terms of areal features. The section on 'Verb forms and inflections' (pp. 209-237) informs on the distribution of TAM-forms in Australian languages. The degree of variation ranges from just two categories (e.g. in Wik-Ngathan) to 'a dozen or more terms' (e.g. Panyjima, p.212). The author relates the TAM-morphology to a rather complex hypothesis about the emergence of 'conjugation classes' in Australian languages. Dixon suggests that at an earlier stage verbs could end both in a vowel or in a nasal or liquid. The non-vocalic element would later have been reanalyzed as a separate element that could merge with TAM-elements (such as imperative, purposive, or

irrealis). The interaction of now 'conjugational markers' and TAM- morphemes would have led to a great number of TAM-allomorphs and new TAM-morphemes.

In Chapter 7, Dixon deals with pronouns. He starts with a discussion of categorial features, that is with the degree of semantic subclassification within the set of personal pronouns (dual, inclusive/exclusive etc.). Although in 'almost every Australian language there are different roots for sg and n[on]-sg or for min[imal] and non-minimal pronouns' (p.246), the typology of pronouns can be scrutinized with the help of the standard parameter 'lexically vs. morphologically based extension of number features'. Dixon arrives at the following conclusion: '[A]t an earlier stage, the pronoun system had fewer number distinctions, probably just sg and n[on]-sg, and that 'rrV was the n[on]-sg marker. A du[al]/pl[ural] distinction developed later and spread by areal diffusion ' (p.255-6). In order to account for the complex world of personal pronouns in Australian languages, Dixon gives a detailed discussion of both pronominal stem forms and of derivational element. This includes a highly sophisticated analysis of paradigms that lack morphological means to produce non-sg forms. Dixon concludes that the evolution of pronominal paradigms has started with a simple system (1/2(/3)). In addition, there may have been an inclusive 'as an extra-systemic term' (p.292). The interaction of the elements in this basic system has led to various kinds of reanalysis and extension resulting in the present-day paradigms. In addition to this discussion, Dixon surveys the evolution and diffusion of pronominal case forms starting with the hypothesis that at an earlier stage, '[s]g pronouns ha[d] distinct forms for S, A and O functions' (p.299), in other words that they were marked by a tripartite paradigm. Unfortunately, Dixon does not pay the same degree of attention to demonstratives as to personal pronouns. He states: 'The forms of demonstratives vary widely . There is need for a full survey across the Australian linguistic area . All I offer here are a few exploratory remarks' (p.335). Hopefully, the task of approaching demonstratives from the 'Dixonian' point of view will soon be accomplished.

Chapter 8 ('Bound pronouns') nicely extends the question of personhood in Australian languages to verbal morphology. Although bound pronouns are typical for prefixing languages, they can be nevertheless described for a number of suffixing languages, too. Usually, bound pronouns mirror bipersonal agreement (S in intransitive clauses, A+O in transitive clauses). Yet, a number of languages have extended their agreement system to peripheral function, while others (though limited in number) may perhaps show an accusative pattern (S, A). Finally, '[a] sprinkling of languages have a limited (and often irregular) set of bound pronouns' (p.345). The chapter extensively reports on the formal, functional, and categorial properties of bound pronominal paradigms in Australian languages. Most importantly, Dixon also compares these properties to the corresponding sets of free pronouns showing that there frequently is a mismatch between these two instantiations of personhood.

Chapter 9 is devoted to prefixing techniques that are relevant for verbal inflection. The number of prefixes may range from fourteen prefix slots in Tiwi to just two (fusing) prefixes in e.g. Alawa (Arnhem Land Group). In order to explain prefixing techniques, Dixon refers to basically two operations: 1) The development of bound personal pronominal clitics into prefixes, and 2) the compounding of coverb plus simple verb into a single unit (p.409). The author extensively portrays the structure of prefixing chains and also considers nominal incorporation as it shows up in about twenty of the prefixing languages (organized in three geographical blocks in Arnhem land). As to expected, noun incorporation mainly concerns nouns in S or O function. Nevertheless, nouns in peripheral function (such as instrumental or locative) may be incorporated, too, e.g. in Warray, Tiwi, Emmi and Patjtjamalh (p.427). Semantically speaking, 'a body part noun is most typically incorporable into the verb, a

generic noun often is, and an adjective occasionally is' (p.427). AS can be expected from the discussion of the heuristic value of 'Pama-Nyungan', see above), Dixon also argues against the interpretation of prefixing techniques as an evidence for genetic relationship among prefixing Australian languages (in the sense of 'proto-prefixing').

Chapter 10 ('Generic nouns, classifiers, genders and noun classes') brings the reader back to semantic (and lexical) issues. Dixon starts with an analysis of generic nouns and classifiers as they frequently show up in Australian languages. He then turns to the question of the 'feminine' marker 'gan' found in some languages of eastern Australia and to gender in free pronouns (especially in the third person singular). Noun classes (marked on bound pronouns) are current in prefixing languages. Semantic 'gender' is present in at least five of the non-prefixing languages, including Wagaya, Diyari, Wangkumara, Bandjalang, and Dyirbal. It is interesting to see that Dixon illustrates the famous four class system of Dyirbal without alluding to Lakoff 1987 together with the assumption of radial categories as proponed by Lakoff. With prefixing languages, noun classes may vary from two to eight in number. Dixon claims that '[t]he variation in noun classes is consistent with the hypothesis presented here, that noun classes have developed recently, as an areal phenomenon, within the prefixing region. It is basically the category of noun classes that has diffused, with each language developing the actual marking for itself, out of its own internal resources' (p.471). On p.515 Dixon states: 'A pervasive theme of this book is the alternation between ergative and accusative schemes of morphological marking in Australian languages'. In fact, many of the parameters, categories and semantic or syntactic features referred to so far are structurally coupled with strategies of clausal organization (see Schulze 2000). Chapter 11 ('Ergative/ accusative morphological and syntactic profiles') is intended to bring the reader back to this central point of grammatical organization. Here, Dixon first recapitulates the means used to mark relational behavior in terms of morphology. The author assumes that originally, nouns were marked for an ergative behavior, whereas personal pronouns were marked for an accusative behavior. This common pattern would then have been rearranged and reanalyzed in different ways, leading to both 'pure' ergative and 'pure' accusative patterns in some languages of Australia. In addition, Dixon discusses the question of how the syntactic feature of pivothood interacts with clause internal strategies of marking relational behavior. He distinguishes languages with no syntactic pivot from languages with an S/O syntactic pivot and from languages with a 'mixed' pivot (e.g. S/O pivot for nouns and S/A pivot for pronouns in Yidinj). Switch reference as a specific type of pivotal behavior can be found especially in the central and western areas of Australia. The author then correlates pivothood to strategies of antipassivization (S/O pivot) and passivization (S/A pivot). Finally, he looks at a number of shifts in profile. He comes to the conclusion that '[t]here does appear to be something of an overall trend towards a more fully acc[usative] system, but there are also languages moving in the opposite direction. The great majority of languages retain both erg[ative] and acc[usative] elements in their grammatical profile' (p.545-6).

The survey of linguistic features in Australian languages ends with an in-depth study of phonology (Chapter 12). Dixon starts with two important phonetic observations that stem from the feather of A. Butcher (forthcoming): First, 'the lowering of the velum for nasal consonants tends to be delayed as long as possible' (p.547). As a result, nasalized vowels rarely occur. In addition, this tendency may result in 'prestopped nasals' that may become distinct phonemes in a number of languages. Second, 'in a stressed syllable, the pitch peak tends to occur relatively late in the syllable' (p.547). As a result, the syllable onset is relatively weak, whereas a coda consonant tends to be strengthened. These two tendencies can be related to a more general articulatory 'habitus' that accounts for the relative close similarities

in the phonological systems of Australian languages. Dixon describes the 'canonical' sytem of Australian phonological organization and then relates individual phonetic features (laminals, apicals and rhotics) to areal distributional patterns. Other phonetic aspects referred in this chapter include initial dropping and medial strengthening, stop contrasts, fricatives and their historical development, the question of glottals, vowels, and phonotactic features. The chapter on 'Phonology' is especially important because here Dixon illustrates and discusses a vast number of phonetic processes that are typical for certain 'blocks of languages'. It comes clear that many such processes cannot be accounted for in terms of simple 'sound changes' as described for punctuated situations of language split.

This point brings us back to the overall model of how languages have evolved in Australia. In Chapter 13 ('Genetic subgroups and small linguistic areas'), Dixon resumes this question. He again stresses that the view of an Australian genetic macro-family 'cannot be sustained when the proper methodology of comparative and Areal linguistics is applied to the Australian situation' (p.659). Nevertheless, Dixon does not claim that the 'Australian situation' is characterized by complete entropy. He shows that a number of low-level genetic subgroups can still be described. Here, he discusses the following groups: the north Cape York subgroup, the Cairns subgroup, the Maric proper subgroup, the Central Inland New South Wales subgroup, the Wannji/Garrwa subgroup, the Yolngu subgroup, the Northern Desert Fringe (putative) subgroup, the Ngarna subgroup, the Tangkic subgroup, the Maringrida (putative) subgroup, the Mnid subgroup, the Kitja/Miriwung subgroup, the South Kimberley subgroup, and finally the North-west Arnhem Land (putative) subgroup. In sum, the author thinks of about forty low-level genetic subgroups ('mostly consisting of just two or three languages' (p.691). On the other hand, Dixon suggests a number of smaller linguistic areas with languages 'hav[ing] much greater similarities to other languages in the area than to anything outside the area' (p.668-9). The following smaller areas are described: Lower Murray, Arandic, North Kimberley, and Daly River. For a number of (genetic) subgroups, Dixon develops a scenario of expansion. For instance, he claims that North Cape York 'is basically of non-Australian type, but with some Australian substratum' (p.681). Maric seems to have expanded from the coasts of the Coral Sea to the inlands. The books ends with a brief summary (pp.690-699), which gives a fairly good though rather condensed overview of the claims and analyses put forward in AL. In his final paragraph, Dixon states: 'The Australian linguistic area poses problems of investigation and analysis unlike those found anywhere else in the world. The established methods of historical and comparative linguistics, which can be applied so successfully elsewhere, have limited appropriateness in Australia' (p.699). Perhaps, this claim too strongly emphasizes the uniqueness of the 'Australian situation'. A cursory look at for instance the 'East Caucasian situation' will reveal that other non-Indo-European areas, too, face the same kind of problems as they have been described by Dixon. In other words: It may well be that the success of the 'Indo- European' comparative method mirrors nothing but the peculiarities of the Indo-European type of language change and diversification. The worth of AL is ' among others ' the fact that Dixon proposes and applies a methodological alternative that departs from the given linguistic situation itself rather than from generalized hypotheses about language change that stem from a linguistic area quite different from the Australian situation in space and time. This does not necessarily mean that we have to adopt Dixon's methodological pathways as such to other linguistic areas. It may well be that this approach is fruitful for such other areas, too. But we should also take into account that different historical setting may result in different types of language change, diffusion and diversification. The main lesson non- Australianists learn from Dixon's book is that just as historical developments may follow both more general patterns and idiosyncratic lines, the language(s) of speech communities not necessarily develop alike.

In sum, AL is an extremely important contribution to both Australianists and non-Australianists. Australianists will probably have to work through the many details to judge whether all of Dixon's hypotheses and claims will finally 'pass the examination'. Non-Australianists will profit from AL in at least three respects: First, they are introduced to the 'Australian situation' in a way that is generally easy to follow. Sure, one has to get involved in Dixon's descriptive and analytic arguments. One has to accept that Dixon's way is stony and full of deviations, windings, and sometimes perhaps too suggestive short cuts. Many will object to some aspects of this way, but for the time being it seems that there is no other way to go. Second, the book can be used as a good instruction to the typology of Australian languages, disregarding whether or instruction to the typology of Australian languages, disregarding whether or not one accepts Dixon's 'Diachronic Areal Typology'. Third, the book also shows how to approach linguistic categories from a descriptive point of view. Not every category or function discussed by Dixon will withstand the critics of Theoreticians, which camp so ever they belong to. Yet, AL opens the way towards a descriptive mode that seems to be applicable to other linguistic areas, too.

REFERENCES

Butcher, A. (forthcoming). The phonetics of Australian languages. Oxford: OUP.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1972. The Dyirbal language of North Queensland. Cambridge: CUP.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1980. The languages of Australia. Cambridge. CUP.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. Ergativity. Cambridge: CUP.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1997. The rise and fall of languages. Cambridge: CUP.

Lakoff, G. 1987. Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind. Chicago: CUP.

Schulze, W. 2000. The accusative ergative continuum. General Linguistics 37:71-155.

Date: Fri, 28 Nov 2003 15:53:35 -0500 (EST)
From: Wolfgang Schulze <W.Schulze@lrz.uni-muenchen.de>
Subject: Cognitive Linguistics and Non-Indo-European Languages

Casad, Eugene H. and Gary B. Palmer, ed.(2003) Cognitive Linguistics and Non-Indo-European Languages. Mouton de Gruyter, Cognitive Linguistics Research 18.

Announced at http://linguistlist.org/issues/14/14-1357.html

Wolfgang Schulze, University of Munich

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps, a potential reader of Casad & Palmer 2003 (C&P) will first be (slightly) irritated by the title of the volume: The term 'Indo- European' is conventionally is to denote a genetically motivated language family and hence belongs into the domain of historical comparative linguistics. 'Non-Indo-European' languages thus are just those languages that do not figure as members of this stock. Now, how is it possible to link the subject of a study that is defined by historical or comparative parameters, to the paradigm of cognitive linguistics (unfortunately called a 'theory' by Casad and Palmer in the 'Introduction'? Perhaps, the first idea would be ask in which way cognitive linguistics can contribute to the genetic classification of languages outside the Indo-European family. However, to my knowledge, cognitive linguistics has rarely been used in this respect (a fact which is deplorable enough). In other words: It would not be very wise to expect from the title of C&P that the book deals with just this perspective. In fact, what C&P refer to by the term 'Non-Indo- European' is thought to represent a heuristic class rather than a structurally or analytically motivated subject. In introducing the volume to the reader, C&P say: "The proponents of a linguistic theory that lays claim to applying universally must demonstrate its application to the study of all spoken languages and not just the standard Western European and other well-known Indo-European languages" (p.1).

This phrasing used to define the scope of the book raises a number of problems some of which may appear sophistic. Others, however, are crucial to the general layout of the volume. First of all, it remains opaque what C&P mean by 'standard Western European': This terms reminds us of Whorf's 'Standard Average European' (SAE), although the reader is not told whether C&P intend to adopt the Whorfian (and often criticized) way of defining SAE. In addition, C&P postulate 'other well-known Indo-European languages' without illustrating when such a language is well-known and in which respect. In my eyes, the use of a family-tree related term to define the scope to which a 'linguistic theory' is applied only makes sense if the theory contributes to the structure of the 'family-tree' itself. In the given case, I cannot escape the impression that the term 'Non-Indo-European' is used in a journalistic way rather than in a scientific one. In fact, what we have at hands is a 'view from the periphery': C&P importantly contribute to a cognition-based approach to languages that do not belong to the central 'space' of linguistic experience as documented in a number of e.g. English centred paradigms. Crucially, C&P also include Cognitive Linguistics into this 'centred' perspective: "In view of the apparent potential of Cognitive Linguistics as a general theory applicable to all languages, we are surprised by what appears to be an increasing dominance of representation from English and other IE ('Indo- European', W.S.) languages in Cognitive Linguistics forums" (p.3). By itself, this observation is undoubtedly correct and a good argument in favour of preparing a volume as the book at issue. Nevertheless, it also includes a rather problematic claim, namely that we have deal with Cognitive Linguistics in terms of a 'theory

applicable to all languages'. However, Cognitive linguistics surely is not a one- dimensional 'general' principle or body of principles used to explain linguistic phenomena (in terms of a causa efficiens or a causa finalis), but rather a heterogeneous set of approaches to language(s) based on common assumptions about the motivation of language phenomena.

If ever the term 'theory' is applicable in the given context, it should refer to specific types of generalization as they characterize for instance Langacker's Cognitive Grammar or the Lakoffian type of Cognitive Semantics. It is interesting to see that (in their 'Introduction') C&P oppose Cognitive Linguistics to approaches as formal syntax, typology, and comparative linguistics (p.3). If we bear in mind that formal syntax is basically 'cognitive' (although from a different perspective) and that both typology and comparative linguistics turn out to have a 'cognitive correlate' (Cognitive Typology in the broader sense and grammaticalization 'theory'), the concept of 'Cognitive Linguistics' turns out to be more a special type of linguistic practice rather than a 'theory'. In sum, the general perspective taken by the editors (as it is encapsulated in the title) draws the reader's attention to a problematic direction. In fact, a paraphrase like 'Cognitive approaches to language phenomena: A view from the periphery' more accurately describes the contents of the present volume.

OVERVIEW

The volume contains sixteen articles of different length, preceded by an introduction of the editors and followed by both a subject index and a language index. The articles are arranged geographically, starting in South America (Quechua), touching upon central America (Cora and Nahuatl), North America (Salish), hopping to Asia and the Western Pacific Rim (Hawaiian, Isnag, Tagalog, Thai, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean) and ending up in Europe (Finnish). In their introduction, C&P review the sixteen papers from a topic point of view (the labels in brackets are mine): 1. Metaphor, metonymy, polysemy and cultural models (that is Cognitive Semantics in a broader sense); 2. Causativity, voice, subjectivity and reference points (syntax); 3. Nominals: salience, polysemy and prototypicality (referential semantics), 4. Spatial semantics: Locatives (again Cognitive Semantics), 5. Comparisons and contrasts (typology). The fact that all papers are oriented in basically the 'same' direction is perhaps related to the fact that they are the output of a theme session ('Cognitive Linguistics and Non-Indo-European languages') held at the International Cognitive Linguistics Association Conference in Stockholm (1999). In addition, this 'common direction' is also due to the fact that nearly all papers are strongly oriented to two 'classical' perspectives taken in Cognitive Linguistics, namely Cognitive Grammar (à la Langacker) and Cognitive Semantics (à la Lakoff). On the one hand, the 'theoretical' commonalities of the individual papers (unfortunately rarely addressed as such) render the book rather homogenous. On the other hand, however, some readers may have difficulties to always follow the lines of arguments because they are strongly related to a given framework (such as Cognitive Grammar) [an example is the two impressive figures in David Tuggy's article (p.103-4) which illustrate the Reduplication Construction in Nahuatl].

In their 'Introduction' already referred to above, C&P concentrate on two jobs: First, they try to outline the dimension of Cognitive Linguistics with respect to Non-Indo-European languages. Here, they convincingly argue that "the world of non-Western languages offers a breathtaking opportunity to delve into a wide spectrum of empirical and theoretical issues, some of which are new (...) and others that have hitherto resisted satisfactory explanations constructed in other linguistics theories" (p.2). In addition they want to show that the volume is intended to avoid "the insularity for which (e.g., W.S.) generative linguistics was so

strongly criticized in its early years" (p.3). It goes without saying that both arguments are nicely met in all the papers of the volume. C&P correctly state: "This book will contribute to the advancement of cognitive linguistic theory (sic!) by giving it a wider scope of applications and testing it against a wider spectrum of languages". Sure, the data and analyses presented in the book put new complexion on both Cognitive Linguistics and the languages hitherto discussed in this perspective. However, this claim becomes relativized if we look at one of the (few) passages in the Introduction that 'define' the 'theory' of Cognitive Linguistics. On p.4, C&P say: "[We]e believe that cognitive linguistics offers the greatest potential for a scientific theory of language that relates syntax to semantics and studies language in a away that is consistent with current research on neural network theory as well as cultural theory". This quote contains a number of highly questionable claims and terms. For instance: If there is a 'scientific theory of language': What is and which role does play a 'non-scientific' theory of language? And: Is it really the main goal of cognitive linguistics to relate syntax and semantics? In my view, this assumption deprives Cognitive Linguistics from its perhaps most powerful 'axiom', namely that any kind of linguistic reality or phenomenon is grounded in cognition, be it synchronically or diachronically (see Schulze 1998:1-14 for a discussion of this 'axiom'). The alleged triade Cognitive Linguistics' <> Neural Network theory <> Cultural theory is far from being more than a mere scientific project (or: speculation). Note that C&P use the singular 'theory' for both the Neural Network and the Cultural domains giving the illusion that there would be just a single theory (which certainly is not the case). In other words: The sloppy formulations given in the Introduction are at risk to denounce the project of Cognitive Linguistics rather than to lay the ground for a substantive discussion.

Second, the Introduction carefully summarizes the sixteen articles given in the volume. Once getting into the data, C&P present a much more consistent and highly illuminating view of what Cognitive Linguistics may be about. The authors carefully discuss the highlights of the individual papers and aim at contextualizing the different arguments with the help of cross-references and more general remarks. Finally, C&P come back to Cognitive Linguistics itself by suggesting a number of issues for further studies. Here, another weak point in the efforts to describe the Cognitive Linguistics enterprise becomes obvious: Just as is it true for the empirics of Cognitive Linguistics (see above), Cognitive Linguistics is characterized by an 'increasing dominance of representation from English' (to use the wordings of C&P). In other words: The many studies in Cognitive Linguistics written in languages others than English (among others in French, Russian, Spanish, Portuguese, and German) are rarely considered by English-based practitioners of Cognitive Linguistics. This aspect sets mainstream Cognitive Linguistics itself at risk to be marked for 'insularity' just as it has been deplored by C&P for the empirics of Cognitive Linguistics. This aspect becomes especially evident when looking at the section on 'future studies'.

Unfortunately, space does not allow to discuss at length the important and in parts brilliant papers included in the volume. The following summaries perhaps help to stimulate the reader's interest just as C&P's introductory summary stimulated the interest of the reviewer.

In his article "Completion, comes and other "downers": Observations on the semantics of the Wanca Quechua directional suffix -lpu" (pp.39-64), Rick Floyd proposes a complex analysis of the functional scope of the 'down' location in Quechua. Contrary to vertical location strategies for instance in East Caucasian, the directional morpheme -lpu seems not to be related to the distal, but rather to the proximal (which again can be transposed from the speaker to another entity). Hence, -lpu is coupled with subjectivity in its broadest sense. Floyd nicely elaborates the metonymic and metaphorical extensions of -lpu and compares them to

for instance the use of 'down' in English and ka- in Cora. The article undoubtedly lays the ground for a more general model of the metonymic and metaphorical potential of the conceptualization of verticality.

Eugene H. Casad brings the reader back to one of the perhaps most studied Uto-Aztecan language, namely Cora. His article "Speakers, context, and Cora conceptual metaphors (pp.65-89) departs from metaphorical expressions for "talking about everyday goofs, shortcomings and failures" (p.65) to arrive at a complex model of Cora metaphorization processes which include (among others) image schemas, the speaker's vantage point, mental spaces, landmark/trajector specifications, and fictive motion. The analysis is again based on locative constructions (preverb plus the verb 'icee glossed 'pass by a conceptual reference point').

David Tuggy ("Reduplication in Nahuatl: Iconicity and paradoxes" (pp.91-133) explores the interaction of form and function/semantics with respect to the domain of reduplication in Nahuatl. His findings will surely stimulate comparable research in other heavy reduplicating languages.

David Beck talks about "Conceptual autonomy and the typology of parts of speech in Upper Necaxa Totonac and other languages" (pp.136-156). His article aims at contextualizing Langacker's Cognitive Grammar in a typological perspective, concentrating on "a cross-linguistic viable semantic characterization of parts-of-speech" (p.135). He uses the concept of 'closedness' to account for the well-known scale (not continuum, as Beck says!) THING <> RELATION (note that this article heavily relies on Cognitive Grammar which means that it does not question some basic assumptions of Cognitive Grammar such as the closedness of THING which in fact may turn out to be just a secondary construction (see Schulze 2001)).

Kenneth William Cook turns the reader's attention to "Hawaiian 'o as an indicator of nominal salience" (pp. 157-171). He suggests that 'o is not a copula verb but (from a formal point of view) a copular preposition (note that most of his arguments against a copular verb interpretation are difficult to subscribe from the point of view of copular typology, see Pustet 2003). From a functional point of view, Cook convincingly arrives at the conclusion tat we have to deal with a "marker of nominal salience" (p.167).

In his article "Animism exploits linguistic phenomena" (pp. 173-192), Rodolfo R. Barlaan discusses the Isnag (Northern Luzon, Philippines) taboo terminology with respect to their cognitive layers and the conceptual and linguistic processes to derive the taboo words (e.g. borrowing, phonological disguise etc.).

Gary B. Palmer's article ("The Tagalog prefix category PAG-: Metonymy, polysemy, and voice" (pp.193-221)) deals with one of the Tagalog verbal prefixes (pag-), analyzing it for its conceptual contents and functional behavior. He arrives at the conclusion that the "schema that subsumes all the PAG forms is action or process that is either profiled in the root or stem or latent in its base".

Douglas Inglis' article ("Conceptual structure of numeral classifiers in Thai" (pp.223-246) is the first of four articles devoted to Thai. His treatment surely importantly improves the general typology of classifiers.

Kingkarn Thepkanjana brings the reader back to syntax: In "A cognitive account of the causative/inchoative alternation in Thai" (pp.247-274) the author nicely elaborates the dynamics of the causative/stative (or: causative/inchoative) pairing (which can also be called 'labile', adopting the terminology for transitive/intransitive pairings e.g. in East Caucasian) and - by questioning the assumption of basicness - arrives at the following conclusion: "I therefore claim that the verb and its noun argument(s) (...) express distinct gestalts" (p.270).

Margaret Ukosakul explores Thai from the point of view of Cognitive Semantics. In her article "Conceptual metaphors motivating the use of Thai 'face'" (pp.275- 303), relates the basic concept of 'face' to the domains of shame and honor and illustrates how and to which degree metaphorical processes are provoked by cultural scripts and models.

The 'Thai section' of the volume ends in Jordan Zlatev's contribution "Holistic spatial semantics of Thai" (pp.305-336). The author refers to his framework of 'Holistic Spatial Semantics' (HSS) in order to show that "a theory of the linguistic expression of spatial meaning that stems from the conceptual framework of situated embodiment" (p.308) for situated (or, in his somewhat unfortunate terms: holistic) spatial semantics in Thai. Zlatev, among others, shows that the famous opposition 'verb framed languages' vs. 'satellite-framed language' (Talmy 185) does not hold in a universal perspective. His final conclusion is worth being quoted: "While formalist approaches err in ignoring the semantic dimension, cognitive approaches tend to err by ignoring the distributional/structural dimension" (p.332). It can hardly be said better!

Ning Yu deals with "The bodily dimension of meaning in Chinese: what do we do and mean with 'hands'?" (pp.337-362). The author takes up the well-known embodiment hypothesis to analyse the grammaticalization effects of Chinese shou 'hand' together with semantic effects in compounding. Crucially, the basic level concept of HAND is related to temporal relations (especially inchoatives) which opens a new window for explaining the grammaticalization path of certain tense/aspect forms.

In a case study from Japanese and Korean, Kaoru Horie asks "What cognitive linguistics can reveal about complementation in non-IE languages" (pp.363-388). The author opts for combining Cognitive and Typological explanations (an enterprise successfully accessed for instance in a number of papers in Gildea 1999). Interestingly enough, the author of this paper is modestly criticized by the editors in the 'Introduction'. Their main point is that Horie's critics of the frame typology already above-mentioned does not necessarily hold for clausal interdependencies. In this context, they suggest to refer to the Langacker framework to explain Horie's finding (p.27), instead of (?) approaching "the problem from a broadly conceived Cognitive Linguistics viewpoint" (p.25-6).

Satoshi Uehara also discusses Japanese issues in his article "Zibun reflexivization in Japanese: A Cognitive Grammar approach" (pp.388- 404). Comparing the use of zibun to English reflexives as they show in the English translation of newspaper editorials, Uehara depicts the schematic differences between the two constructional types.

Mari Siiroinen brings the reader back to Europe: "Subjectivity and the use of Finnish emotive verbs" (pp.405-417) discusses the well-known problem of emotive verb construction types in terms of Langacker's notion of subjectivity.

The final article by Foong-Ha Yap and Shoichi Iwasaki turns to a grammaticalization issue: "From causatives to passives: A passage in some East and Southeast Asian languages" (pp.419-445) is a nice elaboration of the causative>passive path based on the grammaticalization of the lexical concept GIVE. They come to the conclusion that "semantic and functional extensions from causatives to passives is (sic!) a natural and fairly robust phenomenon crosslinguistically" (p.440). The grammaticalization path proposed by the authors can importantly help to explain parallel features in other languages of the world.

CONCLUSIONS

It is out of question that all articles published in C&P represent highly scholarly and important reflections on language(s). The individual papers offer a wide range of both linguistic data and explanatory perspectives. Some of the papers will probably strongly influence analyses related to the languages under discussion, others will stimulate researchers to look for parallel data, processes, or explanatory options in 'their' languages or in a cross-linguistic perspective. A drop of bitterness, however, has to be added: After having worked through the book, the unbiased reader may be left with the impression that Cognitive Linguistics is mainly expressed in the framework of Cognitive Grammar ï¿½ la Langacker. Langacker probably is the author most often quoted in the volume. However, Cognitive Linguistics undoubtedly is more than Cognitive Grammar and even Cognitive Semantics. Perhaps, it would have wise if the editors would have stated more accurately that (and why) most of the papers given in the volume start from Cognitive Grammar, sometimes neglecting other (likewise promising) perspectives. In other words: I would have been glad if I had learnt not only about the applicability of the Langacker framework to what is called 'Non-Indo-European' languages, but also about the possible problems that would face this framework with respect to the data from the languages presented in the volume. Here, a well- known danger arises: It may well be that once a certain perspective has been taken, it tacitly decides on which data are selected in order to sustain the perspective.

The book itself is well-done, although a number of typos have not been eliminated. For instance, on p.27 both a paragraph and an example seem to be missing, and Langacker 2000 referred to in the Introduction is not given in the references. Still, such minor do not effect the overall impression: An important book, which helps to promote the study of cognitive foundations of language(s).

REFERENCES

Gildea, Spike (ed.) 1999. Reconstructing Grammar. Comparative Linguistics and Grammaticalization. (Typological Studies in Language 43). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pustet, Regina 2003. Copulas - Universals in the Categorization of the Lexicon . Oxford: OUP.

Schulze, Wolfgang 1998. Person, Klasse, Kongruenz. Vol. 1: Die Grundlagen. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Schulze, Wolfgang 2001. Selbstlernen und Selbstreflexion: Grundlagen einer Emergenz-Theorie der sprachlichen Interaktion auf der Basis der 'Grammatik von Szenen und Szenarien'. Munich: Working Papers in Cognitive Typology 1.

Talmy, Leonard 1985. Lexicalization patterns: sematic structure in lexical form. T. shopen (ed.). Language typology and syntactic description Vol. 3. Grammatical categories and the lexicon, 57-149. Cambridge: CUP.

Date: Sun, 25 Jan 2004 23:59:17 -0500 (EST)
From: Wolfgang Schulze <W.Schulze@lrz.uni-muenchen.de>
Subject: The Paradigmatic Structure of Person Marking

Cysouw, Michael (2003) The Paradigmatic Structure of Person Marking, Oxford University Press, Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory.

Announced at http://linguistlist.org/issues/14/14-1969.html

Wolfgang Schulze, University of Munich

INTRODUCTION

One of the perhaps most uncontroversial claims related to universal aspects of human language concerns the concept of personhood. In linguistic work, this conceptual layer often is taken for granted and escaped from further elaboration, especially in descriptive work. On the other hand, personhood has been a crucial issue especially in language philosophy, yet rarely reflected in standard linguistic treatises. Not surprisingly, Paul Forchheimer's famous doctoral dissertation (Forchheimer 1953) has remained the only comprehensive survey on 'personal pronouns' for fifty years. Admittedly, a number of individual papers and allusions to the issue in studies related to typology and semantics have appeared on the linguistic market deepening the insights in the linguistic expression of personhood. Nevertheless, the author of the book under review can only be praised for having undertaken the enterprise not just to revise Forchheimer's approach, but to present a typology of personhood that is based on contemporary cross-linguistic methodology and that exploits both the specialized literature published since Forchheimer 1953 as well as proposals related to typological generalizations.

To say it from the beginning: What we have now at hands is perhaps the best survey on the paradigmatic organisation of linguistic personhood ever compiled. Micheal Cysouw's 'The Paradigmatic Structure of Person Marking' (henceforth PSPM) represents a revised version of his 2001 University of Nijmegen doctoral dissertation and we can only thank Oxford UP for having accepted the book to be published in its 'Oxford Studies in typology and Linguistic Theory' series. The inclusion of PSPM into this series not only guarantees the attention of the world- wide linguistic audience but also conditions that Cysouw's work is packed into a well-done and appealing format. Hence, we can expect that PSPM will soon become a standard book of reference for issue related to the morphology of personhood that by far exceeds the quality of its predecessor, namely Forchheimer 1953.

Nevertheless, PSPM cannot be uncontroversial. The reader should constantly recall the title of the volume that focuses on 'paradigmatic structure'. In other words, it deals with aspects of form that are related to functions. This classical form-to-function (here: paradigm- to-function) approach necessitates certain deductive claims on categorial and semantic issues used as a 'tertium comparationis' in Cysouw's formal typology. However, Cysouw avoids pathways that would start with a general discussion of categorial aspects of personhood as present for instance in the tradition of language philosophy, in language sociology, and linguistic psychology. Perhaps, this reluctance to design a 'semantic' template of personhood is due to the fact that even in very recent approaches to the semantics of linguistic units as expressed for instance in the framework of Cognitive Semantics, the question of personhood rarely exceeds very general statements related to the function of 'person markers' in a speech act. In PSPM, the author devotes just three pages (pp.5-7) to discuss some semantic issues of

personhood. Not surprisingly, he makes reference especially to those authors who relate personhood to its role in a turn-taking cluster of speech acts (especially Goffman 1979, Levinson 1988). Accordingly, his definition of 'person marker' reads as follows: "They have to be a shifter, specialized for that function, and used for reference to speech act participants" (p.5). Much can be said about this delimitation of person markers, which clearly shows that Cysouw is not too much interested in the underlying semantics of such markers. For instance, it soon comes clear that the definition does not necessarily hold for so-called non-Speech Act Participants (termed 'other' by Cysouw): This category (if ever it is a linguistic category at all) is not marked for shifter functions, nor do the corresponding forms always specialize in the given function (e.g. demonstrative pronouns used as third person pronouns). In addition, they do not (as their name tells) make reference to speech act participants as such. In fact, a semantic-based typology of personhood would probably have to start from a rather different categorial setting, which would transgress most of the constraints or delimitations set up by the author. Most crucially, it would distinguish a cognitive layer of personhood from its pragmatization in discourse (e.g. in the sense of Mead 1934, Mauss 1938, Schulze 1998:575-601).

It thus comes clear that the reader will appreciate PSPM especially if (s)he has adopted the author's form-to-function approach. A different approach, e.g. based on Cognitive Typology, would probably have led to an alternative design of the paradigmatic embedding of linguistic forms related to the concept of 'person' and of the paradigm internal dynamics (see below). Perhaps it is one of the few shortcomings of PSPM that it does not draw the reader's attention to this fact.

PSPM is an extremely rich book, full of data and stimulating observations. It is out of question that the author had developed an invaluable tool to handle the paradigmatic structures of personhood. His cross-linguistic approach is based on the analysis of the relevant paradigms in more than four hundred languages and hence represents one of the broadest cross-linguistic studies ever prepared. In this review, it is impossible to account for all types of paradigmatic variation as they are elaborated in PSPM. The reader will greatly enjoy both the presentation of these paradigms: Cysouw uses a very helpful schematic representation which allows the reader to constantly refer to the general paradigmatic space described by the author and to locate the given data in this space. The reader will also profit from the careful presentation of the data which are constantly checked against their sources and thus can serve as a reliable data base for further studies.

Instead of detailing out the universe of paradigmatic variation and dynamics, I will briefly describe the overall scheme of the book under review before turning to some general remarks on the approach advocated for by the author.

OVERVIEW

PSPM comprises xiv+375 pages, divided into four major parts, which again are enclosed by an 'Introduction' (pp.1-35) and a 'Finale: Summary and Prospects' (pp. 295-321). In order to help the reader to easily retrieve information, the book gives a list of languages according to their genetic/geographical distribution, and three indices (names, languages, and subjects). The nature of the book conditions that the list of references is of considerable size (roughly some 600 entries). The fact that the author has consulted primary sources as much as possible, illustrates the tantalizing work Cysouw has undertaken. Nevertheless, it must be added that

certain relevant pieces of literature are missing, such as Russel 1940, Mead 1934, Mauss 1938, Anscombe 1981, Kantor 1952, Lévi-Strauss 1962, Myrkin 1964, or Majtinskaya 1969.

The introductory chapter nicely outlines the scope and objectives of PSPM. Most importantly, Cysouw makes clear that once the set of personal markers have been delimited, they have to be analysed in terms of the paradigms they establish. The 'content' of such paradigms may exceed or go behind of what we know from Standard Average European, to use a nevertheless problematic term. Just in the beginning of the Introduction, Cysouw acquaints the reader with the famous passage from Domingo de Santo Tomï¿½s' 'Grammï¿½tica o arte de la lengua general de los ï¿½ndios de los Reynos del Peru' (1560) that lays the ground for the well-known distinction between an 'inclusive' and an 'exclusive' 1pl. We have to thank Cysouw for having made available again this important passage (p.2) both in its original and in translation.

The Introduction also discusses the question of defining the paradigmatic space of personhood, addresses methodological issues and gives a brief report on previous cross-linguistic investigations on the given topic.

Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 discuss basic aspects of person marking. In Chapter 2, Cysouw refers to the "The Marking of Singular Participants",y"cely entitled "One among the Crowd" (p.41). Here, the author concentrates on questions of homophony, suggesting that a) such a homophony is comparatively rare, and that b) it is restricted to inflectional patterns. He argues for nine 'logical' types of homophony, eight of which he is able to back up. The ninth type is marked by second person = zero, 1/3 is marked, hence we have to deal with the opposite of e.g. the German type _ging_ (1/3) vs. _gingst_ (2) 'went'. However, if we look at admittedly rather specialized paradigms such as the cluster imperative-hortative, we may add many such examples, compare Udi (Lezgian) _campazu_ (1), _campa_ (2), _campane_ (3) 'write' (note that here, only markedness is used as a criterion, not the form of the marker itself). In addition, Cysouw describes the degree of variation that can be found with respect to zero-markers.

In Chapter 3, the view is extended to 'group marking'. Here, Cysouw suggests a very helpful redefinition of the notion of plurality. He arrives at a very important point, saying: "First, the multiple persons or objects have to be in the same predicative role. Second, the morpheme has to be unmarked as to the specific amount of elements. Finally, the morpheme should not include the regular reference for any singular person or object" (p.67). Undoubtedly, this chapter represents one of the many highlights of the book. It carefully introduces the reader to the world of pronominal 'plurality'.

Chapter 4 and 5 extend the discussion prepared in the preceding chapters to a typology of paradigmatic structuring. Cysouw develops his typology with the help of mnemotechnically useful terms that stand for specific 'types' (e.g. Latin-type, Sinhalese-type etc.). Each of these types serves as a template to discuss variations within this type. Again, he distinguishes non-homophonous split-types from those which show some kinds of homophony. A further distinction concerns the presence of the inclusive/exclusive dichotomy. Cysouw arrives at a total of sixty-three paradigmatic structures (p.165) and advocates against the assumption that most of these types represent corrupt or extended version of the SAE type marked for the typical six-way paradigm. Nevertheless, his findings allow him to observe eight common types, five semi-common types, whereas the bulk of paradigmatic variation is characterized as 'rare'.

Discussing 'compound forms' in Chapter 5, the author clearly argues in favour of an 'incorporation' strategy. Compound forms are those that either cumulate different persons (e.g. 'we+you') or render a given reading of a pronominal form more explicit (e.g. the Russian inclusive _my s toboy_ ('we [that is] with you', a striking analogy can be found in Inuktitut, see PSPM, p. 183)). Hence, Cysouw distinguishes a cumulative reading from an incorporative reading and arrives at the following conclusion: "The referential value of the compound pronouns either builds categories that are well known (...) or has identical reference as to the non-singular simplex pronouns" (p.184).

Chapter 6 and 7 turn to 'true' number forms. Having eliminated the concept of 'plurality' from the descriptive frame for quantitative reference with person markers, Cysouw correctly assumes that person markers are sensitive for number only if they refer to a concrete number of persons/objects. The author proposes the category of 'restricted groups' to denote this number layer. Restricted groups usually turn up as duals or trials. The (basically graphic) metalanguage developed by Cysouw is a powerful tool to account for variations in number. Nevertheless, it should be added that the glosses are slightly irritating, because the 'non-restricted group' section lacks such a corresponding glossing that would indicate the kind of reference towards person. Perhaps, it would have made sense to add glosses such as '1+2x' (= EGO + unspecified number of TUs), '2x' (= unspecified number of TUs), or '1+3x' (= EGO + unspecified number of non-Speech Act Participants' etc.).

Chapter 6 introduces the reader to the world of restricted number. Here, the author extensively discusses the problem of interpreting the inclusive, which Cysouw views as an ambiguous category (wavering between sg, du, and pl). Chapter 7 turns to "the diversity of restricted groups: a survey of dual person marking". Both duals with and without an inclusive/exclusive distinction are discussed, again concentrating on the types of homophony observed especially with bound pronouns (in sum thirty three paradigms).

Chapter 8 turns to the diachronic dimension. Note that Cysouw uses the term 'crypto-diachronic method', which he describes as follows: "The method (...) is not a historical comparison, but a typological comparison that starts from the broad typological generalization and tunes into the fine-grained differences with a genetic group" (p.247). The author sets up four conditions 'cognate' paradigms have to meet in order to be taken into consideration (p.248). Curiously enough, 'regular sound correspondences' are not among these criteria, although diachronic shifts present with the formal expression of person markers are crucial for both determining a cognate set and the conditions of change. Instead, Cysouw concentrates on questions of homophony and degree of explicitness in order to describe paradigmatic change. In other words: Paradigms are taken as some kind of 'gestalt' that tend to change with respect to their properties over time. The fact that Cysouw neglects the dynamics of sound changes renders it difficult to understand what he means by "phonologically closely related" (p.268). How does the author decide to decide that two forms are related according to this criterion?

For instance, the southern German dialects usually called 'Allemanic' show a third person plural 'bound morpheme' (present tense) _-et_ instead of _-en_. This difference accounts for a varying pattern of homophony (Allemanic 3sg+2pl+3pl / 2pl vs. Standard German 1pl+3pl / 3sg+2pl). If we would not know that the 3pl stems from _-ent_ that regularly developed into _-et_ in Allemanic, but to _-en_ in other dialects of German, we would perhaps assume that the paradigms are not related (admittedly, I cannot say whether Cysouw would interpret the 'correspondence' -_t_ ~ _-n_ as being 'phonologically close related'). Or: How can we decide

that German _-st_ (2sg) is related to say Latin _-s_ (2sg), but not to _-t_ (3sg), if we would not know that _-st_ is derived from *-s + *thu (you:sg)?

These examples may be trivial from an Indoeuropean point of view. Nevertheless, I would like to stress that the criterion mentioned above should be taken with great caution because especially with languages that lack a scientifically elaborated diachronic, similarity in form may turn out as 'false morphological friends'. Or vice versa: Formally non-similar forms may be based on the same morpheme (recall the Armenian nominal plural _-k`_ which corresponds to say the Latin -s- Plural). On the other hand, formal 'similarity' is sometimes used to construe rather problematic assumptions on the categorial affinities. For instance, p. 272 Cysouw starts with the Nabak (a Finisterre-Huan language from Papua) third person (group) _ekngen_ and derives it from the 3sg _ek_ saying "[t]he singular morpheme (...) is compounded with the second person non-singular [_in_] morphemes (sic!) to form third person non-singular forms". It is indeed difficult to understand how this compounding should yield a third person non-plural. The homophonous 2/3 non-singular _gin_ of closely related Wantoat does not help very much, because here the third person singular is _an_. Hence, we would have first to prove that Nabak _ek_ and Wantoat _an_ are related. Only if this correspondence can be safely described with the help of sound laws, we may go on and try to analyse forms like Nabak _ekngen_).

Nevertheless, it is out of question that Cysouw arrives at a very compelling picture of paradigmatic dynamics. Personally, I doubt whether we can go so far to design a 'cognitive map of interconnected paradigmatic structures' based on the criteria set up by the author (p.268). Still, Cysouw's approach can surely help to better understand the dynamics of paradigmatic change.

Chapter 9 extends the diachronic perspective to dual forms. The highly illuminating examples helps him to refine the generalizations of paradigmatic dynamics made in the previous chapter. He again refers to the two hierarchies suggested before (Explicitness Hierarchy and Horizontal Homophony Hierarchy), to which he adds the Dual Explicitness Hierarchy. A 'cognitive map of paradigmatic structure' nicely summarizes the options of paradigmatic change. Here, another word of caution seems appropriate: It is rather modern to refer to 'cognitive maps' in order to account for semantic or categorial correlations. However, each such 'cognitive map' should always be embedded into a more general theory that explains how paradigms are represented in cognition (if ever they are). Naturally, it is rather attractive and seemingly self-evident that the categories of personhood reflect a conceptual layer that organizes the inter-individual discourse. However, we may likewise assume that personhood is not a cognitive 'category' at all, but a side-effect of other cognitive (here: perceptual) 'mechanisms' (such as figure-ground parsing, empathy, distribution of knowledge among individuals and related presuppositions). In other words: What is at need is a cognitive theory of paradigms that goes beyond the standard assumptions of semantic and formal correlations. In the final chapter of PSPM, Cysouw first summarizes his central observations. He then tries to approach a 'theory of person marking' before turning to 'prospects'. Here, he turns the reader's attention to the correlation of 'independent' vs. 'inflectional' person marking. Accordingly, there is "a correlation between less explicitness in the paradigm (meaning more horizontal homophony) and more inflectionally marked pronominal paradigms" (p.313). In addition, Cysouw considers the crucial point of 'asymmetry of affixation' (segmenting a paradigm into prefixing and suffixing strategies). Here, the authors arrives at an interesting observation: "[T]here is a correlation between the size of the paradigm and the affixial status. (...) [T]he smaller paradigms are more often prefixes and the larger paradigms are more often

suffixes" (p.316). Finally, Cysouw briefly alludes to the question of gender marking. Here, I would have appreciated a more concise treatment especially of the question whether gender really is a "curious linguistic phenomenon" (p.319) when present with the first singular. We should recall that grammatical descriptions rarely tell us whether an informant has been a woman or a man. Keeping in mind that in many societies, women are forbidden to interact with 'strangers', we may doubt that the description of personal paradigms sufficiently considers the language of women. In other words, gender studies are not a central issue of language typology. We have to assume that both the group- internal language of women as well as their self-reference in the 'male world' (in terms of social deixis) may considerably differ from what we can find in standard grammars.

SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

It comes clear that the more 'deviations' from SAE-typical paradigms become, the more a well-defined delimitation of Person markers becomes necessary. Here, Cysouw argues that an analysis of personal paradigms must not be restricted to 'free' pronominal forms, but has to take into consideration 'bound' forms, too, as they may show up in term of inflection. For both he observes: "Diachronically, person markers do not behave differently from other linguistic elements. They grammaticalize from independent nouns into person markers. Also independent pronouns grammaticalize into inflectional person markers" (p.5). These two claims, however, cannot be left without comment: First, 'if' person markers may stem from 'nouns', Cysouw violates his own criterion of functional specialization at least from a diachronic point of view: it is a well-known fact that grammaticalization hardly ever happens in terms of function 'hopping', say from 'referential' to 'shifter'. Rather, we have to refer to a scenario (best described in terms of grammaticalization chains) that allow the (intermediate) co- existence of two or more functional domains in one and the same form, be it from a diatopic or a diastratic point of view. Hence, 'if' Cysouw's assumption about the origin of Person Markers is right, we have to assume that there must have been a time, when such markers served for more than just to indicate aspects of personhood (Cysouw himself draws the reader's attention this fact (p.13)). In order to save the case, the analysis has to be confined to paradigms at the 'end' of the grammaticalization chain. Doing so means to deprive oneself of the possibility to explain the make-up of a paradigm from a diachronic perspective, which again does not make sense, if one subscribes to the fact that paradigms of personhood belong to the universals of language (in what shape so ever).

In addition, the criterion of functional 'specialization' presupposes that the category of person is an 'autonomous' category in language. However, we may likewise assume that 'person' results from the blending of different categorial or functional layers (see Mauss 1938). Both 'pronouns' and 'inflectional person markers' are always embedded into both constructional 'frames' and the general Speech Act typology. For instance, a first person singular is prototypically linked to assertions, whereas the second person singular is linked to modal constructions such as imperatives or questions. It may well be that a second person is - in its form - conditioned by the 'grammaticalization' of interrogative strategies (a nice example is German _-st_ (2sg) already referred to above: The clitization of _-t-_ < *_thu_ etc. ('you:sg') can only be understood, if we start from an interrogative pattern, which is marked by a verb-initial construction in polar yes/no-questions. From this, we may conclude that any personal marker is likely to encode (or to be semantically conditioned by) more than just the category of personhood. In other words: The delimitation as proposed by Cysouw serves heuristic purposes rather than 'cognitive reality'. For instance, the author counts the Lak (East Caucasian) clitics (not suffixes!) _-ra_ (1/2sg), _-ri_ (3), _-ru_ (1/2 non-sg) as person markers

(p.127), although their primary function is that of a so-called bipolar focus that has a side-effect as for the category speech relevant (_-ra_ / _-ru_) vs. non-relevant (_-ri_). In fact, none of the three markers are person markers at all.

Furthermore, Cysouw's claim quoted above alludes to popular assumptions on grammaticalization patterns that are perhaps to strongly oriented towards the path 'noun -> non-noun'. If we browse through the diachrony of those personal pronouns the history of which can be (more or less) safely described, we soon realize that it is extremely difficult to postulate with certainty the original nouniness of such pronouns. This difficulty is related to the observation that (singular) personal pronouns often belong to the most stable forms of a language from a diachronic point of view, both with respect to form and to function. Hence, when reconstructing a given pronoun, we often arrive at just another form of the pronoun, but not at something like a noun. On the other hand, Cysouw importantly neglects other hypotheses on the origin of personal pronouns that relate them to the set of demonstratives or more general to deictic terms (a nice example is Liebert's approach to Indoeuropean pronouns, see Liebert 1957, also confer Majtinskaya 1968, Schmidt 1978, Schmidt 1994).

Finally, the quote also refers to what can be cautiously call a 'linguistic myth'. Accordingly, 'bound' morphemes used to subcategorize personhood are often regarded as grammaticalized versions of the corresponding free pronouns, whether or not these have been retained in a given language. Although Cysouw only states that pronouns may turn up as bound morphemes (which is correct), it is important to note that he does not tell whether other grammaticalization paths are possible, too (such as focus and other deictic markers, specialized copular constructions etc.) and which impact such paths may have had on the organization of a paradigm.

As has been said above, the architecture of personal paradigms represents the core issue of PSPM. In order to render his data comparable, Cysouw has to make a number of further delimitations some of which are crucial for his arguments. Most importantly, he neglects functional clusters that involve personhood. Rather, he tends to split off such clusters and to describe the architecture for each paradigm separately. The main reason for doing is to guarantee cross-linguistic comparability: "The result of this approach is an insight into the paradigmatic structure of person marking. Only indirectly will this help us to understand the functioning of a whole language" (p.10). I am not quite sure whether the perspective taken by Cysouw is well-chosen. It disregards the possibility that paradigmatic structures are motivated by their co-paradigmatic environment. An example is already given above. Let me briefly illustrate this point with the help of another example: In Archi, another East Caucasian language, the first person singular _zon_ is embedded into a standard paradigm opposing sg to non-sg pronouns, if we look at the absolutive case. However, this pronoun is the only one which knows a distinct ergative form (_zï¿½ri_). On the other hand, the second person (sg/non-sg) is the only categorial entity which does not reflect the noun class of its possessum if used as a possessor. Obviously, it is the specific conception of agenthood and possessorship in Archi that accounts for these paradigmatic 'split' types. In the Upper Andi variety of Andi, again an East Caucasian language, a slightly analogous split is found: Here, the 1sg _din_ has a distinct ergative form _den_ in the language of women, whereas men use _din_ for both absolutive and ergative. Curiously enough, the Keleb dialect of Avar, a language (distantly) related to Andi, turns the paradigm around: In this language, the 1sg ergative is present in the language of men, but not in the language of women. In Chechen, again an East Caucasian language, the emphatic-reflexive variants of the personal pronouns do not distinguish between 2pl and 3pl (_s^ï¿½s^_), whereas the non-emphatic variants do. In addition, the inclusive

vay (borrowed from an Indo-European language) is the only pronoun that does not know an ergative case.

These examples illustrate that it would perhaps have made more sense to first construe the cognitive space of personhood in the individual languages before starting the comparison. This concerns both the referential behavior of 'pronouns' and the relational behavior of agreement forms (e.g. tense/aspect/mood; diathesis etc.). In other words: It seems doubtful that generalizations resulting from the cross- linguistic comparison of individuated paradigms will tell us more than just what is possible in language. Cysouw himself is well aware of this problem. Nevertheless, he argues: "[A] paradigm is a set of linguistic elements that occur in the same syntagmatic place in the structure of a language" (p.8). In order to also reflect TAM-categories etc., he should have added: "and that belong to the 'same' superordinate paradigm". However, contemporary grammar theories that belong to the camp of e.g. Cognitive Linguistics will likely challenge this view. Cysouw assumes that a person marker acquires its function only because it is embedded into 'its' paradigm that includes 'other' person(s). However, it is rather likely that the same holds for the syntactic and temporal-spatial embedding of such markers (Cysouw himself draws the reader's attention to this point (p.49)). In other words, a 1sg is a 'first singular' (EGO) also because it is embedded into the paradigm of agenthood, a 2sg is a second singular (TU) also because it is embedded into the paradigm of modality (question/command etc., see above). Accordingly, much depends from which dimension is referred to when describing 'paradigms'. The way Cysouw has chosen in PSPM is rather traditional and perhaps too strongly focused on the notion of 'speech act participation'.

Finally, let me briefly turn to the data presented by the author. He writes: "Every delimitation proposed for a cross-linguistic study is bound to encounter exceptions and problematic cases when confronted with the actual linguistic variation" (p.19). Nevertheless, it can safely be said that Cysouw's presentation of the data and the choice of his sample exhibits a highly learnt approach that guarantees the high quality of his analysis. Unfortunately, his sample is somewhat biased by the evident neglect of Russian sources. This fact conditions that the domain of Turkic and Mongolian languages is strongly underrepresented. Modern Iranian languages are lacking completely, although their paradigms add crucial information. Another 'laboratory' of personhood, namely the East Caucasian languages are quoted (except for Hunzib) from second-hand sources only, some of them rather dubious or at least too superficial (see Schulze 1999 and Schulze 2003 for some details on East Caucasian pronouns). Hopefully, the deplorable fact that Russian sources are rarely respected in cross-linguistic comparison will soon face revision.

SUMMARY

In sum, PSPM represents a courageous and highly innovative approach to the paradigmatic architecture of personhood from a cross-linguistic perspective. Contrary to what Cysouw says, no parts of the book are boring or redundant. The author has developed a highly stimulating way of handling and presenting cross-linguistic data, which helps the reader to safely navigate through the world of linguistic variation. (S)he is well-equipped with a huge amount of data and a methodological 'compass' guaranteeing that (s)he never loses orientation. I am not quite sure whether the 'ship' Cysouw invites us to embark will bring us to the final destination, namely to a coherent 'theory of personhood in language'. May well be that Cysouw's journey through the ocean of person markers is comparable to Christopher Columbus' journeys that reached the Caribic islands but not (yet) the mainland. In other words: PSPM is an important

step towards these mainland, which will be probably not reached without considering Cysouw's impressive work.

REFERENCES

Anscombe, G. E. M. 1981. The first person. In: G.E.M. Anscombe. The collected work. Vol 2.: Metaphysics and the philosophy of mind, 21-36. Oxford: OUP.

Forchheimer, P. 1953. The category of person in Language. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Goffman, E. 1979. Footing. Semiotica 25,1-2:1-29.

Kantor, J. R. 1952. An Objective Psychology of Grammar. Bloomington/Evanston: Principia.

Levinson, S. 1988. Putting Linguistics on a Proper Footing: Explorations in Goffman's Concepts of Participantion. In: P. Drew and A. Wootton (eds.). Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order, 161-227. Oxord Polity Press.

Lï¿½vi-Strauss, Cl. 1962. La pensée sauvage. Paris: Librairie Plon.

Liebert, G. 1957. Die indoeuropäischen Personalpronomina und die Laryngaltheorie. Lund: Gleerup.

Majtinskaja, K. E. 1969. Mestoimenija v jazykx raznyx sistem. Moskva: Nauka.

Majtinskaya, K. E. 1968. K tipologii genetičeskoj svajzi ličnyx i ukazatel'nyx mestoimenij v jazykax raznyx sistem. VJa 1968,3:31-40.

Mauss, M. 1939. Une catï¿½gorie de l'esprit humain: La notion de personne, celle de 'moi'. JRAI 68:263-281.

Mead, G. H. 1934. Mind, self, and society. Chicago: CUP.

Myrkin, V.Ja 1964. Tipologija lic^nogo mestoimenija i voprosy rekonstrucii ego v indoevropejskom aspekte. VJa 1964,5:78-86.

Russel, B. 1940. Inquiry into meaning and truth. New York: Norton.

Schmidt, G. 1978. Stammbildung und Flexion der indogermanischen Personalpronomina. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Schmidt, K. H. 1994. Zum Personalpronomen und der Kategorie 'Person' im Kartvelischen und Indogermanischen. HS 107:179-193.

Schulze, W. 1998. Person, Klasse, Kongruenz. Vol. 1: Die Grundlagen. Munich: Lincom.

Schulze, W. 1999. The diachrony of personal pronouns in East Caucasian. In: H. van den Berg (ed.). Studies in Caucasian Linguistics, 95-111. Leiden: CNWS.

Schulze, W. 2003. The diachrony of demonstrative pronouns in East Caucasian. In: D. A. Holisky and K. Tuite (eds.). Current trends in Caucasian, East European and Inner Asian linguistics, 291-348. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins

Schulze, W. (forthcoming). Personhood in East Caucasian.

AUTHOR: Mattissen, Johanna
TITLE: Dependent-Head-Synthesis in Nivkh
SUBTITLE: A contribution to a typology of polysynthesis
PUBLISHER: John Benjamins Publishing Company
SERIES: Typological Studies in Language 57 YEAR: 2003

Wolfgang Schulze, IATS, University of Munich.

TABLE OF PHONETIC SYMBOLS USED IN THIS REVIEW d' = Heavily palatalized alveolar voiced stop (> affricate) e^ = High central vowel g^ = Vocied velar fricative gh = Voiced uvular fricative G = Voiced uvular stop kh = Aspirated voiceless velar stop n' = Palatal nasal ng = Velar nasal r^ = Voiceless dento-alveolar trill t' = Heavily palatalized alveolar voiceless stop (> affricate) th = Aspirated dento-alveolar voiceless stop x^ = Voiceless uvular fricative

INTRODUCTION

Nivkh (also known by its xenonym Gilyak) represents a highly endangered language spoken (in terms of four dialects) by roughly 1.000 people in the Lower Amur basin, along the mouth of the Amur River, and in the coastal regions of Sakhalin. The varieties spoken on the mainland are characterized by a relatively strong impact from adjacent Tunguso-Manchu (Sangi 1988:195, also see Burykin 1988). Up to now, no convincing hypothesis has been put forward that would help to illuminate the genetic affiliation of Nivkh, which hence has to be classified as an 'isolated' language.

Documentary work on Nivkh started as early as 1854-6, when L. v. Schreck and P. v. Glehn led an expedition into the Amur and Sakhalin regions (some results were published by Wilhelm Grube in 1892). Roughly, by the same time, Pere L. Fure and Kausake Okamoto published short word lists of Nivkh. Still, it took another 70 years, until Akira Nakanome published a first grammatical treatment of the language (Nakanome 1927). Today, standard reference grammars are Panfilov 1962/65 and Gruzdeva 1998.

To my knowledge, the book under review (henceforth 'DHSN') is the first comprehensive look at the morphosyntax of Nivkh from a typological perspective (Russek 1996, too, has taken this perspective. Unfortunately, her thesis has remained unpublished). It represents the revised version of Johanna Mattissen's University of Cologne PhD thesis (2001). The author (henceforth 'J.M.') develops her analyses with the help of a broad textual data base (published texts, grammars, individual studies, usually stemming from the Amur varieties) and 'mediated' fieldwork (carried out by Hidetoshi Shiraishi). The book aims at discussing in details a hotspot of Nivkh linguistics, namely the question of polysynthesis (in its broadest sense). J.M. delimits the organization principles of Nivkh morphosyntax from standard polysynthesis as follows: "[A] single homogeneous structural principle is active in Nivkh. This principle consist of a systematic and consistent synthesis of heads and their dependents under adjacency in the order dependent-head (...) and leads to the complex word forms characteristic of Nivkh" (p.1). To illustrate the degree of synthesis that is characteristic of Nivkh, let me quote an example from Gruzdeva 1998, also given by J.M. (p.149):

t'ig^r-park-e^vr-thar^u-gu-ve (Gruzdeva 1998:39)
wood-only-maybe-chop(RED)-CST-IMP.p

'If only you would chop firewood!' [CST = Causative, IMP.p = Imperative Plural; see above for the phonetic symbols]

Nevertheless, it should be noted that not every Nivkh clause is marked for such a high degree of synthesis, as shown by the following examples (p.8):

he^-n'ivg^-gu mur-gir-ko qan-gir-ko phre^-d'-g^u
that-preson-PL horse-INS-ASC.p dog-INS-ASC.p come-IND/NML-PL
'Those people came by horses and dogs.' [PL = Plural, INS = Instrumental, ASC = correlative-associative, IND/NML = Indicative/Nominalization]

The overall presence of synthesis strategies in Nivkh necessitates that any description of this feature has to consider a vast range of grammatical features, including morphophonology and pragmatics. In this sense, the reader of DHSN can rightly expect to learn not only about synthesis in Nivkh together with its typological setting, but also about the main aspects of the grammatical architecture of Nivkh. In this sense, the book follows a currently well-established tendency, namely to use a typologically salient parameter crucial for the grammatical organization of a language to do two things at the same time: discuss the parameter itself and present its overall relevance for the functioning of a grammatical system. This double orientation makes DHSN very useful for both the general audience and people interested in Nivkh itself.

SYNOPSIS

J.M.'s treatise is organized in ten chapters, preceded by a comprehensive list of abbreviations and 'acknowledgements'. The book ends with an 'appendix' (to chapter 3.4), a list of references, and an extremely helpful 'bibliography on Nivkh' (roughly some 400 titles). Chapter 1 (pp.1-34) is entitled 'Introduction' and offers basic information about both the socio-linguistic setting of Nivkh speakers and the general architecture of Nivkh grammar. Typologically speaking, Nivkh "shows affinities to Chukchi, Ainu, and Native American languages" (p.5). Technically speaking, Nivkh is a both prefix- and suffix-agglutinating language furnished with well-elaborated paradigms of nominal and verbal inflection. Nouns lack gender or class indication, but make frequent use of deictic prefixes in terms of locational determiners. Singular possessors (as well as reflexive possessors) can be marked in terms of pronominal prefixes which reflect proclitic variants (or 'clipped forms', Austerlitz 1959) of the corresponding personal pronouns. There are no relational cases (the core relations being expressed with the help of synthesis grading). However, Nivkh knows a number of basically locative case forms (strongly reduced in Eastern Sakhalin) as well as a functionally prominent 'instrumental' case (used to express secondary core relations within the O(bjective) domain). Most locative case forms have a strong tendency towards metaphorization (in the sense of Schulze (in press)). J.M. also notes (p.120) that there is a recent tendency to use the so-called 'causee' case as an accusative-like case marker, obviously based on its use to encode a causee in causative constructions, compare:

if j-ax kepr-gu-d' (Panfilov 1962:248)
he he-CAUSEE stop-CST-IND/NML
'He made him stop' > 'He stopped him.'

Most importantly, Nivkh operates through a great number of so-called 'relational morphemes' (p.10) or former postpositions that have 'entered' the agglutination chain (in terms of layered

morphology, see Mithun 1999). Verbs do not indicate the S/A-domain, but have a slot for referents in O-function. In addition, a number of TAM-related morphemes are added to the verbal stem. Most importantly, the initial consonant of a verbal stem can undergo systematic changes in contact with preceding vowels or consonants. As the segment preceding the stem usually is a unit in O-function, these changes are strongly correlation with transitivity. An example taken from Krejnovic^ 1937:27 is:

qan r^u-d'
dog run=after-IND/NML
'The dog takes up the chase'

qan qanthud'
[qan qan-r^u-d']
dog dog-run=after-IND/NML
'The dog runs after a dog.'

t'x^an n'sangGanthud'
[t'i-qan n'i-t'ang-qan-r^u-d']
2sg-dog 1sg-white-dog-run=after-IND/NML
'Your (sg.) dog runs after my white dog.'

Another salient feature of Nivkh is the fact that two converbs can be marked for person:

jang phr^e^-g-t ezmu-d (p.32)
3sg come-CST-cv:1sg rejoice-IND/NML
'I was happy that he came' (lit. 'I rejoiced letting him come')

Note that the paradigm of person marked converbs is rather exceptional: The cluster (2/3sg) contrasts with the cluster (1sg/1-3pl).

As J.M. puts it "[d]ependent-head synthesis is the principle operative for the encoding of possessors, attributes, objects and complement clauses in Nivkh" (p.33). Accordingly, most syntactic features alluded to in the 'Introduction' are elaborated in more details in the other chapters of DHSN.

Chapter 2 (pp.35-64) turns to Nivkh phonology and morphophonemics. As has been said already above, Nivkh is characterized by complex Sandhi phenomena that always affect the initial sound of a head and are triggered by the final sound of the preceding dependent segment, compare zud' 's.o. washes s.th.' > te^mk-zud' 's.o. washes his hands', nge^g^s-t'ud' 's.o. cleans her teeth', n'e^ng-d'ud' 's.o. washes us' etc. (p.50). J.M. carefully examines the relevant alternation patterns and arrives at a very helpful classification of the complex alternation patterns, which serve as a diagnostic feature for the question of wordhood, discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 65-121). The author considers phonological features (syllable structures, phonotactics, morphophonemics, stress placement), morphological features, and what she calls 'psychological reality' (Nivkh speakers' judgment upon wordhood). In addition, she makes extensive use of non-Nivkh data to both delimit and contextualize the Nivkh findings. She concludes: "[There] is sufficient evidence for recognizing Nivkh complexes as single morphological words" (p.121).

J.M. subdivides the discussion of Nivkh synthesis operations into five chapters. Chapter 4 (pp.122-168) addresses the 'Nivkh noun plus verb complex', that is what is commonly known as O(bjective) incorporation. There are two verb classes in Nivkh, one of which (mono/ditransitives) is obligatorily marked for synthesis. This class can again be subdivided into several, morphophonologically determined subclasses (pending on the type of initial segment of the verb stem). Structurally, J.M. distinguishes five valency classes three of which (avalents, intransitives, intransitives with peripheral participant) do not participate in the dependent-head synthesis as heads (p.136). With monotransitive verbs, various types of 'undergoers' can enter the synthesis 'slot' (patient, product, theme, location, comparational triggers). Ditransitive verbs having two undergoers can be divided into two classes: a) patient/theme + recipient; b) patient/theme + goal. Crucially, synthesis takes place according to the parameter 'primary object' (O (monotransitive) + IO (ditransitive)). But note that the primary object principle is occasionally violated, as in:

n'i Xevgun t'aqo-asqam-d' (p.146)
I Xevgun knife-take=away-IND/NML
'I take the knife from Xevgun'

(instead of ?*n'i t'aqo Xevgun-asqam-d'). J.M. refers to Russian as a possible source for this type of synthesis. After having monitored properties of referential segments in synthesis, J.M. discusses 'non-synthesization of undergoer and verb', that is constraints on the primary object synthesis. As expected, these constraints mainly concern coordination, topicalization/focus and demotion. An example for primary object demotion is (p.165).

e^me^k karandas ph-oghla-khim-d'
mother pencil REFL-child-give-IND/NML
'Mother gave her child a pencil.'

e^me^k ph-oghla-dox karandas i-mg^-d'-ra
mother REFL-child-ALL pencil 3sgU-give-IND/NML-HILI
'Mother gave a pencil to her child.' [REFL = Reflexive, ALL = Allative, U = undergoer, HILI = Highlighting Focus].

Primary object synthesis naturally raises the question whether we have to deal with noun incorporation. J.M. addresses this issue in Chapter 5 (pp.169-181). She carefully discusses the well-known parameters of incorporation and concludes that synthesis does not reflect noun incorporation, but rather results from "dependent-head synthesis operating in the governee-governor relationship" (p.181).

A true highlight of J.M.'s book is the discussion of verb-verb synthesis that comes close to what in generally known as verb serialization (Chapter 6, pp.182-201). An example is:

n'i vi-pher-d' (p.189)
I go-(be=)tired-IND/NML
'Walking, I got tired.'

Obviously, most of these constructions result in some kind of 'manner conflation', ending up in lexicalized forms of verb root serialization (e.g. in'-mangg-d' (eat-strong-IND/NML) > s.o. is voracious' (p.193)).

In Chapter 7 (pp. 202-219), J.M. asks the question: "Nivkh - A polysynthetic language?" Although Nivkh certainly qualifies for a number of features typologically tested for polysynthesis (see Fortescue 1994, Drossard 1997, Evans & Sasse 2002), J.M. again stresses that it the dependent-head template that accounts for the Nivkh synthesis strategy.

The Nivkh section of DHSN ends with Chapter 8 (pp.220-248) that discusses features of synthesis within the Nivkh nominal complex. It is important to note that for instance with personal 'pronouns', synthesis conditions a shift in function, compare (p.220):

n'i e^t'x
I old=man
'I, the old man'

n'-e^t'x
1sg:POSS-old=man
'my old man'

A complex example of NP-internal synthesis is (p.223):

te^m-bal-ngur^-mi n'-wo-ra
this-mountain-heart-inside 1sg-village HILI
'Inside these mountains is my village.'

Qualifying attributes usually are verbs and thus synthesize in terms of verb-noun clusters. The verbal attribute may be marked as a participle (-n-, Sakhalin) which causes nasal alternation. In addition, a suffix -la- can precede this marker denoting some kind of 'permanent property', compare um-n'ivx 'furious-person' vs. um-la-n'ivx 'nasty (= always furious)-person'. Verbal attribution can render relativization. A relativized noun can then again be synthesized with the verb in case it has primary object function. A nice example is (p.236):

n'i phi zosq-t'aqo-ve^kz-d'
I REFL break-knife-throw=away-IND/NML
'I threw away the knife which I had broken.'

Note that here, the reflexive pronoun does not become synthesized, as opposed to non-complex NPs, compare the following example taken from Krejnovic^ 1966:44:

n'i ph-ranr-khez-d'
I REFL-sister-speak-IND/NML
'I have spoken to my sister.'

Obviously, the non-synthesization of phi is conditioned by the fact that it takes 'subject' function (in the relative clause). Recall that synthesis never affects nominals in S(ubjective)/A(gentive) function in Nivkh.

In Chapter 9 (pp. 249-272), J.M. contextualizes Nivkh NP-internal synthesis by elaborating an extremely valuable study on 'complex noun forms in the world's languages'. Basically, this study aims at the question whether complex noun forms can be considered as polysynthetic or not. J.M. portrays a considerable number of languages with respect to this question, discussing non-root bound morphemes, root concatenation, and inflectional patters. The

underlying question cannot be answered even tentatively without approaching the notion of polysynthesis itself. J.M. devotes Chapter 10 (pp.273-289) to this problem. It is entitled 'Typological outlook' and summarizes the findings in Nivkh aiming at an "overall classification of word complexity depending on its ingredients" (p.272). J.M. correctly states that "polysynthesis in the traditional sense is a 'feeling' rather than a clear-cut class" (p.276). The author carefully examines the different parameters set forth for polysynthesis with the help of data from seventy-five languages. She arrives at two characteristic 'axes' that condition types of polysynthesis (a 'substantial' one yield at the material under synthesis, and a 'structural' one that separates templatic from scope-ordered types). By confronting the typological findings with her Nivkh data, J.M. ends up with the hypothesis that a structurally motivated principle of synthesis may represent at least something different from what is generally known as 'polysynthesis'. Taking into account the fact that at least in Nivkh, this principle also concerns complex noun forms, the author concludes: "It seems to make sense to acknowledge the overall structural principle as a type in its own right, perhaps even as a morphological type, as it is superordinate to polysynthesis (as it is presently understood)" (p.289).

EVAULATION

It is out of question that DHSN is a 'must' to read for all who are interested in the question of intra-clausal concatenation strategies from a typological point of view. In addition, the book serves another important purpose, namely to introduce the linguistics of Nivkh to the general audience in a way that brings the book close to a 'functional description' of Nivkh. Sure, the book is not a reference grammar of the language. For this, the reader should for instance turn to Gruzdeva 1998. Still, the amazing wealth of data presented by J.M. allows the reader to get a deep insight into the linguistics of Nivkh that goes far beyond other comparable studies.

Perhaps, the book also profits from the fact that J.M. does not adhere to a specific language or grammar theory. It follows the standards of a typological paradigm (with an admittedly functional perspective). Her approach is related to what can best be called an 'interpretative Basic Linguistic Theory' (iBLT) (modifying Dixon's term (Dixon 1997)). This theory-neutral, nevertheless category-sensitive approach guarantees that J.M.'s analyses are not packed into a format that is at risk to lay more emphasis on the cover than on the contents. DHSN is unbiased towards theoretical issues without being atheoretical. This fact makes the book both a valuable source book and an important contribution to general issues in language typology. Nevertheless, the basically 'structural' approach has its shortcomings, too. For instance, the chapter on wordhood surely is an important issue from a purely structural point of view that posits the existence of 'words' (what ever this may be) in linguistic cognition. However, J.M. herself considers the possibility (p.119) that the concept of wordhood is determined by cultural (especially Western) traditions. The fact that wordhood is often considered as a more or less universal feature of language perhaps unnecessarily complicates the matter. If, for instance, we refer to the concept of 'linguistic information units' (LIU) instead of 'word', we are freed from positing rather complicated and often contradictory parameters for 'words'. Such a cognitive perspective would perhaps also help to account for the most important observation by J.M., namely the dependent-head condition for synthesis in Nivkh (and other languages). In this sense, DHSN lays the ground for a more theory-oriented explanation of this type of synthesis. It is out of question that without the highly learnt and extremely thoughtful approach presented by J.M. this type of explanation would never lurk from beyond the horizon. In this brief review, I cannot illustrate this point in more details, just as it is impossible to comment upon every single claim or observation. Most likely, experts of those

languages that are included in J.M.'s typology, will not always agree with the analyses presented by the author. Nevertheless, the book sufficiently shows that a learnt typological embedding of language-specific phenomena can serve at least three interests: The inclusion of a hitherto less considered language in the dimension of cross-linguistic argumentation, the evaluation and refinement of typological generalizations, and - last but not least - the reformulation of theoretical positions.

We have to thank J.M. for having prepared this wonderful and stimulating book, which is formally well-done and accurate in the presentation of both data and analyses.

REFERENCES

Austerlitz, Robert (1959) Semantic Components of Pronominal Systems: Gilyak. Word 15:102-109.

Burykin, A.A. (1988) Tunguso-man'c^z^uro-nivxskie svjazi i problema genetic^eskoj prinadlez^nosti nivxskogo jazyka. In: Ju. A. Sem & A. I. Gamilov (red.) Voprosy leksiki i sintaksisa jazykov narodov Krajnogo Severa SSSR, 136-150. Leningrad: Leningradskij Ped. Inst.

Dixon, R.M.W. (1997) The rise and fall of languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drossard, Werner (1997) Polysynthesis and polysynthetic languages in comparative perspective. In: B. Palek (ed.). Proceddings of Linguistics and Phonetics 1996, 251-264. Prague: Charles University Press.

Evans, Nicholas & Hans-Juergen Sasse (eds.) (2002) Problems of Polysynthesis. Berlin: Akademie.

Fortescue, Michael (1994) Morphology, polysynthetic. In: R.E. Asher & M.Y. Simpson (eds.). The Encyclodpedia of Languages and Linguistics, Vol. 5, 2600-2602. Oxford etc.: Pergamon Press.

Gruzdeva, E. Ju. (1998) Nivkh. Munich: Lincom.

Krejnovic^, E.A. (1937) Fonetika nivxskogo jazyka. Moskva / Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe uc^ebno-pedag. izd.

Krejnovic^, E.A. (1966) Ob inkorporirovanii i primykanii v nivxskom jazyke. Voprosy Jazykoznanija 1966,3:36-51.

Mithun, Marianne (1999) The reordering of morphemes. In: S. Gildea (ed.). Reconstructing Grammar. Comparative Linguistics and Grammaticalization, 231-255. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Nakanome, Akira (1927) Grammatik der Nikbun Sprache (des Giljakischen). Research Review of the Osaka Asiatic Society, Vol. 5. Osaka: Osaka Asiatic Society.

Panfilov, V.Z. (1962/65) Grammatika nivxskogo jazyka. 2 Vols. Moskva/Leningrad: Nauka.

Russek, Susanne (1996) Studien zur Morphosyntax des 'einfachen Satzes' im Gilyak. Muenchen: IATS (MA thesis).

Sangi, V.M. (1988) Jazykovaja situacija na Saxaline i v nizov'jax Amura. In: V.I. Bojko (otv. red.). Nivxi Saxalina: Sovremennoe social'no-ekonomic^eskoe razvitie, 195-201. Novosibrisk: Nauka.

Schulze, Wolfgang (in press). Invariance, self-similarity and metaphorization: The dynamics of case semantics in East Caucasian. In: Antonio Barcelona, Klaus-Uwe Panther, Guenter Radden & Linda L. Thorburg (eds.). Metonymy and Metaphor in Grammar. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Date: Mon, 2 Aug 2004 16:59:26 -0400 (EDT)
From: Wolfgang Schulze <W.Schulze@lrz.uni-muenchen.de>
Subject: Pronouns: A Cross-Linguistic Study

AUTHOR: Bhat, Darbhe Narayana Shankara
TITLE: Pronouns
SUBTITLE: A Cross-Linguistic Study
SERIES: Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory
PUBLISHER: Oxford University Press YEAR: 2004
Announced at http://linguistlist.org/issues/14/14-3485.html

Wolfgang Schulze, IATS, University of Munich

INTRODUCTION

Let me start with a brief quote from the book under review (Bhat 2004:1): "(...) [W]ords that are generally included under the category of pronouns do not together form a single category. Most importantly, personal pronouns are quite different from the rest of the pronouns. (...) [O]ne can hardly find any characteristic that can be regarded as common to both sets (...)." For the moment, I do not want to take up the question of whether the category of pronouns can be justified at all. Still, it is amazing to see that a book has as its title a term ('Pronouns') that is questioned, not to say negated already on the very first pages of the book. Nevertheless, the author proposes "to use the term 'pronoun' as a cover term for referring to both (...) personal pronouns and proforms, even though (...) there may not be any basis for the establishment of such a super-category, other then the fact that it has the backing of an extended grammatical tradition" (p.5). One may wonder, whether reference towards 'grammatical tradition' suffices to justify the title of the book which appears to be misleading - at least in the light of the author's hypotheses. Perhaps, the author aims at some kind of 'negative phenomenology' which posits the existence of a phenomenon in order to show that it does not exist at all (in other words: the title represents the condensed version of an 'antinomy'). Still, it would perhaps been more wise to indicate within the title of the book that one of its major goals is to revise the assumption of the super-category 'pronoun' replacing it by the two categories 'personal pronouns' and 'proforms'.

Unfortunately, Bhat's terminology is less consequent than his general argumentation. Curiously enough, the author sticks to the term 'pronoun' in order to label just that category for which "the notion of 'standing for' something else is completely unsuitable" (p.2): 'Personal pronouns'. This terminological confusion (or at least: inconsequence) is difficult to understand. Perhaps, the author accepts it in order to attract the attention of more 'traditional' readers. Or: He tacitly works with the assumption of what he calls 'super-category' even though one of his goals is said to be the critique of the super-category 'pronoun'. This becomes rather probable if we read the very last sentence of the book (p.276): "I hope that the present study of pronouns has brought a semblance of order into the chaotic world of pronouns".

Whatever the reasons for this incoherence may have been: Bhat's book can be characterized as a typological approach (basically from function to form) to the two domains of 'Personhood' and 'Phorics' (or 'PnP', to use a fashionable abbreviation), as long as they are expressed with the help of 'lexical' elements. On p.32, Bhat supposes: "We can expect several (...) characteristics [of personal pronouns] to be shown by bound-pronoun languages among their

agreement markers or clitics occurring with the verb, but unfortunately, I do not have sufficient data on languages of this latter type to establish this point". This statement raises a number of questions which, however, I cannot summarize here in their totality. Still, it reflects a rather unfortunate tradition: Accordingly, agreement patterns (or: referential echoes) are said to constitute 'bound-pronoun' patterns, although it is typological common ground that agreement patterns are not necessarily person-oriented and do not necessarily result from the clitization of former 'free pronouns'. In addition, it must be stressed that the distinction between 'free' and 'bound' instantiations of a category rarely shows up in terms of discrete or thetic categorial entities. Rather, we have to deal with variations with cross-linguistic continua. In other words: The concentration on 'free' lexical forms should not reflect just a heuristic constraint or problems with respect to the data-base. Instead, we should expect that the author explains the theoretical and functional motives that have lead to the 'concentration' on free forms (e.g. semantic or conceptual explicitness or transparency).

The data base exploited by the author results from the analysis of more than 220 languages, although it must be stressed that some of the languages cross-referenced in the corresponding index (pp.312-315) occur only in a 'list of languages used as sample', but not in terms of concrete data (e.g. Dong, Evenki, Ila, Nahuatl, Remo, Retura, Yukaghir, to name just a few). Also, the concrete sampling is done for some selected typological aspects only (see below), whereas the inductive basis for some other aspects of 'personal pronouns' and 'proforms' is less pronounced (see p.277). Still, it is out of question that Bhat's book is quite in line with the high empiric standard expectable from the series into which the book is included.

Today, word classes or word class related issues seem to serve as a favorite frame for cross-linguistic, typological studies. However, it comes clear that such a framing heavily depends from the kind of answer to the question of what word classes are at all (and how they can be qualified). It is a pity that the book under review does hardly contribute to this discussion: The reader is thus warned not to expect a theory-driven elaboration of the question whether pronouns (what ever they may be) constitute one or more word classes and - if yes -ï¿½ how these classes can be related to the ontology of 'parts of speech' at all. Nevertheless, the book helps to systematize certain paradigmatic and functional features of both 'personal pronouns' and 'proforms' which will undoubtedly serve to refine the intensional definition of such forms (if ever a purely linguistic definition is possible at all). In this sense, Bhat's 'Pronouns' do not offer a 'new look' at what 'pronouns' may be, but an ensemble of observations that helps to concretize and validate some standard assumptions on 'pronouns'.

SYNOPSIS

Bhat's 'Pronouns' consist of two major parts surrounded by a short 'Preface', an Introduction (pp.1-34), an Appendix (list of 225 languages used as a sample), a list of references (roughly some 400 titles), and three indices (authors, languages, subjects). The main body of the book is formed by the two parts on 'Personal Pronouns' (35-150) and 'Proforms' (151-276). This division conforms to the most central claim, namely that the term 'pronouns' is some kind of cover term that unites 'Personal Pronouns' and 'Proforms'.

In the introductory section, Bhat elaborates the general frame of the volume. First, he introduces his concept of 'Personal Pronouns' vs. 'Proforms', claiming that contrary to other pronouns, Personal Pronouns do not 'stand for' something, but represent 'shifters', whereas the set of true 'proforms' is represented by the remaining 'pronouns'. Although Bhat considers the possibility that we have to deal with some kind of continual chain, he arrives at the hypothesis

that the proposed continual features "derive from an interesting conflict that occurs in our use of personal pronouns" (p.12). Accordingly, the "first person singular pronoun [is] the most prototypical among personal pronouns", whereas other personal pronouns "tend to show some of the characteristics that belong to the neighbouring categories like proforms and nouns" (p.13). As for personal pronouns, the author opposes 'free-pronoun' and 'bound-pronoun' languages (p.15). Here, he refers to the tendency in quite a number of languages to maintain an asymmetric relation between free and 'bound' representations of the 'category person'. Accordingly, free-pronoun languages express the functional domain of personality with free (lexical) pronouns, whereas bound-pronoun languages utilize affixes or clitics to encode this functional layer.ï¿½ In the remaining sections of the 'Introduction', Bhat elaborates this distinction, dwelling upon aspects of disparity, the question of obligatoriness, and categorial (in)stability.

Part I turns to 'Personal Pronouns'. The author devotes five chapters to illustrate the 'nature' of such pronouns. In chapter 2, he discusses the 'relation with the referent' (38-57), that is the question to which extent there is linguistic evidence for referential properties of 'personal pronouns'. Bhat takes up the well-known definition of 'personal pronouns' as 'shifters' (Jespersen 1924: 123), the primary function of which being "to indicate the involvement of speech roles in the event or state that the sentences in which they occur describe" (p.38). In addition, Bhat discusses a number of features related to the question to which degree personal pronouns share properties of referentiality. Still, the reader should not expect to be introduced into the world of analytic language philosophy. Bhat's arguments remain rather general and in parts even difficult to understand. For instance, he uses the term 'non-referential' in cases where we have to deal with non-specific reference (p.41). This terminological (and, perhaps, also reflectional) carelessness does not affect the general claims of the book as long as they concern peripheral arguments. Nevertheless, they may become crucial for instance when aiming at the determination of the nature of the scientific 'object'. Undoubtedly, this holds for the question whether 'personal pronouns' have referential or indexal properties. Unfortunately, Bhat does not refer to the corresponding, long-standing discussion which encompasses philosophical arguments just as evidence from sociology (e.g. Marcel Mauss), sociopsychology (e.g. G. H. Mead) or cognitive sciences. Hence, he confines himself to the very general and traditional description of 'I' and 'you' as 'shifters'. Still, it should be noted that the standard assumption according to which 'I' and 'you' "are well established semantic primitives" (p.25, referring to Goddard & Wierzbicka 1994: 37) raises a number of doubts. Most importantly, it does not respect the well-known controversy of whether the concept of 'personhood' is subcategorized in terms of egocentricity (1 vs. 2(+3)) or sociocentricity (1+2 (vs. 3)). Likewise, it does not relate to the many variations with the Silverstein Hierarchy (e.g. 1.person first vs. 2.person first or: 1 < 2 < 3.... vs. 2 < 1 < 3 etc.) which reveal important aspects of the conceptualization of personhood (Bhat turns to this point later in the book, but very briefly).

Unfortunately, the author abstains from discussing the semantics of 'personal pronouns' more intimately. Hence, it does not come clear whether he subscribes to the primitiveness hypothesis or whether he relates certain constructional properties of the individual 'pronouns' to semantics 'segments' or to subsymbolic layers of the corresponding conceptual complex. For instance, a look at corpora reveals that in many languages, the distribution of first and second person singular concepts is directly linked to mode: A first person usually occurs in assertive constructions, whereas a second person is marked for an interrogative or more or less imperative (hortative) mode. In other words: The concept of 'first person' is 'indicative', but that of the 'second person' is modal, or: self-certainty stands against other-inference. Bhat

himself alludes to the fact that in some languages, the expression of 'personhood' is sensitive for modal features (87-89). However, he does not relate this fact to the properties of the individual 'pronouns', but to their general function: (...) modal distinctions represent either (i) distinctions in the speaker's assessment of the reliability of information or (ii) distinctions in the illocutionary force of a speech act" (p.87).

The question of referential properties is also pursued in chapter 3 (58-90) that discusses 'coreference and non-coreference'. Among others, Bhat turns to logophorics and draws an interesting picture of the interaction of logophorics and anaphorics (as well as of long distance reflexivity). It is out of question that Bhat arrives at a number of illuminating observations, especially with respect to the interaction of logophorics and the SAP domain. In my eyes, however, a purely morphology-based approach to logophorics neglects certain constructional properties related to what in traditional grammar is called '(in)direct speech' (in its broadest sense). Here, a constructional approach would probably help to better understand the typology of logophoric constructions.

In Chapter 4, the author addresses the question of how personal pronouns are 'associated' with 'grammatical categories' (91-119). It goes without saying that a 'grammatically' parallel behavior of nouns and 'personal pronouns' can serve as an important diagnostic feature to determine for instance the degree of 'nouniness' of such pronouns. Bhat considers the following parameters: number, gender, and case. As for number, he argues that pronouns are marked for 'conjunction' rather than for plurality. The corresponding section is in parts reminiscent of the brilliant treatment of pronominal number paradigms in Cysouw 2003, although it comes clear that Bhat takes a more semantic perspective. As for the category 'gender' (better: sexus), Bhat argues that its restricted relevance for personal pronouns results from its function here to indicate "social distinctions, or for complying with social requirements" (p.111). As for 'case', Bhat observes a number of paradigmatic constraints that are said to argue in favor of a 'speech role' based interpretation of case marking strategies with personal pronouns. The author illustrates this point with the help of so-called 'sagittal' case marking patterns (1>2/2>1 ambiguity), prominence of speech act participants, 'direct-inverse' marking and constraints on the occurrence of bound morphemes.

Chapter 5 turns to what Bhat calls "conflicting characteristics" (120-131). In this chapter, Bhat mainly takes up the question whether the relation between first and second person is symmetric or not. In other words: He comes back to the well-studies question of a possible hierarchic ordering within the paradigm of 'personal pronouns'. The author (very briefly) summarizes the typologically well-known facts, arriving at the following conclusion: "Languages generally give greater prominence to the speaker as compared to the addressee, and this has the effect of making the expressions that denote the speaker dissimilar to those that denote the addressee" (p.131). Nevertheless, the fact that "some languages (...) give greater prominence to the addressee (...)" (p.131) remains unexplained. Likewise disappointing is the treatment of what Bhat calls "hierarchy of nominal categories" (p.125-128). Here, Bhat turns to the above-mentioned Silverstein Hierarchy, presenting it however in a way that neglects many important findings in the last decade (in fact, he does not go beyond Dixon 1994).

The final chapter of Part I discusses the 'position of third person pronouns' (132-150). Bhat takes up the 'Benvenistian' claim that "third person pronouns do not belong to the system of personal pronouns" (p.133, recall Benveniste's term 'non-personne'). Nevertheless, he observes a number of paradigms in which the third person is expressed by lexical elements

that are not taken from other (mainly demonstrative) paradigms. He thus suggests distinguishing 'two-person' languages from 'three-person' languages (p.134). Bhat elaborates this distinction from a basically paradigmatic point of view. Unfortunately, he does not make clear (at least to me), what he means by 'third person'. If we take Bhat's term literal, it would imply that some languages lack a third person (as a conceptual layer). Even the hardest version of the Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis would not go so far to support this claim. Here, a major shortcoming of Bhat's approach becomes apparent: He does not make sufficiently clear, when he speaks of 'linguistic categories' (established howsoever) and when he turns to 'conceptual categories' (retrieved howsoever). Likewise, Bhat shows a strong tendency to anthropomorphize the dynamics of language, compare again the quote given above: "Languages generally give greater prominence to the speaker as compared to the addressee (...)" (p.131). Such a prominence, however, can only result from socio-communicative routines and their cognitive foundation, but never 'by language'. Admittedly, the mixing up of linguistic and cognitive matters (without elaborating the actual relationship) renders some of Bhat's explanations at least problematic. Nevertheless, in chapter 6, Bhat arrives at very interesting correlations between the architecture of deictic paradigms and their exploitation for encoding the 'non-personne' domain. Here, the opposition between person-oriented and distance-oriented demonstratives seems to play an important role (see Schulze 2003 for an alternative explanation).

Unfortunately, Bhat confines the examination of the above-mentioned correlation to the 'third person'. Doing so, he deprives himself of the possibility to explain the grammaticalization of personal pronouns based on deictic paradigms, too: There is a long-standing tradition in linguistics to relate the first person to the domain of the proximal, and the second person to the domain of the medial/distal. Some authors (such as Liebert 1957, Myrkin 1964, Majtinskaya 1968, 1969, Schmidt 1978, to name just a few) relate this correlation not only to 'function', but also to 'form' (see Schulze 1998: 575-601)). In fact, Bhat's general hypotheses on the distinctiveness of 'personal pronouns' and 'proforms' (with the domain of 'third persons' serving as an interface between these two domains) seems more to hide than to unveil: A 'lumping' hypothesis deriving both demonstratives etc. and personal 'pronouns' from the space of deixis in fact is an alternative and valid option.

The second part of the book is devoted to 'proforms' (153-276). Bhat discusses the 'structure of proforms' in chapter 7 (151-174), 'constituent elements of proforms' in chapter 8 (175-199), 'characteristics of proforms' in chapter 9 (200-225), the interrogative-indefinite puzzle' in chapter 10 (226-249), 'other related puzzles' in chapter 11 (250-271) before turning to concluding remarks in chapter 12 (272-276). Bhat defines 'proforms' as consisting of "two different elements, namely a general term that denotes the scope of those proforms and a pronominal element that indicates the purpose for which they are used" (p.153). Accordingly, he proposes a paradigmatic make-up that distinguishes semantic (or 'ontological') classes (such as Person, Thing, Property etc.) from functional layers (such as demonstrative, interrogative, relative etc.). The author observes certain correlations within the resulting paradigms, which may be matched by morphology (chapter 7). Both classes and layers can be subjected to lumping strategies, such as {demonstrative + relative} or {interrogative + indefinite} or {interrogative + indefinite + relative} etc. Bhat observes that the general preference (in his corpus) is to place a class-specific element behind the 'pronominal' (or: functional element), such as English wh-o (Person), wh-at (Thing), wh-ere (Place) etc., although the 'inverse' order is documented, too. Most likely, the preferred order is linked to languages with suffixal case marking patterns, whereas the inverse order (GP = general/pronominal in terms of Bhat) "appears to be one of the characteristics of verb-initial

languages" (p.158). Unfortunately, Bhat mainly refers to a particular genetic group, namely Austronesian in order to illustrate this assumption, which is questioned for instance by Old Irish (verb-initial, but PG-type). It would perhaps make more sense to relate the GP/PG-typology to NP-internal positional constraints and preferences.

In chapter 8, Bhat concretizes the functional organization of proforms. Accordingly, he distinguishes demonstratives from interrogative-indefinites and relative-anaphors. He describes various strategies to subcategorize these functional clusters, among them the derivation of anaphors from demonstratives (curiously enough, he refers to Lezgi (Southeast Caucasian) to illustrate a case in which "anaphoric pronouns are quite different from demonstratives" (p.184). Accordingly, "the demonstratives im 'proximate', am 'remote' contrast with ham 'anaphoric'" (p.184). However, ham is nothing but the emphatic variant of am 'distal').

Before discussing semantic subcategories, Bhat considers - in a brief subsection - highly interesting data illustrating the possibility to 'neutralize functional distinctions' (p.186). In chapter 9, the author brings the reader back to the question of referentiality and its relevance in determining the functional scope of proforms. Chapter 10 turns to the long-standing question of how interrogatives are related to indefinite 'pronouns'. Bhat offers a very stimulating analysis of the problem suggesting that in case affinity in given, it "rightly represents the meaning that is common to both interrogatives and indefinites, namely the denotation of lack of knowledge regarding a particular constituent" (p.249). This hypothesis is quite in accordance with both observations concerning the grammaticalization background of wh-pronouns and generalizations stemming from cognitive linguistic approaches.

In chapter 11, Bhat briefly turns to three other 'puzzles', namely the question of how indefinite pronouns are derived, "the puzzle about indirect questions (...) and the puzzle about the affinity between interrogative and relative pronouns" (p.250). All these puzzles are said to be solved based on the 'primacy of indefinites' hypothesis. Still, much of what Bhat presents in this section has to be reviewed in the light of a more comprehensive theory of 'questions'.

In the final chapter (chapter 12), the author gives some concluding remarks that also entail the summarizing definition of what Bhat thinks 'personal pronouns' and 'proforms' are (p.273). Not surprisingly, he describes personal pronouns as "[s]ingle-element expressions that have the denotation of speech roles as their primary function". Proforms, on the other hand, are "[t]wo-element expressions that indicate a general concept and a function (...)" (p.273).

SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

The main claim of the monograph is related to word classes: Accordingly, Bhat wants to show that "personal pronouns and other pronouns (proforms) belong to two different word classes" (p.120). In this sense, it is astonishing to see that the author presents a volume on 'word classes' without addressing the problem of 'word classes' in language as such. Nowhere in the book, is the reader more comprehensively informed about the theoretical foundations of Bhat's argumentation that is about the ontology of word classes, their linguistic and/or conceptual importance and the assessment of those basic discovery procedures that are relevant for positing word classes at all. In fact, the reader is confronted with a type of analysis that puts more effort in the presentation of data than in terminological accuracy and theoretical adequacy. In this sense, the reader learns much about the "chaotic world of pronouns" (p.276), although it has to be added that much of what Bhat says, has already been

said by others. Hence, it is difficult to state what kind of book we have at hands: It surely is not a simple introductory 'reader' on pronouns: On the one hand, Bhat offers many highly interesting details, which can safely be characterized as 'new'. On the other hand, a 'reader on pronouns' should entail a research report concentrating on both definitory and applicatory issues. As has been said above, Bhat's book lacks these components to a certain extent. Nevertheless, if it is thought to be an expert's work on problems of pronominality, both the title of the book and the general organization are misleading. What we have at hands is something 'in between'. This does not mean that Bhat's elaboration is useless. On the contrary! The expert will find very many gems and the 'novice' will surely profit from browsing through the book. However, the expert will soon realize that much of what Bhat says has been already said before, and the novice will (wrongly) put the book aside realizing that it is not an introductory work to 'pronouns'. In this sense, Bhat's book is an important contribution to the study of issues in pronominality, but it is not a book on 'pronouns'.

It is a deplorable fact that Bhat reproduces an unfortunate tendency in contemporary linguistics, namely to concentrate on publications in English. All references given for the list of languages used in the sample are English references, with negative consequences. For instance, Burushaski is quoted with the help of the outdated grammar from Lorimer 1935-38 instead of using the German grammars by Berger 1974 and Berger 1998. In the bibliography, only English titles are given with the exception of Zhirkov 1955 (Russian, wrongly quoted as Zhirkov 1995 on p.26), Burchuladze 1979 (Russian), Guillaume 1919/1975 (French), Hagège (not: Hegège, p.298, French), Humboldt 1830 (German). All these references, however, are quoted from secondary, English sources. Viewing the fact, that there is a long-standing tradition concerning the research on pronouns in Russian, French, and German, this shortcoming cannot be simply ignored. Likewise, it is difficult to understand, how certain language data are quoted from secondary or even tertiary sources, even though the primary sources are immediately available. This holds for instance for Old Greek which on p.155 is quoted via Haspelmath's 1997 book on indefinites. For Irish or French, Bhat does not even consult the relevant grammars, but corresponding sections in overviews on the language families.

Nevertheless, it is out of question that the book enormously profits from the wealth of data used to illustrate the author's claims and analyses. We have to thank the author especially for having directed the reader's attention to the world of languages in India (especially Kannada) which undoubtedly help to better follow Bhat's arguments. Still, the choice of languages seems extremely biased because of the 'language problem' addressed above.

The book itself is well-done and easy to read. There are some typographical errors (e.g. p.39: Jespersen 1923 > Jespersen 1924, p.195 interrogagive > interrogative, p.262 anyody > anybody), which, however, do not harm the pleasure of reading.

In sum, it should have come clear that Bhat's book is an important contribution to the study of pronominality. It is marked for a high amount of linguistic data nicely documented to illustrate a given aspect of Bhat's argumentation. I am not sure whether the book will as such have a long-standing success. Most likely, other books will follow which put more effort in developing a methodologically coherent framework for a theory of pronominality (and its variance). However, whatever will follow: Their authors will have to consider in their debates and in their analyses the suggestions made by Bhat in his 'Pronouns'. In more than just a few cases, they will even have to start from what Bhat has elaborated.

REFERENCES

Berger, Herman 1974. Das Yasin-Burushaski (Werchikwar). Grammatik, Texte, Wï¿½rterbuch. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Berger, Hermann 1998. Die Burushaski-Sprache von Hunza und Nager, 3 vols.. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Cysouw, Michael 2003. The Paradigmatic Structure of Person Marking, Oxford University Press, Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. Ergativity. Cambridge: CUP.

Goddard, Cliff & Anna Wierzbicka 1994. Semantic Lexical Universals: Theory and Empirical Findings. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Jespersen, O. 1924. The Philosophy of Grammar. London: Allen and Unwin.

Liebert, G. 1957. Die indoeuropï¿½ischen Personalpronomina und die Laryngaltheorie. Lund: Gleerup.

Lorimer, David L. R. 1935-1938. The Burushaski language, 3 vols. Oslo: Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning.

Majtinskaya, K. E. 1968. K tipologii genetic^eskoj svajzi lic^nyx i ukazatel'nyx mestoimenij v jazykax raznyx sistem. VJa 1968,3:31-40.

Majtinskaja, K. E. 1969. Mestoimenija v jazykx raznyx sistem. Moskva: Nauka.

Mauss, M. 1939. Une catï¿½gorie de l'esprit humain: La notion de personne, celle de 'moi'. JRAI 68:263-281.

Mead, G.H. 1934. Mind, self, and society. Chicago: CUP.

Myrkin, V. Ja 1964. Tipologija lic^nogo mestoimenija i voprosy rekonstrucii ego v indoevropejskom aspekte. VJa 1964,5:78-86.

Russel, B. 1940. Inquiry into meaning and truth. New York: Norton.

Schmidt, G. 1978. Stammbildung und Flexion der indogermanischen Personalpronomina. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Schmidt, K. H. 1994. Zum Personalpronomen und der Kategorie 'Person' im Kartvelischen und Indogermanischen. HS 107:179-193.

Schulze, W. 1998. Person, Klasse, Kongruenz. Vol. 1: Die Grundlagen. Munich: Lincom.

Schulze, W. 1999. The diachrony of personal pronouns in East Caucasian. In: H. van den Berg (ed.). Studies in Caucasian Linguistics, 95-111. Leiden: CNWS.

Schulze, W. 2003. The diachrony of demonstrative pronouns in East Caucasian. In: D.A. Holisky and K. Tuite (eds.). Current trends in Caucasian, East European and Inner Asian linguistics, 291-348. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins

---

Date: Sun, 28 Nov 2004 22:01:26 +0100 From: Wolfgang Schulze Subject: Case and Agreement in Abaza

AUTHOR: O'Herin, Brian
TITLE: Case and Agreement in Abaza
SERIES: Publications in Linguistics #138
PUBLISHER: SIL International
YEAR: 2002

Wolfgang Schulze, IATS, University of Munich

SPECIAL SYMBOLS ë = schwa l/ = voiceless lateral spirant sh = voiceless alveo-palatal fricative zh = voiced alveo-palatal fricative c = voiceless palatal affricate x = voiceless palato-velar fricative h/ = voiceless pharyngeal fricative (O'Herin writes) / = voiced pharyngeal fricative ' = glottalization (e.g. t' = glottalized t) * = labialization (e.g. c* = labialized c)

INTRODUCTION

The book under review represents a modified version of Brian O'Herin's 1995 University of California (Santa Cruz) Ph.D. dissertation. It concerns Abaza (Abaza Bëzsh*a), a Northwest Caucasian language, spoken by some 40.000 (other sources 31.000) people in the Karachai-Circassian Republic (Russian Federation), located at the northwestern slopes of the Great Caucasus mountain range (see Schulze 2002a for a recent presentation of the Abaza linguistic area). The main Abaza settlements are situated along the upper course of the Little and Great Zelenchuk rivers, as well as along the Laba and the Urup rivers. Here, Abaza speakers are to be found in thirteen villages, e.g. Abazakt, Tapanta, El'burgan, and Psysh. In addition, there are two Abaza villages near Kislovodsk and scattered settlements in the Kabardino-Balkarian Republic. Outside Russia, there are Abaza communities in Northern Turkey (near Amasya), as well as in Syria, Jordan, Egypt, and in the Balkans.

In spite of the fact that Abaza knows a written standard (see below), the language has to be described as endangered. According to the estimation of local speakers, Abaza is hardly ever used in school classes or among youngsters. Its use is mainly confined to the communication within the middle and older generation. Still, it must be added that recent sociolinguistic surveys draw a less pessimistic picture (see Schulze 2000a for some details).

Historically, the Abaza language had been spoken along the coast line of the Black Sea between what today is Tuapse in the North and the river Bzyb in the South. From this we can infer, that Abaza must have been in contact with the now extinct language Ubykh, historically spoken north of that area. Its earlier history is directly connected to that of its 'sister language' Abkhaz, see Schulze 2002b for a brief account. Accordingly, Abkhaz and Abaza form the southern branch of (North)West Caucasian, which again perhaps is related to a group of ancient northern Anatolian languages such as Hatti and Kashki (an early version of 'Circassian'?). Untenable is O'Herin's claim that "the potentially related languages include South Caucasian (...)" (p.6). Colarusso's suggestion to relate Northwest Caucasian to Indo-European is likewise difficult to follow (cf. Colarusso 1992).

Abaza speakers left their original homeland in the 13th-14th century and occupied their present locations devastated by Mongolian and Turkic raiders (1240). The two main dialects

of Abaza (Tapanta and Ashkhar) seem to reflect the dialectal distribution given in the original homeland. Due to the supremacy of Kabardian (Eastern Circassian) groups (from the 17th century onwards), the Kabardian language started to influence especially the Tapanta variety. Due to the Tsarist efforts to russianize the region, more then four fifths of the original population left their homeland between 1862 and 1864. The remaining, by that time 9.000 Abaza were settled in their current locations.

In their historical homeland, the Abaza had been Christians. After their migration to the northern slopes of the Caucasus mountain range, they soon converted to Islam (Hanafiya).

Abaza is a written language (based on the Tapanta dialect). In 1923, the Abaza poet Talustan Talubov created an orthography based on Latin characters (discussed e.g. by Khashba 1931) that was replaced by a Cyrillic version in 1938. There is a considerable amount of literature available that is written in the Abaza language, both journalistic and poetic. Descriptions of Abaza do not start with Bouda (1940), as claimed by the author of the study under review p.1: Already in 1938, G. P. Serdjuchenko (the author of a small grammatical sketch of Abaza (Serdjuchenko 1956)) published an article on the dialects of Abaza (the earliest account seems to be Savinov 1850, a source, which reports (among others) on the Abaza language). As early as 1908, Abaza intellectuals in the Istanbul diaspora designed a written norm for Abaza, which, however, did not see success (nevertheless, the early history of Abaza grammar writing still remains an unstudied matter). In addition, we have to assume that from 1923-1929, several books on Abaza must have been prepared for school classes.

Just as it is true for its sister languages, Abaza is a strongly prefixing, agglutinating language, characterized by strong preferences for head marking strategies. Typologically speaking, Northwest Caucasian has much in common e.g. with the layout of Athapaskan grammatical systems. Contrary to Abkhaz, Abaza has extended the grammaticalization of 'pragmatic markers' as verbal suffixes. The unmarked word order is verb- final, preceded by a focal 'slot' as well as by referential segments marked for grammatical relations. As for these relations, Abaza follows a 'split ergativity' strategy (neutral/ergative, see below). Finally, Abaza, just as it is true for its sister languages, operated through a remarkable paradigm of phonemic variation that gives us for Abaza a system of roughly sixty consonants and two vowels (note that with respect to the number of phonemes, Abaza is rather moderate compared to e.g. Ubykh).

Morphological and syntactic complexity paired with a considerable amount of pragmatically relevant coding strategies render Abaza a typological treasure vault that still awaits a more comprehensive coverage. In this respect, O'Herin's book fills a significant gap: Hitherto, Abaza data have hardly been analyzed from the point of view of General Linguistics, in any framework whatsoever. O'Herin, who has undoubtedly managed to get deep into this language often (and falsely) denounced as an extremely difficult language, concentrates on the domains of Case and Agreement which constitute a major part of the Abaza 'relational' grammar. In this sense, the book promises to contribute not only to a better understanding of what is going on in a 'typical' Northwest Caucasian grammar, but also to the validation of these analytic domains themselves. On p. 1 of his book, O'Herin lists a number of references that are said to illustrate the small amount of linguistic work relevant for Abaza. His bibliography, listing some 110 titles, includes seventeen references that concern Abaza. Still, it should be noted that the author neglects a number of important sources, such as Genko 1954, Lomtatidze 1967, Lomtatidze & Klychev 1989; and Chirikba 1997. He likewise ignores the recent studies on Abaza, prepared by Iosif I. Gagiev (Gagiev 2000a, 2000b).

Another relevant source neglected by O'Herin is given by a set of pedagogical grammars produced by Nur'ya T. Tabulova (e.g. Tabulova 1953, 1969, 1971). Also, he does not consider the vast literature available for Abkhaz, the sister language of Abaza, which shares many of the features discussed by O'Herin with Abaza. For instance, O'Herin remains in nearly complete silence as for the impressive work by George Hewitt, the grand-seigneur of Abkhaz studies.

Nevertheless, it goes without saying that O'Herin's analysis of Abaza that touches upon a very important theme crucial to both syntax theory and language typology is well-grounded with respect to the linguistic data exploited by the author. O'Herin has conducted a number of field trips to the Abaza communities assembling a vast collection of data. Unfortunately, the author does not tell us more explicitly of where and how he collected his data. The names referred to page xi-xii (when thanking his Abaza friends) suggest that the places of field work had been located both in Turkey and in Russia.

CRITICAL SYNOPSIS

O'Herin's presentation of Abaza covers 286 (+ xvii) pages. It is divided into eight chapters, preceded by 'Acknowledgements' and a list of abbreviations, and followed by an appendix (summarizing constructional patterns of 'dynamic and stative predicates') and a list of references (see above). From the very beginning, the reader should be aware of the fact that O'Herin aims at an analysis of the Abaza data that is based on a formal framework, namely Principles and Parameters. This orientation explains what else would remain obscure at least for those readers acquainted with West Caucasian languages: It is standard knowledge that Abaza lacks case forms marked on referential (or nominal in its widest sense) forms. So, how can a book be entitled 'Case and Agreement in Abaza', if the language lacks what usually is associated with the term 'case'? This 'puzzle' is solved once the reader has adopted the formal Case Theory. Accordingly, "all Case assignment occurs in the specifier-head relationship within one of two types of agreement phrases, absolutive agreement phrases (...) and ergative agreement phrases (...)" (p.39). To illustrate this point, let me simply quote an example randomly taken from O'Herin's book (p. 59; here, I have retained O'Herin's glossing; 'sphas' (recte: s-ph/as) is not segmented by O'Herin):

*sara wac*a s-ph/as (')al/ën lë-s-t-wëf-d*
I tomorrow 1s-woman ring 3sf-1s-give-FUT-DYN
'I will give my wife a ring tomorrow'

Neither sara 'I', nor s-ph/as 'my wife' or 'al/ën 'ring' are marked for case. But each case role (if we include the positionally defined zero-echo for 'al/ën) is reflected in the verb via agreement.

The fact that O'Herin adopts a formal framework to illustrate the basic morphosyntactic strategies of Abaza renders the book somewhat hermetic. Readers not interested in or not used to formal approaches to language structures have to single out passages relevant for their proper research interests. In the introductory section, O'Herin makes clear that one of his goals is to convince "those not familiar with formal theories that there is much to be gained from such theories in terms of understanding language". For those not used to the framework of Principles and Parameters, the author offers a (admittedly very) brief overview in section 1.2 of his book (pp.33-41). Maybe that this section is helpful for those who want to learn of how this formal framework accounts for the Abaza data. Also, specialists in this

framework will find numerous arguments that help to refine some assertions of the framework. Still, the 'ordinary' user interested in typological variation together with its historical and pragmatic instantiations in Abaza, probably misses allusions to other explanatory paradigms which have turned out to be at least as powerful as formal theories to account for typological variation (e.g. Cognitive Typology, Cognitive Semantics, historical comparative linguistics etc.) Note that O'Herin's contribution is written from a nearly completely synchronic perspective, although it comes clear that quite a number of findings do not have synchronic motivation but stem from the habitualization of older communicative patters (see for instance Lomtatidze 1977 for a preliminary presentation of the linguistic history of Abaza).

Not being a specialist in formal approaches to language, I will refrain from presenting the individual analyses prepared by O'Herin. I leave it to such specialists to judge upon the appropriateness and correctness of O'Herin's analyses with respect to the underlying framework. Rather, I will simply summarize the main categorial, constructional, and morphological patterns elaborated by the author.

The introductory section starts with a rather condensed description of the grammar of Abaza. He briefly considers the phonological system, which, nevertheless is crucial to some aspects of Abaza morphosyntax. In fact, morphophonological features often help to decide which kind of functional properties we have to deal with. For instance, in Abkhaz, the sister language of Abaza, the first person singular prefix (s-) is assimilated to a voiced onset of the verbal stem (when immediately following the prefix) (> z-). This process, however, is confined to the 'agentive' role (horribile dictu: transitive subject). In case s- reflects a first person singular in objective function ('object'), this process does not apply. According to my consultants, the same holds for Abaza.

O'Herin then briefly considers the 'morphology and syntax' of Abaza, concentrating on postpositional phrases, nominal phrases, and verbal phrases. Each of these domains is further elaborated in the subsequent chapters. Here, it is sufficient to note that Abaza postpositions (echoing the feature 'person/class' of the 'object' of the postposition with the help of the set of possessive prefixes) in fact are not postpositions at all, but grammaticalized possessive structures, e.g. (I have changed the glosses to render them more explicit):

awëy a-mshtax (p.9)
distal 3sg:nhum:A-after
'after that'

*a-s'ëys a-/*ara* (p.50)
DEF-bird 3sg:nhum:A-nest
'the bird's nest'

The hypothesis that both patterns share the same underlying constructional pattern is standard knowledge in West Caucasian linguistics. Nevertheless, O'Herin "posit(s) the possessor in a specifier position within the nominal extended projection and not in a complement position" (p.51). In other words: The issue again touches upon the question whether one gives preference to syntactic 'principles' etc., or whether one addresses 'natural' constraints (i.e., constraints resulting from cognitive and communicative parameters).

Perhaps the most crucial aspect of Abaza morphosyntax is represented by its system of 'agreement' present with verbal structures. O'Herin nicely summarizes the basic facts, that is what he calls 'Ergative Case assignment' (p.49) and 'Absolutive agreement' (p.63). [Unfortunately, he does not use a parallel terminology for both strategies (2.2. vs. 2.3)]. In addition, he informs on the paradigmatically salient opposition of dynamic vs. stative, as well as on some relevant phenomena related to the cluster Tense-Aspect-Mood. After a brief presentation of the underlying framework (see above), O'Herin -- in chapter 2 -- turns to Basic Case Assignment (pp. 43-90). This "core chapter" (p.4) describes and analyses the above mentioned agreement patters of Abaza, as illustrated in the following examples (p.47, 55, 58, 63, 64, 237, glosses modified; DIR = Directive Preverb):

*sh*ë-l-ba-wash-d*
2pl:O-3sg:f:A-see-FUT-DYN
'She will see you (pl.).'

dë-sh-f'ë-d*
3sg:hum:O-2pl:A-kill:PAST-DYN
'You (pl) killed him/her.'

*y-/a-sh*ë-l-t-wash-t'*
3sg:nhum:O-DIR-2pl:IO-3sg:f:A-give-FUT-IND
'She will give it to you (pl).'

sh-/*ë-y-d*
2pl:S-run-PRES-DYN
'You (pl.) run.'

d-yë-c-lë-z-ca-t'
3sg:hum:S-3sg:m(:A)-COM-3sg:f(:A)-BEN-go-DYN
'S/he went with him for her.'

The assumption according to which we have to deal with two different sets of agreement morphemes (S(ubjective)= O(bjective) vs. A(gentive)) turns out to be highly problematic: In fact, the distinction between S=O (= absolutive) and A (=ergative) becomes evident mainly in the third person, but not in those morphemes that encode speech act participants, compare the following paradigm of 'personal' prefixes:

	S=O	A(=IO)
1sg	s(ë)-	s(ë)(~ z-)
2sg:m	w-	w-
2sg:f	b(ë)-	b(ë)-
3sg:m	dë-	y-
3sg:f	dë-	l(ë)-
3sg:nhum	y- ~ NULL	(n)a-
1pl	h/(ë)-	h/(ë)
2pl	sh*(ë)-	sh*(ë)- (~ zh*(ë)-)
3pl	y-	rë-

It comes clear that the formal opposition ABS vs. ERG is present with the third person, but not with a second and a first person. Here, the positional arrangement becomes crucial, compare (field notes):

wë-s-k'ë-y-t'
2sg:m:O-1sg:a-love-PRES-IND
'I love you (sg, masc.)'

së-w-k'ë-y-t'
1sg:O-2sg:m:A-love-PRES-IND
'You (sg, masc.) love me.'

In other words: The alleged ergativity of Abaza is confined to mainly the third person, or the 'non-personne', to use a term coined by É. Benveniste. Thus Abaza conforms (at least synchronically) to the well- known person/agentivity hierarchy (the so-called Silverstein Hierarchy). From this it follows that positional parameters are more salient than the degree of formal distinction. In this, Abaza comes amazingly close to e.g. Athapaskan languages, compare Chiricahua (Pinnow 1988:37):

nishbéézh < **ni-sh-l/-béézh*
2sg:O-1sg:A-CL-cook:IMPERF 'I cook you (sg.)'

shíl/béézh < **shi-ni-l/-béézh*
1sg:O-2sg:A-CL-cook:IMPERF 'You (sg.) cook me.'

In addition, it should be noted that in Abaza, ergative strategies are strongly coupled with anaphoric constructions. Speech Act Participants do not occur as overt pronouns except for emphasis, whereas any third person prefix cross-references a deictic or nominal segment. Crucially, a third person non-human referent is not cross-referenced on the verb in case it immediately precedes the verb (p.20), compare (p.20, glosses modified):

sara a-msh s-ba-y-t'*
I DEF-bear 1sg:A-see-PRES-DYN
'I see the bear.'

sara a-msh shashta yë-s-ba-y-t'*
I DEF-bear early 3sg:nhum:O-1sg:A-see-PRES-DYN
'I see the bear early.'

In sum, it comes clear that O'Herin's description of Abaza as an "ergative- absolutive language" (p.75) is difficult to support. Rather, we should speak of 'split ergativity' with respect to the domain 'Person'. In case the superordinated strategy of word order is taken as a decisive parameter, we should define 'ergativity' in terms of serialization parameters (e.g. Schulze 2000), for instance:

ABS ERG #S-V #O-A-V

Here, the diagnostic feature has to be defined as the left 'word border' to arrive at an ergative strategy (S=O vs. A). There are several additional arguments that support the claim according

to which Abaza is 'configured' in terms of an ergative strategy. But none of them is directly connected to the category of Case.

Chapter 3 turns to 'Stative Predicates' (pp.91-124). Stative verbs are differently tense/mood-framed than dynamic verbs, an opposition that is well-documented for all West Caucasian languages. Most importantly, stative verbs may be intransitive and transitive. Note that the decision whether a verb is stative or dynamic does not necessarily depend from the actual semantics of the verb. On p.93, O'Herin points out that for instance the verb -c*ëmagh- 'hate' is stative, whereas its 'positive correlate', -bzëyba- 'love' is dynamic. He correctly refers to the original (i.e. historical) reading of the two verbs: 'love' is dynamic, because it originally meant 'to see well', and 'hate' is stative, because it originally meant 'be one's enemy'. This example sufficiently illustrates that actual syntactic frames are not necessarily motivated (and processed) on a synchronic level. In fact, all synchronically transitive stative verbs seem to result from the reanalysis or metaphorization of former intransitive constructions, which may involve not only verbs, but also nouns, adjectives, and so-called postpositions. An example for the non-verbal use of stative constructions is (p. 94, glosses are modified):

a-sara d-rë-c-p'
DEF-sheep 3sg:hum:S-3pl(:A)-COM-STATIVE:PRES
'S/He is with the sheep.'

In fact, we have to deal with the grammaticalized version of an older copula construction (copula *wp' (non-Past), *-n (Past)). Again, if we start from this diachronic scenario, much of what O'Herin discusses for stative verbs in terms of formal grammar becomes immediately transparent. Nevertheless, O'Herin's analysis helps to better understand the dimension of stative constructions in Abaza, just because it offers important data hitherto less observed.

Chapter 4 addresses the question of Causatives (pp.125-165). Abaza is marked for highly productive strategies to morphologically mark causative constructions (prefix r-). The position of the causative morpheme (immediately before the root) suggests that we have to deal with a derivational strategy rather with an inflectional pattern. In fact, the serialization of 'agreement' prefixes corresponds to that of transitive structures, compare (p.127, glosses are modified):

*d-a-r-q*ëc-i-t'*
3sg:hum:O-3sg:nhum:A-think-PRES-DYN
'It makes him/her think'

With transitive verbs, the pattern is O - A' - A - CAUS - V (I use A' to indicate the fact that the embedded agent or causee is encoded with the agentive/ergative morphemes, compare (p.133, glosses again modified):

yë-l-së-r-sa-t'
3sg:O-3sg:f:A'-1sg:A-CAUS-cut:PAST-DYN
'I had her cut it.'

O'Herin aims at elaborating the verbal nature of the -r-Causative, which is said to account for the agreement patterns just described. From the point of view of Caucasian linguistics, such an assumption unnecessarily complicates the matter. It is a well-known pattern in some other languages to use instrumental/causal features to encode let-causation. In this sense, the

sentence above would read: 'With/because-of me, she cuts it.' In other words: the segment -së-r- represents nothing but a heavily grammaticalized, postpositional structure that later became incorporated into the verbal frame. There is one phenomenon, which might go against this analysis: O'Herin (p.138-9) shows that with a 3pl embedded agent (usually r(ë)-), dissimilation occurs, e.g. (p.138):

y-d-yë-r-ba-t'
3sg:nhum:O-3pl:A'-3sg:m:A-CAUS-see:PAST-DYN
'He caused them to see it.' (= He showed it to them')

This type of dissimilation does not occur e.g. with incorporated postposition, compare (p.138):

y-r-a-r-h/-t'*
3sg:nhum:O-3pl(:A)-DIR-say-:PAST-DYN
'They said it to them.'

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the two patterns are not alike. The causative pattern mentioned above posits the causee in front of the causer, but not before the 'subject' of the postpositional phrase. Although assimilation and dissimilation may occasionally be motivated by a syntactic arrangement, it is rather unlikely that we have to deal with a synchronically 'transparent' type of dissimilation. This comes also true from the fact that the same 'process' can be observed in Abkhaz. Most likely, the dissimilation had already been fossilized in the time of the Abkhaz-Abaza unit that is roughly some 1500 years ago (if ever it had been a dissimilation at all).

After having discussed reflexive strategies, O'Herin turns to 'Derived Inversion' in chapter 5 (pp. 167-191). Here, the author considers derivational patterns that are marked for the 'inversion' of agreement patterns. This includes for instance the Potential, marked by a prefix -z (ë)-, compare (p.168):

y-së-z-lë-ta-t'
3sg:nhum:O-1sg:A-POT-3sg:IO-give:PAST-DYN
'I was able to give it to her.'

Here, the agentive morpheme has drifted further to the left, opening a 'slot' that may for instance be exploited by an IO prefix. Contrary to O'Herin's view, I cannot really see that inversion would be at work. The main point is that the IO-domain drifts to the right. The same holds for the Potential of Causatives, e.g. (p.189):

yë-s-zë-l-rë-f-t'
3sg:nhum:O-1sg:A-POT-3sg:f:A'-CAUS-eat:PAST-DYN
'I was able to make her eat it.'

The fact that the embedded agent undergoes the same shift as it occurs with the IO of a ditransitive verb (see above), gives us another clue for determining the nature of the embedded agent in causative constructions. Accordingly, we would have to deal with an IO (Indirect Object(ive)) rather than with an 'ergative' agreement marker (just as it is true for instance for the distantly related language Kabardian). As for the Potential, O'Herin suggests

(in simplified, non-formal terms) that the marker -z/ë)- functions as some kind of 'capability auxiliary' followed by the lexical complex. Literally, the above mentioned example isëzlëtat' (y- së-z-lë-ta-t') would read: 'it I could her give' (instead of a non- inversed reading *'it her I would give' (*y-lë-s-zë-ta-t'), compare y-lë-s- ta-t' 'I gave it to her'). This auxiliary hypothesis, which in fact is said to hold for the causative, too, is rather attractive - however, up to now, it lacks clear historical evidence.

Chapter 6 deals with what O'Herin calls 'Lexically Inverted Verbs' (pp.193- 211). In this brief, nevertheless extremely interesting section, the author turns to a class of superficially transitive verbs that are marked for the inversion of the position of A and O functions. Such verbs (among them 'bite', 'touch', strike, hit', attack, forgive', 'help' and 'shoot at') are said to have Inherent Case just as it is assumed for e.g. German 'ich helfe dir (dative)' 'I help you'. AN example for the framing type in Abaza is (p.196, glosses again modified):

*h/ë-y-g*ëk*s-t'*
1pl:S-3sg:m:IO-attack-DYN
'We attack him (the enemy).'

It comes clear that, here, Abaza uses the set of 'absolutive' prefixes instead of the standard 'ergative' series to encode A. O'Herin correctly suggests that "inverted verbs in Abaza are parallel to the dative verbs of Russian and German" (p.196). From a functional point of view, the verb frame mentioned above represents nothing but fossilized antipassives, compare:

Ergative: O-A-V AP: S-IO-V (AP: A>S, O>IO)

Antipassives are well-known in related Circassian and Kabardian, compare for Kabardian (e.g. Colarusso 1992b:177). The IO-character of the 'former O' becomes immediately evident, if we have a look at the Potential. Here, again, the so-called Object prefix (i.e., the IO prefix) shifts to the right of the Potential prefix:

s-z-y-ësë-y-d
1sg:S-POT-3sg:m:IO-hit-PRES-DYN
'I can hit him.'

In chapter 7, O'Herin discusses 'Postposition Incorporation' (pp.213-248). The author carefully analyses the relevant data that are marked for the incorporation of a postpositional complex into the prefix chain (PP-S-V or O-PP-A-V). Semantically speaking, this strategy concerns Benefactives, Adversatives, Comitatives, Locatives, and Instrumentals. A simple example is (p.214):

y-l-zë-s-dz-d*
3sg:nhum-3sg:f(:A)-BEN-1sg:A-drink:PAST-DYN
'I drank it for her.'

This process, which is well-known e.g. from Athapaskan languages, seems to be linked to (among others) the parameter of definiteness: In case the 'subject' of a postposition is marked for (strong) indefiniteness, incorporation applies. This tendency goes together with the preference for (pro)nominals carrying strong reference not to be incorporated (p.224). In fact, the incorporation conditions nicely meet the basic typology set up by Mithun 1984.

Finally, O'Herin turns to Wh-Agreement (chapter 8, pp.249-276). The author observes: "When an argument is [+wh], the agreement with that argument is realized as wh-agreement. This places wh-agreement squarely within the normal agreement paradigm" (p.250). Crucially, wh-agreement is also present e.g. with relative clauses. This fact sets Abaza apart for instance from the East Caucasian language Udi which knows wh-agreement only for questions (see e.g. Harris 2002). The general Abaza wh-marker is z (ë)- (A=IO) and y(ë)- (S=O). Examples are (252, 252, 252, glosses modified; Q = 'wh-agreement marker'):

*a-c*wal yac'*ëya yë-ta-wa*
DEF-sack what Q:S-be=in-PRES:STAT
'What is in the sack?'

dëzda s-axcja zë-ghëcj
who 1sg(:A)-money Q:A-steal(:PAST)
'Who stole my money?'

*ismir dzac*wëya yë-r-ba-k*a-z*
Izmir who Q:O-3pl:A-see-PL-PAST
'Whom did they see in Izmir?'

Just as it to be expected from the linguistics of the given area, Abaza prefers to place wh-words in the preverbal focus field. O'Herin nicely analyses this positional preference without, however, alluding to the fact that we have to deal with an areal phenomenon, common to many languages spoken in and around the Northern Caucasus. Unfortunately, the author does not ouch upon the question of how and why the special wh-agreement pattern has emerged. It is perhaps more than just a guess that both z(ë)- and y(ë)- represent residues of older wh-words (pace Nikolaev & Starostin 1994:492). Note that the wh-agreement prefixes do not distinguish degrees of animacy, whereas the overt wh-pronouns do (dëzda ~ dzac'*ëya 'who' vs. yac'*ëya 'what'). Relative clauses are clearly derived from wh-strategies. Relative clauses operate in the same way as participle-based relativization happens e.g. in Turkic languages, compare (p.260):

y-awë-y-shtë-z a-h/aq-dëw*
Q:O-PV-3sg:A-throw-PAST:REL DEF-stone-big
'The big stone that he threw....'

Still, note that the relative segment occurs to the left of its head, whereas a (usually incorporated) attribute follows it.

Finally, O'Herin draws the reader's attention to a very interesting fact, namely there is an alternative reading of yac'*ëya 'what' > 'why'. The use of 'what' when asking for a reason is also know e.g. from German, e.g. 'was guckst du?' ('why do you look (at me)'). In Abaza, the use of the pronoun as a 'why'-marker is coupled with a special wh-agreement morpheme, compare (p.265):

*yac'*ëya (...) sh*-zë-në-m-xa-wa*
what>why (...) 2pl:S-Q-PV-NEG-work-PRES:NEG
'Why don't you work [even harder]?'

The morpheme is z(ë)- and thus equals the standard Q:A. Unfortunately, O'Herin does not give us an explicit transitive construction (e.g. 'why do you kill the horse?'). Still, the examples given by the author suggest that the Q-marker in why-constructions actually plays the role of the agentive, 'demoting' the standard personal agreement prefix to the Objective. Hence, the example above would read: 'What makes you not to work [harder].' This analysis goes together with the fact that the 'why'- reading of the pronoun presupposes that it is placed clause-initially, that is in just the place that usually is occupied by an overt A-referent. In terms of cognitive linguistics, we have to deal with the metaphorization of 'what' as a 'reason-related agent'.

CONCLUSIONS

Unfortunately, O'Herin's book lacks a summary or a concluding chapter. Especially those readers who are unacquainted with the marvelous world of West Caucasian languages may have difficulties to arrive at a more general picture of the morphosyntax of Abaza. O'Herin has put much effort in giving a detailed account of what is actually going on in the language. The wealth of data (which often include new material) is coupled with a highly sophisticated analysis which sets the reader at risk to concentrate more on details than 'on the whole'. Still, it is my deepest conviction that without understanding the overall strategies and 'mechanisms' of a language (together with their communicative and historical settings), the analysis of particular phenomena may rest episodic.

The reader would perhaps have welcomed the illustration of Abaza with the help of a longer text, fully glossed and commented upon with the help of the analyses presented in the book. I am well aware of the fact that such a presentation would not be in the scope of the formal framework adopted by the author. Still, I assume without a closer look at the organization of textual data (in terms of 'context'), much of what O'Herin proposes in his highly sophisticated and undoubtedly learned analysis remains fragmentary. For instance, pragmatic strategies, the interaction of TAM- framing and clausal organization, variation in the degree of referentialization etc. only become apparent if textual embedding is considered. O'Herin surely has an impressive knowledge of Abaza, at least as far as the synchronic layer is concerned. His data are accurate, well- chosen and highly illustrative. Nevertheless, many questions remain open. In this sense, the book cannot serve as an introduction into the morphosyntax (and morphosemantics and morphopragmatics) of the language, nor does it replace what may be called the pragmasyntax of Abaza. The reader will certainly enjoy the scrutiny of the analyses, as well as the careful and balanced arguments put forward by the author in his analyses. However, as I have pointed out in the beginning of this review, the framework adopted by the author hinders him from approaching alternative explanatory perspectives. Here, it would perhaps have been wise if O'Herin had more frequently consulted grammatical and typological work on other (West) Caucasian languages, readily available on the market. This holds both for synchrony and diachrony. In fact, at least some of the phenomena explained by the author in terms of the Principles and Parameters framework, reflect older layers of the language, the functionality of which can today be only viewed in terms of 'habitualized routines' (or fossilized strategies). The decision to base his analysis on the 'formal paradigm' may help to bring further progress to this framework. But at the same time, the book becomes less useful for those who take a more functional perspective.

Nevertheless, it is a great pleasure to read the book (once one has adopted the formal framework). Even functionalists, 'business-as-usual' typologists, and cognitive linguistics will

enjoy the impressive wealth of data that will undoubtedly contribute to the revision of some generalizations hitherto thought to be 'standard'. In addition, specialists in Caucasian linguistics are strongly motivated by O'Herin's data to take up the enterprise to unearth hitherto neglected categories and functional domains in other (West) Caucasian languages. In this sense, the book, which by itself is extremely well-done, must be welcomed. The only point the reader should be aware of is the fact that it does not (and probably cannot) tell the whole story. It is an important contribution to the morphosyntax of Abaza, but it is (hopefully) not designed to be a reference book of Abaza morphosyntax. At least the reader should not take it as such.

REFERENCES

Bouda, Karl 1940. Das Abasinische, eine unbekannte abchasische Mundart. ZDMG 94,2.

Chirikba, V. A. 1997.: Abazinskij. In: Jazyki Rossijskoj Federacii i Sosednix Gosudarstv. Enciklopedija v trex tomax. I A-I,1-8. Moskva: Nauka

Colarusso, John 1992a. Phyletic links between proto-Indo-European and proto-Northwest Caucasian. In: H.I. Aronson (ed.). The Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR: Linguistic studies, 19-54. Chicago, CLS.

Colarusso, John 1992b. The Kabardian Language. Calgary: The University of Calgary Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. Ergativity. Cambridge: CUP.

Gagiev, Iosif I. 2000a. Prostoe predlozhenie v abazinskom jazyke. Mosvka: Nauka.

Gagiev, Iosif I. 2000b. Sopostavitel'nyj analiz prostogo predlozhenija v abazinskom i anglijskom jazykax. Moskva: Nauka.

Genko, A. N. 1954. Abazinskij jayzk. Grammaticheskij ocherk narechija Tapanta. Moskva: Izd. AN SSSR.

Harris, Alice 2002. Endoclitics and The Origins of Udi Morphosyntax. Oxford: OUP.

Ionova, S. Kh. & A. K. Shagirov: O sociolingvisticheskom sostojaniii, perspektivax i xode izuchenija abazinskogo jazyka. Rodnoy Jazyk 1 (Moskva).

Khashba, A. 1931. K voprosu o sozdanii pis'mennosti abazin Severnogo Kavkaza. In: Prosveshchenie nacional'nostej, 7-8.

Klychev, R. N. 1995. Slovar' sochetamosti preverbov s suffiksoidami i glagol'nymi korjami v abazinskom jazyke. Cherkessk.

Lomtatidze, K. 1967. Abazinskij jazyk. In: E:A. Bokarev (ed.). Jazyki narodov SSSR, vol. 4: Iberijsko-kavkazskie jazyki, 124-143. Moskva: Nauka.

Lomtatidze, K. 1977. Abxazuri da abazuri enebis ist'oriul-shedarebiti analizi. Tbilisi. Mecniereba.

Lomtatidze, K. & R. Klychev 1989. Abaza. In: G. Hewitt (ed.). The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus, vol. 2.: The North West Caucasian Languages, 89-153. Delmar, NY: Caravan.

Mithun, Marianne 1984. The evolution of noun incorporation. Language 60:847-895.

Nikolaev, S. L. & S. A. Starostin 1994. A North Caucasian Etymological Dictionary. Moscow: Asterisk.

Pinnow, Jürgen 1988. Die Sprache der Chiricahua-Apachen mit Seitenblicken auf das Mescalero. Hamburg: Buske.

Savinov, V. 1850. Dostoverye ob Abazii. Panteon 2-12.

Serdjuchenko, G. P. 1938. On abazinskix dialektax. In: Pamjati akademika N. Ja. Marra (1864-1934). Moskva-Leningrad: Nauka.

Serdjuchenko, G. P. 1956. Kratkij grammatichestij ocherk abazinskogo jazyka. Kh. D. Zhirov & N. B. Ekba 1956. Russko-abazinskij slovar'. Moskva: GosIzd Inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej.

Schulze, Wolfgang 2000. The Accusative Ergative Continuum. General Linguistics 37:71-155.

Schulze, Wolfgang 2002a. Abasinisch. In: Milos Okuka & Gerald Krenn (Hrsg.). Wieser Enzyklopädie des Europäischen Ostens, Band 10. Lexikon der Sprachen des europäischen Ostens, 837-841. Klagenfurt: Wieser Verlag.

Schulze, Wolfgang 2002b. Abchasisch. In: Milos Okuka & Gerald Krenn (Hrsg.). Wieser Enzyklopädie des Europäischen Ostens, Band 10. Lexikon der Sprachen des europäischen Ostens, 843-850. Klagenfurt: Wieser Verlag.

Tabulova, N. T. 1953. Grammatika abazinskogo jazyka. Chast' 2. Sinstaksis (dlja 6-7. kl.). Cherkessk.

Tabulova, N. T. 1969. Grammatika abazinskogo jazyka. Chast' 2. Sinstaksis (dlja 7-8. kl.). Cherkessk.

Tabulova, N. T. 1971. Abazinskij jazyk. Fonetika I morfologija (dlja 5-6 kl.). Cherkessk.

Tabulova, N. T. 1996. Dialektologicheskij slovar' abazinskogo jazyka (tapanta-shkaraua, shkaraua-tapanta). Cherkessk.

Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 11:36:42 +0100

AUTHORS: Kuno, Susumu; Takami, Ken-Ichi
TITLE: Functional Constraints in Grammar
SUBTITLE: On the unergative-unaccusative distinction
SERIES: Constructional Approaches to Language 1
PUBLISHER: John Benjamins YEAR: 2004

Wolfgang Schulze (IATS, University of Munich)

INTRODUCTION

The discussion of whether the assumption of so-called unergative (UE) and unaccusative (UA) verb classes (triggering different syntactic patterns) helps to better understand and explain distributional 'anomalies' has a long-standing tradition. It is related to multiple suggestions to classify the verbal lexicon of different languages (starting e.g. with Vendler 1967). In addition, the discussion (pursued especially in formal theories of language) follows closely observations on syntactic behavioral patterns, which stem from the typology of case alignment.

Still, it must be stressed that research on these two types of verb 'classes' (or syntactic 'classes') concentrates on a number of basically European languages (there are, nevertheless, some (admittedly few) studies on unergativity and unaccusativity in non-Indo-European languages, too -- still the impact of these studies is relatively low). More precisely, the literature on the given issue even suggests that the phenomena are a basically 'English' problem. The question of whether UE and UA represent a behavioral distinction common to many more languages often is obscured by the fact that very rarely, cross-linguistic studies take the same diagnostic features as their point of departure. Hence, we are confronted with a patch-work of arguments that, however, seldom sees systematization (see Abraham 2004 for a highly illuminating example of how such systematization can be achieved).

Ergative verbs (or constructions in the broadest sense of the word) are conventionally defined as verbs that, when intransitive, show the 'same' type of NP as their 'subject', that occurs as an 'object', if the verb is used in a transitive construction. The common pattern is (English) 'the door opened' vs. 'John opened the door' (p. 7). Here, the 'intransitive subject' is said to stand in an analogous relationship with the 'transitive object' (hence the term 'ergative'). As this behavior goes against the standard 'accusative' pattern, the alternative term 'unaccusative' is frequently used. Accusative verbs, on the other hand, are conventionally defined as verbs that, when intransitive, show the 'same' type of NP as their 'subject', that also occurs as a 'subject' in corresponding transitive constructions. Here, the common pattern is (English): 'John sang' vs. 'John sang a lullaby' (p. 7). As this behavior now goes against the standard 'ergative' pattern, such verbs or constructions are often called 'unergative'. The reader should not that the term 'unergative' is somewhat misleading: As pointed out by the authors of the book at issue, the term 'ergative' has a strong 'semantic' connotation (Greek ergate:s 'worker').

As far as I know, the first application of the term 'ergative' has to be ascribed to Alfredo Trombetti (1902/03) although it remains doubtful whether it was this author who had coined the term himself or whether he took it from P. Wilhelm Schmidt. The standard assumption that the term was introduced by Adolf Dirr (1912:9: Tvoritel'yj (Activus, Ergativus)), as

proposed by Seely (1977) and still maintained by Dixon (1994:3) should be revised accordingly.

If we stick to the original meaning of the term, an 'unergative' construction would suggest a 'non-volitional, non-agentive' semantics. However, just the opposite is true: an UE is conventionally labeled 'agentive, controlling' etc., whereas an UA is said to encompass the meaning 'uncontrolled, not agentive' etc. Obviously, two different perspectives clash in the terminology: 'ergative' as a distributional feature of constructional paradigms, and 'ergative' some kind of 'semantic case'.

Basically, there are two ways of approaching the UE/UA phenomenology: One the one hand, one can elaborate the diagnostics for an individual language, neglecting the questions to which extent the UE/UA typology is validated from a crosslinguistic perspective and whether it is based on common, maybe universal properties of human 'linguistic cognition'. On the other hand, one may focus on just this latter perspective, disregarding peculiarities in the individual languages (to do both things at the same time seems a tantalizing work). The book at issue (henceforth K&T) takes the first perspective: It concentrates on English, suggesting basically five diagnostic tests to validate the 'nature' of unergativity and unaccusativity and to explore its causal background. Most importantly, K&T do not take a monocausal perspective. Rather, they assume that "subtle semantic and pragmatic factors are crucial to understanding the constraints on grammatical constructions" (p. 29). They continue: "We further propose constraints on the five English constructions [discussed in the volume, W.S.], in which formal, functional, semantic, and pragmatic aspects of the constructions are incorporated as parts of a complex whole, and one dimension cannot be simply derived, or predicted, from any other dimension." (p. 29).

It comes clear that here, the authors follow rather closely the theoretical tenet of Construction Grammar. Else, the general perspective seems to be directed by a critical reception of Formal Grammar traditions, although the authors also point out that their framework "is a continuation of a series of research conducted within the framework of what is called Functional Syntax" (p. 28) (see for instance Kuno 1980, 1987). K&T thus aim at presenting a multicausal scenario for the functional dimensions of UE and UA constructions in English. Still, it must be asked from the very beginning, whether a 'single' phenomenon, namely the distributional patterns of UE and UA constructions should be related to a multicausal scenario. An alternative would have been -- as has been said above -- to unveil a common motivation for all types of constraints etc., into which these constructional patterns are involved (see again Abraham 2004). It goes without saying that even such an approach would not be 'monocausal' in the strict sense of the term, because it would call for the discussion of metaphorization paths and, most importantly, for diachronic considerations. For instance, it may well have been that the constructional type 'the door opened' has been derived from a middle-reflexive construction as preserved in German 'die Tür öffnete sich', also compare:

(1) The book sells well. 'Das Buch verkauft sich gut.'

The diachronic process would have been marked for a strong (formal) 'dereflexivization' of English, based on a constructional type that by itself was makred for the 'anthropomorphization' of concepts in 'subject' function of ergative verbs (see Schulze 2000 for this type of 'promotion'). Another example would be German:

(2) a. Paul erschreckt. 'Paul gets a fright.'
b. Eva erschreckt Paul. 'Eve frightens Paul.'

Superficially, we have to deal with the 'classical' distribution of unaccusative (or ergative) verbs. Still, the past tense makes clear that we have to deal with a derivational process that starts from the intransitive verb:

(3) a. Paul erschrak. 'Paul got a fright.'
b. Eva erschreckte Paul. 'Eve frightened Paul.'

In fact, the transitive verb ('erschrecken', tr.) is derived from the intransitive base with the help of a jan-causative. An intermediate state is reflected by the reflexive 'sich erschrecken' (Past: 'erschreckte sich') 'to get a fright'. The same holds for a number of 'pairs' that historically reflect derivational patterns. If we accept the hypothesis that language is a historical (arte)factum, we arrive at the conclusion that many, if not most of its constructional patterns are grounded in processes motivated at some earlier stage of the language, conventionalized in the habitualization processes of communicative standards. Hence, it would be of the utmost importance first to isolate such historical processes and motivations before turning to explanations based on the assumption of synchronically motivated constructions and patterns. The fact that Modern English has strongly reduced the derivational patterns underlying the alleged UE/UA-constructions considerably obscures the pictures. Sticking to just English data sets the researcher at risk to be led astray.

CRITICAL SYNOPSIS

The book under review bears a highly promising title: Functional Constraints in Grammar. In fact, most of what the book does is to explore such constraints that are conventionally related to UE and UA constructions. Unfortunately, the authors do not tell in details what they understand by 'functional'. Here, the above-given reference to the framework of Functional Syntax (listing a great number of bibliographical references) is nearly all the reader learns expressis verbis about this framework. True, much of this framework lurks through the cautious analyses later in the book; nevertheless, the reader would perhaps have enjoyed a brief presentation of this framework in order to locate the arguments in their theoretical frame. Instead, the authors, in their 'introduction' (pp. 1-29) at length consider issues of UE and UA constructions. This section is by itself highly informative, although it must be admitted that it is marked for considerable redundancies: the alleged nature of UE and UA constructions is summarized again and again, a fact which renders this introduction not very stimulating. Personally, I would have enjoyed to see the contents of this chapter being divided into three parts: 1) The 'problem' and how the book tries to tackle it; 2) the methodological and theoretical frame; 3) a brief overview on UE and UA constructions together with a résumé of suggestions on how to analyze and interpret these constructions. Unfortunately, the authors press many of these aspects into a single section. This renders the introduction at the same time ambitious, informative, and superficial.

In their introduction, the authors also refer to traditions to 'free' the UE/UA-constructions from their syntactic paradigmatics; instead, UE and UA verb classes are established based on mere semantic criteria (such as controlhood, agentivity etc.). Not surprisingly, these verb classes are then paralleled to the classes of intransitive 'active' and inactive' verbs, as described in the tradition of the famous Sapirian patterns (Sapir 1917). Still, the equation 'active' verbs = unergative, 'inactive' verbs = unaccusative remains doubtful (p. 6). For

instance, this distinction, usually known as S-Split (see Schulze 2000 and the references given there), is sometimes present only with certain 'persons'. Have a closer look at two of those languages mentioned by T&K (p. 6): In Dakota, Split-S occurs only with the first and second person (singular; the second person plural is derived therefrom), but it is lacking in the first person plural and in the third person. Holisky (1994: 194) summarizes the Bats facts (East Caucasian, Nakh group) as follows: "If the intransitive subject is third person, it will invariably be in the nominative [recte: absolutive, W.S.] case .... If it is first or second person, however, with some verbs it will be ergative, with others nominative [recte: absolutive, W.S.]. The choice depends on both the semantics of the verb and the speaker's belief about the situation in which it occurs." It comes clear that, here, S-Split shows up as an epiphenomenon of aspects of personality. In addition, Bats belongs much more to the Fluid-S marking type (see Schulze 2000) than to a 'true' (lexically determined) Split-S. In short: It is extremely dangerous to refer to S-Split strategies in order to set up an UE/UA-typology, without elaborating the details of these strategies in the individual languages.

It comes clear that the semantic domains described (for reference) in the 'introduction' of K&T can hardly serve to set up a more general scheme of UE/UA-patterns. The authors rightly emphasize that there are many mismatches among languages with respect to the semantic classification of verbs. They conclude: "[b]ut there is always the possibility also that the syntactic constructions in question (used to set up UE/UA-classes, W.S.) might not select unergative or unaccusative verbs ..., but are controlled by the more complex interaction of verb semantics, sentence semantics, and the discourse factors involved" (p. 17). Nevertheless, the authors decide to use the "semantic roles of subject referents as the central criterion for the unergative-unaccusative distinction" (p. 17). This decision may be accepted for heuristic purposes, still it sets the authors at risk to build their house of arguments on rather treacherous grounds. Fortunately, the authors do not start from a mere lexical approach, that would list the verbs at issue before testing them against given syntactic properties or constructional patterns (such a list is offered for instance by Perlmutter 1978: 162-3). Instead, they start from five diagnostic constructions of English, namely the there-construction (chapter 2), the why-construction (chapter 3), the cognate object construction (chapter 4), the pseudo- passive construction (chapter 5), and the extraposition of subject NPs (chapter 6). K&T do not make fully clear, why they have opted for just these constructional patterns, but it comes clear that all of them seem to involve features of an (English-based) UE/UA-typology.

As has been said above, Chapter 2 is devoted to the English 'there- construction' (pp. 31-65). In English, the use of the clausal initial topic field has become considerably reduced, compare German:

(4) Gestern ging ich in die Stadt.
'Yesterday, I went to town.' / *'Yesterday went I to town.'

Instead, English has strongly functionalized the clause external focus place, leaving the clause internal syntax unchanged. Note that for instance in Standard German, this external slot is not (yet) available:

(5) *Gestern ich ging in die Stadt.

Naturally, the gradual 'closure' of the clause initial (internal) topic field in English is strongly related to the loss of additional (morphological) means to indicate grammatical relations. In

addition, we can expect that the shift from internal topic marking to external focus marking did not happen at once. Rather, this process had been marked by the gradual reduction of the functional scope of the topicalization strategy. Residues of this strategy can be expected to occur in (older) literature, memorized folk tales, and (perhaps) dialects. In fact, the 'there-construction' discussed by K&T seems to represent just one instance of this 'fossilization process'. Accordingly, verbs denoting existence and appearance allow the 'there-construction', whereas other verbs don't, compare:

(6) a. There occurred a tragic event yesterday. (p. 31)
b. *There played three children in the playground. (p. 32).

Again note that e.g. in German, the corresponding 'da-construction' is possible with both examples:

(7) a. Da geschah gestern ein tragisches Ereignis.
b. Da spielten drei Kinder auf dem Spielplatz.

K&T first review the standard assumption that the constraints on the 'there-construction' are linked to unaccusativity. Accordingly, only typical UA-verbs denoting existence and appearance qualify for the 'there- construction'. In section 2,3, they show, that there are unergative verbs (such as rule, creep, crawl, amble, race, spring), which, too, can occur in the above-mentioned construction. Likewise, they show that the 'intransitivity constraint' does not apply either, compare:

(8) Then, all of a sudden, there reached her ear the sound of angel voices. (p. 41)

In addition, K&T mention illustrate that "the acceptability of there- sentences is not dependent on verbs alone, but on the position of a locative phrase and/or on semantic and discourse factors, as well." (p. 43). This also holds for a number of UE-verbs that do not indicate existence or appearance (such as 'swim', 'scream'). The authors carefully analyze the basic features of the 'there-construction' from the point of view of formal grammar and than turn a 'functional account' (chapter 2.4). Here, K&T come to the following hypothesis: "The there construction is acceptable to the extent that the string to the left of its logical subject is interpretable as denoting existence or appearance" (p. 47). This hypothesis is based on the assumption that the verbs in 'locative there-constructions' are segmented into two layers: One expressing existence or appearance (the 'logical subject' being linked to the locative phrase), and another that describes the 'manner/type' of existence/appearance. For instance, the sentence

(9) Deep in him there burned an underlying passion (p. 46)

can be paraphrased as:

(10) There was deep in him an underlying passion that burned.

In addition, K&T observe that, in English, there is a strong tendency to restrict the locative 'there-construction' to logical subjects generally observable for the speaker. The corresponding section (2.4.2) is extremely interesting and stimulating, still the wealth of data does not allow me to get into details here. The basic hypothesis goes as this: "[T]he there-construction must be interpretable as denoting existence (or absence) or appearance (or non-

appearance) observable to the speaker (or the person whose point of view the speaker is representing" (p. 57). From a structural point of view, the authors assume "that there is a universal discourse constraint to the effect that a discourse scene has to be established first in existential and presentational sentences, and that relevant characters are introduced into the scene" (p. 59). However, note that refer to just six languages (four Indo-European languages, plus Japanese and Chinese) to ground this universality claim. For other languages, this claim does not hold: For instance, in Udi, an East Caucasian language, the usual word order in 'there-constructions' (in Udi 'here-constructions') is as follows ["sh" = s-hachek in original -- Eds.]:

(11) a. *mia sa aš bu-ne* (Field notes)
here one work exist-3sg
'There is a work (to do) (here).'

a'. **mia bune sa aš.*

b. *mia sa gala sa xinär-re bu* (Shahvalad, 27)
here on place:dat one girl-3sg exist
'In a certain place, there is a girl....'

b'. **mia sa gala bune sa xinär.*

If we simplify the scenario set up by K&T, we can observe that in some languages, there is a strong preference to first indicate the Ground in which a 'subject' exists or in which it appears, before the Figure (or: 'subject') itself is mentioned (G < F). But there are as well strategies that turn the matter around: Here, the Figure is mentioned first, followed by the Ground from which it is isolated (F > G). In the Germanic languages, G < F strategies prevail especially when a new Ground is established. These strategies are strongly coupled with topicalization. In English, topicalization gradually became restricted to 'existential' sentences, most likely the prototypical core of topicalization/focusing functions; recall that constructions of existence or identification are frequently used to encode a focus cleft, e.g. French and Welsh:

(12) *C'est moi qui vient*
it=is me who come:3sg:pres
'It is me who comes' > 'I come'

(13) *fe fydd y bechgyn yn dringo'r mynyddoedd*
it be:fut:3sg art boy:pl in climbing:art mountain:pl
'It will be the boys (who are) in climbing on(to) the mountains' >
'The boys will climb the mountains.'

K&T draw a convincing picture of how the constraints on there-construction are motivated from a synchronic point of view. Still, it remains unclear why English has developed these constraints. Recall that e.g. in German, no such constraints exist:

(14) Da tanzte sie im Ballsaal. 'There she danced in the ballroom.' [UE]
(15) Da vergilbte das Papier. 'There the paper yellowed.' [UA]

A possible assumption would be to claim that the motivation described by K&T (see above) once represented the core domain of the functional scope of 'there constructions'. The constraints then concerned especially the peripheral use of the construction, coupled with a gradual metaphorization of the locative 'adverb' ('there').

Chapter 3 deals with a rather idiosyncratic constructional type, namely "the way construction" (pp. 67-104). An example is:

(16) Mary danced her way through the park. (p. 67)

Following standard analyses, the way-construction is marked for two aspects: First, the formula 'POSS + way' superficially occurs as the 'object' of a nevertheless 'intransitive' verb; second, all verbs included in this constructional type are said to be unergative (or: 'active'). In order discuss these assumptions, K&T follow the same methodological path as in Chapter 2: First, they give an Generative Grammar account; then, they show to which degree the actual data go against this account, before proposing a functional analysis. What makes the chapter at issue special is the fact that the authors extensively discuss alternative proposals, especially that of Construction Grammar. After having carefully examined and tested the different way-constructions and the alleged constraints, the authors come to the following conclusion: "[T]he Unergative Restriction ... is seriously flawed and untenable because it is too weak in some cases ... and too strong on others. This shows that the way construction does not serve as evidence for unergativity" (p. 78). In their proper analysis, K&T rightly observe "that 'one's way' is associated with a path phrase ... and that this path phrase expresses a physical distance through which the subject referent moves". In fact, the lexical notion of 'one's way' makes appeal to the well-known cognitive schema 'path' (within the source-path-goal frame), see Lakoff (1987).

What we have at hand is a blend between the verbal semantics and the (possessed) notion of 'way': Parts of the mental space of 'way' are activated within the mental space represented by a given (dynamic!) verb. The path can additionally be characterized with the help of locative expressions, but this is not a necessary condition (pp. 80-1). The authors offer a number of additional data to describe in more details the scope of the way-construction, before arriving at the following conclusion: "[T]he [way-]construction becomes acceptable to the extent that it involves a physical, temporal, or psychological distance, the subject gradually moves through the whole distance in an unusual manner, and the verb represents the manner of that movement" (p. 94). Unfortunately, the authors do not refer expressis verbis to the tradition of Cognitive Linguistics (not necessarily Cognitive Grammar!) in order to corroborate their extremely helpful analyses. In addition, they do contextualize the syntactic problem, namely that 'one's way' is seen as an 'object' of nevertheless dynamic intransitive verbs. In fact, it may be hypothesized that the way- construction reflects a constructional type that comes close to the prototype of Figure > Ground constructions, which often show up as superficially 'intransitive verbs' (see Schulze 2004a, 2004b). Accordingly, any intransitive verb is embedded into a transitive frame (basically Referent -- Verb -- Location, to put it into simple terms), which however, can be obscured especially with respect to the locative domain (or its metaphorization). Thus, the way-construction resembles to accusative-based verbs of motion, compare Latin:

(17) *Julius Romam venit*
Julius Rom:acc come:pres:3sg
'Julius comes to Rome.'

This pattern, fairly well established for so-called 'accusative languages' (better: accusatively parameterized constructions) seems to form the syntactic base for constructional types, in which a dynamic manner verb 'exports' its Ground to an outer NP, often in an accusative formula. Unfortunately, the authors do not ask the question a) whether there are other 'path-Nouns' that can be used in the same constructional type, and b) to which extent the way-construction has its analog in other languages (compare the German 'Weg-', the French 'chemin-'construction). Again a more diachronic and comparative perspective would have helped to support the yet highly elaborated and landmark analysis of K&T.

In many Indo-European as well as non-Indo-European languages, the so- called 'cognate object construction' (COC) (or: 'figura etymologica') is a very common phenomenon. K&T, in chapter 4 of their book, pp. 105-135), test this construction (in English) against the hypothesis that it is strongly correlated with unergativity. Conventionally, the COC is interpreted as a construction that involves 'unergative' intransitive verbs and a 'semantically / etymologically' related noun in the 'accusative' case. An example is:

(18) The wolf howled a long howl. (p. 105).

Examples taken from other languages are:

(19) (German) Die Frau tanzte einen schönen Tanz. 'The woman danced a nice dance.'

(20) (Old Greek)
douleías douleúein oudemâs hê:tton aiskhrán
slavery:acc suffer:inf not=such few shameful:acc:f:sg
'to suffer the worst kind of slavery'

(21) (Classical Arabic)
Haaraba muHaarabata l-Gunuuni
fight:perf:3sg fight:acc art-mad=person:gen
'He fought like a madman' (lit.: 'the fight of a madman')

The Greek example already illustrates that the COC is not necessarily restricted to UE-verbs. After giving again a Generative Grammar account, K&T test the UE-constraints against English 'die, 'blush', 'grow', 'blow' etc. and come to the conclusion that the UE-constraint does not hold. The corresponding chapter (4.3) is especially helpful because it summarizes the path of arguments related to the diagnostics of UA- and UE-verbs. In their 'functional account' of the COC (chapter 4.4.), the authors first maintain that COC does not necessarily involve true 'cognate' nouns, as in

(22) He slept a fitful slumber. (p. 118)

This observation is of special importance because it alludes to the question to which extent a naïve speaker can judge upon the presence of lexical etymological correspondence. Many COCs indeed are marked for some kind of 'etymological rhyme', such as laugh (v/n), grin (v/n), smile (v/n), sleep (v/n), yawn (v/n), sneeze (v/n) etc. This rhyme is even present in a pair like die/death. In German, the stronger formal differentiation of verb-noun marking gives even more examples for such rhymes. e.g. gehen/Gang (go/walk), stehen/Stand (stand/stand).

But there both in English and in German (as well as e.g. in Old Greek), types of COC that are based on purely semantic rhyming, compare English vs. German:

(23) a. The general died the death of a hero. (p. 111)
b. Der General starb den Tod eines Helden.

An English example for phonetic/semantic rhyming is:

(24) He slept a fitful slumber (p. 118)

This type is called 'non-cognate 'cognate' objects' by K&T -- a rather unfortunate term. It nevertheless illustrates that a COC is defined rather by semantic or conceptual features than by true 'etymological' reasons (which, by the way, have always to be characterized as folk-etymologies, because the naïve speaker does not have other means to judge upon an assumed 'cognate' relation than phonetic and semantic resemblance). Examples of pure 'semantic' rhyming are:

(25) Van Aldin laughed a quiet little cackle of amusement. (p. 118)

(26) (German) Paul lief das Rennen seines Lebens 'Paul ran the race of his life.'

Reviewing the given constraints on COCs, K&T arrive at the following conclusion: "In the [COC], the cognate object (the whole NP) must represent a specific state or event that is a subset of the possible states/events resulting from the action represented by the verb" (p. 121). This conclusion considers the fact, that in many languages (but not in 'all' languages'), there is a strong preference to attributively mark the 'cognate object', see the examples above. For instance, in Old Greek nearly all COCs are marked by an attribute or a relative clause, rendering unmarked COCs as collocations, such as phulakàs phuláttein 'to watch a watch, be on guard', or phóron phérein 'pay tribute' etc.). On the other hand, the authors observe that "in the passive construction [of COCs, W.S.], a cognate object without a modifier is acceptable as long as Passivization is acceptable" (p. 130). Note that e.g. in Classical Arabic, this option does not hold, compare:

(27) *Duriba zaydun Darban shadiidan*
hit:pass:perf:3sg Zayd:nom hit:acc strong:acc
'Zayd was struck violently.'

The above-given example also illustrates that one of the major features of COCs as elaborated by K&T does not necessarily hold for more than English: In Arabic, a COC may likewise involve a transitive verb, compare:

(28) *Daraba-huu Darban shadiidan*
hit:perf:3sg:a-3sg:o hit:acc strong:acc 'He hit him hard.'

In sum, K&T have convincingly shown that "the acceptability of the [COC, W.S.] is not simply a problem contingent upon whether the verb is unergative or unaccusative, but a semantic, functional, and pragmatic phenomenon in which the meaning of the verb interacts with the meaning of the 'cognate' object, together with our knowledge based on our social customs" (p. 135).

As for the rest of the book, lack of space does not allow me to get into greater details. In chapter 5 (pp. 137-168), the authors turn to 'the pseudo-passive construction and unergativity': It is a well-known feature of English syntax that certain verbs allow some kind of 'prepositional passive', as in the famous example:

(29) That bed was slept in by Napoleon. (p. 137)

A standard assumption is that this type of passivization is only allowed with unergative verbs, compare the unacceptable example:

(30) *The bed was fallen on by dust. (p. 139)

The authors convincingly show that the so-called prepositional passive (or: pseudo-passive) also works for some unaccusative verbs, as in

(31) The conclusion was arrived at late at night. (p. 146)

Obviously, there are other constraints to be accounted for in order to explain the patterning of pseudo-passives. In their 'functional account'. K&T elaborate a number of criteria to characterize this type of passives, dwelling especially on features of 'involvement' and topicalization. They conclude that the 'object' (that is the 'surface subject' must be "involved in the actions or states represented by the verb-preposition sequence" (p. 162). This hypothesis is of extreme importance, because it implicitly suggests that prepositions are strongly coupled with 'their' verb, or, to put it into other terms, that prepositions form a subtype of verbal relations (see Schulze (in press) for some details). Hence, the example given in (29) actually reads:

(32) That bed was slept=in by Napoleon.

Consequently, this type of passive does not differ from standard passives such as 'that bed was made by Napoleon', to which specific constraints apply, too. In addition, the authors argue that the construction at issue is "acceptable only if passivization can be motivated by the Subject Preference for Characterizational Sentences", or if is "can be justified by the Subject-Position Preference for Topics" (p. 163). Again, the authors stress "that the acceptability status of pseudo-passive sentences is not a phenomenon based on the verb alone, but a semantic, functional, and discourse phenomenon based on the meaning of the whole sentence and its relationship to the context" (p. 168).

Undoubtedly, the chapter on English pseudo-passives is an extremely helpful and well-done exercise in linguistic argumentation. Nevertheless, it must be stressed that the argumentation would perhaps have been even more persuasive, if the authors had consulted the vast literature on 'locative passives' (or: locative focus) from a typological point of view (see e.g. Dik 1997).

Finally, chapter 6 (pp. 169-187) turns to 'extraposition from subject NPs and unaccusativity'. By extraposition is meant that a characterizational NP linked to another NP can in English be moved away from its NP host, usually to a position after the verb. An example is:

(33) a. A man with blond hair appeared.
b. A man appeared with blond hair.

Again, it is standard to relate constraints on this constructional variation to features of unaccusativity. In other words: Constructions with UE-verbs are said not to qualify for this type of movement. After having reviewed a formal approach to the problem, K&T nicely elaborate the weak points of such an analysis. They show that certain UE verbs as well may be involved in extraposition strategies, e.g.: (34) An odor awakened me of something burning. (p. 175)

According to K&T, extraposition has not necessarily to do with UA-verbs. Rather, extraposition "is allowed only if the predicate that the P [repositional] P[hrase] crosses over represents information that is discourse-assumed" (p. 176). After having studied a number of highly illustrative examples, the authors modify this assumption, now stressing "that the predicate that the PP crosses over represents anaphorically or deictically grounded information" (p. 180). This hypothesis is said to be based on the 'Flow-of Information Principle for Reordering'. Accordingly, less important (given) information is placed closer to sentence-initial position, whereas segments that represent more important (newer) information are placed closer to sentence-final position (p. 181). This 'Principle' comes close to what I call the 'Attention Information Flow' (AIF, see Schulze 1998, 2004c for details). Still, it should be kept in mind that the authors' generalization perhaps holds for a language like English (which allows a postverbal focus field), but other languages (such as Turkish) may reflect an alternative architecture of the AIF. In addition, in some languages speakers seem to prefer a balanced word order, which means that the referential domain is not loaded to much, compare German (35) which is strongly preferred against (36):

(35) Der Mann verschwand mit wehendem Mantel.
'The man went away with a flowing coat.

(36) ? Der Mann mit wehendem Mantel verschwand.

In addition, the gestalt law of nearness suggests that two NPs in direct contact inform on a rather 'inalienable' relation, whereas extraposed constructions encode an alienable relation, compare again the German example in (35-36) [alienable] and (37-38):

(37) Eine Frau mit Hasenscharte betrat das Geschäft.
'A woman with (a) hare lip entered the store.'

(38) ? Eine Frau betrat mit Hasenscharte das Geschäft.

It should be noted that most of the examples given by K&T, too, represent possessive or instrumental constructions. In other words: The question of (in)alienability typically present with possessive/instrumental patterns becomes apparent with the authors' examples, too. It seems that extraposition of the type discussed by K&T is governed not just by pragmatic features as suggested by them, but also by semantic features related to the type of linkage between the 'host NP' and the prepositional phrase subjected to extraposition.

The book concludes with a nice summary. Most importantly, the authors here offer some kind of "check list for future researchers to use for determining whether the acceptability / unacceptability contrasts they have uncovered for a linguistic phenomenon might be due to nonsyntactic factors" (p. 192). This list includes twenty-one parameters, most of which are of crucial importance. Here, I cannot dwell upon the question whether all these parameters

(which mainly refer to pragmatic and semantic features) are justified from an e.g. cognitive perspective. Still, the reader will greatly enjoy the list because it immediately reflects the set of arguments used by the authors to dismiss the alleged (five) tests for unergativity / unaccusativity.

The book ends with notes (which deserve more attention than what normally is included in such 'notes'), a rich bibliography (which however lacks a pronounced 'typological' and 'diachronic' perspective), and two indices (names and 'subject').

CONCLUSIONS

K&T's book is a extremely important and highly stimulating book not necessarily about unergativity / unaccusativity itself, but on the way of how alleged syntactic or semantic mechanisms should be tested against real data in order to arrive at a more data-oriented and less formal (and less monocausal) analysis of linguistic phenomena. The authors have thus written a wonderful exercise in linguistic criticism, which can be recommended for researchers in linguistics from which perspective so ever. The fact that K&T pay much attention to the five diagnostic test, however, render the book slightly disharmonic. The reader in vain looks for a general criticism of the alleged unergativity / unaccusativity phenomenon. Rather, they have to work through the book to realize that this phenomenon does not pass the five tests.

But does this necessarily mean that the phenomenon by itself does not exist? In my opinion, in order to answer this question, a much broader perspective must be taken. It should include crosslinguistic, that is massive typological evidence, the analysis of diachronic processes, aspects of (diachronic) pragmatics, cognitive linguistics (not only cognitive semantics!), and -- last but not least -- a robust theoretical framework. K&T have occasionally alluded to some of these dimensions; however, by concentrating on English, they have perpetuated the unfortunate fact that the unergativity / unaccusativity hypothesis is mainly based on the analysis of English. In this sense, the reader is confronted with an empirically extremely well-founded book, which mainly indicates the 'way' of criticizing the above-mentioned hypothesis. What it (at least partly) lacks is the indication of and the orientation towards a more general goal, which would help to dismiss or at least to better ground the unergativity / unaccusativity hypothesis.

Nevertheless, it goes without saying that K&T's book ranks among the best books on syntactic issues published in the last year. It is easy to read, although it must be admitted that the great number of textual redundancies may provoke the reader to skip whole passages. Doing so, (s)he will be at risk to miss an important point. The methodological strength of the volume renders the volume an important tool for teaching the cautious analysis of linguistics issues. I have not found hardly any typographical or factual error. This, too, makes the book a pleasure to read.

REFERENCES

Abraham, Werner 2004. Ergative diagnostics: temptatio redux. Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung 57: 393-401.

Dik, Simon 1997. The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The structure of the Clause. 2nd revised edition, ed. by K. Hengeveld. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.

Dirr, Adolf 1912. Rutul'skij jayzk. Grammaticheskij ocherk, teksty, sbornik rutul'skix slov s russkim k nemu ukazatelem. SMOMPK 42.3.

Dixon, Robert M. W. 1994. Ergativity. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Kuno, Susumu 1980. Functional syntax. E. Moravcsik & J. Wirth (eds.). Syntax and Semantics 13: Current approaches to syntax, 117-135. New York: Academic Press.

Kuno, Susumu 1987. Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George 1987. Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Permutter, David 1978. The English verb (2nd edition, 1st edition 1974). London: Longman.

Sapir, Edward 1917. Review of 'Het Passieve Karakter van het Verbum Transitivum of van het Verbum Actionis in Talen van Noord-Amerika' by C. C. Uhlenbeck. International Journal of American Linguistics 1.1:82-86.

Schulze, Wolfgang 1998. Person, Klasse, Kongruenz. Vol. 1 (in two parts). Die Grundlagen. München & Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

Schulze, Wolfgang 2000. The Accusative Ergative Continuum. General Linguistics 37: 71-155.

Schulze, Wolfgang 2004a. Radical Experientialism (Foundations of Cognitive Typology): Materials [Bolzano 2004 lecture; PDF]

Schulze, Wolfgang 2004b. Kognitive Typologie [Mitteleuropa Abend / Bozen 2004: Materialien der Vorlesung; PDF]

Date: Tue, 01 Nov 2005 09:36:34 +0100
AUTHOR: Eberle, Andrea
EDITOR: Schulz, Regine
TITLE: Koptisch
SUBTITLE: Ein Leitfaden durch das Saïdische
SERIES: Languages of the World/Materials 07
PUBLISHER: Lincom GmbH YEAR: 2004

Wolfgang M. Schulze (University of Munich)

INTRODUCTION

It is a deplorable fact that the majority of approaches to General Linguistics and, more specifically, to Syntax Theory, Language Typology, and Cognitive Linguistics tend to neglect data stemming from so-called 'old' or 'dead' languages. One reasons seems to be that researchers who subscribe for instance to usage based approaches reluctantly refer to such data because they cannot be evaluated with the help of informants. In addition, 'old' languages are usually taught in a seemingly non-linguistic environment, namely Philology. The fact that the resulting terminological 'gap' is rarely bridged in the sense of Nagel's well-known 'bridging principle' conditions that 'old' languages (together with their descriptive tradition) do not figure among the hotspots of linguistic documentation. Still, it has to be stressed that 'old' languages have a considerable value in linguistic argumentation: Many of them such as Ancient Greek, Vedic, Akkadian, Sumerian, Hurrian-Urartian, Old Egyptian, or Elamic are documented over a rather long span of time, which allows the researcher to retrieve for instance a considerable number of typologically relevant 'trends' in language diachrony. In addition, 'old' languages help to train researchers in what can be called 'philological linguistics': Here, the philological interpretation of data is crucial for their interpretation, namely to unveil the textual embedding of given data, their relation to text tradition, and to the general historical setting. Finally, the writing system of 'old' languages may become a central argument for instance to discuss issues of phonology and morphology. It would in fact be highly desirable that 'modern language' linguistics assimilate at least parts of this philological tradition of texts critics to interpret their own data. Corpus linguistics surely is one of the linguistics methods that comes closer to what should be expected in this respect.

Thus, the linguistics of 'old' languages is necessarily related to corpus linguistics. This fact has both its advantages and disadvantages: On the one hand, the relevant data are included in a usually 'closed' corpus: Consequently, a given 'old' language can be described as the sum of just all data that are documented in its corpus. In other words: 'Old' languages are captured in terms of a corpus-immanent perspective, whereas 'productive' language traditions are necessarily to be described in terms of a restriction with respect to their corpus documentation: They always are 'corpus-transcendent'.

The claim that 'modern language' linguistics should be more ready to take over the methods of 'philological linguistics' as pronounced in the linguistics of 'old languages' naturally can be turned around: There are many excellent grammatical descriptions of 'old' languages, which, however, often neglect the findings of e.g. Language Typology or Structural Linguistics (in its broadest sense). Their idiosyncratic terminology, their rather interpretative analyses of linguistic data, and their often schoolbook-like presentation of grammatical issues condition that they are somewhat difficult to read for researchers not acquainted with the language at

issue. Naturally, there are remarkable exceptions: For instance, the rather old grammar of Classical Arabic by William Wright (1862) still is the best description of this stage of Arabic, easy to be assimilated modern linguistics. The description of Sumerian had first been modernized by Thomsen 1984 and Wegner 2000 is an extremely valuable presentation of Hurrian from a typological perspective.

The philology of Egyptian languages (or: stages of Egyptian) has - for a long time - cut itself off against the assimilation of linguistic arguments in the narrow sense of the word. Although the latest documented stage of Old Egyptian, namely Coptic, has been taught at European universities as early as the 18th century, it has hardly ever been considered in later linguistic studies. The same holds for the other stages of Old Egyptian, by themselves cautiously described after the decipherment of the Old Egyptian script. Nevertheless, the last 20 years witnessed a growing interest at least in Coptic, not only within the community of Egyptologists, but also among linguists who look at language from a more general perspective, which ever it may be. The grammar by Lambdin (1983), Shisha-Halevy (1988), Plisch (1999), and Layton (2000) can be regarded as a nevertheless meagre evidence for this tendency. To this list of strongly didactically oriented grammars, we can now add the book under review, namely Eberle (2004).

THE BOOK

Background Coptic (better: the dialectal cluster of Coptic) represents the latest stage of Old Egyptian, an Afroasiatic language documented from roughly 3200 BC to 700 AD. Coptic itself had been spoken in Egypt until the 16th century AD. Today, the Bohairic dialect of Coptic is sporadically used in religious service. The documentation of Coptic factually ends soon after the conquest of Egypt by Arab troops in the 7th century (the latest document seems to be represented by a poem called Triadon written in the 14th century). The beginnings of Coptic are more difficult to describe: Linguistically, the early Coptic varieties represented nothing but a variant of the latest stage of Hieroglyphic Egyptian, namely Demotic, which became a written standard in the 8th century BC. In fact, Coptic can be regarded as a late variant of Demotic written in a Greek-like alphabet from the first century AD onwards and marked for a strong Koine-Greek adstrate that became even more visible after the conversion of Coptic speaker to Christianity. After the consolidation of the Coptic written tradition in the 4th century AD, the production of Coptic literature exploded: it covered religious texts (Christian, Gnostic, Manichean), profane literature, as well as administrative and private documents.

The wealth of Coptic documents necessarily conditions that its original character as a corpus language is obscured: Any description of the language has to select its data from this corpus, just as it is true for a number of other 'old' languages such as Ancient Greek, Sumerian, Akkadian, or Old Egyptian in its narrow sense. Still, the corpus can in its totality be consulted if a specific grammatical or lexical issue is under consideration. In other words: The corpus of Coptic texts represents what can be called a semi-open corpus: Just as it is true for instance for Latin and Ancient Greek, researchers of the language may even construe new phrases for illustrative purpose, simulating its character as a (once) spoken language. This type of scientific pseudo- revitalization, however, has a great disadvantage: In case newly construed examples occur in a grammar, users may be at risk to take these examples as granted and as documents of the actual use of the language and to exploit them for a say typological argumentation. Sadly to say that the book under review is an extreme example of this type of didactically motivated pseudo-revitalization: In the 'Vorwort' (introduction), the

author explicitly states: "The given examples are predominantly construed (by the author); in parts they are taken from standard grammars" (p. III, translation W.S.). Hence, what we have at hands is not a reference grammar of Coptic in its original sense, but rather a presentation of grammatical strategies, constructions etc. illustrated with the help of prevailingly artificial examples. I dwell upon this issue because I want from the very beginnings utter the strong warning not to use the examples in contexts others than for which they are intended. In order to retrieve Coptic examples from the actual corpus, one should at any rate consult the relevant grammars (e.g. Till 1966).

Coptic is represented in a number of dialects, the most prominent of which is the Saidic or Sahidic dialect in Upper Egypt. Most of the Coptic grammars strongly refer to this dialect even though the contemporary Coptic variety used in religious service is based on the Bohairic dialect (Lower Egypt). The preference for Saidic is grounded in the fact that by the time of Christianization the majority of Coptic speakers lived in Middle and Upper Egypt. Consequently, the Saidic dialect soon developed as some kind of standard Coptic. Once Alexandria in Lower Egypt became the religious centre, the corresponding dialect (Bohairic) commenced to replace the earlier Saidic standard (see Mattar 1990). Hence, the majority of classical texts have been written in Saidic, which is reflected accordingly in the given grammars of Coptic.

The Contents Andrea Eberle has written the book under review with the help of Regina Schulz, an Egyptologist of high renown. The book is in German and has appeared in Lincom's series 'Languages of the World/Materials' (LW/M, vol. 07). This series currently comprises some 150 books with great differences in quality and size. Normally, the LW/M series aims at documenting language systems from a purely descriptive perspective. Still, nearly every book also witnesses the specific linguistic interest of its author. Eberle's volume is called 'Koptisch - Ein Leitfaden durch das Saidische' (Coptic - a guide to Saidic). The title already pinpoints the main interest of the author, namely to serve as "simple study guide for beginners" (p. III, translation W.S.). The book hence is neither an introduction to the linguistics of Coptic nor a comprehensive descriptive grammar (in the sense of say the Mouton Grammar Library). Rather, it is a compendium for students who wish to check the paradigmatics and constructional principles of Coptic in an easy-to-read mode. The main purpose is to summarize the basics of Coptic morphology and syntax for students who are already somehow involved in the study of the language. Consequently, the Coptic data are always given in the Coptic script (a near-Greek script, augmented by six (Bohairic seven) signs taken from Demotic). Basically, one cannot but applaud the author for having taken this decision: Rarely enough, grammars keep the writing tradition of a speech community in case it is not Latin- based. Still, researchers who want to use Eberle's book as a reference book will probably miss a phonological transcription of the Coptic data, in case they are not ready to assimilate the Coptic script. In addition, practically none of the examples are glossed in the way General Linguists would expect it: There are no interlinear morpheme- by-morpheme glosses: the examples are simply translated into German (occasionally accompanied by morphological comments). In fact, users who want to understand for instance the function of the so- called conjunction 'dzhe' (because) from an example has to fully analyze the given examples, and consult the phrase given on p. 35, whose analysis could be:

(1) *ti-dzho: mmo-s na-k dzhe anok pe-k-shbe:r pe*
1SG-say:PRES REL-3SG:F IO-2SG:M because I ART:M-2SG:M:POSS-friend DEM:COP:3SG:M 'I say it to you, because I am your friend.
' 'Ich sage es dir, weil ich dein Freund bin.'

The lack of interlinear glosses has another negative side effect: Within longer phrases, it becomes difficult to safely identify lexical units: The grammar does not include an index of the words that occur in the examples. Hence, the user faces the problem to constantly refer to a Coptic dictionary when analyzing the Coptic examples. This fact renders the book little helpful for users not trained in Coptic.

Naturally, these observations do not go against the grammatical analyses themselves presented in the book. Once users are ready to use it as some kind of 'teach-yourself book' (with all its consequences), they will find a rather condensed, nevertheless comprehensive illustration of the morphosyntax of Coptic. The author constantly refers the readers to more detailed discussions given in other grammars (among others Till 1966, Lambdin 1983, Shisha- Havely 1988, Plisch 1999) and thus carefully guides them through the deep waters of Coptic grammar.

Eberle's book is not of extraordinary size: It comprises 80 pages of grammar, a brief text ('Apa Mena') with transliteration and word-by- word translation (pp. 81-89), a short thematic bibliography, and a brief index of grammatical terms (pp. 95-97). It starts with a short chapter on 'Language and Script' (pp. 1-5). Here, the user will strongly miss a more detailed treatment of Coptic phonology: Instead, the author only presents the writing system, informs about the pronunciation of the individual signs and some further conventions. Here, I add the corresponding phonological chart (Vd = voiced, Vl = voiceless; in brackets: Bohairic /x/ and Akhmimic /tsh/):

	Stops			Affricates		Spirants		Nasal
	Vd	Vl	Asp	Vd	Vl	Vd	Vl	Vd
Labial	b	p	ph				f	m
Dental	d	t	th			z	s	n
Palatal				dzh	[tsh]		sh	
Velar	g	k	kh		[x]			
Velar-Pal.		ky						
Pharyngeal							h	

Liquids: /l/, /r/, semi-vowels: /y/, /w/. Pseudo-phonemes are /ps/ and /ks/.

The vowel chart has the following form:

i, i:, u, e, e:, ə, o, o:, a

Chapter II covers word classes and their ‚direct phrase combinations' (pp. 5-49). To me, the term 'direct phrase combinations' ('direkte Phrasenverbindungen') remains rather obscure. Most likely, Eberle here tries to circumscribe the term 'morphosyntax'. The chapter addresses the following issues: Determination, nominals, nominal constructions, pronouns, numerals, prepositions, particles, adverbs and adverbial phrases, verbs. The author subcategorizes determination strategies in Coptic according to four classes (standard determination (article), underdetermination (indefinite article etc.), overdetermination (deictic article), indetermination (zero). Usually, the determinating dependent reflects gender (masc., fem. sg.) and number (sg., pl.) and occurs as a proclitic, eg. p-som 'the (masc.sg.) brother', t-so:me: 'the (fem.) sister', n-ro:me 'the (pl.) people'. Quite expectably, the proclitic used for underdetermination results from the grammaticalization of the numeral 'one' (owa, mask. > ow-). Note that Coptic has a plural 'indefinite' article, too (hen- ~ hən-).

Nouns are discussed in section 2.1. Accordingly, nouns are either masculine or feminine. Some relict forms are still marked for the dual, e.g. were:-te 'the two feet'. Usually, number is marked on the dependent (n-ro:me 'the people', hen-ro:me 'people'). Most nouns show just one general form. The status constructus is preserved witrh certain nouns in composition, inalienable body part terms may have a distinct status pronominalis, e.g. dzho:dzh 'head' > dzho:-f 'his head'.

Grammatical relations (cases) are not marked on nouns. The possessive construction is analytic (based on the general relational clitic n- or the clitic preposition nte-/nta-). The objective (O) is encoded by n-/nmo- or e-/ero-; n-/na- is used to mark the indirect objective (IO). Most adjectives (section 2.2) are uninflected and follow their head, to which they are linked with the help of the relational marker n-, e.g. p- ro:me n-sabe 'the wise man' (ART:M-man REL-wise). Few adjectives can be used without this type of izafet-construction, e.g. t-she:re she:m 'the little daughter' (ART:F-daughter little). Here, the noun phrase is marked for a single tonal pattern, resulting in the shortening of the head, e.g. shər-bo:o:n 'bad son' (she:re 'son'). The izafet construction also occurs with possessives (section 3.2), e.g.

(2) *pi:-ni nte p-yo:t*
PROX:M-house REL ART:M-father
'This house of the father'

An example for the use of the izafet construction to mark an objective is:

(3) *f-ol n-tshte:n*
3SG:M-take:PRES REL-dress
'He takes the dress.'

Chapter 4 discusses the amazing world of pronominality in Coptic. The strong analytic typology of Coptic conditions that (especially anaphoric) pronouns play a crucial role in the organization of the syntax. Here, I cannot but just mention some of the highlights: Coptic differentiates adnominal deictic from demonstrative pronouns (both subcategorize masculine, feminine, and plurality). Intermediate positions are taken by the so-called demonstrative article and the identifying demonstrative (> copula), compare:

(4)			
	p-ro:me	'the man'	(adnominal > article)
	pi:-ro:me	'this man'	(adnominal > demonstrative article)
	pai	'this one'	(demonstrative)
	pe	'X (masc.) is...'	(identifying copula)

Personal pronouns (p. 17ff.) are either independent ('nominal'), dependent proclitics (with stative verb constructions) or dependent enclitics (suffix conjugation, possessor). The following table illustrates the different forms (reduced independent forms are omitted):

(5)	Independent	Proclitic	Enclitic
1SG	anok	ti-	-i, -t, -a
2SG:m	nt-ok	k-	-k
2SG:f	nt-o	te-	-te, -e, -ZERO
3SG:m	nt-of	f-	-f
3SG:f	nt-os	s-	-s

1PL	an-on	tn-	-n
2PL	nt-o:tn	tetn-	-tn, -te:wtn
3PL	nt-ou	se-	-ow, -sow, -se

In addition, Eberle informs about the formation of complex possessives, reflexives (no specific pronoun, only reflexive constructions), interrogatives (often in a copula-like position), interrogative particles (of Greek origin), and indefinite pronouns.

Chapter 5 discusses the system of numerals. The counting system is decimal (tens first), e.g.

(6) *hme-t-afte*
forty-EUPH-four (EUPH = euphonic)
'44'

psait-tn
ninety-five
'95'

Numerals usually precede their head, e.g. p-sashf n-oi:k (ART:M- seven REL-bread') 'the seven breads', shmt-she:re 'three child(ren)'. Ordinals are expressed by the lexical element meh- 'filling', e..g. p- meh-shomnt n-hoow 'the third day' (ART:M-ORD-three REL-day), lit. 'the filled three of the day'.

On pp. 31-33, Eberle lists the great number of Coptic prepositions. They normally are proclitics and show up in two types (linked to a nominal or a pronoun), compare hm p-ni 'in/with the house' (in ART:M- house), but nhe:t-f 'in/with him'. Prepositions are either simple or composed (PREP + NOUN, PREP + ADVERB). Favorite nouns in PREP-constructions include body part terms such as rat- 'foot', toot- 'hand', towo:- 'bosom, side', zho:- 'head'. Preposition-like forms include the above mentioned relator n- and its relatives, listed below:

(7)

FORM		FUNCTION
Nominal	Pronominal	
e	-ero-	Indirect Objective, Objective with verba sentiendi
n-		Izafet / Attributive
n-	na-	Indirect Objective
n-	nmo-	Objective
n-, nte-	nta-	Genitive

After having presented the great number of conjunctions (both native and of Greek origin), the author turns to adverbs and adverb-like forms. There are 'true' (basically local) adverbs and derived forms, usually based on prepositional constructions. The relevant nouns include ese:t 'ground', bol 'outer side', me:ne 'day', hoow 'day', owoysh 'time', saf 'yesterday', owshe: 'night', ownow 'hour', he 'type', me 'truth', howo 'overflow' etc. Adverbs can modify verbs (e.g. ko: ebol 'let out') and prepositions, e.g. ebol hn 'from in/with'.

The most complex aspect of Coptic grammar is given by the verbal system. It is amazing to see that Eberle manages to comprehensively illustrate the relevant issues on just a few pages (pp. 41-49). The Coptic verb paradigms reflects the already extremely heterogeneous system if Demotic which has again resulted from important shifts in Egyptian from the beginnings of its documentation onwards. Hence, the Coptic verb does not represent a single strategy to

encode the relational segment in a phrasal unit, but is marked for different layers of conservatism and innovation. The inflectional pattern of Coptic verbs depends from both the phonological structure of the verb stem and the given TAM category. Eberle refers to the seven plus one verbal classes that have been proposed by Shisha-Halevy (1988: 199- 201). These classes are (C = Consonant, ' = glottal stop):

(8)
I	CCC
II	CC
III	C'C
IV	CCC[C] or CC[CC] ([C(C)] = reduplicated syllable)
V	t-Causatives (prefixal t- plus final -o)
VI	Stative verbs
VII	Verbs that have an -e or a -t when followed by a pronominal clitic
VIII	Irregular verbs

Coptic verbs have two forms: an infinitive and a stative (p. 42). The infinitive occurs with a wide range of TAM forms. It again has three forms: A status absolutus or non-composite form: an NP in objective function is not linked directly to the verb, but with the help of the relator n- / nmo-: a status constructus forming a composite form verb+NP(objective); a status pronominalis (with pronominal referents in objective function). An example is:

(9) *a-f-mowkəh* *m-p-yo:t*
PERF-3SG:M-molest:INF REL-ART:M-father
'He molested the father.'

a-f-mekh-p-yo:t
PERF-3SG:M-molest-ART:M-father
'He molested the father'

a-f-mokh-f
PERF-3SG:M-molest-3SG:M
'He molested him.'

a-p-yo:t-mokh-f
PERF-ART:M-father-molest-3SG:M
'The father molested him.'

The standard infinitive can also be used in terms of a verbal noun, e.g. p-rime m-p-she:re 'the weeping of the child' (ART:M-weeping REL- ART:M-child). In addition, it forms the basis for analytic causatives, derived with the help of the form tre-, a t-causative of i:re 'do, make', e.g.

(10) *e-tm-tre-p-ro:me* *bo:k*
so.that-NEG-CAUS-ART:M-man go:INF
'so that (anybody) does not (let) the man go.' (literal)

The stative has only one form. It indicates either a state or a quality.

Section 9.3 discusses the verbal conjugation or paradigm of referential echoes on the verb. A subjective/agentive ('subject') can be echoed either by proclitics or enclitics. This opposition

is distributed lexically. The overwhelming majority of paradigms is marked for proclitic strategies, compare: ti-sotm 'I hear' (lit. 'I (am) at hearing', a-f- sotm 'he heard' (PERF-3SG:M-hear). Enclitic verbs are for instance pedzha-f 'he said', hna-f 'he wanted' and a small number of qualifying adjectival verbs.

The final chapter (pp. 50-72) turns to constructional patterns of the phrasal or clausal level. It starts with a presentation of nominal clauses (copula clauses) together with their pragmatic variants (prefield or postfield focus). Possessive constructions lack a verbal representation of the HAVE concept. Instead, a locative construction is used, e.g. m [n]-nte p-ro:me 'the man does not have...' (NEG-at ART:M-man). The resulting paradigm (p. 54) has acquired verb-like properties, which is illustrated by the fact that a possessed noun may be treated as an objective, compare:

(11) *ow-nta-i* *mmaw* *n-ow-she:re*
one-at-1SG:POSS there REL-ART:INDEF-daughter
'There, I have a daughter.'

With two pronominal referents, the corresponding pronouns follow each other, as in:

(12) *m[n]-nta-s-f*
NEG-at-3SG:F-3SG:M
'she does not have it.'

Adverbial constructions link the TAM paradigm to issues of clausal syntax (p. 55f.). The present tense (or imperfective aspect) is analytically construed with the help of a local (> adverbial) strategy, e.g. p-ro:me so:tm 'the man hears' (ART:M-man hearing). As a result, non-pronominal verbs in this tense/aspect form follow their subject. A referent in objective function must be linked with the help of the izafet construction, e.g.

(13) *ti-dzho* *mmo-s*
1SG:say:INF REL-3SG:F 'I say it'
(lit. 'I [am] in/at saying of it.')

A grammaticalized version of the motion verb now 'go' (> stative na-) can precede a present tense form to indicate some kind of near future (inchoative), e.g. f-na-dzho: 'he will soon say'. The other TAM forms of Coptic are marked for an analytic strategy that is based on grammaticalized verb forms (> TAM categories) to which the pronominal clitics are added (in subject function) plus infinitive. A nominal referent replaces the corresponding pronominal slot. Consequently, the basic word order of Coptic is V(:TAM) S/A V [O]. Coptic has developed a great number of such TAM-proclitics. A table at the end of the book (conjugation paradigms) summarizes the relevant forms, which are presented on pages 58-68. Examples are:

(14) *a-p-ro:me* *sotm*
PERF-ART:M-man hear
'The man heard...'

ere-p-ro:me *sotm*
ADH-ART:M-man hear
[ADH = adhortative, energetic future] 'The man shall hear...'

shant-f-so:tm
until-3SG:M-hear
'Until he hears....'

ntere-tm-p-ro:me *so:tm* *ero-i*
TEMP-NEG-ART:M-man hear IO-1SG
[TEMP = temporalis] 'When the man did not hear me...'

The last example illustrates that subordinate clauses conform to the same constructional patterns as matrix clauses. After discussing strategies of interrogation and negation, Eberle turns to what is called 'transposition'. This term is used to denote certain types of forming subordinated clauses, e.g. adverbial clauses, relative clauses and some kind of pragmatically motivated extraposition. Space does not allow to go in details here. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that the transpositional strategies of Coptic deserve more than just a descriptive treatment. In fact, they nicely show how subordination patterns may emerge.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is out of the question that Eberle's book comprehensively characterizes the major issues of Coptic grammar. Above, I have tried to extract some kind of morphosyntactic profile of Coptic from the book. I hope that it has become evident that Eberle's Coptic grammar in fact addresses many issues of the language that are not only relevant for specialists in Egyptology (in its broader sense), but also for researchers in General Linguistics and Language Typology. Nevertheless it must be said that the organization of the book does not fully conform to what has developed as a descriptive standard in the last years. It mixes up morphological, categorial, and constructional issues and hence renders it difficult to systematically monitor the grammar of Coptic from a more general perspective. Still, it has to be stressed that the size of the book obviously limited the descriptive scope. In addition, it nearly completely lacks a diachronic perspective: However, in case users are interested not only to understand the 'how' of Coptic, but also the 'why', they will necessarily ask for the diachronic background in order to explain grammar rather than just to describe it. Viewing the fact that the different stages of Old Egyptian cover a time span of more than 4000 years it comes clear that the data of this language can serve as an important tool to retrieve and model aspects of language change. In this respect, an urgent task would be to write a historical-comparative grammar of all stages of Old Egyptian. In this light, Eberle's book does not offer anything really new: It is just another instantiation of the many presentations of Coptic, which, however, is well-done, once the readers have taken the perspective the author wants them to take: namely to use the booklet as a tool in Coptic classes.

From a formal point of view, there is nothing to complain about. The book is easy to read and the examples are well-chosen (better: well- construed) and serve their purpose. It may well be that once Coptic has been made more readily accessible for non-Coptologists, some of the descriptive parameters used by Eberle will call for revision (e.g. the section on transposition and on prepositions). For the time being, typologists will have to translate the book into their own scientific format, if ever they are ready to work through the whole book. But this is what they should do: Else, a selective browsing through Eberle's grammar in order to retrieve certain grammatical features will probably end in a disaster. This, however, is not the fault of the book. Instead, it is related to those points I have addressed in the first section of this review. Once typologists and others have worked through Eberle's grammar, they will

probably get interested in learning more about this fascinating language, to work with real data, and to include it more often to their thinking about the diversity and universality of language.

REFERENCES

Shisha-Halevy, A. 1988. Coptic Grammatical Chrestomathy, A Course for Academic and Private Study, Leuven: Peeters.

Lambdin, Thomas O. 1983. Introduction to Sahidic Coptic. Macon: Mercer UP.

Layton, Bentley. 2000. A Coptic Grammar. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Mattar, Nabil 1990. A study in Bohairic Coptic. Pasadena: Hope Publishing House.

Plisch, Uwe-Karsten. 1999. Einführung in die koptische Sprache: Sahidischer Dialekt. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Thomsen, Marie-Louise 1984. The Sumerian Language. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

Till, Walter C. 1961. Koptische Dialektgrammatik. Lepizig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.

Till, Walter C. 1966. Koptische Grammatik (Saidischer Dialekt). Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.

Wegner, Ilse 2000. Hurritisch. Eine Einführung. Wiesbaden: Harrasssowitz.

Wright, William 1861 [1896-98]. A Grammar of the Arabic Language: Translated from the German of Caspari and edited, with numerous additions and corrections. 3rd ed. revised by W. Robertson Smith and M. J. de Goeje, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

EDITOR(S): Mirjam Fried, Hans C. Boas
TITLE: Grammatical Constructions
SUBTITLE: Back to the roots
SERIES TITLE: Constructional Approaches to Language 4
PUBLISHER: John Benjamins
YEAR: 2005 ISBN: 9027218242 Pages: viii, 246 Price: U.S. $ 138.00
ANNOUNCED IN: http://linguistlist.org/issues/17/17-284.html

Wolfgang Schulze, University of Munich [to appear 2006]

1. Introduction

The notion of (grammatical) 'constructions' figures among the most prominent concepts in current linguistic thinking. Mirjam Fried, one of the editors of the book under review, has nicely expressed the main goals of Construction Grammar on a internet page (see http://www.constructiongrammar.org/), which I'd like to quote:

> "At the heart of what shapes Construction Grammar is the following question: what do speakers of a given language have to know and what can they 'figure out' on the basis of that knowledge, in order for them to use their language successfully? The appeal of Construction Grammar as a holistic and usage-based framework lies in its commitment to treat all types of expressions as equally central to capturing grammatical patterning (i.e. without assuming that certain forms are more 'basic' than others) and in viewing all dimensions of language (syntax, semantics, pragmatics, discourse, morphology, phonology, prosody) as equal contributors to shaping linguistic expressions."

To the linguistic audience not trained in Construction Grammar, such a description is at risk to remain rather opaque. Even if it is stressed that (again quoting from the web page mentioned above) "Construction Grammar is a constraint-based, generative, non-derivational, mono-stratal grammatical model, committed to incorporating the cognitive and interactional foundations of language", some people may still wonder what exactly is meant by a 'construction'. A subsequent passage in the Construction Grammar homepage gives a first idea:

> "[L]anguage is a repertoire of more or less complex patterns – constructions – that integrate form and meaning in conventionalized and often non-compositional ways. Form in constructions may refer to any combination of syntactic, morphological, or prosodic patterns and meaning is understood in a broad sense that includes lexical semantics, pragmatics, and discourse structure. A grammar in this view consists of intricate networks of overlapping and complementary patterns that serve as 'blueprints' for encoding and decoding linguistic expressions of all types."

The crucial point is that in Construction Grammar(s), syntactic and prosodic patterns are seen as forming a part of the formal inventory of language, showing semantic (or: functional) correlates just as it is described for lexical or morphological items. If we start from the Saussureian dichotomy of 'signifiant' and 'signifié' (producing the linguistic 'sign'), we can thus claim that in Construction Grammar(s) such patterns have a meaning (sign) resulting

from the pairing of their formal expression (signifiant) with a conceptual layer (signifié > semantics/function). Some other even go so far to claim that any such pairing, be it lexical or syntactical, represents a construction, e.g. Kuningas & Leino (2006: 302): "A construction is, briefly, a conventionalized combination of form and meaning; it is any linguistic unit, no matter how big, as long as it is conventionalized in the language. Every word is a construction, every grammatical "rule" or template is a construction, and so forth."

This definition is somewhat amazing, because it includes both lexical and structural types. I am not sure whether such a view is common ground among the friends of Construction Grammar(s). At least Fried and Östman (2004:18) offer a narrower view: "A construction is an abstract, representational entity, a conventional pattern of linguistic structure that provides a general blueprint for licensing well-formed linguistic expressions."

Here, again, the authors refer to the term 'blueprint' to denote the nature of constructions with respect to linguistic expressions. 'Blueprint' should not be confused with the use of this term in Universal Grammar traditions, compare Kemmerer (in press): Universal Grammar includes "a kind of blueprint of the basic design characteristics of all natural human languages". Rather, the notion of blueprint in Construction Grammar comes more close to what has been suggested in the framework of a 'Grammar of Scenes and Scenarios' (GSS, Schulze 1998). Here, 'blueprints' are seen as an essentially cognitive property (Schulze 1999).:

> "In GSS, 'scenes' (the cognitive layer of constructional types) are regarded as a kind of cognitive blueprint that is activated in pattern recognition. Hence, scenes do not share any real world properties, but reflect the way in which real world experience is construed on the basis of strongly idealized cognitive models or cognitive hypotheses. The blueprints of scenes are thought to be part of the evolution of cognitive and communicative behavior. Their basic structure is constituted by the architecture of those cognitive domains that have been involved in the emergence of scenic blueprint at all. It is assumed that there is a functional iconicity between the neurophysiologic architecture of cognition and the architecture of scenes: Scenes cannot be processed but within the general frame of cognition. Their blueprints represent engrammatic structures that are stored in long term memory. The input of a world stimulus activates procedures of picturing or re-presenting such engrammatic structures."

Turned into linguistics, we can say that blueprints reflect cognitive blueprints (as described) above in terms of language specific ensembles of constructions. Such a view, however, goes against what is sometimes posited as for the nature of constructions. In their 'introduction' to the volume under review, Boas & Fried (2005:2) maintain that

> "the term 'construction' is also a very traditional one, used loosely (…) as a descriptive label that simply refers to a linguistic expression consisting of several part, i.e. something larger than a word."

The authors stress that this usage is not what Construction Grammar(s) aim at. Rather, constructions are seen as what is traditionally termed the semiotic relation between form and concept. A specific (syntactic) type of constructions would accordingly be represented by 'construals', which are more or less lexical-based. In my eyes, it is not fully clear whether all adherents to Construction Grammar observe this distinction. Rather, I am left with the impression that analyses related to the Construction Grammar framework occasionally waver

between these two pole. In addition, the reader should note that the term 'construction' is also used (as in Radical Constructivism) to denote the cognitive attitude towards an Outer World stimulus that is 'construed' before being further processed (see e.g. Schulze 1998, 2006). In sum, there are at least three ways to refer to the term 'construction', which – an this renders the polysemy even worse – can even show up altogether in a unified account of construction Grammar. Hence, it is important to ask whether grammatical constructions (in its strict sense) are emergent and/or dependent from cognitive procedures. Here, the most pronounced approaches are those of Embodied Construction Grammar (e.g., Bergen, Chang & Narayan 2004/5) and Radical Experientialism ("RadEx", e.g. Schulze 2006)). Others, such as Cognitive Grammar (in the sense of the Langackerian approach) just concentrate on the conceptual layer of constructions, others again work with a rather conventional notion of semantics. Some approaches render constructions as cognitively entrenched, whereas others (e.g. the approach of Fluid Constructional Grammar, see e.g. Steels 2005) allow spontaneous adjustments and individual modifications).

Another problem is raised by the following question: Are grammatical constructions elementary buildings blocks of human language as posited by the Fried & Boas on the back cover of their book, are they by themselves again made up of building blocks, or, do they reflect on either level parts of a whole that would have descriptive primacy (as argued in parts by Croft (2001), more pronounced by Schulze (2006)?

The relatively high degree of diversity given with approaches to Construction Grammar logically calls for constant updates of both current trends in CxG (as Construction Grammar is conventionally abbreviated) and its foundations. Even though the book under review has the line 'back to the roots' in its title, this does not necessarily mean that we have to deal with such an update. In order to capture the basic aspects of CxG, one still has to assemble a relatively vast amount of literature, starting from introductory articles such as Fried & Östman (2004). Goldberg 2006 is rather helpful, too. But what still is missing is (as far as I can see) an unbiased and comprehensive presentation of the different constructional approaches to language. The present book cannot fill this gap. It is nevertheless helps the reader to understand how CxG is 'at work', but the reader should not await a full coverage of Construction Grammar issues.

2. The book

Fried & Boas (2005) is a collection of articles, most of which have emerged from papers given at the First International Conference on Construction Grammar (hold at Berkeley in April 2001). Unfortunately, some of the prominent participants of ICCG-1 (e.g. Lakoff, Fillmore, Sag, and Zwicky) did not contribute to the volume (Ivan Sag, for instance, gave a paper on the 'Aspects of a theory of grammatical constructions' that would have nicely framed the current volume). I sum, the book comprises nine papers and an introductory section (by Hans C. Boas and Mirjam Fried). There is a general index and an index of constructions, which by itself is rather helpful because it immediately informs the reader what is understood by (grammatical) constructions in the present volume (e.g., Abstract Recipient, Causative-faire (French), Passive, Left Detachment, or Switch Reference). Unfortunately, there is no general bibliography: Each article has its own list of references, to the effect that some references (such as those to Fillmore, Goldberg and others) show multiple occurrences. The individual articles are of different size, ranging from 17 to 33 pages. For the sake of simplicity, let me reproduce the Table of Contents:

Accordingly, the volume is divided into three main sections each of which deal with a central topic in CxG: 'Syntactic patterning' (three articles), 'Syntax and semantics of the verb' (three articles), and 'Language variation and change' (again three articles).

The back cover of the book comments upon this division as follows: "By exploring the analytic potential and applicability of this notion, the contributions illustrate some of the fundamental concerns of constructional research. These include issues of sentence structure in a model that rejects the autonomy of syntax; the contribution of Frame Semantics in establishing the relationship between syntactic patterning and the lexical meaning of verbs; and the challenge of capturing the dynamic and variable nature of grammatical structure in a systematic way. All the authors share a commitment to studying grammar in its use, which gives the book a rich empirical dimension that draws on authentic data from typologically diverse languages." It should be noted that the data discussed in the volume do not qualify for a typologically oriented presentation of CxG generalizations. Three languages are discussed in more details: English, French, and Finnish. Japanese is discussed in basically two papers (Ohara and Tsujimura), Langacker touches upon Luiseño (Uto-Aztecan), and Ohori (the sole paper that explicitly deals with typological issues) gives rather selective data from Mohave (Hokan), Kiowa (Tanoan), Hua (East Central Highlands, PNG), Haruai (East Highlands, PNG), Mparntwe Arrernte (Pama-Nyungan), Koasati (Muskogean), Newari (Tibeto-Burman), and Old Japanese.

The first section ('Syntactic patterning') starts with an article by Knud Lambrecht and Kevin Lemoine on 'Definite null objects in (spoken) French'. The authors address a problem of what has been termed 'hot languages' in the Generative Tradition, that is languages with strongly overt coding strategies, especially with respect to pronouns. More precisely, the article deals with the question to which extent definite or 'markedly indefinite' (Fillmore) objects in French can be represented as null-objects. The authors recognize "three semantic types of null-instantiation" (p.19): Indefinite Null-instantiation, Definite Null-instantiation, and Free Null-

instantiation. Strategies of Null-instantiation are mainly a matter of inference (coming close to what has been termed 'actant disguise' in GSS, see Schulze 1998: 457-470). Lambrecht & Lemoine's classification of the corresponding constructional types is extremely helpful, also because the classification is illustrated with the help of a large number of examples from Spoken French. In addition, the authors nicely demonstrate how a construction-based account can explain cases of Null-instantiation without referring to a mere syntactic approach. Their final observation is of considerable relevance: "(…) the phenomenon has always existed in French but was pushed out of the linguistic consciousness under the influence of normative grammar, which considers it an unacceptable deviation from 'clarity' and 'logic'" (p.50). It goes without saying that the same holds for quite a number of other syntactic (or, more generally, linguistic) generalizations.

Kyoko Hirose Ohara ('From relativization to clause-linkage') addresses a superficially 'special' problem of Modern Japanese syntax: What is the relation between Internally Headed Relativization (IHR) and certain types of concessive bi-clausal sentences. Unfortunately, the glosses of the first example of an IHR construction (p.57) frequently referred to throughout the text includes an irritating flaw (here 'no' is glossed NOM(inative) instead of N(o)M(ina)L(i)Z(er), just as 'ga' is glossed the other way round). Ohara first argues that we have to deal with two different constructional type (IHR and concessive bi-clausal sentences). Both share the basic architecture of having a referentialized verb-based phrase (indicated by 'no') being followed by the case marker 'ga' (NOM) or 'o' (ACC). But both constructions differ as for features of coreferentiality and 'case matching' (p.60). The author illustrate the divergent properties of the two constructions before turning to the question of whether the constructions are related in a diachronic sense. Here, she refers to constructional reanalysis in order to show that "the concessive construction arose as a result of reanalysis of the IHR construction" (p.66). The crucial point is that the complex 'no ga' / 'no o' are said to have been reanalyzed as conjunctions (roughly = 'whereas'). This goes together with a well-known semantic shift, namely, that from 'temporal sequencing' to 'logical sequencing'.

In his article, Paul Kay turns to 'argument structure constructions and the argument-adjunct distinction'. This highly technical treatment concentrates on the question whether a unification-based or monotonic constructional approach to argument structure or a Goldbergian, non-monotonic approach (Goldberg 1995) should be favored in order to account for instance for the shift of prepositional NPs to argument-like structures in English, e.g. 'the boss promised me a raise' < 'the boss promised a raise to me'. It should be stressed that the problem discussed by Kay is strongly shaped by the architecture of English. The language has lost the 'Dative' as a morphological category (merging with the accusative as shown by personal pronouns like 'me' and 'us'). All the examples given by Kay on p.71 are rendered for instance in German by the Dative case. Hence, from a functional point of view, the riddle can simply be solved by claiming that in English, there is a diachronically motivated, entrenched way of coding the 'Indirect Objective' (be it in argument or adjunct function) by means of a placement rule: If two unmarked (or, pronominally marked by the oblique case) NPs follow the verb, the first one is in IO function, whereas the second is in O function. In other words: a post-verbal NP is formally polysemic, leading to the third type of Dative-Accusative alignment ('neutral' as opposed to Primary or Secondary Objects, for these see Dryer 1986). From a purely synchronic view that starts from verbal semantics, Kay's proposal to analyze the given basic construction together with its three maximal subconstructions importantly helps to classify verbal arguments/adjuncts in terms of Abstract Recipient Constructions. In a second section, the author discusses the question of "inherent arguments, added arguments and adjuncts" (p.86). He carefully illustrates the relevant Argument Structure Constructions

and draws the reader's attention to the fact that sometimes, we do not have to deal with constructions as such, but rather with what has been termed 'pattern of coinage' by Fillmore.

The second section of the book ('Syntax and semantics of verbs') starts with Seizi Iwata's article on 'the role of verb meaning in locative alternations'. Again we have to do with a problem that is immediately related to the diachronic development of English morphosyntax (not addressed by the author). In earlier stages of English, there had been a functionally 'active' preverb be- (< *bi- ~ English 'by' < *'bi:) the function of which was to render a (often locative) prepositional NP as part of the argument-frame of a then transitive verb (> Objective). Whereas a given Objective is put into the periphery. This process is occasionally termed be-Diathesis or Direct Object Diathesis. Although there are residues of this preverb in English, many such verbs have lost the be-preverb without, however, losing the diathesis itself. In other words: A morphosyntactic diathesis has turned into a syntactic diathesis, compare English and German:

(1) John loaded bricks onto the wagon.
Johann lud Ziegel auf den Wagen.

(2) John loaded the wagon with bricks.
Johann belud den Wagen mit Ziegeln.

It is this diathesis that is termed 'locative alternation' by Iwata. In order to capture the semantics of this alternation from a purely synchronic point of view, the author distinguishes two meaning levels of verbs: L(exical Head) meaning and P(hrasal Level) meaning. L-meaning is said to represent the meaning of a verbal head per se (p.104), whereas P-meaning is conveyed by the syntactic frame associated with a given head. The author illustrates the relevance of this distinction with respect to a number of English verbs such as 'pack, 'trim', and 'roll'. Accordingly, L-meaning, itself embedded into complex lexical networks, fuses with constructional meaning, which show different results in case the fusion process involves different types of constructions. Admittedly, I have difficulties to follow Iwata with respect to the assumption of L-meaning. An alternative would be to claim that 'verbs' (or, in a cognitive sense, relations) are prototypically framed by syntax, or, to use more appropriate terms, are prototypically embedded into a specific (often very general or 'abstract') constructional type. This comes clear from the fact that we cannot 'understand' understand verbal relations without considering at least very rudimentary referential entities involved in the event image that again is expressed by the verbal relation (e.g. Schulze 2006). Cognitive Grammar à la Langacker goes in the same direction (though slightly different), compare the following quote from Langacker's article in the same volume:

> "If a verb has any construction-independent meaning at all, this only arises by further abstraction from the more specific senses it assumes in the particular constructions that spawn it (…)." (p.162)

Noriko Nemoto article on "Verbal polysemy and Frame Semantics in Construction Grammar" addresses mainly the same problems as those ones discussed by Kay and Iwata. The author opts for a stronger incorporation of Frame Semantics into CxG approaches in order to prevent these approaches from overgeneralization. Accordingly, "a frame-based description of verbal polysemy may be used to explain a range of argument structures associated with a verb in a constructional approach" (p.133).

In her contribution 'A constructional approach to mimetic verbs', Natsuko Tsujimura aims at evaluating two current hypotheses concerning the 'location' of multiple verb meaning: Projectionism (Rapapport Hovav & Levin 1998) that claims that verbal polysemy is basic and call for individual syntactic patterns, and Construction Grammar that argues in favor of the emergence of polysemy due to the interaction of lexical and constructional semantics. The choice of mimetic verbs in order to approach this task is especially interesting because such mimetic verbs are said to lack a "decomposable semantic representation" (p.147), or, to put it into simple terms, they "lack a clear definition of their 'meaning'" (p.145). Accordingly, "global information spread throughout a sentence including the number of NPs and their grammatical functions, animacy of the subject, and verbal morphology" (p.148) finally helps to constitute the specific meaning of a mimetic verb. This hypothesis comes close to what Blending Theory in Cognitive Linguistics suggests (if we include blends of alleged lexical meaning and constructional meaning). The strength of the paper is undoubtedly given by the choice of highly marked data (mimetic verbs), which underlines the methodologically well thought-out analysis.

The third section of the volume concerns 'Language variation and change'. It starts with a contribution by Ronald W. Langacker, entitled 'Integration, grammaticization and constructional meaning'. First, the author compares his version of Cognitive Grammar with the standard version of Construction Grammar (referring mainly to Goldberg 1995). He mentions twelve features sharing by both approaches, but also uses the occasion to emphasize the differences. In a second step, Langacker describes some "basic notions of Cognitive Grammar" (pp.164-172) useful especially for those who haven't yet explored this approach. Langacker then turns to the question of 'conceptual integration'. The author starts from the assumption that "component structures should (…) be thought (…) as overlapping fragments of the composite conception artificially extracted from the whole for purposes of linguistic symbolization" (p.172). Constructions reinforce conceptual integration and "[t]ighter conceptual integration is characteristic of elements considered grammatical (As opposed to lexical)" (p.172). Langacker illustrates this point with the help of so-called 'Direct object construction with body-part nouns' and features of agreement said to represent "extensive conceptual overlap" (p.176). The more a (former) lexical element becomes 'grammaticized' (or: in typological terms, grammaticalized) the more conceptual integration becomes relevant: Its "conceptual overlap with co-occurring structures tends to represent a greater proportion of [its] content (even the totality)" (p. 178). The analysis of English 'do' and of the development of a quotative marker towards a complementizer in Luiseño helps to illustrate this claim.

Jaako Leino and Jan-Ola Östman turn to the question to which extent CxG should account not only for regularities as such, "but also for tendencies of grammatical organization" (p.191). Their paper is entitled 'Construction and variability" and turns the readers attention to Finnish. The authors start from the assumption that language is by itself defined by "constant change" (p.192). Accordingly, CxG has to account for variation in order to "understand of how linguistic units behave" (p.193). This view is nothing new if we look at e.g. Diachronic Typology or strongly diachronic or variation-oriented frameworks of Cognitive Linguistics (compare the claim in Radical Experientialism that language is (among others) defined by its history and the sum of synchronic variations, be they conventionalized or idiosyncratic, see Schulze 1998, 2006). The authors refer to some kind of prototypicality hypothesis in order to make variation describable. Again, the reader is sensitized to the question of whether variation is an expression of distinct patterns (here: constructions), or emerge as some kind of 'options' with respect to a generalIzed pattern/ construction. The authors strongly argue in favor of the second option, illustrating their claim with the help of a corpus based frequency analysis of

alternations in the case frame of some Finnish perception verbs. They then turn to 'discourse patterns' as another motive for variation, before addressing 'metaconstructions' emerging from analogy. Here, Leino and Östman convincingly argue that "a grammar should not only be an inventory of constructions as generalizations over expressions, but a grammar must also include generalizations over constructions – what we call metaconstructions" (p.206). Metaconstructions (or: co-variant constructions) thus "capture analogical relationships between several pairs of constructions" (p.207). An example quoted by the authors would be the variation of a standard transitive pattern ([S:nom V X] in their terms) showing up in terms of an existential construction ([X V S:par] (par = Partitive)). [[S:nom V X] – [X V S:par]] would be represent the metaconstruction. Note that the representation of these (sub)constructions is not fully sufficient to license corresponding expressions: In [S:nom V X] the verb has to agree with S, whereas in [X V S:par], the verb shows exophoric (deictic) agreement (3sg), at least from a diachronic point of view.

The final paper of the volume is Toshio Ohori's contribution on "Construction Grammar as a conceptual framework for linguistic typology". The aim of the paper is to show that "CxG is in principle compatible with the desiderata of linguistic typology, and (…) that typological studies, in turn, will enrich CxG in significant way" (p.215). Personally, I do nut fully understand why the problem of whether CxG can be compatible with linguistic typology is given at all: Sure, most CxG related analyses are strongly oriented towards data of individual languages (deplorably focusing perhaps too strongly on English), but this does not necessarily mean that CxG would not qualify for cross-linguistic issues. It should be stressed that linguistic typology isn't a framework as such, but rather a methodological pathway towards the revelation of generalizations. Still, it is a myth to assume that linguistic typology is nothing but a purely inductive approach: Even what is known as Basic Linguistic Theory, the standard descriptive layer of many approaches in linguistic typology (see Dixon 1997) has an inherited deductive component. Hence, we may claim that CxG is an option to provide the inductive layer of linguistic typology with a theoretically well-formulated deductive shell. Sure, CxG is just one option that competes with other approaches, let it be a generative formula. The main point is that the deductive layer should be able to account for any type of observable linguistic variance, be it synchronically or diachronically. With respect to CxG this means that CxG should be flexible enough to overcome its strong language-specific orientation. Likewise, CxG should be perhaps adopt the notion of metaconstructions (as suggested in Leino & Oestam's paper in the present volume) in a cross-linguistic sense. Such metaconstructions should then be analyzed in terms of their inherent flexibility and transcendent motivation, be it on the conceptual layer (as done e.g. in Cognitive Grammar) or on the experiential layer (as done e.g. in Radical Experientialism, or, turned into linguistic typology, in Cognitive Typology (Schulze (in preparation)). Ohori's paper undoubtedly helps to contribute to this perspective. The author discusses the phenomenon of switch-reference in a variety of languages. Space does not allow going into the details of this interesting analysis: Still, the reader is strongly advised to assimilate it in all its details to see how a CxG-based approach tries to account for a variety of phenomena related to switch-reference.

3. Concluding remarks

In sum, the volume prepared by Mirjam Fried and Hans C. Boas is an interesting collection of articles that illustrate CxG 'at work'. Addressing the domains of syntactic patterning, verbal syntax and semantics, as well as questions of language variation and language change, the book covers main issues of the current debate in grammar theories. Still, as has been said above, the book surely is not what the subtitle seems to promise ('Back to the roots'). It does not "jettison everything (here in the sense of recent proposals) and start from scratch", as

Langacker has described his motivation to develop Cognitive Grammar (p.157 in the same volume). Hence, the volume is not suited to those who wish to learn about the basics of CxG. The highly diverse instantiations of CxG presented in the book render it difficult for CxG-beginners to find answers to some of the basic questions related to this framework. In this sense, the volume addresses mainly linguists who already have a solid knowledge of CxG. For these, the book offers some kind of kaleidoscope of CxG thinking and methodology. Naturally, the many extremely detailed studies give rise to arguable hypotheses and generalizations. These may emerge from both intrinsic counter-arguments and arguments related to concurrent, but nevertheless relate frameworks, such as Grammaticalization Theory, Cognitive Linguistics (in general terms), Metaphor Theory, and Cognitive Semantics, or Cognitive Typology. Perhaps, it is one of the very few shortcomings of the volume that it does not consider in more detail such alternative explanatory perspectives. Here, the main concerns seems to be to set apart CxG from Syntax Theory. Another problem is established by the fact that CxG does not include a common notational practice. In their Introduction, the editors argue in favor of this representational diversity, claiming that the CxG model is an "enterprise in extracting relevant structures and categories from the data patterns at hand", but not an "exercise in accommodating predetermined formal structures consisting of predetermined abstract variables" (p.3). This may be appropriate, but it sets the CxG enterprise at the risk of developping in terms of a basically interpretative model, with the consequence that the reader has to extract the common denominators from the (in parts) idiosyncratic interpretations. The current heterogeneity in 'applying' CxG is – in my eyes – a typical reflex of a model in its 'early stage', involving a greater variety of allo-models. These allo-models of CxG tend to specialize in very elaborated questions, often related to English or another 'major' language. Time will show whether the CxG practitioners will once strive towards a (more) unified account that would be reflected – among others – in a adequate notational convention. But this presupposes that CxG opens itself towards a broader debate concerning methodological issues (touching upon, e.g., the role of diachrony, language acquisition, and corpus linguistics, etc.) and theoretical issues (e.g., the question of induction and deduction, the question of the ontology of constructions). Such a discourse should not be confined to CxG practitioners, but should include representatives of the many concurrent explanatory models of language currently (and formerly) on the market.

References

Bergen, Benjamin, Nancy Chang & Shweta Narayan 2004/5. Simulated Action in an Embodied Construction Grammar. In: Kenneth Forbus, Dedre Gentner and Terry Regier (eds.). Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, pp. 108-113. Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum. http://www2.hawaii.edu/~bergen/papers/BCN04.pdf.

Croft, William A. 2001. Radical construction grammar: Syntactic theory in typological perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dixon, Robert M.W. 1997. The rise and fall of languages. Cambridge: Cambrige University Press.

Dryer, Matthew 1986. Primary objects, secondary objects, and antidative. Language 62: 808-845.

Fried, Mirjam & Jan-Ola Östman 2004. Construction Grammar: A thumbnail sketch. In: Fried & Östman (eds.) Construction Grammar in a Cross-Language Perspective, 11–86. [Constructional Approaches to Language 2]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goldberg, Adele E.1995. Constructions. A construction grammar approach to argument structure. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kemmerer, David (in press): Action verbs, argument structure constructions, and the mirror neuron system. In: Michael A. Arbib (ed.). Action to Language via the Mirror Neuron System. Cambridge University Press [see http://www.cla.purdue.edu/slhs//pages/fac_staff/ faculty/Kemmerer/kemmerer.chapter. revised3.pdf].

Kuningas, Johanna & Jaakko Leino 2006. Word Orders and Construction Grammar. In: Special supplement. In: Mickael Suominen et al. (eds.). A Man of Measure: Festschrift in Honour of Fred Karlsson on his 60th Birthday, 301-309. [SKY Journal of Linguistics, vol. 19: 2006].

Rapapport Hovav, Malka & Beth Levin 1998. Building verb meaning. In: Miriam Butt & Wilhelm Geuder (eds.) The projection of arguments, 97-134. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Schulze, Wolfgang 1998. Person, Klasse, Kongruenz. Vol. 1 (in two parts): Die Grundlagen. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Schulze, Wolfgang 1999. Cognitive Linguistics meets Typology. The Architecture of a "Grammar of Scenes and Scenarios".
http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~wschulze/cog_typ.htm.

Schulze, Wolfgang 2006 (in press). Sprache als kommunizierte Wahrnehmung. Ein Essay in sieben Teilen. (FS contribution). Paris.

Schulze, Wolfgang (in preparation). Aspects of Cognitive Typology. See http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~wschulze/cogtyp.pdf,
http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~wschulze/gss_main.html

Steels, Luc 2005. The Role of Construction Grammar in Fluid Language Grounding. http://www.csl.sony.fr/downloads/papers/2005/steels-05a. pdf.