

REVIEWS

Alina Mihaela Tigău. 2011. *Syntax and Semantics of the Direct Object in Romance and Germanic Languages*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București. 402 pp.

Reviewed by Alexandra Cornilescu*

The book under review, based on the author's doctoral dissertation, is a work in comparative grammar, centering on the syntax and interpretation of the Direct Object (= DO) in Romance (Romanian and Spanish) and Germanic (German, Dutch, English). The book is of interest to all students of Romanian, and to all interested in the syntax-semantics interface from the combined perspective of minimalist syntax and formal semantics.

The specific problem approached is the manner in which Romance and Germanic languages express binding and relative scope relations, where one of the terms concerned is the DO. This is an interface problem involving LF as well as the Conceptual-Intentional module, where LF determines the class of admissible interpretations. In the present work, the task of the Conceptual Intentional module is taken over by Discourse Representation Theory (DRT), as outlined in Kamp and Reyle (1993) and Farkas and De Swart 2003), a form of dynamic model-theoretic semantics. Following in the steps of Montague Grammars, DRT does not directly interpret LFs, but constructs a discourse-semantic representation, which captures significant generalizations and is the input to model theoretic interpretation. DRT interpretations are explicit and kept under control, since this model operates with local restricted quantificational domains. The translation of LF into DRT is compositional and explicit, conforming to Chomsky's principle of Full Interpretation. The advantages of this model are clearly visible in the interpretation of clitic doubled constructions, CD (= CD) and CLD (= CLD) in Romanian, where an apparently superfluous agreement marker, the clitic, actually has a decisive syntactic and semantic role. From a syntactic point of view, clitic doubled objects are interpreted out of the vP , so that inverse binding of the subject by the object and wider scope of the DO over the subject are always possible for differentially marked DOs.

The main claim of this work is that languages use different strategies to express binding and relative scope. Some languages, here illustrated, by the Germanic family, use configurational means, specifically, the c-command configuration. Antecedents should c-command anaphors and bound pronouns. Likewise, relative scope is also determined by c-command, since a c-commanding quantifier always has wider scope. Binding and scope possibilities are thus modified when a DP moves leftward into a higher position. In other languages, here illustrated, by Romance languages like Romanian and Spanish, c-command plays little or no part. Rather, what counts in determining binding and scope relations is the internal structure of the DP; Romanian and Spanish are differential object marking (= DOM) languages. In contrast, the Germanic languages examined do not exhibit DOM. Romanian and Spanish make use of non-configurational means to render binding and scope: as a rule, differentially marked objects are better antecedents and have wider scope than other competitors, irrespective of their syntactic position. The author thus establishes an insightful novel correlation between a morpho-syntactic property (DOM) and essential interpretative properties like binding and scope. This contrast may be viewed as a

* University of Bucharest, Department of English.

parametric difference between configurational languages, where binding and quantificational dependencies follow from c-command, and non-configurational languages, where the same properties derive from the internal structure of the DP. From a semantic perspective, differentially marked objects are epistemically specific (d-linked, as in López 2009).

Naturally, this proposed parameter stands or falls with the strength of the descriptive data analysed. One must admit that from a descriptive perspective, this work is impressive, in the first place through the breadth, variety, novelty of the Romanian data under analysis, and in the second place through the systematic and insightful account offered to this large body of data. The following represent, in our opinion, important contributions to a better understanding of Romanian data: (i) the synchronic and diachronic description of DOM in Romanian in chapter II (115-162); (ii) the careful, virtually exhaustive, analysis of the scope and binding possibilities of doubled and undoubled Romanian indefinites, in different types of word-orders in chapter IV (207-295).

As to the analysis of DOM, following Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), Cornilescu (2000), the author considers that DOM is represented not only by the preposition PE in front of the DO, but also by CD in the post-verbal CD and the preverbal Clitic-Left Dislocation constructions. DOM is thus a complex phenomenon, represented by three syntactic properties with different, but converging effects: use of the preposition PE, CD, and CLD. The independence of the three properties is confirmed by the diachronic analysis of DOM offered in the thesis and illustrated with a wealth of marvelous examples. Thus, while the prepositional PE Accusative is fully developed in the 16th century, CD is only sporadically attested at that time. PE is sensitive to the parameter of animacy and personhood, PE emerging with Accusative personal pronouns and proper names. Doubling by the clitic has first developed in the CLD Construction, a widespread topicalization strategy unrelated to DOM, since it is also available in Romance languages that do not exhibit DOM (French, Italian). With postverbal objects of the same types, doubling was not obligatory and was not frequent until the first half of the 19th century, while CD is currently on the wane, for reasons which are still poorly understood. From a synchronic perspective, the most relevant contrast between CD and CLD is that the latter suspends the contrast in animacy, since any individual, animate or inanimate may have a high degree of topicality. In contrast, post verbal CD depends on PE-marking, which selects DPs which are high on the animacy scale and contextually salient, therefore specific.

The chapter offers a syntactic analysis of the two constructions (CD and CLD), in the specific minimalist framework put forth by López (2009). What counts for the general purpose of the analysis is that both CD-ed and CLLD-ed objects leave the vP and come to occupy a position of c-command with respect to the subject in Spec vP. In inverse binding situations, the subject is reconstructed in this lower thematic position, so that the object may function as an antecedent or as a quantifier with wider scope.

The last part of chapter II presents a fully original DRT implementation of the two constructions, concentrating on the role of the pronominal clitic. If one starts from Chomsky's old distinction between Focus and Presupposition, the clitic is surely a presuppositional element, which cannot be focused. This is apparent in the impossibility of using the clitic in answers to narrow focus questions: *Pe cine ai văzut?* 'Who did you see?' / *L-am văzut pe el.* / **L-am văzut.*; compare English *him*, which can be focused and can be deictically interpreted, e.g. *Who did you see?* / *I saw HIM*. On the other hand, since it is a D-pronoun, the clitic will introduce its own discourse referent, which denotes an entity known in the discourse, therefore a d-linked entity. The discourse referent introduced by the clitic must be accommodated, as shown by Farkas and De Swart (2003). The double is anaphoric with respect to the discourse referent introduced by the clitic, and when the double is definite (i.e. it is a proper name, a definite/demonstrative description, a possessive description, a strong pronoun), the double is maximal, i.e. it covers the whole set denoted by the clitic, being co-referent with it: hence, the features of [Maximality] and

[Uniqueness] typical of definite DPs. This account has considerable explanatory power, clarifying the discourse role, and thus “the meaning” of the clitic.

The book brings decisive contributions to the interpretation of indefinite DOs, highlighting the differences between differentially marked indefinites and non-differentially marked ones, in chapter IV. The chapter brings to bear the important notion of specificity, following Enc (1991) and Farkas (2002) as well as the theory of information structure packaging. It is convincingly shown that information structure is a pragmatic level of structure, not necessarily connected with semantic effects of binding and scope.

The central hypothesis adopted in the analysis is that Romanian employs DOM to solve problems that languages like German solve by movement or other means of creating a c-command configuration. In Romanian-type languages interpretation depends on the presence/absence of DOM. Differentially marked DOs allow inverse binding and wide scope readings in any syntactic position, and, conversely, non-differentially-marked objects favor narrow scope readings and fail to allow inverse binding even when they c-command the relevant DP.

An important result is that all differentially marked objects are specific, but what they exhibit is epistemic specificity (tied to d-linking), rather than scopal specificity. Objects without DOM are epistemically non-specific, but may enter relations of quantificational dependence, behaving like the indefinites of English or German.

The fact that an indefinite with DOM is epistemically specific means that it functions like a strong presuppositional quantifier in the sense of Milsark (1977). The main property of a strong quantifier is that its restriction is non-empty; in the case of a clitic doubled quantifier, the clitic introduces a discourse referent, namely a set of discourse-given entities. This set is precisely the domain over which the indefinite quantifier ranges. The denotation of the double is a subset of the denotation of the clitic, this being the well-known effect of hidden partitivity (Enc 1991). The idea that the clitic functions as a restriction of the quantifier, explicitly present in the literature at least since von Stechow (1994), is a major idea of the analysis, with considerable explanatory power.

This hypothesis regarding the interpretation of indefinites with and without DOM is tested on all the major classes of Romanian indefinites: the indefinite article, degree quantifiers, lexical quantifiers, cardinals and bare nouns. In order to test the relative relevance of DOM and the corresponding relevance of c-command, for each investigate quantifier the author takes into account all word orders of the transitive clause: VSO, SVO, VOS, OVS. SOV, OSV. For each considered order the following properties are specified: (i) The information structure properties of the investigated order, that is, the relative association of the subject and object with the Focus and Topic. Word order changes directly modify the Topic/Focus interpretation of DPs. (ii) Possible quantificational dependencies are minutely analyzed for each pair of quantifiers. The analysis is based on grammaticality judgments offered by native speakers; (iii) Binding relations are also systematically analyzed for all quantifiers considered.

The theory put forth in this book makes spectacular predictions, confirmed by the data: bare NPs, which cannot be clitic-doubled cannot be specific either. Counting quantifiers, described by Beghelly and Stowell (1996) as non-specific, can, in fact, be clitic doubled. They appear as sometimes epistemically specific (d-linked), even if they are always scopally non-specific.

Mention must be made of the fact that the data discussed in this chapter had never been systematically investigated. The author has selected a number of 85 sentences (selected out of an initial set of 150), controlling quantifier types and clausal word order. A group of 45 speakers, of diverse educational backgrounds and age groups, offered judgments of acceptability and possible interpretations for the 85 sentences selected. These grammaticality judgments, modestly included in the footnotes to chapter IV, represent a fresh and fascinating description of Romanian in one of its practically unexplored areas. Beyond the beauty and coherence of the intellectual construction, this book directly contributes to a better knowledge of E-Romanian.

The book is excellently written, in the sense that despite the breadth of the analysis and the multitude of the theoretical strands brought together, the book manages to be self-contained through the clarity, the coherence and felicitous selection of the problems dealt with.

One minor point: chapters do not have titles, so that the general structure of the book comes out less clearly from the contents than it could. Undoubtedly, this can be rectified when the book is reprinted. In the mean time, this fascinating piece of research will have contributed a lot to a better understanding of how meaning is read off structures in configurational and non-configurational languages.

References

- Beghelly, P. and Stowell, T. 1996. Distributivity and negation. The syntax of *each* and *every*. In A. Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of Scope Taking*. 71-107. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Cornilescu, A. 2000. Notes on the interpretation of the prepositional accusative in Romanian. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* II (1): 1-15.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Enc, M. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 1-25.
- Farkas, D. 2002. Specificity distinctions. *Journal of Semantics* 19: 213-243.
- Farkas, D. and de Swart, H. 2003. *The Semantics of Incorporation*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Kamp, H. and Reyle, U. 1993. *From Discourse to Logic*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- López, L. 2009. *A Derivational Syntax for Information Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Milsark, G. 1977. Toward an explanation of certain peculiarities of the existential construction in English. *Linguistic Analysis* 3: 1-29.
- von Fintel, K. 1994. Restrictions on Quantifier Domains. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Jennifer Hay, Margaret Maclagan and Elizabeth Gordon. 2008. *New Zealand English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 164 pp.

Reviewed by Andrei A. Avram*

New Zealand English is written by three authors who have each conducted extensive first-hand research on this variety of English. The book consists of nine chapters, a “Bibliography of cited works”, and an “Index”.

Chapter 1, “Geography, demography and cultural factors” (pp. 1-13), concentrates primarily on the history of New Zealand. The account covers the arrival of the Maori, the European settlement of New Zealand, the developments in the late nineteenth, the twentieth and the twenty first centuries, the demographic changes such as the growth of the Maori population, the rapid increase of the Asian population, and the growing inflow of Pacific Islanders (from Samoa, Tonga, Cook Islands and Niue).

In chapter 2, “Phonetics and phonology” (pp. 14-46), the authors look at the main characteristics of the segmental phonemes of New Zealand English and of its suprasegmental features as well as at some of the changes having taken place or currently occurring in this variety of English. The discussion of the consonantal phonemes focuses on /t/, /t/ and /l/: New Zealand English is shown to be a non-rhotic variety, with both “linking” and “intrusive” r; the phonetic realization of word-final /t/ is very frequently the glottal stop [ʔ]; the so-called “dark” [ɾ] is

* University of Bucharest, Department of English.

frequently replaced by [ʊ]. The description of the vowel phonemes¹ deals with the following issues: the centralization or even fronting of the START vowel; the centralization of the KIT vowel, to an almost [ə]-like quality; the centralization of the GOOSE vowel; the occurrence of a diphthong with an onglide in the FLEECE vowel; the centralization and unrounding of the GOOSE vowel; the diphthongs. The suprasegmental phenomena covered are the High Rising Terminal intonation, shifts in stress placement and the noticeably less stress-timed nature (demonstrated by the less frequent occurrence of vowel reduction in unstressed syllables). Finally, the sound changes in progress described include: the loss of the contrast between /hw/ and /w/; /l/-vocalization and its effect on the preceding vowel; /tr/ and /dr/ affrication (e.g. [tʃi] *tree*, [dʒim] *dream*); /t/-flapping; TH-fronting; the merger of the diphthongs in NEAR and SQUARE; the shift affecting the short front vowels in KIT, DRESS and TRAP; the marked rounding of the NURSE vowel; the shift affecting the diphthongs in FACE, GOAT, PRICE and MOUTH; the increasing generalization of the pronunciation [ðə] regardless of the nature of the initial sound of the following word; the frequent pronunciation in two syllables of past participles such as *grown*, *known*, *sewn*, *thrown*.

Chapter 3, “Morphosyntax” (pp. 47-64), focuses on a number of selected morpho-syntactic features of New Zealand English. The discussion of verb forms covers a.o. the increasing occurrence of non-standard past-tense variants (e.g. *rung*), the co-existence of *-ed* and *-t* past tense and past participle variants (e.g. *burned/burnt*), the variation in the use of the past participle of *prove* (both *proved* and *proven*), the increasing use of the past participle *gotten*, the “intrusive” *have* in counterfactual conditional clauses (e.g. *If I had have passed...*), and the use of the present perfect with definite time adverbials such as *ago* or *yesterday*. Regarding modal verbs, two characteristics are epistemic *mustn't* (e.g. *The lift mustn't be working*) and the increasing use of *of* instead of (contracted) *have* after modal verbs. The reanalysis of e.g. *would've* as an inseparable unit *would of* is shown to have implications for the placement of *not*, yielding *would of not*, also found in written samples as *would have not*. Subject-verb agreement is shown to vary considerably: some collective nouns (e.g. *team*) exhibit a strong preference for the verb in the singular, while others (e.g. *family*) prefer the plural form of the verb; also, sentences with existential-*there* plurals exhibit very high rates of co-occurrence with *is* or *was*. Possession is expressed in declarative sentences both with *have* and with *have got*, while in negative and interrogative ones either *have + got* or *do + have* occur. As for pronouns and pronominal adjectives, notable phenomena include: an increasing use of the so-called “singular *they*” and of *themselves* and even *themselves*, as its reflexive counterpart; the use of *yous* and of *you guys* as a second person plural pronoun²; the use of neutral *she* (e.g. *She's a hard road finding the perfect woman*); the frequent occurrence of “supporting” *one* with possessive or demonstrative adjectives (e.g. *below our ones*). There are comparatively high rates of use and acceptance of double comparatives and double superlatives (e.g. *more wealthier*, *most cleanest*). Finally, while the use of *very* as an adjectival modifier is decreasing, there is a growing use of *real* (e.g. *he was just real scared*) in relatively informal spoken discourse.

Chapter 4, “New Zealand vocabulary and discourse features” (pp. 65-83), is mainly an overview of the lexical characteristics of New Zealand English, but includes a short section on some of its specific discourse features. Particular attention is paid to the loan words of Maori origin. These are shown to have entered the language in two distinct periods – the first one up to 1860, the second one after 1970 – and are particularly well represented in semantic fields such as place names, Maori society and culture, flora, fauna. New Zealand English is shown to share with Australian English much of its distinctive vocabulary, but it is currently undergoing an increasing

¹ The analysis is made with reference to the lexical sets suggested by Wells (1982).

² The authors do not discuss the origin of these plural forms. In my opinion, *yous* can be traced back to Irish English (see also Trudgill 2004: 19), whereas *you guys* reflects the influence of American English.

lexical influence of American English. Internal changes are illustrated with examples of word-formation (in particular, the frequent use of the diminutive suffix *-ie*), semantic changes (e.g. *cake* ‘bar of soap or chocolate’, *paddock* ‘fenced area, field’), and slang. The section on discourse features briefly discusses, among others, the use of the tag particle *eh* (with its typical falling intonation), of quotative *like*, of *like* as a discourse marker, and gender- and ethnicity-related differences reflected in conversational style.

The emergence and development of New Zealand English is outlined in chapter 5, “Origins of New Zealand English” (pp. 84-94). The first two sections review two “traditional” accounts relating New Zealand English to other varieties of English: one deriving it from the Cockney dialect of London and the other regarding it as a “transported” dialect of Australian English. Both accounts are shown not to be compatible with the demographic data: only 15 percent of the immigrants appear to have been speakers of Cockney, and only approximately 7 percent came from Australia. The third section explains the emergence and development of New Zealand English as a process of what has come to be called “new-dialect formation”³. On this view, differences between the dialects spoken by the various groups of the first settlers are levelled out and a new dialect subsequently comes into being. This new dialect differs from all the dialects initially spoken by the first immigrants. Essentially, the process involves three chronological stages: levelling of the most salient differences between the dialects involved, further levelling and also extreme variability in the pronunciation, and, finally, stabilization of the newly emerged dialect as a consequence of focusing. The next four sections assess the early written records of New Zealand English and the evidence provided by spoken data, in particular by the Mobile Disc Recording Unit archive of recordings – made between 1946 and 1948 – of speakers, the oldest of whom was born in 1851. The chapter ends with a section which summarizes the origins and development of New Zealand English by testing the theory of new-dialect formation against the evidence of early spoken data⁴.

Chapter 6, “Variation within New Zealand” (pp. 95-111), is concerned with several types of variation within New Zealand English: regional dialects, sociolects, ethnolects and registers. Regional variation is illustrated mainly with examples from the Southland dialect, which can mostly be traced back to the large number of early Scottish settlers: the occurrence of post-vocalic /r/ in the NURSE and LETTER vowels, the partial retention of the /hw/ – /w/ distinction, the use of the past participle after needs and wants (e.g. *The plant needs watered*, *The cat wants stroked*). It is shown that the varieties traditionally identified to describe social class-related variation, Cultivated, General and Broad, are less relevant, given the expansion of General New Zealand English at the expense of the other two, and the emergence of Maori as a distinct variety. The features most associated with social class are the pronunciation of the diphthongs in FACE, GOAT, PRICE, MOUTH, /l/-vocalization, /t/-flapping, TH-fronting and the occurrence of word-final [k] in words such as *something*. The two ethnic varieties discussed are Maori English and the so-called “Pasifika” English (of the Pacific Islanders). While the latter is said not to be as yet a distinct variety, Maori English is shown to exhibit several specific features, such as a very fronted GOOSE vowel, non-aspiration of word-initial /t/, devoicing of /z/ in plurals (e.g. *eyes*), stopping of /θ/ and /ð/, the more frequent occurrence of TH-fronting, the very low rate of “linking” and “intrusive” *r*, the high incidence of High Rising Terminals, the more syllable-timed rhythm and the high rates of usage of the tag particle *eh*. Finally, also illustrated are the registers of sports such as horse racing, football and rugby.

³ The initial version of the theory of new-dialect formation was set out in Trudgill (1986). For an application to the emergence of the so-called “Southern Hemisphere Englishes”, see Trudgill (2004).

⁴ For a detailed account of the formation of New Zealand English, see Gordon et al. (2004).

Chapter 7, “Selected Bibliography of Works on New Zealand English” (pp. 112-137) provides the interested reader with a guide to the relevant literature. The bibliography is annotated and it is divided into sections: overviews of New Zealand English; phonetics and phonology; morphology and syntax; vocabulary; discourse; variation; register; attitudes and origins.

The last chapter, “Sample texts” (pp. 138-153), consists of the transcripts of the associated sound file, of New Zealand English word list, and of extracts from interviews with the four oldest speakers recorded by the Mobile Disc Recording Unit in 1948.

This is a comprehensive, though concise, description of New Zealand English. Two chapters, in particular, stand out. The chapter on morpho-syntax does justice to some of the syntactic phenomena in New Zealand English, most descriptions of which focus on its phonetics and phonology. The chapter on variation convincingly shows that there is regional variation, in spite of the relatively short history of this variety of English. Similarly, the occurrence of social variation is demonstrated, in spite of the widespread belief among New Zealanders that social class differences do not exist in New Zealand. There is little one can object to: *my*, *his* are not possessive pronouns (p. 61), but possessive adjectives; the pronunciation of the various diphthongs cannot be not very easily inferred from figures 2.3 (p. 26) and 6.1 (p. 103); the word-final consonant in the pronunciation of words such as *something* (pp. 102-103) should have been transcribed between square brackets ([k], not /k/); some repetitions could have been avoided: thus /l/-vocalization is described both in 2.3.3 (p. 20) and 2.6.3 (p. 35); Trudgill’s theory of new-dialect formation is discussed in sections 5.3 and 5.8 (pp. 86-87 and 92-93 respectively).

Although aimed at a general readership, *New Zealand English* is also a useful reference work for linguists. To conclude, this book is a very welcome addition to the literature on varieties of English, for which the authors should be congratulated.

References

- Gordon, E., Campbell, L., Lewis, G., Maclagan, M., Sudbury, A. and Trudgill, P. 2004. *New Zealand English: Its Origins and Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, P. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Trudgill, P. 2004. *New-dialect Formation. The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wells, J. C. 1982. *Accents of English*, vol. 1, *The British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics (BWPL)

ISSN: 2069-9239

Commenced publication: 1999

BWPL is published twice a year by the Centre for the Study of Language Development and Linguistic Communication, Department of English, University of Bucharest. It publishes work of current interest in all areas of theoretical and applied linguistics.

Contributions

Articles should be in English and must contain work which has not been previously published. They are peer-reviewed, and authors will be informed within three months of receipt of manuscripts whether these are accepted for publication.

Authors are requested to submit their papers electronically. Detailed *Guidelines for Authors* are available at <http://bwpl.unibuc.ro>

Address for correspondence

Centre for the Study of Language Development and Linguistic Communication,
Department of English, University of Bucharest, 7-13 Pitar Moş Str., sector 1, 010451
Bucharest, Romania.

Back issues

Single issues from previous volumes are available from the Centre for the Study of Language Development and Linguistic Communication.

Tiparul s-a executat sub c-da nr. 3052/2011
la Tipografia Editurii Universității din București
