

an International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics

Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández
Editor-in-Chief
Universidad de Sevilla

Pilar Barbosa
Universidade do Minho

Victoria Camacho-Taboada
Universidad de Sevilla

Michelle Sheehan
University of Cambridge

Volume 5 Issue 2, December 2013
ISSN: 1989-8525



Iberia

Editorial Team

Editors

Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández, Editor-in-Chief, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Pilar Barbosa, Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Victoria Camacho-Taboada, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Michelle Sheehan, University of Cambridge, UK

Layout editor

Pedro J. Carrillo-Gomez, Chief Layout Editor, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Victoria Camacho-Taboada, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Alicia González Seco, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Estefanía Guerrero Robles, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Copy editors

Megan Devlin, University of Ulster, UK

Rebecca Woods, University of York, UK

Proofreaders

Victoria Camacho-Taboada, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Pedro J. Carrillo-Gomez, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Principal Contact

Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández, Phd

Phone: (+34) 954 551 546

Fax: (+34) 954 551 516

Email: ajimfer@us.es

Support Contact

Pedro J. Carrillo-Gomez

Phone (+34) 620 581 485

pedrocarrillo@gmail.com

Mailing Address

Facultad de Filología

Universidad de Sevilla

C/ Palos de la Fra. s/n

41004 Sevilla (Spain)

Volume 5 Issue 2, December 2013

ISSN: 1989-8525



Iberia

Scientific Committee

- Caroline Heycock, University of Edinburgh, UK
Anders Holmberg, University of Newcastle, UK
Selçuk Issever, Ankara University, Turkey
Mary Kato, State University of Campinas, Brazil
Michael Kenstowicz, MIT, USA
Itziar Laka, University of the Basque Country, Spain
Alazne Landa, University of the Basque Country, Spain
Mark Jary, University of Roehampton, UK
Maria-Rosa Lloret, Universitat de Barcelona, Spain, Spain
Manuel Leonetti, Universidad de Alcalá, Spain
Ángel J. Gallego, Centre de Lingüística Teòrica & Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain
Mireia Llinas, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain
Giuseppe Longobardi, University of Trieste, Italy
Ana Maria Martins, University of Lisbon, Portugal
Jürgen M. Meisel, University of Hamburg, Germany and University of Calgary, Canada
Amaya Mendikoetxea, Autonomous University of Madrid, Spain
Shigeru Miyagawa, MIT, USA
Andrew Nevins, Harvard University, USA
Jairo Nunes, University of São Paulo, Brazil
Ana Ojea, University of Oviedo, Spain
Francisco Ordoñez, Stony Brook University, USA
Javier Ormazabal, University of the Basque Country, Spain
Sumru Ozsoy, Boğaziçi University, Turkey
Orin Percus, University of Nantes, France
Josep Quer, Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats & University of Pompeu i Fabra, Spain
Andrew Radford, University of Essex, UK
Eduardo Raposo, University of California at Santa Barbara, USA
Gemma Rigau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain
Luiggi Rizzi, University of Siena, Italy
Ian Roberts, University of Cambridge, UK
Juan Romero, University of Extremadura, Spain
Alain Rouveret, University Paris 7, France
Vieri Samek-Lodovici, University College London, UK
Uli Sauerland, Centre for General Linguistics, Typology and Universals Research (ZAS), Germany
Vassilis Spyropoulos, University of Athens, Greece
Esther Torrego, University of Massachusetts, USA
Ana Maria Brito, University of Porto, Portugal
Ignacio Bosque, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain
Zeljko Boskovic, University of Connecticut, USA
Jonathan Bobaljik, University of Connecticut, USA
Elena Benedicto, Purdue University, USA
Adriana Belletti, University of Siena, Italy
Artemis Alexiadou, University of Stuttgart, Germany
Gorka Elordieta, University of the Basque Country, Spain
Utpal Lahiri, University of the Basque Country, Spain
Gabriela Matos, University of Lisbon, Portugal
Ines Duarte, University of Lisbon, Portugal
Maria Joao dos Reis de Freitas, University of Lisbon, Portugal
David Adger, University of London, UK
Teresa Cabre, Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain
Hector Campos, Georgetown University, USA
Anna Cardinaletti, University of Venice, Italy
Juan Uriagereka, University of Maryland, USA
Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria, University of the Basque Country, Spain
Susanne Wurmbrand, University of Connecticut, USA
Francisco Garrudo, University of Seville, Spain
Maria del Pilar Garcia-Mayo, University of the Basque Country, Spain
Teresa Fanego, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain
María Victoria Escandell, UNED, Spain
David Embick, University of Pennsylvania, USA
Violeta Demonte, Autonomous University of Madrid, Spain
Hamida Demirdache, University of Nantes, France
Paola Crisma, University of Trieste, Italy
Joao Costa, New University of Lisbon, Portugal
Guglielmo Cinque, University of Venice, Italy
Cedric Boeckx, Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats & Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain
Olga Fernández-Soriano, Autonomous University of Madrid, Spain
Luis Eguren, Autonomous University of Madrid, Spain
Victor Acedo, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain

Volume 5 Issue 2, December 2013

ISSN: 1989-8525



Iberia

an International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics

Book review

The Syntax of Tuki: A Cartographic Approach. By Edmond Biloa. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2013. Pp. xxiv + 611. ISBN 9789027255860

José Miguel Ruiz Villaécija
Universidad de Sevilla
jrui16@us.es



Volume 5.2, 2013 90-104

ISSN: 1989-8525

doi:tba

The Iberia logo is positioned in the bottom right corner. It features a stylized, curved graphic composed of vertical stripes in blue, green, yellow, and red, resembling a flag or a wing. Below this graphic, the word "Iberia" is written in a bold, white, sans-serif font against a dark blue background.

Iberia



Book Review

***The Syntax of Tuki: A Cartographic Approach.* By Edmond Biloa.**
Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2013. Pp. xxiv + 611. ISBN
9789027255860

Reviewed by **José Miguel Ruiz Villaécija** (Universidad de Sevilla)

The present book offers a syntactic study of Tuki, a Bantu language spoken in Cameroon, from a cartographic perspective. Particularly, it scrutinizes the three domains of syntax, namely the Complementizer Domain, the Inflectional Domain and the Verbal Domain. The author points out that the aim of this cartographic analysis is to update our morphosyntactic knowledge of UG clausal architecture by showing that its rich underlying structural skeleton is associated with a wealthy surface structural and functional map.

This monograph is organized into 16 chapters. To be more precise, Chapter 1, **Introduction** (pp. 1-33), is brief; it provides a summary and overview of the cartographic approach as well as an outline for the remaining chapters.

Meanwhile, Chapter 2, **Clause Structure** (pp. 34-92), describes the structure of the Tuki clause. Before that is done, some background information is provided about the language genetic classification and its noun class system. According to Biloa, Tuki is spoken in Cameroon. Cameroon languages represent the three linguistic families which cover Africa. Specifically, it is argued that the Tuki language belongs to one of these families, that is, the Niger Kordofan linguistic family. In accordance with the *Atlas Linguistique du Cameroun* (1995), there are seven dialects of Tuki: Tungoro, Tukombe, Tonjo, Tocenga, Tutsingo, Tumblele and Leti. Regarding nouns, the author claims that they consist of a prefix and a stem. More concretely, the nominal prefixes are either singular or plural. Nevertheless, not all classes exhibit singular/plural pairs of prefixes. Besides, each of the noun classes for Tuki has a specific class marker and a specific agreement marker which is a verbal prefix. Such a verbal prefix is called the subject marker (SM). In line with Mutaka & Tamanji (2000), there are two types of nominal forms: the underived nouns and the derived nouns. The last ones are so called because they usually derive from verbs. As far as verb morphology is concerned, it is considered that Tuki contains six basic tenses: Past III, Past II, Past I or Today past, Present, Future I and Future II. In the same way, the basic features of the aspectual system are [completive] and [habitual]. In this sense, verbs in Tuki include prefixes and suffixes. Tuki infinitive verb prefixes are [o] and [w]. To achieve reflexivization, it is said that we must prefix the reflexive morpheme /a-/ meaning “self” to the root of the verb. Meanwhile, Tuki infinitive verb suffixes are [a] and [o]. In this case, the suffix /-iy/ triggers causative formation and the suffix /-na/ conveys the meaning

of the English anaphor “each other”. Moreover, the author suggests that subject markers agree in noun class with the subject they accompany. However, object markers in Tuki are only applicable to humans. Object markers for inanimates are expressed by zero morpheme.

Biloa holds that the basic word order of Tuki is SVO. Furthermore, he argues that this language is a null subject or a pro-drop language. In the same way, it is proposed that thematic object positions are freely droppable. This chapter presents the structure of the Tuki verb, which is made of the following constituents: the subject marker (SM), the negation morpheme, the tense marker, the object marker (OM), the verb stem and the final vowel. In this connection, the researcher shows that the subject of tensed and infinitive sentences may remain unexpressed. In particular, Rizzi (1982) claims that the empty category in subject position of Tuki tensed clauses (*pro*) can be interpreted as free or specific, whereas PRO (the infinitive null subject) may never have that interpretation except when it is controlled by some other NP. Contra Jelinek’s Pronominal Argument Hypothesis (PAH), the author states that Tuki is a pronominal argument language. In other words, Jelinek holds that pronominal argument languages do not have anaphors and do not have *pro*. However, it is argued that *pro* and anaphors exist in Tuki. As a matter of fact, Jelinek’s prediction, i.e. pronominal elements must be related to each argument position in the clause in a given language, is borne out in Tuki, as the subject position and the direct object position have their relationships with the verb encoded by a S(ubject) M(arker) and O(bject) M(arker). In addition, Tuki is said to have strong pronouns, that is, subject markers agreeing in noun class with the nominal subject. They constitute AGR-S. The author thus concludes that in Tuki AGR-S can properly govern the subject position. In this way, the verbal morphology is rich enough to make null subjects recoverable semantically though they are phonologically empty. In this framework, the lack of COMP-trace effects in Tuki is expected under the assumption that the language is a null subject one. In this sense, all extractions from subject position in Tuki are acceptable due to the fact that Agr-S licenses the variable in subject position. Regarding predicate cleft constructions, the focused verb appears in clause initial position and it is accompanied by a focus marker. Besides, the author makes a distinction between simple and complex sentences. Simple sentences are divided into: SVA, SVC, SVO, SVOA, SVOC, SVOO and SV. Coordination and subordination are two syntactic operations that are used to derive complex sentences. A number of words are used for coordination in Tuki: *veda*, *kee*, *na/ka* and *ku*. The author also identifies the indicators of subordination: simple subordinators, the lexical complementizer and *wh*-items. Moreover, it is assumed that Tuki *wh*-items are involved in interrogative formation. More concretely, question formation makes use of two strategies: visible movement and *wh*-in-situ. In the case of yes/no questions, they are in-

roduced by what is called a Q morpheme. As for the processes of Focalization and Topicalization, any element within the sentence can be focalized or topicalized. Furthermore, it is indicated that resumptive pronouns are attested in Tuki. Following Sells (1984a, 1984b, 1987), resumptive pronouns are pronouns which appear in *wh*-movement constructions and which are directly bound by the operator. Finally, it is shown that the domain for anaphor binding and the domain for pronominal non reference are not the same, although overlapping is sometimes possible.

In addition, Chapter 3, **The Order of Clausal Functional Heads** (pp. 93-124), tries to determine the order of clausal functional heads in Tuki. In this connection, Biloa argues that tense is marked through the used of bound morphemes. So, the past tense one is expressed by the morpheme /mu/, the past tense two by /má/, the past tense three by /mà/, the present tense by the absence of an overtly realised morpheme and by the occurrence at the end of the verb of an incomplete aspectual morpheme /m/, the future tense one by /nú/ and the incomplete aspectual morpheme /m/ and the future tense two by /mú/ and the incomplete aspectual marker /m/. In the same way, it is claimed that aspect is marked by verbal affixes. In this case, an attempt is made at defining each aspect as it relates specifically to the Tuki data. Moreover, the author states that in this language only one tense marker is allowed per clause, whereas several combinations of aspectual morphemes (in a fixed order) are possible. As far as mood is concerned, it is analyzed the sequencing of modality on Tuki and studied the sets of modal operators attested in the language: mood markers (the marker of condition *ngi* “if, whether” and the marker of time adjunct clause *ara* “when”) and modal auxiliaries. In this respect, the author makes clear that modal auxiliaries can co-occur side by side in a specific order as well as with tense and aspect. Furthermore, he proposes that the elements identified so far head maximal projections, that is, tense markers head tense phrases (TP), aspectual markers aspect phrases (AspP) and modal verb phrases (VP). Lastly, we must make a distinction between root and epistemic modality. In particular, it is suggested that the interpretation of modal verbs is context sensitive and a given reading may turn out to be weak or strong depending on the relationship between participants or the linguistic environment.

In this connection, Chapter 4, **Adverbs** (pp. 125-176), delves into the linear order of adverbs in Tuki with special reference to Cinque’s (1999) seminal work on adverbs and functional heads from a crosslinguistic perspective. Cinque proposes that there is a universal hierarchy of functional heads. He claims that adverbs and functional elements always occupy specific positions in this hierarchy. More concretely, he determines the order of clausal functional heads by analyzing bound and free morphological inflection. In this case, a comparison of the two hierarchies shows that they match semantically. Later, Biloa dissects the architecture of

the clause in Tuki. Specifically, the author makes reference to X-bar theory. In addition, he suggests that IP (Chomsky 1986) must be decomposed to give birth to AgrP (Chomsky 1991). Then, it is considered the relative order of classes of lower adverbial phrases (AdvPs): muka “only” > tama nĩgma “always” > wánda wimá “everything” > pε “completely” > ifúndu “much” > wusi “well”. Most of them occur in post verbal positions. Similarly, it is established a hierarchy of higher AdvPs: bebere “frankly” > na visangena “happily” > koo buki “certainly” > tete odzu “now” > yongosi “perhaps” > na peyo “intelligently”. However, some of them cannot be included in any hierarchy due to their erratic behaviour: space time adverbs, domain adverbs and adverbs of setting. In this connection, an ordered sequence of higher adverbs precedes an ordered sequence of lower adverbs that occur at the end of the VP bearing nuclear or focus stress. According to the author, several AdvPs can be topicalized in Tuki. As far as adverb movement is concerned, it is argued that Tuki patterns with Dutch, French and Italian (Rizzi 2004; Koster 1978; Schlyter 1974). Regarding the structure of the left periphery, the author states that the C system in Tuki can espouse the following configuration: ForceP > IntP > (ModP) > TopP > FocP > ModP > FinP > AgrP. Meanwhile, Biloa suggests that circumstantial adverbials, as opposed to the other AdvPs, are not rigidly ordered with respect to each other. And they are realized either in prepositional form or in bare NP form. Semantically, they seem to behave as “modifiers predicated of an underlying event variable” (Cinque 1999). Syntactically, they are shown to occupy the specifier position of VP. Finally, the author examines focusing and parenthetical uses of AdvPs. In particular, he suggests that some adverbs can precede and modify a constituent or even a clause. Following Cinque (1999), these adverbs should be treated like heads that take their modifies as complements (cf. Bayer 1996).

In relation to Chapter 5, **Null Subjects, Identification and Proper Government** (pp. 177-198), it provides evidence that the answer to the pro-drop dilemma is morphological uniformity in inflectional paradigms. Biloa delves into the analysis of INFL in Tuki. He holds that empty subject positions exist in Tuki. To be more precise, it is assumed that AGR-S properly governs the subject position, thereby licensing the occurrence of null subjects without any ECP violation. In this respect, Jaeggli & Saffir (1989) claim that the licensing condition accounting for the lack of thematic null subjects is not rich agreement, but rather “morphological uniformity”. Tuki is precisely a morphologically uniform language because its verbal paradigm exhibits *stem+affix*. Therefore, Tuki satisfies one of the conditions of null subjecthood. Since in Tuki, agreement affixes are compulsory in verbal constructions, Jaeggli & Saffir assume that *pro* in subject position will always be identified.

Similarly, Chapter 6, **Null Objects and the Pro-Drop Parameter** (pp. 199-224), determines the characteristics of Tuki null objects. The object drop phenomenon is subject to certain constraints in the language: [-human] definite object NPs can be dropped in Tuki, while [+human] definite direct object NPs cannot. On the contrary, indefinite NPs can be dropped irrespective of whether they are [+human] or [-human]. Besides, Biloa provides arguments that null object constructions in Tuki are immune to Subjacency, thereby disqualifying any suggestion that they may be variables formed as a result of Move Alpha. Constraints such as the Complex NP Constraint, the Sentential Subject Constraint, the Condition on Extraction Domain, the *Wh*-island Constraint, the Doubly Filled COMP filter, are systematically shown to be inoperative in Tuki object drop constructions. In this sense, the author holds that null objects in Tuki are base-generated at D-structure as *pro*. Their object markers would be phonetically realized if their linguistic or discourse antecedent is [+human]. Furthermore, it is claimed that null objects pattern with null subjects with respect to Binding possibilities. In fact, both null arguments patten with phonetically realized NP's, validating thereby the existence of empty categories. In this connection, it is argued that, when a direct object is dropped, an object marker identifies the empty category in post-predicate position, much in the same way as AGR-S identifies the empty category that occurs in subject position of tensed clauses. Finally, the analysis of Tuki object drop constructions is compared to the studies of null object constructions in other languages. Specifically, previous analyses of null objects in Chinese, Kinande and Portuguese may not be valid for Tuki.

Regarding Chapter 7, **A-Bar Bound pro** (pp. 225-288), it reveals that the behaviour of resumptive pronouns is subject to cross-linguistic variation. In English resumptive pronouns and gaps behave differently with respect to operator-binding. Gaps can be interpreted as operator-bound variables whereas pronouns cannot. On the contrary, Tuki shows no difference in interpretation between gaps and pronouns. In this respect, Biloa states that unlike [+human] *wh*-elements, [-human] ones can only be associated with an empty category. He also claims that relativization in Tuki seems to constitute a case of resumptive pronoun binding since Subjacency is freely violated. In this connection, it is posited that *wh*-phrases and relative pronouns are base-generated in FocP and CP respectively in Tuki constructions involving resumptive pronoun binding. Moreover, the author suggests that full resumptive pronouns as well as gaps do no exhibit weak crossover effects in Tuki; this constitutes further evidence that these gaps are pronominal. As a matter of fact, the basic pronoun facts of Tuki do not constitute an isolated case in linguistic theory. Furthermore, the proposal that Tuki resumptive pronouns are syntactically bound at S-structure is supported by the analysis of anaphoric binding. Indeed, Biloa identifies a correlation between movement and reconstruc-



tion. He holds that the reconstruction process precedes the establishment of a c-command relation between a variable and an antecedent. In this sense, it is argued that apparent violations of Bounding Theory in Tuki do not involve trace binding but involve resumptive-pronoun-binding, and *wh*-phrases are base-generated in clause-initial position in those cases. Tuki constructions in which resumptive pronouns are not involved would obey Subjacency. As for the properties of *wh*-phrases in-situ, it is assumed that selectional needs of Tuki verbs must be satisfied at LF. Additionally, the author suggests that Tuki obeys Subjacency both in the Syntax and LF because question formation is a genuine strategy at these levels of representation. Meanwhile, it is shown that in Egyptian Arabic (EA) *wh*-questions traces left by S-structure extraction of *wh*-phrases are necessarily phonetically realized as resumptive pronouns. More concretely, evidence suggests that genuine movement is involved in EA *wh*-questions since the relationship between the *wh*-phrases and their associated resumptive pronouns is constrained by Bounding Theory. By contrast, Biloa proposes that relativization and topicalization in EA are immune to Subjacency. He considers that the *wh*-phrase and the resumptive pronoun are base-generated in their respective positions. Then, it is proved that Subjacency is a condition on movement. The author also demonstrates that although Tuki allows Across-the-Board extraction, it does not violate the Coordinate Structure Constraint. In the same way, he considers that NP coordination in Tuki is simply a case of Comitative Coordination Structure, rather than a violation of the Coordinate Structure Constraint. The connector *na* is a preposition-comitative marker which does not allow Preposition Stranding in the language. Later, Biloa makes a contrast between variables created at S-structure and variables created at LF. Resumptive pronouns, null or overt, are semantic variables bound at S-structure by elements in A-bar position; whereas formal variables are those created by LF-movement of *wh*-elements in-situ and quantifiers. More precisely, it is proved that semantic variables do not exhibit weak crossover effects in Tuki at S-structure. Tuki would exhibit weak crossover effects only at LF. In addition, the author introduces Linking Theory which represents the assignment of the antecedent relation between two positions. Linking, however, differs from the antecedent relation in some respects. Indeed, Linking is regulated by a number of formal properties and conditions. To account for the contrast between the absence of weak crossover effects for S-structure variable-binding and the presence of weak crossover effects for LF variable binding, Biloa holds that formal variables do not license the bound reading of an overt pronoun. In other words, it seems to be the case that for an overt pronoun to be bound it has to be linked to a semantic variable. As mentioned before, weak crossover effects are nonexistent in Tuki at S-structure. The reason is that gaps in Tuki constructions are non-overt resumptive pronouns (and therefore semantic variables) rather than formal variables.

As for Chapter 8, **Null Arguments, Agreement, Movement and Configurationality** (pp. 289-326), it examines the relationship between agreement and dislocation in Tuki. Biloa states that dislocation is induced by the presence of agreement when objects are referential NPs in Tuki. In the same way, he provides evidence that agreed-with subjects are dislocated in Tuki and are left adjoined to AgrP. Dislocated object may adjoin to the specifier position of TopP, adopting the split-CP hypothesis proposed by Rizzi (1997, 2001, 2004). Consequently, the Tuki data is *prima facie* proof that Jelinek's Pronominal Argument Hypothesis (PAH) and Baker's (1996, 2003) claim that dislocation is inherently related to the presence of agreement in some languages are on the right track. Following Baker (2003), subjects occur in the Comp domain in null subject languages (NSLs). Nevertheless, Cardinaletti (2004) rejects the left-dislocation analysis for a number of reasons. Meanwhile, Miyagawa (2010) considers that agreement takes place to establish a functional relation, that is, a relation between a nominal and a functional head such as C, T, or V. In this sense, Miyagawa makes a distinction between discourse-configurational languages and agreement languages. Despite this, he claims that all languages have essentially the same grammatical features. As a matter of fact, Miyagawa states that in discourse-configurational languages, topic/focus plays the same role as ϕ -feature agreement: both establish a functional relation. Specifically, he suggests that topic/focus and ϕ -feature agreement are both merged on a phase head (C) and that the probe is inherited by T. The topic/focus feature would be inherited by T in a discourse-configurational language. Regarding Bantu languages, Miyagawa posits that ϕ -probe occur higher than Spec, TP, i.e. in Spec, α P. However, Biloa argues that the latter should be called AgrP (Agr_s or Agr_o, depending on the context of occurrence). In this way, the occurrence of agreement prefixes can be accounted for. As for case assignment, Biloa posits that in Tuki Agr_s assigns nominative case to the grammatical subject, while Agr_o assigns accusative case to the direct object, assuming that T raises to Agr_s and V raises to Agr_o. Finally, it is demonstrated that although Tuki is a configurational language, it shares with non-configurational languages the fact that focus and topic are morphologically marked.

Later, Chapter 9, **DP Structure and Concord** (pp. 327-380), analyses the DP structure and concord in Tuki. Tuki is devoid of definite, indefinite and partitive articles. Its bare nouns can occur freely in argument positions and can receive an indefinite and a definite interpretation. In this connection, Biloa states that when the substantive is recoverable from the context, the possessive/demonstrative determiner can be used alone and it refers to the precedingly used noun. He suggests that in Tuki the possessive/demonstrative determiner follows the noun it modifies and agrees with it in noun class. Furthermore, the author argues that possessive determiners and lexical genitives have an identical structure. More concretely, he

considers that possessive determiners are generated inside a GenP. Besides, it is stated that possessive and demonstrative determiners can either precede or follow nouns, depending on the context of occurrence. Then, Biloa describes the distribution of locative reinforcers in Tuki when they occur inside a DP containing a demonstrative determiner. Locative adverbials supposedly behave like adverbial adjuncts. Specifically, a locative reinforcer in Bantu languages would indicate the location of a given object with respect to the positions of the speaker and the listener. Following Rizzi (2004), it is assumed that the locative reinforcer is hosted by ModP. As for the structure of the Tuki DP with a demonstrative determiner and a locative reinforcer, the correct word order in ordinary contexts would be N-D-Mod (Adv). Biloa argues that in Tuki more than one determiner may modify the noun. In particular, he claims that the possessive determiner always precedes the demonstrative determiner. When both determiners follow the head noun, it would be impossible for the determiner to precede the possessive. Moreover, the author holds that the locative reinforcer can co-occur with the two determiners, thereby deriving the following word order: N-Poss-Dem-Adv. However, the possessive determiner could be focalized. In this way, the DP would be structured as follows: Poss-N-Dem-Adv. Similarly, the noun or the unit formed by the noun and the possessive could also be focalized. Another possible word order in Tuki would be N-Dem-Poss. In this case, the NP containing the demonstrative determinant is focused. According to Biloa, the word order N-Poss-Dem-Dem is equally attested in the language. He states that such an order is rigidly fixed. Nevertheless, he suggests that in a DP containing a head noun followed by three determiners and a locative reinforcer, it is possible for the head noun to be focalized. Biloa claims that the Tuki noun phrases may contain a noun, a numeral, a possessive determiner, a demonstrative determiner, a locative reinforcer. In line with Aboh (2004), Biloa argues that NPs agree in noun class with the inflectional domain that is made up of the modifiers (the numeral adjective, the possessive determiner and the demonstrative determiner). More precisely, the author establishes the universal base order from which all DP-structures should be derived: noun-adjective-numeral-possessive-demonstrative-locative reinforcer. For the head noun to be front initial entails that it raised into that position by movement. In this sense, Biloa claims that the Tuki nominal system is derived by cyclic and snowballing movement. As far as postnominal adjectives are concerned, the author holds that they are derived in the same way as nominal modifiers, that is, they merge to the specifier position of a functional projection. It is also considered that when one of the determiners is focused, it moves to the specifier position of the FocP.

Additionally, Chapter 10, **Adjectives and the Split – DP Structure** (pp. 381-406), examines adjectival ordering restrictions in Tuki. First, Biloa attempts to provide a plausible description of pre-nominal adjectives that show agreement

with the noun they modify. In this respect, the author indicates that the specifier-based analysis can account for the hierarchical order of adjectives. Besides, he holds that pied-piping movement with snowballing effects cannot be limited to a one-step move within NP in Tuki. Then, he talks about adjectives that occur postnominally and that do not show concord with the N they modify. It is stated that these adjectives are merged as the left specifier of some functional projection. Specifically, they occur in postnominal position because nouns move leftward. In addition, the author analyses the interaction between pronominal and postnominal adjectives. In particular, the study of the placement of pronominal and postnominal Tuki adjectives suggests the following typology and classification of adjectives occurring in their canonical sequential order: $Adj_{size} > Adj_{quality} > Adj_{age} > Adj_{shape/height} > Noun > Adj_{nationality/origin} > Adj_{color} > Adj_{quantification}$. Finally, it is argued that verbal adjectives behave like postnominal attributive adjectives, with the exception that they do not show class/number agreement with the nouns they modify.

As far as Chapter 11 is concerned, **The Cartography of the Left Periphery** (pp. 407-476), it scans the cartography of the left periphery in Tuki. Evidence is provided that in Tuki, *wh*-items move to the specifier position of a headed constituent focus phrase. More concretely, the structure of focus sentences is discussed. Then, it is shown that the structure of matrix/embedded *wh*-questions is very similar to the structure of focus sentences in Tuki. In this case, Biloa observes the agreement relation that obtains between the fronted *wh*-word and the focus word. To formalize such a relation, he introduces the SPEC-Head Agreement Hypothesis. In this way, all unvalued features are valued and all uninterpreted features deleted. According to the author, the focus word is base-generated in the head position of FocP. Moreover, he highlights that the semantic structure of *wh*-questions and focussing constructions seems to be the same although the performative involved is different in both cases. Biloa also provides evidence that cleft constructions and content *wh*-questions share the same presuppositional structure as well as the same sentential structure in Tuki. As for the ForceP in Tuki, the author makes reference to the split CP hypothesis proposed by Rizzi (1997, 2001, 2003). In addition, the author indicates that a maximal projection dominating ForceP hosts a null operator and an agreeing word in Tuki relatives. This projection is called Relative Phrase (RelP). In this connection, it is claimed that the strategy available for Tuki relativization is Head-raising (promotion). In other words, the head of the relative clause would be interpreted as if it was in the gap position inside the relative clause. In the same way, in Tuki topicalized constituents substitute for the specifier position of TopicP. Specifically, it is stated that the CP system in Tuki has the following structure: $RelP > ForceP > FocP > TopP > AgrP$. Regarding embedded yes/no questions, it is assumed that there is a position called

Int(errogative) P(hrase) that is dominated by ForceP. The element *ngi* “if” would occupy the head of IntP. To be more precise, the following two positional sequences could be attested in Tuki: ForceP > IntP > FocP > TopP or ForceP > IntP > TopP > FocP. Similarly, Tuki yes/no questions in matrix and embedded contexts can be formed by the question morpheme *yee*. It would be hosted by Int and the null question operator would occupy Spec, IntP. Biloa holds that *ngi* is in complementary distribution with *yee*. Another question morpheme, *aa*, which occurs clause finally, is said to occupy the head of IntP. In this case, it is suggested that the derivation of yes/no questions involves the pied-piping and remnant movement of AgrP into Spec, IntP for the satisfaction of EPP (Roberts 1993, 2001) and the Extension Condition (Chomsky 1993, Koopman & Szabolcsi 2000). It is also claimed that in Tuki indirect yes-no questions function just like direct yes-no questions. Based on Rizzi’s (2004) work and on Cinque’s (1999) analysis, it is argued that adverbs, be they preposed or IP-internal, are licensed in the specifier of a dedicated head called Mod(ifier). A left peripheral adverb would precede and dominate a FocP and a TopP but it can never do so with a *wh*-phrase.

With respect to Chapter 12, **Arguments, Adjuncts and Relativized Minimality** (pp. 477-496), it delves into the behaviour of *wh*-arguments and *wh*-adjuncts in Tuki. According to Biloa, Rizzi (1990) proposes a relativized version of the Minimality Condition. In this system there are two ways to connect an operator and its variable; binding links arguments and their traces whereas government links an adjunct and its variable. Furthermore, it is demonstrated that *wh*-elements in Tuki do not exhibit any subject/object asymmetry. Therefore, they are immune to COMP-trace effects. More precisely, Tuki is immune to COMP-trace effects because the variable created by *wh*-extraction in subject position is properly governed by Agr-S. As for *wh*-in-situ-elements, Biloa shows that Tuki licenses the occurrence of multiple *wh*-arguments and *wh*-adjuncts in situ. He considers that at LF *wh*-phrases in Tuki move into the specifier of FocP. In this connection, the author highlights that when a *wh*-argument and a *wh*-adjunct occur in the same embedded context, the argument is more likely to have a matrix scope reading than the adjunct. Rizzi’s theory accommodates Biloa’s perception that the hierarchy of adjunction is irrelevant at LF.

Then, Chapter 13, **Focus-V-Movement, Predicate Doubling and Parallel Chains** (pp. 497-544), analyses Focus-V-Movement in Tuki. In this language, Focus-V-Movement is expressed by placing a verb in clause-initial position. As Biloa notes, the focused verb may not carry none of the inflectional morphology that appears on tensed verbs. He also indicates that when a focused is moved to clause initial position, its complement cannot follow it. Adverbs can, however, follow the focused verb to clause initial position showing that they are incorporated into it. In line with the present paper, a syntactically raised *wh*-element and

a focused verb may not occur in the same clause, suggesting that syntactic *Wh*-Movement and Focus-V-Movement substitute items to the same position. Indeed, both of them are subject to the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint and the *Wh*-island Constraint. Besides, Biloa holds that *Wh*-Movement and Predicate clefting in Tuki are substitution for a maximal projection rather than adjunction to a maximal projection. In other words, Focus-V-Movement is substitution for the specifier position of a headed constituent focus phrase. To accommodate the Tuki empirical material, it is proposed the Specifier Identity Condition (SIC) that assumes that specifiers of functional maximal projections are neutral with regard to the grammatical function of categories they might be called to host. Specifically, the SIC allows the movement of a head to the specifier position of a maximal projection. Moreover, it is highlighted that the verb raises from VP and adjoins to INFL, that is, to the incomplete/completive aspect marker. Following Nunes (2004), predicate-doubling is a PF-phenomenon conditioned by morphological reanalysis (MR). All the offending copies must be eliminated so that a nontrivial chain is made up of the fronted verb and the IP-internal copy of the verb. These two copies would differ with respect to Morphology. To avoid mixed chains, it is proposed that A and A'-chain be built in parallel. Due to economy considerations, the A-chain contains no pronounced copy. More concretely, it is emphasized that predicate fronting with doubling is an instance of parallel chains whereby the same copy of the verb simultaneously checks the features of two different probes within the INFL and the C domain. As a matter of fact, Biloa comments that in Tuki predicate doubling with fronting is derived in such a way that the V is goalled towards two probes: Asp and Spec, Foc. Regarding other languages, Jon Ortiz De Urbina (1988) indicates that in Basque both *wh*-words and focalized items move in the Syntax to the specifier of CP. He analyses the preverbal position of these operators as an instance of the V-second (V2) phenomenon. Besides, he demonstrates that the verb too can be focalized in Basque. In this case, the Basque data is pretty much similar to the Tuki. However, following Baltin (1991), in Chinese the questioned verb moves to CP at LF. Biloa also claims that V raising to Spec is tolerated while N raising is strictly disallowed. More precisely, V is assigned neither case nor theta-role, consequently it can be raised to the specifier of a functional maximal projection. N, on the other hand, must be assigned both case and theta-role and thus cannot be fronted without violating Case Theory and Theta Theory. Later, it is said that when a *wh*-phrase raises to FocP in Tuki, the latter position is an A'-position; when a focused verb moves to FocP, this landing site is then a V'-position. In this respect, although *Wh*-constructions allow empty categories to be bound by elements in A'-positions, Focus-V-Movement constructions do not license empty

verbal categories. Biloa appeals to Lasnik's (1981) No-Free-Affix Principle to explain the Tuki verb-focusing phenomena. It is assumed that a copy of the verb is inserted to support inflectional heads.

Taking into account Chapter 14, **Anaphora and Binding** (pp. 545-558), it examines the ways in which anaphora and binding operate in Tuki. In such a language, the governing category for an NP could be IP or NP. In addition, Biloa argues that AGR counts as SUBJECT in the determination of a governing category for pronouns in Tuki and does not count as SUBJECT for determining the governing category for anaphors. Hence, the governing category for anaphors is not always identical to the governing category for pronouns. Nevertheless, Biloa considers that INFL is a proper governor in Tuki. In this sense, it is assumed with Chomsky (1986) that the least 'complete functional complex' (CFC) for an anaphor or a pronoun is the minimal governing category (MGC) in which the binding theory is satisfied by some indexing. As a consequence, the concept of 'accessible subject' and the notion of AGR as a binder are discarded.

As regards Chapter 15, **Bound Variables** (pp. 559-580), it studies the relationship between quantificationally bound pronouns, whose antecedents are quantificational, and referential pronouns, whose antecedents are names. Pronouns of which the antecedents are names are called referential pronoun. Biloa highlights that a pronoun must be free in its minimal domain. In particular, he notes that bound pronouns in Tuki behave as referential pronouns. In other words, the binding requirement governing bound pronouns in Tuki parallels the binding requirement governing referential pronouns. Adopting the framework devised by Aoun & Li (1990), it is suggested that the interpretation of Tuki pronominals is regulated by an A-disjointness requirement and a minimal disjointness requirement. A bound pronoun must be free in its minimal domain, whereas a referential pronoun must be free in its local domain. Following Lebeaux (1983) and Chomsky (1986), it is claimed that Tuki long distance lexical anaphors must raise at LF, thereby satisfying the minimality principle. On the contrary, short distance anaphors in Tuki do not raise at LF, and are strictly bound to the first available antecedent.

In the final chapter of the book, **Conclusion** (pp. 581-582), Biloa summarizes the main points of the preceding chapters.

Without a doubt, the monograph in its entirety is inspiring. Biloa offers an important contribution to the cartographic analysis, corroborating previously observed generalizations and discovering new patterns through the peculiarities of Tuki. In this sense, the careful study of a wide range of constructions in Tuki and its relevance for our understanding of the syntax of this language makes this research fairly valuable. Moreover, the general discussion is extremely good, suggesting interesting directions for future investigation.



The style of writing is clear and well organized. The topic of each chapter is presented in the context of the big picture, and subsections are outlined in advance, later summarized. There is some cross-referencing between subsections of different chapters, as some issues cannot be resolved all at once. The language is near perfect, with a good balance of technical terms and idiomatic expressions. However, it's the reviewer's opinion that, independent of the quality of the chapters, the relevant monograph is more suitable for graduate students and perhaps advanced undergraduates.

Finally, a few minor criticisms are also in order. For instance, some editing errors can be found in the monograph, especially in the reference section. An additional problem is that Chapter 2 does not have a conclusion, which prevents the reader from having a real sense of achievement in this case. Nevertheless, all the other chapters consist of a specific and appropriate conclusion. In this way, the reader is not forced to re-scan the chapters to find their main points, sometimes buried in the middle of the sections. Definitely, worth one's time.

References

Aboh, Enoch O. 2004. *The Morphosyntax of Complement – Head Sequences*. Oxford: OUP.

Aoun, Joseph & Audrey Li. 1990. Minimal Disjointness. *Linguistics* 28, 189-203.

Baker, Mark. 1996. *The Polysynthesis Parameter*. Oxford: OUP.

Baker, Mark. 2003. *Lexical Categories: Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives*. Cambridge: CUP.

Baltin, Mark .1991. Head Movement in Logical Form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22 (2), 225-250.

Bayer, Josef. 1996. *Directionality and Logical Form: On the Scope of Focusing Particles and Wh-in-situ*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Cardinaletti, Anna. 2004. Towards a Cartography of Subject Positions. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP*. 115-165. Oxford: OUP.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1991. Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation. In Robert Freidin (ed.), *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory. In Kenneth Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvian Bromberger* [Current Studies in Linguistics]. 1-52. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: OUP.
- Jaeggli, Osvalvo & Kenneth Saffir. 1989. *The Null Subject Parameter and Parametric Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Jelinek, Eloise. 1984. Empty Categories, Case and Configurationality. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2, 39-76.
- Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Szabolcsi. 2000. The Position of Subjects. *Lingua* 85, 211-258.
- Koster, Jan. 1978. *Locality Principles in Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1981. On Two Recent Treatments of Disjoint Reference. *Journal of Linguistic Research* 1 (4), 48-58.
- Lebeaux, David. 1983. A Distributional Difference between Reciprocals and Reflexives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14 (4), 723-730.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Why Agree? Why Move? Unifying Agreement-based and Discourse Configurational Languages* [Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 54]. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Mutaka, Nguessimo & Pius Tamanji. 2000. *An Introduction to African Linguistics*. Munich: Lincom.
- Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Ortiz De Urbina, Jon. 1988. Perpauz Ez-Tenporalizatuak Euskaraz. In Pello Salaburu (ed.), *Sintaxi Arazoak*. EUH/UPV, Bilbao.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982 *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality* [Linguistic Inquiry Monograph]. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the Position Interrogative in the Left Periphery of the Clause. In Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax*. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2003. On the Form of Chains: Criterial Positions and ECP Effects. To appear in Lisa L. Cheng & Norbert Corver (eds.), *On Wh Movement*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Vol. 2. Oxford: OUP.



- Roberts, Ian. 1993. Agreement and Object Clitics in Franco-Provencal Valdotain. *GenGenP* 1, 31-41.
- Roberts, Ian. 2001. Head Movement. In Mark Baltin & Chris Collins (eds.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*. 113-147. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Schlyter, Suzanne. 1974. Une Hiérarchie d'Adverbes et Leurs Distributions – Par Quelles Transformations? In Christian Rohrer & Nicolas Ruwet (eds.), *Actes du Colloque Franco-Allemand de Grammaire Transformationnelle*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Sells, Peter. 1984a. Resumptive Pronouns and Weak Crossover. In Mark Cobler, Susannah Mckaye & Michael T. Wescoat (eds.), *Proceedings of West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics 3*. 252-262. Stanford CA: GSLI.
- Sells, Peter. 1984b. *Syntax and Semantics of Resumptive Pronouns*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Sells, Peter. 1987. Binding Resumptive Pronouns. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10 (3), 261-298.

Reviewer

José Miguel Ruiz Villaécija
Universidad de Sevilla
jrui16@us.es