

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 1, June 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 editors

Victoria Camacho-Taboada, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain
Pedro J. Carrillo-Gomez, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Copy editors

Roberto Cuadros, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain
Megan Devlin, University of Ulster, UK
Frances Kane, University of Ulster, UK
Cristine Schaetz, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain
Rebecca Woods, University of York, UK

Proofreaders

Roberto Cuadros, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain
Mercedes Tubino Blanco, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Translators

Cristine Schaetz, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain
Mercedes Tubino Blanco, 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

Mailing Address

Facultad de Filología
Universidad de Sevilla
C/ Palos de la Fra. s/n
41004 Sevilla (Spain)

Support Contact

Pedro J. Carrillo-Gomez
Phone (+34) 620 581 485
pedrocarrillo@gmail.com

Volume 5 Issue 1, June 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
Luigi 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

Volume 5 Issue 1, June 2013

ISSN: 1989-8525

Iberia

an International Journal *of* Theoretical Linguistics

Book Review

Franco, Irene, Sara Lusini & Andrés Saab (eds.),
Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2010.
Selected papers from 'Going Romance' Leiden 2010
Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2012.

Francesca Ramaglia

Università degli Studi Roma Tre
francesca.ramaglia@uniroma3.it



Volume 5.1, 2013, 126-139

ISSN: 1989-8525

doi: tba

Iberia

Book review

Franco, Irene, Sara Lusini & Andrés Saab (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2010. Selected papers from 'Going Romance' Leiden 2010* [Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory, Vol. 4]. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2012. Pp. viii + 223. ISBN 9789027203847.

This volume proposes a collection of selected contributions to *Going Romance 24*, which was held at Leiden University from December 9-10, 2010 (preceded by a thematic workshop on Morphosyntax-Phonology interface theories).

This selection includes ten contributions (one by the invited speaker Maria Rita Manzini), six of which are co-authored, out of approximately 30 papers presented at the conference. They deal with several topics of research, which are addressed from diverse theoretical approaches and are concerned with recent proposals in different levels of linguistic analysis.

In what follows, a description of each paper will be provided, in which particular attention will be paid to the significance of the issues addressed in the field of Romance linguistics and for linguistic theory in general. The final part presents a general discussion and evaluation of the volume in a wider perspective.

In the first paper, **“From Romance clitics to case: Split accusativity and the Person Case Constraint”** (pp. 1-19), **Maria Rita Manzini** addresses the notion of Case, pointing out the inadequacy of its treatment within the Minimalist framework, where it is considered either as a formal (uninterpretable) feature (Chomsky 1995) or as a form of agreement (Chomsky 2008). The author thus proposes an analysis of Case as an elementary predicate/operator (cf. Manzini & Savoia 2011 and subsequent works). In particular, it is argued that dative Case (and oblique Case in general) instantiates an inclusion (i.e., part-whole) relation (notated as ‘ \subseteq ’), which basically corresponds to ‘possession’. Specifically, this relation is implemented by a $Q(\subseteq)$ operator, taking the possessor as its internal argument, the possessee being its external argument (for an analysis of ditransitive structures in terms of possession, cf. Kayne 1984).

The paper thus concentrates on dative Case, and in particular on the realization of clitic pronouns in Romance: in these languages an asymmetry can be observed between 3rd person (having two separate lexicalizations for accusative and dative) and 1st/2nd person (presenting a single dative-like lexicalization). This phenomenon is included among the numerous issues concerning the interaction between Case and person/animacy (cf. Dixon 1979, Aissen 2003), and is therefore addressed in terms of split accusativity, or Differential Object Marking (DOM). More specifically, it is proposed that the accusative-dative syncretism found in numerous languages for 1st/2nd person

(clitic) pronouns is not a matter of the morphological component but relies on the underlying syntactic structure, which is therefore claimed to make a distinction between 1st/2nd and 3rd person, based on empirical grounds. In particular, it is argued that 1st/2nd person object clitics are embedded as datives (i.e., they include the $Q(\subseteq)$ operator), while 3rd person clitics are not, alternating between dative and accusative. This can not only account for the realization of clitic pronouns in Romance (as well as in other languages), but also for certain morphosyntactic properties of specific verbs/structures (e.g., the asymmetries concerning passivization and past participle agreement between verbs like *aiutare* ‘help’ and *telefonare* ‘telephone’ in Italian) that would remain unexplained under traditional analyses.

The author also suggests a novel approach to the Person Case Constraint (PCC), a phenomenon excluding the cooccurrence of dative and 1st/2nd person objects, which is generally analyzed in terms of a syntactic constraint in the establishment of an Agree relation involving features such as person and animacy (cf., for instance, Anagnostopoulou 2008). In Manzini’s account, the PCC is reinterpreted as a constraint on the interpretation of $Q(\subseteq)$, which allows to capture its connection with DOM phenomena in involving 1st/2nd person pronouns and dative. Specifically, the mutual exclusion between a dative and a 1st/2nd person object clitic is ascribed to the impossibility for both elements to receive an interpretation through an Agree relation with the $Q(\subseteq)$ probe.

In this paper a unified explanation is therefore proposed for split accusativity (DOM) and PCC phenomena in terms of an association of $Q(\subseteq)$ with 1st/2nd person. This constitutes a welcome result, as it allows us to dispense with the complexity of alternative, non-comprehensive accounts, mainly based on the [person] feature rather than dative Case.

David Embick’s contribution on “**Contextual conditions on stem alternations: Illustrations from the Spanish conjugation**” (pp. 21-40) is dedicated to the analysis of stem alternation (or stem allomorphy), which is a type of non-affixal morphological change. The author explores two possible explanations for this phenomenon: the first relies on the so-called stem storage theory, according to which the alternants exist as distinct stem forms in memory and are therefore treated as suppletive contextual allomorphs; the second is in line with a morphophonological theory in which the different allomorphs are derived from a single underlying form by means of a phonological rule. Although both approaches are independently supported, as they can account for two extreme cases of stem alternation (i.e., suppletive allomorphy vs. morphological changes derived by phonology in regular and productive cases), the author delves into intermediate cases such as *sing-sang* (English) and *pensar-pienso* ‘to think’ (Spanish), which are not part of regular phonological processes but at the same time differ from “pure” suppletive allomorphy in that the alternants share most of their segmental material. For these cases, empirical evidence is provided against a stem storage analysis, and a particular version of Distributed Morphology is adopted (Embick

2010), according to which contextual allomorphy is analyzed in terms of an operation of Vocabulary Insertion applied to morphemes. Accordingly, the relevant alternation is constrained by the interaction of specific linear and cyclic locality conditions between the elements that undergo and trigger the morphological change. Given this picture, the crucial idea put forth in this paper is that the Spanish stem alternations examined do not comply with the relevant conditions on contextual allomorphy. Specifically, the author convincingly shows that both diphthongization (as in the *pensar-pienso* alternation) and “raising” (i.e., the /e/-/i/ alternation in verbs of the *-ir* conjugation such as *pedir-pido* ‘to ask’) are phonologically determined, as they are conditioned by properties that would violate the locality conditions imposed on contextual allomorphy (i.e., stress placement and a dissimilation process respectively). A stem storage approach must therefore be excluded in these cases in favor of an analysis based on (morpho) phonological rules operating on a single underlying form.

In their paper “**State Nouns are Kimian states**” (pp. 41-64), **Antonio Fábregas** and **Rafael Marín** delve into the nature of nominal constructions denoting states. After resuming the traditional distinction between D[avidsonian]-states and K[imian]-states in the verbal domain (cf. Maienborn 2005, Rothmayr 2009), the authors explore the possibility whether this distinction is also relevant in the nominal domain. Based on European Spanish data, it is shown that nouns derived from both D- and K-state verbs consistently behave as K-states: even when derived from D-state verbs (which as such have an event variable and therefore allow adverbial modification to specify this variable), state nouns are incompatible with place, manner and temporal modifiers, thus qualifying as K-states.

In order to develop their analysis for derived state nouns, the authors propose a distinction between two classes of D-state verbs: the former includes verbs lacking a state nominalization (which the authors call “Stubborn D-states”), whereas the latter is constituted by “Flexible D-states”, which have a corresponding noun denoting a similar eventuality and become K-states in the nominal domain. The authors therefore analyze the structural properties of D-state verbs on which this distinction relies: it is proposed that a state verb undergoing nominalization is endowed with an internal projection denoting a K-state. If a D-state verb lacks this projection, it qualifies as a Stubborn D-state (i.e., a state noun cannot be derived from it); Flexible D-state verbs, on the other hand, contain the relevant projection, which enables them to act as a base for state nouns. In this picture, the possibility for a D-state verb to be nominalized into a state noun depends on the availability of a dedicated functional projection denoting a K-state in its internal structure (relevant semantic evidence is provided in favor of this analysis). Furthermore, the syntactic and semantic asymmetries between different types of verbs (including, but not limited to, D- and K-states) are argued to be dependent on their internal articulation, in line with Ramchand’s (2008) proposal of verb decomposition, according to which the V head of classical phrase structure should be split into projections corresponding to subevental predications. Specifically, it is claimed

that the possibility for a state verb to be nominalized relies on the presence of a StateP projection, which crucially appears in the internal structure of K-states and Flexible D-states but not in Stubborn D-states: this structural asymmetry can explain both the semantic characterization of the different kinds of states, the types of nominalization that can be built from them and their (in)compatibility with certain adverbial modifiers. The decompositional approach proposed in this paper is strongly supported at the Syntax-Semantics interface, also allowing for further extensions of the analysis (as explicitly stated in the concluding section of the paper).

Fernanda Pratas's article ("**I know the answer': A Perfect State in Capeverdean**", pp. 65-86) deals with the temporal reading of predicates in Capeverdean, a Portuguese-based Creole language. In this language the unmarked form of the stative structure *N sabe risposta* 'I know the answer' has a present reading; this element distinguishes this verb from both eventive and other stative predicates, whose unmarked realization is consistently associated with a past reading (the present interpretation requiring the preverbal morpheme (*ta*). Empirical evidence is provided challenging Bickerton's (1981, 1984) Language Bioprogram Hypothesis, according to which the tense system of Creole languages is such that unmarked stative verbs have a non-past reading while unmarked eventive verbs have a past reading: in particular, it is shown that some bare statives cannot have a present interpretation in Capeverdean. A null Perfect analysis is therefore proposed for the predicate *sabe risposta* 'know the answer', which is argued to have a complex event structure constituted by a culmination ('got to know / found out the answer', functioning as a subevent of the type BECOME; Dowty 1979) + a consequent state (Moens & Steedman 1988). More specifically, it is claimed that all bare forms of lexical verbs in Capeverdean simple sentences, either eventive or stative, are actually marked by a zero Perfect morpheme. Since perfect sentences denote a state located at Reference Time, which is due to the prior occurrence of a closed situation, the author argues that the distinct temporal readings available in Capeverdean depend on the nature of the Perfect State located at Reference Time: in particular, for *sabe risposta* 'know the answer' the Perfect State is a type of consequent or result state, whereas for other eventive predicates involving culmination it is a type of resultant state. Given this asymmetry, only in the presence of *sabe risposta* 'know the answer' does the Perfect State constitute part of the event structure. In other words, the distinctive nature of *sabe risposta* 'know the answer' is due to the fact that only for this predicate may a Perfect State be the direct result of the past eventuality (Smith 1991). Cross-linguistic evidence from Korean is finally provided for this analysis, showing that the semantic specificities of the predicate 'know' with respect to the Perfect State are not restricted to Capeverdean.

The paper "**Stressed vowel duration and stress placement in Italian: What paroxytones and proparoxytones have in common**" (pp. 87-113), by **Stafano Canalis** and **Luigia Garrapa**, examines the interplay between word stress placement and vowel duration in Italian, which constitutes an extremely controversial issue in phonet-

ic and phonological research. In particular, the analysis of vowel duration is shown to be particularly problematic, as a number of questions arise concerning both the explanations proposed in the literature and the empirical data themselves (possibly affected by the measurement criteria adopted by different scholars). This paper presents the results of an experimental study on the duration of stressed vowels in paroxytones and proparoxytones in Italian. The paper takes into account both their absolute value and the ratio between stressed vowel duration and duration of the immediately post-tonic vowel (i.e., their absolute and relative duration). Since stress and duration are relative properties (as a vowel is not ‘stressed’ or ‘long’ in itself, but only with respect to less prominent or shorter segments), relational values may be more informative than absolute ones. The experimental data presented in this work confirms the results of previous analyses (e.g., Marotta 1985) that the absolute duration of a stressed vowel is slightly longer in paroxytones than in proparoxytones. Furthermore, it is shown that its relative duration with respect to the immediately post-tonic vowel presents analogous results in the two word types. In addition, experiments on the duration and centralization of post-tonic vowels in proparoxytones show that the final vowel is both longer and less centralized than the penultimate: this suggests that the latter is subject to some form of reduction and also that proparoxytones have a final secondary stress (cf. Camilli 1965).

The paper also examines the role of syllable weight in stress assignment in Italian. Based on stress placement in loanwords, acronyms, brand names and non-standard pronunciations, it is argued that weight-sensitivity is no longer productive in Italian. Rather, data show that it is the number of syllables in a word that influences stress placement: in particular, Italian lexicon seems to display a tendency towards antepenultimate stress in trisyllables (and, presumably, in odd-syllabled words in general), while quadrisyllables (possibly even-syllabled words) tend to receive penultimate stress, independently of their quantity.

These results lead to a specific interpretation of the Italian metrical structure. Given the weight-insensitivity of CVC syllables, it is claimed that feet are always syllabic and that the foot inventory of Italian includes trochaic and degenerate (i.e., monosyllabic) feet, the latter constituting the metrical representation of oxytones and of the final syllable of proparoxytones. In this picture, proparoxytones are represented as made of a combination of a trochee and a degenerate foot, which can straightforwardly account for the secondary stress on their final vowel. Moreover, this analysis can also provide an explanation for the tendency towards antepenultimate stress in trisyllables, which can be seen as the result of a conflict between a preference for binary feet over degenerate ones and the need to parse all syllables: as a matter of fact, a trisyllabic paroxytone would leave the initial syllable unparsed, hence the tendency towards stressing trisyllables on the initial rather than the second syllable.

Francesc Torres-Tamarit and **Clàudia Pons-Moll** discuss the issue of “**Serial prosodification and voiced stop geminates in Catalan**” (pp. 115-134). In Central

Catalan, a voiced stop in underlying /bl/ and /gl/ clusters is subject to a process of gemination ([b.bl], [g.gl]) when the relevant cluster is found in root-final position, whereas it undergoes spirantization and surfaces in onset position along with the following lateral when preceding a root-internal vowel ([.BlV], [.GlV]). This phenomenon is analyzed in this paper within the Harmonic Serialism framework, a non-stratal derivational version of Optimality Theory (Prince & Smolensky 2004), in which phonological operations are *gradual*. This means that one single modification is introduced at a time with respect to the (latest) input, until convergence on the fully faithful candidate is reached. In this picture, the paper assumes that a prosody-building operation such as syllabification, much like feature-changing operations, is performed in a step-wise manner in the derivation; accordingly, it is constrained by gradualness, and therefore cannot co-occur with other prosody-building or structure-changing operations. A theory of serial syllabification in Harmonic Serialism is thus developed, in which the binary syllable formation operation *core syllabification* can create complex minor syllables by applying to two segments that stand in a linear immediate precedence relation. Crucially, the presence of a prosodic category higher than the syllable creates an opaque domain for *core syllabification*, as the latter is blocked when one of the two adjacent segments, but not the other, is dominated by a prosodic category higher than the syllable, and there is no other higher prosodic category that dominates both of them.

In this framework, the above-mentioned phonological processes of voiced stops in Central Catalan obtain the following explanation. When the consonantal cluster /bl/ or /gl/ is followed by a root-internal vowel, gemination is blocked because the voiced stop is syllabified as the first element of a complex onset. When the relevant cluster appears root-finally, on the other hand, the voiced stop is parsed in coda position: this syllabification triggers voiced stop gemination as a strategy to avoid a rising sonority profile between two heterorganic consonants (i.e., the relevant voiced stop and the following lateral). Crucially, gemination is not blocked in the presence of a vowel-initial suffix, although the latter introduces the phonological context that could bleed the application of gemination by allowing *core syllabification*. This means that a suffixal vowel, unlike a root-internal one, cannot be integrated into a syllable together with the last consonant of the root. The proposed explanation argues for the presence of a prosodic word boundary between these two segments. In particular, it is claimed that the root is parsed into its prosodic word before suffixal vowel insertion: this creates an opaque domain that prevents *core syllabification* to operate with the last consonant of the root and the suffixal vowel. Accordingly, the root-final consonant is parsed in

coda position, and the derivation proceeds as in the case of root-final /bl/ or /gl/ clusters with no overt morph (which undergo gemination).

This paper therefore proposes a straightforward explanation for a phonological process that appears to make a distinction between two seemingly analogous phonological contexts.

In “**Interfacing information and prosody: French *wh-in-situ* questions**” (pp. 135-153), **Viviane Déprez, Kristen Syrett and Shigeto Kawahara** propose an analysis of *wh-in-situ* questions in French, bearing on Cheng & Rooryck’s (2000) proposal that these constructions are syntactically licensed by an intonational morpheme merged in C, which induces an obligatory sentence-final rising contour identical to the one found in *yes-no* questions. In particular, this paper presents Déprez, Syrett & Kawahara’s (2013) experimental findings on the prosody of French *wh-in-situ* questions and delves into the interaction of discourse and prosodic factors in order to ground a theoretical discussion of the information structure and syntactic licensing of these constructions.

The results of the authors’ experimental study partly support Cheng & Rooryck’s (2000) claim concerning the presence of a sentence-final rising intonation in French *wh-in-situ* questions. As a matter of fact, while declarative sentences show little to no final rise and *yes-no* questions nearly always present a final rise, *wh-in-situ* questions are characterized by a final rise in 73,3% of cases: this means that the target construction does have the expected sentence-final rising intonation in the majority of cases, yet presenting a significant difference with respect to *yes-no* questions. In addition, the measurement of F0 values in the relevant sentence types shows that, even when speakers produce a final rising contour in *wh-in-situ* questions, the slope is not as steep as in *yes-no* questions.

The paper therefore examines the interaction between the discourse conditions licensing French *wh-in-situ* questions and their intonational realization. Specifically, the intonational contours of *wh-in-situ* and *yes-no* questions are claimed to share the same abstract intonational morpheme (in line with Cheng & Rooryck 2000), and the phonetic distinction between the two constructions is attributed to information structure. In this respect, the notion of givenness is argued to play a crucial role: since given material is generally de-stressed (cf. Schwarzschild 1999, among others), the prosodic realization of *wh-in-situ* questions is determined by the interaction between the encoding of given information in the non-*wh* part of the sentence (cf. Hamlaoui 2011) and the focus requirement on the questioned term. In particular, the authors propose that the final raising contour observed in *wh-in-situ* questions is related to the presence of a semantic operator encoding givenness (cf. Kučerová’s 2007 G-operator), which triggers the raising of the entire clause to Spec,CP. After this information-driven movement, the abstract intonational morpheme merged in C is located in a sentence-final position, thus allowing the rising contour associated with it exactly in the position where it

is located, namely at the end of the sentence. In this way, the raising of the entire clause to Spec,CP meets both the information-structural requirement on the interpretation of givenness and the locality restrictions on the prosodic realization of the abstract intonational morpheme. In this configuration, however, the *wh*-term, which is generally assumed to encode new information (or focus) is included in the clausal structure, raised to Spec,CP to be interpreted as given: we therefore have a tension between the necessity to mark the containing clause as given and the need to mark the *wh*-item for focus. A possible solution is proposed based on Richards (2010), according to which a prosodic *wh-domain* is formed between the *wh*-term and the sentence-final C, thus creating a pitch compression between the *wh*-term and the final C; this provides an explanation to the fact that a more depressed rising contour is found in *wh-in-situ* questions as compared with their *yes-no* counterparts.

This analysis thus demonstrates the existence of a strong interaction between syntax, prosody and information structure. More specifically, it underlines the crucial role that information structure plays in licensing *wh-in-situ* questions and in determining their intonational contour.

João Costa, Ana Maria Martins and Fernanda Pratas's paper is dedicated to “**VP Ellipsis: New evidence from Capeverdean**” (pp. 155-175). In this Portuguese-based Creole language VP Ellipsis (VPE) is allowed in answers to *yes-no* questions but not in coordination structures, though both constructions represent typical licensing environments for VPE (cf. English and European Portuguese). The properties of VPE in Capeverdean seem to challenge traditional analyses of this phenomenon, which is generally taken to be licensed by a V-related phonologically filled functional category in the inflectional domain (cf. Merchant 2001, Aelbrecht 2010, among others). Since Capeverdean does not display V-to-T movement (cf. Pratas 2007), the functional head licensing VPE in this language cannot be the phonologically filled T. Furthermore, the presence of TMA markers filling the T head in certain Capeverdean constructions does not license VPE, thus showing that the overt realization of T does not qualify as an appropriate licenser of VPE in this language.

This paper thus develops a novel analysis of VPE in Capeverdean, which is mainly concerned with: 1) the contrast between polar answers and coordination structures, and 2) the licensing conditions of VPE in Capeverdean, as well as the identification of the structural locus of parametric variation across languages. The proposal outlined in this work is that VPE ellipsis is licensed by a functional head encoding polarity (Σ). In Capeverdean, ΣP is projected in between TP and VP in polar answers but not in coordination contexts: this means that only in the former construction may the verb move out of the VP (targeting Σ) and VPE is licensed. When TMA markers are overtly realized, they are directly inserted in T and cannot merge with the lower Σ ; accordingly, VPE is not licensed in these contexts. Crucially, parametric variation across languages, as well as across structures within a single language, is assumed to be determined by the presence/absence of ΣP in the clausal functional structure, its position with respect to

other projections (more specifically, with respect to TP) and the occurrence/absence of V-movement to Σ .

Compelling empirical evidence is provided for the identification of the polarity-encoding element Σ as the key functional category in relation to VPE. For instance, the authors show a number of phenomena (such as bare verb affirmative answers, verbal tags, emphatic verb reduplication and enclisis in non-imperative finite clauses) whose availability in many Romance languages patterns with the presence of VPE and is argued to be related to the properties of Σ . Furthermore, the case of imperatives in Catalan (as opposed to Spanish) is discussed as an instance of a language-specific restriction on VPE related to polarity.

The empirical data and the discussion provided in this paper strongly support the crucial role of the polarity-encoding category Σ in licensing VPE. Nevertheless, the structural account of the position of Σ P in the clausal spine seems to suffer from one shortcoming related to the universality of syntactic structures. The paper argues for a parametrization of the Σ P position to distinguish, for instance, Capeverdean and English (in which it is located below TP) from Portuguese and Spanish (in which it is higher than TP). However, assuming that a single projection can be located in different positions of the clausal hierarchy seems to challenge the very nature of UG, which should provide a *universal* array of lexical and functional categories in the architecture of language.

Andrés Saab and **Pablo Zdrojewski**'s contribution "**Anti-repair effects under ellipsis: Diagnosing (post-)syntactic clitics in Spanish**" (pp. 177-202) addresses the issue of clitic resumption in River Plate Spanish, mainly focusing on its relation with extraction and ellipsis. Some empirical observations are presented showing that in this language the realization of resumptive clitics improves certain configurations but shows anti-repair effects in some contexts. In particular, an asymmetry is observed between Focus movement with clitic doubling (CD) and clitic left dislocation (CLLD): whereas clitic resumption repairs extraction from some islands in both constructions, only in the former case does this repair effect vanish under ellipsis; crucially, no such anti-repair effect is attested in structures involving CLLD.

Given this picture, the paper explores these two types of doubling structures in order to account for their asymmetry in triggering anti-repair effects. In particular, it is shown that CD and CLLD display the same behavior insofar as island repair effects are concerned, as both constructions ameliorate the same types of island violations (i.e., extraction from interrogative and subject islands, and for some speakers from sentential complements of nouns as well). However, given the syntactic differences generally attributed to Focus movement and CLLD in the literature (cf. Rizzi's 1997 seminal work), the authors wonder whether the two resumption strategies are the result of one and the same phenomenon. Based on their asymmetry concerning anti-repair effects

under ellipsis, it is proposed that the main difference between CD and CLLD lies in the component of the grammar in which resumption applies: while CLLD instantiates a case of syntactic resumption, CD is the result of PF resumption. This analysis predicts that ellipsis, an operation with clear PF consequences, can destroy island repair effects only if repair is executed at PF; therefore, island repair effects are expected to be canceled in CD constructions but not in CLLD. These predictions are shown to be borne out by data from River Plate Spanish: on the one hand, extraction from an island in fragment answers (which represent a kind of elliptical Focus fronting construction) are ungrammatical regardless of the presence/absence of clitic resumption, thus supporting the hypothesis that CD is a PF operation that is blocked under ellipsis; on the other hand, the fact that elliptical CLLD constructions do not display anti-repair effects suggests that this doubling structure constitutes a purely syntactic operation, which as such is not affected by ellipsis.

In this paper, anti-repair effects are treated as a tool to diagnose the point of the derivation (in particular, the component of the grammar) in which a certain operation applies. In this respect, some support is provided for Bobaljik's (2008) theory of case and agreement as PF operations. This represents a very promising line for future research concerning Syntax-PF interface phenomena.

In the last paper, **“On the argument structure of the causative construction: Evidence from scope interactions”** (pp. 203-220), **Francesco Costantini** delves into scope interaction as an empirical tool to investigate the argument structure of causative constructions (specifically, the so-called ‘*faire*-infinitive’ structures) in Romance languages. Assuming that Quantifier Raising (QR) is a local operation that adjoins a quantified argument to its own vP at LF (cf. Hornstein 1995, among others) and is constrained by the superiority principle (cf. Bruening 2001), scope interaction between arguments in a causative construction can be taken as a diagnostics for their merge position, and in particular for determining whether they are coarguments of the same vP. Scope interaction thus qualifies as a useful method to establish which of the numerous theories that have been proposed in the literature on the argument structure of causatives is empirically more adequate.

The data presented in this paper, taken from Italian, provides strong evidence for the structural relations between arguments in causatives through an investigation on anaphor binding and scope interactions. As far as anaphor binding is concerned, data show that the merging order of the three causative arguments must be causer > causee > object. Scope interactions between quantified arguments in causative structures are therefore explored in order to determine their co-argumentality. In this respect, the causer is shown to take scope over the object, while the scope interactions between the causer and the causee and between the causee and the object appear to be ambiguous. These results suggest that the causee and the object (if any) are arguments of the same predicate (i.e., the causativized verb), whereas the causer is introduced in a higher posi-

tion by the causative head (in line with previous analyses by Kayne 1975, Burzio 1986 and Guasti 1993, among others). Furthermore, the ambiguous scope relation between the causer and the causee (which, under the proposed analysis, are not co-arguments) is explained by assuming that the causee moves outside the causative vP to a higher functional position in order to check dative Case (cf. Kayne 2004): since A-movements reconstruct as far as quantifier interpretation is concerned (Bruening 2001), after its raising for Case checking requirements the causee can be interpreted either in its merge position (within the causativized vP) or in its higher position, determining scope ambiguity with respect to the causer.

Finally, the paper discusses alternative analyses from the literature, arguing that they cannot capture the generalizations concerning scope relations between arguments. In particular, it is shown that causatives do not qualify as a kind of double object construction insofar as their argument structure properties are concerned (i.e., the three arguments cannot be merged in one and the same quantificational domain, such as a vP-shell).

To conclude, the papers collected in this volume provide a relevant contribution to ongoing research on syntax, phonology, morphology and semantics, as well as on the interface connections between these levels of analysis. The theoretical proposals are solidly grounded on empirical data taken from Romance – specifically, from Capeverdean, Catalan, French, Italian, (Brazilian and European) Portuguese, Spanish and Romanian – and the specific phenomena addressed also imply significant considerations on non-Romance languages. All the contributions are of high quality and the general discussion is extremely good, also suggesting interesting directions for future research in their field of interest.

Given the innovative character of the proposals and the variety of the topics addressed, the book can be of interest for advanced students in linguistics as well as for Romance scholars and researchers concerned with the specific issues dealt with in the various papers. However, the miscellaneous nature of its contents also makes it suffer from the well-known shortcomings that usually characterize proceedings of conferences not centered on specific themes. In this respect, it is the reviewer's opinion that, independent of the quality of the papers contained therein, the relevant volume is more suitable for academic libraries than for the general public.

Finally, some editing errors can be found in the volume: most of them are minor details, especially in the reference sections (which are sometimes neither consistent with one another nor within a single paper), but some major faults can also be observed in the text (for instance, in the tree diagram on p. 162 the T head contains linguistic material that should appear in Spec,TP; as a consequence, one of the arrows signaling movement seems to indicate the existence of a Spec,VP-to-T raising).

References

- Aelbrecht, Lobke. 2010. *The Syntactic Licensing of Ellipsis* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 149]. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential object marking: iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21 (3), 435-483.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2008. Notes on the Person Case Constraint in Germanic (with special reference to German). In Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer & Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (eds.), *Agreement Restrictions* [Interface Explorations 15]. 15-47. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1981. *Roots of Language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1984. The language bioprogram hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Science* 7 (2), 173-188.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2008. Where's Phi? Agreement as a postsyntactic operation. In Daniel Harbour, David Adger & Susana Béjar (eds.), *Phi-Theory: Phi Features across Modules and Interfaces* [Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 16]. 295-328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. QR obeys superiority: Frozen scope and ACD. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32 (2), 233-273.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach* [Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 1]. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Camilli, Amerindo. 1965. *Pronuncia e grafia dell'italiano*. Third edition. Firenze: Sansoni.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen & Johan Rooryck. 2000. Licensing *wh-in-situ*. *Syntax* 3 (1), 1-19.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program* [Current Studies in Linguistics 28]. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On Phases. In Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero & Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud* [Current Studies in Linguistics 45]. 133-166. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Déprez, Viviane, Kristen Syrett & Shigeto Kawahara. 2013. The interaction of syntax, prosody, and discourse in licensing French *wh-in-situ* questions. *Lingua* 124, 4-19.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1979. Ergativity. *Language* 55 (1), 59-138.
- Dowty, David R. 1979. *Word meaning and Montague grammar* [Synthese Language Library 7]. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Embick, David. 2010. *Localism versus Globalism in Morphology and Phonology* [Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 60]. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Guasti, Maria Teresa. 1993. *Causative and Perception Verbs: A Comparative Study* [Linguistica 8]. Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier.

- Hamlaoui, Fatima. 2011. On the role of phonology and discourse in Francilian French *wh*-questions. *Journal of Linguistics* 47 (1), 129-162.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1995. Putting truth into Universal Grammar. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 18 (4), 381-400.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1975. *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle* [Current Studies in Linguistics 6]. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1984. *Connectedness and Binary Branching* [Studies in Generative Grammar 16]. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2004. Prepositions as probes. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 3* [Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax]. 192-212. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kučerová, Ivona. 2007. *The Syntax of Givenness*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Maienborn, Claudia. 2005. On the limits of the Davidsonian approach: The case of copula sentences. *Theoretical linguistics* 31 (3), 275-316.
- Manzini, M. Rita & Leonardo M. Savoia. 2011. *Grammatical Categories: Variation in Romance Languages* [Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 128]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marotta, Giovanna. 1985. *Modelli e misure ritmiche. La durata vocalica in italiano*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis* [Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 1]. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moens, Marc & Mark Steedman. 1988. Temporal ontology and temporal reference. *Computational Linguistics* 14 (2), 15-28.
- Pratas, Fernanda. 2007. *Tense Features and Argument Structure in Capeverdean*. Ph.D. dissertation, Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
- Prince, Alan & Paul Smolensky. 2004. *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ramchand, Gillian. 2008. *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon: A First Phase Syntax* [Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 116]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, Norvin. 2010. *Uttering Trees* [Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 56]. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the Left Periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax* [Kluwer International Handbooks of Linguistics 1]. 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rothmayr, Antonia. 2009. *The structure of stative verbs* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 143]. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schwarzschild, Roger. 1999. GIVENness, AvoidF and other constraints on the placement of accent. *Natural Language Semantics* 7 (2), 141-177.
- Smith, Carlota. 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect* [Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 43]. Dordrecht: Kluwer.



Book review by Francesca Ramaglia
Franco et al. (eds.), 2012, *Romance Languages
and Linguistic Theory* (Leiden 2010)

Reviewer

Francesca Ramaglia

Università degli Studi Roma Tre

francesca.ramaglia@uniroma3.it