Book review

Julio Villa-Garcia, ***The Syntax of Multiple-*que *Sentences in Spanish: Along the left periphery****. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2015. xv, 274 pp.

Reviewed by **Jonathan E. MacDonald** (University of Illinois)

In *The Syntax of Multiple-*que *Sentences in Spanish: Along the left periphery*, Julio Villa-Garcia discusses constructions that contain multiple instances of the complementizer *que* 'that', an example of which is provided in (1).

(1)   Dice que por Boston, (que) con   Silvia, *(que) salga.
       says that for Boston, that   with Silvia, that   exit.3sg.subj

       'S/he demands that s/he hang out with Silvia around Boston.'

The *que*s in (1) are divided into two broad types: *primary*, the leftmost *que*, and *non-primary*, the other two *que*s. The two non-primary *que*s are also argued to be distinct. The rightmost *que* in (1) is referred to as *jussive/optative que* (henceforth jus/op-*que*), and the remaining *que* is referred to as *recomplementation que* (henceforth recomp-*que*). Villa-Garcia argues that each *que* in (1) represents different complementizers in a Rizzian-style embedded left periphery: Primary *que* heads ForceP, recomp-*que* heads TopicP, and jus/op-*que* heads FinitenessP.

Villa-Garcia's conclusions regarding multiple-*que* constructions in Iberian Spanish are well motivated. They are based on numerous novel empirical observations that give rise to a number of robust generalizations, which form the foundation upon which Villa-Garcia explores and derives insights into more contentious areas of (Spanish) syntax, namely, the position of preverbal subjects, the movement vs. base generation of Clitic Left-Dislocated Constituents (CLLDs) and locality of movement issues in general. He adopts a minimalist perspective, where the copy-theory-of movement and PF-repair strategies play an important role.

In this review, I discuss the central data, the main claims and the chief conclusions from each of the five chapters of the book. In the end, I point out two sets of data that raise a question about his approach to the locality of movement violations in these constructions and the last resort PF-deletion repair strategy of said violations.

In Chapter 1, the central phenomena and the theoretical framework adopted are introduced. Recomp-*que* and jus/op-*que*, the right-most *que* in (2a) and (2b), respectively, constitute the main empirical focus of the book.

(2) a. Dice que si llueve, (que) viene   Mercedes.
         says that if rains   that   come.3SG.INDIC Mercedes

         'S/he says that Mercedes will come (here) if it rains.'

     b. Dice que si llueve, *(que) venga   Mercedes.
         says that if rains   that   come.3SG.SUBJ Mercedes

         'S/he demands that Mercedes come (here) if it rains.'

Recomp-*que* is optionally found in embedded clauses that contain at least one left-dislocated XP sandwiched between complementizers. Jus/op-*que* appears obligatorily in desiderative/exhortative clauses selected by a verb that does not obligatorily select for a desiderative/exhortative complement. The verb in the desiderative/exhortative clause shows subjunctive morphology.

The theoretical framework is a Rizzian-style cartographic approach to the left-periphery, the basic structure for which is in (3).

(3) [ForceP Force [TopicP Topic [FocusP Focus [FinitenessP Finiteness [TP T …]]]]]

Primary-*que* is assumed to head Force (or Sub(ordinating)P on top of Force). As he argues in Chapters 2 and 3, recomp-*que* heads TopicP and jus/op-*que* heads FinitenessP. In the remainder of Chapter 1, the rest of the chapters are outlined.

Chapter 2 focuses on the properties of recomplementation structures, other instances of non-high *que* that are not recomp-*que* and the nature of the left-dislocated XPs that appear in recomplementation structures.

Villa-Garcia argues that there is more than one non-primary *que*, support for which comes from the mere existence of multiple occurrences non-primary *que* under primary *que* as in (1), as well as languages like Gungbe and Saramaccan (see Aboh 2006) that have different lexical items corresponding to the homophonous complementizers in Spanish.

One property of recomp-*que* is that the left-dislocated XP is followed by a pause, or an intonational break, when recomp-*que* is overt, but not when it is not overt. These intuitions are backed up by spectrograms of the utterances which clearly show the presence and absence of a pause, respectively.

Second, he illustrates that, in general, XPs that can be left-dislocated can appear between primary *que* and recomp-*que*. He illustrates this for subjects, pronominals, bare NP objects, PP arguments (see (1) above), hanging topics and absolute clauses. An example of a left-dislocated subject is provided in (4).

(4) Susi dice que los alumnos, que son felices.
     Susi says that the students that are happy

     'Susi says that the students are happy.'

It has been independently observed that with multiple left-dislocated XPs, primary-*que* can appear to the left and recomp-*que* can appear to the right of all of them. Villa-Garcia adds to this observation that recomp-*que* can follow each instance of a left-dislocated XP as well, as in (5).

(5)　Me dijeron que la　madre　de Ángel, que al　　　perro, que en época　de
　　　CL　told　　 that the mother of Angel that DAT+the dog　 that in　period of

　　　crisis, que no　le　da　　de comer.
　　　crisis　that not CL gives of　eat

　　　'They told me that Ángel's mother doesn't feed the dog during tough financial times.'

The datum in (5) is consistent with the proposal that recomp-*que* heads TopicP in a Rizzian-style left periphery, since both *que* and the left-dislocated XP iterate, a property ascribed only to TopicP in a Rizzian system.

While topical material can appear between primary *que* and recomp-*que*, contrastively focused phrases, quantified phrases, negative quantifiers, and wh-items in indirect questions can only follow recomp-*que*, illustrated for contrastively focused material in (6).

(6)　a.　Me dijeron que a　　tu　　primo, que SÓLO DOS COCHES, le　robaron (,
　　　　 CL　said　　 that DAT your cousin that only　two　cars　　 CL stole

　　　　　no　tres).
　　　　　not three

　　　　　'They told me that it was only two cars that your cousin got stolen, not three.'

　　b.　*Me dijeron que SÓLO DOS COCHES que, le　robaron a　　tu　　primo (,
　　　　 CL　said　　 that only　two cars　　that CL stole　　DAT your cousin

　　　　　no　tres).
　　　　　not three

The position sandwiched between primary-*que* and recomp-*que*, consequently, cannot be a focus-based position. Moreover, recomp-*que* cannot appear below a *wh*-item, as illustrated in (7), suggesting that it is higher than FocusP.

(7)　Me pregunta cuál　 de estos a　　mi　madre　(*que) le　voy a　comprar.
　　　CL　ask　　　 which of these DAT my　mother that　 CL go　 to　buy

　　　'S/he asks me which of these I'm going to buy for my mother.'

Villa-Garcia then makes the novel observation that overt recomp-*que* (and jus/op-*que*) blocks movement across it. This is illustrated in (8).

(8)   Quién me dijiste que a   tu   madre, (*que) la va a llamar.
      who   CL said   that DAT your mother that   CL go to call

'Who did you tell me is going to phone your mother?'

This observation is tied to another in which overt recomp-*que* obviates reconstruction effects of left-dislocated XPs, while this is not the case when recomp-*que* is not overt. Thus, no bound variable interpretation of *su hijo* 'his son' is possible in (9a), while it is in (9b).

(9)   a.   Dice que en su hijo$_{*i/j}$ que todo el   mundo$_i$ tiene que confiar.
           says that in his son   that all   the world   has   that trust

           'S/he says that everybody has to trust his/their (=somebody else's) son.'

      b.   Dice que en su hijo$_{i/j}$ todo el mundo$_i$ tiene que confiar.
           says that in his son   that all the   world has that

           'S/he says that everybody has to trust his/their son.'

Taking reconstruction effects as an indication of movement, and the lack of reconstruction as an indication of the lack of movement, Villa-Garcia concludes that recomp-*que* is an island for movement, an explanation for which he provides in Chapter 5. One important implication is that left-dislocated XPs, including CLLDs, can either move into the left-periphery or be base-generated there.

In a Rizzian-style approach to the left-periphery, TopicP only projects on an as-needed basis. Thus, we expect that, if recomp-*que* heads TopicP, it projects only when there is a left-dislocated XP in its Spec. Villa-Garcia illustrates that this is the case. Moreover, he assumes that there is a checking relationship between recomp-*que* and the XP in its Spec, in which case, recomp-*que* should license ellipsis of its complements, if a functional head that undergoes Spec,Head agreement can license ellipsis (Lobeck 1990, Saito & Murasugi 1990), provided that other conditions on ellipsis are met. He shows that recomp-*que* can license ellipsis of its complement, an example of which is in (10).

(10)   Me dijeron que si llueve, que no vienen a la   fiesta, y   que si nieva,
       CL said   that if rains   that not come   to the party and that if snows

          que tampoco.
          that neither

       'They told me that they will not come to the party if it rains or snows.'

Finally, Villa-Garcia reviews previous accounts of recomplementation, and illustrates the complications that his observations have for them. He finishes the chapter with an Appendix that discusses ellipsis in more detail.

In Chapter 3, Villa-Garcia systematically discusses the similarities and differences between recomp-*que* and jus/op-*que*. He then explores the consequence of his analysis of jus/op-*que* as the head of FinitenessP for the syntactic position of preverbal subjects in Spanish, a controversial topic.

We have already seen three patterns that suggest that recomp-*que* and jus/op-*que* are distinct. I summarize some further differences that are brought to light in this chapter, only illustrating one for the sake of space. For instance, while recomp-*que* requires the presence of a dislocated phrase in its Spec, jus/op-*que* does not. Additionally, in contrast to the possibility of deleting recomp-*que*, jus/op-*que* is obligatorily overt. Villa-Garcia speculates that jussive/optative mood might in fact be realized by *que* plus the subjunctive verbal morphology in Spanish, in which case jus/op-*que* would have semantic content. This, he suggests, might be why jus/op-*que* cannot be deleted, if we assume that semantically contentful heads cannot be deleted, since they would violate Recoverability of Deletion (Bošković 2011). Another contrast between these two non-primary *que*s is that recomp-*que* can iterate but jus/op-*que* cannot. This is expected if jus/op-*que* heads FinitinessP, a category that does not iterate. Also, jus/op-*que* does not license ellipsis, which is explained on the assumption that there is no element in Spec,FinitenessP, and thus no Spec,Head checking. Moreover, while a left-dislocated XP can appear under recomp-*que* it cannot under jus/op-*que*. If jus/op-*que* heads FinitienessP, it falls out naturally why no left-dislocated XP can follow jussive/optative *que*, because FinitenessP marks the lower boundary of the left-periphery.

Among the variety of observations Villa-Garcia makes that argue in favor of treating recomp-*que* syntactically distinct from jus/op-*que*, he offers an interesting one from Asturian Spanish. Asturian Spanish allows both preverbal and postverbal clitics in finite contexts. Clauses with an embedded dislocation show enclisis, as illustrated in (11).

(11) Xulio cree   que nes moces de Mieres enfóta**se** tou Dios.
      Julio believes that in   girls   of Mieres trusts+CL all god

      'Julio believes that everyone trusts girls from Mieres.'

He assumes that enclisis in Asturian results from verb movement from T to C/Finiteness around the clitic. Thus, it is not expected that enclisis occurs (slightly degraded) under recomp-*que*, as illustrated in (12a), but not under jus/op-*que* as in (12b), proclisis being the grammatical option, as in (12c).

(12) a. ?Xulio cree   que nes moces de Mieres, que enfóta**se** tou Dios.
          Julio believes that in   girls   of Mieres that trusts+CL all god

      'Julio believes that everyone trusts girls from Mieres.'

  b. *Repítote que nes moces de Mieres, que enfótase   tou Dios.
       repeat   that in   girls   of Mieres that trusts+CL all god

  c.   Repítote que nes moces de Mieres, que **se** enfóta tou Dios.
       repeat   that in   girls   of Mieres that CL trusts all god

      'I insist again (to you) that everybody trusts girls from Mieres.'

This is expected, since verb movement to FinitenessP should not be possible when it is realized as jus/op-*que*.

The conclusion that jus/op-*que* heads FinitenessP, the lowest head in the left-periphery, leads to a discussion of the implications for preverbal subjects in Spanish, namely, that subjects can appear in Spec,T in Spanish. Concretely, he claims that if projected, Spec,T can host only bona fide subjects. He illustrates with a range of data that only bona fide subjects can occur between jus/op-*que* and the subjunctive verb. The reduced set of sentences in (13) suffice to illustrate this observation.

(13) a. ?*Dicen que, si llueve, que a   mis padres, los llamen.
           say   that if rains   that DOM my   parents CL   call.3PL.SUBJ.

      'They demand that they call my parents if it rains.'

  b.   Dicen que, si llueve, que mis padres   los llamen.
       say   that if rains   that my   parents CL   call.3PL.SUBJ.

      'They demand that my parents call them if it rains.'

CLLD material cannot appear below jus/op-*que*. This contrasts with bona fide subjects, which can. This, as Villa-Garcia, points out leads to a crucial distributional asymmetry between preverbal subjects and CLLD XPs in Spanish and poses a serious challenge for claims that preverbal subjects are always CLLD XPs. Preverbal subjects can, Villa-Garcia concludes, be in Spec,T.

The focus of Chapter 4 is the impossibility of movement across non-primary complementizers. In the presence of overt recomp-*que*, left-dislocated XPs do not show reconstruction effects and *que* itself induces island effects. The main claim is that left-dislocated XPs are base generated in Spec,Topic when recomp-*que* is overt, but move to Spec,Topic when recomp-*que* is not overt. Movement across a non-primary *que*s causes a locality-of-movement violation.

Villa-Garcia observes that XPs occurring between primary *que* and recomp-*que* do not show reconstruction effects, as noted above in (9). The patterns fall out as expected for anaphor binding illustrated in (14), as well as from the scopal interaction of quantifiers.

(14)   Me han   dicho que a   sí   misma$_i$ (*que) María$_i$ se   manda emails
          CL have told   that DAT herself that   Mary   CL   sends emails at

          a   todas horas.
          all hours

          'They have told me that Mary e-mails herself all the time.'

María can bind the anaphor when recomp-*que* is not overt, but not when recomp-*que* is overt. Villa-Garcia interprets these facts as corroboration of the lack of reconstruction in the presence of recomp-*que*, which he analyzes as the lack of movement of the dislocated XP in the presence of overt recomp-*que*. He offers an additional novel argument from negation in Spanish, following work by Bošković (2001).

He assumes that negation in Spanish is a phonologically weak element and requires a host to satisfy PF requirements. A negative affix merges with the negative constituent in PF under PF adjacency. But if it cannot, then *no* is introduced to save the stranded affix, along the lines of English *do* support. On this approach, *no*-insertion is a last resort operation to rescue a derivation. This approach can explain the patterns in (15).

(15)   a.   Nadie   (*no) vino.
               nobody not   come

               'Nobody came.'

          b.   *(No) vino   nadie.
                 not   came nobody

                 'Nobody came.'

          c.   Paula *(no) ha   hecho nada.
                 Paula not   has done   nothing

                 'Paula hasn't done anything.'

Assume that NegP immediately dominates TP, as Villa-Garcia does. In (15a), the subject *nadie* merges, serves as the host for negation, and satisfies the affix

requirement. Thus, *no*-insertion cannot take place. In 15b and 15c negative constituents (*nada*) are present, but they are not adjacent to negation, since they are postverbal, consequently, *no*-insertion must take place.

Now, Villa-Garcia assumes that PF merger can take place if the negative phrase and the negative affix are adjacent at some point in the derivation, such as when the negative phrase moves through Spec,Neg to higher position. This would explain the patterns below in (16), in which the negative phrase *a ninguno de los niños* 'none of the kids' is not adjacent to NegP in the embedded clause, yet *no*-insertion is disallowed.

(16)   María dice que a   ninguno de los niños Juan (*no) los invitó.
        Mary says that DOM none   of the kids   Juan not   CL invited

        'Mary says that as for the kids, Juan didn't invite any.'

Now consider a novel contrast observed by Villa-Garcia in (17).

(17)   a.   María dice que a   ninguno de los niños, que no los invitó.
              Mary says that DOM none   of the kids   that not CL invited

              'Mary says that as for the kids, s/he didn't invite any of them.'

        b.   María dice que a   niguno de los niños los invitó.
              Mary says that DOM none   of the kids   CL invited

              'Mary says that as for the kids, s/he didn't invite any of them.'

In (17a), recomp-*que* is overt and there is a pause indicated by the comma, while in (17b), recomp-*que* is not present and there is no pause. Importantly, in (17a), *no* must be present in the embedded clause, while it cannot be in (17b). Villa-Garcia takes these data to indicate that no movement from the embedded clause has taken place in (17a), since *no*-insertion is obligatory. Were the negative phrase to move from the embedded clause it could pass through Spec,Neg satisfying PF adjacency, and *no*-insertion would be disallowed, as in (16). In contrast in (17b), recomp-*que* is not overt and *no*-insertion cannot take place.

This range of facts, Villa-Garcia concludes, falls out if we assume that in the presence of recomp-*que*, the dislocated phrase is base generated between primary-*que* and recomp-*que*, and when recomp-*que* is not overt, the dislocated phrase moves from the embedded clause to its dislocated position. In fact, the deletion of recomp-*que* is assumed to be a last resort operation, in which case, it can only delete if movement takes place; it cannot take place when the left-dislocated XP is base-generated in Spec,TopicP.

In the final part of the chapter, Villa-Garcia discusses instances of long-distance extraction of *wh*-phrases, foci, and CLLD XPs across overt recomp-*que*, all of which are ungrammatical, further bolstering his observation that overt recomp-*que* induces island effects.

Chapter 5 is dedicated to providing an analysis of the island effects induced by the presence of non-primary *que*s, focusing mostly on recomp-*que*. Ultimately, Villa-Garcia offers a Rescue-by-PF-deletion analysis of the presence vs. absence of locality violations, drawing parallels between his recomp-*que* cases and Comp-trace violations. That is, PF deletion of recomp-*que* removes the locality violation caused by movement across it.

Villa-Garcia observes a parallel situation with Comp-trace violations, an example of which is provided from English in (18).

(18)   Who did you say (*that) is going to call your mother?

It is well known that in English only moved subject *wh*-words give rise to Comp-trace violations. In other languages, Villa-Garcia notes, like non-colloquial Russian, subjects, objects, and adjuncts give rise to violations. The alternation between overt recomp-*que* giving rise to a locality violation and its absence avoiding the locality violation is in part reminiscent of the situation in (18) where the absence of *that* avoids the locality violation and in part reminiscent of non-colloquial Russian, since all moved constituents give rise to a locality violation in the recomp-*que* instances. In both cases, it is the presence of the complementizer that gives rise to the locality violation.

Villa-Garcia observes another parallel between the two cases—the violation is ameliorated when there is an adverbial immediately following the complementizers, as illustrated in (19).

(19)   a. ?Who did you say that in the end became the mayor of the city?

     b. ?Quién me dijiste que a   tu   madre, que al   final la va   a
        who   CL said   that DOM your mother that at+the end CL goes to
        llamar?
        call

        'Who did you tell me is going to phone your mother eventually?'

Appealing to the generalization of Comp-trace violations in English that the source of the violation is the movement from a position immediately to the right of *that*, i.e. movement from Spec,TP, where TP is sister to C, Villa-Garcia hypothesizes that in Spanish, there is an A-bar position immediately below recomp-*que* through which all moved elements in Spanish pass. Some independent support

comes from sentences like in (20), in which a *wh*-word appears immediately to the right of recomp-*que*.

(20) Me preguntó que mi madre, que cuándo podría venir.
      CL asked   that my mother that when   could   come

      'S/he asked me when my mother could come.'

Building on recent proposals that revive Chomsky's (1972) account of the mitigating effect of ellipsis on island violations, Villa-Garcia assumes that upon movement across an island, the island is marked with a star "*". The presence of * leads to a violation in the PF component. The violation can, however, be repaired if the offending *-marked island is deleted, thus, avoiding the PF violation.

Therefore, Villa-Garcia assumes that when a moving element crosses recomp-*que*, it is *-marked. When recomp-*que* is overt and a moved element crosses it, this leads to a PF violation and ungrammaticality, since it is *-marked. However, if recomp-*que* is deleted, which also deletes *, then the PF violation is avoided. If this general deletion account is on track, then as Villa-Garcia points out, ellipsis of the recomp-*que* should also repair the violations induced by movement. He provides data that illustrate that the expectation is borne out.

Assuming this to be the correct approach, Villa-Garcia argues that only when movement across non-primary *que* takes place is it *-marked and deleted, in the spirit of last resort operations. Thus, there will be no derivation in which the left dislocated phrase is base generated in Spec,Topic and recomp-*que* is deleted. He offers the data in (21) as support.

(21) Me dijo que el   baloncesto$_i$ *(que) ese deporte$_i$, le encanta.
      CL said that the basketball   that   that sport   CL charms

      'S/he said that as far as basketball foes, s/he loves that sport.'

In (21) *ese deporte* is a Hanging Topic—evidenced by being doubled by an epithet—which has been argued independently to be base generated in its left peripheral position, not moved. Note that the complementizer cannot be deleted, suggesting that the last resort approach to complementizer deletion is on track.

He then discusses instances where *que* cannot be deleted—as with jus/op-*que*—for independent reasons, and consequently, movement is never allowed. In such case, there are no reconstruction effects, nor is long-distance extraction possible.

Villa-Garcia discusses alternative approaches to the locality effects in the presence of secondary *que*, which rely on phases. He notes that a phased-based account has problems for the reconstruction facts since reconstruction into phases

is allowed, while reconstruction is not allowed into the complement of recomp-*que*. Nevertheless, he leaves the issue open, since there are still many questions regarding the relation between islandhood and phasehood. Finally, in an appendix, Villa-Garcia discusses the obligatory subject-verb inversion in questions in Spanish, an issue that has yet to be resolved, and offers a Copy Theory of Movement approach, in which low copies can be pronounced, as a way to avoid a PF violation.

In my mind, Villa-Garcia has established a set of robust generalizations about the Spanish left-periphery. One can confidently take these generalizations as a starting point to explore more contentious issues in Spanish, such as the position of preverbal subjects, the base-generation vs. movement analysis of CLLD XPs, and the nature of locality of movement restrictions, as he does. While the conclusions drawn are warranted, there are some unaddressed questions that arise regarding locality of movement violations over non-primary *que* and the last resort PF-deletion repair strategy of said violations. In this respect, consider an instance of a single complementizer construction in (22).

(22) Sofía dice que lo coma   Ian
      Sofia says that it eat.3sg.subj Ian

      'Sofia told Ian to eat it.'

Observe that the embedded verb is in subjunctive and there is a desiderative/exhortative interpretation. Villa-Garcia mentions instances like these and assumes, following Rizzi, that if there is no left-peripheral material, then a single head is sufficient to realize different functions by virtue of bearing all of the relevant features. In (22), *que* realizes both force and finiteness. Villa-Garcia supplies the syntactic analysis of a sentence like (22) in (23) to illustrate the basic idea.

(23)   [que [$_{TP}$ …]]

Recall that Villa-Garcia assumes that movement across a non-primary *que* parallels Comp-trace violations in that movement takes place from a position immediately to the right of *que*. Consequently, given the analysis in (23) of the sentence in (22), we expect that movement across *que* should be out, especially if featureally, the construction in (22) is the same as multiple *que* constructions with jus/op-*que*. Observe in (24), however, that movement across the single jus/op-*que* is grammatical. There is no violation of locality in these instances.

(24) ¿Qué dice Sofía que coma   Ian?
       what says Sofia that eat.3sg.subj Ian

      'What is Sofia telling Ian to eat?'

On Villa-Garcia's account something more has to be said. Consider another datum in (25), taken from Villa-Garcia.

(25) Dijo que a   su perro, Juan, que entonces, que no lo va   a vacunar.
      said that DOM his dog   John that then   that not CL goes to vaccinate

      'S/he said that as a result, John is not going to vaccinate his dog.'

Note two instances of non-primary *que* in (25). Note also that the left-dislocated XP *a su perro* 'his dog' is in Spec,TopicP, on Villa-Garcia's analysis, but that the head of this TopicP has been deleted. Recall that deletion of recomp-*que* entails that movement has taken place. The issue that arises in these examples, however, is that in order for *a su perro* to have moved to Spec of the highest TopicP, it must have crossed the two lower non-primary *que*s. This should give rise to a locality violation, on his account, but it does not.

While these data raise questions about the analysis of movement across non-primary *que* and deletion as a last resort PF-repair, they are not detrimental to Villa-Garcia's approach. In fact, they invite an answer that builds directly on his analysis of the Spanish left-periphery, precisely because the foundation for his analysis is solid. In this respect, I believe Villa-Garcia's hope this work will be 'used as a cornerstone for similar investigations ...' will be realized.

References

Aboh, Enoch. 2006. Complementation in Saramaccan and Gungbe: the case of C type modal particles. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24(1), 1–55.

Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Chomsky, Noam. 1972. Some empirical issues in the theory of transformational grammar. In P.S. Peters (ed.), *Goals of linguistic theory*, 63–130. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Lobeck, Anne. 1990. Functional heads as proper governors. In *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society* 20, 348–362.

Saito, Mamoru & Keiko Murasugi. 1990. N'-deletion in Japanese: A preliminary study. *University of Connecticut Working Papers in Linguistics* 3, 87–107.

Reviewer
Jonathan E. MacDonald
jonmacd@illinois.edu
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign