Clause structure in South Asian languages. Ed. by VENEETA DAYAL and ANOOP MAHAJAN. (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 61.) Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2004. Pp. 325. ISBN 1402027184. \$59.95.

Reviewed by JOSEF BAYER, *University of Konstanz**

The languages of South Asia (India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh, the Maldives, and Sri Lanka) are genetically diverse. They belong either to the Indo-Aryan group (i.e. the eastern group of Indo-European), to the Dravidian group, to part of the Austro-Asiatic group, or to part of the Sino-Tibetan group of languages. Nevertheless, they show much convergence in terms of grammatical features. With respect to syntax these include head-final order of constituents, *WH*-in-situ, serial verb constructions, nonnominative subjects, and clause-final complementizers. Common features like these have given rise to viewing South Asia as a specific linguistic area (see Emeneau 1956, Masica 1976, 1991). While earlier research has mainly concentrated on sociolinguistic aspects of this linguistic area, it has become a focus of interest within linguistic typology and especially in the course of a revived interest in formal comparative language research. In their introduction to the present volume the editors emphasize the fact that it was in the 1980s and 1990s that investigations of South Asian languages began to have a critical impact on the development of grammatical theory. Starting out from an account of agreement, scope, and word order in Hindi, both editors have made important contributions in their previous work. Theories of variable word order, theories about the syntax-semantics interface, *WH*-scope, binding, and so forth, and theories of argument structure, predication, and Case can hardly ignore the results that have emerged from the study of South Asian languages over the years.

The present volume offers a collection of ten articles that deal with various aspects of clause structure in South Asian languages. The languages under investigation are 'big' languages throughout. Hindi (or Urdu) as one of the most-studied languages is next to Bangla (also known as Bengali), Kashmiri, and Sinhala (which is heavily influenced by Dravidian) at the center of interest in Indo-Aryan. The Dravidian languages that play a role in individual chapters are Kannada and Malayalam. Austro-Asiatic or Sino-Tibetan languages play no role in the present collection.¹ The contributions are loosely grouped in four blocks: functional projections (R. AMRITAVALLI on the development of functional categories in Kannada, GILLIAN C. RAMCHAND on negation in Bangla), argument structure (K. A. JAYASEELAN on serial verb constructions in Malayalam, JEFFREY LIDZ on causativity and reflexivity in Kannada, P. MADHAVAN on light verb raising and the role of an empty preposition in Malayalam), Case theory (MIRIAM BUTT and TRACY HOLLOWAY KING, as well as ALICE DAVISON on Case in Hindi-Urdu), and movement phenomena (PAUL HAGSTROM on the movement of scope-sensitive particles in Sinhala and Japanese, AYESHA KIDWAI on topic movement and questions of the extended projection principle (EPP) with special reference to Kashmiri and German,

* For various help with this review I wish to thank Benedikt Grimmier, Brian Joseph, and Arthur Stepanov. Remaining shortcomings are, of course, my own responsibility.

¹ However, it is only a question of time before languages from the smaller South Asian languages begin to exert an influence on syntactic theory. Serious efforts are being made at research centers in India to give native speakers of such languages a training in formal linguistics with the aim of having them analyze their languages.

JAMES D. McCawley on different types of relative clauses and relative clause extraposition in Hindi).

Most of the contributions are committed to the principles-and-parameters (P&P) framework as developed in Noam Chomsky's government and binding theory (GB) and continued in the minimalist program. The chapter by Butt and King is couched in lexical functional grammar (LFG). The authors argue that this framework offers advantages in capturing Case phenomena in Hindi-Urdu. McCawley's paper remains largely neutral but makes crucial reference to syntactic versus interpretive accounts of relative clause extraposition. The chapters by Amritavalli and by Butt and King include details about diachronic aspects.

R. Amritavalli's chapter, 'Some developments in the functional architecture of the Kannada clause', takes its starting point from observations about negation in the Dravidian language Kannada. It concentrates on a diachronic development according to which Kannada has undergone a change in which finiteness was first expressed by agr(eement) and then turned into a projection of Mood (MoodP), thereby allowing finiteness to embrace features of negation and modality in addition to agreement. It is argued that Kannada does not have the category of T(ense), but that there are indications that T is developing out of a projection of Asp(ect) that is located in phrase structure between MoodP and VP. One aspect of Amritavalli's contribution, which is rich in evidence for the solution proposed, is that functional elements grow out of lexical heads and establish themselves in the form of separate projections. This is argued to explain why functional heads are extensions of lexical heads in the sense of Grimshaw 1991, and as such should contribute to our understanding of grammaticalization in general. The immediate puzzle that Amritavalli addresses is the fact that in Kannada there is a regular form of negation for affirmative sentences by which the usual morphemes for tense and agreement are lacking for the benefit of the negation form *illa*. The verb form to which *illa* attaches is a gerund.²

- (1) a. *avanu bar- utt- aane.*
 he come NONPAST 3SG.M
 'He will come.'
 b. *avanu bar- uvud- illa.*
 he come GERUND not
 'He will not come.'

Modal sentences show neither tense nor agreement morphology, and they have a special form of negation.³

- (2) a. *avanu bar(a) bahudu.*
 he come(?) may
 'He may come.'
 b. *avanu bar(a) baaradu.*
 he come(?) must.not
 'He must not come.'

² The transcriptions used in this review article are not consistent because they have been taken over as they are in the book, with a few modifications in matters of style. For clarity the grammatical term 'case' is spelled with capital C.

Abbreviations in the glosses are as follows: ACC: accusative, CLASS: classifier, DAT: dative, ERG: ergative, F: feminine, IMP: imperative, M: masculine, NEG: negative, NOM: nominative, PERF: perfective, PRES: present, PROG: progressive, Q: question particle, REFL: reflexive, SG: singular.

³ The ? in the gloss signals that the status of *a* is unclear.

The impression of the presence of tense comes from features that are actually aspectual. What looks like a tense morpheme, for example, *utt-* in 1a, is identified as an aspectual morpheme; *utt-*, for instance, is also found as a progressive marker.

In her discussion of the historical development of the MoodP, Amritavalli points out that neg and modal were once bound morphemes while they are free morphemes in the present stage of the language. This is surprising since one normally sees the reverse process, that is, free morphemes turning into bound morphemes. According to Amritavalli, finiteness (which is primarily signaled by agr) has ‘relocated’ itself to a higher position of the clause, and that as a consequence of this the language had to ‘reinvent’ the forms of neg and modal. Finiteness has, according to Amritavalli, moved up the tree and established itself in MoodP. The diachronic shift is, thus, more than a morpho-phonemic change. It is a complete restructuring of the lexico-syntactic system of the verb. Amritavalli shows that under her analysis of FinP as MoodP and the idea that the extension of projections follows from a reanalysis of lexical head, a number of other phenomena of Kannada that otherwise remain mysterious fall into place.

Bengali (or Bangla, as it is called by its indigenous name) is another Indic language that shows an interaction between verb form and the form of negation. While the (usually postverbal) particle *na* is the general form of negation in the language, negation in the perfective tense can only be formed by choice of the simple present of the verb plus the suffix *ni*. This is seen in 3 and 4.

- (3) ami amṭa k^heyec^hi.
 I mango.CLASS eat.PERF.PRES.1
 ‘I have eaten the mango.’
- (4) ami amṭa {*k^heyec^hi na / k^hai ni}.
 I mango.CLASS eat.PERF.PRES.1 NA eat.1 NI
 ‘I didn’t eat the mango.’

Gillian C. Ramchand’s chapter, ‘Two types of negation in Bengali’, deals with this core contrast by arguing that negation is not a sentential operator but rather selectively binds particular variables as introduced by different syntactic heads. The form *k^hai*, which Ramchand takes to be untensed, carries features for person and honorification agreement and is otherwise interpreted as the habitual present tense. All other forms, including the nonfinite verb forms of the language, take *na*.

- (5) ami amṭa k^hacc^hi na.
 I mango.CLASS eat.PROG/PRES.1 NEG
 ‘I am not eating the mango (right now).’
- (6) ami amṭa k^helam na.
 I mango.CLASS eat.PAST.1 NEG
 ‘I didn’t eat the mango.’

The problem is that *k^hai ni* in 4 and *k^helam na* in 6 appear to be interchangeable for most speakers in most contexts, with a preference for the *ni* form, the conclusion roughly being that the form *k^hai ni* somehow covers both the simple past and the perfect. Ramchand, however, comes to the conclusion that *na* and *ni* perform different functions in the clause: while *na* negates an event variable, *ni* negates a time variable. Ramchand lays out the semantic representations of the two cases in terms of the neo-Davidsonian framework of semantics (cf. Parsons 1990). She assumes elementary tense relations in an Asp(ect) node below the T-node. The perfect essentially says that an event has culminated at or before a particular reference time. Comparisons are made between the Bengali present perfect and the German present perfect, which has for many

speakers (especially in the southern varieties) replaced the simple past (the phenomenon known in German as 'Präteritumschwund'). The reason may be that the past-tense usage is the result of an entailment by which the result state after the culmination of an event is associated with a temporal interpretation. Ramchand suggests that it is the resulting state of the perfect, the 'R-state', that is temporally linked to the present, and that this is directly asserted by a sentence such as 3. The event variable itself is in this case free, and the assumption is that it gets bound by default existential closure. The simple past, in contrast, does not involve default binding of the event variable. In the simple past the event variable is in the scope of quantification over a time variable. When the simple past is negated with *na* (cf. 6), the time variable is contextually linked to a particular time in the past, and the negation *na* states that there was no event of the type specified in the past. Negation with *ni* as in *k^hai ni* in 4 is said to involve a quantifier that binds the time variable directly: at no time before the speech time was it the case that I have eaten the mango. The ill-formedness of **k^heyec^hi na* in 4 is then explained as giving rise to a contradiction because its logical form (LF) says that there existed an event of mango-eating, and simultaneously that there was no such event. Ramchand can explain with her semantic machinery subtleties in the distribution of *na* and *ni* that to my knowledge have not been noticed before, and that will prove to be very useful for further work on negation in Bangla.

Her chapter does not address certain questions that may lead to a fuller understanding of the *ni*-construction. How did the form *ni* develop? Why is it that *ni* attaches to the simple present, which in Bengali has a habitual reading ('I usually eat mango'), a reading that is absent in the scope of *ni*? How is this reading suppressed? Negation in Bangla has a couple of other problems in stock, a full account of which will certainly benefit from Ramchand's work. The references to Ernst 1995 and Lee & Pan 2001 were obviously added later on. They are missing in the list of references.

The papers by Amritavalli and Ramchand suggest that the phenomena under discussion are a widespread areal phenomenon with a certain space of variation that could prove to be an interesting basis for future research in syntax and semantics.

The section on argument structure starts with K. A. Jayaseelan's chapter, 'The serial verb construction in Malayalam'. The construction in question can be considered another areal phenomenon of South Asian clause structure. SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS (SVC) are constructions in which a series of nonfinite verbs, in Malayalam verbs in a 'frozen' past-tense form that has ceased to carry past-tense meaning, is followed by a single tensed verb.

- (7) ñaan̩ oru maanga poTTiccu kazhuki muRiccu upp-il-iTTu kaDiccu
 I a mango pluck wash cut salt-in-put bite
 cavaccu tinn-u.
 chew eat-PAST

'I plucked, washed, cut, pickled, bit, chewed and ate a mango.'

SVCs cannot be identified with V-clusters formed by X⁰-recursion. The projection level of V is such that objects and so forth can be included or must be required for the satisfaction of argument structure, as in 7. By contrast, there are SVCs in which the nonfinite verb does nothing other than contribute an aspectual or directional meaning.

- (8) nii itu koNDu-poo!

you this take-go(IMP)

'Take this away!' (lit. 'You having taken this go!')

Some nonfinite verbs function like adpositions. Notice the equivalence of the meaning of 'having stood there + come' and 'come from' in 9.

- (9) *ñaan awiDe-ninnu war-unnu.*
 I there-stand come-PRES
 'I come from there.'

So what is the proper syntactic structure of SVCs? Jayaseelan assumes for the infinitives a clausal structure with a null subject on the basis of examples in which an overt subject appears, and of course, on the basis of semantic intuitions. Assuming an underlying PRO-subject, Malayalam exhibits exclusively subject control. Apparent exceptions seem to rest on a reanalysis of the verb as a postposition, a phenomenon that is also found in Indo-Aryan languages. An open question is how overt object and pro-object are distributed in 'object sharing' constructions, of which 7 is an example. On the basis of constituency tests, Jayaseelan argues for a structure in which the lexical object is the object of the deepest embedded nonfinite verb, that is, *poTTiccu* in 7. The objects of the other transitive verbs are empty pronominals of the pro-type in his analysis. It is shown that verbs of any valency between one and three arguments can occur in an SVC in Malayalam. An important point in Jayaseelan's discussion of SVC is the fact that the verbs that line up at the right edge of the clause cannot be separated, and the supposed clausal constituents refuse to undergo leftward movement, an operation that is otherwise freely available in Malayalam-type languages.⁴ Jayaseelan accounts for this effect with the help of a verb-raising analysis, as has been classically suggested for Dutch and German since Evers 1975. V-raising leads to a verbal complex, that is, a new constituency. A potential problem for such an analysis is that German embedded clauses show very similar V-cluster phenomena, most prominently V + V adjacency, while movement can still affect constituents of different sizes, and this without creating new meanings.

- (10) a. *wenn er den Stein aufheben müssen hätte, . . .*
 if he the stone lift must had
 'If he had to lift the stone, . . .'
 b. *[Den Stein aufheben] hätte er müssen*
 c. *[Aufheben] hätte er den Stein müssen*

Example 11 shows that the verbs in 10a form a contiguous structure that must not be interrupted.

- (11) *wenn er (ohne Hilfe) den Stein (ohne Hilfe) aufheben (*ohne Hilfe)*
 if he without help the stone lift
 müssen (*ohne Hilfe) hätte, . . .
 must had
 'if he had to lift the stone without help, . . .'

If these phenomena are of relevance for other V-final languages, of which Malayalam seems to be a paradigm case, V-raising may not be able to provide a full answer to the problem at hand.⁵ Another important point is that the central examples of SVC are cases of adverbial modification. Given that head-amalgamation or incorporation can take place only in contexts of lexical selection (or head-government), a head-raising analysis seems to be excluded for such cases as the one in 7. Apart from these theoretical

⁴ A sentence like 'I will open the door for you' comes out as 'I to you [door open] give will'. Fronting the bracketed constituent leads to the awkward reading of 'I will give you a door-opening'. Thus, 'give-will' has obviously become lexicalized.

⁵ Bayer and colleagues (2005) provide data from German as well as from Bangla that show the very same V + V adjacency effects but preclude a head-raising analysis. In the relevant cases the structure to the immediate left of V must be a clause at any stage of the derivation.

problems, Jayaseelan's discussion of SVC, with its broad comparative perspective, offers a very useful introduction to the pertinent problems of clause structure.

In this chapter, reference to Aronoff & Sridhar 1984 is missing, inconsistencies in spelling with or without italics may create confusion, and there are various typos and missing articles.

The thematic cluster on issues in argument structure is continued with Jeffrey Lidz's chapter, 'Causation and reflexivity in Kannada'. Kannada shows a productive process of morphological causativization—another areal phenomenon of South Asian—as well as lexical causatives in change-of-state verbs. There is a rule by which both types of verbs, the lexically causative as well as the lexically noncausative, become anticausative due to the application of a reflexive morpheme. Lidz argues against an analysis of θ -role absorption by the reflexive because the reflexive would in this case be expected to show up also in the intransitive use of lexically causative verbs, which is not the case. A solution to the problem must explain the complementarity between lexical and morphological causatives, as well as the fact that anticausative morphology is not dependent on lexical causativity. According to Lidz, the Kannada causative morpheme *-isū* is the spell-out of little *v*, the head of *vP*, which gives rise to an event structure in which the phrase in the specifier of *vP*—not *VP*, as the text says on p. 101!—is interpreted as an agent or causer. Lexical causatives are the more specific case for which the spell-out of *v* is zero. If *v* is zero, the rule that spells out *v* as *-isū* is blocked by the elsewhere condition. In causative constructions headed by *v*, the agent/causer argument can, however, also be missing. It is exactly in this situation that *v* is spelled out as the reflexive morpheme *-koL-*. While certain intransitive verbs can be reflexive-marked or not, they can only be causativized if they are not reflexivized. The reason is that *-isū* and *-koL-* compete for the same syntactic position, namely *v*. According to Lidz, this can be achieved only if morphology interprets syntactic structure as in postsyntactic morphology, but not in lexical morphology where morphology feeds syntax. Causativity can therefore not start from lexical generation. One complication derives from the fact that there are also reflexive-marked verbs with an overt argument in Spec*vP*, which is the case with reflexives that act as bound anaphors. The appearance of a specifier in this case is argued to follow from the semantic covaluation of specifier and reflexive. Lidz follows Lasnik and Saito (1992) in the assumption of trace-deletion in intermediate A-positions. The deletion of traces may lead to a structure in which the emphatic element *tannee* ('self') remains without a local host. Orphanization of *tannee* leads to ungrammaticality. There is also a ban on emphatic stranding in the presence of the reflexive *-koL-*. A verb like 'sit down' can occur with or without *-koL-*, but presumably never with a stranded *tannee*, whereas 'praise' can occur with stranded *tannee* but not with *-koL-*.⁶

⁶ These facts from Kannada are reminiscent of the distinction between reflexive verbs and transitive verbs with an anaphoric object in German.

- (i) transitive verb
 - a. Hans hat meistens sich selbst gewaschen.
Hans has mostly REFL self washed
'Hans washed mostly himself.'
 - b. Hans hat sich meistens selbst gewaschen.
 - c. Hans selbst hat sich meistens gewaschen.
- (ii) reflexive verb
 - a. Hans hat meistens sich (*selbst) geschämt.
Hans has mostly REFL (*self) shamed
'Hans was mostly ashamed.'
 - b. Hans hat sich meistens (*selbst) geschämt.
 - c. Hans selbst hat sich meistens geschämt.

Presentation of the data and analysis in this chapter are quite clear. Nevertheless, it is somewhat disturbing that the initial claim of showing that only a syntactic analysis of causative and reflexive formation can succeed is not sufficiently taken up again at the end of the chapter, so that to some extent putting the actual conclusions together is left up to the reader. Reference to Aronoff & Sridhar 1984 is missing once again.

P. Madhavan's chapter, 'Light verb raising, empty preposition and zero derivation', investigates the parametric difference between English (and similar languages) and Malayalam with respect to denominal verb formation, as in [_N shelf] → [_V shelve]. Malayalam lacks this kind of derivation (as do numerous other languages with rich verb morphology). After introducing the framework of pre-D-structure lexical syntax developed by Hale and Keyser (1993), crucially involving earlier work by Mark Baker and Richard Larson, Madhavan presents a cluster of properties by which English, and English-like languages, differ from Malayalam. His central claim is that according to the usual feature decomposition of N, V, A, P into $\pm N$, $\pm V$, Malayalam does not allow a nonovert [$-N$] category. According to this, which Madhavan describes as a parameter, Malayalam has neither empty prepositions nor empty verbs, nor empty complementizers. The background is the Hale and Keyser analysis of causative constructions by which a sentence like *the professor put the book on the shelf* has an alternative generation that is structurally alike but lacks an overt V and P. In that case, N raises to P and then to V leading to *the professor shelved the book*. The absence of the V-N alternation in Malayalam is attributed to the nonavailability of an empty preposition (and an empty verb). Madhavan offers an overview of Malayalam verb morphology in which he shows that causativization and transitivity are overtly signaled by *-ikk*, which is the lexicalization of *v* (cf. the morpheme *-isū-* in the chapter on Kannada by Lidz). The lack of an empty P is said to be responsible for the fact that Malayalam lacks the dative alternation, the theoretical account of which here is Kayne's (1984) analysis of the dative as a zero-headed PP, [_P $\emptyset$][NP]]. Another effect should be the lack of exceptional case marking constructions, which are said to also involve an empty P.

It is somewhat unfortunate that at the end of this chapter only less than a page is spent on the question of how a child can find out whether his/her language follows the English or the Malayalam parameter. If universal grammar (UG) allows 'any lexical element [...] to have a non-overt realization' (151) the question is how the child acquiring Malayalam finds out that [$-N$] must not be empty in his/her language. Given that Malayalam—unlike English—has a zero copula, the child could easily come up with a different analysis. More seriously, if zero lexical categories were not universally available, how would the child acquiring English find out that his/her language has empty prepositions and empty verbs? As a more concrete point, Madhavan points out that as a consequence of the particular parameterization the deverbal final complementizer *ennə* of Malayalam cannot be zero. It would be interesting to investigate why similar constructions without the deverbal complementizer *bole* are in fact possible in Bangla, which otherwise closely conforms to the Malayalam system of complementation.

The thematic cluster on Case theory is introduced by Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King's contribution, 'The status of Case'. Hindi and Urdu have been in the center of syntactic theory and especially Case theory for quite some time because of the challenge that these languages pose for certain theoretical claims. The critical point is roughly that the language Hindi/Urdu (HU) shows a system of split ergativity according to which the subject is not always nominative but appears in the ergative Case under certain conditions. Furthermore there are examples in which there seems to be

free choice between ergative and nominative Case, depending on the semantic conditions. For instance, in the pair in 12, the ergative Case in 12b signals a volitional subject, a semantic effect that interestingly does not arise in situations in which ergative Case is structurally required.

- (12) a. ram k^hās-a.
 Ram.NOM cough-PERF.M.SG
 ‘Ram coughed.’
 b. ram-ne k^hās-a.
 Ram-ERG cough-PERF.M.SG
 ‘Ram coughed (purposefully).’

The authors introduce the Cases nominative, ergative, accusative, dative, instrumental, and genitive, each of which—with the exception of the accusative—is said to be able to serve as a ‘subject’. The nominative, as the unmarked (phonologically null) Case, is said to also function as an object. As is widely known, HU shows agreement between object and verb in the perfect feminine.

- (13) Nadya-ne gari cala-yi hε.
 Nadya.F.SG-ERG car.F.SG.NOM drive-PERF.F.SG. be.PRES.3SG
 ‘Nadya has driven a car.’

Nevertheless, *gari* turns out to be accusative when the interpretation should be [+specific], the datum being reminiscent of the widely known role of the Turkish accusative with *-(y)I*.

Butt and King discuss the HU Case system against the backdrop of its historical development, arguing for a particular analysis of the partially ergative system by showing that the Case ending *-ne* is a very recent development, with Sanskrit *-janye* (‘for the sake of’) as a plausible source. They also argue that most of the Case endings are clitics rather than inflectional affixes. Case clitics are in turn distinguished from postpositions. The former build up KPs (kase phrases) whereas the latter build up PPs, the differences often being subtle. The category of KP is also assumed for bare forms like nominatives. In this case K is not projected. The locative *dakxane* (‘to the post office’) is also analyzed as an unprojected KP despite the fact that *-e* is the marker for locative Case, the reason obviously being that *-e* cannot be analyzed as a clitic like *-ne* or (genitive) *-ke*. The syntax of Case is thus very closely determined by morphology and lexical integrity. By contrast, K can, in the Butt and King approach, also embrace information about grammatical functions (GF) and relevant semantic features such as volitionality. It is not immediately plausible to me why in this Case the *-e* in *dakxane* should not autonomously contribute the feature of location and combine with the noun according to standard rules of composition.

Assuming the LFG view of Case, Butt and King leave room for various possibilities of Case assignment. The LFG architecture (c-structure, f-structure) does not presuppose a close link between Case, agreement, and phrase-structural position, but does not preclude such a link either. The suggestion is that HU makes use of different strategies of Case assignment. The authors remark that the link between Case and agreement is unreliable, and suggest keeping the two maximally separate. The authors propose a mechanism of mapping from GF to θ -role that they claim is more successful in dealing with the free word order of HU than the Chomskyan approach, because the latter is said to insist on an identification of GF and phrase-structural position.⁷ The authors

⁷ Work on Case in post-GB generative syntax seems to have had little influence on this view.

seem to leave open under which circumstance a language assigns Case, whether positionally as English mainly does, or by other means. Structural Case is assigned on the basis of syntactic information, but not necessarily on the basis of syntactic position. In HU no example of positional Case has been found by the authors.⁸

Butt and King provide detailed information about the Case forms of HU as well as lexical entries for *-ne* (subject) and *-ko* (object), which are conceived of as underspecified morphosyntactic representations that are handed over to the semantics where additional features may be added in interaction with temporal and aspectual information. It is shown how the lexical entries work when combined with different f-structures. The general conclusion is that HU has largely a semantic Case system in which the semantic Cases in interaction with morphologically unmarked NPs determine clause structures that are not yet fully specified. Although the discussion does not make explicit reference to questions of parametric variation, the approach amounts to saying that the clause structure of HU is by and large the result of lexical information as provided by the Case forms of the language.

The article is carefully edited, but in the references, Chatterjee's standard work from 1926 is listed as *The origin and development of the Bengali literature* (!).

Alice Davison's contribution to the section on Case, 'Structural Case, lexical Case and the verbal projection', is thematically strongly related to the preceding paper but comes theoretically from the perspective of generative grammar. Its goal is to explore Case in HU in connection with verbal projections, and in particular the differences between structurally determined and lexical or θ -related Case. Davison finds evidence for four classes of transitive verbs, as in Table 1 where lexical Cases are marked in boldface.

	CASE OF SUBJECT	CASE OF DIR. OBJECT	CASE OF INDIR.OBJECT
Class A	ergative (obligatory)	nominative/dative	dative
Class B	ergative (optional)	nominative/dative	—
Class C	dative	nominative	—
Class D	nominative	lexical postposition	—

TABLE 1. Four classes of Hindi/Urdu transitive verbs.

The direct object marked with *-ko* is classified as dative, whereas the unmarked direct object is, following Tara Mohanan's work, taken to be nominative (rather than accusative). SpecNP and the subject of nonfinite clauses have a structurally conditioned genitive.

As Davison points out, it is controversial whether ergative Case is structural or lexical. While Butt and King argue for the lexical option on the basis of contrasts such as the one in 12 (but seem to admit also a structural option that does not trigger the volitional interpretation), she takes the ergative as structural Case, which is not bound to a certain θ -role. A list of experiencer verbs is provided that assign a patient/experiencer role to an ergative subject. Furthermore, a test is offered by which ergative in contrast to dative Case is checked in a functional projection. Davison shows that ergative must be licensed by finite Tense and perfective Aspect. In counterfactual/irrealis clauses the absence of perfective Aspect rules out ergative Case, whereas it does not affect

⁸ I am wondering if this statement is meant to be valid for any type of construction. In Bangla it is, for instance, not possible to assign anything but the genitive *-(e)r* Case to a prenominal NP, independent of its semantic role. Given what Butt and King say in §2.6 about the genitive, I suspect that the same is true for the prenominal *-ke* or *-ko* forms of HU.

dative Case. Thus, ergative seems to be a structural Case that is neutral between an agentive/volitional and a nonagentive/nonvolitional role for the subject, while the dative subject, which is taken to have the structure of a PP, is nonagentive under all circumstances and must therefore be seen as semantically conditioned. VP-structures are proposed that distinguish the classes in Table 1. The subject receives its θ -role when it is merged and is subsequently raised to a functional projection for Case checking. Lexical Case is licensed in situ. Classes C and D have a simple VP structure with dative or nominative in SpecVP, respectively. Class C—largely psychological verbs of seeing, coming to mind—has a dative (PP-like) subject, and a structural nominative object projects a VP as follows: [_{VP} PP_{DAT} [_{V'} [NP_{NOM} V]]]. In class D—for predicates like ‘to get bored with’—the structural Case is for the subject and the lexical for the object: [_{VP} NP_{NOM} [_{V'} PP_{INSTR} [_V V V_{GO}]]]. For classes A and B, both of which include among agentive verbs also psychological verbs, the subject is introduced by the light verb *v*: [_{VP} DP_{SUBJ} [_{V'} [_{VP} DP_{OBJ} V] *v*]]. The subject must check its Case feature in functional projections for tense/aspect. Here, the external argument can only be a subject. Binding in HU, which is subject-oriented, is shown to provide evidence for this architecture. A reflexive is bound by a subject, be it ergative, nominative, or dative, while a pronoun may be bound by a nonsubject but not by a subject. Surprisingly, dative subjects can bind a pronoun as well as a reflexive, as in 14.

- (14) mohan_i-koo apne_{i/j} / us-kee_{i/j} maaN-baap-kii yaad aaii.
 Mohan-DAT self's / 3SG-GEN mother-father-GEN memory come.PERF
 ‘Mohan_i remembered his_{i/j} parents.’

Davison resolves this apparent conflict by assuming that reflexive binding is possible due to the dative-PP raising to SpecTense, but that the dative-PP may also stay in VP while it is the nominative NP that checks the tense features. In that case, the dative-PP may bind a pronoun. Independent arguments from structural ambiguity are provided that are predicted by different derivations in which either the experiencer or the theme argument moves to SpecTP. Verbs are being discussed that belong to more than one class, as well as the semantic differences that emerge from this. Much of the work is attributed to the light verb *v*: ‘*v* theta-marks the subject as an experiencer, covertly checks structural dative case on the direct object, and adds aspectual specification’ (223).

In a final section, Davison extends her account, showing how it deals with complex predicates of the N + V type, which are very frequent in HU. Unfortunately, this paper suffers from an annoying amount of typos, wrong references to examples, nonsubscripted indices, and the like.

The book’s final section is on movement phenomena in South Asian languages and starts with Paul Hagstrom’s chapter, ‘Particle movement in Sinhala and Japanese’. Sinhala has clause-internal Q(uestion) or Foc(us) particles that associate with a clause-final scope indicator. This scope indicator (-E) can show up only as long as the Q-particle *də* or the Foc-particle *tamay* has not been moved to the right edge of the clause.

- (15) Chitra ee potə kieuwa də?
 Chitra that book read Q
 ‘Did Chitra read that book?’
 (16) Chitra də ee potə kieuw-e?
 Chitra Q that book read-E
 ‘Did Chitra read that book?’

The theoretical assumption here is that in 15 *də* has moved to its scope position overtly, while it moves to its scope position (indicated by -E) covertly in 16, another assumption being that -E disappears after scope checking.

The hypothesis of a movement relation between the internal particle and the right edge is supported by island effects. Hagstrom shows that island violations can be avoided if the particle *də* appears at the right edge of the potential island. The working of the Sinhala Q-particle is then compared with the working of the Q-particle *ka* in Japanese. Japanese *ka* always appears at the clausal right edge, but from the fact that indefinites are formed by *WH* + *ka*, Hagstrom concludes that *ka* emerges in the clause as in Sinhala and undergoes overt obligatory movement. Using a special form of question, the non-D-linked *ittai* + *WH* ('*WH* the hell', '*WH* on earth'), he shows that the association of the Q-particle with the *WH*-item is island-sensitive in Japanese too. Japanese also shows intervention effects. Question formation is inhibited as soon as there is a higher constituent marked with *ka* that c-commands the clause-final *ka*. The intervention effect can be undone by moving the *WH*-element across the intervener. Thus, intervention constitutes yet another argument in favor of (particle) movement. The intervention effects can be replicated in Sinhala to some extent, but Hagstrom says his research with informants did not lead to entirely conclusive results so far. The proposal of particle movement naturally leads to questions about multiple questions. Multiple questions with pair-list interpretation show the *də* particle only at the most deeply embedded *WH*-element. Naturally there are also further questions that relate to the head-final word-order type that the South Asian languages follow, especially whether movement to the clause-final position should be an option in this type, and exactly what kind of movement it would be. Hagstrom offers speculations as to the attachment of *də* and -E, but he says there are too many possibilities at his stage of research to arrive at a firm conclusion.

The chapter by Ayesha Kidwai, 'The topic interpretation in universal grammar: Evidence from Kashmiri (and German)', is devoted to an ambitious project that sets out to make sense of the typological variation between subject-prominent languages such as English (as well as, somewhat surprisingly, Hindi⁹) and topic-prominent languages such as German, Japanese, and Kashmiri. The discussion makes strong reference to Chomsky's recent theorizing about minimalist language design. The question is whether topicalization can be subsumed under a uniform scenario of bare output conditions as set up by the PF- and the LF-interface. For topicalization, this view would demand satisfaction of a topic feature. But then it is unclear why certain languages allow a topic interpretation in the absence of topic preposing. In English, leftward movement of the object seems to be optional.

(17) Q: Where can I find the cutlery?

A: The forks are in the cupboard, but {**the knives**, I left/I left **the knives**} in the drawer.

This is not the case in topic-prominent languages. Given the question in 17, German would, for instance, want to distinguish between *Die Messer sind in der Schublade* and the inappropriate **In der Schublade sind die Messer*.

⁹ By its head-final structure, its Case system, and word-order variability due to scrambling, as well as by various other features, Hindi does not appear to be close to the European SVO languages at all. As Kidwai herself notes, Hindi (among many similar SOV languages) scrambles nonfocal material (topics?) out of its VP, with the effect of getting focal constituents adjacent to the verb. See also the chapters on Hindi/Urdu by Butt and King and by Davison.

Relying much on Reinhart 1981, Kidwai proposes a distinction between sentence topic, roughly what the sentence is 'about', and discourse topic. The latter is more abstract and unfolds as the text develops. In subject-prominent languages, the sentence topic is identified with the subject, whereas in topic-prominent languages it is identified with an XP in SpecCP. Languages of both types have in common an EPP feature that checks sentence topicality rather than subjecthood. Importantly, the former EPP according to which every sentence must have a subject is now recast as a principle according to which every sentence must have a topic, where what can be a topic is up to parameterization.¹⁰ Kidwai clearly has the V2-languages German and Kashmiri in mind, so the envisaged picture seems to be that in subject-prominent languages the subject/topic moves to SpecTP whereas in topic-prominent languages the topic, be it the subject or something else, moves one floor up, to SpecCP. This simplistic picture is modified, of course, because Japanese, for instance, clearly does not have V-fronting and formation of SpecCP.

Unfortunately, however, the proposal runs into empirical problems also for German. It is a mistake, for instance, to identify SpecCP of V2 clauses with a topic position. The decision about what counts as the sentence topic is made in the middle field (TP), and from there the topic may move to SpecCP, but other constituents may move there as well. Speaker-oriented evaluative adverbs such as *leider* 'unfortunately' clearly do not qualify as sentence topics but are well placed in the prefield of V2-clauses (alias SpecCP). In Kashmiri, the expletive element *yi* (glossed here as 'this') is in competition with other topical constituents that may occupy the preverbal position in V2, and *yi* may in fact be a topic. The same cannot be true, however, for the German cases with *es*, evaluated by Kidwai as 'topic-expletives' in which *es* has no middle field existence and can only have been inserted in order to fulfill the V2 requirement.¹¹ Unlike referential *es* (or even the *es* that is required by atmospheric predicates), this kind of *es* clearly lacks any imaginable reference and is therefore also for semantic reasons disqualified as a topic. Kidwai proposes parametric variation between Kashmiri and German by which both languages have a designated functional head F° in their V2-clauses that attracts a topic, but that Kashmiri unlike German has also an F° -head below the C-domain that triggers embedded topicalization. German is said to differ by having a T° -head below the C-domain.¹² This amounts to saying that German is subject-configurational in its middle field and topic-configurational in its CP/V2 domain. Syntactic research on German from the 1980s onward has led to the insight that if a functional head T° (also known as I°) plays a role in German at all, it must be low enough to provide room in the middle field for higher functional heads, among which one would like to see F° due to the rather clear cases of 'embedded topicalization'.¹³ The conclusion

¹⁰ I think this is a very promising move that may help overcome certain difficulties that emerge from the special role that has been ascribed to the subject in GB-theory. In Bayer 2005 I have, for instance, shown that the bad trace that gives rise to the *that*-trace effect is the trace of a topic rather than the trace of a subject, with English simply obscuring this due to the fact that most of the topics happen to be subjects. See also Rosengren 2002 for an interesting reinterpretation of the EPP as a semantic device.

¹¹ Two of the examples quoted by Kidwai are as follows.

- (i) Es wird hier getanzt. 'There is dancing going on here.'
- (ii) Hier wird (*es) getanzt. 'Here, there is dancing going on.'

¹² Kidwai's example 26b contains a mistake. The embedded phrase must have the index TP rather than FP.

¹³ Frey (2004) argues for a sentence topic position above the base position of sentence adverbials such as *erfreulicherweise* 'fortunately, happily', which have a high position in the sentence.

- (i) Ich erzähle dir etwas über Hans. 'I tell you something about Hans.'

that Kashmiri and German differ along the lines of an FP versus TP below CP as suggested here should therefore be met with some reservation.

The distinction between the specifier of a lower functional head and the specifier of the highest functional head in V2-clauses is nevertheless an important one. Kidwai derives in a somewhat convoluted but essentially correct line of argumentation the result that Case checking (in SpecTP) needs to precede topic checking (in SpecFP). Thus, the critical point here seems to be that her account misses the fact that (i) SpecFP checking in German and Kashmiri are more alike than expected, and that (ii) the expletive *es* in German V2-clauses remains somewhat of a mystery under the assumption that it should be on a par with *there*-type expletives and should therefore not be semantically vacuous.¹⁴

The book concludes with James McCawley's 'Remarks on adsentential, adnominal and extraposed relative clauses in Hindi'. In this paper, which appeared in the volume postmortem and could therefore not undergo revisions by the author, McCawley takes a critical look at Srivastav's 1991 analysis of relative clauses (RC) in Hindi. Hindi has correlative ('adsentential'), adnominal, and extraposed relative constructions. McCawley starts out with extraposed relative clauses and the traditional movement analysis. The crucial observation, due to Subbarao 1984, is that extraposition of RCs appears to be more or less unbounded in Hindi, with individual variation. Since a semantic treatment integrates RCs by making use of lambda conversion and thus is *prima facie* independent of bounding conditions, a semantic account seems to be favorable. McCawley provides a hierarchy of contexts ranging from nonfinite complements to adnominal RCs in which extraposition appears to be gradually degraded, and which seems to be subject to variation among native speakers, contrary to expectations that are nourished by a purely semantic account. The conclusion is speculative and suggests a parametric account by which the subjacency condition is relaxed for Hindi in comparison with English.

In his analysis of adsentential RCs such as 18, McCawley points out that there is in fact an anaphoric relation between the relative operator and the variable-like nominal in the host clause that is obscured in 18 but visible in 19 and 20.

- (18) jo lərki vəhā kʰərɪ hɛ, vo ləmbi hɛ.
 which girl there standing is she tall is
 'The girl who is standing there is tall.'
- (19) jo cʰatr vəhā kʰərɪ hɛ vo lərka mera dost hɛ.
 which student there standing is that boy my friend is
 lit. 'which student is standing there, that boy is my friend.'

-
- a. Ich habe gehört, dass **den Hans** erfreulicherweise nächstes Jahr eine polnische
 I have heard that the Hans.ACC fortunately next year a Polish
 Gräfin heiraten wird.
 countess.NOM marry will
 'I have heard that fortunately a Polish countess will marry Hans next year.'
- b. *Ich habe gehört, dass erfreulicherweise **den Hans** nächstes Jahr eine polnische Gräfin heiraten
 wird.

¹⁴ One may recall here observations by Haider and by myself (see Bayer 1986) from the 1980s according to which the German Vorfeld-*es* fails to yield the definiteness effect that is observed with English *there*. One of Haider's examples was a popular radio announcement in Austria in which the definite DP, of course, refers to the singular famous orchestra.

- (i) Es spielen für Sie die Wiener Philharmoniker.
 it play for you the Viennese philharmonicists
 'The Viennese Philharmonic is playing for you.'

- (20) *jo lərka vāhā kʰəṛa he vo cʰatr mera dost he.
 which boy there standing is that student my friend is
 lit. *‘which boy is standing there, that student is my friend.’

The restrictor of the host NP is not arbitrary but must denote a subset of the restrictor of the RC-NP. Srivastav rules out similar examples with a restricted *j*-operator if the RC has been extraposed from an adnominal position.

- (21) vo lərki ləmbi he [jo (*lərki) vāhā kʰəṛi he].
 this girl tall is which girl there standing is
 ‘The girl is tall who is standing there.’

McCawley shows that similar examples with the same anaphoric relation that has been observed in adsentential relatives nevertheless occur in Hindi, but only with a nonrestrictive interpretation. Unlike restrictive relative clauses, which are one-place predicates, nonrestrictive relatives are propositions that are associated with their own illocutionary force.¹⁵ Given that adsentential RCs such as 18 and 19 have a restrictive interpretation, it is not entirely clear how the observation about extraposed RCs relates to a general account of RCs in Hindi.

If, as in Srivastav 1991, RCs are generalized quantifiers that bind a variable in the host clause, then there should be no stacking of RCs, the reason being that a variable cannot be bound by more than one quantifier. However, Hindi allows constructions such as in 22.¹⁶

- (22) [jo pan-vala₁ cay pi rəha he] [jo₁ vāhā beṭʰa he] vo₁ mera
 which betel-guy tea drink staying is who there sitting is he my
 dost he.
 friend is
 ‘Which betel-leaf vendor is drinking tea, who is sitting there, he is my friend.’

McCawley presents arguments according to which an adnominal/extraposition analysis can be excluded, and according to which both relatives must therefore be adsentential. The question then is how to reconcile [[SS]S] with the unavailability of stacking. The suggestion is that the two *j*-clauses in [SS] are in effect ‘covertly conjoined’. An operation that is possible only in conjoined clauses is right node raising. This operation is shown to yield a grammatical result [SS]. Further examples are discussed that at first sight look like RC-stacking. In each case, McCawley presents arguments by which a stacking analysis can, however, be avoided.

McCawley’s contribution to this volume ends with a critical note on the uniform analysis of Hindi RCs as CPs. As a matter of fact, only complementizer-headed clauses—*ki*-clauses in Hindi—or clauses with obligatory *WH*-operator fronting can safely be considered CPs. Adsentential RCs are incompatible with *ki* and do not show effects of *WH*-movement.¹⁷ An interesting observation is that whenever *ki* does appear

¹⁵ This can be verified with test cases from German. The discourse particle *ja* ‘indeed’ can appear only in root clauses. It is ill-placed in restrictive relative clauses but acceptable in nonrestrictive ones.

(i) Hans hat jede Studentin [die er (*ja) aus dem Seminar kennt] ins Kino eingeladen.
 Hans has every student who he indeed from the seminar knows to the movie invited
 ‘Hans has invited to the movie every female student he (*indeed) knows from the seminar.’
 (ii) Hans hat Paula [die er (ja) aus dem Seminar kennt] ins Kino eingeladen.
 ‘Hans has invited to the movie Paula, who he (indeed) knows from the seminar.’

¹⁶ Mistakes that appear in the original example are removed here.

¹⁷ For further information on complementizers in the South Asian languages see Bayer 1999, 2001.

in an RC, it cannot occupy the usual left C-position. In 23, an example from Donaldson 1971, it appears after two constituents.

- (23) *yəh kal ʃant nahī hɛ [həm jis mɛ (ki) rəhte hɛ].*
 this age peaceful not is we which in that stay are
 'This age that we live in is not peaceful.'

In 23 *ki* is preceded by two constituents. McCawley draws the conclusion that it is therefore not a complementizer here and that the clause should rather be understood as a quantifier phrase (QP), in this case a definite description operator.

To summarize, this collection of papers gives a very good overview of the facts as well as of many current theoretical issues that are connected with clause structure in the South Asian language area. In spite of theoretical differences, the authors have consistently tried to defend their analyses within a framework of UG-oriented comparative syntax. Thus, this volume is interesting not only for those professionals who focus on South Asian languages but also for theoretical linguists and typologists in general. The editors have done the field of linguistics an important service by once again putting the South Asian languages on the agenda and by making central results available to a worldwide readership. Unfortunately, this achievement is in stark contrast with the poor editing of various contributions to this volume. Missing references and inconsistent spellings and headings are difficult to spot and may be pardoned within a certain limit; mistakes that any spell-checker can track down, however, are not. Thus, this volume is not only an important contribution to modern comparative syntax but also an example of what happens when a publishing house shifts almost the entire burden of book-making to academics who are not properly trained and have generally too little time for the task of editing.

REFERENCES

- ARONOFF, MARK, and S. N. SRIDHAR. 1984. Agglutination and composition in Kannada verb morphology. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 20.2.3–20.
- BAYER, JOSEF. 1986. Review of *Syntactic chains*, by Kenneth J. Safir. *Studies in Language* 10.167–85.
- BAYER, JOSEF. 1999. Final complementizers in hybrid languages. *Journal of Linguistics* 35.233–71.
- BAYER, JOSEF. 2001. Two grammars in one: Sentential complements and complementizers in Bengali and other South Asian languages. *The yearbook of South Asian languages: Tokyo Symposium on South Asian Languages—Contact, convergence and typology*, ed. by Peri Bhaskararao and Karumuri Venkata Subbarao, 11–36. New Delhi: Sage.
- BAYER, JOSEF. 2005. Was beschränkt die Extraktion? Subjekt–Objekt vs. Topic–Fokus. *Deutsche Syntax: Empirie und Theorie*, ed. by Franz-Josef d'Avis, 233–57. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- BAYER, JOSEF; TANJA SCHMID; and MARKUS BADER. 2005. Clause union and clausal position. *The function of function words and functional categories*, ed. by Marcel den Dikken and Cristina Tortora, 79–113. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- CHATTERJEE, SUNITI KUMAR. 1926. *The origin and development of the Bengali language*. 3 vols. Calcutta: Calcutta University Press. [Reprinted, Calcutta: Rupa & Co., 1975.]
- DONALDSON, SUSAN KAY. 1971. Movement in restrictive relative clauses in Hindi. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 1.2.1–74.
- EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1956. India as a linguistic area. *Language* 32.3–16.
- ERNST, THOMAS. 1995. Negation in Mandarin Chinese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13.665–707.
- EVERS, ARNOLD. 1975. *The transformational cycle in Dutch and German*. Utrecht: Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht dissertation. [Distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club.]
- FREY, WERNER. 2004. A medial topic position for German. *Linguistische Berichte* 198.153–90.

- GRIMSHAW, JANE. 1991. Extended projection. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, ms. [Published in *Words and structure*, by Jane Grimshaw. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 2005.]
- HALE, KENNETH, and SAMUEL JAY KEYSER. 1993. On argument structure and the expression of semantic relations. *The view from Building 20*, ed. by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 53–109. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- KAYNE, RICHARD S. 1984. *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- LASNIK, HOWARD, and MAMORU SAITO. 1992. *Move α* . Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- LEE, PEPPINE PO-LU, and HAIHUA PAN. 2001. The Chinese negation marker *bu* and its association with focus. *Linguistics* 39.4.703–31.
- MASICA, COLIN. 1976. *Defining a linguistic area: South Asia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MASICA, COLIN. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PARSONS, TERENCE. 1990. *Events in the semantics of English*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- REINHART, TANYA. 1981. Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27.53–94.
- ROSENGREN, INGER. 2002. EPP: A syntactic device in the service of semantics. *Studia Linguistica* 56.145–90.
- SRIVASTAV, VENEETA. 1991. The syntax and semantics of correlatives. *Natural Languages and Linguistic Theory* 9.637–86.
- SUBBARAO, KARUMURI VENKATA. 1984. *Complementation in Hindi syntax*. Delhi: Academic Publications.

University of Konstanz
 Department of Linguistics
 Box D 191
 78457 Konstanz
 Germany
 [josef.bayer@uni-konstanz.de]