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This book is about the universal properties of the language faculty within the principles and parameters paradigm. Some papers deal with principles and others with parameters. Divided in nine contributions, the volume covers topics such as the architecture of the grammar, the role of features in determining cross-linguistic variation, primitives of phrase structure, the mechanisms and motivation behind what can and cannot undergo phonological deletion, and differences in the morphological and semantic features of certain lexical items both within a language and across languages. The editor provides a comprehensive introduction in which a historical view of research on universals is given and current issues in universals are provided. The collection of articles stems in the 1999 Berlin GLOW conference on *Universals* organized by the Research Center for General Linguistics (ZAS, Berlin), the Linguistics Department of the University of Potsdam and the Dutch Graduate School in Linguistics (LOT). Two papers were not presented at the conference, but have been included in the volume: the articles by Boeckx and Fanselow & Ćavar.

The opening contribution is by Maya Arad. In ‘Universal features and language-particular morphemes’, she attempts to give a precise content to the
minimalist claim that language variation is restricted to lexical items. According to her, there are three sources for language variation: the inventory of roots a language has, the features it has selected out of a universal set of features, and the way these features are bundled together. The paper concentrates on feature bundling and argues that the now well-known functional category \( v \) (‘little \( v \)’) proposed by Chomsky (1995) is not a primitive. Instead, languages bundle features in different ways, leading to the situation where there is not one \( v \), but several (or least two). Her proposal is in line with recent suggestions that functional categories are not primitive, but stand for bundle of features, cf. Marantz (1997), Chomsky (2000).

The second paper is by Cedric Boeckx. Entitled ‘Agree or Attract? A Relativized Minimality solution to a proper binding condition puzzle’, his paper examined a paradigm first discussed by Kroch & Joshi (1985) which Lasnik (2002) takes as an argument for feature-movement:

(1) (a) John is likely to win.
   
   (b) There is likely to be a riot.

(2) (a) How likely to win is John?

   (b) *How likely to be a riot is there?

Lasnik uses the paradigm above in support of the Attract-F hypothesis. However, Boeckx shows that Lasnik’s solution to the problem is problematic,
since it relies on a model of the grammar where there is a separated cycle, that of LF. Boeckx argues that it is both theoretically and empirically more advantageous to postulate a grammar with a unique cycle and without a separate LF component.

‘Distributed deletion’ by Gisbert Fanselow & Damic Čavar deals with discontinuous DPs and PPs in German and Slavic languages. Split-DP or split-PP constructions have the following characteristics: they involve raising of a bare operator and the stranding of a nominal or alternatively raising of a nominal and stranding of an operator.

(3) (a) Bücher weiss ich nicht wieviel er gelesen hat.
books know I not how-many he read has

‘As for books, I do not know how many of them he has read?’

(b) Wieviel denkst du dass er täglich Bücher liest?
how-many think you that he daily books reads

‘How many books do you think that he reads every day?’

(Fanselow & Čavar 2002, 89)

The authors argue that movement analyses of such splitting face serious problems. They also claim that base-generation accounts of such constructions (both parts are base-generated in situ) do not fare any better. They propose instead the copy and deletion approach to movement. According to this theory, deletion after the copying operation is possible for both copies.
In ‘Roots, constituents, and c-command’ Robert Frank, Paul Hagstrom & K. Vijay-Shanker make the interesting proposal that syntactic structures should be characterized directly in terms of a primitive c-command relation, as opposed to a primitive dominance relation. Traditional concepts such as roots and constituents are described simply in terms of c-command without referring to dominance at all. The c-command based view on roots distinguishes between the categorical root and the site of cyclic attachment.

In ‘A four-way classification of monadic verbs’, Murat Kural argues that the two-way classification of monadic verbs as unaccusative and unergative verbs, as proposed by Perlmutter (1978) and Burzio (1986) should in fact be viewed as a four-way classification. The four classes are as follows: verbs of being (verbs that indicate that their subject comes to be in some fashion, e.g. *appear, arise, emerge, ensue, exist*, etc.), change of state verbs (verbs that indicate that their subject has undergone a change of state, e.g. *break, burn, change, fold, grow*, etc.), change of location verbs (verbs that indicate the motion of the subject, e.g. *fall, jump, march, roll, run*, etc.), and finally verbs of creation (verbs that indicate that the subject has produced an often abstract, though sometimes concrete but intangible product, e.g. *cough, dance, dream, laugh, sing, sleep*, etc.). Each class is associated with a distinct structure.

Luis Lopez considers the operations Agree and Move. The title of his paper is ‘On agreement: locality and feature valuation’. In that paper, Lopez argues that Agree is strictly local. Secondly, he argues that the operation Move is not Attract/Pied-Pipe, but is triggered by the instability created in the system.
by unvalued features. Finally, he proposes the concept of ‘Co-Valued features’ in order to make explicit the relation between an expletive and its associate on the one hand and the relation between the links of a chain on the other. The combination of locality and co-evaluation allows him to analyse and account for subtle cross-linguistic variation.

In ‘A minimalist account of conflation processes: parametric variation at the lexicon-syntax interface’, Jaume Mateu & Gemma Rigau show that the ‘conflation processes’ involved in so-called ‘lexicalization patterns’ can receive an adequate account when translated into syntactic terms. They demonstrate that the distinction between satellite-framed and verb-framed constructions correlates with the (un)availability of the relevant empty heads (cause/go/be), whose licensing involves Merge, this in order to avoid crashing at PF. They conclude that parametrized variation is not confined to the inflectional system, as is traditionally believed, but that it involves the non-inflectional system as well.

The next paper is by Juan Romero. In ‘Morphological constraints on syntactic derivations’, the author argues that there is no universal catalogue of formal features from which to choose. Instead, each language determines independently its own formal features from the universal set of features F made available by the language faculty. In order to support his hypothesis, Romero shows how certain restrictions, e.g. the Person Case Constraint, only show up if there are agreement features involved. Furthermore, he links this property to the ability found in some languages such as Japanese to delete
arguments without leaving any phonetic trace, agreement or pronoun. Other issues are discussed: for instance, the interpretability of the EPP feature and object shift in Scandinavian languages.

The final paper is by Joachim Sabel. Entitled ‘Intermediate traces, reconstruction and locality effects’, it specifically argues against intermediate adjunction. The idea is that the only existing intermediate traces of a moved element are traces in specifier positions. The basic tests that are used to strengthen his hypothesis involve: wh-movement, empty-operator movement, A-movement, extraposition, quantifier raising, scrambling, and head movement. Instead of relying on intermediate adjunction, the analysis of scrambling in German and Japanese rests on the assumption that Japanese allows for multiple A-specifiers whereas German does not.

The editor of this volume has done a marvellous job at putting together all these articles. The introduction is very helpful, not only in setting out what the volume is about, but also in reviewing the issues and history of universals in linguistics so far. The book is superbly edited. My only regret is that the papers are very different nature. Although there is a common theme, that of universals, and a common theoretical thread, i.e. the Minimalist Program, it is often not so clear what unites all these contributions. The proposals are often very complex and no link between them is necessarily apparent. Perhaps, instead of appearing in alphabetical order, it would have been more judicious to group the articles together under common themes, e.g. those papers dealing with the lexical aspects of universals, those papers on phrase-structure, those
concentrating on the nature and properties of movement relations, etc. For example, Arad’s paper, Kural’s article and Mateu & Rigau’s respective contributions belong together while Boeckx’ and Lopez’ papers are natural candidates to appear side by side. Another complaint is that the index is very minimal and does not do justice to the richness of the concepts and authors cited in the volume.
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