
The book under review is devoted to the linguistic processes by which European languages are becoming more and more alike. It provides a further elaboration of the framework for dealing with language contact and grammatical change developed by Heine and Kuteva in their earlier work by applying it to one particular linguistic area.

Chapter 1, “Europe as a linguistic area”, summarizes earlier research on the European languages with questions like “is there something like a European area that can be defined linguistically and, if so, how can it be delimited, on the basis of which properties, what would count as its centre and what further subgroupings can be found there?” Heine and Kuteva go through a number of recent studies, in particular within the areal-typological approach initiated by the EUROTYPO project (“Typology of languages in Europe”), where the properties of the European languages are plotted against a larger global language sample. These studies reveal various clusterings of linguistic properties within Europe that are relatively rare in other parts of the world and are unlikely to be due to genetic relationship or to coincidence. The clusterings that have attained most attention are particularly pronounced in the languages of western and central Europe — the “Standard Average European” (SAE) languages, defined differently by different authors. Haspelmath’s study (2001) is of special value for Heine and Kuteva in that he not only provides a list of SAE properties, but also evaluates different hypotheses on their origin. Haspelmath argues that most of these features are European innovations as compared to the classical Indo-European languages that diffused across Europe via contacts during the great transformations at the transition from late antiquity to the early Middle Ages.

As the authors comment, Haspelmath’s approach involves mainly standard/written languages, tends to rely on the most salient
construction(s) ignoring alternative ones, and “does not fully account for the dynamics underlying grammatical categorization in European languages. These dynamics can be reflected in dialect variation, in contextual variation, or in the coexistence of different patterns employed for the expression of a given grammatical function, and especially in language change” (p. 33). Heine and Kuteva’s book is partly intended to remedy these problems and to complement Haspelmath’s findings with a more dynamic perspective: “[r]ather than viewing areal relationship as a product, we will describe it as a process induced by language contact, and rather than describing Europe as a linguistic area, we will be concerned with the forces that led, and are leading to areal relationship in Europe” (p. 44). To this end, they try to show how four of Haspelmath’s SAE properties are gradually spreading across the fringe languages of western Europe — Slavic, Finno-Ugric, Baltic, Celtic, and Basque — leading to increasing similarities among the European languages. The key notion here is grammatical replication, whereby new grammatical structures evolve in situations of language contact.

Grammatical replication is further defined in Chapter 2 as “a process whereby a language, called the replica language (R), creates a new grammatical structure (Rx) on the model of some structure (Mx) of another language, called the model language (M)” (p. 49). Grammatical replication falls into contact-induced grammaticalization and restructuring, but it is only the former subtype that is dealt with in the book. The central components of grammatical replication are (grammatical) use patterns and grammaticalization. Use patterns (p. 50) are recurrent pieces of linguistic discourse (a clause, a phrase, or even a single form used in some specific context), associated with some specific grammatical meaning, but their use is optional. They tend to be restricted to particular linguistic and sociolinguistic contexts. In the course of grammatical replication a minor use pattern — which often exists in the language prior to contact — develops into a major use pattern, whereby its frequency increases, it is extended to new contexts, and may become associated with a new grammatical function. Later the major use pattern may develop into an incipient category and even into a fully fledged category. So far this process is comparable to grammaticalization generally. The role of replication is seen in the choice of an initial pattern to undergo grammaticalization in language R. This minor pattern is externally motivated by being in one or another perceived by speakers of R as corresponding to a certain grammatical structure in language M. Replica structure is often less grammaticalized than the corresponding model structure, at least in the younger stages of replication, whereas long contact situations can lead to a great number of replica structures structurally nearly identical to the model
structures. Chapters 3–7 are all concerned with grammatical replication in the European languages.

As Heine and Kuteva point out, their methodology allows them to recognize grammatical phenomena that often remain unnoticed in other approaches. First, they consider different varieties of one and the same language in addition to the standard one. Second, they view grammatical phenomena not as static ready-made products of a long grammaticalization process (fully fledged highly grammaticalized categories), but as something that goes through different stages in its development. In the book under review, the most systematic and, in my view, successful application of this methodology is seen in Chapters 3 and 4.

Compared to the other languages of the world, European languages show an amazingly high proportion of definite and indefinite articles and of possessive perfects, i.e., perfects built on predicative possession (cf. I have a car and I have bought a car), with a particular prominence across Romance, Germanic and the Balkan languages. Chapters 3 and 4 focus primarily on contact-induced grammaticalization of articles and possessive perfects in what the authors call “Europe’s peripheral languages” (languages spoken in the periphery of the Romance- and Germanic-speaking territories). These are normally viewed as the articleless Slavic and Finno-Ugric languages of Central and Eastern Europe in Chapter 3 and Slavic and Celtic with short notes on Albanian, Basque, Finnish and Lithuanian in Chapter 4.

Heine and Kuteva’s methodology “capitalizes on the dynamics of the process leading from the demonstrative and the numeral ‘one’ to the definite and the indefinite article, and the fluid discourse structure giving rise to new use patterns” (p. 108). The conclusion is, that in addition to Bulgarian and Macedonian with fully grammaticalized definite articles, incipient- and intermediate-stage definite articles are found in several western and southern Slavic languages, all of which have had prolonged and intensive contacts with article languages in western Europe. The discussion of indefinite articles, which covers more languages, arrives at a comparable conclusion: “the closer a European language is to a Germanic or Romance language and/or to the south European language Greek, the more advanced the stage of the development from ‘one’ to indefinite article this language is likely to manifest” (p. 132). Chapter 3 suffers, unfortunately, from a serious typographic error: Map 3.1, which is supposed to show the distribution of the grammaticalization stages for the definite article in Europe, turns out to be the same as Map 3.2, The indefinite article in European languages.

I should add that the extent to which Europe is idiosyncratic here is in fact difficult to evaluate: Haspelmath (1998, 2001) quotes Dryer (1989),
out of whose 400-language global sample only 8% contain both definite and indefinite articles. Dryer’s later publications, the chapters on articles for the World Atlas of Language Structures (Dryer 2005a, 2005b), have other figures. Although they do not allow one to draw definite conclusions on the overall proportion of languages with both articles across the world, it should be much higher than 8%. These differences between the different publications by one and the same author cast certain doubts on using the high concentration of articles in Europe as a diagnostic SAE test. But they are, of course, also symptomatic of the difficulties in recognizing articles. Now, as Heine and Kuteva themselves warn on p. 106, their treatment of articles is a sketchy first approximation. My main problems here concern some of the examples and their analysis. Discussions of definiteness and indefiniteness, which are a tricky matter, are dependent on various discourse factors and require that relevant examples be both natural and systematically chosen. Consider an example (3.21) from Russian, translated into English as One day there was a teacher at the police station. Vanja knows the teacher. This example aims to show that Russian can use the same bare noun учитель ‘teacher’ without any additional marker both for introducing a referent and then mentioning it. However, according to my intuition, the bare noun is not appropriate in the second sentence: the highly accessible referent will either be expressed by a short anaphoric expression like him, or will, on the contrary, require a more emphatic expression like this teacher. In addition, several examples (e.g., 3.23 and 3.41), which are supposed to demonstrate that Czech and Polish have reached a more advanced stage in their grammaticalization of articles from the demonstrative and “one” than Russian, have perfect correspondences in Russian. On the basis of just these three examples Russian could, in theory, be evaluated as having more advanced articles than what is meant by the authors. As they themselves write on p. 46, their study is not concerned with “many issues that have been central to typological research carried out in the course of the past decades, such as finding representative samples of languages, devising questionnaires, etc.” Well, relying on good questionnaires and systematic checklists would in fact be a very good idea for a study of phenomena that have not yet made their way into standard grammars.

Grammaticalization of possessive perfects (Chapter 4) goes through several stages, where the initial ones have a certain “possessive” flavor and the final product is the fully established perfect with no (or almost no) constraints on either the subject or the verb, as in The house (inanimate subject) has fallen down (intransitive verb). Perfects can further develop into a generalized past, which is mentioned by Heine and Kuteva
but is of no direct concern for their study. Again, Romance and Germanic are possessive-perfect languages *par excellence* (with possessive perfects found across all the languages in the family), but also Greek, Albanian and some of the Slavic languages show possessive perfects. And again, in most of these languages this is an innovation which, according to the most frequent hypothesis, has its ultimate roots in Ancient Greek or in early Latin, or is the result of parallel development, at least in some cases. Among “Europe’s peripheral languages”, only Southwestern Macedonian has acquired a fully grammaticalized possessive perfect. Within Slavic, a fairly advanced possessive perfect is found in Southern Thracian Bulgarian (for which Greek/Macedonian influence has been suggested) and North Russian (for which Scandinavian/Finnic influence has sometimes been suggested, with both hypotheses being quite problematic). Most modern Slavic languages, apart from Standard Russian (and Old Church Slavonic), have incipient possessive perfects. They show therefore a beautiful areal distribution whereby the most advanced grammaticalization stage is found in the region with a high concentration of possessive perfects (the Balkans), while the language without possessive perfect is spoken far from the possessive-perfect area. Unfortunately we lack any information on Molise Croatian, which figures prominently in the other chapters in the book. Also the data on Sorbian seem preliminary — it is mentioned that possessive perfect constructions are used mostly colloquially, whereas the data and the description come from a grammar of the written language.

Within Celtic, Modern Breton and Southern Irish have fairly advanced, although not fully grammaticalized possessive perfects, while incipient possessive perfects are found in Northern Modern Irish. The section on Celtic contains a suggestive description of Irish English (Hiberno-English), which, in contrast to Standard English, has a weakly grammaticalized possessive perfect, more or less congruent with the one used in Northern Irish. According to the hypothesis defended by Heine and Kuteva, the Irish English construction reflects an earlier stage of some variety of British English, which has been retained under the influence of Irish. Note that it is precisely Northern Irish that shows the same weak grammaticalization of possessive perfect, i.e., the dialects spoken in the area with a high concentration of early English settlers, a fact not commented upon in the book. The differences in the grammaticalization of perfects across Celtic are in fact puzzling: on Map 4.1, Welsh (no possessive perfect) is, after all, as close to English as Breton (advanced possessive perfect) is to French. I suspect that the key to the puzzle can be found in the different sociolinguistic settings in which the different Celtic varieties have been used. A careful sociolinguistic analysis and a quest for
the sociolinguistic correlates for the linguistic differences would be a welcome complement to the purely linguistic description.

Chapters 3 and 4 are relevant for the distinction between replica and ordinary contact-induced grammaticalization, introduced in Heine and Kuteva’s earlier work (e.g., 2005) and repeated in the book under review. According to the authors (p. 63), in situations of language contact “speakers have two choices in replicating what they find in the model language; they may either replicate the process that they assume to have taken place in the model language, or they may draw on universal strategies of grammaticalization in forming a new use pattern or category”. Replica grammaticalization has been repeatedly exemplified with the “hot-news” perfect in Irish English, modeled on Irish and involving the fairly unusual pattern [X is after Y], whereby “speakers of Irish English appear to have chosen exactly the same grammaticalization process to develop an equivalent category. Ordinary contact-induced grammaticalization means that speakers create a use pattern or category they find in another language without being concerned with how this structure may have arisen in that language; in other words, the conceptualization pattern underlying the category in the replica language differs from the one in the model language” (p. 63). As pointed out by Wiemer (2007) and Gast and van der Auwera (2006), such descriptions presuppose an amazing metalinguistic awareness on the part of speakers. Formulations of this kind, which strike me as somewhat naïve from the psycholinguistic point of view, figure on the whole much less prominently in the book under review than in Heine and Kuteva (2005). Here I am more worried about the relation of the supposedly grammaticalization-induced phenomena treated in the book to the distinction between replica and ordinary grammaticalization. Possessive perfects are a simpler case: since perfects can grammaticalize from different sources, among which possessive structures are relatively infrequent, the choice of the possessive “conceptualization pattern underlying the perfect” in language after language can count as replica grammaticalization. But what about articles which, in the absolute majority of cases, grammaticalize from demonstratives and the numeral “one”? How would we know whether speakers of, say, Sorbian are concerned with how the articles may have arisen in German or draw on universal strategies of grammaticalization, when both strategies will most probably lead to the same result? Curiously, the distinction between ordinary and replica grammaticalization is absent from most of the analyses in the book, appearing only in Chapter 6.

Chapter 5, “From comitative to instrumental forms”, is largely based on the results of the large-scale typological project on instrumentals and comitatives run by Thomas Stolz, Cornelia Stroh and Aina Urdze (cf.
Stolz et al. 2007 and numerous other publications). Stolz et al.’s typology contains three types of languages:

- **coherent languages** in which comitatives and instrumentals receive the same marking (e.g., *She danced with her friend* vs. *She wrote the letter with a pencil* in English),
- **incoherent languages** in which comitative and instrumental receive different marking (e.g., *s drug-om* ‘with friend-instr’ vs. *karandaš-om* ‘pencil-instr’ in Russian), and
- **mixed languages** in which there are at least two markers — one used for both comitatives and instrumentals, and the other restricted to either comitatives or to instrumentals (cf. *barať-a´-val* ‘friend-3sg.poss-with, with her/his friend’ and *ceruzá-val* ‘pencil-with’ vs. *család-ostul* ‘family-with’ in Hungarian).

The comitative-instrumental syncretism, or polysemy, is much more frequent in the European languages than globally. Thus, among the 51 languages in Stolz et al.’s European sample, coherent languages are predominating (49%), followed by incoherent ones (31.4%) and, finally, by mixed ones (19.6%). However, globally (in a sample with more than 320 languages), coherent languages constitute only \( \approx 24.5\% \), while incoherent languages clearly predominate (\( \approx 64.7\% \)) and mixed ones are, again, much less frequent than each of the other types (\( \approx 10.8\% \)). Stolz himself has proposed viewing the comitative-instrumental syncretism as a typical SAE feature (cf. also Haspelmath 2001), with a stronghold among the modern Romance and Germanic languages and Greek. It is a relatively recent innovation, since Ancient Greek, earlier Latin and the older German and Celtic languages differentiated between the two functions. However, already Late Latin and the Byzantine Greek used polysemous comitative-instrumental prepositions and have most probably contributed to the development of similar strategies in Germanic, Celtic and the Balkan Slavic languages Bulgarian and Macedonian. Particularly interesting are the differences among closely related language varieties that can be explained by contacts with coherent languages. Thus, while Finnish is incoherent, both Estonian and Northern Saami are coherent, presumably due to their intensive contacts with Germanic languages, and the same goes for Latvian (coherent), as opposed to Lithuanian (mixed). Also the variation across Slavic is telling, where the comitative-instrumental syncretism is primarily found in the varieties known for long and intensive contacts with such coherent languages as German (Sorbian and Slovene), Italian (Molise Croatian) and the various Balkanic languages (Bulgarian and Macedonian).
Heine and Kuteva support the hypothesis, defended by Stolz et al. (2007), whereby the development of coherence starts with comitative markers that are later extended to cover instrumental functions, in other words, the development is always unidirectional. This is fine, but why should it be so? As is clear from the global figures, the comitative-instrumental syncretism is, after all, a widespread phenomenon and not a Romance-Greek idiosyncrasy. We have therefore to explain the underlying similarities between the two functions that are responsible for this phenomenon. Also, the suggested unidirectionality cries for explanation: in what sense is the instrumental function more grammaticalized than the comitative one? I am disappointed that none of these questions has been touched upon by Heine and Kuteva. I am also confused by formulations like “our claim that the rise of a comitative-instrumental polysemy in these languages is due to language contact” (p. 201): as far as I understand, exactly this has been claimed by the authors dealing with these languages and quoted in the chapter.

Chapter 6 deals with the extension of forms used for expressing questions to mark relations within and across clauses, or interrogative-subordination polysemy (cf. Who will come? vs. You know who will come vs. The man who will come here today is my brother). Heine and Kuteva quote Haspelmath (1998: 281–282) for listing this as a SAE property, which is partly wrong. What Haspelmath (1998, but also 2001) points out is that Europe shows a remarkably high concentration of postnominal relative clauses introduced with inflecting resumptive relative pronouns; in addition, in most SAE languages the relative pronoun is based on the interrogative one. Haspelmath has nothing to say on the complementizer part of the polysemy discussed by Heine and Kuteva, and I doubt that there are relevant systematic crosslinguistic studies of this issue (nothing in the World Atlas of Language Structures [2005], at least). The authors suggest a very tentative grammaticalization path from interrogative markers to markers of clause subordination and finally to relative markers and attempt to illustrate it with data from different languages.

Chapter 7, “Europe’s periphery”, is devoted to two different kinds of contact situations involving SAE languages. First, “Europeanization”, or changes in the typological profiles of particular languages under the influence of SAE languages — the languages under scrutiny include Basque spoken in southwestern France (heavily influenced by Gascon and French), the Slavic contact languages in Central Europe (Upper and Lower Sorbian and Slavincian, heavily influenced by German), and Pipil, a Uto-Aztecan language of El Salvador, heavily influenced by Spanish. The descriptions of Basque and Pipil are to a certain extent comparable with each other covering a wide range of different phenomena, while the
section on the Slavic contact varieties mentions just a few. The choice of some of these phenomena and their status as characteristic for the “European typological profile” is not always quite clear. To be sure, the articles in all these languages, the comitative-instrumental syncretism in Basque, the use of interrogatives as relative markers in Basque and Pipil, and the incipient vs. fully grammaticalized possessive perfects in Sorbian vs. Basque do belong to the SAE diagnostic properties. But to what extent are the German abundance of auxiliary verbs used in passive-like patterns (bekommen, kriegen, erhalten, will haben, gehören, sich lassen) and its productive noun-verb compounding (e.g., Staub-wischen ‘dust-wipe.inf’), partly replicated in Sorbian and Slovincian, SAE properties rather than properties of one particular SAE language, German? Examples like these strike me as a rather uncritical use of the available sources, which can be noticed in a number of places in the book. The second kind of contact situation considered in Chapter 7 is “de-Europeization”, or changes in the typological profile of a SAE language under influence of a non-European language — the cases considered are Singlish (Colloquial Singaporean English, heavily influenced by the other Singaporean languages, primarily Sinitic and Malay) and Nigerian Pidgin English (heavily influenced by the Kwa and Benue-Congo languages within Niger-Congo). In both cases, the Englishes acquired surprising non-European properties, many of which can be accounted for by contact-induced grammaticalization. A conclusion I make as a reader is — well, English is like any other language, there is nothing inherently more attractive or robust in its structure, and it is the language-external factors that ultimately determine its fate. A useful reminder, of course (a reference to Thomason and Kaufmann 1988 would be appropriate both here and at some other places in the book).

Chapter 8 summarizes the main conclusions of the book. First, the European languages are subject to a continuous development whereby linguistically and/or geographically more peripheral languages gradually acquire new use patterns and categories on the model of the Romance and Germanic languages and which is leading towards a new typological orientation of these languages. Also, once again, language change often involves both internal and external motivations. The contact-induced grammaticalization cases discussed in the book are internally motivated in the sense that they involve native linguistic material rather than borrowing, but are externally motivated since they were initiated or accelerated by models found in other languages. They have both a universal component due to grammaticalization being a universally defined process and an idiosyncratic component (the choice of a particular use pattern to be grammaticalized).
A few notes of a more formal character, starting with the maps, which are in general very informative and innovative. They are, however, too small and do not normally distinguish among the different dialects discussed in the book — something that should be of major concern for Heine and Kuteva. Likewise regrettable (and also more confusing) is the use of the same color for “no information” and for “Stage 0” in the various grammaticalization scenarios. In some cases this is particularly damaging: for instance, since Greek at its different stages is believed to be highly responsible for the evolution and diffusion of possessive perfects, the absence of any information on it in the book remains a mystery (even more puzzling since the references include Hedin 1987 on exactly this topic, not mentioned anywhere in the text).

The book is accompanied by a very helpful glossary. However, I sometimes wonder about the considerations behind the choice of particular items, e.g., the inclusion of “suffix” and “word order”, but not of “(in)-definite subordinate clause” used throughout Chapter 6 and not being a self-evident term. Sometimes there is a discrepancy between the glossary and the definitions given in the book. For instance, pp. 3–4 treat the notions of linguistic area, sprachbund and grammaticalization area, which are all related without being the same. The glossary, however, has an explanation for only one item — “sprachbund”; “linguistic area” has the note to “see sprachbund”, while “grammaticalization area” is completely absent.

The balance between the prose and the examples is not always optimal: some sections contain a number of similar examples from different languages (e.g., comitative-instrumental cases in Slavic on pp. 189–190), whereas the scarcity of comparable examples in other sections makes the exposition difficult to follow. Some descriptions look like notes taken more or less directly from the sources used by Heine and Kuteva, where some of the information is either unnecessary for the main discussion or remains unclear for the reader.

Finally, in spite of the numerous tables in the book, I feel that the wealth of data in the book calls for more systematic and consistent overview representations than what has been achieved so far. For instance, Chapter 4 contains one table (Table 4.2) on the types of possessive perfects in Slavic languages and another one (Table 4.4) on morphosyntactic changes leading from possessive to perfect schema in Celtic languages, which are organized in quite different fashions, but do in fact represent the same classification. Chapter 3, on the contrary, has no tables summarizing the situation with articles in the languages under consideration. There is also a certain discrepancy in the languages treated in the text and in the various tables: Table 5.3 has no Slovenian, but has Bulgarian,
Macedonian, Livonian, and Hungarian, whereas Table 5.4 has no Bulgar-
ian, Macedonian Livonian and Hungarian, but does have Slovenian. An-
other desideratum would be an overview table listing all the languages
discussed in the book with their relevant properties (like the stage in the
development of articles).

In conclusion, this book is undoubtedly an important and valuable
 contribution to historical and areal linguistics, grammaticalization theory,
typology, “Eurolinguistics” and linguistic theory in general. Heine and
Kuteva demonstrate here once again their impressive capacity to gather
and synthesize a tremendous wealth of data and case studies, using them
for formulating and supporting numerous hypotheses. As I see it, the
book opens several directions for further research, which include at least
the following ones: testing Heine and Kuteva’s hypotheses and results on
further languages; applying their methodology to further SAE properties;
and, finally, elaborating on the correlation between the linguistic phe-
nomena and their sociolinguistic correlates.
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Inverse systems pose a challenge to descriptive, typological, and theoretical studies of language alike. This challenge can be ascribed to two features common to inverse languages. One is the fact that they are organized on the basis of a hierarchical ordering of argument features such as person and animacy. The second is the relation (and similarity) of inverse constructions to passive voice. Consider the following examples from Plains Cree, a member of the Algonquian language family, which is well-known for its inverse systems:

Plains Cree (Algonquian)
(1) ni-wâpamâ-w
   1-see-DIR-3
   ‘I see him/her’ (direct)
   (Zúñiga 2006: 2)
(2) ni-wâpam-ikw-w
   1-see-INV-3
   ‘S/he sees me’ (inverse)
   (Zúñiga 2006: 2)

The examples in (1) and (2) share the same verbal root wâpam ‘to see’ and person morphology ni- (1st) and -w (3rd). The difference in interpretation between the two sentences therefore has to be attributed to the difference in direction marking. The direct morpheme in (1) indicates that the action of seeing proceeds from the highest-ranked argument to the lower-ranked one in this way illustrating the influence of a person hierarchy. The reverse situation is encoded by the inverse marker ikw in (2). Although perhaps less prominent in the case of Plains Cree — where it would be possible to interpret the inverse marker as a passive morpheme with the overall meaning of the sentence being ‘I was seen by him/her’ — the correlation between passive and inverse became eminent when the label “inverse system” was being applied to languages outside the Algonquian family.

In his book *Deixis and Alignment: Inverse Systems in Indigenous Languages of the Americas* Fernando Zúñiga (henceforth FZ) develops a
functional approach to direction marking and inverse systems within a wider typological (Amerindian) perspective. The book falls out in two main parts. The first, Chapters 1 and 2 and the concluding Chapter 8, provides a theoretical background and develops an approach to direction marking. The remainder of the book, Chapters 3–7, demonstrates an application of this framework in the description of the morphosyntax of twelve languages from five different Amerindian families: Algonquian, Kutenai, Sahaptian, Kiowa-Tanoan, and Mapudungun. Additionally, there are three appendices, one with the paradigms of the Algonquian languages discussed, one with an analysis of Kiowa prefixes, and one with a discussion of optimality-theoretic approaches to inverse systems. The volume concludes with separate language, author, and subject indices.

In Chapter 1, FZ provides a discussion of alignment (systems) and its relation to direction marking. Given that alignment involves the mapping between grammatical roles and grammatical functions, he first introduces his conception of these notions. With respect to the former, he adopts the familiar SAO-model (cf. Comrie 1981; Dixon 1994; Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000) in which the grammatical roles are S (sole actant of an intransitive clause), A (actant of a transitive clause that prototypically denotes the controller or initiator of the state of affairs), and O (the other actant of a transitive clause). Furthermore, there is the E-role, which is an extension of the core arguments SAO, and typically denotes a non-A or non-O argument. As for grammatical relations, FZ follows recent functionalist work by treating them not as primitives or structurally defined, but instead as “language-specific notions that may well be fuzzy” (p. 6). The types of alignment found crosslinguistically (e.g., ergative, accusative, etc.) are then illustrated with representative examples. The existence of ‘split alignment’, for which FZ introduces the term “polynomy”, where languages allow for different alignments in different parts of the grammar, such as ergative morphology and accusative syntax or the well-known split-ergativity invokes the discussion of pivot and primary argument, and mixed pivots. Particularly relevant in this discussion are languages in which alignment and formation of pivots is driven by an indexability hierarchy. It is well-known since Silverstein (1976) that semantic and referential properties of arguments can affect their morphosyntactic encoding. These properties are often ranked with respect to each other such that speech act participants (SAP) are placed above third persons, which in turn can be ranked with respect to their animacy (animate > inanimate), topicality or other factors. The result is a hierarchy, which is also variably labeled nominal, person, animacy or empathy hierarchy.

FZ notes that languages which show sensitivity to such indexability hierarchies cannot be easily described with a regular SAO model. In order
to incorporate such languages, models of alignment either have to invoke additional principles such as sensitivity to hierarchies which the author considers “something of a *deus ex machina*” (p. 12), or they should postulate “hierarchical alignment” (Nichols 1992) or “inverse” (Klaiman 1991) as a separate alignment type in addition to the established ones. In this book FZ adopts the second stance and in the final part of Chapter 1 he discusses the relation between hierarchical alignment and direction marking. He argues that, although intimately related, these are “logically independent features that can, but need not, co-occur” (p. 28). Instead, the two notions are fundamentally different in that hierarchical alignment is concerned with the mapping between grammatical relations and grammatical functions, whereas direction marking is a reflection of alignment between a role hierarchy (A > O) and an indexability hierarchy. When the higher-ranked argument is the A, a predicate or clause may be marked as direct. Inverse is used when the O is the higher-ranking argument. As such, direction may occur in languages with hierarchical alignment but may equally well be observed in languages of different alignment types.

In Chapter 2, the author sets out to develop a theory of direction. In the first part he is mainly concerned with the relationship between passive voice and direction marking, an issue which occupies an important position in the literature on inverse systems. In many approaches passives and inverses are seen as in competition and the central question to be answered is whether “construction X in language A is a passive or an inverse” (p. 40). FZ shows that this question is often answered on either structural or functional grounds. As a proponent of the first stance he puts forward Klaiman (1991) who treats inverses as a separate voice type and Dixon and Aikhenvald (2000) who treat it as a construction type different from voice constructions. Both approaches develop structural criteria for telling inverses apart from passives. On the other hand, there are functional approaches, as the one by Givón (1994), that treat inverse as a (detransitive) voice type but define it on functional grounds. In Givón’s approach inverse is a detransitive voice that, like passives, contains an O that is more topical than the A, but, unlike passives, has an A that retains considerable topicality. No structural cues can be used to tell the two apart.

Following work by DeLancey (e.g., 1981, 2001) FZ takes a different approach to direction in which it is not related to voice type but instead constitutes a category of its own. “[I]n this view direction is essentially deictic. This means that its yield is indexical: it points to something, in this case to the admittedly rather abstract notion of direction in which a state of affairs flow — not spatially or temporally, but in terms of the action that takes place between two or more arguments” (p. 31). The re-
sult is a “deictic opposition between an action directed toward a referent outranking most others on an indexability hierarchy and an action directed toward a referent that is outranked by most others on the same hierarchy” (p. 41). By treating direction as a category of its own different from voice, FZ can reformulate the common question phrased above “is construction X in language A a passive or an inverse?” to the question “does construction X in language A express an inverse meaning? If so, is it also a passive, or a passive-like structure?” (p. 40). Moreover, as a result of the separation of direction and voice a range of morphosyntactic mechanisms, including passive constructions, can be analyzed as expressions of the direct-inverse opposition. On the structural side he acknowledges the existence of a separate construction different from passive, which he labels “remapping”.

In the second part of Chapter 2, the author describes three parameters of direction that together articulate his model. First, “locus of marking”, which concerns the overt manifestation of direction marking in a clause. Four possibilities are distinguished: (i) detached: marking by means of phrasal clitics; (ii) head-marking; (iii) dependent marking; and (iv) double marking, which is a combination of (ii) and (iii). FZ explicitly excludes word order permutations from his analysis (contra Givón 1994). The second dimension is that of “direction domains”, which pertains to the persons involved in the direction marking. The label “mixed” is used to refer to situations in which both a SAP and a 3rd person are involved and is also called “core direction”. “Non-local” refers to situations where only 3rd persons are involved. Again a more fine-grained distinction can be made dependent on whether the 3rd persons differ in inherent semantics (e.g., animacy), discourse factors, or grammatical factors (e.g., possessor vs. possessee). Finally, there is the “local” domain referring to scenarios involving only SAPs.

The third direction parameter is that of “focality” which concerns the degree of specificity of the information encoded by direction markers. Four degrees of focality are distinguished: (i) “non-focal” (unrestricted) direction: only the person features of either the A or the O are explicated; (ii) “low-focal” direction: both O and A are present but persons are not explicated, only direction is, e.g., “high → low” or “low → high”; (iii) “mid-focal” direction is more explicit than the previous category and a further distinction is made between whether participants are adjacent on the indexability hierarchy or not, labeled weak and strong direction respectively; (iv) “high-focal” (particular) direction: direction markers explicate both the A and O person features.

With these general concepts and his framework in place, the author sets out in Chapters 3–7 to apply his model to the description of the inverse
systems of twelve Amerindian languages from five different families. Given that these chapters contain detailed discussion of the morphological and syntactic paradigms of these languages, I will not attempt to give a synopsis of them, as I cannot do justice to the wealth of these descriptions here. Instead, I will discuss some of the conclusions provided in Chapter 8, which generalize over the languages discussed in the book.

This chapter sets off with a comparison of the behavior of the different languages with respect to the direction parameters introduced above. Of particular interest are the parameters “locus of marking” and “direction domains”. As for the first, most languages use a head-marking strategy to mark direction. The Tanoan languages differ from this as they use the double marking strategy. Umatilla Sahaptin is considered the most complex system as it combines several types of marking including case on the dependents. As for direction domains, most languages show direction in all three domains discussed above, and are labeled languages with global direction. Kutenai, however, only displays non-local direction, and Nez Perce only local direction. Kiowa shows core direction without non-local direction and is difficult to categorize with respect to the local domain. FZ shows how these findings complement ideas about the evolution of inverse systems. He then continues with a discussion of the correspondence between form and function in global direction languages. He distinguishes four ways in which the different direction domains can be associated with form: (i) “symmetric”: all domains are formally distinguished; (ii) “primary-centered”: the local domain is marked differently from the other two, which are marked the same; (iii) “secondary-centered”: the non-local domain is marked differently from the other two, which are marked the same; and (iv) “one-dimensional”: all domains are formally marked the same. After a discussion of proposals for a voice and inverse continuum, and a note on the formal modeling of inverse systems, the chapter is concluded with some prospects including a sympathetic plea for the rescue of languages from extinction.

Due to its high degree of technical discussion and the inclusion of detailed descriptions of a wide variety of languages the present book does not present itself as an easy read. FZ seems to be fully justified when he writes in the opening sentence of the concluding chapter that “[r]eaders previously unacquainted with most of the languages discussed in the preceding chapters may want to take a longish break and ponder on the crucial statements, reconsider the available evidence, and/or consult primary sources” (p. 245). Indeed, the book seems most appropriate to the more advanced reader with a thorough background in functional approaches to alignment and some knowledge of the problems central to the discussion of inverse systems. Apart from the complexity of its subject matter, the
difficulty of the book can be partially attributed to the way it is organized. The fact that the author wants to do full justice to the subtleties in the discussions and the contributions of other researchers — in itself a valuable quality — and the absence of sharp definitions of central concepts makes that the central line of argumentation sometimes becomes obscured. This holds in particular for Chapters 1 and 2. An illustrative example of such a regression from the central argument is the discussion of the notion of “orientation” on p. 14. Given that it is not pursued further in the overall discussion I believe the author should have omitted it or transferred it to a footnote in order not to interrupt his own line of argumentation.

It should, however, be noted that these objections disappear in Chapters 3–7, where the carefulness of the author can be nothing but appreciated. Here, the analyses and descriptions of the languages benefit to the full from his care and precision in the discussion of the paradigms. Nowhere does the author jump to conclusions and in many cases he points rightly to the need for further research before any strong commitments to one analysis or the other can be made. Illustrative in this respect is the fact that, where possible, he has consulted different sources of a single language and different members of a single language family in order to arrive at a balanced and well-founded description of the inverse systems. This comparative method is a very strong feature of the book as it often gives deeper insight into the working of a single language and brings to light the complexity of the phenomenon under discussion.

Moreover, the framework as developed in Chapters 1 and 2 proves to be a valuable tool in the description of the patterns of the individual languages and for the comparison between them. The distinction between the parameters “direction domain” and “focality” makes it possible for the author to provide detailed descriptions of the data. Furthermore, the move to treat direction as a category of its own separate from voice enables him, and with him the reader, to arrive at a better understanding of direction by going beyond the controversy of voice versus inversion. I believe this to be one of the most important contributions of the present book.

The view on direction makes it possible to extend an analysis in terms of a direct-inverse opposition to languages where it does not have a morphological reflex. As such, it ties in with the approach on the intimately related phenomenon of obviation as developed in the work of Aissen (1997, 2000), who applies an optimality-theoretic analysis in terms of obviation to languages that do not reflect this category directly in their morphosyntax. Given the similarity in approach, a discussion of the latter work would have been a welcome addition to Appendix 3 of the book,
which has as its main goal to substantiate the claim that “the view of direction proposed in the present study is essentially compatible with an optimality-theoretic approach” (p. 275). As it is now, the appendix focuses solely on existing OT-syntactic analysis of inversion and does not really detail how these can be combined with the framework developed in the book.

Given the appendix, FZ clearly shows an interest in bridging the gap between functional and (more) formal analyses of direction, but I believe he could have gone further in exploring this. Much of the discussion seems to relate to and be relevant for broader themes debated in the literature. To capitalize on one issue take that of indexability hierarchies. FZ points out that “the underlying rationale of an indexability hierarchy . . . appears to be somewhat elusive, even after nearly three decades of research” (p. 21). In fact, different researchers (in the generative tradition) even question the primitive status of such hierarchies (see, for instance, Jelinek and Carnie 2003; Carnie 2006; Trommer 2006 for discussion). In particular the discussion of the Algonquian languages in Chapter 3 is relevant to this debate as it shows that the use of a single hierarchy to describe the phenomena in these languages is “at least an oversimplification and at worst an urban legend” (p. 127). Moreover, in the concluding chapter FZ writes that “one detailed cross-linguistic hierarchy [is] likely to be rather an impressionistic oversimplification than a useful analytic tool, but also one language-specific hierarchy may miss the point in some cases” (p. 253). This conclusion is in line with that of other researchers and the discussion in (and outside) the book could have benefited from putting it in this broader perspective.

The points raised above are by no means intended to downgrade the book, but are rather meant to illustrate the broad relevance of the issues discussed. I believe FZ has done an impressive job by writing — to my knowledge — the first full-length monograph on inverse systems with the inclusion of such a wealth of crosslinguistic data. The result is a book that should be, if not the starting point, an obligatory stop on one’s quest for the understanding of the underlying mechanisms of inverse systems.

Radboud University Nijmegen
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Syntaxe générale: une introduction typologique [General syntax: a typological introduction] gives a coherent and typologically informed overview of the phenomena that are or should be discussed in the syntactic description of a previously un(der)described language. Its goals and scope are comparable to those of the influential Shopen volumes. It can be hoped that Creissels’ volumes will play a similar role in the francophone descriptive tradition, which would especially benefit our knowledge of the syntax of African languages. Typological data are adduced not so much to illustrate exhaustively the diversity of syntactic structures in the languages of the world, but rather to illustrate the difficulties a linguist is
likely to encounter when making a first syntactic description of a language and to introduce the analytical tools and terminology necessary to cope with them. Creissels points out some oversimplifications in the typological literature, e.g., regarding lexical variation in syntactic alignment (vol. 1, p. 308) and repeatedly notes terminological confusion in the literature (e.g., the confusion between numeral classifiers and measure terms, vol. 1, p. 107). At times, the use of terminology is slightly idiosyncratic; see, for instance, the definition of *voice* below or the specification of cataphora as a type of anaphora (vol. 1, p. 82, Note 2).

One of the outstanding qualities of this work is the large and coherent set of accurate and workable definitions for grammatical phenomena. Nothing is assumed to be self-evident. Another plus is that having done extensive field work himself, the author has first-hand knowledge on many of the languages cited, e.g., Tswana, Manding, Hungarian, and Basque. This introduction thus benefits in several ways from the author’s long experience in descriptive linguistics. Whereas typologically oriented introductions to syntax generally tend to focus on subjects that are or have been popular in typological research, Creissels’ volumes pay much more attention to less studied aspects of syntax with which grammar writers are likely to be confronted. Even where little space is dedicated to developing these subjects, the fact that they are discussed will definitely help field workers structure their grammar. A case in point is the discussion of *adjectiviseurs*, a term coined by Creissels for morphemes that mark typical dependents of verbs — such as adpositional phrases — when they function as nominal dependents (Chapter 4, pp. 77–79), not to be confused with *adjectivisers* in the sense of affixes that derive adjectives from other word classes. Creissels gives examples from Hungarian, Basque and Turkish. In Hungarian, for instance, postpositional phrases must be marked by a suffix *-i* and case-marked noun phrases by *levő* (a participle of the verb ‘be’) when they function as dependents of nouns (1a)–(1b).

\[(1) \quad \text{a. } a \text{ templom után-i kereszteződés} \]
\[
\text{DEF church behind-ADJ crossroads} \\
\text{‘the crossroads behind the church’}
\]
\[
\text{b. } a \text{ hegy-en levő ház} \\
\text{DEF hill-SUP ESS ADJ house} \\
\text{‘the house on the hill’}
\]

A bibliography, list of abbreviations, subject index and language index are provided in both volumes. The language index gives an indication of the published sources used for a language, its language family and geographic location and a list of the discussed phenomena with a reference to the relevant section. The volumes start with their table of contents.
and conveniently end with the table of contents of the other volume. Every chapter concludes with an overview of suggested further reading. This probably explains the (sometimes regrettable) absence of bibliographical references in the text. The editing is at times untidy, but fortunately all examples are carefully glossed.

The first volume *Categories and Constructions* opens with a short introduction on the theoretical background of the book, which is characterized as eclectic, lexicalist, realist (i.e., basically refusing to refer to invisible elements and transformations from abstract, equally indiscernible representations) and neither generativist nor functionalist. Creissels cites HPSG, role and reference grammar and Dik’s functional grammar as major sources of inspiration, but does not adopt their particular formalisms. Chapter 1 discusses basic notions of syntactic analysis, such as *word, sentence, word class, agreement* and *coordination*. The major word classes *noun* and *verb* receive a prototype-theoretical characterization in Chapter 2, which also introduces the main phrase types (French *types majeurs de constituants*). The next chapters (Chapters 3–15) treat individual word classes in more detail, as well as syntactic phenomena and grammatical categories that are directly relevant for these word classes: nouns (Chapter 3); dependents of nouns (Chapter 4); pronouns (Chapter 5); nominal classification, including gender, noun classes and classifiers (Chapter 6); quantification and number (Chapter 7); definiteness (Chapter 8); genitives and possessives (Chapter 9); verbs (Chapter 10); tense, aspect and mood (Chapter 11); adjectives (Chapter 12); nonfinite verb forms and hybrid (verbal-nominal) forms (Chapter 13); adpositions (Chapter 14); and finally adverbs and ideophones (Chapter 15).

Volume 2 starts with a very clear introductory chapter, *The sentence* (French *la phrase*), on verbal valency, transitivity and voice, here defined as any type of change in verb forms that relates (more or less) regularly to a change in valency. The next five chapters each elaborate on a voice category: reflexive, reciprocal and other types of middle voice (Chapter 22); passive and other types of subject demotion (Chapter 23); causative (Chapter 24); applicative (Chapter 25) and antipassive (Chapter 26). There are also chapters on possessive sentences (Chapter 27); topicalization and focalization (Chapter 28); negation (Chapter 29) and speech act distinctions (Chapter 30). The last seven chapters are dedicated to complex constructions, starting with a general chapter on the integration of sentence level structures, which includes a discussion of subordination and coordination (Chapter 31). This is followed by three chapters on relative clauses (Chapters 32–34) and chapters on complementation (Chapter 35), raising and control (Chapter 36) and complex predicates (Chapter 37).
The content and organization of the chapters can be illustrated by means of an overview of the chapter on the applicative (Chapter 25). When these volumes appeared, there was no monograph-size typological study of the applicative (in the meantime there is Peterson 2007). Hence the typological generalizations proposed in this chapter are to a fair extent original. As in most chapters, the first section provides a precise definition of the grammatical category under discussion. The applicative is defined here as a derived form of the verb that has as its canonical function to allow a constituent to be assigned the syntactic relation of object, which it could not otherwise assume. Creissels distinguishes between two main types of applicative, namely, optional and obligatory. Elements that can be expressed by means of an oblique are promoted to object status by means of an optional applicative, whereas obligatory applicatives introduce elements that cannot be expressed otherwise.

In the second section Creissels notes that the general use of the term applicable is relatively recent and therefore tends to be restricted to the literature on languages without a long linguistic or philological tradition, but that its use can be extended to phenomena such as what is called objective version and locative version in Georgian linguistics. These are morphological modifications of the verb that allow elements that can normally be construed only as obliques to assume the dative relation, which in Georgian is a nuclear syntactic relation. Similar efforts of terminological (and therefore analytical) homogenization can be found across the volumes. In the chapter on nouns (Chapter 3), for instance, the notion of construct state, usually restricted to Afro-Asiatic linguistics, is applied to other languages. Construct state is a special form that nouns have to take in order to combine with certain dependents, especially genitive ones. If a noun in the construct state is used in the absence of such a dependent, it is interpreted as a possessee the possessor of which has to be retrieved anaphorically. With this in mind, Creissels argues, it makes sense to use the term construct state in languages with a paradigm of possessive affixes where the alleged 3rd person singular affix is obligatory in the presence of some types of dependent (e.g., Hungarian). This affix is better analyzed as a construct state marker that receives a default 3rd person singular possessive interpretation in the absence of a genitive dependent.

Sections three to five in the chapter on applicatives discuss typological variation in the use of applicative constructions, i.e., whether the applicative adds an object to the valency of the verb or replaces one object with another one (Section 3); and whether the semantic relation of the applicative object depends on the lexical semantics of the verb or is defined by the applicative affix itself (Section 4). Section five discusses the usefulness of optional applicatives, e.g., making it possible to focalize instruments in
Wolof by promoting them to object status. The next three sections focus on formal aspects, noting that applicative affixes are often historically related to adpositions (Section 6); that just as causatives, applicatives can be expressed by means of periphrastic constructions, often involving a verb meaning ‘give’ (Section 7); and that in several genetically unrelated languages the same morpheme can mark the causative and the applicative (Section 8). The chapter closes with a section on noncanonical uses of applicative markers, all illustrated by means of interesting data from the Bantu language Tswana.

In addition to being an excellent introduction to syntactic description, Syntaxe générale offers a reference work for definitions of grammatical terms, as well as an overview of the syntactic theory developed by Creissels in numerous publications.
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