This work is a monumental undertaking, and will be a standard reference work for many years to come. As B acknowledges (15), its main defect is the ‘inadequate or nonexistent etymologies’, which in some cases can be remedied by future research (largely in the west and Alaska), but sadly in the case of much of the east and south likely cannot be. The volume is handsomely and sturdily bound, and the typeface is easy to read against the high quality paper. Amazingly—or perhaps not, given B’s eagle editorial eye—I detected only four typos in over 600 pages (‘Algo-quian’ for ‘Algonquian’ on p. 121, ‘term’ for ‘turn’ on p. 192, ‘Fa.’ for ‘Fla.’ on p. 264, ‘adaptation’ for ‘adaptation’ on p. 296). This book should be found on the shelves of all reference libraries, and of course (well thumbed) in the personal libraries of onomasticians.
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Reviewed by IDA TOIVONEN, Carleton University

The phenomena of raising and control have, together and separately, been the topic of a very large number of publications within the general school of thought that we call generative grammar. In The grammar of raising and control: A course in syntactic argumentation, William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky guide the reader through the various analyses of raising and control that have been proposed from standard theory up until the present.

The book consists of thirteen chapters, which are organized in four units, as well as author and subject indices. Unit 1, ‘Classic transformational grammar’, contains five chapters. Ch. 1 is a short introduction to raising and control, including an overview of the classic tests by which the phenomena can be teased apart. Already in this chapter, D&D point out that the picture is not as neat and tidy as it first may seem: evidence from French, first presented by Ruwet (1991), serves to illustrate that it is not always possible to appeal to syntactic diagnostics to identify and distinguish between raising and control. Ch. 2 introduces standard theory and presents Robert Lees’s and Peter Rosenbaum’s analyses of raising. Ch. 3 discusses Paul Postal’s (1974) book, On raising, which is perhaps the most important and most comprehensive work to date on raising. In Ch. 4, we are introduced to Noam Chomsky’s extended standard theory, which eliminates raising-to-object. Extended standard theory also replaces the notion of a deleted equivalent NP with a base-generated ‘controlled’ PRO. As Postal’s book contains a number of arguments for raising-to-object, Chs. 3 and 4 give the reader insight into an exciting exchange of views. The
excitement is turned up a notch or two in Ch. 5, where the ‘On raising’ debates are covered. Bresnan takes the extended standard theory position that the infinitival subject stays in situ in so-called raising-to-object constructions. Postal responds. Bach points to a third possibility: it is actually possible that the NP in question is base-generated in the matrix object position.

In Unit 2, ‘Extensions and reinterpretations of standard theory’, D&D draw our attention to the array of new approaches to syntax that emerged in the 1970s. The two chapters included in the unit specifically focus on David Perlmutter and Postal’s relational grammar (Ch. 6) and Chomsky’s revised extended standard theory (Ch. 7). The basic formal mechanisms and theoretical assumptions are presented, and it is also explained how raising and control are analyzed in the respective frameworks. The treatments of raising-to-object illustrate the formal differences as well as the differences in theoretical assumptions between relational grammar and revised extended standard theory. Relational grammar of course does not adopt the formal mechanism of movement, but nevertheless assumes that the 1 (‘subject’) of the embedded clause ascends to hold a 2-relation (‘object’ relation) in the matrix clause. In revised extended standard theory, as in extended standard theory, no movement is assumed: the deep subject is the surface subject in raising-to-object.

Much research within relational grammar focuses on the discovery and formulation of universal principles that identify and restrict certain phenomena (in particular, relation-changing operations) crosslinguistically. Universal principles similarly become the focus in the principles-and-parameters (P&P) framework within transformational grammar, which is the topic of Unit 3, ‘Government and binding theory’. Unit 3 contains three chapters. Ch. 8 introduces Chomsky’s government and binding (GB) model and the exceptional case marking (ECM) account of raising-to-object. Within GB, it is assumed that every NP must be assigned (abstract) case, according to certain restrictions on what a potential case assigner is and how case can be assigned. Under the ECM account of raising-to-object, the matrix verb ‘exceptionally’ assigns accusative case to the embedded subject across a clause boundary. Ch. 9 discusses the limited success of applying an ECM analysis to crosslinguistic data. In Ch. 10, certain (apparent) raising constructions from languages other than English are considered in more detail. In particular, the chapter points out that not only is it difficult to develop satisfactory analyses of raising crosslinguistically, but it is also sometimes unclear whether the data under scrutiny in fact instantiate raising at all.

In Unit 4, ‘The minimalist program’, we witness another overhaul of transformational grammar. This new view of syntactic theory (introduced in Ch. 11) surprisingly led to the abandonment of ECM, and raising-to-object is once again analyzed as movement of the subordinate subject into the matrix object position. Ch. 12 discusses several papers that resuscitate a raising analysis of raising-to-object. Due to changes in the theory, the new raising analyses look quite different from the classic analyses: modern raising-to-object involves movement into a functional projection above the VP. Ch. 13, the final chapter, covers the recent debates on whether control and raising should be unified as a single syntactic phenomenon, and, relatedly, whether the distinctions between raising and control are syntactic or semantic. The book lacks a clear concluding chapter. This is a shame: an overview and general commentary at the end would have been beneficial.

D&D develop several threads in this book. First and foremost, they trace the turbulent history of generative treatments of raising and control. As a background to this, D&D tell the tale of how transformational syntax has developed and changed from Aspects (Chomsky 1965) up until modern times. More generally, they teach syntactic argumentation, as promised in the subtitle of the book. For each analysis that is reviewed, D&D explain the line of reasoning lucidly, while illustrating with relevant examples. They take care to separate theoretical and theory-internal arguments from empirical arguments. They also point to strengths and weaknesses in different lines of argumentation. Furthermore, they are careful to point out when a key empirical point or an analysis reappears in the literature after having been forgotten for a period of time, sometimes decades.

Substantial passages from original articles and books are integrated into the chapters. For example, the book includes the first three sections of Chomsky’s ‘Conditions on transformations’ (1973), and the beginning of Cole and Hermon’s ‘Subjecthood and islandhood: Evidence from
Quechua’ (1981). The passages are carefully selected and flanked by explanatory discussion, clarifications, and critical commentary. Together with the historical overview that the core of the chapters provides, these passages provide good insight into how the field has changed over the past half century or so. For example, the reader is led to understand the specifics behind the shift in focus from language-specific and construction-specific transformations, to conditions on transformations, to conditions on representation, and further on to economy conditions on derivation.

The work as a whole focuses on proposals from transformational grammar, but there is also some mention of various nontransformational analyses. The only nontransformational treatment that gets more than a couple of pages of attention is relational grammar. Throughout the book, however, there are references to other formal frameworks, certainly enough to make readers aware that alternatives exist. By contrast, the book does not convey just how carefully worked out and comprehensive several of the nontransformational accounts in fact are.

Directly reflecting the body of literature it reviews, this book strongly focuses on English data. Some sections specifically address raising and control in other languages, but the examples included are generally not rich enough to properly illustrate the intricacies of the data. The relevant sections nevertheless make clear that crosslinguistic considerations are highly relevant for a full understanding of raising and control. Also, they provide enough data to give a picture of what sort of variation one might expect to encounter when considering languages other than English.

This text is an invaluable source of reference for raising and control. It is also a good reference book for the history of generative syntax. For young scholars and students, it can be difficult to read early generative literature. Anyone who wants to delve into preminimalist writings will be greatly helped by this book. I have used this book twice as a textbook in advanced undergraduate courses. Since the text is packed with information, intricate data, and theoretical twists and turns, the pace needs to be slow and additional explanation and exercises are required. With some effort on the part of the lecturer and the students, however, the book works well as a textbook at the undergraduate level. My guess is it works even better at the graduate level.

Overall, this is a terrific book. D&D manage to combine clear prose with a large amount of information. Moreover, the book makes an exciting read as it presents the fierce and lively theoretical battles that have been fought over raising and control. It is also very interesting to see how analyses have been proposed, rejected, and then revived. These cycles that seem to bring us back to the starting point may lead a cynic to the conclusion that syntactic analysis is a pointless endeavor. On the contrary, I think D&D’s book reveals a field of inquiry that is intricate and vibrant, a field where progress has been made, even though much remains to be explored.
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