Further, while it is clear that typographic errors are likely to creep into a work of this scope, although in the text itself none were blatant, there were a few unusual or incorrect choices of representation of certain language forms. In particular, Turkish and Vietnamese were misrepresented on several occasions. Thus, Turkish forms often (e.g. pages 128, 298) show s for š (rendered on page 217 as ş, which approximates the symbol found in Turkish orthography) and i for orthographic un-dotted-i (132), rendered elsewhere (217) as ı; a particularly egregious example, showing multiple instances of both of these, is found on page 200. In Vietnamese, the lack of tone diacritics (e.g. page 123) is especially unfortunate in the forms meaning 'here' and 'there' (173), as these are differentiated precisely by the tonal contrast. Given the resources of a press like Cambridge and the relatively well-known nature of the languages, these orthographic issues are particularly unwelcome. These typographical problems of course could be fixed in subsequent editions.

Despite the problems outlined above, the lexicon is overall a valuable contribution to the field and one I would recommend to anyone interested in grammaticalization or in processes of linguistic change generally.

Author's address: Department of Linguistics, University of Manchester, Oxford Road,
Manchester M13 9PL, U.K.
E-mail: greg.anderson@man.ac.uk

Tania Kuteva, *Auxiliation: an enquiry into the nature of grammaticalization*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Pp. ix + 209.

Reviewed by JOHN NEWMAN, University of Alberta

Grammaticalization defines a whole agenda of research for some linguists, while its very legitimacy, as a distinct topic of research, is questioned by others (cf. Campbell 2001). Kuteva falls well and truly into the former group. The book makes clear at the outset that what follows is based on, and represents an extension of, Heine (1993). A key feature of Kuteva's approach is a panchronic view of the object of study, a view which encompasses both synchronic and diachronic aspects. The panchronic approach allows the author to invoke either synchronic relationships (e.g. polysemy) or diachronic relationships (e.g. change in usage of a form over time) in order to complete an account of auxiliation. And, as with any attempt to motivate polysemy or semantic extension, the orientation is necessarily one that draws upon cognitive principles, as opposed to studying language phenomena as an autonomous system, independent of cognition. Characteristically, her accounts rely upon grammaticalization chains, with the links of the chain provided by panchronic observations. The persuasiveness of the whole (usually hypothetical) chain depends upon a seamless sequencing of smaller and less controversial discrete steps drawn from panchronic observations.

Chapter 2, 'The conceptual-semantic aspect of auxiliation', is very much in the vein of Heine (1993) in the way Kuteva sees the recurring patterns of auxiliary developments across languages as rooted in conceptualization principles. For example, the idea that abstract notions are conceptualized as, and expressed by, concrete notions, familiar from recent work in polysemy and metaphor, is claimed to play an important role in motivating the development of auxiliary structures. To illustrate this, she considers in some detail the recent emergence of a German dialectal progressive constructed with *sein* 'to be' and the portmanteau marker *am* 'on, at + article', as in *Der Pilot ist am fliegen* 'The pilot is flying' (with *fliegen* represented orthographically without a capital letter, suggesting an infinitive, rather than a gerundive). The use of the infinitive *fliegen* in this construction is seen as an abstract semantic extension of *sein* + *an/am* from the concrete locative use in *Ich bin am Bahnhof* 'I am at the railway station' and represents the end-point of a grammaticalization chain.

Chapter 3, 'On "functional need" explanations in auxiliation', deals with the emergence of aspectual markers out of erstwhile posture verbs, specifically 'sit', 'stand' and 'lie'. Again, she argues for a particular kind of grammaticalization chain, in this case: *posture verb > unmarked canonical locative verb > aspectual auxiliary*. This chapter could be seen as further exemplification of the themes of chapter 2, demonstrating the 'conceptual-semantic aspect' of grammaticalization (recurring grammaticalization patterns of posture verbs across languages, pointing to common kinds of conceptualization) and a concrete-to-abstract type of extension (bodily posture extending to location). However, Kuteva does not make either of these observations about the posture-based auxiliations in chapter 3. Instead, the chapter is constructed around arguing against a particular 'functional need' argument as to why posture verbs should have developed into auxiliaries. Here, as elsewhere in the book, one feels that the chapter seems to have been written more as a stand-alone essay rather than as an integrated chapter of a monograph.

In chapter 4, 'Identifying a gram in auxiliation across languages', the author considers a little-discussed grammaticalization: *past volition > … > avertive*, called the 'Past Volition' chain by Kuteva, not to be confused with the 'Non-past Volition' chain: *non-past volition > … > proximative*. The avertive has a meaning along the lines of 'was on the verge of V-*ing* but did not'; the proximative, on the other hand, has a meaning like 'the temporal phase just before the V-*ing* commences/commenced'. Kuteva finds evidence for the 'Past Volition' chain in Bulgarian, as well as a further development of the avertive to a proximative, and skilfully discusses the subtle semantic nuances which are relevant to these developments.

I found chapter 5, 'Auxiliation in discourse context', the most original of all the chapters. Here, Kuteva selects a particular kind of speech act occurrence as a micro-historical event in which a form uttered by the speaker is subsequently given a slightly different MISMATCHED interpretation by the hearer. The mismatch is related to 'non-shared discourse world knowledge', i.e. a world knowledge relating to the discourse which is differently constituted for speaker and hearer. In such individualized exchanges, Kuteva argues, we see a kind of semantic shift which can herald a change in the language system (the micro event of a speech act as activating language change, including auxiliation). Here, too, the development of the Bulgarian volitional verb into an avertive is provided as a relevant case study. A very brief chapter 6, 'From everyday linguistic communication to grammaticalization', reads more like an additional section of the preceding chapter, rather than as a chapter in its own right. A concluding chapter of four and a half pages summarizes the main points.

There is a high standard of scholarship evident throughout the book, with quite original discussions of auxiliation, particularly as it applies in Bulgarian. The inclusion of speech act dynamics as part of the larger discussion is an important new direction for grammaticalization research and Kuteva does an excellent job of arguing the case for the relevance of a particular kind of communicative mismatch in this type of research. As such, I consider this an important book and one that will be profitably read by all those interested in grammaticalization. An impression I was left with, however, was that the book feels more like a collection of (eloquent!) essays strung together than a monograph *per se*. My impression comes from the minimal cross-referencing between chapters, the way in which chapters zero in on a particular (though always interesting) point as opposed to covering many facets of a phenomenon, and a somewhat perfunctory concluding chapter. These features in no way detract from the overall high quality of the contents, but they do suggest that a sub-title like *Essays on grammaticalization* might have been more appropriate than *An enquiry into the nature of grammaticalization*.

REFERENCES

Campbell, L. (2001). What's wrong with grammaticalization? In Campbell, L. (ed.), *Grammaticalization: a critical assessment*, special issue of *Language Sciences* **23**. 113–161.
Heine, B. (1993). *Auxiliaries: cognitive forces and grammaticalization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Author's address: Department of Linguistics, University of Alberta, 4–32 Assiniboia Hall, Edmonton AB, T6G 2E7 Canada.
E-mail: john.newman@ualberta.ca
(Received 31 December 2002)

María Luisa Rivero & Angela Ralli (eds.), *Comparative syntax of Balkan languages* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. Pp. 234.

Reviewed by Arhonto Terzi, Technological Educational Institute of Patras

This volume is a product of the workshop on Balkan languages that followed the 1996 GLOW conference in Athens. With an article on general issues concerning the Balkan isoglosses, three contributions on sentential structure, two on the nominal domain and one on verb movement, it constitutes a good first effort to bring together relatively current theoretical work in comparative syntax while also familiarizing the reader with distinctive characteristics of the Balkan sprachbund.

In 'Is Balkan comparative syntax possible?', Brian Joseph draws our attention to the terms 'comparative Balkan syntax' and 'comparative syntax of the Balkans', which he associates with different approaches to the study of isoglosses: the former detects areal features and explores how contact-induced changes emerge, while the latter focuses on areal features with the aim of obtaining insights into the properties of Universal Grammar. The author presents a number of fascinating Balkan areal features, but expresses concern as to whether studies of the latter type are useful for current syntactic theory (mainly because of the relatively recent contact situation that gave rise to the various constructions), and he seems to believe that they do not necessarily contribute much to detecting distinctive properties and the genesis of a sprachbund either (probably true to a large extent, given their orientation). One should point out here that the tradition in microcomparative syntax (starting with Kayne 1975) has focused on synchronic differences primarily and also that recent work on creole languages (DeGraff 1999) considers contact situations in interesting ways for syntactic theory. In the final section the author ultimately concludes that there are indeed merits in doing 'comparative syntax of the Balkan languages', and such studies can be of use to studies in 'comparative Balkan syntax' as well.

The next three articles of the volume are engaged with the most prominent characteristic of Balkan languages: the subjunctive clauses that have replaced infinitives. As expected, these papers center around three concepts associated with these domains crosslinguistically: control, subject raising and subject obviation.

In 'Head-to-head merge in Balkan subjunctives and locality', Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin recasts in current terms her own earlier claims regarding the status of subjunctive subjects and their referential properties. She does not adhere to the PRO vs. *pro* distinction but adopts the notion of contextual vs. inherent anaphor instead. Subsequently, she proposes that the governing category for Balkan subjunctive subjects (which she considers contextual anaphors) is different from that in Romance or Germanic languages, and that the difference is crucially related to the subjunctive particle, which, unlike C, restructures with the rest of the Infl heads. As for the lack of obviation, the author holds that it follows from the contextual anaphor status of Balkan subjunctive subjects. The details are not immediately obvious, however, nor is it clear why only a subset of subjunctive subjects are associated with obligatory control ('anaphoric binding' in the author's terms). The novelty lies in the fact that the proposed restructuring of subjunctive subjects is captured better in bare phrase structure than in GB.

In 'Control and raising in and out of subjunctive complements', Anna Roussou does not adhere to the PRO vs. *pro* distinction either and points out that the anaphoric properties of Balkan subjunctive subjects are to be found in (other) finite and infinitival complements as well. Finiteness is considered a property of C interacting with I and depends on the semantic properties of the matrix predicate (in the sense of word dependencies translated as lack of embedded Cfin), and the AgrS of the embedded clause. Control and raising clauses lack Cfin and AgrS, but differ in terms of the theta-roles associated with their subjects. When the same sentences are introduced by C, Cfin is realized and control becomes impossible. Volitionals with null C are incompatible with control because AgrS is present, while realization of C in the same type of clause triggers disjoint reference, in a way that needs to be made more precise.

Iliana Krapova's discussion of 'Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek' ('Modern' being redundant in this context, as it is the only 'Balkan' stage of Greek) is 'mainstream', in the