sign: morphologically complex signs are more likely to cooccur with mouth gestures than with mouthings.

In conclusion, I find this book somewhat of a mixed bag. Overall, the text would be improved with some better editing, and some references are missing. Regarding the content, the typology of mouthings is a bit shaky, in my opinion, and is not assigned any specific theoretical interpretation in the spirit of Johnston et al. 2015 or Sandler 2009. That no attempt was made to discuss the theories on mouthings in the light of the results of Ch. 5 is a missed opportunity. The results of the study, however, are interesting in themselves as they partly deviate from findings in studies on other sign languages. The findings on ISL thus help us to establish how sign languages may differ in their use of mouth actions. Moreover, the analysis of word classes in ISL is audacious and interesting.

REFERENCES

Bank, Richard. 2015. *The ubiquity of mouthings in NGT: A corpus study*. Utrecht: LOT. Online: http://repository.ubn.ru.nl/handle/2066/133714.

Bank, Richard; Onno Crasborn; and Roeland van Hout. 2015a. Alignment of two languages: The spreading of mouthings in Sign Language of the Netherlands. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 19.1.40–55.

Bank, Richard; Onno Crasborn; and Roeland van Hout. 2015b. The prominence of spoken language elements in a sign language. Nijmegen: Radboud University Nijmegen, ms.

Boyes Braem, Penny, and Rachel Sutton-Spence (eds.) 2001. *The hands are the head of the mouth: The mouth as articulator in sign languages*. Hamburg: Signum.

Crasborn, Onno; Els van der Kooij; Dafydd Waters; Bencie Woll; and Johanna Mesch. 2008. Frequency distribution and spreading behavior of different types of mouth actions in three sign languages. *Sign Language & Linguistics* 11.1.45–67.

Johnston, Trevor. 2008. Corpus linguistics and signed languages: No lemmata, no corpus. *Construction and exploitation of sign language corpora: Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on the Representation and Processing of Sign Languages (LREC)*, 82–87. Online: http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2008/workshops/W25_Proceedings.pdf.

Johnston, Trevor; Jane van Roekel; and Adam Schembri. 2015. On the conventionalization of mouth actions in Auslan (Australian Sign Language). *Language and Speech*, published online before print February 22, 2015. doi:10.1177/0023830915569334.

Lane, Harlan. 1984. *When the mind hears: A history of the deaf*. New York: Random House.

Sandler, Wendy. 2009. Symbiotic symbolization by hand and mouth in sign language. *Semiotica* 174.241–75.

Department of Linguistics
PO Box 9103
NL-6500 HD Nijmegen, The Netherlands
[r.bank@let.ru.nl]

Micro-syntactic variation in North American English. Ed. by Raffaella Zanuttini and Laurence R. Horn. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. 365. ISBN 9780199367214. $39.95.

Reviewed by Neil Myler, Boston University

This excellent and timely volume, published in the 'Oxford studies in comparative syntax' series, is a collection of papers on various morphosyntactic phenomena in North American English dialects. The contributions come from scholars representing many institutions, but the impetus behind the book stems broadly from the Yale Grammatical Diversity Project, and specifically from the symposium on 'Micro-syntactic variation in North American English: Aspects of negation and polarity', held at the 85th annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America in Pittsburgh in 2011.

The opening chapter, by Raffaella Zanuttini, places the volume in its theoretical context and summarizes the contributions. Differences between closely related languages and dialects have played an important role in the development of parametric approaches to morphosyntactic variation since their inception. Richard Kayne, a pioneer of microcomparative syntax, has emphasized the power of such studies as a test-bed for parametric hypotheses (Kayne 1996). In the last few decades, systematic efforts to document and analyze such variation have contributed to an explosion in our knowledge and understanding of the morphosyntactic component of the language faculty. Many of these efforts have concerned the languages of continental Europe. To name just three of many prominent examples,[1] we have the project to develop an atlas of North Italian dialects associated with Paola Benincà, Richard Kayne, and many others (Atlante Sintattico d'Italia, ASIt); the work of the Merteens Institute, spearheaded by Hans Bennis and Sjef Barbiers, to document and analyze variation in Dutch varieties; and such projects as Scandinavian Dialect Syntax (ScanDiaSyn) and the Nordic Center of Excellence in Microcomparative Syntax (NORMS), focusing on North Germanic.

The English-speaking world, by contrast, has yet to see its Merteens Institute, its ScanDiaSyn, or its ASIt. This is curious, both because of how well studied and well represented English is as the native language of many working linguists, and because dialectological and sociolinguistic documentation of relevant phenomena is abundant. The Yale Grammatical Diversity Project, a research team led by Jim Wood and Raffaella Zanuttini, has begun to fill that unfortunate gap. The publication of this volume, the first collection of papers that explicitly aims to relate syntactic variation in English dialects to questions of theoretical syntax, is a landmark event in that endeavor.

The rest of this review summarizes the remaining chapters in turn, before turning to a more general evaluation.

Ch. 2, 'SO [TOTALLY] speaker-oriented: An analysis of "drama SO" ', by PATRICIA IRWIN, presents an analysis of the use of *so* found in such examples as *everyone is SO wearing flip-flops this season*. This phenomenon, dubbed drama-SO by Irwin, is found mainly in the speech of people born in the late 1960s or more recently, and thus reflects a case of generation-dependent microvariation (reflected in the term 'Generation X-so', the term used by Zwicky (2010) in a discussion of the same phenomenon). Irwin proposes that drama-SO is simply degree-modifier *so* modifying an optionally silent speaker-oriented adverb *totally*. Since this speaker-oriented use of *totally* is restricted to Generation X and below, this accounts for the generational restrictions on the construction. As Irwin also shows, this hypothesis accurately predicts many of the distributional properties of drama-SO.[2]

The third chapter, 'Affirmative semantics with negative morphosyntax: Negative exclamatives and the New England *so AUXn't NP/DP* construction', by JIM WOOD, analyzes the SAND (So-Aux-NP/DP) construction associated with New England English, exemplified by *so don't I*, which coexists with the more familiar *so do I* construction in the same dialect. Wood demonstrates, using a battery of tests going back to Klima 1964, that the construction has affirmative polarity (despite the presence of the negative morpheme *-n't*). Rather than propose that the negative is simply not interpreted for some special reason, Wood provides a compositional analysis that requires no construction-specific stipulations. The *-n't* morpheme negates the proposition just as it usually does, yielding $\neg p$. A polarity focus complementizer, Σ, syntactically induces inversion and semantically generates the alternative set $\neg p \vee \neg(\neg p)$. Finally, *so* is attracted to spec-ΣP (just as it is in standard English constructions like *so do I*). Because *so* has affirmative semantics, it selects the affirmative alternative from the set generated by ΣP, yielding $\neg(\neg p)$ as the meaning of the whole structure. This successfully accounts for the pragmatic force of the construction: *so don't I* differs from *so do I* in that it presupposes that the proposition is somehow unexpected, or that the

---

[1] For others, see http://www.dialectsyntax.org/wiki/Projects_on_dialect_syntax.

[2] I note, however, that at least some millennials (as represented by the undergraduates in my 'Variation in English dialects' class at Boston University in Fall 2014) reject the string *So totally!* as a fragment answer (in contrast to the judgments cited by Irwin), although they accept drama-SO more broadly.

addressee assumes the proposition to be false. Hence, the *-n't* in *so don't I* ends up having the effect of denying the addressee's presumed assumption.

In Ch. 4, 'Force, focus, and negation in African American English', Lisa Green analyzes negative auxiliary inversion (NAI), in which negated auxiliaries invert with the subject in declarative contexts (*don't nobody want to ride the bus*). Green proposes that NAI involves head movement of T to a Focus head bearing 'NegFoc' features. This explains why, unlike question inversion, NAI is compatible with an overt complementizer: *I don't care if can't nobody drive* vs. **I don't know if can't he come*. NAI targets a lower position than Force in the Rizzian C-domain (namely Foc; see Rizzi 1997), whereas question inversion targets Force itself. Green also proposes important refinements of the constraints on subjects in NAI. Whereas previous analyses have claimed that (i) the subject in NAI must be negative and (ii) the subject must not be referential, Green shows that both of these generalizations are false. Instead, Green suggests that the relevant constraint is that the subject must belong to the high end of the quantifier scale of Horn (1989).[3]

In Ch. 5, 'Transitive expletives in Appalachian English', Raffaella Zanuttini and Judy B. Bernstein analyze sentences of the sort *there can't many people do that*. Noting the amazing fact that Appalachian English transitive expletive constructions (TECs) have restrictions on their subjects that are identical to the restrictions in NAI, Zanuttini and Bernstein propose a partly unified analysis of NAI and Appalachian English TECs. TECs involve movement of a negative auxiliary to the same head above TP as is involved in NAI (following Matyiku 2013 and Foreman 1999, and contra Green's piece in this volume, they take this position to be a higher Neg head associated with the scope of negation, dubbed Neg2). Where TECs differ from NAI is that, additionally, the negative auxiliary probes the subject for certain features, which are then merged in spec-Neg2P and are spelled out as the expletive. This probing is dependent on NAI applying because of a universal constraint on TEC constructions, which unites Icelandic TECs and Appalachian English TECs, requiring that the tense-bearing element move through two head positions within the IP domain.[4]

The sixth chapter, 'The syntax and semantics of personal datives in Appalachian English', is by Corinne Hutchinson and Grant Armstrong. The phenomenon of interest here is exemplified by the pronoun *him* in sentences like *he loves him some baseball*. Hutchinson and Armstrong analyze the construction as involving a special satisfactive Appl(icative) head, accounting for the semantics of the construction and for the fact that such personal datives (i) are in complementary distribution with the indirect object of the double object construction, and (ii) are compatible with transitive verbs only (since Low Applicative heads in Pylkkänen's (2008) framework require the presence of a direct object).

In Ch. 7, Sara S. Loss examines 'Iron Range English reflexive pronouns'. Unlike most other English varieties, speakers in the Iron Range of Minnesota allow long-distance interpretations for reflexive pronouns, as in *Bill$_i$ told John$_j$ that Tom$_k$ likes himself$_{i/j/k}$*. Loss shows, using a magnitude-estimation study, that such long-distance interpretations are sensitive to syntactic islands, and that they are subject to blocking effects along the lines identified for other long-distance reflexives crosslinguistically. These constraints cannot be explained on a logophoric analysis, nor on an analysis in which the reflexives are optionally converted to pronouns. Loss concludes that they thus constitute a true counterexample to Pica's (1987) generalization that long-distance reflexives are invariably monomorphemic. She proposes that Iron Range English reflexives differ from reflexives in other dialects in carrying an operator feature, allowing them to undergo covert A-bar movement into higher clauses, potentially feeding binding relations.

In Ch. 8, 'This syntax needs studied', Elspeth Edelstein proposes a novel analysis of the *needs washed* construction, based on an online judgment survey of twenty-five speakers from

---

[3] It is not clear how this account can extend to cases like *don't many people know that* or *ain't five people coming*, cited by Matyiku (2013) as possible in West Texas English NAI constructions. *Many* is not at the high end of Horn's scale, and numerals are not to be found on that scale at all.

[4] This constraint itself remains rather mysterious. One also wonders why *do*-support is not sufficient to rescue TECs in Appalachian English, as it is in Belfast English (Henry & Cottell 2007).

Pittsburgh. The embedded predicate in the construction is clearly a verbal passive participle (as Edelstein shows by citing earlier work by Tenny (1998)). However, Edelstein argues that it does not involve deletion of *to be*, instead proposing that the construction involves embedding a smaller structure, consisting of just the passive participle.

Ch. 9, 'We might should be thinking this way: Theory and practice in the study of syntactic variation', by J. DANIEL HASTY, has two goals. One is to present a syntactic account of multiple modal constructions, based on earlier published work of his (Hasty 2011, 2012). Hasty points out that the first modal must always be an epistemic one, and proposes that these modals occupy an M head that merges above TP in the relevant dialects. This M head bears an EPP feature that attracts the subject, deriving both the surface word order and the possibility of stranding a quantifier in between the two modals (i.e. in spec-TP for Hasty; an example would be *we might all could go to the store*). Hasty's second goal is to make some methodological observations on the definition of the term 'sociolinguistic variable' as it applies to syntax, and on the way in which syntactic research on nonstandard dialectal phenomena should be conducted.

Ch. 10 also has a more methodological bent. In 'Addressing the problem of intra-speaker variation for parametric theory', CHRISTINA TORTORA points out that intraspeaker variation complicates the task of identifying microparametric clusters of phenomena. When there are multiple phenomena that exhibit surface variants, the question arises as to which, if any, of those variants are tied to the same parameter setting. Tortora notes that a similar kind of problem has been identified in the literature on diachronic syntax, where a principled solution has been found in the form of Kroch's (1989) 'constant rate effect'. While Kroch's method relies on comparing data from across time periods and therefore cannot be directly carried over into synchronic work, Tortora proposes three novel adaptations of it that hold the promise of solving the problem of identifying microparametric clusters in the face of intraspeaker variation. All of these rely on 'simulating' diachronic studies in various ways.

The final chapter, Laurence R. Horn's 'Afterword: Microvariation in syntax and beyond', offers commentaries on the other papers. In doing so, Horn points out connections to other areas of syntax and semantics, as well as numerous sociolinguistic, historical, and lexicographical issues. The chapter is also extremely useful in that it contains a plethora of references to additional literature and online resources not cited in the body of the book.

The quality of argumentation in the book is generally extremely high (Wood's contribution, in particular, is a tour de force, and Irwin's paper could serve as a how-to manual for future investigations of intensifiers). I was pleased to see so much emphasis placed on eschewing construction-based stipulation, and on explaining the dialectal phenomena as a result of the principled interaction of the syntactic properties of the elements involved. Some papers achieve this to a greater extent than others, but the prevalence of this ambition is to be lauded. It was also good to see a great deal of discussion of methodology in dialect syntax investigations. The chapters by Edelstein, Loss, Hasty, and Tortora are especially useful in this respect.

The volume is aesthetically pleasing and well organized, with adjacent chapters often being thematically related in a way that makes reading the book cover to cover a smooth and coherent experience. I counted fifteen typographical errors, but none of these are potential impediments to comprehension.[5] Each paper has its own bibliography, rather than there being a single unified bibliography at the end of the book. I believe this was a good choice, since it allows individual papers to be read along with their own bibliographies (in the context of a seminar, for example), as well as making it easier for the reader to delve further into the literature on a particular phenomenon of interest. It also, blessedly, has footnotes rather than endnotes, and the index is intuitive and useful.

This book should be read by anyone interested in comparative syntax. It would also be suitable for use in a seminar on microparametric syntax for graduate students or advanced undergraduates. Many of the analyses, if adapted slightly, are suitable for presentation to less advanced undergraduates—having tried this in my own 'Variation in English dialects' course at Boston

---

[5] It is unfortunate, however, that Irene Heim's surname is misspelled as *Hiem* in two places (pp. 236, 240).

University, I can highly recommend it as a way of provoking discussion and getting students excited about comparative syntax.

REFERENCES

FOREMAN, JOHN. 1999. Syntax of negative inversion in non-standard English. *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL)* 17.205–19.

HASTY, J. DANIEL. 2011. I might not would say that: A sociolinguistic investigation of double modal acceptance. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 17.2.91–98.

HASTY, J. DANIEL. 2012. We might should oughta take a second look at this: A syntactic reanalysis of double modals in Southern United States English. *Lingua* 122.1716–38.

HENRY, ALISON, and SIOBHAN COTTELL. 2007. A new approach to transitive expletives: Evidence from Belfast English. *English Language and Linguistics* 11.279–99.

HORN, LAURENCE R. 1989. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

KAYNE, RICHARD S. 1996. Microparametric syntax: Some introductory remarks. *Microparametric syntax and dialect variation*, ed. by James R. Black and Virginia Motapanyane, ix–xviii. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [Reprinted in *Parameters and universals*, by Richard S. Kayne, 3–39. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.]

KLIMA, EDWARD. 1964. Negation in English. *The structure of language*, ed. by Jerry Fodor and Jerrold Katz, 246–323. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

KROCH, ANTHONY. 1989. Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change. *Language Variation and Change* 1.3.199–244.

MATYIKU, SABINA. 2013. Motivating movement: The case of negative inversion in West Texas English. Paper presented at the 25th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics.

PICA, PIERRE. 1987. On the nature of the reflexivization cycle. *North East Linguistic Society (NELS)* 17.2. 483–99.

PYLKKÄNEN, LIINA. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

RIZZI, LUIGI. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of grammar: Handbook of generative syntax*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

TENNY, CAROL. 1998. Psych verbs and verbal passives in Pittsburghese. *Linguistics* 36.591–97.

ZWICKY, ARNOLD. 2010. GenX so in the funnies. *Arnold Zwicky's Blog*. Online: http://arnoldzwicky .wordpress.com/2010/09/11/genx-so-in-the-funnies/.

CAS Linguistics Program
Boston University
621 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
[myler@bu.edu]