

the author proceeds to look at how they combine. He then devotes a chapter to the special issue of compound pronouns and a section to duals and related matters. The synchronic chapters are followed by a section on diachronic aspects of person marking, and the book concludes with a summary chapter.

Since the author was particularly interested in capturing the whole range of variation in person marking paradigms, he did not follow pre-established guidelines in constructing his typological sample. The only principle followed is that "genetic families never count for more than three cases" (p. 312). By these means, Cysouw arrived at a sample of 309 paradigms distributed over different genetic groupings and geographical areas.

The investigation of how singular marking is structured shows that nearly all languages—Cysouw estimates around 98 per cent—distinguish first, second, and third person in singular paradigms. In the remaining languages all the logically possible homophonies are attested, i.e. the conflation of first and second person, second and third person, first and third person, and finally the existence of just one generic singular marker (in opposition to one or more plural markers). The fact that such homophonies are not uncommon in European languages makes these languages stand out typologically. Cysouw's findings concerning zero marking conform to what one might expect. Zero marking for third person is common, whereas it is rare for second person and even rarer for first person.

In his overview of plural marking Cysouw observes that 'plural' is a misnomer. He redefines this domain as 'group' marking, arguing that it is not so much the number of participants but the kinds of participants involved that define different elements in the 'plural' paradigm. Thus, 'we' does not refer to two or more people speaking in unison, but to either the speaker and one or more addressees (symbolized 1+2), the speaker and one or more associates (1+3), or the three combined (1+2+3). While the English pronoun *we* does not distinguish among the three referential possibilities, some languages have special markers for some or all of them. Thus, cross-linguistically we find the categories 'inclusive' (1+2), 'exclusive' (1+3), and 'augmented inclusive' (1+2+3). The 'second person plural' may theoretically either correspond to a group audience (2+2) or an addressee plus associates who are not present during the speech event (2+3). Cysouw argues, however, that this distinction has not become grammaticalized in any known language despite claims to the contrary regarding languages such as Abkhaz (north-west Caucasian) and Mao Naga (Tibeto-Burman). Thus, there are all in all just five group categories among the languages of the world: 1+2, 1+3, 1+2+3, 2+3, and 3+3. Since all the possible homophonies and presence/absence of marking allow for very many theoretic-

REVIEW

Michael Cysouw: *The paradigmatic structure of person marking*. Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory. Oxford University Press. 2003. ISBN 0 19 925412 5. Pp. 375 + x.

Reviewed by

SØREN WICHMANN

This book, which is a revision of the Michael Cysouw's 2001 University of Nijmegen doctoral dissertation, represents a cross-linguistic study of the structures of paradigms marking person and number, the first major investigation of its kind since Forchheimer (1953). The delimitation of the study to the *internal* structure of person-marking paradigms, where a paradigm is defined as "a closed class of linguistic elements that occur in complementary distribution" (p. 8), is adhered to very strictly. Thus, it is disregarded for a given paradigm whether or not it is employed in conjunction with another, functionally related paradigm, for instance affixes that serve to disambiguate singular-plural homophony. Likewise, whatever function a given person-marking paradigm may have in addition to that of marking person is disregarded. For instance, paradigms that mark person-of-subject are treated just like paradigms marking person-of-object, and portmanteau affixes merging person marking with some other category such as tense are similarly classified exclusively with respect to the way they mark person. Finally, affixes, clitics, and free pronouns are lumped together. Information concerning aspects of person marking paradigms other than their internal structure is only given where specific examples are discussed. Given the enormous amount of cross-linguistic variation in person marking shown to exist, the author seems justified in the choice of limits that he has imposed upon his study.

The book progresses logically. It is introduced by a chapter on aims, methodology, and previous studies in the field. Then follow chapters on respectively the marking of singular participants and the marking of plural participants. After having looked at paradigmatic structures in each of these two areas separately,

cally possible paradigmatic patterns of group marking, Cysouw restricts his overview of cross-linguistic variation in the group domain to the first person category. He finds that there are only five common patterns:

1. none of the three categories (1+2, 1+2+3, 1+3) are marked by a specialized morpheme ('no-we');
2. all of them are marked by one and the same morpheme ('unified-we');
3. the categories 1+2 and 1+2+3 are together marked by a specialized morpheme and 1+3 is not marked by a specialized morpheme ('only-inclusive');
4. the categories 1+2 and 1+2+3 are together marked by a specialized morpheme and 1+3 is marked by a separate specialized morpheme ('inclusive/exclusive');
5. each of the categories (1+2, 1+2+3, 1+3) is marked by a specialized morpheme ('minimal/augmented').

The order in which the possibilities have been cited corresponds to a hierarchy of increasing differentiation, the 'First Person Hierarchy'. Some further generalizations are that if there is a specialized exclusive there will also be an inclusive, and if there is an augmented/minimal inclusive distinction there will also be a specialized exclusive.

The description of the combined patterns of singular and group marking could easily have run amok given the great number of possible patterns, but Cysouw avoids this by immediately zooming in on the patterns that contain the five major subpatterns of the first person complex described in the previous paragraph. He thus assigns the first person complex the privileged role of being the central classificatory device for the paradigmatic structures at large. The paradigmatic structures are then classified according to whether or not there is an inclusive/exclusive distinction and according to whether or not various kinds of homophonies are present. One of the observations that emerge from the study is that there are far fewer attested paradigmatic structures with an inclusive/exclusive distinction than are theoretically possible, which leads to the generalization that homophonies at large tend to be less acceptable the more explicit the person marking is in the first person group domain. Even less variation is found in paradigms having an opposition between minimal and augmented inclusive. The more common patterns suggest an implicational hierarchy, labelled the 'Horizontal Homophony Hierarchy', according to which the presence of a conflation of first person singular and plural (or first person singular and exclusive in the case of an inclusive/exclusive distinction) implies the presence of a conflation of second person singular and plural, which in turn implies the presence of a conflation of third person singular and

plural. On the bottom of this implicational hierarchy is the already-mentioned case of the presence of an inclusive-exclusive distinction, which generally implies the absence of homophonies across the singular-plural distinction (horizontal homophonies).

In one of the most central generalizations of the book Cysouw makes an addition to the First Person Hierarchy (mentioned above), resulting in what he calls the 'Explicitness Hierarchy'. He observes that homophony in the singular is generally not found without homophony in the group domain (vertical homophony). Thus the type of paradigm which merges the greatest amount of categories will be a paradigm having homophony in the singular. Then comes a paradigm having vertical homophony in the plural only. This two-stepped hierarchy is connected to the First Person Hierarchy in the following way:

Explicitness Hierarchy:

Singular homophony > vertical homophony > unified-we > inclusive/exclusive > minimal/augmented

The Explicitness Hierarchy Together with the Horizontal Homophony Hierarchy are said to result in "an interconnected model of the paradigmatic structure of person marking" (p. 164). For better comprehension¹ the Horizontal Homophony Hierarchy is restated here in a schematic form:

Horizontal Homophony Hierarchy:

first person (sg/pl or sg/excl) homophony > second person homophony > third person homophony > no homophony

It may be said that the Explicitness Hierarchy describes degrees of explicitness in person marking along the vertical axis of paradigms and the Horizontal Homophony Hierarchy describes degrees of explicitness across the singular/plural distinction.

1 Cysouw has one Horizontal Homophony Hierarchy for paradigms without an inclusive/exclusive and another for paradigms with this distinction. I have merged these. Since I do not find it particularly pedagogical, I have not reproduced Cysouw's depiction of his conflated version of the two hierarchies (his Figure 4.12). In my opinion the figure does not quite convey the two-dimensional space that it is supposed to. Moreover, it is confusing that the arrows in the Horizontal Homophony Hierarchy I and II take opposite directions in different representations of it (compare examples 4-107/108 and Figure 4.12).

While the two hierarchies primarily represent his distillations of some major insights into the relationships among major typological variants of person marking paradigms, the author also tries to test whether the hierarchies might constitute possible hypotheses concerning diachronic paths of change in person marking paradigms. Cysouw calls the interpretation of typological hierarchies as pathways of diachronic changes the 'crypto-diachronic' method. The test of the method consists in looking at minimally different paradigms in closely related languages or dialects to see whether it is possible to find cases where the differences correspond to single steps to the left or right in either the Explicitness Hierarchy or the Horizontal Homophony Hierarchy. Cysouw may be right that if it is possible to find such cases then one has come some way towards rendering the crypto-diachronic method plausible. It is, however, a weakness of the test of the hypothesis that it aims directly at finding cases that confirm the hypothesis disregarding all other cases. Ideally one would have to put the typology momentarily aside, look unbiased at all the attested diachronic developments of person marking paradigms world-wide, and only then compare the results with the typology. Obviously this ideal research strategy is so time-consuming as to be almost unviable, so Cysouw is excused in his more selective approach. Nevertheless, the failure to follow the methodologically ideal strategy casts doubt on Cysouw's results. Moreover, even as it is, his investigation does not quite turn up the expected results. The Horizontal Homophony Hierarchy does not prove to be a good hypothesis for diachronic change since cognate paradigms often leap across steps in the hierarchy. The Explicitness Hierarchy fares better, though, in particular as concerns the first person plural end of the hierarchy, where it turns out that a minimal/augmented opposition in the inclusive is only added when all other categories are already distinguished.

In relation to his redefinition of 'plural' as 'group' marking, Cysouw notes that there does remain a category which still roughly may be regarded as a true plural number category, namely the dual (including the trial and paucal). He nevertheless chooses the new label 'restricted group' for the dual. The idea behind the terminology may be illustrated with the first person inclusive. This is unrestricted in that it may include not only one but several addressees or associates of the addressee in addition to the speaker. The first person dual inclusive, however, is restricted to just the speaker and the addressee. In his typological survey of dual marking the author identifies thirty-three different paradigmatic structures. One of the two most common has six different person markers in the group domain, distinguishing between generic first person dual vs. plural (or 'restricted' vs. 'non-restricted'), second person dual vs. plural, and

third person dual vs. plural. The other most common type additionally marks the inclusive/exclusive distinction. None of these common patterns present homophonies among the singular, dual, and plural markers. Among the semi-common patterns, one is the so-called unit-augmented paradigm, where pronouns distinguish among the speech-act dyad (referentially a dual), the speech-act dyad plus one additional person (referentially a trial), and the speech-act dyad plus an indeterminate number of people. This type is only found in Australia and in a few Papuan languages. Rare paradigms involving the dual are defined by various kinds of homophonies. The typological findings concerning dual marking are also looked upon in a diachronic light.

Although, as mentioned in the beginning of this review, Cysouw restricted himself to *paradigmatic* structures narrowly defined and excluded from consideration the functions of person marking paradigms (other than that of marking person) as well as their status as independent elements, prefixes, suffixes, etc., he does briefly discuss such *syntagmatic* issues in the concluding chapter. There he shows, for instance, that morphologically independent paradigms tend to have more grammatical oppositions than affixes. It also appears that the smaller paradigms are more often prefixes and the larger ones more often suffixes, something which probably relates to the fact that many of the prefixal paradigms with much horizontal homophony have separate suffixal number marking. Finally, there appears to be a correlation between the presence of an inclusive/exclusive opposition and the absence of gender marking. These observations just give glimpses of the kinds of insights that might be obtained when the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic study of person marking paradigms are combined. It would be unfair to judge the book on the basis of what it explicitly does not set out to investigate, but the isolation of the paradigms from their syntagmatic contexts does leave a lot to be desired. One area where this is particularly felt is in Cysouw's framing of diachronic hypotheses. Historical changes affecting person marking often involve syntagmatically interconnected changes, for instance when suffixes take over the functions of prefixes or in cases of grammaticalization. Nevertheless, the limits imposed upon the investigation are understandable and it is laudable that Cysouw at least points to some directions for future research. A topic also not covered by the book is that of paradigms in which person-of-subject and person-of-object are combined in single markers. The exclusion of such paradigms seems rather arbitrary and it has the effect that many languages are simply left out of the sample. Combinations of persons in single markers yield highly complicated paradigms in some languages, e.g. some languages of Australia and the Americas. It would seem that the typological analysis of paradigms where person categories

do not combine in single markers ought to shed light on paradigms where they do combine.

Having stated these desiderata I must nevertheless conclude that the book represents a major achievement. It presents path-breaking new typological insights, is clearly written, well organized, almost free of typos, and supplied with all the apparatus in terms of illustrations and indices that one expects from a first-rate publication.

References

Forchheimer, Paul. 1953. *The category of person in language*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

REVIEW

Shoichi Iwasaki. 2002. *Japanese*. London Oriental and African Language Library, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 360 pages + viii-xvii.

Reviewed by

JANICK WRONA

According to Shoichi Iwasaki (SI), his book, "is intended to make a very modest contribution [to a rich and long tradition in Japanese linguistics, JW]" (p. xiii). It is SI's hope that "it will provide a useful outline, especially for those who are not familiar with the language" (p. xiii). On the whole, SI has succeeded in achieving this goal. *Japanese* will be a useful first place for people to look for a basic overview of the grammar of Japanese. The following briefly summarises the content of the individual chapters:

Chapter 1 is a very brief introduction to some geographical and archaeological issues, and a few remarks about the history of Japanese. In Chapter 2 SI gives a short outline of the writing system. Chapter 3 is about the phonetic and phonemic inventory of Japanese and some phonological rules. SI also treats pitch accent and the units mora and syllable. In Chapter 4, the three layers of the lexicon (native, Sino-Japanese and foreign) and major and minor word classes are described. Chapter 5 is about the morphology of the inflectional categories and some word-formation processes. In Chapter 6 SI describes prominent argument and adjunct structures. Tense and aspect is described in Chapter 7. In Chapter 8 SI discusses various constructions such as passives, causatives, benefactives and reciprocals. Relative clauses of various kinds are discussed in Chapter 9 on noun phrase structures. Internally headed relative clauses are treated with complement clauses and certain adverbial clauses in Chapter 10 on embedding. In Chapter 11, topic-comment and topicless sentences are described. SI also treats topicalisation and focus constructions in this chapter. Chapter 12 has a section on clause combining and a section on referent tracking. In Chapter 13, called pragmatics and grammar, modality,

Søren Wichmann
Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology
Deutscher Platz 6
D-04103 Leipzig
Germany
e-mail: soerenw@hum.ku.dk