

LANGUAGE

JOURNAL OF THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

VOLUME 84, NUMBER 2

JUNE 2008

Letters to <i>Language</i>	215
Grammaticality and ungrammaticality in phonology <i>Andries W. Coetzee</i>	218
Differential function marking, case, and information structure: Evidence from Korean <i>Song-Nim Kwon & Anne Zribi-Hertz</i>	258
Discussion Notes:	
From linguistic elicitation to eliciting the linguist: Lessons in community empowerment from Melanesia <i>Lise M. Dobrin</i>	300
When is a temporal marker not a tense? Reply to Tonhauser 2007 <i>Rachel Nordlinger & Louisa Sadler</i>	325
Defining crosslinguistic categories: The case of nominal tense (Reply to Nordlinger and Sadler) <i>Judith Tonhauser</i>	332
Review Articles:	
Borer: Structuring sense, vol. 1: In name only.	
Borer: Structuring sense, vol. 2: The normal course of events <i>Christopher Potts</i>	343
Fabb: Language and literary structure: The linguistic analysis of form in verse and narrative <i>Kristin Hanson</i>	370
Alternative (Re)views:	
Boeckx: Linguistic minimalism: Origins, concepts, methods, and aims <i>F. J. Newmeyer</i>	387
Boeckx: Linguistic minimalism: Origins, concepts, methods, and aims <i>N. Fukui</i>	395
Reviews (see back cover).....	401
The Editor's Department: Annual Report <i>Brian D. Joseph</i>	449
Recent Publications	463

PUBLISHED BY THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Abstracts:

GRAMMATICALITY AND UNGRAMMATICALITY IN PHONOLOGY

Andries W. Coetzee

University of Michigan

In this article, I make two theoretical claims: (i) For some form to be grammatical in language *L*, it is not necessary that the form satisfy all constraints that are active in *L*; that is, even grammatical forms can violate constraints. (ii) There are degrees of ungrammaticality; that is, not all ungrammatical forms are equally ungrammatical. I first show that these claims follow straightforwardly from the basic architecture of an optimality-theoretic grammar. I then show that the surface sound patterns used most widely in formal phonology cannot be used to test the truth of these two claims, but argue that results from speech processing experiments can. Finally, I discuss three experiments on the processing of non-words of the form [stVt], [skVk], and [spVp] in English that were designed to test these claims, and show that both claims are confirmed by the results of the experiments.

DIFFERENTIAL FUNCTION MARKING, CASE, AND FOCUS STRUCTURE: EVIDENCE FROM KOREAN

Song-Nim Kwon

University of Paris-8/UMR SFL, CNRS

Anne Zribi-Hertz

University of Paris-8/UMR SFL, CNRS

The central goal of this article is to propose a systematic description of DIFFERENTIAL FUNCTION MARKING (DM) in Korean, a language in which both subject and object markers may fail to be spelled out. Taking Aissen's (2003) theory of DM as a starting point, we show that although its predictions seem mostly consistent with the statistical results of corpus-based research on Korean (and Japanese), this model does not accurately account for the Korean data. We argue that subject and object bareness (the lack of a functional particle) regularly correlates with interpretive effects that should be captured in terms of information structure (focus structure). Adapting Erteschik-Shir's (1997, 2007) framework to represent f(ocus)-structure, we argue that bare subjects and objects, in Korean, fail to be visible at this level. Consequently, they may be construed neither as active topics, nor as foci, and thus must either be left out of f-structure, or incorporated within larger f-structure constituents, in order to be interpreted. We show that bare objects are never construed as topics or foci and always exhibit a form of semantic incorporation, while LEUL-marked objects always stand as f-structure constituents construed as focused at some level. Bare subjects, unlike NEUN-marked topical subjects and GA-marked subjects, can be construed neither as active topics, nor as foci, and always occur in tense-deficient clauses construed asthetic and anchored to speech time. We argue that our own assumptions correctly predict the results of corpus studies, and we suggest that as regards nominal arguments, F-STRUCTURE VISIBILITY might ultimately stand as the crucial interpretive correlate of FUNCTIONAL positions in syntax.

DISCUSSION NOTE: FROM LINGUISTIC ELICITATION TO ELICITING THE LINGUIST: LESSONS IN COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT FROM MELANESIA

Lise M. Dobrin

University of Virginia

Moral problems arise when the notion of community empowerment is adopted as the guiding framework for endangered language research and development (EL R&D), particularly where EL R&D projects falter or fail under a community's control. If "only the community can save its language," then program failure implies a lack of ability or commitment on the part of the community that can reflect on it negatively, reinforcing the feelings of disempowerment that feed language shift. While a handful of cases of language program failure have been described in the literature, linguists have yet to fully absorb the consequences of this phenomenon for the field. This paper examines the case of a traditionally Arapesh-speaking community in the linguistically dense Sepik region of Papua New Guinea, where language shift is advancing rapidly, even in rural areas where extensive multilingualism is the historical norm. When understood within the community's own cultural framework, a failed vernacular schooling project and local responses to linguistic researchers themselves reveal a set of concerns quite unlike those described in the contemporary EL R&D literature: an intense desire to elicit the involvement of powerful outsiders—people precisely like foreign linguists. The study suggests that what is truly empowering in the Melanesian context is not for local communities to be able to carry out language work on their own, but rather for outside linguists to engage with them in the kinds of ongoing personal relationships that recognize and reciprocate the communities'—and by extension, their languages'—value.

BOOK REVIEWS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashby & Maidment: Introducing phonetic science	<i>J. H. Esling</i>	401
Burling: The talking ape: How language evolved	<i>D. Bickerton</i>	404
Chamoreau: Purépecha de Jarácuaro, Michoacán	<i>W. Bright</i>	406
Dixon & Aikhenvald (eds.): Adjective classes:		
A cross-linguistic typology	<i>A. Spencer</i>	407
Hawkins: Efficiency and complexity in grammars	<i>J. Aitchison</i>	410
Kayne: Movement and silence	<i>A. Carnie</i>	411
Kruspe: A grammar of Semelai	<i>A. Y. Aikhenvald</i>	415
Lipski: A history of Afro-Hispanic language:		
Five centuries, five continents	<i>R. Otheguy</i>	416
Lodge: A sociolinguistic history of Parisian French	<i>J. Milroy</i>	419
Östman & Fried (eds.): Construction grammars: Cognitive grounding		
and theoretical extensions	<i>J. Barðdal</i>	422
Pensalfini: A grammar of Jingulu: An Aboriginal language of the		
Northern Territory	<i>J. Simpson</i>	425
Roberts & Roussou: Syntactic change: A minimalist approach		
to grammaticalization	<i>G. Longobardi & G. Rigon</i>	428
Sampson: The ‘language instinct’ debate	<i>J. H. McWhorter</i>	434
Sihler: Edgerton’s Law: The phantom evidence	<i>J. S. Klein</i>	438
Tannen: You’re wearing that? Understanding mothers and daughters		
in conversation	<i>S. Gass</i>	439
Woodard (ed.): The Cambridge encyclopedia of the world’s		
ancient languages	<i>B. W. Fortson IV</i>	442