

- Gershenson, Olga. 2003. "Misunderstanding between Israelis and Soviet Immigrants: Linguistic and Cultural Factors." *Multilingua* 22: 275-290.
- Hoffman, Ewa. 1990. *Lost in Translation: A Life in a New Language*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Kartalova, B. Yuliya. 1996. "Cross-Cultural Differences in American and Russian General Conventions of Communication. In *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, Monograph series, edited by Lawrence F. Bouton, 7: 71-96. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Division of English as an International Language.
- Kasper, Gabriele. 1981. *Pragmatische Aspekte in der Interimsprache: eine Untersuchung der Englischen fortgeschrittener deutscher Lerner*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Kasper, Gabriele, and Carsten Roever. 2005. "Pragmatics in Second Language Learning." In *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, edited by Eli Hinkel, 317-334. New Jersey and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers Mahwah.
- Kozlova, Iryna. 2004. "Can You Complain? Cross-Cultural Comparison of Indirect Complaints in Russian and American English." *Prospect* 19 (1): 84-105.
- Kraft, Bettina, and Ronald Geluykens. 2002. "Complaining in French L1 and L2: A Cross-Linguistic Investigation." *EUROSLA Yearbook* 2: 227-242.
- Kraft, Bettina, and Ronald Geluykens. 2007. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics and Interlanguage English*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Larina, Tat'iana V. 2009. *Kategorija vezhlivosti i stil' kommunikatsii. Sopostavlenie angliiskikh i russkikh lingvokul'turnykh traditsii*. Moskva: Rukopisnye pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Murphy, Beth, and Joyce Neu. 1996. "My Grade's Too Low: The Speech Act Set of Complaining." In *Speech Acts across Cultures: Challenges to Communication in a Second Language*, edited by Susan M. Gass and Joyce Neu, 191-216. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Ogiermann, Eva. 2009. *On Apologizing in Negative and Positive Politeness Cultures*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Olshstein Elite, and Liora Weinbach. 1987. "Complaints: A Study of Speech Act Behavior among Native and Nonnative Speakers of Hebrew." In *The Pragmatic Perspective: Selected Papers from the 1985 International Pragmatics Conference*, edited by Jef Verschueren and Marcella Bertuccelli-Papi, 195-208. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Olshstein Elite, and Liora Weinbach. 1993. "Interlanguage Features of the Speech Act of Complaining." In *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, edited by Gabriele Kasper and Shoshana Blum-Kulka, 108-122. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Owen, Jeannette S. 2001. "Interlanguage Pragmatics in Russian: A Study of the Effects of Study Abroad and Proficiency Levels of Request Strategies." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bryn Mawr College.
- Perelmutter, Renee. 2010. "Impoliteness Recycled: Subject Ellipsis in Modern Russian Complaint Discourse." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42 (12): 3208-3231.
- Piotrowska, Maria. 1987. "An Investigation into the Sociolinguistic Competence of Hong Kong University Students with Specific Reference to Making Complaints." Unpublished M.A. dissertation, Hong Kong University.
- Prykarpatska, Iryna. 2008. "Why Are You Late? Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Study of Complaints in American English and Ukrainian." *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 21: 87-102.
- Shardakova, Maria. 2009. *Intercultural Pragmatics of the Apology: How Americans Acquire Sociolinguistic Competence in Russian*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.
- Tanck, Sharyl. 2002. "Speech Act Sets of Refusals and Complaint: A Comparison of Native and Non-Native English Speakers' Production." Paper for TESL 523 Second Language Acquisition, Washington, DC: American University.
- Thomas, Jenny. 1983. "Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure." *Applied Linguistics*, 4: 91-112.

- Trosborg, Anna. 1995. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Umar, Abdul Majeed Al-Tayib 2006. "The Speech Act of Complaint as Realized by Advanced Sudanese Learners of English." *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Educational and Social Sciences and Humanities* 18 (2): 9-40.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1991. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

David K. Hart and Grant H. Lundberg. *Fundamentals of the structure and history of Russian: a usage-based approach*. Bloomington: Slavica, 2013.

Fundamentals distinguishes itself from other English-language textbooks about the structure of Russian by being *usage-based*, which means that the authors eschew underlying abstract forms and ordered rules and instead anchor their synchronic description of Russian phonetics, phonology, and morphology in correspondences and choices among surface forms. (ix, 56ff.) The assertion that “a usage based description [...] renders a better picture of [phonetic and orthographic] reality than the generative-based description” (56; bracketed text added) is self-evidently true, and it is hard not to appreciate the difference the authors draw between generative *production* and what they archly call *degeneration* in the case of listener *perception* (57), that is, the unwinding of generative processes by a listener who begins with a surface form and must deduce an abstract underlying representation.

Because *Fundamentals* is a textbook, though, a more useful question in a pedagogical context might address not physical reality, but whether this particular descriptive approach is more *successful* than others in helping advanced language learners become more accurate and comfortable in their use of the target language. The anecdotal classroom experience of at least some language teachers seems to be mixed; there are students for whom the generation of related concrete surface forms from a common abstract base is illuminating, explanatory, and pedagogically useful, and others for whom the very fact of abstraction is distracting and confusing. Given that type of learner difference, this new textbook is welcome because it provides a pedagogical alternative to the more abstract models found elsewhere, and may therefore prove successful with students who find abstract treatments more alienating than illuminating.

Fundamentals is divided into three main sections: “Russian sounds” (1–63), “Morphology and morphophonemics” (65–149), and “Historical sound changes” (151–94), followed by a list of fifteen sources consulted by the authors (195–96). There is no index of either words or

ideas, but the table of contents and the use of section headings are sufficiently detailed to make it possible to navigate to major descriptive topics. The unequal allocation of pages to the three principal sections reflects the authors' primary emphasis on providing a synchronic description of modern Russian that uses only surface information available directly to speakers (parts 1 and 2). The authors segregate historical explanation (part 3) because, although it may illuminate why Russian behaves the way it does, diachronic information cannot be usage-based in situations where early linguistic forms are not directly accessible to modern speakers, and therefore cannot play an explicit role in a model that is allowed to look only at real surface forms (x). The title is potentially misleading because the treatment of structure is systematic, while the treatment of history is anecdotal; *Fundamentals* is not equivalently and comparably about the *structure and history of Russian* as much as it is a textbook about structure that makes effective and illuminating reference to history where it can help explain how structure came about.

The target audience for *Fundamentals* is advanced Anglophone students of Russian—advanced both because of the breadth of coverage and because the lengthy citations in academic Russian are presented without translation (e.g., 15). Technical linguistic terms (e.g., involving articulatory phonetics, 13) are given in both English and Russian, presumably so that students will learn this specialized vocabulary and be able to read more about the subject in authentic Russian linguistic sources. Each explanatory section is accompanied by exercises that enable students to explore and apply what they are learning in practice (e.g., phonetic transcription, 11). The language of the text is direct, informal, and clear, and the style, which incorporates rhetorical questions and a wealth of illustrative examples, makes the information (both factual, about Russian, and methodological, about how to think about Russian) accessible to a student audience that may lack experience reading academic prose. The authors' frequent emphasis that alternation under inflection exemplifies *relationships* (e.g., 30) and *generalizations about relationships* (e.g., 39, 59), rather than *processes*, is important to their methodology, although some instructors who are otherwise comfortable with the explanatory model might nonetheless prefer not to emphasize the methodology itself as strongly as the authors have chosen to do. The authors themselves occasionally find it difficult to adhere consistently to their orientation around surface forms,

e.g., “a complete word can be composed of a single morpheme: *слово* ‘table’” (69) alongside the description of “the ‘no ending’ or ‘zero ending,’ the lack of an overt ending” as “there is an ending [...] the ending is empty” (72–73).

What is likely to prove most original and broadly valuable in *Fundamentals* is the authors’ decision to provide a separate historical section in a textbook about the structure of Russian, and this part is likely to be of use as a supplement even in classrooms where the instructor might otherwise prefer a generative approach to synchronic description over the authors’ usage-based one. The phenomena discussed in this part correspond to questions that arise frequently in language classes (e.g., fleeting vowels [187–90], *e ~ ě* [162–66]) or those that have historical explanatory value (e.g., jotation, here called dejotation [180–82]), and the authors make effective use of comparison with other Slavic languages (166–70), something students of Russian frequently find exciting and engaging. The explanations and examples are clear, and although the section is too brief and selective to serve as a general introduction to the history of Russian, the historical discussion of specific topics is likely to be highly effective in the important role that the authors have defined for it: showing how language history can illuminate how modern Russian came to be the way it is.

It is difficult to avoid letting a small number of errors, inconsistencies, and imprecisions slip through in the first edition of a book that entails this degree of typographic complexity: The softness diacritic is described as an apostrophe written *above* a letter (7), but the example writes it after, rather than above, the consonant to which it applies, and it is described correctly as being written after the base consonant elsewhere (9). The phrase *usage-based* is sometimes hyphenated and sometimes not, even on the same page (e.g., “a usage-based program” ~ “a usage based description”, 56). The authors generally avoid Romanization of Cyrillic spelling, but where they do use it, their usage is not consistent either internally or with traditional practice in Russian linguistics and language pedagogy; thus *Julija* (34), *ikanje* (41), *yeri* (27ff.), *yat’* (158), *jer* (161). The decision not to mark stress on monosyllabic words (e.g., in the reading passage on p. 40) is common in textbooks, but since there are both stressed and unstressed monosyllabic words in Russian, as well as monosyllabic clitics that may be stressed when attached to some headwords but not to others,

this decision seems to perpetuate a questionable line of reasoning that rests on assumptions (stress needn't be marked in these situations because its presence and placement can be inferred) that are only largely, but not entirely, supported by the facts of the language. The curved superscript diacritic over the letter *ü* is oddly displaced to the right in a few places (e.g., 3 of 8 times in the list of sources, 195–96).

Whether instructors will adopt *Fundamentals* as the primary textbook for their Structure of Russian courses is likely to depend on how effective they find the usage-based explanatory model. Even those instructors who prefer a more abstract generative model for pedagogical reasons, though, should nonetheless consider incorporating the material from the historical portion of the book into their courses. And perhaps not just at the advanced level; if you've taught first-year Russian, you've probably had students ask "so where does that peculiar hard sign come from anyway?" You can find an accessible explanation on p. 161.

David J. Birnbaum
University of Pittsburgh

David Pesetsky. *Russian Case Morphology and the Syntactic Categories*. MIT Press, 2013.

David Pesetsky's *Russian Case Morphology and the Syntactic Categories* (MIT Press, 2013) is one of the most thought-provoking works of theoretical linguistics to appear in many years. It provides a startlingly original analysis of a well-known thorny problem of Russian morpho-syntax, embedding the analysis of that puzzle within a radical rethinking of the role of case in syntactic theory, and taking us on a journey of consequences and extensions that challenge one's views of many aspects of minimalist theory, including key components of case theory, phrase structure, locality and others. If a monograph is to be judged by its creativity, its significance for the theoretical field at large and the range of details of its technical implementation, then *Russian Case Morphology and the Syntactic Categories* deserves mention among some of the most significant recent works of theoretical linguistics.

Readers must approach the work with an open mind, however, and be willing to adjust, and in some cases, abandon core assumptions about syntactic relations in order to embrace the proposed system. Many, though not all, of those adjustments seem worth the effort; it remains to be seen to what degree syntactic theory as a whole will alter its course to accommodate the full set of necessary changes. In this review, I will not attempt to weigh the benefits against the costs of the proposed system. Rather, I will describe the structure of the theory Pesetsky builds to solve the Russian Paucal Puzzle, an apparently minor puzzle of Russian morphosyntax, introduced in Chapter 1, and raise some concerns about consequences that might be less innocuous than they might seem at first glance. First and foremost, however, my goal is simply to encourage people to read the book and judge for themselves. It is not only persuasively written and constructed, it is highly enjoyable to explore.

The core meta-theoretical question underlying the monograph is presented in Chapter 2, namely: “why is there case?” Related to this is the question of the elusive relationship between the set of morphological case paradigms we find in highly inflected languages such as Russian and the syntactic structure in which they occur -- can this relation be systematically captured in an enlightening way? In Chapter 2, Pesetsky discusses and dismisses the possibility that the morphological categories known as Genitive, Accusative, Nominative and so on can be reduced to something *morphologically* more basic, while at the same time arguing that it is a worthwhile project to try to relate those categories to something more basic within the *syntactic* apparatus. And this is exactly what the book proposes to do—to reduce (the primary) morphological case categories (at least 4 of them) to *part of speech* morphology – in the form of a direct relationship of the following form:

(1) Reduction of case to part of speech categories: (Pesetsky p. 7)

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| a. Genitive → N | b. Accusative → V |
| c. Nominative → D | d. Oblique → P |

The claim is that the cases listed in (1) are simply morphological instantiations of the associated part of speech categories. That is, Genitive case morphology *is* the appearance of [N], Accusative *is* [V], Oblique case *is* [P], and Nominative case *is* [D]. Some of these associations are of course

familiar from case *assignment* systems – in three of the four instances (a,b,d) the claim may seem somewhat unremarkable – we often think of Accusative as canonically “assigned” by V (or *v*), of Genitive, at least in adnominal usages, as being “assigned” by N and of Oblique as being “assigned” by P¹ (I return below to the 4th claim, (c) the issue of D and Nominative case). However, such familiar case “assignment” by a head to its complement represents only the first of two ways that part of speech features can end up on an element in Pesetsky’s system. What is unexpected about Pesetsky’s version of these associations is that what he means by (1) is not (only) that these category heads “assign” this case to their complements (and inside their complements), but also that they “wear them on their sleeves,” *themselves*. This is particularly relevant for Genitive, which is the “primeval” form of the NP part of nominals, as given in (2).

(2) “**Primeval genitive**” conjecture (Pesetsky p. 9)

N_{GEN} categorizes a Russian root as a Noun (in the lexicon)

That is to say, NPs (a sub-structure of DPs) are themselves *inherently* Genitive – Genitive case simply IS a spellout of the category feature [N]. If nothing else happens to mask its appearance, an NP (at least in Russian) will surface as Genitive -- “you are what you assign.”² The theoretical benefits should be fairly obvious – cases are reduced to parts of speech, an undeniable primitive of any grammatical system.³

¹Pesetsky leaves aside the issue of distinction among Obliques (Instrumental vs. Dative vs. Prepositional, etc), though he does tackle some of the issues of Prepositions that assign Accusative (Section 7.3) and Genitive (Section 8.5). He also does not address other possibly structural instances of Genitive unrelated to primeval instances, such as Genitive of negation, Genitive time expressions, Genitive after intensional verbs and others.

²Pesetsky does not concern himself in detail with the cross-linguistic consequences of this approach to case, except with regard to the possibility of a default-like Nominative case emanating from the category D in Russian, but possibly not elsewhere, (see Chapter 7). However, the implication is that the essential relations given in (1) are universal, with differing systems of morphological realization. How this relates to languages with more than 4 major distinct case categories, or to ergative systems, is not taken up in the monograph, though it certainly opens up new ways of approaching such questions.

³Interestingly, the notion that a case is just the spellout of its traditional assigner’s part of speech category is one of the best-known strengths of a series of papers by Pesetsky and Torrego (2001, 2007), in which Nominative (and Accusative) are claimed to be reflexes of T. That is not one of the associations proposed in this work, but it is a direct precursor of

Of course, many, if not most, NPs do not in fact surface with Genitive case. This leads us to Pesetsky's other major innovation in the book, namely the system of *case stacking* and *overwrite* that he promotes. The basic assumption is that cases *stack*, so that the primeval Genitive that NPs carry finds itself stacked within the Nominative layer associated with D, which in turn could be stacked within an Accusative layer associated with V or an Oblique layer associated with P and so on. Thus we would often expect to have a situation such as (3):

(3) Case stacking: [PP P⁰ [DP D⁰ [NP N⁰_{GEN}]_{NOM}]_{ACC}]

in which 3 cases are stacked on N, in the layering GEN > NOM > OBL. A case realization rule, such as (4) then determines which element surfaces in the morphology:

(4) **The One-Suffix Rule:** Delete all but the outermost case suffix⁴ (Pesetsky p. 11)

Thus we find Oblique case on objects of prepositions because it is the outermost suffix in the construction and not because it is the only one. It simply "overwrites" the Nominative and Genitive cases already stacked on the relevant elements. Note that this system contrasts sharply with more standard approaches to the *locality* of case-assignment, whereby a more local head simply blocks the application of a more distant case-assigning head, as might be expected within Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990, 2004 etc.). Indeed, Pesetsky removes locality from the case assignment component of the grammar, other than through the indirect mediation of phases, a move whose consequences are taken up in detail in the later chapters of the book, especially Chapters 7 and 8.) In fact, a recurring

the idea of associating part of speech with case realization. I return below to the question of whether [T] in fact might be a better candidate for Nominative than [D], even given the rest of Pesetsky's assumptions in the book.

⁴On p. 101, this is replaced by the **The One-Prototype Rule:**

In the configuration [_{β} n x [_{β} n y ... β ...]] (order irrelevant), where x and y are the realization of prototypes, delete y.

The prototype version is not relevant to the discussion at hand about Pesetsky's general case-stacking resolution ("overwrite") system.

theme of the book concerns the burdens faced by an overwrite-based system of case realization as compared with a locality-based system, and how to overcome them. I say “burdens” because although the overwrite system solves the core Russian morphosyntactic puzzle, in some ways for the first time satisfactorily, the solution comes with a cost in terms of expectations of overwrite in many instances where it is not found. Proponents of Pesetsky’s approach will want to find additional instances where overwrite accounts for linguistic phenomena better than locality does.

Because there is a claim of universal case stacking, we have an expectation that *overt* instances of case-stacking would occur in some languages. One such language, Lardil, is examined in detail in Chapter 3, (and a more subtle version of overt stacking is also proposed to account for certain Russian word internal morphology in Chapter 9 -- that of certain personal possessives such as *Mašina kniga* [“Masha’s book”]). In the absence of overt case-stacking in the majority of instances, however, it is a morphological resolution rule such as (4) that determines which of the stacked cases appears, namely the outer one.

Now, why might we prefer a grammar with a case-stacking and overwrite system over a system of locality? We would prefer it if there were grammatical phenomena in which a primeval category/case surfaces in certain instances, but is overwritten by a higher category/case feature in other instances. That is, if there are clear instances of higher case manifestation within what appears to be the domain of a more local case assigner, then the stacking+overwrite system has a clear advantage over one of absolute locality. The Russian Paucal Puzzle is exactly such an instance, and it is careful analysis of this long-standing problem that is Pesetsky’s central accomplishment in the book, the details of which occupy Chapters 4-6.

In order to elucidate the ingenuity of the solution offered, one needs to understand the basic puzzle, which I will present briefly here. The Russian paucal numerals (“2”, “3”, “4”, “1.5” and certain other lexical items), themselves marked Nominative or Accusative (in Nominative or Accusative contexts) are typically followed by adjectives in the Genitive plural and nouns in the Genitive singular, but can be preceded by Nominative plural elements. This so-called *heterogeneous pattern* is shown in (5).

• Nom/Acc “context” -- **Heterogeneous pattern:**

- (5) èti dva novyx stola
 these-NOM.PL 2-NOM new-GEN.PL table-GEN.SG
 “these two new tables”

There is a clear number mismatch – the associated adjectives are plural, but the paucal element itself and the head noun following it are (apparently) singular. In terms of case, the paucal seems to determine a Genitive case domain, and has traditionally been assumed to “assign” Genitive to its complement (Babby 1987, Bailyn 2004 a.o.) in one way or another (after all, without a paucal or other numerical expression present, there is also no Genitive present). The case piece here is not in and of itself a difficult puzzle – after all these could be case assigning heads, and only the number mismatch would be mysterious. However, as soon as the relevant DP finds itself in an Oblique context, that is, as object of a Preposition, the paucal no longer behaves as if it determines a Genitive case domain. Rather, the entire phrase is *overwritten* by the (Oblique) case required by the preposition, producing what is usually referred to as a *homogenous pattern*. (Note that the number mismatch also disappears). This is shown in (6):

• oblique “context” -- **Homogeneous pattern:**

- (6) s dvumja novymi stolami
 with 2-INSTR.PL new-INSTR.PL table-INSTR.PL
 “with two new tables”

It is the contrast between (5) and (6) that constitute the full Paucal Puzzle – why do paucal elements and their complements differ in case (and number) when the entire phrase is in a Nom/Acc environment, whereas they share case and number in an Oblique context? No theory of case locality can easily account for this contrast; Pesetsky’s system can.⁵

The number mismatch is resolved by Pesetsky in Chapter 4 in a particularly creative way. This is the core of the analysis: in keeping with

⁵Traditionally, the related case puzzle involving the higher numeral “5” and above had been resolved by appealing to a Case Hierarchy (see Babby 1987), whereby lexical case outranks structural case, allowing apparently non-local case assignment in (6). Of course such a system can in and of itself be understood as a precursor to an overwrite system, as it also defies standard locality of case assignment. Another relevant overwrite system is proposed in Matushansky (2010), with regard to other puzzles of Russian case.

somewhat similar-looking classifier systems, the paucal is analyzed as a self-standing [-sg] number (Nbr) head (with which adjectives show number agreement, hence their plural form). Crucially, the head noun in the construction is *numberless*, given the separate manifestation of the Nbr element. It is the ability in Russian to have the Nbr feature surface independently that allows the construction in (5). The Nbr element is generated low, and raises to D (in fact through an intermediate Q position, whose relevance is discussed in detail in Chapter 6), and the noun remains numberless. At Spellout, a default number form surfaces, which mimics the singular. The number mismatch is thus explained. (In Oblique overwrite instances such as (6), the P head acquires a [-sg] value from below and passes it down into the NP domain, thus eliminating the number mismatch in those cases as needed.)

The strength of the analysis is in its derivation of the case pattern in (5). This works as follows: the raising of the Nbr head to D means that when D merges with NP, NP does not entirely satisfy the “complementation requirements” of D, and this renders D powerless to allow Nominative to overwrite the Genitive below. Thus the appearance of Primeval Genitive is directly tied to the separate head status of the paucal. Overwrite by D_{NOM} is impossible, while overwrite by a higher P_{OBL} is not only expected, but required. The case contrast between (5) and (6) is now derived.

Chapter 5 then follows with a brilliant piece of confirming evidence that paucal Nbr elements are indeed generated *lower* than the adjectives that follow them in surface order and raise to a higher spot. The evidence comes from certain feminizable Class I nouns (typically masculine), such as *vrač* (‘doctor’), whose intricate patterns of agreement are the subject of Chapter 5. Lebanese Arabic is shown to have an identical system in its number agreement; both systems show that a mismatch of features of a certain kind can be explained by the insertion of a feminizing (Russian) or pluralizing (Arabic) morpheme in the spine of the nominal, but only at a certain height. Pesetsky proves that that height is lower than adjectives, and thus derives the claimed base position of the paucal Nbr heads. The evidence is incontrovertible and the analysis high in originality and elegance.

Chapter 6 then extends the analysis to constructions with higher numerals, which do not show a number mismatch, but have the same case

situation as paucals. The puzzle here is essentially the same – in Nominative/Accusative environments we get a heterogeneous pattern, whereas in Oblique contexts we get Oblique homogeneity throughout.

- higher numerals in Nom/Acc context (gender neutralized)

= **Heterogeneous pattern:**

- (7) èti pjat' novyx stolov
 these-NOM.PL 5-NOM new-GEN.PL tables-GEN.PL
 “these five new tables”

- higher numerals in oblique context (gender neutralized)

= **Homogenous pattern:**

- (8) s ètimi pjat'ju [novymi stolami]
 with these-INSTR.PL 5-INSTR [new table]-INSTR.PL
 “with these five new tables”

The analysis of numerals such as “5” is essentially the same as for paucals, though technical issues of number agreement and complementation requirements might need closer scrutiny to determine all consequences. Certain assumptions about the timing of the derivation, spellout, and the inability to value number need to be accepted to allow things to proceed, but if that much is granted, the elegant solution for the paucal numbers extends naturally to the higher numbers. The overwrite system remains at the core of the analysis, and the potential advantage of eliminating case locality and directly associating case with part of speech is maintained as the meta-goal of the approach. This alone sets Pesetsky’s book apart from many other works on this topic.

Pesetsky’s monograph is also to be praised for its honest attempt at addressing potentially problematic consequences, such as the expectation that we would find overwrite in all sorts of instances where we do not find it – such as verbal Accusative overwriting into the paucal domain, Oblique and Accusative overwriting into the adnominal Genitive domain and various others. Chapters 7 and 8 address this potential problem. The essential insight is that DPs form *phases* that exempt them from the reach of overwrite from above, thereby maintaining the apparent effect of case assignment locality into, say, an adnominal Genitive domain within a PP. In the absence of phasehood, however, we expect outer case instances to