T. Reinhart (auth.), *M. Everaert, M. Marelj, E. Reuland* (eds.). **Concepts, syntax and their interface: The Theta System**. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 2016. 288 p. ISBN 9780262034135[*].

Mikhail Yu. Knyazev　　　　　　　　**Михаил Юрьевич Князев**

National Research University Higher School of Economics, Saint Petersburg, 190121, Russian Federation; Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; mknyazev@hse.ru

Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики», Санкт-Петербург, 190121, Российская Федерация; Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Санкт-Петербург, 199034, Российская Федерация; mknyazev@hse.ru

1. Introduction. Due to her untimely death in 2007, Tanya Reinhart never completed the planned *Linguistic Inquiry* volume on the Theta System (TS), which is regarded by some as "one of her major contributions to linguistic theory" (p. xi). The planned volume was supposed to provide a comprehensive text containing a systematic exposition of TS, reflecting its subsequent development by Reinhart and her collaborators since the publication of her first two expository articles on TS in 2000 and 2002. The aim of the book under review, edited by linguists at Utrecht institute of Linguistics OTS (UiL OTS), with whom she actively collaborated for the last 15 years of her life, is to provide such a comprehensive text.

Chapter I, the core of the book, is an extended and annotated version of Reinhart's "foundational" article "The Theta System: Syntactic realization of verbal concepts," supplemented by a summary of [Reinhart 2002] by the editors. Although the article was previously published as [Reinhart 2000] in *UiL OTS Working Papers in Linguistics*, the editors decided that, due to its seminal status, it deserves to be more widely accessible. The chapter also contains a short note by Reinhart's former graduate student and now an assistant professor at UiL OTS Marijana Marelj, which discusses implications of TS to Case Theory and is based on the LSA course co-taught by Reinhart and Marelj in 2005.

Chapter II, "The Thematic Phase and the architecture of grammar" by Reinhart's former colleagues at Tel Aviv University Julia Horvath and Tal Siloni, is arguably the most interesting contribution in this volume for a general linguistic audience already familiar with TS. The chapter discusses differences between TS and the so-called "syntacticocentric" approaches to argument structure espoused by Hagit Borer [2005] and Gillian Ramchand [2008] among others. The chapter provides evidence against such approaches and in favor of the *active lexicon* approach favored by TS.

Finally, Chapter III, "Clitics and reflexives: Reducing the lexicon-syntax parameter," by Marijana Marelj and Eric Reuland, does not address TS directly but is concerned with the status of the Lex(icon)-Syn(tax) parameter [Reinhart, Siloni 2005], developed within TS and aimed at explaining cross-linguistic variation in reflexivization and other thematic arity operations. The article is part of a larger project of revising Chomsky's [1981] canonical Binding Theory, led over the years by Reuland and his co-authors, including Reinhart herself (e. g. [Reinhart, Reuland 1993; Reuland 2011]). In their contribution, Marelj and Reuland attempt to reduce the Lex-Syn parameter to independent principles of grammar (in accordance with the current minimalist assumptions) while supporting the core theoretical insight of TS, i. e. the existence of lexical operations.

After a brief introduction of TS (Section 2), I will critically examine the following three questions, which roughly correspond to the three chapters of the volume:

— What is the empirical motivation for TS (Section 3)?

— What are the advantages of TS over syntacticocentric approaches to argument structure (Section 4)?
— How can TS and the results obtained within TS be integrated into the current grammatical theory (Section 5)?

2. TS in a Nutshell. The main question TS is concerned with is what kind of information pertaining to the conceptual structure of verbs is legible to the computational system (syntax). To address this question, TS proposes a way of **encoding** verbal concepts in the form of particular combinations of feature clusters (related to each other by arity operations) as well as the **interface** between the system of concepts and syntactic structure in the form of mapping/linking instructions. Thus, TS can be viewed as a kind of channel through which conceptual information is passed down to the syntax. In this way, TS crucially differs from "**syntacticocentric**" approaches, where conceptual information (often referred to as "encyclopedic information") is either totally inaccessible to the syntax (as in Borer's [2005] approach) or accessible only in the form of a small inventory of c-selectional features (as in Ramchand's [2008] approach). Under both approaches, thematic information is encoded directly by the syntactic structure (hence "syntacticocentric"), rendering the lexicon superfluous as a separate module of representing conceptual information.

Perhaps the most recognizable feature of TS is the decomposition of traditional semantic roles into clusters of two binary features [±c] for causal responsibility and [±m] for (obligatory) mental involvement in the event/state, giving rise to eight possible combinations, as in the Table below.

Table

**The correspondence between the feature clusters of the Theta System
and the traditional semantic roles**

Cluster	Label	Causes the denoted event (change)	Mental state (volition, intention) is relevant
Fully specified clusters			
[+c+m]	Agent	Yes	Yes
[+c−m]	Instrument	Yes	No
[−c+m]	Experiencer	No	Yes
[−c−m]	Theme/Patient	No	No
Unary clusters			
[+c]	Cause	Yes	Unvalued
[+m]	Sentient[1]	Unvalued	Yes
[−c]	Goal/Benefactor	No	Unvalued
[−m]	Subject Matter/ Target of Emotion	Unvalued	No

Such decomposition allows to define classes of theta-roles (akin to classes of phonemes) and thereby (i) capture generalizations about mapping/linking (see (1)), as well as (ii) give a precise formulation of thematic arity operations such as Expletivization (external role reduction), Bundling (reflexivization), Causativization, etc. (see Section 3). In addition, TS provides an instruction for marking the concept with the ACC(usative) feature (cf. Burzio's generalization).

(1) *Merging instructions*
     a. The class of [+] clusters is merged externally.
     b. The class of [−] clusters is merged internally.[2]
     c. When nothing rules it out, merge externally.

---

[1] This cluster is associated with the subject of verbs such as *see*, *hear*, *love*, *know*, and *believe*.

[2] Theme unergatives like *glow* present an exception to (1b), which led Reinhart to restrict the rules in (1) to concepts with n>1 clusters. See, though, [Potashnik 2012] for an alternative analysis of these verbs.

(2)   *Accusative marking*
      If the lexical entry includes a [+c] cluster and a fully-specified cluster [−c±m] (i. e. [−c+m] or [−c−m]), it is marked with the ACC feature.

We now turn to empirical arguments advanced by Reinhart in favor of TS.

3. Empirical motivation for TS. Reinhart's article in Chapter I presents two main arguments for TS, which come from the Unaccusative puzzle and Experiencer alternations.

The **Unaccusative puzzle** consists of two questions: (i) how can the grammar and the child learning the grammar "know" which verbs have unaccusative syntax (i. e. that their sole argument is internal); (ii) why do unaccusative verbs often share morphology with reflexive verbs, cf. *Stakan razbil**sja*** 'the glass broke' and *Ivan pomyl**sja*** 'Ivan washed.' Building on the observation that most unaccusative verbs have transitive counterparts allowing for both animate and inanimate causers (cf. *Max*/*The storm*/*The stone broke the window*), Reinhart argues that a verb is unaccusative iff (i) its verbal concept includes a [+c] role, and (ii) this role is reduced (by Expletivization—external role reduction). Transitive counterparts of unaccusative verbs are thus contrasted with "true" causative verbs like *walk*, derived from the separate Causativization operation, which adds a [+c+m] (mentally involved) argument (cf. *Max*/ **Hunger walked the dog*) to the original entry. By giving a formal, feature-based definition of unaccusativity in contrast to purely semantic approaches like that of [Levin, Rappaport Hovav 1995], Reinhart is able to correctly classify "semantic exceptions," namely "Theme unergatives" like *glow* (which do not seem to have transitive counterparts, but see [Potashnik 2012]) and "internally-caused" verbs like *arrive* and *happen* (which do have transitive counterparts in some languages). Given that unaccusative verbs are derived by a role-reducing operation, i. e. Expletivization, Reinhart is able to capture their morphological similarity with reflexive verbs, derived by the Bundling operation (which also reduces the internal role).

Experiencer alternations (e. g. *The doctor's letter worries her* vs. *She worries about her health*) are puzzling because: (i) intransitive alternants are unergatives despite their morphological similarity to unaccusatives (cf. *udivit'**sja*** 'become surprised' and *slomat'**sja*** 'become broken'); (ii) subjects of transitive alternants have "unaccusative" properties (allow backwards anaphora as in *Her$_i$ health worries every patient$_i$*) despite being externally-merged as Causes [Pesetsky 1995]; (iii) simultaneous realization of Cause ([+c]) and Subject Matter ([−m]) roles is disallowed (Pesetsky's [1995] T/SM restriction), cf. **[**The doctor's letter**] worried Lucy [$_{PP}$ **about her health**]*, see (5). Reinhart argues that both transitive and intransitive alternants correspond to the underlying three-place concept ([+c], [−c+m], [−m]). Intransitive alternants are derived by the Expletivization operation reducing the [+c] role (hence morphological similarity to unaccusatives), but their remaining cluster is mixed ([−c+m]) and thus, by (1c), is external. The T/SM restriction is derived from (i) the assumption that clusters having a construal under which they are identical are **non-distinct** (thus [+c] and [−m] in (5) are non-distinct as they both can be construed as [+c−m]), and (ii) a ban on the co-occurrence of non-distinct clusters.[3] Because of this semantic similarity the transitive subject can be construed not only as [+c] but also as [−m] and thus merged internally, accounting for the backwards anaphora pattern.

In addition to Reinhart's arguments, Marelj's contribution (extending Reinhart's article) presents evidence in favor of the accusative marking principle in (2). Marelj argues that it captures the failure of PP-selecting verbs such as *worry (about)* and *wonder (about)* to assign accusative case—a behavior unexpected under Burzio's generalization, which assumes that the presence of an external argument is sufficient for accusative-assignment. Marelj observes that the PP-argument of these verbs is compatible with (but does not require) a Cause interpretation, as in *The question made John wonder* (cf. **The question made John ask*), and hence should correspond to the [−m] cluster, unspecified for the [±c] feature. Therefore, by (2), it cannot ACC-mark the verb. This allows Marelj to derive the case-related distinction between *ask* and *wonder* assumed by Pesetsky [1982].

---

[3] The notion of non-distinctness here follows Marelj's [2004] reinterpretation of Reinhart's original definition.

While Reinhart's analysis of unaccusative and Experiencer verbs is convincing, the ACC-marking principle in (2) and the account of the T/SM restriction are not unproblematic. The problem with (2) is that it is too strong. First, contra (2), accusative can be assigned by verbs that lack [+] clusters—a problem inherited by (2) from Burzio's generalization—as in Russian *Menja*_{ACC} *tošnit* 'I feel nauseated' and English *It struck **me** that I should have used "Elmer" in this sentence* (see [Marantz 2000]). Second, contra (2), accusative can be assigned not only to Theme ([–c–m]) or Experiencer ([–c+m]) arguments but also to Goals ([–c]) and Instruments ([+c–m]), as shown in (3).

(3)   a. *John*_[+c+m] *gave **Mary**_[–c] a book*_[–c–m].

       b. *John*_[+c+m] *shot the bullet*_[–c–m]/***the victim**_[–c]/**the gun**_[+c–m].   [Potashnik 2012]

One may object that this is not a "true" accusative but an underlying dative/oblique disguised as accusative, as proposed in [Potashnik 2012] and [Botwinik 2013], and thus is not subject to (2). However, if "surface accusative" is not regulated by TS, Marelj's account of the difference between *ask* and *wonder* is lost, as nothing precludes the [–m] cluster of *wonder* to be assigned "surface accusative" (unless one provides an **independent** account of the difference between "surface" vs. "deep accusative").[4]

Reinhart's account of the T/SM restriction in terms of non-distinctness is also too strong. First, it incorrectly rules out the co-occurrence of [–c] and [–m] (which are non-distinct under Reinhart's definition), cf. Pesetsky's [1995] example *Sue is angry with Bill*_[–c] *about the party*_[–m].[5] Second, it fails to account for the contrast in (4) (due to [Hartman 2008]), similar to the T/SM restriction. It is not the co-occurrence of [+c] and [–m] per se that causes ungrammaticality in (4a), cf. the grammatical (4b), but that of the three clusters ([+c], [–m] *and* [–c+m]) simultaneously, cf. (5).[6]

(4)   a. **The bridge*_[+c] dwarfed Mary*_[–c+m] *the lighthouse*_[–m].

       b. *The mansion*_[+c] *dwarfs the house next door*_[–m].

(5)   **The doctor's letter*_[+c] worried Lucy*_[–c+m] *about her health*_[–m].

Having presented empirical arguments for TS, we turn to more conceptual issues relating to the difference between TS and alternative approaches to argument structure.

4. Comparison between TS and syntacticocentric approaches. The main claim of Chapter II by Horvath and Siloni is that syntacticocentric approaches to argument structure such as that of Borer [2005] and Ramchand [2008] came to dominate over *active lexicon* approaches such as TS not because of their intrinsic value but due to the fact they fit better with other influential proposals (e.g. Larsonian [1988] VP-shell, Chomsky's [1995] little *v*/Kratzer's [1996] Voice, semantic decomposition of verb meanings into abstract predicates such as CAUSE and BECOME [Dowty 1979], Baker's [1988] Uniformity of Theta-Assignment Hypothesis and Distributed Morphology [Marantz 1997]). The aim of Horvath and Siloni is threefold: (i) to reexamine evidence for syntactic decomposition/syntacticocentric approaches, which Horvath and Siloni believe is sparse, (ii) to propose an alternative for articulated VP to handle three-argument verbs, and (iii) to present evidence for *active lexicon* approaches.

---

[4] Note that "deep accusative" cannot be identified by standard structural Accusative diagnostics as shown by the passivization of verbs with [–c]/[+c–m] arguments, as in *The victim was shot* and *Mary was given a book*, cf. (3).

[5] See [Knyazev 2013] for some further problems with this constraint.

[6] Knyazev [2016] argues that the T/SM restriction in Russian (cf. the Russian counterpart of (5) **Pis'mo doktora bespokoit Ljusi o ee zdorov'e*) stems from the realization of the same theta-role twice. This is suggested by the fact that the subject of object Experiencer verbs like *bespokoit'* 'worry' and *pugat* 'frighten' is not a Cause but a Subject Matter (contra [Pesetsky 1995]). This is shown by the infelicity of examples like #*Tabletka pugaet*/*bespokoit Ivana* '#The pill worries/frightens John' in a sci-fi context where a fear/worry-inducing drug affects Ivan unbeknownst to him.

Horvath and Siloni start with calling into question evidence for syntactic decomposition approaches from the ambiguity of *again* (e.g. [von Stechow 1996]) and other adverbials, showing that such ambiguity is not as pervasive as these approaches suggest (by freely providing different structural positions for such adverbials), cf. the lack of the *restitutive* interpretation in #*John cleaned the jacket **again*** ('the jacket became clean again without John having cleaned it before') and the lack of the result state modification in #*I dried the towels **for a few days*** ('the towels were dry for a few days'). Horvath and Siloni also argue against approaches introducing external arguments by a separate head (little *v*/Voice) (i) by providing examples where a verb imposes selectional restrictions on its external argument (cf. *The bees*/**The snake stung John*), which are hard to capture in such approaches, and (ii) by questioning the standard "special meanings" arguments for such approaches (e.g. [Marantz 1984]). Horvath and Siloni suggest that special meanings for external but not internal arguments, i.e. the fact that the interpretation of the object in *John killed a bottle* influences that of the subject (cf. *John killed a cockroach*) but not vice versa, are due to the conventionalization of interpretive units (= constituents), which include [V-O] but not [S-V], rather than from the separation of the external argument from the VP. The same applies to the argument from the non-existence of S-V idioms. Horvath and Siloni also correctly predict that special meanings are in fact possible with external arguments of unergative verbs (*The engine ran*, *His nose ran*, etc.), which is unexpected under the "little *v*" approach.

In order to handle three-argument verbs and IO-DO asymmetries (see [Larson 1988]) in a system without articulated VP, Horvath and Siloni propose that V can **remerge** at the root of the current VP, providing space, i.e. a specifier, for the extra argument. For example, after [$_{VP}$ *Mary give a book*] is built, *give* is remerged to yield [$_{VP}$*John* [*give* [*Mary ~~give~~ a book*]]]. The asymmetries between the arguments follow from the order of merger, which itself follows from a modification of Reinhart's merging instructions in (1): (i) [–] clusters are merged by the first merger of V; (ii) [+] clusters are merged by the last merger of V; (iii) mixed clusters ([+c–m] and [–c+m]) are merged either by the second (including vacuous) or last merger of V, depending on whether there is already a [+] cluster. These rules explain different realization of mixed clusters as in *Max peeled the apple **with the knife*** vs. ***The knife** peeled the apple* and *His health worries **John*** vs. ***John** worries about his health*.

Horvath and Siloni present three arguments against syntacticocentric approaches and in favor of the *active lexicon*. First, arity operations can have selectional restrictions that are easier defined in terms of TS features than in terms of functional heads, e.g. Hungarian causativization, which requires a [+] argument [Horvath, Siloni 2011]. Second, reduction operations (e.g. Expletivization, deriving Unaccusative/subject Experiencer verbs) do not make sense in the syntax assuming syntax does not destroy structure, whereas nothing precludes eliminating clusters from a concept (= a *set* of clusters) in TS. This is explained in TS by placing such operations in the (active) lexicon, which is achieved by Reinhart and Siloni's [2005] Lex-Syn parameter.[7]

Third, arity operations can be lexically restricted in some languages (e.g. Russian -*sja* reflexivization). Although Horvath and Siloni effectively destroy arguments *for* syntacticocentric approaches, their arguments *against* such approaches are not definitive. First, the argument against reduction in syntax begs the question as to whether unaccusative and subject Experiencer alternations cannot be accounted for without reduction, as, for instance, in [Ramchand 2008]. Second, the argument from the thematic sensitivity of arity operations also begs the question as to whether such sensitivity cannot be captured by syntactic selection for different functional heads (encoding different external arguments), as, for example, in Folli and Harley's [2005] "flavors" of *v* approach. Thus, in order to evaluate Horvath and Siloni's first two arguments, one needs an explicit side-by-side comparison between TS and the aforementioned approaches, which is unfortunately missing in Horvath

---

[7] In Chapter III, Marelj and Reuland present an additional argument against the view that roots are category-neutral, which is often associated with Borer/Distributed Morphology. The argument concerns verbalizing morphemes in Sakha [Vinokurova 2005]. Although such morphemes are highly productive, they still resist inherently "verbal" roots like 'cut' (and similarly for nominalizing morphemes), suggesting that roots do have categorial specification (see [Wood, Marantz 2017] for further discussion).

and Siloni's text. However, as it is also generally missing in syntacticocentric literature, this reinforces Horvath and Siloni's main point that TS/active lexicon has been abandoned without sufficient scrutiny. Their third argument, which might be the strongest, is discussed in the next section.

5. TS and present-day grammatical theorizing. Chapter III by Marelj and Reuland is concerned with a specific proposal developed within TS, namely Reinhart and Siloni's [2005] Lex-Syn parameter, rather than with TS per se. Marelj and Reuland's aim is to bring Reinhart and Siloni's parameter up to date with the current theoretical assumptions (i.e. minimalism). Dissatisfied with its "domain-specific" and "global" character, Marelj and Reuland attempt to reduce it to "low-level differences in functional structure between languages" coupled with "domain-general" explanatory mechanisms—an agenda stemming from Reuland's "reductionist" approach to reflexivity (see, e.g., [Reuland 2011]). Instead of restricting lexical reflexivization to "lexicon languages" like Russian, as envisaged by Reinhart and Siloni's Lex-Syn parameter, Marelj and Reuland argue that it should in principle be **universally** available, including in "syntax languages" like Italian (the remaining differences between "lexicon" and "syntax" reflexives being accounted for by independent properties of clitics in the "syntax languages"). Thus, while rejecting a specific TS proposal (the Lex-Syn parameter), Marelj and Reuland's approach supports the crucial TS assumption of active lexicon and thereby TS itself.

The aim of Marelj and Reuland is twofold: (i) to provide an alternative account of "the Lex-Syn parameter effects" without invoking the parameter itself (i.e. the notion of a "syntax language"), (ii) to provide an argument for the existence of lexical reflexivization even in what was described by Reinhart and Siloni as "syntax languages" (e.g. Italian), suggesting its universality.

Reinhart and Siloni's Lex-Syn parameter is motivated by the contrast between lexically restricted (simplex) reflexives like Dutch *zich* in (6), and reflexive clitics like Italian *si* in (7). While *zich* is mostly restricted to grooming verbs, as in (6a), and is blocked with verbs like 'admire', as in (6b) (cf. Russian reflexive *-sja* in **Ivan uvažaet**sja***), *si* is fully productive.[8] On Reinhart and Siloni's account, the contrast follows if Bundling, i.e. the operation deriving reflexive predicates, is parameterized as occurring in the **lexicon** in languages like Russian or Dutch (hence lexically-restricted) and as occurring in the **syntax** in languages like Italian (hence lexically-unrestricted).

(6)   DUTCH
    a. *Jan*   *wast*   ***zich***.
       Jan   washes   ZICH

    b. *Jan*   *bewondert*   ***zich*(zelf)***.
       Jan   admires   ZICH(ZELF)

(7)   ITALIAN
    Gianni   ***si***   *lava*/*ammira*.
    Gianni   SI   washes/admires

Marelj and Reuland propose an alternative explanation of these facts capitalizing on the additional contrast between simplex and complex reflexives in (6b). They argue that the ungrammaticality of *zich* in (6b) actually follows from the fact that simplex reflexives, being argumental expressions, are subject to the constraint against identical co-arguments (IDI) [Reuland 2011], which is circumvented by complex reflexives like *zichzelf* ("protecting" the argument, as it were). As for (6a), here *zich* is not a true argument because reflexivization of grooming verbs in Dutch is derived in the lexicon by Bundling creating a one-place predicate (with no argument slot). The role of *zich* in (6a) is merely to check the "accusative case residue."

In order to account for why Italian *si* in (7) does not violate IDI, Marelj and Reuland observe that *si* independently differs from both *zich* and *-sja* in its clitic status. Assuming that clitics attach to heads from argument positions, they form non-uniform A—non-A—A chains in examples

---

[8] Unfortunately, the authors do not discuss ECM reflexivization as in French *Jean se considère intelligent* 'Jean considers himself intelligent', which is a hallmark of "syntactic" reflexivization according to [Reinhart, Siloni 2005].

like (7), as in [$_{TP}$ *Gianni*$_i$ ... [$_{vP}$ [$_v$ *si*$_i$ + ammira] [$_{VP}$ ~~*ammira si*$_i$~~]]]. Marelj and Reuland further assume that non-uniform chains are treated by the computational system as two distinct argument chains and thus interpreted as two **distinct** arguments, thereby circumventing IDI.

Marelj and Reuland's account of (6)—(7) is based on the assumption that both *zich* in (6b) (but not in (6a)) and *si* in (7) can be true arguments. To support this claim, they present evidence from the availability of **proxy readings**, which require an argumental reflexive, cf. *Ringo načal razdevat **sebja*** 'Ringo started undressing himself' vs. #*Ringo načal razdevat**'sja*** '#Ringo started undressing' in the "wax museum" context. While Dutch *zich* in principle allows proxy readings, they are unavailable with grooming verbs, as in *Plotseling begon Ringo **zich*(zelf)** te ontkleden* 'All of a sudden Ringo started undressing.' Such readings are also (partially) available for reflexive clitics like Italian *si* supporting Marelj and Reuland's non-uniform chain analysis.

To show that even in "syntax languages" like Italian, reflexivization (Bundling) must occur in the lexicon, Marelj and Reuland present evidence from *auto*-prefixation (cf. Russian *samo*-prefixation), illustrated in (8). They observe that *auto*-prefixation (i) disallows proxy readings in examples like (8a), and (ii) is disallowed with grooming verbs, as shown in (8b) (see [Castella 2011]). This pattern follows if (i) *auto*-prefixation involves Bundling in the lexicon, explaining the lack of proxy readings, and (ii) grooming verbs like *lavare* are reflexivized prior to *auto*-prefixation thereby blocking it (assuming *auto*-prefixation applies to two-place verbs).

(8) ITALIAN

    a. *Quel   politico   **si**   è   **auto-**eletto.*
        that   politician   SI$_{CL}$ AUX   SELF-elected

    b. *Gianni   **si**   (*****auto-**)lava*
        Gianni   SI$_{CL}$ SELF-washes

Summarizing, Marelj and Reuland explain the empirical results of the Lex-Syn parameter by reducing "reflexivization in the syntax" to independent properties of reflexive clitics, simultaneously providing support for the potential universality of lexical reflexivization and thus for active lexicon/TS itself.

Marelj and Reuland's contribution suggests that while the empirical results and theoretical assumptions of the Lex-Syn parameter/TS are mostly correct, it fails as an explanatory framework **as is** because it lacks the degree of flexibility required to capture the complexity of the data, which is evident from comparing its modest conceptual apparatus to that of Marelj and Reuland, who use a diversity of theoretical tools. On the flip-side, Reinhart's work retains a stronger "theoretical unity" and, in a way, provides a more "psychologically satisfactory" explanation. In fact, the same applies to the comparison between TS and syntacticocentric approaches (see Section 4). Because of its smaller "theoretical flexibility," TS is harder to tweak to gain in descriptive adequacy, as opposed to syntacticocentric approaches which are "omnivorous" in being able to accommodate any new data (by, for example, postulating another functional head). However, because of this very reason, TS has a much stronger explanatory potential.

From this perspective, it appears that the dominance of syntacticocentric approaches in linguistic practice (pace Horvath and Siloni) actually stems from the fact that most formal linguists working on argument structure place greater premium on the accurate description of the observed phenomena rather than "deep explanations." Syntacticocentric approaches become the approaches of choice because they are more suited to such description. Whether this characterization is true, the lesson provided by the discussion of TS in the reviewed book, beyond its doubtless theoretical and empirical value for specialists working on argument structure, is that linguists should be more aware of the theoretical choices they make and should reflect more on the development and progress of linguistics.

REFERENCES

Baker 1988 — Baker M. *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1988.

Borer 2005 — Borer H. *Structuring sense*. In 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2005.

Botwinik 2013 — Botwinik I. PP-verbs: The phenomenon of PP-verbs (in Hebrew). *Lingua*. 2013. Vol. 133. Pp. 127—151.

Castella 2010 — Castella M. The autoanalysis: The Italian verbal prefix "auto." Master's thesis. Utrecht Univ., 2010. Available at: http://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/179520.

Chomsky 1981 — Chomsky N. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1981.

Chomsky 1995 — Chomsky N. *The Minimalist program*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 1995.

Dowty 1979 — Dowty D. *Word meaning and Montague grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1979.

Folli, Harley 2005 — Folli R., Harley H. Flavors of *v*: Consuming results in Italian and English. *Aspectual inquiries*. Slabakova R., Kempchinsky P. (eds.). Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2005. Pp. 95—120.

Hartman 2008 — Hartman J. *Dwarf*-class verbs, theta-theory, and argument linking. *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Abner N., Bishop J. (eds.). Somerville (MA): Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 2008. Pp. 203—210.

Horvath, Siloni 2011 — Horvath J., Siloni T. Causatives across components. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. 2011. Vol. 29. Pp. 657—704.

Knyazev 2013 — Knyazev M. A theta-theoretic account of the distribution of sentential complements. *Proceedings of ConSOLE XX*. Kohlberger M., Boone E., Schulpen M. (eds.). Leipzig, 2013. Available at: http://www.hum.leiden.edu/lucl/research/sole/proceedings/console-xx-proceedings.html.

Knyazev 2016 — Knyazev M. *Licensing clausal complements: The case of Russian* čto-*clauses*. (LOT International Dissertation Series.) Utrecht: LOT Publications, 2016.

Kratzer 1996 — Kratzer A. Severing the external argument from its verb. *Phrase structure and the lexicon*. Rooryck J., Zaring L. (eds.). Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1996. Pp. 109—137.

Larson 1988 — Larson R. K. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1988. Vol. 19. No. 3. Pp. 335—391.

Levin, Rappaport Hovav 1995 — Levin B., Rappaport Hovav M. *Unaccusativity: At the syntax—lexical semantics interface*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 1995.

Marelj 2004 — Marelj M. *Middles and argument structure across languages*. (LOT International Dissertation Series.) Utrecht: LOT Publications, 2004.

Marantz 1984 — Marantz A. *On the nature of grammatical relations*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 1984.

Marantz 2000 — Marantz A. Case and licensing. *Arguments and case*. Reuland E. (ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 11—30.

Marantz 1997 — Marantz A. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*. Dimitriadis A., Siegel L., Surek-Clark C., Williams A. (eds.). (Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics, 4.2.) Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania, Penn Linguistics Club, 1997. Pp 201—225.

Pesetsky 1982 — Pesetsky D. *Paths and categories*. PhD diss. Cambridge (MA): MIT, 1982.

Pesetsky 1995 — Pesetsky D. *Zero syntax: Experiencers and cascades*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 1995.

Potashnik 2012 — Potashnik J. Emission verbs. *The Theta System: Argument structure at the interface*. Everaert M., Marelj M., Siloni T. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2012. Pp. 251—278.

Ramchand 2008 — Ramchand G. *Verb meaning and the lexicon: A first phase syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008.

Reinhart 2000 — Reinhart T. *The Theta System: Syntactic realization of verbal concepts*. (OTS Working Papers in Linguistics 00,01/TL.) Utrecht: Utrecht Univ., 2000. Available at: http://www.let.uu.nl/~tanya.reinhart/personal/Papers/pdf/Lexic_00.pdf.

Reinhart 2002 — Reinhart T. The Theta System: An overview. *Theoretical Linguistics*. 2002. Vol. 28. Pp. 229—290.

Reinhart, Reuland 1993 — Reinhart T., Reuland E. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1993. Vol. 24. Pp. 657—720.

Reinhart, Siloni 2005 — Reinhart T., Siloni T. The lexicon-syntax parameter: Reflexivization and other arity operations. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 2005. Vol. 36. Pp. 389—436.

Reuland 2011 — Reuland E. *Anaphora and language design*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 2011.

von Stechow 1996 — Stechow A. von. The different readings of *wieder* 'again': A structural account. *Journal of Semantics*. 1996. Vol. 13. Pp. 87—138.

Vinokurova 2005 — Vinokurova N. *Lexical categories and argument structure: A study with reference to Sakha*. (LOT International Dissertation Series.) Utrecht: LOT Publ., 2005.

Wood, Marantz 2017 — Wood J., Marantz A. The interpretation of external arguments. *The verbal domain*. D'Alessandro R., Franco I., Gallego Á. J. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2017. Pp. 255—278.