

Chelaru-Murăruș raportându-se la teoria metaforei conceptuale, introdusă în lingvistică de George Lakoff și Mark Johnson (pp. 193-194, 205-206). În primul studiu, autoarea face unele observații privitoare la structura metaforelor culinare identificate în limbajele orale, în vreme ce în cel de-al doilea, valorificând rezultatele primului studiu și pe cele obținute în articole mai vechi, autoarea inventariază un număr semnificativ de metafore culinare, în spatele cărora identifică unele scheme metaforice conceptuale: *produsul culinar este o ființă umană* (pp. 212-213), *produsul culinar este un element al naturii* (pp. 213-214) și *produsul culinar 1 este produsul culinar 2* (pp. 214-215).

În fine, în ultimul studiu, *National Minorities in Romania revisited. Language Policies and the Protection of the Linguistic (Human) Rights*, Oana Chelaru-Murăruș revine asupra unor cercetări mai vechi din domeniul politicilor lingvistice referitoare la minoritățile etnice din România. Perspectiva de analiză este dată de cadrul general al sociolingvisticii, autoarea raportându-se la unele subdomenii ale acesteia, precum politici lingvistice, planificare lingvistică și bilingvism (p. 219). Oana Chelaru-Murăruș prezintă structura minorităților etnice din România și cadrul legislativ referitor la drepturile lingvistice ale acestora și arată că, în contextul integrării europene, România a înregistrat progrese vizibile în ceea ce privește implementarea unor reforme legislative și instituționale privind politicile lingvistice din acest domeniu.

Lucrarea Oanei Chelaru-Murăruș se revendică de la școala de stilistică bucureșteană, reprezentată de profesorul Ion Coteanu, căruia îi este de altfel dedicată. Meritul cel mai important al cărții constă în analizarea unor fenomene stilistice extrem de diverse. *Limbajele sectoriale* oferă o panoramă asupra diversității stilistice a limbii române actuale, autoarea întemeindu-și interpretarea pe cercetări solide, monografice. Densitatea informațiilor, limpezimea analizelor, bogăția și varietatea corpusurilor folosite, bibliografia atent selecționată (pp. 255-274) conferă lucrării sobrietate științifică, cartea dovedindu-se de un real interes pentru toți cei interesați de dinamica *limbajelor sectoriale* ale limbii române actuale.

drd. ALINA-GEORGIANA FOCȘINEANU
Facultatea de Litere,
Universitatea din București

JEFFREY KING, *Complex Demonstratives: A Quantificational Account*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT Press, 2001, 207 p.

King's monograph is devoted to an innovative theoretical proposal for the semantics of complex demonstratives (CDs) – *i.e.* expressions made up of a demonstrative followed by a noun or by a restrictive clause, such as 'that man'/'that man who eats spaghetti'. The aim of the author is to show that the traditional account for this type of expressions is deficient and that a new approach, in favor of which he argues throughout the paper, succeeds in covering a wider range of linguistic data than the previous one.

The issue regarding the correct semantic analysis for CDs was first raised in the field of philosophy of language. The debate proceeded from two important observations: on the one hand, the presence of the demonstrative term pointed to a common treatment with that of simple demonstratives (SDs) as purely referential terms, but, on the other hand, the presence of the nominal component with descriptive content indicated that an appropriate analysis should be one similar to that of descriptive, quantifier groups. Up to King, the dominant approach was that of traditionalists who interpreted CDs as direct reference instruments based on their typical uses, but the author manages to demonstrate by analyzing a wide variety of contexts in which such structures occur that they can actually be interpreted as quantifiers. The essential difference between the two views lies in the contribution of the expressions to the propositional content. While the advocates of direct reference theories argued that the meaning of CDs is represented by

the individuals to whom speakers intended to refer in a given context (Kaplan 1989), the quantificational account identifies their meaning with properties established by these intentions.

King's work opens with an introduction in which he summarizes the traditional semantic interpretation of CDs and motivates the need for a more detailed and unified semantic account for these expressions. Then, the author presents the structure and objectives pursued in each of the five chapters of the book.

The first chapter, *Against a Direct Reference Account*, consists of a brief presentation of the linguistic arguments underlying the new theoretical proposal for CDs. King's arguments are divided into two categories: on the one hand, non-referential uses of demonstrative structures that the advocates of direct reference theories have neglected to mention in their papers, and, on the other hand, syntactic evidence that reveals some sort of quantificational behaviour of CDs based on strong similarities with quantifier phrases (QP). Some of the most important evidence in favour of the quantificational account is illustrated below:

a) *NDNS uses (no demonstration no speaker reference uses)* – occur in statements in which the speaker doesn't have a specific individual in mind to refer to and therefore if that individual is not present in the physical context of utterance there is no need for gestures accompanying the CD structure:

1) *That hominid who discovered how to start fires was a genius.* (King 2001: 9)

b) *QI uses (quantification in uses)* – are specific to those statements in which CDs contain a pronoun which functions as a variable bound by a QP in whose scope the demonstrative structure occurs:

2) **Every father** dreads *that moment when his oldest child leaves home.* (King 2001: 10)

c) *Ambiguous uses* caused by scope interactions between quantifiers and CDs:

3) *That senator with the most seniority on each committee* is to be consulted. (King 2001: 10)

Here, the structure can receive a referential interpretation if the speaker uses it to refer to a particular individual (one of the senators from each committee, Jack, for example, will be consulted), but also a non-referential interpretation, when the CD takes *narrow scope* relative to the QP occurring in its relative clause (for each committee one senator, whoever that is, he/she will be consulted).

d) *Weak crossover phenomena* – cases in which possessives contained in the subject determiner phrase cannot be interpreted as anaphoric on CDs which are placed in object position:

- 4) a. *His mother loves that man with the goatee.*
 b. *His mother loves every man.*
 c. *His mother loves John.* (King 2001: 18-19)

The argument goes as follows: while in sentences containing CDs (*that man with the goatee*) and QPs (*every man*), 'his' cannot be interpreted as an anaphor, sentences which include proper names (*John*) can receive such an interpretation because it's easy to imagine a context in which 'his' and 'John' refer to the same individual. This is considered to be a strong syntactic proof, which clearly shows that CDs are similar to QPs and differ from purely referential expressions such as proper names.

In the second chapter, *Three quantificational accounts for 'that' phrases*, the author formulates three different quantificational accounts for describing CDs behavior and argues in favor of one of them. The main idea he highlights here is that even CDs and quantifiers have a common semantic feature, namely the fact that their propositional contribution consists of relations between properties, there is, however, something that differentiates them – the way we come to determine those properties. In the case of CDs, speaker's intentions are the ones considered to be responsible for fixing properties that further restrict the quantification expressed in contexts in which they occur. The author identifies two types of intentions: *perceptual intentions* (when speakers have direct perception of the object they want to talk about) and *descriptive intentions* (when speakers want to refer to an object they believe it possesses certain properties). Then, he establishes correlations between referential uses of CDs and speaker's perceptual intentions, on the one hand, and between non-referential uses of CDs and descriptive intentions, on the other. In the end, when discussing his final account for CDs, King describes the lexical meaning of the demonstrative 'that' by means of a relation with four argument places for properties ('_ and _ are uniquely _ in an x object and x is _') and shows how they can get saturated based on the context and also on the type of intention that the speaker possesses.

In the third chapter, *Modality, negation, and verbs of propositional attitude*, King considers a wide range of linguistic contexts in which he identifies scope interactions between CDs and other types of expressions that contextually affect their semantics: modal operators, negation, and verbs of propositional attitude. Due to the fact that the advocates of direct reference theories do not have the appropriate means to explain how can it be that CDs exhibit narrow scope readings, King focuses his attention on creating and debating a large set of contexts of this kind, which he considers essential to the view he supports. The examples are not limited to sentences in which CDs have non-referential uses (cases in which narrow scope readings can be spotted quite easily) but show that even with referential uses such readings are possible, reinforcing once again the idea that the quantificational approach manages to unify theoretically two different types of uses which would apparently require different semantic solutions.

The following chapter, *This and that: A Variety of Loose ends*, consists of some debatable issues regarding the quantificational treatment of demonstrative structures. Here, King talks about the particular character of the demonstrative 'that' among other determiners, insisting on the idea that the speaker's intentions are significant in restricting the domain of quantification. The author discusses similar statements in which either QP or CD structures occur and provides different semantic interpretations for each of them. In the last part of the chapter, King deals with the possibility of applying the same semantic analysis of CDs to SDs. He admits that some of the syntactic arguments put forward to strengthen the quantificational approach for CDs do not work for SDs, but he does not exclude the possibility that the latter be interpreted semantically similar. King is of the opinion that SDs include an empty constituent [_s[_{np}]_{det}That]_[_ne][_{vp}is F] (King 2001: 141), which has a great contribution on the propositional content of the sentences in which they occur. Then, using the same theoretical model as for CDs, the author demonstrates that properties dictated by the speaker's intentions can also be determined for SDs. Consequently, he argues that the new approach has the means for being extended to plenty of other types of language expressions.

In the last chapter of his monograph, *Against Ambiguity Approaches*, the author criticizes theories which claim that various uses of CDs cannot be embedded in a single semantic theory. These theories provide a direct reference interpretation for the referential uses of CDs and offer different versions of semantic interpretation for their non-referential uses. King maintains that the strong similarities between both types of readings that CDs may exhibit require a unified approach and shows that his theory succeeds in explaining on the basis of reasonable principles why it is not necessary for these uses to be given a separate semantic treatment. Among the arguments put forward by the author are the following: the possibility of having contextual supplementation by speaker's intentions for both types of uses, various contexts in which

depending on the type of intention the speaker possesses the same CD can receive both referential and non-referential interpretation and also strong syntactic similarities. Moreover, King drew a parallel with definite descriptions which despite their different contextual readings (referential or attributive) are however accommodated within a single semantic theory. Finally, he suggests that an ambiguity theory should be appropriate to explain the different semantic behaviour between SDs and complex ones, but excludes the possibility that such a theory be valid for CDs, given the systematic character and great explanatory power of the quantificational account.

The monograph ends with an appendix that includes formal representations of the semantic theory formulated by the author.

Even though King's work is impressive there are some critical remarks which can be made with respect to it. In the first place, although the author formulates a theory for the whole class of demonstratives, the examples he uses throughout the paper contain only the demonstrative 'that'. It can be inferred that, in his opinion, the proximal demonstrative (*this*) and the plural correspondents of the two (*these, those*) exhibit the same kind of semantic behavior, but a careful look at the contexts considered by the author reveals that the demonstrative 'that' cannot be always replaced by other demonstratives. Replacement failure most probably shows they are not actually semantically equivalent. In 'Every father dreads that moment when his oldest child leaves home', for example, 'that' cannot be replaced with 'this' because it would not have a non-referential reading anymore. Moreover, it is curious how non-referential readings can be established exclusively for distal demonstratives (*that/those*) – we could not find any context in which 'this hominid who discovered how to start fires', 'this senator with the most seniority..' or 'this moment when..' can receive non-referential interpretation. This idea could be exploited by the advocates of other theories by identifying and interpreting that particular element which justifies non-referential readings only for distal demonstratives, and once the invalidity of the quantificational theory for the entire class of demonstratives has been settled, the explanatory power of King's approach would be strongly diminished.

Another observation that could affect King's theory is that arguments based on syntactic similarities between QPs and CDs can often be countered. I will concentrate only on one example: the sentence '*His mother loves that man with the goatee*' is used by King to establish a correspondence with '*His mother loves every man*', but although he maintains that in none of them 'his' can get an anaphoric interpretation on the structures in the direct object position, by creating an appropriate extralinguistic context, such an interpretation proves to be possible. Consider the following situation: during the hospital's visiting hours, only one of the three male patients in the salon receives a visit; an old woman brought him food and seemed very worried about his health; one of the other two patients whispers to his comrade: 'His mother loves that man with the goatee'. Undoubtedly, in this particular context, the possessive 'his' and the CD structure are coreferential. The consequence, in this case, is that there are some context-related aspects (beliefs, assumptions, shared knowledge possessed by interlocutors) that play a significant role in interpreting demonstratives. Furthermore, this context is more of an argument in favor of the direct reference interpretation of the demonstrative since the CD behaves syntactically similar to other singular terms – see (4c). It may also support the idea put forward by Lepore & Johnson (2002: 22) that all these syntactic similarities have a logical explanation, namely the fact that QPs and CDs display the same syntactic form – [Det N']. Therefore, it seems that even if we can spot some syntactic similarities between the two, they do not represent sufficiently strong evidence to justify QPs and CDs' interpretation as members of the same semantic category. Some other syntactic arguments King presented in his work have been criticized by Lepore & Johnson (2002), Altshuler (2007), Braun (2008).

One last point I will consider has to do with the translation in Romanian and in other languages of the examples used by King. In order to reject those theories which argue in favor of the idea that non-referential uses of CDs can always be replaced by definite descriptions and therefore that they should be treated similarly to them, the author discusses the following two

statements: 'Every professor cherishes that publication of his' and 'Every professor cherishes the publication of his' (King 2001: 74). He then argues that CDs cannot be replaced with their purely descriptive correspondents because the second sentence is clearly ungrammatical. In Romanian, however, the substitution is possible ('Fiecare profesor prețuiește acea publicație a sa' / 'Fiecare profesor prețuiește publicația sa') and therefore the replacement test King uses proves to be not very reliable. A similar observation is made by Corazza (2003) who talks about the translation of some of King's examples in French and Italian. He shows that cross-linguistically it often happens to express the same thing by using different structures, definite descriptions for example in French and Italian instead of CDs in English. The problem for King is that his purpose was to formulate a valid theory for language in general, not for English. The fact that translations in other languages do not correspond to the semantic interpretations offered by King on the basis of English sentences he commented upon is definitely a limitation of the quantificational account.

Despite these issues, King's book marks an important scientific event, not only because it radically stands out from a common conception of CDs, with strong roots at the time it was written, but also because it has provided a new model of semantic analysis which continues to be applied or debated at present by researchers who are interested in the semantic or syntactic study of CDs.

ȘTEFANIA VULPE

Institutul de Lingvistică al Academiei Române
"Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti", București

REFERENCES

- Altshuler, D., 2007, "WCO, ACD and What They Reveal about Complex Demonstratives", in *Natural Language Semantics*, 15, no. 3, pp. 265-277.
- Braun, D., 2008, "Complex Demonstratives and Their Singular Contents", in *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31, no. 1, pp. 57-99.
- Corazza, E., 2003, "Review: Complex demonstratives: A quantificational account", in *Mind*, 112, no. 448, pp. 734-740.
- Kaplan, D., 1989, "Demonstratives", in J. Almog, J. Perry, H. Wettstein (eds.), *Themes from Kaplan*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 481-563.
- Lepore, E., Johnson, K., 2002, "Does Syntax Reveal Semantics? A Case Study of Complex Demonstratives", in *Philosophical Perspectives*, 16, pp. 17-41.