

BOOK REVIEW RESPONSE

Response to book review of *Verb Derivation in Modern Greek: Alternation Classes, Conceptual Structures, Semantic Fields* in JGL7.

Chariton Charitonidis

I would hereby like to reply to the review made by Marina Tzakosta in the *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 7 (Tzakosta 2007, hereafter also referred to as T07).¹ I will discuss the most important points, leaving aside formal issues, such as transcription problems, etc.

In Charitonidis (2005, hereafter also referred to as C05), the term ‘multi-mapping’ (19f.) is introduced. By this, I mainly mean cases of voice switch such as *skórpisan* (active) and *skorpístikan* (non-active/passive) in (1), where both verb forms denote the same auto event,² as occurs in (1).

- (1) *Ta skupídhia skórpisan/skorpístikan.*
the.PL rubbish.PL they.scattered/they.were.scattered
‘The rubbish was scattered.’

In the terms of the proposed tripartite model, the derivatives in (1) belong to the same alternation class (AC: *1a/b_2a/b_8a/b_9*),³ the same *underspecified/minimal* conceptual structure (CS: LCS2)⁴ and the same semantic/situational field (SF: LOSS OF INTEGRITY).⁵

Tzakosta states that she is not sure about the formulation “parallel suffixes compete with *-ízo* for the expression of the same verb meanings” (194). By this I mean cases such as *asxim-ízo/asxim-éno* ‘make ugly’, *nostim-ízo/nostim-évo* ‘flavour’, ‘make tasty’ (C05:90), *luludh-ízo/luludh-iázo* ‘flower’, ‘blossom’, ‘bloom’ (C05:95), etc. In a model which assumes ACs to be a level of lexical knowledge, the assignment of the competing forms to ACs is surely very important, cf. *asxim-ízo* (AC: *1a/b_9*) and *asxim-éno* (AC: *1*a/b_9*) where only the auto alternation *1b* appears equally in both verbs. However, this comparison was not attempted because it would be methodologically risky; only after the *complete* elaboration of the relevant systems of ACs, CSs and SFs for the other main suffixes, i.e. *-évo*, *-éno*, *-óno* and *-(i)ázo* could such a comparison be safely made.

As concerns the appropriateness of the title “Morphology” for Chapter 2 (see T07:195), I admit that a title such as “On Relatedness in Greek Verb Derivation” or the like would convey more accurately the content of the chapter. On the other hand, the assessment of morphological subclasses and the crucial character of the internal and external exclusion criteria for the *-ízo* verbs make clear that

relatedness is a precondition for, and integral part of morphology and morphological analysis in general.

Tzakosta criticizes the incompleteness of analysis in relation to the proposed SFs for the *-ízo* verbs (195).⁶ She argues that verbs other than *-ízo* derivatives may modify or extend this list and that the explanatory power of such a framework is restricted. In C05, it is argued that “the assertion of particular semantic fields/features can only be made holistically” (81), that is regarding the interaction of fields in the whole system of derivatives with a particular suffix. Again, this would first call for the elaboration of the relevant tripartite systems of ACs, CSs, and SFs for the other main suffixes and secondly the comparison of semantic fields to each other, a task beyond the scope of a doctoral thesis. As concerns the explanatory power of the framework, Chapter 4.1.1 on the co-operation of SFs with CSs (see C05:73–76), paves the way towards a universal account of verb derivation. This perspective is brought up by *The Semantic Fields’ Inventory Hypothesis*, which states that “the interpretation of a verb derivative depends on an inventory of semantic fields composed of all semantic fields appearing in verb derivatives with the same suffix and the same base complexity” (C05:75). Once more the systematic analysis of the other derivation suffixes is necessary.

As Tzakosta rightly notes, the analysis “does not provide definite answers regarding productivity in verb derivation” (196). In Charitonidis (2007, *hereafter also referred to as C07*), I conclude that the set of CSs appearing in *-ízo* derivation show that there is no restricted pattern in this domain, in that the content of the derivation base can assume a variety of semantic roles (see the six LCSs in C05:59 or C07:32). Therefore, justice cannot be given to the claim that morphological productivity is always based on a semantically restricted and homogeneous pattern, connected with a limited range of choices which a native speaker makes when producing new words (cf. van Marle 1988, Plag 1998, 1999). Moreover, the six LCSs represent a group of basic semantic patterns attested among 182 *synchronically related -ízo* derivatives. Opaque derivatives and derivatives as products of once-only rules or metaphorical shifts were not taken into account. Given the fact that all the latter constitute a significant part of the verbs examined (101 verbs out of a total of 283), one gets a much more heterogeneous set of forms — a fact which strengthens my claims (C07:35, f. 31).

On top of this, it becomes evident that in some cases the alternations account can properly accommodate many heterogeneous factors of productivity. The large class *8a/b_9* in which (i) the INSTRUMENT field appears most (semantics), (ii) at least 10 base nouns/adjectives end in *-i* (morphophonology) and (iii) no rival suffixes are attested (morphology) point to an account of productivity based on multiple factors. On the other hand, non-alternating verbs such as the large class of SIMILATIVE & ATTITUDE verbs (cf. *xameleodízo* ‘play the chameleon’, *gabrízo* ‘act

like a bridegroom, 'flirt', 'court' and many others — see C05:150f) show that productivity is related to an interplay of a particular SF with a CS denoting State in the identificational field (see Jackendoff 1983, 1990), whereas this pattern is mainly semantic. Again, more research with other suffixes will validate these patterns of interaction.

That the 'split verbs' of Chapter 6 differ from the rest of the verbs is obvious; they constitute cases of polysemy whereby the question is whether this polysemy is regular or not (see T07:196). I give an example: the verbs *asfalízo*, *asprízo*, *axnízo*, *dhrosízo*, *kapnízo*, *ksinízo*, *midhenízo*, *orízo*, *plevrízo*, *prasinízo*, *progízo*, *sximatízo*, *termatízo*, and *xronízo* belong to the category 'split verbs with transparent structures'. That is, their interpretation is based on the lists of 6 LCSs and 75 SFs. It is not clear, however, whether particular patterns in this class are regular or not, cf. the pairs *asfalízo1* and 2 and *midhenízo1* and 2 in Table 1.

Table 1

Verbs	Senses	ACs	SFs	CSs
<i>asfalízo1</i>	'secure' (LCS2) 'lock' (LCS1)	<i>8a/b_9</i>	PROVISION	LCS3 (=LCS1 or LCS2)
<i>asfalízo2</i>	'insure'	<i>4a/b_8a/b_9</i>	PROVISION	LCS2
<i>midhenízo1</i>	'reduce to nothing'	<i>2a/b_9</i>	VALUE & LOSS	LCS2
<i>midhenízo2</i>	'reduce to zero' (for counter, LCS2) 'give no marks at all' (literally 'give the mark 0', LCS1)	<i>8a/b_9</i>	VALUE	LCS3 (=LCS1 or LCS2)

8a/b_9: Causative Active/Control Passive_Passive Participle

4a/b_8a/b_9: Causative Active/Reflexive Passive_Causative Active/Control Passive_Passive Participle.

2a/b_9: Causative Active/Auto Passive_Passive Participle

LCS 1: CAUSE([_{Thing}], [GO([_{Thing} BASE], [_{Path} TO([_{Thing}]))])])

LCS 2: CAUSE([_{Thing}], [GO([_{Thing}], [_{Path} TO([_{Thing} BASE]))])])

A regular process in this case may be the generation of the verb senses in terms of ACs and CSs, see for example the senses 'secure' of *asfalízo1* and 'reduce to zero' of *midhenízo2*, as opposed to the senses 'lock' of *asfalízo1* and 'give the mark 0' of *midhenízo2*. The LCS1 meaning of *asfalízo1* and *midhenízo2* involves (approx.) the transfer of an entity to another entity, whereas the LCS2 meaning of the same verbs involves the maintenance of a default state. On the other hand, the meanings of *asfalízo2* and *midhenízo1* are metaphorical, both referring to LCS2. In this case, the difficulties that split verbs would pose for language acquirers/learners (see T07:196) is that speakers have to choose only one structure from a pair of ambiguous structures for the metaphorical meaning, in this case LCS2, while keeping the same field, in this case PROVISION for *asfalízo2* and VALUE for *midhenízo1*.

Again, if the detection of regularity is aimed, such an hypothesis must be validated by analyzing a large corpus of verbs with different suffixes.

Tzakosta states that “how alternating verbs are distinguished from non-alternating ones is an issue not discussed” (196). However, in C05 (147–158), many factors of non-alternation are introduced, e.g. (a) the State LCS of many verbs, cf. *dhipnízo* ‘take supper’, *pelagízo* ‘be on the open sea’, *spanízo* ‘be rare’, *saradízo* ‘be forty days old’, (b) the fields SIMILATIVE & ATTITUDE (cf. *xameleodízo* ‘play the chameleon’),⁷ INTERNAL MOTION & SOUND EMISSION (cf. *gavgízo* ‘yap’), WEATHER (cf. *xionízi* ‘it snows’), etc. That a principled account on factors of non-alternation is not provided may be a drawback, but this issue could not/cannot be immediately answered.

Tzakosta states that “it is not clear whether the list of verbs in Appendix A relies on the dictionary of Anastasiadi-Simeonidi (2002) or whether the list was based on native speakers’ intuition” (T07:196). However, in C05, there is a clear statement that “in the following chapters, I present a large number of *-ízo* derivatives which, for the most part, participate in a group of alternation classes... The verbs are taken from the online version of the *Reverse Index of Modern Greek* (Anastasiádhi-Simeonídhi 2002) by entering the end string *-ίζω* in the search box at <http://www.komvos.edu.gr/dictionaries/dictOnLine/DictOnLineRev.htm>” (C05:35).

Moreover, Tzakosta notes that in a limited language experiment which she conducted with ten adult native speakers of university education in Thessaloniki, “it was shown that verbs like *ksafnízo* (“to surprise”), *strabulízo* (“to sprain”), *thikarízo* (“put a sword into a sheath”) were questionable regarding their grammaticality, because an alternate or periphrastic or derived form was preferred, such as, for instance, in *ovelízo* < *eksovelízo* (“eliminate”). Verbs like *galízo* (“imitate the French”), *podhízo* (“bear off/away”), *sodhomízo* (“sodomize”) were considered totally ungrammatical” (196). I have to counter first that the research in C05 is mainly based on a corpus and the internet. In particular, the verbs *ksafnízo*, *strabulízo*, *ovelízo*, *podhízo*, and *sodhomízo* can be easily found on the internet. The other verbs in discussion, i.e. *thikarízo* and *galízo*, can be found in Babiniótis (1998) and are for some informants (and for me) grammatical. *Verb Derivation in Modern Greek* is not an intuition study. Even if the latter were the case, field research with informants would go beyond the scope of the thesis. On top of this, judgements of informants on the relatedness of forms and the existence of forms are risky tasks, which do not guarantee the reliability of the analysis (on this point, see C05:37f). Moreover, even if a handful of forms are considered ungrammatical by some informants, the reliability of an analysis carried out upon hundreds of verbs remains intact.⁸

In C05, I speak of the psychological reality of verb derivation as a human urge to regularly associate a derivative, transparent or not, with an origin base (3), and not about the psychological reality, i.e. existence, of a derivative as such in terms of intuition (see Tzakosta above). This can be seen as an argument for the inclusion of *attested* back-formations in the analysis and the assessment of implicit arguments in some derivatives (see SFs in Table 3 below).

The definition of the subcategory ‘opaque verbs’ is given in C05 and is not restricted only to derivatives which have “a readily recognizable root or a stem” as Tzakosta (2007:196) assumes. I cite the relevant entry from *Verb Derivation in Modern Greek*:

The semantics of opaque verbs cannot be unequivocally represented by a conceptual structure since their base is not visible or missing, cf. *gnorízo* with a non-visible base. A special case of opaque verbs is when the base of an old derivative is a non-existing form in *standard* Modern Greek. For example, the verb *miktirízo* ‘scoff,’ ‘mock,’ ‘sneer’ is regarded as opaque because its base *miktír* ‘nostril’ is a non-existing form in contemporary Greek, mostly known only by scholars. In this work, verbs which are semantically *completely disassociated* from their base are regarded as opaque too, even if both members of the derivational pair are existing forms in standard Modern Greek, cf. the derivational pair *dhekatízo* ‘decimate’ < *dhékatos* ‘tenth.’ (C05:30).

Tzakosta notes that “according to the introduction, the author’s goal was to discuss the morphological, semantic and syntactic factors involved in the derivation of *-izo* verbs. However, it is more than obvious that the book takes a semantic perspective, placing greater emphasis on the alternation classes, conceptual structures and semantic fields that determine verb derivation” (197). I counter that in C05, such a disciplinary division is avoided. The level of alternations constitutes a unification of morphology, semantics and syntax. Moreover, alternations are recurrent *semantico-syntactic* shifts between lexical units, i.e. they concern not only semantics, not only syntax.

In the last part of this review reply, I would like to point to some implications of my approach for: A) lexical semantics, and B) current syntactic/morphological theory.

A) In relation to the different senses of the English verb *smoke*, Jackendoff (2002:341f) points out that two transparent chains begin from the derivation base *smoke*₁ ‘smoke’ that are connected with lexical rules. These chains are shown in (2).

- (2) 1st chain: **smoke**₁ → smoke₂ (V = ‘give off N’)
 smoke₂ → smoke₃ (V = ‘cause to V’)
 smoke₃ → smoke₄ (V = ‘V something’)
 2nd chain: **smoke**₁ → smoke₅ (V = ‘put N into/onto something’)

Although Jackendoff seeks to define the precise content of the derivation base of the related verbs *smoke*_{2,3,4} and *smoke*₅, he ultimately offers no solution. He simply implies that the derivation base of *smoke*_{2,3,4} and that of *smoke*₅ must not be the same. My own proposal is that different entities in the derivation base of these two chains must be recognized. In the first chain of (2) the base receives the characterization EMISSION/ENDOGENOUS PRODUCT, and in the second chain, the base receives the characterization COVERING.

Let us see how this approach can be applied to the senses of the Greek verb *kapnízo* ‘smoke’ (see Table 2 — *kapnízo1* corresponds to *smoke*₂ and *kapnízo2* corresponds to *smoke*₅).

Table 2

Verbs	Senses	ACs	SFs	CSs
<i>kapnízo1</i>	‘smoke,’	<i>1*a/b_*9</i>	EMISSION/ENDOGENOUS	LCS4
	‘give off smoke’	(No alternations)	PRODUCT	
<i>kapnízo2</i>	‘smoke,’ ‘cure’	<i>2a/b_8a/b_9</i>	COVERING	LCS1
<i>kapnízo3</i>	‘smoke,’ ‘puff’	<i>8a/b_9</i>	EMISSION/ENDOGENOUS PRODUCT	LCS4

*1*a/b_*9*: *Causative Active/Auto Active_*Passive Participle

2a/b_8a/b_9: Causative Active/Auto Passive_Causative Active/Control Passive_Passive Participle

8a/b_9: Causative Active/Control Passive_Passive Participle

LCS 1: CAUSE([_{Thing}], [GO([_{Thing} KAPNÓS], [_{Path} TO([_{Thing}]))])])

LCS 4: CAUSE([_{Thing}], [GO([_{Thing} KAPNÓS], [_{Path} FROM([_{Thing}]))])])

As can be seen in Table 2, *kapnízo1* and *kapnízo3* have the same CS and belong to the same SF. The ultimate differentiating factor is nothing but the ACs in which the verb derivatives appear. This fact suggests that for *kapnízo1* (‘give off smoke’), the significant differentiating factor is the class *1*a/b_*9*, and for *kapnízo2* (‘process with smoke,’ e.g. *smoke a fish*) the class *2a/b_8a/b_9*. In other words, the AC marks the content of the verb base additionally, i.e. the content of the base of *kapnízo1* is not simply [SMOKE] but [SMOKE] + *1*a/b_*9* (→EMISSION/ENDOGENOUS PRODUCT) and the content of the base of *kapnízo2* is not simply [SMOKE], but [SMOKE] + *2a/b_8a/b_9* (→COVERING) etc., so that the precise determination of the verb base can be achieved *co-operatively* (see Charitonidis 2005, 2006). To go back to Jackendoff’s example, the corresponding ACs for the verb unit in (2) must be similarly elaborated in order to test the validity of the associated lexical rules, and esp. to find out whether the split pattern of the two chains is recurrent/regular or not.

B) Following the framework of Distributed Morphology (DM — Halle & Marantz 1993, Marantz 1997 a.o.), Alexiadou (forthcoming²) states that “roots surface as members of the so-called ‘lexical categories,’ traditional parts of speech such as Nouns, Verbs and Adjectives” (4), and “in the default case, the morphological structure at PF is simply the syntactic structure” (2). The DM framework is embedded

in the tradition of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995) and subsequent work, which raises the question of how syntax interacts with phonology, morphology and semantics (Alexiadou forthcoming²:1).

According to this framework we can accept categorized roots in verb derivatives, such as the N *kérdhos* in the verb *kerdhízo* (cf. Giannakidou & Merchant 1999). Such a strict syntactic approach to verb derivation prevents us from considering cases of Argument Fusion (see Jackendoff 1990). For example, in (3), the conceptual structures [KÉRDHOS] ‘[PROFIT]’ in the conceptual structure and [AF-TOKÍNITO] ‘[CAR]’ in the syntactic structure are fused into one entity by means of an index, i.e. *j*.

(3) *I* *María kérédhise éna aftokínito.*

the María she.won a car

‘Mary won a car.’

a. Syntactic structure: [_S[_{NP}I María]_i [_{VP}kérédhise [_{NP}éna aftokínito]_j]]

b. Conceptual structure: _{Event}GO(_{[Thing} KÉRDHOS]_j, [_{Path}TO(_{[Thing} MARÍA)_i]))

The DM framework handles cases like (3) only with difficulty, because a strict syntactic derivation of the verb *kerdhízo* would result in a clash of the N *kérdhos* in the derivation base with the object NP-argument *éna aftokínito*. The rule of Argument Fusion helps to identify the precise semantic content of a verb root, because the fused arguments (cf. *kérdhos* and *éna aftokínito* above) ensure success in the identification of a hypernym/supercategory. The issue of the semantic properties of a verb root is already identified in Alexiadou (forthcoming¹:15f) in the case of the Greek deverbal nominals, but it is not sufficiently addressed.

In Charitonidis (2005 and subsequent works), it is proposed that the examination of the split patterns of the derivatives can detect the exact content of a verb root, see Table 3 for the case of the verb *potízo*.

Table 3

Verbs	Senses	Acs	SFs	CSs
<i>potízo</i> ₁	‘water,’ ‘irrigate’	<i>8a/b_9</i>	WATER	LCS1 (inferred)
<i>potízo</i> ₂	‘water sth/sb’	<i>4a/b_8a/b_9</i>	LIQUID/WATER	LCS1 (inferred)
<i>potízo</i> ₃	‘ooze’	<i>1a/b_2a/b_9</i>	LIQUID/MOISTURE	LCS1 (inferred)

8a/b_9: Causative Active/Control Passive_Passive Participle

4a/b_8a/b_9: Causative Active/Reflexive Passive_Causative Active/Control Passive_Passive Participle.

1a/b_2a/b_9: Causative Active/Auto Active_Causative Active/Auto Passive_Passive Participle

In the DM framework (cf. Alexiadou forthcoming²), a root $\sqrt{\text{POT}}$ would be assumed, the syntactic derivation would be set before Spellout (=the point in a derivation at which phonological and semantic features are processed by separate

components of the grammar, i.e. the components of Phonological Form (PF) and Logical Form (LF)) and the idiosyncratic meaning of the derivative would be connected with the Encyclopedia component after Spellout. In other words, in the DM framework, Encyclopedia (“pragmatics”) is addressed after the main syntactic operations.

In my approach, the semantic/situational fields emerge naturally inside the alternation classes (see the fields WATER — LIQUID/WATER — LIQUID/MOISTURE in Table 3). That is, Encyclopedia is already addressed before Spellout; the semantic and pragmatic structures are not distinct — they are only one structure, the *conceptual structure* (see Jackendoff 1983, 1990 and the arguments therein). Moreover, this approach strengthens the claims of DM, that “roots are assumed to be present with all their features throughout the derivation” (Alexiadou forthcoming²:4). In conclusion, one of the challenges is to bring together a root-based approach to verb derivation like that of DM (see Alexiadou forthcoming^{1,2}) and a word-based approach (see Charitonidis 2005 and subsequent works). Nonetheless, both approaches are decompositional and compatible, at least in relation to the semantic specification of the verb root.

Notes

1. I would like to thank Marina Tzakosta for her inspiring remarks, and the editorial board of *Journal of Greek linguistics* Gaberell Drachman, Geoffrey C. Horrocks, Brian D. Joseph, and Irene Philippaki-Warbuton for the publishing of the review.
2. An auto event involves the absence of a control agent throughout the event.
3. The description of the alternations can be found in Charitonidis (2005:15–19 and 2006:32–37).
4. See a group of six LCSs (Lexical Conceptual Structures) in Charitonidis (2005:59 and 2007:32).
5. See Charitonidis (2005: 124) for details.
6. Tzakosta states, though reluctantly, that 94 SFs are proposed (195). According to my own counting these are only 75 (complex SFs united with ,&’ were decomposed into separate fields). Like Tzakosta, my counting relates only to alternating synchronically-related verbs in *-izo* (the verbs of Appendix B in C05:177–182).
7. Only the verb *papagalizo* ‘parrot’ appears among the alternating verbs in *-izo* in the SIMILATIVE & ATTITUDE field. Its marginal status should not concern us.
8. Tzakosta’s short experiment was conducted in Thessaloniki, so regional factors may be at work.

References

- Alexiadou, A. forthcoming¹. "On the role of syntactic locality in morphological processes: the case of (Greek) derived nominals". *Quantification, Definiteness and Nominalization* ed. by A. Giannakidou & M. Rathert. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alexiadou, A. forthcoming². "Syntax". *Principles of Linguistics Sciences*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Anastasiádhī-Simeonídhī 2002. *Reverse Index of Modern Greek*. online version at <http://www.komvos.edu.gr/dictionaries/dictOnLine/DictOnLineRev.htm>.
- Babinióti, G. 1998. *Leksikó tis Néas Elinikís Glósas* [Dictionary of Modern Greek Language]. Athens: Kédro Leksikologias.
- Charitonidis, C. 2005. *Verb Derivation in Modern Greek: Alternation Classes, Conceptual Structures, Semantic Fields*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cologne. (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 21: Linguistik, Band 284). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Charitonidis, C. 2006. "Verbalternationen und Verbspaltung im Neugriechischen". *Linguistik Online* 26, 1/2006.
- Charitonidis, C. 2007. "Greek *-ízo* Derivatives: a Conceptual Analysis". *Linguistik Online* 30, 1/2007.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Giannakidou A. & J. Merchant. 1999. "Why Giannis can't scrub his plate clean: on the absence of resultative predication in Greek". *Eliniká Grámata*, 122–134.
- Halle, M. and A. Marantz 1993. "Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection". *The View from Building 20* ed. by S. J. Keyser & K. Hale, 111–176. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. 1983. *Semantics and Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. 1990. *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. 2002. *Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marantz, A. 1997. "No escape from Syntax: Don't Try Morphological Analysis in the Privacy of Your Own Lexicon". *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* (4:2) ed. by A. Dimitriadis & L. Siegel, 201–225. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Plag, I. 1998. "The polysemy of *-ize* derivatives: On the role of semantics in word formation". *Yearbook of Morphology 1997* ed. G. Booij, and J. van Marle, 219–242. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Plag, I. 1999. *Morphological Productivity. Structural Constraints in English Derivation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tzakosta, M. 2007. "Chariton Charitonidis: *Verb Derivation in Modern Greek: Alternation Classes, Conceptual Structures, Semantic Fields*" (book review). *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 7 (2006). 193–198.
- van Marle, J., 1988. "On the role of semantics in productivity change". *The Yearbook of Morphology 1988* ed. by G. Booij & J. van Marle, 139–154. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

