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only two generations. Its fall was not due to any defect in its syntactic theory; rather, the attack was directed at its philosophical underpinning, at the *modi significandi* themselves. Forced to focus on metatheoretical issues, the Modistae were distracted from the further elaboration of their syntactic theory, which rapidly faded into obscurity. As Covington points out (131) – and it is a point which linguists often forget – even in its heyday modistic grammar was an esoteric subject restricted to a small band of enthusiasts. Only after it was already under attack did it begin to filter down into lower levels of instruction in a dilute form; and it was only the showpiece of the theory, the *modi significandi* themselves, which were so perpetuated. Modistic syntactic theory never succeeded in displacing the *regimen*-based theory of the ‘normative’ tradition, which, unlike modistic syntax, can legitimately claim a continuous tradition from the rediscovery of Priscian’s *Institutiones grammaticae* in the ninth century (Law, 1985) to the Renaissance and beyond. Not even Covington’s modest claim on page 1 that ‘some concepts, such as government and dependency’, of present-day theory are derived ultimately from the work of the Modistae, is borne out by his own story. We are reminded – not for the first time – that linguistics, like any other intellectual discipline, is subject to fashion. Just as the Modistae, with their very modern preoccupations, were elbowed out of the way by an unappreciative generation of youngsters, so their present-day counterparts can expect one day to find their most central questions branded irrelevant. In the meantime, however, they will find this introduction to the work of their precursors fascinating reading.
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Reviewed by V. A. Law, Department of Linguistics, University of Cambridge.

(Received 20 March 1986)


Every so often it seems to become important for linguistics to engage in explicit debate about the scope of linguistic inquiry. Philologists of the nineteenth century, for example, found it necessary to argue that the study of sounds in isolation did not exhaust the areas of potential linguistic interest, but could be greatly enriched by the study of the properties of sounds within
words. In the mid-twentieth century, again, it was felt useful to argue that the sentence should be considered a primary object of linguistic investigation, rather than just one linguistic level of representation among many. And it is only comparatively recently that linguists have focussed on the theoretical import of connected speech phenomena. In this book Kaisse makes an explicit, and strong, case that connected speech phenomena are not only of descriptive interest, but of considerable significance to linguistic theory. The characteristics of connected speech have exercised the practitioners of a variety of disciplines in recent years. For example, connected speech effects are important to phoneticians, within whose province falls the study of, for instance, coarticulation, speech timing and the production and perception of juncture. Similarly, an understanding of what happens in connected speech is vital for psycholinguists trying to describe the process of speech recognition, and for engineers and speech scientists trying to implement that process automatically. Machines are already available which recognize isolated words, but connected speech is the tangled knot which automatic speech recognition has hardly begun to unpick. And both syntacticians and phonologists, as Kaisse’s book adequately demonstrates, can find in these phenomena rich material for theoretical exploitation.

The book is partly based on previously published studies of particular connected speech processes, and brings together a number of arguments about clitics and their theoretical relevance which Kaisse published in various, not always easily accessible, outlets in the early 1980s. But a good deal of material has been added; and the whole is provided with a theoretical framework which allows the author to make a statement about the relationship between syntax and phonology, which, as the subtitle of the book indicates, is what the work is really about. Kaisse sets up a sort of continuum of connected speech phenomena. At one end is cliticization, with clitics being seen as purely syntactic phenomena. At the other end are what Kaisse calls fast speech rules, which are determined almost exclusively by speech rate; these are strictly phonological phenomena. Between the extremes fall (word-external) sandhi effects, which are sensitive both to syntactic and to phonological structure. About half the book is devoted to discussion of particular processes which Kaisse assigns to this class, and it is here that her main thesis is propounded.

The argument is cast within the framework of lexical phonology. In Kaisse’s view, the labelled bracketing output by the syntactic component is directly accessible to phonological rules implicated in external sandhi phenomena. The figure presents her view of the structure of the grammar, and where the three classes of connected speech processes fit into it. To the syntactic class, i.e. the class of connected speech phenomena with no phonological relevance, Kaisse assigns, for example, auxiliary reduction in English. In other words, reduced auxiliaries are held to be clitics. She bases this argument on the claims that, on the one hand, the distribution of reduced auxiliaries is not predictable
from that of their unreduced counterparts, and on the other, that there are no general rules of English phonology which will predict the form of the reduced versions on the basis of the unreduced forms. The syntactic conditions which govern Auxiliary Reduction are captured by the concept of c-command: in its initial formulation, the condition is stated as ‘Auxiliaries may cliticize only onto a c-commanding NP’.

To the phonological class, i.e. syntactically insensitive fast speech rules, Kaisse assigns, *inter alia*, Flapping and Schwa-Deletion. This tidying up of the edges of the continuum, so to speak, leaves the central class still very respectably populated (and would incidentally leave considerable scope for debate about whether there is actually a proper continuum, i.e. whether within this central category there are some processes which are more syntactic, others which are more phonological). For instance, there is French liaison, which is, not surprisingly, the subject of extended discussion. Kaisse calls on the evidence of French in the course of her argument against the claim that external sandhi effects can be predicted from word boundary structure; the distribution of boundaries in French actually does not predict the distribution of liaison. Liaison is again called upon as evidence in the specification of the syntactic conditions governing external sandhi rules. Again, the central syntactic concept is the notion of c-command; in its simplest formulation, Kaisse’s statement of the environment for application of an external sandhi rule is ‘One of the words must c-command the other’.
For French liaison, the specific condition is that the second word must c-command the first. Thus, to take an example from the text, plus intelligent is a liaison environment because heads of phrases always c-command their modifiers; part immédiatement is not a legal environment for liaison, however, because the abverb does not c-command the verb. Other evidence in support of this definition of external sandhi rule contexts in terms of the c-command relation is garnered from Italian raddoppiamento sintattico (which is in fact misspelt sintattico throughout), from Mandarin tone sandhi, and so on. In all, a couple of dozen language-specific connected speech rules are treated in detail in the course of the book, making it very useful to many researchers. Although the details of Kaisse's theoretical analysis will be bound to provoke disagreement from some readers, she has brought together an array of data which offers a valuable resource, and she has without doubt successfully made the case that connected speech phenomena are of significance both to phonology and to syntax.

Reviewed by ANNE CUTLER, MRC Applied Psychology Unit, Cambridge.
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This is a revised, updated, translated version of Scalise (1983), providing an historical overview of the treatment of morphology in generative grammar. The first chapter covers the treatment of the lexicon from Syntactic structures (Chomsky, 1957) to the Standard Theory (Chomsky, 1965) and the transformational treatment of word formation (Lees, 1960) with its associated problems. The second chapter considers lexicalist morphology, from 'Remarks on nominalization' (Chomsky, 1970) to Halle (1973). The author is particularly impressed by Halle's introduction of the concept of word formation rules (WFR's), 'the mechanism that has been the orienting and unifying force in the research on morphology within the generative framework over the past ten years', as he puts it (27). This is a bit strong, especially since morphologists are now moving away from WFR's to a model where morphemes are attached together in accordance with their subcategorization frames, as, for example, in Lieber (1980; 1983), whom he cites, but not in this connection. His argument that concatenation is not adequate (32) depends on the unsupported (and unstated) assumption that concatenation does not provide constituent structure. Accepting the claim that constituent structure is necessary (which is surely correct) does not entail that WFR's are preferable to concatenation, and in Lieber's approach, as in lexical phonology (Kiparsky, 1982; 1983), cyclic concatenation provides just the correct constituent structures, except