

are less likely to extrapose and are even less frequent. There are good reasons for this. The resistance to extraposition can be explained by observing that verbal predicates tend to be quite long and informationally heavy. This is especially clear in (3) above. The subject clause in this sentence is informationally not prominent (the *rising sun* is mentioned in the directly preceding context) and hence moving it to a sentence-final position would disturb the informational balance of the sentence. The reason why ISCs depending on verbal predicates are extremely rare is that verbal predicates are usually dynamic and require an animate subject and clearly ISCs come low on what has been called the *animacy hierarchy*.

The final evaluation of this monograph is that, on the whole, it is a meritorious piece of work, very well-written and well-researched, with interesting contributions to our knowledge of discourse syntactic processes. It is, however, disappointing as far as analytical content and the rather narrow-minded methodological out-look are concerned

### References

- CHOMSKY, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- CHOMSKY, N. and H. Lasnik (forthcoming). "Principles and Parameters Theory". J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld and T. Vennemann (eds.). *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- GIVÓN, T. (1979). *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- HYMES, D. (1971). "Competence and Performance in Linguistic Theory". R. Huxley and E. Ingram (eds.) *Language Acquisition: Models and Methods*, pp. 3-24. New York: Academic Press.
- LABOV, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- QUIRK, R., S. GREENBAUM, G. LEECH and J. SVARTVIK. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Bas Aarts

Department of English Language and Literature  
University College London

ANDREW SPENCER. *Morphological Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990. 512 pages.

Spencer's book is a nearly exhaustive introductory to morphology, with exercises from very different languages, and recommendations for further reading at the end of each chapter. The book also contains a subject index, a name index and a language index, which makes looking for very specific information an easy and fast task. In addition, the most important terms are written in boldface the first time they appear in the text. Spencer's book presupposes little knowledge of morphology, but discusses fairly complicated issues, which can however be easily understood because of his accessible style and a gradual introduction to the most intricate aspects of morphological theory.

Morphology is a difficult subject, with a lot of complex relations with phonology, syntax and semantics; it interacts with all the components of the grammar. The borderline between phonology and morphology, for instance, is not clear at all, and a particular sequence might be considered an allophone or an allomorph depending only on the theoretical framework adopted. Spencer's book reflects all the relations morphology has with other components of the grammar (except for semantics, which receives little attention), and he reviews the most important proposals that have been made with respect to the subject from different points of view, most especially within the framework of generative grammar.

*Morphological Theory* is structured in four main parts, roughly according to the nature of the chapters. The first part is devoted to preliminary issues. Ch. 1 is an introduction to basic concepts in morphology, such as allomorphy, the distinction between inflection and derivation or the distinction between morphs and morphemes, a distinction that is often forgotten in linguistic work. Some of the problems that will be discussed in later chapters are first introduced in Ch. 1. The beginning of Ch. 2 introduces other concepts in morphology, which have to do with morpheme types and morpheme-related problems one might encounter. One of the examples Spencer discusses is, for instance, the so-called cranberry morphemes, morphemes that occur only with very specific words (such as the morpheme *cran-* in the word *cran-berry*, which is a type of berry. *Cran-* does not appear in any other English word). The rest of Ch. 2 and Ch. 3 provide a brief summary of pre-generative approaches and early generative approaches to morphology. The pre-generative approaches Spencer discusses are all within the structuralist framework, and are known as Item-and-Arrangement, Item-and-Process, and Word-and-Paradigm. Within the early generative approaches, Spencer mainly discusses the ideas of the early 70's about the location of morphology in the grammar, especially the opposition between the proponents of generative semantics—for whom words are built in the syntax—and the lexicalists, who consider that all the morphology (or at least most of it) takes place within the lexicon; according to them words enter the syntax as such.

The second part of the book is devoted to the morphology-phonology interface. In Ch. 4, Spencer summarizes several approaches to allomorphy, including the one advocated for by the theory of Lexical Phonology. According to this framework, the building of words in the lexicon alternates morphological operations (mostly addition of morphs) with phonological processes that affect mor-

phemes and, finally, the word as a whole. In Ch. 5 the object of study is nonconcatenative morphology and reduplication. Reduplication is a morphological process by which a part of a word is copied and affixes onto that word to create a derived form (e.g. in Agta: *takki* 'leg'; *taktakki* 'legs'). In nonconcatenative morphology, very common in Semitic languages, morphemes do not appear one after the other (as in the English word *period+ic+ity*), but the root is split by different morphemes. Both reduplication and nonconcatenative morphology constitute a very interesting field for linguistic theory, both from a phonological and a morphological point of view, and has received much attention since the late 70's.

Part three of Spencer's book is devoted to the morphology-syntax interface. The issues discussed in the four chapters of this part have sometimes been discussed from a strictly morphological point of view, assigning a particular component of the grammar to morphology. Other linguists believe that all these issues are syntactic in nature and, often, that there is no need for a separate morphology component. Ch. 6 deals with the basic issues that belong to the morphology-syntax interface, and pays special attention to inflection, a topic that is currently the subject of much research. Ch. 7 is devoted to grammatical relations. It examines how passives and similar constructions have been accounted for.

These phenomena are directly related to argument structure. Compounds are discussed in Ch. 8. In this case, both syntactic and morphological accounts have been proposed, syntactic accounts being, usually, more recent. Clitics, dealt with in Ch. 9, constitute the most paradigmatic case of phonology-morphology-syntax interface. For instance, pronominal clitics (like the ones found in all Romance languages) behave syntacti-

1. For instance, in Arabic, there is a root *ktb* (related to 'write') which appears in forms like *katab* 'write' –perfective active–, *kutib*, 'write' –perfective passive–, or *kattab* 'cause to write'.

cally as other objects of the sentence (direct objects, indirect objects, etc.). However, morphologically and phonologically they have a very close relation to their host, like many morphemes.

The last part of Spencer's book addresses one of the most important questions in morphology: what is a word? One of the phenomena that makes the answer difficult is what has been called bracketing paradoxes (discussed in Ch. 10). This term refers to the cases where the bracketing imposed on a sequence according to the phonology, for instance, does not match the bracketing imposed by the morphology, the syntax or the semantics. A very familiar example of this sort is the term *atomic physicist*. Even though the suffix *-ist* is attached to the stem *physic*, the adjective *atomic* does not refer to *physicist* but only to the *physic* part (we are talking about a person who does atomic physics, not a physicist who is atomic). Finally the last chapter of the book (Ch. 11) addresses the concluding question: given all the facts discussed throughout the book, what place in the grammar should morphology occupy? This is a question that has not yet received a satisfactory answer and is still the subject of much debate. Spencer's book constitutes a long-needed summary of the most significant work that has been done in theoretical morphology in the last fifty years. In spite of very minor objections one can make to it (like the excess of emphasis on classification issues<sup>2</sup>), it is a very valuable piece of work for anybody interested in the field of morphology.

Eulalia Bonet

Departament de Filologia Catalana  
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

2. Especially in his treatment of clitics, Spencer seems too worried about the status of certain elements as clitics or morphemes. He does not consider the possibility that these ambiguous elements might be the result of the interaction of different types of processes, in a fashion parallel to the way passives, for instance, are viewed in the generative framework.

ANDREW RADFORD, *Syntactic Theory and the Acquisition of English Syntax: The Nature of Early Child Grammars of English*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990. viii + 311 pages.

*Syntactic Theory and the Acquisition of English Syntax* makes an important contribution to the study of first language acquisition. The main goal of the book is to analyse child speech within the Principles and Parameters framework and within a Maturation model of language acquisition. The Principles and Parameters model (Chomsky 1981, 1986a, 1986b, 1988), on the one hand, is a theory of language that explains crosslinguistic similarities by assuming that there is a core of universal principles (UG) common to all languages and a set of parameters, with a number of open values, that account for language variation. As far as the nature of these parameters is concerned, two major hypotheses have been put forward: one (Chomsky 1986a) that associates parameters with UG principles and another according to which parametric variation is connected with functional categories (Borer 1984, Chomsky 1988, Ouhalla 1991), where functional categories include the set of elements which in traditional typology have been referred to as *closed class*, that is, Determiners, Complementisers, Inflection (Tense and Agreement), Negation...

The Maturation model of language acquisition, on the other hand, claims that the different stages that all children go through are constrained by inherent maturational factors. In this respect, within the Maturation Hypothesis<sup>1</sup> two different proposals have been put forward: one (Felix (1984) and Borer and Wexler (1987)) that claims that the availability

1. This theory of language acquisition contrasts with the Continuity Hypothesis (Hyams (1987) and Weissenborn (1990) among others) according to which all UG principles and parameters (however not fixed) are present throughout the language acquisition process.