Book Reviews

Alice C. Harris, *Endoclitics and the Origins of Udi Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, xvi + 299 pages, ISBN 0-19-924633-5, £ 57.50.

Reviewed by KEREN RICE, University of Toronto

At the heart of this book is a question that has long been of key importance in linguistics, namely, what is a word. Harris takes as her starting point the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis, that the morphological composition of a word is not accessible to the rules of syntax (e.g., di Sciullo & Williams 1987, Bresnan & Mchombo 1995). She argues that Udi, a language of the Lezgian subgroup of the North East Caucasian language family (NEC, or Nakh-Daghestanian), provides a challenge to these assumptions in that morphemes that are syntactic in nature can, under some conditions, attach at morphologically well-defined locations within a word, thus accessing the morphological composition of the word.

In particular, person markers may be internal to a verb. A monomorphemic verb is shown in (1): in this example, the person marker *-ne-* splits the monomorphemic verb *ef-* 'keep'. (I follow Harris in glossing, giving the split verb stem twice, with a different subscript on each part.)

(1) *e-ne-f-sa*
keep$_1$-PERSON-keep$_2$-PRESENT
'She keeps (it).'

While this is perhaps the most dramatic of the positions in which the person marker can appear, in complex verbs, or verbs that include an incorporated element and a light verb, the person marker appears following the incorporated element and preceding the light verb. The positioning of the person marker thus is sensitive to both phonological information (place the person marker before the final consonant of a simplex verb) and morphological information (place the person marker after the incorporate in a complex verb and into the root of a simplex verb).

Linguistic Typology 8 (2004), 287–303 1430–0532/2004/008-0287

These facts on their own do not necessarily challenge the idea that the internal structure of a word is inaccessible: one could imagine that the placement of the person markers is part of the morphology, with the root-internal position of the person marker being a phonologically determined default position, or that the word-internal position of the person markers is phonologically determined, say, by the position of stress. However, Harris argues that neither of these alternatives is adequate. First, the person markers cannot find their position in the morphology because the rules that position the person markers must be in part syntactic. Specifically, and to simplify, the person markers attach to a focused constituent in the syntax. It is only in the absence of a focused constituent that they occur within the verb word. The first choice, then, is to attach the person marker to the focused element, and this element can be defined only in the syntax. Thus, Harris argues, the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis is violated because the person markers must refer to the syntax but can, under the appropriate conditions, be located internal to the verb word itself.

Harris further rejects a second hypothesis, that the position of the person markers is phonologically driven, by arguing that their position cannot be determined with respect to the position of stress. She concludes that the person markers are clitics, and that they have the possibility of being realized on the surface as endoclitics, or clitics that appear placed internal to a word. This, she argues, raises theoretical challenges not only to the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis (a syntactic rule must be able to access word-internal structure, contrary to this hypothesis) but also to the claim that no category of endoclitic exists (e.g., Klavans 1979, 1985). The book is a journey through the complexities of Udi morphosyntax with the aim of showing how the position of the person markers is determined, and how, diachronically, they came to be in the position that they are.

Endoclitics and the Origins of Udi Morphosyntax is divided into two major sections. The first is synchronic in focus. In this section, Harris provides a brief sketch of some of the major grammatical phenomena of Udi, including declension, case marking, the structure of the verb, the tense-aspect-mode system, person marking, and word order. In addition, she touches on aspects of phonology that are useful to her in developing her analysis. In the bulk of this portion of the book, Harris presents a careful examination of three major topics of Udi grammar: focus, verb-internal structure, and clitics. These topics all require in-depth discussion as her analysis of the Udi person marker system requires reference to both focus and verb-internal structure, and relies on the claim that the person markers are clitics. In the second major section of the book, entitled "The Explanation", Harris introduces the reader to the diachronic development of Udi morphosyntax, examining in particular the development of the verb, the origin of the focus construction, changes in case marking, and the origins of the person marker position, with the aim of showing how the complex situation in

Udi could have arisen, and, secondarily, providing support for the principles of syntactic change developed in Harris & Campbell (1995).

In this review I focus on the first portion of the book, the synchronic study. I begin with discussion of the analysis and then look at some of the theoretical issues around lexical integrity.

Harris begins her major analysis with a chapter on focus. As Harris points out, there are no particular syntactic or phonological universal characteristics that one can say invariably mark focus (e.g., word order). She therefore relies on Lambrecht (1994) to frame the discussion of focus, taking focus to be "the semantic component of a pragmatically structured proposition whereby the assertion differs from the presupposition", and "the focus of the proposition expressed by a sentence in a given utterance context, is seen as the element of information whereby the presupposition and the assertion DIFFER from each other. The focus is that portion of a proposition which cannot be taken for granted at the time of speech. It is the UNPREDICTABLE or pragmatically NON-RECOVERABLE element in an utterance. The focus is what makes an utterance into an assertion" (p. 45, quoted from Lambrecht 1994).

Harris uses several diagnostics for focus that have been established in the literature. First, in the answer to a content question, the word that corresponds to the variable expressed by the question word is in focus. Second, a questioned constituent is in focus. Third, a marker of negation is associated with focus. Harris also follows Lambrecht in assuming three different types of focus structures, argument-focus, predicate-focus, and sentence-focus. Using these properties, Harris examines questioned constituents, answers to content questions, and negation in Udi, showing that each of these is followed by the person marker, and concludes that the person marker attaches to a constituent that is in focus and that this constituent (focused constituent in argument-focus plus person marker) is usually found immediately before the verb. This chapter is empirically rich and it is a major contribution to the understanding of the area of information structure in Udi. The study of focus provides the key to account for the syntactic placement of the Udi person markers.

The second major topic examined by Harris is complex verbs. This topic is important to achieving the overall goal because, if no appropriate focus position is available, the person markers can appear inside of complex verbs. Harris' aim in this chapter is to "develop some criteria that will enable us to distinguish between complex and simplex verbs and diagnostics to differentiate between complex verbs and constructions that closely resemble them" (p. 64). The complex verbs in Udi contain, Harris argues, an incorporated element. An example is given in (2) (p. 65).

(2) *äyel* *kala-ne-bak-e*
child.ABSL big-3SG-BECOME-AORISTII
'The child grew (up).'

In this example, the light verb is *bak* 'become' and the incorporated element is *kala* 'big'. Note the position of the person marker, within the verb word, between the incorporated element and the light verb.

Harris first argues that what she calls complex verbs are indeed complex, and can be distinguished from simplex verbs. The complex verbs contain a light verb such as *-b-* 'do, make', *-bak-* 'be, become', *-p-* 'say', and *-d-* CAUSATIVE. Harris establishes two points. First, she argues that complex verbs must be treated as single words synchronically, and are not syntactic constructions. She begins her discussion not with an argument as to whether the complex verbs are formed in the morphology or in the syntax, but rather with an argument that the complex verbs are lexically listed, showing that many complex verbs are non-compositional in their meaning. She follows this with several arguments for the morphological rather than syntactic status of the complex verbs. First, many incorporated elements do not occur independently; for instance *furu-p-* means 'stroll, hunt for', but there is no independent word **furu*. Second, complex verbs may occur as input to derivational processes that create new words from verbs. Assuming that the processes that create the new words are derivational and lexical, one would expect any processes that feed them to also be lexical rather than syntactic. Third, Harris looks at negation, showing that the negative particle (and the person marker) immediately precede both simplex verbs and complex verbs, thus treating the incorporated element as part of the verb word. An example of each is given in (3); the negative (and attached person marker) is bolded.

(3) a. negative before a simplex verb *beɣ* (p. 80)
b. *äyl-en* ***te-ne*** *beɣ-sa* *k'uč'an-ax*
child-ERG NEG-ERG see-PRES puppy-DAT
'The child does not see the puppy.'
c. negative before a complex verb *ta-d-* (p. 80)
mot'ɣon ***te-q'un*** *ta-d-e*
they.ERG NEG-3PL thither-LIGHT.VERB-AORII
'They did not give it.'

Complex verbs may contrast with phrases consisting of the same elements.

(4) a. complex verb *aš-b-* (p. 81)
merab-en *zavod-a* *te-ne* *aš-b-esa*
Merab-ERG factory-DAT NEG-3SG work-DO-PRES
'Merab does not work in a factory.'
b. phrase *ašb-* (p. 81)
merab-en aš-l-ax te-ne b-esa
Merab-ERG work-OBL-DAT NEG-3SG do-PRES
'Merab does not do the work.'

Notice that in both of these examples, the form *aš* 'work, business, matter' is present, but in one case it is part of a complex verb (with *b-* 'do') and in the other it is not part of the complex verb but part of a phrase. The different positions of the negative in these examples supports this analysis.

Returning to arguments that the complex verbs are formed morphologically, the fourth argument relies on phonology. Harris recognizes that it can be problematic relying on phonological evidence for determining morphological or syntactic structure, but shows that the phonological evidence in Udi converges with evidence from other sources. Udi has a syncope rule that applies if its structural description is met within a word, but not if it is met between words of a phrase.

Harris presents three more arguments that complex verbs are words rather than phrases, relying to a large degree on work by Bresnan & Mchombo (1995) for the argument types. These arguments have to do with the fact that the incorporated element of a complex verb does not pattern as an independent element syntactically. First, while a phrasal element can be modified, the incorporated element of a complex verb cannot be. Second, clauses, phrases, and words can be conjoined; incorporated elements cannot be. Third, verbs, including complex verbs, can be gapped, but part of a complex verb cannot be. Finally, complex verbs are like single words in that they pattern as anaphoric islands, and it is not possible to replace the incorporated elements with proforms. The weight of the arguments in this discussion together provide compelling evidence for the wordhood of the complex verbs.

Having argued for wordhood, Harris concludes her discussion of complex verbs with an important second major point, that these complex verb stems are indeed complex, containing at least two morphemes, an incorporated element and a light verb. She supports this position for internal complexity with evidence that some of the light verbs can occur as independent verbs (see (4b)); some of the incorporated elements can occur independently (again see (4b)); light verbs recur with many independent incorporates; and the incorporated element and the light verb can be separated by person markers.

Having established that the placement of person markers is related to focus and that complex verbs are word-like in nature, Harris steps back from the study of the position of the person markers to spotlight properties of the person markers themselves. Her goal is to show that the person markers are clitics rather than affixes. This conclusion is perhaps not surprising, especially since they can attach to syntactic constituents, but it raises problems for the general conception of what a clitic can be.

In order to distinguish clitics from affixes, Harris utilizes criteria provided in the literature by Zwicky & Pullum (1983), Klavans (1985), and Scalise (1984), including the following. Like clitics, and unlike affixes, the person markers have a low degree of selection with respect to their hosts; there are no arbi-

trary gaps in the combinations of hosts and person markers; there are no morphophonological idiosyncrasies or semantic idiosyncrasies; the person markers and their hosts are not affected by syntactic rules; the person markers can attach to material already containing clitics; the person markers can subcategorize for phrases; the person markers do not change category. In addition, Harris provides a careful comparison of Udi person markers with Romance clitics, showing that they have similar properties. Detailed evidence is presented for all the clitic-like properties of the person markers discussed in this chapter. Harris ends the chapter with a discussion of agreement, showing that the person markers have one characteristic that appears to be affix-like, namely they appear to mark subject agreement. She cites Spencer (1991: 14) – "we would be unwilling to think of the clitic as some kind of inflection" (p. 110) – and points out "that is precisely what Udi PMs appear to be". She argues that the agreement-like properties of the Udi person markers does not prevent them from being clitics.

Harris thus sets the stage for her major claim in the first hundred pages of her book. In these pages, she gives the reader an excellent introduction to the grammar of Udi, especially to focus, complex verbs, and the status of the person markers as clitics. Any typologist interested in these areas will find this part of the book alone to be rich in its contribution.

Harris devotes two full chapters to a discussion of the position of clitics in Udi. The first of these chapters is primarily descriptive. Harris remarks that the position of the person marker in Udi has never been fully described, and takes as her goal in this chapter to show that the position is predictable if one takes several factors, including semantic syntactic, morphological, and phonological, into account. In addition to proposing a number of rules to describe where the person markers are placed, Harris also demonstrates how the placement of clitics has changed over time. The second chapter on clitic placement provides an Optimality Theoretic analysis. Making use of a set of alignment constraints (McCarthy & Prince 1993), Harris argues that, basically, by ranking the syntactic alignment constraints above the morphological ones, and the morphological ones above the phonological ones, the placement of clitics can be predicted.

The second major section of the book revolves around how the Udi situation might have arisen. Following an overview of the relationship of Udi to related languages, Harris examines the development of complex verbs from syntactic constructions and the origin of focus. She shows plausible paths of development for the various positions of the person markers – following argument-focus, between the pieces of a complex verb, within a verb stem, and so on – and concludes that these person markers came to achieve their synchronic positions through different historical paths.

Having provided an overview of the synchronic analysis of Udi clitic placement, I would now like to focus on the topics of lexical integrity and the need

for identifying a category of endoclitic. Recall that Harris takes as a major point that violations of lexical integrity exist in Udi. The reason for this is that the stem must be visible. Abstracting away from situations where focus determines the placement of the person marker, in simplex verbs, it is necessary to know where the simplex verb ends in order to put the clitic in its place; the stem can be followed by other morphemes. In complex verbs, it is necessary to identify the boundary between the incorporate and the light verb in order to place the clitic properly. It is in exactly these two situations in which the clitic is considered to be an endoclitic by Harris rather than an enclitic.

Is lexical integrity a principle of linguistics? Lexical integrity has a long history in lexicalist theories of morphology; Borer (1998) provides a useful overview. The principle of lexical integrity was proposed by Chomsky (1970). It was taken up in the theoretical literature on Lexical Phonology (e.g., Kiparsky 1982, Mohanan 1986) under the term Bracketing Erasure or opacity. Basically, within Lexical Phonology, lexical integrity is formalized as the erasure of brackets at the end of a cycle of word formation, rendering access to the internal structure of the word opaque for later cycles of word formation, for later phonological rules, and for the syntax.

Violations of lexical integrity, often discussed as violations of bracketing erasure, are acknowledged in the Lexical Phonology literature. Here I summarize a few cases in which it appears that access to word-internal structure is required either by later morphology or by the syntax. One interesting English example is discussed by Halpern (1995). Halpern argues that the English possessive suffix has syntactic properties since it can attach to the right edge of a phrase as well as the right edge of a word. However, he points out that it is sensitive to word-internal structure, as can be seen by examining its patterning following a sibilant. Following a regular plural marker, the possessive suffix is not present (or perhaps more accurately, only a single consonant surfaces; e.g., *the books' covers*, **the books's covers*), but it is present following a sibilant at the end of a noun stem (e.g., *the lease's conditions*, **the lease' conditions*). Thus, the possessive suffix must "know" if the final sibilant of the word is part of the noun itself (*lease*) or is a suffix (*books*), requiring access to word-internal structure, access which is impossible if the internal structure is opaque at the point at which the possessive is added.

Another example from English, the plural, perhaps exemplifies the endoclitic-type problem exhibited by Udi. The English plural marker is generally considered to be a suffix, unlike the Udi person markers. While generally the suffix attaches to the right edge of the word, there are cases in which it is attached to a noun stem which is not at the right edge, including nouns such as *attorney-general* (*attorneys-general*) and *sister-in-law* (*sisters-in-law*). In Lexical Phonology, one would expect that because of bracket erasure, by the time the plural suffix is added, access to the internal structure of these complex

nouns would not be possible. Even though the plural might best be classified as a suffix in English, the problem is parallel to the Udi problem: a morpheme must be placed inside a word at a point at which the internal structure of the word no longer should be visible based on a principle such as lexical integrity.

Other languages provide similar counterexamples. In Slave ([slevi], Athapaskan), a noun stem can be followed by a diminutive (*ah* in the example here) or an augmentative (*cho*) marker, as illustrated in (5).

(5)	*'ah*	'snowshoe'	*'ah-cho*	'hunting snowshoe'
	łuh	'spoon'	*łuh-ah*	'small spoon, teaspoon'

There is a marker of a possessive construction in Slave that is generally considered to be a suffix in the Athapaskan literature (e.g., Rice 1989), but it is possible that it could be analyzed as a clitic because it is sensitive to syntactic structure in the syntactic possessive construction. In Rice (1998: 655–666), I look at the problem that the ordering of the diminutive/augmentative and the possessive marker poses in terms of the claim that inflection occurs outside of derivation. The possessive suffix occurs, somewhat surprisingly, adjacent to the stem rather than outside of the diminutive/augmentative. The possessive marker is bolded in (6).

(6)	*-'ah-**é**-cho*	'hunting snowshoes, possessed'
	*-luz-**é**-ah*	'small spoon, teaspoon, possessed'

Here too there is a morpheme that occurs in an unexpected position, following a stem. Again, if the internal structure of the stem is opaque, determining the position where the possessive suffix should be placed is difficult.

Unexpected positioning of morphemes is a characteristic of Athapaskan languages more generally. As discussed in detail in the Athapaskan literature, most recently in Rice (2000), many verbs in Athapaskan languages have a lexical entry in which the pieces are discontinuous. For instance, the verb 'talk' in Slave has the discontinuous entry *go-de* (the second element is called the stem in the Athapaskan literature and the first element a prefix). This stem does not occur independently of this prefix. To take just subject marking, the subject appears between the two pieces of this lexical entry, e.g., *go-h-de* 'I talk,' where *h-* marks the 1st person singular subject. While how the verb word is formed is a topic of much debate in the Athapaskan literature, one possibility is that the person markers are placed inside of the basic lexical entry, requiring visibility into the internal structure of the word, structure which, based on bracketing erasure, one would not expect to be accessible at the time that the subject markers are added. If such an analysis were adopted, the subject marker would have the properties of the Udi person markers in that it would appear, unexpectedly, in a position that would not, given lexical integrity, be accessible.

These cases are not as compelling as the Udi case discussed by Harris as the evidence for the interaction of distinct levels is perhaps not so clear. Sproat (1993), in a volume on Lexical Phonology, raises some very interesting problems for the principle of lexical integrity, one having to do with phonetics being able to access word-internal structure and the other with pragmatics being able to see this structure. As Sproat points out, phonetics and pragmatics have generally been considered to be unable to access word-internal structure, and thus, given a principle like lexical integrity, one would not expect phonetic rules to treat word-internal segments in different morphological positions differently, nor should pragmatic rules be able to see inside of words.

Briefly, in terms of phonetics, Sproat reports on a study of the articulatory phonetics of allophonic variation in the English lateral consonant /l/, showing that not all word-internal laterals are identical in their duration, with a morpheme-final lateral being longer when it is the final consonant of the first member of a compound than when it is the final consonant of a stem followed by an affix. The morphology provides a cue here for duration of the lateral, but if word-internal structure is not available, then one would not expect these laterals to differ in length. I return to this case after discussing the second set of issues raised by Sproat.

In a series of works by Sproat, Ward, and others, beginning with Sproat & Ward 1987 (see Sproat 1993 for other references), anaphoric islands are investigated. Just as lexical integrity should prevent access to the internal structure of a word to allow for morphologically-conditioned phonetic rules, it should also prevent access to the internal structure for semantic or pragmatic reasons. However, in the work by Sproat and his co-authors, and supported by other work, naturally occurring examples have been found in which a pronoun could have an antecedent inside a word. Sproat (1993: 182-183) provides many examples (e.g., *I had a [paperroute] once but my boss said I took too long deliverin' em'*, L.A. Law, 1987). Sproat (1993) points out that reference into words is often felicitous when the semantics are transparent, and that the syntactic position of a word can be important in determining whether there can be reference into words, but he argues that there is no morphological prohibition against reference into words per se (Sproat 1993: 184).

To return to lexical integrity, it appears that violations of lexical integrity are not uncommon: it is a soft constraint rather than inviolable. The violations do not appear to be random: in looking at the examples of violations of lexical integrity discussed here, it is interesting that they all involve stems in some way. Sproat (1993: 174) remarks that the evidence from phonetics and pragmatics for the visibility of word-internal structure comes from compounding. While the English and Slave examples do not necessarily involve compounding, they do all involve the identification of a stem (or root). This is true in Udi as well, where it is stem/root-final boundaries that must be identified in order to properly situate the clitic.

In at least some of the cases in which access to word-internal structure in order to determine the base of affixation/cliticization has been argued for, phonological factors have been called on to define the environment. For instance, in Rice (1998) I argue that in Slave the possessive suffix attaches to a prosodic constituent, the minimal word, rather than to a morphological constituent. Sproat (1993) suggests that a phonological solution might be available for the English lateral duration cases: while the phonetics might not be able to "see" that two morphological words are available, perhaps it can see that two phonological words are present. Sproat (1993: 181) suggests that "At the very least this weakens the predictive power of BE [bracketing erasure], since some of morphological structure becomes visible via smuggling through metrical structure". However, as Sproat points out, there often are very strong phonetic cues to morphological structure, particularly to stems. Not only are stems often stress-bearing, there may well be other cues to stems including both vowel and consonant duration.

Harris recognizes the possibility that phonological factors may play a role in terms of determining the placement of the Udi person markers through her examination of stress. Looking only at the cases in which the person marker is an endoclitic, stress has a tendency to fall on the last syllable of the incorporated element in a complex verb stem and on the last syllable of a simplex verb stem. However, there are cases in which the person marker does not follow the stressed syllable. There may be other phonetic cues that identify the position for the person markers when they occur inside of the stem, so the possibility of the base being phonologically/phonetically determined remains an interesting question in Udi, and opens avenues for new research on the language. If it were the case that the base of affixation could be recognized in some phonological way, then the Udi endoclitic examples would not be problems for the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis, as it would be phonological rather than morphological structure that was accessed.

Harris remarks that the facts of Udi present an important challenge to linguists, showing "a new kind of complexity in language" and demanding "explanation in terms of origins and human cognitive capacity to deal with this complexity" (p. 283). She further notes that "[a] fundamental difference between Udi and most other languages is that Udi values the integrity of the word, even the integrity of the morpheme, less highly than most languages do. Given the evidence from Udi, it is impossible to maintain strong forms of the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis or to accept lexical integrity as the primary criterion for wordhood. It is true that the ability of clitics to occur within words is rare and that lexical integrity can be used as one flexible criterion of wordhood, but it cannot be the only criterion" (pp. 165–166). This study of Udi re-opens many important questions about a fundamental issue in linguistics, "What is a word?". Harris' lucid demonstration that the Udi verb shows properties that

are word-like in some ways but not in others is very likely to trigger further research on this fascinating question, freeing researchers to recognize other cases where there are similar properties, such as cliticization into a morphologically well-defined environment, that have not been treated as such.

While Harris' book is not the first to challenge lexical integrity as an inviolable principle, it is one of the most convincing and cogently argued pieces of work to present this position. I have not begun to capture the subtleties and elegance of Harris fine research either in terms of its outstanding empirical contribution nor in terms of its sophisticated argumentation. *Endoclitics and the Origins of Udi Morphosyntax* addresses theoretical issues of long-standing that simply refuse to go away. For me high praise of a book is that it is one that will stand over time; this book is definitely one that will be of lasting value.

Correspondence address: Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto, 130 St. George Street, Toronto, Ont. M5S 3H1, Canada; e-mail: rice@chass.utoronto.ca

Abbreviations: 3 3rd person; ABSL absolutive case; AOR aorist; DAT dative case; ERG ergative case; NEG negative; OBL oblique base; PL plural; PRES present; SG singular.

References

Borer, Hagit (1998). Morphology and syntax. In Andrew Spencer & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *The Handbook of Morphology*, 151–190. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bresnan, Joan & Sam A. Mchombo (1987). Topic, pronoun, and agreement in Chichewa. *Language* 63: 741–782.

Chomsky, Noam (1970). Remarks on nominalization. In Roderick Jacobs & Peter Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, 184–221. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn.

di Sciullo, Anna-Maria & Edwin Williams (1987). *On the Definition of Word*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Halpern, Aaron L. (1995). *On the Placement and Morphology of Clitics*. Stanford: CSLI.

Harris, Alice C. & Lyle Campbell (1995). *Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kiparsky, Paul (1982). Lexical morphology and phonology. In I.-S. Yang (ed.), *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, 3–91. Seoul: Hanshin.

Klavans, Judith L. (1979). On clitics as words. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society: The Elements: Parasession on Linguistic Units and Words*, 68-80.

— (1985). The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. *Language* 61: 95–120.

Lambrecht, Knud (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, John J. & Alan S. Prince (1993). Generalized Alignment. In Geert Booij & Jaap van der Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1993*, 79–153. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Mohanan, K. P. (1986). *The Theory of Lexical Phonology*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Rice, Keren (1989). *A Grammar of Slave*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

— (1998). Slave (Northern Athapaskan). In Andrew Spencer & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *The Handbook of Morphology*, 648–689. Oxford: Blackwell.

— (2000). *Morpheme Order and Semantic Scope: Word Formation in the Athapaskan Verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scalise, Sergio (1984). *Generative Morphology*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Spencer, Andrew (1991). *Morphological Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sproat, Richard (1993). Looking into words. In Sharon Hargus & Ellen M. Kaisse (eds.), *Studies in Lexical Phonology* (Phonetics and Phonology, 4), 173–195. San Diego: Academic Press.

Sproat, Richard & Gregory Ward (1987). Pragmatic considerations in anaphoric island phenomena. *Papers from the Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 23: 321–335.

Zwicky, Arnold M. & Geoffrey K. Pullum (1983). Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't*. *Language* 59: 502–513.

Eduard Buschmann and Wilhelm von Humboldt, *Wörterbuch der mexicanischen Sprache*. Mit einer Einleitung und Kommentar herausgegeben von Manfred Ringmacher. (Wilhelm von Humboldt, Schriften zur Sprachwissenschaft. Dritte Abteilung: Amerikanische Sprachen. Dritter Band.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 2000, lxxvi + 1034 pages, ISBN 3-506-73988-3, EUR 313.80.

Reviewed by VOLKER HEESCHEN, Universität München

For Wilhelm von Humboldt the diversity of language was not only a subject for philosophizing, but also a matter of worldwide correspondence and continuous efforts to get hold of manuscripts, grammar sketches, vocabularies, and fragments of texts of languages so far unknown: his library contained 510 works on 180 languages. Indeed, Humboldt's development from early political and anthropological studies to his opus postumum, dedicated to the Kawi language or perhaps rather to *The Diversity of Human Language and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*, can be described as an act of liberation from the framework of any kind of *grammaire raisonnée* or *Allgemeine Sprachkunde*, from the aesthetic evaluation of the diversity of languages as suggested among others by Jenisch (1796), and even from the Kantian philosophy of language as translated into linguistics by Bernhardi (1801–1803). Nevertheless, Humboldt became the source and starting-point for language philosophies, while his advances (in the literal as well as the metaphorical sense of the word) into empirical studies have been widely neglected when comparative Indo-European philology pushed back general and typological linguistics during the 19th century and after (see Mueller-Vollmer 1993: 28–37).

The re-discovery of Humboldt's empirical work began with hints at the existence of a Basque grammar and of studies on American languages and the Javanese verb (Heeschen 1972: 63–69, Mueller-Vollmer 1974, Percival 1974); it led to Buchholz's (1986) well-balanced appreciation of Humboldt's studies on Austronesian languages and to a renewed interest in Humboldt's unpublished linguistic writings, which were traced and masterly assessed by Mueller-Vollmer (1993). The publication of the Mexican grammar (Humboldt 1994) as well as the work under review are indebted to Mueller-Vollmer's journey of