

speech and language, and the history of English. The latter topic seems out of place in a work of this type.

Chs. 3 and 4 present the consonants, vowels, and glides. I see little advantage to K's replacing the term labial with lip consonant (34). The information on dialectal differences is germane and useful (46–48).

Ch. 5 contains information on syllables and stress. I do not believe it helps students to read that when an Old English affix is added to a word, it has no effect on stress, whereas when words have been borrowed from Greco-Latin or French sources, there is often a stress shift (*origin, original, originality*, 79).

Ch. 6 on phonotactics wisely contains a brief section on borrowed words as exceptions to phonotactic constraints (e.g. *pueblo* with *pw-, 100).

Ch. 7 discusses consonant and vowel variation. In his discussion of gemination, K repeats information found in a plethora of texts, viz. that English has geminated consonants across morpheme boundaries. He specifically mentions *unknown* (116). Here, I agree with Bertil Malmberg (*Phonetics*, New York: Dover, 1963, p. 77, n. 3), who mentions degemination in *un[k]nown* for many speakers. (See now my 'Gemination in English', *English Today* 21.43–55, 2005.)

Ch. 8 deals with the consequences of phonotactics. The discussion of plural and possessive allomorphy uses /-iz/ for the far more common /-əz/ or /-ɪz/ (e.g. *churches*). Similarly, he uses the transcription /-ɪd/ for /-əd/ or /-ɪd/ for the past tense (e.g. *waited*).

In the remarks on allophonic vowel nasalization, K affirms that 'the /ə/ in *an aim* . . . is likely to be nasalized, while the /ə/ in *a name* . . . is not nasalized' (136). A vowel before a nasal consonant tends to be nasalized (see Peter Ladefoged, *A course in phonetics*, 4th edn., Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 2001, p. 84).

Ch. 9 is on the rhythm of English speech. K explains herein why English is a stress timing, not a syllable timing, language.

Ch. 10 covers intonation. Happily, K makes good use of the outstanding work by Dwight L. Bolinger.

Ch. 11 presents basic stress rules, essentially following Noam Chomsky and Morris Halle (*The sound pattern of English*, New York: Harper and Row, 1968).

Ch. 12 covers prefixes, compounds, and phrases. Many excellent observations will help motivate students to get involved in these intricate data; for example, *bisect* is sometimes stressed on its initial syllable, and influenced by this verb, *dissect* follows along similar lines.

The final two chapters explain the phonological processes of vowel reduction, vowel and consonant loss, progressive and regressive assimilation including palatalization (*did you*), spirantization (*part, partial*), velar softening (*electric, electricity*), and vowel shifts (*goose, gosling*). Once again, the indebtedness to Chomsky & Halle 1968 is obvious.

Two remarks on the author's bibliography (296–302) are in order. K should have used Ladefoged's 4th edition of *A course in phonetics* (2001), not his 3rd (1993). I would also recommend the addition of Ladefoged's *Vowels and consonants* (London: Blackwell, 2001). [ALAN S. KAYE, *California State University, Fullerton*.]

Salish etymological dictionary. By AERT H. KUIPERS. (University of Montana occasional papers in linguistics 16.) Missoula: University of Montana, 2002. Pp. x, 240. ISBN 1879763168. \$20.

Aert Kuipers's *Salish etymological dictionary* is the culmination of nearly forty years of research into the comparative phonology and lexicon of the Salish languages from the leader of the great Dutch tradition in Salish linguistics. The bulk of the work is dedicated to the dictionary itself (12–231), which further subdivides into a number of coherent sections. This is preceded by a brief introduction (1–11) and followed by a list of non-Salish elements in the dictionary (232–33) and a partially categorized bibliography (234–40).

The introduction summarizes the results of years' worth of work in comparative Salish phonology by the author (as well as others) and offers justification for the sound correspondences that form the basis of the reconstructed Proto-Salish forms offered. K's presentation also offers an explicit assessment of what specific elements or correspondences merit inclusion into proposed Proto-Salish forms (i.e. they must be found in both Coast Salish and Interior Salish, with proper sound correspondence).

The dictionary section itself is subdivided into several sections of uneven length. It begins with a brief but clear and concise overview on how to use the dictionary (12–15), providing the order of languages presented, the alphabetization used, and the like. The largest section of the dictionary is an alphabetical listing of Proto-Salish forms (15–135). The list of common Proto-Salish items found in the dictionary is followed by lists of roots that can only be reconstructed back either to Coast Salish (136–57)—in a broad understanding of this genetic unit, including Bella Coola and Tsamosan languages—or to Proto-Interior Salish alone (158–202). Given both the relatively shallow nature of Interior Salish in terms of time-depth with respect to Coast Salish, and the thorny issue regarding the position of the Tsamosan languages and Bella Coola with respect to the core 'Central Salish' group of Coast Salish languages, it comes as no surprise that the Interior Salish group of cognates is significantly larger.

The core dictionary part of the volume is followed by a section devoted to the reconstruction of the char-

acteristic system of lexical suffixes (203–14) found in the Salish languages (i.e. bound elements with content semantics used in a range of word-building formations). This section uses the subdivisions seen in the dictionary section, consisting of lists of Proto-Salish lexical suffixes (203–11), Coast Salish suffixes (212), and Interior Salish lexical suffixes (213–14).

K follows these two sections with two other important cognate sets found in particular subsets of Salish languages. The first of these includes lexical items found only in Central (or core Coast) Salish languages (215–18). The second set includes a group of words that are shared by various groups of Coast Salish languages and the Interior Salish languages Lillooet and/or Thompson (219–30). This is an important area of Salish language and cultural interaction cross-cutting genetic boundaries.

This dictionary is a landmark achievement in Salish comparative linguistics that will stimulate further research for generations. Its primary audience is of course specialists in Salish linguistics, but anyone interested in comparative linguistics could use it with ease and learn much from it. On the negative side, there is no real discussion of what the reconstructed Proto-Salish vocabulary contained in the volume means for Salish prehistory, for example, what kinds of cultural practices or proto-homeland it sheds light on, and so on. In addition, there is no use or even mention of the commonly used modern names of various languages, such as St'at'imcets for [sɔ́'ÉX'əmxɛ] for Lillooet. Overall though the volume is highly recommended. [GREGORY D. S. ANDERSON, *Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology*.]

Fare: Elementi di sintassi. By NUNZIO LA FAUCI and IGNAZIO MIRTO. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2003. Pp. 108. ISBN 8846708164. €9.

This book deals with the syntax of the Italian verb *fare* ('to do, to make') in a functionalist perspective. Nunzio la Faucci and Ignazio Mirto (L&M) develop a syntactic analysis of *fare* within the framework of relational grammar. The book consists of four chapters characterized by humorous titles that refer to the history of Adam and Eve. While Chs. 1–3 address the *fare* issue in depth, Ch. 4 proves very tentative.

In Ch. 1, L&M first provide a short introduction to relational grammar. Causative *fare* is then examined, and the conclusion is drawn that its role in a sentence is to increase the number of grammatical functions that a predicate may license. Causative *fare* licenses an additional argument of the verb, but *fare* can never initiate a new syntactic configuration. Rather, it needs to be added during the derivation. The second part of Ch. 1 addresses the peculiar use of *fare* in

reflexive causative constructions, such as *farsi notare* ('to draw attention to oneself').

Ch. 2 is dedicated to another *fare*-construction, the predicative one. In addition to its causative meaning, *fare* also has a predicative use and can be used in predicative constructions in combination with a noun, like in *Adamo fa una carezza ad Eva* ('Adam caresses Eve', lit. 'Adam makes a caress to Eve'). This use of *fare* is called by L&M 'support-*fare*'. Support-*fare* and causative *fare* show functional complementarity. In this chapter, the substantial differences between predicative noun constructions with *fare* and plain verb constructions are elaborated.

In Ch. 3, the use of *fare* with nouns denoting professions is examined. First, L&M reject Lorenzo Renzi and Laura Vanelli's ('*È un ingegnere/è ingegnere* (e anche *fa l'ingegnere*)', *Lingua nostra* 36.81–82, 1975) hypothesis according to which a construction like *fare l'ingegnere* ('be an engineer') may be analyzed as bearing an underlying meaning, roughly translatable as 'do what an engineer does'. According to L&M, this explanation is flawed by clear functional indeterminacy and is therefore inadequate. As an alternative explanation, they propose that this use of *fare* offers a suppletive mechanism of word formation, due to the fact that verbs such as 'ingegnerare' and 'giornalistare' (lit. 'to engineer', 'to journalist') are absent in Italian. One can observe, however, that these forms are also absent in other languages, and one does not necessarily want to assume that 'is a journalist' is a suppletive word formation rule to 'to journalist' or 'journalize' and the like.

The fourth and last chapter concerns the use of *fare* + noun with the meaning 'to play, to represent' + noun. According to L&M, *fare* is a very flexible verb, and this is what allows for its use in such constructions. An epilogue summarizes the central idea of the book: *fare* is a flexible verb, almost like an auxiliary. [ROBERTA D'ALESSANDRO, *University of Cambridge*.]

Research in Afroasiatic grammar 2. Ed. by JACQUELINE LECARME. (Current issues in linguistic theory 241.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp. viii, 550. ISBN 1588113868. \$168 (Hb).

This volume consists of twenty-two papers presented at the fifth Conference on Afroasiatic Languages held at the University of Paris 7 on June 28–30, 2000. I comment here on eight of them in accordance with my background and interest. The remaining titles and authors are listed at the conclusion. This decision does not relegate those essays not discussed to any lesser category.

KARIM ACHAB's 'Alternation of state in Berber' (1–19) deals with morphological and syntactic phe-