

REVIEWS

Lexicalist phonology of English and German. By Steven L. Strauss. Pp. 180. Dordrecht — Holland/Cinnaminson — USA: Foris Publications, 1982. Reviewed by Edmund Gusemann, Catholic University of Lublin.

S. L. Strauss's *Lexicalist phonology of English and German* (henceforth LPEG) is an attempt to link more closely than before the regularities in the sphere of sound structure with those in the domain of word structure, i.e. morphology.* Strauss argues that for phonological rules to be properly and adequately formulated, recourse must be had to properties of word structure and not only to morphological features. In other words, LPEG tries to reduce phonological arbitrariness by relating phonology to independently necessary morphological properties which include, in particular, different bracketing accompanying individual types of morphological processes, i.e. inflection, derivation, and compounding, where derivation specifically separates prefixation from suffixation. If phonological rules can be shown to depend crucially on this sort of hierarchical morphological organisation, then Strauss can be said to have succeeded in developing a theory of "Natural Word-Structural Phonology", which he also calls *lexicalist phonology*.

The way Strauss sees it, "lexicalist phonology is concerned with elaborating an autonomous, internally justified theory of word-formation" (p. 5) and it further "seeks to analyze and explain how the word-structures generated by the theory of word-formation influence the form and application of phonological rules" (p. 6/7). Quite obviously, lexicalist phonology as defined here goes far beyond what is normally understood by phonology since it covers both phonology and morphology. This is no accident or oversight since of the two types of phonological rules that Strauss recognizes — cyclic and word-level — the former apply each time a new affix has been appended, while the latter apply once to the word structure as a whole. Specifically, Strauss claims (p. 149) that "the cycle is just the outward appearance of a phonological rule that applies after each new suffix is added".

The phonological rules that Strauss constructs follow the general SPE format as modified by Mascaró (1976), Kiparsky (1973) and Halle (whose significant 1979 paper is singularly absent from Strauss's bibliography).

The morphology developed in LPEG is in line with the dominant model of the 1970's initiated by Siegel's 1974 dissertation (published in 1979) and raised to a significant theoretical model by Aronoff's (1976) seminal monograph, with additional contributions from Allen (1978) and others. Strauss reviews these earlier proposals with a lot of perspicacity and some criticism. Thus he argues that morphology is not done in the lexicon, as claimed by several scholars, but in a separate component of word-grammar. The model of word-formation that Strauss arrives at (p. 53) is largely the result of introducing

* I wish to thank Dr Anna Malicka-Kleparska, Ms. Jolanta Szpyra and Dr Bogdan Szymanek for discussions of lexicalist phonology and morphology.

a number of modifications to Siegel's proposals. Specifically, Strauss endorses Siegel's claim that affixes in English make up two levels: Level I affixes are stress-determining, as against those of Level II which are stress neutral and, furthermore, Level II suffixes never precede or are followed by those of Level I. He argues with good reason, however, that once suffixes have been assigned to these levels the need for boundary distinctions other than + disappears since brackets and/or morpheme boundaries will ensure the proper application of phonological rules. The point is well-taken, I believe, as is Strauss's claim that prefixation and suffixation are independent of each other in English (the same is true about Polish, incidentally; this may be a more widespread regularity). I am less convinced by the third major amendment to Siegel's model whereby Class II affixes may attach to stems, a situation disallowed by Siegel (although she did recognize derivation from roots, an equally dubious development). An interesting idea of Strauss's which, quite unintentionally weakens the level ordering hypothesis, is the argument that Class II prefixes are to be interpreted as compounding elements; in effect, English affixation comprises one level of prefixation and two levels of suffixation.

Generally speaking, LPEG makes quite interesting reading on the morphological side, even if some of the arguments and conclusions are controversial. What I find most disturbing about the book is the fact that not a single morphological or phonological rule of English has been satisfactorily formulated. As far as word-formation is concerned we are given seven general formulae of the type: derivation by means of suffixation turns the symbol [t]A into the symbol [[t]A + u]B, hardly an arresting result.¹ This has the usual consequences, of which we will consider just a few.

Strauss makes the admittedly interesting claim that *-y* is suffix in words such as *happy, lazy, pretty, zany* etc (p. 28). The arguments in support of this are particularly bleak and infelicitous: it is claimed (p. 40) that *in-* prefixation does not apply to such words since *-y* is a Class II suffix and *in-* is a Class I prefix (as noted, there are no Class II prefixes at all). Leaving aside for a moment the whole concept of level ordered morphology, note that there can be no such argument since, obviously, the rule of *in-* prefixation, once it has been formulated, will contain the condition that the base must be [+Linate]; otherwise we would have to explain why there is no **inkind, *inwise, *indry* etc., clearly a pseudo-problem.

The suffixhood of *y* in *happy, zany* etc. is further claimed to be supported by the fact that Class I suffixes do not attach to it whereas Class II ones do, e.g.: *happyness* vs **happyity, *happyalA, *happyize, *happyist* (spellings are Strauss's). Note that *-ity* normally attaches to Linate bases hence **happyity* shows nothing; *-al* derives adjectives from nouns (*diphthongal, procedural*), never from adjectives, hence **happyalA* is ungrammatical for very good reasons and quite independently of any Class I -- Class II distinction; the de-adjectival verbalising suffix *-ise* attaches to Linate bases which additionally meet other requirements (see Gussmann, in press a); personal nouns in *-ist* can indeed be related to a base in *-y* but only when the latter is a noun rather than an adjective, e.g. *botany* — *botanist*, see Malicka-Kleparska (1983). Note further that contrary to Strauss's claims, *-ify*, which is a Class I suffix, can attach to adjectives in *-y*, e.g.: *happify, prettify, tipsify*. Clearly an argument is as strong as the evidence which is used to support it — in the case at hand this is regrettably very meagre.

¹ Let us note that the structural descriptions given in the text (12–15, 18) do not allow for the possibility of recognising so-called *intermorphs*, i.e. semantically empty morphological entities separating the stem from the suffix in, for example, *habitual, professorial*. For some discussion of the issue see Szymanek (1983).

Another case where hasty (non)formulation of rules leads to deceptive conclusions or spurious arguments can be seen in the following: "The suffix *able* is ordinarily fully productive, there not being any verbs to which it cannot attach, *except for -en verbs*" (p. 36). Strauss fails to mention the fact that also intransitive verbs never undergo the *-able* attachment, i.e. **goable, *dieable* (see Szymanek (1981), Bauer (1983: 224)).

Turning now to more general issues it seems that Strauss endorsed Siegel's level ordered morphology too uncritically; by trying to bypass some of its weak points he contributed to further confusion. The hypothesis predicts that Level I affixes affect stress placement while Level II ones do not and that the former can never be preceded by the latter. In the case of clashes between the two criteria noted by Aronoff (1976: 84) Strauss abrogates the stress function of the level distinction and requires that the classhood of suffixes be determined solely by their position relative to other suffixes. Thus the suffix *-able* is claimed (p. 29–30) to belong to Level I because *-able* adjectives can serve as bases for the *-ity* attachment, e.g. *readable* — *readability*. In the event the level hypothesis boils down to a claim that given two suffixes, they must never be arranged in the order Class II — Class I; not a staggering conclusion in view of the absence of independent criteria for deciding class membership. Despite support from Kiparsky (1982) and Mohanan (1982), the level ordered morphology is a most fragile construction (see critical comments by Malicka-Kleparska (1983), Aronoff and Sridhar (in press), Booij (in press)). An additional weakness of the hypothesis is that it obviously has nothing to say about the order of suffixes coming from one level. Since in Siegel's model, adopted by Strauss, suffixes can be attached not only to words but also to roots, there is nothing to explain the grammaticality of *tox-ic-ity*, as against ungrammaticality of **tox-ity, -ic*. What we clearly need are adequately formulated rules which specify conditions on bases; only then will we be able to claim that (p. 23) "rules of derivational morphology are as regular, semantically and phonologically as other generative rules" (see also Plank (1980)). Once this is done, the flimsy evidence currently available in support of the level distinction will presumably vanish into thin air altogether.

The phonological sections of LPEG suffer from much the same failings as the morphological ones, viz. there is too little data and it is analysed in a way which is, at best, sketchy. The German data falls outside this criticism since it covers the totality of the schwa-zero alternations with implications for the analysis of umlaut. I am not competent to comment on the interpretation but clearly four rules of schwa deletion are a far cry from what the title of the book promises.

Seven rules of English phonology are listed in the summary (p. 171–172) although a few more are mentioned in the body of the text. Of these rules three are allomorphy deletions and one is an apparently late process of *i*-laxing in the environment of several suffixes (*happily, beautiful, penniless* etc.). The remaining three phonological processes are in various ways mishandled:

- fricative voicing, developed in Allen (1978) and repeated in Allen (1980) is a highly restricted minor rule which applies to lexically marked items (see Gussmann (1982)); it never appears to affect the palato-alveolar spirant. If Allen's and Strauss's rule were to be followed, we would get voiced fricatives in *messy, fluffy, fishy* or in the plural *proofs, beliefs, safes* because we have *prove, believe, save*, or in the adjective *selfish* because we have *selves*.
- nasal assimilation as formulated by Strauss fails to accommodate cases such as *irrational, illogical* where the stem initial segment is a sonorant. Furthermore, being reduced to prefixes, it requires that the two nasals in *incomplete* become velar and bilabial respectively (p. 80). This is dubious since the first nasal (*in-*) may as well be alveolar, i.e. assimilation here is optional while the nasal of

con- must be bilabial, i.e. the failure of assimilation results in ungrammaticality (*complete). No adequate description may disregard such facts.

- the familiar SPE rule of *s*-voicing is also restricted to prefixes, i.e. cases such as *music*, *rosary*, *exam* are not discussed. Here the much criticised equals boundary (=) is replaced by a morpheme boundary followed by a prefix bracket. The force of this modification is perhaps debatable.

LPEG formulates the need for non-arbitrary phonology in a persuasive way; derivational structure as the source of phonological motivation seems equally plausible.² Unfortunately the way these intuitions have been justified and defended admits of a 'not proven' verdict only.

REFERENCES

- Allen, M. R. 1978. *Morphological investigations*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. The University of Connecticut.
- Allen, M. R. 1980. "Semantic and phonological consequences of boundaries: a morphological analysis of compounds". In M. Aronoff and M. L. Kean (eds). 1980. 9–27.
- Aronoff, M. 1976. *Word formation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Aronoff, M. and Kean, M. L. (eds). 1980. *Juncture*. Saratoga, Cal.: Anma Libri.
- Aronoff, M. and Sridhar, S. N. (in press). "Morphological levels in English and Kannada". In E. Gussmann (ed.). (in press b).
- Bauer, L. 1983. *English word formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Booij, G. E. (in press). "Lexical phonology and the organisation of the morphological component". In E. Gussmann (ed.). (in press b).
- Brogyanyi, B. (ed.). 1979. *Studies in diachronic, synchronic and typological linguistics. Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Fujimura, O. (ed.). 1973. *Three dimensions of linguistic theory*. Tokyo: TEC Co.
- Gussmann, E. 1982. Review of M. Aronoff and M. L. Kean (eds). 1980. *SAP 15*. 172–177.
- Gussmann, E. (ed.). 1983. *Phono-morphology. Studies in the interaction of phonology and morphology*. Lublin: Catholic University of Lublin.
- Gussmann, E. (in press a). "The lexicon of English de-adjectival verbs. In E. Gussmann (ed.). (in press b).
- Gussmann, E. (ed.). (in press b). *Rules and the lexicon. Studies in word-formation*. Lublin: Catholic University of Lublin.
- Halle, M. 1979. "Formal vs. functional considerations in phonology". In B. Brogyanyi (ed.). vol. 1. 1979. 325–341.
- Hulst, H. Van der and Smith, N. (eds). 1982. *The structure of phonological representations. Part 1*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kiparsky, P. 1973. "Abstractness, opacity and global rules". In O. Fujimura (ed.). 1973. 57–86.
- Kiparsky, P. 1982. "From cyclic to lexical phonology". In Van der Hulst and N. Smith (eds). 1982. 131–175.
- Malicka-Kleparska, A. 1983. *The conditional lexicon in derivational morphology. A study of double motivation in Polish and English*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. Lublin: Catholic University of Lublin.

² For a different hypothesis relating phonology and morphology based on an impressive set of data see Szpyra (in press).

- Mascaró, J. 1976. *Catalan phonology and the phonological cycle*. Bloomington: IULC.
- Mohanan, K. P. 1982. *Lexical phonology*. Bloomington: IULC.
- Plank, F. 1980. *Morphologische (Ir-) Regularitäten*. Tübingen: G. Narr Verlag.
- Siegel, D. 1974/1979. *Topics in English morphology*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Szpyra, J. (in press). "Input to WFRs — phonological, intermediate or phonetic. The case of verbs and deverbal nouns in Polish". In E. Gussmann (ed.). (in press b).
- Szymanek, B. 1981. *Morphological and phonological constraints on suffixational derivation of Polish and English adjectives*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. Lublin: M. Skłodowska-Curie University.
- Szymanek, B. 1983. "On intermorphemic extensions in English and Polish". In E. Gussmann (ed.). 1983.

Existential There. A Synchronic and Diachronic Study. By L. E. Breivik. Pp. XIV +458. Bergen: Stoens Offset, 1983. Reviewed by Aleksander Szwedek, Bydgoszcz.

The book is a revised version of the author's doctoral dissertation completed in 1981, and one of a number of works written by the same author on the same subject (cf. Breivik 1975, 1976, 1977, 1981). Although only one of a number, it is by far the most complete and exhaustive studies of existential *there*. The book is devoted to a presentation of various approaches to *there*, the development of *there* in the English language, and equivalents of *there* and of existential clauses in a number of other languages such as Norwegian, Danish, Swedish, Icelandic, Faroese, German, Dutch, French, Hungarian, Serbo-Croatian, Czech, Modern Hebrew and Russian. This predominantly presentational character of the book forces upon the reviewer a presentational format of the review, short of copying the Contents.

The method adopted by the author, as he himself admits (p. 9), is eclectic "in view of the somewhat unstable climate in present-day linguistics" (p. 9). As recent criticism (Derwing 1973, Pullum 1983, Sampson 1974) has shown, language still proves to be too complex a phenomenon for any theory of language to grasp all of its aspects adequately.

Breivik's study is based on a corpus (Quirk's Survey of English Usage and earlier English texts) and informant reaction tests.

The book is divided into six chapters, each of which is followed by a summary and concluding remarks. This is an excellent idea in view of the detailed, presentational nature of the work.

In chapter 1 Breivik discusses some 25 different approaches to *there*. The author's criticism of most of the analyses is similar to the criticism against recent linguistic theories, i.e. that they are too syntactically oriented, limited to the structure of the sentence (cf. for example, Derwing 1973). One of the few exceptions is Bolinger (1977) who "argues against the prevailing view that *there*, insertion is governed by purely syntactic conditions, and that *there*, contributes nothing to the semantic content of the structure in which it occurs". (p. 116). Breivik draws particularly heavily on the thematic analysis of Firbas (1961, 1966), despite all of the shortcomings of the Communicative Dynamism approach, especially its lack of clear criteria in determining the elements of the thematic structure (theme proper, rest of theme, transition proper, rest of transition, rest of rheme, rheme proper) and their degrees of Communicative Dynamism. Such a position can, however, be easily understood and justified in the sense that Breivik is concerned basically with only one element (*there*) in the thematic structure, an element of a relatively clear degree of Communicative Dynamism.

In chapter 2 the author discusses the differences and similarities between *there*₁ (existential) and *there*₂ (locative), arguing that they can also be distinguished on the basis of semantic and syntactic evidence (beside the obvious difference in the pronunciation). Breivik concludes that *there*₁ is constrained to occur in subject position and does not appear to have referential meaning, while *there*₂ shows the distributional characteristics of a locative adverb and carries the meaning "at that particular place".

Chapter 3 is devoted to a detailed description of the principles underlying the use and non-use of *there* in present-day English. In accordance with the criticism in chapter 1 and his adoption of Firbas' views, Breivik finds that *there*₁ "carries a kind of pragmatic information which we will call *signal information*: it functions as a signal to the addressee that he must be prepared to direct his attention towards an item of new information". (p. 205--206). This is reminiscent of Jespersen's (1933) "preparatory *there*" and can hardly be treated as a novelty.

In the summary of chapter 3 the author, quoting Givón (1979), repeats a somewhat obvious in recent years conclusion that "the study of syntax, when limited to the sentence - clause level and deprived of its communicative - functional context, tends to bypass and even obscure the immense role that communicative considerations affecting the structure of discourse play in determining so-called syntactic rules" (p. 205). At the same time, however, he sometimes uses context frames in an unconvincing way. For example, when discussing the examples *Well, there's Oslo in Norway. ...* and *Well, Oslo is in Norway*, he makes the difference between them dependent on the preceding context: *Which of the Scandinavian capitals have you visited?* and *Where is Oslo?*, respectively. It should at least be added that *Where is Oslo?* is not an unambiguous context for *Oslo is in Norway*, as the following example shows: *Where is Athens? Well, there is Athens in Greece. And there is Athens in the US. ...*

In chapter 4 Breivik describes the use and non-use of *there*₁ in earlier English (up to 1550) in a number of clause types. He demonstrates that *there*₁ and *there*₂ were already differentiated in period I (up to 1070). He succeeds in showing that the development of *there*₁ in earlier English is "part of parallel syntactic changes, acting in a coordinated manner". (p. 354).

Since the data indicate that the separation between *there*₁ and *there*₂ must have taken place before the Old English period, in chapter 5 Breivik devotes his attention to equivalents of the existential *there* in other Germanic and non-Germanic languages. Having found that the counterparts of the English *there*₁ construction are manifested in a variety of forms in the languages of the world, he comes again to a somewhat obvious for some time conclusion that those various "manifestations are strategies for accomplishing the same communicative goal: the introduction of new information". (p. 401).

Finally in chapter 6 Breivik explains the origin of *there*₁ in terms of Stockwell's (1977) theory of word order change and in terms of Western's (1921) proposal of a semantic reanalysis of Norwegian *der*₁ (=English *there*₁). Despite all the thoroughness of the analysis Breivik is only able to say that "It is not unreasonable to assume that not only *then* but also *there* is sometimes inserted as an empty topic in the TvX(V) structure, and that the subject function of *there* develops from its topic function, by extension of TvX(V) → SvX(V)". (p. 409).

The hypothesis looks simple and plausible, and fits in Stockwell's theory, but it would be nice to have more evidence in support of it with relation to *there*.

The book concludes with a recapitulation of the main points of the discussion.

To complete this short and presentational review it has to be emphasized that the book contains a wealth of material. It is based on an analysis of a corpus leaving very little to speculation. It also gives the reader an overview of approaches to *there* reflecting

different theoretical positions, and attempts to integrate synchronic and diachronic descriptions. However, in the opinion of the present reviewer, the most valuable contribution of Breivik is his own approach to the problem, an approach not limited to semanto-syntactic analysis; an approach based on broader, communicative foundations. Such an approach enabled Breivik to avoid the limitations of earlier treatments and to bring to light new, important aspects of *there*.

The review would be incomplete without a mention of an impressive bibliography of some 260 works.

All in all, the book is a good example of a thorough, scholarly work worth reading and referring to by those interested in both synchronic and diachronic, as well as theoretical and corpus studies alike.

REFERENCES

- Bolinger, D. 1977. *Meaning and form*. London: Longman.
- Breivik, L. E. 1975. "The use and non-use of 'Existential there' in present-day English". *Forum Linguisticum* 7. 57-103.
- Breivik, L. E. 1976. "There₁ and there₂: a reply". *Anglo-American Forum* 5. 29-81.
- Breivik, L. E. 1977. "A note on the genesis of existential *there*". *English Studies* 58. 334-348.
- Breivik, L. E. 1981. "On the interpretation of existential *there*." *Language* 57. 1-25.
- Derwing, B. 1973. *Transformational grammar as a theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Firbas, J. 1961. "On the communicative value of the Modern English finite verb". *Brno Studies in English* 3. 79-100.
- Firbas, J. 1966. "Non-thematic subjects in contemporary English". *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* 2. 239-256.
- Givón, T. (ed.). 1979. *Syntax and semantics, 12. Discourse and syntax*. New York: Academic Press.
- Jespersen, O. 1933. *Essentials of English grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Li, C. (ed.). 1977. *Mechanisms of syntactic change*. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.
- Pullum, G. K. 1983. "How many possible human languages are there?" *Linguistic Inquiry* 14. 447-467.
- Sampson, G. R. 1974. "Is there a universal phonetic alphabet?" *Language* 50. 236-259.
- Stockwell, R. 1977. "Motivations for exbraciation in Old English". In Li (ed.) 1977: 291-314.
- Western, A. 1921. *Norsk riksmåls-grammatik*. Oslo: Kristiania.

Phonology in the 1980's. By D. L. Goyvaerts, ed. Pp. viii+647. Ghent: E. Story-Scientia, 1981. Reviewed by Katarzyna Dziubalska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Phonology in the 1980's edited by D. L. Goyvaerts is a collection of papers which focus, as the title suggests, on the vital issues of phonological research that has been carried out since the late 60's and continued in new forms and with varying results into the 80's. The book is most insightful both for seminar students specializing in phonological studies and, especially, for active phonologists currently working in the field.

The volume begins with the editor's "Introduction" which is a short survey of basic aspects of the phonological research of the past ten or so years. According to Goyvaerts, the research paradigm of this period has been formed by two distinct approaches to language studies:

- (i) trying to define the status of linguistics as a scientific discipline
- (ii) critically analysing Chomsky and Halle's SPE.

He supplies the reader with a concise account of both approaches.

The controversy connected with (i) is based on the question whether linguistics is a science of empirical, non-empirical or "combined" nature, and what consequences its status has for the validity of its claims. As far as the second, more typical, approach is concerned, Goyvaerts mentions ten main issues which most often raise discussion while investigating the transformational-generative model: morphology, simplicity, linguistically significant generalization, abstractness, intrinsic/extrinsic rule ordering, explanation, the phoneme, markedness, interlevel directionality and, finally, phonetics, phonology and distinctive features. He provides a short discussion of each notion, presenting existing criticisms of the TG grammar approach to them. Although names of some linguists who contributed their own interpretations to the general investigation of these problems do appear in Goyvaerts' discussion, the list of them is by no means exhaustive. Suffice it here to mention the works of Kiparsky (1968, 1973) on abstractness and rule ordering, or Halle's (1978) considerations of formal vs. functional explanation in phonology. However, detailed information concerning phonological research, historical perspective included, can be obtained, for instance, from Fischer-Jørgensen's book (1975), and if Goyvaerts' aim was to give the essence while avoiding the details, this aim has been perfectly fulfilled by his short résumé.

The "Introduction" also includes a brief summary of all the papers which appear in the volume. They may be grouped under headings similar to those listed by Goyvaerts as vital issues of contemporary phonology. Thus, the problem of abstractness forms the background of the articles by Zonneveld, Skousen, Lightner, Eliasson, and, to some extent, also Smith and Foley. The rule ordering controversy is dealt with by Feinstein and Vago, Kaye, Iverson, and Robinson. The coexistence of theory and data is discussed by Campbell. Nessly, Wilbur and Kenstowicz consider the validity of empirical evidence in phonology. Morphology and its relationship with phonology is discussed by Lightner, Basbell, Chin-Wu Kim, Dressler, and Smith and Foley. The relationship between phonetics and phonology is a basic problem for de Cornulier, Martin, Michaels, Griffen, and Wojcik. The question of unidirectionality appears in Eliasson's paper; Lass and Iverson concern themselves with phonological change; the criterion of linguistically significant generalization supports the claim of Greenberg's paper; the archiphoneme is reintroduced and "reinforced" by Pettersson. A few articles should be viewed against the background of more recent theoretical developments, viz. autosegmental phonology - papers by Goldsmith and Clements and Ford, "upside-down" phonology - Robinson's paper, atomic phonology - that of Dinnsen, systematic morphonology - articles by Smith and Foley, and polycentristic phonology - Dressler's paper.

The views put forward in a few papers which may be regarded as representative of the above problems will now be presented. The choice made is in no way intended to imply any value judgement of other papers contained in the collection.

"Verbal paradigms in Dutch" is the title of W. Zonneveld's paper. With regard to the abstract/concrete opposition the author adheres to the former approach to phonological description. He appears to be one of those linguists who would sacrifice empirical validity of a theory for the sake of its generality and simplicity. As a basis for his claims he uses data taken from modern Standard Dutch.

O. W. Robinson's contribution to the volume is a paper on "Rule ordering in a parsing model of phonology". The paper presents a sketchy outline of the "upside-down" or parsing theory of phonology, originated by Robinson and Leben in 1977, and discusses some consequences the theory entails. In short, the theory assumes that the function of phonological rules is to enable speakers to relate the surface forms of their language to each other.

In his paper "Generative phonology vs. Finnish phonology: retrospect and prospect" L. Campbell considers the interdependence between theory and data as bi-directional, i.e. not only does the theory explain the data, but also the data provide the check on the theory. He reinforces his belief by juxtaposing the data from Finnish and the theory of generative phonology.

R. B. Wilbur's paper "Theoretical phonology and child phonology: argumentation and implication" raises the question of the relationship of acquisition data to theoretical claims. To what extent may a disagreement between child language data and theoretical claims be tolerated without changing the theory? He suggests limiting child language-based propositions in developing a phonological theory.

H. Basbell elaborates "On the function of boundaries in phonological rules". In his opinion, ranking is the only function of boundaries with respect to phonological rules. He establishes five possible ranks, viz. the sentence boundary, the strong word boundary, the weak word boundary, the morpheme boundary and the syllable boundary (i.e. the syllable is also treated as a unit of rank). In the paper he presents his views against the background of other hypotheses on the function of boundaries.

In "A nonsegmental model for description and analysis" T. D. Griffen attempts to build a nonsegmental model of phonology by collecting and systematizing the already existing suggestions about the possible hierarchical nature of speech. He bases his concept on the findings of dynamic phonetics.

Finally, mention should be made of the paper by R. Lass entitled "Undigested history and synchronic 'structure'." From the bulk of detailed phonetic material about vowel lengthening and vowel retraction in American English the author deduces the existence of fossilized, unfinished historical processes which he calls "undigested history" in the language. This discovery contributes to the study of the relation between synchrony and diachrony in linguistic description.

One critical remark suggests itself in connection with the choice of the articles included in the volume under review. If the book aspires to be a relatively exhaustive and comprehensive survey of the trends in phonological research of the past decade, then an obvious lack is any contribution devoted to phonostylistic studies. A paper on this subject might have been able to give both a rapid/casual speech perspective to the theoretical explorations in phonology and, possibly, impetus to further study in this somewhat neglected area (although one must not overlook outstanding works of linguists like Zwicky, Dressler or Rubach). However, one criticism should not and cannot conceal the extreme value of the book the study of which should be advantageous for all interested in the field.

REFERENCES

- Dressler, W. 1973. "On rule ordering in casual speech styles". *WLG* 4. 3-9.
 Fischer-Jørgensen, E. 1975. *Trends in Phonological Theory*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
 Fujimura, O. (ed.). 1973. *Three Dimensions in Phonological Theory*. Tokyo: TEC.

- Halle, M. 1978. "Formal vs. functional considerations in phonology". Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Kean, M. L. 1974. "The strict cycle in phonology". *Ling. Inq.* 5. 179-204.
- Kiparsky, P. 1968. "How abstract is phonology?" In Fujimura, (ed.) 1973. 5-56.
- Kiparsky, P. 1973. "Abstractness, opacity and global rules". In Fujimura, (ed.) 1973. 57-86.
- Rubach, J. 1974. *Variability of Consonants in English and Polish*. Unpublished Ph. D. diss. University of Warsaw.
- Rubach, J. 1977. "Contrastive phonostylistics". *PSi CL* 6. 63-72.
- Zwicky, A. 1972. "On casual speech". *Papers from the 8th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Battle and Quest: The American Fable of the Nineteen-Sixties. By Elżbieta Oleksy. Pp. 91. Warszawa-Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1983. Reviewed by L. L. Lee, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Wa.

This is an interesting, intelligent, and useful book. For Elżbieta Oleksy's purpose here is to enable us to better read the works of authors, often rather difficult authors, who are involved in what now seems a major movement in American (and other) literature(s), the "post-modernist" movement. She does this by giving us terms and a methodology that applies, on the surface, only to a few particular works of a few authors of one decade. But, as I think it will become clear, one can use her approaches to examine many, if not most, "post-modernist" American authors. (We will see, though, that she finds a peculiarly American slant to the conclusions of many of these novels).

Dr. Oleksy points out that "post-modernist" does not refer simply to a time but rather to what one might call an attitude. This attitude is not necessarily the author's beliefs or stance in the face of "reality" but, rather, the way the *work* treats its matter. And "matter" is both reality and language. "William Styron, Bernard Malamud, and Graham Green are not post-modern writers. ... On the other hand, such writers as Franz Kafka, Gertrude Stein and Bruno Schulz... wrote fiction which we would now consider post-modern". (p. 3).

She also notes that there are at least two major and "frequently overlapping" strands in post-modern fiction of which we should be aware: the first, so-called "meta-fiction", is characterized by "formal experimentation", by, indeed, self-reflection. The second strand is marked by "the resurgence of certain genres and conventions, such as, for example, romance and fable".

Oleksy begins her analysis of the 1960's American "fable" by arguing that much modern "experimental" fiction makes use of a literary form that most of us would regard as utterly worn out, the "allegory". But "allegory", as used by modern writers, is never "pure allegory". Such modern works look back to "Ariosto, Goethe and Hawthorne" rather than to the rigid allegory of the medieval moment, even when they use the medieval romance, as read by Jessie L. Weston, as a basis. This "allegory" is multifaceted, the symbolic and the actual brought together in such a way that one cannot neatly divide them into narrative and meaning. (She points to the truth that, of course, no "realistic" work is ever "an absolute rendition of objective reality, nor is fable completely divorced from reality"). But the modern fable is, to use Robert Scholes' term, a "fabulation", a "storytelling, with a particular sense of pleasure in form". And one must add one other element: such "fabulation" expresses a certain "spirit of playfulness".

but Oleksy does not mean "play" just as recreation, but play as conscious ambiguity, a deliberate denial of any "consistent allegorical pattern".

This kind of "allegory", Oleksy argues, is present in modern "fabulation" in forms she calls "Battle" and "Quest". Battle she further divides into "philosophic ambivalence" and "emotive ambivalence". And she sees three kinds of Quest: "1. the existential Quest; 2. the Perceval version of the Quest; 3. the Gawain version of the Quest".

Oleksy takes up Battle first. And, if there is a weakness in the book, it is with this term and her use of it. The discussions of the novels she treats under the term seem sometimes a bit mechanical and not always related to the term itself. But this is, I think, because the term, as defined, demands that the works be more rigidly patterned than perhaps they are in actuality.

Battle and Quest differ, Oleksy says, structurally. Battle reflects a kind of stasis, a symmetry whose movement is not linear but back and forth, a "see-sawing"; it is essentially "mental", even though there may be much action. Quest, on the other hand, is a "ritual form" that implies "a moving sequence". What happens is of importance. Too, "a characteristic theme of Battle is temptation... but the notion of... 'goal'" is essential to Quest. Obviously, then, the two are not absolutes; obviously they blend into one another.

Still, Quest seems a better means of explaining narrative, story, than Battle. And all the works that Oleksy considers here do tell stories, even stories on the low level of "and then", as E. M. Forster defines "story" in *Aspects of the Novel*. Quest, then, seems the book's central thematic term; Battle is secondary.

Nevertheless, I do not wish to make too much of this. For Battle does help us understand the function of the structure, and thereby give us the meanings, of such "existentialist" works as John Barth's *The End of the Road* and Norman Mailer's *An American Dream*. Certainly the protagonists of these novels have no real "goal" in mind, except perhaps the sense of being fully alive.

Oleksy defines the conflict, the Battle, in Barth's *Road* as philosophic ambivalence. One must read the conflicting forces as essentially intellectual balances: as example, Oleksy sees the three major figures this way, "Rennie Morgan (a 'tabula rasa'), Joe Morgan (Positive Force), Jacob Horner (Negative Force)". And it is what one might call the struggle between Joe and Jacob over Rennie that brings about the catastrophe. But these characters are never really developed as characters; they are ideas, i.e., exemplars of an allegory of modern existence.

Emotive ambivalence, on the other hand is based upon "taboo", and is thus concerned with "temptation". The tabooed "object" is often desirable but a danger. To violate a taboo is to take risks, and so to live with some intensity, perhaps to live authentically, as opposed to the simple acceptance of societal mores. It is, as Oleksy quotes Mailer, "to set out on that uncharted journey into the rebellious imperatives of the self". The violences of *An American Dream* are not simply violences but a necessary element in Stephen Rojack's search for authenticity (this "search" suggests that Quest is an element in the novel. And Rojack does, as Oleksy says, "light out for new territories at the end", just as Huck Finn did). Yet the novel is filled with ambiguities that undercut the Quest. One can begin with the title, a title that brings up a series of oppositions which are not resolved. Indeed, it is the doubleness of this novel that makes it a good lead-in to the following discussion.

Using Quest as her operative term, Oleksy now examines Walker Percy's *The Moviegoer*, Ken Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, and Thomas Pynchon's *The Crying of Lot 49*. The *Moviegoer* is an "existential quest", she says. The protagonist of the novel, Binx Bolling, is both ordinary and extraordinary; he seeks (and finds)

a purpose to his life not in the ordinary but in "the idea" which in his case is the commitment to provide mental support" for a woman. This positive choice, Oleksy says, may be "makosht", but it is oddly American as opposed to the European — the European existentialist is utterly pessimistic.

As noted above, Oleksy reads *Cuckoo's Nest* and *Lot 49* as, essentially, romances, i.e., types of allegory. And, of course, the reaching of a goal is the end of all romances. *Cuckoo's Nest*, as an example of the Perceval pattern, puts its emphasis "on the condition of the Fisher King"; the "waste-land", the modern world of conformity, forms the background. It is the sacrifice of McMurphy, the Grail Knight, which enables the "Fisher King", Chief Bromden, to return to life — to return to the natural.

Her reading of *Lot 49*, as good a reading as one will find, shows us how the romance elements are really made modern. Here, the waste land is all important, since it is San Narciso, and San Narciso is "present day America". Even the novel's pervasive tone of nostalgia reflects the wish for a world, that America, before the Fall, before the loss of meaning. Above all, though, this modern world is marked by "entropy", the tendency towards randomness — here, towards the "disintegration of language", and so the failure of communication among people, among Americans. Still, if Oedipa Maas is another Grail Knight, looking for "her own deliverance"; if we do not know what she finds at the end, the novel does not close with an image of defeat but rather of waiting. There may be, once more and despite all, a kind of hope.

John Webster Citizen and Dramatist. By M. C. Bradbrook. Pp 218. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980. Reviewed by Ewa Elandt-Jankowska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

F. L. Lucas, upon re-editing Webster's *The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfi* (1958), said "less is known of the life of John Webster than of those of the great Greek dramatists". Indeed, a few references in Henslowe's *Diary* and the publication dates of Webster's works have been, until recently, the only records from which one could infer something about the life of this darkest of Jacobean tragic poets. The blanks in our knowledge of Webster began to be filled with the discoveries of Mary Edmond. Her *In Search of John Webster* (1976) was the first attempt at tracing the dramatist's family origins. We learn from Edmond's article that he lived in the north-west quarter of London, not far from the Middle Temple, the Fortune and the Red Bull theatres.

Professor Bradbrook, acknowledging the discoveries of Mary Edmond, expands the scope of her study to include London's social history, its three monarchs, its courtiers, legends and naturally, its theatre. Her knowledge of the period allows her to competently evaluate one of its major dramatists, realising all the while, that many of the questions regarding Webster's life and art must still be left unanswered.

The work is presented in two parts. The first, headed under a self descriptive title *The London of John Webster*, is divided into four chapters: (1) *The Websters of West Smithfield*, (2) *The Middle Temple: a Literary Centre*, (3) *The Lady of St Bartholomew's: a London Legend*, and (4) *Antonio Pérez, the Spanish Spy: a London Legend*.

In this section Professor Bradbrook focuses on the exterior forces forming Webster, the future dramatist. She demonstrates how the ideas and attitudes of four well-known figures of Elizabethan London, influenced the playwright. The first important insights Webster attained at the Merchant Taylors' School. Its original High Master, Richard Mulcaster (the first of Bradbrook's figures), rather than concentrating on disciplines as separate entities, aimed at developing the person as a whole. His students were instructed in reading, acting, painting, dancing, wrestling, etc. The craft of writing and speaking

in the native language, however, was stressed the most. Mulcaster's system of developing man's physical and mental resources, the system that Webster must have absorbed, is given considerable attention in this chapter.

Though there is no final evidence that Webster entered the Middle Temple, his association with Marston and Ford (both members of the Society), his preoccupation with court scenes and, finally, the entry of a "John Webster of London" in the Inn's records, credibly document Professor Bradbrook's premise that Webster was a Templarian.

The chapter on the Middle Temple provides an interesting account of its festivities. The spirit of these Revels, as the festivities were called, later was to be revealed in the writings of John Webster, at this point the Inn's freshman. He was admitted to the Society in 1598, at the time of the quarrel between two Utter Barristers, John Davies (the second of Bradbrook's personages) and Richard Martin. The former, a talented writer, whose literary tastes inspired Webster, was expelled from the Society for making a physical assault on Martin. Other members of the Temple who came to fore during Webster's education, and, thus, might have affected his personal development, are discussed here. Professor Bradbrook shows, for instance, how Marston's style, with its ironic reversals and elements of parody or satire, was the foundation on which Webster built his own dramatic poetry. As it is indicated in the *Notes*, much of the material for the discussion of the Inn's cultural milieu, comes from Philip Finkerpearl's: *John Marston of the Middle Temple*, and from Krueger — Nemser's Introduction to their edition of John Davies' poetry.

The two remaining chapters of *Part One* deal less directly with Webster, nonetheless, they foreshadow what will appear in his dramatic works. Both centre around the lives of the two legendary figures of the seventeenth century London, Lady Penelope Devereux Rich and Antonio Pérez. The author has chosen them to "provide for the modern reader a re-entry into Webster's world, not by reconstruction but by reconstitution" (p. 2). Penelope, extolled by many poets (Sidney's Stella) appears in Miss Bradbrook's presentation as a prototype of the Duchess of Malfi. There is also much in her of Webster's Vittoria Corombona.

Lastly, there comes Pérez — an ingenious double agent from Spain. The vicissitudes of this remarkable character make in this book a chronicle of political games in the seventeenth century Europe. The reader is expertly guided through the intricate web of intelligence networks, encounters, courtly intrigues, disguises and treasons. Those familiar with Webster's major tragedies will find Pérez gradually emerging as an amalgam of Bosola and Flamineo. Miss Bradbrook argues that "Bosola's insecurity, his bitter jesting and self-mockery... his love of disguises as a mode of psychological relief can all be found in Pérez" (p. 146). The same attitudes link Pérez with Flamineo.

But it is not the author's intention to draw endless analogies between the characters of Webster's London and those that populate his plays. Chapters three and four aim rather at a comprehensive understanding of how these legends contributed to the writer's personal development, and were worked into a high tragedy. From several sources that provide the accounts for these two respective careers, Professor Bradbrook directs our special attention to Ringler's edition of Sidney's poems, and to Ungerer's work: *A Spaniard in Elizabethan England; the Correspondence of Antonio Pérez's Exile* (1975—6).

In the *Second Part* of the volume, the author moves to examine Webster's specific works. This section is also divided into four chapters, rounded off by the conclusive *Final Perspective*.

The Plays of London Life, as the initial chapter of this part is entitled, surveys John Webster's theatrical activity between 1602—1606. Regrettably, the records of his contri-

bution to the theatre at the turn of the century are sketchy, and insufficient for the author to fully estimate the playwright's involvement in it. However, by weaving City affairs with the theatre industry of that time, Professor Bradbrook establishes the socio-cultural climate in which Webster's dramatic endeavours were inaugurated. She asserts that his name was first mentioned in Henslowe's *Diary* in 1602. According to those records, Webster and collaborators were to receive money for the plays: *Caesar's Fall* (performed in spring of that year), *Lady Jane* and *Christmas Comes but Once a Year* (performed in the autumn season).

Adequately supported by the preceding discussion, sections on *The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfi* show how the outer world, in which Webster took acute interest, now is turned into a stage-world. The author also points out the crucial influences of the Merchant Taylors' and the Middle Temple education. In her analysis of *The White Devil* the reader's attention is first drawn to various methods of the dramatic projection. One of them is a technique of "shifting perspectives". It allows the audiences, as well as the characters in the play, to alternate views; to see as many variations of a single relationship, or action, as they wish. "Webster uses this art both for presenting his figures, and for their inter-relations, their views of one another". This, Bradbrook continues, "forces the spectator to review them, rebuild them; the activity of interpretation exercises him in a kind of action, as well as in solving a kind of puzzle" (p. 126). Closely allied with the above is a technique of "disjoined speeches" (for example, Flaminio's death speech). Professor Bradbrook points out, quite interestingly, that the staccato rhythm in the verse, reflects the character's abrupt shifts of mood. In due course, the chapter concentrates on the confusion surrounding Webster's verbal borrowings. Professor Bradbrook's concern is to prove that a Merchant Taylor scholar would employ borrowed sentences judiciously, often modifying them to his purpose. Webster was likely to use Ralph Johnson's *Scholar's Guide from the Accidence to the University* (1665), where the rules how to "allude to sentences of authors" were prescribed (p. 138).

The Duchess of Malfi is approached from a theatrical perspective, too. Reflecting on the old, as well as the contemporary sources of the tragedy, and providing a character analysis of the leading dramatis personae, the chapter is concluded by a discussion on a masque-like character of the play. In the author's own words, the drama "from beginning to end, depends upon varying or enlarging, contracting or inverting the forms of a masque" (p. 161). Bradbrook, then, proceeds to demonstrate how certain scenes of "inverted rites"¹ (Hurt 1962: 42-7) are, in fact, little masquerades that aim at the "unfolding" of the characters. Quite thought provoking is the author's suggestion about correlation between the art of Webster, and that of Inigo Jones. In her view, Webster's step-by-step revelations of character recall Inigo Jones's gradual alterations in scenery, which he introduced in Jonson's *The Masque of Oberon* (1611). Jones designed sets of sliding shutters which, while moving, eventually revealed Oberon, thus supporting the highpoint of the masque.

The Citizen at Drury Lane concludes the *Second Part* of the volume. It shows Webster vigorously defending a "common player", at whom slanders were often hurled from some "gentlemen of the Inns". By presenting him as a poet, a designer (Webster was the author of a big pageant show, *Monuments of Honour* (1624), and lastly as a liveryman (since 1615 he had been a member of the Merchant Taylors' Company — the presiding Livery Company) Miss Bradbrook completes the first full portrait of perhaps the greatest

¹ Ferdinand's gift of a dagger, or the prison scenes, are the examples of "inverted rites" in *The Duchess of Malfi*. The concept of reversed formal practices in Webster is analysed at length by J. Hurt (1962: 42-47).

Jacobean poet after Shakespeare. By examining the dramatist's works, and by providing richly layered account of the seventeenth century London theatre, politics and people, she has shown that there is a striking resemblance between several historical facts, and the plays that John Webster wrote. By such a method of presentation, the playwright's whereabouts became partly penetrable.

Naturally, the readers may have reservations, especially on details relating Webster's school years and his familiarity with certain historical personages. It is here where much evidence is lacking, and factual information is mainly guesswork. One is also likely to take issue with some aspects of the plays' interpretation (the most characteristic ones were given a brief consideration in this review). In all these cases, however, Professor Bradbrook makes it clear that she suggests topics for further investigations, and does not claim that her statements are incontrovertible.

The body of *John Webster Citizen and Dramatist* is complemented by a map of Webster's neighbourhood, a table of dates, and Webster's family tree. These, along with notes, a select bibliography and index, make a neatly unified study, addressed not only to the scholars of Elizabethan theatre and drama, but to the educated general reader as well. Preceded by Miss Bradbrook's six works, issued as *A History of Elizabethan Drama* (Cambridge University Press, 1979), this volume could be a seventh in this great series.

REFERENCES

- Edmond, M. 1976. "In search of John Webster". *Times literary supplement*, Dec. 24.
Hurt, J. 1962. "Inverted rituals in Webster's *The white devil*". *Journal of English and German philology*, 61. 42-47.