

R E V I E W S

A Transformational Syntax: The Grammar of Modern American English. By Baxter Hathaway. Pp. X, 315. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1967.
Reviewed by Waldemar Marton, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

Someone said that whether the transformational grammar will ultimately triumph over other current linguistic theories or not, its impact upon modern linguistic thought has been so great that no linguistic description after the appearance of this theory will be the same as it might have been before it. The good proof for the validity of this assertion is the new book by Baxter Hathaway, entitled *A Transformational Syntax*. To a reader familiar with most of the contemporary transformational literature, the book may seem peculiar at first glance in that it does not contain the usual formulas, rules, and drawings representing phrase markers, and other exponents of proper transformational algebra. Yet while reading it, we see that the title is by no means misleading, as, in his book, the author takes the approach and applies the concepts and terminology developed by transformational grammar, although he retains a lot of his own terms and ideas. The author's assumption is that it is impossible to claim that a grammar generates all and only the grammatical sentences of a language and that it does this in a formal and explicit way. Hathaway is of the opinion that the insistence on mathematical precision and explicitness in linguistic description may even thwart and retard the development of linguistics, and that generative and transformational grammars are not necessarily dependent upon the kind of highly "technical" thinking associated so far with the creators and promoters of such grammars. This kind of approach may be, at least in my opinion, symptomatic of certain tendencies among contemporary grammarians who have readily adopted basic transformational concepts, but do not believe a living, natural language can be represented by a finite set of formulized rules, and are irritated by the present-day emphasis on associating linguistic description with computers or communication theory. Perhaps the distinction made by linguists between the so-called scientific grammars and pedagogical grammars will be further specified in such a way that the latter will be more or less of the form represented by Hathaway's book, while the former will follow the classical and more rigorous lines. Whatever the development will be in the future, the book under discussion is interesting enough at the present stage of transformational expansion to commend a closer inspection of its contents.

Like other transformationalists, the author also views syntax as the device for forming sentences. Yet he is more outspoken on what a sentence is, or, rather, not a sentence but a *predication*, as it is the term the author uses, trying to represent by this term both the essential function and the components of the sentence. A *formal predication*, then, is a clause containing a subject-part and a finite verb together with any other complements and modifiers it may possess. Both independent and dependent

clauses are thus formal predications. In his book, the author investigates how these formal predications are formed and manipulated by the syntactic rules of the English language. His main interest is in the generation of syntactic structures, and to account for this process he uses all the most basic transformational concepts, considering all the more complex structures as derived from basic ones through various transformational operations. His own peculiar contribution is the way in which he views English syntax as the battlefield between three main systems competing with one another. The author's belief is that Chomsky and his followers, in their application of linguistic analysis, have ignored the polysystemic nature of present-day English, and that the realization of the competition among these syntactic systems is very important for all grammatical and stylistic considerations. The three systems mentioned above are the analytic system, the synthetic system, and the compositional system. As an example of the choice among these three we may consider the following structures of modification: (a) the United States' steel production (b) the steel production of the United States (c) the United States steel production where (a) represents the synthetic, (b) -- the analytic, and (c) -- the compositional system. It seems that the consistent consideration and representation of the choices offered by these three systems is one of the great merits of Hathaway's syntactic analysis.

After the introduction of his views concerning the polysystemic nature of the English language, the author (in Chapter Three) gives the list of the most important relational concepts that are expressed by particular syntactic devices of the English language. As he admits, this listing has been taken primarily from Latin grammar. Although it is fairly complete and seems to cover all the essential grammatical relations in English, this list is at best an approximation, because the relational categories specified overlap and there are no-man's-land areas between them.

Then, in Chapter Four, the author proceeds to the discussion of the parts of speech, trying not to confuse the formal and the functional criteria of classification. Accordingly, he readily classifies nouns, verbs and adjectives into three distinct form classes, following Fries's classificational criteria, but he has trouble with adverbs and he is quite right in pointing out that when we usually classify words as adverbs we do it most often considering various functions of these words in a sentence much in the same way as when we call certain phrases adverbials. In fact, very few derivational shifts come from the adverb class, and most of the words we call adverbs are derived from adjectives (*quickly* < *quick*, *intensely* < *intense*). Thus the adverb class is, according to Hathaway, almost an appendage to the adjective class. There are some base adverbs, such as *often*, *seldom*, *then*, *now*, etc., but the list is so short that we may consider these words to be practically function words or analytic particles. Concerning other parts of speech, the author follows the classical structuralist classification, with some additional insights and remarks made from the transformational point of view which concern mainly functional shifts of words belonging to particular classes by addition of derivational affixes.

Chapter Five deals with the basic patterns of formal predication, or, using the classical transformational terminology, with the kernel of the language. The author discusses first some of the difficulties facing anyone who wants to establish these basic patterns and then, in an obvious wish to oversimplify and to reduce the number of these patterns as much as possible, he proposes only three obviously most basic patterns which are:

1. Subject + intransitive verb (with possible adverbial complement)
2. Subject + transitive verb + direct object (with or without indirect object)
3. Subject + copulative verb (*be*) + predicate noun, predicate adjective, or whatever other phrase or clause or kind of construction can function as predicator after a copula.

At this point it might be said that it is very characteristic of his approach to discuss

first various difficulties involved in any kind of linguistic analysis or classification, and then to resort to oversimplification in his ultimate solution. Of course, it is good that he does it consciously and makes his readers aware of this, but this procedure seems to me to be, at least, controversial. Wouldn't it be more rewarding for someone who sees so many fine points and distinctions connected with a linguistic analysis to attempt somewhat more comprehensive divisions and classifications?

In this chapter we can find an interesting solution concerning the so-called objective complement. The author is very much against the well known Paul Roberts's treatment of the unit comprised of verb, direct object and objective complement, according to which the objective complement is substantially part of the verb phrase, moved to the position following the direct object by an obligatory transformation (Paul Roberts, *English Syntax*, alternate edition, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964: 160-77). According to the above mentioned scholar, the sentence *I considered him a fool* is a transformational rearrangement of the source *I considered - a fool him*. The author is of the opinion that the whole unit *him a fool* should be considered the reduction of a predication (*him to be a fool* < *he is a fool*), functioning as a direct object. In this way he removes the objective complement construction from the area of basic sentence patterns to that of transforms and included predications. It seems that it is a much better solution than that suggested by Roberts, and it is quite in accord with later versions of transformational analysis of English syntax. In his discussion of copula variants in the same chapter, Hathaway points out two interesting problems, which, to my knowledge, have not been worked out by transformational theory so far. One of them is the syntactic status of the structure of intransitive verb + adjective when the adjective seems to function somewhere between a predicate adjective (following *be*) and a result adjunct (*bang shut*, *blow open*, *break loose*). The other problem concerns the sentence containing what Curme called a *predicate appositive*. In the author's opinion, this structure results from a transformation. In the sentence *He died rich*, two predications are implied: *he died* and *he was rich*, so that the sentence could be rewritten as *When he died, he was rich*. The question that comes to mind here is how this particular structure could be accounted for by the formalized and later, post-Aspects version of transformational grammar, to which, incidentally, the author never refers, as, probably, he was not acquainted with it yet at the time of writing his book.

In Chapter Six, entitled "First Level Transformation", the author deals with the most fundamental transformations effecting mainly rearrangements of the basic sentence patterns, such as the question, negation, and passive transformations. Since the author is not interested in the formulation of precise transformational rules, the description of the above mentioned syntactic operations is not much different from the one that may be found in any traditional textbook of English grammar, apart from the occasional use of some transformational terminology. Nor is it more enlightening. When we compare this chapter to a formalized presentation of the same operations, as given by Chomsky, Paul Roberts, or Owen Thomas, we can see that the latter treatment is really revealing as it gives us a new insight into the inner workings of the subtle and precise mechanisms of the language. The role and functions of the dummy tense carrier *do* in interrogative, negative, and emphatic structures, for instance, are really shown in a new light in the syntactic analyses by the above mentioned scholars, and not so much in the present book, and it seems to me that it is only this novel approach that is able to generate „the awe for ourselves and our abilities as we come to an imperfect understanding of the subtle mechanisms that we unconsciously employ", which, in Hathaway's own words (91), is the chief value the study of a language may bring to the native speaker. It is my belief that such reflections as this one may occasionally arise

in the mind of any reader studying the book under discussion, who is also familiar with other transformational works. Such reflections may engender doubt in Hathaway's assumption that formalized versions of transformational grammar are useful chiefly for computers. The section describing the derivation of pre-positional adjectives from predicate adjectives in basic copula predications offers an interesting distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives from the point of view of their transformational history. The author agrees that both categories are transforms of predicate adjectives, but a difference between the two kinds does exist in respect to the point in some "ideal" time in which the transformation has taken place. So if we consider the sentences *A good Indian is a dead Indian* and *Behind the bush lay a dead Indian*, the first *dead* represents a transformation prior in time to the second one.

The author's treatment of adverbs and adverbials is also proof of his very good transformational insight or instinct, as it might be called, since he distinguishes between adverbs which seem to be necessary predicate complements occupying positions in basic sentence patterns and other adverbs which in fact function as transforms.

Chapter Seven, entitled "Redistributions", deals mainly with the kind of construction in which a copula is followed by a predicate adjective and an infinitive. This structure is highly ambiguous and may be accounted for by at least five varieties of redistributions (or, in other words, structural rearrangements) that all end up with this surface pattern.

In the next chapter, devoted to dependent clauses, the author discusses relative clauses and adverbial clauses in a rather traditional way, and, reading these sections, we again have the impression that this is just another traditional textbook of English grammar. The section describing noun clauses is much more interesting, because Hathaway very rightly explains various complex structures as transforms resulting from nominalizations of the predicate parts of source sentences. So, for instance, the construction that occurs when the noun clause is in so-called close apposition as, e.g., *His argument that the Congress should adjourn surprised no one*, is considered to be derived from a source sentence in which the noun clause functions as the direct object of the verb activity still resident in the noun derived from a verb of mental activity. This source, in our case, will be the formal predication *He argued that the Congress should adjourn*.

Chapter Nine, dealing with semi-predicative structures, seems to be one of the most interesting and revealing in the whole book and it contains some very significant generalizations reaching into the very core of the language system. Two obvious kinds of semi-predicative structures, discussed by the author in this chapter, are appositive phrases and participial phrases. These units are called semi-predicative because, although they are derived from full predications, they are in their transformed condition not formally complete predications in themselves. They are included structures and they contain one of the two essential parts of a formal predication — the predicate-part. The subject-part of the included structure is present in the matrix sentence and it thus exists upon a higher linguistic level than does the predicate-part.

The term *semi-predicative structure* is certainly very well chosen and is helpful towards the understanding of transformational reality named by it. An appositive phrase represents the truncation of the predicate of a copula predication by the deletion of *be*, leaving the predicate word or phrase as predicator. A participial phrase similarly represents a truncation of a basic sentence pattern, by the transformation of any transitive or intransitive verb to one of its participial forms (active, past, passive), leaving unchanged any direct object, indirect object, or any dependent unit in the predicate part of the source predication.

Then the author discusses other kinds of reduced and semi-reduced predications,

First of all, absolute constructions and 'with' constructions are dealt with, and they are presented by the author as dependent units containing both subject-part and predicate-part, neither of which is shared with any unit on a higher linguistic level. Then we proceed to the description of infinitives and infinitive phrases, which, according to the author's assumptions, derive from verbs but are not verbs, since both formally and functionally only finite forms are verbs. As with other structures, the author is particularly concerned with the derivation of the above mentioned transforms and with what happens to subjects and agents of the verbs which are sources of these constructs. Apart from abstract infinitive phrases without explicit subjects, functioning nominally (e.g. *To see is to believe*), the author views infinitive phrases as one-nucleus reductions and two-nuclei reductions. The former are parts of sentences in which the subject of the verb acts as subject of a direct object infinitive, e.g. *He decided to go home* < *He decided that he ought to go home*. Two-nuclei reductions are infinitive phrases which function as direct objects and which have their own subjects, e.g. *We considered him to be a hero* < *We considered that he was a hero*.

In Chapter Twelve the author describes the derivation of noun-headed reduced predications, by which he means various kinds of gerund phrases and abstract noun phrases, the latter being derived either from verbs (like *decision, rejection, request*) or from predicate adjectives (like *scarcity, serenity, goodness*).

In the last chapter of the book, the author briefly sketches a grammar of compositional phrasing. This term is used to name the syntactic arrangements by which approximate relations are expressed by compounds, forming thus a distinct system — the compositional system. In spite of the fact that most of the elaborate compounds in English have noun-heads, the author resists the temptation to consider this system merely one of the sub-divisions of nominal phrasings, because some compounds are adjective-headed (like *pearl gray, baby soft*), some are verb-headed (like *she baby-sits, he money-watches*), and some have *-ing* words as heads (like *high-flying, far-shooting*). The author tries to find some general ordering principles in an almost infinite variety of compositional phrasings and describes some principal kinds of compositional reductions in terms of transformational processes accounting for their derivation.

After this short presentation of the contents of the book, we shall now turn to some more general comments and remarks. It seems that Hathaway's chief concern is to show relations holding between various syntactic structures of the English language in terms of their derivation from one another. As the basic syntactic unit the author recognizes a full predication, which is defined as a clause containing a subject-part and a finite verb together with any other complements and modifiers it may possess. This basic unit manifests itself in three elementary variations, called basic patterns of formal predication. This assumption imposes a definite directioning of transformational changes, which go from full to reduced predications. On the whole, the author presents this concept of English syntax in a consistent and convincing way. Yet the reader acquainted with formalized transformational descriptions may be of the impression that these presentations show us language as a system in a better way. By this I mean that in formalized descriptions transformational rules are tied up with one another in an obvious attempt to limit their number for the sake of economy. To whatever extent we may fail in our attempts to generate all the grammatical sentences of a language by a finite set of rules, in our struggle to reach this goal we may bring to light many important generalizations which would otherwise escape unnoticed. Syntactic descriptions like the one under discussion seem to be less concerned with this important methodological principle. On the other hand, it is easy enough to see the theoretical grounds for our decision concerning what is basic and what is derived in a formalized

version of transformational grammar where we are guided by the above mentioned principle of explicitly demonstrated economy. It is not so easy and sometimes even quite impossible to account in some consistent way for the stipulated directioning of transformations in a non-formalized description, unless we are satisfied with the explanation that it is our intuition that has suggested a given decision. It is very characteristic of Hathaway's approach to often suggest various possible derivations for a given transform (see his discussion of the derivation of pre-positional adjectives in Chapter Six), but he considers each of the proposed transformations somehow independently of any others and, consequently, finds it difficult to decide which of the possibilities might be accepted and which should be definitely rejected.

Talking about formalizations, I also find it difficult to agree with the author's attitude towards one of the claims made by the writers of formalized transformational grammars. They claim that in these formalized versions the intelligence of the user is not called upon in manipulating the rules. Accordingly, Hathaway believes that this renders these grammars "ultimately doubtful as a philosophical or educational discipline, since only by allowing fluid understanding to the user of the grammar can complete re-tooling be avoided every time the language changes or varies" (20). What is claimed on the part of transformationalists by the above mentioned principle is simply that our grammatical description should be quite explicit and that nothing can be left unsaid or implied as known to the native speaker of the language. But, certainly, the forming of such explicit rules and the understanding of their functioning within the whole system require a great deal of intelligence and the ability to abstract. And it is precisely this explicitness that has a great philosophical and educational value since only it makes it possible for the reader to see what a complex and ingenious system language is.

Yet, in spite of these considerations, we must admit that at least in one respect the book under discussion is richer and better than other current formalized grammars. As the author is not bound by any strict formalizations and does not expect them of his readers, he is free to use samples of real English for his examples and exercises. Each chapter in the book closes with the section entitled "Materials for Exercise and Further Study". All these sections contain very well selected materials and very useful exercises providing a lot of practice in both linguistic analysis and transformational (although not formalized) derivations. The reader may feel relieved that, at last, those exercises and materials utilize the kind of English that is really spoken and written by the grown-up people of today. Here we at last see English in all its richness and complexity, instead of rather strange sentences, very simple in structure and bizarre in vocabulary, full of pterodaetyls, monsters, abstract notions frightening the reader, and other things like these with which we have been made familiar by other transformational grammars.

To conclude, *A Transformational Syntax* may be considered a very useful book. It will be useful for the general reader who wants to learn how his language operates. It will be useful for those students of English syntax who want to become familiar with a more modern approach, but are frightened away from formalized grammars by their mathematical associations. It will be useful for linguists concerned with the formalization of English syntax, who can utilize many of the concepts and materials presented in the book. It seems that even if in the future we witness a further development of the computer-type of transformational grammar, there will be a place for books like this one.

Die Expanded Form im Altenglischen. Vorkommen, Funktion und Herkunft der Umschreibung "beon/wesan + Partizip Präsens". By G. Nickel. Pp. 400. Neumünster: Karl Wachholtz Verlag, 1966.

Reviewed by Jacek Fisiak, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

No satisfactory up-to-date account of Old English syntax has so far been published and, therefore, any contribution based on recent linguistic findings is more than welcome among researchers in the field.

G. Nickel's opus is one of such entirely modern works. It deserves special attention for two reasons. Firstly, because it is one of the first attempts to apply a transformational-generative framework (based on Chomsky 1957 and 1964, Lees 1960 and Bach 1964) to the analysis of Old English syntax, i.e. to the analysis of an aspect of the history of English. Secondly, because the attempt is successful and solves beyond any doubt several debatable queries concerning a problem in the syntactic component of Old English, i.e. the expanded form (the periphrastic locution of the type *beon/wesan + present participle*), an issue which is by no means a peripheral one.

Nickel's work is, moreover, the most thorough and well-documented presentation in the field of historical linguistics produced in the last twenty years or so.

The purpose of the work, as indicated in the subtitle, is to present the origin and functions of the expanded form (henceforth abbreviated EF) in Old English as well as to characterize its occurrences.

There is no doubt that this purpose has been fully accomplished by the author.

The material of the book has been organized in five chapters and *Conclusions* which are followed by a bibliography, appendices, name index, and English, French and Russian summaries.

The methodological premises underlying the whole work have been lucidly presented in chapter one (*Grundsätzliches*, 17 - 58). Chapter two (59 - 82) contains a review of EFF in various languages outside English. The occurrences of EFF in Old English poetry and prose both independent and translated from Latin have been described in chapter three (83 - 207). The functions and origin of EF have been discussed in chapter four (208 - 67) and five (268 - 300) respectively.

Having applied the transformational approach to the analysis of thousands of Old English sentences, Nickel has brought to our attention and formalized what usually remained unnoticed in earlier studies, i.e. the fact that the locutions of the type *beon/wesan + present participle* are by no means homogeneous formations. In point of fact they may be *surface* representations of two entirely different *deep* structures. E.g.,

(1) *He is in temple lærende*

may have represented due to the relatively free word order in Old English the following two strings:

(2) *NP + Tense + Aspect + Vi + Loc*

(3) *NP + S' + Tense + be + Pred*

The Modern English equivalent sentences to (2) and (3) due to the rigid word order may properly illustrate the problem.

(2) *He is in temple lærende* = *He is teaching in the temple.*

(3) *He is in temple lærende* = *He is in the temple teaching.*

Thus, in (2) we have a true expanded form, whereas in (3) an appositive participle construction derived from *S'* by means of an appositive transformation as follows:

- (4) $NP (+NP' + Tense + Aspect + Vt) + Tense + be + Pred \Rightarrow NP + ende + Vt + Tense + be + Pred.$

Other transformations will next re-arrange the order of elements in the string so that we can get (3).

Nickel has demonstrated beyond any doubt that the expanded form is an *idiomatic native category*. A close investigation of several Old English translations and paraphrases of Latin texts (e.g. *Glosses, Cura Pastoralis, Orosius, Boethius, Bede*) as well as of a large amount of native prose works has shown that the occurrence of expanded forms was independent of Latin sources. The fact that the constructions were rare in Old English poetry (an argument used earlier to prove the foreign origin of EFF), as has been rightly pointed out in the book, does not prove in the least that they were not native. These forms are also rare in modern English verse.

The author has convincingly shown that the periphrastic constructions *þeon/wesan + pres. part.* had the following functions in Old English:

1. The indication of temporary validity (243-4), as in
(5) ... *he wæs sin þyrstende monnes blodes...*
2. Duration, although it can often be expressed by a simple form (244 ff.), e.g.,
(6) ... *and wæron swiþor winnende on Thebane þonne hie fultumes hæfde, and hloþum on hie staleden, oð hie abræcan Arceædum heora burg...*
3. Frame of time reference, as in the sentence (254 ff.)
(7) ... *þæt þæt scip wæs ealne weg yrnende under segle Weonodland him wæs on steorbord...*

Various fluctuations of these functions which can easily be noticed do not disqualify Nickel's observations. As has been rightly pointed out by him they only prove that the *expanded form subsystem* of the English verb was still being formed and was undergoing modifications towards its present shape (266).

The bibliography of the work is extremely rich. It includes all the items pertinent to the subject that were printed before 1965 and shows the author's extraordinary erudition.

The misprints are fortunately few.

At the beginning of the present review I have pointed to the fact that Nickel's opus has a special place among contributions to Old English syntax because it applies modern methods of investigations and with these solves some problems. At this point one should add, however, that its importance goes far beyond the field of Old English or the history of English. The work clearly proves that modern linguistic theories, and transformational grammar in particular, are new powerful tools not only in solving synchronic but also diachronic problems in linguistics.

Tense and Aspect of Present-day American English. By Akira Ota. Pp. 135. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1963.

The English Verb. Form and Meanings. By Martin Joos. Pp. 251. Madison and Milwaukee: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

Reviewed by Aleksander Szwedek, Łódź University.

(Reviews of these books appeared in *Language* 40 and 41 respectively, but the present review has been written to discuss some problems which were not considered there. The discussion of all the interesting points brought up by Ota and Joos would probably

take another book, thus, I shall concentrate on only certain problems which I think have been omitted or treated unsatisfactorily. Points already discussed in the reviews of the authors will not concern us here more than will be necessary).

Both books deal with a similar problem — the semantics of the so-called tenses in English, Joos in British English, Ota in American English. Additionally Joos deals with non-finite forms and *shall/will* forms. They differ, however, in aims and approach. Joos's aim is to describe the semantics of the verb forms taking them as a system, whereas Ota discusses the semantics alone. Joos chooses to discuss the meanings of the verb forms, basing on a detailed and precise description of a broad context (including non-verbal one as well). Ota bases his discussion on the verbal "context within the same sentence", and on numerical data concerning the occurrences of time indicators and distribution of particular verb forms.

In this review I shall concentrate on the finite verb forms as a system and shall also discuss briefly the semantics of these forms.

What they try to do and what has long been attempted is to find basic meanings (Joos) or essential meanings (Ota) of the verb forms, i.e. "the semantic component that is common to all occurrences of a particular form and that serves to distinguish them from the occurrences of other forms" (Ota, 12).

Ota starts his discussion with arranging the verb forms in a system which follows the one presented by Trager and Smith in *An Outline of English Structure* (1951):

| | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <i>present</i> | <i>past</i> |
| <i>simple forms</i> | eats | ate |
| <i>secondary forms</i> | { has eaten is eating has been eating | { had eaten was eating had been eating |

Thus he makes the present vs. past dichotomy "the basic dichotomy that underlies all the other forms" (Ota, 18). This view is supported by the statement that "the first constituents of perfect, progressive and perfect progressive are in the present form or in the past form" (Ota, 18) and that "the numerical distribution of simple past vs. simple present is quite different from that of perfects and progressives vs. simple forms" and therefore simple present and simple past are "more basic" than progressives and perfects.

Ota fails to see several things:

1. The numerical distribution can be explained historically.
2. In the same way we can explain the fact that perfects and progressives "are built upon this contrast" (i.e. present vs. past); all new grammatical forms are built on already existing ones unless borrowed from another language.
3. The system proposed by Trager and Smith and adopted by Ota can be arranged in two other different ways:

| | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| <i>non-progressive</i> | <i>progressive</i> | <i>non-perfect</i> | <i>perfect</i> |
| eats | is eating | eats | has eaten |
| ate | was eating | is eating | has been eating |
| has eaten | has been eating | ate | had eaten |
| had eaten | had been eating | was eating | had been eating |

And then the basic dichotomy would be different in each case.

Joos arranges the verb forms according to the "marked-unmarked" dichotomy and arrives at the following system:

| Category | Tense | Assertion | Phase | Aspect | Voice | Function |
|----------|--------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|--------------|
| Unmarked | Actual | Factual | Current | Generic | Neutral | Propredicate |
| Marked | Remote | Relative | Perfect | Temporary | Passive | Verb |
| Markers | -D | WILL, etc | HAVE-N | BE-ING | BE-N | SHOW etc. |

Yet if we provide examples for each of Joos's categories (excluding Function):

| | | | | |
|----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| I show | I show | I show | I show | I show |
| I showed | I shall show | I have shown | I am showing | I am shown |

it is easy to see that formally there is only one unmarked category with many meanings. And here we touch upon the problem to the solution of which many scholars were very near, yet none of them (Twaddell, Hatcher, Khlebnikova, Trager and Smith, Ota, Joos) formulated it. The nearest was Twaddell with his O Modification (which "conveys the semantic content of the verb alone"). Both Ota and Joos admit in various places that, for example, "generic aspect has no meaning of its own. It gets its meaning entirely from the context" (Joos 1964: 112) or "simple present indicates the occurrence of an action or the existence of a state." (Ota 1963: 18).

This clearly leads to the conclusion that the so-called Simple Present Tense: a. is only a Subject-Verb sequence signalling finitude, b. has no basic meaning of its own but gets its meanings from the context, c. can be modified by -D, BE-ING, HAVE-N, and BE-N.

As to the semantics of other verb forms here is what they say:

1. -D modification is treated by Ota only in its past tense meaning (the limitation of which he is perfectly aware of) and by Joos in its past and conditional meanings. This modification presents little problem and most scholars agree as to its meaning. Joos calls the -D modification Remote Tense which is meant to account for both meanings.

2. HAVE-N is treated traditionally by Ota: "Present Perfect (...) indicates the occurrence of an action or the existence of a state in or for a period of time extending from some time in the past up till the moment of speaking" (Ota, 41), whereas Joos continuing Twaddell's conception says that the HAVE-N signal removes "our attention from the event" and relocates it "on the subsequent opportunities for events" (Joos, 140).

3. The most controversial verb category has for a long time been the progressive form. Again Ota sticks to the tradition: "Progressive forms indicate an action in the process (of taking place)" (Ota 1963: 59), whereas Joos again continuing Twaddell's idea of "limited duration" describes it differently as a limited "validity of the predication". This seems to be what scholars have been trying to find for many years since so far no counter examples have been found.

4. Passive Voice is only mentioned by Ota in passing and Joos devotes a whole chapter to it, defining it finally in negative terms: BE-N means "that its subject is not the actor" (Joos, 96).

Joos discusses two issues - Assertion and Nbn-finite forms, the latter rather briefly. One full chapter is devoted to Assertion because, as he says, "it is the most difficult to discuss among the six categories of the English finite verb" (Joos 1964: 147). The discussion of that problem can be found at length in Ota's review (*Lg.* 1965), so it would be useless to repeat it here.

Both authors contribute immensely to our knowledge of the English verb forms. They do it in different ways. Ota provides the most reliable numerical data for the occurrences of the verb forms in various contexts thus giving support to their semantics. Joos attempts to set up a system of the English verb and though he misses some important

points, as has already been said, it is a very important step in the description of the verb forms. Both works are among the most interesting and stimulating ones on the subject, stimulating further studies of the English verb forms not only from the point of view of present-day English but also from the point of view of their historical development. They could also be successfully used in making the teaching of the English verb easier. The books can be recommended to all who are interested in English. They would make difficult but fascinating reading.

REFERENCES

- Joos, M. 1964. *The English Verb. Form and Meanings*. Madison and Milwaukee: The University of Wisconsin Press.
 Joos, M. 1965. rev. of Akira Ota, *Tense and Aspect of Present-day American English*. *Lg.* 41. 477-98.
 Ota, A. 1963. *Tense and Aspect of Present-day American English*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
 Ota, A. 1964. rev. of Martin Joos, *The English Verb. Form and Meanings*. *Lg.* 40. 657-73.
 Trager, G. L. and H. L. Smith, 1951. *An Outline of English Structure*. Washington: SIL Occasional Papers No 8.
 Twaddell, F. 1960. *The English Verb Auxiliaries*. Second ed. revised. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University Press.

The Meanings of the Modals in Present-Day American English. By M. Ehrman
 Pp. 106. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.

Reviewed by Piotr Kakietek, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

The English modal auxiliaries have been dealt with by a considerable number of linguists on various occasions. There are, however, comparatively few works which are concerned exclusively with the modals. Of the quite recent attempts at a systematic account of the modal verb in English the following might be mentioned here: Twaddell (1963); Diver (1964); Joos (1965:147-201); Palmer (1965:105-139).

Because of the great scarcity of works on the subject concerned, the book under review is particularly welcome. As the author herself admits it has appeared as the result of her effort to find out whether Joos's semological classification of the English modals is also valid for American English. That it is not valid for British English, which Joos chose to describe, has been quite conclusively pointed out by F. R. Palmer in his review of Joos's book, (1967: 179-95; Palmer's main objection against Joos's approach is that it completely ignores the correspondence between the 'formal' and 'semantic' patterns of the English verb). Ehrman appears to have succeeded in proving the same with regard to American English.

The primary concern of this review will be with what seem to be the weak sides of the analysis of the modals proposed here. However, before we set to this task, we would like to devote some space to the discussion of the main theoretical points made in the book under review.

Ehrman's analysis is based on a corpus of 300,000 words taken from American prose writings published in 1961. It comprises such items as *can, could, may, might, will, would, shall, should, must, ought to*, and the two 'quasi-modals' *need* and *dare*. These were selected on purely syntactic grounds. They appear to share the following characteristics: (1) they occupy the first position of a verb phrase; (2) they cannot be preceded by any other verb; (3) they invert with the subject in interrogations; (4) they are directly negated by *not*. The second characteristic sets off the modal verbs from primary auxiliaries (see Palmer), which may also occupy the second position in a verb phrase.

The whole work is organized as follows: Chap. I — Introduction; Chap. II — Can, Could; Chap. III — May, Might; Chap. IV — Will, Would; Chap. V — Shall, Should; Chap. VI — Ought to; Chap. VII — Must; Chap. VIII — Dare, Need; Chap. IX — Conclusion; Appendix A — The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries in Shakespeare's Plays. Appendix B — The Modals in Dryden. A comparison with Shakespeare's usage, and where relevant with Present-Day English. Bibliography.

Of particular importance is the introductory part. It provides condensed information regarding the whole framework of the book and contains a discussion of the basic terminology that is consistently used by the writer.

On p. 10 the writer explicitly states that her purpose in undertaking this study was "to determine just what each modal auxiliary means, exactly what it does to the predication of which it is a part". Accordingly each of the modal verbs is presented in terms of the so-called basic meaning described by the writer as "the most general meaning of the modal in question, the meaning that applies to all its occurrences" (10). Thus, for example, 'the occurrence of the predication is guaranteed' is regarded as the basic meaning of *will*.

Derivative of the basic meaning are overtones. These are conditioned by various contextual elements. To quote Ehrman: "overtones are subsidiary meanings which derive from the basic meaning but which add something of their own" (10). Two overtones are established for *will*: sequential and volitional. The sequential overtone appears in statements expressing cause-and-effect relations or in statements expressing two or more events one followed by another. The following would thus be the examples of the sequential overtone of *will*: 'The smaller the particle the further it will travel downwind before setting out', and '...as historic processes of modernization gradually gain momentum, their cohesion will be threatened by divisive forces, the gaps between rulers and subjects, town and country, will widen'.

A very useful distinction has been drawn between two time functions, neutral and future. Time function itself is defined as a "contextually conditioned variation in temporal relationship to the surrounding discourse which affects all overtones and the basic meaning" (11).

The writer adds that time function is used only for *will* and *shall*. Thus, depending on the nature of the context in which it appears, *will* can be either time-neutral or time-future. *Will* appears with a time-neutral interpretation in contexts bearing a general character, i.e., in 'generic' statements and statements of description. "Neutral time-function may be said to correspond to the contextually abstract" (34 - 5). On the other hand, future time-function is associated with concreteness. The future-time *will* will then refer to "a specific unique predication the occurrence of which is later than that of the discourse" (35). The time of the discourse (the immediately surrounding context) must not be confused with the time of the utterance (the moment in which the modal is actually spoken or written).

Some of the modals are also described in terms of the so-called uses. Uses, according to Ehrman, are "meanings conditioned by specific sentence elements and features of non-semantic interest" (10). They differ from overtones in that, unlike the latter, they involve close specification of the 'aspect of the environment' requiring the predication. Thus in the 268 and 269 examples 'I must plead guilty to a special sympathy for nomias' and 'While it must be said that these same Protestants have built some new churches during this period...', respectively, Ehrman suggests 'honesty' as the aspect of the environment. As far as *must* is concerned, three uses are distinguished: the 'concession' use, the 'deferent' use, and what one might call the 'insistence' use. 268 and 269 are illustrative of the 'concession' use of *must* which is said to appear in cases where the modal combines

with verbs like *say*, *concede*, *admit*, and *express*. The use in which "the addressee is required either to forgive or to understand the speaker" is referred to here as the 'deferent' use mentioned above. The examples provided on this occasion are: 'You must forgive me if I seem to dwell too much on her physical aspects but I am an artist', 'You must understand I haven't been in this state too long...'. In 'If you must know I do not get along with the landlord...', and 'Captain, .. Jan .. must you go inside Majdanek? The stories... Everyone really knows what is happening there' (Ehrman's examples 272 and 273, respectively), it is the addressee's insistence that requires the predication (the 'insistence' use).

For a number of terms the writer is indebted to other linguists and, as she herself admits, to Joos and Twaddell in particular. The phrase "state of the world", for instance, has been borrowed by her from Joos and the term "modification" as well as some others she handles in the same way in which they are employed in Twaddell.

These would be in outline the main theoretical points propounded in the book under review. And now a few words of criticism and appreciation.

Joos's presentation of the modals is often attacked on account of the general opacity of the motivations that Joos provides for the particular modals. It happens that the same criticism can be directed against Ehrman's own analysis since it is not wholly free from statements lacking in both lucidity and precision. Let us take, for example, terms like 'honesty' or 'intellectual honesty' that are mentioned in connection with sentences 268 and 269. These are rather vague in themselves and it is a pity that the writer does not even so much as unambiguously delimit their intended senses. Besides, one cannot imagine why 'honesty' should be regarded as the aspect of the environment in the 268 and 269 examples. Moreover, to say that in the 128 example Fanny and Mrs. Godwin will be glad 'only after they have been told' sounds rather ridiculous. It stands to reason that the occurrence of one of the events involved in 128 is not necessarily dependent upon the occurrence of the other. A little further on we are confronted with another fantastic statement. When we come down to 'You'll have the neighbor's eyes popping as well as their mouths watering' (example 129), we are told that here the reader must infer something like "after you follow these directions" (38).

The book also contains a handful of inconsistencies. Thus on page 10 the author remarks that "No overtone accounts for all the occurrences of a modal in that case it would be a basic meaning, and all are conditioned by elements of the context which cannot be identified, isolated, and listed". However, in the second part of the statement the writer quite clearly contradicts herself. If, as she would like to have it, it were not possible to identify, isolate, and list the contextual elements in question, then one would like to know how she has at all managed to arrive at the overtones she suggested for the particular modals. Besides, one would wish to know how in the light of this statement one might account for the native speaker's proper use of the modals.

Earlier in the book it has been explicitly stated that time function is used only for *will* and *shall* (11). In actual fact, time function is also mentioned in connection with the 'probability' overtone of *should* (61), the 'probability' overtone of *ought* (65), and with *may* (23 - 27). There *may* is said to occur with future time-function "...to the extent it displays the occurrence dimension".

Finally, from the present viewpoint, the status of the uses as they are adumbrated by Ehrman seems rather questionable. That the uses contribute very little, if anything, to the description of the modals can be perhaps shown with the example of *must*. It will be recalled that in the book the three uses have been made dependent upon the combination of the modal with a definitely specified group of verbs. Thus the 'deferent' use has been said to appear when *must* collocates with verbs like *say*, *concede*, *admit*, and *express*. In the present view, however, the three uses are wholly explainable in terms of the se-

semantic content of the verbs involved in the matter. Accordingly, in 268 - 273 *must* is regarded merely as the exponent of the basic meaning which in the case of this modal comes to be something like "the predication is required by some aspects of the state of the world".

Let it be understood here that although our criticism of the uses was limited to *must* only, it could be easily extended to most of the other uses as well.

One more point concerning *must* might be made here. To say that in sentences 268 and 269 *must* may convey "the feeling of reluctance" to comply with the requirement is doubtless expecting too much of the modal itself. The question here might be whether something like "the feeling of reluctance" is at all linguistically expressible. At any rate, it seems it cannot be rendered by *must* alone. A similar statement, but this time with reference to *can*, is made on page 13. There it is suggested that in 9 *can* implies "positive qualities of religion as well: there is nothing other than the auxiliary in the sentence which contributes to such an interpretation". But a simple substitution operation will easily reveal the fallacy of this statement. Suppose we replace all the lexical items of the verb phrase in 9 by, say, *destroy*, then, how shall we interpret *can* in the resulting sentence? This interpretation of *can* could not be said to be correct even in relation to 9 itself.

Time function as delineated in the book reviewed turns out to be a very effective tool in accounting for sentences like '...but sometimes a man in Miyagi or Akita is much more hairy than the average Japanese, and occasionally a girl will be strikingly beautiful' and '...it possesses only a large number of long, branched hairs on its legs, on which the pollen grains will collect' (Ehrman's examples 120 and 119, respectively). It is generally agreed among grammarians that 119 and 120 are not future tense but that they are both present tense and habitual aspect. Some grammarians, however, mistakenly associate the feature *habitual* with the presence of *will* in these sentences. In the light of Ehrman's interpretation *will* in 119 and 120 is simply time neutral (thanks to the general character of both the sentences) and basic meaning. In 'Sugar will dissolve in water' and 'He'll sit there for hours doing nothing' *will* is often assigned two interpretations, that is, it is said to express a general truth and a habitual activity, respectively. (Palmer's induction and characteristic uses of *will*). It appears that from Ehrman's point of view the distinction between the 'induction' and the 'characteristic' use is quite unnecessary. *Will* in both of the sentences receives the same interpretation, i.e., it is basic meaning and time neutral.

Ehrman's analysis reveals that the 'volitional' overtone of *will* is less frequent than the non-volitional future-time *will* in American English. This would, actually, imply that in this respect American English usage diverges from British English usage. In his account of the volitional use of *will*, Palmer notes that this *will* is "more common perhaps than the previous one (the futurity *will*), at least with all verbs that refer to activities that may be willed or agreed" (110 - 11).

In the chapter dealing with the modals in Shakespeare, the writer states that sentence 66 is the only instance of a 'characterizing' *would*. However, two more instances of this *would* have been also found in: 1H4 III. 2. 46; Macb. III. 4. 77. Besides, a 'predictive' *would* makes appearance also in: 1H4 I. 1. 172; 1H4 III. 1. 87; JC III. 2. 114. An additional instance of a time-future volitional *would* has been found in Macbeth IV. 3. 223.

To conclude, one remark suggests itself. It seems that it is not so much the purely theoretical implications provided in the book under review, but rather matters of a more particular nature that one might most object to.

REFERENCES

- Diver, W. 1964. "The Modal System of the English Verb." *Word* 20. 322-352.
 Jespersen, O. 1931. *A Modern English Grammar*. IV. London: Allen and Unwin.
 Palmer, F. R. 1966. *A Linguistic Study of the English Verb*. London: Longmans.
 Palmer, F. R. 1967. "The Semantics of the English Verb". *Lingua* 18. 179-195.
 Twaddell, W. F. 1965. *The English Verb Auxiliaries*. Providence: Brown University Press.

Papers in Language and Language Teaching. By P. D. Strevens. Pp. viii, 152.
 London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
 Reviewed by Hans Jalling, University of Stockholm

In this volume Professor P. D. Strevens, the well-known Director of the Language Centre at the University of Essex, has collected twelve papers which he has "found to be of some help to students and teachers in explaining and discussing modern developments in the field of applied linguistics and language teaching and in the linguistic sciences" (vii). The majority of the papers were originally published in the early 1960's, but two of the papers "Pronunciations of English in West Africa", and "The Performance of 'PAT'" date from 1955 and 1958 respectively. As pointed out by the author, it is inevitable "that such a long time span makes the papers less representative of the author's present views on these questions". Nevertheless, these papers are not only of interest as an example of "the development and change" undergone by the linguistic sciences but are of great value to students and teachers today.

Seven of the papers deal with the relations between modern language instruction and the linguistic sciences under the general heading *Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching*. Using the conversion of the textile industry from a craft to an applied science, backed by a technology, as an example of a parallel development, the author underlines the importance of a close cooperation and understanding between research in different disciplines related to language learning and the actual language instruction. The advancement of instruction methods pre-supposes further research, and the author provides us with a list of research needs, unfortunately in rather general terms (4). The author makes a distinction between the *scientific basis* and the *technology* of language teaching¹. It is evident that all such distinctions are somewhat arbitrary — it could be argued e.g. that the development of learning theory belongs to the scientific basis for language instruction rather than to the technology — but it may be useful to make this distinction with regard to the goals of the research in question. It is surprising, however, to find *applied linguistics* being regarded as separate from psychology, methodology, and equipment; it seems preferable to regard applied linguistics as the combination of disciplines investigating the "technology" of language instruction. It is indeed true that linguistics can be applied to many other fields of the study of human behaviour and language learning²; yet, the everyday use of the term applied linguistics seems to be restricted to language instruction, and it seems probable that a new term will have to be coined for linguistics applied in other directions.

The author correctly stresses the importance of *motivation* in the learning process, and he also states that the "notion of 'appropriateness to the pupils' is a fundamental advance in language teaching from the pedagogical point of view" (3). Even if this is of

¹ A more detailed analysis of research needs can be found in the desiderata given by Ornstein and Lado in their article on "Research in Foreign Language Teaching Methodology", IRAL V/1, 1967. 23-4.

² A recent example of forensic linguistics is the investigation of the Evans trial, Jan Svartvik, "The Evans Statements", *Gothenburg Studies in English*, Gothenburg, 1967.

particular importance for the teaching of adults, this principle must also be recognized in the ordinary school and university teaching, and, as a consequence, much greater care must be given to a detailed analysis of the *aims* of language teaching (or better, language learning) for the *individual student*. This is a very complicated process, not only involving a more specific description of course aims in general terms — as pointed out by the author, descriptions like “learning French” are rapidly becoming superseded by more specific aims like “learning French to become an economist with the Council of Europe” (29 - 30) but demanding a detailed analysis in *linguistic terms* of the student's expected terminal behaviour.

It is, for instance, obvious that the teacher (or someone on his behalf) must decide on the variety of the target language which he is going to teach. This is not simply a question of choice between possible regional varieties, and the author suggests that the target language should be defined by five linguistic categories: *medium* (spoken or written), *dialect*, *accent*, *register*, and *style* (86)³. Accepting the principle that no element has meaning in itself but acquires meaning through opposition to other elements in the same field, the author recommends that definitions should be based on a linguistic description of the language in question covering *phonology*, *grammar*, *lexis*, and *context*. This, in turn, creates a demand for more linguistic research in order to describe each variety of language in detail; something that will take a long time even for the major European languages. As the student's previous linguistic experience (usually his mother tongue) is bound to influence his learning of a new language, the author stresses the importance of contrastive analysis, and points to the study of error-analysis as a means to carry out what is in fact a limited contrastive analysis before adequate descriptions of the mother tongue and the target language are available.

‘Appropriateness to the pupils’ also includes the provision of individual learning programmes, and the author states that the principles of programmed instruction “have a degree of relevance to language teaching” (13). Today the prospects of programmed instruction for language learning purposes seem even brighter⁴, although many problems remain to be solved on the linguistic side. However, programmed instruction requires the immediate testing of the material presented for learning, and this represents another difficult problem: the construction of objective tests. The author deals with this important aspect of language learning in a separate paper, and even if “the construction of suitable formal tests is a highly specialized and technical business” (100), it is clearly of great importance that an understanding of the underlying principles is brought to the notice of all teachers. The inadequacy of existing language tests seems to be caused more by the inability of the linguists to specify what basic categories should be tested than a lack of suitable testing methods⁵.

It may be possible to establish an overall picture of the student's language proficiency through the use of extensive test batteries in which one category of any skill is tested at a time⁶. The author gives some examples of simple objective tests, and of particular value is the reference to the McCallien Tests which seem to offer a relatively high objectivity

³ The author has added the concept of *accent* (identical, or nearly identical, grammar and vocabulary but different sound patterns) to the four categories normally given. From this follows, as is pointed out by the author, that American English often can be regarded as the *same dialect* with a *different accent* as British English.

⁴ This has been recognized by the author in other papers, e.g. the address given to the Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association in Britain 1965.

⁵ Cf. “This dilemma can be broken partly by locating and describing the linguistic problems to be tested with the accuracy that linguistic analysis makes possible”, Lado, *Language Testing*, London, 1961, 29.

⁶ For a discussion on the correlation between multiple-choice tests and the standard written proficiency tests now in use, cf. an article by G. Kjellmar in *Moderna Språk* 61 (1967) 13 ff.

in oral production tests by making the examiners concentrate on certain pre-selected items as they occur in the text. The essay questions are refuted by the author, but modern evaluation methods — of the same kind as used by McCallien — have increased the objectivity also of the essay question. When having to choose between the more apparent validity but less objectivity and the more objectivity and the less apparent validity, we may have to resort to a kind of essay question, in which the students' answers are rigidly steered into a desired direction. However, the sheer volume of testing in modern language instruction will tend to make objective tests more common because of the possibility of scoring them by mechanical methods, and there can be little doubt that this will in time “lead to appreciable changes for the better in the methods and scope of language teaching in the area concerned” (102).

How does the development of the applied sciences affect the teacher? It is certainly true that “the place of linguistics is *behind* the classroom teacher” (73), but to what extent should a training in applied linguistics be included in the teacher training programmes? The author distinguishes between several categories of teachers, and while he requires “those who prepare syllabuses, testbooks, workbooks, examinations and the other apparatus of the English-teaching profession” to have “acquaintance with at least one of the three major modern linguistic theories”, he seems satisfied if the classroom teachers “know of the existence of scientific linguistics without necessarily having to understand it” (73). This may be a realistic appraisal of the situation, but, at the same time, one cannot help regretting the fact that very few classroom teachers are aware of the developments of (applied) linguistics. Far too many teachers have become fixed in their teaching methods and refuse to accept the evidence of modern educational technology. It seems that one of the most important tasks of applied linguistics is to develop an understanding for the needs of change in methodology and prepare the teachers for the possibility of the introduction of a new method. The ideal classroom teacher must have an open mind in this respect.

Throughout the book the author makes a distinction between *linguistics* and *phonetics*, and the three last papers of the book deal with phonetics. The paper on ‘PAT’, the Parametric Artificial Talking device originally developed by Mr W. Lawrence, gives an interesting description of a pioneer research project in instrumental phonetics. The paper is now out of date, as ‘PAT’ has been further developed, and has even had a “brother”, Ove, developed at the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm⁷. The operation of ‘PAT’ is described in a paper on sibilant sounds of speech, and in the last paper of the volume some aspects are given on recording techniques and classification criteria.

The volume also contains two interesting articles on the English language in Africa: an analysis of factors in the reform of language teaching in Africa, and the pronunciations of English found in certain areas of West Africa, a part of the world the author knows extremely well by his own experience.

⁷ Developed by Professor Gunnar Fant.

A Guide to Old English. By Bruce Mitchell. Pp. 152. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
Reviewed by Miroslaw Nowakowski, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

The Guide, in the author's own words, “aims at making easier the initial steps in the learning of Old English”. It has been intended for “those wishing to acquire a reading

knowledge of the language" as well as for all the "potential specialists in philology" to help them in their "preliminary studies of the essential grammar" (VII).

The work is divided into seven chapters and supplied with two indices: Index of Subjects (151 - 154) and Index of Words (155 - 160). The chapters are: I. Preliminary Remarks on Language (9 - 10), II. Orthography and Pronunciation (11 - 13), III. Inflexions (14 - 51), IV. Word Formation (52 - 57), V. Syntax (58 - 117), VI. An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon Studies (118 - 142) and VII. Select Bibliography (143 - 149). A section "How to Use This Guide", intended for the students working without a teacher, precedes the first chapter; (1 - 8).

From what has already been said two things, at least, are likely to strike the reader familiar with some other books on the subject. These are: (a) lack of a chapter on phonology, and (b) the extent of the work devoted to syntax (approx. 40% of the whole text).

As to the former, the author explains in the Foreword that "the important sound changes are treated briefly when they provide the accepted explanation of apparent irregularities in inflexion" (VII).

Thus, in chapter III, Mitchell introduces some "technical terms" concerning: syllables, vowel diagram and OE vowel system (this is a LWS system; presented here without references to the history of the sounds) (17 - 19). Next, he discusses i-mutation (25 - 26); breaking, the influence of nasals, the influence of the initial *g*, *sc*, *c* (35 - 37); and Grimm's and Verner's Laws (38 - 40). Throughout the chapter a careful reader will find some additional explanation of metathesis, doubling of consonants, absorption and lengthening, and syncopation of endings. It may, however, seem doubtful that the student can understand and "absorb" all the facts crammed into some fifteen pages.

As to syntax, it has been said that the amount of space devoted to it in chapter five contributes to the disproportion of the work. This may be accounted for by two facts: (a) that this particular chapter is by far the most original one in the book, and (b) that in copiousness of details i.e. in the number and variety of examples presented and topics discussed, the Guide surpasses here most of the handbooks of its type.

The chapter is divided into eleven sections with subdivisions. The headings of these units as well as the order of the presenting of the material is that of a standard modern school grammar. Thus, starting with the OE word order and sentence structure (sections 1 - 2) Mitchell goes through the OE clauses; first - subordinate (s. 3 Noun Clauses, s. 4 Adjective Clauses, s. 5 Adverb Clauses), then - coordinate (s. 5 Parataxis), to conclude the chapter with the description of such categories as concord, case, "article", pronoun, numeral, verb and preposition (s. 6 - 11). The chapter includes lists of: (a) conjunctions and adverbs connecting the clauses, (b) commonest modal auxiliaries, and (c) prepositions. Each section contains a number of OE sentences taken from various texts and periods to exemplify the problems discussed.

Mitchell's treatment of syntax is traditional. There are some points in his description on which it is hard to agree with the author.

So even if, for example, one believes that "OE verb was not as flexible an instrument as MnE verb" (97) he may object to Mitchell's measuring the flexibility with the number of tenses found in OE conditional sentences as compared to that of the MnE sentences. Few, if any, would agree to label OE as a primitive language: "Some of the reasons for the belief that OE was a primitive language have been discussed in §§ 148 - 152. (These were: recapitulation, correlation, the splitting of heavy groups and anticipations). Another is frequent use of parataxis" (99). And coming across a remark like that: "One negative does not cancel out another... This could be added to the list of things which make people think of OE as a primitive language" (101) the reader may recall the noble language of Tolstoy.

One may also object to subjective remarks of the type: "This (i.e. "Fondness for correlations") may have its origin... in the same feeling of insecurity in the face of complicated sentences which produced the awkward repetitions (...)" or "It is (I should say) certain beyond all doubt that AElfric was influenced by Latin prose style; I cannot see how it could have been otherwise. But... this powerful and moving sentence... contains nothing which is not 'good Old English'" (66). And yet all these drawbacks are incomparably smaller than the merits of the chapter.

Other chapters are much weaker. Chapters I (Preliminary Remarks on the Language) and IV (Word Formation) contain what may be found in any standard OE primer. The same concerns chapter III (Inflexions) which in addition to the earlier mentioned notes on OE phonology contains only the paradigms.

The chapter on Orthography and Pronunciation (chap. II) is short and conventional in addition to being controversial. Even if one accepts that the author tries to be practical one can hardly agree with the advice to pronounce OE /o:/ like Mod.E diphthong in *goad* (why not like *saw*, *law*, *caught*?). The students may also have some troubles in pronouncing words like *sengan*, *sprennan*, or like *niht*, *riht*, *cnicht*. In the case of the former Mitchell gives no clue at all; as for the latter, the remark that in positions other than initial "h- is like German ch" may be not enough, especially for those "working without teacher".

In his treatment of history, archaeology and literature (chap. VI) the author makes no claim to originality and his contribution is usually limited to some far-fetched analogies which certainly will not help in "reducing rote learning" and hardly make easier the understanding of the Old English period as he wishes in his *Foreword*. Two examples of that will probably be enough here: while describing the situation of a man without his lord, Mitchell compares him to "a lonely refugee from behind the Iron Curtain who has left dear ones behind him and now exists without hope in a camp for 'displaced persons'" (138) or he concludes his discussing the combining of the pagan and Christian elements in poetry: "Something of the same (but perhaps in reverse) must, one imagines, be part of the make-up of those middle-aged and elderly Russians of today who were brought up Christians but who have consciously or unconsciously been influenced by the teachings of Marx. In 1961 Mr. Khrushchev was reported as saying that the Soviet Union possessed a 100-megaton bomb 'which, God grant it, we may never have to explode' (...) etc." (139).

A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. By Ernest Klein. Pp. XXVI+1776. Amsterdam-London-New York: Elsevier Publishing Company, 1966 (vol. 1), 1967 (vol. 2).

Reviewed by Jerzy Wejna, University of Warsaw

This new etymological dictionary by Ernest Klein continues the series of recently published English etymological dictionaries. These dictionaries are by F. Holthausen [rev. ed. 1949], E. Weekley [1952, rev. 1961], E. Partridge [1952, rev. 1958], and finally C. T. Onions whose dictionary was published almost simultaneously with that by Klein. The first two of them are of a very limited scope and therefore may be safely disregarded here. Of the remaining two, Onions's work is a continuation or rather a modern counterpart of W. W. Skeat's dictionary, especially in the system of choosing and presenting the etymologies and in the selection of words discussed there.

Finding a counterpart of this type for Klein's work would be much more difficult. His selection of vocabulary for etymological description is highly original and unprecedented though his analyses seem to follow the old traditional line of W. W. Skeat. Partridge's dictionary to some degree similar in its scope was based on the principle of widely used cross references leading to one root entry which was given a very long and detailed etymology according to the distribution of the corresponding Indo-European roots of various Indo-European language families. Klein's work is based on a strictly alphabetical arrangement with cross references mutually interrelated and further references added at the end of the analysed words. Main entries are discussed rather briefly and in many cases we must refer to other cognate words in order to have a full picture of their etymology, but separate entries for *Darwinian* and *Darwinism* or *Hindu* and *Hinduism* are simply an exaggeration.

In the introduction to his dictionary Klein puts forward his view on previous etymological researches:

"As a rule even the most authoritative English etymological dictionaries give such etymologies as reflect the level reached by philology about half a century ago. In most cases etymologies given up by serious science long ago are still wandering out of one dictionary into another and continue living with tenacity, apparently ignoring the truths established in the field of philology in the course of the latter decades" (Klein: IX).

Therefore in his choice of vocabulary Klein goes far beyond the limits set by his predecessors introducing words of purely scientific character and not commonly used. Those scientific terms belong to different disciplines "with special attention paid to biology, zoology, botany, mineralogy, geography, geology, history, astronomy, physics, chemistry, mathematics, grammar and philosophy" (Klein: XII). The abundance of scientific terms makes the work similar to a dictionary of foreign words or almost a small scientific encyclopaedia.

In the analysis of some words in this group like *abiotrophy*, *calciphyllaxis*, etc., Klein gives not only their etymology but also the name of the word-coiner together with the date of its introduction into the language. The hybrids are usually analysed critically, i.e. a more proper form from the linguistic point of view is postulated. Thus for *aureomycin* (Latin *aureus* + Greek *mykēs*) he postulates *chrysomycin* with both elements of Greek origin.

Introduction of loan translations and their relatively wide treatment is a very important innovation of Klein. It is useful to the reader that he includes not only "direct" but also "indirect" borrowings. The former group may be illustrated by *citizen of the world*, loan translation of Greek *kosmopolitēs*, and *dativ* [case] from Latin *dativus*, loan translation of Greek *dotikē* "the dative" where the translation borrowing takes place at an earlier stage, is the example of the latter.

Much attention has been paid in the dictionary to proper names. They may be classified into following major groups:

- a. personal and mythological names (cf. *Clio*, *Louis*, *Methusea*, *Thor*);
- b. adjectives modelled after well known names (cf. *Voltairean*, *Byronic*, *Calvinist*, *Rabelaisian*);
- c. names of characters from world literature (cf. *Pangloss*, *Panurge*);
- d. names of countries and their inhabitants (cf. *Russia*, *Syria*, *Poland*, *Swede*);
- e. different geographical names (cf. *Paris*, *Pomerania*);
- f. various genera of animals and plants (cf. *Tomistoma*, *Trichophyton*, *Parmentiera*);
- g. names of associations and organizations (cf. *Sokol*, *Soviet*); and some other groups of minor importance.

An objection should be raised, however, against introducing into the dictionary a great number of words which should have been omitted for the simple reason that they do not exist in the English language. Examples: *sine*, a pure Latin word meaning "without" which can be found only in phrases from that language; *Bhagavad-Gita* "the celebrated dialogue between Krishna and Arjuna inserted into the Mahabharata"; *Marshvan* "the 8th month of the Jewish year" with 15 lines of explanation and many other words of that kind. The presence of the scientific terms can be justified, but the above mentioned words are foreign to many Englishmen and therefore there is no justification for treating them as if they were native. The same can be said about phrases like *qui pro quo*, *qui vive* included into some English dictionaries, but as they are foreign idioms they should not be discussed in a publication like this. An encyclopaedia is the most proper place for terms *Pre-Raphaelite*, *Grimm's Law*, etc.

Hebrew words and Semitic words in general, are treated here with great care and precision. Their etymologies are illustrated by numerous examples from the Semitic languages. Klein elaborated a special system of transliteration of Semitic words rendering every consonant, vowel and diacritical sign, thus trying to create a foundation for a future etymological dictionary of the Semitic languages. Consequently there are numerous words belonging to that family which upsets the balance of the dictionary's word selection.

Now some remarks about the etymologies. Klein blames his predecessors for leaving too many words unexplained and with the remark of "uncertain origin" or "of Oriental origin" after the entries. Consequently he has tried to correct this omission and give explanations to several hundred of them. However, after checking thirteen words which were listed at the end of W. W. Skeat's dictionary as not explained it can be found that only three of them now possess new etymologies. The case is similar with the "uncertain etymologies" in E. Partridge's dictionary. Only some of them are explained by Klein.

The presentation of a wide variety of counterparts of the words discussed should be one of the dictionary compiler's aims. This is the best achievement of the author. Samples from the related languages are very numerous including Tocharian references absent from the previously published etymological dictionaries.

Slavonic etymologies are scarce thus continuing the tradition of other publications of this kind. The etymologies in this group are limited to traditional words like *czar*, *kopec*, *mazurka*, although some new etymologies are worth noting (cf. *Sejm*, *sputnik*, etc.) But in spite of the fact that he knows some Slavonic languages, Klein made several minor mistakes. *Polack* is given the reference *Polsko* "Poland" (correct: *Polska*) which is a Czech word. *Poljane*, also a reference to *Polack*, is inaccurately translated as "Poles". *Droshky* according to Klein is related to Polish *draga* not existing in the Polish language (correct: *droga*). *Sputnik* is derived from Russian *put'* and the corresponding Polish word is given as *pać*, instead of correct *pać* with the palatal value of *c*.

Such mistakes are not so important, yet efforts should be made to eliminate them in future editions. However, when analysing words of Indo-European stock, Klein does not give examples from Slavonic though other language families are represented. This objection is especially important when it concerns words which could have been borrowed from some Slavonic language in the period of the Germanic community. Thus *malt* (OE *mealt*) is not illustrated by any Slavonic word though there is a corresponding Polish word *mloto* (see Brückner 1957). There are no correspondences of *till* (OE *tillian*) and OSlavonic *t'lo* "cultivated land"; *thing* (like in *storting*) ONorse *þing* — and OSlavonic *teža* "meeting of judges"; *bale* (OE *bealu*) is also missing in the correspondence though there are numerous cognates in the Slavonic languages, to mention Polish *ból* "pain".

Klein criticizes "obsolete" etymologies of the other dictionaries but he does not

make attempts to revise doubtful ones and repeats traditional solutions. For the word *town* he postulates the development OSlavonic *tyŋ* < German < Celtic. But Celtic *dānom* had the meaning "mountain, hill" (cf. OE *dūn* "mountain, hill", OHG *dūne* "mountain"). The later meaning "stronghold" originated at a later period when Celts started to build fortresses on hills. Germanic *tūn* on the other hand meant "fence, hedge" and when we separate it from its Celtic etymology the word remains unexplained. That is why there is a possibility of this word having been borrowed from a Slavonic dialect (cf. Мартынов 1963 : 145). One can find some other doubtful cases which should be re-analysed, cf. *wreak*, *weep*, *deal*. Recent research does not confirm in full the etymology of *cheap* (Germanic > Slavonic) as the borrowing process could go in the opposite direction. (Мартынов 1963).

A lack of precision can also be seen in some of the English etymologies. *Call* does not come from OE *ceallian* which is a West-Saxon word, but its true source is a dialectal form not mentioned here. The same can be said about *all*, *fall*, etc. In the case of *hold* both forms are given making its etymology acceptable — cf. *hold* from OE *healdan*, *haldan*. (This problem has been briefly analysed by G. L. Brook 1963 : Chapt. 2). Also some Latin sources should have been given more precisely: *creed* (OE *crēdā*) does not come from Latin *crēdere*, and the true development was OE *crēdā* < Latin *crēdō* "I believe". On the other hand noun borrowings are given Latin accusative consistently.

Lastly some remarks about linguistic reconstructions in the dictionary. Indo-European archetypes are given in abundance which is perhaps due to the fact that Klein is conversant with about forty languages. The reconstructions are also added as an illustration of borrowings (cf. *sputnik*). The Indo-European reconstruction of *bee* (OE *beo*) presented as **bi* — (cf. Partridge **bhi-*, Kluge **bhi-*) and not corrected in "corrigenda and addenda" at the end of volume two is probably a printing mistake.

Primitive Germanic roots are reconstructed only here and there and are more controversial than the Indo-European ones. Following the pattern of the other compilers Klein uses phonetic and not phonemic reconstruction of Germanic sounds; therefore some inconsistencies can be found in the dictionary. The author distinguishes two variants of Germanic continuants of Indo-European **dh*, **gh*, but only one of **bh* in his reconstructions. In the intervocalic position he reconstructs **ð*: **brauda* (see: *bread*) and **d*: *peudo* (see: *Dutch*), that is two variants in the same context: **VðV* and **VdV*; correspondingly we have **jugunþi* (see: *youth*) and **hruzan* (see: *roe*) that is **VðV* and **VzV* in the same phonetic context.

In addition to this we find two strange Germanic reconstructions in the dictionary. One is Teutonic **bhrenk* (see *bring* and cf. Onions **brengan*). It either shows some earlier form of *bring* not explained elsewhere by the author or is simply a mistake not listed, however, in "corrigenda" of volume two. The other puzzling form is Teutonic **ghelp* (see *yelp*, and cf. Onions **galþjan*, Partridge **gelp*). Perhaps this is some pre-Teutonic form as this term is applied to **ghelto* (see *yield* and cf. Onions **geldham*, Partridge **geldh-*). Also the reconstruction of the Past Participle suffix **-do* (see *-ed*) shows an archaic form since **o* did not exist in Primitive Germanic at all and no other Gmc **o* reconstruction is given in the dictionary. The proper suffix is **-ða* (cf. Onions **daudaz* > OE *dēad*). The differentiation of Gmc **q^w* and **kw* is not observed by all the etymologists, Klein: *qualm* -- **kwelan*, *quick* -- **q^wiq^wa*).

The above remarks naturally do not cover the enormous number of problems which will no doubt be raised after a thorough exploration of the dictionary entries. All in all it appears to be a very reliable work, now in scope but rather traditional in solving etymological problems. A concise version of this dictionary would also be welcome.

REFERENCES

- Brook, G. L. 1963. *English Dialects*. London: André Deutsch.
 Brückner A. 1957. *Słownik Etymologiczny Języka Polskiego*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
 Kluge, F. 1957. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Deutschen Sprache*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.
 Мартынов, В. В. 1963. *Славяно-германское лексическое взаимодействие древнейшей поры*. Мянск.

English and Its History. The Evolution of a Language. By R. D. Stevick. Pp. xi, 339. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968.

Reviewed by Wiesław Awedyk, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

In the past few years several books dealing with the history of the English language have appeared. Stevick's work which is designed for advanced university courses is one of them. This study comprises the whole language system, i.e. phonology (Chap. 3 - 10), morphology (Chap. 11 - 17), semantics (Chap. 18 - 22), spelling (Chap. 23) and syntax (Chap. 24 - 26). Chapters 1 - 3 are an introduction to linguistics and in Chapter 27 the problems of change, variation and dialects are discussed. The arrangement of material within chapters is as follows: (1) the Modern English system, which also serves as the basis for the discussion of linguistic terminology, (2) the Old English system, and (3) the evolution of the system from Old English to Modern English.

The book could have been a good introduction to the study of the history of the English language if it were not for serious methodological and factual errors. For example, Stevick discusses the consonants (Chap. 3 - 6) and vowels (Chap. 7 - 10) separately, although he admits that 'systems may interact as in the relations of vowels and consonants' (315). Thus, the student learns first about diphthongs in Middle English which developed from the vocalization of [x, g] before he knows anything about the Middle English vocalic system, let alone the Old English system. Moreover, the author is forced to repeat the same thing twice; first, when discussing the evolution of the constant system — the change is labelled 'the loss in consonant system' (66 - 7); second, when discussing the evolution of the vocalic system — the change is labelled 'the development of new diphthongs' (87 - 8). This apparent systematic treatment only obscures the problem.

Another methodological drawback can be exemplified by the fact that spelling which in historical studies is of primary importance and should come first is considered only in Chapter 23 (272 - 80).

In Chapter 2 'Some Background Information' Stevick gives some general information about the history of English and its dialects in Old and Middle English. In the last section of this chapter we find a description of the vocal tract which is treated as 'one additional kind of background information' (18). Since the book is designed for advanced courses we do not understand why the author introduces this problem.

Another example of Stevick's inconsistency: in Chapter 5 (39 - 54) 'Consonant Clusters' he discusses the initial and final clusters, but only initial clusters of Old English are presented. Some problems are presented in an ambiguous way, for example, it is not quite clear how <(e)s> came to signal the 3rd person singular of the present tense verb form (205 - 6). The development of the periphrastic marking of the comparison of adjectives (164) as well as the discussion of more general problems like the definition of the English language (6 - 9) are equally obscure.

Similarly, the classification of Old English nouns (167 - 9) according to the gender category obscures the similarities between declensions, e.g. between the Strong Masculine *a* and Strong Neuter *a*.

Stevick takes up some quasi-problems like 'fortuitous recurrences or symbolisms' (219). Under the heading 'Absence of morphological patterning' he considers the following forms: *blow, blop, blap, blurt, blast* where /bl-/ signifies 'something like violent exhalation' (219). Another example of this kind: under the heading 'Sets with ambivalent characteristics' (217 - 8) the author considers the possibility of regarding /-θ/ and /-st/ of Old English forms *north, süθ, east* and *west* as morphemes signifying axis which are parallel or at right angles to the path of the sun. He rejects this possibility but the discussion is unnecessary and misleading.

Stevick tries to deduce prosodic features from writing. The examination of an Old English manuscript leads him to the following conclusion: 'What has been marked for Modern English as < \ > [signals END] corresponds to maximum spacing in the manuscript evidence ... What has been marked for Modern English as < - > [signals GO ON] regularly corresponds to spacing wider than other spacings except those at the sentence boundaries'. (294) We seriously doubt whether there is any sound basis for such an interpretation.

The author also commits a number of factual errors, e.g. in the Old English consonant system he does not distinguish [ç], an allophone of /x/, which appeared in words like *cnihht* 'boy', *niht* 'night'. On the other hand he distinguishes [ɣ], an allophone of /x/ as in *beorgan* 'to protect' and /g/ as in *dragan* 'to draw'. The majority of scholars express the opinion that both in *beorgan* and *dragan* the same allophone [ɣ] occurred.

We do not understand, since no proof is given, why Stevick interprets the first phoneme of the Old English form *gōd* 'good' as /g/, i.e. a voiced palatal-velar spirant, and the first phoneme of the Old English form *gār* 'spear' as /g/, i.e. a voiced palatal-velar stop.

Stevick's interpretation of the Old English vocalic system (83) is also erroneous. According to him the diagraph in *eald* 'old' represents a phonic and phonetic diphthong with a short second element, i.e. [æald], while the diagraph in *dēad* 'dead' represents a phonic and phonemic diphthong with a long second element, i.e. [dæad]. Other diagraphs are treated in the same way. This interpretation has been rejected by nearly all linguists in whose opinion the difference between the vocalic segments in *eald* and *dēad* is as follows: [ald] compared with [dæəd], i.e. a simple vowel against a diphthong.

It is also not clear why Stevick considers the <-i- > in *nerie* 'I save' as a consonant /g/, i.e. /nerge/, and the <-i- > in *lufie* 'I love' as a vowel /i/, i.e. /lufie/ (190).

In Chapter 19 'Lexical Resources' (231 - 44) the distinction between loan-words and loan-translations is not clearly marked.

All the methodological drawbacks outlined in the present review as well as the factual errors point to one conclusion: Stevick's work cannot serve its purpose, i.e. it can hardly be used as a students' manual. The book can be regarded rather as a popular summary of the history of the English language for those who want to learn something about their mother tongue.

English Language Teaching and Television. By S. Pit Corder. Pp. IV, 107. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1966.

Reviewed by Zofia Jancewicz, Warsaw Agricultural University

As the title implies, the book is primarily intended to deal with problems of English language teaching. However, it seems that it will also be useful to teachers of other foreign languages, and to those concerned with new developments in education in general.

Not only does this book fill a need that teachers of foreign languages have, but it will encourage such teachers to pay more attention to new and important aspects of foreign language teaching.

This reviewer believes that the book will be of primary interest to the reader seeking a concise introduction to the problems connected with harnessing television as a vehicle of foreign language instruction. With the impact of TV we are faced with the need to devise new techniques or adapt old ones for more efficient FLT.

"The theme of this study", the author clearly states in the introduction, "is that the problem is one of method; it is a problem, in the first instance, for the teacher, the linguist, and the psychologist, and secondarily for the TV producer and technician."

The book under review constitutes a good example of rigorous scholarship of the author and pleasant readability. To make it more readable, the author tries merely to touch upon the problems of pedagogy, linguistics or methodology, and for the same reason seems to avoid the use of technical terminology in linguistics and psychology.

The material in the book is presented in a very orderly manner, the chapters well organized, and the theme logically developed. The book contains nine chapters. At the end of each chapter there is a short list of references. The contents of the book may be roughly divided into two parts: part I, treating the problems connected with Television as a new vehicle of language instruction, and part II, dealing with the aspects of methodology of FLT by use of TV.

In Chapter 1, *Television in Education*, the reader is made to see some inherent characteristics of Television as a vehicle of instruction which make it especially suited for the task. They are: 1. The accessibility of TV; 2. The immediacy of TV; 3. The advantage of a front seat; 4. Extension of the visual sense; 5. Contact with the best teachers ("not every teacher in the classroom" — the author says — "is an outstanding teacher, but every teacher who is concerned with the preparation of an instructional TV programme and with presenting it over the air, should be outstanding"); 6. Presentation of visual aids; 7. Ease and economy of the use of film material; 8. Low cost of audience coverage.

Chapter 2 deals with the controlling variables. First of all, the author discusses various types of audiences, i.e. "captive audience" made up of learners who are attending voluntarily or compulsorily some educational institution, "non-captive audience" made up of viewers who follow the TV-LT course privately in their own homes, and the "voluntary captive audience" made up of viewers who belong voluntarily to an organization or club, either formal or informal, whose object is viewing TV programmes. The author then examines their characteristics as an audience for TV and, on the basis of the results, tries to establish what influence they may have as a controlling variable on a design of a TV-LT course.

The next part of Chapter 2 contains technical considerations of TV production. As the techniques of TV production are an important variable in connection with planning and execution of a live TV-LT series, the author describes the means that exist for producing sound and vision in TV, the facilities that may be at the disposal of a designer of a TV-LT course and the general limitations he must be prepared to face. In addition, the author discusses the inherent technical limitations of sound and vision equipment in the studio itself in order to establish the influence that they may have on the method at the presentation stage. Then follows a discussion of the psychology of learning by TV. The author signals scarcity of research work and reviews his own and other authors' findings on this subject. The importance of the impression of reality is discussed, as well as the characteristics of an instructional TV programme which will ensure good comprehension and learning, such as: movement, diagrams and visual aids, coordination

of visual aids and verbal material, correctness of material, and some others. The chapter ends with the description of the costs of TV-LT, i.e. the cost of running the transmitting station, the cost of production (script writing, salaries of the staff, the cost of effects and the cost of textbooks). It also ends with an assessment of the relative costs of the two alternative methods of production, i.e. of live courses and film courses.

Chapter 3 is an attempt to answer the question why a methodology is needed especially for TV. This chapter makes a good link between the first part of the book dealing with technical and other conditions of setting the new vehicle into operation, and the second one discussing a proposed method for Television. This is duly the second longest chapter in the book, very well organized and with excellent clarity of exposition. First of all, the author discusses some processes in the teaching of a foreign language in a normal classroom situation and then investigates whether or not they can operate on TV, and if so how far. Ample consideration is given to the feed-back signals, and a table of positive and negative feed-back signals in different language skills is included. Also various contextualizing processes in the classroom are aptly discussed, and tabular classification of various contextualizing procedures in language learning included. It is concluded that "TV-LT can outdo the classroom only in simulated contextualization. In this it offers a much broader scope than the teacher can ever hope to achieve in the classroom even with the best audiovisual aids".

Chapter 4, the most expanded one in the book, reveals the main purpose of the study, i.e. a proposal of a method for Television. It opens with a discussion which tends to show that the traditional methods of teaching languages cannot be effectively adapted at all stages to studio teaching whether live or telerecorded. Some space is then devoted to a consideration of those linguistic habits which we try to teach, in order to define their status and their relationship to verbal behaviour. The author proceeds by reminding the reader that the pupil is so often unable to make use of his linguistic habits outside the classroom, unless they have been taught as responses to a variety of contextual stimuli. "It is for this reason", the author states, "we introduce contextualization into the classroom". The process of making responses available for all contexts is known to psychologists as stimulus generalization, and is one which is in continuous operation while the child learns his mother tongue. "The implication for the method which is being advocated in this and succeeding chapters is that we must make sure that responses which are identical in a linguistic sense must be taught in a variety of contexts to ensure generalization. TV offers us the opportunity to do this". After a short review of recent attempts to teach some foreign language material in and by context, the traditional method is confronted with the new one proposed by the author — the Contextual Method — and the implications of the approach are evaluated. Short evaluations are made with references to: 1. the behavioural unit, 2. intelligibility and meaning, 3. grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation, 4. bilingual comparison, 5. utility ("the contextual method", the author states, "since it teaches whole behavioural units has, on the one hand, immediate surrender value of that which has been taught, from the very start"), 7. learners' previous knowledge of the language, 8. the student's book, and 9. use of the mother tongue. The Contextual Method operates in a diametrically opposed direction to that of the traditional one. It starts from an analysis of living contexts, selects and grades the contextual and verbal items to be presented, and then fits them together. The new approach has been based on the unique power of TV to contextualize language on the one hand, and on the limitations which TV must impose on live teaching by the traditional method on the other. The contextual method must be consigned to film and has wide, if not universal applicability.

Chapter 5 is a continuation of the theme developed in the previous chapter and it

discusses the presentation of the context, which is the central point of the new method, and the means offered to the learner on TV to practice the verbal behaviour taught in contexts. The proposed method of presentation consists of three stages, corresponding to the presentation, practice and consolidation stages in the classroom. A short description of how these operate on TV is presented. The chapter ends with the description of an episode which is offered as an example of the sort of context which might be presented in one lesson in the contextual method.

The impact of Chapter 6 is a discussion of the principles of selecting and grading contextual material. It informs the reader what constitutes the material we are going to teach when designing a contextual course. Some factors are outlined which will have to be taken into account in selecting the material and in grading it, as well as very brief indications in what way this may be done. Ample space is devoted to the question of 1. context of situation, 2. verbal behaviour, 3. the selection of verbal material, 4. grading of the verbal material of context, and 5. the role of controlling variables in the selection and grading of verbal material.

Chapter 7 treats the student's book which accompanies the TV series. After presenting a short review of the functions of the traditional classroom textbook, and discussing its function in live TV-LT for captive and non-captive audiences, the author considers its role in the contextual method. There would be three sections in the student's book in the contextual method: 1. The English script of the lessons with a translation into the student's mother tongue; 2. Explanations referring to the differences in verbal behaviour between English and the mother tongue; 3. There might be a case for including some description or analysis of the linguistic forms used in the lesson.

Chapter 8 presents to the reader in a form which allows easy comparison the principal points of difference between the traditional and the contextual methods as they appear in the previous chapters. Tabular form of the comparison adds to the clarity of the exposition and is welcomed by the reader.

The final Chapter 9 is a call for further research and inquiries. The author feels that the inquiries should fall into three distinct categories: viewer research, studies in learning by TV, and assessment of achievement in specific TV-LT courses.

The reviewer feels that the book could be improved by either expanding Chapter 5 which seems to be much too short, or by including a separate chapter that would show a real sample of the Contextual Method at work.

One would very much favour an extensive continuation of this book that would treat more fully theoretical principles of the new approach and results of the applied studies. An instructional film illustrating how the Contextual Method operates and a book to accompany it would certainly meet the demand of many.

In conclusion, I consider this book a valuable and welcome sign of the arrival of a new and potent tool for teaching foreign languages and of the problems connected with its setting into operation and effective utilization.

An Introductory English Grammar. By Norman C. Stageberg, *With a Chapter on Transformational Grammar* by Ralph Goodman. Pp. 506. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.

Reviewed by Nina Nowakowska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

The book under review is a pedagogical grammar of English. To briefly bring to mind the distinction between scientific and pedagogical grammars, one can recall O. Thomas that the former should offer a logical, complete and self-consistent explanation

for the way any particular language operates, whereas the latter is simply that which a teacher uses in the classroom in accordance with the age, nationality etc. of the students. In contradistinction to many scientific descriptions of English available, pedagogical grammars are much fewer in number than one could expect, not to mention the out-of-date methods of presentation of material the reader might find in the texts. The work under discussion is a modern grammar, taking advantage of some of the latest achievements in the development of linguistic theory.

In the chapter *To the Instructor* Stageberg sketches the outline, aim, and coverage of the volume. Introducing it as a college textbook, designed for a three-hour, one-semester course for undergraduates, the author admits the limitations of the quantity of grammatical description and exemplification, drawing the reader's attention to the fundamental importance of a great number of self-controlling exercises the book contains. The exposition of the material, as the chapter reads, "advances by short-step progression, with an exercise after nearly every step" (VII) — an ingenious method which can be traced throughout the whole book.

The first section of the book contains a structural description of the language at its three levels: phonology, morphology, syntax. A generative-transformational model presented by Goodman, covers approximately a third of the work. The idea of presenting to the student two contemporary linguistic schools at work simultaneously seems to be both advantageous and courageous, as any attempt confronting the old and the new must be. While Stageberg's description should be viewed as an achievement resulting from long tradition of structural method, Goodman's model, "offered as a hypothesis" (383), is one of the first applications of the theory to the analysis of English, and as such must be subject to verification and modification.

Part One: *The Phonology of English* consists of the following chapters: I. The Production and Inventory of English Phonemes, II. Assimilation and Other Phonetic Processes, III. Spelling and Pronunciation, IV. Stress, V. Pitch Levels and Terminals, VI. Internal Open Juncture, VII. The Distribution of Phonemes.

One cannot fault the work for including in the discussion some problems of subsidiary importance. It seems, however, that unequal success has been gained in approaching various fundamental questions, i.e. the analysis of one or two topics lacks accuracy in being too simplified. The notion of phoneme being consistently viewed as a speech sound that signals a difference in meaning can serve as an example. Such simplified analysis leads to inadequacy in sound classification from which certain important categories are either absent (e.g. phonetic features), or not rigorously defined (e.g. allophones). On the whole, the ingenious treatment of the suprasegmentals surpasses any other investigations in the phonological section. The analysis of the stress patterns is accompanied by a great number of useful exercises. Those which draw the student's attention to the correspondences between the grammatical structures and stress patterns seem most noteworthy. For the prospective foreign student of English the treatment of the stress gradation is a bit too short since no information as to which parts of speech are weakly stressed has been included. The discussion of intonation ends with the enumeration of the basic intonation contours, which result from the possible combinations of four pitch phonemes and three terminal junctures, and assigns them to the most frequent types of utterance. Obviously the author has taken advantage of some thorough linguistic studies in the field.

It seems appropriate here to object to the procedure that is present throughout the whole volume, namely the absence of any bibliographical notes (except of the short acknowledgements), which in this kind of textbook should serve the student as a list of the collateral reading.

Part Two: *The Morphology of English* includes the following topics: VIII. Morphemes, IX. Words, X. Inflectional Paradigms, XI. Four Processes of Word Formation, XII. Determiners and Prepositions.

Not much can be added to the above beside stressing that the discussion covers the whole of the included problems, with the analyses of some subjects being very detailed and highly formalized (e.g. Inflectional Paradigms, 119 - 48). Keeping in mind the aim of the book, no fault has been found with the absence of minor categories in the theoretical remarks (e.g. infix, which does not exist in English), nor in the fact that some ad hoc definitions could dissatisfy a rigorous scholar (e.g. the working definition of bases and affixes). The more rigorous definitions which occasionally occur in the footnotes exceed the practical requirements of the student (e.g. the footnote p. 88). Perhaps it will be worth mentioning that a large number of appropriate exercises can with equal success be applied as advanced language tests for the non-native speakers.

Part Three: *Syntax* covers the chapters: XIII. Noun and Verb Clusters, XIV. Basic Sentence Patterns, XV. Parts of Speech, XVI. Modifications, XVII. Constituents, XVIII. Some Syntactic Details.

This seems to be as thorough an analysis of the English syntax as can be expected within the designed scope. The first chapter, a short one, introduces the most important terms (sentence, clause, phrase, head, modifier, etc.), and is succeeded by the presentation of nine basic sentence patterns, which are in fact one-, two-, three-, and four-element clause patterns. The chief purpose of this presentation is to equip the student with information on the seven sentence functions (subject, verb, etc.). The classification by function is accompanied by two other classifications, namely: by form (noun, verb, etc.), and by position (nominal, verbal, etc.). The three put together show the value, on the one hand, of finding out all the sentence relations, and on the other, of describing explicitly each sentence element. The amplification of the above mentioned concepts revealed in the next chapters aims at exhausting the classifications by form and position. The entries are classified as the form-classes in accordance with their fulfilment of the inflectional and/or derivational requirements of a given class, e.g.

quickly — an adverb, because of the -ly suffix

fast — a UW (uninflected word)

boy — a noun, as capable of accepting two inflectional and at least one derivational suffixes

golf — a UW

Certain sentence positions are characteristically the habitation of each of the form classes and, correspondingly, these are called nominals, verbals, etc.; as a result not only nouns can be correctly called nominals:

e.g. "Steadily is the best way to work".

steadily — an adverb by form, subject by function, nominal by position.

One of the function classes, modifiers, dealt with in a separate chapter, are divided into three subclasses, one of them comprehending all the English subordinate clauses.

Stageberg's contribution to the volume concludes with a synopsis of the most useful IC analyses. These analyses are contained in the theoretical explanations and exercises and have been presumably meant as an intermedium between the structural and transformational parts of the grammar.

Part Four: *Transformational Grammar* consisting of one chapter, XIX. A Look at Transformational Grammar, aims at providing the student with some elementary knowledge of the subject.

In his introductory remarks the author points out the generative power of the grammar, drawing the reader's attention to the primary distinction between the structural

ral and transformational descriptions. The former attempts to give rules for automatically analysing arbitrarily given sentences, whereas the latter gives rules for producing all and only grammatical sentences. In doing so it assigns each generated sentence an analysis. This brief account, supplemented with a series of illustrative examples and exercises, seems to be convincing and clear.

Writing his transformational grammar of English Goodman is only in part a successor of other scholars working on the subject. As his predecessors and contributors the author names N. Chomsky, R. Lees, R. Stockwell, R. Schachter, T. Anderson.

The presented five-part grammar consists of: (1) a phrase structure grammar, which includes recursive rules that generate an infinite number of strings and within which transformations are selected, (2) lexicon, (3) morphophonemic rules, (4) transformations, (5) Rules of Order. The model differs exceedingly from the earlier applications of the theory to the analyses of natural languages. A convenient countercurrent may be O. Thomas's pedagogical transformational grammar of English published the same year. The procedure accepted by Goodman aims at writing a grammar capable of generating without transformations a vast amount of sentences called kernels. The functions usually assigned to transformation have been shifted over to the Lexicon Charts, morphophonemic rules and first of all, to the Rules of Order. Those „traffic" rules will contain such formulas as Noun Selection, Verb Selection, Subject-verb Agreement, etc. Some of these rules are apparently nothing more than the previously called obligatory transformations, e.g. Rule of Order 5.6.2. "if past is selected add the element 'past' to the right of the verb" (336). Scarcely justified seems to be the author's procedure of introducing to the grammar this new, hardly formalized component.

To generate Nonkernel transformations are applied in accordance with the Rules of Order for Non-kernels. They operate on the extended phrase structure strings, symbolized EPS, within which T-markers have already been selected.

It should be admitted that the highly complicated apparatus employed by the author as well as the inadequacy of certain definitions and classifications do not allow one to approve of the proposed grammar on conditions other than mere hypothesis, however interesting it may be. On the other hand in this analysis of the concrete language a number of tendencies characteristic of the further development of the theory of generative-transformational grammar can be traced, e.g. an extension of phrase structure grammar, a rigorously designed lexicon etc.

Foreign Language Learning. By Robert L. Politzer. Pp. IX+155. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Reviewed by Jadwiga Nawrocka-Fisiak, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

The book is concerned with the problems involved in the process of learning foreign languages. It is, first of all, addressed to the learners of foreign languages, particularly to the native speakers of English and the whole discussion is almost entirely based on English.

Its main goal is to provide some explanation for the process of the creation of certain skills in language learning in order to increase the ability of the mature language learner by the understanding of what he is going to do.

The book consists of fourteen chapters organized into the following four major sections:

I Language and language learning (Chap. 1 - 3)

II The nature of language (Chap. 4 - 6)

III The problems of foreign language learning (Chap. 7 - 10)

IV How to learn a foreign language (Chap. 11 - 14)

The last three sections are provided with a series of exercises.

The first three chapters are introductory and contain some general remarks on the nature of language and the problem of interference in learning a foreign language. The linguistic philosophy which underlies this section as well as the whole book is neo-Bloomfieldian structuralism.

Section Two consists of the discussion of selected problems of English phonology, morphology and syntax. It gives the author an opportunity to explain some basic language phenomena and also to acquaint native speakers of English with the phonetics and grammar of their own language. As to the sounds, the author says: 'it is helpful to know just how the sounds of English are produced so that we can learn how those of the foreign language differ, how we must modify the English sound in order to produce the foreign sound' (19).

As to the morphology and syntax, his attitude is similar. It is easier to understand the differences between the two languages, the native one and the one we learn, if we have some knowledge about the former.

In *Section Three* Politzer analyses the reasons of errors and the difficulties encountered in the process of learning a foreign language, pointing to the fact that in learning foreign sounds the main source of difficulty may be either the absence of this sound in the native language of a student, or the so-called 'genuine pronunciation problem', that is the inability of the student to pronounce a particular sound, and the tendency to replace it by a similar one from his own language. He also rightly indicates that in the sphere of morphology 'the reason for using a wrong form (wrong in the sense that it is put together incorrectly) lies in confusion created by the language to be learned rather than in some sort of mix-up caused by the native language of the learner' (68). It may result in the wrong extension in use of derivational or paradigmatic endings or even in making up wrong complete patterns.

The mistakes in syntax are, according to him, due to either the misapplication of a pattern correct in itself in a given situation or simply to 'the assembly of words according to the blueprints of the native language rather than according to those of the language to be learned' (97).

Section Four represents to a certain degree a continuation of the previous section but it also contains some suggestions how to overcome the difficulties in the process of learning. For those who want to achieve good pronunciation the author recommends some ear training exercises in a form contrasting the foreign speech sounds with the native substitutes. In order to learn syntactic patterns Politzer suggests having a stock of ever-growing model sentences and applying some simple transformations such as substitution, expansion, and passive or negative transformations, to get new sentences.

The term transformation is used by Politzer in a few places. Its application in the work under review may raise objections as it really does not seem to fit the rest of the material presented in a typically static structural mode.

Since the last two sections form an integrated body the question may arise whether it would not be better for the sake of clarity to treat them together. It would help to avoid some repetition of material and would not require looking back to the part previously read.

On the whole the book is written in a readable fashion. It includes a number of useful observations and if one keeps in mind the type of reader to whom it is addressed,

one may agree that it is a useful piece of work although slightly outdated in its linguistic background.

Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading. By Carl A. Lefevre. Pp. XXI+262. New York—San Francisco—Toronto—London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
Reviewed by Jadwiga Nawrocka-Fisiak, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

As the title indicates, this book deals with the problem of teaching reading. The linguistic framework of the work is neo-Bloomfieldian structuralism as developed by Trager and Smith.

The book is divided into nine chapters and supplied with two appendices: A — Summary of symbols and abbreviations, B — The human speech instrument. It contains a short preface (vii-x), an introduction (xi-xxi) and a selected bibliography (232-42).

In the *Introduction* and *Chapter One* Lefevre presents some basic notions of language and his approach to the problem of reading. Reading, according to him, is "first and foremost a language process. Any language process may best be studied integrally with the signalling system or code that transmits meaning. Reading depends on auditing and speaking and is closely linked to writing; auditing and speaking are audiovisual processes, reading and writing are manual-visual, but all are language processes. Speaking and auditing may be thought of as sending and receiving operations of audio-lingual communication; writing and reading as sending and receiving operations of communication — 'graphics'" (196).

Chapter Two presents an analysis of reasons for the reading retardation among children and adults in the United States. *Chapter Three* deals with an analysis of the child's world of language from cradle to pre-school age, with special reference to such factors as formation and development of the speech mechanism, the role of family members, childhood friends and teachers in kindergartens.

Chapters Four to Eight discuss in turn American English intonation, basic sentence patterns and their variations, structure words, word-form changes, all in relation to reading.

The last chapter comprises some remarks about language in general, the history of the English language, the place of American English among other languages, etc.

The book is intended, in the author's own words, 'for all who have a part in developing literacy in the young: school, college, and university teachers of English language and literature, of language arts methods, and of reading; students preparing to teach, in-service teachers; school administrators, program supervisors, curriculum specialists; parents, relatives, and friends of children' (xiii).

It advocates a whole-sentence method of teaching reading as against vocabulary methods. The author rightly points out that 'in reading, the learner must grasp the meaning-bearing structures as wholes in order to comprehend meaning. Sentences are the basic building blocks of meaning; comprehension begins with sentence comprehension' (81).

Lefevre is also right when he insists that the best method of teaching reading and writing for the beginner would be to start with the patterns the children already bring to school with them.

The work, however, has one major defect. It appeared at least twenty years later, than it should. The linguistic theory on which the author bases himself has recently been replaced by more modern approaches to language, and it is strange, indeed, that

the author who quotes two of the more recent works, has not profited from what has been going on in linguistics since 1957.

As for minor shortcomings, one must note too many needless repetitions throughout the book.

Linguistics and the Teaching of English. By Albert H. Marckwardt. Pp. 136. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.
Reviewed by Andrzej Kuczyński, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

In this book A. H. Marckwardt presents and discusses various possibilities of applying linguistics to English teaching in American primary and secondary schools.

After the first introductory Chapter (3-6) dealing with linguistics as a means of enlarging the teacher's knowledge about language and thus improving his teaching efficiency, the author suggests many different ways of, and reasons for, applying the science of language to all the more important aspects of the teaching of English, such as grammar, usage, composition, spelling, reading, and literature.

An attempt to find the answers to the teacher's questions, "What shall I teach?", and, "What and how much should I know?" is the subject of Chapter 2 — *Current Approaches to English Grammar* (7-26). It is when trying to find answers to these questions that most teachers find themselves at a loss. The educational authorities of both America and Britain being by no means satisfied with the standard of English of the young generation nor with the efficacy of the teaching methods, have devoted a great deal of time and energy to find some workable and effective measures of improvement. Having touched upon the changing role of grammar since the Middle Ages, the author gives a brief and simplified description of the traditional, structural, and transformational approaches to language followed by the statement that no single grammar is a complete picture of the structure and operation of the English language. This is why the teacher should know as much as possible of each of these grammars.

The complex problem of usage is dealt with in Chapter 3 — *Usage: Varieties, Levels, and Styles*, (27-47). The concept of usage has gone through various stages of development before reaching its present shape. Chapter 3 gives a survey of different attitudes towards varieties, levels, and styles of the English language from the right—or—wrong dichotomy at the beginning of the present century, through the ladder — like hierarchy of levels, to Kenyon's "cultural levels" and "functional varieties", and Joos's five styles of English. The examples of various approaches to styles and levels of language show the complexity of the matter in question. A single, hierarchical arrangement of language levels is impossible as there are many factors, such as class dialect, the nature of the medium, the features of the style, that have their bearing on the situation. No individual word or form can be placed on an ascending scale without reference to its total context. If the teacher wants his students to use the right language in the right situations he must develop in them such an instinct for a situation, and feeling of language that will enable them to reach this goal. And he cannot do that without first developing these qualities in himself, without following all the new ideas and suggestions in this particular field.

The discussion of usage is continued in the next Chapter, *Finding and Interpreting the Facts* (48-65). This part of the discussion seems to be of more practical value for the teacher as it deals with all kinds of sources of information concerning the English language. The character of the teacher's work frequently demands from him judg-

ments on various matters of usage and, as no single person can fully rely on his own intuition in linguistic matters, he has to resort to reference sources such as dictionaries of all kinds, compendia of usage, linguistic atlases, grammar books, etc. A number of these are presented and recommended here, and it is up to the teacher to make best use of this contribution of linguistics to his work.

Some interesting suggestions as to how linguistics can help in the teaching of composition are put forward in Chapter 5 — *Linguistics and the Teaching of Composition* (66 - 84). Two significant points have been emphasized here. The first one is that in teaching composition, literature, and reading, linguistics has merely an auxiliary role. The second point is that no "linguistic methods" of teaching composition, reading, and foreign languages exist. One can only speak of linguistically based materials and linguistically orientated approaches. The main conclusion that can be drawn from the author's suggestions in this chapter is that by showing the student how the language works, by teaching him the expansion of language patterns the teacher should develop in him the negative and positive attitudes to his language which, on the one hand, will help him avoid incorrect or clumsy expressions and, on the other hand, will make the student aware of the vast possibilities of usage.

A new outlook upon the English writing system can be developed with the help of some background information supplied by historical linguists. Chapter 6, *Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading and Spelling* (85 - 99), points out how this system, usually so much criticized for its inconsistencies and irregularities, begins to look more logical and sensible when one is aware of at least some of the more important historical phenomena that have brought about its present state. Even a superficial knowledge of basic facts from the history of English will be of great use to the teacher in teaching spelling, in explaining its intricacies and seeming inconsistencies. Linguistics is also beginning to influence the teaching of spelling in that it provides criteria for selecting the most suitable vocabulary items to be taught at the beginning stage. The second part of the chapter is devoted to the contribution of linguistics to the teaching of reading which chiefly amounts to putting a linguistically orientated context at the teacher's disposal. One of the main principles to be remembered is that teaching a child to read does not mean teaching him the language but teaching how to put in writing what he already can express in speaking.

Although a growing tendency towards specialization has brought about a separation of literary and linguistic studies, it does not necessarily mean that the separation is complete, and that there are no points of common interest or grounds for co-operation. This is the subject of Chapter 7, *Linguistics and the Study of Literature* (100 - 21), in which the author points out that both the literary critic and the linguist, each in his own way and for his own reasons, are interested in the language of a literary work, and this is where the linguist can be of great assistance to his literary colleague. This assistance can be described as a shield against rash and incorrect conclusions concerning linguistic facts, against forming false and unsupportable definitions as often happens as a result of ignoring some easily available historical data. Instead, the linguist can offer a sound, systematic, scientifically based method for the interpretation of linguistic phenomena in a literary work.

A kind of theoretical summing up of what has been said in this book constitutes the final chapter, *The Role of Language in the Curriculum* (122 - 36). Referring to some more important arguments from the preceding chapters, the author sets forward a number of cultural, social, political, and international reasons for devoting more space and time to all aspects of language teaching in the school curriculum, meaning both native and foreign language instruction.

English Syntax: Advanced Composition for Non-native Speakers. By A. E. Nichols. Pp. XVI, 224. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
Reviewed by Ironeusz Jakubczak, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

As the author states in the Foreword, this text aims at two things:

- a) "to augment the general handbook information needed in any composition class with specific information that the non-native speaker needs...."
- b) to apply the techniques and principles used in teaching English on the aural-oral level to the teaching of written English".

Thus the book tries to fill in the gap existent since World War II, for the reason that "linguists have produced a large body of material for teaching foreign languages on the aural-oral level, but until recently they have neglected written language".

The book is designed for composition teachers, whether they are linguists or not. It is especially thought of as a help for those who teach foreign graduate students in the United States. The reviewed work combines features of descriptive grammar as well as those of a handbook. It is done so by clear-cut separation of its two main parts: one on English syntax (chiefly descriptive) the other, on composition (prescriptive). The parts are neatly joined with a transition chapter: *Style and Structure*. Each part is divided into several chapters on one or more points which are further divided into subchapters. Each subchapter is provided with a good amount of exercises on a particular point, e.g. kinds of nouns. The exercises in the second are mainly *controlling context exercises*, because as the author judges "when a student controls a model paragraph, he masters both logical and rhetorical patterns as well as syntactically related sentences". And then comes the structural grammars' warning that "the amount of time spent talking about English should be minor in proportion to the time spent using the language".

The theory in Part I should clarify the principles involved in the exercises, but theory "is only a means, never an end in itself". The author's approach is eclectic; she tries to combine the best elements from the following linguistic theories:

- a. traditional in general
- b. structural, in particular the IC analysis
- c. transformational in its simpler form

The IC Analysis is her main tool of investigation. She adapts here Friesian algebraic shorthand and also his symbols as used in *The Structure of English*. Transformational theory is simplified and reduced to the patterns as used in Roberts' — *Patterns of English and English Sentences*. The reason for this is that she writes from the point of view of the foreigner learning English, rather than from that of the linguist describing English. And so she admits: "I have at times adapted linguistic theory to my own purposes; for example, my use of transformation is sometimes only an approximation of Chomsky's theory". Since the book is intended for teaching written English, questions of style arise here and there in the text. They are very important in sentence analysis. The author limits her investigation to only some styles, namely those of: "a note to an intimate friend, directions to a casual acquaintance, a lab report, a term paper, a doctoral dissertation". It is especially true about Part I, while Part II expounds only one level — that of college or university writing. One of the author's main concerns is to set up criteria for distinguishing between formal (general) written, and non-formal, colloquial both written and spoken English. She is also aware of differences existing between American and British English though to a comparatively smaller degree. Anyhow, American English is primary for her.

Throughout the text Ann Nichols pursues her two goals stated at the beginning of the Foreword, and she does so by introducing written-language characteristics such as

punctuation which is present in many subchapters that deal with phrase and sentence patterns. Only once does she make a concession and uses speech signals as an evidence, when talking about the following structures:

we were told, it is understood as sentence modifiers.

Now, let us comment on individual chapters.

Chapter I: *Syntactical Classes* — discusses two levels of description: grammatical and syntactical. And here, she is fully structural in her approach when she says that, for example, “a *nominal* is any word or group of words that patterns like a single noun, inasmuch as she analyses classes from their position in a sentence (Fries’s approach). Next, she goes into a detailed discussion on each of the classes.

The author points out to the differences in usage between American and British English in respect to agreement and reference, viz. *everybody*, which is singular in American and plural in British English.

Chapter II: *Sentence Patterns* — gives us description of English sentences. The basic patterns are five in number; and there are two additional ones. From these patterns many other sentences can be derived by means of transformations. The author, enumerating restrictions on the use of verbs that can be employed in an individual pattern (e.g. intransitive verbs can be used in pattern 1 p. 67) and also troubles at distinguishing transitive from intransitive ones (68), gives the rules for:

- a. appositional transforms
- b. noun phrase transforms
- c. passive and prepositional transforms.

Some transforms of the type b. are at least doubtful, since “the man is right — the right man” are different structures.

Coordinate clauses are given their due weight in this chapter. The important thing here is the distinction between *coordinators* — *and, but* and sentence connectors such as *therefore*, accordingly (93 ff.)

Chapter III: *Constructs* — dwells on the subordinate clause, the participial and gerund phrases, and the infinitive phrase.

The author accounts for the term “Construct” stating: “Subordinate clauses and 2 -en, 2 -ing, and to-2 phrases are being treated together under the title *construct* because they all have one important feature in common. In similar, yet different ways they are all analogous to the structure of English sentence patterns in that they are constructed according to the basic design that underlies sentence patterns”.

Chapter IV: *Style and Structure* — gives some hints as to what and what not to write. The author warns us against:

1. Non-parallel constructions e.g. (134)
2. Wordy constructions

Part II — *The Paragraph* — starts the composition portion of the text. After a really short outline of the history of the English paragraph, and some suggestions about its appearance, there are a few sentences on the internal organization of a paragraph. The author draws our attention to the graphic paragraph signals such as white spaces, and also to the technical device known as *the topic sentence*. One example shows how to develop the central point held by the topic sentence.

Then follows a brief discussion on *transitions* from one sentence to another, from one paragraph to another, *transition words*, and *periods* understood as “sentences composed of more than one complete sentence pattern” (148). Distinguished authors are set as examples (148 ff).

The following section provides model paragraphs. There are five kinds of them.

Each paragraph is accompanied with analysis both linguistic and logical, based on imitation exercises. Then, writing assignments follow.

Part III is devoted to the essay in which Ann Nichols distinguishes six kinds, according to their purpose. Each category is backed up with a model essay e.g. taken from well-known authors. Each essay is viewed structurally and logically. Punctuation is given a lot of attention. What is important is that the author describes the kind of audience an essay is addressed to. Writing assignments are an integral part of exercises accompanying a given essay.

There is perhaps one thing which the author should have avoided, namely, too many examples how not to write a paraphrase, a summary, etc. In our judgement more examples showing how to write a good essay should have been included.

We can only appreciate the author’s deep insight into English structures, and her skill in seeing a non-native speaker of English through all the intricacies of English, from simple structural devices to the highly complex language of literature.

Ann Nichols is really a good guide in linguistics and stylistics. Her language is clear, crisp, to the point. Any advanced learner of English can profit much from the book, let alone teachers.

It is to be regretted that the part on composition is not more extensive. More exercises would come in useful.

Otherwise it is a good book, a handy tool for teachers, showing how to apply linguistic knowledge to style studies.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED FOR REVIEW

- Kühlwein, W. 1967. *Die Verwendung der Feindseligkeitsbezeichnungen in der altenglischen Dichtersprache*. Neumünster: Karl Wachholtz Verlag. Pp. 316. DM 30.
- Weinstock, H. 1968. *Mittelenglisches Elementarbuch*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co. Pp. 239.
- Palmatier, R. A. 1969. *A Descriptive Syntax of the Ormulum*. The Hague: Mouton and Co. Pp. 137. DFL. 35.