Studia Anglica Posnaniensia XXIX, 1994

REVIEWS

A history of the English language. Fourth edition. By Albert C. Baugh and Thomas Cable. London: Routledge, 1993. Pp. xvi + 444.

The origins and development of the English language. Fourth edition. By Thomas Pyles and John Algeo. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1993. Pp. xii + 381.

The English language: A historical introduction. By Charles Barber. (Cambridge Approaches to Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Pp. xii + 299.

Reviewed by Manfred Voss, Bonn University.

The three works under review certainly require no extensive introduction: Baugh – Cable (henceforth B-C) was first published in 1935, Pyles – Algeo (P-A) and Barber (B), although this does not become immediately apparent from the title page in the case of the latter, have been around in one form or other since 1964. Textbooks that have managed to go through more than one edition tend to receive fewer and fewer reviews and ever shorter notices, while at the same time they acquire the status of unquestioned authorities, becoming mines of useful and accessible information for writers of term papers and suchlike. Although it will close with a lament, the present review will not engage in extended and, in the end, fruitless discussions of scope and theoretical approach chosen (if any). Instead, it will concentrate on whether the combined efforts of authors, readers retained by the publishers (anonymous or otherwise) and reviewers of previous editions have resulted in that consistent reliability befitting introductory texts.

The third edition of B-C has been called a "relic of the Stone Age", "antediluvian" and "a living dinosaur" by Peters (1979: 94). The superficial revisions a decade and a half later would in all likelihood do nothing to make that reviewer return a more positive verdict now. The plan of the work has not been tampered with in the least, it is still what is generally termed an external (i.e., at best incomplete) history, one that neglects systemic phonological, morphological, semantic and syntactic processes within the language in favor of discussions of, for instance, historical and literary factors at work. There remain the by now familiar imbalances: e.g., the heavy emphasis on the vocabulary and especially loans, the exaggerated depiction of the Norman Conquest as a cataclysmic event at the expense of an account stressing the underlying continuity between Old and Middle English, the many pages devoted to abortive endeavors to establish an English Academy or to the faintly ridiculous efforts of spelling reformers. All this is certainly more entertaining than a series of phonemic splits and mergers, as is the occasional apocryphal anecdote interspersed such as the one of a future pope encountering fair-haired Anglian slave boys in a Roman marketplace (pp. 80-81).

The blurb informs potential buyers that for the fourth edition the first chapter on the place of English in the world has been rewritten (it takes into account recent political developments); that further material on varieties of English around the world has been added; that the sections on Old and Middle English syntax have been thoroughly revised (they remain woefully inadequate) and that the bibliographies have been updated (this has been done quite successfully). There have also been revisions of details, e.g., not long after the millennial year the site of the Battle of Maldon has now been finally moved to where it properly belongs; as the poet, however, makes abundantly clear, by no means all the English on the battlefield were "heroic in defeat" (p. 92). In matters of linguistic theory B-C remains reassuringly old-fashioned: a definition of the dread phoneme still appears hidden away in a footnote now on p. 394. On the other hand, although this in itself may look somewhat quaint nowadays, the number of token references in the index to works of a certain Noam Chomsky has increased from 5 to 7.

What follows is a ragbag of marginalia entered in my copy of B-C (expletives have been deleted). The list does not aspire to completeness and equally refers to errors of substance, misprints and inac-

curate or out-of-date bibliographical information: p. 14: there is a 2nd ed. of Hock (1986); p. 31: the term "Anglo-Frisian" has exceeded its sell-by date; p. 39: Szemerényi's *Einführung* is in its 4th ed. (1990); last line: *Verschlusse*, l. *Verschlüsse*; p. 42: the speculations about the life-styles of Stone Age people, of whose language nothing is known, are redundant; pp. 43, 46-47: of the language of the Picts (mostly unintelligible) scraps are known; pp. 45ff.: the ancient reports on the settlement of Britain by Germanic tribes should be treated with even more caution; p. 48: the Anglo-Saxon system of justice was not all about the payment of *wergild;* p. 50, fn. 1: and French; p. 54, fn.: Brunner, *Altenglische Grammatik* (3rd ed., Halle, 1965), l. Tübingen; p. 63: *mōdgeþoht*, l. *-þōht*; *guþ*, l. *gūþ;* pp. 63-64, 179, 297-298: it is doubtful whether the term "self-explaining compound" is a useful one; p. 65: *geferascipe*, l. *geferscipe;* why not introduce *kenning*?; p. 70: the Old English *Orosius* was not translated by Alfred; p. 71: more recent histories of the Anglo-Saxon period or parts of it include Campbell (ed.) (1982), Yorke (1990) and Kirby (1991); Holthausen, *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 3rd ed. (1974); p. 76: *Ie* as a product of *i-umlaut* was not Common Old English; pp. 76-77: palatal diphthongization was restricted to certain dialect areas; p. 77: *cīese*, l. **cīese* (also p. 78, last line), **cǣsi*, l. **cǣsi;* pp. 78-79: *flasce* and *spelt* are not loans from Latin; p. 91: the treaty between Alfred and Guthrum which defined the line ("roughly from Chester to London") between the West Saxon territories and the Southern Danelaw was concluded not in the year of the Battle of Edington (878), but in 886 or soon after; p. 95: *sk* was palatalized to *sh*, "except possibly in the combination *scr*": really?; *hale* is not Scandinavian; p. 96: *thwaite* is in the first instance best rendered as 'clearing'; p. 98: *welaway*, l. *wellaway;* p. 100: "the form *are* in Modern English undoubtedly owes its extension to the influence of the Danes": in fact, this is somewhat doubtful; p. 101: 3rd sg. pres. *-s* is probably not Scandinavian; the Scandinavian origin of the Northern present participle ending *-and* is at least open to doubt; pp. 103, 151, 414: the manuscript of the *Ormulum* was written ca. 1175-1180; p. 106: the Duchy of Normandy was established in 911, not 912; p. 112: the Belgian sociolinguistic scenario presented requires more thorough revision (or should be omitted entirely); p. 117: (90: "The Diffusion of French and English"): Latin as the language of highest prestige should rate a mention; p. 118: "the original language of the *Rule* (sc. *Ancrene Riwle*) itself was almost certainly English": delete *almost;* p. 143, fn. 2: although in this edition *ejaculated* has been changed to *exclaimend*, the second French quotation is still left untranslated; p. 144, fn. 2: London pillar-boxes with the word "country" on them are an anachronism today; p. 153: *Anglistic*, l. *Anglistik;* p. 157: there seems to be some confusion as to the origins of Modern English *these* and *those*, it should be made clear that the two do not go back to Old English *þās;* fn. l: *aller* ist not 'of us all'; p. 162: German *Weib, Kind:* compare *weib, kind* on p. 11; p. 168: "It is melancholy to think what the English dinner table would have been like had there been no Norman Conquest.": this is empty speculation, but it would probably not have looked much different; p. 170: "the English words *judge* and *chant* preserve the early French pronunciation of *j* and *ch*, which was softened in French in the thirteenth century to [ž] and [š]": *simplified* may be a better word; [č] does not appear in the table of phonetic symbols on p. xvi; p. 171: Modern English *wasp* is not of French origin; p. 175: *leod*, l. *lēod;* pp. 176-177 and fn. 1 on p. 177: *ox, sheep, swine, calf* vs. *beef, mutton, pork, veal*: the passage from Scott's *Ivanhoe* is worthless as an illustration for linguistic purposes, the claims in B-C should be compared with the documentations of the words in question in the dictionaries, see Berndt (1981); p. 193: Reismüller, *Romanische Lehnwörter (erstbelege)*, l. *(Erst-)*; pp. 193-194: Kristensson has published another volume of his *Survey;* p. 231, fn.: Ekwall, 3rd ed. 1956, l. 4th ed. 1965, the heavily annotated English translation by Alan Ward (Oxford, 1975) is not mentioned; p. 232: Middle English diphthongs also developed from the combination of vowel + *j;* Old English *bācan*, l. *bacan;* pp. 235-236: the *his-* (*her-, their-*) genitive construction has its origin in a dative of possession; p. 281, line 24: *and*, l. *an;* p. 295: German *Flak* ist not short for *Fliegerabwehrkanone*, but for *Flugabwehrkanone;* p. 318: the RP transcription should be checked; p. 324: the Caymans Creole transcription requires checking; p. 343: a third volume of the *Scots section* of *The linguistic atlas of Scotland* was published in 1986; p. 345, fn. 1: why not then call the chapter "The English language in the U.S."?; p. 364, line 30: *etc.;*, l. *etc.,;* p. 399: Gimson's *An introduction to the pronunciation of English* is cited in its 2nd ed. (1970), *Everyman's English pronouncing dictionary* in its 13th ed. (1967); Wells's *Longman pronunciation dictionary* (1990) is not mentioned at all; p. 403: line 6, *weren, węren*, l. *wēren, wǣren. Sub* Meillet, A., the index obviously refers to p. 14 of the 3rd ed.; B-C still lacks a word index.

When compared to B-C, P-A's coursebook may seem less dated. A definition of the phoneme appears relatively early into the book on p. 40, phonemic notation, however, is not used in the book. Instead, "phonetic broad transcriptions" are employed, and, although P-A advertises itself as an internal history (p. v), not much effort is made to present the inner workings of language as systemic processes. The preface informs us that for the fourth edition "[a] variety of more radical revisions were considered but finally rejected" and that the guiding principle was the somewhat trite "If it ain't broke, don't fix it" (p. v). Minor changes have been made to "update the information" and "simplify the presentation" (p. v). The book is still written in an easy laid-back style, there are numerous jocular asides, and, as in B-C, the occasional anecdote or tall story is strewn in like the one about the Jutes and Hengest and Horsa (p. 97 and fn. 1) — *se non è vero, è ben trovato*. Although the bibliography, which remains somewhat eclectic, has been brought up to date, individual chapters still lack suggestions for further reading (one exception occurs on p. 179f.). There surely must be readers who, at leat occasionally, want to go beyond what is on offer on the pages of P-A. Or at least there ought to be: one of the more important tasks for any textbook is to encourage independent study.

This is a list of observations on matters of detail: inside front and back covers: it is not entirely clear why the table of IPA symbols is printed, P-A certainly deviates from it in a number of ways; p. 22: on the Eskimos and their "many words for many kinds of snow" see Pullum (1991: 159-171); p. 48: a ligature of *o* + *e* was not used in Old English manuscripts; p. 49: not all Insular scripts have rounded letters; the digraph *æ*, l. ligature; p. 68 (Indo-European tree): Anglo-Frisian: see the comment above (B-C p. 31), see also P-A p. 93; p. 76: "nor are there any Gothic loanwords in any of the Germanic languages": this may not hold true for certain dialects of Southern Germany; pp. 87 and 90: not every Indo-European *gh-* became a voiced stop in Germanic, witness Modern English *yard* (an example given on p. 88); pp. 92-93: "Plattdeutsch" should be replaced by "Niederdeutsch" and "Low German" should only be used as a translation for this (B-C p. 31 has "Plattdeutsch" alongside "modern Low German", see also P-A p. 68); p. 96: "we may in a sense begin thinking of Britain as England": never ever!; p. 100: Alfred did *not* translate the Old English Orosius; p. 103: [ʊ] as in *nut: nut* as pronounced in the North of England, for instance?; pp. 103-104: *ĕo* is usually thought to have developed into a rounded monophthong first; pp. 107 and 293: although Jespersen (1982: 64) may say so, Old English *brēad* did not mean 'fragment' (or 'bit, piece'), but 'bread' or 'piece, morsel of bread', the use of *loaf* cognates in the sense 'bread' came to be restricted in all Germanic languages (except Gothic) and this was a comparatively late development in Old Norse; pp. 114 and 157: weakly-stressed *the* in comparisons is not necessarily derived from dialectal *þē* for *þȳ;* Modern English *those* does not go back to Old English *þās;* p. 117: the genitive of *git* 'you both' is *incer;* p. 135: "in those days the French had no learning, art, or literature comparable to what was flourishing in England": really?; p. 141: the author of the *Ancrene Riwle* dit not write in the Southern dialect as defined on the same page; p. 144: (3.) "Between a consonant, particularly *s* or *t*, and a back vowel, *w* was lost": there is no such general rule; (4., see also p. 266) "In unstressed syllables, *-ch* was lost in late Middle English, as in *-ly* (OE *-lic*).": Modern English *-ly* and *I* are derived from forms in weakly-stressed positions where affricates did not develop; p. 145 (8.): voicing of initial fricatives may still be heard in parts of England, e.g., in "Zomerzet"; p. 149: no lengthening occurred in Modern English *fiend;* p. 161: in what manner exactly is the present participle ending *-ing* to be derived from the verbal noun ending *-ung*?; p. 175: there was no phonological development [ʊɪ] > [əɪ] > [ɔɪ], see Diensberg (1985: 41); pp. 184-185: on the *his-* genitive construction see above, B-C pp. 235-236; p. 295: "No loanwords unquestionably of French origin occur in English earlier than 1066": compare, for instance, Modern English *proud;* on the various animals served up as food at Norman tables see above, B-C pp. 176-177; p. 302: Dutch loanwords should not be treated under the general heading "German loanwords"; p. 304: 'beer of Eimbock', l. 'beer of Einbeck'. For the following items in the bibliography more recent editions should be cited: Elliot (1959), Franz (1924), Hock (1986), Honey (1989), Jespersen (1954), Jones and Gimson (1977), Mitchell (1968) and Palmer (1976). For Breivijk read Breivik, McIntosh et al. was published in 1986. — The chapter on "World English" (pp. 233ff.) remains inadequate.

Set against either B-C or P-A, B emerges as an altogether more modest effort as regards its size and lay-out (but not its price: at the time of this writing it costs only 55p less than P-A in Britain). It is a revised version of the author's *The story of language* (London: Pan Books, 1964), also known in a hardback edition as *The flux of language* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1965), also known in the U.S. as *The story of speech and language* (New York: Crowell, 1965). The blurb of the new Cambridge edition informs us that the original was universally acclaimed, although not much of that universal acclaim may be retrieved by thumbing through the relevant volumes of the *Bibliographie linguistique* and the *Annual bibliography of English language and literature*. The publishers, incidentally, do not point out in all their

publicity material that the book is a revised reissue of an older one. In an advertisement on the last page of the journal *Language* (vol. 69 [1993], no. 3), on the other hand, it is billed as a third edition.

All in all, B is a fairly reliable introduction along well-trodden paths. The notorious phoneme makes an early appearance on p. 15, phonemic notation is used throughout, and in some respects, indeed, B looks more modern than the two other works under review. Whether it fulfills the aims of the series in which it appears is a totally different matter. Books in the series are supposed, *inter alia*, to outline the 'state of play' in the subject areas treated and enable readers "to read some of the more technical literature in textbooks and journals" (p. iv). Readers of B will be awestruck when encountering the output of generativist, dependency or natural phonologists, for instance. Nor is there any guidance on which current school might repay the effort of getting deeper acquainted with it.

B is rather carefully proofread, more attention, however, might have been paid to typographical matters: ashes and thorns are frequently not italic where they should be so; on p. 107 there is a misshapen wynn; on p. 165 (line 5) topsy-turvy *y*'s masquerade as *h*'s. Further points of detail include: p. 13: *ø*, l. *ø:;* p. 45: Old English *þymel,* l. *þȳmel;* p. 63: Sanskrit *sat,* l. *sas-;* Greek *pater,* l. *patēr;* pp. 85-86: Anglo-Frisian: see above, P-A p. 68; p. 132: Old English *bread:* see above, P-A pp. 107 and 293; p. 134: Rollo became the first Duke of Normandy in 911; pp. 139-140: initial fricative voicing also occurred in certain areas north of the Thames, see Dietz (1990: 293-294); p. 165: Old English *þuman,* l. *þūman;* p. 195: /ʒ/, l. /ȝ/. In the bibliography Hock (1986), Meillet (1917), Mitchell and Robinson (1986) and Wakelin (1972) should be cited in more recent editions; Krapp and Dobbie (1931-1942), l. (1931-1953); A.N. Francis, l. W.N.; Allan Ward, l. Alan; Holthausen (1934), Martinet (1955), Meillet (1937), Todd (1984): the years of publication are given twice; Baugh (1978), l. Baugh and Cable (1978) or (1993).

To conclude: of the three books here reviewed not one has undergone revisions radical enough to close the yawning gap between introductory textbook and current scholarly debates. Whether this is due to the lackadaisical maxim "If it ain't broke, don't fix it" or to purely commercial reasons (or a combination of both) must be left open here. All three books are certainly eminently readable, but the readers deserve more of an effort. B-C and P-A, now in their fourth editions, are still burdened with a certain measure of errors and howlers. But in the end there only remains to say: *caveat emptor!, caveat lector!*

REFERENCES

Berndt, Rolf
1981 "The 'Ivanhoe' legend and changes in the English lexicon after the Norman Conquest." *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte* 35: 10-23.

Campbell, James (ed.)
1982 *The Anglo-Saxons*. Oxford: Phaidon.

Diensberg, Bernhard
1985 *Untersuchungen zur phonologischen Rezeption romanischen Lehnguts im Mittel- und Frühneuenglischen. Die Lehnwörter mit* oi/ui *und ihre phonologische Rezeption*. Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik, 268. Tübingen: Narr.

Dietz, Klaus
1990 "Die südaltenglische Sonorisierung anlautender Spiranten." *Anglia* 108: 292-313.

Jespersen, Otto
1982 *Growth and structure of the English language*. (10th edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kirby, David Peter
1991 *The earliest English kings*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Peters, Robert A.
1979 Review of Baugh – Cable (3rd edition). *Journal of English Linguistics* 13: 94-95.

Pullum, Geoffrey K.
1991 *The great Eskimo vocabulary hoax and other irreverent essays on the study of language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Yorke, Barbara
1990 *Kings and kingdoms of early Anglo-Saxon England*. London: Seaby.

The Oxford Companion to the English Language. Edited by Tom McArthur. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992. Pp. 1184.

Reviewed by Tadeusz Piotrowski, Wrocław University.

This is a new volume in the well-known series of Oxford encyclopedias, which are called companions by Oxford University Press. No publisher had thought, it appears, of publishing an encyclopedia specifically about the English language before, so this is a new type of encyclopedia in the English-speaking world. There are such books published in other countries: the speaker of Polish has *Encyklopedia języka polskiego* (Urbańczyk 1991), which is shorter, not as comprehensive in coverage, and its style is more formal. It is also unduly and typically preoccupied with the problems of the correct, or proper, language. We shall come back to comparisons of the two encyclopedias in what follows.

It has to be stressed that the companion is about the English language, not about general theories of language, including English, and this is what distinguishes it clearly from other available linguistic encyclopedias, such as *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language* (Crystal 1987). Quite a number of more theoretically-minded linguists seem to confuse the two aspects. Of course there are some succinct descriptions of linguistic theories, occasionally in separate entries (*transformational-generative grammar*), but more often within the entries on particular linguists: systemic linguistics is treated at *Halliday*, and transformational grammar again briefly at *Chomsky*. More attention is also given to prominent figures in general and English linguistics rather than to scholars less known to the general public. Thus, Jespersen, Sapir, Halliday are in the companion, Poutsma, Pike, Lyons are not. Finally, the general theoretical issues are also discussed in well-written, informative entries (as, for instance, *grammar, meaning, noun*).

The companion has some 4,000 entries written by 100 international experts (with one Polish consultant, Michał Jankowski, Adam Mickiewicz University (Poznań), on Polish). Numerous entries — to be exact, 40% of them — bear the signature of the editor himself. The entries are organized into larger themes, or, rather, the themes were used to prepare the list of entries. Perhaps the scope of the companion can be best appreciated when all the themes are listed:

- Geography:
  - Africa
  - Americas
  - Asia
  - Europe
  - Oceania
- History
- Biography
- Name:
  - Proper nouns
  - General entries
  - Entries for words ending in *-onym*
- Literature
- Style
- Education
- Grammar
- Writing
- Speech
- Reference
- Word
- Usage
- Language
- Variety
- Media
- Technology

Each theme has an entry on its own, at which the user can find the list of all entries belonging to it. The themes are listed in the introduction, but I suppose that, as with any dictionary or encyclopedia, the introduction to this volume will be rarely read, so it would be a good idea, it seems, to have an entry actually listing the themes, and the theme entries would be referenced to the "blanket" entry. Each "ordinary" entry has also an indication, at its end, of the themes it belongs to, as well as cross-references to other entries. Here is an example of the referencing system:

> *hand* ... See CALLIGRAPHY, LONGHAND, MANUAL, MEDIUM, SHORTHAND, SIGN LANGUAGE. [WRITING].

The reference in the square brackets directs the user to the theme entry *writing*, which begins with the following names of entries starting with *a*:

> *A-L*, ABBREVIATION, ABRIDG(E)MENT, ACCENT, ACUTE ACCENT,

AELFRIC, ALPHABET, AMPERSAND, ANACHRONY, ANACOLUTHON, ANGLE, ANGLIC, APOSIOPESIS, ARTICLE[2], ASCENDER AND DESCENDER, ASH, AUREATE DICTION, AUTHOR

As a result of the cross-referencing we have a very coherent book, in which the user can shift from the general to the particular, and vice versa, at any point. There is one drawback: the lists of entries comprising the fields are usually very long and printed in the alphabetical order, and I suppose that even quite determined users, like me, give up their consultation of the list after one third. It is certainly interesting that the editors of the Polish encyclopedia had the same idea, and their realization of it is very useful, because they provide an index of the entries at the end of the book, and the arrangement of the index is topical (starting from general linguistics, through the history of Polish, to individual aspects of the language). On the other hand I suppose that it would be very difficult to do so in the Oxford book, as it is far larger. The companion has also an index of biographical names, very detailed, in which all occurrences of any name in the text is noted. The Polish encyclopedia has no such index.

The entries vary enormously in size and scope — they may cover a single point of usage (for example *companion*) or provide a brief explanation of a term (*hand, foot, community language*), or else an entry may extend across several pages of dense print (*grammar, borrowing*). The short entries have a very interesting structure: the explanations of terms are usually backed up by numerous quotations from either the relevant literature or the press. This way the companion serves as a citation dictionary as well. That it is an encyclopedia-cum-dictionary can be also seen in the fact that short etymological notes are provided to all the names of entries, and this feature is rather untypical of encyclopedias.

As can be seen from the list of themes, it is difficult to find an aspect of the English language that is not covered in some way in the companion, which includes also adjacent subject fields, at least in some way related to English, and the user may find numerous entries on, for example, printing, computers, publishing, teaching, literature, etc. Those fields are given full attention. I learned a lot about printing processes, for example, and at last I found a coherent explanation of the slightly unusual use (for me) of *copy* (as in *copy-writing, copy-editor*), etc. As regards the ubiquitous computers, it is shown what linguistic uses they are put to (word processing, concordancing, printing, etc.) but at the same time the user is informed what the computers are doing to the English language (the entry on *computer English*). Coming back to general issues: I feel that what we have in the companion is a description of the culture of the English-speaking world, which is viewed through the single unifying force in this world: language. And it is a fascinating description.

One feature that the companion conspicuously lacks is illustrations, if we disregard the illustrations which show the development of the letters of the Latin alphabet in English (a feature clearly borrowed from the American *The American Heritage Dictionary*, Morris 1969). Come to think of that, no volume in the companion series known to me has any illustrations, but this can be only regretted. I have no doubt that most users will be fascinated by the well-known (to lexicographers) photograph of Sir James Murray in his Scriptorium. The users tend to look in another way at historical monuments, such as the *Oxford English Dictionary*, when they can see the man who shaped it. I would be very interested to see what such people as Daniel Jones, the Fowlers, and others, look(ed) like, and the companion would be an excellent place in which to show their faces. The Polish encyclopedia includes pictures of prominent Polish scholars.

Comparing the companion to its Polish counterpart I have also mentioned that it is less formal. Indeed, some of the pieces are quite lively, for example those by Robert Burchfield, though, on the other hand, informativeness seems to be somewhat sacrificed for the sake of liveliness in those entries, with the available space having been taken by witty examples or quotations (for example the entry on Fowlers, or on their Modern English Usage). But, thanks to the principle of verbal illustration, I could spend a delightful evening reading the jokes which run through one theme in the companion: national stereotypes and jokes. Much to my disappointment I could not find any Polack joke, and I wonder whether the genre is dying. I hope not.

If there is one theme that I could single out as particularly well represented in the companion then it is the one of varieties of English (or Englishes), though this is probably because I was particularly interested in this problem. I mean any variety, including city and rural dialects, or national varieties, like British and American English. In fact, the entry on the differences between British and American English is a small and comprehensive essay on the subject, very well informed (so well indeed that Robert Burchfield's idiosyncratic view that the two varieties are drifting apart is not mentioned at all).

Are there any shortcomings in this book, which it is my bounden duty to report? I think that I could point to several general areas, and next identify single errors. As to the former, the user, I suppose, can often feel cheated to find "empty" entries, which have no textual material, but serve only to direct the reader to another entry. Why have them at all? Their function is justified in case of abbreviations, for example *OED*, at which the user is informed that he or she should search for *Oxford English Dictionary*, or with synonymous entries, which direct him or her to the adequate entry name, but what is the use of an entry like "*American College Dictionary* see BARNHART", which can be seen after following the reference to *American College Dictionary*? Cannot the user be directed to *Barnhart* at once? This way the entry *Barnhart* is in fact composed of two: Barnhart and ACD. Moreover, I believe that an influential dictionary like *ACD* should have a separate entry.

It would also be excellent if the user was informed within the entries which biographical names have their own entries. I know of course that the index is supposed to be used for that, but when I have six, or more, names in an entry (for example in *usage guidance and criticism*), and I want to have some more information about the people mentioned there, I have to shift many times between the index and the main part. An ingenious technique is used in *The Oxford Thesaurus* (Urdang 1991): the word which in itself constitutes an entry has a graphic sign indicating that (i.e., *go*), and I suppose that it could be used in the companion as well. And, to exhaust the theme of biographical names, I would welcome the addition of the dates of birth and death in the index: Lindley Murray was an important figure as far as usage is concerned, but he has no entry, and I cannot find when he lived.

What surprised me was the repetition of the same material in different entries. We have noticed that earlier: the principles of transformational-generative grammar are discussed both at the entry *transformational-generative grammar* and at the entry *Chomsky*. The reader can find very much the same description of Merriam-Webster dictionaries in at least the following entries: *dictionary*, *Webster's New International Dictionary*, Roget's thesaurus is treated in both *Longman* and *Roget's thesaurus*, etc. The lexicographer in me was disturbed at this extravagance — space is very precious in reference books, though the scholar in me was glad to have various overlapping views on a subject. This method means, however, that I have to follow all the entries related to what I am looking for to have the full range of information.

There are also the more delicate questions of interpretation in the entries, which we have also noticed above. We can discuss also other instances. The entry on the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* was written by the editor of the latest edition, Robert E. Allen, who says that in the *COD* "prescriptivism was avoided in all editions", in fact his entry is a summary of the main points from his earlier paper (Allen 1986). It is interesting that a former editor of the same dictionary, J. B. Sykes, apparently did not think so when he wrote the following in the introduction to the 6th edition: "the general aims of the dictionary have remained as they were specified by the original editors ... The attitude taken, however, is now essentially descriptive rather than prescriptive (Sykes 1976: vii). I would be very interested to see what the evidence is, or was, for both editors, as there is none discussed.

In many cases the adopted view is traditional — this, however, should not be surprising in a book aimed at the general public, yet occassionally it disregards other traditions, or interpretations, too much. I have in mind here the entries on *Roget's thesaurus*, in which it is suggested that there is only one proper thesaurus, that published by Longman. This is not necessarily true — I have shown elsewhere that Longman cannot decide just when they bought the copyright (Piotrowski 1994a). No hint can be found that there is an equally venerable tradition of publishing a notional thesaurus in the USA, a publication which was first connected with the name of Thomas Y. Crowell, now it is published by HarperCollins (Chapman 1992). Another encyclopedia, an international one on lexicography, does include both types of Roget's thesaurus (Marello 1991).

With regard to Roget's thesaurus we have also an interesting inaccuracy: the staggering number of words which the British thesaurus is said to contain (entry *Roget's thesaurus*) — 1,250,000 — is somewhat exaggerated, as all publicity material I know of has only the number 250,000 (whatever the term word means here), for example the blurb on the dust jacket of Kirkpatrick 1987.

The other points of criticism that I could make relate to trifles: in the detailed history of English a major influence on English is said to be the computer Apple Macintosh (year 1984), and there is no mention of the IBM PC, launched on August 12, 1981, which had perhaps a greater importance (particularly in Poland) in making computers so popular. Ironically, the editor uses an IBM, as he himself says in the preface.

As to COBUILD (an entry in its own right), the lexical database at Birmingham University, which

is alluded to quite often in the entries on corpora, corpus linguistics, etc., some mention should have been made, I believe, of the whole series of COBUILD books aimed at the foreign learner of English, each of which is a valuable contribution to the particular type of reference book (grammar, usage guide, etc.).

In the entry on Slavonic languages *mazurka* is attributed the time-honoured etymology of dubious appropriateness: "after a regional Polish name", i.e., as the popular etymology usually goes on, *Mazurka* 'a woman from Mazowsze', a Polish word which in itself is almost unattested in dictionaries. Actually, as Martin Lehnert has convincingly shown, *mazurka*, a word present in the majority of European languages, is the accusative singular of *mazurek*, the Polish dance (Lehnert 1977: 44), and the etymology has been adopted in at least one American dictionary (*Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*, Mish 1984). Finally, Miłosz is entered under Mitosz in the index (but before *l*, which clearly shows there is something wrong), but has the correct form in the relevant entry (*pun*).

The companion contains a wealth of information, and I was able to check recently its consistency and accuracy when I was writing a book on lexicography (Piotrowski 1994b; hence my discussion contains mostly references to dictionaries). I can say that there are few inaccuracies, and I was very glad indeed that I could keep just this single volume handy on my desk instead of stacks of cards with bibliographical references (from my pre-computer period). The companion is also extremely up-to-date: the most recent reference I found was to a paper from July 1992, and the companion was published in September, 1992!

In Poland this encyclopedia is simply invaluable, both for the student and for the scholar of English. Where else can they find so much information, which often comes from some scholarly paper buried away in a journal not to be found in Poland? Moreover, the information is organized neatly in a very convenient way. I do believe that a copy (at least one!) of the companion should be in the libraries of all English departments in our universities and teacher colleges.

REFERENCES

Allen, Robert E.
1986 "A concise history of the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*", in: Hartmann (ed.), 1-12.

Chapman, Robert L. (ed.)
1992 *Roget's international thesaurus* (5th edition). New York: Harper Collins.

Crystal, David (ed.)
1987 *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hartmann, Reinhard R.K. (ed.)
1986 *The history of lexicography. Papers from the Dictionary Research Centre Seminar at Exeter, March 1986*. Amsterdam — Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Hausmann, Franz Joseph – Oscar Reichmann – Herbert Ernst Wiegand – Ladislav Zgusta (eds.)
1991 *Internationales Handbuch der Lexikographie. International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*. Vol. I-III. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hüllen, Werner (ed.)
1994 *Die Welt in einer Liste von Wörter/The world in a list of words — onomasiological approaches in lexicography. Proceedings of the international conference, Essen, 1992*. (Lexicographica, Series Maior). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Kirkpatrick, Betty (ed.)
1987 *Roget's Thesaurus of English words and phrases*. Harlow: Longman.

Lehnert, Martin
1977 "Slawisches Wortgut im Englischen", *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR. Gesellschatswissenschaften* 8/G: 17-61.

Marello, Carla
1991 "The Thesaurus", in: Franz Joseph Hausmann – Oscar Reichmann – Herbert Ernst Wiegand – Ladislav Zgusta (eds.), 1083-1094.

Mish, Fred (ed.)
1984 *Webster's ninth new collegiate dictionary*. Springfield: Merriam–Webster Inc., Publishers.

Morris, William (ed.)
1969 *American heritage dictionary of the English language*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Piotrowski, Tadeusz
1994a "British and American Roget", in: Hüllen (ed.), 154-171.
1994b *Z zagadnień leksykografii* [On lexicography]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Sykes, John B. (ed.)
1976 "Introduction", *Concise Oxford Dictionary*. (6th edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Urbańczyk, Stanisław (ed.)
1991 *Encyklopedia języka polskiego* [Encyclopaedia of the Polish language]. (2nd edition). Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich

Urdang, Laurence (ed.)
1991 *The Oxford Thesaurus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corpus linguistics and the automatic analysis of English. By Nelleke Oostdijk. Amsterdam – Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1991. Pp. XI-267.

Reviewed by Yuri Tambovtsev, Lisitechnical University, Lvov.

This book gives a linguist both theoretical and practical knowledge which may turn very useful in their practical research. As we shall see later this book is very useful for the so-called "classical" linguist who usually thinks his or her studies to be too far away either from mathematical, or corpus linguistics. I remember Dr.E.I. Rombandeeva told me that the descriptive linguistics (i.e., in her view "classical" linguistics) is good and the other sorts of linguistics are from the devil. She was against studying Mansi (Vogul) by the methods of experimental phonetics and mathematical linguistics. Nevertheless, even such linguists subconsciously use the methods and principles of corpus linguistics. It is an interesting guide to the complexities of corpus linguistics which is considered by N. Oostdijk to be a separate self-sufficient branch of linguistics. One can hardly agree to it since in my view it is the set of certain methods of how to select linguistic material for any linguistic research. In fact it penetrates all branches of linguistics, so a question arises: could something be considered a separate part if it is contained in every part? May be because of it the majority of linguists in the countries of the former USSR do not believe that corpus linguistics has developed into a discipline of its own right. If one looks through the main journals of linguistics in the countries of the former USSR, one cannot find many articles on corpus linguistics, so this book can fill the gap all right if it is published in Russian. One should agree that this book provides us with a close and detailed outlook on if not the main, then a very important ancillary part of modern linguistics. Its methods are close to the methods used in phonological, lexical, and syntax statistics which could be also considered a separate branch of linguistics. Thus, in my mind if it develops rapidly further, corpus linguistics can grow out into a separate discipline. One can see that this is the case which is known in philosophy as the transfer of quantity into quality since the huge linguistic data which were possible to obtain before on a very small scale, now allow a researcher to reveal the hidden features. Corpus linguistics certainly can very well help a linguist in practical application and research since a linguist is often encounted with a problem: what style (according to Russian traditions in linguistics style is understood as genre) represents a language best of all? For example, I studied 42 languages of the world with the help of computer and chose the style (genre) of fiction (prose) to represent the language. However, it was different with English. I computed the phonological chains of the English poetry of Th. Moore and G.G. Byron, the English prose by G.G. Byron and O. Wilde, the English drama of B. Show, the English technical text and the English oral speech fed into computer. In fact they all showed certain differences. Unfortunately it was before I read the book by N. Oostdijk which would give me certain clues. So, it was quite a task to choose a fair representative of the English language, or should I take a certain set of the genres, e.g., prose and poetry, or oral speech and drama, or only all of the genres can represent a language? And then what genres we should understand by

"all". Different authors find different number of genres (e.g., is newspaper genre one or several, is it "an oral style" when two scientists speak about the problems of technical physics?). N. Oostdijk does not avoid discussing such type of problems. She seems to have done a great deal of work by analyzing the corpus and statistical approaches described in 134 entries of her list of literature which are the more or less complete list of the literature on corpus linguistics, though in my opinion, it should have been enhanced by some "Eastern" linguists. In the West any book or article is easily available, while our libraries are being closed for the lack of budget. I cannot understand why the Western scholars do not use the vast and powerful facilities of the West. We shall discuss some of the works which may be recommended for the list further to break this self-imposed isolationism. The author is correct to point out that in the 1970 and 1980 the natural language processing by computer was booming. Now the fashion has faded out, though, may be the most interesting and promising results, like the book of N. Oostdijk, begin to appear only now.

The book has an introduction (p. 1-14), four chapters and 8 appendices (p. 235-267) where the author provides the reader with the valuable information on the technical fetures of the main (major) world corpora (SEEU, London-Lund, Brown, LOB and TOSCA). In the introduction N. Oostdijk discusses the natural language processing, corpus linguistics and its data in general and then she analyses the computational tools for corpus linguistics in more details (p. 6-18). N. Oostdijk begins with the description of the Linguistic String Project (LSP), as it was given in the book by Naomi Sager. Though the description is brief, she finds it necessary to point out that its basic categories do not suit the linguistic description. In my opinion, the author correctly observes that either the extention or a similar grammar for another language may be too difficult, while the other drawbacks of the string analysis are the obscure terminology and the lack of relevant generalization from a linguistic point of view (p. 10-12). In fact, N. Oostdijk discusses only one more corpus-oriented linguistic system (beside her own) which is the Parsifal system, created by Mitchell Marcus, who assumed that human language processing is basically equal to the deterministic parsing. So, the author has a right to criticise the Parsifal system for excluding such syntactic phenomena as coordination, pp-attachment and lexical ambiguity. Nevertheless, its structure was taken as an example for the other parsor system of industrial application called Paragram developed by E. Charniak (1981). It is important to bear in mind, that N. Oostdijk took part in the development of the TOSCA system, based on the CCPP system at Nijmegen university with 130,000 words. Nevertheless, she does not fail to show the CCPP drawbacks which are the way in which the linguistic knowledge is used in the process of analysis and the fact that the context-free grammar does not play the basic role and the lack of automation tagging during the preprocessing step, though manual tagging gives a lot of mistakes and takes much time. The TOSCA system is claimed to process large untagged corpora of the texts and is language independent. TOSCA (Tools for Syntactic Corpus Analysis) is based on British English. May be American English would be more preferable since American English is more popular among the teachers of English in the world. However, it is more preferable that there should be more such researches in both versions of the English language. As a matter of fact, the author is also rather lapidary in describing her own project, no wonder that she does not mention such corpus linguistic systems as FIDDITCH (Hindle, 1983), MITEP (de Marcken, 1990) or MFR (Karaulov, 1988). There are some other projects of the computer corpora, i.e., of Turkic (Muhamedov, Piotrovsky, 1986) and Finno-Ugric, Tungus-Manchurian, Mongolian, Paleo-Asiatic (Tambovtsev, 1991). A very interesting discussion arises in the chapter (2) called "A Corpus Linguistic Approach to Linguistic Variation". In fact this is the discussion of the object of the study. I am sure the phenomena of typology, genres and other categories of the text are two sides of the same medal. The linguists should keep to the restrictions recommended by the specialist of corpus linguistics when they select texts for their studies. Though Kučera and Francis wrote 30 years ago that representitavity can be obtained if one takes not less than 500 samples of 2,000 words each in more than 15 categories, not many linguists keep to this rule, e.g., the research made in 1990, i.e., some 30 years after (see Tambovtsev and Feller 1993 on L. Ferm who analysed the expression of direction with prefixed verbs of motion in modern Russian, but did not pay much attention to the strict selection of the material. Thus, she claimed that the results are valid for the whole Russian language, though she investigated only one genre – fictional prose.). Unfortunately not many linguists take into account the outcome of the study of Kučera and Francis (1967) that the results of certain research should be explained by the certain occurrence of words in different styles (genres) rather than to chance. One of the minor drawback of the research by Oostdijk is that she does not provide the clear and transparant criteria to distiguish between the genres taken for her investigation.

The author seems to know well the works of Biber, Finegan others, those who use statistical methods to study linguistic variation in corpus linguistics, e.g., Biber, 1988; 1990; Biber and Finegan, 1989.

They put forward and try to solve with the help of the statistical methods the problems that Neleke Oosdijk does not consider well enough: 1) how long texts should be in order to represent reliably the variation of linguistic features of different levels in language and in particular text categories; 2) how many such texts are required. Nevertheless, the author briefly dwells upon the use of multivariate statistical techniques, especially factor analysis to determine co-occurrence relations among the linguistic features, faciliating the identification of underlying textual dimentions (p. 41), criticising them for "their samples may yet be proven to have been too small (p. 43). She is correct that the size of the sample is more reliable if it is great, though in the works of D. Biber and Finegan, the latter seem to have proved their results correctly from the statistical point of view. However, she may be correct in her criticism concerning the validity of the genre distinctions (p. 44). One cannot help agreeing with the author that (p. 44) corpus-based studies of linguistic variation have so far failed to make a substantial contribution to the development of a descriptive theory of linguistic variation. She believes (p. 45) that it happened because of the lack proper data and a proper methodology. She claims (p. 46) that the drawbacks of the previous investigations were taken into consideration and abolished in the research project which has recently been carried out at the University of Nijmegen where a corpus of present-day British English was compiled. Unfortunately Oostdijk does not believe it possible to combine the probabalistic methods and the rule-based generative approach as it is vivid from her next chapter "The Design of the Grammar", though the results here seem to be great. I shall not discuss the further details of this most impressive and well-written book which fills in the gap and allows any linguist correctly set up linguistic material. After correcting some clumsy phrases and typographical errors I recommend "Rodopi" Publishing House to produce the book in question with hard cover and more copies.

REFERENCES

Altmann, Gabriel – Michael Schwibbe.
1989 *Das Menzerathsche Gesetz in informationsverarbeitenden System.* Hildesheim — Zürich — New York: G. Olms.

Biber, Douglas
1988 *Variation across speech and writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1990 "Methodological issues regarding corpus-based analyses of linguistic variation", *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 5 (4): 257-269.

Biber, Douglas – Edward Finegan
1989 "Drift and the evolution of English style: A history of three genres", *Language* 65: 487-517.

Charniak, E.
1981 "A parser with something for everyone", in M. King, (ed.), 117-150.

De Marcken, C.G.
1990 "Parsing for the LOB Corpus", *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics.* Pittsburg. 243-251.

Ferm, Ludmila
1990 *Expression of direction with prefixed verbs of motion in Modern Russian.* Uppsala: Uppsala University Press and Almqvist & Wiksell.

Hindle, D.
1983 *User manual for FIDDITCH, a deterministic parser.* Technical Memorandum 7590-142, Naval Research Laboratory.

Karaulov, Yuri
1988 *Mashinnyj fond russkogo jazyka* [Machine fund of Russian (Computer Corpus of Russian)]. Moscow: AN SSSR, Institute of Russian.

King, M. (ed.)
1981 *Parsing natural language.* London: Academic Press.

Kučera, Henry – Nelson Francis
1967 *Computational analysis of present-day English*. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University Press.

Muhamedov, Sabit A. – Raimond G. Piotrovsky
1986 *Inzhenernaja linguistika i opyt sistemno-statisticheskogo issledovanija uzbekskih tekstov* [Engineering linguistic and the testing of systemic-statistical research of Uzbek texts]. Tashkent: FAN.

Tambovtsev, Yuri
1991 "The development of artificial intelligence and linguistics in the USSR", in: Christopher Turk (ed.), 137-162.
1993 Review of Gabriel Altmann – Michael Schwibbe. *Word* 44 (2): 343-346.
1994a *Dinamika funktsionirovanija fonem v zvukobyh tsepochkah jazykov razlichnogo stroja*. [The dynamics of functioning of phonemes in sound chains of the languages of different structure]. Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk University Press.
1994b *Tipologija uporjadochennosti zvukobyh tsepej v jazyke*. [The typology of order of speech chains in language]. Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk University Press.

Tambovtsev, Yuri – Martin Feller
1993 Review of Ludmila Ferm. *Word* 44 (2): 347-355.

Turk, Christopher (ed.)
1991 *Humanities research using computing*. New York: Chapman and Hall.

ŀJ∫2x *(Ehmay ghee chah) – A universal second language.* By E. J. Hankes. Minneapolis, Minn: The Hankes Foundation, 1992. Pp. 160 plus pocket charts.

Reviewed by Anna Luchowska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

The book presents a rough version of an artificial language, meant to serve as a universal means of communication, including man-machine interaction. The author does not discuss the advantages and disadvantages of a lingua franca as such; he assumes that the need for a common language is attested by the numerous attempts to find one, and presents a solution.

The language is called ŀJ∫2x (Ehmay ghee chah), which can be translated as: "second language in the polite mode" (cf. p. 1. of the book reviewed). It is "designed for simplicity" (p. 10), and meant to avoid diversification. A new set of graphic signs is developed, and an attached audio-tape presents the phonics. The book presents not only the invented language itself, but also the evolution of the model; besides, it discusses the advantages of ŀJ∫2x and the way its use should be controlled. All these problems are presented in a rather chaotic manner, and the structure of the book does not provide for their clear separation. Thus, the publication is not a manual nor a grammar book in the strict sense. Nevertheless, one can attempt to summarize the most recent version of the language, even though the summary may be defective.

Graphic signs used in ŀJ∫2x include: the alphabet, punctuation marks, Arabic numerals and operational commands.

The alphabet is described as dual-binary. A single sign of this group is a combination of a vertical spine with one to three horizontal bars (to the right for vowels, to the left for consonants) and zero to two dots in between the bars. The 56 possible arrangements constitute the alphabet. There are 20 consonants and 20 vowels (henceforth Cs and Vs, respectively). The remaining 16 signs are "potents", used as affixes (cf. pp. 5 and 11). A special mark added to the alphabetical signs changes them into "alien characters", used to transcribe the foreign expressions in ŀJ∫2x[1].

Punctuation marks fall into seven categories. Each of them makes use of three elements combined to render seven characters in each category (cf. pp. 16-17).

[1] Supposedly, whenever native sounds coincide with ŀJ∫2x ones, ordinary alphabetical signs are to be used, and other marks are to indicate the alien character of the expression (cf. p. 6).

Operational commands, as listed in the chart of graphics (cf. p. 5), include kern, space, and the marking for alien characters. The three are assigned sounds.

All the sounds of the system are formed using 30 "phonemes". Some additional sounds are assigned to the alien characters, of which 21 are given a phonetic interpretation; the rest apparently being left open at the present time. The sounds are meant to be kept discrete, unaffected by adjacent ones (cf. p. 3). As word-boundary markers, the author recommends stressing the first sound and making pauses at the end of the word (cf. p. 4).

Both the spelling and pronunciation of ŀJ∫2x are expected to contain neither irregularities nor peculiarities, and to enhance man-machine interaction (cf. pp. 10 and 3).

The vocabulary consists, basically, of 3-letter cores and modifying affixes (cf. pp. 66ff). Apparently, the affixes have no fixed identity yet and could be treated as cores (cf. p. 18). The initial vocabulary involves VCV and CVC words (cf. p. 19). No ŀJ∫2x word has more than one meaning (cf. p. 10). Cores are categorized in a way based on Roget's Thesaurus, and the way a core begins shows which category it falls into (cf. p. 10 and 19). Cores may be combined to render compounds, the last core being dominant unless otherwise indicated (cf. p. 18). A considerable part of the book consists of basic ŀJ∫2x — English and English — ŀJ∫2x dictionaries. The category of case seems abandoned, except for the optional marking of the objective case (cf. p. 66). Verbs are marked as such, and inflected, using a regular system of affixes (cf. pp. 12-15). The role affixes perform as verbal markers (and, presumably, as identifiers for other "parts of speech" as well) is considered syntactical (cf. p. 10). Agreement is abandoned (cf. p. 12).

Much of the information is meant to be encoded in punctuation and in sentence format. Punctuation, as has been stated, involves seven families of signs. Five of these families "can be ignored and local grammatical customs observed" (p. 16). Two of them, however, are considered essential: one of them marks possessive, plural and reflexive forms; and the other is used to indicate the meaning of compounds (ibid). Punctuation and sentence format together are expected to encode voice, mood, person and number,but the division of their respective roles is not yet clearly defined (cf. p. 12). Sentence format by itself is meant to express "the various aspects of the subjunctive" (ibid) and to indicate, for verbs, the direction of action (cf. p. 66). However, ŀJ∫2x sentence format is hardly discussed in the book, which is one of its most serious drawbacks. Presumably, English sentence format is adopted (see below).

The advantages and disadvantages of ŀJ∫2x I intend to discuss will concern the assumptions of the system rather than its technicalities. The discussion will concern the function of ŀJ∫2x as a universal language; the facility of learning and the regularity of ŀJ∫2x; and its special functions: facilitating the man-machine interaction, unifying the numerical nomenclature in the world, and making communication easier for the handicapped.

The book does not discuss, as has been mentioned, a lingua franca as such. However, even if we discuss ŀJ∫2x in its own terms, the problem of its universality echoes the general discussion over artificial languages of that type.

The author emphasizes the need for strict international control over the further development of ŀJ∫2x (cf. pp. 16 and 147). Also, perfect reproduction of the pronunciation model is advocated (cf. p. 3). On the other hand, however, the language is expected to incorporate, locally, elements of particular natural languages. This concerns the names of persons, things and places (written in native alphabets or in the ŀJ∫2x characters discussed above) (cf. p. 6), forms indicating the age and (marital) status of a person (cf. p. 66) and the majority of punctuational functions (as discussed above). Punctuational functions open to local variations, as presented in the book, include signs such as: "and", "or", "fullstop" and "comma" (cf. p. 17). The presented degree of allowed variation seems fatal to the universality of ŀJ∫2x. Even if, by a minor technical amendment, we exclude the key signs from the range of local variation, the richness of native languages will probably reduce the universal value of ŀJ∫2x. Also, some elements of particular languages may happen to have the same form when transcribed in ŀJ∫2x. Besides, one can expect that new signs, both graphic and vocal, will tend to appear whenever the original signs of ŀJ∫2x fail to render the phonetic value of local expressions, or the local language requires more punctuation marks than ŀJ∫2x provides. (Another, and perhaps worse possibility, is that instead of creating new signs, local communities will change the meaning of existing signs whenever the original meanings seem unnecessary). An additional problem is that while ŀJ∫2x is designed as a polite language, a tendency to produce non-polite expressions appears both unavoidable and understandable; thus, local communities will probably develop diverse forms of these. Taking all this into account, one can expect that it would

be extremely difficult to keep control over such a world-wide process, and even if such control could be performed, the time required would paralyse the usage.

The simplicity and regularity of the initial model should indeed facilitate the process of learning. One should, however, consider the price that has to be paid. Insofar as the simplification[2] involves the substitution of irregular forms by regular ones, the price may be negligible. Yet, if we eliminate a given norm completely, this need not be the case. For example, ŀJſ2x eliminates verbal agreement. This seems to mean that a sentence is ambiguous with respect to the subject unless it is explicitly stated. In English the presence of explicit subject is obligatory, but in some languages it is not. Speakers of these languages could consider the transaction a loss. On the other hand, if we provide no substitute for the eliminated norm, the achieved simplicity may consist in a reduction of semantics, which is a dubious success. One should also consider the fact that the initial categorization of cores on the basis of their initial letters will probably be disturbed once we go beyond the basic CVC and VCV lexicon.

Another supposed advantage of ŀJſ2x is the equal start in learning it gives to everybody (cf. pp. 2-3). Here, we must neglect the questions of personal abilities and familiarity with artificial symbols (related to one's social position), because any objection we could raise in this respect seems to concern any foreign language. The problem is that ŀJſ2x, claimed to have no "overt linguistic parentage" (p. 2), shows strong similarity to English, which may cause problems to the non-English learners. This concerns the structure of compounds (last core being dominant unless otherwise indicated), the patterns of verbal inflection (including past, present and future tenses with perfective and progressive variants – cf. p. 13), and the above mentioned exclusion of verbal agreement. ŀJſ2x sentence format, as one can infer from the sample English — ŀJſ2x translation included in the book (cf. p. 157), allows (or demands) the following orderings: subject – predicate; possessive pronoun – noun; and predicate – adverbial of place. The vocabulary of ŀJſ2x is defined in terms of English. Even though a change in this respect is allowed (cf. p. 104), one can suppose that a coexistence of English definitions and the new ones would lead to ambiguities, which are meant to be avoided.[3]

Further analysis of the syntactical and semantic assumptions of ŀJſ2x could render more examples. In writing, the alphabetical character of ŀJſ2x, the spacing between the words within a single phrase, and the direction of writing are to be considered as disadvantageous to some speakers (cf. Chinese, Hindi and Hebrew). (The acceptance of the decimal system and Arabic numerals, though it seems to be the best solution, is also a result of the defeat of other systems.) In speech, the sounds (oppositions) that are used in ŀJſ2x may also be alien to some groups of speakers. All this strongly questions the egalitarianism of ŀJſ2x.

The use of the ŀJſ2x alphabet is expected to facilitate machine reading considerably. According to the author, ŀJſ2x involves no cursive or connected characters – unlike traditional systems of writing (cf. pp 3-4) – and, due to the simplicity of its alphabet "reduces the number of options that a scanning system must consider by several orders of magnitude" (p. 3). The discussion of this point seems not only to skip the marginal group of Arabic numerals, but also to exclude the problem of punctuation, which makes use of numerous minute signs. These will have different meanings in the various local variations of ŀJſ2x – and therefore will presumably hinder any reading – and may also, for the comfort of handwriting, evolve into new combinations of arcs, together with ŀJſ2x letters. Turning hand-writing into hand-printing, suggested as an advantage of ŀJſ2x, has both been achieved and been abandoned in natural languages.

At the level of sounds, the obligatory segmentation of ŀJſ2x expressions seems a real advantage in the man-machine interaction. The question remains, as it does in the case of written ŀJſ2x, whether the segmentation can be maintained. Already in the name of the language the sequence "Eh Muh Ay Ghee Chah" is transcribed as "Ehmay ghee chah" (cf. p. 1)[4].

The book exposes the beneficial role that ŀJſ2x can play by providing a simple and orderly system of names for the numerals of the decimal system (cf. pp. 4, 7 and the cover). The purpose is indeed

[2] The word: "simplification" (and later, "substitution" and "elimination") suggests the existence of a preliminary language which is being simplified. Indeed, ŀJſ2x appears to be a simplified version of rudimentary English (cf. below).

[3] The English definitions themselves may be considered ambiguous, but the categorization of ŀJſ2x cores by means of their initial letters helps to disambiguate them. The problem of how high a level of disambiguation can be thus achieved could be discussed separately.

[4] The audio-tape presents only the readings of ŀJſ2x alphabetic signs and numerals.

desirable, yet some objections do arise. One of them concerns the phonetic problems some speakers may have (see above). Another question is whether a person, or a society, will consider it worthwhile to assimilate a set of alien vocal signs if it is not a part of a well-developed and well-established system. The answer to that question, apparently, will determine the future position of both the numerical nomenclature and ŀJſ2x itself. If the assimilation is worthwhile, the numerical nomenclature has a chance to be generally accepted, even if ŀJſ2x as a whole will not become widely used; which need not be the case. If the answer is negative, neither ŀJſ2x, nor the numerical nomenclature on its own, will be widely accepted. In my opinion the answer is negative: the effort made to learn is better invested if the same skills can be used for a variety of other purposes; the wider the variety, the better. This is why, I believe, it is preferable to learn the somewhat irregular numerals in a popular natural language (and to thus make a step towards learning it) than to master a perfectly regular set of vocal symbols that belong to a system that has not yet reached a comparable stage of development.

"With ŀJſ2x people are able to communicate even if blind, deaf and mute." (cf. p. 1.). The advantage that ŀJſ2x gives to the handicapped consists seemingly in the possibility of using a keyboard operated machine to encode and decode messages. The problem we face here is similar to the one discussed above: when compared to Braille, the proposed system offers poorer semantics expressed by signs of comparable graphic complexity (cf. p. 149). (The brevity of ŀJſ2x cores is hardly a factor in the comparison, because one must consider compounds.) The advantage of ŀJſ2x over Braille may lie in the ease of auditory communication with other people, using the machine (and with voice-operated machines themselves), but with the above reservations concerning the semantics.

Studi sulla traduzione nell'Inghilterra del seicento e del settecento. By Carmela Nocera Avila, preface by Tullio De Mauro. Caltanissetta/Roma: Salvatore Sciascia Editore, 1990. Pp. 139.

Tradurre il Cortegiano. The Courtyer di Sir Thomas Hoby. By Carmela Nocera Avila. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1992. Pp. 206.

Reviewed by John Denton, University of Florence, Italy.

Apart from the late Gianfranco Folena's internationally known and frequently cited contribution to the 1972 Translation Congress in Trieste dealing with ideas and terminology of translation in Medieval and early Renaissance Europe, recently reprinted as a booklet with a bibliographical update by the author (Folena 1991), the most substantial contribution in Italy to the history of translation, in the last twenty years or so, consists of a long series of conference papers and articles by Carmela Nocera Avila, culminating in a book length study of a particularly significant translation for Renaissance England: Thomas Hoby's version (1561) of Castiglione's *Il Libro del Cortegiano.*

A selection of Prof. Nocera's articles have been collected together in the first of her books under review, with an introduction by the author ("Traduzione "intertraffique of the minde"", 15-25) and an important preface by Tullio De Mauro (5-9). The chapters in this selection begin with an overview of the history of translation ("Per una storia della traduzione", 27-56), continuing with studies of the 1611 English translation of the Bible ("La King James Bible nella teoria e storia della traduzione", 57-70), poetic translation in 17th and 18th century England ("Aspetti teorici della traduzione di poesia nell'Inghilterra del seicento e del settecento", 71-87), Pope's translation of the *Illiad* in the context of the early 18th century view of translation ("La traduzione nella cultura inglese del settecento: una nota sull'Illiade di Alexander Pope", 89-105), concluding with Tytler's famous treatise on translation ("L'Essay on the Principles of Translation di A. Tytler, Lord Woodhouselee: summa settecentesca dell'arte del tradurre", 107-131).

On the evidence of these and other examples of the author's published work (some of which is referred to in the footnotes), it is easy to see why she is described by Prof. De Mauro as a "pioniera" (5) (at least in the Italian context) in her chosen field of research, which is fast becoming an important component of the academic growth industry known as *Translation Studies,* or *Translatology.* One consequence of this development is a major international project, under the direction of the *Comité pour l'histoire de la traduction,* of the *Fédération internationale des traducteurs* leading to the publication of a thematic history of translation scheduled for 1996, which will "highlight the role that translators have played throughout history in the various fields in which they have practised". The chapters which make

up this first book do precisely that, within the chronological and regional limits that the author has set herself.

Prof. Nocera only goes beyond these limits in the first chapter, which began life as a historical introduction to the role of translation in inter-cultural relations presented at the 1987 Salerno congress on translation. The inclusion of this contribution is particularly valuable, since the proceedings of the congress have not been published. Over the brief span of thirty pages she manages to provide the reader with a clear idea of the central role of translators and translation in (European) inter-cultural relations from ancient times to the 1980s. In the experience of this reviewer there is no better starting point for students approaching the study of the history of translation for the first time than this overview, which is also valuable for the copious bibliographical references (the only serious omission being any reference to Louis Kelly's brilliant book (1979), which could be the ideal follow up for students to Nocera's survey), and for the extensive quotations from and summaries of some essential works on translation theory over this long span of time. The divisions followed are basically those of George Steiner (1993), the longest being the period from Cicero to Tytler (1st century B.C. to the end of the eighteenth century), which was dominated by ideas about language enshrined in Classical Rhetoric. This unity of approach over such a long period is also confirmed by the recent detailed study by Federick Rener (1989), which places translation theory and practice firmly within the context of Classical linguistic theory and its Renaissance derivatives. Although Rener's seminal work came out too late to be considered by the author in any of the contributions to her collection of articles, which cover the period 1981-88, she acknowledges its importance in her study of Hoby's translation of *il Cortegiano.* The survey continues with a critical look at the Romantic break away from Classical certainties, leading up to the idea of the impossibility of translation, to conclude with more recent linguistic and semiotic approaches.

The second essay (originally presented as a contribution to the section of the 1982 Bologna congress of the *Associazione Italiana di Anglistica* dedicated to the role of the Bible in English culture) deals with the approach to translation in the special genre of Sacred Texts, as revealed by the translators of what is without doubt the most influential translation ever made into English: the *Authorized Version* of the Bible (1611). The author shows how the translators, though taking account of previous English versions, departed from the venerable tradition of literalness advocated by St. Jerome for this type of translation, creating a version which, to a certain extent, anticipated the dynamic equivalence approach advocated by Nida for Biblical translation, over three hundred years later.

The third chapter (originally a paper read at the important 1988 Bergamo Congress on the translation of poetry, one important consequence of which was the setting up of one of the few Italian reviews dedicated specifically to translation, *Testo a Fronte)* is a survey of ideas about poetic translation, especially of Classical poets, in 17th and 18th century England. Again the author makes extensive use of the invaluable source of information about translators' aims and methods provided by dedications and epistles to the reader, which are a constant feature of translations of the period (as they are of the previous century). In the 17th and 18th centuries these metatexts become more and more informative about the problem of stylistic loss during the translation process and about the necessity of capturing the "spirit" of the SL text. This does not mean, however, that most translators followed the erudite literalism advocated by Ben Jonson. On the contrary, the mid 17th century was the period of the English equivalents (though with subtle variations) of the *belles infidles,* represented chiefly by the work of Denham and Cowley. At the turn of the century it was Dryden who began to introduce some order into this Baroque exuberance. In his often cited preface to the translation of Ovid's *Epistles* (1680), he advocated the middle way ("paraphrase") in preference to the extremes of literalism ("metaphrase") and excessive departure from the ST ("imitation"). Prof. Nocera follows the usual view that Dryden was here making an original contribution to English translation theory. However, it should be pointed out that this tripartite division of translation strategies can already be found in the Latin treatise on translation by the English scholar Lawrence Humphrey (*Interpretatio linguarum seu de ratione convertendi et explicandi autores tam sacros quam prophanos*) published in 1559. Here Lawrence also opts for the "via media". This treatise, as much scholarly writing of the period in Latin, has been neglected by translation historians up to very recently. One of the numerous merits of Rener's (1989) invaluable study is to have restored to it the importance it deserves.

In the fourth chapter (originally a contribution to the 1983 *Associazione Italiana di Anglistica* congress in Pavia), Prof. Nocera goes beyond translators' statements about their aims and takes a closer look at the translation process in the specific case of Pope's translation of the *Illiad.* Pope followed Dryden in his preference for the middle way. This did not, however, prevent him from refining what

he considered the "low" elements in Homer's language, to make his translation acceptable to the presumed expectations of his readers in matters of "taste". It was this aspect of 18th century translation which proved most unacceptable to the following century.

The book concludes with an important study (which first appeared in the review *Le ragioni critiche* in 1981) of the first treatise in English (though not in England; see the remarks above about Humphrey) on translation: Tytler's famous *Essay on the Principles of Translation.* Tytler himself claims that his work is the first real attempt to set down a series of rules to be allowed in translation, with the purpose of improving what he considered such a vital vehicle or inter-cultural communication. Concerning previous work he states: "I have met with nothing that has been written professedly upon the subject of translation considered as an art, depending on fixed principles" (quoted by Nocera on p. 118). The only conclusion that one can draw is that Tytler cannot have read very much, none of the various Latin and vernacular treatises of the Renaissance for example, otherwise he would not have made such an untenable claim. The value of Tytler's work, as Prof. Nocera points out, is that he put together a kind of systematic digest of, particularly neo-classical, opinion on translation, and provided a rich sample of examples of how to and how not to translate, in accordance with contemporary precepts.

The chapters that make up the first of the books under review are of value not only to the relatively new breed of scholars now known as *translatologists*, but also to historical linguists and literary historians interested in ideas about translation in the period covered and in some of its most influential translations. We are also given a glimpse of a translator at work (in this case, Pope). All this fully justifies the publication of this selection of papers which have already appeared elsewhere (with one exception), and are not all that easy to find in their original format, especially outside Italy.

More detailed studies of the translation process in any period require much more space than that allowed by a conference paper or even a scholarly article. We are offered such a detailed study in the second of the books under review, to which a series of recent contributions by the author (Nocera Avila 1990, 1992) serve as a prelude. Prof. De Mauro, in his preface to the first book, posits a new typology of translation in the form of a seven stage ascending scale of adequacy (denotative, syntactic, lexical, expressive, textual, pragmatic, and cultural). It is the author's partial use of this scale in her analysis of Hoby's translation that provides a link between the two books.

The second book opens with a brief, general introduction to translation in Elizabethan England, going on to deal with the reception of the chosen text in a new cultural context, and its influence, particularly on Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Castiglione's work is then discussed in its intertextual relationships, and we are given a brief portrait of his first English translator, largely by means of the particularly rich store of metatexts prefacing the translation itself. These are also exploited in the second chapter, which looks at language attitudes in the period, and devotes special attention to an important document for all historians of English, first published as part of the first edition of *The Courtyer:* the letter of Sir John Cheke, dated July 16 1557, in praise of Hoby's translation, affirming the need to maintain the *puritas* of the English language. The reader is thus introduced to the modern translatologist's interest in the problem of who translates what, where, when and for whom (Lambert 1993: 11-12). The effect of these factors on the 'how' of translation is covered in the third and fourth chapters, which constitute the core of Nocera's study. In them she subjects selected passages from the dialogues and monologues both in source and target texts to detailed comparative lexical analysis, making extensive use for the latter of the *OED.* Her aim is to show how the translator's lexical choices, though tending to reflect Cheke's "puristic" approach (but not going to his extremes) and the need to communicate, as far as the limits imposed by English language and culture of his time allowed, with the "unlearned" readership to whom the translation was addressed, were also influenced by the eloquence of the source text, thus causing a kind of bidirectional tension in the translator's approach.

In the last chapter Prof. Nocera, in contrast with two earlier studies of Hoby's translation Raleigh (1900) and Matthiessen (1931: 8-53), underlines the descriptive rather than evaluative nature of her approach. This brings her in line with the work of modern translatologists. Earlier approaches to translation in a historical perspective were dominated by the, usually forcefully expressed, subjection of the translations studied to the good/bad test, in the light of the translator's linguistic abilities and degree of "faithfulness" to the original. Susan Bassnett-McGuire (1991 [1980]: 150) noted some time ago that Matthiessen's "classic" work was "useful, but unsystematic". Prof. Nocera's study of Hoby's translation is characterized by just that systematicity lacking in Matthiessen.

REFERENCES

Bassnett-McGuire, Susan
1991 [1980] *Translation studies.* (2nd edition.) London: Routledge.

Folena, Gianfranco
1991 *Volgarizzare e tradurre.* Torino: Einaudi.

Gambier, Yves – Jorma Tommola (eds.)
1993 *Translation and knowledge.* Turku: University of Turku — Centre for Translation and Interpreting.

Kelly, Louis G.
1979 *The true interpreter: A history of translation theory and practice in the West.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Lambert, José
1993 "History, historiography and the discipline. A programme", in: Yves Gambier – Jorma Tommola (eds.), 3-25.

Matthiessen, Francis Otto
1931 *Translation: An Elizabethan art.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Nocera Avila, Carmela
1990 "Il Libro del Cortegiano nella traduzione di Sir Thomas Hoby (1561): Un problema linguistico e culturale", *Textus* 3: 225-242.
1992 "The language of Hoby's COURTYER", in: Carmela Nocera Avila – Nicola Pantaleo – Domenico Pezzini (eds.), 237-251.

Nocera Avila, Carmela – Nicola Pantaleo – Domenico Pezzini (eds.)
1992 *Early Modern English: Trends, forms and texts.* Fasano: Schena.

Raleigh, Walter
1900 *The Book of the Courtier* (transl. by Thomas Hoby 1561). London: Nutt.

Rener, Frederick M.
1989 *Interpretatio: Language and translation from Cicero to Tytler.* Amsterdam — Atlanta: Rodopi.

Steiner, George
1993 *After Babel.* (2nd edition.) London: Oxford University Press.