

REVIEWS

The psychology of language. By J. A. Fodor, T. Bever and M. F. Garrett. Pp. XVIII + 538. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Reviewed by Richard M. Weist, SUNY, Fredonia.

The books in the area of psycholinguistics can be divided into at least three categories: anthologies, e. g. Jakobovits and Miron (1967), texts and monographs on language development, e. g. Brown (1973) and Bowerman (1973), and texts which cover a wide range of psycholinguistic problems, e. g. Slobin (1971). In the last category there is no advanced text which provides a critical analysis of the mental processes involved in the comprehension and production of linguistic information. This book fills the void. The book represents a culmination of arguments by these authors which began in the mid 1960's (e. g. Garrett and Fodor 1968) and progressed into the 1970's (e. g. Bever 1970).

The purpose of this book was to investigate the mental processes involved in the comprehension and production of syntactic structure. The authors assume that the comprehension and production processes require the recovery and utilization of some internal representation of syntactic structure. The first half of the book is concerned with establishing the presumably universal characteristics of internal representations of syntactic structures. The second half of the book considers the nature of the perceptual processes required by an adequate information processing theory. The search for an adequate theoretical alternative can be summarized by the three steps presented in Table 1. (p. 188).

The argument moves from a comparison of the mediation hypothesis (based on the Hullian tradition in psychology) with the taxonomic view of grammar (based on American structuralism) to a discussion of attempts to incorporate standard theory into a theory of language processing. The major contribution of this book lies in the evaluation of the derivational theory of complexity (DTC) and the proposal of an alternative approach to the problem of comprehension and production. This review will concentrate on the third step in Table 1 from DTC to the perceptual strategy alternative.

In spite of the fact that many of the psychologists who were responsible for the mediation hypothesis (e. g. Jenkins and Palermo 1964) no longer believe that the hypothesis represents a viable alternative, the Chapter 2 discussion of taxonomic grammar and mediation theory is pedagogically appropriate since this position was thriving in psychology at the beginning of the decade of research that this book covers. The treatment of taxonomic grammar centers around the assumption of a hierarchical structure in language ("the taxonomic condition") and a limited view of methodology ("the operationalist condition") which relied on well-defined discovery procedures. The authors show how these conditions lead to conceptual problems, such as the phonological analysis of the words *latter* and *ladder* in dialects of English which realize the medial consonant as the [D] flap. The mediation hypothesis had all the problems of taxonomic grammars plus a few inherent difficulties. The most devastating of the ills that beset mediation theory derived from the fundamental fact that linguistic relationships were all reduced to associative relationships, e. g., the ordering relationships defined by the concatenation

Table 1

The Search for an Adequate Processing Theory

Psychological	Linguistic
Step 1	
<p>Mediation Hypothesis- The temporal position of constituents and diagnostic environments provide the mediating mechanisms in the development of equivalent classes of words and phrases. Phrase structure evolves as a set of implicit mediating responses held together by transitional elicitation probabilities.</p>	<p>Taxonomic Grammar- Linguistic structure is revealed by the classification of speech events into categories at progressively higher levels of a hierarchy.</p>
Step 2	
<p>Derivational Theory of Complexity- It is assumed that the derivational procedures of standard theory can be incorporated into an analysis by synthesis (or analysis) processing theory. Hence, grammatical complexity becomes an index of perceptual complexity.</p>	<p>Transformational Grammar- Deep structures are transformed to yield surface structures. The former receive semantic interpretations and the latter phonological interpretations.</p>
Step 3	
<p>The Perceptual Strategy Hypothesis- Standard theory provides a workable definition of internal structure, but a set of perceptual heuristics are used to recover deep structures.</p>	
<p>tion NP VP and the dominance relationship [NP, VP] were merely viewed as two examples of associative relationships. The authors conclude Chapter 2 with four contrasts between associative and linguistic relationships which dramatize the weakness of any associative theory.</p> <p>The third chapter contains a standard presentation of generative theory with an emphasis on the arguments which motivate a transformational grammar. The chapter gives the reader additional reasons for abandoning the mediation hypothesis and provides enough background in generative theory so that the reader will be able to negotiate the second half of the book. The chapter on semantics which follows was a disappointment to this reviewer. It is difficult to fault the authors for limiting the scope of their discussion to interpretive and generative semantics, but their basic argument against the DTC could have been strengthened by an examination of semantic functions (or case relations), e. g. Chafe (1970), Fillmore (1968 and 1971), or, staying within interpretive semantics, Katz (1972).</p> <p>The second half of the book demonstrates the "psychological reality" of transformational grammar and then evaluates how aspects of syntactic structure are perceived, produced, and acquired. Chapter 6 begins with a discussion of speech perception. The</p>	

form of the argument in this section is typical of many sections of the book. The authors start by stating a hypothesis which presumably has the critical features of a view of speech perception which was prominent at one time (presumably not a "strawman"). This hypothesis is called the naive theory of speech perception and it holds that "for each phone there is a list of criterial acoustic properties which are speaker- and context-independent" (281). The authors have obvious plans to demolish this hypothesis in the ensuing argument and to provide a more nearly adequate alternative. The naive theory of speech perception makes an easy target. A review of some of the research of Alvin Liberman and the Haskins Laboratory group serves to demonstrate the context-sensitive nature of speech sounds. This research leads the authors (as it has others, cf. Liberman 1970) to the conclusion that the process of perception somehow makes reference to abstract factors involved in the process of production.

The analysis by synthesis and analysis by analysis models of syntax recognition evolve from the principle which links production to perception. According to the analysis hypothesis, the grammar comes into play during recognition in a backward manner, "starting with the sequence of words, computing the intermediate representations in reverse order, and terminating with the symbol S" (313 - 314). Alternatively, the analysis by synthesis hypothesis makes the claim that "a grammar is literally a part of a sentence recognizer, and the grammatical generation of a sentence is literally part of recognizing it" (316). Both of these hypotheses represent attempts to incorporate linguistic theory into a theory of information processing. While there are some difficulties which are unique to each position, the acceptance or rejection of both hypotheses rests on the common assertion that the number of grammatical operations involved in generating a derivation either backward or forwards serves as an index of perceptual complexity. This metric was called the derivational theory of complexity (DTC). In chapters 5 and 6, the authors review research that is relevant to DTC. While some of the early research (e. g. Miller 1962) seemed to support the DTC, a closer look at that research and the additional perspective from other research (e. g. Fodor and Garrett 1967) indicates that DTC is a very loose index at best. However, the research related to DTC produced one persistent finding: transformations which obscure base structure grammatical functions make sentences more difficult to process. Assuming that the base structure of standard theory adequately represents the presemantic goal of sentence recognition, the problem of sentence recognition reduces to the discovery of the perceptual strategies or heuristics used to recover base structures. Lexical information which facilitates the clausal analysis of sentences or in other ways discloses deep structure configurations represents one important cue for the operation of perceptual strategies.

Chapter 7 delves into the problem of sentence production. The first step in production presumably requires a mapping of semantic representations onto base structures, but as the authors argue, "these problems tend to hinge on the character of semantic representations, and this is itself not fully known" (397). A discussion of case grammar would have been interesting at this point but the authors only mention that Fillmore's (1968) paper is relevant. The research reviewed on hesitations, spoonerisms, and other surface phenomena of sentence production was interpreted as supporting the general argument that the clausal structure of sentences constitutes an important part of planning sentence productions.

The chapter on first language learning does more to define some critical issues than to review the relevant research. If readers want an indepth review of language development research, they will have to look elsewhere (e. g. Brown 1973). In the first part of the chapter the authors argue that language is a species-specific and task-specific behavior. In their discussion of how language develops, the authors return to the major

theme of the book. The "ontogenetic equivalent of DTC" is presented as follows:

To show that the number of rules required to specify a grammatical structure predicts the stage at which the structure is mastered is to provide evidence that the representation of his language the child is acquiring is closely parallel to the representation afforded by the grammar (490 - 491).

The form of the argument against this DTC equivalent is reminiscent of Chapter 6. Evidence in favor of the view (e. g. Brown and Hanlon 1970) is reevaluated and related to other evidence (e. g. C. Chomsky 1969) which supports the authors' proposal that understanding the development of perceptual strategies provides the key to explanations of language development.

In general, the book deals with very basic issues in psycholinguistics, e. g. sentence recognition, species-specificity, etc. The book does not present an introductory treatment of these issues as the full title indicates. Instead, the book contains a number of penetrating arguments which identify the problems psychologists must face and evaluates solutions which have been proposed. Their approach is positive in the sense that they provide an alternative solution to some of these problems.

While the authors' reluctance to speculate about semantic perceptual strategies is understandable, it is also regrettable. In order to complete the process of sentence comprehension or start the process of production, the listener and speaker may have to utilize semantic functions (or action roles), such as instigator of action, recipient of a change of state, instrumental in the causation of an event, etc. These semantic relations have been proposed as universals (e. g. Fillmore 1968), integrated into information processing theories (e. g. Rumelhart, Lindsay and Norman 1972), and considered as fundamental elements in language development (e. g. Bowerman 1973). A stronger presentation of perceptual strategies would have entertained the possibility that base phrase structure does not serve as an intermediate step in the retrieval and utilization of semantic relationships.

This book has received at least one other review by St. Clair (1974).

REFERENCES

- Bach, E. and R. T. Harms. (eds). 1968. *Universals in linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bellugi, U. and R. W. Brown. (eds). 1964. *The acquisition of language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bever, T. 1970. "The cognitive basis for linguistic structures". In Hayes, J. R. (ed.). 1970. 279 - 361.
- Bowerman, M. 1973. *Early syntactic development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R. W. 1973. *A first language: the early stages*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, R. W. and C. Hanlon. 1970. "Derivational complexity and order of acquisition in child speech". In Hayes, J. R. (ed.). 1970. 11 - 54.
- Chafe, W. L. 1970. *Meaning and the structure of language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chomsky, C. 1969. *The acquisition of syntax in children from 5 to 10*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Dixon, T. R. and D. L. Horton. (eds). 1968. *Verbal behavior and general behavior theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1968. "The case for case". In Bach, E. and R. T. Harms. (eds). 1968. 1 - 88.

- Fillmore, C. J. 1971. "Types of lexical information". In Steinberg, D. D. and L. A. Jakobovits. (eds). 1971. 370 - 392.
- Fodor, J. A. and M. F. Garrett. 1967. "Some syntactic determinants of sentential complexity". *Perception and psychophysics* 2. 289 - 296.
- Garret, M. F. and J. A. Fodor. 1968. "Psychological theories and linguistic constructs". In Dixon, T. R. and D. L. Horton. (eds). 1968. 451 - 477.
- Hayes, J. R. (ed.). 1970. *Cognition and the development of language*. New York: Wiley.
- Jakobovits, L. A. and M. S. Miron. 1967. *Readings in the psychology of language*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Jenkins, J. J. and D. Palermo. 1964. 1964. "Mediation processes and the acquisition of linguistic structure". In Bellugi, U. and R. W. Brown. (eds). 1964. 141 - 169.
- Katz, J. J. 1972. *Semantic theory*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Lieberman, A. M. 1970. "The grammars of speech and language". *Cognitive psychology* 1. 301 - 323.
- Miller, G. A. 1962. "Some psychological studies of grammar". *American psychologist* 17. 748 - 762.
- Rumelhart, D. H., Lindsay, P. H. and D. A. Norman. 1972. "A process model for long-term memory". In Tulving, E. and W. Donaldson. (eds). 1972. 197 - 246.
- Slobin, D. I. 1971. *Psycholinguistics*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co.
- St. Clair, R. 1974. Review of Fodor, J. A., Bever, T. G. and M. F. Garrett. 1974. *The psychology of language*. *Modern language journal* 58. 354 - 355.
- Steinberg, D. D. and L. A. Jakobovits. (eds). 1971. *Semantics: an interdisciplinary reader in philosophy, linguistics and psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tulving, E. and W. Donaldson. (eds). 1972. *Organization of memory*. New York: Academic Press.

Linguistic stylistics. By Nils Erik Enkvist. Pp. 179. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1973. Reviewed by Irena Kałuża, the Jagiellonian University of Cracow.

Professor Enkvist's book is an admirably informative and concise guide to the current views and controversies in linguistic stylistics, with illustrative material drawn mainly from English. Written in a non-partisan spirit, it outlines a variety of approaches, in the belief that the immense diversity of stylistic phenomena calls for such differentiation in models and methods.

Style itself, Enkvist reminds us, is an elusive concept. It is a notational rather than substantive term since it can be defined in other, more basic terms, such as for instance those used in linguistics. Thus, style can be understood as a *departure* from a 'norm', as an *addition* of certain stylistic traits to a neutral prestylistic exposition, or as a *connotation* whereby linguistic features acquire their stylistics value from the textual and situational environment. Furthermore, taking into consideration the relation between the 'addressor/addresssee' and the text, style may be defined as present in the 'addressor - text' relation (idealistic school, Spitzer), or in the 'text - addressee' relation (Russian formalism, functionalism of the Prague school). It may also be objectified as immanent in the text (American New Criticism, stylistic studies based on the tenets of American structural linguistics). From the point of view of 'institutionalized' variants of an ethnic language, style may be connected with or equated with a temporal (historical), regional or social *dialect*, while all these communal variants may be contrasted with individual *idiolects*. Both dia-

lects and idiolects may in turn be viewed as containing a number of situational *registers* (British school of situational linguistics). In short, stylistics is not autonomous: its sphere of interest overlaps with that of theoretical and diachronic linguistics, dialectology, socio- and psycholinguistics, and on the other side with literary criticism, literary history (stylistic characterization of 'genres'), and even, we may add, with aesthetics.

For his study Enkvist has adopted a basic view of "style as a differential between a text and a contextually related norm" (p. 5). This view accounts for the fact that different people may react differently to the style of a given text. Their assessment depends on what they expect of it, that is, what contextually relevant 'norm' they choose to compare it with. The linguistic features whose frequencies of occurrence differ in text and in 'norm' are called *style markers*. Consequently, a probabilistic level, specifying the (predictable) frequency of occurrence of the given feature within a given context should be built into the grammar. In theory, this can be done both in the structural system (cf. Herdan's (1964) argument for interpreting de Saussure's *langage* as specifying statistical information on language structure, reported by Enkvist on p. 40) as well as in the generative-transformational system (cf. Labov's Variable Rules specifying "quantity ϕ which denotes the proportion of cases in which the rule applies as part of the rule structure itself"; in Labov (1969), quoted after Enkvist p. 45). This should eventually lead to a grammar incorporating stylistic information represented by indications of rule applicability in relation to the context, i.e., to a grammar capable of predicting the stylistic make-up of a concrete text.

In spite of Enkvist's confidence in this scheme — and assuming that such a grammar could eventually be written — let me point out that it still would be capable of dealing with 'institutionalized' or 'codified' styles only, since only such could be pre-programmed into the rules. In his unified view of style, Enkvist does not seem to be concerned with the need to differentiate between institutionalized, i.e. predictable, styles, and those freely creative 'poetic' styles whose value lies at least partly in their unpredictability. In other words, he overlooks the fact that grammar may in theory be required to be able to generate all the grammatical sentences of a language, and to provide structural description for all kinds of, for instance, possible 'deviance', but it cannot even in theory be required to predict what concrete combinations of deviance and statistical features will occur in concrete 'poetic' contexts. To put it differently, we cannot foresee the stylistic strategies of a future Cummings, or even a future Faulkner.

However, Enkvist is not dogmatic on the concepts he personally favours. On the contrary, his plan is to present a great many theories, often conflicting, for the reader to choose from, according to his interest. Inevitably, such a presentation gains in breadth what it loses in depth. Another thing is that it does not clearly distinguish between *what* there is to find in a text, and *how* to find it. From the point of view of linguistic theory, this is not necessarily a demerit: for instance, in generative grammar, a structural analysis of a string is simply a function of the grammar which provided the rules for the analysis. But in practical stylistic work, this means that what style markers you are going to find in the text is preconditioned by what grammatical model you apply. Consequently, pre-orientation is needed as to which models are more suitable than others to account for particular kinds of stylistic phenomena. Here are a few hints on this subject, out of many that may be gathered from Enkvist's survey.

The British school of 'situational linguistics' is helpful in context classification. Professor Enkvist himself (in Enkvist, Gregory, and Spencer 1964) pioneered the setting up of context taxonomy by supplying inventories of significant features for textual context, split into a linguistic and a compositional frame, as well as for extratextual context split, for instance, into period, context of situation and environment, gesture, genre, and

relationship between speaker/writer and listener/reader (in terms of sex, age, familiarity, education, social class, etc.). In the same book, Gregory and Spencer indicated the need for placing a text into its proper historical and dialectal setting and devised a scheme of three contextual parameters called Field, Mode, and Tenor of discourse. Further refinement and simplification at the same time was proposed by Crystal and Davy (1969: 66) in their "dimensions of situational constraint", systematized into features of Individuality, Discourse, and Province.

The Prague school concepts of Theme — Rheme (Topic — Comment) and the Functional Sentence Perspective have proved useful in studying textual patterns of sentence sequence. One of the recent developments in this kind of analysis is *theme dynamics*, with terminology worked out by Daneš (1970a and 1970b), and presented 'in action' by Enkvist in "'Theme dynamics' and style: an experiment", published in 1974, that is, after the appearance of the book under review.

Some of the Functional Sentence Perspective considerations have recently been introduced into transformational grammar, both of the interpretive semantics (e.g. Chomsky 1971) and the generative semantics (e.g. Lakoff 1971) variety, but this is not yet reflected in Enkvist's book. Nevertheless, generative-transformational grammar emerges as actually, and even more so potentially, well-suited to provide an explicit description of style markers. Transformational grammars, Enkvist explains, are more likely than others to grasp the processes of *choice* responsible for differentiation of styles. (In this respect, only Halliday's 'systemic grammar' could compete with TG.) To show how a sentence was derived we must go back to deep structure and this opens up the possibility of choosing one of a number of transformational routes by which to reach the surface. This idea underlies Ohman's (1964) pioneering work in contrasting literary styles by indicating the writer's preference for some specific transformational routes. For instance, Faulkner's convoluted style is the result of his frequent application of the 'additive' transformations which include relativization, conjunction, and comparison. Generative transformational apparatus may also be potentially capable of explicitly defining some of the time-honoured traditional rhetorical devices, such as ellipsis (through the deletion transformation), and simile, metonymy and metaphor (as kinds of grammatical-semantic deviance). It obviously is the best system for a stringent description of ambiguity, by providing n ways of generating an n -ambiguous sentence.¹

As for some concepts which originated in the science of logic and have recently been made use of by generative linguistics, Enkvist mentions *performatives* (from Austin 1962). As developed by Ross (1970), they bring some features of the context into a deep layer of grammar. Similarly, *presuppositions* are mentioned briefly, also in the role of intertextual markers, such as [\pm mentioned], "attachable to noun phrases to govern the choice of syntactic function (such as theme or subject), of the choice of article ...", etc. (p. 11). Let me add that since the publication of Enkvist's book the role of presuppositions has widened enormously to cover, for instance, such a stylistically sensitive area as selectional restrictions, and hence the metaphor. Also that scholars such as Ohmann (1971) have tried to discuss the *pragmatics* of literary style by applying the concept of '*locutionary/illocutionary/perlocutionary acts*' proposed by Austin and elaborated by Searle (1969).

In discussing the generative linguistics contribution (actual and potential) to style study, Enkvist correctly stresses the fact that the notions applicable in stylistics were in-

¹ It should also be mentioned that generative phonology may be expected to contribute substantially to the study of metre, cf. Halle and Keyser (1966) and (1971), and a host of accompanying articles. In Halle and Keyser (1971) theories of Old English alliterative verse and of iambic pentameter are presented. However, Enkvist does not deal with metre and versification in his book.

roduced into generative grammar on purely linguistic, non-stylistic motivation. One may add, I believe, that generative linguistics — in trying to account for a broader range of language phenomena than ever before — seems now to be incorporating into a uniform system of language description also those domains which were traditionally held to be stylistic rather than purely linguistic. If this is the case, one may wonder what will become of linguistic stylistics. But whatever its future status, we are now all in Professor Enkvist's debt for giving us such a lucid and stimulating, and indeed invaluable introduction to the present complexities of linguistic stylistics.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Chatman, S. (ed.). 1971. *Literary style: a symposium*. London and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1971. "Deep structure, surface structure, and semantic interpretation". In Steinberg, D. D. and L. A. Jakobovits. (eds). 1971. 183 - 216.
- Crystal, D. and D. Davy. 1969. *Investigating English style*. London: Longmans.
- Daneš, F. 1970a. "One instance of Prague school methodology: functional analysis of utterance and text". In Garvin, P. L. (ed.). 1970. 132 - 146.
- Daneš, F. 1970b. „Zur linguistischen Analyse der Textstruktur". *Folia linguistica* 4. 72 - 78.
- Enkvist, N. E. 1971. "On the place of style in some linguistic theories". In Chatman, S. (ed.). 1971. 47 - 64.
- Enkvist, N. E. 1974. "'Themo dynamics' and style: an experiment". *SAP* 5. 127 - 135.
- Enkvist, N. E., Spencer, J. and M. Gregory. 1964. *Linguistics and style*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Garvin, P. L. (ed.). 1970. *Method and theory in linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Halle, M. and S. J. Keyser. 1966. "Chaucer and the study of prosody". *College English* 28. 187 - 219.
- Halle, M. and S. J. Keyser. 1971. *English stress — its form, its growth, and its role in verse*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hordan, G. 1964. *Quantitative linguistics*. London: Butterworths.
- Jacobs, R. A. and P. S. Rosenbaum. (eds). 1970. *Readings in English transformational grammar*. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn and Co.
- Labov, W. 1969. "Contraction, deletion, and inherent variability of the English copula". *Language* 45. 715 - 762.
- Lakoff, G. 1971. "On generative semantics". In Steinberg, D. D. and L. A. Jakobovits. (eds). 1971. 232 - 294.
- Ohmann, R. 1964. "Generative grammars and the concept of literary style". *Word* 20. 423 - 439.
- Ohmann, R. 1971. "Speech, action, and style". In Chatman, S. (ed.). 1971. 241 - 259.
- Pentherik, K. 1975. Review of Enkvist, N. E. 1973. *Linguistic stylistics*. *Style* 9/1. 103 - 105.
- Ross, J. R. 1970. "On declarative sentences". In Jacobs, R. A. and P. S. Rosenbaum. (eds). 1970. 222 - 272.
- Scarle, J. 1969. *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steinberg, D. D. and L. A. Jakobovits. (eds). 1971. *Semantics: an interdisciplinary reader in philosophy, linguistics and psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Proceedings of the third congress of the Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée, Copenhagen 1972. Vol. 1: *Applied contrastive linguistics*. Ed. by G. Nickel. Pp. 307. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag, 1974.

Reviewed by Wolfgang Kühlwein, University of Trier.

0. The fact that one out of three volumes of the proceedings of the 3rd AILA Congress is entirely devoted to Contrastive Linguistics (CL) is a striking proof of the growing importance of this discipline within the entire range of applied linguistic fields. The two companion volumes are *Applied sociolinguistics*, ed. by A. Verdoot and *Applied linguistics: problems and solutions*, ed. by J. Qvistgaard, H. Schwarz and H. Spang-Hanssen. Necessarily this tripartition contains many intersections and demonstrates most clearly that we are perhaps more remote than ever from a systematic structure of the field Applied Linguistics. It is true, an applied discipline cannot be defined according to object or methods of its research but only according to the goals of its research; in this respect the task of organizing e.g. an applied linguistic congress proves to be much more difficult than that of a theoretical linguistic congress; nevertheless, the organizers of the 4th AILA Congress, which is going to take place at Stuttgart (FRG) in 1975 will be well-advised at least to attempt some kind of structure of the goals of applied linguistics to find an encompassing framework, in order to prevent the congress from ending up in a mixed bag of fairly heterogeneous small areas of research — often without any significant interrelationship among each other — and of isolated contributions (which, admittedly, are often very valuable *per se*).

The editor of the volume on CL is well aware of the fact that heterogeneity does not only characterize the present state of applied linguistics as a whole but also his specific field, CL. It is presumably this lack of a coherent structure of present CL which induced the editor to choose the noncommittal alphabetic order according to the names of the authors as his guiding principle for the presentation of the twenty-five contributions which make up this volume. According to their principal goals they can be allotted to five fields of interest:

- (1) basic problems of theoretical and applied CL
- (2) reports on current projects
- (3) specific studies in theoretical and applied CL
- (4) didactic strategies as based on CL
- (5) error analysis and its relationship to CL.

This list shows that the editor succeeded in taking into consideration all major and controversial areas of present-day CL. Though the respective section of the congress was devoted to *applied* CL, several papers convey useful insights into *theoretical* CL as well.

In conclusion of these introductory remarks the astonishingly high amount of typing-errors should be criticized; it is often hard to decide whether they stem from the authors' manuscripts or from too much carelessness or pressure of time in the technical process of editing.

1. A contrastive analysis can be carried out on the basis of any linguistic theory — presupposed the descriptions of the two (or more) respective languages are comparable, i.e., are established in terms of the same theory. Nevertheless, the problem as to the theoretical basis of contrastive analysis was a major issue of various contributions. In weighing the pros and cons of contrastive analysis S. Dardjowidjojo criticizes not only the surface structure oriented structural taxonomic contrastive analyses but also the generative approaches for their lack of a clear distinction between deep and surface

structure ("How deep is deep structure?"), for the vague location of universals, and for the problems concerning their application in foreign language teaching: creating a "rich linguistic environment" (as a consequence of a mentalist theory of language acquisition) will certainly facilitate the first five years of the acquisition of one's first language, but "the most crucial problem for us (as second language teachers) is how to shorten these five years or so into a few hundred hours and to present the materials in the most condensed and yet comprehensive way in an unrealistic classroom situation..." (57).

Another basic problem of CL was raised by Th. Ebnetter: equivalence. The author proposes to widen the scope of contrastive linguistic parameters. At present they consist of the all-or-none opposition 'similar vs. different': equivalence depends on the question whether underlying simple sentences in the languages under comparison match each other or not, or it depends on the surface structure oriented postulates concerning presence vs. absence of rules in contrasted languages, or a tertium comparationis in terms of identical meaning is postulated. The skilled application of procedures derived from set theory on the basis of distinctive feature analysis could well contribute towards introducing the notion of gradience into contrastive linguistic description by applying partial similarity as a third parameter, thus covering the relationships of inclusion, equipollence, surjection and bijection in a highly economic way.

Within the realm of phonology K. J. Kohler suggests to give more emphasis to its syntagmatic dimension in Contrastive Sentence Phonology.

A further most basic enlargement of CL was demanded by R. J. Di Pietro in "Contrastive analysis: demise or new life?": sociocultural variables should be taken into account. Like general linguistics, most research in CL (both theoretical and applied) has concentrated on the syntactic part of the semiotic functions of language, and, at best, on its semantic side by merely investigating the purely linguistic structures (from sound to sentence) and their relations to extra-linguistic correlates. Aspects pertaining to the user of language, to speaker and hearer, were banned from the traditional competence-oriented generative study of language. The limitations of linguistics, if it is defined so narrowly, become especially obvious in CL. It is true, generative CL has solved the problem of treating semantics, syntax, and phonology as components of one integral model, thus doing away with the one-way road from phonology via morphology to syntax of the structural-taxonomic view on language, where these components of language had rather been regarded as self-contained levels. Thus, traditional generative CL enabled the linguist to account for syntactic structures in language A whose function was carried by e. g. lexicological or phonological structures in language B. If, however, equivalent linguistic structures bear different meanings on behalf of differing sociocultural contexts, traditional generative CL failed. The reviewer would even advance one step further than Di Pietro: we must not only develop a contrastive sociolinguistics (e. g. in order to facilitate the process of foreign language learning by e. g. pointing out to sociolocal German structures like *das Kind, von dem ich den Vater kenne* or *er war am Schlafen* when teaching French *l'enfant dont je connais le père* respectively English *he was sleeping*) but also a contrastive pragmalinguistics — and both disciplines have to set the framework for what is presently done in CL. Both contrastive pragmalinguistics and contrastive sociolinguistics have to come first! The same consequence poses itself when going through R. Zimmermann's quite randomly chosen German-English contrastive by-products of his reception of Scarle.

An interdisciplinary prerequisite which is of equal importance for a contrastive analysis that claims to be applicable for language teaching is stated by T. Slama-Cazacu:

it is necessary to carry out not only (I) the usual contrastive linguistic study (consisting in establishing, *in abstracto*, the similarities and differences between the two systems) but also to undertake (II) a *psycholinguistic contrastive study*, since in research concerned with the learning of language and not with linguistic typology as such, there is a very concrete factor which the researcher cannot bypass and which is in this study-situation: the two systems — *BL* and *TL* — meet *in the learner* (236 f.).

2. In her empirical research, which was carried out along these lines, T. Slama-Cazacu could produce evidence for one of the most central and most crucial problems of foreign language learning; most psycholinguistic arguments which relate to language acquisition are derived from observations of *first* language acquisition; e. g., there is a fairly wide agreement concerning the systematicity (due to 'language regularization') of the initial stages of first language acquisition ('approximative systems' à la W. Nemsler and T. Slama-Cazacu, 'compromise systems' à la R. Filipović, 'Interrims-grammatiken' à la W. Köhlwein), but the respective evidence for the psychology of second language learning still is rather limited. T. Slama-Cazacu observed native speakers of 22 different mother languages when they learnt Romanian as target language — and noticed the same errors in an investigation of more than 600 children from 2 - 7 years who acquired Romanian as their mother tongue. The far-reaching consequence which we can draw from this observation for AL and the teaching of a foreign language is that the 'approximative systems' as postulated above, obviously do exist psychologically and can be described linguistically because they are systematically structured; if, however, we can describe them linguistically, we can (and should) use these descriptions as implements in the didactics of foreign language teaching.

D. Chițoran provides the reader with more general information concerning "The Romanian-English contrastive analysis project", presents various theses of general interest which had been written within the framework of the Romanian Project — among others e. g. one of the few existing contrastive lexicological theses, which is likely to incite similar research in other contrastive projects as well. As for the particular linguistic theory which should serve as a basis for contrastive analyses, Chițoran is absolutely undogmatic; each researcher may choose the theory which suits his purposes best. This problem-oriented selection of theories may be convenient for the solving of particular problems in language teaching, but if one of the aims of the project is the achievement of a general contrastive English-Romanian grammar, it will be very hard to incorporate findings which are based on very different theories of language.

In "Testing the results of contrastive analysis" R. Filipović elaborates one feature of the Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project, which it shares with the Romanian-English project: the complementary view of CL and error analysis. He convincingly demonstrates how the results of CL are checked by the findings of error analysis.

3. The reports on specific studies, some of which are carried out within some of the larger current contrastive projects, are almost exclusively devoted to syntactic problems — E. Dinsen's study on "L'acquisition de la prononciation du français par les Danois" being the major exception; Dinsen uses a surface-oriented approach, based on articulatory criteria, and checks CL by error analysis both at the segmental and the suprasegmental level.

The diversity of linguistic theories underlying these various syntactic investigations demonstrates most clearly, that there is no specific contrastive linguistic theory, and that CL, actually, is not explanatory but merely collects facts (Fisiak 1974). There is surface-oriented structural research in P. Mrazović's "Konfrontative Analyse der Wort-

stellung Deutsch-Serbokroatisch". In "The actualization of the noun phrase in Hungarian and Serbo-Croatian" M. Mikes, L. Dezsö and G. Vukovic set out from a distinctive feature matrix, containing the features 'identified', 'qualified' or 'quantified', add the theme-rheme distinction and ask how the languages which they contrast realize this matrix. There is also the equally surface-oriented approach, underlying N. D. Liem's "Clauses and cases in English and French in contrast", who attempts, however, a combination with Fillmore's theory of Case Grammar beyond the mere tagmemic comparison of clause types. It is also Case Grammar which M. C. Gatto takes as the basis for "Une étude contrastive du français et de l'espagnol et ses implications pour l'enseignement du français langue étrangère", whereas an older generative model (Katz — Postal 1964) is used by H. A. Bennett to describe "'Simple' sentences in three languages: a contrastive study using transformational generative grammar". J. L. Wyatt's investigation of "Nominalized clauses in English and contrastive linguistics" also rests on generative grammar; CL is used here, however, mainly for the purpose of elucidating particular structural features of the L_1 (English) more clearly. V. Mach and S. Machova apply a type of dependency grammar when they set out from the process of nominalization and ask for its functions in English and Czech. In attempting a "Kontrastive Analyse der Negation im Deutschen und im Französischen" J. Lerot had to cope with the most difficult problem of drawing contrastive conclusions from two descriptions which rest on very different linguistic theories: G. Stickel's transformational treatment of negation in German and D. Gaatone's more traditional investigation of negation in French. These obstacles led to the expected conclusion "daß eine kontrastive Analyse nicht nur zwei nach derselben Methode vorgenommene Analysen des zu behandelnden Themas voraussetzt, sondern auch eine umfassendere Theorie und sogar eine ganze Grammatik, denn eine ziemlich leicht abgrenzbare Erscheinung wie die Negation spiegelt sich auf allen Sprachebenen..." (158). A. Fülei-Szanto's "Kontrastive Beschreibung der deontischen Modalität im englischen und spanischen Sprachsystem" cannot be strictly allocated to one of the current linguistic theories. The author sets out from a set of logically given parameters and asks how this system is realized by the contrasted languages. M. O. Tomić discusses scope features in "Unmarked determiners in English, Macedonian and Serbo-Croatian". He does not attempt to solve his problem, as might be expected, on the grounds of formal logic, because "the semantics of formal logic differs radically from the semantics of modern linguistics: whereas logic starts from the individuum and on its basis constructs complete or partial sets with the aid of existential and universal quantifiers, linguistics should choose as primitives the sets and specify them in terms of the participation of their members into given states or actions" (253).

4. A variety of method, as wide as the one which is indicated by the specific research projects, underlies the didactic strategies. The full range of traditional, structural and pragmatic procedures is given.

W. Boeddinghaus compares Afrikaans to German. As his presentation is exclusively devoted to the comparison of cognates, the title of his paper, "Lehrstrategie im Unterricht nah verwandter Sprachen" certainly is too presumptive. To be sure, he is right in emphasizing listening comprehension as the first teaching goal in the case of closely related languages. His basic idea, however, "durch das extensive Verstehen von vorbereitetem Satzmaterial so weit wie möglich in die fremde Sprache einzudringen" (30) is certainly not new, and his strategy of setting out from those structures which have the highest degree of similarity in both languages, and gradually going on to less and less similar structures stands in striking contrast to L. Zabrocki's results of well-based empirical research.

In "The contribution of contrastive linguistics to the preparation of language-teach-

ing materials" W. R. Lee criticizes CL for its putting too much weight on the prediction of errors from mere L_1/L_2 -contrasts and for its orientation towards adult speech, and implicitly acknowledges the importance of 'approximative systems' (s. a.). The course design, however, which he then advocates, is astonishingly traditional: (1) choice of structural items to be taught, (2) embodiment of these items in actions, activities, etc., where CL can help to decide which items should be omitted for the time being, and how the items which are to be included shall be sequenced and spaced out.

In making "Some remarks on the formal properties of contrastive pedagogical grammars" W. Marton sets out from largely similar ideas, arrives at an altogether different conclusion, however, as regards the design of courses. Recognizing the well-known psycholinguistic shortcomings of a pedagogical grammar as based on the traditional versions of TG, he would rather base course designing on conceptual organization as it is involved in the encoding of a given content plan into the signs of a target language, and on the respective differences in conceptual organization and its lexical and syntactic realizing between L_1 and L_2 . This position consequently leads him to a Contrastive Grammar which should be based on notions, to a procedure of "establishing certain fairly general semantic areas which are functional in the syntactic systems of the pairs of languages under comparison and in very explicitly showing how each language dissects these areas in a different way" (189). The didactic application of such a type of contrastive pedagogical grammar can well be achieved via a situational approach, which is not governed by the sequence of structural items but by "a number of sociolinguistically specified functions of communicative acts, with each of these functions utilizing various typological structures" (192). No doubt, this suggestion is in line with most recent reasoning in theoretical pragmatically based linguistics, and its didactic application, as suggested here, seems well feasible. The major problem of this kind of contrastive grammar, however, rather lies on its theoretical side: how to arrive at the complete inventory of the notional primes, how to classify them, and how to account for the interlocking of verbal and non-verbal components of their realizations in different languages? Thus, the didactic implications of CL once again lead us back to the key problems of its theory.

5. In the contributions where error analysis plays a major part its scope and relation to CL is the central problem. As most error analyses are based on materials from introductory or intermediate levels, foreign language teachers will certainly appreciate J. P. Menting's "Analyse de fautes dans l'enseignement du français langue étrangère au niveau supérieur aux pays bas", which is empirically well-founded.

J. P. Walmsley's comparison of "Cantonese-English: an essay in diagnostic linguistics" reveals how ill-defined the profile of error analysis had hitherto been: both as regards its interior structure and its borderline towards CL. He attempts to account for the errors made on the phonological level. Though this attempt largely rests on a structural basis, it becomes obvious fairly soon that this end can only be achieved by including morphosyntax: "It is obviously pointless to provide drills in phonology without first finding out whether a subject's problems do not originate in the graphological, morphological or lexical systems" (270f.). Just like the ultimate conclusion of J. P. Angelis' contribution on "Listening comprehension and error analysis", the consequence of this statement for error analysis is the systematic investigation of "transitional dialects" of the learner, which should be carried out by "longitudinal studies" (8 resp. 272). This, however, can only be achieved by defining error analysis as the superior frame, which encompasses — among other things, e. g. the errors which are due to transfer and interference among different stages of the learning process within the L_2 alone — CL. After some decades of often quite esoteric speculation of theoretical linguistics applied contrastive linguistics should not discard this consideration too rashly.

REFERENCES

- Fisiak, J. 1974. "Phonological contrastive studies". A lecture delivered at the University of Trier, May 7, 1974.
- Katz, J. and P. Postal. 1964. *An integrated theory of linguistic descriptions*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Error analysis. Ed. by J. C. Richards. Pp. 228. London: Longman, 1974.

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

According to D. H. Brown, in a paper read at the 1975 TESOL convention, within the last century there has been a revolution in language teaching every 25 years.

Certain changes which can be observed in recent years may be symptoms of another revolution and a new era in language teaching. One of these changes is a shift of emphasis from a preoccupation with teaching processes towards learning processes; a shift of attention from the teacher as a controller of language learning to the learner himself, his powers and abilities to learn a second language.

One major result brought about by these recent changes is an assumption that some kind of linguistic system different from the mother tongue and the target language underlies the speech of a learner of another language, and that this entire system of the second language learner should be investigated. This assumption ascribes a special place to the analysis of errors made by a second language learner. His errors, as Corder observes, are indicative both of the state of learner's knowledge of a target language at a particular point (his 'interlanguage' or 'approximative system') and of the ways in which a second language is learned. They are, therefore, significant to the language teacher, language researcher and language learner. These problems are the subject of the volume under review.

The book is a collection of eleven papers, which are arranged in four parts, each of which is preceded by a short introduction by the editor of the whole volume.

Part one contains two papers:

"The study of learner English" by J. C. Richards and G. P. Sampson and "The significance of learners' errors" by S. P. Corder which give an overview of the field of error analysis as well as a justification for the study of learners' errors.

Part two contains three papers:

"Interlanguage" by L. Selinker

"Approximative systems of foreign language learners" by W. Nemser and

"Social factors, interlanguage and language learning" by J. C. Richards.

The first two are concerned with the linguistic system of the learner's speech and with different factors pertaining to the development of this system. The third paper discusses social factors of interlanguage. The paper makes a distinction between second and foreign language goals and settings and discusses their influence on the nature of the learner's interlanguage. Richards accepts Kachru's distinction between deviations and mistakes and comes to the conclusion that in the foreign language setting "there is no room... for the concept of deviancy, since the socio-cultural basis for deviancy does not exist in the foreign language setting... Limitations to the acquisition of standard English in the foreign language setting are hence not socially imposed limitations, which we encountered with the analysis of

domestic dialects; in the foreign language setting limitations are rather individual, reflecting personal differences in motivation perseverance, aptitude and so on" (88).

Part three of the book is devoted to the presentation of the concrete results of the study of second language acquisition in children and contains the following articles: "You can't learn without goofing" by H. C. Dulay and M. K. Burt

"Language acquisition in a second language environment" by R. Ravem

"The development of WH-questions in first and second language learners" by R. Ravem.

Dulay and Burt are critical of the contrastive analysis approach to second language learning and favour the hypothesis that a "child's organisation of L2 does not include transfer from (either positive or negative) or comparison with his native language, but relies on his dealing with L2 syntax as a system" (115). Consequently, they explain interference-like goofs made by Spanish children learning English in terms of overgeneralization of some English structures. Thus, goofs like

*Now she's putting hers clothes on

*She putting hers pyjamas on

which might reflect modifier-noun number agreement required in Spanish are, according to them, a result of overgeneralizing either the possessive *-s* from NP's which are nouns (e. g. *Tim's*, *Mary's*) or the structure [NP is X's] (*It's hers*, etc.) Although the fact that we do not find structures like **big's houses*, **tall's boys* supports the hypothesis that the above goofs are not a result of Spanish interference, it might be interesting to check whether these goofs will occur in the speech of other children learning English as a second language whose first language does not require agreement between a modifier and a noun. If these mistakes are really a result of overgeneralization, then similar data should be found in the speech of other than Spanish-speaking children who are learning English.

Ravem's papers present some of his findings concerning the acquisition of English as a second language by two Norwegian children and show that there are striking similarities between the acquisition of English as a first and as a second language.

Part four of the book deals with the methodology of error analysis as applied to the analysis of adult language learning, and contains the following papers:

"Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis" by S. P. Corder

"A non-contrastive approach to error analysis" by J. C. Richards

"Error analysis: source, cause and significance" by M. P. Jain.

Corder presents here a model based on a distinction between an idiosyncratic dialect (the learner's personal grammar) as opposed to a social dialect or even an idiolect and discusses the variables involved in it. Richards, while admitting that interference from the mother tongue is a major source of difficulty in second language learning, points to a number of other sources of errors such as overgeneralization, incomplete application of target language rules, failure to learn conditions under which rules apply, formation of false concepts, etc. Jain discusses and documents a thesis that many errors are a result of a general tendency in language learners to reduce the target language to a simpler system. While children learning their tongue acquire the full system at a certain point, the second language learner continues to use the reduced system with varying degrees of adjustment and varying degrees of deviancy from the target language.

The book as a whole is a valuable set of readings in the field of errors analysis. Both the selection of papers and the commentaries offered by Richards give the reader an overview of the field and make him aware of the importance of error analysis to the language teacher and language researcher. Despite different approaches to the problem, all writers

agree on one point — the study of learner's errors has both practical and theoretical implications for the whole process of learning a language.

Sociolinguistics. An introduction. By Peter Trudgill. Pp. 189. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1974.

Reviewed by Karol Janicki, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

The book is a collection of seven introductory articles treating selected aspects of sociolinguistics. The general orientation of the volume is descriptive not methodological, i.e., the issues brought up are the functional relations between language and the various aspects of society and culture rather than the methods or techniques utilized for investigating and analyzing language variation.

The first article — "Language and society" — is of the most general nature. Trudgill touches upon a variety of problems to come up when language is related to society. The reader's attention is drawn to the two basic aspects of language when viewed from the social point of view — 1. the function of language in establishing social relationships, and 2. the function of language in conveying information about the speaker.

Fundamental concepts like *language*, *standard language*, *non-standard language*, *dialect*, *accent*, etc., are defined. It is emphasized that value judgements concerning individual varieties or their elements are purely social.

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is brought up and commented on. The strong version of the hypothesis, which claims that perception is entirely determined by language, is objected to. Also, the less controversial development — the one-way relationship in the opposite direction — is exemplified. According to this hypothesis, the structure and changes of societal arrangements are reflected in language.

Taboo words are reported to be both linguistically and sociologically-marked facts. The various examples illustrate this typical sociolinguistic phenomenon very well.

In the second article Trudgill relates language to social class. He stresses the significance of *socioeconomic index* as a vehicle enabling the assigning of individuals to particular social categories.

Some of Labov's contributions to the field of sociolinguistics are discussed. Among other facts, Trudgill stresses one of the most fundamental of Labov's advances — the rejection of the non-sociolinguist's notion of free variation.

Both regional and social dialects are approached by Trudgill as dialect continua, i.e., dimensions along which no clear-cut divisions can be made. In both cases extensive overlap of forms is conspicuous.

An interesting issue taken up by Trudgill is that of *inherent variability*. The variable rule which operates in Detroit Negro and Norwich speech yielding the orthographically designated *-s* or zero agreement morpheme in third person singular Simple Present verb forms, is assumed by the author to reflect inherent variability with respect to this feature, present in both of the mentioned dialects.

According to the *inherent variability view* advocated by Trudgill, such occurrence or non-occurrence of *-s* is merely a characteristic feature of the system under consideration. The opposing *dialect-mixture view* maintains that the variable occurrence of *-s* is due to the mixture of Detroit Negro English with Standard American English (in the Detroit case) and the mixture of social dialects (in the Norwich case). In other words, the problem is whether the existing variability can or cannot be traced to any linguistic or extralinguistic determining factors.

Two basic ways of analyzing social-class dialects are possible:

1. grouping informants around common sociological measures and correlating these facts with linguistic ones.

2. clustering informants on the basis of identical linguistic characteristics and then seeking their social correlates (cluster analysis).

According to Trudgill, the advantage of the latter method is that new social dimensions can be revealed which otherwise pass unnoticed.

Toward the end of the second article Trudgill takes up the notions of *elaborate code* and *restricted code* as introduced by Bernstein (1964). Powerful evidence (quoted after Labov 1972a) is provided for the rejection of one of the interpretations of Bernstein's theory. As presented by some educationalists it (not Bernstein's theory but the interpretation or rather misinterpretation in question) claims linguistic deficiency of the members of the working class.

It is not clear in Trudgill's presentation what is the difference between 1. the position holding that it is simply social convention which requires a child to use elaborate code at school, and 2. the position holding that the use of elaborate code is not a social convention but an essential requirement of the educational process itself (52).

In part three of the volume language is related to ethnic group. Bilingual situations are exemplified and attention is drawn to the impact that the native language of a particular ethnic group exerts on the patterns of the second language spoken in a different socio-cultural environment. Examples quoted illustrate this situation in the United States, Ghana, Yugoslavia, etc.

In this chapter the author's attention is focused, however, on the basic characteristics and origin of Black English Vernacular (BEV) in America. Both phonological and grammatical traits are enumerated and commented on. The following four possible views on the origins of BEV are discussed:

1. The *different-equals-inferior view* maintains that there are no differences between the speech of black and white Americans in the sense that all characteristics of BEV can be traced back to British English or are innovations that can also be encountered in the speech of white Americans.

2. The *dialectologist view* recognizes the discrepancies between BEV and the white speech but maintains that the dissimilarities can nevertheless be traced back to British English dialects.

3. The *integrationist view* claims that the black speech of America is correctly approached when seen to have been derived from some African-influenced creole type of English. Nowadays, however, the features pertaining to that creole and thus differing from those of the white speech are no longer present.

4. The *creole view* maintains that the significant differences between BEV and the white speech can most satisfactorily be accounted for if BEV as it is spoken at present is viewed as a creole.

BEV also creates an educational problem. Trudgill adumbrates the three fundamental approaches to the solution of the problem of school-situation inevitable co-existence of BEV and white American English:

1. elimination of non-standard (BEV) speech

2. bidialectalism (the permission to treat the two varieties as distinct entities to be discussed at school with extensive restrictions, however, as to the use of the non-standard variety at school)

3. appreciation of dialect differences (involves the change of the deeply-ingrained present societal attitudes aiming at depreciating the non-standard varieties). In Trudgill's opinion a combination of 2 and 3 might yield the best results.

In chapter four Trudgill raises one of the central problems of sociolinguistics — the relation between language and sex. Attempts are made at identifying the origins of sex variation. *Taboo* is reported to be the source of sex linguistic dissimilarity in a number of

languages. In other languages (e.g. Chiquito) kinship and gender systems account for the split of forms. Still in other cases complex rules of unidentifiable provenance control the distribution of male and female forms.

The women, who are reported to be more status-conscious, are more sensitive to linguistic forms which are correlated with social characteristics. Also, differences in self-evaluation tests are found for male and female informants. Women tend to believe that they use higher-status linguistic forms than they actually do. Men, however, show the reverse, i.e., they underrate their linguistic performance in terms of social prestige hierarchy.

Chapter five relates language to the non-linguistic context in which it is used. Differences along the dimension of occupational situation are provided. Within this framework Trudgill elaborates on the role of status, age and social class in the linguistic outcome determined by a combination of those social factors.

Styles are viewed by Trudgill as linguistic varieties determined by the many aspects of the social situation. References are made to Labov's techniques of isolation of contextual styles (Labov 1972b).

In the interpretation of Bernstein's *elaborated* and *restricted code* dichotomy Trudgill speculates that, perhaps, the working class child is linguistically-impaired not in the sense of having no access to the elaborated code but in the sense of not having access to the many styles as are available to the middle-class child.

Whatever solution is suggested for this and other problems, many of the questions raised in this chapter remain unanswered.

It is well known that the rules of social interaction involving language are fairly complex. The number of variables involved in a single speech event is vast. Successful attempts have been made (e.g. Ervin-Tripp 1973) at formalizing at least some of those rules. Trudgill, however, does not mention those advances.

Referring to Brown and Gilman's "The pronouns of power and solidarity" (Brown and Gilman 1960) Trudgill states that "Pronouns of the V type signal a relatively formal style..." (110). Examples from Javanese and Korean are provided. Although Trudgill does not claim explicitly a universal nature of this V type pronoun—formal style relationship, one might get the impression of his doing so. Counterexamples, however, are available from Polish where the obligatory choice of the V type pronouns may frequently involve the use of many linguistic forms (particularly phonological, but also lexical) typical of the lower level styles — intimate, casual and consultative.

In the remaining part of chapter five Trudgill brings up the problems of *linguistic insecurity*, *diglossia* and *language switching*.

In chapter six some of the macro-sociolinguistic issues are taken up. Language is related to nation. Bilingual and multilingual situations are exemplified. Language minorities are discussed and attention is drawn particularly to those instances where language planning is an expedient of political preferences with respect to those minorities.

In the final chapter some of the problems pertaining to language and geography are touched on. Aspects of linguistic change and its spread across dialect areas are made note of. Notions like *linguistic areas*, *pidginization*, *creolization* are elaborated on and exemplified.

In giving a general opinion of the book, although considering the introductory nature of the volume, one cannot disregard the occasional oversimplifications which may lead some readers to confusion or misunderstanding.

It is surprising to the reviewer that no mention is made in the book of and credit given to such American sociolinguists as Susan Ervin-Tripp and Allen Grimshaw, whose contributions to the field, in particular to the theory of sociolinguistics, are of utmost importance.

The bibliographical information appended to the text proper is offered in the form of *Annotated bibliography and further reading*. The information is not complete, however, since in none of the cases Trudgill provides the year of publication of the quoted book.

The index following the annotated bibliography includes only selected items. Names of languages such as *North Caucasian* and *South Caucasian*, which are italicized in the text, are not entries in the index. One must look up *Caucasian languages* to trace the two former terms. Other language names, e.g., Polish, Georgian, Dutch, Kashubian do not appear in the index at all.

One more shortcoming pertaining to the entirety of the book must be pointed out. In a considerable number of instances (pp. 67, 70, 73, 74, 75, 84, 93, 100, 127, 179) Trudgill signals the existence of some experimental data, advanced research, theories, etc., but furnishes no bibliographical reference. It seems that lack of such information will bother in particular those readers who either want to question some of the issues raised or who simply want to enlarge their knowledge by attending to the data allegedly available.

Probably the criticism of the references and the index could more justly be directed toward the publishing house than the author, but this may be being too charitable.

In spite of the few misgivings indicated above, Trudgill's book is worth recommending particularly for the intending student of sociolinguistics who wants to get acquainted with some of the most fundamental concepts of the field.

REFERENCES

- Bernstein, B. 1964. "Elaborated and restricted codes". *The ethnography of communication*. Special issue of *American anthropologist* 66. 6. 2. 55 - 69.
- Brown, R. and A. Gilman. 1960. "The pronouns of power and solidarity". In Giglioli, P. P. (ed.). 1972. 252 - 282.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. 1973. *Language acquisition and communicative choice*. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press.
- Giglioli, P. P. (ed.). 1972. *Language and social context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Labov, W. 1972a. "The logic of non-standard English". In Labov, W. 1972c. 201 - 240.
- Labov, W. 1972b. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. 1972c. *Language in the inner city: Studies in Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

New frontiers in second language learning. Ed. by John H. Schumann and Nancy Stenson. Pp. 175. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1974.

Reviewed by Karol Janicki, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

The book is a collection of articles divided into two major parts. Preceded by an introduction, the first part of the volume is directed toward the practical aspects of error analysis. The second part is more theoretical, and treats a variety of related topics all of which focus on the learner as the object of primary interest in the learning-teaching process. Both the first and the second parts include articles which vary with respect to validity, originality and controversial nature of the topic. As this review proceeds the reviewer's evaluation of individual articles will be arrived at on the basis of these characteristics.

Within the first group of articles the ones that deserve most attention are Jack C. Richards' "Error analysis and second language strategies" and Marina K. Burt and Carol

Kiparsky's "Global and local mistakes". Richards, while expressing his point of view on error analysis, provides a relatively extensive discussion of the many possible identifiable sources of error. He lists the following six categories:

1. Interference (transfer of native language habits to the target language)
2. Overgeneralization (extension of target language rules to the areas where the rules are not applicable)
3. Performance Errors (occasional errors which are due to memory lapses, fatigue, excitement, etc.; opposed to systematic competence errors)
4. Markers of Transitional Competence (errors which are believed to occur naturally at different points of the developmental process of second language acquisition)
5. Strategies of Communication and Assimilation (errors that result from the student's efforts to communicate in those situations where his command of the target language does not really allow him to do so)
6. Induced Errors (errors which result from the contents of the textbook or classroom pedagogical procedures).

Within the discussion of interference Richards mentions the phenomenon of sociolinguistic errors which, for many reasons, is found by the reviewer to be of great significance. Although Richards makes note primarily of contrasts between styles across languages, this subsection seems to contribute a lot to one of the critical issues of foreign language learning — the acquisition of sociolinguistic rules along with the learning of grammar, phonology, etc.

On the basis of this subsection one might get the impression that the only source of sociolinguistic errors is transfer of native sociolinguistic habits to the target language. While there seems to be hardly any evidence that this is not the case, the reviewer's hunch is that all the sociolinguistic errors made at different levels of the learning process could be classified into various categories possibly parallel to those listed by Richards for purely linguistic behaviour.

In "Global and local mistakes" Burt and Kiparsky arrive at a hierarchy of mistakes which should be suggestive of the priority for correction. Only syntactic errors are reported. Phonology and semantics are not taken into account. *Global mistakes* are those which violate rules involving the major relationships of the sentence constituents thus decreasing the comprehensibility of the sentence. *Local mistakes* violate rules pertaining to a particular constituent. These notions are relative since a mistake which is labelled global in one sentence may be marked local in another, depending on the complexity of the overall structure of the sentence. Global mistakes are higher in the hierarchy than local ones. Burt and Kiparsky define the hierarchy as follows: "A is higher than B in the hierarchy if the correction of A contributes more to comprehensibility than the correction of B" and later redefine it: "A is higher in the hierarchy than B if violating A makes sentence comprehension more difficult than violating B" (72).

Typical global mistakes are those which involve the misuse of meaningful constituent connectors, distinction between co-ordinate and relative clauses, tense continuity across clauses, etc. Typical local mistakes, marked much lower in the hierarchy, are those which involve the wrong handling of such categories as noun-verb agreement, articles, etc. Since comprehension is one of the fundamental skills to be evolved by the student, global mistakes, according to Burt and Kiparsky, should be corrected prior to local mistakes whose contribution to the non-understanding of a sentence is much smaller or none.

The questions to be put forth at this point are: how necessary and useful is the distinction suggested? what kind of practical, school-situation solutions does this distinction entail? While appreciating the valuable observations reported above, one should be very

cautious about the practical application of the finding with respect to the average foreign language teacher. It seems that the teacher should be given explicit guidance as to how to handle the correction of the mentioned two categories of mistakes. On the other hand, a problem of a psycholinguistic nature arises. Burt and Kiparsky claim that it is easier "to make a student appreciate and correct a global error" (79). Although this might be true, one should consider the consequences of a procedure in which local mistakes would not be corrected along with global mistakes. How psycholinguistically sound (and practically plausible) is it to have a student correct **English language use much people into* **Much people use English language* and then into the actual standard form. Although the theoretical considerations with respect to comprehensibility are undoubtedly an evident and valuable advance in the general theory of error analysis, the practical application of this development requires numerous elaborations and extensive adaptations.

Section I includes four more articles. R. Wardhaugh in "The contrastive analysis hypothesis" provides a comprehensive account of the tenets of contrastive analysis, and challenges the strong version of the hypothesis which claims that on the basis of detailed contrastive descriptions of the native and the target language systems it is possible to predict the difficulties which the student of the target language will encounter in the process of learning. While also rejecting some of the more recent suggestions from the generative-transformational grammarians, Wardhaugh accepts solely the weak version of the contrastive analysis hypothesis which sets off from the data collected and uses such evidence to account for the similarities and discrepancies between two systems.

In "Students' errors and the learning of French as a second language. A pilot study" M. Buteau provides experimental evidence for the claim that interlinguistic interference is not sufficient to explain all the difficulties that can be traced in the foreign language acquisition process. The existence of intralinguistic interference, mainly in the form of overgeneralization, is confirmed particularly at an advanced level. Other factors of difficulty must also be considered, e.g., the number of possible alternatives in a single choice and awareness of contextual cues.

Buteau's findings generally point to the irrationality of the predictive power of contrastive analysis. In particular, Buteau refers to Pascasio (1961) and Stockwell (1965), who claim that the areas of most difficulty are those which include the learning of grammar elements that do not exist in the native language. Buteau's findings on gender agreement in French (in an experiment administered to English speaking students) did not confirm this claim.

This article and many others suggest either implicitly or explicitly that more and more experiments of Buteau's kind should be encouraged. It is the reviewer's contention that particularly longitudinal experiments should be recommended since they can shed much more light on the overall second language learning process, if not finally answer the many questions which otherwise will remain open for many years to come.

In "Induced errors" N. Stenson elaborates on category 6 of Richards' system. According to her, teacher-induced errors, as distinguished from spontaneous errors, are a convenient vehicle that provides otherwise unobtainable information about the student's competence. A linguistic element that does not appear in the student's repertoire cannot be assumed to have been acquired. That is why the significance of induced error is great; the gaps in the student's knowledge of the target language can be detected. Stenson stresses that teacher-induced errors should be clearly distinguished from those reflecting the student's developing competence. The former function as an indicator of what the student does not know. The latter — at what stage of the developmental process the student stands. As Stenson herself admits, it is not clear how to practically keep the two categories apart.

In the last article of Part I — "Imitation and correction in foreign language learning" — F. M. Holley and J. K. King return to the problem of the relationship between first and second language acquisition. Referring to some experimental evidence on first language acquisition they maintain that the teacher's insistence on grammatical accuracy does not contribute to the student's better mastery of the system. On the contrary, overt correction may be detrimental.

Since grammatical mistakes are considered normal and are not stigmatized in the child's language, the extrapolation Holley and King make is that the foreign language student should be approached in the same way, thus being given a fair amount of freedom for "normal" linguistic manipulation. Under the circumstances the learner will gradually change and rectify his linguistic behavior in terms of native competence. Holley and King emphasize that ungrammatical sentences should even be encouraged, thus allowing the learner to progress the way the child does, by forming and testing hypotheses.

The covert correction of grammatical structures suggested by Holley and King includes three major categories:

1. Rephrasing the question with possible emphasis on content words
2. Cueing — using different grammatical variants of the key words of the sentence
3. Generating simple sentences — doing substitution exercises which in fact almost preclude mistakes.

In the guidelines for the teacher, toward the end of the article, the authors suggest that the student be allowed to complete without interruption an incorrect sentence which ought to be corrected by the teacher producing the correct variant, without drawing the student's attention in an overt form to the corrected structure as modeled by the teacher.

Although much has been said and written on the relationship between first and second language acquisition, no final answer, obviously, has, as yet, been given. Thus, positing any equivalence between these seemingly parallel processes must be made with great caution. An extensive discussion of the current attitudes toward the problem in question does not fall within the scope of this review. Suffice it to say that there is no objective experimental evidence which would allow us to accept Holley and King's conclusions and model our teaching on the suggested procedure. Definite statements and extrapolations concerning the discussed relationship should be made only after multiplied longitudinal experiments have been administered to a variety of samples.

Although Holley and King merely suggest a technique to be used in a second language class-room, the nature of the technique undoubtedly carries methodological implications pointing to the equivalence of the first and second language acquisition processes. Irrespective of the possible results of the mentioned longitudinal experiments, which hopefully will let us arrive at definite conclusions, many of the techniques based on the assumption of first and second language acquisition equivalence should be extensively tested since they may prove both convenient and efficient.

Part II of the book includes five articles of which J. H. Schumann's "Implications of pidginization and creolization for the study of adult second language acquisition" seems most enticing. The author draws an analogy between pidginization and creolization on the one hand and the two basic stages (beginning and advanced) of the process of second language learning, on the other.

There are three basic functions of language: communicative, integrative and expressive. According to Schumann, pidgins exhibit only one of those functions, namely, the communicative function. Some of the features that most adequately characterize pidgins are: lack of redundant grammatical features, word order tending to replace inflectional morphology, lack of agnate sentences, elimination of stylistic devices, reduction in

grammatical transformations, reduction of lexicon, deletion of monomorphic words, absence of tense markers, lack of articles, predicate negation formed by placing *no* before the center of the predicate, copula deletion, extensive use of gesture, etc. It must be kept in mind that the above-mentioned features do not refer to one particular pidgin. Those are only some selected traits pertaining to a variety of considered systems.

When a pidgin extends its functions to integrative and expressive, it becomes a creole. A creole thus basically differs from its antecedent pidgin in that it is spoken as the first language by a given community. Along with the extension of functions a pidgin, while becoming a creole, gradually enlarges its grammatical system (in the sense of introducing more functional grammatical categories) and relies much more on developing morphology.

With respect to the four features: *simplification*, *reduction*, *complication* and *expansion* the pidgin systems are found by Schumann to be analogous to the interlanguage as represented by the incipient learner. The juxtaposition of functions also contributes to the proposed analogy. The beginning student does not make use of the integrative and expressive functions of the target language since he has not yet acquired (or acquired adequately in terms of native competence) all the markers and elements of the entire system. As in the case of a creole speaker, the advanced student of a second language, having expanded the various subsystems, no longer has to rely on simplified and reduced constructs but makes full use of the complicated grammatical system, vast vocabulary, redundancy, etc., thus having access to the integrative and expressive functions of the language.

The analogy suggested by Schumann is undoubtedly an interesting observation. As he himself suggests, longitudinal studies of second language acquisition should be encouraged to test the pidginization-creolization hypothesis whose corroboration might enable valuable insights into the second language learning process.

In "The significance of learner's errors" S. P. Corder relates the fundamentals of first and second language acquisition processes. He departs from the general hypothesis that the human being is born with an innate capacity for language which, when exposed to actual linguistic data, is triggered off thus enabling the child the acquisition of a particular language. It is Corder's contention that in the case of second language learner the inborn predisposition for language still operates and in fact is fundamentally the same. Although Corder by no means states that the two processes are exactly the same, it can be easily inferred from his argument that the number of similarities decisively outweighs the number of discrepancies. Since Corder believes that at least some of the strategies employed by the first language learner are substantially the same as those adopted by the learner of a second language, one of the consequences of this standpoint is that the second language is acquired through a sequence of hypotheses-forming and hypotheses-testing strategy. It follows that errors in second language learning are not instances of deviant behaviour to be corrected but regular and systematic occurrences which indicate the student's advancement with respect to the interim systems along which he is likely to proceed.

Corder differentiates between *errors* and *mistakes*. The former are similar to those of a child acquiring the first language. They are systematic and thus give evidence to the teacher of how far in the learning process the student has advanced. *Mistakes* are more ephemeral. They are the frequent slips of the tongue and performance failures due to all kinds of exolinguisic factors.

Within the marginal issues Corder's distinction between *intake* and *input* as referring to the language processing is worth mentioning. This distinction is of great significance. It directly points to the student's individual language mechanism as shaped by many

physiological and psychological properties (determines *intake*), and the form of the syllabus or linguistic data available (determines *input*). The further investigation of the student's intake should aim at describing his built-in syllabus which, if it really exists, is likely to be very different from the syllabus generated by the instructor.

Developing his argument about error analysis Corder implicitly depreciates the relevance of imitation in the second language learning process, and explicitly questions the validity of imitated utterances as marking the student's advancement in the target language.

In the reviewer's opinion Corder's discussion does not put sufficient emphasis on the characteristics that are endemic to individual components of language. It is the reviewer's belief (supported by some research, e. g. studies on speech perception) that in first and second language acquisition comparisons each of the components of language as well as selected aspects of language use (e. g. sociolinguistic rules) should be investigated separately. It applies to strategies employed by the learner, language processing and perception, and learning conceived of in a very general sense. Only after detailed comparisons of particular components have been attempted should generalizations be formulated.

In his second article "Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis" Corder develops his theory introducing the notion of *idiosyncratic dialect* as distinguished from both *idiolect* and *social dialect*. *Idiosyncratic dialect*, while in fact being a more general term, with respect to foreign language learning is defined by Corder as the interim target language system that the student has at his disposal at the various stages of the learning process.

Idiosyncratic dialects have grammars of their own whose rules come from two sources:

1. the set of rules defining the grammar of the target social dialect to which the idiosyncratic dialects are approximations
2. the individual, i.e., some of the rules that account for a given idiosyncratic dialect are peculiar to an individual.

Idiosyncratic dialects are ephemeral, unstable, and therefore difficult to describe. The grammar changes all the time since the learner, in order to communicate easier, keeps bringing his linguistic behavior into line with conventions of some social group.

In this system errors do not enter the framework suggested by Corder's earlier theory or those of other researchers. Since all sentences of the idiosyncratic dialect are grammatical in terms of the learner's language, errors can be viewed only as results of performance failures (i.e., *mistakes* in Corder's "The significance of learner's errors"). It is emphasized by Corder that the notion of idiosyncratic dialect as applied to second language *teaching* will be fully appreciated and made principled use of only after it is understood how and why the various constructs within idiosyncratic dialects occur.

Corder's model is highly theoretical. Its evaluation would be speculative since no existing empirical evidence proves or disproves the posited relationships. Again, only longitudinal studies can start answering some of the questions raised by Corder and others.

The topic of transitional systems is taken up again by Larry Selinker in "Interlanguage". The general orientation of the article is psychology and second language learning. Learning is clearly kept apart from teaching which is not of interest to Selinker in the present discussion.

Within the learning perspective Selinker posits the existence of a *latent psychological structure* which gets activated when a human being attempts to study a second language. Thus, Selinker's assumption is that those students of a foreign language who

managed to achieve native-speaker-like competence have been fully successful in reactivating their brain-located latent psychological structure.

Selinker defines *interlanguage* as a "separate (from the native speaker's) linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a TL norm" (117).

Interlanguage as viewed by Selinker is found to be close to Corder's idiosyncratic dialect, with, however, different theoretical and pedagogical implications. It is assumed by Selinker that the theory of second language learning should be basically concerned with the linguistic realizations as peculiar to interlanguage, as well as the knowledge underlying interlingual behavior.

The five major processes which are found by Selinker to be central to second language learning are:

1. language transfer
2. transfer-of-training
3. learning strategies
4. communication strategies
5. overgeneralization

The final issue taken up by Selinker is that of *fossilization*. The five processes mentioned above are said to bring about the existence of fossilizable forms which are those that, in spite of extensive exposure to native data and long instruction, remain deviant or erroneous in terms of native competence. The regular reemergence of these items is frequent in particular when the speaker's attention is suddenly diverted to another topic, under the influence of excitement, when very relaxed, etc. It is hoped by Selinker that meticulous investigation of the fossilization phenomenon will markedly contribute to a better understanding of the second language learning process.

The questions Selinker raises toward the end of the article offer preliminary insights into the complex relationships between fossilizable items, NL (native language), IL (interlanguage) and TL (target language), unambiguous identification of particular processes and the postulated latent psychological structure.

The final article "The development of wh-questions in first and second language learners", by R. Ravem, is an example of the longitudinal studies recommended in the foregoing paragraphs of this review. Ravem compares his experimental data obtained from two Norwegian children acquiring English as a second language with those collected by R. Brown (1968). The results of Ravem's study indicate that the similarities (only as for wh-questions) between the two processes in question are striking but not entirely up to one's expectations.

It must be stressed again that only this kind of observational studies are likely to answer the many questions raised by Corder, Richards, Selinker and others.

To conclude this review, it should be noted that *New frontiers in second language learning* adequately reflect, with its general orientation, the current trend of relating the process of second language learning to that of first language acquisition. Not theoretical linguistic models but detailed analyses of first language acquisition (to the description of which linguistics is obviously indispensable) seem to be a better reference for second language learning researchers. It is too early to evaluate this development, but no doubt exaggeration in the form of a bias toward one or the other area may prove to be harmful.

Most of the reviewed articles are reprints (some of which have been revised) from various periodicals. Exceptions are articles by Nancy Stenson, Marina K. Burt and Carol Kiparsky, and John H. Schumann which appear in the present volume for the first time.

REFERENCES

- Brown, R. 1968. "The development of wh-questions in child speech". *Journal of verbal learning and verbal behavior* 7. 279 - 290.
- Pascasio, E. M. 1961. "Predicting interference and facilitation for Tagalog speakers in learning English". *Language learning* 11. 79 - 84.
- Stockwell, R. P., Bowen, J. D. and J. W. Martin. 1965. *The grammatical structures of English and Spanish*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

A grammar of subordinate structures in English. By Eldon G. Lytle. Pp. 139. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Reviewed by Anna Morel-Melerowicz, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

The author's research in syntax, conducted in 1968 - 69, resulted in the elaboration of the junction theory of language. The book is a monograph to which a more detailed sequel is apparently being prepared.

The theory itself sounds interesting since it offers a neat generalization of base rules for the generation of subordinate structures in English. The author implies that the rule system of the junction theory may be of universal nature.

The book has been organized in 8 chapters and 2 appendices. It contains an index and bibliography.

In chapter 1 the author discusses the theoretical background for the grammatical model he is going to advocate in his study. From fig. 1. 2 we can see that the author disposes of transformational component in the base. Constituents are subordinated by means of the phrase structure rule $NP \rightarrow NP S$, properly revised and generalized. Other transformational functions will be supplanted by lexical operations. Although lexical rules have not been discussed in detail, an illustrative set of them is given in Appendix I.

The theoretical exposition is clarified with two schemes. The relation of the grammatical components to the four levels of symbolic representation is discussed on the background of linguistic thought of Humboldt, Whorf, and Chomsky.

In chapter 2 three basic operations combining sememes into meaningful expression — on the II Level of representation — are postulated. Of these, adjunction is generated by the rules $S \rightarrow NP PdP$ and $PdP \rightarrow VP NP$. Adjunction designates the relationship between subjects and predicates, and between predicates and objects. It can be generalized as $X \rightarrow Y Z$. Conjunction, then, will be formulated as $X \rightarrow X$ and X_1^n .

As far as subjunction is concerned, the author proves that the relative clause rule $NP \rightarrow NP S$, which practically adjoins a relative clause to an antecedent NP, should be reinterpreted as 'NP subjoin NP of S' with the notation $NP/NP S$. Generalizing the subjunction operation as $X/X S$ we are able to predict different types of subordinate clauses existing in English and probably in many human languages. Specific subordinate structures of English are discussed in chapters 4 and 5.

Before discussing the English instances of homogeneous and heterogeneous subjunction the author quotes the approach of G. Lakoff (1965) and Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1968) towards restrictive vs. non-restrictive relative clauses. They derive non-restrictive clauses transformationally from conjoined sentences, with appositive clauses functioning as intermediate steps in the derivation. The author of the book, however, assumes one underlying structure for all subjoined relative clauses (fig. 2.5), the general assumption being that "language-specific rules of grammar interpret and reflect syntacto-se-

mantic deep structures, yielding a lexical representation, but do not disturb or alter structural relationships, which we take to be an essential ingredient of meaning" (42).

In other words, relative clauses having the same phrase structure may differ in certain values deriving from the lexico-referential relationships responsible for the restrictive-nonrestrictive dichotomy. This status of reference, definable in terms of r , r' , and U , is reflected by modifiers, not determined by them.

In chapter 3 the author puts forward more arguments against deriving non-restrictives from conjoined sentences. As the discovery procedure for conjoined vs. subjoined structures the author postulates the Interrogative-Shift Test (IST), i.e., the test on the distribution of the interrogative envelope (envelope features are discussed at length on pages 33 - 35). Conjoined sentences share in the modality of the compounded structure, whereas subjoined sentences remain declarative regardless of the modality of the superordinate sentence.

In chapter 4 the author discusses particular instances of the homogeneous subjunction $X/X S$:

- $NP/NP S$,
 $PdP/PdP S$ — 'x does what y does',
 $VP/VP S$ — 'I did to x what you did to y',
 $AdjP/AdjP S$ — 'x is like y',
 $AdvP/AdvP S$,
 $QP/QP S$ — comparative structures.

Readers should refer to Appendix II for a detailed inventory of subjunction rules with English examples and phrase markers. Homogeneous structures, then, involve constituents functioning in the same lexical category in both the super- and subordinate sentences.

Analogically, heterogeneous subjunction, dealt with in chapter 5, will be exemplified by structures whose constituents belong to different categories. The rule $X \rightarrow Y Z$ accounts for the following specializations: $NP/S S$, $AdvP/S S$, $AdjP/S S$, $QP/S S$ and for the sentences in which the dependency status of the participating clauses is reversed: $S/NP S$, $S/AdvP S$, $S/AdjP S$, $S/QP S$. In the following sections of this chapter the author suggests that VP and PdP may also participate as the Y element of the formula, with the categories NP, AdjP, and AdvP as values for X.

Chapters 4 and 5 are of considerable descriptive and argumentative value. In chapter 6 secondary predicators such as prepositions, adjectives and adverbs are described and necessary notational adjustments of the subjunction rule are introduced.

Chapter 7 discusses the general structure of reference. In chapter 8 the evaluation of the proposal is summed up and its applications are discussed.

Reading the book we may well agree with the author that he has captured some interesting linguistic generalizations. It seems regrettable, however, that a work submitted for print in 1971 should reach the reader in 1974. The clarity of exposition and argumentation makes the book accessible to students of linguistics and makes it interesting for an advanced linguist.

REFERENCES

- Lakoff, G. 1965. *On the nature of syntactic irregularity*. Report No NSF-16 to the National Science Foundation. Cambridge, Mass.: The Computation Laboratory of Harvard University.
- Jacobs, R. A. and P. S. Rosenbaum. 1968. *English transformational grammar*. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co.