

BOOK REVIEWS

Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, Eva F. Schultze-Berndt (eds), *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. xxv + 448 pages

Reviewed by *Tor A. Áfarli**

Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim

Secondary predication is and has been central in modern theories of grammar, not least in the small clause hypothesis of the principles and parameters framework. This book collects 13 mainly typological-descriptive papers on depictive secondary predicates, most of which were presented at a conference on depictives organized by the editors in 2001.

Depictive secondary predicates as in (1a) should be distinguished from resultative secondary predicates exemplified in (1b).

- (1) a. Mary ate the carrot raw.
b. Mary boiled the carrot soft.

In (1a) the carrot is raw at the same time as Mary is eating it, whereas in (1b) it *becomes* soft as a result of Mary boiling it. Both depictives and resultatives are participant-oriented expressions, i.e. they are secondary predicates that take a participant of the main predication as its predication subject. Thus, the direct object (*the carrot*) of the main predication is the predication subject of the depictive predicate *raw* in (1a) and of the resultative predicate *soft* in (1b). A depictive predicate can also take the subject of the main predication as its predication subject. This is exemplified in (2), where Mary is angry while she is eating the carrot.

- (2) Mary ate the carrot angry.

The book is concerned with the depictive type exemplified in (1a) and (2), not the resultative type exemplified in (1b).

* Author's address: Norwegian University of Science and Technology, N-7491 Trondheim, Norway; e-mail: tor.aafarli@hf.ntnu.no.

Whereas depictives are adjuncts, resultatives are probably not. Thus, depictives are properly classified as a type of participant-oriented adjunct expressions. Much of the book is concerned with describing and discussing different types of participant-oriented adjunct expressions and constructions in different languages. Specifically, many languages do not distinguish formally between depictives as in (2) and corresponding participant-oriented adverbials as in (3).

(3) Mary ate the carrot angrily.

An exploration of the similarities and differences between depictives and participant oriented adverbials is central to many papers in the book.

In the preface to the book, the editors say that the book provides new perspectives on depictives in two ways, first, that it considerably expands the database for depictives by showing that a wide range of different expressions warrant an analysis as depictives, and second, that it brings together different research stands that have tended to ignore each other because they belong to different topic areas or theoretical persuasions. As for the first point, it strikes me that the book provides very detailed and interesting information on depictives and related constructions in a wide range of languages. This is the main virtue of the book. As for the second point, the claim that the book brings together different theoretical stands, is less strikingly true. Apart for one paper (Müller-Bardey, chapter 3), the papers are mainly typological-descriptive in approach, broadly operating within the theoretical universe of the editors (who are frequently referred to throughout the book). In my opinion, that is just as well in a volume like this, which covers so much new empirical ground.

The first chapter is a long introductory chapter written by the editors, titled *Issues in the syntax and semantics of participant-oriented adjuncts: an introduction*. It praises a crosslinguistic approach to the study of linguistic phenomena, and suggests that such a perspective brings to the fore the problem of distinguishing between depictives and (certain kinds of) adverbials. This distinction appears to be straightforward in English where it is formally expressed, as seen in (2) vs. (3), but it is more problematic in other languages, where it is not formally expressed. In those languages, the distinction seems more to be a matter of vagueness than ambiguity, according to the authors. They give the following German example to illustrate their point, but emphasize (p. 3) that it is common in the languages of the world that “the same morphosyntactic construction is used to render depictive and adverbial content.”

(4) Claire hat wütend das Zimmer verlassen.
 Claire has angry/angrily the room left

Thus, they propose that depictives and the types of adverbials in question form a single domain for crosslinguistic comparison, which they call participant-

oriented adjuncts. Commonalities and differences between different types of such adjuncts, as well as some important terminological distinctions, are discussed, and so is the semantic range of participant-oriented adjuncts (using semantic maps). A “programmatically” morphosyntactic typology is sketched, as well.

Chapter 2 by Jane Simpson is called *Depictives in English and Warlbiri*. The author compares depictives in English and Warlbiri and finds that depictives in the two languages “appear to be doing much the same thing semantically,” but that there are more syntactic and semantic constraints on depictives in English than in Warlbiri (p. 71). The author suggests that many of these differences stem from basic syntactic differences between the two languages in that depictives act syntactically as part of different systems of grammar in each language. Specifically, in Warlbiri they are part of a general system of secondary predication using nominals, which act syntactically as adjuncts, while in English, depictives have closer ties with the ways of expressing complements (p. 71). The latter claim goes against the common view that English depictives, as opposed to resultatives, are adjuncts. The chapter contains a detailed comparison of depictives in the two languages in question, focussing on the various constraints on depictives in English as compared to the larger degree of freedom allowed for depictives in Warlbiri regarding both distribution and interpretation.

Chapter 3 by Thomas Müller-Bardey is a quite eccentric guest in the typological-descriptive party that constitutes this book. The chapter is called *Adverbials and depictives as restrictors* and sets out (p. 107) to “propose a model to characterize depictives and different classes of adverbials in terms of their capability to be restrictive in quantificational relations,” in essence applying the framework developed for indefinites by Diesing (1992). Unlike the other chapters, this chapter is quite technical and requires some command of notational conventions used in logical semantics to be fully understood. Moreover, although it deals with both English and German, its main aim is the (logical) analysis of depictives as such, rather than crosslinguistic or typological description. My impression is that this chapter should rather have been included in a volume called something like *Quantification in natural languages* than in the present volume, although the article is interesting enough on its own terms.

Chapter 4 by Claudia Bucheli Berger is titled *Depictive agreement and the development of a depictive marker in Swiss German dialects*. It provides a description and discussion of different patterns of adjectival inflection in three Swiss German dialects. One of the dialects shows full attribute, predicative, depictive agreement, whereas another shows attributive agreement, but no predicative and depictive agreement. The third one (in Appenzellerland) also shows only attributive agreement, but has in addition a specialized depictive marker. The depictive marker minimally distinguishes depictives from corresponding expressions with predicative or adverbial function. Subtle meaning differences involving the presence and absence of the depictive marker are discussed, and it is argued that the depictive marker is historically grammatical-

ized from the masculine singular agreement form through a restructuring of the agreement paradigm during the loss of depictive agreement in the dialect in question.

Chapter 5 by William B. McGregor is called *Quantifying depictive secondary predicates in Australian languages*. The chapter opens by pointing out that depictives are well known in Australian languages, and that most examples of depictives found in the Australianist literature illustrate temporary qualities of entities, where the depictive expression agrees in case-marking with its controller. However, the main topic of the chapter is quantity expressions (e.g. the terms for 'one', 'two', 'a few', and 'many') in what appear to be depictive use. Such quantity expressions are discussed in a number of Australian languages. First, an attempt is made to identify the range of secondary predicate expressions that admit quantifying interpretations. Second, the status of such expressions is discussed, e.g. whether or not they represent constructions (in the sense of Construction Grammar).

Chapter 6, authored by Winfried Boeder, is called *Depictives in Kartvelian*. It gives a survey of Kartvelian (Georgian and Svan) depictives and tries to delineate depictives from related adjuncts like adverbials and similitive expressions.

Chapter 7 is called *On depictive secondary predicates in Laz* and is written by Silvia Kutscher and N. Sevim Genc. The authors show that Laz adjunct expressions *cannot* generally be divided into depictive and adverbial constructions on the basis of their morphosyntactic properties. However, interestingly they argue that there are reasons to believe that adjuncts expressing respectively manner and state can to some extent be distinguished prosodically on the grounds of intonation patterns. They also argue that adjuncts in Laz are vague regarding participant- or event-oriented readings.

Chapter 8 by Pilar M. Valenzuela is titled *Participant agreement in Panoan*. It examines participant agreement (i.e. the use of a distinct inflectional morphology on adjuncts in correlation with the syntactic function of the participant they are predicated of) in a Panoan language called Shipibo-Konibo spoken by c. 30000 people in the Peruvian Amazon. Panoan languages are unusual in that adjuncts may show participant agreement, whereas there is no NP-internal agreement, and in fact very limited use of agreement marking generally, apart from participant agreement. The chapter discusses the overt markers involved in the coding of participant agreement and proposes a classification of the adjuncts based on the agreement patterns they allow.

Chapter 9 is called *Secondary predicates and adverbials in Nilotic and Omotic: a typological comparison*. It is authored by Azeb Amha and Gerrit J. Dimmendaal. The chapter starts out by pointing out that there is a tendency towards distinct coding mechanisms for the expression of morphosyntactic relations in verb-initial as against verb-final languages. With that in mind, the chapter takes a closer look at depictives in verb-initial Nilotic languages and

verb-final Omotoc languages, arguing that depictives in these two language families involve different syntactic categories whose position relative to the main clause also varies. In spite of major differences between the two language families regarding depictives, the authors also argue that there are certain similarities.

Chapter 10 by Tom Güldemann is called *Asyndetic subordination and deverbal depictive expressions in Shona*. This chapter deals with a special type of participant-oriented adjunct expression in Shona, the major Bantu language of Zimbabwe. These adjunct expressions may be depictive and are instantiated by a special type of verb form which displays normal segmental verb inflection, but which is prosodically marked as subordinate. The author proposes to analyse these expressions as general adjunct constructions because they do not only have depictive function, but may also have several types of adverbial functions.

Chapter 11 is called *Forms of secondary predication in serializing languages: on depictives in Ewe* and is authored by Felix K. Ameka. The chapter discusses depictives in Ewe, a West African verb-serializing language. After a typological overview of the language, the author sets out to show that Ewe has nominal depictive secondary predicates, *contra* certain existing claims in the literature, and that the same form that is optionally used to mark nominal depictives is also used in subtypes of serial verb constructions.

Chapter 12 by Nicholas J. Enfield is called *Depictive and other secondary predication in Lao*. The chapter points out that Lao is an isolating language, and that therefore it is of special interest from a crosslinguistic perspective on depictives, since analyses of depictives typically appeal to morphosyntactic patterns of agreement and finiteness which are not overtly marked in Lao. The author first discusses expressions that are participant-oriented and therefore depictive, and observes that the very same expressions may alternatively be used to express adverbial (manner) readings and resultative readings. The chapter also describes two ways in which nominals may contribute to depictive expressions in Lao, namely as predicative nominal phrases or as included in an adjunct structure headed by a special verb (which is otherwise used as a copula). Again the same structures may be used with adverbial (manner) readings and resultative readings.

Chapter 13 is called *A semantic map for depictive adjectivals* and is written by Johan van der Auwera and Andrej Malchukov. The authors take as their point of departure the idea advanced by the editors of the present volume that depictives and related adverbials are semantically very close, and that certain languages have constructions that cover both and whose meaning is therefore neutral between the two. The authors explore these matters by using semantic maps. They discuss various types of adjectival constructions, including depictives, and they focus especially on the relation between depictive adjectivals and non-depictive adjectivals. They find that depictives show a semantic continuity

w.r.t. four other expressions, two of them being attributives and adverbials, and that this semantic continuity is reflected formally, such that depictives may align themselves with one or more of their semantic neighbours.

As for evaluation, I would say that most chapters contained in this book are fine representatives of typological-descriptive linguistics. That is, they contain detailed and systematic descriptions of a limited empirical area in one or two languages, often with a crosslinguistic perspective including further languages. This is very often revealing in that it puts established linguistic notions and distinctions to test, and what is most revealing is that the established notions and distinctions sometimes fail the test. For this reason, I have always found good typological-descriptive works both interesting and educative, and this book is no exception.

The chapters that I liked best, perhaps since they touch on certain broader issues, are first the introductory chapter by the editors, and then chapter four on depictives in Swiss German dialects, chapter seven on depictives in Laz, and chapter twelve on depictives in Lao. In my view, the introductory chapter provides a nice overview of its subject matter, i.e. participant-oriented adjuncts, and serves as a self-contained introduction to its topic. I find the various discussions both clear and informative, and a lot of interesting data are presented. This introductory chapter provides a very useful overview of the topics covered in the book and thus sets the stage for most of the other chapters. The chapter on Swiss German dialects is fascinating since it focuses on variation between very closely related varieties, making a case for the grammaticalization of agreement morphology into an invariant depictive marker. The chapter on Laz is particularly interesting since it shows quite convincingly how the distinction between depictives and adverbials cannot be made on the basis of morphosyntactic criteria, but at the same time that the distinction may nevertheless be made on the basis of intonational criteria, thus making a case for the importance of prosodic factors in the study of grammar. The chapter on Lao is particularly interesting since it discusses depictives and related expressions in an isolating language, i.e. a language that does not have the usual affixal means to signal the function of a given expression. Thus, it raises particularly clearly broader issues pertaining to the relation between syntactic form and semantic content.

As for possible weaknesses that this book may have, I am tempted to claim that its main strength is also its main weakness. The book's main strength is its detailed descriptions of the various phenomena under investigation, often in a cross-linguistic or comparative setting, and involving a wide variety of typologically different languages, some of which most linguists have little knowledge. However, the book's descriptive scrupulousness is also its main drawback, since, in my opinion, many of the chapters would have gained from a more pronounced structural approach. Specifically, a deeper structural approach would probably have brought (even) more insight into the central distinction between depictives and adverbials, and into the claimed semantic "vagueness" pertaining to them. For

instance, on p. 56 it is claimed that participant-oriented adjuncts have a dual role as participant-oriented predicates and as verbal adjuncts. However, they are presumably rather either-or, depending on their structural analysis. For instance, in the Norwegian example in (5), the present participle *trampande* 'trampling' may be interpreted either as a manner adverbial or as a predicative.

- (5) Dei kom trampande.
they came trampling

This does not mean that *trampande* 'trampling' is semantically vague, or that it has a simultaneous role as a participant-oriented predicate and as a verbal adjunct. It is more likely that the string in (5) can be assigned two different structural analyses, and that the string is semantically and syntactically disambiguated as dictated by the structural analyses that are assigned in each instance.

To conclude, I find this book generally interesting and instructive, not least since it questions certain established notions of grammar, and some of the chapters are particularly interesting since they raise broader issues, as I have tried to indicate above. I recommend this book to anyone who has an interest in predication generally and in depictives specifically. Both typologists and linguists following the generative path will have much to learn from this book.

The book has a comprehensive reference list and an index of languages and an index of terms. It also contains a list of abbreviations and glossing conventions, and brief academic biographies of the contributors, as well as a preface with chapter summaries. I have found just one typo: In the glosses in example (16b) on page 263, ABS (absolutive) should be ERG (ergative).

Edward L. Keenan, Edward P. Stabler, *Bare Grammar: Lectures on Linguistic Invariants*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 2003. 192 pp.

Reviewed by *Jarosław Jakielaszek**
University of Warsaw

Very rapid development and diversification of different linguistic frameworks in the last century has as its unwanted consequence a growing problem of mutual

* Author's address: jakielaszek@uw.edu.pl

intelligibility and translatability of proposals made in competing theoretical settings. This, in turn, is hindered by notational differences which stem from particular traditions and which may well obscure real theoretical import of specific proposals and, on the other hand, lead to polemics directed against purely imaginary opponents. Keenan and Stabler aim at facilitating the comparison of various theoretical proposals by taking a more abstract view at language structure, adopting an algebraic approach to language.

Basic notions of their approach are introduced and explained in the introduction, where Bare Grammar is explicitly defined as the tuple $\langle V, \text{Cat}, \text{Lex}, \text{Rule} \rangle$, where V is the set of *vocabulary items* and Cat is the set of category symbols. The set Lex is defined as a subset of $V \times \text{Cat}$, the set of *lexical items*. This definition would be compatible with a wide range of approaches which study language as a formal system – as a set of finite-length strings over a finite alphabet – including those which define language via a set of constraints (i.e. with non-derivational frameworks). An important point is that the set of rules is defined as the set of *structure building functions*. The way rules for the grammar are defined makes the system derivational. Thus, apart from defining language as an infinite set of expressions built from a set of basic elements, relations defined over them follow from rules of building complex expressions.

The whole study aims at investigating properties which remain invariant under automorphisms of grammar. The second chapter (*Some case studies*) is devoted to an analysis of the antecedent-anaphor relation in different languages (ranging from Korean to Malagasy). The main claim may be summarized as the hypothesis that the relation antecedent-anaphor is invariant in the sense elucidated in the introductory remarks, yet this does not mean that their grammars do not differ with respect to the sets of categories, lexical items or rules of formation. Chapter three (*Some familiar grammars*) explores both the validity of some claims made in other frameworks within the theoretical setting of Bare Grammar and the relationship between various grammatical formalisms on the one hand and Bare Grammar on the other, from context free grammars and various types of categorial grammars (classical categorial grammars, combinatory categorial grammars and pregroup grammars) to constraint-based grammars (including the optimality theoretic approach). Chapter four (*Laws of Language*) is devoted to formulating some proposals about general properties which a grammar understood as a Bare Grammar must have, in particular, constraints on sets of admissible categories and rules.

Keenan and Stabler make a reference to Klein's 1872 Erlangen Program, where geometry is defined as the science which studies objects invariant under a group of symmetries, a view further generalized and extended by H. Weyl to reach a level of abstraction allowing an investigation of all structured objects of inquiry – to use Weyl's words: *Whenever you have to do with a structure-endowed entity, try to determine its group of automorphisms*. The authors

speculate further that levels of linguistic structure may be appropriately characterized by their automorphisms, most probably different for different levels. Consider in this light the treatment of second position effects as exemplified *inter alia* by the positioning of Latin enclitic *-que* ‘and’. Keenan and Stabler analyze the data as indicating that *-que* attaches to the left of the first word in the second coordinated constituent, a view which is supported by examples. Yet this characterization of the second position phenomenon of the enclitic *-que* ‘and’ is too simplified. True, it coordinates constituents of different categories and it comes mainly after the first word in the second coordinated constituent; but there are some exceptions, e.g. it never attaches to the negation *non*, and rules governing its place in prepositional phrases are quite complicated – sometimes it is clearly because a monosyllabic preposition is not a suitable host, yet in some cases there is much optionality, so that we may say *inque eam rem* lit. ‘into this (thing)’ alongside with *in eamque rem*, although only *ob eamque rem* ‘because of this’ and not **obque eam rem*. The definition of the first word (the function *fwd*) should take the phenomenon of variability in the first case into account to cover empirical data in sufficient detail. The proper treatment of the second case, i.e. impossibility of insertion of *-que* immediately after certain prepositions is more obscure, perhaps forcing a conclusion that the phenomenon, while prosodically conditioned, is subject to constraints specific for particular lexical items. The whole problem opens the question of appropriate delimitation of different levels, together with correct definitions of sets which define the grammar of the level. This problem arises within the Minimalist Program much more sharply than ever before, in particular in an architecture which explicitly differentiates between different levels in terms of both objects over which generative procedure operates and operations which are at work as well. The proper characterization of items taking part in syntactic computation has been a subject of a lively debate over last decades of theoretical research, with strict lexicalists assuming fully formed lexical items to emerge from an omnipotent lexicon and separationists admitting various instantiations of late feature specification (putting aside hybrid approaches, combining mechanisms of both extremes). In a model in which surface position is determined post-syntactically as a result of various processes related to interface requirements, the surface string becomes (to some extent at least) opaque with respect to its underlying syntactic structure. A welcome extension of the research reported in the reviewed book would be to study properties of linguistic levels as postulated by specific theoretical frameworks, as e.g. the minimalist family of approaches.

The research program of Keenan and Stabler is an example of a most general tendency to reduce the number of historical residues which have lost their original motivation and are just remnants of earlier developments. One of the most important trends of current minimalist research is to eliminate superfluous, reified concepts, once necessary and useful in linguistic theorizing, now fully

dispensable, like the notion of government – omnipresent in GB theory, rejected in the early days of minimalism as not derivable from basic assumptions, finally replaced with several relations obtaining as a result of indispensable syntactic operations. From the methodological point of view, this tendency is not without its predecessors. Recall e.g. the theory of *lingua mentalis* as developed by mediaeval philosophers. Seeking to find which grammatical properties are relevant for the mental language, Occam takes as his guiding principles (i) methodological parsimony (which so famously became tied to his name) and (ii) truth conditional properties of relevant propositions. In that way, he separates properties (accidents) common to spoken and mental language – among them case and number for nominals, mood, voice, person, number and tense for verbs – from those proper to the spoken language only, like gender and declension for nominals and conjugation for verbs. Details put aside, both aims and methodology of Occam are interesting and significant: taking an empirically attested language, find those elements (types of words and their properties) that are necessary to build ‘mental propositions’ consisting only of elements receiving an appropriate interpretation. The differences between the minimalist enterprise and Occam's search for mental language are too deep and too obvious to allow far-reaching comparisons. Note, however, that Occam's results are surprisingly similar to Latin, thus warning against taking particular properties of an object language to be of universal importance.

This methodological minimalism appears to be interestingly compatible with ontological minimalism of the sort connected with Chomsky's Strong Minimalist Thesis. The Strong Minimalist Thesis forces a very restrictive theory of Universal Grammar, relegating successively the source of superficially observable differences among languages from the core of the grammar to its more peripheral parts, a tendency manifesting itself earlier in removing some phenomena from the core computational processes, leading e.g. to abandonment of head movement as a syntactic operation. As a consequence of these innovations, several changes in the linguistic theory are clearly needed, most importantly replacing syntactic modularity and non-local relations with results of basic syntactic operations. There are many obstacles on this way, which may be understood from the perspective of the algebraic approach of the bare grammar as seeking to find structures to investigate – from this point of view, language consists of different structures, and only having distinguished them appropriately can we *determine their groups of automorphisms*, to use Weyl's words once again.

Bare Grammar is therefore a highly valuable contribution to the field in two ways: first, it proposes a specific way to study natural language phenomena, making a carefully prepared theoretical proposal, coupled with an elaborate treatment of several phenomena. Second, also for those who do not want to embrace their particular theoretical solutions in all detail, it is an invitation to rethink many assumptions made almost automatically – an invitation to look

'from outside' and to distinguish between hypotheses which purely reflect theory-internal relationships and dependencies. It is impossible to build a theory from scratch every time one tries to analyze a linguistic phenomenon. Many tacit assumptions are necessarily made, sometimes taken to be intimately tied with a particular framework, if not with the object of the study in general. The approach presented in this book helps to clear the field of inquiry.

Siobhan Chapman, *Thinking about Language. Theories of English*. Houndsmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. X + 174 pages. pb (Series: Perspectives on the English Language)

Reviewed by *Iwona Witczak-Plisiecka* *
University of Łódź

Thinking about Language. Theories of English is one of the three new books in the Palgrave 'Perspectives on the English Language' series. This newly-launched series has the aim to provide teaching aids for language studies on various levels of advancement. Siobhan Chapman's book, which has been published as the first one, has been followed with Lesley Jeffries's *Discovering Language: The Structure of Modern English* and is to be complemented with Urszula Clark's *Studying Language: English in Action*, which together offer an introduction to the study of language, addressed mainly to undergraduate students. One common feature of all three books in the series is their focus on the English language, which is reportedly to answer current demands of the linguistic market and provide material relevant both to students who want to focus on linguistics and literature. As Leslie Jeffries (the series editor) explains in the Series Preface (p. ix) there are plans for sets of more advanced books to be published in the same series in the near future.

The thematic structure of the three books being made available now is representative of the series focus on three main areas: methodology, theoretical issues and descriptive tools used in the analysis of language. Thus, Urszula Clark's *Studying Language: English in Action* is to put emphasis on contextual information and discourse and their descriptive power, by e.g. teaching how to transcribe

* Author's address: wipiw@uni.lodz.pl

tape recordings. The already available Lesley Jeffries's (2006) *Discovering Language: The Structure of Modern English* describes basic tools for analysing English following traditional strata of linguistic analysis known from other "introduction to linguistics" books (e.g. Fromkin and Rodman's 1983/and Hyams 2003, Yule 1985/1996), i.e. what is commonly recognised as "core linguistics": phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. These traditional topics have been supplemented with a more experimental final chapter (chapter seven) entitled *Theory, Text and Context*, which introduces selected notions associated with text linguistics (e.g. cohesion) and more advanced theoretical concepts such as turn-taking or the cooperative principle in conversation analysis. It also provides explanation of varied concepts which cut across the fields of syntax, semantics, pragmatics, logic, as well as general characteristic features of language. Thus, the topics found in the chapter include arbitrariness, duality, displacement, but also paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, diachronic and synchronic dimensions, language deixis, the notions of denotation and connotation. In squeezing such varied, often diverse and conflicting concepts into one chapter, the author evidently tries to point to, in her opinion, most important issues, which otherwise could have been neglected in an introductory book of limited necessarily scope and size. This approach to present the rudiments of many theories and orientations is inherent in the series and can be seen in the reviewed book as well.

Siobhan Chapman's book has the aim to provide a broad overview of theories which underlie current linguistic investigation and define its contemporary shape. In the 'Introduction' (pp. 1–4), the author makes it explicit that her book is not meant to be an introduction to particular linguistic theories either in specific branches, such as phonology and syntax, or as a holistic subject within general linguistics. Instead, its main aim is to show how various theoretical and methodological commitments, whether consciously adopted or implicated, influence and shape linguistic thought.

Thinking about Language. Theories of English by Siobhan Chapman is composed of two main parts. Part 1, *Introducing Language Theory* (pp. 5–24), offers an introduction to most representative linguistic approaches and various methodologies associated with them.

The first chapter, *Theory in Language Study* (pp. 7–24), opens with comments on the place and role of theory in language study in general. Chapman contrasts well known quotations from W.V.O. Quine's *Word and Object*, N. Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures*, and B. Spolsky's *Sociolinguistics* to show explicit and implicit assumptions hidden in these diverse approaches to language study. In the subsequent sub-chapters she successfully sketches divergent perspectives on language, pointing to the consequences of theoretical commit-

ments accepted within them, presenting among other things types of data used in linguistic research. Being realistic, but far from being overcritical or fanatic about any approach, she manages to demonstrate the relevance and legitimacy of linguistic analysis rooted in various fields. Chapter two, *Language is...* (pp. 25–67), gives an account of three main approaches to language study, which subsequently focus on empirical studies, mentalist research, and communicative analysis. The sub-chapter *Language is a type of behaviour* (pp. 27–38) shows language studies against anthropological and psychological background. The researchers referred to in the discussion range from empiricists such as Geoffrey Sampson and Leonard Bloomfield through W. V. O. Quine to the main representative of linguistic integrationism – Roy Harris. The sub-chapter *Language is a state of mind* (pp. 38–54) explores Chomskyan linguistics with its theoretical commitments and the core concept of universal grammar. In a clear and relevant discussion Chapman demonstrates how counter-intuitively language according to transformational-generative grammar approach is to be manifest in thought rather than in real life communicative situations. Chapter three, *Language is communication* (pp. 54–68), goes back to the 17th c. with John Locke and his idea of language as a means to conveying ideas between people, which can then be traced in approaches mostly critical of (or rather reactive to) the generative approach. It is shown how researchers working within the communicative framework, even such distant from one another as e.g. William Labov, Geoffrey Leech, Dell Hymes, Norman Fairclough, emphasise the social aspect of language. A considerable space in the discussion has been devoted to Michael Halliday and his ‘functional grammar’. The chapter also presents the pros and cons of corpus linguistics, both acknowledging its relevance in presenting real life data and pointing to its limitations in being finite and selective.

The sections in chapter one are not evenly structured and are evidently representative of the state-of-the-art thematic and methodological balance in linguistic research. For example, while the ‘Language as a state of mind’ part is almost entirely devoted to Noam Chomsky and his insights into the nature of language, the other two parts of the chapter include further extended discussions are references to generative concepts, often with reference to its criticism within other theoretical frameworks (cf. e.g. Chomsky vs. integrationism, p. 47; Leech vs. Chomsky, p. 55). However, having acknowledged the importance of Chomskyan linguistic theory in the 20th century and onwards, Siobhan Chapman explicitly calls the reader attention to the fact that the generative approach, although influential and widely present in contemporary linguistics, may not be the most important and adequate theory.

Part 2, *Applying Language Theory* (pp. 25–163), is much longer and presents core problems in linguistics. It contains concise chapters, which are typically

structured as a question followed by answers representative of relevant approaches. Chapter three *How do Words Work?* (pp. 71–79) involves issues such as sense and (direct) reference, connotation and denotation, use and mention. One section is devoted entirely to Gottlob Frege (pp. 74–76). Chapter four, *How does Language Relate to the World?* (pp. 80–90), comments on the relationship between language and reality. It mentions truth-conditional meaning, the correspondence account and its origin in Aristotle's writings; it also includes a discussion of analytic and synthetic sentences and the problems of verification. Chapter five, *Is Language Like a Code?* (pp. 91–102), provides a short analysis of the theory of signs with reference to Charles Sanders Peirce and Ferdinand de Saussure, but also John Locke and Paul Grice. Chapter six, *How is Language Related to Thought* (pp. 103–114) further investigates the language – reality relationship placing emphasis on the concept of Sapir and Whorf's linguistic relativism/determinism as well as the problems of 'thinking in words', the language of thought (with focus on Jerry Fodor's proposals) and figurative language. Chapter seven, *How does Context Affect Meaning?* (pp. 115–126) is a brief introduction to 'meaning in use' in the sense of Wittgenstein and John L. Austin's speech act theory. It further involves the pragmatic problems of language deixis and ambiguity, which serve as a background for comments on the semantics – pragmatics distinction. In the next chapter, *Is Language Logical?* (pp. 127–140), Chapman provides an account of possible applications of logical analysis in linguistics. She presents conflicting opinions related to the issue, commenting on the Vienna Circle, especially Rudolf Carnap, as well as John L. Austin and Oxford 'ordinary language philosophers'. The chapter includes a summary of the debate between Bertrand Russell and Peter Strawson, an account of Paul Grice's theory of conversational implicature, and a comment on logical notation. Chapter nine, *How do Children Learn Language?* (pp. 141–154) is devoted to different approaches to the problems of first language acquisition with focus on B. F. Skinner and N. Chomsky, but also includes the 'child-directed speech' issues. The last chapter, *A Final Thought: Do Other Animals Have Language?* (pp. 155–163) explores the relationship between human languages and animal communication systems, the discussion being illustrated mainly with widely quoted examples of experiments involving chimpanzees and the bee dance.

The main body of the book is supplemented with a bibliography section (pp. 164–168), which mentions over a hundred books and articles, and an index (pp. 169–174), which cites names and technical key words referred to in the book.

Thinking about Language is very broad in scope. It covers many topics present in other 'introduction to linguistics' books, from theoretical considerations on the nature of meaning to the problems of language acquisition. What makes it

different and unique is that while being a core introduction, the book is organised so as to reveal philosophical-linguistic perspectives on language in theory rather than traditional layers of linguistic analysis, such as phonetics, phonology, syntax, semantics etc. The presented structure helps overcome the limitations often imposed by the other approach, where more attention is devoted to the delineation of particular fields of studies, e.g. phonetics vs. phonology, syntax as opposed to semantics, semantics as opposed to pragmatics, etc. The advantage of the present approach for readers interested primarily in the philosophy of language and more theory-oriented issues can be seen by contrasting Siobhan Chapman's book with the two other books in the series, especially *Discovering Language: The Structure of Modern English* by Lesley Jeffries (2006), who follows the more traditional path.

The book is clearly structured and offers a reliable overview of relevant problems and their theoretical accounts, especially part one is rich in relevant quotations and illustrations with vivid examples culled from both original texts and other textbooks and secondary works, cf. e.g. Carl Hempel's criticism of the inductive method (p. 19). There are very few typographical problems, e.g. 'is' instead of 'in' on page 14, or a missing 'are' on page 148.

Technically, the book is user-friendly thanks to the fact that each chapter includes a *Further reading* section, which should help the reader find further information. However, it should be noted that it often ignores advanced materials. For instance, there is no direct reference to Wittgenstein's original texts in the section focused on his theory (pp. 116ff.); instead, the reader is directed to a secondary source. This may be seen as much as a drawback as a virtue in an (by definition) introductory book, whose aim is to present a topic to non-initiated readers rather than discuss it exhaustively. Siobhan Chapman's *Thinking about Language* does more than that by presenting a dense network of cross-references, which navigate the reader within the text (especially between Part 1 and Part 2), but also to relevant parts in the other two books in the series, facilitating research and constructing an information system on the basis of all the three books (forming a flexi-text which should evidently contribute to their commercial success as well). In this context *Thinking about Language* is reminiscent of (and can be complementary to) e.g. *Language in Theory* by Mark Robson and Peter Stockwell (2005) belonging to the Routledge 'RELI' (Routledge English Language Introductions) series, which also focuses on linguistic theory underlying particular problems and presents its core topics via flexi-strands.

In Siobhan Chapman's words "one of the central tenets of this book could be summarised as 'theory is everywhere' " (p. 1). The aim of presenting the tenet may seem difficult to pursue without wreaking chaos in the exposition and yet the author has managed to present a book which is both informative, interesting

and far from a dull list of particular issues, or a tedious account of their historical development. It does reveal assumptions underlying different linguistic approaches and theories and, giving a succinct account of relevant issues, opens many paths to follow for the reader, especially the anticipated undergraduate academic audience with an interest in topics on the verge of philosophy and linguistics. While discussing various assumptions and approaches to language Chapman manages to sketch linguists and linguistically oriented philosophers as real figures, which fosters interest in their work and shows her expertise in the topic, which has also been documented in her other publications (cf. Chapman 2000, 2005). Unlike many books in which the thinkers are largely anonymous, *Thinking about Language* introduces them as live people, which brings to mind another book – *Key Thinkers in Linguistics and the Philosophy of Language* edited by Siobhan Chapman and Christopher Routledge (2005).

In summary, *Thinking about Language* is an interesting, well written book, which invites further studies and can be a valuable teaching aid for undergraduate courses and beyond. It may impress the reader with the variety of assumptions, commitments and approaches found in linguistics. However, as claimed by the author, despite the fact that because of the variety there is no chance to eventually reach agreement or even compromise in linguistic thought, “[r]ather as being a weak spot in linguistics, or suggesting a series of dead ends in linguistic enquiry, this is something to be celebrated” (p.3). It shows the complexity of linguistic issues, once more puts emphasis on the commitments held in the background in every linguistic theory and demonstrates that there are hardly any self-evidently true answers in language studies.

References

- Chapman, S. 2000. *Philosophy for Linguists. An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chapman, S. 2005. *Paul Grice: Philosopher and Linguist*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Chapman, S., and Routledge, C. (eds) 2005. *Key Thinkers in linguistics and the Philosophy of Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fromkin V. and Rodman, R. 1983. *An Introduction to Language*. CBS College Publishing.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R. and Hyams, N. 2003. *An Introduction to Language*. Boston, MA: Heinle.
- Jeffries, L. 2006. *Discovering Language: The Structure of Modern English*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave.
- Robson, M. and Stockwell, P. 2005. *Language in Theory. A resource book for students*. London and New York: Routledge ('RELI' – Routledge English Language Introductions series).
- Yule, G. 1985/1996. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Judith Rodby, W. Ross Winterowd, *The Uses of Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. xiv + 274 pp.

Reviewed by *Wiktor Pskit**

Higher Vocational State School in Włocławek

The book under review is a textbook of English grammar. It can be contrasted with large-scale reference grammars such as Quirk et al. (1972, 1985), Biber et al. (1999), or Huddleston and Pullum et al. (2002), from which it differs above all in size, purpose, scope, and detail of analysis. Rodby and Winterowd's work belongs to a large group of coursebooks designed for descriptive grammar classes. The representatives of this group usually adopt a particular theoretical framework, e.g. Wekker and Haegeman (1985) and Radford (1997) adhere to subsequent models of generative grammar, whilst Downing and Locke (1992) provide a handbook based on systemic-functional grammar, or constitute an eclectic combination of various approaches.

Rodby and Winterowd attempt to integrate traditional grammar, structural linguistics, and generative grammar (p. 8), which remains visible throughout the book in the range of the issues discussed, mode of explanation, or graphic representations of linguistic structures. For example, the authors employ both Reed-Kellogg diagrams dating back to the beginning of the twentieth century and branching trees with categorial and phrasal labels. The authors claim that the organisation of their book is exceptional in that it abandons the traditional bottom-up organization starting from the smallest units such as parts of speech and proceeding to larger ones (phrases, clauses, sentences). However, the Instructor's Manual accompanying the handbook offers an alternate table of contents for those willing to follow the more traditional course format. Importantly, the object of description is the American variety of English.

The authors' declared goal is to take account of both formal and functional aspects of grammar, which is manifest in the investigation of the functions performed by particular forms. However, contrary to the authors' claim, this approach is hardly unique since virtually all modern grammars devote a lot of attention to the form of units in grammatical structure as well as to their grammatical functions.

* Author's address: pskit@wp.pl

An interesting feature of the reviewed grammar is a companion website with additional exercises, the answer key to these exercises and to the exercises provided in the book, and two chapters: on the system of punctuation, and on English as a second language. However, it remains unclear why the two extra chapters are omitted from the book and available online only. The website is also intended to be a forum for discussion based on the feedback from instructors employing the handbook in class.

The book consists of a preface, seventeen chapters, a glossary, and a subject index. In the preface the authors state their goals and present the features of the book. Each chapter follows the same format and begins with a preview outlining the basic concepts and problems to be covered. The preview is followed by the main body of text interwoven with practice exercises and boxed materials such as summaries, “Challenger”, and “For discussion” items. The “Challenger” and “For discussion” sections are intended to give students more insight into the relevant issues as well as to encourage them to consider further examples illustrating particular problems and to provide an opportunity for an in-class discussion. For instance, in Chapter 8 one of the “For discussion” sections makes the reader consider the stylistic effects of verbless clauses in the provided passage (p. 117), whereas the “Challenger” in Chapter 14 involves two possible interpretations of the same clause (p. 206). Another part found in most chapters is “Passages for Analysis”, which are longer pieces of text, usually prose, prompting the reader to analyse “the uses of forms and functions in contexts that are more extensive than the snippets given in the exercises” (p. xii). At the end of each chapter there is a review, which is either a list of the most important concepts introduced in the chapter or a list of tasks.

The examples selected for the illustration of particular grammatical phenomena and the items in practical exercises include authentic language: quotations from famous people, parts of newspaper and magazine articles, extracts from books (both prose and poetry), and samples of everyday speech or writing. This is intended to reflect language use, ‘use’ being, along with ‘form’ and ‘function’, one of the central terms in the textbook.

Chapter 1, *The Uses of Grammar*, presents the authors’ understanding of the term ‘grammar’: it “describes language in use” (p. 1). The handbook is concerned with the forms of English, the ways in which the forms function in sentences, and usage (i.e. knowledge of how to use the language appropriately). The chapter also offers a brief historical outline illustrating the evolution in the development of grammar textbooks, beginning with ancient Greeks and Romans, through early English grammars, Structuralism, Behaviourism, to Transformational Generative Grammar (pp. 2–7). It also draws the important distinction between the prescriptive and descriptive traditions.

The next chapter is devoted to the basic concepts like ‘grammaticality’, ‘form’, and ‘function’. It also introduces the basic terms needed in the analysis of sentences such as ‘subject’, ‘predicate’, ‘phrases’, and provides provisional definitions of parts of speech.

Chapter 3 is a cursory presentation of morphology, which is usually absent from handbooks of this type (cf. Wekker and Haegeman 1985; Downing and Locke 1992; Radford 1997). It is, however, so short (mere six pages) and scanty that it should have been either expanded or removed altogether. In the current size and form its contribution to the subject of the book is rather doubtful.

The following chapters discuss the standard topics in descriptive grammar. The presentation of basic sentence patterns precedes two chapters characterising the verb (Chapter 5 *Tense, Auxiliary Verbs, and Modals*, Chapter 6 *Perfect and Progressive Aspect*). Then, negative, interrogative, imperative, and passive structures are examined. The next three chapters are concerned with nouns and nominals, with the latter being defined as “a noun or any word or phrase that can be substituted for a noun in function” (p. 94). In a similar fashion, the following parts of the book discuss adjectives and adjectivals, and adverbs and adverbials. A separate chapter is devoted to prepositions, particles, and various functions of prepositional phrases. The last ‘descriptive’ chapter analyses types of sentences and conjunctions as well as expletive *it* and *there*. Finally, the authors conclude with a short chapter presenting their reflections on errors, language acquisition, dialects and diversity, bilingualism, and issues of education.

One of the aims of textbooks such as *The Uses of Grammar* is to equip the student with the terminology needed to discuss the structure of English at a more theoretical level. Unfortunately, Rodby and Winterowd tend to avoid the more technical vocabulary, which leaves the reader unprepared for dealing with more theoretically-oriented linguistic literature. An instance of this can be found in Chapter 5 in a section devoted to modal verbs: terms ‘belief modals’ and ‘social modals’ are used instead of commonly accepted ‘epistemic modals’ and ‘deontic modals’, respectively.

What appears to be missing from the book is section(s) giving suggestions for further reading, a feature intended for those willing to explore the relevant issues in more detail and thus expand their knowledge. The authors do not provide any bibliography or list of references although they do refer to other books. However, footnotes with bibliographical information on quoted works and extracts in *Passages for Analysis* are given.

The language of explanation and avoidance of more technical terminology makes *The Uses of Grammar* a handbook suitable for undergraduate students, but, at the same time, slightly too simplistic for the more advanced ones. Still, the book may be used as a supplementary coursebook, and one could certainly

consider using the exercises involving items that are quotations from celebrities or extracts from literary works, which can add variety to descriptive grammar classes.

References

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. and E. Finegan, 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Downing, A. and P. Locke, 1992. *A University Course in English Grammar*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Huddleston, R. and G. K. Pullum et al. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and J. Svartvik, 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and J. Svartvik, 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Radford, A. 1997. *Syntactic Theory and the Structure of English. A Minimalist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Wekker, H. and L. Haegeman [1985] 1993. *A Modern Course in English Syntax*. London and New York: Routledge.

Laura J. Downing, Alan T. Hall and Renate Raffelsiefen (eds), *Paradigms in Phonological Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. 349 pages.

Reviewed by *Jolanta Szpyra-Kozłowska**
UMCS Lublin

The volume under review is a collection of 11 papers written by several researchers and devoted to a single topic – the role of paradigm uniformity in modern phonological theory and the application of this concept to the description of a variety of irregular phonological phenomena in several languages. It is an interesting and valuable publication which successfully revives and develops the notion of paradigm regularity, largely neglected and almost forgotten in contemporary linguistic thinking. All the authors argue that it can be employed

* Author's address: jszpyra@klio.umcs.lublin.pl

in accounting for numerous surface exceptions to phonological generalizations, which have so far escaped any satisfactory explanation, in such diversified and often unrelated languages as English, Hungarian, Spanish, Russian, Bulgarian, Jita (Bantu), Chimwini, Korean, Arabic, Yidiŋ, Hebrew, Halkomelem (Central Salish) and many others. As stated by the editors in the introduction (p. 1), “it has been recognized that many exceptions to regular phonological processes (or sound laws) can be explained by proposing that paradigms of morphologically related words influence each other’s pronunciation”. Moreover, all the contributors share a conviction that none of the problems discussed by them can be handled by the existing derivational frameworks, such as, for example, Lexical Phonology, and, for that reason, alternative nonderivational options must be investigated and pursued.

This renewed interest in paradigmatic effects and their formal description has been sparked off and made possible due to the mechanisms introduced by Optimality Theory and, more specifically, by its subtheory of Output-to-Output correspondence. It is therefore not surprising that the overwhelming majority of studies in *Paradigms in Phonological Theory* are either directly couched in terms of OT or, even when no mention of this theory is made, make use of violable constraints, typical of this framework. As a matter of fact, in most cases the discussion focuses on theory-internal issues, namely the adequacy of two competing proposals, known as the Base Priority model and the Optimal Paradigms approach. According to the former, one base form has morphological and phonological priority over related items and exerts phonological pressure on them. In other words, a set of appropriate constraints assures phonetic identity of different members of the paradigm with the base. In the latter theory, no form has priority over the others and all members of a paradigm can influence each other’s pronunciation. This means that constraints requiring identity for some phonological property hold for the whole paradigm. Most of the papers in the book under review argue for one of these proposals on the basis of a detailed analysis of selected data taken from some language(s).

Since almost all contributions to the volume are studies of complex linguistic facts, their detailed discussion certainly surpasses the scope of a brief review. Therefore, in what follows, we shall only sketch the papers’ content focusing on the proposed solutions and their theoretical relevance.

The introductory chapter, written by the editors, is a very useful and lucid presentation of various approaches to the role of paradigm uniformity in phonology. It provides a brief historical overview of this issue, first in pre-generative work and then in generative studies. The authors demonstrate that in the latter the majority of paradigm uniformity effects are handled by means of rule ordering and the cycle. Next, two approaches to paradigm regularity in the Optimality Theory framework outlined above are presented together with a brief discussion of their strong points as well as problematic aspects.

Albright, in his paper entitled *The morphological basis of paradigm leveling*, offers a model of paradigm acquisition in which the preferred base that underlies analogical change is selected by the learners. He argues that in Latin paradigms involving rhotacism (such as *honos – honoris*, later leveled to *honor – honoris*) it is an oblique form, and not the nominative, which is chosen as the base for the remaining members. In other words, the pattern of non-alternation, dominant in the Latin lexicon, is extended to other cases. According to him (p. 41), “this result provides evidence for a model of paradigm learning in which learners choose the base form that is the most informative – i.e. that preserves the most distinctions between classes of words, and allows the remainder of the paradigm to be predicted with the greatest accuracy and confidence”. He adds (p. 42–43) that, “the prediction of this model is that distinctions that are preserved in the base form will be easily learned and maintained, whereas distinctions that are neutralized in the base form may be lost by leveling or regularization”. It should be added that Albright’s claims are mostly programmatic in character and an explicit formal procedure must be developed for his proposal to be applicable to other linguistic data.

Bat-El’s study *Competing principles of paradigm uniformity: evidence from the Hebrew imperative paradigm* is written in support of a Base-Priority approach. Its author analyses the formation of imperative forms in Colloquial Hebrew and demonstrates that their peculiar phonological properties can be accounted for if future forms of verbs are viewed as bases whose shape is prioritized. It should be stressed, however, that, as the imperative and future are mutually exclusive inflections of the same verb, they cannot be viewed as derived from each other morphologically. This means, in consequence, that the Output-Output model of Base-Priority can operate on forms which are morphologically derived from a shared base root, but not necessarily from each other.

Burzio, in his mostly theoretically oriented paper *Sources of paradigm uniformity* examines possible causes of the phenomenon in question which he sees in some important and not always well-understood aspects of the phonology-morphology interaction. He claims (p. 67) that, “the degree of parallelism in the system is in fact far more extensive, concerning not only the internal structure of phonology, but also the relationship between phonology and morphology”. It should be added that this paper makes a rather difficult reading abounding in technical terms and abbreviations.¹

Davis’s *Capitalistic v. militaristic: the paradigm uniformity effect reconsidered* focuses on a detailed discussion of the pronunciation of two items in American English, i.e. *capitalistic*, in which /t/ in the third syllable is flapped,

¹ A typical example of Burzio’s style is the following sentence (p. 66), “In terms of (2), MWF left no window of opportunity for MC, whence the lack of PU in Latin”.

and *militaristic*, where /t/, located in a similar context, is not flapped but aspirated, in spite of the same stress pattern of both words. This difference has been claimed (e.g. by Steriade) to stem from the phonetic identity of the bases (i.e. the forms *capital* and *military*) and the adjectives derived from them. Were it the case, instances like these would constitute evidence that even noncontrastive (allophonic) phonetic properties are involved in paradigm regularity effects. Davis argues, however, that an alternative account of these facts is also available in that (p. 108) “the nonflapping of the /t/ in the third syllable of *militaristic* reflects a general pattern in American English and need not be a paradigm uniformity effect” while, in his view, the flapping of the plosive in *capitalistic* follows from the fact that this adjective and the form *capital* have the same foot structure. I consider this paper interesting because of its focus on an in-depth analysis of well-known English data that departs from a frequently offered superficial examination of a handful of facts taken from a variety of languages.

Downing’s major claim is expressed in the title of her paper in which she maintains that *Jita causative doubling provides optimal paradigms*. In other words, she presents some evidence from Jita (spoken in Tanzania) supporting McCarthy’s view that no single base underlies cases of paradigm uniformity, but the whole inflectional paradigms. To be more exact, phonetic identity is enforced on the phonological string shared by a set of morphologically related forms which need not be a well-formed morphological constituent. She also argues that the Jita facts cannot be handled adequately by a derivational cyclic analysis.

Kenstowicz in *Paradigmatic uniformity and contrast* demonstrates that phonological properties of numerous forms taken from different languages (e.g. Spanish, Russian, Bulgarian, Chimwini and Arabic) cannot be accounted for in a cyclic model of the phonology-morphology interaction. He attempts to draw some generalizations concerning the typology of such phonologically irregular cases and repair strategies adopted by various languages. Kenstowicz is not, however, committed to any specific framework and claims that developing appropriate analytic tools and grammatical formalisms to express phenomena of paradigmatic uniformity and contrast is a task for future research.

McCarthy’s *Optimal Paradigms* outlines a proposal of a new model to handle cases of unexpected phonological properties of various forms. Thus, he provides (p. 171) “a novel formalization of surface resemblance through shared paradigm membership, couched within Optimality Theory and correspondence theory”. McCarthy develops his model meticulously and applies it to a complex set of data from Classical Arabic. He maintains (p. 171) that “in this Optimal Paradigms model, an OT constraint hierarchy evaluates candidates consisting of entire paradigms. There is an Output-Output correspondence relation between each member of the paradigm”. According to McCarthy (p. 174), a distinction

should be made between inflectional paradigms in which “all members are co-equal in their potential to influence the surface phonology of other members of the paradigm” and derivational morphology in which a derivational base takes morphological and phonological priority. It is, in the present reviewer’s opinion, the best paper in this volume since it successfully combines a novel theoretical proposal with its application to a detailed and insightful analysis of very complex linguistic facts.

Raffelsiefen in *Paradigm uniformity effects versus boundary effects* addresses some important issues involving the phonetics-phonology and phonology-morphology interface. She makes an interesting attempt to incorporate prosodic categories, phonological words in particular, and their boundaries into considerations of paradigm uniformity phenomena. Raffelsiefen demonstrates convincingly that paradigm regularity effects must be distinguished from prosodic domains effects. If this distinction is not made, false conclusions can be drawn concerning the presence of phonetic features in the lexicon. She thus shares with Davis caution with which same cases of alleged paradigm uniformity effects should be approached as frequently simpler and more adequate alternative accounts are available. She develops criteria for recognizing boundary effects and keeping them apart from genuine paradigm uniformity effects, and applies them to a large body of English data. I find this paper particularly valuable as it draws our attention to morphological and prosodic factors that often tend to be neglected in phonological analysis and warns against making hasty conclusions based on data which are not well-researched.

Rebrus and Törkenczy examine *Uniformity and contrast in the Hungarian verbal paradigm*. They focus on two competing forces within a paradigm: one which requires the phonological/phonetic identity of its members (i.e. paradigm uniformity), and another which requires contrast between them (i.e. paradigmatic contrast), and analyse a conflict between these factors in the Hungarian verbal inflection. They argue that the Hungarian data can be successfully accounted for in terms of the interaction of paradigm uniformity and paradigmatic contrast constraints.

Finally, Urbańczyk in *A note on paradigm uniformity and priority of the root* analyses selected data in Halkomelem which display both phonetic uniformity and nonuniformity in a paradigm. She argues that the base priority approach is not workable for the facts she scrutinizes and that McCarthy’s model of Optimal Paradigms can handle them far more adequately.

As this brief summary of the contents of *Paradigms in Phonological Theory* demonstrates, this volume, rich in empirical data, provides insightful theoretical proposals concerning the formalization of nonderivational paradigmatic relationships, particularly within the so far most successful model developed for handling such cases, i.e. Output-Output correspondences of Optimality Theory.

Clearly, due to this publication a major step has been made towards our better understanding of paradigmatic phenomena and their formal description. It should be emphasized, however, that the reader will find no definite answers to many of the queries raised in the book under review. Thus, we can only agree with the editors (p. 16) that “its most important contribution will be to provide an empirical and formal basis for future work on the role of paradigms in phonological theory”.²

Max W. Wheeler, *The Phonology of Catalan. (The Phonology of the World’s Languages)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. XI + 387 pp.

Reviewed by *Przemysław Ostalski**
University of Łódź

The book under review is essentially the most comprehensive account of Catalan phonology (with the exception of Catalan intonation). The author’s approach is through Optimality Theory. After an introduction to the varieties of Catalan, the author devotes chapters to segment inventories, syllable structure, phrasal phonology, coda voicing, coda place and manner assimilation and neutralization, cluster reduction, epenthesis, stress and prosody, word phonology, and the syllabification of pronominal clitics.

The introduction presents the territories (of which 96,2 per cent lie within Spain) where Catalan is natively spoken by six and half a million people (north-eastern Spain, the Principality of Andorra, French Catalonia, the Balearic Islands, and a small region of Sardinia) and places the Catalan language within the Romance family of languages, with Italian, Sardinian, Occitan, and Spanish being its nearest Romance neighbors. What, perhaps, is missing at this point is a clear presentation of Catalan as a distinct language against the Indo-European background.

Furthermore, Wheeler describes dialect divisions in Catalan, there being two major dialectal groups. The eastern dialect group includes North Catalan, central Catalan, Balearic, and *alguerès* (spoken in a small region of Sardinia). The western group consists of north-western Catalan and Valencian. The dialect that

² A minor complaint is the tiny print of the book which makes reading it more difficult.

* Author’s address: ostalski@uni.lodz.pl

receives the most detailed treatment in the present account of Catalan is central Catalan, the variety of northern and eastern Catalonia, including the city of Barcelona, additionally the author provides a considerable amount of information about western varieties, including Valencian, and about Balearic.

Within the very same chapter, theoretical assumptions and framework are discussed. And although Wheeler (p. 3) admits that his account of Catalan phonology falls squarely within the bounds of, what he calls, ‘conservative’ and ‘orthodox’ Optimality Theory (e.g. Kager (1999), McCarthy (2002), and McCarthy (2004)), there remains a point or two of critical nature. First, the present account is a very rich (and dense) descriptive source of dialectal, social and stylistic variation present in modern Catalan and yet Wheeler adheres to the strict ranking of constraints in his OT analyses of the variation in question, and this certainly goes nowhere near explaining or even modeling variation. And thus the reader is faced with a mismatch between descriptive richness and theoretical simplification/idealization. Second, the OT version used in the book is realistically not orthodox. Wheeler applies snippets of theories (Functional and Dispersion Theory) that are clearly outside conservative OT. Finally, the introduction does not contain any description of the basics of OT, and as a consequence remains rather impenetrable in its theoretical part to anyone not versed enough in the intricacies of OT, while still providing the wealth of linguistic data.

The second chapter introduces the segment inventories found in central and western Catalan. Of particular importance to a phonologist of any theoretical stance is the subsection devoted to the phonemic status of Catalan affricates (apico-alveolar [tʃ], [dʒ] and lamino-alveolo-palatal [tʃ̠], [dʒ̠]). The affricate [tʃ] or [ttʃ] in, for example, *atxa* ‘torch’ contrasts with a fricative [ʃ] in, for example, *aixa* ‘adze’ in most Catalan dialects, but in Valencian and southern Catalonia affricates are also found word-initially in, for example, *xinxà* ‘bedbug’ [tʃ̠inʃ̠a], in these varieties the unit affricate interpretation seems the most likely, inasmuch as affricates occur in word-initial position where obstruent clusters are not found, as well as medially and finally. In the other varieties, which lack word-initial invariant alveolo-palatal affricates (with the pronunciation [ʃinʃə] for *xinxà*), the balance seems to tip towards the biphonemic interpretation of the affricates that contrast with fricatives. Therefore the exact phonemic status of affricates in Catalan appears to be regionally conditioned.

In this chapter Wheeler also analyzes Catalan rhotics which are of two contrastive types: alveolar trill in, for example, *serrai* [ˈsɛrə] ‘saw’ and alveolar tap in, for example, *cera* [ˈsɛrə]. This contrast is neutralized except in intervocalic positions. The distribution in the remaining positions is as follows: a trill is found in a syllable onset at the beginning of a root or a lexical prefix (e.g. *ros* [ˈros] ‘fair’), after a heterosyllabic consonant (e.g. *folro* [ˈfolru] ‘lining’) and

between vocoids word-internally (e.g. *ferro* ['feru] 'iron'). Only in the last of these contexts is a contrast with a tap available. Wheeler provides a convincing explanation of Catalan rhotic distribution in terms of OT as a resolution of conflict between two fundamentally different articulatory markedness constraints: *FAST: avoid faster-than-usual articulatory transitions and *HOLD: avoid a longer constriction. The author highlights, moreover, a clear phonetic difference between a trill and a tap. According to a common misconception a trill is simply a sequence of taps and by providing a detailed articulatory description of both taps and trills, Wheeler clearly shows that this is not so.

In addition, attention should dully be paid to the subsection which describes and analyzes Catalan vowel reduction in unstressed syllables. It is here that Wheeler adopts the functional OT approach, according to which there are two types of phonetically motivated vowel reduction. A 'contrast-enhancing reduction' aims to ensure that, in a context disfavoring perceptual contrast between vowels, the contrast retained should be the best available from the point of view of perception.

The other type of phonetically motivated vowel reduction is 'prominence reduction'. There is an analogy to be drawn with prominence within the syllable, whereby certain sound types (those of high sonority) are best suited to a position of high prominence (the nucleus), while low sonority sound types are better suited to low prominence positions (margins). It need sincerely be admitted that the OT analysis of Catalan vowel reduction is exhaustive, a praise-worthy achievement if one makes allowances for the fact that in some varieties (e.g. Balearic) [ə] is also found in stressed syllables and cannot, therefore, be treated as a default reduction vowel, in the same way that schwa in, for instance, English can.

The third chapter is an attempt to analyze Catalan syllable structure, onsets and nuclei, in particular. In this analysis Wheeler employs the well-known Sonority Sequence: sonority must increase from the beginning of an onset to the nucleus of a syllable, and must decrease from the nucleus to the end of the syllable, where the scale of sonority is: stops < fricatives < nasals < liquids < high vocoids < non-high vocoids. Aside from SONSEQ, requirements of minimum sonority distance (MSD) between adjacent segments within a syllable are taken into account. Thus, for onsets, from the sequence obstruents-nasals-liquids-high vocoids-non-high vocoids Catalan allows only obstruent+liquid or consonant+high vocoid sequences.

The section dealing with the problem of hiatus and its resolution seems to be particularly remarkable, as Wheeler meticulously analyzes vocoid clusters in both stressed and unstressed environments. For instance, for each sequence of unstressed vocoids both of which are high, [ui], [iu], there are three potential (anti-hiatus) syllabifications: [ui] may be [u.i], [uj] or [wi], and [iu] may be [i.u], [iw], or [ju]. Depending on stylistic factors, Catalan resolves hiatus either

by resyllabification (formal styles) or creation of falling/rising diphthongs (informal styles), e.g. *biblioteca* 'library' is formally [bi.βli.u.'tɛ.kə] and informally [bi.βlju.'tɛ.kə]. In effect, the exact output form is chosen through the conflict of two markedness constraints: *LAPSE3σ: a sequence of three unstressed syllables is not permitted, and METCONσ (metrical consistency): the head of a syllable in a base corresponds to the head of a syllable in a derivative. Iff *LAPSE3σ is ranked above METCONσ, then [bi.βlju.'tɛ.kə] wins over both [bi.βli.u.'tɛ.kə] (it violating *LAPSE3σ by having four unstressed syllables) and [bi.βliw.'tɛ.kə] (it violating METCONσ by having [w] that does not correspond to the head of a syllable in the base).

This section, however, raises some critical points. Despite the wealth of data that Wheeler collected, his analysis turns out to be extremely restricted. This is because, he observes the strict ranking provision only and does not allow any local re-ranking of crucial constraints or probabilistic ranking. And thus, any socio-stylistic variation must be curtailed, which curtailment, no doubt, contrasts somewhat unpleasantly with the full-fledged variation inherent in the descriptive part.

The fourth chapter presents the issue of vowel sandhi in Catalan (phrasal phonology). When a vowel-final and vowel-initial words are adjacent in a phrase, one of four possible outcomes is at issue: hiatus (no change to the shape of the words as uttered in isolation), glide formation (if one of the vowels in contact is high), fusion (if the vowels in contact are identical) or elision. It is interesting to observe how Wheeler accounts for the glide formation in sandhi contexts, e.g. *menú imprès* [mə.'nujm.'pɾɛs] 'printed menu'; *això importa* [ə.'ʝɔjm.'pɔrtə] 'that matters'. Vowels in unstressed syllables preceded by stressed vowels are first resyllabified and then changed into glides. This movement is shown to be in line with *CLASH constraint (phonological phrase-head stresses do not fall on adjacent syllables whose heads are separated by no more than one mora).

The fifth chapter provides the account of coda voicing neutralization and assimilation. On the whole Catalan voicing neutralization is comparable to that observed in Polish or Russian (devoicing). There are, however, subtle differences. Polish neutralizes voice in the environment of a following word-final sonorant but Russian does not, both Russian and Polish neutralize voice in the context of a following obstruent. Balearic Catalan would resemble Polish in this regard, as far as perception is concerned, showing neutralization in [VCr#] and [VCl#] clusters. However, in Catalan a preceding nasal is sufficient to preserve contrast, in [VNCr#] and [VNCl#] clusters; that is to say, the only context in which word-final voicing contrast is preserved in Catalan is one in which an obstruent is both preceded by a nasal and followed by a liquid.

The sixth chapter surveys phonotactic possibilities of Catalan coda. Catalan is relatively rich in the range of consonants that can appear in codas, though

word-medial codas are restricted in length to one consonant, or to one consonant + [s] (as in *extra* [ˈɛks.trə] ‘extra’). The diversity of word-final codas, in particular, gives scope for extensive assimilation and neutralization of contrast before following consonants. The range of internal clusters that involve contrast among major places of articulation in the coda consonant is somewhat restricted: denti-alveolar—labial (*atmosfera* [dm] ‘atmosphere’), denti-alveolar – denti-alveolar (*falda* [ɫd] ‘lap’), denti-alveolar – alveolo-palatal (*xarxa* [rʃ] ‘net’), denti-alveolar – velar (*orgue* [ry] ‘organ’), labial – denti-alveolar (*comte* [mt] ‘count’), labial – alveolo-palatal (*objecte* [bʒ] ‘object’), velar – labial (*enigma* [gm] ‘enigma’), velar – denti-alveolar (*estricte* [kt] ‘strict’).

Non-obligatory place and lateral assimilation of coda consonants affects consonants with the least marked, denti-alveolar place; non-obligatory assimilation of nasality affects stops of all places. Only slightly less than totally obligatory is the assimilation of denti-alveolar (but no other) nasal place to the place of a following consonant (as in English), e.g. *són pocs* [mp] ‘they are few’; *ratpenat* [pp] ‘bat’; *set nyanyos* [ɲɲ] ‘seven bumps’. Catalan coda assimilations are style conditioned: in most formal styles only least marked denti-alveolar /t, d, n/ assimilates to the place of a following alveolo-palatal; in slightly less formal styles /n/ assimilates not only to alveolo-palatal place but also to velar and labial; in non-formal styles all denti-alveolar stops assimilate to all the places of articulation and also manner of articulation (nasal and lateral, e.g. *set làmines* [ɫɫ] ‘seven engravings’).

The seventh chapter is the analysis of cluster reduction in Catalan and fairly analogous chapter eight deals with epenthesis. In these chapters Wheeler groups Catalan consonants on the sonority scale and establishes specifically Catalan minimum sonority distance requirement. One controversial issue concerns the tap and its placement above the laterals on the sonority scale. This is attributed to the fact that Catalan /l/ is typically velarized and thus less sonorous than /r/.

The ninth chapter is a presentation of Catalan suprasegmentals with the subsequent OT analysis. The analysis is generally orthodox, with a possible exception of the colon. Wheeler introduces the colon as a category that comes in the prosodic hierarchy below the prosodic word and above the foot, and groups feet in a manner corresponding to the manner in which feet group syllables. The use of this prosodic label, however, appears to be ambiguous and unfounded, as there are certainly no phonological or morphophonemic processes in Catalan that may be directly linked with cola.

The tenth chapter is devoted to phonologically conditioned allomorphy in Catalan. Wheeler analyzes Catalan lenition using various constraints from the LAZY family (minimize articulatory effort). Of particular interest to the phonologists familiar with English should be the section about r/zero alternation (reminiscent of English linking/intrusive r phenomena), e.g. *clar* [kla] ‘clear’,

clars [klas] plural /+z/, *clara* ['klarə] feminine singular, *claror* [klə'ro] 'light'. This pattern of r/zero alternation is characteristic of Catalan dialects other than central Valencian, where orthographic final and preconsonantal *r* is realized [r]. In all the varieties where r/zero alternation is found there are significant numbers of lexical exceptions, which are numerous in continental Catalan but few in number on the islands, especially Majorca. The number and diversity of these exceptions in continental Catalan mean that it is quite implausible to deal with r/zero alternation as a motivated phonological process, though phonological factors may certainly favor or hinder 'r-deletion', alongside morphological factors. The factors affecting the lexical incidence of 'r-deletion' are these: grammatical category (infinitives *ésser* ['esə] 'to be'); stress pattern: oxytone or paroxytone; number of syllables; morphological structure; quality of vowel preceding /r/ (a preceding high vowel strongly favors r-retention; and possibly word frequency).

This pattern no doubt reflects the arrested lexical diffusion of a sound change whose progress was originally conditioned by a number of prosodic, phonetic, and grammatical factors, as well as geographical ones which are still in evidence. The r-final allomorph is always preferred before vowel-initial suffixes (avoiding ONSET violation).

The final chapter describes the syllabification of pronominal clitics in Catalan. The system of pronominal clitics is probably the most complex element of Catalan grammar. There are fourteen clitic elements, most of which are polysemous to some degree. They frequently occur in combination, up to six at a time. Combinations of more than three pronominal clitics are unusual, but most clauses in spontaneous speech contain one or two pronominal clitics. In addition to the complexities arising from polysemy, there are complexities due to the fact that clitic sequences are often not straightforwardly compositional. Some of the clitics are morphologically complex – for example, in the third person plural dative clitic represented here as *elzi* three morphemes can be clearly identified: /l/ '3rd person' /+z/ 'plural' /+i/ 'dative/locative'.

In sum, *The phonology of Catalan* is a remarkable and scrupulous analysis within the (mostly) orthodox OT framework. It is highly recommended to anyone interested in Romance (especially Catalan) phonology and modern phonological theories.

References

- K a g e r, R. 1999. *Optimality Theory: a Textbook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 M c C a r t h y, J. J. 2002. *A Thematic Guide to Optimality Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
 M c C a r t h y, J. J. (ed.) 2004. *Optimality Theory in Phonology: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jan-Olof Svantesson, Anna Tsendina, Anastasia Karlsson, and Vivan Franzén, *The Phonology of Mongolian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. Pp. xix + 314.

Reviewed by *Alfred F. Majewicz*

Adam Mickiewicz University

The book has appeared under the OUP “Oxford Linguistics” label in the series “The Phonology of the World’s Languages”, in which in the consecutive volumes the phonetic and phonological components of such previously well-described languages as English, German, Portuguese, German, or Chinese, have been presented besides those that have hardly ever been adequately described in this respect like Kimatuumbi (~ ki-Matu(u)mbi, South Eastern Bantu of Tanzania) or relatively well-described but lesser-known like e.g. Armenian or Slovak. According to the frontispiece information, some seventeen such monographs have already been published or are in preparation.

The Mongolian language, its phonology included, belongs to those relatively well described, although often fragmentary and in languages by far not commonly known, like – just Mongolian, but also Russian, Chinese, Japanese, or Buriat. Therefore, one can easily agree with what one finds on the jacket flap of the book that “it provides the first comprehensive description of the phonology and phonetics of Standard Mongolian, known as the Halh (Khalkha) dialect and spoken in Ulaanbaatar, the capital of the Republic of Mongolia”. Using results of most advanced research in both theoretical phonology and applied or experimental phonetics and based on field work data collected and analyzed for the purposes of the book as well as on extensive literature (the list of references expands over 67 pages of very dense print), the book doubtlessly is a milestone in Mongolic studies.

The monograph offers much more than the expected, judging by the title, synchronic description of contemporary Mongolian standard. It provides also relatively abundant data on Mongolian dialects and written variants (using Uighur, Chinese, Phags-pa, and Cyrillic, but even Arabic scripts) and on other Mongolic languages (Buriat~Buriad, Khamnigan Mongol~Kamnigan, Oirat~Oirad – with Kalmuk~Kalmuck treated as its dialect rather than an independent tongue, Daghur~Dagur, Shira-Yugur~Eastern Yugu(r)~Yellow Uighur, Monguor~White Mongol, Dongxiang~Santa, Baoan~Bonan, Kangjia, Moghol, Kitan), using all this material for the compilation and presentation of the historical development of the entire group of Mongolic ethnolects. Thus, the

book constitutes at the same time a monograph of the historical phonology of Mongolic languages, claimed – most probably legitimately – to be “the first” such “account in any language” (*ibid.*). Short information is provided (p. 155) as well about ethnolects that have been reported to be in use by ethnic groups officially included either in the Mongolian, 蒙古族, or other – e.g. Monguor, 土族, Hui, 回族, Dongxiang, 东乡族, from among the 55 officially recognized „minority nationalities” (*shaoshu minzu*, 少数民族) but not being Mongolic, such as Khatso, Wutu, Tangwang, and Benren.

The entire material provided is organized in ten chapters, preceded by “Acknowledgements” (p. ix), lists of tables (p. x – 14 items listed), figures (p. xi – 35 items listed), and “Abbreviations and symbols” (pp. xii–xiv), a note on “Transcription” (p. xv), and a general “Introduction” (pp. xvi–xix), and followed by “Appendices” A and B (pp. 218–239) consisting in bibliographical references to “relevant sections” of the volume, and by the list of “References” mentioned above (pp. 230–297), general “Index” (pp. 299–310) and “Index of Old Mongolian words” (pp. 311–314).

Chapters 1 (pp. 1–11) and 2 (pp. 12–21) pertain to acoustic phonetics and present results of the analysis of, respectively, vowels and consonants from recordings, of specially prepared language material, made by Svantesson in Ulaanbaatar in 1990 (the informants were Ulaanbaatar-born three males aged 21, 26, 36). Chapter 3 (pp. 22–33) provides the inventory of segmental phonemes, with a special section (pp. 30–33) on “loan-word phonology” (loans being mainly from Russian). Chapter 4 (pp. 34–42) in turn provides graphemic-phonemic correspondences for the Cyrillic orthography in use in the Republic of Mongolia and for the modernized Uighur-script orthography in use in Inner Mongolia in China; differences between values of Cyrillic characters used for Mongolian and for Buriat and Kalmuk are indicated. Chapter 5 (pp. 43–61) shows “Phonological processes”, with the obvious focus on vowel harmony, chapter 6 (pp. 62–84) deals with the syllable and word structures, and chapter 7 (pp. 85–97) is devoted to “Prosody”.

Chapters 8–10 constitute the diachronic part of the book. Chapter 8 (pp. 98–139) introduces the historical written varieties under the heading “Old Mongolian” (analyzed are “Uigur Mongolian”, “Sino-Mongolian” (that of *The Secret History of the Mongols* in the first place), (the little known) “Arabic Mongolian”, and “*Phags-pa* Mongolian”) to reconstruct Old Mongolian sound system; samples of “Old Mongolian vocabulary” have been appended here (pp. 126–139). Chapter 9 (pp. 140–177) supplies data on and from the Mongolic languages listed above and presents their “comparative vocabulary” (pp. 155–177). The concluding chapter 10 (pp. 178–217) discusses the “Development of the modern Mongolic languages”.

As usually, I started the initial inspection of the book under concern from the table of “Contents” (pp. v-viii), and detecting the volume of “References” I felt provoked to test the degree of its completeness and, somehow, the degree of availability of rare and lesser-known publications that might be of interest to the authors if all among the listed items were; it was only too obvious to me that all possible publications from both Mongolias, Inner and outer, as well as those from China, Russia, and Japan would be accessible to them, so I checked for a few rare and little known editions from Poland – and I was pleased to find out that among the items referred to have been e.g. Kotwicz’s 1939 account on Shira Yugur printed in Vilna just before World War II and much easier available from *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* [Henceforth RO] 16 (1953) 435–65 or Surengiyn Moomoo’s Russian-language monograph of Mongolian phonemic system duplicated in a very limited edition at Warsaw University in 1977. But seeing Kuribayashi’s 2003 index to *Hua-yi Yiyu*, I was a bit disappointed not to find Marian Lewicki’s 1949 *La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIVe siècle, le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389* and/or its 1959 index (published posthumously and, unfortunately, abundant with errors); I think, Lewicki’s Vilna 1937 booklet *Les inscriptions mongoles inédites en écriture carrée*, and perhaps Kałużyński’s “Dagurisches Wörterverzeichnis”, RO 33/1 (1969), 103–44 and 33/2 (1970), 109–43, and Stanisław Godziński’s 1970 “Observations sur quelques suffixes formant les noms en Mongol contemporain”, RO 33/2, 145–59, deserved a reference as well. Other possible, and useful to a non-Mongolist reader but absent from the book, references would include e.g. Murayama’s 1969 article on Middle Mongolian long vowels “Chūki mongorugo-ni hozon sareta mongorugonohihaseiteki chōboin” (“中期モンゴル語に保存されたモンゴル語の非派生的長母音” in Festschrift for Professor Yoshisuke Fukuda – 福田良輪教授退官記念論文集), B. I. Pankratov’s 1962 Moscow facsimile edition of *The Secret History of the Mongols*, the Ulan-Ude 1965 collection *Issledovaniye buryatskikh govorov, vypusk 1* edited by C. B. Cydendambayev and I. D. Burayev (if Cydendambayev ed. 1977 is on the list; there is plenty of data on the phonetics of a number of Buryat subdialects), Cenggeltei et al. 1979 report on research on small Kitan script (契丹小字研究方法簡論, 內蒙古大学蒙古语文研究室), Wuda’s 1985 Bargu vocabulary 巴尔虎土语词汇 (if other vocabularies of the MTKASC series are listed), etc.; of course, these are first-look haphazard observations only, I could have overlooked many things (e.g., it would never come to my mind to look for e.g. Sanzheyev et al. eds. Moscow 1962 Buryat grammar (phonetics and morphology) under Buraev 1962, although spotting it there occurs to me correct: Burayev in fact was the author of the part on phonetics). One may wonder why Cheremisov’s Buryat-Russian dictionary edition of 1951 and not of 1973 has been used, and how can one identify the 2001–2 great

academic Mongolian-Russian dictionary under Bajarsajhan, etc. – the list of authors does not appear on the title page which in such case should be the basis for bibliographical descriptions. This actually is a bigger problem as the authors of the book under concern rightly deciding on collecting all references to the same author under one name form regardless of the language it had been noted in and on the preference of the Mongolian versions of names in the case of Mongolian authors, decided also – apparently wrongly, making evidently their book much less user-friendly than it could be – to shift necessary cross-references to the index. The book contains original research results important to Mongolists and may be even addressed to the very small flock of Mongolists worldwide in the first place but the book has to be addressed also to general linguists, typologists, etc., and few among such will know that the name usually written by its bearer himself as Junast and known otherwise in its Chinese version as Zhaonasiu should be looked for under Jagunasutu, similarly – Qinggeltai~Cingeltei~Chin. Qingge’ertai under Cenggeltei, Sechinchogtu ~Chin. Siqinchaoketu under Secencogtu, Nadmud~Chin. Nademude under Nadamid, Chaganhad under Caganqada, Hujiltu~Chin. Hujiletu under Kögjiltü, Buhe under Böke (though the latter two cases in fact are easier to associate), etc. Such cross-references should be possible in the “Index” *and* in the list of “References”.

To make the book more user-friendly, bibliographical references should also inform about more recent or more easily available editions (one case indicated above, this would also refer to e.g. the 1976 reprint of Ramstedt’s *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch* (at least one reprint is referred to in the “References”), and 1990 Tokyo collection of Jagunasutu’s studies on ’Pags-pa Mongolian, 八思巴字和蒙古语文献) and provide rather full titles of publications referred to (here Skorik ed. 1968 can serve as an example of a title deprived of its important – from the point of view of the main subject of the book under concern – part, namely that the volume quoted includes data on “*Mongolic, Manchu-Tungusic, and Paleoasiatic languages*”).

All in all, the book presented in this review is a significant contribution to Mongolic as well as general linguistics and together with Juha Janhunen’s recent (2003) collection *The Mongolic Languages* considerably facilitates access of linguists and other potential audience to up-to-date reliable data on the Mongol linguistic world.

One of the authors – Vivan Franzén – did not live to see the book in print, passing away in 2004; I dare dedicate the present review to her memory.

Cliff Goddard, *The Languages of East and Southeast Asia. An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. pp. xvi + 315.

Reviewed by *Alfred F. Majewicz*

Adam Mickiewicz University

Although this reviewer rather is deeply interested and involved in research on languages in use in the region defined by the title of the book under scrutiny here, he paid little attention to the title prior to its reaching his desk. The reviewer assumed it to most probably be a yet another survey of either selected languages and/or language groupings from the region or language situations in particular countries of the area, or both, too small even in volume to add anything to what already stands on the shelves of his still quite impressive (despite the much publicized fire consequences) library.

Of course, the volume in question does provide information on both the languages of the region as such and on language situations in countries situated there as well as on the status and situation of selected major languages but this kind of information is only a small part of what the book offers, in fact only *one* chapter, out of seven, labeled “Language families, linguistic areas and language situations” (pp. 27–61) and thus a potential reader looking for comprehensive data in these domains should be warned at this very moment that it is definitely the best source to be reached for.

The very formulation of the title did arouse suspicions. If not a survey of languages and language families and/or language situations of the region then what could be included between the covers of a volume of only a little over 300 pages, this reviewer wondered, being only too well aware of the great linguistic diversity in every dimension possible of the region concerned. Another expectancy, then, was that the author of the book must, at least for the purposes of the very book in question, have assumed a very narrow, very limited perspective for the notion of “East Asia”. And here the reviewer was right: for me East Asia definitely covers the entire territory of China and the Russian Far East and Far North including Chukotka as far north as the Bering Strait, Kamchatka, and e.g. the Kolyma region deep inland and numerous very unique in every aspect languages classified as Paleoasiatic, Eskimo-Aleut, Yeniseian, Manchu-Tungusic, Mongolic, while for the Goddard of his book East Asia – going northwards – ends at best with northern Japan (the Ainu language is mentioned, p. 51, but do not expect to learn anything exact or original about it; the Nivghu~Nivkh language, neighboring Ainu and used also in Hokkaido and equally isolated, is not; actually, Ainu, but also Korean and Japanese are located by

Goddard in North Asia, p. 30 – expectedly, in view of the fact that his specialty is Malay), and e.g. the Eastern and Southeastern Asia of the book does include China but excluded are vast Uighur-, Mongolic-, and Tibetan-speaking areas of the country, hence ethnolects of the groupings just enumerated are simply excluded from consideration. And – no wonder: otherwise Goddard’s work would have to be incomparably thicker or much more superficial than it is now – because *it is*, inevitably, superficial in many respects.

The discussion is limited to areas where languages of the following linguistic divisions are spoken: Austronesian, Mon-Khmer, Tibeto-Burman, Tai-Kadai, Hmong-Mien (still, Miao-Yao would seem more suitable: Hmong is only one of Miao representatives the same as Mien being only one of Yao ethnolects), and Sinitic (including ethnolects often referred to as groups of dialects of Chinese – such as Yue of which one, “standard” is Cantonese, Hakka (formulations like “Kejia (also called Hakka)”, or “Xiang (Hsiang), Wu, Gan (Kan)”, p. 38, verge on gross terminological inexactitudes: *kejia* 客家 is, basically, Mandarin for Hakka *hakka* < Yue *haak³ga¹*, while *xiang* 湘 and *gan* 贛 are officially approved *pinyin* transliterations of what is in Wade-Giles transliteration *hsiang* and *kan*, and then the Pinyin *wu* 吳 of course also has its Wade-Giles equivalent, incidentally also *wu*, but in Baller English transliteration it is *u*, hence – to be consistent – the middle part of the latter should be “Wu (Wu, U)”) or Mandarin (by the way, also having its Chinese name – 官話, in Pinyin *guanhua*). Short passages on “language situations” brief – superficially – on “Insular Southeast Asia” (Indonesia, East Timor, Malaysia, Brunei, Singapore, Philippines), “Mainland Southeast Asia” (Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam), “China”, and “Korea and Japan” (some funny things also appear here and there in these passages, like e.g. providing the Japanese name *nihongo*, with capital N, as alternative (?) for “Japanese” and not providing anything like that for “Korean” in table 2.5., p. 50, suggesting (?) – what ? – that Koreans have no name for their “mother tongue” in their mother tongue ?).

Doubtlessly, the author could select only these languages and these countries for consideration in his book but, equally doubtlessly, this reviewer can have opinions as presented above.

If not a survey, then *what* does the book actually constitute and include? What is it an introduction to?

In the first place, it turns out to be a handbook, with “key technical terms” provided at the end of every chapter, with a section of “exercises” (pp. 239–529) and “solutions” (pp. 261–276) to them, with a “glossary of linguistic terms” (pp. 277–294; here, basics to be found in absolutely any language handbook, grammar, or introduction to linguistics, like accusative, affix, affricate, case, imperative, morpheme, object, syllable, etc., occur alongside terms denoting phenomena really specific in some way for languages of the region in question,

like lexical tone, honorifics, logographic writing, etc.). According to Goddard himself, his “goal is to provide an accessible resource for students and teachers of linguistics, language studies, and Asian studies” and “most of the book should make sense and be interesting reading for those with a minimal background in linguistics, and little or no personal knowledge of any East or Southeast Asian language” (p. ix). This “minimal background in linguistics” probably explains the, just pointed to, contents of the terminological glossary.

Chapter 1 (pp. 1–25) is to give “a first look” at the peculiarities of the languages of the region, with such (somehow “mythological” among language students) phenomena specifically signaled as “lack of inflection” resulting in (not always so) strict constituent order, classifiers (~“measure words”), honorifics, verb serialization, phonetic features of these languages, including lexical tone, and related features of local scripts, sentence particles of modality, or elaborated systems of address.

Chapter 3 (pp. 53–93) offers much for those interested in ethnolinguistics and cultural anthropology, tracing history of words, focusing on interlanguage influences, lexical loans, “cultural key words” (like e.g. Japanese *amae* and *omoiyari*), “meaning differences between languages” (like e.g. Japanese *nomu* equivalent to English ‘drink’, but also ‘smoke’, ‘eat’ – and not precisely and not always), and on word structures and word formation processes (like compounding, reduplicating, affixation, etc.).

Chapter 4 (pp. 95–147) elaborates on specific grammatical categories (like aspect dominating over or replacing tense, classifier, topic, “trigger”), categorical meanings (like sentence-final modality), and categorical markers (e.g. verb serialization, sentence-final particles).

Chapter 5 (pp. 149–175) presents “the soundscape of East and Southeast Asia”, with focus on “uncommon” sound and phoneme inventories (e.g. vowel-richest, with “68 contrastive vocalic nuclei” in a Bru ethnolect of Vietnam), syllable structures and sound cluster possibilities, tonal systems; separate (and rather misleading) sections are devoted to Japanese rhythm units (*mora*) and pitch-accent (pp. 171–175).

Chapter 6 (pp. 177–207) provides some very basic information on some of the numerous local scripts of the region – alphabetic Arabic as applied to Malay and Korean *hangul*, syllabic Thai and Japanese (the two *kana* syllabaries), and logographic Chinese, also as applied to languages other than Chinese (Sinitic, but also in the mixed logographic-syllabic Japanese writing system); some valuable but far from sufficient information concerns Roman-character transliteration systems and on Chinese calligraphy.

Chapter 7 (pp. 209–237) somehow complements Chapter 3 and would be of greater interest to similar audience being devoted to language etiquette, rhetoric skills, speech and communicative styles, taboo words and language, “elaborate

expressions”; of particular value for a general (“backgroundless”) reader can be the sections on the Javanese etiquette-conditioned everyday *ngoko-krama* (~*kromo*) diglossia (pp. 216–218) and on the Japanese honorific (~*keigo*) system (pp. 220–229).

It is obvious for Goddard, and it should be obvious for anyone, that “no person can be a specialist on the number of languages and language families found” in that extensive and populous region, so it is and should be equally obvious that the author “had to rely on the works of a great number of dedicated linguistic scholars” (ix). His “task”, as defined by himself, “has been to locate and select a range of comparable material, and then to digest, explain, and contextualize it so as to fashion it into a coherent, clear, and above all interesting story” (ibid.).

All this is easily understandable but equally understandable, then, is that many readers of the book with more than minimal background in linguistics and at least some experience with languages of the area covered by Goddard’s book may see, perceive, or interpret certain facts differently, not fully agree with what the author proposes, or even find factual inexactitudes or errors (which in turn does not mean that other interpretations are necessarily better or disqualifying those of Goddard’s). As in the case of the volume of the book presented here, the space for this review is also limited, so it is unimaginable to point to every such discrepancy in opinion between the author of the book and this reviewer but what follows are examples of such discrepancies.

The *secundum comparationis*, the reference language for the absolute majority of comparisons is English, and it seems natural as the metalanguage of the very book (and, I presume, the author’s first language) is English – but at the same time English serves as international, and the only, language of global influence, hence the greater responsibility of authors writing in English and greater risk to sound naïve, provincial, parochial. The basis for other “European” comparison is very limited – actually to French and German, which – seen from the point of view of native speakers of, say, Baltic or Slavic or Celtic languages – have almost precisely the same structure as English. Thus, the sensational revelation that English has “even some three-consonant clusters” (p. 10) may trigger but a look of disdain on the part of a Pole (cf. syllables like [kwamstf] CCVCCCC) or a Georgian (with up to seven-consonant cluster possibility, cf. [vhsdzɣvnob] CCCCCCVC). This reference to English, as a matter of fact, often oversimplifies (and, in fact, a bit falsifies) facts described, if read by native speakers of languages structurally distant from English (it is evident from the very first examples in Asiatic languages, like Thai or Japanese – but, on the other hand, one could wonder how to provide a simple explanation in such cases in a different way). For this reviewer, the explanation of “the lack of inflection” (p. 3ff.) seems odd; it would be incomparably better to explain it in terms of *lexical* versus *categorial* meanings and their respective vehicles (i.e., words

conveying lexical meanings versus “formal words” conveying only grammatical, and not lexical, information). Describing in grammars “measure words” and “unit counters” as “subcategories of classifiers” does not seem to be that “unfortunate” as Goddard seems to suggest (p. 16): grammatically, it is exactly so, all words are, from our point of view, uncountables; this is another example of mixing up grammar with semantics under the influence of one’s own mother tongue. Similarly, anything that can be translated into English by what is called a pronoun (*I, we, you, she*, etc.) in that language, *ipso facto* becomes a “pronoun” in Goddard and is treated as such, regardless of the existence or not of special pronominal paradigm(s) in particular languages (preferable would be sticking to the principle «as many lexical categories in a language described as grammatical paradigms only»)¹. The entire (brief) discussion of (the difference between) gender and numeral classifying (p. 16–17) is also a miss: both do classify surrounding objects and phenomena categorically, only the basis of classification is different. To conclude this portion of the present review, in the Lao example (p. 23) “the word *kin*³ ‘eat’ is” *not*, in this reviewer’s opinion, “a purposive clause even though it is not marked as such” (pp. 18-19), precisely *because it is not marked as such* and *because* “the purposive marker *phua*¹ [...] can be inserted in front of *kin*³ [...]”, even if it happens “with no change in meaning”; in the former case it is not a purposive clause structurally, because it is not marked as such, even if it conveys such meaning.

As pointed to above, the descriptions of language situations are superficial and little informative (conditioned by space limitations, I presume, but...) – here are some examples. Somehow typical or characteristic of the book is the description of the situation in Vietnam: “great diversity of languages but the national language, Vietnamese, is spoken by the great majority of the population and is clearly dominant” (p. 48) – and virtually nothing about this diversity! (e.g. the simple “how many languages there?”). Questionable is equaling “Mandarin Chinese” and “Modern Standard Chinese” – at the very beginning of the book (p. 4); and, staying by Chinese – if one accepts the *pinyin* 拼音 transliteration system for Chinese words throughout the book, it should be used consistently (thus, e.g. “Kaoshan” (p. 50), should be *Gaoshan* or, at least, “Gaoshan (Kaoshan)”, although the term used in Taiwan in relation to what the People’s Republic of China collectively labels *gaoshan shaosu minzu* 高山少数民族 ‘Gaoshan nationality minority’ is, and since 1994 constitutionally, *yuanzhumin* 原住民, in Japanese they were referred to as *takasagozoku* 高砂族). The fact

¹ This sentence actually paraphrases Roy Andrew Miller’s statement from his now classical monograph *The Japanese Language* of 1964 (reference at hand is to the Tokyo: Tuttle edition of 1980: 312; see also Majewicz in Brigitte L. M. Bauer and G.-J. Pinault (eds) 2003. *Language in Time and Space. A Festschrift for Werner Winter...* Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 271–285.

that now we know about the linguistic situation in China incomparably more than a few years ago thanks to the monumental publications like *中国语言地图集* // *Language Atlas of China* (Wurm et al. eds. 1987. Hongkong: Longman), *中国少数民族分布图集* // *Atlas of Distribution of National Minorities in China* (Hao Shiyuan 郝时远 et al. eds. 2002. Beijing: SinoMaps Press), and these resulting from extensive field research of such scholars as Stevan Harrell (especially studies on Liangshan Yi) or Sun Hongkai 孙宏开 and his team (a monumental project on “China’s newly discovered languages” with about thirty volumes of monographs on particular ethnolects published so far). Finally, it can be understandable why linguistic atlases of certain areas (like e.g. those of the Philippines by Curtis D. McFarland) have been disregarded for reference but it is more difficult to understand why e.g. the *Atlas of Languages of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas* (Wurm-Mühlhäusler-Tryon 1996) has not been referred to either, especially if the situation surveys are only so sketchy.

Much could be commented on particular issues and languages dealt with but – to cut it short – let it be one language again for exemplification. Let it be Japanese. Here the phonetic/phonological component is illustrative: inconsistent, eclectic, rewritten from several – representative but worst possible – descriptions and interpretations, taken as a whole is hardly acceptable (trying at least to treat length of both vowels and consonants as phonologically relevant would improve much (to me, analyzing e.g. long vowels as geminates is simply a nonsense). The fragment on “pronouns” above in this text refers very much to what Goddard has written on Japanese – e.g. *boku* can easily be used by distinguished ladies – with the meaning ‘he’ or ‘you’ in relation to a male child (thus, information on person is not its primary meaning), while *anata* in everyday Japanese usage is above all the way to address ‘my husband’ (it appears in abundance in Foreigner Japanese Talk and is typical of Handbook Japanese but one clever handbook warns: “unless intending a deliberate insult do not ever address your teacher as *anata*”² (of course, “teacher” here – and in reality – stands for a very large class of people). Dictionaries may qualify *anata* as “pronoun” (reflecting thus the impact of “hollandology” *rangaku* 蘭学, a sheepish imitation of “things European” during Japan’s period of seclusion *sakoku* 鎖国) but in other dictionaries it is qualified as “noun”³. All “pronouns” belong to declinables and there is no ground for a separate lexical category for them. The choice of such words, normally avoided whenever possible, depends not only on one’s attitude towards the person one is speaking to (p. 19) but also the person(s) one is speaking about,

² Zeljko Cipris and Shoko Hamano 2002. *Making Sense of Japanese Grammar. A Clear Guide Through Common Problems*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, p. 14.

³ E.g. Shigeru Takebayashi 1992. *The Kenkyusha Japanese-English Learner’s Dictionary*. Tokyo, p. 17.

to be sure. There is a subclass of formal words that can and usually are called particles (as e.g. sentence-final modal particles) but e.g. case markers like *-wa*, *-ga*, *-o*, *-no*, *-mo*, etc., certainly do not belong here; in fact, they are not at all separate words but endings of declinables (why should they be regarded as separate words rather than suffixes is not at all clear, especially in the view of the fact that the Japanese orthography does not use any spaces between words). Contrasting not *-wa* and *-ga* from among them but just *-wa* and *-mo* as the primary opposition (*-mo* as subject/topic/focus augmentative, and *-wa* as subject/topic/focus attenuative case markers) would serve much better for the understanding of the <topic=subject> issue in Japanese as well as in other languages and in understanding the phenomenon in general (cf. pp. 126ff., 132ff., 136ff.). Coming to conjugables - *-ta/-da* forms do not indicate past the same as their *-ru/-u* equivalents do not indicate present. There is no past tense in Japanese in the sense that there is past tense in English; typologically, there are three “absolute” obligatory tenses in English (past-present-future in relation to the moment of speaking) while there are only two “relative” optional tenses in Japanese (antecedent and non-antecedent, depending on whether the speaker wishes to describe events in sequence or does not feel it necessary) and *-ta/-da* forms can be well used with predicates denoting future situations. There are basic inconsistencies throughout the book in transliterating Japanese words: when you apply *sh* you must apply *tsu*, when you decide on selecting *tu* you must consistently apply *s(y)* and the rest of the system accordingly. On p. 89 **nihonjiron* could be result of a misprint but it appears twice there (it could also be a typical computer-copying error; it should be *nihonjinron* 日本人論).

Languages treated in the book share astonishingly many features with numerous African languages (like e.g. tone, serial words, isolating nature, numeral classifiers and generally grammaticalized classification of surrounding reality, etc.); it is a pity that it remained unmentioned. This reviewer could only praise Goddard’s attitude and approach towards the writing systems of the area, especially the written languages – indeed, many written languages of the region never actually were even intended to be spoken! But even here, some flaws occur – for instance, the Chinese-type writing system is a bit less unique than the text would suggest: at least one more such system with even more complicated characters than Chinese (moreover, a product of not development but original language planning: the script was created on orders of the emperor) was in use through several centuries, namely Tangut (Xixia 西夏 in Chinese).

As a handbook, Goddard’s work has been well designed but even in this respect minor cases of carelessness (probably unavoidable) could be detected. To exemplify: if e.g. Hmong examples appear on p. 7 and remarks on tone notation in Hmong come not earlier than on p. 14, then at least a three-word reference would be in place.

It still remains unclear to me how useful the handbook will be – and to whom it is addressed (Masayoshi Shibatani is here in a far better situation: he calls the book (back jacket) “a long-overdue introduction to the languages of the Pacific Rim Asia” – at least in part mistakably. But I am sure that teaching certain subjects will be easier: it is a mine of examples from really numerous and diverse languages skillfully collected in one not very thick volume constituting a handy tool to comfort teachers of linguistics. Teachers with no previous experience or touch with Asian languages will be now in a much better position to broaden and enrich their courses, while those “with background” will always be in the position to use Goddard’s material with their own comments and interpretations. A full evaluation and possible appreciation of the book will be possible in a few years from now.