REVIEWS

There are many introductions to logic. Hitherto, however, there has been no introduction written specifically for students of linguistics. Twenty years ago, this would not have mattered. Over the last ten years, however, proponents of both generative and interpretative semantics have recognized that grammars of natural language must include a level of logical form in something like the traditional sense. At the same time, logicians like Montague (Thomason 1974) and Cresswell (1973) have applied logical concepts to new areas of language. In this situation, it is important that students of linguistics should have an understanding of various aspects of logic. There is, then, an obvious need here. On the whole, Allwood, Andersson and Dahl (hereafter A., A. and D.) meet this need quite well. They discuss all the main areas of logic, and, although their discussion is a little sketchy in one or two places, they provide a generally clear and well-organized account of the central notions. The main weakness of the book is its failure to take up a number of questions about logic that are of central importance for linguists.

After some introductory remarks in chapter 1, A., A. and D. proceed in chapter 2 to a discussion of set theory. They provide a lucid account of the basic concepts which they are able to draw on when characterizing various logical notions in subsequent chapters. Then, in chapter 3, they introduce the subject matter of logic with a discussion of deductive inference and logical form. They also provide a useful introduction to such basic concepts as propositions, possible worlds, and analytic truth.

In chapter 4, A., A. and D. discuss propositional calculus, and, in chapter 5, they consider predicate calculus. The former is quite good. A., A. and D. take the wise step in a book aimed at linguistics students of using tree diagrams to display the structure of formulae of propositional calculus. Also of note is their consideration of the possibility that the semantic differences between the connectives of propositional calculus and their analogues in natural language can be accounted for in Gricean terms. Chapter 5 is less satisfactory. It contains a number of unclear formulations. A., A. and D. suggest, for example, that predicate logic is concerned not with "logical relations that hold between sentences" but with relations "that hold within sentences". In fact, however, both propositional and predicate calculus are concerned with logical relations that hold between sentences, but predicate calculus is concerned with relations that depend on aspects of meaning that are ignored by propositional calculus. A further weakness of this chapter is its failure to consider the differences between the quantifiers of predicate calculus and their natural language analogues. Again, Gricean considerations appear relevant. See' for example, Horn (1973). This chapter concludes with a useful discussion of the logic of relations.

In chapter 6, A., A. and D. discuss the idea of a deductive system, and illustrate various kinds of deductive inference. They rightly stress the fact that deductive arguments in ordinary conversation involve hidden premisses and unstated steps. They might have noted here Labov's elegant demonstration of the way that colloquial speech can

involve much greater logical complexity than what is apparently much more sophisticated discourse (Labov 1969). In chapter 7, A., A. and D. provide a useful outline of the basic notions of modal logic. They also consider de dicto/de re ambiguities and the questions of specificity and opacity. They conclude the chapter with some remarks on tense logic.

In chapter 8, A., A. and D. outline the basic notions of categorial grammar and intensional logic. This is a particularly valuable part of the book. A., A. and D. might have noted with Lewis (1972) that a categorial grammar does not have to have N and S as its basic categories, and they could have noted that concatenation need not be the only mode of combination. Nevertheless, this is a clear and concise introduction to issues which, in view of the development of Montague Grammar and related ideas, are of considerable importance.

In chapter 9, A., A. and D. discuss some extensions of standard logic, such as iota and lambda operators. Then, in chapter 10, they conclude their discussion with some remarks on the place of logic in linguistics. Among other things, they suggest here that we can regard meanings as extension-determining principles. It is worth noting that this view is a debatable one. In the work discussed in Fodor (1975), Hilary Putnam has argued that the meaning of a predicate determines at most its putative extension and that whether this is its real extension is at the mercy of empirical discoveries. The argument is a plausible one.

Observations about the place of logic in linguistics are scattered throughout this book. There are, however, a number of important questions which are not taken up. Firstly, there is the question of how inferences like that from (1) to (2), which do not depend on any so-called logical words, should be accounted for.

(1) Sam is a bachelor.
(2) Sam is unmarried.

One way to account for them is to assume a system of meaning postulates. Another is to assume that lexical items are decomposed in logical form. The merits of these two approaches have received considerable discussion. See, for example, Lakoff (1972a), Katz and Nagel (1974) and Fodor, Fodor and Garrett (1975). Secondly, there is the question of how vagueness should be handled. Lakoff (1972b) argues that it necessitates a many-valued logic. Katz and Bever (1976) disagree. Finally, there is the question of naturaness. Unlike logicians, linguists are interested in a system of logic which is natural in the sense that its formulae are as much like syntactic structures as possible. It follows, as Keenan (1972) observes, that unrestricted quantification is unacceptable. It also follows that a unified account of proper names and quantifiers like that of Montague is desirable (see Cooper 1977). All these issues merit some attention.

I think, then, that this book has its weaknesses and limitations. It also has considerable merits, however, as I have indicated. There may well be better books written on this subject, but this is not at all a bad book. If used intelligently, it should ensure that students are not frightened off by work that employs logical concepts, and equally important, that they are not unduly impressed.

REFERENCES

Bever, T. G., Katz, J. J. and D. T. Langendoen. (eds). 1976. *An integrated theory of linguistic behaviour*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
Cooper, R. 1977. Review of Thomason (1974). *Language 53*. 895—910.
Cresswell, M. J. 1973. *Logics and languages*. London: Methuen.

Davidson, D. and G. Harman. (eds). 1972. *Semantics of natural language*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
Fodor, J. A. 1975. *The language of thought*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
Fodor, J. A., Fodor, J. D. and M. F. Garrett. 1975. "The psychological unreality of semantic representations". *Linguistic inquiry 6*. 515—532.
Horn, L. R. 1973. "Greek Grice: A brief survey of proto-conversational rules in the history of logic". *CLS 9*. 205—218.
Katz, J. J. and T. G. Bever. 1976. "The fall and rise of empiricism". In Bever, T. G., Katz, J. J. and D. T. Langendoen. (eds). 1976. 11—64.
Katz, J. J. and R. Nagel. 1974. "Meaning postulates and semantic theory". *Foundations of language 11*. 311—340.
Keenan, E. L. 1972. "On semantically based grammar". *Linguistic inquiry 3*. 413—462.
Labov, W. 1969. "The logic of non-standard English". *Georgetown monographs on language and linguistics 22*. 1—31.
Lakoff, G. 1972a. "Linguistics and natural logic". In Davidson, D. and G. Harman. (eds). 1972. 545—665.
Lakoff, G. 1972b. "Hedges: a study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts". *CLS 8*. 183—228.
Lewis, D. 1972. "General semantics". In Davidson, D. and G. Harman. (eds). 1972. 169—218.
Thomason, R. H. (ed.). 1974. *Formal philosophy: selected papers of Richard Montague*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

A study in generative historical linguistics. By Mirosław Nowakowski. Pp. 122. Poznań Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1978.
Reviewed by Christopher Greene, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

This monograph was written as the author's Ph. D. dissertation and submitted in 1973. As he himself points out in the Preface, written in 1976, this means that everything produced in this field since then is excluded. He regrets in particular the omission of "a second stage of what has been discussed here as the variation theory of language change" by which he means the work of "notably E. Closs-Traugott, D. Bickerton, J. Dore, E. V. Clark and N. Baron... trying to combine the two most fascinating areas of language study nowadays, namely sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics" (p.5). One should also note that post-1973 criticisms of generative historical linguistics (e.g. Anttila (1975) for an extreme form) could not be taken into account either.

The book falls into three parts: in Section One the author outlines what he feels a theory of change must be like and from this angle provides a critique of generative and variation theories of change; Section Two contains a discussion of the processes of nominalization set against the theoretical background of Section One and illustrated by a discussion of Old English nominal compounds; there follows an appendix which lists, without much discussion but rather exhaustively, types of word-formation in Old English including prefixational, suffixational and zero-derivational types. I shall have no more to say about the appendix as the meat of the work lies in the first two sections, but it stands alone as a fascinating collection of examples of these processes and makes a very tasty sauce which amply repays 'dipping'.

In Section One, Nowakowski introduces his view that we must develop an adequate theory of language before we can have a proper theory of language change, whose job is limited to 'explaining' questions arising from Rational Problems (why languages change of necessity), General Problems (whether and how the set of possible changes is limited)

and Historical Problems (data). The latter, it seems, are subordinate to the other two (p. 10). In these terms he examines the success (or lack of it) of generative theories of change. It is his feeling that these theories contradict the theory of language they are based on: "what King and Closs call a generative theory of change is either not 'generative' (unless the term is to have some specific meaning, thus the theory is not inter-subjectively testable) or not a theory at all (as internally inconsistent with GG theory in general)". He rejects the theory that theories of change can bear on a theory of language and is thus opposed to the position of Paul that "history must be acknowledged even in a synchronic grammar" (quote from Anttila 1975) and that of Kiparsky that language-change is a window on linguistic competence (Kiparsky 1968:174). For Nowakowski a theory of change can only come from the comparison of two or more synchronic grammars constructed on the basis of an adequate theory of language (differentiation in time of two definite states $L - L_1$). "The process of differentiation of two indefinite states $L -$ non-L in social and geographical space and possibly in time" is dismissed as leading to theories of variation, not of change (p. 36).

The homogeneity hypothesis is accepted as "a working hypothesis for a theory of change" (p. 13) in spite of the fact that he asks explicitly and incisively why ideal speaker-listeners should accept innovations and mutations in a homogeneous community (p. 14). He quotes with great approval a metatheoretical condition postulated by Kruszewski (1883:57—8) to the effect that "a sound system is roughly identical for all the individuals within a given dialect and period of time"; unless Kruszewski had a definition of 'dialect' that excluded 'sound system', it is difficult to see the relevance of this perfectly circular statement. Because of his position on these points, however, when it comes to discussing Competence, Nowakowski has to rule out of discussion our awareness of different dialects (pp. 16—17).

On page 18 the question is raised of what a generative grammar of a dead language is. By writing such grammars, says Nowakowski, we equate dead and living languages and decide that GG will treat, say, Old English as any other language "in the sense that the intuitions of the native speaker of this language are restricted by identical innate predispositions as the intuitions of a speaker of any other language". So far so good; this is just another way of stating the Uniformitarian Principle without which no science of reconstruction can progress very far. But Nowakowski goes on to say, "Thus (sic), never will a theory of change be explanatory in the sense of Chomsky (1965 : 24—7)". One might quibble as to whether there was any a priori reason to expect the two types of explanation to be the same animal, but the real reason for quoting this passage is as an illustration of the rather frequent short cuts in argumentation in the monograph.

Having established his position, Nowakowski then goes on to examine various schools and individuals that have proposed theories of change within a generative framework and concludes that none satisfy his requirements. He notes in particular that TG is too powerful, both for synchronic (p. 27) and for diachronic studies (p. 32). Rather surprisingly for such a wide-ranging review, certain notable critics and criticisms are missing. For example, Anttila's name does not appear at all in the bibliography of roughly 140 items and some important, critical reviews of major works, such as Campbell (1971), do not seem to have been drawn on.

The author turns next to the variation theories of e.g. Weinreich et al. (1968) and Bailey (1973), which was available to the author in a preliminary version. Unfortunately, Nowakowski's position leads him into difficulties in treating variation theories on their own terms. Since, for him, a theory of change comes from comparing static, homogeneous grammars of synchronic stages, variation theories are attacked for being unable to supply the raw material for such a study. Clearly, such an attack is futile, as these theories

make no pretence of doing so. It is as if, having criticised blurry pictures of a point on a hillside, he goes on to castigate a cine-film for not giving a clear, static picture of the spot as it pans across.

So, clearly, the discussion of nominalization in Section Two is to be synchronic and here again the lack of revision is to be regretted: in the Preface, Nowakowski explicitly mentions Jackendoff's work and though this account is set firmly in the derivational (generative) semantics framework, it would have been interesting to see whether such a broad mass of data as Nowakowski brings to bear would support or weaken the proposals made in Jackendoff's work on the lexicon, for example (1975).

Nowakowski's position is that nominalization is a transformation which takes place in the lexicon before lexical insertion: furthermore, there is no difference between semantic and syntactic relationships or processes. In particular, all nouns have a binary structure at some level which he wants to say is predicate and argument. One factor he quotes in support of this position is Rozwadowski's claim (1904 : 24) that "almost every word in the IE family of languages may be reduced to a binary structure of the form: root + affix". This interesting claim is rather spoiled in this work by the presence in the appendix, and hence presumably in Nowakowski's analysis, of zero-derivational processes which make the claim trivial — another gap in argumentation.

The treatment of case, which Nowakowski wants to introduce as, it seems, inherent in the predicate and argument of the underlying forms, is very skimpy. In a European monograph it is strange that only Fillmore's work is considered and that without any real discussion. Nowakowski feels he is close to the "traditional notions of nomina loci, nomina instrumenti, nomina agentis, nomina acti and actionis" (p. 75) but names no "traditional" authors for the reader to refer to. Since case is fairly central to his categorization of non-linking nominalizations, it is a pity that he did not discuss the work of other linguists interested in case such as Hjelmslev, or more recent localist work, e.g. Anderson (1971).

Nominal compounds are divided into linking and non-linking processes. The latter are divided into 26 subtypes according to the cases of the underlying predicate and argument. It is not easy to see with such a plethora of types how a grammar can assign particular compounds. Let us take one example. sæ þeof (sea thief) is listed as +Loc +Ag and gold þeof as +Obj +Ag; now one presumes that both mounted robbers and horse thieves, or both boat-borne thieves and boat stealers were concepts that Old English speakers might have needed but in Nowakowski's account it is not clear on what principles the compounds would be chosen nor whether ambiguity can be tolerated or whether different compounds would be coined. This, however, is not necessarily an objection in principle, although one can't help feeling that such a list is more a taxonomy (with the principles not fully discussed to boot) than the descriptively adequate account the author claims to provide.

In summary then, this monograph contains a wide-ranging discussion on problems in historical linguistics, a detailed account of the author's views on nominalization in general and the processes involved in Old English in particular, along with an absorbing collection of data. As such, the time gap between writing and publishing is only to be regretted. A graver weakness is the occasional short cut in argumentation which leads to a lack of clarity, thus lessening the value of the theoretical sections to outsiders.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. 1971. *The grammar of case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Anttila, R. 1975. "Was there a generative historical linguistics?" In Dahlstedt, K.-H. (ed.). 1975. 70—92.

Bach, E. and R. T. Harms. (eds). 1968. *Universals in linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bailey, C.-J. N. 1973. *Variation and linguistic theory*. Arlington: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Campbell, L. 1971. "Review of King, *Historical linguistics and generative grammar*". *Language* 47. 191—209.

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Dahlstedt, K.-H. (ed.). 1975. *The Nordic languages and general linguistics 2* (Proceedings of the second international conference of Nordic and general linguistics, 1973). Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Jackendoff, R. 1975. "Morphological and syntactic regularities in the lexicon". *Language* 51. 639—671.

Kiparsky, P. 1968. "Linguistic universals and linguistic change". In Bach, E. and R. T. Harms. (eds). 1968. 171—204.

Kruszewski, M. 1883. "Zarys nauki o języku". In Kruszewski, M. 1967. 47—150.

Kruszewski, M. 1967. *Wybór pism*. Z przedmowami J. Kuryłowicza i R. Jakobsona. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Lehman, W. P. and Y. Malkiel. (eds). 1968. *Directions for historical linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Rozwadowski, J. M. 1904. "Słowotwórstwo i znaczenie wyrazów. Studium nad ich podstawowymi prawami". In Rozwadowski, J. M. 1960. 21—95.

Rozwadowski, J. M. 1960. *Wybór pism*. Tom III: *Językoznawstwo ogólne*. Warszawa: PWN.

Weinreich, U., Labov, W. and H. Herzog. 1968. "Empirical foundations for a theory of language change". In Lehman, W. P. and Y. Malkiel. (eds). 1968. 97—195.

A reference grammar for students of English. By R. A. Close. Pp. 342. London: Longman, 1975.

Reviewed by Elżbieta Mańczak, The Jagellonian University of Cracow.

A reference grammar for students of English, beginning with R. A. Close's *Preface*, is basically organized into two parts. The first part (pp. 1—106) presents how an English sentence is constructed and how it may be expanded or condensed. The second part (pp. 107—297) deals with the detail, i.e. with the description of eight traditionally recognized parts of speech. The difference in the proportion of space allotted to the two parts results from their contents. This is followed by two appendices, bibliography, and a very detailed index.

The primary purpose of the book is to serve as a textbook for advanced foreign learners of English grammar. The author aims at providing all necessary information concerning grammatical usage, which he explains as follows in the *Preface*:

> With the rapid advance of linguistic science, there has been a revolution in English grammar. 'Traditional' grammar is now considered to be obsolete, to have been forced into a mould originally intended for Latin, and to be dominated by dogma about what should and should not be said. New theories, or 'models', of grammar are constantly being developed. Yet the facts of English usage remain; and people need to know what the facts are.

Therefore the author objectively assesses and summarizes the main points of the usage of contemporary English. This is mostly presented in the light of traditional grammar; however, some innovations from structural or generative-transformational approaches are introduced, e.g. the term of 'a slot' in a paradigm (p. 6) or the concept of creativity, which is indirectly mentioned on pp. 67—8. But *A reference grammar for students of*

English is more than a textbook, since, as its title suggests, it may also be used as a book of reference. Particularly, Part I is organized in such a way that a reader may turn to it since it is much easier to detect a desired piece of information in the book under discussion than in some other grammar books, like e.g. in R. W. Zandvoort's *A handbook of English grammar*, where the author constantly refers the reader to the preceding or following paragraphs.

The book is comprehensive, detailed but brief. The wealth of detail becomes evident if we compare the discussion e.g. of the passive voice in R. A. Close (pp. 227—31) with that in A. J. Thomson and A. V. Martinet's *A practical English grammar for foreign students* (pp. 201—2). The latter is confined only to the presentation of the form and the use of the passive voice, whereas the former besides giving the same kind of information supplements it with all the verb patterns that may occur in the passive voice, which is quite useful for practical application. Besides, the reviewed book should also be praised for the fact that no grammatical problem is illustrated by more than one example, which again results in economy of space. The number of details in such a condensed manner is laudable and it constitutes one of the principal values of the book.

As has already been mentioned, first R. A. Close describes an English sentence. Such an approach is probably a right choice, since it seems to be more logical to discuss a sentence in a general way and only later to describe its constituents. However, it would have increased the value of the book enormously if the first chapter, entitled "Constructing the sentence", were reduced to a few remarks connected with the construction of an English sentence and to a well-presented discussion of different types of English sentences, which it does in fact. Anyhow, the author decided to present some pieces of information about each constituent of a sentence, which, later on, is enlarged in Part II while discussing respective parts of speech at length, e.g. as far as nouns are concerned the discussion of their plural is first found on pp. 6—7 (Part I) and then the information on the irregular plural is presented on pp. 112—16 (Part II). The suggested reduction of the content of Chapter I would result in a more clear organization of the material which R. A. Close discusses.

Occasionally, some minor inconsistencies are found in the book, e.g. on the one hand R. A. Close rightly suggests that modern terminology should be followed and the present and past participles should be called the *-ing* participle and the *-ed* participle, respectively (p. 12), but on the other hand on the same page and on the following ones (e.g. p. 13), he uses the old terminology, i.e. the present and past participles.

Moreover, *A reference grammar for students of English* still deserves a few comments on specific points:

(1) R. A. Close claims that in the case of defining relative clauses with personal antecedent *who* or *that* or nothing can be used (p. 52); however, he does not mention the cases when *that* should obligatorily be applied. He writes only about the use of *that* instead of *who* in the case of defining relative clauses with non-personal antecedent (pp. 53—4). Similarly, it should have been noted that *that* must occur in defining relative clauses with personal antecedent in the following contexts:

> after superlatives; all, any, only; it is
> (Allen 1957:220).

(2) Although the book is sufficiently exhaustive, R. A. Close occasionally omits some points when giving certain directions how to use a given category, e.g. in the case of the occurrence of the indefinite article (pp. 129—30), he does not mention all the possibilities, such as the fact that *a/an* is used when an abstract noun is qualified by an adjective (e.g. *a pitiful state of mind*) or when a plural noun has a singular meaning (e.g. *a headquarters*), etc.

(3) It would have been better to formulate a rule when *the* is part of the name of a country than to provide an incomplete list of such items (p. 136). Such a rule is, among others, found in Ward (1967 : 104):

> If the names of countries contain either a preposition or the words Kingdom, State(s), Union, or Republic, *the* is used.

Despite these critical remarks, I still think that the book is very useful for learners of English due to its careful explanation and exemplification of the facts of English grammar and it should be particularly recommended to students of English philology.

REFERENCES

Allen, W. S. 1957. *Living English structure*. London: Longmans.
Thomson, A. J. and A. V. Martinet. 1967. *A practical English grammar for foreign students*. London: Oxford University Press.
Ward, J. M. 1967. *Peculiarities in English grammar*. London: Longmans.
Zandvoort, R. W. 1967. *A handbook of English grammar*. London: Longmans.

The US federal system of government. By Elżbieta Ryszka. Pp. 125. Warszawa: PWN, 1977.

Reviewed by Zbigniew Lewicki, University of Warsaw.

Courses in American life and institutions are now a part of the curriculum of English Institutes in Poland and while this is not an altogether new development, the new organizational framework requires an appropriate handbook. Elżbieta Ryszka's recent publication, *The US federal system of government*, is meant to fill the gap and provide students with a handy compendium for the course.

The scope of the book is not limited to what the title indicates. First of all, the regrettable absence of history courses from the curriculum forces the teachers of American life and institutions to include some basic historical information in their course, which in turn was one of the reasons for including the chapters on *The origin of American national government* and *The birth of the United States* in the book. While these chapters are well-organized and interesting, they nevertheless stand apart from the rest of the book. It is a pity, since on the whole *The US federal system of government* is exceptionally well-balanced and unbiased: the specific American system of government is not easy to explain to foreign students and Mrs. Ryszka has undoubtedly done an excellent job.

This said, let me point to a few problems whose treatment could be somewhat improved in future editions of the handbook. First of all the book, while attempting at maximum objectivity, seems to be too preoccupied with what certainly was the main political topic of the time it was written: the Watergate scandal. It was no doubt a major political event, yet in a book concerned with the structure of American government it should have been treated as no more than an incidental phenomenon: after all, Mrs. Ryszka does not discuss the Teapot Dome scandal. The space thus saved could have been devoted to a longer discussion of the question of governmental interventionism, which is now only mentioned but which is undoubtedly more important to the relationship between the US government and the people. Similarly, a discussion of what happened to the original texts of the *Constitution* and the *Declaration of Independence* does not really seem to be of much importance, while the book does not explain the procedure on which new states joined the USA after 1776.

In a book this scope and length it is very difficult to avoid factual errors, yet this is what Mrs. Ryszka actually manages to achieve. The only major inexactitude I found (and it appears in many similar publications) concerns the American national anthem. Though "The Star-Spangled Banner" was officially approved as the American anthem not earlier, however, than in 1931, several other songs, such as "God Bless America", "Hail Columbia", or even "Yankee Doodle", are frequently referred to as "national songs" and played on official occasions.

are reliable, some sections of it could be made more clear. For example, Gerald Ford is certainly given undue credit for his influence upon the office of the President; the explanation of the "patronage system" could be amended by saying that Presidents frequently appoint not their own but Senators' protégés in return for future support; the discussion of the inter-relation between the three branches of government could be made somewhat more realistic by mentioning the fact that President Eisenhower tried to "help" Chief Justice Warren reach the verdict in *Brown vs. Board of Education* and when the Supreme Court decision went the other way, he never spoke to Warren again; the discussion of the Congressional functions should also include the fact that the Congress, rather than courts, makes the final decision in cases of doubtful results of Congressional elections (as it did in 1974 when some voting machines were malfunctioning in New Hampshire); it was also misleading to refer to the President as the "chief" of his party while no mention was made of the office of National Chairman. The electoral system discussed in the last section of the book is not explained too clearly and the single-member district system is unnecessarily made more complicated by including the factor of the state over-all election results: in fact, there is no relation here and a party can in theory get all the seats but one with less than 50% of the votes. Similarly, it may be strongly misleading for the students to come across a sentence like: "Congress now has one Representative for about half-a-million people; and one Senator for over two million people" because — as it is in fact explained elsewhere in the book — while Representatives are assigned to states on the population basis, Senators, obviously enough, are not. Finally, while the Watergate scandal is discussed at length, it is nowhere mentioned that a grand jury named President Nixon an indicted co-conspirator, which is and will remain the only legal charge against him.

Most of these are relatively minor points and should not obscure the fact that *The US federal system of government* is a very good handbook. Its greatest asset lies probably in the fact that Mrs. Ryszka provides a historically dynamic picture of the problems she discusses, and that various elements of the structure are shown both at their creation in the 18th century and during their changes and development up to our times when their shape is frequently different from what the Founding Fathers meant them to be. Such treatment is in fact more important than the historical outline mentioned before as it cannot be readily found in manuals of American history. Mrs. Ryszka is also a very keen observer of the contemporary political scene and her discussion of recent changes in the "seniority rule" is one of many such examples.

Mrs. Ryszka makes an extensive use of American and Polish sources, but at the same time provides her own vision of the problems she deals with. For instance, her discussion of the roles the President plays is very interesting and is certainly a valuable contribution to the complex problem of the American Presidency.

On the whole, *The US federal system of government* provides a full and multilateral picture of the American power structure and as such will certainly be useful not only to students but also to all scholars interested in American studies.