

REVIEWS

Modern phonology. By Alan H. Sommerstein. Pp. 282. London: Arnold, 1977.
Reviewed by Elżbieta Górska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Since the author does not state directly what the purpose of his book is and for whom it has been written, or what underlies the choice of the material, it seems justified to postpone answering these questions after a short discussion of the content.

The first chapter of the book is entitled "Aims and principles". It does not deal with the aims and principles recognized by the author but by phonological theories in general. Here the distinction is drawn between classical and generative phonology. It becomes clear that the two differ in theoretical assumptions, methods of analysis and ways of verifying their descriptions. The author rightly stresses the fact that the new problem brought into light by generative school is how the structure of the innate mechanism for learning a language can be accounted for through a study of linguistic universals. Yet, having shown that the two approaches to phonology differ in many points, he closes the discussion with a rather surprising statement that a good classical phonemic analysis may have "as much explanatory power as the rules of a generative analysis" (p. 15). This seems like imposing the aims of one school upon the other.

The title of the book is *Modern phonology*. It seems right to ask what the adjective "modern" covers here. Modern times for phonology start in the 1920s (Chapter 2) with the phonemic analyses developed in Prague and in America (the reader is warned, however, that the idea of phonemic contrast goes as far as the second century B. C.). There, the greatest attention is given to the American structuralism and only some differences with the Prague approach are stressed. First the criteria for grouping various types of phones into smaller classes are presented. And it is already at this place that the way in which the material in Ch. 2 has been organized reveals its weak point. The author makes it clear that there are, for example, different possibilities of dealing with the problem of non-uniqueness of voiceless unaspirated stops in English when after /s/ (p. 23). Yet it is not till the end of the chapter that the reader learns why Prague School has introduced here an archiphoneme. Similarly, it becomes obvious that various criteria can be used for establishing phonemic level (when the phoneme is understood as a class of sounds) of e.g. English phonological system and that not infrequently they are in conflict (the status of /h/, long vowels, affricates). But the fact that the choice of the criteria is to a large extent determined by the aims of distributional structuralism is not made explicit enough at the moment when the analysis is presented. It is not till the last subchapter (2.4.) that the reader learns that the American School was primarily concerned with the classification of observable data of a language. In much the same manner, the fact that American descriptivists doubted the observational status of the allophonic level and that this led to phonological systems of a language consisting of a list of phonemes "without making any statement about their allophones or about their phonetic characteristics" (p. 46) is discussed not sooner as the comparison of the American and Prague approach is dealt with. This could have given quite a different perspective on the importance of the criteria presented at the beginning of this chapter.

The author mentions also some contributions of Prague School to the development

of general phonology (e.g. the emphasis on the phonic matter, the study of phonological oppositions, the idea of archiphoneme). Here again the author is not very much concerned with what underlies the solutions proposed by Prague School. The fact that phonological oppositions were of primary importance since they served well in accounting for functional relatedness of sounds is not given its proper wording.

A brief outline of classical morphophonemics is presented (pp. 41-45) but since its exposition covers analyses done within American School it seems right to remind the reader that the idea of morphophoneme has its origins in the "morphoneme" of Prague School.

Chapter 3 on prosodic phonology is written in quite a different manner. The discussion of smeared features shows that they were not adequately held by classical phonology and it prepares the reader for the fact that this phenomenon is of primary importance to prosodic phonology. The links of the latter with long component analyses done in America are mentioned as well. It is demonstrated that prosodic phonology originated to a large extent as an opposition to classical phonology, i.e. it gave non-linear, non-segmental descriptions. This, on the other hand, reflects one of the aims of prosodic phonology to "integrate syntagmatic and paradigmatic statement(s) in a single unified description" (p. 55). The reasons for the abandonment of the classical phonemic level are also explained. Theoretical assumptions of the school are discussed and later illustrated by a prosodic analysis of monosyllabic utterances of the form CVC in English. Finally, the author comments on some weak points of the prosodic approach, such as numerous repetitions (caused, for example, by the tendency to posit distinct systems) or complexity of exponence statements.

Stratificational phonology is the next modern phonology to be discussed. The author draws attention to basic assumptions of SG and explains clearly that they directly follow from the view of language recognized by this theory. The structure of phonemic stratum is presented as well as the examples of relationships typical of the level and formal devices to represent them. It is also shown how the evaluation of alternative descriptions is carried out by the simplicity criterion. Examples of stratificational description of word initial clusters beginning with an obstruent and of velar softening in English are given. The author points out that although SG is still only a theoretical model not much tested (yet testable), it has already revealed certain drawbacks. Some of them seem to be caused by the fact that formal simplicity is treated as the only evaluation measure. One can observe here that this criterion, though used to evaluate quite different descriptions, appeared to be misleading in the theory considered later, namely, in generative phonology.

The theoretical assumptions of generative phonology are preceded by the presentation of the development of the feature theory (Chapter 5). The author is mainly concerned with modifications of the feature theory done after the appearance of *SPÉ*. The discussion makes it clear that the feature theory is in a state of flux. The position accepted by the author is illustrated with an example of classificatory matrix (p. 112). One of the major changes as compared to *SPÉ* is the multinary feature of height. This exemplifies the author's dissatisfaction with the *SPE* treatment of the binarity hypothesis. Some arguments against it are provided but the consequences of the acceptance of both binary and multinary (as well as complex) features for the evaluation measure are not even mentioned. This is quite understandable since without prior presentation of the basic assumptions of generative phonology such a discussion should not have taken place. The point is, however, that the binarity hypothesis is a part of the theory and it seems that both the empirical evidence for and against it should be considered together with its role in the model.

The fact that the exposition of the *SPE* system is preceded by the discussion of the feature development after *SPE* has also some unfortunate consequences for the clarity of the presentation of the *SPE* theory itself (Chapter 6). Its main assumptions and methods of analysis are often illustrated with the use of features not found in *SPE* but with those that have been accepted by the author (e.g. multinary feature of height; continuant treated as a complex feature; [\pm apical]). Though all the differences are pointed out, it seems that it is difficult for the reader to learn what was in *SPE* itself and what was after it. Besides, this appears to be inconsistent with the aim of the chapter which is "to describe the theory as it is presented in *SPE*" (p. 114). Since a lot has changed after 1968, the purpose as stated above turns out very difficult to obtain. Thus, on one hand, the syllable boundary is not discussed in this chapter because "it is not referred to at all in *SPE*" (p. 144); mirror image convention, however, is not only presented but also used in connection with various phenomena (e.g. Rule 149 in the subchapter on rule ordering). I would like to state it clearly that the author explains that, for example, mirror-image was introduced after *SPE*. I am trying to suggest only that a different organization of the material would have been more conducive to clearness and would have added to the value of the chapter.

In the rest of the book the author presents some problems which generative phonology has faced after *SPE*. Various solutions put forward since 1968 are discussed. The first area of controversy covers distinct modes of application of the same rule to a given underlying form and interdependences among rules in the same derivation (Chapter 7). In the case of the former, four types of rule application are presented (two simultaneous applications: once and only and iterative; two directional: left-to-right and right-to-left). None of this is universal. A new universal principle of rule application proposed by Anderson (1974) is mentioned but its validity is not tested.

The problems of ordering of rules in a derivation start with the discussion of one ordering paradox raised against the *SPE* notion of linear ordering. Alternative hypotheses to the latter are given. One of them, partial ordering hypothesis, is the author's own proposal and it is proved that it can account for all data that can be handled by another hypothesis, namely, local ordering (cf. Anderson 1974). An example is given that can be explained by the former but not by the latter. Some French data (p. 187), however, cannot be dealt with by partial ordering or local ordering. Here one must disagree with the author's reluctance to accept syntactic conditions on phonological rules or to recognize lexical exceptions. Though not very attractive, these solutions are sometimes unavoidable in phonology.

Evidence is also given to prove that the proposal of no-extrinsic ordering should be ruled out, yet it is suggested that the universal principle of Proper Inclusion inherent in this hypothesis is of great value to the phonological theory. The principle, however, is very similar in nature to the Elsewhere Condition and the two can be combined into a single one, i.e. Stiffing. Finally, the need for global constraints in phonology is discussed.

It is worth noticing that the Principle of Natural Order applied to pairs of rules with respect to a concrete form (i.e. local ordering) has revealed a great predictive power in analyses of Polish and English data (cf. Rubach, forthcoming).

The solutions presented in the chapter leave no doubt that the problems of rule application are still open. One can note here that a similar conclusion can be drawn from a detailed discussion of rule application by Goyvaerts (1978).

The author believes that some problems are caused by the fact that surface phonotactics and the syllable have been disregarded by standard GP (Chapter 8). In order to account for the functional relatedness of rules for which standard GP has no formal

apparatus, the author puts forward a theory of phonotactic motivation. It is assumed that morpheme structure conditions are redundant and that the principles of phonological well-formedness are related to phonetic representations (p. 196). Yet, when arguing for tactive rules to apply to phonetic representations, only the creativity of the process of perception is considered, i.e. according to the author, tactive rules are used when "a speaker hears a form that does not already belong to his vocabulary" (p. 196). One may wonder, however, how in this situation the creativity in the process of production can be explained. The argument presented seems to imply that a native speaker can judge well-formedness of his own hypothetical form after he has already produced it, i.e. there is nothing to stop his *trials* except the actual *error* violating surface phonotactic constraints. This suggests that we should hear (and produce) a great number of phonologically ill-formed words, which seems not to be the case. One can observe that even if the problems and inadequacies enumerated by the author were solved, the implications of the theory of phonotactic motivation on the model of GP could not be escaped easily.

The fact that the syllable has been abandoned by standard GP is said to be another source of controversies. Yet one cannot agree with the author's statement that the syllable was not used in GP only for the reason that its definition could not be given. Let me repeat here after Hyman (1975 : 192) that "one argument which has been raised against phonological syllables is that, unlike segments, the location of syllable boundary within a morpheme can never be phonemic". What seems important is that, according to the author of the book under review, there is evidence for the phonological treatment of syllable boundaries. So the disagreement is caused rather by the interpretation of the data and not only by the lack of the satisfactory definition of the syllable in standard GP.

Whatever the reasons, the introduction of the syllable, as the author rightly stresses, requires various modifications of GP. Let me observe only that the cost of the syllable boundary should be somehow built into the evaluation measure and that this will certainly have some effect on the status of other boundaries.

Three areas of phonological theory that still call for re-examination (understood as a tendency to constrain phonological rules) are discussed in Chapter 9. The first of them covers the types of rules that are to be recognized by the phonological theory. The author argues for the trichotomy of rules, i.e. morpholexical, morphophonemic, phonetic, and makes it clear that further investigation is necessary to validate his proposal. One can notice that the problems tackled here are only indirectly connected with a general trend to constrain phonological rules. They refer rather to the organization of the phonological component. Yet it is obvious that by postulating three kinds of rules, each with distinct characteristics, the power of the phonological rule of the standard GP-type is considerably reduced.

Other proposals that follow constrain phonological rules in an indirect manner as well. Their main purpose is to limit the abstractness of underlying representations. Yet there is no doubt that the conditions on possible abstract representations narrow the scope of phonological rules. The importance of the presented solutions to the abstractness controversy for standard GP is stressed (numerous references to other proposals are given; for a detailed discussion of Alternation Condition based on Polish data, the reader may consult also Rubach (forthcoming)). It is clearly stated that they speak for re-examination of standard theory and that no final agreement on possible abstract representations has been reached so far.

Natural phonology is also treated as a tendency to constrain phonological rules. A concise outline of this approach is given. It is viewed as an attempt to find some general principles from which "numerous and complex principles of phonological rule

plausibility" (p. 227) can be derived. The discussion starts with the *SPE* theory of markedness, through its later development in a form of a fixed universal set of natural rules, to finish with a brief presentation of Natural Phonology. One can observe that natural phonology (in a broad sense) constrains phonological rules by limiting the number of natural processes.

From what has been just mentioned it should become apparent that the author presents different ways of constraining the phonological rule. Though the discussions put forward in the chapter are very useful as they stand, one may only regret that there is no conclusion being made about the way in which the phonological component works, i.e. any change in one of its parts is crucial for others, hence the same descriptive tendency may be expressed in a very distinct, often indirect manner.

This characteristic feature of a way language functions becomes especially prominent when we look at historical changes. Here one must welcome the discussion of phonological changes given in the last chapter of the book. The author strongly stresses the fact that "it is probably rare for a single change to result from a single factor" (p. 224). Various types of phonological changes are presented (such as restructuring of underlying representations, addition, loss or simplification of a rule) and it is made clear that they are introduced to the language for complex reasons (here a few proposals of possible directions of change are given) and that their effects on a language are not to be isolated. One may observe only that the same applies to any linguistic description if it is to reveal the mechanism of a language.

Now let us come back to the questions raised at the beginning of this review. The purpose of the work discussed, as suggested by the title, is to present modern phonology. There is, however, no statement about what underlies the choice of phonological schools presented in the book. One may say from the way in which the material has been organized that the structural approach, since it has not gained wide acceptance, can be viewed as a history of modern phonology, i.e. GP. The book reveals that the majority of linguists work within the generative framework (more than half of the book deals with GP). Yet it becomes obvious that the new approach owes a great deal to the achievements of structuralism. Some links of GP to classical phonemics are mentioned though quite a number of them is not expressed clearly enough (for a concise discussion, cf. Rubach, forthcoming). The book shows that GP is far from its final stage. Numerous problems that GP faces are presented, others given detailed references. It should be stressed that this is one of the greatest merits of the work.

Who can profit from this book most fully? No doubt, it requires some knowledge both in phonetics and phonology but a trained reader can learn from it a lot. This task will not always be easy, as the remarks on the organization of the material suggest, but he certainly will realize that much is still to be done in this field.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, S. R. 1974. *The organization of phonology*. New York: Academic Press.
 Chomsky, N. and M. Halle. 1968. *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper and Row.
 Goyvaerts, D. 1978. *Aspects of post-SPE phonology*. Ghent, Antwerp, Brussels: Scientific Publishers.
 Hyman, L. H. 1975. *Phonological theory and analysis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
 Rubach, J. (forthcoming). *Analyses of phonological structures*. Warszawa: PWN.

Contrastive Polish-English consonantal phonology. By Edmund Gussmann. Pp. 173. Warszawa: PWN, 1978.

Reviewed by Włodzimierz Sobkowiak, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Edmund Gussmann's *Contrastive Polish-English consonantal phonology* comprises 4 chapters, a list of symbols and abbreviations used, a preface and a bibliography.

Chapter 1, entitled "Morphological alternations in phonology" (18 pages), is a succinct overview of the abstractness controversy — currently the most disputable issue in phonological theory. The discussion starts with structuralist morphophonemics and glossematics, and then passes on to the Polish morphological tradition originating with de Courtenay and Kruszewski and continued by Doroszewski and his pupils. The author points to the inadequacies and weaknesses of those approaches from the generative point of view. At the end of the chapter justification is adduced for the fairly abstract generative framework that Gussmann is working in throughout the book. A number of important contributions to GP are mentioned, views are compared and discussed and the more 'concrete' theories of phonology criticised.

Chapter 2, "Consonantal alternations in Polish" (97 pages), is the largest in the book and deals specifically with such morphonological processes of Polish as: (de)palatalizations of anterior and velar consonants, obstruent and nasal assimilations, final devoicing and cluster simplifications. The analysis proceeds from the simplest to the most difficult and controversial problems, using abundant data, from both inflective and derivative alternations, positing and rearranging rules, providing sample derivations of some words and constructing underlying representations at a fairly abstract level (but, admittedly, justified within the system, freely accepting e.g. 'absolute neutralization' in Kiparsky's sense). Though not directly pertinent to the discussion, some important universal issues are mentioned, e.g. rule ordering, boundaries, grammatical information in the phonological component, etc. At points where no definite solution has yet been achieved, Gussmann provides possible options briefly discussing the merits of each.

Chapter 3, "Consonantal alternations in English" (24 pages), is basically a critical approach to the *SPE* analysis. The following problems are briefly discussed: the status of spirants and rounded velars in the UR, softening of velars, glide insertion, palatalization, nasal assimilation and cluster simplification. Gussmann makes certain corrections to the *SPE* analysis and emphasizes the problems where further research seems necessary before any definite conclusions can be reached.

Chapter 4, "Contrastive phonology" (17 pages), contains some theoretical considerations pertaining to the status and character of contrastive studies (CS). Gussmann follows Fisiak (1975, 1976) in emphasizing the difference between CS as such and their application to error analysis and/or language teaching — a distinction not yet fully comprehended by many scholars (for the same emphasis compare also all volumes of *PSiCL*). He also demonstrates certain fundamental inadequacies of the taxonomic model of phonology when applied to contrastive purposes. Gussmann believes that the core of CS in phonology should be the functional comparison of underlying phonological systems and of rules. The importance, or status, of rules in the languages compared should be seen as the manner in which these rules interact with other rules of a given phonology (compare Kisseberth's 'conspiracies'), i.e., how many rules they bleed or feed, how transparent they are on the surface, how late they apply in the derivation, etc. The choice of distinctive features, the status and character of surface phonetic realizations, and the possibility of stating certain universal processes are seen as dependent on the functional analysis of rules. The chapter (and the book) terminates with a sample functional comparison of some English and Polish rules.

Gussmann's line of reasoning is basically sound and water-tight throughout the book, though, due to the abundance of detail and data, it sometimes loses clarity and speed. A subdivision of chapter 2 into well defined passages covering processes under discussion (and not, as it is, individual suffixes) could be one way to make amends for this. Apart from certain evident errors or misprints (?) (the last sound in *wróbel* specified as [-ant] on page 41, the stem-final velar in *bokiem* as [+back] on page 60, alpha variables on page 140, the stop in *abhor* specified as [+cor] on page 144, etc.) it could be possible to raise questions about certain specific issues, e.g., the use of diachronic evidence as motivation for setting up rules (a lot of diachrony actually underlies Gussmann's formulations, though he does not care to justify it), the dubious status of velar spirant in 1 and 2 Polish palatalizations (pages 35, 51, 73) or the indeterminacy in the use of features.

This last point is especially interesting. The issue of the choice of features for contrastive analysis has not yet attracted the scholarly interest it deserves. Cygan's paper at the 17th International Conference on Polish-English Contrastive Linguistics (Boszkowo, May 10—12, 1979) is just an exception to the rule. So far, phonologists (including Gussmann) have assumed no basic differences in the inventory of phonological features used for English and Polish. Gussmann consistently uses *SPE*-type features in his analysis of Polish in chapter 2. While this may work in most cases, there are clear instances where some alternative set of features would account better for certain regularities, simplifying notation at the same time. Some Jakobsonian distinctions might be of use, or simply a different subset of *SPE* features (as done in Fisiak, Grzegorek, Zabrocki 1978). To exemplify the latter solution, let us take Gussmann's rules 7 and 8 (page 35), covering the first velar palatalization in Polish /k - č, g - ž/dž, x - š/:

$$7. [-ant] \longrightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} +strident \\ +coronal \\ +del. rel. \end{array} \right] // \text{-----} \left[\begin{array}{l} +syll \\ -back \end{array} \right]$$

$$8. \left[\begin{array}{l} -ant \\ +strid \\ +voice \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow [+cont] / \left\{ \begin{array}{l} [+syll] \\ [-syll] \\ [-cont] \end{array} \right\} \text{-----}$$

Rule 7 is supposed to change velar obstruents into postalveolar affricates and rule 8 has to spirantize these affricates in some cases (e.g., *brzeg* - *brzeżek*, *orzec* - *orzeszek*). The problem with rule 8 is (except the disjoint environments, acknowledged by Gussmann) that it cannot change intermediate [ožeček] into [ožešek] as it is positively specified for voice and the stem-final obstruent in *orzec* is voiceless. Neither can this rule account for the *druk* - *drużyna* sort of alternation as stated on page 51.

The problem with rule 7 is much more serious. The rule as stated lacks naturalness (and this similarly pertains to some other rules having to do with (velar) palatalizations). Why should velars become strident and affricated before front vowels? This is of course what happens, but I would like to claim that the two features are just fortuitous and that the rule can best be formulated as:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} -ant \\ \alpha cont \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} -back \\ -high \\ \alpha cont \end{array} \right] // \text{-----} \left[\begin{array}{l} +syll \\ -back \end{array} \right]$$

This formulation seems to buy us at least two things:

1. the emphasis on the natural assimilation process underlying the alternation: [+back] → [-back]/___[-back],

2. a natural way of handling the velar spirant /αcont/, not achieved by Gussmann (of course, rule 8 would have to stay, as it is motivated on grounds independent of /x/ — /ʒ/ alternation).

It is very probable that, reworked along these lines, Gussmann's rules would sometimes be simpler and would provide still more valuable insights into the workings of Polish morphology.

One major formal weakness of the book seems to be that it does not do what it has promised, that is: "...not so much to present an exhaustive study of either Polish or English phonology as to raise questions concerning contrastive generative phonology..." (page 28). Though the presentation of Polish phonology is not exhaustive, still chapter 2 occupies more space than all the other chapters put together, whereas chapter 4 ("Contrastive phonology"), most legitimate in a study of this kind and truly fulfilling the reader's expectations, is the shortest in the book. The author seems to be much more interested in investigating Polish data than in actually comparing phonological rules. What he adduces at the end of chapter 4 as a sample comparison might be profitably expanded (using the data from chapters 2 and 3) and associated with the most fundamental phonological problems of rule order, distinctive features, conspiracies, boundaries, opacity, etc. Such a comparison would be very likely both to produce and to stimulate original new solutions, questions and ideas in the field of contrastive phonology.

However all the criticisms notwithstanding, as far as *Polish* morphonology is concerned, Gussmann's book is a fairly detailed and comprehensive generative study carried out at a high level of abstraction, scientific sophistication and methodological regime. As such, it is to be welcomed as one of the few larger works in Polish generative phonology we have so far (Laskowski, Rubach, Schenker). Gussmann's down-to-earth, strictly factual presentation of the complex morphonological issues and persuasive argumentation inspire respect and stimulate interest. The last, truly contrastive, chapter is especially interesting as Gussmann's suggestions for rule comparison procedures are extremely valuable (even though it is partly a repetition of his 1975 "How do phonological rules compare?").

Suggesting new solutions to the old problems and posing new questions, often revealing in themselves, Gussmann's work is a notable contribution in the field of Polish and contrastive phonology.

REFERENCES

- Chomsky, N. and M. Halle. 1968. *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cygan, J. 1979. *Distinctive features for contrastive studies*. Paper presented at the 17th International Conference on Polish-English Contrastive Linguistics, Boszkowo, May 10—12.
- Fisiak, J. "The contrastive analysis of phonological systems". *Kwartalnik neofilologiczny* 22. 341—351.
- Fisiak, J. 1976. "Generative phonological contrastive studies". *Kwartalnik neofilologiczny* 23. 119—124.
- Fisiak, J., Lipińska-Grzegorek, M. and T. Zabrocki. 1978. *An introductory English-Polish contrastive grammar*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Fujimura, O. (ed.). 1973. *Three dimensions of linguistic theory*. Tokyo: TEC.

- Gussmann, E. 1975. "How do phonological rules compare?" *PSiCL* 3. 113—124.
- Kiparsky, P. 1968. "How abstract is phonology?" In Fujimura, O. (ed.). 1973. 5—56.
- Kisseberth, C. W. 1970. "On the functional unity of phonological rules". *Linguistic inquiry* 1. 291—306.
- Laskowski, R. 1975. *Studia nad morfonologią współczesnego języka polskiego*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Rubach, J. 1976. *Consonantal changes in English and Polish. A generative account*. MS.
- Schenker, A. M. 1964. *Polish morphology*. The Hague: Mouton.

Language of poetry and generative grammar: toward generative poetics? (with sample analyses of T. S. Eliot's poems). By Nina Nowakowska. Pp. 137. Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, 1977. Reviewed by Irena Kałuża, the Jagellonian University of Cracow.

"Toward generative poetics?" — When the question put in the title of Dr. Nowakowska's book gets a negative answer, it is not — as more timid souls may expect — because of the sheer unattainability of such a goal at the present state of our knowledge. On the contrary, Nowakowska's dismissal of the desirability of creating an autonomous model of poetics is due to her belief that the time has come for broadening the scope of linguistics so as to embrace all manifestations of language, including the language of poetry, in one integrated model. Of course, tendencies toward such holistic conceptions have been gaining ascendancy for some time now. Consider, on the one hand, various attempts to construct a theory of metaphor within existing 'ordinary' models by adding a minimal number of rules, and on the other, the empirical 'discoveries' that phenomena hitherto regarded as stylistic are capable of functioning as grammatical factors in control of cognitive meaning. For instance, shifts in sentence stress have been shown to have a direct bearing on pronominal reference (cf. Chomsky 1971:211) and on presupposition (cf. Lakoff 1971).

Yet, Nowakowska's sweeping attack is, so far as I know, quite unprecedented in its scale. Her proposal to incorporate poetics into generative linguistics seems to proceed from an *a priori* decision, in spite of her protestations that it was reached inductively, in the course of evaluating various TG models with respect to their ability to account for the language of poetry. The peremptory tone of the book, curt dismissal of 'authorities', and highly articulate self-assurance heighten this impression. The author's impatience at the limitations of our knowledge is in a way invigorating, and she uses her erudition almost on a par with imagination to indicate how these limitations may be overcome.

Let us now have a closer look at the contents of the book. After a brief introduction stating the aims and methods of work, three chapters (2—4) are devoted to a critical survey of doctrinal developments in transformational generative grammar and in European functional linguistics, with the view to discovering those conditions that must be met if a model is to account for poetic as well as for 'neutral' language. The discussion is organized around three definitional postulates that Nowakowska considers basic in generative theory, namely that

- (1) the grammatical rules consist in relating *meaning* to *sound*,
- (2) the grammar is a mechanism of *sentence* generation, and
- (3) the grammar is the theory of linguistic *competence* (p. 7).

With respect to (1), those theories which give maximum attention to specification of meaning are more highly valued, (2) is rejected as inadequate in favour of text grammar,

and (3) is rejected in favour of textual functional competence. Consequently, Chomsky's predominantly syntactic and sentence-oriented Standard Theory and Extended Standard Theory are rejected, together with the concepts of linguistic competence, syntactic selectional restrictions, and degrees of grammaticalness regarded over a decade ago as a suitable basis for theories of metaphor. Similarly, an imposing array of stylistic studies and theories written within the framework of generative grammar are rejected, for instance, to mention only a few, Weinreich (1966), Reddy (1969), Thorne (1965, 1970), Cinque (1973), and Kaluža (1975).

In the course of the discussion there emerge fragments of various theories that Nowakowska considers acceptable for her purposes. These she reinterprets for her needs as theories of language functioning, in order to facilitate an integration of transformational grammar with the functional grammar of European linguistics.

A natural starting point for the presentation of Nowakowska's model, outlined in chapter 5 of her book, is provided by her acceptance of Lakoff's (1971) concept of well-formedness of an utterance as relative to its own presuppositions. This concept, though coming from a generative semanticist, has no clearly defined status within generative semantics, as Nowakowska rightly observes, but can be accommodated within an interpretive semantic component. She thus accepts Jackendoff's (1972) version of interpretive semantics together with the distinction of the formal plane of language from its content (originating from functional linguistics?), but is of the opinion that lexical insertion occurs in different places of derivation, in accordance with generative semantics. In the lexicon, which forms a separate component, the structure of lexical items resembles that of other linguistic units (after Weinreich 1966, then also generative semantics) and lexical items are viewed as predicates carrying both lexical and presuppositional meaning (Fillmore 1969). The underlying structure, to which the least attention is given, is also conceived of in the spirit of generative semantics. It specifies logical relations which may be defined in terms of the first order predicate calculus and dominance relations. Thus Chomsky's strict subcategorization is expressed by means of the number of arguments a predicate takes, while his selectional restrictions are controlled by presuppositions, which places these troublesome constraints squarely within the semantic component.

Understandably, it is the semantic component that possesses the most extensive ramifications in the modal. It assigns meaning to the previously generated structures and provides assessment of semantic well-formedness. The kinds of meaning (which is identified with language functioning) include functional or ideational (corresponding to the referential function), modal (emotive-appellative function), and informational (textual function). Ideational interpretation makes use of an inventory of semantic cases after Fillmore (1968, 1971) and Halliday (1973), provisionally specified as Agent, Experiencer, Instrument, Object, Source, and Goal, which perform participant roles; and Beneficiary, Location, Time, and Manner, whose roles are circumstantial. The Predicates are grouped into three main classes: material, mental, and relational, each of them capable of further subdivision into conceptual-functional subclasses. The modal meaning looks after modals, tense, aspect, quantification, negation, definitivization, and, possibly, coreferentiality (*via* modal operators, as in Jackendoff 1972). The informational structure accounts for textual coherence, for instance by identifying transitions between theme and rheme, that is in terms of thematic structure, following Czech and Polish linguistics (cf. Mayenowa 1971). Coherence is understood as a well-formedness constraint on a text.

Semantic well-formedness is assessed by a separate semantic subcomponent. Naturally, any text, not only poetic, is examined with respect to semantic well-formedness, but in the latter (so far as I understand Nowakowska) well-formedness is revealed in incomparably more ways and can contribute to the aesthetic, symbolic, etc., interpreta-

tion of the text, so that the impressionistic commentaries by literary critics may gain support from linguistic facts which were not statable in earlier grammars. Theoretically, all types of semantic information are subject to this mode of evaluation, preferably by a unified set of notions. This uniformity can be assured, Nowakowska thinks, by exploiting the notion of presupposition in the following way: for instance, if we presuppose that informational structure of the text must adhere to sequential thematization (i.e. to a definite manner of coherence devising) then a text which is lacking in this respect is defined as ill-formed. (What kind of presupposition is it: metalingual? supratextual? or it is just a preconceived 'norm' to which we have decided a text should adhere?) The same is true of the ideational meaning. If we confront a metaphor with dictionary readings of its constitutive parts, the metaphor must be evaluated as semantically ill-formed since it does not denote conventional referents as stated in the dictionary. If, however, we define metaphor as relative to its own unconventional presuppositions, then metaphor is also semantically well-formed and this assessment can be strengthened when textual metaphors are found to contribute to the coherence of the informational content. As far as modal meaning is concerned, no indication as to how presuppositional checking of well-formedness may be executed has been given by the author.

It is very hard to evaluate Nowakowska's proposal for a 'universal' model of language functioning. For one thing, it consists, as we have seen, of a number of more interesting or 'revolutionary' fragments of theories which are often in opposition to one another: This breeds at least a potential danger of contradictoriness, but then the model is not explicit enough to allow deduction of various consequences, hence no precise evaluation can be made in this respect. To give an instance of many potential doubts: how can Nowakowska's acceptance of the GS concept of multi-level lexical insertion be made to agree with her acceptance of Jackendoff's IS with its *en bloc* insertion into the preterminal string, as in *Aspects*? Or, consider her belief in the isomorphism of linguistic units (p. 29 and elsewhere), which is at variance with Jackendoff's (1972:15) statement that some "elements of semantic representation do not lend themselves to being represented in trees or functional form".

Of course, when such a vast enterprise is undertaken by one author, explicitness is hardly to be expected and Nowakowska admits that for some parts of her model no formalism is available at present. In fact, she indicates a number of times that she is not particularly interested in precision and formalism. Her goal is to cover the 'infinite variety' of language by means of finding promising theories to which she assigns only "an instrumental function" (cf. p. 5), whereas most of the stylistically oriented studies in TG so far have aimed rather at exploring the possibilities of particular TG concepts in accounting for particular stylistically marked structures, and hence have been able to devote more attention to explicitness. As a result of Nowakowska's aims and attitudes, her model is generative in the 'projective' sense only, the other requirement for generativeness, i.e. explicitness not having been — as indeed it could not have been — observed.

Other difficulties arise in connection with the 'generative poetics' part of the universal model. Remembering that 'generative' can also be used in opposition to 'interpretive', consider as an example (of a minor technical difficulty?) the task of accounting for the relatively simple device of figures of repetition. Nowakowska attributes repetition either to non-application of a reduction transformation (p. 84), or to the operation of a copying transformation (p. 86). Technically, these syntactic statements may be quite correct but they hardly provide an adequate explanation. The question that arises is what precisely triggers or blocks these transformations? They certainly do not operate at random, the way Chomsky's referential indices did in *Aspects*. Consequently, it is not

enough to investigate the repetitive patterning as an important cohesive device, a mode of investigation implied in the book. One has to find the controlling factor which shapes the repetitive patterning, and this may be lodged in any of the three main components: phonological, syntactic or semantic, or in a combination of these. Does that mean that phonology and semantics become semi-generative on such occasions?

Next, consider a more basic problem. Nowakowska, after Jakobson (1920) and others, holds poetry to be a "conscious exploitation of the potentials of the linguistic code" (p. 26). Theoretically, is it then possible to predict the results of such exploitations, in other words, to foresee the poetic techniques to come? Will such a venture not lead to a situation where, metaphorically speaking, a Boileau's rules will be expected to capture the innovations of a Dylan Thomas? It is, of course, feasible that some schemata could be established to allow 'infinite' possibility of variation within the model. One might for instance reasonably try to delimit the range of poetic inventiveness as bounded by the formal universals on the one side and by some low-level semantic interpretability on the other. But, I am afraid, one is likely to find that even such sensible delimitation has already been disrupted in reality, for instance by an occasional irrecoverable deletion in Emily Dickinson's poetry. In brief, this time it is not only the explicitness of the model but also its projective nature that is being questioned.

The closing chapters (6--8) of the book present sample analyses of T. S. Eliot's poetry (*The love song of J. Alfred Prufrock*, *The waste land*, and others) to show the theory at work. I shall concentrate on Nowakowska's account of the processes of metaphorization. Having accepted Lakoff's (1971) relative well-formedness, Nowakowska assumes that "the concept of presuppositional activation is a necessary and sufficient description of the complex notion of metaphor" (p. 48), where, so far as I can see, 'activation' stands for allowing some unconventional presuppositions to operate. The semantic interpretation of a metaphor consists of two stages: identification, which involves the detection of the unconventional ideational structure, like personification, reification, etc.; and motivation (largely neglected in earlier theories), which seeks to identify the covert *tertium comparationis* between the two (overtly expressed?) metaphoric terms, for instance, by finding the presuppositions that they share. From the exemplificatory material that follows these statements I have decided to quote Nowakowska's description of the celebrated line opening *The waste land*. For the sake of simplicity, the line has been isolated from its context but we must remember that in Nowakowska's way of thinking the considerations of the context will enrich the description and provide means of assessing its correctness.

April is the cruellest month (W. L. — 1)

the superlativization entails: months are cruel

cruel presupposes: primarily: human Agent, or

secondarily: natural force Instrument (metonymy)

thirdly: reified Instrument of Agentive God.

month is reinterpreted from Time into one of the above, since *cruel* presupposes also animate Goal, so does *month*, since reference of *month* is purely linguistic, i.e. inaccessible to other than human animates, the reference of the Goal is limited to: human motivation of the reinterpretation

1. ?

2. presupposed cruelty of natural force Instruments

3. presupposed cruelty of the Agentive God factor, and derivatively of his Instruments in the reading of *April* similar presuppositions are activated (p. 115).

Whether this sophisticated network is superior to the traditional and far simpler

notion of animation of the forces of nature is a moot question. For one thing, in order to demonstrate that it works systematically, and not in an *ad hoc* fashion, it is necessary to devise redundancy rules regularizing the possibilities of ideational content shifts and their connection with the accompanying presuppositions. This can be done only after a vast amount of empirical material has been investigated. The traditional non-presuppositional animation, on the other hand, gains direct support from immemorial myths which animate or deify the forces of nature in their cyclic change of seasons, and thus becomes psychologically viable.

Observe, moreover, that in her interpretation Nowakowska stops short of pointing to what is no doubt crucial in *April is the cruellest month*. The surprise the reader experiences is not so much concerned with a season of the year being described as 'cruel', but with the fact that this property is ascribed to the spring month of April. In our climatic zone the winter months are 'cruel' in the sense of 'life-extermimating', through cold and lack of food suffered by birds and animals. April, on the contrary, fosters the life of plants and animals. Eliot's statement is, of course, a paradox and it seems that the essence of paradox can be handled by the notion of presupposition again, though this time of a pragmatic nature. Furthermore, if we stretch the notion of pragmatic presupposition, it may cover associations hitherto reserved for literary criticism, and, for instance juxtapose Eliot's "April is the cruellest month" with Chaucer's "Whan that Aprill with his shoures soote...", thus adding another dimension to the interpretation of Eliot's line. These examples indicate that presupposition has great possibilities in accounting for a wider range of phenomena than those described by the author. I suppose that unconventional presupposition may also underlie other tropes, such as irony, hyperbole or oxymoron. Consequently, if we wish to distinguish between the tropes (and it makes sense to do so since the distinction originates in speakers' intuitions), the presuppositional properties will have to be shown as forming different configurations for each of the tropes. If this is correct, then Nowakowska's claim that "the concept of presuppositional activation is a ... sufficient description of ... metaphor" (p. 48, quoted above in full) cannot be maintained. Let me add that Nowakowska has not considered the need for diversification of unconventional presupposition activation so, naturally, she does not touch upon the issue, but the matter is worth investigating.

It is to be regretted that the text under review has not been more carefully prepared for publication. As it is, the book is marred by numerous misprints (e.g. *simile* consistently spelled as *similie*, pp. 93, 94, 110, 114), chaotic application of graphic devices (e.g. uneven indenting on p. 115), bibliographical inaccuracies (e.g. reference to McCawley 1976b, p. 45, not listed in the bibliography; or is it McCawley 1967b that is meant?), and even by an occasional confusion in terminology (e.g. "implicational, i.e. presuppositional terms", p. 60). Moreover, the author let her individualism run away with her even when the deconies of English grammar and usage are concerned (e.g. "underlied terms" p. 27, "theory [the agentive, etc.] is underlied by", pp. 68, 86, 88, 89; "basing on Ziff's..." p. 20, "basing on Bühler's..." p. 81; "examples are apt to revision" p. 49, "poetry is apt to unique interpretation" p. 15, etc. etc.). She also shows little consideration for her readers, who may be less than perfectly familiar with the theories she discusses. A highly condensed form of presentation (including rather awkward enumeration running into the tenths: "first, secondly, ..., twelfthly, thirteenthly..." pp. 40-47) makes *Language of poetry and generative grammar* a book mainly for the initiated.

But, when all things are considered, it is an important and a courageous book, the more to be appreciated as it represents a serious contribution to that elusive branch of linguistics which purports to deal with the language of literature. I am confident that it will have a stimulating effect on other workers in the field.

REFERENCES

- Bach, E. and R. T. Harms. (eds). 1968. *Universals in linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: The M I T Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1971. "Deep structure, surface structure, and semantic interpretation". In Steinberg D. D. and L. A. Jakobovits. (eds). 1971. 183—216.
- Cinque, G. 1973. "Towards a grammar of metaphor: presuppositions vs. selectional restrictions". *Edinburgh working papers in linguistics* 2. 38—62.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1968. "The case for case". In Bach E. and R. T. Harms. (eds). 1968. 1—88.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1969. "Types of lexical information". In Steinberg D. D. and L. A. Jakobovits. (eds). 1971. 370—92.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1971. "Some problems for case grammar". *Monograph series on language and linguistics* 24. 35—56.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1973. *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Jackendoff, R. S. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: The M I T Press.
- Jakobson, R. 1920. *Novejšaja russkaja poezija*. Praha.
- Kaluža, I. 1975. *English feature grammar and its application to deviant sentences*. Kraków: PWN.
- Lakoff, G. 1971. "Presupposition and relative well-formedness". In Steinberg D. D. and L. A. Jakobovits. (eds). 1971. 329—40.
- Lyons, J. (ed.). 1970. *New horizons in linguistics*. London: Pelican Books.
- Mayenowa, M. R. (ed.). 1971. *O spójności tekstu*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Reddy, M. J. 1969. "A semantic approach to metaphor". *CLS* 5. 240—251.
- Sebeok, T. A. (ed.). 1966. *Current trends in linguistics*. Vol. III: *Theoretical foundations*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Steinberg, D. D. and L. A. Jakobovits. (eds). 1971. *Semantics: an interdisciplinary reader in philosophy, linguistics and psychology*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Thorne, J. P. 1965. "Stylistics and generative grammars". *Journal of linguistics* 1. 49—59.
- Thorne, J. P. 1970. "Generative grammar and stylistic analysis". In Lyons, J. (ed.). 1970. 185—97.
- Weinreich, U. 1966. "Explorations in semantic theory". In Sebeok, T. A. (ed.). 1966. 395—477.

A history of English spelling. By D. G. Scragg. Pp. 130. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1974.

Reviewed by Josef Hladký, University of Brno.

The third volume of the Mont Fellick series is once again a monograph (after a collection of papers discussing spelling reform in *Alphabets for English* and a monograph by the editor of the series W. Haas on the relation between written and spoken language *Phonographic translation*), devoted this time to the history of English spelling. The author, D. G. Scragg, traces the history of English spelling from the earliest written documents up to the present time.

The reader, even a non-linguist, is gradually introduced to the field and to the prob-

lems involved. The first chapter, "The foundation", explains the basic terminology (including, e.g., Old English) and presents the historical background for the development of the English language. The wide-scale production of books in English (i.e., not in Latin) at the end of the 10th century led to the stabilization of orthography on West Saxon basis, well preserved during the 11th century. In the 12th century, however, there was no further national development and regional orthographies began to develop. The output of English books was much lower, which also contributed to the loss of unity.

The varied orthography of the Middle English period is gradually replaced by a more uniform system only in the late fourteenth century, after Wyclif and his followers. This more uniform orthography, however, spread more widely in Central Midlands only and London writings were not part of this type of production. London usage was to become uniform only later, after English was adopted for the written documents of the royal chancery. During the fifteenth century then, the chancery orthography was accepted even in the regions.

The influence of loanwords upon the English orthography was rather varied: the Old English borrowings from Latin left no traces in the orthography (these borrowings were not very numerous and were integrated into the basic word stock within a relatively short time) but the ME and ENE borrowings from French and Latin (and Greek) led to confusion as these borrowings quite often preserved their original form in writing.

The sixteenth century introduced many etymological spellings for earlier French borrowings (*trone* — *throne*), sometimes based on false analogies. There was, however, one welcome effort, i.e. the effort to avoid homographs.

The printing press had a stabilizing influence on English spelling. It was not Caxton or his direct followers, however, who started this influence. Their spelling, as the author of *A history of English spelling* shows, was very irregular (as opposed to the works of the scribes' establishments) and it was only in the sixteenth century that "the orthographic practices of the manuscript shops were transferred to the printing houses" (p. 67). The fixed spelling of the printers there provided a norm for private spelling.

An important role in the stabilization was played by the spelling books, especially the one by Edmond Coote (his criterion for selection of a particular spelling was its frequency). There were only a few spelling changes after 1700. Johnson's *Dictionary* followed the established spelling practice and spread it into the sphere of private writing.

The last and the longest chapter of *A history of English spelling* concentrates on the history of attitudes to incorrect spelling and on the search for an optimal writing system. The work of Hart, Bullokar, Wilkins, Franklin, both Pitmans, Ellis, and many others is discussed. There have been many approaches, many schemes, and they have not met with any substantial public or official support (and if they have, like the *v.l.a.*, they have not succeeded). Bradley's paper of 1913 is quoted refusing the axiom that the sole function of writing is to represent sounds. Views of other scholars are given as well and the very last lines of the book stress the importance of the knowledge of the history of English spelling and of the history of the attempts at its reform. Without such knowledge, centuries-old arguments for and against spelling reform are just repeated once again. Scragg's book is, in fact, a good source of such knowledge. It does not study the history of English spelling in any wider linguistic context, it does not discuss the relation between the written and the spoken norms of English, but it presents a comprehensive — in fact, the first comprehensive — survey of the history of English spelling. The book is not only comprehensive, but also comprehensible to non-specialists, who are gradually introduced to the terminology.

To sum up, D. G. Scragg's book is a clearly written survey of the history of English spelling and will be undoubtedly of use to all those who are interested in this subject.

