REVIEWS

Pragmatics: implicature, presupposition, and logical form. By Gerald Gazdar. Pp. xv+186. New York: Academic Press, 1979. Reviewed by Ryszard Rasiński, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Despite the existence of a vast body of literature on so called presuppositional phenomena, the notion of presupposition has remained resistant to any general formal explanation. Semantic theories of presupposition are no longer considered feasible, while most pragmatic accounts of it suffer from an apparent tendency to invoke undefined or ill-understood terms such as sincerity, appropriacy, dispositions, expectations, reasonable inferences, etc. However, the need for a more formal methodology in pragmatics has been recognized for some time now and Gerald Gazdar's recent book seems to be a good exemplification of this fact.

According to the Preface, the book is "a radical, although essentially structure-preserving transformation" of the author's doctoral dissertation published as Gazdar (1977). It consists of seven chapters, preceded by an extremely useful list of symbols and typographical conventions.

Chapter 1, 'Introduction', presents the basic terminological and methodological assumptions adopted throughout the book. Gazdar identifies the term *pragmatics* with the set of non-truth-conditional aspects of meaning, which view he paraphrases in a persuasive, slogan-like formula: PRAGMATICS = MEANING – TRUTH CONDITIONS. This is obviously a slight oversimplification and the dividing line between pragmatics and (truth-conditional) semantics will later be shown to be difficult, if not impossible, to draw. This explains perhaps why some of Gazdar's noted predecessors – e.g. Kempson (1975), Wilson (1975) – have, as he puts it, "cut the cake of meaning in somewhat different ways" (p. 3).

As for methodology, the author endorses and defends a formal approach to pragmatics, justified in his view by the impact that mathematically rigorous works in semantics, especially those of Richard Montague, have had on the field. The uninitiated reader need not worry though, for model-theoretic formulas are absent from the present book. In fact, most of the theoretical claims expounded therein can be appreciated with only elementary knowledge of set theory and first order predicate calculus. An occasional use of modal operators or lambda abstraction does not extend these prerequisites seriously.

Chapter 2, 'Illocutionary force: the performative hypothesis', is entirely devoted to a critical analysis of the only well-developed, albeit non-pragmatic, theory of illocutionary force to date. Gazdar shows, or refers to works which show, that none of the claims which comprise the performative hypothesis can be plausibly maintained. Among the victims of his meticulous repudiation we find the claim that illocutionary force is a semantic notion, i.e. that it can be accounted for within the semantic representation of an utterance. However, the question of whether a pragmatic analysis of illocutionary force could replace the performative hypothesis is left unanswered. This makes Chapter 2 much less satisfying in comparison with the remainder of the book where many com-

plex phenomena have been given an interesting treatment within a formalized pragmatic theory.

One of the issues that the present book has much to say about is the notion of implicature discussed in Chapter 3. Following Grice (1975), Gazdar makes a careful distinction between *conventional implicatures* and *conversational implicatures*; it is the latter type that is given a formal treatment. First, however, Gazdar takes a close look at Grice's maxims of conversation from which such implicatures arise. Only two out of four maxims seem to submit to formalization: the quality maxim and the maxim of quantity. The former gives rise to the notion of quality implicature, which the author defines in terms borrowed from the epistemic logic of Hintikka (1962). So formulated, the implicature turns out to be an instance of Hintikka's epistemic implication, which excludes from the domain of quality maxim all nonassertoric speech acts such as questions or imperatives. Thus, the maxim ceases to be a general rule of conversational inference and becomes instead one of the felicity conditions for making a successful assertion.

A different approach is taken toward the maxim of quantity. Gazdar examines a number of examples and argues that the relation between specific pairs of presented sentences is neither that of entailment nor presupposition, but is best motivated by reference to the maxim. The paradigm case is given below, where sentence (1) quantity implicates sentence (2).

(1) Some of the boys were there.
(2) Not all of the boys were there.

Roughly speaking, the relation of quantity implicature, unlike entailment, can be cancelled and, unlike presupposition, it vanishes in a certain class of embedded sentences.

The formalization that follows the discussion of the ontological status of quantity implicatures owes much to Horn (1972), especially to his idea of a quantitative scale. The details of that formalization are not crucial here; it suffices to say that Gazdar defines two functions which assign to any sentence the set of quantity implicatures potentially implicated by that sentence. Some, in fact all, of those *potential quantity implicatures* may be removed by the cancellation system defined later in the book.

One immediate and interesting consequence of this account is an explanation for a well-known fact that in natural language disjunctions are usually heard as exclusive, i.e. (3) is commonly interpreted as synonymous with (4).

(3) John is either patriotic or quixotic.
(4) John is patriotic or quixotic, but not both.

A simple proof of this fact given in this chapter (p. 59) signals that Gazdar's pragmatic theory already has some explanatory power.

The case of disjunction, just presented, leads naturally to the general problem of meaning discrepancies between logical functors and their natural language counterparts, i.e. words like *not, and, or,* and *if*. Chapter 4, 'Logical functors', offers some interesting insights into this issue. For natural language negation the purported discrepancies have a sound pragmatic explanation says the author, referring the reader to the work of Givón (1975). In much the same spirit Gazdar resists the wide-spread thesis that negation is semantically ambiguous (external/internal dichotomy) his view of negation is that of a sentential operator defined on a standard bivalent semantics.

Similarly conservative is Gazdar's interpretation of natural language connectives. Only *and* and *or* are assumed to be truth-functional, while other often cited linking words such as *without, but, neither ... nor,* and *unless* are all denied this property. Also the conditional *if ... then,* to which a whole section has been devoted, ends up in the latter class.

The claim that only two among sixteen combinatorially possible logical connectives are lexically manifested in English has one seemingly counterintuitive consequence, namely, that there is no English morpheme for exclusive *or*. However, Gazdar presents a detailed and convincing argument in favor of this contention and suggests eventually that it may well be a linguistic universal.

Chapter 5, 'Presupposition', is focused on two issues that have been subject of much controversy surrounding the notion of proposition: 1) the problem of definition (semantic vs. pragmatic); 2) the well-known projection problem for presuppositions of complex sentences.

Gazdar rejects numerous semantic accounts of presupposition on the grounds that they fail to cope with the projection problem while giving rise to nonbivalent interpretations, ambiguous account of negation, and counterintuitive definitions of sentential connectives. Pragmatic theories, in turn, apart from their notorious vagueness, rely on a doubtful assumption which requires that the presuppositions of an utterance be entailed by the existing context. This would imply that no new information could be conveyed in presuppositional form — a conclusion that is disconfirmed by some data presented in this chapter. Gazdar proposes to replace the entailment requirment by a more liberal one, namely, that presuppositions be *consistent* with the context, where consistency is a well-defined notion from logic. A similar proposal has been made recently by Karttunen and Peters (1979), who suggest that presuppositions be noncontroversial in the context of use. The latter work, together with an earlier paper by Karttunen (1974), is the only pragmatic treatment of the projection problem that the present book gives some credit to, even though their "plugs, holes and filters" account of projection does not explicitly support the idea of presupposition cancellation.

The notion of cancellation is central to Gazdar's system, whose main line of functioning parallels closely that given already for quantity implicatures. Every sentence induces a set of *potential presuppositions* which can be identified in a fairly mechanical way, given a taxonomy of simple presuppositional sources such as factive verbs, definite descriptions, proper names, cleft constructions, etc. The actual *presuppositions* of the sentence are those potential ones that have passed successfully through the cancellation system defined in Chapter 6. The system works like a kind of "consistency filter" filtering out potential presuppositions inconsistent with the previously established context, or with entailments and implicatures of the sentence.

Chapter 5 contains also a section on entailment where an important theoretical claim appears concerning the relationship between this semantic notion and pragmatically defined presupposition. The claim says that simple affirmative factive sentences entail their presuppositions while the corresponding negative sentences do not. This view of entailment provides, for example, a simple explanation for an acknowledged but so far unexplained asymmetry in acceptability of many conjoined structures such as (5) and (6) below.

(5)*John has stopped beating his wife, because he never beat her.
(6) John hasn't stopped beating his wife, because he never beat her.

The explanation, ignoring certain epistemic fineries, goes as follows: sentence (5) — treated as a conjunction — entails, due to its first conjunct, that John used to beat his wife. This proposition, being an entailment, cannot be cancelled despite the fact that it contradicts the second conjunct — hence the anomaly. There is no such problem in (6), as the first conjunct only presupposes wife beating and this presupposition can, and in fact will, be cancelled.

Chapter 6, 'Projection and contextual change', is undoubtedly the most important chapter in the book. It begins with a formal elaboration of Gazdar's cancellation system,

called a presupposition and implicature assignment device. The main explanatory feature of this system is a built-in priority schema for assignment of indirectly conveyed meanings. According to this schema, the context resulting from a given utterance is first increased by entailments, followed by implicatures, followed by presuppositions of the utterance. Two central sections of the chapter illustrate the performance of this device against various counterexamples to the existing presuppositional theories. The variety of data considered is quite impressive; they range from simple yet seemingly paradoxical sentences to many complex ones.

A simple cancellation account (p. 142), augmented by some epistemic qualifications, suffices to explain, for example, why the relevant presuppositions of certain factive sentences do not survive if the subject is first person. Thus, (7) below does, while (8) does not, presuppose (9) and this fact is shown without recourse to two kinds of negation or two senses of *know*.

(7) Boris doesn't know that Maria is a secretary.
(8) I don't know that Maria is a secretary.
(9) Speaker knows that Maria is a secretary.

Somewhat more complex are examples of sentences with logical connectives where there is an apparent interaction of implicatures with potential presuppositions. It was Karttunen (1973 : 180) who noted that a disjunction like (10) below poses problems to his own projection system, because the relevant presupposition (11) is not filtered out.

(10) Either all of Jack's letters have been held up or he has not written any.
(11) Jack's letters exist.

On Gazdar's account (11) is cancelled out by implicatures of (10) and this fact is demonstrated in a fairly rigorous way (p. 145).

The complexity and oddity of further data accounted for in this chapter are such that the author feels oblidged to defend his theory against possible charges of vacuity, especially that the few acknowledged counterexamples to the proposed system look extremely bizarre. The defense invokes the ordering built into the cancellation procedure, which ordering implicitly limits admissible configurations of actual implicatures and presuppositions. Also the restrictive formal definition of "context" given in the chapter precludes any arbitrary manipulation of this notion against potential counterexamples to the system.

Speaking of counterexamples, there is one interesting class of presuppositional phenomena, not mentioned in the present book, that seems to be troublesome to Gazdar's theory. It is the case of so called "dangling presuppositions", the term attributed to Karttunen (cf. Gazdar (1977)), whose original filtering system predicted incorrectly that (12) presupposes (13), but does not presuppose (14).

(12) If Jack has children, it was heartless of them not to visit him at the hospital.
(13) Jack's children did not visit him at the hospital.
(14) Jack has children.

In other words, (13) "dangles" as it is retained by the system even though its own presupposition (14) has been filtered out. This problem has been discussed in Gazdar (1977) where we find a claim that the cancellation system identical to the present one handles the relevant data in the right way, i.e. it predicts that (12) presupposes neither (13) nor (14). However, the accompanying proof of this fact is clearly incorrect, as it is based on the assumption that simple negative sentences entail their presuppositions. This assumption violates Gazdar's fundamental thesis, expressed also in the present book, namely, that only affirmative sentences have such a property. It seems, then, that the case of "dangling presuppositions" might be added to the small list of counterexamples to the present theory.

In Chapter 7, the concluding chapter of the book, Gazdar elucidates his position on the metatheoretical issue of the status of pragmatics within linguistic theory. What follows is essentially a recapitulation of the main points of the book set against the claim of Lakoff (1972), who suggested that pragmatics could be reduced to "garden variety semantics" where such notions as illocutionary force, implicature, and presupposition are all defined in terms of entailment. The evidence Gazdar amasses from various chapters of his book shows convincingly that Lakoff's claim is untenable.

The chapter closes with a short yet illuminating insight into as yet unexplored question of whether semantics is autonomous with respect to pragmatics, i.e. whether the truth conditions of a sentence can be made independent from its pragmatic properties. Although Gazdar's own analyses in the book seem to rely implicitly on such an assumption he rejects the semantic autonomy thesis eventually. His conclusions may only be interpreted as tentative, though, since the evidence presented in their favor remains highly speculative and somewhat superficial.

There are many other points in this book that call for comment, but as most of the book's merits have already been presented, it is time perhaps to mention some of its apparent shortcomings. One point where the book does not seem to live up to its title is the treatment of logical form. The reader looking for any specific proposals concerning this notion will quickly discover that there are none, except for some marginal remarks about unordered semantic representation (p. 103). In fact, there is not even an entry for logical form in the index to the book — something that can hardly be interpreted as an oversight.

Another mild disappointment is the absence of any proposals concerning the possibility of a general definition for presupposition. It should be apparent (cf. the discussion of Chapter 5 above) that Gazdar's treatment of this notion is purely procedural, i.e. he avoids the question of what are general identification principles for presupposition. Instead, an (admittedly incomplete) list of lexical and syntactic presuppositional sources is presented together with a procedure on how to deal with complex sentences and context. This is, incidentally, a problem for most pragmetic theories, some of which, e.g. Karttunen and Peters (1979), simply accept the notion of presupposition as primitive.

Be that as it may, these few critical remarks should not conceal the reviewer's enthusiasm for the overall approach adopted by Gazdar. It is beyond a doubt that the questions he has answered satisfactorily far outnumber those he has either not answered or avoided. Altogether, there is much to be learnt from this lucid and stimulating book.

REFERENCES

Cole, P. (ed.). 1978. *Syntax and semantics 9. Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.

Cole, P. and J. L. Morgan (eds). 1975. *Syntax and semantics 3. Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.

Davidson, D. and G. Harman (eds). 1972. *Semantics of natural language*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Gazdar, G. 1977. *Implicature, presupposition and logical form*. Mimeograph, Indiana Linguistic Club.

Givón, T. 1975. "Negation in language: pragmatics, function, ontology". In Cole, P. (ed.). 1978, 69—112.

Grice, H. P. 1975. "Logic and conversation". In Cole, P. and J. L. Morgan (eds). 1975. 41—58.

Horn, L. R. 1972. *On the semantic properties of logical operators in English.* Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Hintikka, J. 1962. *Knowledge and belief.* Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press.

Karttunen, L. 1973. "Presuppositions of compound sentences". *Linguistic inquiry 4.* 169–93.

Karttunen, L. 1974. "Presupposition and linguistic context". In Rogers, A., R. Wall and J. P. Murphy (eds). 1977. 149–60.

Karttunen, L. and P. S. Peters, 1979. "Conventional implicature". In Oh, C. K. and D. Dinneen (eds). 1979. 1–50.

Kempson, R. M. 1975. *Presupposition and the delimitation of semantics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G. 1972. "Linguistics and natural logic". In Davidson, D. and G. Harman (eds). 1972. 253–86.

Oh, C. K. and D. Dinneen (eds). 1979. *Syntax and Semantics 11. Presupposition.* New York: Academic Press.

Rogers, A., R. Wall and J. P. Murphy (eds). 1977. *Proceedings of the Texas conference on performatives, presuppositions and implicatures.* Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wilson, D. M. 1975. *Presupposition and non-truth conditional semantics.* London: Academic Press.

Generative phonology. Description and theory. By M. Kenstowicz and Ch. Kisseberth. Pp. xiii+459. New York: Academic Press, 1979. Reviewed by Elżbieta Górska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Any teacher of generative phonology (GP) should seriously consider the book reviewed here ("GPDT"), as a possible primary reading for a course in GP. There is no doubt that "GPDT" differs in many ways from introductions to GP published previously. It aims not only at a presentation of the theory of GP (cf., e.g., Schane 1973), but it also tries to show how an actual linguistic practice is performed. The same, however, can be said of e.g. Hyman's (1975) *Phonology*. Yet the differences between the two books are numerous. First, distinct methods of presentation are used. "GPDT" reconstructs the model of GP gradually. This is clearly evident from the way in which the material has been organized. The first two chapters are devoted to basic theoretical concepts of GP. The motivation for each concept is provided by the analyses of numerous examples from various languages (cf. language index, pp. 449–52). A given notion is then further developed in the chapters (6–10) which discuss the main theoretical problems of GP. There, a re-analysis of data discussed earlier often becomes necessary. One should observe here that each chapter is accompanied by an additional set of exercises (in this respect it is similar to, e.g. Sloat 1978). Thus, at the stage when the theoretical model accepted by the authors finally appears, a student should be well prepared to justify his own stand. In Hyman's book, on the other hand, a theoretical model is *in a sense* "given" necessarily and the task of a student is to learn what motivation for it can be provided (there for the changes in the model is also discussed). The latter book, in contrast to "GPDT", provides also a detailed historical background to modern phonology. This is certainly one of its greatest merits. The historical outline of phonology gives basis for a critical approach to GP. The fact that Kenstowicz and Kisseberth do not place GP in a historical perspective, however, does not result in a non-critical approach to modern phonology. Here, different bases for criticism are chosen. A student is taught how a given set of data can lead to changes of some model of GP, and how a given stand can be motivated on the basis of corpus -internal and external evidence. And, there is no doubt that this book has succeeded in preparing a student for research of his own. In order to be a good linguist, however, he would have to learn the development of phonology by himself. "GPDT", in its aims and methods, is similar to *Analysis of phonological structures* by Rubach (in press). The two books place strong emphasis on the motivation of phonological descriptions, and present a theory of GP through a detailed analyses of data (Rubach's book is based mainly on Polish). In Rubach's book, however, similarities and differences between GP and earlier approaches are also outlined. The books just compared seem most appropriate for a rather extended course in modern phonology (in a department of linguistics rather, than e.g. in English departments); or, for seminars (for a short in-introductory course in phonology, a teacher may choose, e.g. Hyman 1975, Sloat, 1978). Let us pass now to a discussion of the content of "GPDT". In order to make the teacher's choice easier, the presentation below is rather detailed.

Chapter 1 consists of two unconnected sections. The first one starts with preliminary remarks on generative grammar, and places GP within the generative model of grammar. The other, presents "a brief survey of linguistic phonetics" (only 16 pages long!). The authors motivate the type of transcription they use. Then,an articulatory description of sounds follows. Four processes involved in the production of sounds are briefly discussed, and basic types of speech sounds are described and illustrated with examples taken from various languages. The material is presented clearly, yet there are points at which a student who has a "little background in phonetics" (p. xii) might not follow the presentation. There are a few cases where the authors, while describing places of articulation, take the term "fricactive" for granted. It seems that without prior explanation of the notion, the following sentence might be meaningless for a beginner: "Since it is difficult to make a complete closure here (E. G.: between the root of the tongue and the back of the pharyngeal wall), only fricatives are found at this point of articulation" (p. 14). What follows is a mixture of important, though hardly connected terms: glottalic and velaric air-stream mechanism, primary and secondary articulation, prosodic features. The chapter closes with the question "how sounds are to be represented for the purpose of phonology". There, the concepts of binary feature and feature matrix are introduced. The closing paragraph succeeds in creating the atmosphere of GP, but one may wonder whether there are not too many unknown terms for a beginner put together.

Let me observe, that although the introductory remarks on GP serve their purpose, the section devoted to phonetics cannot be said to provide basis for a book on phonology. In order to understand phonology, a student must have some training in phonetics, and a "brief survey" can be treated only as an overview of the knowledge a student has previously acquired. This remark, however, is not meant to discourage a teacher from choosing "GPDT" as a primary reading for a course in GP. The chapters that follow prove the contrary.

As the first step in the reconstruction of the GP theory, the concepts of phonological rule, underlying representation and phonetic representation are introduced (Chapter 2). Here, the technique for teaching GP adopted by the authors can be seen at its best. The argument begins with a description of a model of grammar in which there is no need for a separate phonological component (the null hypothesis). Then, several considerations follow that gradually lead to a total rejection of this approach. It becomes clear that the null hypothesis cannot account for the phenomenon of morphological alternation and that it cannot distinguish between systematic and idiosyncratic features of pronunciation. Also two types of external evidence are given, to show that systematic and idiosyncratic features are psychologically real. At this point the final solution begins to emerge.

The mechanism in which the phonological component works is first discussed on the basis of vowel lengthening and aspiratiion in English. Final section presents additional examples from three languages (Zoque, Papago and Chatino) that illustrate the notion of a list of morphemes and of a phonological rule. The discussion of the motivation for phonological rules brings in some guiding principles for setting up underlying representations (URs) in a natural way. Finally, the rule of stress placement in Chatino shows that grammatical information (word boundary) can also determine a phonetic representation (PR) of an utterance.

The evidence for phonological rules discussed so far was based mainly on the predictability of non-alternating features. The aim of the 3rd chapter is to show that the same mechanism should be employed in order to account for the phenomenon of alternation. Taking examples from Russian, the authors draw a distinction between idiosyncratic and systematic alternations, and show that the former should be listed in the lexicon, while the latter are to be derived by phonological rules. The differences between the two types of alternations are further illustrated on the basis of a tentative analysis that restricts voicing alternation of final obstruents in Russian to certain grammatical contexts. Here again, external evidence is provided to show that the latter description is false. The lack of predictive power of yet another alternative, namely, one that postulates voiceless obstruents as basic and a rule of voicing, is also discussed. After strong support for the rule of final devoicing (FD) has been supplied, numerous interactions of FD with two rules that account for some alternations of Russian verbs (l-drop and dental stop deletion) are considered. At this point the idea of ordering restrictions is introduced. The authors also distinguish 4 steps in the analyis of phonological alternations. These are further exemplified with data from Chamarro and Tonkawa in the sections that follow. Here, the issue of abstractness of URs is raised (cf. vocalic alternations in Tonkawa). It is also shown how the choice of a given UR (consonant initial vs vowel initial verbal stems in Tonkawa) can influence the form of a phonological rule (the elision rule). The point is made that the ordering of rules should be such as to reveal the nature of underlying segments and the naturalness of the processes involved (cf. p. 70).

Chapter 4 is an excellent exemplification of an "actual descriptive practice" (p. 77) employed in setting up URs and establishing interrelations between phonological rules. Since the analyses are based on phonological systems of 4 divergent languages, the student would certainly learn that the problems a linguist encounters in the description of different languages are similar. Moreover, he would be convinced that the same mechanism can be adopted in order to account for diverse phonological processes. The first section examines morphological alternations in the verbal paradigm of Yawelmani. There, great emphasis is placed on the necessity of independent motivation for abstract URs. The abstract underlying quality of vowels of some verbal roots (and the vowel lowering rule), motivated by vowel harmony and the principle of paradigm unity (here: a balanced system of underlying short and long vowels), is further supported by the regularities observed in echo verbs and by the rule shortening vowels before the future suffix (pp. 89—99).

The analysis of the vowel system of Slovak serves as another illustration of the claim that "asymmetrical phonetic inventories often arise from more balanced underlying ones via phonological rules that obscure the underlying pattern" (p. 100). A fairly abstract system of underlying short and long vowels, which permits a straightforward description of alternations exhibited by syllabics, gains additional support from various lengthening and shortening processes and the rhythmic law (at this place, one should remind a teacher who has not extended a "survey of phonetics", to present the classification of diphthongs here). It is assumed that the rule of diphthongization also accounts for non-alternating diphthongs, but, unfortunately, neither the motivation for, nor the implications of, this stand are discussed.

The description of sample data from Lardil demonstrates several cases where the UR of a stem should be identical withone of the inflected alternants. The analysis also shows the way in which a phonetic constraint may restrict the application of a phonological rule (e.g. the rule of apocope). Let me note that the operation of the constraint is presented clearly. One may only regret, however, that no reference has been made to functional relations among phonological rules.

In the final section, the mechanism adopted by GP is applied to an analysis of the tonology of Makua, one of the Bantu languages. It becomes clear that tonal structures exhibited by verbal forms result from a complex interplay of five phonological rules: tone assignment, tone lowering, tone doubling, glide formation and vowel reduction. Great emphasis is placed on independent motivation of each process.

Let me observe that the chapter discussed above clearly demonstrates a great variety of possible solutions that are open to a linguist when he faces the data for the first time. In this way, the need for a strong justification for a given description, based on definite criteria, becomes evident. This, no doubt, is what one would expect a student of linguistics to learn.

Chapter 5 is a systematic presentation of various types of evidence and motivation for phonological descriptions referred to in previous chapters. The first section discusses corpus-internal evidence. There, principles for setting up URs are examined. Considerable attention is given to various meanings of the notion "independent motivation". The authors claim that unmotivated URs should be banned from GP. Thus, if a phonological solution cannot be supported by appeal to other facts (such as distributional limitations), the nonphonological description is to be preferred on the grounds that it is more straightforward" (p. 152). It is made clear that generative grammar, aiming at the description of the linguistic knowledge of native sepakers, cannot rely exclusively on corpus-internal evidence. In the section that follows, the psychological reality of phonological descriptions is discussed in terms of a few kinds of corpus-external evidence (unfortunately, the issue of language acquisition is not raised, cf. e.g., Hyman 1975). The authors present a rather safe approach to extrasystemic devidence. The claim that "just because a particular feature of internal analysis is not revealed in external linguistic behaviour, it does not necessarily follows that the feature is not psychologically real" (p. 159), although quite well motivated, is generalized in such a way that the value of external evidence is practically null. More often than not, if external evidence does not support a language-internal analysis, it is believed that external behaviour is based on the phonetic, rather than the underlying, form of an utterance. It is extremely rare to have a description changed as a result of a disagreement between internal and external justification. And no single example is provided where a given description would be questioned due to external evidence alone (the psychological reality of a rule deleting final consonants in Maori is doubted, in the face of both internal and external facts, pp. 171 — 174). Given this attitude, one might be rather sceptical about the real value of extra-linguistic considerations, the importance of which is constantly stressed by the authors in the chapters that follow.

"The problem of abstractness" (Ch. 6) opens a series of theoretical issues of GP discussed in the rest of the book. Yet, before the question of the degree to which UR can deviate from PR is raised, the authors provide a kind of historical background to the concept of the UR. The mechanism adopted by GP is compared with that of the Morpheme Alternant Theory (MAT). The latter is a kind of "the basic approach to morphophonemics taken by American structuralists" (p. 181). The inadequacies of the MAT, which arise as more data is provided, are gradually emended. The discussion leads to

the point where further revisions of the MAT, which are necessary in order to explain, e.g. the choice of the plural allomorphs in cases of dental stop deletion in English (cf. *plan-t-s*), would make it almost identical to GP. There is no doubt that the discussion above is an excellent introduction to the main theme of the chapter.

As a strating point, various constraints that lead to concrete URs ("concrete" in the sense that the UR must be identical with one of its surface alternants), are examined. The analyses of numerous examples (mainly from Russian), reveal that all these constraints are too restrictive. Thus, the need for more abstract URs becomes evident. The next section gradually presents higher levels of abstractness of URs. (the UR containing abstract segments represents the highest level). It become obvious that in order to account for the data (cf. pp. 205–208), some abstract descriptions are necessary. Yet, the analysis of Menonimi data (pp. 208–211), within a theory unconstrained for abstractness, appears incorerect. There, a lexical solution is to be preferred over a phonological one. This clearly reveals that there must be a principled way to disallow certain abstract analyses. The latter problem is taken up in the sections that follow. Two approaches, which limit the abstractness of URs by restricting the concept of a possible phonological rule are discussed. First, the proposal put forward by Kiparsky (1968, 1971) is presented. The authors doubt the strength of Kiparsky's arguments against the existence of absolute nutralization (AN), The exclusion of AN from phonological theory is considered too strong a constraint on UR since it prohibits a number of independently motivated analyses. The weak version of the alternation condition is accepted, but it is claimed that it is not a solution to, but "just a restatement of the problem of abstractness" (p. 219). The final section shows how a different approach to the notion of a phonological rule can lead to extremely concrete URs. Here, the True Generalization Condition (TGC), developed by Hooper (1976) is discussed. It becomes clear that if all phonological rules are "defined to operate on the phonetic representation" (p. 221), the level of abstractness of URs is drastically reduced. Examples are given that falsify the validity of TGC (pp. 225–31). Finally it is observed that violations of TGC, that are allowed by Hooper's theory, prove the internal inconsistency of the approach.

Clearly, the chapter presents only selected views on abstractness that can be observed within GP. Yet, the mtaerial is chosen in such a way that the existence of conflicting trends becomes apparent. Thus, the conclusion that the problem of abstractness is till open is evident.

"The representation of sounds" (Ch. 7), is the next theoretical issue to be discussed. Before going into details, the authors mention a few arguments for the semi-continuous nature of an utterance and for the representation of each segment as a matrix of phonetic features. "A survey of features" (pp. 241–53), which is one of the main topics of the chapter, is preceded by a brief presentation of generally accepted criteria for the choice of a particular feature system. A discussion of most commonly used features follows. Examples of phonological processes that illustrate the naturalness of a given feature or a combination of features are provided. The question of binary features is also raised. It seems, however, that the argument for the maltivalued nature of vowel height and consonatal place of articulation is not strict enough. Features denoting vowel height and place of articulation in consonants (whether binary or multinary), should not be treated in the same manner: only the latter describe the contact of *two* articulators.

The next section reintroduces the concept of a syllable into GP. Evidence is given to show that the syllable is relevant for the statement of phonological generalizations. It is also claimed that syllabification might be distinctive in some languages. The question about the place in the grammar where the syllabification rules would apply is raised) but no definite conclusion is reached here.

In the rest of the chapter, problems related to the representation of tone are discussed. After some differences between tone and pitch have been explained and various types of tones described, the authors proceed to a discussion of contour tones. It is shown that contour tones can develop from level tones, and that they can function as a compound structure of level tones. The latter observations, however, is not confirmed by the data from Kru. This, in turn, suggests that it might be sometimes necessary to represent contour tones as distinct tonological units. Two different views on the representation of tone in the lexicon are presented: segmental and suprasegmental. Evidence (mainly from Thai) for each approach is provided. In the final section, basic assumptions of the autosegmental approach by Goldsmith (1976) are briefly discussed. There, the data presented previously in favour of the suprasegmental representation of tone are re-analyzed in terms of the autosegmental approach. One may only regret, however, that there is no autosegmental description of tonal phenomena that have been presented as evidence for the segmental representation of tone. As it stands, the autosegmental approach provides just a different description of the data that supports its basic assumptions, but gives no solution to cases that speak against the suprasegmental representation of tone.

Chapter 8 raises two issues: the interactions of various rules and the reapplication of the same rule in a phonological derivation. Three approaches to the first problem are presented: the direct mapping hypothesis (DMH), the free reapplication hypothesis (FRH), and the ordered rule hypothesis. Inadequacies of the first two approaches are illustrated on the basis of phonological processes from various languages (such as, Lardil, Russian, Tunica, Yawelmani, Modern Hebrew). The 3rd approach to the rule interactions, namely, the ordered rule hypothesis, appears to account for all examples of previous sections that were presented for and against the other two approaches. A brief discussion of three kinds of theoretically possible counter-examples to the ordered rule hypothesis follows. It is claimed that although some evidence against this hypothesis exists it is "explicable in terms of auxiliary principles" (p. 318).

The discussion of the second issue of the chapter shows that three approaches to the reapplication of the same rule in a phonological derivation parallel those that were distinguished in reference to interactions of various rules. That is, simultaneous application principle corresponds to the DMH, iterative application principle corresponds to the FRH, and directional iterative application is similar in its effects to the ordered rule hypothesis. Also, the reasons for the rejection of the first two approaches, and the choice of the 3rd one, are the same as those that led to the choice of the ordered rule hypothesis in the previous section (there, the comparison of the rhythmic law in Slovak and vowel shortening in Gidbal is extremely appealing). The chapter leaves no doubt that the similarity of the views on the two problems is not accidental. Clearly, it reflects the fact that the same ordering relations are exibited by distinct rules and by multiple application of one rule.

Chapter 9 presents an overview of conventions for the application and formulation of phonological rules. After a few introductory remarks on the necessity of explicit formalism in GP and on the criteria for the evaluation of notational devices, the authors proceed to the discussion of the convention on rule application and of the feature notation. The importance of the criterion of naturalness is stressed. As observed by the authors, the choice of the material in the sections that follow (abbreviatory devices developed mainly in SPE), does not make it necessary to consider the problem of naturalness in relation to other notational devices. This is quite understandable, but in view of later developments of GP, highly regrettable.

First the concept of rule schema is explained (on the basis of two vowel shortening rules in Old English and Middle English), and the SPE approach to notational devices is

briefly characterized. A detailed discussion of the functions of each abbreviatory device follows. The distinction of two functions of parenthesis notation is claimed to be of help in solving the problem of ordering: only the parenthesis that does not abbreviate elementary rules should be ordered conjunctively. This solution seems very promising. In order to be of any help, however, one of its basic assumptions, namely, the concept of an elementary rule, should be explicitly defined. Until then, the claim that the concept of "elementary rule ought to be reserved for a rule that has some independent status as a possible rule of grammar" (p. 351), gives a great possibility of speculations.

The functions of angle brackets are exemplified with English stress rules, the umlaut rule of Old High German and the 2nd Velar Palatalization in Polish. (for a different treatment of Polish data, cf. Gussmann 1978a, b). The problem of ordering of subrules collapsed by angle brackets is present throughout the whole section.

A comparison of vowel insertion processes in Yawelmani and vowel deletion in Tonkawa shows clearly that, in order to escape insignificant generalizations, the power of the brace notation should be limited. A possibility of eliminating brace notations from grammar is mentioned, but its validity is strongly doubted. The next section shows that variable relations may hold between one feature or between distinct features. Problems that arise in connection with mirror image rules are discussed, but no solution to them is given. The mirror image schemata are said to illustrate the state of flux in the area of notational devices in GP.

The next section presents arguments for and against introduction of transformational rules into GP. It is shown that methathesis provides strong evidence for the transformational formant. This, however, leads to the question whether this device should be used in order to account for other phenomena (e.g. vowel coalescence, vowel nasalization, compensatory lengthening). The situation is far from clear, and no definite conclusion is reached. The representation of length, which is the topic of the next section, is said to be governed by language specific, rather than universal, principles. Some language require a geminate representation of length (e.g. Lithuanian), while others, provide evidence for feature notation for length (e.g. Dinka). Evidence is given (both language internal and external) that shows that two dialects may differ in the representation of length. A short discussion of the empirical evidence for expressing the underlying unity of phonological processes closes the chapter. There, language games, historical changes and the principle of "sameness of restrictions" are analyzed. Although the presentation is rather sketchy, it makes its point clear.

The final chapter investigates two types of non-phonetic factors (extragrammatical and grammatical), that may determine the application of a phonological rule. Due to the lack of thorough studies (but, cf. Rubach 1974), extraggrammatical factors (rate and style of speech, etc) are treated rather briefly. Grammatical factors, on the other hand, are described in a more detailed manner. The authors demonstrate that a morpheme may be exceptional in two ways: it may fail to undergo a rule or, it may fail to condition a rule. The fact that each of the two types of exceptional behaviour can be exibited either by a small class of morphemes (e.g. rhythmic law in Czech) or, by the majority of the morphemes (e.g. a rule that vocalizes yers in the present tense in Russian), makes the nede for a distinction of minor rule (and exceptional plus rule feature), and major rule (and ex ceptional minus rule feature) absolutely clear. It is shown that the borderline cases, where the distinction cannot be drawn (e.g. the Spanish diphthongization rule), require lexical marking of all targets of a given rule. Before the issue of the lexicon is further developed, three sections are devoted to the analysis of the interdependences of phonology, morphology and syntax. First, given a situation where a rule applies only in the environment

of a morpheme with a definite grammatical status, two analyses are compared: that with morphological marking and that with the minor rule. The retraction rule in Russian illustrates a case where only the former type of description captures a significant generalization. English stress rules (e.g. the retraction rule for disyllables), leave no possibility for a description with the minor rule. There, only the analysis that directly refers to the grammatical category is available.

The next section discusses the functions of various types of boundaries. Considerable attention is given to the motivation of the use of each type of boundary. Next, the question whether cyclic rules always apply to grammatically defined contexts is raised. In the last section, various approaches to the description of segmental and sequential constraints are considered. The authors present the way in which these constraints are expressed by morpheme structure rules (MSRs). Several examples illustrate drawbacks of the MSR approach. The ordering solution is discussed as a way out of the problem of duplication of phonological rules by MSRs, but again, it is proved to be inadequate. The distinction of the two ways in which a constraint on UR may influence the application of a phonological rule leads to a total rejection of the ordering solution. Thus, given that MSRs apply in the lexicon, tha authors proceed to discuss the ways in which redundant features of pronunciation and limitations on morphemes might be described. One position is that all constraints on morphemes should be accounted for by feature redundancy rules. Evidence from Russian and Classical Arabic is given to show that this approach is false. The authors take a stand that some constraints "should be expressed by means of conditions on URs, rather than by rules that assign redundant feature values" (p. 435). The book closes with useful language and subject indexes.

The discussion above should, hopefully, convince the teacher that "GPDT" is an extremely valuable and exhaustive textbook. Both the teacher and the student would enjoy the reading of analyses (and solving of the Exercises), that are based on such a great variety of languages. And, as already observed, the method of presentation adopted by the authors should make the reading even more interesting. No doubt, a course that relies on "GPDT" would prepare students for real phonological work of their own.

REFERENCES

Dingwall, W. (ed.). 1971. *A survey of linguistic science*. Colledge Park, Maryland: University of Maryland Press.

Goldsmith, J. 1976. *Autosegmental phonology*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, the MIT. Reproduced by Indiana Linguistic Club.

Gussmann, E. 1978a. *Contrastive Polish-English consonental phonology*. Warszawa:PWN.

Gussmann, E. 1978b. *Explorations in abstract phonology*. Lublin: M. Curie-Skłodowska University Press.

Hooper, J. 1976. *An introduction to natural phonology*. New York, Academic Press.

Hyman, L. H. 1975. *Phonological theory and analysis*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Kiparsky, P. 1971. "Historical linguistics". In W. Dingwall (ed.). 1971. 577–642.

Rubach, J. 1974. *Variability of consonants in English and Polish*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Warsaw.

Rubach, J. In press. *Analysis of phonological structures*. Warszawa: PWN.

Schane, S. A. 1973. *Generative phonology*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Sloat, C. et al. 1978. *Introduction to phonology*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

SPE — *The sound pattern of English*. (Chomsky, N. and M. Halle, 1968. New York: Harper and Row.)

Principles of diachronic syntax. By David W. Lightfoot. Pp. X+. 429. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Reviewed by Roman Kopytko, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Principles of diachronic syntax by David W. Lightfoot (henceforth PDS) is an important publication in the field of diachronic linguistics at the close of the seventies. However, the problems and questions raised in the book are of great methodological significance both to synchronic and diachronic studies of language. The theoretical framework adopted in PDS is that of EST as developed by Chomsky (1973, 1975, 1977). PDS contains an extensive presentation of EST (with some modifications proposed by the author) and its application to the analysis of diachronic syntax. A number of issues presented in PDS are controversial, some of them speculative and unacceptable even to the proponents of TGG.

PDS consists of seven chapters, bibliography, index of references and citation index. Chapters 2, 3 and 7 are crucial to the presentation of the main ideas of the book (therefore they will be reviewed in more detail); chapters 1, 4, 5 and 6 are auxiliary and illustrative in nature.

Chapter One deals with a theory of (restrictive) grammar, i.e. a version of EST based on the latest developments in the field including the autonomy of syntax hypothesis and a version of interpretative semantics (Chomsky 1975), '$\bar{\bar{X}}$ convention' (Jackendoff 1977), the distinction between lexical and transformational rules (Wasow 1977), root and structure-preserving transformations (Emonds 1976), conditions on the applications of transformations (Chomsky 1973) and finally NP-preposing and WH-movement transformations (which constitute the 'core grammar' of English). The trace theory of movement rules is discussed in chapter six.

Lightfoot discards the notion of 'psychological reality' in favor of 'the correct grammar' for a certain language, i.e. the one which accounts for the maximum data with minimal machinery. (The data include those from language acquisition and diachronic change).

Chapter One contains also a section devoted to a survey and critique of the early generative approaches to syntactic change (including such authors as P. Kiparsky, E. Traugott and R. Lakoff).

In sum, Chapter One constitutes a very useful summary and critical survey of the current developments in the field of TGG and its application to the diachronic analysis of language.

Chapter Two consists of two sections; the first deals with modals in modern English; the second presents a diachronic analysis of modals.

Lightfoot's basic claim is that the antecedents of the modern modals (i.e. 'pre-modals') for example OE verbs *sculan*, *willian*, *magan*, *cunnan* and *motan* had all the characteristic properties of verbs; however, a number of independent isolated changes that took place at the end of the fifteenth century led to a re-analysis of the 'pre-modals' as a new category 'modal'.

The changes which isolated the pre-modals as a distinct class were the following:

(i) loss of all the direct object constructions with pre-modals,

(ii) loss of all the preterite-presents except the premodals, thereby isolating the latter as a unique inflectional class,

(iii) increased opacity of the past tense pre-modals *might*, *could*, *should*, *would* and *must*,

(iv) special marking for epistemic pre-modals to avoid otherwise expected SVOM or it M NP... S structures,

(v) the development of *to* infinitives with almost all verbs except the pre-modals.

A remarkable thing is that all those changes took place within the same short period.

The restructuring can be summarized as follows: (pre-modals are subsumed under V in OE under M in ENE)

Fragment of OE grammar	Fragment of ENE grammar
S → NP VP	S NP Aux VP
VP → V (NP)	Aux T(M)
NP → {N, S}	VP (have+en) (be+ing)V(M)
NP N	

The linguists working within the framework of 'semantically based grammars' will not be entirely satisfied with the explanation of the diachronic development of modals as offered in PDS according to the principles of autonomous syntax. (Many semantic factors were not taken account of in the analysis e.g. the semantic change of the pre-modals and its possible grammatical consequences, the relation of modals to the subjunctive mood, etc.)

Chapter Three presents an explanation of the restructuring of modals (as presented in Chapter Two) by the Transparency Principle (henceforth TP). With the five independent changes which affected the pre-modals the grammar of English had become increasingly marked in certain areas. The complexity developed by the increase in the number of exception markers will lead to a sudden cataclysmic restructuring of the grammar due to the operation of the TP. Lightfoot defines the principle as follows: "... the TP characterizes the limits to the permitted degree of exceptionality or derivational complexity ... as these limits are approached so some kind of therapeutic re-analysis will be necessary to eliminate the offending complexity. Viewed in this way, such a principle of grammar will predict the point at which a radical reanalysis will take place" (p. 122). The TP requires derivations to be minimally complex and the underlying structures to be close to their respective surface structure. The TP is a part of a theory of grammar; it is not a component of a theory of syntactic change.

The goal for work in syntactic change is the formulation of a TP. The TP being a principle of the theory of grammar eliminates certain otherwise possible grammatical descriptions (if they disagree with a TP). The TP revealed through historical change has consequences for synchronic descriptions and provides a basis for selecting one synchronic grammar over another.

Several questions and doubts suggest themselves in connection with the TP. Firstly, does the TP explain all syntactic changes? (excluding those caused by extralinguistic factors); secondly, how to treat syntactic changes not accompanied by simultaneous changes in other parts of grammar?; thirdly, how to restrict the TP to ascribe some predictive force to its operation? The post-factum analysis of syntactic change as presented in PDS does not meet the methodological standards of empirical sciences. On the other hand, the formulation of the TP is so broad and its operation so vague that it seems to be able to account for all changes possible (or impossible) in any language.

A theory of change proposed by Lightfoot in Chapter Three contains four assumptions:

a) communicability must be preserved between generations,

b) grammars practise therapy rather than prophylaxis,

c) less highly valued grammars are liable to re-analysis,

d) certain therapeutic changes are more likely than others.

Generally, it is postulated that there are no formal constraints on possible change, beyond those imposed by the theory of grammar. Accordingly, no 'diachronic universal' is independent of a theory of grammar. Under this approach research on diachronic change is

integrated with work on grammatical theory. Although, on the one hand it seems to be a very desirable move, on the other it may lead to quite undesirable consequences, namely, the vicious circle — when some principles of grammar (hypothetical and speculative in nature) will justify diachronic rules or processes which in turn are used to motivate some synchronic rules or principles. Furthermore, the diachronic principles and descriptions will differ between linguists adopting various restrictive models and principles of grammar.

In the final section of Chapter Three Lightfoot claims that syntactic reconstructions (whose historical reality is doubtful) do not contribute much to the investigation of language change.

Chapter Four gives more examples of historical reanalysis of the type presented in Chapter Two (i.e. English modals). Accordingly, English quantifiers, the English infinitive, the rule $NP \rightarrow \bar{S}$ in ENE and serial verbs in Kwa are discussed in successive sections.

Chapter Five presents some changes which affect the lexicon and are claimed to follow from the TP. Those include impersonal constructions in ME and the passive constructions in Greek and English. The analysis of passives in English is based on the distinction between lexical rules and transformations proposed by Wasow (1977). Lightfoot argues that the transformational passive was introduced into English in the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries.

Chapter Six deals with two cyclic transformations i.e. *NP*-preposing and *wh*-movement. The basic claim is that the introduction of NP-Preposing in late ME accounts for the simultaneity of various ME changes (i.e. the passive, impersonals, subject to subject raising, intraposition). Accordingly, a single change in the abstract grammar (e.g. the introduction of NP-Preposing in late ME) leads to surface changes which occur simultaneously. Chapter Six concludes with a historical account of relative clauses, complementizers and *wh*-constructions in English.

Chapter Seven discusses the causes of re-analysis. In the first section the author presents H. Andersen's views on types of historical change and language acquisition. Then, Lightfoot analyses the role of surface structures and analogies as explanatory principles for historical change. In the section devoted to independent causation three kinds of extra-grammatical causes of change are distinguished: foreign influence, expressivity and 'after-thought'. Lightfoot argues however against independent diachronic principles as 'explanatory principles' in diachronic syntax. Accordingly, he claims that the typological shift SOV to SVO does not explain various language changes and contradicts the theory of language acquisition which asserts that grammars are constructed anew by the individuals of each generation. The author views change as a function of chance and necessity. Thus, it is a matter of change that one kind of opacity is resolved by one reanalysis rather than another; on the other hand it is a matter of necessity that grammars will not tolerate excessive opacity and perceptual difficulties.

Several genral remarks suggest themselves in connection with PDS. Firstly, the title of the book seems to be somewhat misleading. As a matter of fact Lightfoot has not succeeded in establishing any principles of diachronic syntax; instead he has proposed a 'research programme' (in the Lakatosian sense) and the book should be rather entitled *A research programme for diachronic syntax.*

Secondly, the value of particular chapters in PDS is uneven. Chapter One is a concise and very useful presentation of EST at the close of seventies. Chapter Two, Three and Seven are crucial to the exposition of Lightfoot's main ideas on diachronic syntax. Of those three, Chapter Seven is the weakest. Except for the operation of the proposed TP the author has nothing new to say on the subject of the causes of re-analysis; therefore he

admits the traditional views in that respect. Chapters Four, Five and Six are mainly illustrative and do not contribute much to the development of new ideas in PDS.

Thirdly, some problems presented in those chapters are very loosely connected with the main topic of PDS. Accordingly, the section on the serial works in Kwa (Chapter Four) could be utterly omitted in the publication. Some other sections should be re-made and shortened.

The main value of this book lies in an attempt to establish a research programme for diachronic syntax based on EST. Some doubts connected with the proposed research programme have been expressed in the review of Chapter Three (above). Irrespective of the fruitfulness and success of the proposed programme it will certainly stimulate research in the field of historical syntax.

In conclusion, it should be stressed that PDS is a must for students of diachronic linguistics familiar with current developments in linguistics.

REFERENCES

Anderson, S. and P. Kiparsky (eds). 1973. *A festschrift for Morris Halle.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Chomsky, N. 1973. "Conditions on transformations". In Anderson, S. and P. Kiparsky (eds). 1973. 232—86.

Chomsky, N. 1975. *Reflections on language.* New York: Pantheon.

Chomsky, N. 1977. "On *wh*-movement". In Culicover, P. et al. (eds). 1977. 71—132.

Culicover, P., T. Wasow and A. Akmijan (eds). 1977. *Formal syntax.* New York: Academic Press.

Emonds, J. 1976. *A transformational approach to English syntax: root, structure preserving and local transformations.* New York: Academic Press.

Jackendoff, R. S. 1977. *$\bar{X}$ syntax: a study of phrase structure.* Linguistic inquiry monograph no. 2. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Wasow, T. 1977. "Transformations and the lexicon". In Culicover, P., et al. (eds). 1977. 327 — 61.

The self-begetting novel. By S. G. Kellman. Pp. x+161. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Reviewed by Janusz Semrau, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

It is satisfying to note the appearance of a new study grappling with novelistic self-consciousness, a subject somewhat neglected until only recently. The stated intention of *The self-begetting novel* is to "define and account for a major sub-genre of modern French, British, and American fiction" which the author labels "self-begetting". The term telescopes the two following ideas: 1. the "illusion of writing itself", 2. the concomitant development of the central character "to the point at which he is able to take up his pen and compose the novel we have just finished reading" (p. 3). What it informs, then, is the projection of both "a self" (the author) and "itself" (his work) being born.

The book opens with a short preface and its main body is organized in seven chapters of which the first performs the function of a general introduction. Each of the chapters falls in turn into smaller sections; appended at the close are a list of "Some reflexive fictions", notes, and an index. Although there is no formal bibliography, the list can well serve as a useful guide to further reading.

Rooting the concept of self-begetting fiction in the tradition of the French novel, Kellman devotes to it most of his attention and much of the space of the study. The bulk

of his evidence rests on Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu* and Sartre's *La nausée*, each alloted a separate chapter (q and 3). Chapter 4 concentrates largely on Butor's *La modification*, and also accommodates cursory discussions of selected books by André Gide, Alain Robbe-Grillet, Claude Mauriac, Robert Pinget, and Nathalie Sarraute which are meant to demonstrate what is typical and characteristic of the sub-genre under discussion. The next two parts deal, respectively, with English and American literature. Though classified as "less than central" to the first realm, the self-begetting urge is associated by the author with a number of important British writers (James Joyce, Aldous Huxley, Iris Murdoch, Lawrence Durrell, Doris Lessing). In keeping with the orientation of the study, their individual works (*A portrait of the artist as a young man*, *Point counter point*, *Under the net*, *The Alexandria quartet*, *The golden notebook*) are examined basically as "variations" on the French paradigm. The self-begetting theme in American letters is presented as a marginal but at the same time more idiosyncratic development owing to its alleged fusion with and qualification by some of the country's popular myths ("initiation", "self-made man", "Great American Novel"). The final chapter is devoted entirely to Samuel Beckett's novelistic trilogy: *Molly*, *Malone dies*, *The unnamable*, which provides, according to Kellman, "a thematic limit" to the convention of self-begetting fiction.

Built upon an original thesis, written with clarity and persistently argued, *The self-begetting novel* is an interesting and, potentially, an important book. Also, the author brings to his analyses impressive scholarship drawn from a variety of sources. Much as it is challenging and ambitious, however, it is itself challengeable at many points along the line of its execution. To start with, the very title of the study proves to be something of a misnomer or, rather, not to rule out its validity as a critical term, the novels chosen by the author serve but poorly to illuminate the issue at question. With the possible exception of Beckett's trilogy, hardly one of them "deliberately lays bare all its working parts" (p. 9), offers a "happy fusion of form and content" (p. 3) and, finally, lives up to the proclaimed status of "both process and product" (p. 4). Although some of the presented works contain reflection on literary theory and technique, none of them begets itself in the true sense of the word; at best they do no better than impart a description of their genesis rather than expose the mechanics itself. One is not surprised, then, to find out that during his discourse Kellman settles for a significantly altered definition of novelistic self-begetting, making it appear as a function of the novel's thematic plane (e.g. "Jacke's development as a novelist is inseparable from his growth as an individual. Both produce *Under the net*", p. 89 emph. J. S.). Most of the discussed novels do indeed trace the maturing of a writer, still they all could be comfortably defined by established narrative types, notably Künstlerroman or Bildungsroman. Moreover, to do justice to the idea of artistic self-begetting, the author is often forced to rely on the somewhat slim premise that "the very existence of the book (we are reading) itself constitutes objective evidence of (the narrator's) eventual choice of a literary calling" (p. 3).

Apart from these general remarks, the work under review is marred by several technical shortcomings. For a study of this nature, its introductory chapter is disappointingly thin and unimpressive, especially in view of the virtual absence of any substantial theoretical criticism later in the book or a résumé at the end of it. Notwithstanding its claim to originality, *The self-begetting novel* is quite tranditional in approach. Although Kellman focuses closely on the analysed novels to illustrate his thesis, apparently to stress and utilize the self-begetting principles of "autogeny" and "self-sufficiency", he tends to depend also on external and very often peripheral evidence like the fact that "just as Iris Murdoch's critical study of Sartre preceded her own *Under the net*, Beckett's first published book was appropriately a monograph entitled *Proust*" (p. 130), or the "freakish coincidence" that C. B. Davis's *The great American novel* — was published in the same year as *La nausée*" (p. 121). Furthermore, thorough as they are, the particular major interpretations do not result in many new insights since many of them lapse into plot summary and quotations (in the case of French sources the latter given, unnecessarily, it seems, both in English and the original). Besides, all the novels treated so extensively here have on many occasions been discussed at great length elsewhere. On the other hand, a number of relatively less generally known works which could considerably contribute to our knowledge and appreciation of self-begetting fiction are dealt with marginally or perfunctorily (e.g. Flann O'Brien's *At swim-two-birds*, Robert Pinget's *Quelqu'un*, or Claude Mauriac's *La marquise sortit à cinq heurs*).

Within the self-evolved limitations of the study, its individual sections comply, on the whole, with its thesis and, in general, are concentrated and well united. The only exception appears to be the chapter devoted to American literature which is the most controvertial part of *The self-begetting novel*. Compared with European tradition, American fiction might indeed loom as "the preserve of idiots (...) and other miscellaneous naifs" (p. 101) rather than intellectuals, may come short of "attention to subtleties of form" (p. 102), and be characterized by "mistrust in the autonomy of art" (p. 103). Still, it is intriguing to confront this outlook with the latest book by J. Klinkowitz holding that "...the strength of Hawthorne's works establishes an essential principle for the development of American fiction: self-conscious critical attention to matters of theme and form will be the yeardstick by which our fiction grows. (Klinkowitz 1980:4). As a matter of fact, Kellman eventually adopts the view that although the sophistication necessary for it "was some time in developing", "an element of self-consciousness" has finally found its way into American letters. As mentioned earlier, the author presents the process against the evolution of some of the country's congenial myths. This is, however, where the book loses much of its credibility as a dedicated and sustained study of the novel. Apart from Henry Miller who is the only writer discussed in any detail, the other few relevant novelists included in it (e.g. Vladimir Nabokov, John Barth) are given but scanty attention. Instead, the chapter expands into a cliché-riddled survey of American literature at large — from James Fenimore Cooper, Walt Whitman, Emily Dickinson — through John Berryman, Charles Olson and on to Norman Mailer and Donald Barthelme, with occassional references to such figures as Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln and Malcolm X. There seems to be also a problem of proportion here, for example, significant as he is to the self-begetting theme, Whitman himself takes up as many as five pages of this slender volume.

Another disturbing aspect of the reviewed book is the fact that it gives the impression of a historically closed study. Actually, it admits a couple of promising, avant-garde writers of today but the author does not even mention their works. This is regrettable because some of them, like the novels by Sukenick or Sorrentiono, could offer an exciting opportunity to ventilate the issue of the future of self-begetting fiction.

If *The self-begetting novel* fails to fulfil its intentions, let alone justify its jacket blurb, it at least succeeds in pointing out and partially filling in some gaps in the study of novelistic self-consciousness. With the current wave of its popularity, different and often confusing names have proliferated to inform its intensity and particular techniques. By his consistent usage of the notion of " (self-) reflexiveness". Kellman makes a positive step towards restricting it to fiction that expresses its awareness of an authorial construct set up against literary tradition and convention through inherent or interpolated theoretical discourse. This certainly makes for a better understanding of the other most widely used term: "self-reflective", which should be rather reserved to the "mirror-effect" of turning the novel back upon itself to "deliberately lay bare all its working parts" through formal maneuvering of the very medium. So far, however, we have lacked a broader term

for such intensly self-conscious books as Robert Coover's *Pricksongs and descants*, John Barth's *Lost in the funhouse*, or Raymond Federman's *Take it or leave it*, where both self-reflexive and self-reflective strategies variously dominate and virtually take over the thematic plane. This is precisely where Kellman's title coinage is likely to gain full endorsement as a definitive critical category in its twofold informative capacity ("a self" and "itself"). Instructively, the author's definition of the self-begetting novel easily satisfies Federman's own call for a kind of fiction that "will establish itself as it writes itself": "While (...) telling the story of his life, or the story of any life, the fiction writer can at the same time tell the story of the story he is telling, the story of the language he is manipulating, the story of the methods he is using..." (Federman 1975:12). Even if this is going to be its only hasting contribution to the study of the novel, the present work should not in any event be neglected.

REFERENCES

Alter, R. 1975. *Partial magic. The novel as a self-conscious genre*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Federman, R. (ed.). 1975. *Surfiction. Fiction now ... and tomorrow*. Chicago: The Swallow Press.

Graff, G. 1979. *Literature against itself*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Klinkowitz, J. 1977. *The life of fiction*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Klinkowitz, J. 1980. *The practice of fiction in America. Writers from Hawthorne to the present*. Ames: The Iowa State University Press.