

REVIEWS

A modern approach to English grammar. An introduction to systemic grammar. By James Muir. Pp. 149. London: Batsford, 1972.

Reviewed by Florant Aarts, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

It is now a fairly long time ago since *Word* published Halliday's famous but rather programmatic (and often obscure) article "Categories of the theory of grammar" (1961), in which he first expounded what is now known as "systemic grammar", but what was usually referred to as "scale and category grammar" in the sixties. Since 1961, Halliday's model has been worked out in a number of articles (notably his own "Notes on transitivity and theme" (1967-68)), but more comprehensive accounts are also available. Apart from the book under review there are F. S. Scott et al. (1968) *English grammar. A linguistic study of its classes and structures*, R. A. Hudson's (1971) *English complex sentences. An introduction to systemic grammar* and J. McH. Sinclair's (1972) *A course in spoken English: grammar*, while H. M. Berry's *Systemic linguistics*, described in Muir's preface as "a theoretical counterpart to this book", is shortly to be published.

Muir's book falls into three parts. Part one is a general survey of systemic theory, which introduces the reader to the various theoretical categories and concepts it employs: unit, class, structure, system, etc. A distinction is made between surface grammar (part 2) and deep grammar (part 3), which is based on the possibility of looking at language from the point of view of the chain axis or the choice axis (Halliday's terms for syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations).

Part one is a straightforward exposition of systemic doctrine which leaves little to be desired, except that it does not quite succeed in explaining why a grammar should have both a surface and a deep component. If two superficially different sentences (an active/passive pair, for instance) are felt to be semantically equivalent, then how exactly do we account for this? What Muir explains is that their different surface structures are the result of making different choices from a set of underlying systems, but he fails to show how the grammar accounts for the fact that structurally dissimilar items may nevertheless be related. To say that "It is by way of systems that different syntagms... can be shown to be related, and similar syntagms... can be shown to be unrelated" (12) will not do.

Part 2 is divided into four main sections (morpheme and word, word and group, group and clause, clause and sentence), which, starting with the morpheme, discuss the various units of the grammatical rank-scale in terms of their structure, and in terms of their function in the structure of the unit next above. Thus the unit "group" has three classes (nominal, verbal and adverbial). The structure of the nominal group is described as (m), h, (q), i. e., modifier-head-qualifier, where the arrow denotes obligatory sequence and the bracketed elements are optional. Nominal groups are said to function at two places in the structure of the clause, viz. at "subject" and at "complement". In all there are five units on the grammatical rank-scale: morpheme, word, group, clause and sentence. Each of these, with the exception of the morpheme, has a particular structure,

describable in terms of the unit next below, and each, with the exception of the sentence, has a particular place in the structure of the unit next above. Whenever this regular pattern is disturbed, for instance when a clause functions in the structure of a group or a group in the structure of a word, systemic grammar speaks of rankshift.

Part 2 is a useful survey of a number of important grammatical structures in English, but unfortunately it is marred by a large number of mistakes and inaccuracies. For reasons of space I shall only mention a few of them. The *mine*-set of the possessive pronouns (24) occurs as the head of a nominal group not only at C but also at S in clause structure (e. g. *Mine is over there*). The discussion of the auxiliaries (42 ff.) owes a great deal to Palmer's *A linguistic study of the English verb*. Like Palmer, Muir classifies auxiliaries into two groups: non-modal (*be, have* and *do*) and modal (*will, shall, can, must, ought, dare, need*). *May* is not mentioned, although it belongs to the second group, of course. *Be* and *have* are said to be capable of being followed by both the *-ing* and *-en* forms of the verb, but this is only true of *be*. The verb *dare* in *Do they dare us?* is not an auxiliary, but a lexical verb, which, in this sense, always requires *do* in interrogative clauses. Muir includes the negative element *not* as part of the structure of the verbal group, which he describes by means of the formula $\overline{(a)} \overline{(n)} \overline{1}$ (= (auxiliary) (negative element) lexical verb). This formula does not account for the place of *not* in some non-finite verbal groups (*not having been informed*) nor does it explain that in such cases *not* cannot have its enclitic form. Furthermore, it fails to make explicit that *l* is always non-finite except when neither *a* nor *n* are chosen. The decision to describe *not* as being part of the verbal group is of course quite problematic anyway. So is the recognition of an element Z in clause structure for nominal groups in sentences like *They want the boys to do it*, where, according to Muir, *the boys* functions as complement of *want* and as subject of *to do*. This is quite counter-intuitive: every native speaker of English "knows" that *the boys* cannot possibly be interpreted as the complement of *want*. Unfortunately, this Z element is not treated in part 3, where one would have expected it, since the only way to deal satisfactorily with such cases is in terms of deep grammar.

In part 3 two reasons are given for the necessity of having a deep component in one's grammar: the first is that surface grammar assigns similar descriptions to unrelated sentences and different descriptions to related ones, the second is that it does not explain that the occurrence of a particular item is the result of a choice from a set of items, each of which might also have been selected at that particular place in structure. The total number of options at any place is known as a system, each particular choice as one of the terms or features of that system. It is also pointed out that before the options available at a particular place can be specified it is necessary to establish the environment of the system to which they belong. All this agrees with Halliday (1963: 5-15), who claims that an adequate description of a language can only be provided by a grammar which is concerned with chain classes as well as with choice classes and that it is impossible for choice classes to be primary classes, "since we cannot account for a choice until we have established that place in structure where the choice is made..." (Halliday 1963: 9).

Now the trouble with Muir's book is that he does not quite succeed in making it clear what exactly the relation is between the two components of systemic grammar. In part 3 he discusses the main systems at clause rank (3.1) and at group rank (3.2) without specifying how these systems (or the choices made from them) account for such facts as the synonymy of two sentences that are superficially different. It is evident that an active/passive pair of sentences should receive different surface structure descriptions (110). However, their systemic descriptions are different, too. How then do we explain the fact that we interpret them as semantically identical? A dilemma

also arises in the case of pairs like *The knife cuts well* and *The meat cuts well*, which are superficially similar, but are interpreted differently. If we say that the different interpretations are due to different choices from underlying systems, we are saying in fact that different systemic choices account not only for different surface structures with identical meanings (as in active/passive pairs), but also for different meanings with identical surface structures (as in the example just quoted). In that case TG's solution, viz. one deep structure in the former case and two in the latter, is much to be preferred. There is another aspect in which TG is superior to the version of systemic grammar outlined by Muir, and that is that it clearly specifies the way in which deep structures are related to surface structures, viz. by means of transformational rules. "Meaningful choices", writes Muir (91), "are related to the classes and structures of surface grammar by a scale of realisation", but how this scale works is not adequately explained. There is nothing, for example, corresponding to the realisation rules and structure-building rules described by Hudson (1971). The reader therefore does not gain enough insight into the way in which systemic contrasts are related to structural differences. "One of the characteristics of systemic grammars", says Hudson (1971: 87), "is that structures are entirely predictable from features: given all of an item's features, we can predict exactly what its structure will be". I am afraid that this is not possible with the systemic apparatus supplied in this book. *

It would be unfair to the author to ignore the fact that this book is intended to serve as an introduction. In spite of its inaccuracies (and numerous misprints) it contains a great deal of information on some of the most important grammatical structures of English and as such it may serve a useful purpose. However, I do not think that it is a successful attempt to explain the rudiments of systemic theory.

REFERENCES

- Berry, H. M. (forthcoming). *Systemic linguistics*.
 Halliday, M. A. K. 1961. "Categories of the theory of grammar". *Word* 17. 241 - 292.
 Halliday, M. A. K. 1963. "Class in relation to the axes of chain and choice in language". *Linguistics* 2. 5 - 154.
 Halliday, M. A. K. 1967. "Notes on transitivity and theme in English". Part 1. *JL* 3. 37 - 81.
 Halliday, M. A. K. 1967. "Notes on transitivity and theme in English". Part 2. *JL* 3. 199 - 244.
 Halliday, M. A. K. 1968. "Notes on transitivity and theme in English". Part 3. *JL* 4. 179 - 215.
 Hudson, R. A. 1971. *English complex sentences. An introduction to systemic grammar*. Amsterdam, London: North-Holland Publishing Co.
 Palmer, F. R. 1965. *A linguistic study of the English verb*. London: Longmans.
 Scott, F. S. et al. 1968. *English grammar. A linguistic study of its classes and structures*. London, Auckland: Heinemann.
 Sinclair, J. McH. 1972. *A course in spoken English: grammar*. London: Oxford University Press.
Intonation. Ed. by Dwight L. Bolinger. Pp. 463. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1972.
 Reviewed by Halina Ziółkowska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

With recent advances in the techniques of analysis, more attention has been focused on intonation, that aspect of speech which has often been considered rather vague and difficult to classify. Selected readings in *Intonation*, edited by Dwight Bolinger, offer a

number of articles presenting the subject from different points of view. The book proves that intonation may be a vast area of study and may be examined in relation to various levels of expression.

The articles brought together are classed into eight parts. Each part deals with a different aspect of intonation and is preceded by a short introductory note. Part one entitled "Preliminaries" includes two papers. The first, "Around the edge of language: intonation", by Dwight Bolinger, introduces the basic facts about intonation and the fundamental terms necessary for grasping the subject. In the second article, Pierre R. Leon and Philippe Martin describe instruments that may be used to gather and verify the physical data. The authors begin with the most primitive machinery and pass on to the most modern, sophisticated equipment, namely the Melodic Analyser, which may greatly affect future work.

In part two, "Theory", an attempt is made at a systematic treatment of intonation. The reader is acquainted with a number of theories that have been developed up to the present day. This part includes five papers. The first three authors (Kenneth L. Pike, George L. Trager, and Robert P. Stockwell) represent the American school, out of which Robert P. Stockwell adopts the generative-transformational approach. Here he discusses mainly three problems, namely the problem of linguistic representation of intonation, the problem of placing the contour centre, and the problem of boundaries. At the same time he modifies some of his former views. David Crystal's article is a thorough summary of the British tradition, while the problem investigated by Dwight Bolinger ("Relative height") has not been given any attention up to now.

How does grammar relate to intonation? This question is dealt with in part three, "Intonation and grammar". Several languages are taken as the basis of analysis: French by Pierre Delattre, German by Maria Schubiger, English by Richard Gunter and Russian by František Daneš. The function of intonation in indicating the major parts within a sentence and in indicating sentences within discourse is discussed by Pierre Delattre. Maria Schubiger examines how the use of modal particles in German is parallel to the use of intonation in English. That sentences cannot be treated in isolation and that intonation connects sentences in context is proved by Richard Gunter. In the fourth article, František Daneš shows how the deficiencies of fixed word order in English are complemented by intonation and compares it with the Slavic languages where that dependence is not so strict.

Particular intonations are obviously connected with particular emotions. In their paper in part four "Intonation and emotion", Philip Lieberman and Sheldon B. Michaels analyse which of the acoustic phenomena have to be taken account of for a full identification of such emotions. Elizabeth Uldall, for her part, classifies emotions which are carried by specific intonations.

Intonation as the melody of speech, may also be seen in relation to music. Part five "Intonation and music", includes three papers: George List discusses "Speech melody in Central Thailand", Robert A. Hall points out that Elgar's typically British music is wholly dependent on the characteristic British melody of speech, and Ivan Fónagy and Klara Magdics deal with "Emotional patterns in intonation and music".

Are there any characteristic features that may be considered common in the intonations of different languages? Six papers in chapter six, "Universality", constitute an attempt to answer this question. It seems that intonation, more than any other area of linguistic study, offers evidence for solving this problem. Raymond S. Larsen and Eunice Victoria Pike consider Haustec intonation, and Allan Pence "Intonation in Kunimaipa (New Guinea)". The intonations of English and Japanese are compared by Isamu Abe,

of English and Swedish by Kerstin Hadding and Michael Studdert-Kennedy, and of English and Italian by Marguerite Chapallaz.

Part seven, "Perturbations", deals with those factors that, though unrelated to intonation, may cause certain changes in the chain of speech. The interference of vowels and consonants with intonation contours, the ability of listeners to detect intonation contours in whispered speech and the interrelation of tone and intonation in tone languages are the main problems presented here. The last part, "Varieties of English", is devoted to a discussion of the intonations of certain dialects of English, namely of Hawaiian English and of Gullah.

The collection of papers gathered in this book constitute an important and interesting help for readers who want to widen and deepen their knowledge of the subject and of problems connected with it. However, as it appears from the "Introduction", the work is meant for those readers whose acquaintance with the subject is rather limited or perhaps non-existent. With this assumption, it would have been worth-while to include some additional information concerning mainly the terminology used in particular articles, be it in the form of a glossary or footnotes. Those footnotes that are present do not explain terms like 'parenthesis' or 'disjuncture'. Consequently, such notions become rather vague and the reader may associate incorrect meanings with them.

Preliminaries to linguistic phonetics. By Peter Ladefoged. Pp. 122. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Reviewed by Wiesław Awedyk, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Ladefoged has undertaken a formidable task to describe "some of the phonetic events that occur in the languages of the world" (1). He employs the apparatus of experimental phonetics to describe "contrasts observable at the systematic phonetic level" (1). However, the ultimate aim of the author is "to assist in the development of a set of features which would be appropriate for phonological descriptions" (4).

The book is divided into ten chapters, the first nine chapters deal with the features connected with the phonation process (pp. 7 - 22), the airstream process (pp. 23 - 31), the oral-nasal process (pp. 32 - 35), places of articulation (pp. 36 - 45), manners of articulation (pp. 46 - 58), secondary articulation (pp. 59 - 66), vowels (pp. 67 - 80), and prosodic features (pp. 81 - 89). Each feature is described in terms of "the maximum number of systematic phonemic contrasts" and "arbitrary specified terms for use at the systematic phonetic level" (cf. 92 - 94). In the tenth chapter (pp. 91 - 111) Ladefoged compares his set of features with that proposed by Chomsky and Halle in *The sound pattern of English* (1968).

Since I cannot verify Ladefoged's set of features simply because of the lack of informants, I will take it for granted that he is right and limit myself to some methodological remarks.

The set of features proposed by Ladefoged is mainly of a physiological nature; there are, however, some acoustic (auditory) features, e. g., GRAVITY (44). Ladefoged is certainly right when he states that "some patterns can be explained in terms of acoustic events, others in terms of articulatory events" (4). He quotes an example from the history of English, where /x/ changed into /f/ and states that this change can be explained only with the help of the feature GRAVITY. I will not argue this assumption, but I believe that the two sets of features: physiological and acoustic (auditory) should be

clearly kept apart. Speech encoding and speech decoding are not based on the same principles, and speech decoding is not merely a reversed process to speech encoding (cf. Kim 1971 : 79 - 80). The feature SYLLABIC is a good example. In speech encoding the syllable seems to be the basic unit, though the processes like distant assimilation or spoonerisms (cf. MacKay 1969) point out that perhaps a unit larger than the syllable has to be considered. In speech decoding, on the other hand, that basic unit is probably the "taxonomic phoneme", but the neurophysiological investigations have not given a decisive answer to this question.

Ladefoged accepts a neurophysiological definition of the syllable (81). This definition does not carry any information about the physiological nature of the syllable. (Personally, I believe that the opening of the vocal tract is the basis of syllable formation, cf. Awedyk 1971). Moreover, the feature SYLLABIC is also a continuum. Vowels are syllabic in all languages, liquids and nasals are syllabic in English only in some contexts but they are regularly syllabic in Czech. Even spirants, which are occasionally syllabic in Indo-European languages, are regularly syllabic in some languages, e. g., Lendu described by Tucker (1940), who is also listed in Ladefoged's bibliography.

It is somewhat surprising that Ladefoged gives no definition of the diphthong, though the term has been used (77).

Chapter 10 is most exciting. Ladefoged points out how inadequate Chomsky and Halle's set of features is and demonstrates that their explanation of some features is unmotivated, e. g., the explanation of the feature SONORANT (109 - 110). It is astonishing that so many linguists have blindly followed Chomsky and Halle without questioning their assumptions. Unfortunately, Ladefoged is also influenced by some of Chomsky and Halle's principles, e. g., the principle of simplicity. For example, he says that "if we regard affrication as a separate feature which may or may not occur with stops, then we cannot (without extra rules) show that affricates are simply related to fricatives" (55). It does not matter whether we have extra rules or more complex rules, they must mirror the observable data. If one gives priority to simplicity, then he is forced to postulate such nonsense as an underlying final /e/ in *cement* /cEmente/ in order to be in accordance with a "simple" stress predictability rule (cf. Chomsky and Halle 1968 : 147 - 148, see also Hall 1973 : 27).

Those few critical remarks are not intended to belittle Ladefoged's achievements. This is a good and necessary book: he points out the gaps in our knowledge of phonetics and gives directions which should be followed. Ladefoged is modest, he is not afraid to say "I don't know", which makes him a true scholar.

On the other hand, one really wonders about how little attention has been paid to Ladefoged's work; for example, Schane (1973) follows Chomsky and Halle almost verbatim.

REFERENCES

- Awedyk, W. 1971. "A contribution to the theory of the syllable". *Biuletyn fonograficzny* 12. 49 - 56.
- Chomsky, N. and M. Halle. 1968. *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Dingwall, W. O. (ed.). 1971. *A survey of linguistic science*. College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland.
- Hall, R. A., Jr. 1973. "'Underlying representation' and observable data in phonology". *JL* 7. 21 - 42.

- Kim, C. W. 1971. "Experimental phonetics". In Dingwall, W. O. (ed.). 1971. 17 - 135.
- MacKay, D. G. 1969. "Forward and backward masking in motor systems". *Kybernetik* 6/2. 57 - 64.
- Schane, S. A. 1973. *Generative phonology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Tucker, A. N. 1940. *The Eastern Sudanic languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Generative phonology. By Sandford A. Schane. Pp. XVI+127. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
Reviewed by Danuta Wolfram-Romanowska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Sandford A. Schane's book presents the main issues of generative phonology. The author only briefly sketches the properties of generative phonological systems. The numerous examples are drawn from many languages (e.g. Hanunoo, Turkish, Yoruba, Nupe, Yawelmani, Twi, Diegueño, Spanish, Russian, German, French, and, of course, English) which, according to Schane, are to prove the universality of these systems.

The whole book consists of two principal parts — *Segmental phonology* and *Dynamic Phonology* — with four and seven chapters respectively which are further subdivided. A *Bibliography* and *Index* are appended at the close of the book. It is also provided with the author's *Preface* and *A final note*.

In *Segmental phonology*, Chapter I "The segment" — Schane discusses continuousness of speech production and discontinuousness of speech perception, as well as levels of abstractness of phonemes.

In Chapter II, "Phonological Patterns", the author formulates goals which should be fulfilled by any phonetic theory, describes vowel/consonant dichotomy and possible vowel systems in language, starting with the simplest Eskimo three-vowel system and systematically proceeding to more complicated ones. He is also concerned with consonants, their place and manner of articulation, as well as secondary vowel and consonant modifications (vowel nasalization and voicelessness, consonant labialization, aspiration and glottalization) and marks the distinction sonorant versus obstruent.

Chapter III, "Distinctive features", gives us information about segment viewed as being composed of *sets of properties* which are defined by Binary Features, the Major Class Features, Manner Features, Place of Articulation Features, Body of Tongue Features, Subsidiary Features and Prosodic Features.

"Redundancy", Chapter IV, is presented by a formal notation of phonological systems (phoneme and lexical matrices). The author refers to redundancies within segments and *across segments* (sequence redundancy) and briefs on language specific and universal redundancies. He also mentions partially and fully specified matrices.

Part II starts with Chapter V — "Phonological processes". It gives detailed examples and an explanation of such phonological processes as assimilation, deletion, open-syllable, coalescence, metathesis, diphthongization, vowel shift and neutralization.

Chapter VI on "Phonological Rules" introduces notational convention for rule presentation, as well as the rules themselves: Feature Changing Rules, Rules for Deletion and Insertion, Rules for Permutation and Coalescence, Exchange Rules and Rules with Variables.

In Chapter VII, "Underlying representations", Schane shows how to determine underlying representations and their derived forms. At the end of the chapter he discusses levels of abstractness.

Chapter VIII, entitled "Ordered rules", provides the reader with an explanation why certain rules should necessarily be ordered while others can be partially ordered or unordered.

The variety of rules converting underlying representations into their derived forms is presented in Chapter IX — "Derived representations". The author acquaints the reader with formal notation for multivalued rules (e.g. degrees of aspiration), draws a distinction between systematic and taxonomic phonemics and shows the relationship between systematic phonemic and systematic phonetic segments.

Chapter X, "Nonphonological effects", deals with nonphonological properties of forms contributing to phonological change (e.g., stress placement in noun phrases and compounds or certain phonological processes occurring only in some verb tenses) and provides rules with their exceptions for these phenomena. It also explains the notion of phonological cycle.

The concluding Chapter XI on "Natural phonology" gives a list of examples of "naturalness" in languages. Further, it exhibits various aspects of the concept of markedness as best capturing the "naturalness" of certain segments and phonological systems.

Generative phonology is not aimed to be highly technical, thus it is an excellent "primer" for all those who want in future to approach more intricate works, such as for instance *The sound pattern of English* by Noam Chomsky and Morris Halle. An experienced reader, however, will find this book rather boring and annoying, as the author displays only the fundamental notions of generative phonology with which any linguist is well acquainted. Besides, examples and problems needlessly reiterate. Nevertheless, if we keep in mind the kind of reader to whom the author addresses his book, this no longer seems to be a weakness. For such a reader Sanford A. Schane's *Generative phonology* is certainly worth-while reading.

The phrasal verb in English. By Dwight L. Bolinger. Pp. xviii+ 187. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Reviewed by Anna Nogala, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

To the relatively rich literature dealing with the problems of phrasal verbs a new item has been added by Dwight L. Bolinger.

The author's goal, as stated in the foreword, does not consist in "remedying the lack of an inventory of phrasal verbs nor in examining more than incidentally the problem of how they are generated and what relationships they have with simple verbs" (xiv). He is concerned instead with syntactic questions: component categories, possibilities of arrangement, the effects of context and the tension between stereotyping and dynamics.

The method that has been adopted to serve this purpose goes a step beyond the traditional analyses of the linguistic data. It examines not only the material we have at our disposal as everyday speakers, but penetrates also a great many other possibilities that we become aware of only when stretching language to its limits.

The book is divided into twelve chapters. The first chapter outlines the author's approach to the subject matter. What lies within the scope of his interest are combinations (in general: verb proper+particle) which display shared regularities or irregularities and show some special degree of cohesion that sets them apart from the more freely composable constructions. The classification proposed by Mitchell differentiates the constructions frequently confused:

- | | |
|---------------|---------------------|
| 1. nonphrasal | a. nonprepositional |
| | b. prepositional |
| 2. phrasal | a. nonprepositional |
| | b. prepositional |

This is 2a type (phrasal nonprepositional) which is investigated by the author.

In the remainder of chapter I Prof. Bolinger attempts to establish the full set of criteria for culling out pure phrasal verb constructions by listing several diagnostic frames. One of them, i.e., The Definite-Noun-Phrase Test, is expanded on in chapter 5. It distinguishes between transitive phrasal verbs and transitive combinations that are not phrasal verbs in the following way: if the combination is transitive, the particle can precede a simple definite noun phrase (a proper name or *the* plus a common noun) without taking it as its object, e.g., *Did you bring along the Browns?* What counts is the ability to stand, as a unit, in the position which is otherwise private to a unit verb.

The successive two chapters (2, 3) go through particles that form the most typical phrasal verbs, and their functions as, adverbs, adpreps and prepositions distinguished by two tests: the test of order (examining the mobility of the particle) and the one of accent. Two terms henceforth frequently occurring in the text are explained. They are: prepositional adverb, i.e., particle that oscillates between preposition and adverb, and particle which performs the double function, now being a constituent of the phrasal verb, now belonging to the prepositional phrase, for which Hill's term "adprep", though slightly redefined, is adopted.

Great emphasis is laid upon the interaction of phrasal verbs with the prosody of English sentences (chapter 4). The treatment of the prosody is related to accent, arrangement and semantic problem in the following way:

accent: how the fact that the phrasal verb contains more than one element affects the problem of accents, because we know that the more words there are, the wider the speaker's choice will be in where the accents are to fall and how many there can be.
 arrangement: how the fact that the elements of the phrasal verb do not have to remain side by side and in the same order contributes to meaning.
 semantic problem: what is the semantic sensation of spreading the meaning over two or more components.

The three elements intertwine and the author treats them together as prosody.

The seventh and the eighth chapters provide useful information on the semantic features of the particles. Professor Bolinger states that phrasal verbs present a vast range of meanings, from concrete meanings of motion and result to abstract ones akin to aspects. He inventories the particles (as unlike one another as possible, from the complex up to the univocal nautical adverbs) to show the samples of their aspectual meanings.

Though the phrasal verb, in general, is viewed as a combination variable syntactically, chapter 9 reveals that there are many phrasal verb entities which are relatively or absolutely inseparable.

In the next two chapters (10, 11) the author examines combinations of phrasal verbs with there being more than one particle and the possibilities of their arrangement, as well as the effects of various kinds of insertions (manner adverbs, degree adverbs, noun and adjective clauses, verbs conjoined with one another, etc.).

The unfinished business concerning phrasal verbs is touched upon in the last chapter. The author says he purposefully limited the field by omitting certain combinations. A few questions that deserve to be studied are signalled under the following headings:

- Questions of register
- Neology of phrasal verbs
- Neology of deverbal nouns

Lexical surveys

Problems of grammatical theory

The underlying structure of phrasal verbs

The headings are followed each by rough suggestions towards a further exploration of phrasal verbs. The means for the analysis proposed here are quite general. The author did not develop a general theoretical framework within which the investigations could be explicated.

To sum up then — the book is an exposition of many intricate problems concerning phrasal verbs, supported by generous sets of examples for each special use. Intended primarily for advanced learners, both the foreign students who already have a fair command of English and the native English speakers who either have no knowledge whatsoever of how to go about analysing this complex grammatical category, or — familiar with the phrasal verbs — require a reference book, the work highlights the ways in which considerable attention is drawn to their interaction with the prosody of English sentences. Many interesting observations are made, based on a rich collection of examples from the modern linguists (Kennedy, Mitchell, Jespersen).

Footnotes contain extension of points treated in the text.

Despite the limitations of the last chapter, the book constitutes a significant increase in published information on phrasal verbs — an increase which provides much that is likely to be of value not only to students but also to linguists working on the subject.

Meaning and the English verb. By Geoffrey N. Leech. Pp.131. London: Longman, 1971.
Reviewed by Piotr Kakietek, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Meaning and the English verb is devoted to one of the most troublesome areas of English grammar, viz. the finite verbal phrase. It is primarily designed for teachers and advanced students of English. In the Introduction the writer makes it clear that his main objective is not to help readers to learn facts, "...but to coordinate and deepen their grasp of the language, by seeing facts (wherever possible) not as isolated facts, but in a fresh way, as part of a regular pattern" (v).

Since the book is not addressed to a professional linguist, it is written in a language free of the often cumbersome terminology so typical of most of the more important recent treatments of the English verb. It contains none of the formal apparatus applied by the writer in his earlier publication *Towards a semantic description of English* (1970). The author's great concern to make more accessible to the reader what has been so far written on the subject in question at an academic level is visible throughout the book.

The book reviewed here consists of a short introduction (v-viii) followed by seven chapters, a guide to further reading and an index. The Introduction informs the reader about the main purpose of the book, the method of presenting the grammatical material, and discusses some points of grammatical terminology.

The seven chapters cover the following questions: Chapter One — Simple Present and Past Tense, Chapter Two — Progressive Aspect, Chapter Three — The Expression of Past Time, Chapter Four — The Expression of Future Time, Chapter Five — The Modal Auxiliaries, Chapter Six — Indirect Speech, and Chapter Seven — Theoretical and Hypothetical Meaning.

As can be seen, in presenting the material the writer combines two approaches, that is to say, he groups his observations now according to meaning (Chapters Three, Four and Seven) and now according to form (the remaining chapters). As regards the moti-

vation behind the choice of this sort of combined approach, the writer himself has the following to say: "What is lost in consistency here is, I feel, atoned for by the flexibility which makes it possible to bring together contrasts and similarities in whatever seems to be the most illuminating way" (vi).

Although the variety of English described in this volume is contemporary standard British English, differences between American English and British English, as well as varieties of style (e.g. formal vs. informal/colloquial) are carefully noted where they seem to the writer to be of importance.

The present reviewer has no difficulty in agreeing with the writer that basing his study solely on his own speech has disadvantages, but he does not share the writer's opinion that the procedure he chose to follow has "the one supreme advantage of being practical" (viii). 'Practical' seems to be an empty word here. It seems that a different procedure such as would also take note of the discrepancies between the various dialects (described in various extant grammars and handbooks of English) would be perhaps more profitable from the point of view of the needs and linguistic situation of the prospective reader (and of the teacher of English in particular).

In what will follow the reviewer would like to focus chiefly on what seem to be deficiencies accompanying the study under review.

All the examples employed as illustrations of various grammatical points are the author's own creations, checked by a number of other native speakers of English. Leech attaches, at least theoretically, much importance to the suitable choice of examples, as, in his opinion, the kind of study he presents here should contain simple, self-explanatory, and economical illustrations (viii). In practice, the writer often fails to produce examples that would meet all the criteria just mentioned. Some examples are simply ambiguous. Thus the sentence *I shall keep my word*, meant to illustrate the 'futural' use of *shall*, may equally well serve as an illustration of the writer's *shall* of intermediate volition. For some writers, even, the first of the two readings suggested for the modal would be entirely out of the question.

Basic theoretical terms have been chosen by Leech with a view to immediate intelligibility by the reader. 'Tense', for instance, is used to refer not only to the basic tenses, the Present Tense and the Past Tense, but also to any combination of those with either the Perfect or Progressive Aspect. The term 'aspect' stands for the progressive and perfect modification (vii).

The Progressive Aspect is dealt with at length in Chapter Two. For some reason, no separate treatment is given to the other aspect. After having wrongly stated the function of the Perfect Aspect, Leech decides to include it among his means of expressing past time. Some inconsistency on the part of the writer is obvious here. On page 30 we read: "It is well known that English has two chief ways of indicating past time by means of the verb: the Past Tense (*I worked, he wrote, etc.*) and the Perfect Aspect (*I have worked, he has written, etc.*)". That in English the Past Tense is a morphological (verbal) category is beyond any argument, but to hold the same (even with a view to attaining some pedagogical goals) about the Perfect Aspect must be some gross misunderstanding. Sentences like *I have worked* and *He has written* are not illustrations of the use of the Perfect Aspect alone, but, more correctly, of the combination of the Perfect Aspect and the Present Tense. The "tense" used in the sentences is commonly referred to as the Present Perfect Tense.

The grammatical categories dealt with in the present volume are described in terms of their uses or meanings (interchangeable terms). A category may be assigned one or more uses. Thus, to take an example, the Simple Present Tense is ascribed the following uses: UNRESTRICTIVE USE (*We live in London*), INSTANTANEOUS USE (in dem-

onstrations, e.g. *I take this card from the pack and place it under the handkerchief — so*), HABITUAL USE (*He walks to work*), HISTORIC PRESENT (used in reference to past time), and finally its FUTURE TIME USE (*I start work next week*).

It can be easily seen that in at least some of their uses the grammatical categories discussed by Leech are inseparably bound with certain contextual elements. For example, in its 'futural' use the Simple Present as a rule combines with an adverbial of future time. This dependence of the Simple Present for its 'future time' use on the presence of an adverbial of future time should be duly stressed, something that is not done in the book under consideration.

It is not hard to see that it is not emphasis, as the writer suggests, that is decisive as regards the use or the non-use of the adverb of frequency *always* in *I've always walked to work* (34). The presence of *always* here is not optional but simply obligatory. Note that its relegation from the sentence would cause a change in the aspectual specification of the action involved in the matter. *I've walked to work* is, clearly, minus habitual aspect and refers to a single event located in an indefinite, or, which would seem more likely, in recent past (it may belong to a context like *I've walked to work today*). It is, of course, no accident that all of Leech's examples produced to illustrate the 'habitual' use of the Present Perfect ('Habit-in-a-period-leading-up-to-the-Present'), contain an explicit marker of frequency (or duration). If stripped of the adverbial element, each of Leech's examples would cease to be habitual. Sometimes a replacement of one adverb by another belonging to the same class is enough to bring about the change of the aspect of the action from plus habitual to minus habitual, as is the case in *Mr. Phillips has sung in this choir for fifty years* (habitual in Leech) and *Mr. Phillips has sung in this choir for two hours*, which sounds a little strange.

The Present Perfect has basically nothing to do with the habitualness of the action of the main verb. The most that could be said about this tense is that it is not incongruent with the idea of habituality.

In the book there are some more examples of unnecessary, and, what is even more important, empirically unjustified, multiplication of meanings (uses) of particular grammatical categories. To our mind, there is no reason actually to draw a distinction between *duration* and *limited duration* as two separate aspects of meaning of the Progressive (15). The two uses of the Progressive are exemplified by the following pairs of sentences:

I'm raising my arm (duration)

Oxford are rowing well (duration)

I'm living in Wimbledon (limited duration)

I'm enjoying the seaside (limited duration, this particular holiday)

In both pairs of the sentences the meaning of the Progressive is *limited duration* and nothing else. Any semantic differences between them derive from the meaning of the Progressive and that of the main verb. Note that in contrast to *raise* and *row*, *live* and *enjoy* are non-process verbs of undefined time-span. With verbs like *raise* and *row* the Progressive indicates that the action is under way at the time of speaking.

Also certain of the meanings imputed to the modals are rather spurious. To take just one example, among the meanings associated with *may* are benediction and malediction (69). These alleged meanings of the modal are illustrated by the following examples: *May his evil designs perish!* and *May God grant you happiness!* In the first of the examples *may* is said to denote malediction and in the second benediction. But even a cursory look suffices to see the critical role played here by the main verb.

Apart from the above shortcomings, there are some glaring inconsistencies and obscure passages. Concerning the construction *have to*, counted as a modal auxiliary by

Leech, on page 67 we read: "In grammatical terms, *have to* is not an auxiliary verb on the same footing as the others: it has, for example, an infinitive form, which means that it can combine with other modals (as in *We may have to go*) and can combine with *will/shall* to express future time: *We'll have to go*. Nevertheless, it cannot be semantically separated from *may*, *must*, and *can*". The other modals referred to by Leech in the quotation are: *may*, *can*, *must*, *will*, and *shall*. As may be seen, semantical criteria are applied to *have to* and formal criteria to the other modals. This shows the writer's inconsistency in his use of the criteria of classification. It is not clear on what grounds items like *should* (historically the past tense of Palmer's 'promise' *shall*, 1965), *ought to* and *need have* not been included into the modal auxiliary class.

The grammatical properties hinted at in connection with *may*, *can*, *must*, *will* and *shall* do by no means exhaust the list. Leech mentions only two structural features typical of the modal auxiliaries, viz. their non-combinability with one another and the fact that they lack infinitival forms (67). Thus, a number of features of no less importance is passed over in silence. In addition to the two already mentioned, the modals also exhibit the following features: a. they undergo Subject-Auxiliary inversion, b. they undergo Negative Placement, c. they don't undergo Number Agreement, and d. they occupy the initial position in the verbal phrase.

On page 70 it is said that "In colloquial speech, the difference between *can* and *may* is unimportant enough to be ignored in most cases". But only four pages later the reader is informed that "In no case, however, are two verbs actually interchangeable: there is always some slight difference of meaning. When we come to ask the question 'What are the slight differences?', it will be seen that *may* is in the same relation to *can* as *must* is to *have (got) to*". Now, is *actually interchangeable* here equivalent to *totally synonymous*? If so, then the first of the two statements must be necessarily false.

The section concerned with the modals *will* and *shall* is perhaps the most confusing of all. The writer differentiates between three types of volition: weak volition (=willingness), strong volition (=insistence), and intermediate volition, the latter decomposed into intermediate volition of subject and intermediate volition of speaker. 'Intermediate volition' itself is rather vaguely characterized as the sort of volition that is placed somewhere between "the submissive volition of 'willingness' and the assertive volition of 'insistence'" (78). It is said that *will* in the sense of intermediate volition (in the case of *will* it is always intermediate volition of subject) occurs mainly with first person subjects (82). Leech, by the way, quotes no examples of the *will* of intermediate volition occurring with second and third person subjects. It would follow then that on most (if not all) occasions *will* and *shall*, as markers of intermediate volition, are interchangeable, since, as we have seen, both of them are, in fact, limited to first person subjects. No procedure for distinguishing between the *will* of weak volition and the *will* of intermediate volition is even so much as suggested.

Finally, apart from its function as an exponent of intermediate volition of speaker, *shall* is used also as a future time auxiliary, in which function it is also restricted to first person subjects.

The problem again is how the poor reader is to tell one kind of *shall* from the other, if both appear to be restricted to first person subjects only. No explicitly stated basis for distinguishing between them is provided. Even the examples are not of much help.

The critical remarks made above should by no means be understood as implying any lack of appreciation for the book. The reviewer believes that even with its weaknesses the book may be profitably used by all prospective readers.