

pecially as codified in dictionaries, grammars, phonetic-phonological treatments, and a wide assortment of other sources. In doing this we are more Anglo-American than Antipodean, more middle than working class, more Eurocentric than not, and look more to written than spoken language.' In spite of this orientation, however, they have given full attention to the diversity of varieties of modern English, even to the inclusion of a chapter on pidgins and creoles.

The sixteen chapters of the book are grouped in three divisions: 'English as a linguistic system', 'Uses and users of English', and 'National and regional varieties of English'. Part 1 gives a succinct but thorough review of the structure of English, covering lexicon, phonology and orthography, grammar, and textual analysis. The point of view is traditional, inclining toward Hallidayan-systemic and Firthian, rather than Chomskyan-generative; the complexity of syntactic theories which have developed in the last twenty years is not even alluded to.

Part 2 deals with functions and uses of language. There is a good discussion of speech acts, conversational principles and interaction, and other sociolinguistic matters. A multiplicity of terms for the phenomena of spoken discourse is introduced, to the point where the beginning reader could be snowed under (this in contrast to the other sections, where technical terminology is used sparingly). A chapter of fifteen pages deals with modes of address, covering national, regional, and class variation of a form of usage not usually treated in such detail in books for second language learners.

The six chapters of Part 3 describe the main varieties of English, both native and nonnative. A chapter on English in the British Isles covers RP, regional dialects, Scots, and Irish English, dealing with the ways in which they differ from Standard English. Succeeding chapters are devoted to American English; Australian, New Zealand, and South African English; English as a second language in Asia and Africa; and pidgin and creole English.

Throughout the book, frequent references are given to sources or authorities, often with recommendations of additional readings. A full list of the references follows each chapter. It is obvious that the authors have read widely in the extensive literature about the English language. Each point that they make is supported with illustrative examples, and authorities are frequently quoted. The effect is sometimes

overwhelming to the reader going more or less rapidly through the text, but it is better suited to the student working through the material more slowly with the aid of an instructor. The style is easy and clear, and shows no evidence of the fact that the authors are speakers of German who themselves have learned English as a second language. The book is especially recommended for readers interested in the language itself, rather than in linguistic theory. [W. N. FRANCIS, *Brown University*.]

Heuristik der deutschen Phonologie:

Eine elementare Einführung in Strategien der Problemlösung.

By ANDRÁS KERTÉSZ. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1993. Pp. x, 291. \$36.00.

Kertész teaches in Debrecen, Hungary; he is the author of *Die Modularität der Wissenschaft. Konzeptuelle und soziale Prinzipien linguistischer Erkenntnis* (1991). The object of this 1993 book is to provide, for advanced students without specific linguistic training, a descriptively adequate understanding of Modern German phonology through discovery and solution of a series of problems, and beyond this some proficiency in general techniques of problem solving. The book is divided into a general introduction (Einleitung, 1–8) and four basic parts: (1) Hintergrundkenntnisse [grammatical, phonetic, phonological], 9–78; (2) das Phonemsystem des Deutschen [alternations, assimilations, rules], 79–194; (3) Ausblick am Beispiel des Umlauts [natural, autosegmental, lexical phonology], 195–235; (4) Anhang ['Appendix', solutions to problems in Chs. 4–16, symbols, concluding remarks (Nachwort)]. The Glossar (278–88) is not restricted to specifically linguistic terms; some of its definitions must confuse the reader, e.g. of K's term *Lautindividuum* (= Sprachlaut?) and the book's most important term, *Umlaut* (never i-Umlaut!). The bibliography (Zitierte Literatur, 289–91) gives full titles of the many publications mentioned in the 'Literaturhinweise' after the various chapters and used for the 'Probleme'. We find pertinent titles by Wolfgang U. Wurzel, whose *Phonologie* (1981) is called a personal 'Ausgangspunkt' (6), Willi Mayerthaler, Noam Chomsky, David Stampe, Noam Chomsky & Morris Halle's 1968 *Sound Pattern of English* is called 'sehr wichtig.

allerdings nicht mehr aktuell' in its approach. K's umlaut items are by R. Wiese and H. Scheutz, which explains some of the pseudo-problems created for a lucid but complex phenomenon with which the author is obviously quite familiar. He repeatedly quotes the Old High German paradigm of *gast* (e.g. 218, 221, 226f.), but not the grammar used (Braune-Eggers 1975?). This is actually not a good example, since the singular shows analogical change to the endings of the *tag*-type (cf. Penzl, *Althochdeutsch*, Peter Lang 1986, §§19.1, 158). Generativistic descriptions have led K to assume two kinds of *i*-umlaut—one with and one without morphological alternation—but the examples quoted (199) show the identical assimilation of velar stem-vowels to *i*-sounds in the following syllables: *Käse* (OHG *cāsi*), *Schlüssel* (OHG *sluzzil*), *schön* (OHG *scōni* [adj.]), *Säule* (OHG *sūli* [pl.]) and *Kälber* (OHG *-ir*), *läge* (OHG *-i* [pret. subj.]), *Gäste* (OHG *gesti*). This is also 'Vokalharmonie'; but it is not triggered by the stem vowels, as in Hungarian, but rather by *i*-sounds in suffixes and 'Nebensilben' (226).

Kertész does not quote *Siebs Deutsche Aussprache* (1969¹⁹), the standard reference book for the pronunciation norm, but instead its former East German equivalent. To him, however, regional deviations, types of Umgangssprache through the dialects, are of no interest whatsoever. Standard German is uniform to him, and he shows native (bilingual?) command of it. That such a sophisticated German book could again be published in Hungary in 1993 indicates a significant change after 1945, when the status and distribution of Standard German in Europe greatly suffered for internal ('Mundartwelle') and external reasons (e.g. partial prohibition [in France's Alsace] or reduction of instruction, replacement by English and especially Russian in eastern Europe). [HERBERT PENZL, *University of California at Berkeley.*]

From Indo-European to Latin: The evolution of a morphosyntactic type.

By HELENA KURZOVÁ. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1993. Pp. xv, 259.

This book is divided into three main sections: (1) The origins and evolution of the Indo-European (IE) inflectional type (1–46), (2) The basic

principles and origins of the nominal system and inflections (47–104), (3) The IE origins of the Latin verbal system (105–92). The main intent is to show that the Latin paradigmatic inflections of noun and verb evolved from a 'derivative-flectional stage'. The author admits (4) that 'the paradigmaticization of basic cases was already completed in the Common IE period', but she wishes to claim that, since verbal systems differ greatly among IE languages, the verbal inflections of Latin should be traced back to derivations.

There are, however, fundamental problems with such a view. First, the verbal systems of the Romance languages are quite different from that of their Latin parent, but no one would wish to claim that Latin verb morphology was therefore not paradigmatic, but derivational; and second, an even more radical argument is that derivations are notoriously nonsystematic, whereas it is hard to imagine a verbal system that is not systematic. The author claims (3) that her view 'differs from the traditional theory of prehistoric language change of IE structure from isolation to flexion via agglutination', but this latter style of change is richly attested, as in Latin *amare habeo* > French *aimerai*, where the free verb *habeo* (isolation) becomes cliticized (agglutination) and finally grammaticalized (inflection). Why shift from a model that is well supported by empirical evidence to one that is not only dubious but unattested?

In terms of detail, in fact, there is substantial counterevidence to the author's claim that in PIE only the active verbs had aorist forms and only the inactive had perfect forms. The mixing of these two morphologies in the Latin perfect paradigms is supposed to illustrate this, as in the author's examples *dixi* 'I said' and *vidi* 'I saw'. But what of *sensi* 'I felt' and *mansi* 'I remained', inactive verbs with the morphology of the sigmatic aorist? And what of *momordi* 'I bit', *dedi* 'I gave', and dozens more active verbs with the reduplication that is typical of the PIE perfect? The author seems to be aware of this problem: on p. 151 she cites *tetigi* 'I have touched' and describes it as 'aoristic', claiming that aorists may have reduplication as well. The evidence on which this dubious claim is based is a single Homeric perfect participle. Against this there are Latin stems where both morphologies may be found (which should be an impossibility): alongside *momordi* 'I bit' there is (with preverb) *praemorsi* 'I took a bite of, bit the end off.'