

Linguistic Society of America

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Randy J. LaPolla

Source: *Language*, Vol. 70, No. 1 (Mar., 1994), pp. 195-196

Published by: [Linguistic Society of America](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/416758>

Accessed: 31/01/2011 02:38

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=lsa>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Linguistic Society of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Language*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

JOHN RICKFORD's analysis of the lone Gullah speaker, Wallace Quarterman, drives home this point about the artifactual nature of transcriptions, adding depth and coherence to Quarterman's narrative but also cautioning that such tapes provide no transparent answers to the central questions of linguistic ancestry and structure. JEUTONNE BREWER contributes a fascinating portrait of one naive but talented interviewer, white Southerner John Henry Faulk, examining the complex effects of his social identity and fieldwork methods. Together with the scrupulous and thoughtful editors' introduction and the articles by historians PAUL ESCOTT and JOE GRAHAM, these suggest a wider use for the volume in field methods and oral history courses. (These entries also point to a greater social complexity than the facile field-hand/house-slave plantation model usually assumed in discussions of creolization and Southern dialect genesis.)

JOHN HOLM explains why the ancestry of AAVE is controversial and important, giving also a brief primer of creole features—which, he concludes from the ESR data, informed AAVE from the start, though it never went beyond semicreole status. JOHN SINGLER similarly compares the ESR language with current Liberian Settler English, noting differences in verbal aspect, contraction and inflection, and noun number-marking. Exhaustive analysis by SHANA POPLACK & SALI TAGLIAMONTE of a single inflection, verbal /-z/, for both the ESR and current Samaná English (both misleadingly dubbed 'early Black English') find surprisingly little resemblance between ESR and recent U.S. AAVE studies—which, as their useful survey points out, are both contradictory and inconclusive. These analyses by creolists do more to raise new analytical questions than to strengthen the case for creole ancestry of AAVE.

The Gullah text and articles are exceptional. (Readers of the texts are advised to save Quarterman's, printed first, till the last in order to appreciate fully how strikingly different his grammar is.) Comparing Quarterman's admittedly mesolectal interview to informal 1980s speech which he labels 'basilectal', SALIKOKO MUFWENE describes a wider range of creole forms in the latter (complementizer *fih*, serial *say*, *dih* + Verb duratives, Noun + *dem* plurals); but the unequal comparison vitiates his controversial conclusion, that Gullah has not decreolized since 1935. Mufwene's and Rick-

ford's articles make it clear that Singler was right to exclude the Quarterman data from his study as different in kind (a step Poplack & Tagliamonte should perhaps have taken in theirs).

The editors are to be commended for their careful labor, their open and intersubjective transcription practices, and their choice of contributors; the combination of essential texts and penetrating commentary makes the volume doubly valuable. The book contains a solid 20-page bibliography, lacking only a few of the text references, but it suffers from the careless proof-reading and occasionally misleading errors noted before for this series (e.g., p. 255 of Singler's paper should clearly read 'with [+ Punctual] verbs far more likely', rather than '...[- Punctual]...'). [PETER PATRICK, *Georgetown University*.]

The Classical Tibetan language. By STEPHAN V. BEYER. (SUNY Series in Buddhist Studies.) Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1992. Pp. xxvi, 503. Paper \$18.95.

Beyer's intention in writing this book was 'to provide procedures for the understanding of [Classical Tibetan] texts' (1). What he has produced, though, goes far beyond that, being almost a 'state of the art' of Tibetan linguistic studies. While being a comprehensive grammar of Classical Tibetan (CT), giving clear explanations of how each form or pattern is used, including copious examples from the CT texts of different periods, the book contains a tremendous amount of information about the history not only of CT, but of modern Tibetan dialects as well. CT is also discussed in the context of the Tibeto-Burman family and even Sino-Tibetan as a whole, and the text is interspersed with etymologies and notes about shared grammatical forms and patterns.

Almost all aspects of the grammatical system and its use are covered, from phonotactic constraints on the syllable to lexical derivation, word families, the various types and sources of loanwords, morphophonemics, phrasal morphology, simple propositions, complex propositions, sentence types, and beyond the sentence to discourse connectives and metrical composition.

The writing is clear and generally nontechnical. B introduces all linguistic terminology in

plain language, so the sophisticated layperson should be able to understand the book. The style is decidedly humanistic, and quotes on language from various philosophers and writers are scattered throughout the text. There is a very good (75-page) bibliography, organized by subjects, for those interested in further study, and there is also a subject index.

Only a few minor points detract from the overall excellent quality of this book. One is that the book is written as a popular, not an academic, book, so there are no citations for the sources used. As a number of the etymologies and claims B makes are new or controversial, it is frustrating not to know what he is basing them on. One must rely on searching through the bibliography for a likely source. A second point is that, when citing Chinese forms, B gives only the Middle Chinese reconstruction and not the Chinese character, so it is sometimes difficult to know what word B has in mind. A third point is that, though the book is intended to be an aid in the reading of Tibetan texts, the Tibetan writing system is not fully introduced, and all examples are in romanization. A newcomer to Tibetan would become used to reading romanized forms, would then have to look elsewhere to learn the writing system, and then in reading the texts would have to convert constantly between the two writing systems.

This book is without doubt the best and most comprehensive book on Classical Tibetan. I highly recommend it to anyone interested in the Tibetan language. It would also make an excellent first text in Tibeto-Burman linguistics for those just beginning in the field. [RANDY J. LAPOLLA, *Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.*]

Grammatical relations: The evidence against their necessity and universality. By D. N. S. BHAT. (Theoretical linguistics.) London & New York: Routledge, 1991. Pp. xii, 189. Cloth \$75.00.

In this monograph, on the basis of a detailed examination of two Indian languages, Kannada (Dravidian) and Manipuri (Tibeto-Burman), Bhat lays out a rather strong claim that there is neither a need for nor a possibility of postulating grammatical relations for languages where all morphological and syntactic processes are explainable directly by semantics and pragmatics.

The monograph is divided into two parts. In the first part (Chs. 2 and 3), 'Evidence against the necessity of grammatical relations', B argues that the notion of grammatical relations is not necessary in languages like Kannada. Ch. 2, 'The need for grammatical relations' (9–31), illustrates two types of languages with respect to representing semantic and pragmatic relations. One type is exemplified by English, which combines semantic and pragmatic relations in the formal representations in rather complex ways, and the other is exemplified by Kannada, in which the representations of semantic and pragmatic relations are kept distinct. B claims that grammatical relations—abstract entities intermediate between semantic or pragmatic relations and their formal representations—need to be postulated only in the former type of language, in order to provide an economical and explicit description of the grammar. B further argues that certain disputes in some contemporary theories, such as the issue of 'configurationality', are caused by a failure to recognize these two different types of languages, a failure which itself is a result of the exclusion of pragmatic factors from the scope of the investigation. In Ch. 3, 'Semantics and pragmatics in Kannada' (32–94), B presents a detailed description of the formal representations of semantic and pragmatic relations in Kannada, followed by sections showing how the various morphosyntactic processes, including those which would be discussed with reference to grammatical relations in other languages (eg. reflexive control, coreferential NP deletion, and verbal agreement), are constrained directly by semantic or pragmatic factors in this language.

The second part (Chs. 4 and 5), 'Evidence against the universality of grammatical relations', serves to illustrate B's claim that postulation of grammatical relations is not only unnecessary but conflicts with the situation in languages like Kannada and Manipuri. The discussion concerns two notions which form the basis for grammatical relations: transitivity and verb phrase. Ch. 4, 'Universality of grammatical relations' (97–115), demonstrates that the grammatical system in Kannada is organized not according to the intransitive-transitive distinction or the S, A, O distinction among the arguments but according to the notion of volitionality. In the last section of this chapter, B argues that the distinction between external and internal arguments (outside or inside the verb phrase) does not hold for the logical and syntactic structure