erhaltende Funktion. Gerade diese benützt er aber in dieser Strukturveränderung, die im übrigen gegen das auf S. 4 genannte Prinzip (Strukturveränderung — Bedeutungsveränderung) verstößt.

Das Buch ist sehr gut redigiert worden. Trotzdem sind einige kleinere Versehen stehen geblieben: S. 40 wird „EF" ohne Erläuterung eingeführt, diese erfolgt erst auf S. 68; S. 47 „the" → he; S. 59 „In allen obigen Sätzen" → [außer 207]; S. 79 „he stoop up" → d; S. 96 „lexikaliche" → sch.

Insgesamt ein willkommenes Lehrbuch, das nicht nur dem Lernenden von praktischem Nutzen ist, sondern auch dem theoretisch Interessierten eine Integrationsmöglichkeit verschiedener linguistischer Richtungen zeigt: Es verbindet traditionelle Auffassungen mit funktionalen Argumenten und strukturellen Analysemethoden. Es wird sich als Arbeitsgrundlage nicht nur für universitäre Sprach- bzw. Syntaxkurse anbieten, sondern sich hervorragend für Lehrveranstaltungen eignen, die gleichzeitig mit der Sprachvermittlung auch auf vermittlungstheoretische, didaktische und methodische Probleme der Schulpraxis eingehen.

Bernhard Kettemann
Institut für Anglistik
Universität Graz
A-8010 Graz
Österreich

LITERATURANGABEN

Garey (1957): „Verbal Aspect in French", *Language* 33, 91-110.
Kress (1976) (*ed.*): *Halliday: System and Function in Language.* London: OUP.
Nehls (1974a): *Synchron–diachrone Untersuchungen zur Expanded Form im Englischen.* München: Hueber.
Nehls (1974b): „Bemerkungen zur Zeitenfolge im Englischen", *Neusprachliche Mitteilungen* 27, 19-24.
Nehls (1975): „The System of Tense and Aspect in English", *IRAL* 13, 275-292. (Nachgedruckt in D. Nehls, ed., *Studies in Descriptive English Grammar,* Heidelberg: Julius Groos, 1978, S. 45-62).
Zydatiß (1976): *Tempus und Aspekt im Englischunterricht.* Kronberg/Ts.: Scriptor.
Zydatiß (1978): „'Continuative' and 'resultative' Perfects in English? ", *Lingua* 44, 339-362.

Lilo Moessner, *Morphonologie.* (Anglistische Arbeitshefte, 17.) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1978. ix + 90 pp.

Moessner's book, intended for students of general linguistics and English, shows the development of work for a seminar she held at the University of Freiburg in 1973/74. In keeping with this audience it contains exercises interspersed throughout the text.

The plan of the book is tripartite. The first chapter (3-20) discusses the notion of morphonology and presents a classification of alternations which is then applied to English in the second (21-72). The third chapter (73-78) summarizes the results of the second and touches on the role of morphonological alternations in language typology. A bibliography (79-82), solutions to exercises, and indices of topics (89) and authors (90) conclude the work.

M describes her model as "generative-structuralist" (2), generative in that it accounts for forms beyond those of the corpus used, and structuralist in that it is exclusively concerned with surface structures. Aside from her use of D. Jones's transcription of English and charac-

teristically Praguean terms like "opposition" and "neutralization," M does not indicate what premises of phonological theory underly her study.

M's understanding of morphonology derives essentially from N.S. Trubetzkoy, but her first chapter also examines the views of other European linguists in some detail. M concludes that A. Martinet, while explicitly rejecting morphonology, in fact reinstates it through a reinterpretation of morphology (9-10); O. Akhmanova, despite her importance for M's considerations, does not succeed in delimiting morphonology from phonology and morphology (14), and S.K. Šaumjan fails to show how his model accounts for alternations (12). M draws attention to the contradictory statements of J. Kuryłowicz on the subject (8).

Only a brief characterization of generative phonology is provided by M, and criticisms raised may confuse students unfamiliar with this model. Many readers will be surprised by her claim that "the literature provides much less detailed information on the phonological component than on the syntactic and — in recent times — the semantic components" (10).

M depicts N. Chomsky's abandonment of the term "morphophonemics" in favor of "systematic phonemics" as being arbitrary (11) and makes no reference to his explicitly stated grounds for this change (cf. Kilbury 1976:110).

It is generally unclear whether and in what respects M distinguishes morphonology from morphophonemics (as practiced by American structuralists) and generative phonology. Her own model and her concentration on European structuralists suggest a narrow understanding of the term "morphonology" while the discussion of generative phonology and her unrepresentative list of descriptive studies (7) point to a broad sense. If M in fact agrees with Šaumjan that "Chomsky's systematic phonemics is nothing but well-known morphonemics in the disguise of a phonemic terminology" (quoted, 12), then it is remarkable that she has paid so little attention to the results of studies done within this framework.

M's use of basic terminology is sometimes unclear. "Variant," "alternant," and "allomorph" seem to appear interchangeably (e.g. 13, 24, 30). Expressions like "phonologically related morpheme variants" (17) and "basic form *(Grundform)*" (14) are employed without adequate explanation. "Automatic alternation" is discussed (15-16) without any indication of its meaning in the work of L. Bloomfield and C.F. Hockett although the term is closely identified with these linguists (cf. Kilbury 1976:130).

P. Garde (1965) provides the classification of alternations adopted by M and presented on pp. 18-20. For every alternation an alternating morpheme and a morpheme that "causes *(be-wirkt)*" the alternation are distinguished. Both morphemes have a conditioning, i.e. a "changing power *(verändernde Kraft)*," which is either phonological or morphological. The conditioning of the alternating morpheme is internal and that of the other, external. On the basis of the conditioning a distinction is drawn between *neutralization* (int. phon. + ext. phon.) and alternations that are *exogenic* (int. phon. + ext. morph.), *endogenic* (int. morph. + ext. phon.), or *free* (int. morph. + ext. morph.). Alternations are either progressive or regressive.

English alternations that illustrate the classification are shown by the forms *dear* (r-less): *dearer* (neutralization), *tone : tonic* (exogenic), *inaccurate : impartial* (endogenic), and *wife : wives* (free). In examples like the last the dichotomy of phonological versus morphological conditioning is unfortunate, since one might say that the presence of the stem-final spirant is a necessary but not a sufficient condition. Suppletion is not recognized as an alternation type, so that *good : better* (26) is not distinguished from *man : men* (24) or *wife : wives* (25), which are all free.

The corpus on which M bases her study is D. Jones's *English Pronouncing Dictionary* (11th edition, reprinted 1958). Aside from any questions as to the suitability of this corpus, it is difficult to understand why data from the 12th (1963) and 13th (1967) editions were not incor-

porated. The 14th edition (1977) appeared after M's book went to press. In order to under-stand M's discussion of stress alternations (36-37) students will need to be told why earlier edi-tions give *disartículate* while the 14th writes *dìsartículate.*

M closely follows H. Marchand's (1969) account of English word-formation but otherwise makes virtually no reference to the extensive literature on English alternations. Her own hand-ling of the data reflects an approach which is in many respects anachronistic. Thus, variability is ironed out with normalization (2) and avoided as a linguistic problem. Her techniques are taxonomic in an extreme sense, emphasizing pure classification rather than relations and gener-alizations. Parallelisms within sets of alternations are ignored, and questions regarding the nat-uralness of alternations are not considered. M likewise fails to show the interaction of stress and segmental changes.

Perhaps the greatest flaw in M's study is her inadequate use of basic forms *(Grundformen),* which she mentions in connection with neutralization (14, 22) but overlooks otherwise. Just as the alternation in German *Rad : Rades* (18) is phonologically conditioned only if the alter-nant occurring in the position of maximum phonological differentiation is taken as basic, the alternation of the regular English noun plural ending is phonological if the alternant chosen as basic is that which occurs where all three are phonologically possible, i.e. /-z/. M instead − fol-lowing Garde − makes the latter alternation endogenic (16, 19), but the same logic could just as well apply to *Rad : Rades,* since nothing about German phonology reveals whether an isolat-ed form pronounced /ra:t/ has the genitive *Rades* or *Rates.* Thus, her attempt to distinguish neutralization from automatic alternation is unsuccessful.

M gives the suffix of electrician as /-ən/ and states that it has "no alternating variants" (39) but says nothing about forms like *guardian* and *episcopalian.* She expresses surprise at Marchand's representation of the suffix *-ure* as /jə(r)/, which she finds only in *failure* (39). No parallel is drawn between the alternations /z/ ~ /ʒ/ *(closure),* /s/ ~ /ʃ/ *(pressure),* and /t/ ~ /tʃ/ *(departure),* nor is a phonetic motivation offered; *procedure* with /d/ ~ /dʒ/ is not mentioned at all.

Accidental and *artificial* have the same suffix /-ə l/, and the last *i* of *àrtifícial* is regarded as a "graphic sign for the morphonological alternation" /s/ ~ /ʃ/ (46). Another exogenic alternation zero ~ /I/ is needed to get the segment back in *àrtificiálity* (56), and the form *ministerial* is not cited.

Abbreviation has the suffix /-ən/ and an exogenic alternation /t/ ~ /ʃ/, for which M provides 2 ½ pages of examples (59-62) including verbs like *fustigate* and *tesselate,* but the predominant pronounciation of *equation* with /ʒ/ and the form *rebellion* are ignored. The important diction-ary by M. Lehnert (1971), which readily provides all examples of *-ation,* is not mentioned.

M assumes an alternation /əʊ/ ~ /u:/ for the past forms of *know, blow,* etc. (32) but then needs an alternation /n/ ~ /nj/ to account for *knew* although initial clusters like /blj-/ are pho-nologically impossible. Likewise, she postulates a free alternation zero ~ /n/ for *damn-able* (42), *autumn-al* (47), *solemn-ize* (45), *hymn-ic* (53), and *solemn-ity* (58) but nowhere points out that a final cluster /-mn/ cannot occur phonologically. Even in the case of linking-*r* she speaks of mor-phemes with certain final vowels as having *r*-variants prevocalically (21-22, 66-67).

In all the above cases M's description is complicated by her failure to work with basic forms, which need not conflict with her restriction of the study to surface structures (2). Generaliza-tions can be achieved without the abstract devices of generative phonology, but M discusses the alternations of *divine : divinity, serene : serenity,* etc. (56) without suggesting any parallelism between the alternations, without mentioning their recurrence as a set elsewhere in the morpho-logy, and without even noting that the stressed vowels of the derived forms build a special set (lax, or checked).

It is difficult to see what is gained by using a type of morphology with zero-suffixes that condition morphologically nondistinctive alternants in *men* (24), *less* (26), *came* (32), and even *went* (34); this approach was discussed and largely rejected by structuralists decades ago. Equally unclear is how the stem alternations of *left* can be "caused by the variant /t/" (28) rather than by the past morpheme itself. M sees one possible analysis of /v/ ~ /f/ in *left* (30) as neutralization, otherwise reserved for linking-*r*. Zero alternants in possessive forms (22-23) are avoided by ignoring plurals like *boys'* (cf. *men's*) and the unlikelihood of *Aristophanes's*; noun plurals like *crises* are overlooked.

Certain infelicities reflect deeper problems in M's model. What does it mean in explicit linguistic terms to say that "two alternants are concealed in one variant" (30) or that "an alternation is endogenic but one variant is sometimes free" (34)?

Typographic and minor errors: p.6, 1.3 and p.83, L.9, read "/e/" for "/æ/" in *bäckt*; p.14, 1.5, read "Phoneme" for "Morpheme"; p.18, note *Radachse* with /t/; p.33, item 38, read "/ʌ/" for "/ɔ/"; p.36, *sexuálity (EPD* [13] 1967) requires type I; p.65, note *imbalance;* p.79, l. 1, read "Akhmanova" (as in the publications themselves); pp.81-82, *edinicach, zadačax, otscherk,* etc. show inconsistent transliteration; p.82, l.4, read "Skousen"; p.83, L.4, omit ":".

The merit of M's study lies largely in the attention it draws to an alternative model that can broaden the perspective of current investigation of alternation. Her work generally shows technical care but does not adequately utilize the resources of the model she has chosen.

James Kilbury
Freie Universität Berlin
Institut für Englische Philologie
Gosslerstr. 2-4
D-1000 Berlin 33
Federal Republic of Germany

REFERENCES

Garde, P. (1965) [1967]: "Limites de morphèmes et limite de phonèmes (avec application au russe)," *Word* 21:360-390.

Kilbury, J. (1976): *The Development of Morphophonemic Theory.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lehnert, M. (1971): *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der englischen Gegenwartssprache.* Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.

Marchand, H. ([2]1969): *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation.* München: Beck.