

what to include and what to leave out and ample skill to bring his message over to the student at the introductory level.

F. Ponelis
University of South Africa

P.H. Matthews, *Morphology: An Introduction to the Theory of Word-Structure*. Cambridge University Press, 1974. x, 243 pp. Boards £4.80. Paperback £1.60.

'This is the first title in the series; there are other titles in preparation' state the publishers of *Morphology*, perhaps a little cryptically. One looks forward to hearing more about this (*Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics*), the latest in a spate of series on linguistics to hit the market in recent years.

Although it is called 'an introduction', one does not have to read very far to realize that this book is not intended for linguistic greenhorns. An introductory work perhaps only in the sense that it is broad-based and eclectic, it is an attempt to delineate 'the state of our knowledge' with respect to morphology and as such is doubtless a very worthwhile endeavour. Nevertheless the author is highly critical in his approach and leaves a few stones unturned in his quest to assess the pro's and con's of various viewpoints and theories. This, in other respects very laudable, approach and Matthew's not-so-lucid style combine to make the book rather heavy going for the uninitiated reader.

Introducing the subject the author argues that despite the dominant position of sentence-based generative grammar today, morphology, 'that branch of linguistics which is concerned with the structure of words' must continue to be the object of serious study, particularly for investigators of little-known languages. The point made is of course a valid one: no matter what model may finally be chosen to describe a language, the linguist must be able to distinguish and give an account of units smaller than the sentence and he should therefore be au fait with the methods and problems of morphological analysis.

Some of these problems are exemplified. We say for example that *baker* consists of two morphemes, *bake-* and the agentive suffix *-er*, but what of *butcher*? The hypothetical root *butch-* doesn't enter into any relationship with other morphemes of the language. Should we then consider *butcher* as morphologically simple despite the obvious parallel between it and *baker*, *farmer*, etc?

The author goes on to distinguish three types of 'words', i.e. the *word-form* (Lyons' 'phonological word'), the *lexeme* (fundamental unit of the lexicon) and the *word* (Lyons' 'grammatical word'), and word-like units are examined accordingly. Thus for example the Latin form *virumque* may be regarded as a word from the point of view of phonology but not from the lexical or grammatical point of view. The author takes pains to introduce a particular orthography for each type of word (e.g. small capitals are used when the lexeme is intended), but his explanations are not always as straightforward as they could be. This is a pity as, if the reader does not grasp the distinctions made here, he will flounder later on in the book.

The middle section of the book (Chs. IV–VIII) deals with *inflection*, which is distinguished from *word formation* (derivation and composition), the former relating essentially to the grammatical word whilst the latter concerns the lexeme in the first instance. The traditional Word and Paradigm (*amo, amas, amat ...*) model is treated in some detail, the exposition being helped along by some quotations from the grammars of Donatus and Priscian. The original Latin is given for those who may wish to contest Matthews' translation! The traditional model is contrasted with the more modern approach according to which words are split up into successions of roots and affixes. Although Matthews admits that the Word and Paradigm (WP) analysis has its weaknesses, he feels that the modern linguist is inclined to underestimate its value:

It is easy to make jokes about the Western grammatical tradition. It is particularly so for linguists who have not read the sources, and who come across what are merely bad or selective misapplications (paradigms of case in English are a hackneyed instance). Another temptation is to ignore it, to feel that all this has passed under the bridge. Now the older grammarians undoubtedly made mistakes. But it is possible to learn from them

The difference between the WP approach and modern morphemic analysis is treated in greater detail in chapter VII, *Morphological Processes*, one of the best written and most useful chapters. Here the reader is introduced to zero morphs, discontinuous morphs, replacives, affixes, suprafixes, suppletives and other of the mental pliers, hammers and screwdrivers that accompany the morphologist on his investigatory excursions. The author argues that this approach too has its weak points and in his assessment of the situation in the following chapter he favours the WP model but refuses to be dogmatic:

The answer is bound to be controversial, but in the author's view the case for the traditional model is quite convincing. There can be no language, of course, which literally cannot be described in terms of morphemes — just as there can be none, indeed, which literally cannot be described in terms of lexemes and morphosyntactic properties. As so often in linguistics, it is not possible to give knock-down arguments in favour of either model:

(p. 137)

The question of how morphology should be integrated with the study of syntax on the one hand and phonology on the other is taken up before the author moves on to consider the place of morphology in generative grammar. He shows that generative linguists (or rather, 'lexicalist' generative linguists) do in fact make use of various models or morphological analysis in their grammars, including the WP model, as instanced by W.U. Wurzel's study of German, a discussion of which concludes the book.

It is impossible here to give an adequate account of the scope of this book. In the space of little more than 200 pages Matthews takes up a welter of different issues and introduces his reader to a veritable cornucopia of morphological terms and concepts. On the double page 40-1 for instance, no fewer than fourteen brand-new terms are proffered and the resulting mental indigestion suffered by those who have not yet developed a 'taste' for the subject must surely be considerable.

One must take one's hat off to the author — he certainly knows his subject. But he takes up far too many issues, and in too quick a succession, leaving the reader to draw his own conclusions often with only a string of rhetorical questions to guide him. One also has

to contend with continual references as to what was said in Chapter X and what will be said in Chapter Y — all very well in moderation, but here it becomes a rather exasperating habit which disturbs one's concentration and threatens to upset one's already overloaded train of thought. This problem no doubt results from a desire on the part of the author to keep returning to earlier themes and models rather than to exhaust the possibilities of each at one go. No doubt he has his reasons, but the outcome is, pedagogically speaking, not very satisfactory.

It is unfortunate that Matthews makes no use of headings and sub-headings within his chapters but contents himself with brief summaries (sometimes mere concatenations of terms) at the beginning of each, making it all the more difficult for the reader to gain a proper perspective on the material. On the other hand, the review of suitable supplementary reading matter which follows each chapter should prove to be of value to every reader, be he first-year or professor.

When considering the strengths and weaknesses of this book it is particularly important to bear in mind for whom it intended. In his preface Matthews expresses the hope that 'it will be of value to specialists in particular European languages, as well as to postgraduate and undergraduate students of general linguistics'. Of its usefulness to the first two groups there can be no doubt — it contains a wealth of information, a good index, and considerable in-depth critical discussion — but as a teaching 'introduction to the theory of word-structure' it falls a little short of the mark.

E.H. Hubbard
University of South Africa

Geoffrey Leech, *Semantics*. Penguin, 1974, xii, 386 pp. Paperback 70 p.

This book is one of the latest members of the 'Pelican Original' linguistics series. Like its fellow volumes (*Linguistics*, *Grammar*, *Phonetics* and *Stylistics*) it bears a simple, supposedly all-embracing title, but the author shows from the outset that he