

offensive kind of behaviour, nobody should be encouraged to use it; when it *is* used, bad language is generally regarded as even more offensive if the speaker is not a native speaker of the language. (p. 103).

Some readers may object to the presence of these phrases, together with a number of common expletives, but the advanced learner of English is bound to come across this type of usage, both written and spoken, in day-to-day life. And one might counter this objection by pointing out that the existence of such words is hardly an obligation to use them!

The handbook has been designed chiefly for foreigners living in England, and it is probably unfair, therefore, to criticise the authors' use of Sunday *dinner*, which may suggest to some readers an evening rather than a lunchtime meal. But this is a trifling quibble. The lively, informative approach and the occasional use of light humour save this handbook from dry-as-dust pedantry, and it successfully achieves its stated aims within the modest space of 105 pages.

A.G. Ulliyatt.

Jiri Kramsky: *The Word as a linguistic unit*, Mouton, The Hague, 1973.
Fl. 14.

The word is an institution in linguistics, notwithstanding – or perhaps because of – its nebulous status. The processing of the voluminous literature on the word in such a wide variety of languages constitutes a challenge to the adept polyglot. Kramsky's bold attempt gives a very useful summary of viewpoints expressed in the European and especially the less readily accessible East-European literature. Scant attention is paid to the Reichling's word theory, which is, however, tucked away in Dutch publications.

The account of the most important word characteristics, i.e. inner cohesion and mobility, is clear and straightforward (pp. 22-9). Unfortunately these central formal characteristics are not represented clearly in the general – and rather vague – definition of the word on p. 67. The gradient, non-absolute nature of these features is noted but not exploited by Kramsky. Various units (bound morpheme, clitic, full

word) may be graded on the scale of wordlikeness on the basis of their mobility, to name but one instance.

The remarks on the orthographical word (pp. 53-7) are to the point. Kramsky briefly touches on the inconsistency in the representation of English compounds: *middle class* (two orthographical units), *taxi-driver* (one hyphenated orthographical unit), *bricklayer* (a single orthographical unit). Everyone of these is a single linguistic word on the basis of its inner cohesion and mobility, irrespective of the orthographical representation.

The status of Kramsky's claim that: "It is beyond dispute that the word is, above all, a unit of the lexical plan" (p. 15) is not entirely clear. However, it appears that Kramsky nowhere distinguishes between the word and the lexical item, the latter being a semantic prime. Because of this he indulges in an excursus on theoretical semantics (p. 40 ff.), which I find totally irrelevant. The truly relevant issue, viz. the word as a semantic Gestalt, is glossed over: compounds (*night light*), pseudo compounds (*cranberry*) and derivations (*marriage*) frequently have meanings that are not deducible from the meanings of their parts.

Within transformation grammar, scant attention is paid to the word. However, there are encouraging stirrings in the most recent literature that may now merit a fundamental statement of the position of the word based on a much more solid theoretical foundation than Kramsky's. As a compendium of statements on the word Kramsky's work will undoubtedly remain useful.

F. Ponelis
University of South Africa

G.W. Turner: *Stylistics*, Pelican, 1973. 256 pp. Paperback 50p.

'Linguistics', writes Mr Turner in the first chapter of his book, 'is the science of describing language and showing how it works; stylistics is that part of linguistics which concentrates on variation in the use of language, often, but not exclusively, with special attention to the most conscious and complex uses of language in literature'. From this