Few people will doubt that there is a market "for a dictionary which will explain the many new terms [of linguistics] and at the same time relate the new approaches and concepts to the already familiar traditional grammatical terminology."(viii). Although it can hardly be said that we are suffering from a shortage of introductory courses and textbooks - some would maintain that there are far too many - most of them have serious draw-backs when considered in terms of their usefulness to the interested non-specialist: they are either too technical, usually confined to only one theoretical approach, or simply too long and detailed; and they very rarely explain different terminologies systematically. Hartmann and Stork's (H&S) intention of providing an up-to-date reference work that might be useful "to students of linguistics and language teachers, including teachers of English as a foreign language, and to all those, whatever their field, who are interested in the study of language" (viii) must therefore be welcomed.

The compilers' aims and choice of potential reading public rest inter alia on two assumptions: first, that "traditional grammatical terminology" is actually familiar to the potential users of the dictionary and, second, that it is possible to cater for the needs and interests of students of linguistics, language teachers, philosophers, sociologists, etc. in the space of one fairly concise volume. I would not want to say categorically that these assumptions are ill-founded, but perhaps it should be kept in mind that most school-leavers, for instance, have very little sound knowledge of traditional grammar and its terminology. (Formal grammar teaching was, after all, abandoned in this country a long time ago, and what little knowledge is retained depends very much on the views and methods of the various teachers of French, Latin, etc.) The rather diverse needs of e.g. students of linguistics, language teachers and sociologists interested in the study of language do, moreover, not help to make the already extremely difficult task of selecting appropriate entries any easier.

In view of these questions the professed aims of the authors indicate that they have been looking for a very sensible compromise: the dictionary is to contain representative samples from the "various branches of linguistics scholarship"(ix) in the widest sense, i.e. including phonetics, applied linguistics etc. as well as theoretical and descriptive linguistics. Non-technical terms which are usually found adequately explained in a general dictionary are to be excluded, but on the other hand the compilers did not want to avoid technicality where undue simplification would have had a distorting effect (ix). I shall make some comments below on whether these aims have been achieved.

The dictionary entries themselves are preceded by a useful list of abbreviations and notational conventions, and followed by a fairly detailed bibliography to which frequent reference is made in the individual entries. Thus a reading of the definitions of e.g. MORPHEME or DIALECT could easily be followed up by a number of books ranging from introductory to fairly technical. Although one could quibble about the value of some of the books listed, and about some aspects of the classification of the bibliography,
it is on the whole comprehensive and useful; the sectioning from general/introductory to specific/technical and the long list of important journals should be particularly helpful. The list of major languages of the world together with the accompanying statistics will also appeal to many readers, and the reprint of the IPA transcription system might be vital to an understanding of the entries on phonetics and phonology.

The actual dictionary entries are very clearly presented, and contain a number of useful diagrams and tables. Cross-referencing is also good, and the book appears to be remarkably free of ordinary misprint. (Perhaps one should mention one oversight: in the entry on the WORD the cross-reference should be to 'systemic grammar', not 'systematic grammar'). In giving examples for their definitions H&S try to stick to English and the better known European languages as much as possible. This is obviously a sensible decision — especially since most of the examples are well chosen — because it is doubtful whether some of the 'exotica' found in ordinary textbooks would clarify the point rather than confuse the average reader. Occasionally, however, an example may not have the desired effect. Thus the varying phonemic distinctiveness across languages of phonetic segments is demonstrated by contrasting German Ruhm/Ruhm /u/vs/u:/ with the variant pronunciations of room /u:, u:/ in English. If the pair fool /u/vs/u:/ occurs to the reader the point has not been made in the intended way.

One of the major problems for the compilers must have been the question of deciding on the appropriate entries for the Dictionary. It seems unlikely that any two specialists would be in complete agreement as to which selection constitutes a "representative sample" of the discipline, and even less likely that they would agree on what should go into a dictionary of this kind. Nevertheless I feel that, in view of the authors' express aims, some critical comments are appropriate. If, for example, considering the large number of language teachers among the potential readership, an entry on LANGUAGE LABORATORY was felt to be necessary this may be quite appropriate, but one wonders why space has been taken up with e.g. an explanation of the electronic mechanisms of a TAPE RECORDER. This surely has nothing specifically to do with the subject, and would probably best have been left to an encyclopaedia. Similarly, in the entry on PUNCTUATION, it seems quite unnecessary to list the punctuation marks of Latin scripts with their common English names; a reference to the use of punctuation marks in linguistic notations would have been quite sufficient. With the entry as it stands the reader might just feel unduly patronised. One could also correctly assume that most readers would find an appropriate gloss for ADAM'S APPLE in the Concise Oxford Dictionary.

On the other hand there are quite a number of short entries giving definitions of rather obscure and rarely used terms that could have been omitted without great loss. If these terms crop up at all in modern books on language and linguistics they are in any case usually explained. As a possible 'purge' of the letter P I would be happy to sacrifice the following: PARAGOGUE, PARANOMASIA, PAUCAL, PEREGRINISM, PETROGLYPH, PETROGRAM, PETROGRAPHY, PHONEASTHEME. Obviously these are minor points, but the space taken up by these entries might have been more usefully been devoted to an expansion of some definitions (e.g. SYNTAX, PREDICATE) and the inclusion of additional items (e.g. COGNITION, OPAQUE/OPACITY, TRANSPARENT/TRANSPARENCY).
It is perhaps futile to argue about minor disagreements concerning the selection of representative entries. In trying to assess the quality and content of the dictionary entries one is bound to be subjective; the phonologist will concentrate on aspects different from the ones the semanticist is interested in, and the non-specialist perhaps needs a different kind of explanation than the student of linguistics who is familiar with many basic assumptions and arguments in the field but wants to deepen his understanding and expand his knowledge. Keeping in mind these different aims one can say that a good deal of the dictionary is helpful, and provides a good compromise between simplification and technicality. Nevertheless I feel that certain aspects need improvement if the book is to serve its purpose fully, and a number of mistakes should be eliminated as soon as possible. One should not forget that in making available a reference work of this kind, the authors have taken on a tremendous responsibility. The specialist will find it easy enough to pinpoint an obvious mistake and to look for the right kind of information in the literature, but the 'linguistic layman' might be led up the wrong alley for a long time.

In leafing through the dictionary I was struck by the fact that the level of technicality and exhaustiveness of coverage varied a good deal from one section of the field to another — although the number of entries is fairly constant. The entries concerned with variation in language and applied linguistics (mainly language teaching), for example, on the whole give concise and fairly non-technical information — obviously a good point. Some of the entries on phonetics and, particularly acoustic phonetics, are, on the other hand, rather detailed and technical. There is basically no harm in this, but the same level of technicality is not upheld in entries dealing with other 'branches of linguistic scholarship.' A similar inconsistency also becomes apparent when one e.g. compares the entries on PHONOLOGY and SEMANTICS with that on SYNTAX. The entry on semantics (almost a full page) attempts a brief historical outline as well as a rough classification of approaches — PHONOLOGY is similar — whereas all one finds under SYNTAX is a very short and general statement to the effect that the syntactician studies the systematic arrangement of words in sentences. Either type of definition is defensible (although the former is certainly more illuminating), but the authors should have made a clear decision as to which kind of definition is intended, and stuck to it. Otherwise there is a danger that the unsuspecting 'consumer' gets the wrong impression about what importance linguists attach to the various sections of their discipline.

This last point touches on a very difficult though central question: to what extent is the specialist with didactic intentions justified in simplifying the account of his discipline at the cost of possibly giving a distorted picture? H&S's decision — which I would fully support — is clearly indicated in the preface. They do not want to avoid technicality where an attempt at simplification would have a distorting effect, and they have not tried to standardize the use of linguistic terminology "except where such codification has been achieved by the experts themselves"(ix). However, these aims have not always been achieved. One handicap is a certain vagueness in the language of the definitions, i.e. the occasional failure to define the terms in the metalanguage. This can be demonstrated by a few minor points: one has to read several definitions until one can be sure that for H&S grammar=syntax; this then 'explains' the phrase "linguists, grammarians and phoneticians" in the preface (viii). A simple cross-reference to the entry on GRAMMAR could have helped. Location like the following
are 'aesthetically' annoying rather than misleading: "...language as a self-contained system, without any reference to external factors such as philosophy, sociology, etc." (107, emph. mine). Moreover, vague, 'traditional' (?) notions are sometimes used to explain syntactic terminology, cf. e.g., the definition of SUBORDINATE CLAUSE as "a clause which is dependent on another clause for its full meaning..." It may not be all that had a definition, but other syntactic notions are paraphrased in purely syntactic terms. To mention only one further - more substantial - point: the entry on DETERMINER lists five types of lexical items, among them 'pre-articles' such as both, all, half and another class "which operate in complimentary distribution with articles", e.g. some. Under PRE-DETERMINER ("alternative term: pre-article", 181) the definition given is "...words which can occur in front of an article or other determiner in a noun phrase, e.g. some of in some of the men." Although the definitions are - at least at this level of technicality - not directly wrong I could easily imagine that somebody who is not familiar with the relevant syntactic arguments might find these two explanations at least partially contradictory.

The things I have mentioned so far are relatively minor inaccuracies. More problematic are those distortions that might be attributable to the authors' intention to present complicated and diverse phenomena in a fairly simple and concise way. To mention only one point: H&S appear to have a rather peculiar understanding of the -emics/-ology distinction as applicable to phonology and morphology. In the entry on PHONEMICS e.g., they concede that 'phonology' is often used as the more general, superordinate term, but continue like this: "...the originally American usage of the term phonemics is becoming more widespread. In this sense phonemics is a branch of phonology concerned with the synchronic analysis of the sound system of a given language, particularly with reference to reducing language to writing, as opposed to historical or diachronic phonology." Although one could no doubt find some linguist who would define phonemics in this way, it is at best a most unusual and idiosyncratic definition, and as such has no place in a general reference work. Phonemics is usually understood as a particular way of doing phonology, and in this sense contrasts with prosodic phonology, generative phonology, etc. Moreover, in historical phonology, the same different approaches can, and have been applied, and have led to an account of diachronic phenomena in terms of phoneme split and phoneme merger, rule addition and rule loss, etc., etc. The distinction the authors make between morphemics and morphology is odd in the same way, and my comments apply to it as well.

Another example of - probably unintentional - distortion which I feel rather unhappy about can be found in the entry on SEMANTICS. In their attempt to set off linguistic semantics from philosophical approaches to meaning H&S have thrown a whole array of important aspect of the field overboard: "LINGUISTIC SEMANTICS has studied meaning more in terms of the connexions of speech acts and the physical and intellectual environment of the speaker." Moreover, the classification of (linguistic) theories of semantics is rather dubious: "(a) the CONCEPTUAL THEORY...(b) the REFERENCE or CORRESPONDENCE THEORY...(c) the CONTEXTUAL THEORY...(d) the FIELD THEORY...(e) COMPOSITIONAL ANALYSIS...(f) COMBINATORIAL SEMANTICS or SEMOTACTICS...(g) GENERATIVE SEMANTICS..." Criteria of classification from different levels have apparently been confused in an unfortunate manner. If e.g., (e) is a 'theory' (rather than a method), then (a) to (d) are probably 'meta-theories', or theoretical frames of reference. Thus one could, depending on one's choice between these
frames, define semantic feature analysis 'conceptually' (as, to some extent, in Glossematics or Katz/Fodor-type semantics), or in terms of reference relations, or simply as an abstraction from situational context (as in some anthropological studies, or Systemic Grammar). In the last sense, then, componental analysis is the method used by e.g. 'systemic' linguists to describe the context of situation. Therefore it is also at best rather narrow to furnish - as H&S do - as the only demonstration of (c) the study of collocations, especially since systemic linguists would probably want to make a distinction between semantic description (context of situation) and the study of lexical meaning (formal collocation relationships). Similarly, (f) refers to one part of any more comprehensive semantic description rather than constituting a theory; that is, semantic descriptions in systemic grammar, stratificational grammar, transformational-generative grammar (TG) etc. are all in part 'combinatorial'. It is moreover misleading to define semotactics (which in any case is a technical term used in stratificational grammar and not a theory) as the study "which looks at both the lexical meaning \( \Gamma \) of individual items and their syntactic arrangement." If implicit reference is made to a Lamb-type description two strata have been confused; if it is to make sense, 'syntactic' must be understood in a way similar to its use in 'logical syntax' - but this sense of the term is otherwise absent from the definitions. Semotactics in stratificational grammar states which combinations of word meanings (described in terms of semantic features) constitute semantically well-formed strings. (g), finally, is simply described as the theory "which studies underlying logical relations." First of all it is not clear whether the authors intend to refer to that group of generative linguists represented by names like Lakoff, MacCawley and Postal whose approach to linguistics usually bears the label 'Generative Semantics', or whether they simply mean 'semantics in TG'. Secondly, semantic descriptions in a TG framework have, like all other comprehensive descriptions, tried to characterise word meanings and the semantic well-formedness of sentences. If this is studying 'logical relations' then any proper semantics studies logical relations in as far as they are relevant to natural languages. The casual, and unexplained, use of 'underlying' still does not give any real clues as to what distinguishes these theories from others. I am not suggesting that all the relevant background information and the very complicated state of affairs should have been represented in the entry; what I am suggesting is that the authors' attempt at presenting a simplified and clearly structured overview will give the person looking for the correct information a rather garbled version of the 'state of the art' and its history.

Finally, I have to mention a number of entries which contain information that is simply wrong or unintelligible. Although it would probably be unfair to hold the authors responsible for all of them, it is a pity that they were allowed to go beyond the proof-reading stage. Under WORD FORMATION H&S characterise derivational processes i.a. by the following statement: "DERIVATION in contrast to inflection produces a form which has substantially the same grammatical status as the original or base form." If 'grammatical status' is meant to indicate 'category' this is obviously wrong, as the (correct) sentences that follow make clear (cf. modern, modernise). The statement might make sense, however, as a characterisation of inflectional processes since affixation (e.g. the 'addition' of number or tense morphemes) preserves the category of the root. Obviously something has gone wrong somewhere. This is unfortunately also true of the definitions of ITEM-AND-ARRANGEMENT and ITEM-AND-PROCESS. H&S define IA as an approach "which excludes all con-
siderations of time", and IP as a method "which describes language as a
dynamic system." Clearly the implications of the former and the assertion
contained in the latter statement are incorrect since neither approach con-
stitutes anything but a static method of synchronic description, and the
'processes' of IP refer to purely descriptive techniques, and not to real-
time sequences in speech production. The following sentence appears under IA:
"Passive and active sentences, for example, can be considered to exist
regarding one as being derived from the other as opposed to an item-and-
process approach." If anything, this is a characterisation of IP, not IA,
and one cannot help feeling that two distinct entries have been confused.
Perhaps one should also indicate that these descriptive techniques were
developed primarily as methods of analysis for morphology rather than syntax.

Some of the entries on TG are also rather weak. As a general point one
could mention that it would be very helpful if some entries (e.g. KERNEL
SENTENCE, TRANSFORMATION RULE, GENERALISED TRANSFORMATION) contained some
cross-reference to the main entry on TG since it is otherwise not at all
clear which particular model the entries refer to, or even that there may
be a difference between e.g. the role of transformations in Syntactic Structures
and Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Specifically, one could mention the
following points. 1. (PHRASE-MARKER) Transformations convert P-marker into
P-marker, and do not produce "new sentences" from P-markers (at least in the
later model). 2. (PROJECTION RULE) In an Aspects-type grammar the assignment
of "a semantic reading to syntactic structures" is not the task of the pro-
jection rules, but of the semantic component. The projection rules, as part
of the semantic component, 'amalgamate' the semantic descriptions of lexical
items thereby producing a semantic reading for the whole sentence.
3. (COMPETENCE and PERFORMANCE) This entry contains a glaring misrepresentation
of the role and form of the grammar. Having made the distinction between
competence and performance (more or less correctly) the authors continue:
"In transformational-generative grammar features of competence are represented
in the deep structure exhibited by the syntactic component of the grammar,
whereas features of performance are represented in the surface structure
produced by the phonological component of the grammar." Of course most
linguists need no reminder that features of performance are represented
nowhere in a Chomskyan grammar, that deep structures as well as surface struc-
tures are produced by the syntactic component, and that the phonological com-
ponent provides underlying phonological representation as well as taking
surface syntactic structures as input. But this may be just the sort of
information the user of the dictionary is looking for. Slips like these are
therefore annoying not so much because the linguist finds an area of his
field misrepresented but because the person interested in the study of
language often finds TG the least accessible of linguistic theories despite
the interest it has roused. The dictionary could have helped to correct some
of the wild speculations that are so often found floating around in interested
but semi-informed circles.

I have exemplified my major misgivings about the book in some detail
because I think that it could be a very valuable and helpful reference work
for a wide audience if some of the more obvious faults were put right. With
the appropriate revision the dictionary might also make good supplementary
teaching material for students in the initial stages of a linguistics course.
Even as it stands it has a coverage which is not general found in more
accessible books on linguistics, and contains a good deal of well-planned
and concise information. Finally, I should like to add - if I may - a remark
addressed to the publishers. The readership for whom this book is intended is not a group of specialists in linguistics - and they are probably the only ones resigned to the sad truth that books in their discipline come at exorbitant prices. Providing a paperback edition at half the price should therefore have top priority - if only to double the sales figures.

R. O. U. Strauch