ON THE OCCASION OF THE PUBLICATION OF *AN INTRODUCTION TO JAPANESE LINGUISTICS*

TSUTOMU AKAMATSU
Department of Linguistics and Phonetics. The University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT. England

El libro del que más abajo nos ocupamos estudia diversos aspectos del japonés hablado actual (dialecto de Tokyo) desde un punto de vista lingüístico y dentro de un marco generativista. Como indica su índice, se estudian aspectos relativos a la fonética, la fonología, la morfología, la sintaxis, la semántica, la lingüística histórica, las variaciones dialectales y la sociolingüística. El intento de abarcar un espectro tan amplio en un único volumen, incluso de una extensión como la que este presenta, resulta, sin embargo, excesivamente ambicioso. La autora presta una mayor atención a la fonología y a la sintaxis. Mientras que algunos de los otros aspectos no son tratados con el detenimiento que requieren.

Palabras clave: Japonés hablado actual, mora, /n/ moraica, romanización, Rendaku, formalización, sintaxis.

The book to be discussed below presents current spoken Japanese (the Tokyo dialect) in its multifarious facets from a linguistic point of view in a generative framework. As the table of contents indicates, the facets studied concern the language's phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, historical linguistics, language variation and sociolinguistics. To cover such a wide range of varied topics in a single book, even of this size, proves, however, to be over-ambitious. The author's major attention is given to phonology and syntax, while a few of the other facets suffer from less than an adequate treatment.

Key-words: Contemporary spoken Japanese, mora, moraic /n/, romanization, Rendaku, formalization, syntax.

Natsuko TSUJIMURA, *An Introduction to Japanese Linguistic,* Backwell Textbooks in Linguistics 10. Blackwell Publishers Ltd., Oxford, 1996 (1st ed.), xiv + 401pp.

The hefty book (415 pages long) in question has been written by a Japanese linguist, hereafter NT, for the benefit of either those who already know linguistics but not Japanese or those who already know Japanese but not linguistics. The author does not rule out that non-Japanese readers may already be acquainted with some Japanese. The style and the clarity of her exposition are throughout admirably suited for the book addressed to both

categories of readers. Volumes dealing with a broad range of aspects of Japanese written in Japanese have been available in Japan, if not necessarily in the same theoretical framework as NT's, but the present book is certainly one of the first textbooks written in English to cover comprehensively various linguistic aspects of Japanese. It is apparent already in an early part of the book (in the Introduction) – and the readers go on to confirm this in the rest of the book – that the 'non-Japanese' readers being addressed are essentially supposed to be speakers of English, in particular, of American English.

The original draft of the present article on NT's book was roughly three times longer than what is presented here in a radically reduced form due to shortage of space. I can, in what follows, only scratch the surface of the ice-berg as a result.

NT clarifies the aim of her book in these words: 'to examine [contemporary] spoken Japanese [as practised in the Tokyo dialect] from a linguistic perspective' (p. xii). According to NT, the book is basically intended for 'undergraduate students who are interested in Japanese linguistics' (*ibid*.), though neither prior knowledge of linguistics is assumed nor graduates are excluded. NT examines (spoken) Japanese in its multifarious aspects such as, as she herself specifies them, phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, historical linguistics, language variation, and sociolinguistics. Limitation of space has prevented NT from including psycholinguistics and pragmatics (p. xii).

Emphasis is placed, as NT herself says, on phonology (pp. 23-124) and syntax (pp. 160-304), which between them account for just under 65% of the whole book. Following the Preface and the Acknowledgements, the book falls into seven chapters: Introduction (this counts as Chapter 1), Chapter 2 titled Phonetics, Chapter 3 Phonology, Chapter 4 Morphology, Chapter 5 Syntax, Chapter 6 Semantics, and Chapter 7 Language Variation. Note that historical linguistics, language variation, and sociolinguistics are treated in one chapter, Chapter 7. Each of Chapters 2 to 7 ends with 'Suggested Readings' and Exercises (no answers are provided). The book closes with the Bibliography and the Index. One infelicity I immediately noticed occurs in the Contents, where the whole of p. viii, page numbers are missing, doubtlessly a mechanical hiccough of some sort which must be regarded as very unfortunate since it is evidently inconvenient to the readers.

The type of linguistics in terms of which NT presents the phonology and syntax of Japanese is, as she puts it, 'primarily…the Generative approach developed since Chomsky (1957)' (p. xii). Incidentally, NT's Bibliography identifies Chomsky (1957) as *Syntactic Structure* [sic] rather than *Syntactic Structures*. One reason why NT has elected to devote a large section of her book to phonology and syntax is, self-avowedly, that they are readily amenable to formalization if treated within a generative framework (p. xii). The readers therefore know in advance that formalization is the ultimate aim in NT's presentation of the phonology and syntax of Japanese in her book, as they will indeed find so. That language is systematic and rule-governed and that moreover generalization is of the utmost importance in formalizing are shown to be evident throughout the pages of NT's book.

NT's aim to examine current *spoken* Japanese in her book justifiably necessitates her presentation, to start with, of phonetics in Chapter 2 (pp. 5-22) in which general phonetics, English phonetics and Japanese phonetics are comparatively set out. NT aims to provide the phonetic inventory of the sounds of English and Japanese in a comparative fashion, no doubt to facilitate English-speaking (specifically, American-English-speaking) readers to gain thereby some knowledge of Japanese speech sounds. However, NT's presentation tends to suggest 'similarity' more than 'dissimilarity' there is between the sounds of Japanese and English, which is somewhat problematic. For this reason, her presentation does not always lead to factually correct description of Japanese sounds nor does it lay sufficient emphasis on such phonetic qualities of certain Japanese sounds as would need specific and constant attention of most non-Japanese readers; for instance, the lack of lip-rounding in the articulation of [ɯ] or the 'flapness' of [ɾ]. NT might be forgiven for suggesting that the Japanese [š], [ž], [č], [ǰ] (her notations) and the English [š], [ž], [č], [ǰ] (also her notations) are similar to each other – they are in fact quite dissimilar – in order to avoid going into excessive detail about the phonetic differences in the two languages. However, it seems unfortunate that she has decided to use the notation [r] after all instead of [ɾ] which she herself uses just once as standing for a 'flap' in Japanese (p. 14), and also to use consistently the notation [w] rather than some other symbol (e.g. [ɰ]) for a certain Japanese sound which she knows is unrounded. [w] sticks out like a sore thumb when, to give just one example, when NT notates [tanakasan wa…] in an exercise on p. 22; incidentally, I disagree with NT

notating [n] before [w] (or as I would put it, [ɥ]). For the English sound, she correctly uses the notation [w]. Likewise, it is regretted that, having briefly used the notation [ɯ] for the Japanese 'unrounded high back vowel' (p. 18), NT opts for the sake of simplicity to use the notation [u] for the rest of the book.

The diagram showing the vocal tract in Figure 2.2 on p. 4 is largely error-free, but her indication of the tongue blade is unclear and that of the tongue root is incorrect.

NT's presentation of 'Hiragana syllabary' in Fig. 2.1 (p. 6) gives only a partial picture of the traditional syllabary. Her position is most likely that *hiragana* characters involving palatalization (e.g. しゃ) are secondary in that they involves products of a process of palatalization and consequently do not need to be listed. Her position is congruent with the absence of palatalized consonants in the inventory of the Japanese consonants given in Fig. 2.2 (p. 16), though with the notable exceptions of [š, ž, ǰ, č, ň, ç, ɲ], i.e. what she presents as 'alveo-palatal' and 'palatal'.

I disagree with NT when she writes (p. 16) that a long [t] (i.e. [tː], as she notates) or a long [k] (i.e. [kː]) occurs in e.g. *white tape* or *black kite* in *rapid* speech. Is it not in slow speech, if anything? A minor point though this may seem, the matter is of importance in that the discriminate use of a short or a long consonant (likewise, of a short or a long vowel) in Japanese is not only essential but a frequent trouble-maker for foreign speakers of Japanese. NT says that 'Japanese […] contains a long vowel' (p. 19) and adduces e.g. *too* 'ten' (as opposed to *to* 'door'). But if a long consonant is, to her, equivalent to a geminate consonant, is a long vowel eqivalent to a doubly long vowel? (NT talks of 'elongation' (*ibid*.).) If so, would she call – or how would she call it? – a thrice long vowel as in *too o* 'tower (as in *too o akeru* '(to) open a tower'), assuming that there occurs no vowel rearticulation between the individual *o*s? And how about *too oo o oo u* 'to cover Eastern Europe'?

I agree with NT that there is the phenomenon, for example in the Tokyo dialect, of 'vowel devoicing' which results in 'voiceless vowels' (NT's expressions). This revolves round a controversial point (though she does not present it as such) since specialists of Japanese are divided, some sharing NT's (and my own) view and others seeing 'vowel deletion' instead.

NT exemplifies the phonetic phenomenon of 'coarticulation' by what she refers to, in later pages, as 'moraic /n/' in Japanese (p. 65 *et passim*). On one point relating to the phonetic realization of 'moraic /n/', I disagree with NT. She says in note 6 in Chapter 2 that before alveo-palatal ([ň] as she notates) and palatal consonants ([ɲ]), there occur the alveo-palatal nasal and palatal nasal, respectively, and adduces *ken zya* (*nai*) [keň ǰa (nai)] "it is not a ticket" and *ken ya* (*kane*) [keɲ ya (kane)] "things like ticket and (money)" (p. 20). It is the alleged occurrence of [ɲ] before *ya* [ya] (= IPA [ja]) that I question. [y] (= [j]) requires such an articulation that no closure is formed in the oral cavity, so that the nasal consonant that occurs in coarticulation with [y] is what may be described as a 'nasalized vowel', in the articulation of which there also occurs no closure in the oral cavity. [ɲ], however, requires a closure in the oral cavity. Presumably NT similarly sees the occurrence of [ɲ] before [s] and [z] (alveolars), [š] and [ž] (alveo-palatals), and [ç] (palatal) as well; if so she would be wrong. Suffice it to give just one relevant example; NT is wrong to notate [sansatˢu] '3 books' on p. 29, for it is a 'nasalized vowel' that occurs before [s]. Sequences like [-ɲy-], [-ɲš-], [-ɲž-] and [-ɲç-] that NT also gives do not represent cases of coarticulation either.

NT chooses to use Kunrei-style Romanization throughout her book. This is one of the three systems of romanization known to the Japanese and is the one favoured by the Japanese Ministry of Education (first promulgated through a Cabinet decree in 1937 and re-promulgated in 1954), but is hardly used and understood by average Japanese people. It is largely the Hepburn system of romanization (devised by James Curtis Hepburn (1815-1911), an American missionary/physician) that is familiar to the Japanese and is seen in the street, on railway platforms and elsewhere for the benefit of foreign residents and tourists in Japan. The choice of Kunrei-style Romanization by NT in her book no doubt facilitates her presentation of what some call morphophonemics (which NT deals with in some subsequent chapters under the guise of phonology) and morphology. However, NT's use of Kunrei-style Romanization in the phonetics chapter poses some problems to the readers in general, English-speaking ones included. Let us take a concrete example. No. 5 of Exercises (p. 22) has the following instruction: 'Have a native speaker of Japanese pronounce the following words that are written in Romanization ("Kunrei"-style) and provide transcriptions of these words.' Her instruction is then followed by *isi* "stone", *hon* "book", *tetudau* "help", *itta* "went",

matimasyoo "let's wait", etc. [NT's romanization but my italics]. The trouble is that average native speakers of Japanese would, at least at first, be induced to pronounce [isi] (instead of [iši], as NT would put it), [tetudau] (instead of [tetsudau], the use of [u] instead of [ɯ] being NT's), [matima-] (instead of [mačçima-]) or [mačima-] as NT would put it). Instances like *syoo* and *syo* would probably puzzle most Japanese readers. The use of the Hepburn system would prove preferable in such cases. Besides, how many of the non-Japanese readers of NT's book will still remember when arriving at later chapters how *ti, tu, si, syo*, etc. are to be pronounced in Japanese? Not that the Hepburn system presents no problems. Those readers who are interested in theoretical implications of different romanization systems of Japanese may wish to consult Hattori (1979).

On the whole, NT's presentation in the phonetics chapter is clear and adequate and prepares the readers for the next chapter which concerns phonology. 'Suggested Readings' on general terminology in phonetics at the end of Chapter 2 mentions three items all of which are well known to American readers. I would be happier to see in addition Abercrombie (1967), Catford (1988) and O'Connor (1973) which are well known in the U.K.

I move on to one of the two major chapters of NT's book, i.e. the chapter entitled Phonology. As is customary in a generative work, phonology means treatment of just about everything that pre-generative (and some, if not all, non-generative) linguists understand is described in phonetics, phonemics and morphophonemics. NT's phonology is no exception. As is well known, the distinction between a sound, a phoneme and a morphophoneme (NT uses the terms 'sound' and 'phoneme' in her book, but not 'morphophoneme') is neither relevant nor necessary. This may be somewhat confusing to some readers as they wade through the phonology chapter, as NT does distinguish between a sound and a phoneme at the beginning of the chapter. But how does she define phonology, as she calls it, in this book? 'The area of **phonology** [NT's boldface] deals with the systematic patterning of speech sounds' (p. 24). The readers soon find out, as they proceed, that it is more complicated and complex and comprehensive than that. Above all, by 'the systematic patterning of speech sounds' the readers should not understand anything like phonotactics.

The aim of the author in her phonology chapter is clear: not so much to describe how the relevant sounds function in Japanese as to propose various formalizations which relate to the sounds as they 'pattern' in Japanese, such that these formalizations are intended to achieve as much generalization as possible. What I have noticed is that in this task, NT proposes formalizations by sacrificing such 'phonological' facts as would not fit the fomralizations or, having proposed formalizations, immediately admits that these formalizations cannot account for all the 'phonological' facts; in other words, in either case, over-generalizing. This is not intended to be a criticism of NT's works alone, but of generaivists' in general when they want to generalize and formalize. Anyway, as I happen to be a native speaker of Japanese as much as NT is, I personally found it interesting to go through the whole chapter, knowing the facts relevant to the rules NT proposes and how successfully or otherwise NT formalizes. I suspect that, on the other hand, English readers who know little or no Japanese cannot, when reading this book, do otherwise than uncritically accept what NT tells them through formalizations.

Certain phonetic phenomena in Japanese which are traditionally well known are chosen by NT for the purpose of presenting 'phonological rules' as she calls them. Devoicing (note, not deletion) of high vowels is the first one NT deals with. As is the general practice on the part of specialists of Japanese, NT invokes – rightly – the phonetic context 'between voiceless consonants' where /i/ or /u/ is 'realized' voiceless. However, (1) she inadequately specifies as 'the end of the word' (p. 28) the phonetic context where [i̥] or [u̥] occurs instead of 'before a pause' and (2) she fails to mention at all (therefore no relevant formulation) that the prepausal devoicing of high vowels is optional in any given speech style of an individual speaker (for example, either [muki̥] or [muki] occurs for *muki* 'direction'). Indicating [muki̥] only, as she does (p.27), is therefore inadequate. (She gives a good number of other examples of this sort throughout her book.) The two resulting rules (i.e. (9) and (10) on p. 28)) are consequently also inadequate themselves. I disagree with her when she says that the occurrence of [i] or [i̥], or [u] or [u̥], is completely predictable' (p. 29). What is rather surprising and proves baffling to careful readers is that NT who *has* specified the occurrence of [i̥] or [u̥] in, allegedly, 'word-final position', then completely forgets about it and consistently indicates [i] or [u] only (which she has never specified) in the ensuing pages of the book (e.g.

[matˢu] 'pine' on p. 31, and many other similar instances elsewhere), and this without even warning that she will only put [i] or [u] to stand for either [i] or [i̥], or [u] or [u̥], for convenience sake (such a warning is of course impossible because she has not specified [i] or [u] in 'word-final position' in the first place). Note that in dealing with the phenomenon of 'devoicing of high vowels', NT fails to mention the possible intervention of accent in a number of cases which prevents devoicing taking place in spite of the appropriate phonetic contexts as specified by her.

   The second phonetic phenomenon NT deals with is what she calls 'nasal assimilation' (p. 29ff.). This crucially involves the presence of what she calls 'moraic /n/' (not a very appropriate designation, it seems to me, because of '/n/') and presents only those cases where 'moraic /n/' has [m], [n] and [ŋ] as its allophones, in order that she may show the readers how to formulate the relevant rules. This is fair enough. NT proceeds to assign [m], [n] and [ŋ] in question to some phoneme or other, but this is where one finds her solution confusing: [m] is presented as an allophone of 'moraic /n/' as well as what she might call /m/, [n] as an allophone of 'moraic /n/' as well as /n/, and [ŋ] as an allophone of 'moraic /n/' as well as /g/. NT does not recognize /ŋ/, and some readers may agree with her here, while some may not. (/g/, she says, has both [ŋ] and [g] as its allophones, and introduces the concept of free variation on p. 31.) Her decisive criterion here seems to be phonetic similarity, though she never explicitly mentions this criterion in her book. Besides, the phonological status of 'moraic /n/' is never clear in her book. The readers are told on a subsequent page (p. 65) that 'The "moraic" /n/ […] refers to an occurrence of /n/ that is not followed by an accompanying vowel.' NT also talks about 'syllable final, or "moraic", nasal /n/' (*ibid.*). Her expression 'not followed by an accompanying vowel' is rather vague. How is one to understand the presence of 'moraic /n/' in e.g. *sen'i* 'fibre' (as some specialists of Japanese romanize, with an apostrophe, which practice or any other special practice NT who would spell *seni* does not resort to)? What is decisive is that *n'* and *i* here, phonetically, share the same manner of articulation (i.e. nasal), which NT herself has previously indicated in arriving at a relevant phonological rule. This is not the place to suggest my analysis worked out in a theoretical framework different from NT's. Incidentally, if NT does deal with 'moraic /n/' which is otherwise known as 'hatsu-on' ('hatu-on' as NT would romanize) or 'hane-on' or 'hane(ru)-oto' in Japanese, she does not provide her phonological

analysis of its non-nasal counterpart known as 'soku-on' or 'tsumaru-oto' which corresponds in the Japanese writing system to the small raised ⎰ (as in *kassai* 'applause' [kassai], or [kasːai] to employ the romanization NT would prefer). Presumably, if she did, she would talk about 'non-nasal assimilation'. It is to be regretted that NT merely *alludes to* 'soku-on' in connection with what she calls 'long consonant' or 'geminate consonant' while failing to discuss its phonological status or present relevant phonological rules in her book. The readers can only specualte, *a priori*, as to what NT would call this other counterpart phonological unit until they reach p. 356 – in the final chapter (on language variation) far away from the phonology chapter where NT mentions – this is the only time she does – the term 'moraic consonant'. An alternative – and better – term would be 'moraic non-nasal'.

NT's romanization in which 'moraic /n/' is represented simply by the letter *n* proves unsatisfactory and ambiguous. This is acutely obvious in such cases as *Renyookei* which is the technical term for one of the conjugated forms of Japanese verbs, *tenin* 'clerk' (p. 109) and *momenito* 'cotton thread' (p. 111), for example. How does NT expect non-Japanese readers who do not know these words in advance to understand that the **n** (boldface by me) in *tenin*, *Renyookei* and *momenito* corresponds to 'moraic /n/'? Surely it would have been well-advised for her to spell, for example, *ten'in*, *Ren'yookei* and *momen'ito* (as some scholars do) in order to ward off mispronunciations in which *n* would be understood as a 'non-moraic /n/'.

The question of a phoneme consisting of allophones – NT specifically takes up the allophones [t], [tˢ] and [č] belonging to /t/ and [h], [ɸ] and [ç] belonging to /h/ – is discussed (pp. 32-40) as a case of 'alternation' which is compatible with the necessity of formulating rules as representing processes in the generative framework. NT provides, among other rules, the rule 't → č' and considers [t] and [č] (together with [t] and [tˢ]) as allophones of /t/. On the other hand, it is only with some reservations that she recognizes /č/ (pp. 39-40) which can occur in Japanese before the five vowels, i.e. /i/, /e/, /a/, /o/ and /u/ (correctly /ɯ/), as /t/ does (e.g. [ta] 'paddy rice field', [ča] 'tea') and /š/ (*ibid.*) which can also occur before all five vowels. NT's analysis strikes me odd. Here NT acts illogically since she has previously cited minimal pairs like [matˢu] 'pine' and [natˢu] 'summer' (p. 31), though this is in fact not an ideal minimal pair, due to the different prosodic contexts involved, for the purpose

of justifying recognition of /m/ and /n/. By way of buttressing her position whereby [č] and [š] are to be assigned to /t/ and /s/ and not to /č/ and /š/, respectively, NT puts forward a few arguments (pp. 39-40) which I find quite unconvincing. Least of all, those arguments are reasons external to phonology proper and cannot be considered to be legitimate. I am not ready to accept NT's argument that 'it is typically the case in language after language that any consonant phoneme can be followed by any vowel phoneme'. It is a tenuous and irrelevant argument in tackling the present issue. Nor am I impressed by NT drawing on her morphophonemic analysis of 'verbal conjugation endings' to resolve this phonological issue. Incidentally, I do not agree with NT who further says as part of the argument that [ti], [si], [zi], [hu] and [hi] simply do not exist in Japanese' (p. 39), if we consider various dialects of Japanese.

Rendaku (or 'sequential voicing', as NT also puts it; but other specialists call it 'intervocalic voicing') is a phenomenon somewhat like, in its ultimate function, 'liaison' in French or '*r*-linking' in non-rhotic British or American English. NT's exposition on this phenomenon is clear and comprehensive. Different scholars' analyses which do not necessarily agree with each other are explained and exemplified. Regularities and irregularities in Rendaku are demonstrated. Particularly interesting is NT's discussion of Rendaku in cases where compounds consist of three or more constituents. The discussion entails the examination of the internal structure of such compounds, which she clarifies with the help of diagrams reminiscent of tree-diagrams and labelled brackets used by generativists but in reality akin to the IC-analysis practised by Bloomfieldians. Compatibility or otherwise between Lyman's Law and Right Branch Condition is profitably expatiated on. Personally, I would wish to see references made by NT to many a case in which Rendaku *fails to* occur even if Lyman's Law is satisfied, e.g. *takahashi* (*takahasi*) which is pronounced neither [takabaši] nor [takahaǰi] < *taka + hashi* (*taka + hasi*), *oosawa < oo + sawa* pronounced [oosaɰa] not [oozaɰa] (but, note, *unabara < una + hara*, not *unahara* 'ocean'), and *toyota* [tojota] or *toyoda* [tojoda] which are both current for two different items deriving from *toyo + ta*. In other words, Rendaku, like liaison or *r*-linking, may have compulsory, optional or forbidden cases.

'Mora' and 'syllable' in connection with analyses of spoken Japanese continue to be a controversial issue among both Japanese and non-Japanese specialists of Japanese. NT comes out strongly in favour of attaching great

importance to the mora rather than the syllable not only in her phonology chapter but in subsequent chapters too, certainly where spoken Tokyo Japanese is concerned. I thoroughly agree with her. I am not in favour of the term 'mora' when employed in the sense of what NT means by her term 'mora unit' (mine is 'moraic unit'), as is frequently done by both Japanese and non-Japanese specialists. NT uses both 'mora' and 'mora unit' to designate the structure itself and also 'mora' alone to designate a time unit (p. 66). Strict uniformity in the use of these terms would be desirable for any specialists of Japanese. NT's demonstration of Japanese words in terms of mora units instead of syllables (for example, *gakki* 'musical instrument' consists of three mora units; *nenkin* 'pension' of four mora units; etc.) will surely be a revelation as much as a puzzle to non-Japanese readers of many if not all languages, though NT is obviously not the first nor the only Japanese specialist to demonstrate or have demonstrated this point. Yet this is one of the points about spoken Japanese which cannot be overemphasized. A comparison between the mora and the syllable in (125) on p. 66 will be illuminating to many non-Japanese readers.

The subject of accent in Japanese rightly takes up some space (pp. 72-93). NT correctly characterizes accent in Japanese as 'pitch accent' (involving high pitch or H and low pitch or L on the individual mora units) as different from 'stress accent' as in English. As regards the accentual pattern of individual words, NT mentions Initial Lowering Rule, a rule proposed by Haraguchi (1977). One gets the impression that there is a kind of hierarchy between accent falling on the initial mora unit and accent falling elsewhere, which is inevitably implied by this rule, as any rule presupposes a process. Initial Lower Rule is to the effect, as NT explains, that 'the pitch of the first mora of the word is low unless the accent is placed on that mora' (p. 75). It sounds as if the first mora unit of a word inherently bore a low pitch (with accent falling elsewhere) but undergoes a change if accent falls on the initial mora unit. But this may well not be the correct understanding, as NT says that 'all morae preceding the accent diacritic receive high pitch […] The Initial Lowering Rule, however, changes the high pitch of the first vowel to low […]' (p. 75).

Of the various formulations proposed by McCawley (1968, 1977), Higurashi (1983) and Tsujimura [i.e. NT] and Davis (1987) regarding the generalization on the place of accent in long nominal compounds, I feel that the last-mentioned is the most adequate. I quote here in full what their

proposed generalization looks like: 'a. If the accent of the second member is placed on the final mora or the penultimate mora, then shift it to the first mora. b. If the second member is unaccented, place an accent on the first mora' (p. 85). The example they give for the first part of the generalization is *hanaurí* 'flower-selling' + *musumé* 'girl' → *hanaurimúsume* 'a girl who sells flowers', and the one for the second part of the generalization is *ni* 'load' + *kuruma* 'car' → *nigúruma* 'cart'. (I have slightly modified their presentation without doing violence to its essential purport.) NT does not hide the fact that there are more problems in generalizing in connection with *short* nominal compounds. The point about the accentual pattern of short and long nominal compounds is taken up again briefly for discussion from the point of view of the word length at the end of the phonology chapter (pp. 113-114). One aspect that NT does not specifically mention but which I feel interesting is that HL for the first and second mora units in the first member of a compound changes to LH in a very large number of compounds (e.g. *asa* bearing HL + *huro* > *asaburo* bearing LH for the first and second mora units). I have deliberately gone exclusively into this aspect in my account of accentual patterns of nominal compounds in Akamatsu (1997).

Chapter 4 on morphology makes lighter reading compared with the phonology chapter that precedes it and the syntax chapter that follows it. NT understands morphology to be a study of 'how words are formed and the internal structure of words' (p. 125). The constituents in the internal structure of words are of course what she calls morphemes. NT also examines 'how morphological processes interact with phonology, semantics, and syntax' (*ibid*.). NT lists and explains the 'parts of speech categories' in Japanese, such as 'noun', 'verb', 'adjective', 'adverb', 'postposition', 'case particle', 'adjectival noun' and 'verbal noun'. Of these, 'postposition' will be immediately seen by English readers to be a category which is absent in English as their language employs other devices rather than postpositions. 'Adjectival noun' and 'verbal noun' are distinct from 'noun', though there is a conceptual commonality between them. However, I find 'adjectival noun' and 'verbal noun' to be somewhat problematic categories as understood by NT. I suggest that the readers turn to the relevant sections (1.7 for 'adjectival nouns' and 1.8 for 'verbal nouns') to assess the validity of these two categories mentioned by NT.

One part of speech category which I find singularly missing is 'pronoun', unless 'pronoun' is considered to be included in 'noun'.

Chapter 5, which deals with syntax, is one of NT's self-acknowleged two major chapters of the book (the other being the phonology chapter) in which principal attention is given to explication of formalization rather than description. According to NT, syntax deals with the question of 'how the words are put together to create grammatical sentences' (p. 160), though the readers are left to guess progressively what is meant by 'grammar', 'grammatical' or 'grammaticality' (or for that matter 'ungrammaticality') which NT fails to define early enough in the chapter. It is of some concern to me that NT consistently employs the technical term 'generate' (taken originally from mathematics) in the sense of 'produce' – without explanation – against which a few generativists have warned. This technical term should be so used in generative grammar as to mean 'specify how to form, interpret and pronounce (the infinite set of well-formed sentences in the language), as Radford (1981, pp. 19 and 21), among others, points out. It is possible that NT deliberately wishes to avoid the overprecise technical sense of 'generate' in this book. NT starts with explanation and illustration of 'phrase structure' with data culled from Japanese (and English) and moves on to 'transformational rules', after which 'scrambling', 'null', 'anaphora', 'reflexives', 'passives', 'causatives', 'relative clauses', 'unaccusativity', and 'the light verb construction' are treated in this order. The readers are introduced to various rules formulated whereby syntactic phenomena in Japanese (and in English for comparison's sake) are generalized. The formulation is, as expected, achieved by means of a good number of tree-diagrams. NT's exposition and explanation is admirably clear and the readers will find the paths on which NT lead them very easy to follow, irrespective of whether they may occasionally disagree with her.

It is clear that in handling spoken language in our daily life, structural ambiguity which NT and others refer to and explain by means of syntactic trees is less of a problem, thanks to not only the presence of context and co-text but also various prosodic devices we automatically resort to in an effort to disambiguate. Structural ambiguity such as NT demonstrates in connection with Japanese is a thing less onerous than she seems to suggest; recall that contemporary *spoken* Japanese is supposed to be the subject matter of NT's book. Take, for example, *akai hon-no hyooshi* in Japanese, which is presented as an instance of structural ambiguity because it is amenable to two interpretations intended by the speaker, 'the cover of a red book' and 'a red cover of the book'. However, so far as I can see, the Japanese speaker

pronounces the syntactically different phrase (at deep level) in two non-identical ways by employing prosodic devices differently and there is consequently no ambiguity in the message intended. This instance may be compared with the case of *nurihashibako* 'lacquered chopstick-box' and *nuribashihako* 'box for lacquered chopsticks' which NT earlier discusses (p. 58ff.) in connection with Rendaku in the phonology chapter. There is no structural ambiguity in such a case, and the native Japanese speaker automatically discriminates the two messages by means of, this time, Rendaku, rather than prosodic devices. It goes without saying that the matter of structural ambiguity is a concern of not only syntax but also phonology, semantics and pragmatics.

It is well known in generative works on syntax that native speakers of a language may not necessarily agree about the 'ungrammaticality' of some sentences discussed therein. Such a lack of agreement detracts from the validity of the rules being proposed as being generalizations. I was, on the whole, happy with the various examples that NT presents and discusses until I reached her syntax chapter, i.e. her own examples and those she cited (sometimes with minor modifications) from fellow researchers. I am concerned about the implausibility of a number of NT's example sentences, the implausibility arising from her use of certain case particles and postpositions. For example, NT consistently presents *ga* as the case particle for Nominative rather than *wa* in most example sentences where I would personally use *wa.* That NT consistently considers *wa* as the case particle for Topic Marker (*ibid*.) is equally relevant in the matter. Since rules that generativists formulate are supposed to account for and are compatible with the examples, it is essential that the examples are anything but quite implausible. NT's characterization of *ga* and *wa* and her presentation of them represent, unfortunately, only a half-truth since, as is well known, *ga* and *wa* can function precisely in the opposite way, in individual sentences, from that which NT suggests earlier (p. 134) in her morphology chapter. It so happens that NT presents, in her quasi-total examples, *ga* as Nominative particle even where, at least in my view and usage, *wa*, not *ga*, normally occurs as Nominative particle. This makes her examples quite dubious. Such examples occur particularly frequently in the course of NT's exposition of 'scrambling' (pp. 205-212), 'null-anaphora' (pp. 212-215) and 'reflexives' (pp. 215-228), but also elsewhere, not that the implausibility of NT's examples has an effect

of ultimately discrediting the rules themselves that she discusses. Here are just a few of the many instances of her implausible example sentences which she presents as 'unmarked'. I will cite those occurrences of *ga* in **bold type** and add *wa* within parentheses where I personally think *wa* rather than *ga* occurs in 'unmarked' sentences. Likewise, I will indicate certain postpositions NT uses and add other postpositions I think normally occur instead.

Sono giron-**ga** (wa), John-**ga** (wa) [omosiroi]-to omotte iru 'John thinks that that argument is interesting' – example (97) on p. 210.

Taroo-**ga** (wa) eigo-ga yoku wakaru 'Taro understands English well'. – example (98a) on p. 210.

Eigo-ga Taroo-**ga** (wa) yoku wakaru 'Taro understands English well' – example (98b) on p. 211.

Hanako-**ni** (wa) huransugo-ga hanaseru 'Hanako can speak French'. –example (101a) on p. 211.

Huransugo-ga Hanako-**ni** (wa) hanaseru 'French, Hanako can speak [my translation]' – example (101b) on p. 211.

Taroo-**ga** (wa) [Hanako-ga atarasii huku-o katta]-to omotta 'Taro thought that Hanako [had] bought new clothes' – example (95) on p. 210.

NT's *idée fixe* that *ga* always functions as Nominative indicator and *wa* as Topic Marker is bound to cause infelicities in her syntactic analyses.

NT presents a few example sentences elsewhere which no-one would either utter in spoken Japanese or, for that matter, write in Japanese. The Japanese would resort to ways and means to maximize the degree of clarity of their utterances or written pieces or to reduce to a minimum any chance of potential misinterpretation on the part of their interlocutors. A rather stark example of a convoluted sentence is found in (125) on p. 129 which runs: Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga zibun-no kawarini zibun-no heya-de zibun-no sigoto-o siteita]-to itta. Who would resort to such a convoluted Japanese sentence even in writing, to say nothing of spoken Japanese? To be fair to NT, I should add that she herself clarifies that this and another such-like example sentence are provided by Howard and Niekawa-Howard (1976, p. 23). But it is true that NT does not do so with criticism and therefore possibly agrees with them and finds no objection to such sentences. The point NT wants to make about the anaphoric possibilities of the Japanese word *zibun* is clear, valid and

understandable. Only, the sentences that syntacticians choose to illustrate syntactical analyses should not be such that the readers almost suspect that the sentences have been concocted out of the syntactician's zest to make the point.

In a sub-section, 3.3.2. in her syntax chapter, the technical term 'pronoun' makes its first appearance in the book and recurs on pp. 212, 213, etc. Curiously, as I have pointed out further above, NT fails to provide 'pronoun' as any part of speech categories in her morphology chapter where she does present other parts of speech categories. The readers are suddenly confronted with the first actual example of a Japanese pronoun *kare* on p. 200. Nor does she give any formal definition of 'pronoun'. As this particular part of speech category is an essential one in her exposition on 'pronominal reference (pp. 198-205) and 'null anaphora' (pp. 212-215), 'reflexive' (pp. 215-228) and 'gender differences' (pp. 372-380), its above-mentioned omission is regretted.

I am somewhat alarmed with NT's assumption that – to quote her own words – 'we (she and other researchers of the same linguistic conviction) assume that all languages are like Latin or German, where a rich Case system is observed, regardless of whether individual Cases such as Nominative, Accusative, Dative, and Genitive are overtly manifested' (p. 186). This assumption is partly at the bottom of NT's stance to separate postpositions and case particles from each other in her treament of Japanese.

The crucial relevance of semantics (and pragmatics) in syntax hits the readers more and more in what NT writes on the subjects of 'the notion of subject' (pp. 228-230), 'reflexivization' (pp. 230-231), 'subject honorification' (pp. 231-232), 'passives' (pp. 232-247) and 'causatives' (pp. 247-249).

Dependence on semantics and pragmatics is evident on a number of allegedly syntactic issues. For example, while discussing 'relative clauses without gaps' in Japanese, NT says that 'the modification relation is normally established on semantic and pragmatic bases.' (p. 268). Chinese is well known to operate in a similar way. It is interesting that in such a case, the syntactic issue cannot be solved by a syntactic criterion but succumbs to semantics and pragmatics for its solution. To give another example, NT writes: 'Since internally headed relative clauses do not have a specific position internal to the relative clause that the head noun is supposed to occupy, either NP can be construed as its head so far as no semantic or pragmatic oddity arises, and consequently, two interpretations are possible' (p. 270). Indeed, I come across

a number of cases where the generativist syntactician tells us that a sentence is ambiguous between two interpretations (that is, syntactically) but I see no ambiguity as I understand a sentence (or rather an utterance) in context (consisting of text, co-text, semantics, pragmatics). It is quite clear while going through NT's book that there is in some cases no solution of syntactic nature and that semantic and/or pragmatic elements bring about the ultimate solution to allegedly syntactic problems. As she writes in one place, 'the Case distribution observed in the light of verb construction finds its explanation in connection with the semantic properties of verbal nouns' (p. 279).

What NT writes on 'the notion of subject' seems almost sterile to me. The identification of the subject of some sentences is shown to be so indeterminate by syntactic criteria that she ends up resorting to the Japanese native speaker's 'intutition' as being able to determine what the subject is in those sentences. It is apparent that what can resolve the question of the identity of the subject is the native speaker's knowledge of semantic and pragmatic order. NT mentions 'intuition', 'intuitively', etc, here and there, but it is important to remember that the so-called 'intuition' of a native speaker is nothing but a consequence of linguistic usages he has been exposed to in his practice of his mother tongue over the years, and that intuition does not explain linguistic practice. In other words, one must avoid 'putting the cart before the horse'. The sub-section about reflexivization (involving *zibun*) is also little helpful, as it is shown that it is semantics (and pragmatics), not syntax, that is capable of identifying the subject correctly. One cannot but feel that a vicious circle is involved in NT's (and other researchers') argument here. In the case of 'subject honorification' (another area of subject identification), we see that ultimately, it is again semantics, and moreover a morphological diagnostic this time, that is shown to be capable of determining the subject correctly.

Of the three types of passives in Japanese that NT discusses, it is indirect passives (adversative passives) that is the most interesting, the two others being direct passives and *ni yotte* passives. Indirect passives correspond to what is known as 'meiwaku no ukemi' in traditional Japanese grammar, though neither 'meiwaku' nor 'adversative' (as NT herself admits) necessarily best characterizes the nature of indirect passives. The substitutability or otherwise of *ni* and *ni yotte* in the passive (pp. 241-247) is so subtle – it is even opaque to me – that this will probably be of little interest to most readers, be they native speakers of Japanese or not.

One particular construction in Japanese that I personally find peculiarly interesting and expected to be discussed under 'passives' and/or 'causatives' by NT is illustrable by, for example, *utawasete itadakimasu* where one would say in English *I am going to sing* or *I will sing*. Such a construction is presumably closely linked to the necessity of diffidence on the part of the speaker *vis-à-vis* his listener(s) in Japanese culture. Incidentally, I find quite implausible a few of the example sentences allegedly associated with causative passives, such as (244b) Ziroo-ga Hanako-o/ni Taroo-ni sikar-are-sase-ta 'Ziro made Hanako be scolded by Taro' on p. 259 and (245c) Mitiko-ga Ziroo-ni (yotte) kodomo-o home-sase-rare-ta 'Michiko was made to praise the child by Ziro' on p. 259, which NT presents as being grammatical. But what Japanese speakers would use such convoluted sentences?

Not all the issues in the syntax of Japanese (or that of English, as NT herself will not deny) have, understandably, been dealt with. Her big syntax chapter is the most expansive yet tightly organized and the most interesting to read, regardless of whether the readers agree with her theoretical framework or with the solutions that NT and/or her fellow researchers propose to the individual issues discussed. 'Suggested Readings' attached to the end of the syntax chapter are wide-ranging and very serviceable for those who wish to know more about how other generativist researchers tackle various issues of Japanese syntax. Unfortunately, a good number of works mentioned in 'Suggested Readings' for the syntax chapter are missing in the text proper, though listed in the Bibliography.

Semantics discussed in the semantics chapter is largely concerned with Japanese verbs, not only at word level but – chiefly – at clause and sentence level. Having informally referred to semantics as a discipline which 'deals primarily with the meaning of linguistic expressions' (note 12 on p. 294), NT later formally defines semantics as 'The area in which the meaning of sentences, phrases, and words is dealt with' (p. 305). This means that her discussions are conducted in such a way that syntax still dominates in this chapter. NT herself admits that in the semantics chapter, she will discuss 'topics that are related to semantics as well as some of the instances that illustrate the interaction of syntax and semantics' (p. 305). Indeed, a few of the issues already dealt with in the syntax chapter are brought back for discussion, and the contents of the semantics chapter straddles mostly over syntax and semantics.

Little space is alloted to lexical semantics. Most of the fundamental concepts in lexical semantics are left unmentioned since, I presume, NT wishes to hurry on to her discussion of verbs in Japanese. Also, little is said of what other books on semantics (not mentioned by NT in either the text proper or the Bibliography) customarily introduce to general readers. This is why I feel that the additional reference on NT's part, either in the text proper or in her notes, and (consequently) in the Bibliography, to such works as Palmer (1981), Lyons (1977) as well as Cruse (1986) would be both helpful and desirable.

Syntactic ambiguity and lexical ambiguity are mentioned, but the former (also known as structural ambiguity) is really a phenomenon of syntactic nature, not semantic, and NT's previous example of akai honno hyoosi (interpretable either as 'a book cover which is red' or 'a cover for a red book') recurs with two appropriate tree-diagrams (p. 306). A brief and useful explanation follows on truth-condition and entailment. Japanese verbs are extensively discussed in the ensuing pages, for the greater part in conjunction with their aspectual characteristics which have relevance to a few different classifications of verbs by researchers.

With 'unaccusativity' (pp. 323-329) and 'stative predicates' (pp. 329-333) discussed in the semantics chapter, we are well-nigh back to syntax. In connection with 'unaccusative verbs', NT reiterates some generativists' assumption that 'the surface subjects are originally coming from the direct object position at d-structure, and are then moved to the subject position at s-structure, leaving a trace behind' (p.325), which assumption she earlier referred to in the syntax chapter. What is interesting is that NT herself goes on to say that 'In the pursuit of such a key property that contributes to separating unaccusative verbs from unergative verbs [both being the so-called intransitive verbs], a number of researchers have examined the semantic characterization of unaccusativity' (p. 325) and mentions some of these researchers' names including her own (p. 325). A resolution of a number of apparently syntactic problems owes thus to facts of semantic order.

It must be specifically mentioned that the appropriateness of two (among the many) example sentences adduced by NT in the semantics chapter seems to be in doubt. In a generalized fashion, NT rules out as ungrammatical Dare-ni okane-ga iru no desu ka (according to her, Dare-ga okane-ga… is alone grammatical) 'who is it that needs money?' (p. 333), but this *is* grammatical if

the speaker means to say to the effect 'For whom is the money needed?'. Also, Taroo-ga Hanako-ga suki-da, which NT adduces (p. 333) is implausible to me; Taroo-wa Hanako-ga suki-da is normal.

To conclude her semantics chapter, NT chooses to discuss 'Verbs of Giving and Receiving' (pp. 334-351). Somewhat curiously, NT discusses this topic, among others, as illustrating the concept of deixis. The readers find that NT understands deixis as 'aspects of language that are called for' (p. 334) - then NT goes on to quote from Fillmore (1975, p. 38) who NT says writes '…when the sentences in which they occur are understood as being anchored in some social context, that context defined in such a way as to identify the time during which the communication act is performed', a definition of deixis that is not quite one we generally expect from other writers who have discussed semantics. I have noted further above that NT in her book hardly defines 'pronouns' but subsequently utilizes this part of speech category which is in fact one of the classes of deictic words. The readers will be left with the feeling that deixis not adequately treated in NT's semantics chapter after all. NT could alternatively choose some other Japanese verbs for discussion than those of 'giving and receiving'. For example, verbs associated with the act of eating, coming, going, etc., through which NT can make similar points as she does with the kinds of verbs she chooses to discuss. The justification for her choosing verbs of giving and receiving is found in a small sub-section in that chapter when she proceeds to discuss the use of the said verbs *in the role of auxiliary verbs in Japanese* in such sentences as, to cite some of NT's examples, Watasi-ga sensei-ni zyuusyo-o kaite-sasiageta 'I wrote the address for my teacher' / Titi-ga Yamada-kun-no kuruma-o naosite-ageta 'My father fixed (my friend) Yamada's car (for him)' / Musume-ni hon-o yonde-yatta/ageta 'I read a book for my daughter'. The role of verbs of giving and receiving as auxiliary verbs is manifested by sasiage(ta), age(ta) and yat(ta) in such example sentences, where these verbs are found suffixed as auxiliary verbs to the gerundive form of various verbs. These are interesting enough topics in discussing Japanese. What I would wish to see NT discuss here but she never does is the type of expression in Japanese where the causative (in the gerundive form of a verb) is followed by verbs of giving and receiving as auxiliary verbs. My examples would be, for example, utawasete itadakimasu, utawaseta moraimasu, utawasete kudasai. The first two example sentences of mine are particularly interesting in that this type of locution in Japanese is

closely associated with the culture of diffidence in Japan and finds no equivalents in many other languages including English. The English equivalents, as actually used, would be *I/we am/are going to sing* or *I/we will sing* which involves neither a causative sense nor an element of diffidence. The example sentence of mine would be translatable as 'Let me/us sing (please)' which is a request to someone so that I or we may sing with his permission.

Another topic that NT could treat in connection with deixis is what happens in Japanese in cases where, as NT herself does, English speakers frequently resort to expressions like *he/she* (or *s/he*), *his/her* and *him/herself*, under pressure of 'political correctness' which reigns supreme in certain languages nowadays. The absence of a Japanese equivalent of such an English sentence as *The student is asked, when he/she has finished writing his/her report, to submit it to his/her teacher when he/she is free* would deserve some discussion on NT's part as this is a question of, apart from that of null anaphora that she discusses (pp. 212-214) in a previous chapter, not only deixis but also the neutralization of a semantic opposition which is discussed and explained differently by various researchers on semantics.

When I reached the last chapter of NT's book and while going through the first section entitled Historical Linguistics (pp. 352-362), I could not help feeling that the contents of that section are out of place in this book which are after all designed 'to examine [contemporary] spoken Japanese [as practised in the Tokyo dialect] from a linguistic perspective' (p. xii). The very title of the chapter, Language Variation, suggests, *a priori*, that emphasis will be placed on types of variation observed in contemporary spoken Japanese. Why historical linguistics in this book, even if this is in relation to Japanese, in some detail? Only when the readers reach subsequent sections 'Dialectal Variation' (pp. 365-372) do they realize that what is previously said about historical linguistics was meant to be invoked subsequently in order to account for just a few instances of morphological (NT would prefer to say morpho-syntactic here) dialectal variants of certain Japanese verbs with recourse to presumed historical changes. One is happy to have reached the later sections entitled, respectively, 'Honorification' (pp. 362-364), 'Dialectal Variation' (pp. 365-372) and 'Gender Differences' (pp. 372-380) where NT at last has things interesting enough to tell the readers about language variaiton in contemporary spoken Japanese as a matter of non-historical interest. It is in

'Honorification' and 'Gender Differences' that sociolinguistics is involved. The honorific system is presented by NT as classifiable into 'honorific', 'humble' and 'polite'. Of these 'polite' is probably the least transparent to most readers; in other words, why is, for example, ikimasu 'Yes, I go', a polite form? NT explains that the use of the polite form 'can be viewed as his [the professor's] attempt to keep a formal relationship between the two parties in order to maintain social distance' (p. 363). One of the most intresting honorific devices is the prefixing *o* to a verb, as in *o-kiki-simasu* 'I will ask (her for you)' (which NT cites on p. 364) or *o-denwa-simasu* 'I will give you a ring' (my example) wherein the activity expressed by the verb is the speaker's. I would have been happier if NT had dwelt a touch more on it.

   Under 'Dialectal Variation' NT discusses both segmental and suprasegmental matters, the latter being principally those concerning accent. The variant accentuations of the same Japanese word depending on the different dialects concerned always attract scholars of spoken Japanese, and NT is quite right to exemplify them on pp. 367-369. Lexical differences are not forgotten by NT, who gives a few interesting examples on pp. 370-371. I must disagree with either her or/and Yoshimoto (1991) from whom she probably cites, however, only one item. NT writes (p. 370) that 'In Mie prefecture, the western part of the Kii peninsula, *sumimasen*, which can mean "I am sorry" or "excuse me" in the Tokyo dialect, is used to express "thank you".' As far as I know, this usage is certainly much more pervasive than NT suggests.

   Lastly, NT discusses what she calls 'gender differences'. I happen to be one of those who are not happy about the recent fad even among linguists to talk of 'gender' where 'sex' is meant. Terminological confusion, intended or otherwise, between gender and sex can be deleterious in semantics and a part of grammar, in particular, and a continued distinction between the two seems to be well-advised. NT is perfectly right to point (in a note on p. 380) to the growing use of 'unisex speech' (in favour of male speech) among young Japanese people these days, that is, females adopting male speech. On the other hand, she says nothing about more and more Japanese young people not being able to correctly handle honorification. Nor does NT hardly mention language variation associated with age differences of the speakers except, minimally, in a note. At the end of her language variation chapter, she correctly observes, by referring to Haig's (1990) study, that female speakers

tend to use and preserve the standard speech, in contrast to males who tend towards dialectal or non-standard speech because of masculinity that it is supposed to engender. I agree with these researchers' conclusion. What I do not agree with is NT's conclusion that 'the generality of this finding awaits further study' (p. 380). The generality of such findings *has* been known for many years through works of the so-called sociolinguists, British, American and others.

The Bibliography is ample and contains references to not only those works mentioned in the text proper and notes but also those mentioned in 'Suggested Readings' and in the Exercises. A number of (MA, PhD) dissertations of quite recent dates are included. Unfortunately the Bibliolgraphy (by which I take NT to mean the References in fact; a bibliography is one thing and references another) leaves much to be desired. NT's shortcomings are of three types. First, there are items which are listed in the Bibliography but not referred to in the text proper (including the Notes) and 'Suggested Readings' or the Exercises and therefore must be considered as redundant. Secondly, the Bibliography is also inadequate for the opposite reason; she fails to include in the Bibliography some items to which she refers in the text proper (including the Notes) or 'Suggested Readings'. Thirdly, discrepancy exists in a few cases between the supposedly identical items mentioned in the text proper (including the Notes) or in 'Suggested Readings' on the one hand and in the Bibliography on the other. The rest of the shortcomings in the Bibliography are of diverse nature. Regretfully, for reason of space, I cannot give the list of all the many relevant omissions and shortcomings.

NT does not provide a list of abbreviations of the titles of a number of journals mentioned in the Bibliography, so that not a few readers may not immediately identify NELS, CLS, CSLI, ESCOL,WCCFL, IULC, etc. It would be desirable, and kinder to the readers, to either spell them out or attach a short list of abbreviations.

The five-and-a-half page Index is far from adequate in its coverage. A number of technical terms, some very important ones, including in some cases even those appearing in **bold type** in the text proper, are absent. The absence of the technical terms has the general effect of inconveniencing the readers, particularly those who wish to refresh their memory of some concepts (sometimes recurring in the Exercises) whose corresponding technical terms they have encountered in earlier pages and wish to re-read the relevant pages.

I would suggest that any readers who meet with technical terms new to them or are interested in the relevant concepts should, as they go along, jot down the page numbers on which those technical terms make their first appearance in the text. Otherwise, the readers would realize too late that it is well-nigh impossible for them to recover those page numbers easily. To give a few examples, the term 'reflexive pronoun' appears, in **bold type**, on p. 215, but is missing in the Index; the term 'coindex' (frequently mentioned in the syntax chapter) first appears on p. 171 and recurs on several subsequent pages, e.g. pp. 183, 191, 216, 218, 226, 237, 256, 266 and 268, but the term itself is completely absent in the Index; the term 'classifier' first occurs on p. 192 (and possibly recurs elsewhere, but I do not remember where) but is altogether absent in the Index; the term 'long-distance scrambling' is not found where the readers would first expect to find it and is eventually found under 'scrambling', so that the readers would in such cases appreciate cross-referencing (there is very sparse cross-referencing); the term 'postposition' is indicated, in the Index, as first occurring on p. 133 but in fact it first occurs on p. 101; the term 'pronoun(s)' is referred to pp. 373-5, but in fact it pre-occurs, i.e. on pp. 198, 212 and 213; the term 'denasalization' is indicated as occurring on pp. 254-256 but in fact it recurs on p. 354 which NT does not indicate. Even (to NT and/or fellow researchers) important terms which occur and are discussed or explained in the text are missing in the Index. It is hoped that in a future edtion, NT will substantially reconstitute the Index for it to be really serviceable.

Genuine misprints are few for a book of this size. This certainly reflects excellent proof-readings. I have noticed the following misprints: *Block* (pp. 15, 20 *et passim*) occurs instead of *Bloch*; Beckman and Piere[sic]humbert (1988) occurs on p. 20, though Pierrehumbert is correctly spelled on p. 117; *genture* occurs (instead of *gesture*) on p. 39; the unattested imaginary word **ecstaticest* on p. 104 should rather be spelled **ecstatickest*; *Beckman* is misspelled *Bechman* in Bechman and Pierrehumbert (1988) on p. 117 (I should add that NT puts Bechman [sic] and Pierrehumbert (1988) on p. 117 but Pierrehumbert and Beckman (1988) in the Bibliography (p. 391)); a comma is missing after Kageyama (1989) in 'Suggested Readings' on p. 157; *sannin* in line 3 on p. 198 should read *sansatu*; NP immediately dominated by S in the diagram in example (76b) on p. 199 should be NP1; *to* (a Japanese postposition meaning 'and') is missing after *hito* in example (89) on p. 207; ni

yotte-passives on p. 244 should be *ni yotte*-passives; '…(227c), (228c)…' in line 5 on p. 254 should read '…(227b), (228b)…'; adversity causatives occurs instead of adversative causatives on p. 259; and finally there occurs on p. 381 accen-tuation (with a hyphen) in the middle of a line instead of accentuation.

The group of potential readers of NT's book who would benefit the most would be, it seems to me, those who are already well acquainted with current spoken Japanese and are at the same time working in the generative framework. On the other hand, NT's book would interest those who work in a non-generative framework while being well versed in facts of current spoken Japanese. This ambitious work, with its wide-ranging coverage, can be recommended to both groups of potential readers.

REFERENCES

ABERCROMBIE, David (1967). *Elements of General Phonetics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

AKAMATSU, Tsutomu (1997). *Japanese Phonetics: Theory and Practice.* München and New Castle: Lincom Europa.

CATFORD, John Cunnison (1988). *A Practical Introduction to Phonetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CHOMSKY, Noam (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

CRUSE, D. Alan. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DAVIS, S. (1988). *Topics in Syllable Geometry*. New York: Garland.

FILLMORE, Charles (1975). *Santa Cruz Lecture on Deixis 1971*. Bloomington: IULC.

HAIG, John (1990). "A Phonological Difference in Male-Female Speech among Teenagers in Nagoya", in IDE and MCGLOIN (1990), pp. 5-22.

HARAGUCHI, Shôsuke (1977). *The Tone Pattern of Japanese: An Autosegmental Theory of Tonology*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

HATTORI, Shirô (1979). *On'inron to Seishohô* [Phonemics and Orthography]. Tokyo: Taishûkan.

HIGURASHI, Yoshiko (1983). *The Accent of Extended Word Structure in Tokyo Standard Japanese*. Tokyo: Educa Inc.

HOWARD, I. and NIEKAWA-HOWARD, A. (1976). "Passivization", in Shibatani (1976), pp. 201-238.

HYMAN, Larry M. (1977) (ed.). *Studies in Stress and Accent*. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 4. USC.

IDE, Sachiko and MCGLOIN, Naomi Hanaoka (1990) (eds.). *Aspects of Japanese Women's Language*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.

KAGEYAMA, T. (1989). "The place of morphology in the grammar", in *Yearbook of Morphology* 2, pp. 73-94.

LYONS, John (1977). *Semantics*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MCCAWLEY, James D. (1968). *The Phonological Component of a Grammar of Japanese*. The Hauge: Mouton.

MCCAWLEY, James D. (1977). "Accent in Japanese", in Hyman L.M. (1977), pp. 261-302.

O'CONNOR, Joseph Desmond (1973). *Phonetics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.

PALMER, Frank R. (1981). *Semantics*. 2nd ed. [1st ed. 1976]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PIERREHUMBERT, J. and BECKMAN, Mary. E. (1988). *Japanese Tone Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

RADFORD, Andrew (1981). *Transformational Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SHIBATANI, Masayoshi (1976). "Causativation", in Shibatani (1976), pp. 239-294.

SHIBATANI, Masayoshi (1976) (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics* 5 (Japanese Generative Grammar). New York: Academic Press.

TSUJIMURA, Natsuko and DAVIS, S. (1987). "The Accent of Long Nominal Compounding in Tokyo Japanese", in *Studies in Languages* 11, pp. 199-206.

YOSHIMOTO, K. (1991). *Hogen Zogo*. Toyama: Hurusato no bunka o hagukumu kai.