

Introduction to Tagmemic Analysis. By Walter A. Cook, S.J. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969. Pp. viii, 210.

Reviewed by CESAR A. HIDALGO, *University of the Philippines*

Introduction to Tagmemic Analysis is a lucidly written introduction to tagmemic theory and to its analytical procedures on the grammatical component. It summarizes the thinking of some tagmemicists and other linguists (except advances on the sentence and discourse levels, cf. Longacre, 1968 and 1969); it presents procedures and level outline analyses for the sentence, clause, phrase, and word; it sets up procedures for determining the generative potential of tagmemic grammar and presents a sample sentence generator for computerized programming; it points out some similarities and differences between tagmemics and transformational generative grammar.

It is a virtue of this work that Cook explicitly cites the specific contributions of the leading tagmemicists and clarifies through clear explanation and illustrations these concepts (cf., for instance, his explanation of particle, wave, and field for the phonological, lexical, and syntactic components). This is the type of clarity that his students at Georgetown University are unanimous in praising Prof. Cook as a teacher. In certain parts in his book, however, his presentation seems inadequate and perhaps misleading. Consider the sentence level.

Cook recognizes the sentence level as distinct from the clause level but the sentence level presentation is inadequate. This level has been the subject of criticisms and proposed analytical revisions. Gleason (1965: 329), for instance, observes that "much of the structure of clauses has been described as applying to sentences by focusing on one-clause sentences and neglecting the distinction between the two levels of structure." Cook recognizes the distinction between the two levels, but when he names as one of the primary sorting procedures on the sentence level the reduction of the corpus to single clause structure (p. 43), the sentence and clause level sorting procedures are blurred. This procedure seems to be more appropriate on the clause level (cf. Longacre, 1964:39). There are tagmemes, besides those that Cook names, which are appropriate only on the sentence level (cf. Longacre, 1965, Lind, 1964, Hidalgo, 1969) and it is suggested that these should be the subject of sentence level investigation.

The classification of sentences according to clause types—compound, complex, and simple—and according to mode—statement, question, and command—has been questioned. Longacre (1967a) points out that a mode classification is more appropriate in relation to clauses and that the simple, compound, and complex sentence classification is inadequate. A complex sentence classification,

for example, fails to distinguish sentences that are usually simple sentences in structure, as in *I'll go when he comes* where the embedded *when he comes* fills a temporal slot on the clause level. Cook refines his definition of complex sentence on the clause level to take care of this problem. This should have been done on the sentence level. The sentence level discussion includes such concepts as intransitive, transitive, and equational and operators like negative and voice. This discussion seems to be more appropriate on the clause level.

On the sentence level and on other levels, one wonders what role dual structural difference plays in the identification of syntagmemes. Longacre's Rule of Two is presented, but it seems that Cook does not use it in his analysis. Take for instance his minor sentences, e.g. his addition sentence and his response sentence. It would be interesting to see how he separates the two constructions on the basis of dual structural difference. To avoid proliferation of sentence types and other types of constructions and to prevent arbitrary classification of constructions, perhaps adherence to dual structural difference is more appropriate so that a syntagmeme should not be defined merely as "a construction [which] is a potential string of tagmeme units" (p. 27) because this can also be said of an allosyntagmeme.

Still another concept that needs clarification is the kernel sentence (adapted from Chomsky, 1957). But does the native speaker derive a question sentence, for instance, from a statement? Chomsky (1965:18) says: "The notion 'kernel sentence' has . . . an intuitive significance, but since kernel sentence plays no distinctive role in the generation or interpretation of the sentence, I shall say nothing more about them here." He points out further that "one must be careful not to confuse kernel sentence with basic strings that underlie them [sentence]" which he thinks, including base phrase markers, play a distinctive and crucial role in language use. Furthermore, in tagmemics, the notion kernel sentence should really be kernel clause.

A tagmeme on the sentence level that poses some difficulties is the margin tagmeme which is defined in terms of the filler. Perhaps a relational definition in relation with the nuclear sentence constituents is more helpful. The distinction between nuclear and peripheral seems arbitrary. Why not present a set of criteria for determining which is nuclear and which is peripheral?

While the constant comparison between tagmemics and transformational grammar has its merits, particularly with the insights that transformational grammar has brought into the understanding of the operations of languages (e.g. its distinction between deep and surface structures), it is suggested that it should be made clear that the two models are really different basically. Tagmemics is a behavioristic model and as such is data-oriented while transformational grammar is mentalistic and as such attempts to present a hypothesis about language and uses data for verification purposes. Cook (1969) seems to be out to prove that Cook (1964:42) was right in echoing Pike: "if tagmemes and transforms are

developed far enough, they will come to the point of complete overlapping." Take for instance Cook's announcement that in this introduction the symbol #Sent# is the initial string in his work, that every analysis begins with this symbol, and proceeds as far as the ultimate constituents—the morphemes. Does Cook mean that there are levels in transformational grammar corresponding to the levels in tagmemics and the student can compare these levels in the sense that he may note similarities or differences? This does not seem to be the case, since the tagmemic levels (the structures indicated in each level) do not have counterparts in transformational grammar.

The deep and surface structure distinction should deserve a better treatment than the passing reference given to it. More so because this work purports to be an introduction to tagmemic analysis and that this introduction claims that tagmemics distinguishes these two concepts. How does tagmemics present, for instance, the deep structure of a Chomskyan example: "A wise man is honest"? Very little has been said about deep and surface structure distinction of tagmemics. Longacre (1967b) does present something on these concepts, but it is a summarized presentation—hardly the place to refer beginning students.

The outline analyses for each level, particularly the sentence level, must not be taken too seriously. The beginning student and the non-linguist could develop a false sense of confidence after going through the outline analyses. Obviously there is more to language analysis than just data gathering and classifying the data using the scheme of analysis outlines in Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5. Cook, of course, intends these outlines as guides, yet it emphasizes the inadequacy of mechanical discovery procedures, in spite of work being done on it (cf. Garvin, 1967). It must be pointed out that Cook's work on the phrase level which he views as a composite of layers belonging to three distinct strata and that for an ordered analysis the upper layer should be analyzed first seems to be the most complete and incisive work on the phrase level of tagmemics.

There are a number of other misleading statements, which, in some instances, appear to be typographical errors: a) the (Compound) Sent. p. 46, is said to consist of an obligatory base slot₁ and an obligatory base slot₂, among other things, yet the (Complex) sentence consists of an obligatory base slot and an *optional* margin slot (p. 46); b) the object, the locative, and the temporal (p. 34) are marked optional (this seems to be possible only if the students know beforehand the structure of English); c) the statement that the "all and only" provision can be reduced to an exact mathematical figure for all sentences generated by a finite grammar with a limited lexical inventory must also add that there should be no recursivity in the grammar; d) the statement that the criterion for judging whether or not a sentence is complete depends upon whether it contains an independent clause. This does not seem to be true for all languages. Ivatan (one of the Philippine languages), for example, has a comparative sentence where both bases are manifested by dependent clauses with a built in subordinator, e.g.

Kavyavid mu am kavyavid na 'being beautiful you connect or being beautiful she/She is as beautiful as you are.'

But we have capitalized on some of the phases where we think improvement might be possible. As an introduction to tagmemic theory and analysis, Cook's book is an excellent book.

REFERENCES

- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- . 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.
- COOK, WALTER A. 1964. *On Tagmemes and Transforms*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- GARVIN, PAUL. 1967. "The Automation of Discovery Procedures in Linguistics," *Language* 43, no. 1.
- GLEASON, H. A. JR. 1965. *Linguistics and English Grammar*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- HIDALGO, CESAR A. 1969. *Ivatan Grammar: a Tagmemic-transformational Analysis*. Ph.D. dissertation, Georgetown University.
- LIND, JOHN O. 1964. "Clause and Sentence Syntagmemes in Sierra Popoluca," *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 30, no. 4.
- LONGACRE, ROBERT E. 1964. *Grammar Discovery Procedures: a Field Manual*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- . 1965. "Discussions," *Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics*, no. 18. Ed. Charles W. Kreidler. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- . 1967a. "The Notion of the Sentence," *Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics*, no. 20. Ed. E. L. Blansitt, Jr. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- . 1967b. "Reply to Postal's Review of Grammar Discovery Procedures," *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 33, no. 4.
- . 1968. *Discourse, Paragraph, and Sentence Structure in Selected Philippine Languages: Discourse and Paragraph Structure*. Vol. 1: Discourse and Paragraph Structure, vol. 2: Sentence Structure. Santa Ana, California: The Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- . 1969. *Discourse, Paragraph, and Sentence in Selected Philippine Languages: Text Material*. Santa Ana, California: The Summer Institute of Linguistics.