it is as important to propagate what we have known or found about language on a larger scale than hitherto as it is to engage in scholarly debates.

Although it is very unlikely that Andersson and Trudgill’s crusade against negative attitudes and prejudices about bad language, and the complaint tradition will make any substantial impact (it is an uphill battle, as we all painfully know), the authors have taken the right step to not remain inside their ‘fortress of linguistic theory’, but to talk directly to the general public. In fact, they have taken a further step towards this end by making Bad Language more accessible in terms of price and distribution by having it published in paperback in addition to the hard cover edition published in 1990.

Finally, there is a minor flaw in the lay-out: the anecdotes, excerpts and quotations enclosed in boxes are interspersed throughout the book in so disorderly a manner that they seem to detract from the overall easy smooth comprehension, especially when they are not referred to in the main text at all.
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In Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents Mira Ariel presents a comprehensive and theoretically appealing explanation of the means by which text producers select referential expressions. This explanation addresses both discourse
anaphora and sentence anaphora and also discusses the influences of pragmatic and social factors. For this reason the book is of relevance to a wide range of linguists from syntacticians to pragmatists.

The theory Ariel presents is known as accessibility theory. This theory is founded upon the notion of accessibility introduced by Sperber & Wilson (1986). Sperber & Wilson claim that contexts differ according to the degree to which they are available to the addressee at any particular stage of a discourse. Accessibility theory argues that speakers indicate how accessible they estimate a referenced entity to be by means of the referring expressions they select (Ariel 1990:4). Thus, Ariel claims it is the accessibility of entities in the hearer’s consciousness (as estimated by the speaker) which is the crucial criterion determining the form of referential choice (1990:16).

The background and details of accessibility theory are introduced in the introductory chapter. Following this, Parts I and II deal with discourse anaphora and sentence anaphora respectively. Finally, Part III addresses the social and pragmatic issues which influence speakers’ referential selections. The organisation of this review will generally follow that of the book.

When introducing accessibility theory Ariel distinguishes between three levels of accessibility marking. High accessibility markers such as pronouns are used to refer to entities that the speaker judges are highly salient to the hearer. Low accessibility markers are used to refer to entities that the speaker judges are not accessible or salient to the hearer. Examples of these include full names and definite noun phrases. The last category, Intermediate accessibility markers, includes demonstratives and personal pronouns and are used to refer to entities of intermediate accessibility.

One of the major advantages of accessibility theory is its ability to explain the findings of many previous studies of referential choice. In the introductory chapter, as well as throughout the book, Ariel addresses the findings and conclusions of previous studies dealing with referential choice. Among the issues discussed in detail are Hankamer & Sag’s (1976) distinction of deep and surface anaphora, ‘Chomsky’s (1981) Avoid Pronoun principle as well as switch reference, resumptive pronouns and backwards anaphora. In each case Ariel argues that accessibility theory provides a more principled and complete explanation of the observed phenomenon than those previously provided.

As well as introducing accessibility theory, the introductory chapter also addresses the issue of cognitive organisation. It is found that the Parallel Distributed Processing model of Rumelhart & McClelland (1986) is the most compatible with accessibility theory. The final section of the introductory chapter discusses the notion of accessibility itself. In particular, Ariel examines the factors which affect the accessibility status of noun phrase antecedents. Analysis of a variety of studies leads her to conclude the following factors are among those which affect accessibility.
(a) Distance: distance between antecedent and anaphor.

(b) Competition: number of competitors for the role of antecedent.

(c) Saliency: whether it is a topic or non-topic.

(d) Unity: The antecedent being within the same frame/world/point of view/segment or paragraph as the anaphor. (Ariel 1990:28-29)

Sensibly, although disappointingly, no attempt is made to provide an exhaustive list or to determine the relative priorities among the competing influences.

While the introductory chapter introduces the theory, it is only when Part I is reached that the specific details of the relative accessibility of a variety of referential expressions is examined. Three of the four chapters in Part I are devoted to investigating the relative accessibility levels of a range of High, Low and Intermediate accessibility markers. Chapter one is concerned with Low accessibility markers such as definite descriptions and proper names. Chapter two examines Intermediate accessibility markers such as personal pronouns and demonstrative pronouns. Chapter three is concerned with High accessibility markers such as third person pronouns, zero anaphora and the effect of stressed/unstressed pronouns. In Chapter four, Ariel summarises this information and establishes the following hierarchy of accessibility markers:

Low accessibility
Full name + modifier
Full name
Long definite description
Short definite description
Last name
First name
Distal demonstrative + modifier
Proximal demonstrative + modifier
Distal demonstrative (+ NP)
Proximal demonstrative (+ NP)
Stressed pronoun + gesture
Stressed pronoun
Unstressed pronoun
Criticised pronoun
Extremely high accessibility markers including gaps, pro, PRO, wh-traces, reflexives and agreement.

High Accessibility (Ariel 1990:73)
Chapter 4 also addresses the relationship between referring expressions and the accessibility they indicate. Ariel claims that this relationship is not arbitrary and postulates three principles which underlie the scale given above. These principles of Informativity, Rigidity and Attenuation translate the concept of accessibility into actual linguistic choices. The principle of Informativity relates to the amount of information provided in a referential expression. This principle can be used, for example, to distinguish pronouns from definite noun phrases and zero anaphora from pronouns. The principle of Rigidity refers to how close the expression is to referring to one entity unambiguously in a potentially ambiguous context. This criterion distinguishes between names and definite descriptions and also between various names. The third principle, Attenuation, distinguishes those shorter and longer forms which do not differ with respect to the amount of information or ambiguity. This principle distinguishes stressed from unstressed pronouns and also distinguishes between extremely high accessibility markers.

The claims Ariel makes in Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents are not restricted to English. Indeed, the three principles outlined above are claimed to be used by all languages in translating the concept of accessibility into an actual linguistic marking system. To support this claim Ariel examines a variety of studies which investigate referential choice in languages other than English. All cases conform to the order given in the list above. However, two provisos are made regarding this scale. Firstly, it is not claimed that this actual scale is universal. Ariel correctly points out that this list does not cover the full range of referential expressions in all languages. Secondly, it is not claimed that the absolute accessibility of referential expressions is the same in all languages. Rather, it is the relative accessibility levels which are claimed to have universal status.

Part II of Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents deals with the interaction of accessibility theory and sentence anaphora. This ability to be relevant to sentence anaphora as well as discourse anaphora is fairly unique among studies of referential choice. Ariel presents two versions of the influence of accessibility theory. The stronger version which is not defended in this work claims that it is the degree of accessibility which differentiates the nominal expressions subject to binding theory (anaphors, pronouns and R-expressions). This version is not rejected by Ariel but is left for future investigation. In this book, Ariel argues for the weaker version that accessibility theory i) constrains possible grammaticalisation processes involving pronominal forms, and ii) governs any optional decisions left by the grammar concerning sentential anaphora.

To support this view Ariel argues that accessibility theory provides a better explanation than Chomsky's Avoid Pronoun principle. She claims that accessibility theory correctly predicts where the principle works and provides
principled explanations for cases where it is inapplicable. In addition, analysis of zero/pronoun preferences reveals that these preferences can be explained in terms of accessibility. Similarly, resumptive pronouns and backwards anaphora also benefit from an accessibility theory analysis.

A further issue addressed in this section is the relationship between accessibility theory and the theory of grammar. Ariel argues that accessibility theory should be considered as part of the grammar as it is concerned with issues that are specifically linguistic. She contrasts this with Sperber & Wilson's (1986) theory of relevance and Grice's (1975) conversational maxims, which she argues, are not part of the grammar as they describe general behaviour patterns.

Part III of Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents goes beyond accessibility theory to consider the role of context in interpreting referring expressions. Ariel claims that although accessibility theory can explain speakers' choice of referring expressions, complete interpretation of any referential expression depends on contextual considerations. Among the specific examples discussed are cases of ambiguity, and concepts which lack a specific memory representation. In addition, Ariel argues that cases where accessibility predictions are violated also require contextual information for interpretation.

Accessibility violations are the focus of the final chapter of the book. Rather than weakening the accessibility approach, the systematic use speakers make of violations provides further support for the accessibility approach. Ariel shows that speakers use accessibility violations to achieve specific goals; violations can be used to indicate, among other things, vividness, greater or lesser empathy and various negative connotations. In addition, Ariel finds that minority groups are more prone to being referred to with higher accessibility markers.

The only criticism to be made of this book concerns the lack of definition of the term 'accessibility'. This concept is central to the theory, yet it has only been defined in very general terms. It is obvious that it is no easy task to define this term. In fact, even with such a general definition Ariel presents very persuasive data. However, if the theory is to gain wider acceptability it is crucial to provide a more detailed definition.

In conclusion, Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents offers a thought-provoking approach to the problem of how speakers select referential expressions. The theory offered is appealing firstly because it deals with both cognitive and linguistic aspects of the problem and secondly because it deals with all types of referential choice and not just discourse or sentence anaphora. A further advantage of the book is the wide range of issues which are covered. For this reason there are few linguists to whom this book will not appeal.

Chinese sentences, different from those of inflectional languages, depend more on word order for their meanings, and the flexibility of that word order often presents insurmountable difficulties to linguists who attempt to find its underlying principles. *Order and constituency in Mandarin Chinese* by Yen-hui Audrey Li is therefore useful as it offers a concise and principled account of the subject.

Chinese has been a consistent counterexample to typological generalization regarding word order in natural languages. It features SVO, prepositional and N-final, which suggest that the language is head-initial in VPs and PPs but head-final in NPs. Furthermore, a verbal head in Chinese may occur in a non-peripheral position, e.g. between a PP and the object of the verb. This disharmony in head position across categories and the possibility of non-head-peripheral structures pose problems for an 'X-theoretic' approach to word order incorporating the head parameter. These problems are dealt with by Huang (1982) through relaxing the structural constraints of 'X Theory to allow multiple branching of 'X structures as well as different levels of branching with different head positions. However, apart from some empirical problems, setting up language-specific stipulations concerning which level(s) and categor(ies) have different head positions does not seem to characterize word order properties of Universal Grammar.