Abstraction and instance: The type-token relation in linguistic theory By Christopher M. Hutton (review)

Edgar W. Schneider

Language, Volume 68, Number 1, March 1992, pp. 229-230 (Review)

Published by Linguistic Society of America
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1992.0046

The indigenization of Pali meters in Thai poetry. By THOMAS JOHN HUDAK. (Monographs in International Studies, Southeast Asia Series, 87.) Athens, OH: Ohio University Center for International Studies, 1990. Pp. x, 237. Paper $15.00.

This meticulously executed book is a welcome addition to the relatively small, though growing, corpus of studies on the Thai language. The book appeals to a far wider audience than its title may suggest, because it discusses not only details of Thai poetry, for which Hudak is regarded as the foremost authority in North America, but also the culture, language, and people behind it.

In Ch. 1 (1–23), on the literary history of Thailand, the reader will be struck by the obsession of the Thai people with poetry, as indicated by the saying 'Thais breathe in and out in poem'. Not surprisingly, most premodern literature in Thailand took verse forms, praising, as favorite themes, courageous kings in battles, the virtues of their Teacher (Buddha), and love.

H describes in Ch. 2 (25–44) how highly Thais regard speech acts that are pleasing to the ear (phayrɔ́ʔ). Indeed, the language itself is rich in features that help to create the aesthetics of sound, among them reduplication, alliteration, intensification, and elaborate expression (e.g. *rɔ́ɔn ʔòk rɔ́ɔn cay* 'to be anxious' [lit. 'hot chest hot heart']). From a linguistic viewpoint, all these features are rich mines to be explored.

Briefly discussing the influence of Pali (Buddhist) literature in Thailand, H explains in Ch. 3 (45–95) the transformation of the Pali stanza (chanda) to the corresponding Thai form (chăn). Among the five major types of Thai poetry, chăn is unique in that it is sensitive to syllabic weight. Although chăn adopted Pali meters, it differs from chanda in the definition of syllabic weight and in that rhyme is added (for the sake of enhancement of phayrɔ́ʔ).

Chs. 4 (97–145) and 5 (147–72), the core of the book, reproduce H's previous works in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (1985, 1986). Ch. 4 examines the importance of treating chăn as a reciting art rather than as a written art. H takes exception to the criticism that the earlier chăn (composed before the introduction of printing in Thai) often violates meter requirements, arguing that all these apparent metrical discrepancies are due to scholars' ignorance of such conventions as vowel reduction, degemination, and nasal deletion. These poetic conventions transformed heavy syllables to light ones when chăn was recited, thus conforming to the chăn meters. Ch. 5 continues this theme, discussing the conservative trend appearing in the chăn literature, leading to an emphasis on strict adherence to the syllable arrangements required by meters and to their written forms.

Ch. 6 (173–5) describes the decline of the chăn literature in Thailand. Chăn was destined to diminish because its metrical requirements were never suited to the language, whose phonological structure has limited environments for light syllables (e.g., they never occur in word-final position). In addition, the thematic material of the chăn failed to reflect people's real life. With the rise of Western prose literature, and also with the rise of klɔɔn, indigenous poetry whose rhyme structure was perfectly suited to the tonal language, chăn lost popularity when the Thai nobility, who were the primary guardians of literary activity, were ousted from the main political scene in 1932.

H's citations of Thai, Pali, and Sanskrit terms are meticulous, and so is every aspect of the book's editing. The bibliography will be helpful to those interested in Thai linguistics. Appendices (175–225) include twenty-three pages of poems in Thai scripts which are cited in the main text in roman script—a thoughtful addition for those who can read Thai. Just as Mary R. Haas's dictionary (*Thai-English student's dictionary*, Stanford UP, 1964) is a must for every learner of Thai, so, too, is Hudak's book. [TADAO MIYAMOTO, *University of Victoria*.]

Abstraction and instance: The type-token relation in linguistic theory. By CHRISTOPHER M. HUTTON. (Language & Communication Library, vol. 11.) Oxford: Pergamon, 1990. Pp. viii, 180. $52.95.

Basically, Hutton is right: the type-token relation is generally accepted because of a strong intuition, but it is insufficiently explicated in depth. However, he finds it difficult to give substance to the notion and its ontological whereabouts; ultimately, he denies the relevance of abstraction and idealization in linguistics, and

rejects the recognition of types, without offering a serious alternative.

Chs. 1–3 are purely philosophic in character and topic. 'Peirce and the type-token relation' (8–30) argues for an inherent conflict in the statements by the philosopher who proposed the distinction. 'A survey of some writings on the type-token relation' (31–61) reviews issues that have been raised by several philosophers; 'The type-token relation and the aesthetic object' (62–91) examines a parallel that some theoreticians see to the abstract existence and concrete realization of works of art, and also to the score and the performance of a symphony.

The next three chapters focus more narrowly on linguistics, providing theoretical discussions of selected publications and issues. 'Linguistic abstraction and linguistic knowledge' (92–125) examines statements by Ferdinand de Saussure, Hugo Schuchardt, Leonard Bloomfield, Otto Jespersen, Louis Hjelmslev, William Labov, and others. 'Grammaticality' (126–38), understood as a property of the type, is claimed not to exist. Ch. 6, 'The grammatical hierarchy' (139–61), is supposed to relate the type-token distinction to the conventional levels of language organization, but in fact H discusses context, abstraction, behaviorist approaches, and the mental lexicon in this chapter. In the 'Conclusion' (162–68), after summarizing some issues, H explicitly admits that he is interested, not in a 'more precise or noncontradictory formulation' of the type-token problem, but rather in 'the ontology of the linguistic system'.

This is a philosophical, metatheoretical book, a succession of statements, views, and tacit assumptions made explicit, with H frequently surmising what an author may actually have meant or what may be implied by some statement. Refusing to accept types and tokens as analytical tools in a model, H keeps asking for their precise 'mode of being', frequently switching between extremely sophisticated and plain common sense considerations. Although the level of abstraction and discussion is high and the author takes pains to clarify his intentions, always providing intermediate summaries, even linguistic theory cannot do without language—nowhere do we find a detailed discussion of a single example or real linguistic feature. Many topics for which the type-token relation is immediately relevant are plainly ignored: there is no comment on emic vs. etic units or the status of structuralists' 'allo'-forms; no mention of concepts such as lexeme, lexicalization, polysemy, sememe, or prototypes; hardly anything on morphemes or phonemes, or on the purported constant semantic identity of certain syntactic structures under transformations; and nothing on the sociolinguistic concept of variables and their variants. Some statements are just untenable—e.g. that there is 'no dispute about the nature of the linguistic system and of linguistic communication' between Labov (whose views are rendered inadequately) and Chomsky (124), that native speaker intuitions are invalid because they are not shared by speakers of other languages (136), or that the nature of a syntactic construction is purely additive (140–1).

A philosopher's impression may be different, but as an ordinary empirical linguist I did not find these deliberations particularly enlightening or helpful. [EDGAR W. SCHNEIDER, *Freie Universität Berlin.*]

Report on Russian morphology as it appears in Zaliznjak's grammatical dictionary. By EEVA ILOLA and ARTO MUSTAJOKI. (Slavica Helsingiensia, 7.) Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 1989. Pp. 235.

If you are fascinated by statistical arcana about the morphology of Russian, then this is the browsing book you have been dreaming of. Ilola & Mustajoki have taken a Soviet-made computer-readable version of A. A. Zaliznjak's *Grammatičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka* (Moscow: Russkij jazyk, 1977) and have performed very extensive searches to produce 233 tables containing all manner of statistical generalizations about the morphology and phonology of contemporary standard Russian. We can learn, for example, that there are 7 masculine nouns ending in the consonant *b* which have fixed desinential stress (96), that there are 10 adjectives whose stems contain 10 syllables (109), that in 20.6% of Russian imperfective 1st-conjugation verbs with the suffix *-a*, pre-suffixal *t* undergoes mutation (166), and so forth. The raw statistical tables are accompanied by running annotations and examples, sometimes rather interesting. However, there is no analytical discussion of the significance of the statistical data for the linguistic description of Russian.

The statistical information provided is only as reliable as the database from which it was taken. Zaliznjak's dictionary was compiled by hand,