Approaches to second language acquisition Ed. by Kari Sajavaara and Courtney Fairweather (review)

Stephanie Gottwald, Margaret Thomas

➡ *For additional information about this article*
   https://muse.jhu.edu/article/453104/summary

40 dense pages, is that 'the level of readability of accounting messages is difficult, and the level of understandability of the meaning of accounting messages is less than perfect'.

The following three chapters are separate explorations, or applications, of bits of linguistics to accounting, apparently undertaken to see what will happen. The first of these, on 'linguistic relativity', turns out to be on the Boas-Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. This is expounded in full primeval force, not omitting Eskimo words for snow and even going on to claim that there are many terms for horses among speakers of Arabic. (Alas, no new evidence is adduced for this.) When the time comes to apply this in accounting, there is a very brief consideration of whether people who use accounting language in different ways can be shown to behave differently, but the discussions are painfully obscure and apparently without clear result.

For the second thesis, thumbnail sketches of some sociolinguistic issues are given (variation by race, gender, class; and Bernstein's thesis of 'elaborated codes') and then accounting language is back: do accountants use a special style to give their writing more authority, is there a schism among accountants in the degree of elaborateness in the code they use? Again, no clear answer is given, despite a lengthy statistical study, attempting to correlate opinions about accounting doctrines with subpopulations of accountants (professors, practitioners, and students).

Finally, there is the 'bilingual' thesis, which seems to be that bilingual people are intellectually better off. R-B appends an empirical study to show that language (English versus French) has some effect on how accounting concepts are understood. He concludes that language teaching should be part of accountancy training.

The book ends up showing what it had originally set itself to explain: accountancy writing, especially by academic accountants, can be unreadable, obscure, and turgid. It is hard to imagine an attempt at explanation which contains not a single insight, but if it is possible, then Belkaoui has achieved it with this book. [NICHOLAS OSTLER, *Linguacubun Ltd, Bath.*]

Approaches to second language acquisition. Ed. by KARI SAJAVAARA and COURTNEY FAIRWEATHER. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä, 1996. Pp. 269.

This collection of 26 papers is from the 1992 meeting of the European Second Language Association (EUROSLA) held in Jyväskylä, Finland. It has a European flavor with an accent on the host country: Most contributors have affiliations in Finland, the Netherlands, or Britain; among language learners discussed are native speakers of Finnish, Swedish, Bulgarian, Dutch, Turkish, Arabic, Polish, German, and Vietnamese; the languages they are acquiring include Finnish, French, Dutch, and the ubiquitous English.

After a first paper by EUROSLA President V. J. COOK, on relationships between linguistics and second language (L2) research, most contributions report empirical studies of L2 acquisition by adults. The editors first group together nine papers on lexical acquisition. PETER BROEDER, GUUS EXTRA, and ROELAND VAN HOUT aim to distinguish universal versus native-language (L1) influences on word-formation processes in L2 Dutch. DAVID SINGLETON disputes the claim that L2 lexicons are more dependent than L1 lexicons on phonological information. There are two papers in German: MAIJA GRONHOLM explores degrees of lexical refinement attained by Swedish-speaking children learning Finnish, KIRSTI SIITONEN seeks to universalize causes of semantic errors in advanced learners of Finnish. The remaining contributions include papers on the acquisition of grammar, reading, phonology, morphology, discourse, and several on pedagogical topics. Among them is PETRA BOS and JEROEN AARSSEN's study which passes rather too quickly over data showing that 4- and 8-year old Turks and Moroccans are more accurate in determining the antecedents of pronouns than of reflexives in L2 Dutch. A paper by GERTRAUD HAVRANEK contains a sensitive analysis of the (non-)effects of explicit correction of classroom L2 learners' errors (guarded conclusion: Learners to whom feedback is directed often fail to profit from it, but classmates may do so). SUE SINCLAIR and NICK ELLIS contribute a well-shaped, lucid study arguing that incorporating a 'silent period' into early L2 instruction promotes neither accurate pronunciation, nor lexical acquisition, nor implicit or explicit grammatical knowledge.

Thus for L2 researchers interested in the lexicon, or in acquisition of Finnish or Germanic, there are a number of worthwhile papers here. In addition, for those of us who missed EUROSLA 1992, reading this collection may serve to an unusual extent as a substitute for attending the conference. Some papers are as short as four pages, as if the authors are still hurrying to avoid the time-keeper's intimidating 'Stop Now!' sign. There are also technical lapses paralleling typical conference talk mishaps, such as in ENCHO GERANOV and KRASSIMIRA RANGELOVA's paper which makes reference to Figures 1–8 which are nowhere to be found (as if the presenters ran out of handouts), or in WILFRIED WEIDEN and WILLIAM NEMSER's paper where five pages of discussion of voiced versus unvoiced interdentals is obscured because the slashes within which both /ð/ and /θ/ should have been typeset were left blank (as if a public address system periodically failed during the presenta-

tion). Finally, there are the inevitable one or two papers whose circuitous paths or mismatched introductions and conclusions make them appear to have been written up in the hotel the night before. [STEPHANIE GOTTWALD and MARGARET THOMAS, *Boston College*.]

Licensing empty nouns in French. By PETRA SLEEMAN. The Hague: Holland Institute of Linguistics, 1996. Pp. 205.

Petra Sleeman presents an interesting and thorough study of noun ellipsis in French, constructions in which N, dominated by DP, is empty, as in *Trois* PRO *arriveront demain* 'Three will arrive tomorrow'. S follows other work on ellipsis in claiming that 'noun ellipsis' actually involves an empty NP PRO which must be licensed and identified. Her analysis departs from other approaches to PRO, however, in proposing that the empty nominal in French DP is not licensed and identified by morphological agreement, it is licensed by the semantic feature [+ partitive] and identified by discourse linking with an antecedent which must be specific in interpretation. S extends her account to certain related constructions in English, Dutch, Spanish, and Italian.

Ch. 1 is a short introduction, with Ch. 2 providing the core of the analysis elucidated in subsequent chapters. S first develops a theory whereby different kinds of French prenominal adjectives and determiners are specified for the semantic feature [+ partitive]. On her account, cardinals, superlatives, ordinals, *seul/autre*, etc., color adjectives, and certain adjectives of quality such as *grand/petit* are all partitive. Other adjectives of quality are nonpartitive and fail to license ellipsis. Thus, a nonpartitive adjective such as *intéressantes* is not a potential licenser of PRO in **Je n'ai pas entendu les deux intéressantes* PRO. 'I have not heard the two interesting (ones).' Ellipsis is grammatical in cases in which *pro* is licensed by a numeral, a color adjective, or a partitive adjective of quality. Examples are, respectively: *Trois* PRO *arriveront demain* 'Three will arrive tomorrow.' *Je prends la petite verte* PRO 'I will take the small green (one).', and *Je préfère les deux grands* PRO 'I prefer the two tall (ones).' The requirement that PRO be identified by specificity is illustrated by the contrast between *Trois* PRO *arriveront demain* and **J'ai lu trois* PRO 'I have read three'. In the latter, the DP object containing PRO is nonspecific, and identification fails. In the former, as in the other grammatical examples discussed above, DP is specific, and NP PRO is both licensed and identified. S extends her analysis to English, Spanish, and Italian and argues that English differs from French in relaxing the requirement that PRO in DP be specific, from which it follows that '*I have read three*' in English

is grammatical. In her brief discussion of Dutch, German, and the Scandinavian languages, S proposes that empty NP in these languages is licensed and identified through adjectival inflection, concluding that at least two different licensing and identification strategies for NP PRO exist, one involving semantic features, and the other, morphological agreement features.

A central tenet of S's analysis of the phrase structure of DP is that prenominal elements, including certain adjectives, numerals, etc., are specifiers of functional projections dominating NP. She does not elaborate on the nature of the functional heads of these projections and assumes that many such heads are phonologically empty with feature specifications, though exactly what these specifications are remains unclear. Proper government (licensing) of empty NP is through Spec-head agreement of a lexical element in Spec with an empty head, and empty X^0 in such cases licenses PRO. Numerals, for example, are not generated in Num but rather in the Spec of a higher functional QP. Num itself heads a lower NumP and is presumably the locus of features, though this is not made clear. Why numerals are not associated with the projection NumP is not addressed.

In order to account for the distribution of personal and other pronouns in French, S proposes in Ch. 3 that these pronouns are actually DP dominating NP PRO in which either D or its specifier are filled. Demonstratives such as *celui*, possessive pronouns such as *sien*, and quantifiers such as *certains*, *plusieurs*, *chacun*, and *quelques-uns*, among others, are pronouns generated in Spec of functional projections of NP. They are [+ partitive], and when the containing DP is specific, ellipsis is grammatical as PRO is both licensed and identified. Examples include *celui* PRO *que tu aimes* 'that that you like', *Certains* PRO *sont venus me voir* 'Some have come to see me'. and *Je préfère le sien* PRO, *de chat* 'I prefer his/her cat'. S argues that personal pronouns (strong forms such as *lui* and weak forms, the clitics *le/me* etc.) are generated in D with NP PRO complements. These heads are [+ partitive], and license NP PRO. NP PRO is identified in these cases, however, not by association with a [+ specific] DP but rather by association with a [+ human] antecedent in *Je lui parle* 'I am speaking to him/her'. and an antecedent which is either [+ human] or [− human] in *Je le vois* 'I see him/it'. S extends this analysis to English and argues that demonstrative, personal, and possessive pronouns all involve an empty PRO licensed and identified as in French.

In Ch. 4 S addresses the distribution of partitive *en* and provides extensive arguments that *en* is the lexical counterpart of NP PRO discussed in previous chapters. She proposes that *en* is used in derivations in which NP PRO is nonspecific, to keep such derivations from crashing. In Ch. 5, she turns to 'substantivized' adjectives such as *le malade* and *l'important*,