

*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,