Beyond Generative Grammar: A Course in Performative Linguistics
Book review: M.K.C. Uwajeh,, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited, 2002., pp. xiv+170

Reviewed by C.U.C. Ugorji

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland

In Chomsky (1992), the demise of Syntax is envisaged. In Uwajeh (2002), the subject of this review, Syntax is dead. Whereas Chomsky seems not to bother to explain how, Uwajeh tries to spell out comprehensively, logically and convincingly how this death comes about. If the tenets of the book are accepted, the Chomskyan revolution of about five decades is apparently being brought to an end and a new radical revolution is taught to commence, as the tripartite paradigm of language and linguistics theory of the Generative school gives way to a bipartite theory of language. It is also to be hoped that all disciplines that interface with language and linguistics are also in for another revolution, which may last for a very long time to come. Its critiqueness appears far-reaching both in its scope and depth in dismantling the all-time edifice of the generative (syntacticists) school, among which include its focus on the nature of language and its concept of linguistics and grammar. It follows after de Saussure (1916) in presenting a bipartite theory of language in which language is shown to comprise only a form part and a meaning part. While the form part describes all language symbolization systems (including gestures), the meaning part describes thoughts or conception; and both relate as the two sides of a coin, having nothing in-between. The thoughts are represented by the forms and the forms call up the thoughts; that is, a relationship of the representer (form) and the represented (meaning or thought). It thus, opposes (standard) generative emphasis on a tripartite theory of language, linguistics and grammar shown to comprise the syntactic, the semantic and the phonological components, with the syntactic component as the 'core' that actually 'generates' while the 'semantic shows how meaning is interpreted (contains the rules for interpreting meaning) and the phonological shows how sounds are interpreted (contains rules for realizing pronunciation); the latter two being somewhat peripheral.

This review is organized to highlight these contrasts essentially, showing where they differ in their handing of different aspects of the intellectual concern, which includes, among others, the nature of language, the science of linguistics, pragmatics and grammar.

The intention of the author is to "update Saussure's A Course in General Linguistics and stipulate the recommended shape of linguistics for the twenty-first century by highlighting several key aspects of the nature of language as a social phenomenon" p. 2. It is further disclosed that the book is "… set in a scientific paradigm diametrically opposed to… the Generative Grammar school of linguists who to date have been overly fascinated with what they call, syntax." p. 12. Its preoccupation is to do Grammar without doing syntax.

While Sausure's orientation is presented in the introductory chapter, chapter one contains a succinct review of the prime concerns of the Generative linguists from Chomsky's (1965) Aspects of the Theory of syntax to the Minimalist Program of 1992, summing all as the tripartite paradigm of language theory, comprising a syntactic component, a semantic component and a phonological component (with a slight modification in Minimalist Program). This paradigm represents the grammar as well whose preoccupation is with language structure, and is itself structure-dependent and not contextual. The author sums that "the standard characterization of language by Generative Grammar cannot be a true theory of language because it introduces a third, fictitious, component (i.e. the generative or syntactic component) into language's make-up, which renders language phenomenon essentially incomprehensible. He demands instead that.

Units of sound and processes of relating sound units to one another should constitute one main component of language, while.

Units of meaning and the processes of relating meaning units to one another should constitute the other major component.

Language should thus, have two and only two immediate constituents in its make-up (see page 11). Accordingly, he characterizes language as "any semantic-symbolic intercommunication representational system-structure" p. 12 and specifies 'meaning' as 'a system-structure of thought, and 'form' as a system-structure of symbolization" representing thought. Following this, his Performative Linguistics divides the concern of linguistics into (a) Semantics, the study of thoughts or meaning, and (b) Symbolics, the study of symbolization or form.

He discusses the relationship between Grammar and Linguistics in chapter two, and shows that contrary to the generativist's equating of grammar with linguistics, that grammar concerns the structural aspects of linguistics or Textual linguistics; and that, on the other hand, linguistics concerns itself with both the structural aspects of language and the nonstructural or contextual aspects of language. In other words, that linguistics should logically be viewed as comprising Grammar and Pragmatics.

The relationship between Grammar and semantics is taken up next, in chapter three, to show that grammar is not all that generativists assume it to be. In this chapter, grammar is shown to comprise structural semantics and structural symbolics. By this, the author stresses that contrary to generative assumptions that the whole of language meaning, semantics, is part of the study of language structure, i.e. grammar, it is only the structural aspects of meaning, structural semantics, that constitutes part of grammar.

The relationship between grammar and syntax comes up next in chapter four in which the author argues that grammar is not equal to syntax as purported in generative grammar; and that the usage it makes of 'syntax' in grammar "lacks content" p. 84. He posits instead, that the concept of syntax should involve "the study of the external structuring of words" p. 85. Thus, syntax is to concern itself with the study of "all the supra-word level symbolization structures" (i.e. phrases, sentences, etc.).

Chapter five discusses the relationship between grammar and lexicon. The lexicon constitutes the 'base' of grammar, following Chomsky (1965). The problem, however, is that "the characterization of the constituents of the lexicon (i.e. any lexical item) in generative Grammar's parlance is a theoretically disastrous problem for the intellectual paradigm" p. 108. The issues raised include Generative Grammar's reliance on Traditional Grammar's 'parts of speech' (e.g. noun, verb, adjective, article etc) and the feature-bundle approach in the definition of the lexicon. Precisely, it argues that from Traditional Grammar to Generative Grammar, modes of defining lexical items "are fundamentally unsatisfactory". These include, the morphological mode, which defines a word by its form (say, a noun is identified as that which accepts plurality, e.g. book – books), and the syntactic mode, which defines lexical items in terms of position (e.g. a noun occupies the initial position in a sentence). Both are said to be unsatisfactory because they are not universal going by gross-linguistics evidence and therefore cannot identify the relevant items consistently. Furthermore, the composite feature-bundle approach of generative grammar is said to 'compound the problem' p. 114, that is, by its adopting Traditional Grammar's putatively unsatisfactory definition alongside its (binary) feature-bundles. In other words, Uwajeh's (2002) Performative Linguistics is opposed to Generative Grammar's tripartite characterization of a lexical entity as a phonological unit (a form), a meaning (or semantic) unit and as a position (or syntactic) unit. It therefore, resituates it as partly a form unit and partly a meaning unit which has got 'variable position in textual composition" p. 115.

The relationship between Grammar and Pragmatics is taken up in chapter six, which commences with a laudable appreciation of the contributions of Noam Chomsky in defining the goal of linguistic science as that which must somehow "go beyond the mere characterization of language substance to explain the language faculty itself of the human mind" p. 118, but complains that his method or tools for attaining the set goal "is irremediably flawed, (and that) the generative… paradigm is inherently useless for explaining the language faculty of the human mind" p. 119. Reasons for this rejection include that a psychologically real grammar must be a performance grammar (that is, not of competence as claimed by Generative grammar) and psychologically real grammars must not be context-free, (as generative grammar is). Thus, not being a psychologically real grammar, Generative Grammar cannot be a correct basis for making serious claims about the language user's mind. On the other hand, a performative grammar is context-sensitive and also necessarily a competence grammar; thus, speaking of competence grammar becomes, as the author puts it, intellectually vacuous; and, since according to performative linguistics, language structure is determined by language use, the relationship between Grammar and Pragmatics is easily definable namely, text (i.e. communication text) characterizes Grammar while context (language communication context) characterizes Pragmatics.

The author concludes with a note on the problem of chaos. He shows the entire enterprise of science to comprise both chaos and order in the so-called chaos theory of linguistics. As shown in earlier chapters, a context-free grammar is not a true grammar, but the context-sensitive one, which is said to be true, however, relies on the rather indeterminate factors of communication context. Logically, since what counts for language communication is itself indeterminate, verging on probabilities instead of certainties, a non-rule-governed language faculty is envisaged; hence the chaos. This apparent chaos, this apparent disorder, however, is said to characterize human language in verity as a cosmo-logical principle, which is already well attested in the physical sciences.

A first impression one may get reading this book is that a lot of labour has gone into it. It is no doubt an in-dept and rigorous piece of research. The ideas dovetail into one another and the issues, as skill-fully organized in chapters, co-refer with natural facileness and the logic of argument is not easily faulted. Notwithstanding, there are a few reservations and comments as we now outline.

The author's choice of title appears inappropriate: instead of reading, say, 'Beyond de Saussure… 'as the author rightly acknowledges in page 2 as well as in the blurb (e.g. "… a logical successor to de Saussure") it reads "beyond Generative Grammar…" the implication of which the book does not jus-tify. Rather, it contradicts and rejects the tenets of Generative Grammar with a damning force and could not have built on it as it does not at any point purport to seek to advance such, but quite obvi-ously builds on de Saussure's orientation.

The book provides extensive justification for its attack on Generative Grammar's leaning on categories and labels defined in the faulty paradigm of Traditional Grammar such as noun, verb, adjective, etc. But the arguments appear rather inconclusive as the author fails to suggest alternative classificatory labels in place of the Traditional Grammar types. By this, it could be assumed that the author too is yet to be free from the faults he finds with generative grammar in this respect. Unlike the generative school, as elsewhere (Ugorji 2001) suggested, whose main stock lacks commitment to definition of concepts for which it has a rather confused usage of 'Grammar', 'Linguistics', 'Syntax', etc., the author painstakingly defines his concepts. Failing to do so for the grammatical categories is therefore viewed as a weakness especially because it is needful.

The book is putatively revolutionary and linguistics will not remain the same any longer as it succinctly demonstrates the inadequacies of the core preoccupation of the generative school till date and demol-ishes the grounds for that paradigm clearly and convincingly. It, however, does so with glaring immod-esty in presentation and language use. In page 8, for instance, we read "My general driving motivation for writing this book is to demonstrate conclusively that the theory of language proffered by Generative Grammar is irremediably flawed…". Also, in page 119, the author states that Chomsky's methods are "irremediably flawed" and his generative paradigm "is inherently useless". A number of these forms of expressions dot the paragraphs and pages of the book. Such claims appear too finite and all-time ex-haustive as if the author has the prerogative of insight. On the contrary, however, the author con-fesses being afraid to make the claims (page 141). Could that be another problem of chaos, in which there appears to be a marriage of both intellectual humility and arrogance? However the argument goes, the least to say is that the writing shows annoyance, perhaps, as the author's ploy to provoke more intellectual reactions.

In addition, the author's comment on the Minimalist Program highlights a step towards a bipartite the-ory of grammar (if its 'Computational Machine' does not amount to another generative syntactic com-ponent) in line with his performative grammar. Dwelling on this should have enhanced this major view-point of his book but only a passing comment is provided.

These few shortcomings notwithstanding, Uwajeh's (2002) performative theory of language and lin-guistics is worthwhile. It is radical. It is revolutionary and would hold the ground of linguistics science for a real long time, if accepted, especially if the Minimalist Program (which tends already to suggest a bipartite paradigm) becomes its true forerunner. If a good scientific theory includes one capable of handling a wide range of phenomena, performative theory is one of such, as it promises to proffer ex-planations for language in general, linguistics (including pragmatics) and other intellectual disciplines which interface with language, namely, communication, translatology, philosophy, psychology, sociol-ogy and so on. It is therefore an invaluable material for both professionals and students working in these areas. Its bottom line is the call to do linguistics the pragmatic way.

References

Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the theory of syntax* Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky,N. (1992) "A Minimalist program for Linguistic Theory'. MIT. *Occasional Papers in Linguistics.*

Chomsky, N. (1995) "Bare Phrase Structures" in *Government and Binding Theory and Minimalist Program.* Gerth Welbelhuth(ed) Blackwell Publishers. Pp. 385-486.

Ugorji, C.U.C (2001) "An Explanation of 'Trace' in Universal Grammar" in *Journal of the Humanities,* Imo State University, Owerri. 6,2001:134-238