

BOOKNOTES

injustice in jobs, and homes, and mortgages, and other aspects of life, and the language can look after itself. It usually does, rough-hew it how we will. Injustice exists in real life, not in dictionaries.' (D.H.)

THOMAS S. KUHN, *The essential tension. Selected studies in scientific tradition and change*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978. Pp. xxiii+366.

The 14 essays collected in this book represent Kuhn's thinking on the nature of scientific development both before and after the publication of his famous work, *The structure of scientific revolutions*, in 1962. Linguistics and anthropologists have cited Kuhn's concept of 'paradigm' in their attempts at self-understanding, but Kuhn has not returned the compliment with attention. He sticks to the natural sciences for examples. George Stocking's work in the history of anthropology is noted (112), but students of language are mentioned only in illustration of other points (Cassirer, Osgood, Whorf), not as participants in a case to be addressed. Nevertheless, those who have been influenced by Kuhn's concept, or to whom a specific conception of the nature of science is important, will be interested in the reflective preface to the book and in the availability in one place of the shrewd argumentation as to the legislative nature of individual concepts (ch. 10), the role of the scientific group and puzzle-solving (as against Sir Karl Popper's view) (ch. 11), the fallacy of obscuring the contrast between science and art (ch. 14). Ch. 12, 'Second thoughts on paradigms', will be of special interest. For a critic's perspective on the vicissitudes of Kuhn's use of the term 'revolution', see S. Toulmin, *Human understanding. The collective use and evaluation of concepts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972; paperback, 1977. Toulmin's conceptual framework seems more adequate to understanding the development of the study of language, especially the issues that arise out of the interdisciplinary nature of that study. (D.H.)

RAYMOND WILLIAMS, *Marxism and literature* (Oxford Paperbacks 382). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977. Pp. 217.

This short book is published in the series of 'Marxist introductions' edited by Williams and Steven Lukes. Students of sociolinguistics, or language in culture, will find the chapter on 'Language' (Part I, #3, pp. 21-44), on 'Signs and notations' (Part III, #4, pp. 165-72), and such chapters as that on 'Structures of feeling' (Part II, #9, pp. 128-35) to be sensible, cogent presentations of a point of view that has obvious affinity (though no apparent root) in the later perspective of Sapir. The insistence on 'constitutive' and 'continuous social process' as a reality and vantage point matches Sapir's concern for 'social psychology' as a perspective, and a recasting of the study of language in terms of 'living speech'. Williams cites Chomsky and Voloshinov, but not the sociolinguistic or ethnolinguistic literature in which a perspective like his has been developed. The thrust of Williams' excellent book might be said to be to integrate an ethnography of communication with a sensible, open Marxist orientation. (D.H.)

ERRATUM

Language in Society 6. 3 (December 1977). Woodward & De Santis, 'Negative incorporation in French and American sign language'.

CORRECTED PARAGRAPH - p. 380-1 (bottom ¶)*

However, when we compare modern FSL and modern ASL with an actual separation of around 160 years, we find a totally different picture. Woodward (1976b) found that with

*Bracketed figures are the corrected portions of the paragraph.

LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY

872 modern FSL and modern ASL signs the rate of cognates was only 57.3%. This would hypothetically date the arrival of FSL in America between A.D. 584 and A.D. 802] with a 90% level of confidence. This is a [1,000–1,200] year discrepancy. Even limiting the analysis to words chosen from the Swadesh word list, Woodward (1976b) found only a 61% rate of cognates between modern FSL and modern ASL. This would hypothetically date the arrival of FSL in the US even earlier, between [A.D. 504 and A.D. 1172] at a 90% level of confidence.