

lative and Instrumental in Hittite, Harvard 1977) to have based its analysis on a chronologically sifted text collection. This method in turn depends on advances in Hittite cuneiform paleography, allowing manuscripts to be distinguished as Old, Middle, or Neo-Hittite, and its linguistic importance cannot be overstated. In Y's words, which also aptly describe his own work, the method typically reveals 'that what was earlier seen as haphazard fluctuation in orthographic, morphological and syntactic usage is in fact partly attributable to the differing ages of our texts' (4).

Second, distinguishing the linguistic features of Old and Neo-Hittite in this way is obviously crucial for wider Anatolian or Indo-European comparison. Accordingly, Yoshida's conclusions will enter into any future discussion of the *-r* which characterizes some mediopassives not only in Anatolian but also in Tocharian, Italic, and Celtic. In particular, in no other Indo-European branch is this element restricted, as it may have been in Proto-Anatolian, to the third person. There are obvious ramifications if that restriction proves to have been original and the other languages to have innovated.

Like many de Gruyter volumes, this one is handsomely and sturdily produced but priced out of individuals' reach; I noticed only a few minor typos. [ANDREW GARRETT, *University of Texas at Austin*.]

Variation in interlanguage morphology. By RICHARD YOUNG. (Theoretical studies in second language acquisition, 1). New York: Peter Lang, 1991. Pp. 279. \$44.95.

Presenting a detailed account of a study of the use of an English plural morpheme by Chinese ESL students, and drawing on the literature on variation, first- and second-language acquisition, and pidgin and creole languages, Young's book addresses itself to the problem of systematicity in interlanguage (IL) variation.

Y discusses assumptions about systematicity and reviews previous IL studies in terms of their theoretical approaches and methods of data collection. Ch. 1, 'Introduction' (1–16), defines the terms 'systematicity', 'development', and 'context' for the purposes of the study, and establishes the questions which the research will address. Ch. 2, 'Approaches to variation in IL studies' (17–51), reviews the different ap-

proaches that previous research has taken. Of these, Y argues for variable rule analysis as the most effective for the purposes of his study. A similar selection is made for the method of data collection in Ch. 3, 'Methods for the study of IL variation' (53–77).

The criteria for the selection of the dependent variable and the subjects are presented in Ch. 4, 'Design of the study' (79–102). The plural morpheme [-s], which Y calls '(s) plural' (82), is chosen because it is a bound morpheme and, according to Y, is acquired early and is easy to learn. The subjects are selected for the similarity of their linguistic background (Chinese) and are divided into two groups, high-proficiency and low-proficiency, based on their TOEFL and pre-TOEFL scores.

In Ch. 5, 'Hypotheses and motivation' (103–25), the possible explanations for variation are discussed: linguistic or sociolinguistic factors, factors of acquisition or randomness, or a combination of factors. Fifteen hypotheses are derived from these factors, based on psychosocial, developmental, linguistic, and communicational considerations.

Y describes the application of the VARBRUL program to the data in Ch. 6, 'Analysis and results' (127–47). His results show that variation is conditioned by several independent factors: the stage of IL development, the linguistic environment, and communicative redundancy. Each of these factors differs in importance according to the proficiency of the speaker. Contrary to speech accommodation theory, the ethnicity of the interviewer has no effect on variation (147).

Ch. 7, 'Discussion of results and conclusions' (149–67), applies the findings to the problem of systematicity in variation. Possible explanations for the results in relation to the fifteen hypotheses presented earlier are given. The limitations of the study are discussed, and Y offers suggestions for further research. He concludes (162) that 'the kind of system that is apparent here is not the categorical system of reference grammars and prescriptive linguistics'. Rather, the systematicity of IL is due to a complex web of phonological, syntactic, and semantic factors, which change in importance as the learner's IL progresses.

As one who is interested in linguistic variation and second-language acquisition, I found that this book explores important issues, and invites further research and discussion. Pidgin and creole specialists might be dubious about the par-

allels drawn (108–12) between the development of features in Tok Pisin and similar features in IL systems, but good use is made of the literature on IL and related subjects. The logical organization of the book and the chapter

summaries are helpful. Y's detailed description of his study means that it can be duplicated and tested by scholars with similar interests. [JAMES A. WALKER, *University of Toronto.*]