REVIEWS

The series in which this book was published deserves attention of everyone dedicated to teaching syntax and the syntax of English in particular on the university level[1]. This time we have been offered a presentation of most recent developments in English transformational grammar put into a format of a college textbook, whose appearance, following other publications in this field, emphasizes once again the fact that teaching practice does not necessarily have to lag much behind current theoretical issues. The book is narrow and maybe too narrow to allow a more detailed treatment of topics, it provides the reader, however, with the first up-to-date report of improvements made in the conceptual framework of generative approach. The discussion is mainly concentrated around the Aspects model and Fillmorian case grammar blended with G. Lakoff's abstract syntax considerations. The aim of this review is not to go into the problems as they have been investigated by the afore-named linguists but rather render them as they have been put in Langendoen's study.

The topics of the First Chapter are those which, as is usual, introduce the reader to the basic concepts of linguistic science such as language and its creative aspect, sentence, theory of grammar, competence vs. performance, to mention just a few. It is also here where the outline of the content of the subsequent chapters is given.

Chapter Two deals with the nature of linguistic data and the elicitation judgments employed in their examination. Speaking of the notion of grammaticality the author is aware of the inadequacy of these judgments, he stresses, however, their usefulness especially when they are accompanied by other more refined methods, which, I think, seem to emerge from a happy combination of linguistic, logical, and philosophical explorations in language. The latest efforts in this direction, made mainly by G. Lakoff, McCawley, Bach, Ross, and Fillmore are carried on to the point of discovering a number of very intricate abstract logico-semantic principles governing our thinking processes. That syntax cannot be studied in separation from semantics has been established beyond doubt. In view of this belief the oddity of sentences like *The table drank your milk* must be given a different semantic dimension and somewhat different type of grammar organization which at present we know nothing of. This, in the opinion of the reviewer, is the theoretical perspective for the broader understanding of Langendoen's considerations, though he himself does not make it explicit. Further in the chapter we find very handy explanations of parsing, and why it is to be made use of in language de-

---

[1] Two other books in the series are Cook, W. A., *Introduction to tagmemic analysis* and Jespersen, O., *Analytic syntax*, both published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

scriptions. This, consequently, leads the author to show how ambiguity can be represented and what we gain by distinguishing between deep and surface structures of sentences. Finally, it is observed that syntax can be studied under intensive and extensive approaches, both of which having their respective advantages.

A brief syntactic description of English sentences carried out in terms of basic PSG rules is the subject of Chapter Three. At the beginning the author directs the reader's attention to the problems of language acquisition. What comes next is the extensive discussion of how the generative descriptions reflect our linguistic intuitions by means of employing syntactic rules that map the speaker's conceptual knowledge of the language, via transformations, onto the level of expression. Having set up a number of classical rules the author turns immediately to the criticism of their inadequacy, which, it seems, is a little too hasty for 1) the critique is semantically grounded, and the chapter on semantics is still to come, 2) the transformations discussed further still work, at least theoretically, on the outputs of these rules. Anyway, the shortcomings of the Aspects model of grammar, as pointed out by Langendoen, are those that were put forward by Fillmore in his case grammar proposition.

In the next Chapter the author tries to cast some light on some perplexing problems of semantic analysis. Working on the assumption that the reader is familiar with the pioneer work of Katz and Fodor he proceeds to the presentation of new insights gained since the publication of their paper. Here are some more interesting points. First comes the treatment of the properties of semantic features of nouns, which is roughly a simplified version of Chomsky's contribution (1965); that is, binarism, hierarchy, and cross-classification of features are dealt with. The statement that "semantic features do not represent properties of the universe but innate properties of the human mind itself and of the human perceptual apparatus" (37), opens a discussion of such features as *human*, *male*, *dimensional*, *penetrable* etc. Further on, we find a brief account on the semantic content of adjectives and verbs followed by a section on the projection problem. The first thing to be noted here is that Langendoen uses classical terminology in a redefined sense. This refers to the concepts of selectional and strict subcategorization features which are no longer considered binary. Besides, unlike in Chomsky (1965: 114 - 15), the selectional features of the verb impose now specifications on subject and object NP's even if these are unspecified for the features of the verb; this being the consequence of the adopted view of "verb-centered semantics".

What Langendoen says about the projection problem amounts to an indication of how possible it might be for the semantic features of lexical items to be conveyed onto larger constituents which contain them. A few types of NP constituency is examined from this viewpoint. The coordination of NP's is given special care as the author employs here the latest proposal consisting in providing each noun with a referential index taking on variables[2]. It is a pity, however, that so little has been said on the semantic representation of sentences. Langendoen's half-hearted apology leaves the impression as if it were an attempt not to commit himself on this controversial issue.

The bulk of Chapter Five is devoted to a neat explanation of the nature and function of a few transformational processes of English. The author refrains from a thorough account of the component selecting only five classical topics that were worked on in the first half of the sixties and are still under investigation. These are: extraposition, infinitival clause separation, relativization, pronominalization, and coordination, to which a number of "minor" transformations are added on the way. At this point I wonder, why Langen-

[2] McCawley, J. D. 1968. "The role of semantics in a grammar". In Bach and Harms, 124 - 169.

doen, when talking of extraposition, dropped the idea of putting in a few remarks on the interesting "expletive it" constructions the analysis of which is his own contribution[3]. Negation, imperatives, and questions are left untouched until the following chapter where they are treated in a new fashion. If this is right I wonder again. It must be added that each of the afore-said operations is given the latest possible treatment, e. g., the account of pronominalization is based on the work of Ross (1967) and Langacker (1969), the latter was forthcoming at that time[4]. Each time the author takes up a new topic he starts a new section and states the most relevant facts such as applicability conditions, optionality, ordering of rules etc. All this is naturally simplified, sometimes too much, but I must admit that I cannot think of doing it otherwise. The operations are described without the use of rigidly formalized rules, whose occurrence in textbooks often turns out to bring more harm than good, especially when overdosed. As for the diagrams, it seems that the reader would have been better assisted if presented with intermediate steps of transformational operations in more than a few cases. This refers especially to the situation where a definite transformation is applied more than once to the same deep structure, e. g. 65 - 6.

Though not the longest, the Chapter on English sentence types is certainly the most significant one. Its significance consists in almost a complete revision and reshaping of the type of grammar presented up to this place, effecting a new set of PSG rules which are now ready to cure all the illnesses of the former ones. The reader familiar with the most recent "acquisitions" of transformational theory will recognize immediately the findings of Fillmore and the Lakoff's. The rules explained, the next step is the introduction of subjectivalization, which is a transformational rule whose function is to select one of the arguments of the predicate to be the subject of the sentence. In this section Langendoen also deals with a very complicated syntactic problem of how adjectives and nouns behave in the deep structure. The treatment, however, seems to be very sketchy and superficial. The reader is left unguided with a number of difficult syntactic operations which he has to cope with himself. Some transformations are made anything but clear, e.g., the infinitival clause separation, once said to require modifications to fit new rules was left unmodified at all. Another flaw I would like to point out concerns the omission of the objectivalization transformation which is second, in rank, surface structure rule in every respect. The next problem taken up is the relationship which holds between predicates and their arguments followed by the considerations devoted to various kinds of abstract predicates in the sense of Lakoff (1965: IX, 9. 1 - 9. 21). Yet, Langendoen demonstrated more cases of their existence than Lakoff did. To the causative and inchoative he also added the instrumental, passive, perfect, progressive, tense, modal, interrogative, imperative and negative. The demonstration is far from being exploratory but no one, of course, expects it to be such.

The final section brings us a typological classification of sentences. The proposed criteria serving this purpose are few. The basic distinctions are made on the grounds of possessing by a predicate one, two or three arguments, their semantic and syntactic features, and kinds of predicates in a structure. Such a classification bears all the features of a consistent approach to language universals. A clearly missing thing here is the verb

[3] Langendoen, D. T. 1966. "The syntax of the English expletive *it*". In Dinneen (Ed.), *Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics No. 19*, Washington, Georgetown University Press, 207 - 216.

[4] Ross, J. R. 1969. "On the cyclic nature of English pronominalization". In Reibel and Shane 187 - 200; Langacker, R. W. 1969. "On pronominalization and the chain of command". In Reibel and Shane, 160 - 186.

have, which in spite of its being vigorously investigated in recent literature has been hardly mentioned in its morphological aspect only. Also adverbs have been practically neglected. Besides, the scanty presentation of case notions employed here and there is something to be regretted. After all, it is they that make up the syntactic frame of the verb. In the description of interrogative structures the reviewer has found it hard to accept the statement that the abstract interrogative predicate requires two arguments, unlike the imperative which takes on three (124). The reason is that questions have been found to form a subset of commands from a performative viewpoint, and, as in the case of commands, also here the addressee is required. Thus, the pattern for both commands and questions in the deep structure is, roughly speaking,

P	NP	NP	NP
order	I	You	S
ask	I	You	S

The deep structure for the question can be represented in a fashion very much like that for the imperative. If it were not the case, the sentence *I ask you if John likes Mary* could not be derived.

Last but not least, the reviewer would like to direct the reader's attention to the problems of ordering of predicates in the deep structure[b]. Though nothing has been said on it in the chapter, it seems, at first glance, that there is some evidence, however superficial it may be, that there exists some ordering in the structures presented by Langendoen. For example, the *not* predicate is sure to "dominate" the tense predicate, which, in turn, dominates the abstract predicate, which finally dominates the lexical one. The question arises as to what type of ordering, if any, ought to be assumed in case, e.g., there is more than one abstract predicate pertaining to one simple sentence. In other words, is, for example, the causative always to precede the inchoative if both are present?

In Chapter Seven, Morphology, Langendoen gathered the most important facts related to the morphological realization of elements which once being categories on the deep level are now to appear, via the transformational component, in speech and writing. Various kinds of morphological change in nouns, verbs, and adjectives have been mentioned. Apart from the standard affixation problem a few thoughts are added on the semantic and morphological relationship among words, such as *heat — hot, address* (speak) *— address* (designate for). Also two more abstract predicates appeared: the infinitival predicate and the nominalization predicate.

The concluding Chapter entitled Why Deep and Surface Structure gives a brief justification of the transformational approach to language as well as some information about the central topics of present-day investigation. What makes the book better is the carefully prepared glossary, up-to-date bibliography and an index. The problems for students are of graded difficulty and some require additional reading.

To reduce this criticism to details one word on one word is here in order. Langendoen offers a spelling dilemma using both *subjectivization* and *subjectivalization* throughout Chapter Six. Do we have a choice? On p. 128 the rule referred to is 6.53 and not 6.54 which is meant. These are tiny flaws.

Turning again to matters of substance, one might say that even despite the bigger flaws the book gives the reader considerable insight into a great many refined problems in language and language study. The merit of Langendoen's work is, among others, the frequent reference made to different views on many live issues. The rare way of combin-

---

[b] The problem of ordering of predicates in the deep structure is discussed in Kaznowski, A . "Some observations on the intuitive understanding of the concept of agency". *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 5 (forthcoming).

ing two mutually exclusive approaches in a textbook like this is an attempt both original and venturesome. The presentation of such a lot of material in such a small format had to result in a number of oversimplifications, omissions and understatements, which the author himself is fully aware of. That is also why some of the topics have been scattered all over the book. On the other hand, it is fair to say that the good sides outnumber in great part the weak ones and for all that the reviewed book will certainly be found as worth reading by every prospective reader.

REFERENCES

Austin, J. L. 1968. *How to do things with words.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bach, E. and Harms, R., eds. 1968. *Universals in linguistic theory.* New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge, Mass.: The M. I. T. Press.

Fillmore, Ch. J. 1968. "The case for case" in Bach and Harms, 1968.

Lakoff, G. 1970. *On the nature of syntactic irregularity.* New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Reibel, D. A. and Shane, S. A., eds. 1969. *Modern studies in English.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

The new English grammar. By N. R. Cattell. Pp. XiX, 157. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1969.
Reviewed by Tadeusz Zabrocki, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

The obligatory two-semester course in English grammar (morphology and syntax) has a bad reputation among the students of English Institutes in our country, comparable only to the atmosphere of horror surrounding Old English classes. Often one hears complaints that transformational theory has made the introductory grammar too difficult for the abilities and preparation of the average student, especially for that who does not in any way aim to specialize in linguistics.

Indeed, after completing the course, many students have still only a vague idea of what the whole thing is about although all of them have memorized Chomsky's definition of language and can easily name the components of grammar or different kinds of grammatical rules.

There are also some disappointed linguists who claim that we should teach TG only to the senior, linguistically-oriented students since the full understanding of the theory in its rigorously expressed scientific form demands a sound knowledge of linguistics and some familiarity with the foundations of the methodology of sciences and symbolic logic.

All those people are advised to read Cattell's book which constitutes an attempt to explain modern grammatical knowledge in terms that can be easily understood and even communicated to the pupils'. The attempt has been entirely successful, not only in my opinion but also in that of Chomsky who is reported to say that it 'gives a better grasp of fundamentals ...than anything else I am familiar with.'

The book has deserved this praise because of the extraordinary (for such an elemen-

tary handbook) accuracy of its theoretical considerations combined with a remarkable clarity of presentation. The author possesses a rare gift of perceiving and then communicating to other people in a simplest possible way the most significant elements of the complicated scientific theories.

One of the sources of this clarity and accuracy lies in the very careful organization of its content. It can be divided into three parts. The first two chapters are devoted to the brief presentation of three approaches to the structure of English in their chronological order: traditional, structural and transformational grammar. As in every other handbook (Gleason, Francis, Hill, etc.) there are here some remarks on the popular misconceptions about English usage and correctness. The importance of the spoken variety of language is stressed and the notional definitions of parts of speech criticized. The chapter on structuralism contains an interesting summary of Fries' views. Together with the four-page report on Chomsky's contribution, it may be regarded as a masterpiece of combining brevity with the great informative value.

After this 'theoretical' introduction follows a concise and relatively up-to-date presentation of many insights of the transformational grammar of English. The variety of topics covered is astonishingly large. They range from the enumeration of kernel structures, through the problems of number, agreement, formation of questions passives and negatives, conjoining, relative clauses, adjectivals, comparatives, genitives, possessives and nominalizations to the discussion of the verbal categories of time and mood.

Much of the analysis comes from Klima (1964), Lees (1960), Smith (1961), and Chomsky (1957, 1965).

Negation, genitives and relative clauses are given special attention. We have to deal, for example, not only with the negation of the whole sentences but also with such topics as negative preverbs, constituent negation, combinations of negatives and indefinites, negation and quantifiers.

All the problems are discussed very carefully so the book is remarkably free of factual errors and inconsequences. The only thing of this kind that could attract the attention of the student is the author's assertion that genitives are derived from sentences that attribute possession by means of the verb HAVE, which is certainly untrue since, as it is rightly pointed out later, only a limited group of genitive structures signifies the relationship of possession.

The presentation of all the problems is informal. Cattell does not formulate the rules explicitly. IC structure of kernels is represented by branching tree diagrams and transformations are viewed as rearrangements and deletions performed on one or several, hierarchically structured simple sentences.

Most of the technicalities of generative grammar are left to the last two chapters where IC structures are translated into the language of PS rules and the notational conventions introduced. We can find there an illustrative example of the PS component of the English grammar (taken with slight changes from 'Aspects') and a brief but very informative account of subcategorization rules in which Cattell's book surpasses Jacobs and Rosenbaum's textbook where no hint whatsoever is given as to the formulation of these rules.

The book is provided with an interesting foreword written by Wayne O'Neil in which the role of grammar in general education is discussed. It appears that language study can play an important role in a general goal: learning theory construction which means developing an ability to draw significant generalizations and offer coherent explanations for the wide array of facts. What makes grammar a particularly fruitful area for such attempts is the availability of data to be accounted for. Pupils, being speakers of language have an intuitive knowledge of it, which can be tapped with some help from the teacher.

They may construct hypotheses and then test them against the practically unlimited body of data, to which they have an immediate access through a guided introspection.

At the very end of the book there is a useful glossary of linguistic terms.

As we can see from this short summary Cattell has his own answer to the question that confronts every author of an elementary handbook on TG grammar: to formalize or not to formalize? When we consider the popular texts written so far any straightforward yes or no answer leads here to undesirable results. Thomas (1965), Roberts (1964) and Kotsoudas (1966) decided to introduce the mechanics of TG notation at the very beginning of their well known books. Much effort is devoted by the student to mastering the notational technicalities. He spends a great deal of time going through the mechanical procedures of derivation until he convinces himself that the main problem in writing a transformational grammar is to write some rules conforming to the seemingly empirically unmotivated conventions of the symbolic notation. Instead of grasping the significant insights into the structure of English provided by transformational grammar the student is supposed to deal with such technical and relatively unimportant questions as affix movement rule or word boundary transformation.

It seems to me that at this point we touch an important issue. One of the fundamental principles of learning says that we should proceed from the simple to the difficult. It happens however that the complexity of a formal operation does not always equal the difficulty of its comprehension by students, who wish to know not only how to perform it but why it should be performed in the first place.

In more formalized handbooks such as Owen Thomas' text the reader is acquainted with transformational rules through the above mentioned affix movement rule. Then he proceeds to the different kinds of nominalizations, relative clause reductions, and adjectival movement to arrive finally at the formally 'most complicated' (that is involving the greatest number of elementary transformations) rules of question formation and passivization.

In my opinion the most natural way to illustrate the idea of transformational rules is to begin with the rules rearranging simple sentences into passives and non-indicative structures like questions. The most difficult to understand are usually embeddings, especially those which reduce verbals to their infinite forms.

What I mean by 'understanding' is not the ability to memorize the operation but the rationalized conviction in the necessity of a particular rule, which can be achieved only through the elicitation of the deep seated linguistic intuition of the student. Such an elicitation can be brought about in the most economical way through the informal presentation of a rich, specially graded body of linguistic data. Only after the student has internalized some unknown heuristic mechanism that enables him to think in some rational manner about his linguistic intuitions, we may teach him to present his observations in a rigorously explicit way.

All this is realized by Cattell and is reflected in the organization of his book. In the descriptive part of his *Grammar* he starts the presentation of English transformations with the simple particle movement rule and then passes on immediately to the imperative and question T-rules. In the next chapter, where he deals with the transformations operating on more than one kernel structure, the informal mode of presentation allows him to start from what is intuitively easiest to grasp-coordinate conjunction. Since in a more formalized description, conjunction is quite a difficult subject to deal with (involving the controversial rule schemes) it is only briefly touched upon at the end of Thomas' handbook.

Cattell's book has been intended by its author primarily for the high-school course in 'modern grammar' and is naturally not enough accurate and rigorous in its content

to be recommended as a basic textbook for an academic course (even for an introductory one). Nevertheless it will be, as the author puts it 'a useful preliminary for any student who wishes to proceed later to the more demanding study of grammar through linguistics.'

Operators and nucleus: A contribution to the theory of grammar. By Pieter A. M. Seuren. Pp. X, 230. Cambridge: University Press, 1969.
Reviewed by Wiesław Oleksy, Łódź University.

The theory of transformational grammar has undergone considerable changes after the publication of Chomsky's *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Within the framework of a review it is impossible, and unnecessary, to report on the most remarkable findings provided by recent developments in the field of transformational grammar. One can only say that most work has been devoted to:

a. status of semantic component in grammar

b. the form of deep structures and their functioning in language and in models of grammar

c. the form and ways semantic description should be incorporated into grammatical analysis

d. formalization of grammatical descripiton.

Admittedly, all these four points can be reduced to, simply, adequacy of grammatical description.

Since no satisfactory proposal of an adequate grammatical description has so far been offered, any contribution in this field is more than welcome.

Seuren's monograph deserves attention for, at least, three reasons. Firstly, because it is a good and critical presentation of developments in transformational generative grammar up to approximately 1967. Secondly, because it is one of the attempts to modify the model of grammar established by Chomsky and his followers, with special interest devoted to semantic description of deep structures. And thirdly, the model presented by Seuren has some weaknesses but it throws a good deal of light on some crucial points in linguistics.

The book falls into five chapters. Appended are Bibliography and Index which includes the indexes of terms and quoted authors.

The misprints are fortunately few.

The first chapter (*Preliminaries*, 1 - 25) is devoted to the discussion of some elementary linguistic terms commonly used by transformationally oriented authors. It must be pointed out at the outset that Seuren is very inconsistent and imprecise when dealing with grammaticalness, deviance, and non-deviance. One can accept his classification of sentences as constituting two sets. A set of grammatical sentences which contains a sub-set of grammatical non-deviant sentences and a sub-set of grammatical deviant sentences, and a set of ungrammatical sentences. The set of structurally well-formed and meaningful sentences is called grammatical and the set of structurally ill-formed sentences is called ungrammatical. So far so good. Then Seuren claims that "... no structurally defective, or ungrammatical, string has a meaning" (17). At this point we hit upon some inconsistencies. On p. 19 Seuren says that the sentence "man bit dog" is "... immediately understood (in the linguistic sens of 'understanding'), although it is structurally defective according to the rules of an adequate grammar of English", which, needless to say, contradicts his own claim about the meaninglessness of structurally defective sentences. On the same page he implies that a pair of sentences:

"... find nation the nationalize hidden national sentence nationally" and "scientists truth the universe" should be treated on a par and excluded from the grammar for being ungrammatical though, on the other hand, the sentence "... the beef cut sincerity" is grammatically impeccable because, as Seuren holds, the non-observance of selection restriction rules does not determine grammatical structure (20). In short, Seuren does not specify whether he means structural well-formedness on the level of deep structure description or on the level of surface representation.

Another, more serious problem arises from the discussion of the relationship existing between the elements of the deep structure and their representation in the surface structure. It is implied on p. 4, and then in the chapter dealing with deep structure rules, that the constituents of the deep structure, that is relational constituents, have a one-to-one correspondence with the constituents of the surface structure, which, according to Seuren, is a natural consequence of the assumption that transformations do not affect meaning. This widely accepted assumption has led Seuren to allow for the process of passivization to take place in the deep structure. Accordingly, he claims that "... by letting passivization take place in the deep structure component we avoid the difficulty, arising in previous, transformational, treatments, of a deep structure object, etc., becoming surface structure subject, which complicates the relationship between relational constituents" (177).

The point of view taken here not only destroys Seuren's insistence on the role of relational constituents in the description of sentences (which he argues against Chomsky, 69 - 71) but also fails to assign the proper function to relational constituents in the overall process of a linguistic description.

Nobody has so far demonstrated what exactly the relationships holding between deep structure and its surface representation are but at least one thing is certain, namely that the surface structure is not merely a mirror reflexion of the deep structure. In Seuren's presentation of the problem under discussion there is no syntactic correlation between actives and passives since the "object character" of the subject in the passive sentence is accounted for by the lexicon (177).

Furthermore, Seuren's grammar can generate passives only when the subject-slot is to be rewritten as the noun already selected in the position of object. (Here we have to do with another inadequacy; how is the grammar to know when to select the noun in the subject-slot before selecting any other noun, which would always result in an active sentence, and when to select a noun for the object-slot first and then select it once more for the subject-slot, thus generating a passive sentence). Then in the process of generation the slot from which the subject-noun is taken may be deleted, thus allowing for a sentence "Water is drunk". This sentence cannot be related to any active sentence in Seuren's deep structure.

In point of fact, while generating a passive sentence Seuren begins with a construction which is then unnaturally broken by shifting the positions of relational constituents Subject and Object. This shifting is a purely mechanical procedure in his grammar and cannot account for the syntactic relationship existing between active and passive sentences. Moreover, the deletion of the subject alluded to above is, strictly speaking, a transformational operation "secretly" dwelling in the base.

The bulk of the discussion in chapter 2 (*Chomsky's model of grammar*, 26 - 46) and chapter 3 (*Criticism of Chomsky's model*, 47 - 88) is devoted to the presentation and criticism of Chomsky's (1965) model. The author has succeeded in presenting what may be called the outline of Chomsky's model with the modifications introduced into the theory of transformational grammar by other linguists after the publication of *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. What makes this outline valuable and interesting is that Seuren does

not solely concentrate upon the presentation of tendencies prevailing among transformationalists but provides a critical evaluation of the most important issues dealt with by those authors whose main concern has been the semantic component and its status in the theory of grammar. The most interesting are the following sections: 2.3. (*Selection restriction rules*, 35 - 42), 3.3.3. (*Relational constituents*, 68 - 77), and 3.4.2. (*The status of the semantic component*, 84 - 88).

Having presented the criticism directed against Chomsky, Katz, and Postal, to mention just the most frequently recurring names in the discussion, Seuren postulates the requirements a grammar is expected to fulfil. Firstly, a grammar should be able to guarantee only such deep structures which can be developed into surface structures. Secondly, relational constituents should be given an adequate expression both in deep and surface structure. Thirdly, a grammar should provide a syntactically motivated apparatus for semantic description. Lastly, a selection of the nominal lexical items should be permitted independently of the structure of an already generated noun phrase.

In the next section of his book, chapter 4 (*Deep structure and operators*, 89 - 165) Seuren presents his model of deep structure description. In this model a new category in deep structure, the category of operators, is assumed. Thus, every deep structure contains two constituents: an operator and a nucleus. The category of operators contains quantifiers (QN) (analogously to operators in logic) which operate on nominal elements in the nucleus, and qualifiers (QL) which have a bearing on the semantic quality of their operand. Qualifiers, and especially qualifiers of tense, permit us to distinguish between nucleus, proposition, and sentence. This distinction is claimed to account for the differences between different types of sentences (negative, assertive, etc.), and between dependent and independent clauses. An analysis in terms of operators is assumed to define sentences syntactically and give a precise account of their semantic characteristics.

Every sentence has one sentence qualifier (SQL) and embedded clauses are introduced by a clause qualifier. The nucleus is purely relational: it contains lexical items in certain definable relational constituents such as Subject, Object, Verb, etc. The underlying structure of every sentence is read linearly from left to right by concatenating the interpretations of the operators and reading the nucleus. These readings constitute "texts" which are semantic descriptions of deep structure, and ideally they should lead to the establishment of a semantic descriptive language. Since deep structures permit a direct reading of their syntactic and semantic contents, it is postulated that a separate semantic component is not needed (see also Mc Cawley, J. D. 1968: 165 - 69).

Having briefly presented a sketch of Seuren's deep structure hypothesis let us now comment upon some disputable problems.

It seems that the status of sentence qualifiers (SQL) in Seuren's model is not at all clear. We are told (138) that their semantic interpretation is formulated as a phrase beginning with the first person singular "I" followed by a performative Verb in the present tense; assert, wish to know, request, etc., which are semantic interpretations of ASS(ertion), QU(estion) and IMP(erative), respectively. It may be argued that the semantic interpretation of sentences by means of these qualifiers may very often lead to ambiguity because the semantic contents of the lexical items: assert, request, etc., are ambiguous (for similar view see E. D. Cook 1970).

Closely connected with the above mentioned problem is the way Seuren arrives at his "interpretations" of deep structures. For instance, the deep structure:

ASS U Prob Past: Plato write this letter

is interpreted as: "I assert that it is likely that at a previous time Plato wrote this letter" (199), which may be transformed into "Probably Plato wrote this letter", whereas the deep structure:

ASS Pres Prob Past: Plato write this letter

is analysed as: "I assert that at this time it is likely for Plato at a previous time to have written this letter". This is said to be transformable into: "Plato is likely to have written this letter".

One can see that the universal tense qualifier U in the first example is deleted from the interpretation though Seuren insists on the importance of this constituent in the deep structure because it allows for the deep representation of the lexical item "probably". It is difficult to figure out how these semantic interpretations should be read from the deep structure if the order of constituents in deep structure is irrelevant:: in the first example the sequence — Past: Plato write — is interpreted as: "... at a previous time Plato wrote", in the second example the same sequence is interpreted as: "... for Plato at a previous time to have written...". Another problem is "interpretation" of the interpretation "... at this time it is likely for Plato at a previous time...".

According to Seuren (129) the deep structure of the sentence "John is taller than Mary" should be as follows:

E(degree): John Pres be tall to that degree

and Neg: Mary Pres be tall to that degree

which is interpreted as: "There is a degree such that John is tall to that degree and it is not true that Mary is tall to that degree'. We shall claim here that it is not impossible for the above deep structure to represent a sentence, e.g. "Mary is taller than John" because the expression "... it is not true that Mary is tall to that degree" does not exclude the possibility that Mary possesses the feature assigned to John by the existential quantifier E(degree) to a larger extent than John does.

As we have demonstrated above Seuren's interpretative language is subject to further interpretation, which may be due to the lack of precision in the formation of his semantic readings of deep structures, and to a complicated form of these readings, e.g. they have relative clauses in them.

One can also notice that the reading of the interpretations of operators and nucleus is complicated by the fact that these interpretations are disconnected from the model of description and the semantic interpretation of operators is inconsistent. On p. 111 E(1X) is interpreted as "... there is one X such that...", whereas on p. 125 E (arbX) is interpreted as "...there is at least one arbitrary X such that...", then A (arbX) is interpreted as "...for every arbitrary X such that..." (125), and A (X) is interpreted as "...for all X..." (111), though every and all are claimed to be different semantically (121).

In the last section, chapter 5 (*A specimen of description*, 165 - 225), some deep structure rules are presented with a sample of the lexicon. Verbs are selected before any other lexical item and their specification is done according to what selectional subclasses can be taken non-deviantly as their subject, object, indirect object, and prepositional object. In the case of copula-verbs pairs of classes of subjects and classes of predicate nominal adjectives have been proposed. Nouns are selected according to rules of selectional restriction, selectional instruction, or arbitrarily.

We do not intend here to deal with all the imprecisions and questionable formulations one finds in Seuren's book. It must be pointed out, however, that Seuren is aware of the shortcomings of his model of grammar, and they, what is more important, do not discredit the model proposed by him.

In summary it can be said that Seuren has contributed an interesting proposal concerning the concept of the base by attempting a formalized semantic description of deep structure. His hypothesis of deep structure is an important insight into the theory of grammar and it has enabled him to explain some important facts about the English

language (see his analyses of negative sentences (128 - 35), interrogatives (151 - 56), and the interpretation of "any", "some", and "every" (119 - 34)). His book may be recommended for advanced students in linguistics both for its theoretical assumptions and for the number of English sentences dealt with.

REFERENCES

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: M. I. T. Press.
Cook, E. D. 1970. "Deep structure and surface structure". *Lingua* 25. 101 - 114.
Mc Cawley, J. D. 1968. "The role of semantics in grammar". In: Emon Bach, and Robert T. Harms (eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 125 - 169.

The London dialect of the late fourteenth century. By Rodolfo Jacobson. Pp. 193. The Hague: Mouton Co., 1970.
Reviewed by Maria Lipińska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

The analysis of the fourteenth-century London dialect which constitutes the main part of this book is based on a corpus of 111 sentences of both literary and non-literary sources. The investigation is made within the framework of transformational theory as it was being developed at the time when the book was written (1966).

The objective of the first chapter (*Some aspects of the history of linguistics*) is to show the main theoretical issues of European and American thinking which had influence on the linguistic theory of TG. In the discussion of the views on language of such scholars as Humboldt, Wundt, Herbert, Boas and others, the emphasis is placed on their approach to diachrony because the connection between TG and diachronic studies is the main concern of the author.

The first part of the second chapter (*Transformational grammar and transformational analysis. The relative clause in transformational grammar*) is a summary of certain notions crucial for Chomsky's linguistic theory. Among others the terms *langue* and *competence* are discussed. For Jacobson these two notions are different in the following way: *langue* is a system of opposing members, *competence* is a system of rules that are hierarchically distributed.

In the second part of this chapter the author presents the place of noun modification in transformational analysis. The chart which summarizes this discussion includes ten years of transformational research in this field.

At the beginning of the third chapter (*A constituent grammar of Middle English*) Jacobson explains the procedure he used to arrive at a set of sentence patterns. The constituent structure rules which he gives for his corpus are basically the same as Fillmore's rules for modern English. Jacobson takes Fillmore's rules as the starting point for the rules he then gives for Middle English because he considers the late fourteenth century dialect of London to be structurally similar to modern English. He changes Fillmore's rules only occasionally for dialectal or theoretical reasons. For instance, Fillmore's F.3:

$$MV \longrightarrow \begin{Bmatrix} BE + Pred \\ Vb \end{Bmatrix}$$

is changed into:

$$MV \longrightarrow \begin{Bmatrix} be + (Pred) \\ Vb \end{Bmatrix}$$

in order to permit generating non-grammatical kernels which the author finds in the corpus.

At the end of the chapter the detailed derivations of certain kernels and the lexical rules for the corpus are given.

Chapter four (*The transformational level*) is the most elaborate and original part of the book. At first, the author gives an inventory of forty-one transformational rules and then explains the form and application of each of them separately. Some of his solutions will be discussed in this review.

In the *Conclusion* (chapter five) in summarizing his investigations Jacobson states: "This description served a two-fold purpose, first to make a proper analysis of Middle English corpus and second to demonstrate that the transformational format is adequate to handle historical data and appropriate to give a deep insight into the historical development of the language" (172). As far as the second point is concerned, TG has really proved to be appropriate in synchronic studies. Not much can be said, however, about the advantages of transformational theory for diachronic studies since very little has been done in the field of diachronic syntax so far. We agree with Jacobson's view that the basis for the diachronic study of any language are the synchronic studies of the successive stages of this language. We would not, however, agree to limit diachronic studies to the mere comparison of the grammatical systems in terms of e.g. simplification, or greater complexity as is proposed by the author. If the diachronic studies were to stop at this point no TG would be necessary since conclusions of this kind were drawn by all traditional grammarians dealing with the history of language many years ago. What we expect from TG in connection with diachronic studies is to show whether the base rules were the same for all stages of the development of a given language, and, if so, to show how the same deep structure of the sentence received different surface structures due to the changes occurring in performance, that is, in the components most closely connected with the physical act of speaking, i.e., in the phonological component mainly. In other words, we expect to see how within the same language all changes taking place occur in the transformational part of the grammar while the base structure rules remain the same.

The other problem we are going to discuss here is that of the "nongrammatical kernels" which according to Jacobson are the following: 0) *NP and 1) *NP+ +BE(+L)(+Ma)(+T). "They are nongrammatical and yet must be viewed as basic constructions of the language because — transformed or not — they are actually in the corpus" (72).

Pattern 0 refers to those cases in which a noun phrase is introduced at some place in the sentence and is left without any predication structure. Such NP is *coempcioun* in the example Jacobson takes from Chaucer:

Coempcioun, that is to seyn, comune achat or bying to gidere, that were established up-on the people by swiche a manere imposicioun as who-so bought a bussel corn, he most yeve the king a fifte part.

Although Jacobson does not deal any further with this pattern he is correct in raising the problem of ungrammatical strings of this type. Fragments like this should also be accounted for in any description of the language since they often occur, especially in the spoken texts. Since, however, they never occur in sentences uttered in isolation, they should be analysed as part of the grammatical and stylistic relations holding between elements in texts larger than one sentence. We agree with Jacobson that the description of his corpus must include this case. We would not, however, put it among other kernel patterns since whereas all other patterns refer to one sentence type each, this pattern does not underlie any kernel but part of some other sentence whose whole can be gathered

or guessed from a larger context. Thus, although the sentence including this NP is un-grammatical, this fragment itself is not.

The second pattern (pattern 1) also on closer examination appears not to be non-grammatical. Let us compare this pattern with Jacobson's grammatical pattern 4.

1. *NP+BE (+L) (+Ma) (+T)
4. NP+be (+L) (+Ma) (+T)

The examples corresponding to these patterns are:

ad 1. ...ther been three accions of Penitence

ad. 4. þo ben þer

These patterns seem to be identical, but the deep structures of the sentences exemplifying them show the difference:

Pattern:		NP	be	L	Ma	T
D.S. 1:		three accions REL	been			
D.S.		þo	ben	þer		

In 1 *ther* is introduced transformationally to avoid the unacceptable surface structure *three accions been*, whereas in 4 *þer* is the filler of the L-slot. The two patterns *NP+be* and *NP+be +Pred* are different not because the first is defective because it lacks the *Pred* but because in 1 *be* is a fully notional verb which demands the *Pred*. Hence Jacobson's constituent structure rule 3 (see above) is not correct because it actually allows the derivation of ungrammatical strings. *Pred* in this rule should be left obligatory. The "be" of kernel 1 is one of the cases into which Vb is further rewritten and in this case the transformation introducing *there* obligatorily applies. The point is that coping with the problem of surface structure modifications should be left to the transformational component and should not affect the constituent structure rules. Thus the change of Fillmore's rule was not necessary, and certainly not for dialectal reasons since sentences of this kind occur both in Middle and Modern English (compare: *There are three ways of doing it*).

Another example of Jacobson's own theoretical solutions is the *That-blocking transformation*. In Middle English texts the wh-pronoun when not used as interrogative is often followed by *that*. The contexts in which *that* occurs have not been established. Grammarians point to the freedom in using or omitting this *that*. The conclusion that this element occurs "...sometimes no doubt for the sake of metre, but by no means exclusively so, since groups with *that* are also found in the prose stories" (Kerkhof, 1966 : 157) seems to be the final word on this subject.

Jacobson tries to solve this problem by the introduction of the *That-blocking transformation* (T-4) on which he comments: "The TH-attached element occurring at the beginning of the string is followed optionally by *that* if the graphemic representation of the th-word does not determine whether it is a relative or interrogative. Accordingly *that* may occur after such pronouns as *which, when, where, how, why* if they function as relatives but not after *as* or *that*. *That* functions as a blocking element in such a way that, if it has been inserted after a wh-pronoun, the latter is no longer available for the question transformation, that is, its development has been blocked and it must function as a relative" (124). Otherwise, according to Jacobson, the th-attached element is changed into an interrogative pronoun (although no graphemic or phonemic change of the word may occur).

Regardless of whether the That-blocking transformation is necessary or not (we shall return to this problem) we want to point out some other similar uses of *that*. In sentences 1 and 2 *that* does not follow a relative pronoun but a complementizer (we use here Rosenbaum's term) introducing the subordinate clause.

1. Where that he be, I kan nat soothly seyn. (C. T. I-3670)
2. And eek ye knowen wel how that a jay kan clepen "watte"
   as wel as kan the Pope. (C. T. I-642)

Whether *that* really has a blocking function in these cases and those quoted by Jacobson is doubtful. If it were so, it would occur in all instances in which the wh-pronouns are not interrogatives (otherwise all sentences without *that* should be treated as ambiguous). Also, as Jacobson himself points out, there are other "decoding devices" which help us to distinguish between the interrogative and other functions of these pronouns. These devices are: word order, intonation (of no use in historical texts) and context. Context is most important here, but not in Jacobson's sense of the surface structure environment of the wh-pronouns but understood as the deep structure restrictions allowing the introduction of either the relative or interrogative pronouns or of a complementizer.

Comparing the deep structures of sentences 3, 4, and 5 we shall see that no further blocking is necessary because these structures uniquely determine the transformations which can apply to them: for 3 only the question transformation can apply, for 4 the insertion of a relative clause and for 5 — the verb phrase complementation.

wh-pronoun as interrogative:

3. What, who artow?... (C. T. I-5766)

wh-pronoun as relative:

4. Syklay the goode man, whose that the place is. (C. T. III-1768)

wh-pronoun as complementizer:

5. Let se now who shal telle the firste tale. (C. T. I-831)

The corresponding deep structures are:

ad 3: $Q+NP_1+V+Pro-NP_2$

ad 4: $NP_1+Rel+VP_1$
  $Rel=S$ $S=NP_2+VP_2$ $NP_1=NP_2$

ad 5: NP_1+V_c+C
  $C=S$ in which a Pro-form occurs e. g. for this sentence
  $S=Pro-NP_2+V+NP_3$

V_c — verb demanding a sentential complement
C — a verb phrase complement

According to Jacobson a sentence which is the potential question or the filler of the *Rel* slot is transformed before it is (or is not in the case of questions) inserted into the matrix as *Rel*; hence, in his treatment there is at a certain point in derivation an option, and a given element can be further developed as either interrogative or relative. According to our view the insertion is first, and only then can any transformations changing the inserted kernel apply.

In his attempt to make the description of the corpus as exhaustive and complete as possible the author also adds a series of transformations responsible for the surface structure word order. These transformations are divided into two types: the Word Order Shift rules which deal with the stylistic reordering of elements caused by focus or emphasis and the Word Order Reversal rules which are: "...specific instructions to reverse, for some controllable reason, the arrangement of the contiguous elements" (p. 150). As far as the first type of rules is concerned they may be treated as a formalized description of the actual corpus. They cannot be treated as representative of the whole dialect and their dependence on "major" and "minor" focus makes them quite independent of the linguistic factors.

Of much greater significance are the *Word Order Reversal* rules which show some stylistic tendencies of the dialect under discussion which are dependent on the linguistic environment of the elements which are reversed. A good example of such a stylistic rule is T-34, the Quoter Clause Insertion transformation:

$$\underset{1}{\underline{NP,}} \; \underset{2}{\underline{quod,}} \; \underset{3}{\underline{A,}} \; \underset{4}{\underline{B,}} \; \dots \Rightarrow \underset{3}{\underline{A,}} \; \underset{2}{\underline{quod,}} \; \underset{1}{\underline{NP,}} \; \underset{4}{\underline{B,}} \; \dots$$

The general criticism of Jacobson's work is that the analysis of the material is too often interrupted with methodological remarks and explanations of the notions which are well known to the reader of books on transformational grammar. This is due partially to the fact that this book was written a few years ago when some of the things discussed by the author were not so familiar to linguistics as they are now.

In spite of these drawbacks the book deserves attention for the following reasons:

1. The author attempts to give a complete grammar of the corpus (in other transformational works of this period only certain aspects of the syntax are concentrated upon or theoretical issues discussed),
2. The book is a good example of the application of TG to historical material.

A theoretical English grammar; syntax. By N. F. Irtenyeva, O. M. Barsova, M. Y. Blokh, A. P. Shapkin. Pp. 144. Moscow: Higher School Publishing House, 1969. Reviewed by Janina Ozga, The Jagiellonian University of Cracow

This short study bears a very promising title but it is sufficient to read the *Preface* (3 - 4) to see that the reader's expectations as to its contents will be only partially answered. The authors were evidently not interested in analysing English syntax as such, but rather in presenting some of its problems within a survey of main linguistic trends, schools, and theories, from those of Ancient India and Greece to those of the early sixties of the present century. The choice of this particular approach, which has consequently limited the scope of the subject proper, appears to have been dictated by pedagogical considerations: by the level, interests, and needs of those to whom the book is addressed, i. e. undergraduate students of Russian Teacher Training Institutes and of philological departments (not necessarily English) of universities.

The book is primarily meant to 1. give the students a brief outline of the history of linguistic study before the twentieth century (Chaps. 1, 2), 2. give them a fairly detailed acquaintance with the basic concepts and techniques of modern linguistic theories, particularly with the origin and development of transformational grammar (TG) in the USA (Chaps. 3, 6), and 3. illustrate the application of TG to the description of natural languages on the example of Modern English (Chaps. 7, 8, 9) and it is in this sense that the book, or part of it, may be called a theoretical grammar of English.

Each of the nine chapters is followed by a "Check Yourself Test" and after six (Chaps. 3, 5–9) there are 'Problems': exercises set to illustrate the principles introduced in the text. As most of the examples given are English, the title of the book is justified in yet another sense.

The last chapter, 10, concludes the discussion with a few remarks concerning a problem of vital importance to future teachers — the prospects of the application of TG to foreign language teaching.

There are a few observations worth mentioning in connection with the survey of linguistic theories. Firstly, it is a pity that no attempt is made to supply systematized bibliographical information; there is no bibliography and no index at the end, authors and titles are mentioned only in the text or in footnotes. Secondly, there is a certain inconsistency in the presentation of particular periods. I do not mean here the disproportion in space, for modern linguistics is naturally given more consideration. The outline of the pre-Saussurian period is deliberately brief and general. But except for the occasional spelling mistakes (Thrux for Thrax, de-Saussure for de Saussure, Dietz for Diez, etc.) it is a reliable and compact account. On the other hand, clarity of presentation, achieved at this stage, is frequently obscured in the subsequent chapters, as if the authors have forgotten all of a sudden that their book is addressed to readers only residually acquainted with the wealth of sophisticated concepts and terms of contemporary linguistics. It is true that summarizing adequately yet simply the works of Jakobson, Bloomfield, Harris, Fries et al. is a hard task. Still lumping together the more important quotations or their paraphrases is hardly a way out (30, 51 ff, 78). The illustrative examples provided (also in Chapters 7–9) are sometimes well above the level of the students; e.g. Bloomfield's 'phonetic modification' (44) is exemplified by *do — don't*, but the principle of the 'modification' is not elucidated; infinitival nominals are said to occur in NP positions after A (adj.) in sentences like *It is harmful for a man to drink* (108), but the basic structure *NP is A* is not mentioned, the source sentence being, for all purposes, **It is harmful NP*. Some examples and statements are obviously incorrect, e. g.?! *Do don't lets say it* (89) is interpreted as the output of T-W (special question) and T-A (affirmative); AUX is rewritten as tense (M) (have-en) (be-ing) $\frac{V}{BE}$ (80), with a footnote explaining that 'parentheses [ ] mean "optionally chosen items". Braces ( )?! mean "obligatory alternative replacement".'; an IC analysis is carried out as follows:

IV *The* || *old* ||| *man* | *went* || *to* ||| *his son'* | *s* |||| *house.*
V *The* || *old* ||| *man* | *went* || *to* ||| *his son'* |||| *s* ||||| *house.*

In addition, there are cases of 1. substituting established terms by others, less familiar (e.g. using 'morpheme' for Fries' 'formal marker' (58), using the term 'descriptive linguistics' throughout the study, while 'structural linguistics' is mentioned only once, in a quotation from Harris, on p. 53), 2. confusing the notations used by various authors: now there is Harris' *v*, now Chomsky's *aux* (cf. 76, 80), 3. misquoting (53), and referring readers to wrong pages (67, footnote). There are occasional misprints (70, 77) and factual mistakes (e.g. Baudouin de Courtenay and Kruszewski are referred to as 'Russian linguists' on p. 42; the year of Hjelmslev's death is given as 1959 cf. correct 1965).

It remains to give a brief account of the transformations of English introduced in the study. Three chapters, 7–9, analyse the following types of T-rules respectively: S↔S, S↔NP, $S_1 + S_2$↔SSS and $S_1 + S_2$↔S_3 (Harris' approach is adopted). For a book published in 1969 the approach and terminology are considerably out of date, as the latest American studies referred to were published in 1964 (though the Russian sources go as far as 1967). But even within this limited framework many basic concepts and terms of TG have not been so much as mentioned (E.g. string, generative, lexicon, features, phrase structure, phrase marker, etc.). The transformations of the first model (S↔S) are largely those of Chomsky's *Syntactic structures*, though the model itself and the list of the kernel sentences is taken from Harris (hence the inconsistency of notation). Two things are characteristic of the nominalizing transformations presented: 1. that they operate on single source-sentences (cf. R. B. Lees' approach), and 2. that the sentences on which they operate are subdivided according to the type of their VP (with HAVE, BE, Vt, Vi). However, the most interesting and original part of this largely non-formalized grammar

is the analysis of the generation of sentence-sequences (subdivided into compound and semi-compound on one hand, and complex and semi-complex on the other). The approach is somewhat similar to that of Jacobs and Rosenbaum (*English transformational grammar*, 1968).

In view of these criticisms, the value of the study reviewed may seem doubtful. I believe, however, that at least parts of it may, with proper supervision and in classroom conditions, be used to advantage by students of language departments, in other countries as well.

Descriptive syntax of Old English Charters. By Charles Carlton. Pp. 200. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.
Reviewed by Teresa Retelewska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Charles Carlton wrote his book with the purpose of using the technique of modern descriptive linguistics in a syntactic analysis of the Old English Charters "in order to ascertain the facts of the word order and structure of sentences (...) and the use of syntactic signals (...) in the individual words as they pertain to structural meaning in the Charters" (18).

The book under review consists of nine chapters supplemented by a bibliography and an index.

In the introductory chapter, the author having disposed of many earlier works on Old English focuses his attention on the problems connected with the selection of the material for analysis, on Latin influences and on dialectal differences in the texts studied etc. The introductory exposition also contains a discussion of the method applied in the investigation. The author offers a detailed presentation of the techniques of C. C. Fries and the adaptation of these to the author's own needs. In fact, the whole work is a systematic fulfilment of the basic methodological assumption to approach the analysis from the whole to the part, beginning with whole documents and ending with "formal and positional signals".

Chapter One deals with the basic syntactic units in O. E. The author discusses the procedure of isolating sentences in the corpus, which being taken from the original manuscripts lack conventional punctuation. The only means then, to recognize units of structure is to rely on structural criteria. The presentation of sentence isolating procedures is richly illustrated by the material from the corpus and statistical accounts of the ratio of occurrence are given.

Chapter Two is an attempt to determine the elements of the O. E. sentence. The author's conclusion is that the O. E. sentence is composed of "mandatory basic elements" such as subject and "verb", and optional elements such as direct and indirect objects of the verb. It is already at this point that there arise some objections as to the modern techniques and "formal" criteria employed by the author. C. Carlton takes great pains to define such notions as direct object, by means of some elaborate negative statements, only to conclude by stating that "the direct object is the receiver of the physical action performed or mental action held by the subject of the transitive verb" (44).

Chapter Three deals with secondary elements in the O. E. sentence. Having given a general introduction to the structure of modification, the author considers in detail the most common modifiers in O. E. Here he lists all the instances of possible head words and their modifiers. The exposition is systematic, yet by mixing together both relevant

and irrelevant information it loses rather than gains in precision. The chapter contains attempts at defining the order of elements within various structures of modification as well as some quasi definitions which are neither precise nor general. And thus, for example, it is said that a prepositional phrase as a modifier denotes "the person or institution (sometimes the location of a church or a monastery) to whom or to which something is given, granted or said, brought or done" (57).

Chapter Four is concerned with the problem of negation in O. E. The interpretation of the facts encountered in the data is scarce and most of the chapter is taken up by illustrative material quoted extensively under such headings as: pronouns, negatives, conjunctions, etc. The phenomenon of multiple negation, although not completely disregarded is given only marginal attention and the discussion is limited to double negation only.

Chapter Six contains the discussion of the syntactic signals pertinent to nominal, pronominal, and adjectival categories, where each of these is treated separately though not very exhaustively. With adjectives, for example, it is only briefly remarked that there existed three genders in O. E. but among the large number of adjectival inflection only three were distinctive, that is ambiguous outside the context. It seems that such a treatment is at least superficial if not false, as the inflectional signal is not the only means to disambiguate the item, and that word order, although not of primary importance, must be taken into account.

In the section on number in O. E. one encounters statements which are obvious to layman, let alone to readers well initiated into linguistic studies. "The third person refers to the individual thing or people or things written or discussed" (77).

It is in this chapter that it becomes obvious at what cost Fries' techniques can be applied to a study of an inflected language with a relatively free word order. Carlton's treatment of case, for example, reminds that of the so much criticized "traditional authors", with the difference that perhaps each statement is abundantly illustrated. Still it does not diminish the charge against the use of semantic criteria in dealing with the category of case. The lack of clarity of this chapter is even more increased by the fact that such categories as case, gender, number are discussed in separation as if in O.E. they were not signalled simultaneously by the same inflection.

More or less the same objection could be raised against Chapter Seven in which syntactic signals of O. E. verbs are discussed.

Chapter Eight is the most extensive in the study. To prove the thesis that word order operated in O. E. as a secondary or supplementary syntactic signal the author lists all possible arrangements of elements within the O. E. sentence and gives numerous statistical accounts of these.

The final conclusion, as stated above, could have been quite convincing in the light of these indisputable arguments if it was not for the authors' serious attempts in the previous chapters to question the significance of "ambiguous inflection" as a structural signal.

The book under review was meant to add more to our understanding of O. E. syntax, still incomplete and vague. At the outset the author has convincingly pointed out the inadequacies and superficiality of studies in O. E. syntax published so far. One would expect that having applied "modern descriptive techniques" the author would give a more penetrating insight into the intricacies of the subject. The reader however, is confronted with techniques propagated by C. C. Fries which although revolutionary, as they might be in his days, strike us as rather outdated for a study which is claimed modern. Still, the author must be given due credit for giving the corpus and subject a detailed and extensive treatment. The wealth of detail provided by the author is really enormous

though in places the abundance of detail obscures the problem discussed. In this case, the utmost concern for the minute peculiarities of the corpus is a fault rather than a merit and does not allow the facts about the O. E. language to be stated in a more general and condensed form. The most serious objection, however, is that linguistic phenomena are treated in a superficial way. Apparent surface similarities of the structure serve as bases for description and conclusions. In general, the very methodological background underlying the study does not permit any statement which would go beyond mere observation and recording of facts. The latter are merely described but are not given any relevant and sufficient explanation.

In recent years an increasing number of strictly synchronic descriptive grammars of O. E. have been published. It cannot be denied that such are urgently needed but one cannot help wondering what such studies as Carlton's contribute to our general linguistic knowledge and to the understanding of the problems of historical linguistics, apart from restating and reformulating previous observations. Carlton's study may be one more piece of evidence that Fries' frames are imprecise and inadequate tools in coping with the language which displays comparative freedom of word order and uses inflections as a syntactic signal.

Syntax and semantics of the English verb phrase. By Michael Grady. Pp. 84. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.
Reviewed by Anna Morel, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

The book was presented as a Ph. D. dissertation in linguistics at Stanford University. It is apparent from the title that an analysis of the English verb phrase is the author's main interest, the analysis dealing with both syntactic and semantic aspects.

Although admitting close interrelations between semantics, syntax, and morphology Grady advocates their separation for the analysis of specific problems.

The author reviews the MIT model of language in which the syntactic component, consisting of a lexicon and projection rules, is basic. In other words, the syntactic structures are realized semantically and phonologically. In this work, however, the separateness of the semantic and syntactic systems, both highly structured, is assumed. Their intersection is marked by the speech-form. The author elaborates this intersection in the form of a detailed descriptive grammatical-semantic grid built on x, y axes (cf. ch. 10). The x axis stands for semantic ordering, the y axis — for grammatical classification. Grady considers this form of presentation best for demonstrating "the definitely structured semantics of the verb phrase" (12). Grammatical—semantic equivalences are set up in chapter 11. Chapter 12 presents equivalences in the opposite direction, i.e., semantic—grammatical.

In chapters 2 to 6 an analysis of the grammar of the verb phrase presents the VP as resulting from a series of right-branching embeddings.

The concepts of external and internal grammar are explained in the *Introduction*. External grammar refers to the function of a morpheme or construction within the syntax of a structure it enters. Internal grammar refers to the underlying function of a morpheme or construction within the form itself. In the example *I may have been talking* the external function of *have been talking₁* is nominal—object in reference to *may*, the verb. Yet the phrase itself is derived from *I have been talking* (*have been talking₂*), where a verb-

object relation occurs between *have*, the verb, and *been talking*. The internal grammar of *have been talking₁* is identical with that of the pre-nominalized *have been talking₂*.

In *Chapter 2*, the author develops his assumption that the infinitive is not a verb externally, hence the modals are verbs. He presents a chart of marked or unmarked infinitives, depending on which modal they take. The arguments for the statement that in the external function infinitives are nominals are developed in this chapter. Sequences of *modal + infinitive* cannot be looked upon as sequences of *auxiliary + MV* but as sequences of $V + N_\infty$.

Consistently and in the same way Grady analyses *I am dancing* as $NP + Aux + Be + N_{ing}$: *-ing* forms are nominals (meta-verbal nouns), *be* is a verb. To trace the author's argument and comment the reader should refer to *Chapter 3*.

Analogically to *-ing* forms and infinitives, *-en* forms are considered nominal in external function hence the sequence $NP + Aux + have + N_{en}$ for the 'perfects' and $NP + Aux + Be + N_{en}$ for the passives. The author considers the relationship between a subject and N_∞, N_{ing}, N_{en}, closer than the relationship between *Aux* and *MV*. He concludes that in external function only tense-bearing forms are verbal whereas infinitives and participles are only objects or complements to these forms. Logically enough, modals *be* and *have* are considered 'true verbs'. These assumptions are illustrated by labelled bracketing. Knowledge of the history of a language is regarded as an aid in analysing it synchronically.

In *Chapter 5* the derivation of absolute forms such as *Having achieved the victory, John smiled* and *The race being won, John smiled* is presented.

Summarizing the first part of the book in *Chapter 6* Grady draws conclusions concerning English verb phrase grammar presenting PS-rules as well as T-rules operating on the VP.

Chapters 7 - 14 deal with the verb phrase semantics. Semantically the verb phrase is defined as "a notional unity perceived as such by a native speaker, expressed through a grammatical construction containing a tense-bearing verb, followed by an N_∞, N_{ing}, $\bar{N}$, N_{en}, Adj, or Adv; or by a combination of these" (41). Semantic verb phrases are classified according to the categories of semantic notionality expressed and according to their grammatical form. The categories are given the term of orders (cf. chapter 8).

In section 7.2 the author remarks on the necessity of setting up semantic equivalences for translation purposes. At this point he emphasizes again the independence but also the interrelation of grammar and semantics setting forth his hypothesis for the process of translation. Grammatical categories are translated into semantic categories which are matched with the semantic component of the target language. The target language semantic categories automatically 'select' the proper grammatical forms.

Phrase $GL_1 \Leftrightarrow$ Phrase $SL_1 \Leftrightarrow$ Phrase $SL_2 \Leftrightarrow$ Phrase GL_2 (44)
Speculating on the concept of a Universal Semantics ("a collection of all semantic categories in all human languages", 44) this formula takes on a more general shape:

Phrase $GL_1 \Leftrightarrow$ Phrase $SL_1 \Leftrightarrow {}_xS^u \Leftrightarrow$ Phrase $SL_2 \Leftrightarrow$ Phrase GL_2,
where ${}_xS^u$ stands for the category of the Universal Semantic system and is named the Universal Semantic Translator Arc.

In *Chapter 13* the reader becomes acquainted with derivational rules for semantic verb phrases.

In *Chapter 14* Grady proposes the following semantic transforms:

14.1 Tsem Emphasis
   Order ⇒ emphatic + Order

14.2 Tsem Degree
   Order ⇒ degree + Order

14.3 Tsem Degree-Emphasis

Order $\Rightarrow$ degree $+$ emphasis $+$ Order (74),

and generalizes transforms of context:

Tsem^c [[X-VP^a] $\Rightarrow$ [Y-VP^a]]/a   (75).

However original and provocative Grady tries to be in rejecting some concepts of the MIT linguistic school the reader will soon discover that Katz and Postal have influenced a discernible amount of what the author has to say.

The work should not prove too difficult for any reader familiar with recent trends in linguistics. It should be praised for its clarity though some may find a number of apparent oversimplifications.

The terminological index of terms used and introduced by the author is of help to the reader. The selected bibliography directs him to sources basic for understanding the problems discussed in the book.

Leistungsmessung im Sprachunterricht. Zweite Internationale Expertenkonferenz über Testmethoden im Fremdsprachenunterricht der Erwachsenenbildung. (*Language Testing*. Second International Conference of Experts on Foreign Language Testing in Adult Education). By H. Schrand. Pp. 155. Marburg/Lahn: Informationszentrum für Fremdsprachenforschung, 1969.

Reviewed by Władysław Kaniuka, University of Łódź.

It is a collection of papers which were read by experts on language testing at the conference in Sonnenberg in April 1969.

First I will call in succession the authors and the titles of their papers. There are: Reinhold Freudenstein (Informationszentrum für Fremdsprachenforschung, Marburg): Testen im Sprachunterricht — Notwendigkeiten und Gefahren (8 - 26); Alan Davies (University of Edinburgh): Language Testing (27 - 51); John A. Upshur (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor): Measurement of oral communication (53 - 80); Rebecca M. Valette (Boston College, Boston): Criterion-referenced testing (81 - 102); Roy H. Kingsbury (European Language and Educational Centres, Bournemouth): Oral English testing (103 - 107); Alan Davies (University of Edinburgh): Error analysis (109 - 123); Heinrich Schrand (Informationszentrum für Fremdsprachenforschung, Marburg): Zur Kontrolle und Bewertung mündlicher Leistungen in der Zertifikatsprüfung (125 - 129); Terence Creed (Royal Society of Arts, London): Picture composition and oral-response tests (131 - 148); Robert Nowacek (Deutscher Volkshochschul-Verband, Frankfurt): Zur Entwicklung einer höheren Stufe des Volkshochschul-Sprachzertifikats für den Bereich Wirtschaft und Industrie (149 - 155).

R. Freudenstein concentrates on problems which are connected with foreign language testing in West Germany. He considers that a test is a good form of an evaluation of language mastery. Then he continues to say that tests are objective and contributive to the democratization of language teaching in schools. The author criticizes the German traditionalism as regards language testing and he thinks with Karlheinz Ingenkamp that West Germany is an underdeveloped country in the field of *educational measurement*. At the same time the author sets limits concerning application of tests. In his opinion a test plays merely a complementary role in the examination methods that are currently in use. In this place we would like to mention that the Information Centre for Foreign

Languages Research in Marburg which was represented at the conference by R. Freudenstein published the "Thesaurus" in August 1969 (pp. 46). It includes all basic terms of didactics, pedagogy, linguistics and of testing, of course, in so far as the terms are important for modern languages teaching. This thesaurus comes in useful for teachers and experts on testing.

A. Davies sees language tests as tools of research in experimental work in education. Language teaching with the help of teaching machines or of programmed textbooks requires a test. Tests are helpful in the step-by-step orientation of the process of learning in the language laboratory. According to the author the step-by-step procedure may involve a reinforcement by the representation of correct responses. Here is what he himself has to say: "The point of tests with a progress aim is still to compare pupils not with one another but with an already determined standard (28)". Then it is suggested that testing is not an end in itself; its essential aim is to provide meaningful information for the teacher's work. The author separates the language from other activities and calls it a special ability. In the paper the writer discusses also some of the uses of language tests, for example, *Achievement*, *Proficiency*, *Aptitude* and *Diagnostic*. He proposes to test reading and speaking, comprehension and writing and on the other hand dictation, précis and essay writing. The author points out that the traditional examination included 80% of reading/writing, and the new type of an examination consists of 80% of speaking/ /listening.

J. A. Upshur postulates a model and a technique for testing. His is a model of communication testing in general and of oral production testing in particular. The writer points out that the examiner applies different pictures during testing. This model can be used only at the elementary stage of language teaching.

R. M. Valette considers a model for the construction of criterion-referenced tests. For the author a criterion-referenced test consists of questions or items whose function is to measure the degree to which student has mastered a set of specific objectives. For example, he takes the learning of a list of words or the memorization of a dialogue as a criterion. The criterion-referenced test has received wide acceptance in the United States. We must stress the fact that one of the most valuable papers read at the conference was that by R. M. Valette.

A. Davies analyses questions which are connected with a test, an error and with an error analysis. In his second paper of importance is his statement to the effect that a test is not a questionnaire.

H. Schrand in connection with comprehension distinguishes four different stages which can be applied in the examination for an Adult Education Certificate in Modern Languages. In the examination of this kind speaking skills are especially important.

T. Creed speaks about the visual material which is necessary for the oral test. At Stage I he does not recommend the use of pictures. In his paper we read: "The psychology of perception has demonstrated that graphic representations can mean different things not only to different nationalities but also to different groups and individuals within a common cultural environment (135)". At an elementary stage he suggests testing *comprehension*, *communication*, *stress*, *pronunciation* and *fluency*.

R. Nowacek discusses a problem connected with the *Higher Certificate*. The German industry expects that its young leading cadre should use foreign languages in the field of economy and technics. German experts on teaching and testing are at the moment engaged in working out the Higher Certificate for English and French. In the next five years this certificate should be applied for Russian and also German as a foreign language.

This inspiring collection of papers is addressed to foreign language teachers and hundreds of valuable suggestions and remarks make it an important testing tool for all those who are directly involved or interested in language teaching and testing.

Coordination of relative clauses in sixteenth century English. By Mats Rydèn. Pp. 81. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1970.
Reviewed by Piotr Kakietek, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

The book under discussion is a sequel to the author's thesis on *Relative constructions in early sixteenth century English, with special reference to Sir Thomas Elyot* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Anglistica Upsaliensa 3. Uppsala 1966). The principal aims of the book are as follows: a. to establish the conjoinability of relative clauses with other structural units, b. to analyse the systemic use of coordinate relative markers, and c. to shed some light on the relation of relative clauses to other structures of modification pre- or postnominal, and on the relation of relative connectives to other pronominal clause-markers, especially personal pronouns (12 - 13, 72 - 73).

The analysis presented here focuses on a fairly wide range of material representing the works of Sir Thomas Elyot as well as the following texts: 1. Fitzherbert: *The book of husbandry* (1534); 2. Awdeley: *The fraternitye of vacabondes* (1560); 3. Harman: *A caueat or warening, for commen cursetores vulgarely called vagabones* (1567); 4. Writhesley: *A chronicle of England during the reigns of the Tudors from A. D. 1485 to 1559*; 5. *Chronicle of the grey friars of London*; 6. *The chronicle of Calais*; 7. Thomas More: *The history of king Richard the thirde* (c. 1513).

The book falls into: Preface, Introduction, three Chapters, Conclusion, Bibliography, and a list of Abbreviations.

In the Introduction the author deals with problems of a methodological nature and specifies the chief objectives of the present investigation as well as the method underlying it.

Chapter One is concerned with syndetic coordination (i.e., constructions with explicit coordinator). The author makes a distinction between symmetrical and asymmetrical coordination. Another distinction is made between two-clause and multiple clause coordination.

Chapter Two concentrates on asyndetic coordination, that is, on sequences with zero coordinator (asyndeton). The asyndetic combinations have been found to include symmetrical and asymmetrical two-clause combinations, on the one hand, and symmetrical and asymmetrical multiple clause combinations, on the other.

Chapter Three is devoted to the discussion of syndetic/asyndetic blends, that is, combinations of syndetic and asyndetic patterns.

What the reader is offered here is a work that is wholly concerned with an analysis of purely surface relations without any regard to the more significant and immediately unobservable facts involved in the coordination of relative clauses. The fact that the author limits himself to the description of surface phenomena only is a direct consequence of his formulation of the primary task of diachronic linguistics: "... diachronic investigations must concentrate on the mapping of constructions..., whereas the analysis of the creative aspect of language is best applied to testable material" (12). It is clear that, thus defined, the task of diachronic investigations is definitely too modest. The present

book is, in fact, no more than a well-organized classification of the material compiled by the author which should subsequently be subjected to synthetic analysis. The so-called formulaic devices Rydèn introduces into his formal apparatus convey nothing that would go beyond what is immediately apparent. They are simply convenient descriptive devices used to make the presentation of the material more readable. For example, the formula:
$$CS \rightarrow AC [+R] + RC + Co [+R] + RC$$ (where CS = clause sequence, AC = antecedent clause, R = relative pronoun, RC = relative clause, Co = coordinator, e.g., and, but, or, etc.) serves to indicate one of the two subtypes the author distinguishes within the symmetrical syndetic two-clause pattern.

Rydèn argues that because the diachronic linguist has no access to the native speaker's linguistic intuition he will never be able to satisfactorily handle problems such as degrees of grammaticalness, types of ambiguity, synonymy, and perhaps a few others. On the basis of this observation the author draws the conclusion to the effect that it is most advisable to leave these to the attention of the descriptive linguist who is in the position to check the validity of his hypotheses by appealing to the native speaker's linguistic judgement.

It can be easily seen that the author's position is that of the extremist. In actual fact, the difficulties the writer is inclined to interpret as being typical of the diachronic linguist's situation only appear to be also valid in the case of the descriptive linguist. It may be noted that although a great deal has by now been written on the subject of grammaticality and acceptability with reference to living languages, no satisfactory and definitive solution has yet been proposed. Of course, all this should not lead us to the rather pessimistic conclusion that the above-enumerated phenomena cannot be, at least tentatively, made explicit.

Rydèn's scepticism concerning the possibilities of diachronic investigations could perhaps be explained by what we find in the following statement by E. Closs: "But this does not mean that all investigations of language not native to the linguist must de facto be abandoned, any more than any theory of history, whether cultural or geological, must be rejected because we cannot recapture all and only the characteristics of previous eras. We might quite legitimately put forward a theory of a dead language in terms of a grammar which fulfils the requirements of descriptive adequacy and explanatory power" (1969: 396 - 97).

So far, a number of attempts have been made to apply the transformational grammar to the description of historical material. Some of them have proved very successful. Suffice it to mention here just a few: 1. Closs, E. "Diachronic syntax and generative grammar" (*Language 41*, 1965: 396 - 415); 2. Closs, E. *A grammar of Alfred's Orosius* (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation); 3. Matsuda, T. A. *A transformational analysis of the Old English Pastoral Care* (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation); 4. Nagucka, R. *The syntactic component of Chaucer's Astrolabe* (Kraków 1968). These and other works not mentioned here have clearly demonstrated that, contrary to what Rydèn insists upon, problems like those specified above as well as the creative aspect of language can be, with greater or less success, handled by the historical grammarian. What is more, the results obtained in some of them have revealed many interesting facts about the general nature of language. It appears, for instance, that there are processes in language operating without any time limitation and thus they are universal features of language.

Before we conclude, a few minor points should be made. In the Introduction we come across the term 'descriptive adequacy' which the writer uses in connection with discussing the data collection stage (11). Although the term is not explicitly described, it is obvious that it is employed by the writer in a way different from that in which it is generally applied in transformational theory. As is well known, the transformational interpretation

of the term assumes the existence of deep structure, and Rydén's analysis omits this aspect of language altogether.

It is rather unfortunate that the author does not bother to inform the reader as to the precise value of the terms 'popular style', 'colloquial style', and 'loose style' since these sometimes seem to be interchangeable.

Our final point concerns the use of footnotes (at least some of them). The present reviewer does not see any point in providing footnotes that refer the reader to publications that are generally unavailable, which seems to be the case, for instance, with the writer's thesis on *Relative constructions in early sixteenth century English*.

In view of what has been said above, the present book can hardly be regarded as a real achievement in the field of diachronic syntax and therefore recommending it to the reader would prove inconsistency and insincerity on the part of the reviewer.

REFERENCES

Closs, E. 1969. "Diachronic syntax and generative grammar". *Modern Studies in English*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 395 - 408.

Nagucka, R. 1968. *The syntactic component of Chaucer's Astrolabe*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED FOR REVIEW

Gerbert, M. 1970. *Besonderheiten der Syntax in der technischen Fachsprache des Englischen*. Halle (Saale): VEB Max Niemeyer Verlag. Pp. 148.

Greenbaum, S. 1970. *Verb-intensifier collocations in English*. The Hague: Mouton. Pp.96.