David Reibel and Sanford Schane (eds.):

*Modern Studies in English: Readings in Transformational Grammar*


Thirteen years have passed since that commemorative booklet by Chomsky was published in 1957. The progress of linguistic investigations during this period, obviously accelerated by the appearance of the theory of generative-transformational grammar, has been considerable. A number of important facts were brought to light which had hitherto been disregarded, and, more significantly, a number of insights were made into the nature of particular languages and human language in general. The theory of generative-transformational grammar has not only survived the challenge by other theories but remains still overwhelmingly dominant over them.

The anthology under review is a collection of twenty-nine papers from the viewpoint
of generative-transformational grammar, dealing with various aspects of English grammar. Each one of them embodies contributions to the general linguistic theory as well.

It seems to me that the success of the generative-transformational school has been chiefly due to its basic attitude toward scientific investigation, namely that linguistics is an empirical science. This means that, firstly, linguistics as a science is primarily concerned with explanation and not with mere collection or classification of data; and secondly, the hypotheses put forth in the course of investigation must be tested against empirical evidence. In fact, these are the requirements on any empirical science whatsoever.

The selection of papers in this anthology was apparently made in such a way that the reader might easily see how linguists have been investigating, and continue to investigate language in terms of theory construction, how older theories or hypotheses have been superseded by new ones on the basis of empirical evidence, etc.

Consider, by way of example, the section dealing with the grammatical process of pronominalization. It contains the following four papers:

Ronald W. Langacker (1966) 'On Pronominalization and the Chain of Command'.
Paul M. Postal (1966) 'On So-Called "Pronouns" in English'.

The papers are ordered essentially in chronological fashion. This arrangement is quite felicitous because later works are usually based on the achievements of earlier works. In the section under consideration, Lees and Klima present an initial attempt to describe certain aspects of English pronominalization within the generative-transformational framework. Langacker then picks up one of the problems which rose out of the Lees-Klima treatment of pronominalization, namely, that of specifying the conditions under which the process of pronominalization operates. Ross confronts the problem of the constraints on pronominalization from a somewhat different viewpoint. Finally, Postal discusses in some detail the relationships between pronominalization and other anaphoric processes.

Careful readers may easily recognize that in these papers, the accounts proposed for particular grammatical phenomena interact in a fundamental way with the general linguistic theory. Langacker for instance proposes that constraints on pronominalization be stated in terms of what he calls 'primacy relations', namely, the relations of 'precedes' and 'command', and then advances his arguments to show that primacy relations are independently motivated notions and hence should be incorporated in the general linguistic theory. Ross points out that the notion of 'transformational cycle', motivated independently from pronominalization processes, plays a crucial role in accounting for a
set of seemingly paradoxical examples, which in turn demonstrates the validity of the notion of 'transformational cycle' itself.

So far I have been trying to demonstrate the pedagogical usefulness of the anthology under review: it can easily serve as a good textbook both for courses in linguistics and for courses on English structure. However, it is no less useful to advanced investigators, since every paper in this book is, so to speak, a 'must' for anyone who has a first-hand concern with linguistic investigation.

It must be noted, however, that this book does not cover the most recent advances in transformational studies. As some readers may know, the generative-transformational school is now splitting rather sharply into two separate schools, i.e. those of the 'lexicalists' and of the 'transformationalists'. The lexicalist-transformationalist controversy will be clearly recognizable in the forthcoming anthology edited by Roderick Jacobs and Peter Rosenbaum, *Readings in English Transformational Grammar* (originally to have appeared in 1968). This controversy was made explicit by Chomsky in his paper, 'Remarks on Nominalization', to appear in the Jacobs-Rosenbaum anthology just mentioned. The basic issue was pertaining to the 'trading relations' between various components of the grammar, about which Chomsky hypothesized that 'evaluation procedure must be selected in such a way as to prefer an elaboration of the base to an elaboration of the transformational component.' Thus Chomsky argued that derived nominals such as 'John's refusal to go' should be derived directly from base rules and not through nominalization transformations. The lexicalist-transformationalist controversy raised another issue, namely, exactly what the nature of semantic information should be. Lexicalists argue that the deep structure is not the only source for semantic interpretation, and there must be some 'rules of semantic interpretation' operating on some level of representation near the surface structure. Transformationalists, on the contrary, strongly persist in the Katz-Postal hypothesis that transformations do not affect meaning, and argue that there is no such level of deep 'syntactic' representation appropriate for semantic interpretation. The input to the grammar, in this view, is the semantic representation, which is converted through the successive application of a single system of rules, transformations, into the surface structure. Recent works by Ross, Lakoff, Postal, and McCawley try to argue for the transformationalist posi-

---

1 More recent works in generative-transformational grammar will be found in the following anthologies to appear: Manfred Bierwisch and Karl Heidolph (eds.), *Recent Advances in Linguistics* (Hague, Mouton), and L. A. Jakobovits and D. D. Steinberg (eds.), *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics, Anthropology and Psychology.*
Although the lexicalist-transformationalist controversy will not be explicitly manifested until the publication of the Jacobs-Rosenbaum anthology, some of the basic issues are discussed in a few papers in the Reibel-Schane anthology. Thus Kuroda’s article, ‘Attachment Transformations’, presents the first attempt to challenge Katz-Postal hypothesis: Kuroda argues that for the sake of simplicity in syntactic description, the occurrences of such words as even, also, etc. must be accounted for by postulating transformations which do affect the meaning. The anthology under review is therefore not simply a convenient handbook of past advances in the transformational study, but also serves as a bridge over the past and future investigations in linguistics.

— S. I. Harada

Walter A. Cook, S. J.: *Introduction to Tagmemic Analysis*


I have just received the first number of the new linguistic journal from the M. I. T. Press, *Linguistic Inquiry*, in which I find Postal’s article advancing the case for the transformationalist position (and against the lexicalist one, of course), ‘On the Surface Verb “Remind”’, on pages 37-120. This seems to be the first work ever published that argues extensively for the transformationalist position.