Review: [untitled]
Author(s): Jerrold M. Sadock
Reviewed work(s):
The Study of Syntax by Terence Langendoen
Source: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (Jul., 1972), pp. 209-212
Published by: The University of Chicago Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1264917
Accessed: 13/05/2009 15:52

Hodge, Handbook 2.99, seems to have the same village (so that he gave it twice, without realizing that fact), as NUTLTLEIK.

This he defines as 'a Bellacoola village on Bellacoola r. about Nuskelst, Brit. Col.' and he gives two spellings from Boas, Nūtltlē'iq (1891) and NULLĒ'îx (1898).

We should mention, regretfully, that the population was removed to the mouth of the Bella Coola River decades ago.

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE,
LOS ANGELES

THE STUDY OF SYNTAX, by Terence Langendoen

JERROLD M. SADOCK

Most of us who have taught introductory courses in generative syntax have keenly felt the lack of a good text book. Recently, several have succumbed to the urge to fill this gap. D. Terence Langendoen is among them and is thus one for whom, presumably, the lack no longer exists. The rest of us, I'm afraid, must continue to suffer.

It should be pointed out, however, that it is extremely difficult to write THE syntax text. There are two principal reasons for this. First, there are widely divergent opinions on what the present theory ought to be. Secondly, no matter which faction one adheres to, there exists no accepted body of pedagogical fiction, no set of bold-faced lies which one is generally allowed to tell a student in order to bring him to the state where he can recognize them as lies. A teacher of introductory physics needn't even blush while explaining to his students how Newton's second law accounts for the behavior of physical bodies even though he knows that there are cases where f does not equal ma and even though he knows why. But a syntactician must accompany a discussion of the passive rule, for example, or a discussion of the transformational cycle with apologies and excuses for the well-known cases where these hypotheses give wrong results.

Langendoen attempts to solve both problems in a single stroke. He attempts to weave the truth about English out of those threads of various recent syntactic theories which seem strongest to him. This stratagem is designed to appeal to generative grammarians of every stripe (except lexicalists, who get only a courtsey in a footnote). Simultaneously he can, in the main, avoid the mention of theories the problems with which are well known. There is neither a passive transformation nor a cycle in Langendoen's exposition (although there is an apparent case on page 109 of the cyclic application of a transformational rule). Nevertheless it is the case that as strong and as enlightening a case can be made for either of these hypotheses as for any other syntactic theory of which I'm aware, the difficulties notwithstanding.

This great task Langendoen attempts to accomplish in 174 pages, nearly half of which are taken up by diagrams, footnotes, problems, glossary, index, blank pages (168, 169—except for the word INDEX—, and 170) and blank spaces at chapter ends and beginnings.

Whether or not there is merit in Langendoen's syntactic synthesis—a question to which I shall return—his book would be a didactic success if it explained or at least demonstrated what a good syntactic argument is. Unfortunately, The Study of Syntax is almost devoid of such material. Up to page 72 there is only one real attempt made to back up the intricate theory which the author presents. It is worthwhile examining this argument, which is to be found on page 26.

After discussing extraposition of subject clauses, Langendoen wishes to decide whether extraposition has applied to the object clause of his sentence 5.9:

5.9 Politicians know that voters prefer results.

He brings up the contrast in grammaticality among the following sentences: (Langendoen's numbering)

5.10 Politicians know well that voters prefer results.

5.11 *Politicians know that voters prefer results well.

5.12 Politicians know campaign trips well.

5.13 *Politicians know well campaign trips.

Langendoen argues that extraposition obligatorily moves the clausal object around the adverb in 5.10. Where this movement has not occurred, the string (5.11) is ungrammatical. This argument, though, depends on establishing that immediately before extraposition, adverbs like WELL follow the direct object. For this step we have the following sentence which is quite typical of The Study of Syntax (p. 55): "Presumably in the deep structures underlying both sentences 5.10 and 5.12, the adverbial modifier follows the direct object . . . "

It is often the case, in fact, that Langendoen has direct inside information into deep-structure which is denied to the rest of us On page 97, for example, we learn that English is an underlying VSO language even though this necessitates the addition of a 'subjectivization' rule which was not otherwise needed. Not one shred of evidence is presented in favor of McCawley's very abstract notion. In other cases the author pulls deep structures from hats with phrases such as " . . . suppose we formulate . . . " (p. 29), "Suppose we take . . . " (p. 57), "It turns out . . . that . . . " (p. 98). In one case, " . . . pairs of sentences are felt to have the same deep structure . . . " (p. 30). By whom, I wonder. There are arguments by paraphrase, such as the one for abstract higher performatives on pages 122 and 123, and many cases where evidence for constituency is assumed to be evidence for deep constituency (e.g. pp. 98–99).

One sort of argument which is almost entirely lacking is that based on generalization. I don't think there is a single occurrence of the word in the text. It seems, in fact, that Langendoen has considerable disdain for generalizations and in several cases goes out of his way to avoid them. For example, on page 56 he formulates a restriction on THAT (complementizer) deletion as follows: " . . . this word may not be deleted if it introduces a nonextraposed subject clause. Otherwise it may optionally be deleted." As far as the data he has discussed so far are concerned, this complicated statement is equivalent to a simpler and more general statement such as: This word may be deleted if it is not sentence initial. The simpler statement, additionally, makes correct predictions where Langendoen's fails, e.g. in the case of the topicalized clause: That syntax is difficult, no one doubts. VERSUS *Syntax is difficult, no one doubts. But this is more a criticism of theory than one of presentation. What is perhaps an even clearer example of a detour made to avoid generality is found on page 132. Here he describes subject-verb agreement in English with the sentence, "If the subject is singular and not a first or second person pronoun, then the present tense predicate is realized as ... -(e)s ... " What's wrong with the more traditional statement to the effect that the suffix is -(e)s if the subject is third person singular? Neither is quite accurate, of course, so Langendoen's choice of the negative disjunction is puzzling. This very superficial and, I would assume, generally known fact, as well as the enlightening information that AM, IS, and ARE are the forms of the verb BE with first singular, third singular, and other subjects, respectively, seems curiously out of place in a book which also informs the student, almost matter-of-factly, that there are six embedded sentences and eight noun phrases in the structure underlying the sentence, "Claude is a man," (not counting, of course, the indefinite article and any higher abstract performative clauses.)

As does his presentation, Langendoen's theory shows a strange disregard for generalizations. It is interesting, in this regard, that in discussing theories in the introduction, no

mention is made either of generalization or its cousin, predictive capacity. A theory appears rather as a useful catalogue so designed as to display known or hoped-for facts of language.

In cases where the very earliest treatments captured generalizations, albeit clumsily, these are set free without a murmur in The Study of Syntax. In Syntactic Structures the observation was formalized that the form of a verb is uniquely determined by the preceding verb in the same verb phrase. In Langendoen's book this fact is hardly represented at all. It just so happens that in his deep structures the infinitival predicate (whose semantic value is entirely mysterious to me) magically appears under modals, (figs. 7.1, 7.2), the past participial morpheme (or earlier just a past participle) under passive be (figs. 6.17, 7.4), and so on. Where Chomsky tried to account for the appearance of DO in questions, in Langendoen's theory it is conveniently present without explanation when neither a modal, HAVE nor BE is the highest predicate. The closest Langendoen comes to an attempt to capture a generalization is where he speaks of analogous rules (e.g. on page 80). But he never gives a formal status to the notion of analogous rule nor could he. No effort has been made to formalize any transformational process. This lack of rule-writing sometimes results in dismal obscurity. In describing the process generally known as predicate raising, he says that a lower predicate 'is substituted for' a higher one. Taken literally, this can't yield correct results for it is the identity of ALL the predicates which eventually determines the lexical item. In chapter 6 lexical items are changed as predicates are substituted for higher ones but in chapter 7, if I read it right, lexicalization is saved for the end. I frankly can't figure out how Langendoen visualized the process.

But the theoretical part of the book is quite interesting, not so much to beginning students of syntax, who are bound to find it difficult, confusing, and seemingly contradictory, as to professional syntacticians. The author has tried to integrate the thinking of several somewhat divergent schools of transformational thought into a coherent whole. The extent to which this effort succeeds is a measure of the compatibility of the theories involved for Langendoen has tried hard. Since the confusion is often the author's, the obscurity often necessary and the contradictions often genuine, the book points clearly to the fact that some of these ideas are fundamentally at variance.

Here are some of the contradictory theses which are simultaneously accepted in this book: Chapter 4 is called The Nature of Semantics. (It thus vies with Some Transformations in English (the title of a chapter in Chomsky's Syntactic Structures) and with the title of the book itself for the pretentiousness prize.) In it Katz and Postal semantics complete with features and interpretive semantic rules operating on underlying representations is presented. But throughout the remainder of the book arguments and justifications for specific hypotheses are clearly founded on the generative semanticists' hypothesis that deep structure IS semantic structure and no interpretation is necessary. The use of semantic features is also puzzlingly at odds with the pronounced tendency of the book to split off elements of meaning in deep structure into the separate propositions where they belong semantically.

Most peculiar of all is the attempt to reconcile Fillmore's case grammar with generative semantics. Fillmore was correct in observing that the specific relationships which a noun phrase can have to a surface verb are many more than the few such as subject of, and direct object of. These, then, are insufficient from a semantic point of view. Fillmore therefore listed a number of special cases in which a noun phrase can occur, which determine, among other things the semantic relations which hold between the noun phrase and the verb. Generative

semanticists, on the other hand, perceived the various relations as separate predicates which are often abstract. Thus what would be a noun phrase in Fillmore's agentive case would be the subject of an abstract predicate meaning, approximately, 'is the agent of'. But in the study of syntax, both treatments are used simultaneously. Thus, for example, in fig. 6.10 we find an abstract instrumental predicate one of whose arguments is a noun phrase in the instrumental case. One of these mentions of instrumentality is clearly superfluous. Moreover, it seems strange to me that prepositions, clearly predicative elements, are not treated as predicates (although Langendoen adds to the confusion by mentioning that they can be so thought of) while nouns, whose essentially predicative nature is much more difficult to see ARE treated as predicates, following Bach's suggestion.

By an extreme effort of will, I have refrained as much as possible from criticizing the specific analyses which are found in this book. The reason is that I don't believe a syntax text can be written at this point in the development of the science which would not give rise to violent disagreement on specific points of analysis. The strength of any such text book must, for the time being, reside in the coherence and pedagogical value of its analyses and I have therefore concentrated on these points. In an attempt to compensate for the rather negative tone of this review, I will close with a few words of praise. I'm sure that using this book as a basis, Professor Langendoen could give an excellent introduction to syntax. The outlines of a rigorous and interesting if somewhat idiosyncratic course are here. And the prose is to be admired. It's bright and interesting which is all too infrequent a thing in books of this kind.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PORTRAITS OF LINGUISTS: A BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE BOOK FOR THE HISTORY OF WESTERN LINGUISTICS, 1746–1963, edited by Thomas A. Sebeok, Indiana University Press, 1966, 2 volumes, xviii + 580 and x + 606 pages.

ROBERT AUSTERLITZ

This is a very ambitious anthology. It would be futile to challenge the taste or choices of the compiler (the only truly flagrant omission being, in my opinion, Graziadio Ascoli, 1829–1907), for the selection is so rich that one rather wishes that fewer portraits had been included. The ambitiousness of the project prompts the reviewer to be equally ambitious, or at least exhaustive, in accounting for the contents of the volume and for their value to the student of linguistics. To do this economically, I have constructed the table on pages 213–4 which lists the 73 biographies (column on the left), their 90 biographers, the first page of each essay and the year in which it was published (if it did not appear relatively soon after the biographee's death), the language (F[rench], G[erman]) in which the essay appears, if not English, and a laconic characterization of the essay. This vignette should not be taken too literally: it is my personal reaction to the manner in which the essayist treated his subject; its brevity conceals injustices which should not be interpreted as instances of irreverence.

Note that four biographees [1 4 6 34] are allotted three essays each and that nine biographees [3 5 13 35 36 38 42 54 68] are allotted two each. In such cases I will refer to the biographies by means of auxiliary letters [68a, 68b]. Volume 1 ends with [27].

Most of these essays are obituaries. Of these, those culled from the Allgemeine deutsche Biographie [3a 4b 6b 11] and various yearbooks (e.g. [40]) tend to be somewhat dry. The same genre, however, also has its virtuosos, such as Emeneau [54a 66], Malkiel [60 62 69], Jakobson [22 65 70] and Lane [45]. To this class also belong Bloch and Sturtevant (on Bloomfield [68]), Sebeok [72], Wrenn on Sweet [21], and the three Saussure necrologies [34], perhaps a clear