

John P. Broderick, *Modern English Linguistics: A Structural and Transformational Grammar*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1975. ix + 260 pp.

Broderick states that his book „aims to present a broad range of factual information about contemporary American English, using scientific linguistics“ (17). The body of the work is prefaced by a chapter that contains sections on generative-transformational and American structural linguistics as well as empirical scientific method. A short (22 pp.) but substantial chapter on structuralist-oriented morphology is followed by a chapter on English constituent structure that builds a transition to the core of the book (4 chapters, 96 pp.), which is “a self-contained basic generative-transformational grammar of English” (18). The next chapter provides discussion and exercises that suggest how the basic grammar can be expanded. The work concludes with chapters on semantics (21 pp.) and phonology (25 pp.) plus a summary of basic transformational rules, bibliography, and an index. B clearly assumes American undergraduate students as his primary audience, but the book can be used – under proper guidance by a teacher – with students who are not native speakers of English.

B writes clear and literate English, and he avoids the condescending tone that mars some textbooks. The material is skillfully arranged and presented so that the reader naturally anticipates what follows. It is greatly to the author's credit that he deals with both transformational and structuralist linguistics, but aspects of the book suggest that he is less at home in the latter, e. g., when he speaks of “the stem of the *-ed* inflectional suffix” (34). Similarly, his understanding of the morpheme (cf. 11, 26, 38) differs considerably from that general among structuralists, and the view that “the verb in both *We eat cheese* and *He eats cheese* is analyzed morphologically as *eat-prs* [present]” (39) lacks consensus.¹

¹ Cf. E. A. Nida, “The Identification of Morphemes”, *Language* 24 (1948) pp.414–441.

No introductory textbook can offer a comprehensive survey of English syntax. B's basic transformational grammar includes the auxiliary, indirect objects, passives, sentence negation, imperatives, questions, noun clauses with *that*, and relative clauses, but Chapter 5 extends this with sections on agentless passives, particle movement, deleted relative pronouns, cojoining, adverbial clauses, and pronouns. A useful set of exercises (189–94) deals with tag questions, conjunction reduction, adverbial movement, and additional types of nominalization. More material on raising (e.g., *I expect him to go*) and related verb classes would have been welcome. B devotes attention to special conditions on the application of transformations and raises the issues of derived constituent structure (esp. 108–10) and ordering (esp. 118–19), but he essentially dismisses the latter two problems as being beyond the scope of the book. He correctly observes that the generative-transformational model implies an unlimited number of sentence *patterns* in English (59) but later qualifies the statement (68, 96).

It would be largely unfair to criticize B for weaknesses in the theory of generative-transformational grammar itself. The character of the work as an introductory textbook precludes discussion of many controversial issues. But B implies that there is an intuitively clear and well-established "scientific theoretical sense" of simplicity which applies to the ordering of transformations (118–19, 152), whereas linguists in fact are still groping in the dark with this issue. He offers a passage disguised as an argument for putting *it* in the deep structure of *It is clear that he will fail* (146–47), but he is merely following a familiar but questionable precedent. We are abruptly informed that "all nominal modifiers can be paraphrased as complete clauses following a noun" (158), thus allowing the modifiers to be derived from such clauses in deep structure, but not a single word is spent on the problems of attributive and predicative adjectives or restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses. B should have mentioned the interrelation of indirect object movement and particle movement that prevents **He passed out the students the tests* (175).

The chapter on semantics calls *boy* a 'synonym' of *child* (200), but a term like 'hyponym'² seems more appropriate. B's loose definitions imply that *boy* is an antonym of *man* (200), which is hard to accept. The chapter includes a section on case grammar (208–16).

B attempts in his chapter on phonology to introduce both transformationalist and structuralist viewpoints; but the latter is badly represented. The claim that "the [structuralist] definition of the phoneme rests crucially on the assumption that a given morpheme will always be pronounced with a fixed sequence of phonemes" (233) is patently false. The structuralist notions of alternation, morpheme alternants or allomorphs, and morphophonemics arose precisely out of the realization that a given morpheme may have two or more phonemically distinct pronunciations. B uses the term 'underlying' (235 ff.) frequently but without a definition or adequate explanation. The reader is quickly led from the most primitive phonetic concepts to "phonological" rules that derive *ignite* and *ignition* from common underlying representations (236), but no indication is given as to how words like *neat* and *night* (which show no vocalic alternations) will be incorporated into the system.

The statement on the cover that "By treating [American structural linguistics] before presenting [transformational grammar], Broderick in fact writes a history of scientific linguistics" is a gross misrepresentation. The historical sections are among the weakest in the book. Of the structuralists B mentions only Sapir and Bloomfield, but the reader is told that "To the structuralist, a language *is* the corpus of data" (13) and that phonetic transcriptions were the only "type of data considered empirical by the American structuralists" (15). One may then wonder why Bloomfield bothered to learn to speak Menomini or how he ever managed to write his grammar of the language. It is unfair to

2 Cf. John Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, Cambridge, 1968, pp. 454–55.

Sapir to say that "he was motivated by a sense of urgency [to record American Indian languages], rather than by theoretical considerations" (9). And B reverses history when he states that the syntactic distinction between deep and surface structure provided an analogy for underlying representations in generative phonology.

B clearly has tried to be fair to both transformational grammar and structuralism, but his distorted picture of the latter makes him wonder how we can "derive a coherent presentation of the facts of English grammar from linguistic theories so much in conflict" (17). In presenting the notion of deep structure B considers how a *difference* in word order of two transformationally related sentences can be accounted for in such a way that the *sameness* of the sentences is also explained (99), yet it is precisely this resolution of differences at one level through the creation of new units at another level that is the foundation of American structural linguistics.³ Thus, the greatest disappointment in the book is B's failure to recognize and show the essential unity of the theories he discusses.

James Kilbury
Freie Universität Berlin
Institut für Englische Philologie
Goslerstraße 2-4
D-1000 Berlin 33

³ Cf. Z. S. Harris, *Papers in Structural and Transformational Linguistics*, Reidel, Dordrecht-Holland, 1970, pp. v-vi.