

A. Kraak and W. G. Klooster, *Syntaxis*. Uitgeverij Stam-Kemperman N.V., Culemborg-Cologne, 1968. 298 pp.

This book was neither written as a textbook nor does it present itself as a collection of studies in syntax. Its aim is to provide students of Dutch grammar with the essential ideas prevailing in present-day transformational grammar and with a number of grammatical problems. It does not concentrate on formalisms of description but rather on systematic observation. Thus it serves a most useful purpose in a situation where modern grammar is to be taught and where it is only fair to say that the most powerful model of grammatical description, the transformational model, is far from having found a definitive and satisfactory form.

The prime criterion of adequacy for a grammatical description is that it should formulate in its rules all regularities in the sentences of a language which help to explain the grammaticalness and the semantic properties of the sentences. Only then can a grammar be said to offer an explanation for the fact that native speakers express their thoughts in certain ways and not in others. It has become clear that the principle of simplicity in grammatical description is nothing but the expression of all relevant generalizations. If we find a class of generalizations which cannot be expressed in a particular model of description, the model is inadequate and must be amended or rejected. This is precisely the reason why transformations were introduced by Chomsky: constituent structure rules cannot express large masses of generalizations. Once the transformations had been accepted, more and more fundamental regularities were discovered most of which asked for transformational treatment, whereas others, especially relating to the lexicon, do not seem to fit naturally into the transformational frame as we know it nowadays. Kraak and Klooster's book helps the student to develop an eye for grammatically relevant regularities, while at the same time offering suggestions for possible descriptive solutions.

The book contains eleven chapters. The first three give a general introduction to the fundamental concepts of transformational grammar. Chapter 4 deals with the subject-predicate distinction. The authors adhere to the widely accepted view that every sentence, in its deep structure, is primarily divided into these two main constituents (p. 89). It must be noted, however, that even this first rule of, perhaps universal, grammar is open to doubt. There may well be a more fundamental distinction, such as between performative and proposition.

In Chapter 5 noun-phrases are discussed. The range of observations made here makes it clear that no satisfactory solution has as yet been found for the deep structure origin of determiners and quantifiers. The authors assume,

tentatively, three main underlying categories for determiners: definite, indefinite and categorial, the latter being manifested by bare plurals, as in *Formulae may be difficult*, or by a superficially indefinite noun-phrase, as in *A formula may be difficult*. Quantified noun-phrases may only be either definite or indefinite (with certain restrictions): *He answered many questions correctly* (i.e. many of the questions) and *He asked many questions*. They point out the ambiguity of a sentence such as *Six elephants will be shown*, which is either 'six of the elephants' or 'six out of all elephants' (p. 115), the former interpretation being definite. However, as they themselves point out, we also have *The six elephants will be shown* (pp. 117–8). They offer no satisfactory solution to this problem.

The sixth chapter deals with verbal elements in the predicate. Two tenses are distinguished, present and preterite, to which a 'perfective element' may be added.

In Chapter 7 predicate nominals and copula-verbs are considered. Among the many phenomena observed, two may be singled out as particularly interesting. First, there is the fact, in Dutch and many other European languages, but not in English, that the noun in predicate nominal-position does not have an indefinite article if it indicates a role or function of the subject (which, in this case, must be animate): *Zijn vader is artiest* (His father is an artist). If the indefinite article is present, as in *Zijn vader is een artiest*, the sentence means that the subject has artist-like qualities, but is not a professional artist. Likewise, one cannot say *Zijn vader is muggezifter* (His father is a hairsplitter), unless a context is pre-supposed where the subject plays the part of one of a group of hairsplitters, as in a comedy with a chorus of hairsplitters. This fact is, of course, well known, but it is not at all clear how it can be accommodated within a grammatical description. The authors hold the view (pp. 146–8) that nouns indicating a function should not be regarded as a nominal constituent. Such nouns lack many features common to nominals. For example, they do not occur without an article in other nominal positions: **Artiest is thuis* (*Artist is at home); they do not take relative clauses or adjectives: **Zijn oom is bekend artiest* (*His uncle is well-known artist). They suggest (p. 149) that such nouns should be regarded as adjectives.

Secondly, they illustrate with a wealth of examples that some participles, present or past, can occur as adjectives, while they provide all sorts of tests to decide whether a participle is used adjectivally. They point out, among other things, that such participles are not gradable, unless used metaphorically: **This flat is very self-contained*; but: *Your friend is very self-contained*.

Chapter 8 is about transitive and intransitive verbs. The active-passive relation is discussed, as well as the indirect object, which is correctly dis-

tinguished from *for*-phrases (or rather, their Dutch equivalent). Two lexical analyses are given, one for the verb *schrijven* (to write), another for *weigeren* (to refuse), which is sometimes equivalent to 'refuse to give', and sometimes to 'refuse to accept'.

Some problems are raised in connection with the active-passive relation. Thus, it is pointed out (p. 178) that, e.g., *The employee informed the director reluctantly* is not equivalent to *The director was informed reluctantly by the employee*. They propose that adverbs such as *reluctantly* should be placed outside the deep structure subject-predicate construction (which would imply that this is not the first distinction to be made in the grammar). Even so, however, the passive transformation would still have an irregular semantic effect. It is perhaps better to treat such adverbs as underlying verbs, so that we would have the approximate underlying *The employee was reluctant to inform the director*, and *The director was reluctant to be informed by the employee*, respectively. This would explain why one can have two 'contradictory' time adverbials in Dutch sentences containing such manner adverbials as are equivalent to *reluctantly*, etc. English *Yesterday the employee was still willing to inform the director tomorrow* can be rendered in Dutch as: *Gisteren lichtte de werknemer de directeur nog graag morgen in* (literally: Yesterday the employee still informed the director willingly tomorrow).

Adverbials are discussed in Chapter 9. Some incipient order is established in the apparent chaos. Especially manner adverbials and modal adverbials are beginning to show some system in the light of the observations made here.

Relative clauses are the subject-matter of Chapter 10. A highly suggestive explanation is proposed for the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses. The latter are to be derived from two *and*-conjoined underlying sentences, the same noun-phrase occurring in both. Thus, *The men, who missed the train, were late* can presumably be derived from: *The men missed the train and they* (i.e., the men) *were late*. If the relative clause is restrictive, however, this derivation is impossible. Then it seems more appropriate to assume an existential quantifier in the relative: *Some men missed the train; those men were late*. Unfortunately, the authors get confused when the antecedent noun has a universal quantifier, i.e., in their terms, when it is categorial. On p. 226 they distinguish between a restrictive and a non-restrictive relative clause in: *We do not catch whales which are too big*, whereas on p. 230 they claim that such antecedents require a restrictive relative clause. Yet, obviously, we can have: *Whales are too big and we do not catch whales*.

Chapter 11 is devoted to coordinative constructions. As far as *and*-con-

junctions go, the authors distinguish clearly between ordinary *and*-conjunction and what has been termed phrasal conjunction,¹ although they do not commit themselves to Lakoff and Peters' account of the latter. They show clearly the relation between phrasal conjunction and *each other*-constructions. They also go into the problem of 'consecutive' conjunction, as in: *He put it into his mouth and swallowed it*. Here they adopt Lakoff and Peters' suggestion to assume an underlying *then* in the second clause.

Their explorations into *or*-conjunctions are fascinating. They show clearly that there are significant syntactic relations between *and*+*negation* and *or*, and their observations are highly suggestive for *if*-clauses. For example, underlying *I do not like port and I do not like sherry* is rendered naturally as: *I do not like port or sherry*. And, as Lakoff pointed out in passing,² so-called pseudo-imperatives are naturally followed by *or* (*else*): *Don't go there or you'll be kicked out*, which is equivalent to: *If you go there, you will be kicked out*. There is, perhaps, some point in assuming that a slightly modified paraphrase, including not only *or* and *not* but also *must*, would show a deep structure source for all *if*-clauses. *If he is ill, he cannot come* can be paraphrased as: *He cannot come, or it must be that he is not ill. Or it must be that not* or the like would thus stand for *if*. The negative element would then account for the occurrence of such negation-bound words as *ever* or *any*. Obviously, this point cannot be pursued here, but it is one illustration of the many ideas that sprung to my mind while I read this book.

The authors distinguish between exclusive and non-exclusive *or*, as in: *Does he play chess or bridge?*, which is ambiguous in this respect. They remark (p. 269) that in the exclusive sense there are two questions: *Does he play chess? And if not, does he play bridge?* whereas there is only one (yes-no) question in the non-exclusive sense. If we accept this, however, it appears that both exclusive and non-exclusive *or* are derivable from ordinary logical non-exclusive *or* and that the difference consists in the position of *or*. In the exclusive sense *or* would precede the question operator in both clauses, but in the non-exclusive sense it would stand between two clauses, both dominated by the question operator. The distinction between exclusive and non-exclusive *or* would thus be accounted for by different positions in deep structure representations.

I have only made a selection of the interesting topics dealt with in this book. The reading and re-reading of it took me a considerable amount of time, because I felt the constant urge to see if it might be possible to formu-

¹ G. Lakoff and S. Peters, 'Phrasal Conjunction and Symmetric Predicates', *Report No. NSF-17*, Cambridge, Mass., 1966.

² G. Lakoff, 'Stative Adjectives and Verbs in English', *Report No. NSF-17*, Cambridge, Mass., 1966.

late rules in order to account for the great mass of observations made, an attempt which was unsuccessful in most cases.

The authors have succeeded very well in showing the continuity of traditional grammar and modern work in transformational grammar. Those readers who are versed in traditional Dutch grammar will have no difficulty in understanding the book, and will be comforted by the frequent references to good traditional grammars of Dutch, such as the long forgotten but now rediscovered grammar by C. H. den Hertog, *De Nederlandsche Taal, Praktische Spraakkunst van het Hedendaagsche Nederlandsch*, Amsterdam 1892, or G. S. Overdiep, *Stilistische Grammatica van het Moderne Nederlandsch*, Zwolle 1937. Their references to present-day work in transformational grammar, however, could have been more frequent, especially where they obviously draw upon work by Lakoff, Ross and Peters. On the other hand, however, since most of this work has not been published properly, such references might easily frustrate the reader wishing to consult it and not finding it in the libraries.

It is no empty praise to say of this book that it is highly challenging and stimulating. There would be ample scope for such a book on the English market.

Darwin College, Cambridge

PIETER A. M. SEUREN