BOOK REVIEW

Rodney Huddleston – Geoffrey Pullum: A student's introduction to English grammar.
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005, 312 pp.

The author of this review, while sharing the enthusiasm of other reviewers (see *Customer Reviews,* Bas Aarts' and Peter W. Culicover's blurb), entertains it with some criticism even though he has been been an admirer of Huddleston's earlier publication (Huddleston 1984) for nearly two decades. Why readers (and hopefully teachers) admired that work was because in Huddleston (1984) the author asked innocent and at the same time relevant questions about the content and use of grammatical terminology as well as methods of analysis, and attempted to answer them. Naturally, most of the answers were the same as, or very similar to, the ones found in any grammar since there were not better or more coherent ones available, and the purpose of a coursebook, which Huddleston (1984) is and was intended to be, is not to revolutionarise a particular field of enquiry but to provide its readers with reliable data and analyses. This new book turns the sometimes provocative but always argumentative question/answer exchange of the 1984 book into consolidated academic statements about grammatical, methodological and metagrammatical issues. Though this work faithfully follows the college spirit of the 1990s and 2000s in that it takes very little for granted and explicates the issues in an informal tone, it avoids being condescending or dogmatically pedagogical.

Most traditional academic and school grammars are rightfully criticised or even abused by teachers because they state facts, formulate rules, dump data on the reader and student without arguing why, for instance, a particular construction is classified as *B* while a completely similar structure is identified as *C*. This book, while keeping to the descriptive tradition, manages to make statements, formulate rules and also give data, and at the same time, succeeds in demonstrating how grammatical analysis works. In this respect this book stands out as a remarkable achievement in both the descriptive and generative textbook tradition, which latter, unfortunately, follows in

most cases the dogmatic approach of its predecessors even though their authors emphasise their distance from that tradition. It is a unique feature of the book that the authors examine their descriptive statements (or arguments) in light of the prescriptive tradition, demonstrating that a purist view to certain structures is simply wrong or mistaken. Further, they emphasise the difference between standard vs. nonstandard and formal vs. informal language varieties. These issues are discussed in Chapter 1. In the third section of the same chapter (pp. 5ff) Huddleston and Pullum (H&P) raise the question of to what extent grammatical terms are meaningful. They point out the discrepancy between a grammatical form (the past tense and the imperative) and its meaning—an argumentation that is rarely found in books of similar scope. As a general statement, this textbook abounds in metagrammatical remarks and observations, which help the reader to understand (and appreciate) what the advantages of a particular analysis over another are.

As far as the structure is concerned, this book follows tradition in that it partly organises the presentation of the data and discussion of various problems around the phrases that are headed by the parts of speech, that is, the VP (Chapter 3), NP (Chapter 5), AP, AdvP (Chapter 6), and PP (Chapter 7), recognising that the category 'phrase' is a more manipulable and less controversial unit in clausal analysis than the word. There are five chapters (of the sixteen) that concentrate on various aspects of clause structure (Chapters 4, 9, 10, 13 and 14), and a full chapter is devoted to the detailed discussion of relative clauses (Chapter 11) while Chapter 15 examines how the information content of a sentence relates to clausal structure. Finally, a separate chapter discusses negation (Chapter 8) and the problems of morphology (inflectional and word formational processes), and spelling (Chapter 16). In the following paragraphs I will be making some remarks, sometimes critical, sometimes impressionistic and sometimes personal, on the terminology adopted by the authors as well as the other aspects of this grammar; however, my occasionally critical statements do not purport to change the general evaluation of the work. More particularly, some of my remarks will be critical in that I find details of analysis missing; others will be impressionistic in that (a) it is impossible to give a detailed review of every aspect of the book, and (b) since this book is basically a textbook, I will be trying to comment on its theoretical as well as practical aspects. Further, some minor remarks will be made from a non-native point of view, too. The structure of this review follows a simple pattern: I will examine each chapter to varying degrees depending mostly on my preferences of the topics raised in the book.

In Chapter 2 *(A rapid overview)* the authors discuss (among other things) the parts of speech. As usual, they identify eight parts of speech: noun, verb, adjective, determinative, adverb, preposition, coordinator and subordinator. Interestingly, H&P discuss the meaning of the parts of speech without mentioning that there is at least as much discrepancy between the meaning of the members of a word category as, for instance, between the past tense form and its meanings. That is, not all, say, nouns express (or mean, or refer to) some (physical) object; activity can be expressed by other words than verbs. Further, the authors attribute to some parts of speech, adverbs and determinatives, function rather than meaning. In my view, it is a highly sensitive point in grammar to establish which elements have meaning and which ones function, and how the two notions relate to each other, therefore, this question would require more subtle elaboration.

Chapter 3, which is entitled *Verb, tense, aspect and mood,* examines verbs and complex verbal structures. In the verbal paradigm *primary* vs. *secondary* forms are distinguished, which clearly corresponds to the traditional *finite* vs. *nonfinite* distinction; however, in H&P this latter pair of terms is only used to characterise clauses. The purpose of this distinction is obvious: as the authors argue, verb forms have different properties from clauses but since the defining properties of *finite* vs. *nonfinite* clauses ultimately rest on verbal inflection, the traditional terminology could have been kept. One could say that, from the point of view of grammatical content, the terms *primary* vs. *secondary* are just as opaque as the terms *finite* vs. *nonfinite.* I hope I understand the authors' intentions in that they wish to distinguish between a grammatical form and the meaning conveyed by that particular form. Thus, for instance, while the pair of terms *perfect* vs. *nonperfect* characterises grammatical forms (i.e., verbal structures with/without the auxiliary *have*), *perfective* vs. *imperfective* describes the meaning of a verbal construction. Still, I wonder why the authors reintroduced the term *preterite,* which is defined as "inflectionally marked past tense"(p. 30); why not use the self evident term: *past tense* form? In this case *past tense* could refer to the form and the term *(past) time reference* the meaning. Also, the use of the term *preterite* would be natural if schools provided a traditional grammar education, where the expression *preterite* was used instead of *past tense,* but this does not seem to be the case any more. Verb forms are renamed, too. *Plain form* seems to name a secondary (aka nonfinite) uninflected form while *plain present* identifies primary (i.e., finite) inflected forms. In a later section, however, it turns out that a plain form verb may appear in finite clauses (imperative and subjunctive). I find this confusing. The distinction that is introduced in, for instance, Quirk et al. (1985, 96) is much clearer: there are four verb forms, each of which has a finite as well as a nonfinite distribution (or use? or function? or meaning?). However, the term *gerund-participle* is a good choice since it is self-explanatory, at least for those who know that students (at least, the ones who have some knowledge of English grammar) are ready to confuse the participle with the gerund. Why not invent a new term for those who will not recognise it is a new term? In the remaining sections of Chapter 3 the authors explicate the meanings of various simple and complex verb forms, too. For instance, they explain how to interpret clauses, such as *She mows the lawn* or *She has lived in Paris for ten years* with respect to the tense forms that appear in these clauses. I think that the explication of the meanings of the various tense forms would have profited from the introduction and coherent application of the notion of inherent aspect, or at least a pervasive application of the notion of *situation* that the authors suggest using on page 43 but which, unfortunately, they never exploited. Also, the explanations of the various tense forms may be adequate for native speakers but they will obviously not do for non-natives who will find no system in the translations of these verbal structures: for them sentences will have unpredictably different (linguistic and pragmatic) meanings simply because there are different words in them. Each verb has some inherent aspect, which combines with the grammatical form (perfect, progressive etc.), and their amalgam will give us the meaning. For the benefit of nonnative students the authors could have consulted, for instance, Leech (1971, 23), who states that the progressive form added to the momentary verb *nod* "...in attributing duration to [it] forces one to think of a series of events, rather than a single event" (cf. *He was nodding*). In contrast to this, an event verb, such as *drown* in the progressive form (p. 20) shows the event denoted by the verb as incomplete, still in progress; cf. *He was drowning.* Similar illustrations could be multiplied.

Still, a particularly positive, and perhaps unique, feature of this Introduction is that, unlike in other grammars in which readers are invited to trust the authors and believe them everything uncritically, H&P let grammar students see how the analytic procedure works. There are innumerable examples of this. For instance, on page 34 a simple substitution test helps the students to identify which verb form (preterite or past participle) appears in a particular verbal structure by replacing an irregular verb for a regular one, which clearly shows the right classification of the verb form in question.

The term *dually classified verb*s redraws a traditional boundary: in earlier grammars authors separated the three verbs *be, do* and *have* (and called them *primary verbs*; cf. Quirk–Greenbaum 1973, 26) from both modal auxiliaries and lexical verbs since these three verbs may appear once as auxiliaries accompanied by a lexical verb, and once as lexical verbs. The basis of the traditional distinction was form and distribution: these three verbs, unlike modal auxiliaries and similarly to lexical verbs, have the full range of forms; for instance, the lexeme HAVE may appear as *have, has, had, having,* and is ready to combine with the past participle form of other verbs (e.g., *have gone*) or take some non-verbal complement *(have a house, have his car stolen).* In contrast to this, H&P emphasise the importance of distribution, thus *do, have, need* and *dare* constitute this new class since all the four have auxiliary as well as lexical verb distribution; (e.g., *I [need*$_{aux}$ *not say] that I [have*$_{aux}$ *had*$_{lex}$*] this car for two years; I [need*$_{lex}$ *to finish] this work; I [didn't dare*$_{lex}$ *to tell] him this story.*) Why *be* is not in this lot would be nice to know. Further, the authors ignore complex semi-auxiliaries, such as *have to, be going to, be about to,* etc.

In section 3.4, H&P make some general remarks on the properties of auxiliaries; again, an intelligent distinction is made between meaning and category: auxiliaries express meanings that can be conveyed by lexical verbs, too, but this fact does not warrant analysing them as auxiliaries—a statement whose truth is shown by Hungarian, where the equivalents of the English auxiliary constructions are translated with lexical verbs and/or adverbs. There are further terminological innovations in this chapter. For instance, the authors introduce the notion of *open* vs. *remote condition* (pp. 46–7): the explication of the terms and the terms themselves are fully acceptable (even if it may take some time for the author of these pages to be able to digest these as technical terms). *Open condition* is expressed by the simple present and the subordinating conjunction *if,* as in *If he loves her, he'll change his job* while *remote condition* is illustrated by the clause *If he loved her, he'd change his job.* However, I cannot see the reason what motivates the expression *futurate,* which refers to the future use of the present simple, as in *The next high tide is at 4 o'clock* (p. 45), and the pair of terms *continuative* vs. *noncontinuative,* which again shows the necessity of the introduction of inherent verbal aspect into the discussion. *Continuative* refers to the meaning of a present perfect structure in which the verb expresses state rather than some activity. While *She's already gone to bed* is *noncontinuative* because "the perfect locates her going to bed in the past", the clause *She's been in bed for two hours* is *continuative* since "her being in bed continued over a period of time" (p. 51). How could we account coherently for *I can see that she's been crying* or *The kid's been kicking the nursery door for ten minutes* or *Mr Brown has been singing in the choir for fifty years* etc. without the notion of inherent aspect?

In Chapter 4 *(Clause structure, complements, and adjuncts),* H&P examine basic clausal structures, which they call *canonical clauses*: these are finite, simple declarative clauses. They argue that the verb is the most important element in a clause, which

takes a certain number of complements; one of these complements is the subject. In other words, the authors introduce the notion of argument structure without explicitly using the term. Following current literature, however, they adopt the term *licensing:* the verb head of a VP, the predicator, licenses its internal as well as external (i.e., subject) complements. Again, this chapter abounds in treasures as to the demonstration of how grammar works. For instance, the authors show on what basis grammarians distinguish between objects and adjuncts, on the one hand, and objects and predicative complements on the other. This book enumerates five canonical clause types; however, the SVA (e.g., *The skeleton is in the cupboard*) type is missing, or perhaps it is subsumed under the SP, i.e., the subject–predicate type: H&P are not explicit on the point. The authors adopt a graphic representation of the basic clauses which is highly reminiscent of the tree diagrams of the generative literature of the sixties: no bar levels, but there are multiply branching nodes. The chapter explicates the syntactic and morphological properties of subjects, objects, and also the semantic classification of adjuncts. The authors point out, and generously demonstrate, how traditional grammar confused the syntactic category of subject with that of topic and actor.

Chapter 5 *(Nouns and noun phrases)* discusses the grammatical problems of noun phrases. This is the first and only chapter where the authors have exploited the notion of prototype, which was already present and widely applied in Huddleston (1984). A word class is associated with a number of grammatical properties. However, not all items in the class have all those grammatical features; the ones which do are the prototypical members of the class, while the others are less prototypical or nonprototypical members. For example, a prototypical noun inflects for number, freely takes pre- and postmodifying elements and functions as head of a NP, which in turn appears as subject, object or predicative complement. It transpires that in both Introductions (i.e., Huddleston (1984) and H&P 2005) prototypicality is not a theoretical construct, it mostly serves mnemonic purposes. The chapter conscientiously enumerates and discusses problems that are relevant for nouns, i.e., the types of dependents nouns take, including determinatives. What I find interesting is the term *fused head.* A fused head is a word that is classified as a determiner-pronoun homomorph, or a pronoun in other grammars, such as ***Many*** *would disagree* or ***Some*** *of his remarks were quite flattering* or *Kim has lots of friends but Pat doesn't seem to have* ***any*** (p. 97). That is, such expressions are heads of the NPs in which they are the only members. The authors explain that "...the head is combined, or fused, with a dependent element, usually the determiner or an internal modifier." This remark indirectly smuggles abstract entities into a descriptive grammar: fusion is only meaningful if there are at least two elements so there must be a phonologically null element somewhere in the sentence (cf. *fused relative clauses* below). Section 8 of this chapter discusses pronouns, with remarks in separate boxes on prescriptive grammarians who advise their readers not to use forms which are in fact rooted in the standard language. These topics include the appearance of pronouns in coordination and predicative position as well as anaphoric use of the personal pronoun *they.* For instance, in the clause ***Everybody*** *has told me* ***they*** *think I made the right decision* (p. 104/52ii) the use of the personal pronoun *they* is characteristic of Standard English in the same way as both the subjective and objective case pronouns are in *She's younger than* ***I/me*** (p. 106/56ab) and *They invited Sandy and* ***me/I*** (p. 107/57iiab). The last section explicates the genitive case, where the authors demonstrate that they can be as helpless as any old descriptive grammarian: form, category, function and meaning come in a blissful confusion.

Chapter 6 is about adjectives and adverbs. There are no surprises: the writers patiently tell us all about adjectives and adverbs, their morphological, syntactic and semantic properties as well as their relation to the other parts of speech. Again, we are shown how grammarians work; in this case, we learn how to distinguish between, for instance, adjectives and determinatives: unlike adjectives, determinatives can be obligatory, are never gradable; they never occur predicatively and, finally, they never denote any semantic property of the noun they combine with.

Chapter 7 *(Prepositions and prepositional phrases):* this chapter on prepositions and prepositional phrases gives a thorough and detailed treatment of prepositions. The topics are: how the P class differs from adverbs, adjectives, subordinators and verbs. Then the structure of prepositional phrases is examined, i.e., what sort of complements and modifiers they are ready to combine with. The authors emphasise the difference between fossilised and contrastive prepositions: the former appear mostly in verbal idiom (aka phrasal verb) constructions. The most interesting aspect of this chapter is the suggestion, which may also be found in the current generative literature (cf. Emonds 1987; Radford 1988) but which was first put forward by Jespersen (1924/1993, 89), that the class of prepositions should be extended. Again, the argumentation helps the readers understand the workings of grammatical analysis. The authors claim that on the analogy of verbs, which may be intransitive, transitive or both while still verbs, the members of the new extended class of prepositions should be allowed to take no complements or take optional complements. In this way, some items that traditionally belong to the class of subordinating conjunctions and some members of the traditional adverb class can be reinterpreted as prepositions. In the following clauses *before, into* as well as *abroad* are prepositions.

(1)   He came [PPbefore the class started]

(2)   He came [PPbefore the boys]

(3)   He came [PPbefore]

(4)   He is [PPinto yoga]

(5)   He is [PPabroad]

In (1) *before* is a P that takes a clausal complement, similarly to a V + clause construction (e.g., *He says **that he will marry soon***); in clause (2) *before* is a P that licences a noun phrase, as a V+NP structure (e.g., *He loves **his children***). In (3) the preposition *before* is intransitive, as a verb which takes no complement (e.g., *Snowwhite sleeps ∅*). In (4) *into* illustrates an obligatorily transitive preposition, which makes it similar to a V + O structure (e.g., *The boy kicked the ball*). The former adverb *abroad* in (5) is reanalysed as an obligatorily intransitive P. However, not all subordinating conjunctions are reanalysed as prepositions, only the ones that behave as heads: *before* determines the structural and semantic properties of its complement, *that, whether* and *if* remain conjunctions. Theoretically, this suggestion is coherent, it also helps to streamline the adverb category, which was a wastebasket of words whose membership was difficult to determine, hence the name *pandektes* in Antiquity. On the other hand, the traditional distinction was reasonable from language learners' and lexicographers' perspective: it is easier to handle words with fewer grammatical characteristics. A traditional P always takes an NP complement, a conjunction obligatorily combines with some clause,

while an adverb does not require a complement at all and can be characterised for a particular meaning type: location, time, purpose, etc.

Section 5 of this same chapter is devoted to stranded and fronted prepositions, and to the discussion of what motivates the choice between the two sometimes alternative structures, while the authors cast a critical and, at the same time, elaborate as well as edifying glance at the prescriptive statements about preposition stranding. For instance, they argue that a fronted P may be simply ungrammatical in spite of the insistence of prescriptive grammarians on the contrary; cf. *That depends on to whom I give it* (p. 139). In other cases it is the stranded preposition that is unacceptable; cf. *This is the safe which the key to was stolen* (p. 139), while there are clauses in which the choice depends on style: the fronted version sounds more formal, e.g., *Where did this come from?* or *From where did this come?* (p. 138). As to terminology: H&P argue that the traditional expression *phrasal verb* is misleading, insisting that it is not the whole expression *fall out, tie in with* that are verbs, only *fall* and *tie*. Therefore, they propose the term *verbal idiom*. However, one might argue that not all verbal idioms are idiomatic; personally, I am not sure whether I will adopt this new term. A minor critical point to raise here is that the authors define *lexeme* (p. 15) as an abstract word which subsumes under it various inflected, i.e., phonologically different word forms. Since prepositions are uninflected forms, they cannot be lexemes as the authors claim on page 127. Also, I found the section on particles (7.3, p. 144) less informative than it should be: I perceive that students find it difficult to make the distinction between prepositions and particles, and this short explanation will not be of too much help either.

Chapter 8: *Negation and related phenomena*. In this chapter, which gives the reader no surprises, the authors carefully enumerate and illustrate the various types of clausal, subclausal, verbal and nonverbal negation. They devote a lengthy section to the discussion and criticism of the prescriptive position that holds that two negative words make a statement positive, that is, in English only one negative item is possible in a clause. H&P argue that the prescriptive tradition confuses logic with natural language, and there is nothing wrong with double negation in English (let alone other languages). The topic of section 5 is the scope of negation: the correct interpretation of clauses, such as the Shakespearean *All that glisters is not gold* (The Merchant of Venice (II, vii)), depends on the resolution of scope ambiguity. I find the discussion adequate but further examples could have been offered and examined to help nonnative students (as well as teachers) to get a firmer grip on the problem.

Chapter 9 *(Clause type: asking, exclaiming and directing)* examines simple clauses on the basis of what speech act they perform. There are five types of clause: *declarative, closed interrogative, open interrogative, exclamative* and *imperative*. Closed and open interrogative correspond to the better known yes/no and *wh*-questions, respectively. As in Chapter 1, the authors emphasise (and illustrate) that syntactic form and meaning—in this case clausal form and speech act—do not match up in a one-to-one fashion. For example, the declarative clause with a rising intonation *You're sure you can afford it?* (p. 162) is a closed question despite its form. That is, intonation, which is an additional factor, overrides syntactic form; observations on intonation rarely feature in students' grammars. Further, the authors use the more precise expression *interrogative phrase* rather than *word* since a *wh*-expression may contain more than word, and find it important, which grammars usually do not, to classify open questions (i.e., *wh*-questions) into *fronted* and *non-fronted* types. Fronted open questions are the well-

known direct *wh*-questions while non-fronted ones comprise sustained as well as echo questions. The former mostly feature in court, quizzes and gameshows (e.g., *Tirana is the capital of which European country?*; p. 165) while the latter asks for the repetition of specific information; (*A: He invited Arthur. B: He invited who?*; p. 167). Following the practice of distinguishing between syntactic form and meaning or speech act, the authors suggest that while the term *exclamative* refers to a particular arrangement of elements in the clause, viz. a fronted *wh*-phrase followed by neutral declarative word order, *exclamation* refers to a speech act, which might be achieved by various clausal structures. Again, I wish to emphasise that such distinctions are carried out very carefully so that the authors avoid the confusion into which communicative coursebooks and discourse-function oriented grammars fall. H&P always start with the explication of the syntactic structure so that students can get a firm grip on the form, and then get down to the details of meaning or discourse function.

Chapter 10: *Subordination and content clauses.* This short chapter enumerates and examines the finite subordinate clause type that the authors call *content clause.* This group comprises various types (declarative, open/closed interrogative and exclamative) of the sentence construction that is identified as finite complement clause in more current syntactic terminology—clauses introduced by the subordinating conjunctions (or: complementisers) *that/whether/if/for.*

Chapter 11 *(Relative clauses)* addresses the problem of relative clauses (RC), in which the authors do not shrink from smuggling ideas associated with the generative view known as Principles and Parameters into the analysis of *that* and *bare* (aka zero *that) relative clauses.* More specifically, they (implicitly) claim, first, that the *that* element in the relative clause is a subordinating conjunction, and further, that there is a covert relative pronoun in the clause. To motivate the idea of a covert relative pronoun, they invoke, just as generative grammarians do, the ungrammaticality of the clause **The film that I needed* [*more time*] *was unobtainable* (p. 184/4). The bracketed phrase sits in the position of the hypothesised empty (or covert) relative pronoun. However, they do not carry this idea through coherently since they do not assume the existence of the same gap in a *wh*-relative in, e.g., object, prepositional complement or adjunct position. Nevertheless, what I find really illuminating in this chapter is the arguments that are presented in favour of discarding the good old pair of terms *restrictive* vs. *non-restrictive* (and the synonymous *defining* vs. *non-defining*) with respect to RCs. As is well known, this basically non-syntactic distinction ultimately rests on how words refer to the nonlinguistic world, and its importance, at least from a syntactic point of view, lies only in the choice of relative pronoun: restrictive (or defining) relative clauses show the full range of options. That is, a *wh*-element, *that* or *zero* are equally possible while non-restrictve (or non-defining) relative clauses only allow the appearance of *wh*-pronouns. H&P suggest using the term pair *integrated* vs. *supplementary* relative clause. The authors think that what grammars call restrictive RCs are not always restrictive in the (usual) sense that the relative clause, by giving a description, restricts the applicability of the noun head, of which the RC is a modifier, to a particular referent, thereby defining who or what entity the speaker has in mind. For instance, in the sentence *Martha has two sons* [*she can rely on*] *and is not unduly worried,*

> "[t]here is no implication that Martha has more than two sons. The information given in the relative clause does NOT distinguish these two sons from any other sons that she might have. Nevertheless, it is presented as an integral part of the larger message."   (p. 188)

The *supplementary RC* type covers the rest of what is traditionally understood by a RC: non-restrictive relative clauses as well as the type that is not even attached to a noun head, such as *This will keep us busy until Friday, by which time the boss will be back* (p. 189). The nominal relative clause of traditional school and academic grammars is called *fused RC*; the term is obviously based on the analysis that the relative element of a fused RC is considered to contain both the antecedent and the relative pronoun, as in *Whoever said that was trying to mislead you* (p. 191). *Whoever* is seen as corresponding to *sons who* as in *two sons who she can rely on.* The reader will remember that the term *fused* is also used to describe pronominal NP heads (cf. Chapter 5, see above).

Chapter 12, *Grade and comparison,* discusses the terminology and the semantic as well as the structural problems concerning the grades of adjectives and adverbs, and comparative clauses. The only surprise is that the grade which is neither comparative nor superlative is identified as *plain.*

Chapter 13, *Nonfinite clauses and clauses without verbs.* The most important point of nonfinite clauses is the interpretation of the missing subject, more specifically how and to what extent the subject is formalised. This textbook stays with the conservative view that the non-explicit, that is, covert, subject, which the authors refer to as *understood subject,* is not an abstract pronominal element. Rather than extending the explanation into an abstract theoretical direction, H&P concentrate on cases where the understood subject of the nonfinite subordinate clause is not identical with the explicit subject or object of the main clause — a phenomenon known as unattached or *dangling participle/modifier.* The authors insist that the following sentence is not ungrammatical, and the understood subject is clearly identifiable even if it is not identical with the main clause subject; %*Born and bred in Brisbane, the Sunshine Coast was always my preferred destination to recharge and socialise from my teenage years* (p. 208). The authors emphasise that such constructions may be acceptable despite the warnings of prescriptive grammarians. This is again an edifying point for nonnative English teachers and students. Also, H&P maintain that there are acceptable, good English nonfinite clauses whose non-explicit subject is not even in the sentence, as in %*Being desperately poor, paper was always scarce — as was ink* (p. 208) but inferrable from the larger context.

(Descriptive) grammars usually analyse [auxiliary + verb] sequences as complex verbal forms; in this book the subject and the auxiliary constitute the main clause while the rest of the construction is analysed as a nonfinite subordinate clause; for instance, in *You should take legal advice* the underlined portion is a *bare infinitival* clause while the one in *She has written another novel* is a *past participial* clause. Unfortunately, the authors do not offer multiple auxiliary constructions, such as *She may have been being interrogated then,* and therefore the reader cannot be sure how many clauses this structure represents. Again, discussing simple and complex *catenative constructions,* which is an unusual feature in student's grammars, the authors are at their best demonstrating the syntactic differences between *ordinary* and *raised subjects/objects.* In a simple catenative structure the nonfinite clause has no subject, while in a complex catenative construction the nonfinite clause has an explicit subject. While in the simple catenative construction *Sara wanted to convince Ed* the underlined expression is *ordinary subject* since its passive infinitival conveys a different core meaning from that of the corresponding active clause *(Ed wanted to be convinced by Sara),* and, further, this clause has no grammatical paraphrase with a *dummy subject.*

In contrast to this, the passivisation of the sentence *Sara seemed to convince Ed* (cf. *Ed seemed to be convinced by Sara*) does not result in ungrammaticality either, but the passive variant has the same *core meaning* as the active clause, and a paraphrase with a dummy subject is also available: *It seems that Sara convinced Ed.* (H&P define core meaning as the "meaning which, in declarative clauses, determines the truth conditions..." (p. 217).) The problem of *ordinary* vs. *raised objects* appears in complex catenative constructions, such as *We urged a specialist to examine Ed* vs. *We wanted a specialist to examine Ed,* where the underlined *intervening NP* gives rise to the term *complex catenative construction.* Again, the passivisation and the dummy pronoun test distinguish between the two objects.

Chapter 14 *(Coordination and more)* addresses the questions related to coordination—a unique feature of a textbook of this size. The authors carefully point out the distinctive syntactic properties of coordination as well as the various types: layered, main clause, lower level coordination, joint vs. distributive and nonbasic coordination.

Chapter 15 *(Information packaging in the clause)* discusses (some of) the clause types that H&P call noncanonical: clauses that illustrate passivisation, extraposition, the two types of clefting (*it-* and pseudo), pre- and postposing, dislocation and the existential strucure. In short, these clauses organise the information differently than a canonical clause: both the canonical and its noncanonical version (e.g., active vs. passive) share the same core meaning, that is, both clauses have the same truth conditions.

Finally, Chapter 16 gives an overview of the most important aspects of English morphology *(Morphology: words and lexemes)* The first two sections contain information typical of Introduction to Linguistics textbooks, inflection and derivation, while the remaining sections address questions of spelling (section 3), regular and irregular verbal inflection (section 4), regular and irregular plural forms, genitive formation (section 5). Grade, that is, plain, comparative and superlative degree, is the topic of a short subchapter (section 6), and in the final section the various derivational processes are presented.

As to the audience: this grammar is obviously not a teaching grammar; it requires a considerable knowledge of English so courses and teachers offering a degree in English will find this book useful. Related to this is the fact that H&P only illustrate various grammatical phenomena but do not enumerate (all or some of) the forms that belong to the problem discussed (unlike, for instance, Thomson–Martinet 1986 or Swan (2001) or large handbooks, such as Quirk et al. 1985; Huddleston–Pullum 2002). Following the spirit of the age, the authors compiled a set of exercises after each chapter. This contrasts with the practice of Huddleston (1984) which reckoned that relevant classroom discussion of the topics raised in the book was feasible without any help since both teachers and students were intelligent enough to find out what needed to be discussed. The exercises, which conclude each of the sixteen chapters of the book, conscientiously tackle the topics raised in the chapters, so teachers need not worry about organising their classes, they only have to take care of the correct timing. The exercises mostly approach problems of classification and analysis from a practical, illustrative aspect, and it is the teacher's decision whether s/he wants to extend the discussion to the theoretical aspects of the book. For instance, exercise 1 (p. 260) asks the students to identify whether the following ten clauses are canonical or non-canonical while the next exercise invites them to analyse the clauses from the point of view of voice; both tasks are the practical application of the classificatory statements elaborated in the chapter. On the other hand, exercise 2 (p. 110) instructs

the reader to decide whether the ten nouns given in the exercise have only plural-only or ordinary interpretation as well. Exercise 1 in the chapter on adjectives urges the student to comment on the distributional potential of ten adjectives, *ersatz* and *galore* included—not particularly frequent vocabulary items; that is, some exercises will boil down to vocabulary extension exercises rather than serious discussion of some problems of descriptive grammar. I intend the previous statement as a warning for non-native users of the book and not as a critical remark.

There is a chapter entitled *Further reading* at the end of the book, which contains suggestions—in two sections—for the general reader as well as the linguistics student. In the first, written for the benefit of the general reader, H&P are very careful to avoid mentioning specific titles that would match their Introduction in size or scope. However, they refer the reader to venerable handbooks, old and more current, and to manuals of English usage. The section for the linguistic student is more generous and impressionistic at the same time: since English has increasingly been the most wanted language in the past few decades, and indirectly related to this is the fact that it has also been in the focus of much linguistic research, the choice from the vast amount of literature is practically impossible so the authors refer the readers to the titles they found useful as sources.

A carefully edited glossary and index are the last two sections of this textbook.

Lajos Marosán

References

Emonds, Joseph 1987. Parts of speech in generative grammar. In: Linguistic Analysis 17:3–42.

Huddleston, Rodney 1984. An introduction to the grammar of English. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Huddleston, Rodney – Geoffrey K. Pullum 2002. The Cambridge grammar of the English language. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Jespersen, Otto 1924/1993. The philosophy of grammar. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Leech, Geoffrey N. 1971. Meaning and the English verb. Longman, London.

Quirk, Randolph – Sidney Greenbaum – Geoffrey Leech – Jan Svartvik 1985. A comprehensive grammar of the English language. Longman, London & New York.

Quirk, Randolph – Sidney Greenbaum 1973. A university grammar of English. Longman, London.

Radford, Andrew 1988. Transformational grammar. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Swan, Michael 2001. Practical English usage. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Thomson, Audrey Jean – Agnes V. Martinet 1986. A practical English grammar. Oxford University Press, Oxford.