

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Transformational Grammar and Daughter-dependency Grammar	1
1.2. A First Sketch of Daughter-dependency Syntax	4
1.2.1. Levels of Language	4
1.2.2. Rules, Conditions, and Processes	11
1.2.3. What a Daughter-dependency Grammar Generates	14
1.2.4. How a Daughter-dependency Grammar Generates	19
1.3. Some Attractions of Daughter-dependency Grammar	23
2. Classification Rules	27
2.1. Introduction	27
2.2. Constraints on Classification by Features	31
2.3. Classification of Sentences and Phrases	36
2.4. Classification of Words	52
3. Structure-building Rules	66
3.1. A General Overview	66
3.2. Daughter-dependency Rules	71
3.3. Sister-dependency Rules	82
3.4. Feature-addition Rules	90
3.5. Peripherality-assignment Rules	92

3.6.	Function-assignment Rules	97
3.7.	Sequence Rules	108
3.8.	Raising and Discontinuity	115
3.9.	Understood Elements	126
4.	Auxiliary Verbs	136
4.1.	The Chomsky Analysis	137
4.2.	The Ross Analysis	143
4.3.	The Daughter-dependency Analysis of Auxiliaries	149
4.4.	Passives	155
4.5.	'Dummy' Auxiliaries: <i>Do</i> and <i>Shall</i>	160
4.6.	Extending the Analysis	165
5.	Conclusions and Implications	177
	<i>Appendix One: A Partial Grammar for English</i>	181
	<i>Appendix Two: Daughter-dependency Grammar and Standard 'Dependency Theory'</i>	197
	<i>References</i>	207
	<i>Index</i>	213

Preface

This book is an attempt to justify an alternative to transformational-generative grammar, called 'daughter-dependency' grammar, which is better at doing the things transformationalists want to do, but can do them without the use of either transformations or the deep/surface distinction in syntax. Since much of it is taken up with criticisms of transformational grammar, I should like to emphasize here that I think very highly indeed of very many proponents of this theory—I do not believe that people who accept false theories do so because they are fools. Indeed, I should be proud to be ranked with most of the transformational linguists whose works I refer to in this book. There is certainly no way in which this book could have been written—or daughter-dependency theory developed—without the stimulus and ideas that have come out of the transformational-generative school. I should like to record my particular debt to my transformational colleagues, from whom I have learned a lot—including the very general point that one is much more likely to persuade a transformational linguist if one plays the game according to his rules.

My other obvious source of ideas is Michael Halliday. Daughter-dependency theory is a rather radical version of 'systemic' theory, and all versions of systemic theory derive ultimately from Halliday's article 'Categories of the theory of grammar' of 1961. However, I have also benefited from working and talking with other linguists interested in these theories, including all those at the 'Systemic grammar workshops' of 1974 and 1975, and some with whom I've had more or less extensive correspondence—especially Michael McCord, Joe Taglicht, Jim Martin and Robin Fawcett.

I am most grateful for the comments I have received on earlier