Preface

This work is a progress report. It contains seven essays representing the gradual introduction of a new technique into analytic philosophy. The emergence of this method, to my mind, is nothing but the natural continuation of the line of development that goes through the philosophers of ordinary language to J. L. Austin. Along this line the appeal to the facts of our natural language, which is the common feature of this whole approach, becomes more and more systematic. The philosophers of ordinary language used these facts as they found them and as they needed them for their various purposes in an intuitive fashion. Austin tried to organize these facts according to principles of his own invention. The present method consists in an appeal to the facts of language already organized by the science of structural linguistics.

The essays in this book were written in the years between 1956 and 1965. During this period, to be exact from 1952 on, structural linguistics itself was revolutionized through the development of transformational analysis.

PREFACE

My acquaintance with this method goes back only to 1959. Two essays (contained in Chapters 3 and 4) had been completed before that time, and the remaining five (contained in Chapters 6, 7, 5, 1, and 2, in the order of their composition) mirror the growth of the underlying linguistic theory. Each new insight into the syntactical structure of the language is bound to have repercussions beyond the immediate field of the discovery. Accordingly, I now feel that the earlier papers could be rewritten with profit and all of them integrated into a more coherent whole. I decided against doing this for two reasons. In the first place, the development of transformational grammar is by no means complete, and I have no reason to think that its present state will be permanent even for a short period of time. The second reason is that the earlier material, in spite of its many imperfections, has become known among a number of philosophers, so that it would be unfair to ask them to follow me in my present wanderings over the same terrain. The point of this work is not to offer impeccable solutions for a few problems, but to show that the more or less sophisticated data provided by structural linguistics can be used in philosophical arguments. Even if better data in more capable hands should override some of my conclusions, this work will have achieved its aim. Thus I have restricted my revisions to passages in which I had been clearly wrong, and I did not press unity beyond the point of conceptual and terminological consistency.

The material making up four of the seven chapters (3, 4, 6, 7) has been published before. According to what I just said, in spite of the several corrections, insertions, and occasional rewriting, I tried to preserve the original pa-

PREFACE

pers substantially the same. Bibliographical data are given in the text.

I have kept the technical apparatus to a necessary minimum. The text does not require any previous acquaintance with transformational grammar, and the only symbols I have used in giving transformations are very elementary: *N* for noun, *A* for adjective, *V* for verb, *D* for adverb, *P* for preposition. In exhibiting words, phrases, or sentences I conform to the style of the linguists by italicizing them rather than giving them in quotation marks. The asterisk (*) in front marks deviant sentences. A technical account of the grammatical background behind Chapters 5, 6, and 7 can be found in my *Adjectives and Nominalizations* (The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1967). In writing Chapter 2, I greatly profited by the mimeographed first version of Dr. Beverly Robbins' work, *The Definite Article in English Translation* (The Hague: Mouton and Co., forthcoming). Zellig S. Harris' recently published "Transformational Theory" (*Language* 41 [1965], 363–401) provides a short but comprehensive summary of the particular version of transformational grammar used in these works.

There are three men without whose influence these essays could not have been written: Paul Ziff, who taught me philosophy; Zellig S. Harris, who taught me linguistics; and J. L. Austin, who made me see the connection of the two. In addition I want to acknowledge the help of the members of the National Science Foundation Project in Linguistic Transformations, Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania—especially that of Henry Hiz. Finally, I owe to Max Black the stimulation and encouragement to put this book together.

PREFACE

I gratefully acknowledge the permission of the editors of *The Philosophical Review* to reprint the articles “Verbs and Times” and “The Grammar of Goodness”; of the editor of *Mind* to reprint the article “Each and Every, Any and All”; and of Professor R. J. Butler, editor of the volume *Analytical Philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962), to reprint, in part, the paper “Effects, Results and Consequences.” I also wish to thank Professors Max Black and Terence M. Penelhum for a number of stylistic suggestions.

ZENO VENDLER

University of Calgary
December 1966