In his book, Bad Language. Are Some Words Better Than Others?, Edwin L. Battistella addresses linguistic usages that some people might label “bad language”. Following the introductory chapter, which outlines the topic and key notions of the book, the second chapter (“Bad Writing”) discusses the question of what can be regarded as “good” writing. After explaining that different types of writing, such as academic essays, job applications or diaries, need to fulfil different criteria in order to be “good” and that evaluative judgements on “good” writing have changed over the centuries, Battistella comes to the conclusion that “good writing is a relative notion” (39) and that the quality of a piece of writing is very much determined by whether this piece of writing fulfils its actual purpose.

Chapter 3 focuses on “Bad Grammar”, i.e. on deviations from usages which traditional or prescriptive grammar would describe as correct. Looking at the justification why certain grammatical choices should be regarded as correct and others not, Battistella rejects the inherent logic of grammatical rules in favour of the social function that the establishment and maintenance of linguistic standards can have. “Bad Words” are the subject of Chapter Four; offensive language, slang and the discussion of political correctness are dealt with in turn. Battistella offers these as a further demonstration of the importance of social function – “badness” can be seen as a result of either the non-conformity of certain expressions or the deviation from established usage.

The book goes on to explore the relationship that is sometimes established between the “right” language and “good” citizenship and evaluates the validity of slogans such as “One Flag – One Language” (Chapter Five: “Bad Citizens”). In this context, Battistella describes the change of attitudes towards Native American languages and sign language in the USA and discusses recent models established to tackle the problem of linguistic pluralism in the classroom.

Chapter 6 then focuses on “Bad Accents”, commenting on attitudes towards and prejudices against foreign accents, regional dialects and African-American English, whereas the last chapter “Images and Engagement” offers a summary of the most important arguments and reflects on the role of linguistics in the public discussion of language issues.

Having outlined the general structure of the book, the following questions are worth addressing: how new is this topic or, put differently, how new are the insights provided by this book? Furthermore, how relevant is this topic and
which readership is addressed? An answer can be found in the book’s structure, in its presentation of what constitutes “bad language”:

The chapters are well-structured and lucid so that no prior knowledge of the matter is required to follow Battistella’s line of argument. This is achieved by providing ample background information, often describing how certain attitudes or linguistic aspects have developed over the centuries, and by using many examples. The discussions of and debates over certain topics, as for example the status of African-American English, are well explained and easy to follow even for those who are not acquainted with the respective arguments.

The chosen cultural context is clearly that of the USA; the few references to British English are limited to descriptions of historical developments. It is therefore the sociopolitical history of the USA that provides the basis for Battistella’s outline; the linguistic examples mainly draw on American English or languages spoken in the USA. The choice of topics reflects an US-American perspective, too: apart from obvious cases like Native American languages or African American English, also the discussion of political correctness seems especially relevant for the US-American community.

But Battistella does not restrict himself to outlining the different attitudes towards “good” and “bad” language usage, he also reflects on them from a linguistic point of view. This linguistic point of view is decidedly descriptive and advocates a relativist approach to language phenomena, preferring the notion of appropriateness to that of correctness. Furthermore, he stresses the importance linguistic description should have in all of these discussions, demanding that the public pay closer attention to linguistic findings, but also that linguistics make a substantial contribution to these issues.

In short, the book is best suited for an introductory exploration of sociolinguistic topics, including attitudes towards certain linguistic varieties. The intended readership is assumed to have little or no prior linguistic knowledge, so that for such an audience the book offers new and interesting insights into sociolinguistic topics in general and linguistic stereotypes in America. For a linguist or a reader with profound linguistic knowledge, “Bad Language” might be seen as preaching to the converted. However, what it does offer also to this kind of reader is a collection of a large amount of background information and a useful synopsis of the phenomenon of linguistic stereotyping. To sum up: this book can certainly be seen as “good writing”, fulfilling the criteria that Battistella himself establishes for it: “[…] all good writing requires a discernable logic and degree of organization, cohesion, unity and clarity appropriate to the subject and audience” (39).

Katrin Götz-Votteler (Erlangen)
The four volumes under review are the latest publications in the series *Glossaries in Linguistics* by Edinburgh University Press, launched in 2003 with Trudgill's *Glossary of Sociolinguistics*. The glossaries are intended as pocket-guides to topics in linguistics which define key terms of the respective fields (EUP catalogue *Language & Linguistics 2006-7*, 7). All of them provide concise definitions (usually a few lines, sometimes up to a page) of a few hundred items, arranged in alphabetical order and with a layout that makes for easy access. The definitions are preceded by a few pages of introductory remarks and followed by a short section of references and/or suggestions for further reading. Although the similarity of the titles suggests uniformity, the individual volumes, each authored by one or several specialists in the respective fields, differ from each other in several important respects and therefore warrant individual consideration.

The most easily noticeable differences are the type and scope of the topics and the number of entries. Whereas both Cruse’s and Leech’s volumes deal with levels of linguistic analysis (semantics and pragmatics on the one hand, and grammar on the other), Davies’ covers what might be considered as a subfield of linguistics (applied linguistics) and Baker et al.’s volume covers a method of performing linguistic analyses (corpus linguistics). In addition, Leech’s volume on grammar is explicitly limited to the English language. The other three, although this is nowhere made explicit, also focus on English, but make occasional reference to other languages. While the average length of the entries is similar across volumes (with Leech’s definitions being particularly concise), the number of entries varies quite considerably, with Baker et al.’s *Glossary of Corpus Linguistics* containing the greatest and (perhaps somewhat surprisingly) Davies' *Glossary of Applied Linguistics* the smallest number of terms. Further differences include the function of the short sections preceding and following the body of entries, the ways of indicating the origin of the information given in the definitions, and, most importantly, the consistency in the selection of entries.

Leech’s *Glossary of English Grammar* is “a revised, updated and much expanded version of the author’s *Introducing English Grammar* (Penguin, 1992)” (4). The introduction serves to give a fairly detailed account of the principles on which the selection of terms is based, as well as of the origin of the examples in the definitions and the rationale behind the reference lists provided at the end of
the book. The entries focus on terms that are largely theory-neutral and widely
used. The principal basis of the terminology covered in the glossary is Quirk et
al.’s *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (Longman, 1985), but
some terms from other grammars, in particular Huddleston and Pullum’s *Cam-
bidge Grammar of the English Language* (CUP, 2002) have also been included.
The selection appears very careful indeed, and the glossary reads like a list of
terms the undergraduate student of English linguistics ought to know, from
abstract noun, accusative case (“An alternative term for objective case.”), active
voice, actor (“see agent”) to zero article, zero plural, zero relative clause (“see
relative clause; cleft, cleft construction”) and zero relative pronoun (“see rela-
tive clause; relative pronoun”). Clear language is used throughout, as indeed in
all the volumes reviewed here. In the *Glossary of English Grammar*, most defini-
tions are additionally illustrated by examples, which are consistently well-
chosen. They are partly based on intuition and partly adapted versions of authen-
tic language extracted from computer corpora of Present Day English. A par-
ticularly useful feature of this glossary is that the individual definitions often
include information on the approach or theory in which a certain term is (usu-
ally) used (e.g. *continuous*: A term used instead of *progressive* in many peda-
gogical treatments of grammar […]; 27). At the end of the glossary, suggestions
for further reading are provided, first in the form of a bibliography, and then in
the form of a list stating which of the books cited are useful to whom and/or
follow which approach. The lists, and supposedly also the glossary as a whole,
are intended “for students or people without a specialist knowledge of […] gram-
mar” (132). Although it naturally only contains a small part of existing
grammatical terminology and certainly does not (and is not intended to) replace
a grammar, this book is a useful complement, in particular for the beginning
student of linguistics.

Cruse’s *Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics* is aimed at the same target
group, as stated explicitly in the introduction, and at “more advanced students
who are beginners as far as semantics and pragmatics are concerned” (1). The
introduction also briefly provides some information on the selection and length
of the entries. Terms have been selected for inclusion if they are likely to be
countered by those beginning with the study of the fields in question and have
been taken from all “main theoretical approaches” (4), and an entry typically
gives a bit more information than is usually found in an encyclopaedia entry.
Most of the introduction, however, is devoted to outlining the fields of seman-
tics and pragmatics, as well as semiotics, which the glossary also covers to some
degree. The outline includes brief explanations of different approaches and major
concepts in the respective fields and is highly accessible. The same is true for the
definitions given in the entries, despite the fact that these often deal with fairly
abstract concepts. Whenever possible, examples are provided. As in Leech’s vol-
ume, information is frequently given as to where a particular term originates
and/or which theory primarily uses it. As is to be expected considering the main
research interests of the author, semantics, and in particular lexical relations and
Cognitive Semantics, receive particular attention in the book. The central terms of pragmatics are, however, also covered (such as terms from speech act theory or conversation analysis). Unfortunately, there is no information on which work(s) the definitions in the glossary are primarily based, but at the end a bibliography is given, which lists those works which are referred to by author’s name in the definitions. The final section also provides suggestions for further reading, nicely ordered according to level and subfield or approach, and with comments on each publication cited (as to its coverage and level of difficulty). This glossary is therefore a useful, and unique, complementation to introductory textbooks in the fields of semantics and pragmatics.

While Cruse’s glossary is unique in that definitions of terms in the fields covered up to its publication only appeared in general dictionaries of linguistics, the *Glossary of Corpus Linguistics* by Paul Baker, Andrew Hardie, and Tony McEnery, is not only unique but also fills a real gap, as terms relating to corpus linguistics have not been systematically compiled at all before and hardly appear in general linguistic dictionaries. The greatest part of the introduction is taken up by a long list of acronyms (and their full forms), which the field has brought forth in abundance. Information on the selection of terms is provided on the back cover, where it is stated that entries focus on six broad areas, namely important corpora, key technical terms in the field, key linguistic terms relevant to corpus-based research, key statistical measures used in corpus linguistics, key computer programs used in the construction and exploitation of corpora, and standards applied in the field of corpus linguistics. Also to be found in the glossary, though not listed as a separate area, are several names of associations devoted to the field, for example organisations devoted to the distribution of corpora. All of the areas listed are well-represented, though a number of widely-used terms pertaining to the third category are missing, for example *span*, *node* or *chunk*. But as there was no previous work to draw upon in the compilation of terms, this is forgivable. More importantly, for the first time, terms such as *semantic prosody* or *colligation*, which are widely used in corpus linguistics and only rarely by researchers not familiar with the field, can be looked up. In addition, for most corpora and corpus software with a separate entry, information is also provided on where they can be obtained (which in many cases means downloaded or accessed). As in the other glossaries under review here, definitions are easily comprehensible throughout, even those explaining statistical measures. Of the glossaries reviewed, it is the only one providing references throughout the definitions and, as a consequence, an extensive reference list. An additional (shorter) list of suggested further readings (ideally with comments), is, however, not provided, and would be a welcome addition for a potential future edition. As the glossary covers a large number and wide range of relevant terms, it is useful not only for corpus users but also for corpus compilers, and suitable for both students and researchers who are beginning to explore the methodology as well as for more advanced corpus linguists.
The fourth volume under review, Davies’ *A Glossary of Applied Linguistics*, does not quite reach the standard set by the other three. Partly this is due to the fact that applied linguistics is an ill-defined and potentially large field. In the introduction, this problem is addressed, and two different definitions of applied linguistics contrasted, one that largely limits the field to language teaching (Corder) and one that includes all investigations of real-world problems in which language is central (Brumfit). It is claimed that the glossary follows Corder’s definition, “by targeting language teaching” (2), but at the same time Brumfit’s definition seems to be considered the more accurate one. While this already shines through in the introduction (where linguistics is said to deal “with idealisations”; 1), it becomes obvious in the selection of entries. It is true that many entries focus on language learning and teaching, but there are also many entries which are not from these fields, such as general core-linguistic terms such as *phonology, phoneme, grapheme, semantics, lexicology, reflexivity* (as a grammatical term), as well as terms from areas of linguistics such as pragmatics, socio-linguistics and variety studies, for example *Australian English, Bokmal, Brown corpus, colloquial, gender, turn-taking,* and numerous others. While the inclusion of some of these, in particular the core-linguistic terms, might have been justified if reference to the field of applied linguistics had been made in the definitions, this is mostly not the case (e.g. “grapheme The smallest unit of a writing system capable of causing a contrast in meaning. In English the 26 units of the alphabet are the main graphemes. See also phoneme”). What is more, the inclusion of terms from fields other than language learning and teaching often seems rather random. One example is the inclusion of *Bokmal* (defined as “One of the two officially recognised standard forms of Norwegian […]”), whereas the focus otherwise is on English; another example is the inclusion of *Brown corpus* as a headword (but not of any learner corpus or indeed the concept of learner corpus, which is highly relevant to the field of language learning and teaching). In view of the inconsistency in the selection of items, it seems somewhat ironic when it is claimed on the back cover that the glossary helps define the field of applied linguistics. On the positive side, many terms central to the field of language learning and teaching have been included (e.g. *acquisition, CALL, error, hypercorrection, immersion, language aptitude, learning strategies* etc.), though naturally not as many as can be found in other dictionaries of applied linguistics and/or language teaching (as for example those published by Longman). The terms are defined in the clear and concise style common to all the volumes. The final section presents a short reading list ordered as to type of publication (dictionaries, handbooks etc.), without further comments, however. A list of authors on whose works the definitions are based is also provided (in the preface), but the complete references are not.

To sum up, *A Glossary to English Grammar* and *A Glossary to Semantics and Pragmatics* can be recommended to beginning students in the respective fields, as useful supplements to grammars and textbooks on the topics. *A Glossary of Applied Linguistics* is only of limited use, and only for beginning students in the
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field of language learning and teaching, and *A Glossary of Corpus Linguistics* is most useful to anyone interested in the field, be they beginning or more advanced students or researchers.


As is indicated by its subtitle, this book is a *festschrift* for Manfred Markus, Professor of English Linguistics at the University of Innsbruck – one of those colleagues who appear so juvenile and energetic that one is surprised to find he is of *festschrift* age. Typical features of this genre in the book include a very nicely written preface and dedication by the editors, two of his former students; a photo of the smiling jubilee; a Tabula Gratulatoria; and an Appendix with his list of publications. Markus is perhaps best known internationally for having compiled ICAMET, an electronic corpus of historical English texts, and so it is fitting that this book revolves around the interface between “Corpus Linguistics”, the fashionable application of data processing techniques to machine-readable texts, and the historical text documentation and investigation of English.

There are twenty-one papers in the volume. Some of them are actually rather marginal to the volume’s topic, or fail to relate to it at all. Leona F. Cordery points out select topics to be found in medieval texts on the crusades, largely from a historical and literary perspective. Heidemarie Ganner muses on how to translate the words *boy* and *black*, used in a New Zealand Maori narrative, adequately into German. Horst Weinstock discusses some aspects of the Middle English text *Vices and Virtues*.

Conversely, a few papers are absolutely to the point in that they provide investigations of historical processes based on electronic corpora. In a small-scale but sophisticated study which employs online versions of the *Dictionary of Old English* (DOE) Corpus and the *Middle English Dictionary* (MED) as well as ICAMET, Hans-Jürgen Diller impressively traces the demise of lexemes which contain the morpheme *mod* in Middle English. Marina Dossena zooms in on a detail of corpus compilation, the choice of annotating tags in a corpus of nineteenth-century Scottish correspondence. Udo Fries screens the development of the abbreviations ‘*tis* and *it’s*, with or without an apostrophe, in the Zurich English Newspaper Corpus of the late seventeenth and eighteenth century. Maurizio Gotti compares the uses of *shall* and *will* for third-person future reference in the major types of pertinent speech acts, based on an Early Modern English subsection of the Helsinki Corpus; he finds them distributed in a more complex
fashion than described in earlier grammars. Also using the DOE and MED corpora, Thomas Kohnen tackles and illustrates a core methodological problem in historical corpus linguistics, namely that of identifying occurrences of a topic under investigation (in his case manifestations of the speech act “directives”), given the problem of lexical and orthographic variability. Christian Mair uses his Freiburg 1990s updates of the classic 1960s corpora of British and American English to investigate the putative comeback of the ’s-genitive as against the postnominal of-phrase and finds rather complex constraints in effect, and above all a continuing reluctance of inanimate nouns to adopt the inflectional ending. Lilo Moessner looks into the uses of the subjunctive in Early Modern English corpora.

Some contributions use not electronic text files but other collections and sources (“corpora” in a broader, non-technical sense) to investigate issues in the history of English. Uwe Böker surveys earlier scholarship on and aspects of eighteenth-century cant (secret vocabulary of marginal groups), with the long-term goal of building an electronic corpus of such texts from old lexicographic sources and court proceedings; he thus contributes an interesting perspective which oscillates between cultural history and methodological issues in corpus compilation. Manfred Kienpointner promises to analyze semantic change in verbs and nouns in the word field of love-hate-anger over the last 300 years, based on data from the electronic Oxford English Dictionary (OED) and recent dictionaries, but essentially he rehashes familiar tenets of word field theory and then throws in a few word lists and select examples. Gabriele Knappe uses Roget’s Thesaurus and other early dictionaries as evidence for nineteenth-century phraseology. Hans Peters uses dictionary evidence and applies a cognitive framework to track the semantic changes of the adjective smart since Old English. Akinobu Tani looks into select quasi-synonymic word-pair conjoints in the Thesaurus of Old English and in a Middle English text, though the rationale of this study is difficult to see.

Some papers discuss aspects of modern English, with or without an explicit corpus base. Using the British component of the International Corpus of English and the British National Corpus as evidence and employing complex programming tools, Jürgen Esser searches but fails to identify age-related differences, i.e. language development in a lifetime, in syntactic complexity, defined quantitatively (as words per sentence or frequencies of certain types of constituent embedding). Reinhard Heuberger documents word frequency information, the use of authentic language samples, and the inclusion of self-contained corpora in CD-ROM versions as innovative features of recent British dictionaries for foreign-language learners which reflect their origins in electronic text databases. Productive processes of lexical change (primarily word-formation) in present-day English are systematically listed and illustrated by many examples in a contribution by Raymond Hickey – an article which is interesting and certainly useful but somewhat marginal to the volume topic. Based upon the voluminous
Mannheim electronic Corpus of German, Bernhard Kettemann shows that, contrary to widespread claims, recent anglicisms in German are both morphologically integrated (using the examples *recycelt*, *gelayoutet* and *outgesourct*) and serve to introduce semantic differentiations (as in the cases of *shoppen*, clearly a leisure-time activity unlike laborious *einkaufen*, or, similarly, *cool* vs. *kühl* and *Event* vs. *Ereignis*). Based on a rather narrow, purely formal definition of “anglicisms”, Alexander Onysko discusses methodological questions of identifying them in the magazine *Der Spiegel*. Wolfgang Vierck introduces his project of setting up an atlas of English family names (which does include a diachronic component as well), emphasizing methodological problems like sources and mapping procedures and presenting some early results in the form of maps and tables.

As in any such collection, there is of course a certain unevenness in the quality and focus of the individual contributions; some are more central to the topic than others; and quite a number fail to contribute to the cross-over which should give it its distinctive character. Perhaps this is indicated by the fact that, regrettably, the papers are ordered alphabetically rather than by thematic subgroups. Overall, however, no doubt this is a fine collection, with a few very interesting and innovative and some outstanding and highly valuable contributions. It is a welcome indication of the recent trend that *festschriften* are no longer planned as collections of next to anything but that they are intended to come out as thematically coherent volumes which make a significant contribution to a field. As such it constitutes a fitting gift to and appreciation of the work of the honoree.

*Edgar W. Schneider* (Regensburg)

---


The phenomenon of phraseology is one of the key topics in current linguistics. As its title indicates, this volume tries to examine the relationship between phraseology and cultural perspectivization, tackling the question which role (semi-)preconstructed items play in the context of the linguistic relativity principle: following the assumption that linguistic expressions are reflections of conceptual dimensions on the one hand and influence perception on the other, the volume seeks to explore how cultural identity manifests itself in linguistic usage, especially in (semi-)preconstructed items.

The articles in this volume are grouped into different sections, according to their focus of interest: the first section concentrates on particular lexemes. Anna Wierzbicka, for example, examines the phrase *reasonably well* and, drawing on corpus analysis, the Anglo history of Enlightenment, the semantic change of *reasonable* and a comparative analysis with French, is able to demonstrate that
this phrase can be described as “a whole cloud of culture condensed in a drop of phraseology” (paraphrasing Wittgenstein; 50). Bert Peeters focuses on the importance of weekend in Australian culture; but whereas this claim is certainly uncontroversial, its proof is not always linguistic (e.g. the fact that a jury voted for the song *Friday on my mind* being the most important Australian song or that it is not unusual for university departments to hold weekly sessions called *Thank God it’s Friday*), and if it is, it is not necessarily restricted to semi-preconstructed items (e.g. the derivation *Mondayitis*). Using the *Bank of English* Monika Bednarek and Wolfram Bublitz analyse colligations, semantic preferences and collocations of the imperative *Enjoy…!* (as in *Enjoy your meal!*), coming to the conclusion that “[e]verything in the data embodies and proclaims the simple message: ‘having fun’ is good” (129), an implicit meaning of *Enjoy…!* that is for example exploited by the persuasion and advertising industry. Doris Schönefeld takes a cross-linguistic perspective, comparing the collocations of English *hot*, German *heiß*, and Russian *gorjachij*. Her findings suggest that in the literal sense, *hot*, *heiß* and *gorjachij* have a quite similar semantic range (even though English *hot* seems to be used for lower temperatures than German *heiß*); differences in usage can however be found on the metaphorical level.

The second section discusses the role of idioms for cultural conceptualization. It starts with the contribution by Charles Clay Doyle, which mainly provides a historical overview of collections of proverbs and proverb dictionaries. Only in the last section of the article (“gendered’ proverbs”) it is attempted to establish a connection between proverbs and conceptual attitudes. This, however, is done with a tendency to stereotypical generalizations: it can for example be read that “[c]ollege-aged women, with their ‘body-image issues’ and their proneness to eating disorders, say ‘A moment on the lips, forever on the hips,’ and ‘It’s better to look good than to feel good’” (197-198), whereas “[c]ertainly men are capable of satirizing the stereotype of themselves as sexist pigs” (199).

At least for the author of the present review it was not easy to see the relevance of statements such as: “Maybe there is even something redemptive in the undiscriminating attraction to all women; after all, how different, in its ‘meaning,’ is the wholesome proverb ‘Beauty is only skin deep’ from the newer male proverb ‘It’s all pink on the inside’? At least *that* is not the sentiment that gives rise to anorexia in young women” (199). Wolfgang Mieder investigates American proverbs and especially those used in New England. A categorization of various New England proverbs leads him to the conclusion that “[t]here certainly is a lot of practical wisdom in these common-sensical proverbs that are definitely part of the worldview or mentality of the people in New England” (228). Quite similarly, by investigating similes and other evaluative idioms in Australian English, Pam Peters identifies certain topics that seem to be prevalent in Australian experience. In the last article of that section, Svenja Adolphs takes a close look at the modality cluster *definitely maybe*; but even though the linguistic analysis and its result that the meaning of this cluster conveys a certain idiomatic quality are
convincing, it is not easy to see how this cluster exerts an influence on or is influenced by cognitive schemata.

The contributions by Melina Magdalena and Peter Mühlhäusler, Andrea Gerbig and Angel Shek, and by Karin Aijmer focus on registers: environmental language, or “greenspeak”, is the topic of the article by Magdalena and Mühlhäusler. Drawing on texts published between 1993 and 2003, the authors investigate aspects such as e.g. length of expressions, resources, derivation, or word-formation processes in greenspeak and are able to shed some light on how environment is talked about and therefore conceptualized in different contexts. Gerbig and Shek compare several keywords connected with the concept of tourism and analyse their linguistic usages in the Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen Corpus, the Freiburg-Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen Corpus and the British National Corpus, observing “shifts in cultural practices; from travelling as a privilege for the aristocracy and the rich to holidays as seasonal movements of the masses, to globalisation and travelling as a prerequisite to professional success” (318). Aijmer explores the development of text-type specific routine formulae, as they have come to be used with answering-machines. Her data reveals that messages on answering machines follow a specific sequence allowing for structural variation, and that the routine formulae are borrowed from various other registers, such as face-to-face communication, telephone conversation, letter writing and radio communication.

The last section of the volume is concerned with phraseology in dialects and ethnolects. The first variety presented in this section is Tristan da Cunha English, with Daniel Schreier investigating the symbolic value of the greeting formula How you is? His recordings reveal that at least some Tristanians regard this greeting as part of their own cultural identity. Discussing multiword units in Aboriginal English, Ian G. Malcolm and Farzad Sharifan show that “[t]he vernacularization of English by Aboriginal people has (...) involved the use of English lexical items with semantic shift” (380) and that the differences between Aboriginal English and Australian English can be accounted for by different conceptualizations of life and environment. Similarly, Hans-Georg Wolf and Frank Polzenhagen convincingly demonstrate that cultural schemata prevailing in African communities find their reflection in linguistic usage, the African English usage conveying different linguistic patterns than British and American English. Last but not least, Christian Mair examines collocational choices made by writers in different varieties of English, describing these choices as “complementary approaches to the same phenomenon, culturally motivated lexical variability in world Englishes” (442). As follow-ups to his findings he addresses the question of collocational density in learner language in comparison to second language varieties as well as the suitability of the Web as a source for extensive corpus analysis.

The four sections are introduced by a prologue by Andrew Pawley, which offers a valuable summary of the development of phraseology in the last decades, bringing together results and insights of various disciplines regarding the status
of preconstructed items. The concluding contribution to the volume, the epi-logue written by Penny Lee, stresses the central role of phraseology for the un-derstanding of the nature of language and sums up the findings of the preceding articles.

As can be seen from the outline above, the articles address various facets of phraseology and culture in English on the one hand, and use different approaches to investigating the problem in question on the other. In order to as-certain whether “a language, especially its lexicon, influences its speakers’ cul-tural patterns of thought and perception in various ways” (v), some of these methods prove to be more suitable than others. If conceptualization and the perspective on our surroundings are to be influenced by the way these surround-ings are encoded by our language, there are two sides of the coin to be taken account of: the semantic nature of the linguistic expression used to refer to cer-tain concepts, objects or situations can reveal how these are perceived; but it is probably only in a certain quantity that these linguistic expressions actually in-fluence our way of perspectivization. One approach with which these two lines of investigation can be combined is corpus linguistics, as it is able to provide information on both aspects. The articles using corpus linguistic methodology can therefore be said to make a valuable contribution to the topic of the volume, always provided that a link between corpus findings and their implications for cultural conceptualization is established. Furthermore, comparative analyses examining the usages of (near-)equivalents can reveal how in different languages or varieties the realizations of so-thought same semantic concepts can form part of quite different (semi-)preconstructed items. To find an answer to the ques-tion asked in the preface of the volume, the direction to take is therefore first to have a look at the linguistic material and then draw conclusions for the cultural implication, but not vice versa.

Summing up, it can be said that the question whether the lexicon of a lan-guage exerts influence upon our way of thinking can only be answered by analys-ing large amounts of data. As is the nature of articles in such a volume, the pre-sent contributions can only focus on details; but taken together, they add up like pieces of a puzzle, suggesting indeed that cultural conceptualization finds its reflection in linguistic expression and that the semantic side of linguistic expres-sion is responsible for cognitive categorization.

Katrin Götz-Votteler (Erlangen)
This new textbook, by a respected language historian, is said to be intended for advanced undergraduate and graduate students. Characteristic textbook features include lists of key words and topics for discussion and exercises at the end of each chapter (with a key to possible answers in an appendix) and rich illustrative material, including cartoons, pictures, graphs, and, above all, many text samples, including facsimile reproductions of old texts. The appendix also has useful sections with a chronology of English language history and on how to use the OED online. One special feature mentioned to justify yet another textbook in this battled area is the explicit integration of the internet: there are many URLs quoted which lead to further materials (e.g. audio samples of readings of historical texts), and there is a website supporting the book (nicely done but with very little additional information of any value). Another one is a purported emphasis on internal changes – more on this below.

Four core chapters, largely similar in structure, cover the main historical periods of English. Chapters 4 on Old English, 6 on Middle English, 7 on Early Modern English, and 8 on Modern English provide information on textual documentation and spelling conventions, “sounds” (the notion of phonemes is not employed), morphology and syntax, the lexicon, and dialects, in their respective periods. Many text samples are integrated (some of them glossed); and each of these chapters is followed by lengthy appendices in which about a handful or more of texts from the respective period, of several pages length each, are reproduced. Some of the Old English texts are translated or glossed; most of the others are not.

The other chapters, while addressing an extremely wide range of topics, are less clearly focused. Chapter 1, “The English language”, discusses early settlement history, the notion of euphemisms, sounds and grammatical words, topics of sociolinguistics, types of language change, prescriptivism, identity markers in Canadian English, external history, and the Battle of Hastings, roughly in this order. If this chapter “explored defining English” (10), it is definitely more of an exploration than a definition. Chapter 2 combines “English spelling, sounds, and grammar”, covering topics which range from basic articulatory phonetics via notions like epenthesis or metathesis to a preview of the Great Vowel Shift, and, similarly in grammar, from elementary terms like inflection and case to grammaticalization. This, I feel, provides less of a helpful “background” (26) than a collection of all kinds of issues which are distantly related to each other, from the maximally simple to the highly complex. Chapters 3 and 5 will be discussed below. Chapter 8, interestingly enough and certainly welcome in principle, opens the perspective to “English around the World”, discussing the external history of the expansion of English and select peculiarities of new varieties of English on
the levels of pronunciation, spelling, grammar, and vocabulary; it also mentions pidgins and creoles and English as a threat to the world’s language diversity. Whether these grammatical properties can and should be presented as a continuation of earlier internal trends of English, as is done in the end (273), seems highly doubtful, however. Finally, Chapter 10, the “Conclusion”, promises to “review the major changes in English” (281), which, in all fairness, it does, in two or three brief paragraphs, while most of the space is spent in a discussion of theories of language change in very abstract terms, and the Sapir-Whorf-Hypothesis.

No doubt there are lots of valuable facts and a whole range of interesting details presented in this book. Any reader who takes the time to work through all of it will profit from this and is likely to find something of interest and something new, and students who really digest all of these texts and examples will command a thorough familiarity with English and its history. But is it a suitable textbook? As is implied in my notes above I find it confusing and illogical in both its macro- and its micro-structure. All kinds of fashionable topics in linguistics are mentioned in passing, and details are presented which are totally irrelevant for the history of English, while some essential facts and, more importantly, explanations are missing. What follows are some illustrations of these concerns.

As to the overall structure, let us look at what Chapters 3 and 5 offer. In the chapter “Before Old English” we get discussions of the following topics: archeology; migrations of early man; Egyptian logograms (nicely reproduced); the comparative method; Grimm’s Law (now we are there after all – but there is no word on Verner’s Law, the important sideline); the Second, High German Consonant Shift (I fail to see what the relevance of this is for the history of English); case systems of Sanskrit and Hindi (with examples); and ideological issues in recognizing or denying any relatedness between Japanese and Korean (!). The fact that there are distinctive properties of Germanic languages, like weak verbs and adjectives, is mentioned very briefly, but there is no word on the Germanic Main Stress Rule or on vocalic changes leading from Indo-European to Germanic. In Chapter 5, its title, “From Old to Middle English”, is, quite simply, a misnomer. It discusses loan words in English, from practically all periods: Celtic, Latin (both pre-OE and modern), Scandinavian, and French (notwithstanding their much later intrusion). Sections on the mixed-origin lexicon of English as a means of deception (105) or a rehash of the notorious creole origins thesis of Middle English, long refuted (unless one subscribes to a totally nontechnical understanding of “creole” as broadly influenced by any kind of contact) do not contribute to the clarity of this chapter. Similarly, the Middle English chapter ends with a list of all “internal changes” in English, regardless from which period (138).

This rather chaotic line-up of topics can be found on the micro-level of the text in many chapters as well, I’m afraid; subsequent statements and topics are
Recently only very distantly related to each other, while a reader is likely to search for a cohesive connection. For example, on a single page (3) the text jumps from the Roman occupation of Britain and early European slavery via an illustration of difficult Latin-derived loans in a modern text and, in passing, the native origin of the English plural – to the notion of euphemisms. Where is the logic behind this?

Many details are mentioned which to a student of the history of English are simply superfluous and distracting, while, surprisingly, some facts which I would consider essentials are missing. In the first category: cartoons are always fun, of course, but I wonder what the learning effect is of reproducing one with a sign “Key puff” at the edge of a cliff, unexplained and uncommented (6)? When the terms *sounds*, *vowels* and *consonants* are introduced, readers are told the number of consonants in Hawaiian and Finnish (8 and 13, respectively, in case a reader of this review is interested ...); similarly, elementary notions like *word order* and *grammatical words* are illustrated by mentioning the lack of endings in Chinese and multiple prefixation in Navajo (5-6). There are lots of details in this book – some which are relevant but of questionable necessity (like endless Old English paradigms), others which are just distracting and irrelevant (like, for instance, a long listing of “literary figures” in the World Englishes chapter – with all due respect to authors like Tsitsi Dangarembga and others of equal standing; 254). Furthermore, the wording in detail sometimes is such that certain facts come out a little infelicitously. For instance, did English really “officially start” in 449 (2)? Or, on the same page: mentioning both Latin being spoken in Britain before 410 and the existence of early Latin loan words like *wine* in Germanic in the same paragraph will automatically imply to the uninformed reader that this is where and when these words entered English, which is a characteristic erroneous assumption of many students. A similarly misleading statement much later: Australia was certainly not, next to America, one of “the first” world regions to be affected by the global spread of English (250). Or, from the modern English chapter: assuming that a textbook writer usually proceeds from the most to the less important, stating that the twentieth century is “characterized by revolutions in art (e.g. Cubism, Surrealism, [...]), two world wars, and many technological and medical advances as well as changes in political and social ideas” (205) makes me wonder whether priorities are right here.

Conversely, in the discussion of the sounds of Middle English changes in vowel length are mentioned briefly (119), but no principles, explanations, or sound changes are offered (although this is an important topic with substantial consequences in the pronunciation and spelling systems of modern English!). The Great Vowel Shift is covered only very briefly. Strangely enough, while the book claims to emphasize internal change and the restructuring of English from a synthetic to an analytic language as its core topics, the most important of all likely, purely internal reasons for this grammatical change, the fixing of stress in Germanic which led to the phonetic weakening and ultimately loss of endings, is
not mentioned at all (and the change of the character of English is tentatively accounted for by language contact, a purely external factor; 98).

In sum, it is perhaps a bit unfair to sound so critical, given that, yes, there is a whole lot of material in this book which makes it worthwhile reading: many relevant statements and details, and many discussions of examples that a reader will profit from. But from a textbook I would expect clarity of structure and presentation, systematicity, guidance as to what is important and what isn’t, and a consistent and possibly increasing level of difficulty, and all of these qualities I miss here. Teachers who consider adopting this book as course reading should be warned that a lot of additional efforts will be required from them, explaining and accounting for some facts, and, above all, providing connections and a structured context, all of which the book largely fails to provide.

Edgar W. Schneider (Regensburg)


John Sinclair’s and Anna Mauranen’s book Linear Unit Grammar presents a challenge to much conventional thought in linguistics. It investigates the perspective of how readers or listeners make sense of a text. One of the claims of the book is that the approach described applies equally to all varieties of a language, thus, as indicated by the subtitle, integrating speech and writing.

The central issue of the book is chunking. It is argued that in some form or other chunking takes place whenever a sentence of English is encountered by a reader or listener, although different speakers would not necessarily identify identical chunks in a given stretch of language. The ability to chunk a text is seen as an intuitive skill (54), as “a natural and unavoidable way of perceiving language text as it is encountered” (6). The role of chunking is effectively demonstrated in a preamble in which the reader is presented with four lines of text in the following form (xxx):

(1) theheadmasterofharrowtellssannmcferranwhyhehas ...

Focussing on the analysis of chunks means a concentration on the linear aspect of language: “Our policy is to maintain linearity until we combine elements so as to be closer to the requirements of a natural grammar” (6). This policy has a number of interesting consequences for the analysis: on the one hand, of course, the model is able to deal without difficulty with such phenomena as false starts etc. typical of spoken discourse. On the other hand, it provides a justification for rejecting categories like “ellipsis” or “words understood” (150). Notions such as
acceptability, grammaticalness or well-formedness obviously play no role in this approach (49).

The term chunk as used in the book is described as “pre-theoretical term” (130). Although the enormous role of recurrent chunks such as formulaic wholes is underlined with reference to current linguistic and psychological models, these are not the kinds of chunk that are in the centre of this book. Rather, the chunks concentrated upon here are linear sequences of usually not more than four or five words, although this is not to be taken as an absolute upper limit. It is obvious that the chunks identified in this bottom-up type of grammar are not identical with the constituents of, say, phrase structure grammar. In fact, it is one of the main attractions of this book that it forces the reader to question traditional or established categories or principles of grammatical description or to find additional evidence for questioning them. Thus the fact that the sequence

(2)  i haven’t | i didn’t see anything | because | it was during the night

is chunked in this way (in a slightly different graphic representation) leads to an interesting discussion about the status of the conjunction because, which is analysed as belonging to neither clause, which is a break from conventional grammar in which such conjunctions are generally seen as part of a subordinate clause which as a whole functions as an adverbial in the main clause. Although of course there are good reasons for such classifications, rejecting “the argument that our texts must all be divided into clauses” (18) seems very attractive for a number of reasons, as is demonstrated in the discussion of the role of phrases such as and then or first of all, which are often described as conjuncts or disjuncts (75).

The approach which is outlined in this book, making use of a large number of different types of text examples, consists of several steps, which cannot all be described here. A first step consists of identifying a PUB (provisional unit boundary), which separates one chunk from another. Then, a distinction is made between two basic types of elements: message-oriented elements (M), “which are concerned with that which is being talked about”, which “increment the shared knowledge of the speakers”, and organisation-oriented elements (O), “which are primarily concerned with managing the discourse” (59), the latter being subdivided into text-oriented (OT) and interactive-oriented (OI). These distinctions may be easier to draw in theory than to apply in practice. The analysis of the occurrence of these types of chunk reveal interesting differences between different text samples (ranging from spoken language to Joyce).

A further important distinction that it is introduced is that between message fragments (MF), which are not continued, M−-elements, which are not complete but continued, and +M-elements, which continue M−-elements (xxx):
There seems to be a certain inconsistency in the model in that elements are classified as M− if they are followed by a +M; if chunk 4 were missing, 2 would presumably be classified as M. Here, structural properties of lexical items, in particular valency properties in terms of optional or obligatory complementation, could provide a useful elaboration of the model. The classification of elements as M− opens up interesting parallels with the strategies described by Clark and Clark (1977).

This kind of chunk description – with a few more types of chunk such as MS (message supplement) and MR (message revision) – is then used to arrive at a revised kind of analysis, in which OI-elements and message fragments are removed from the linear stream and M−-elements are reconciled with +M-elements, for example, to provide a basis for further descriptive analysis (91). However, it is debatable whether all of the adjustments of texts toward written norms are really necessary. Thus it is difficult to see why a stretch such as (xxx)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A: erm</td>
<td>OI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>if you have a direct contact</td>
<td>M−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>with the people</td>
<td>+M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>OT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>you don't have</td>
<td>M−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>efficient Estonian</td>
<td>+M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

should lead to a “revised version” which “is close to the norms of coherent written prose” (101):

(3) It was an article I read about a famous Estonian television reporter who went on hunger strike.

This is rather surprising because it suggests superiority of the written medium after all. It might seem preferable to keep the surface-orientation of the analysis and develop a system for expressing the relations between the different chunks.

While sections A and B set out the background and system of the analysis, the chapters in section C provide a detailed analysis of a number of text extracts and an attempt to position Linear Unit Grammar in the linguistic scene. In the introductory section Nida’s immediate constituent analysis, Brazil’s Grammar of Speech, and construction grammar receive particular attention. In many respects, the approach outlined can be seen as plea for a shift in emphasis. This does not only apply to models of syntactic analysis, but also to discourse analysis, where it is argued that while in the past differences between conversation and written
texts and the analysis of the competitive aspect of the participants in a conversation were emphasized, it may now be time to look at complementary aspects. In the final chapter, the authors discuss questions of alignment with other grammars and outline its use “as a novel kind of shallow or partial parser” (147) or possible applications in language and information science or in language teaching and interpreting.

Room for further research obviously concerns the psychological aspects for chunking. While many references to current approaches in psycholinguistics and cognitive linguistics and also to Thom’s catastrophe theory are made, the approach outlined in *Linear Unit Grammar* is not immediately related to experimental evidence. Rather, the book can be seen as preparing the ground for such research and for opening up the right kind of research paradigm: “The possibility of experimental confirmation is, however, a live issue, and if our general approach and thesis finds approval then the expenditure of time and effort to substantiate our supposition could be justified” (7). The model sketched out by Sinclair and Mauranen – with its emphasis on real text, on the syntagmatic and linear aspects of language and on the need to question the validity of the categories with which we tend to describe language – provides many interesting insights into language text and opens up many fascinating research paradigms.

Since this is John Sinclair’s last book, it must be added that this book contains many of the features that are typical of John Sinclair’s approach to language and that this book is another example of the immense inquisitiveness and originality of his valuable contribution to the subject.

*Thomas Herbst (Erlangen)*
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