Reviews

Hilde Hasselgård. *Adjunct adverbials in English* (Studies in English Language). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 320 pp. ISBN 978-0-521-51556-6. Reviewed by **Gunnel Tottie,** University of Zurich.

When I first started taking an interest in English adverbials in the early 1980s it was news to use corpora for quantitative research on these items and to look at differences between their use in speech and writing (Tottie 1986). We have come a long way since then: not only have corpora proliferated and become more user-friendly, but the tools for analyzing and making sense of output from corpora – conceptual as well as practical – have been refined. From hands-on statistical programs and simple ways of creating charts and diagrams to theoretical models based on research in text linguistics, discourse analysis, functional sentence perspective, systemic-functional grammar and pragmatics – we now also have the wherewithal to handle and present our findings that were not available to early workers in the field.

Hilde Hasselgård makes good use of new resources in her impressive new monograph on adjunct adverbials – the term *adjunct* is used in the sense of Quirk *et al*. (1985), not as an umbrella term for all adverbials as in Huddleston and Pullum (2002). Part I of the book consists of three chapters, in which she introduces her subject and her approach. In Chapter 1 she presents her material, the British English version of the International Corpus of English (ICE-GB), designating 60,000 words of it as her 'core corpus,' with 10,000 words from each of the following six text types (defined on the basis of non-linguistic features): conversation, commentary, personal letters, news, fiction, and academic writing, thus transcending the simple spoken/written dichotomy. By means of a manual search Hasselgård identified a total of 4,470 instances of adjuncts. When further examples were needed for qualitative analysis, Hasselgård searched the entire ICE-GB corpus as well as, occasionally, the British National Corpus. Quantitative data form the backbone of the book; Hasselgård states her credo as

follows on p. 7: “Qualitative statements are often of little value for generalizations about language use unless they can be corroborated by quantitative observations.” But the focus of the book is the “qualitative aspects of the use of adjunct adverbials” (*ibid*.).

However, the subject matter of adverbials remains elusive and hard to define, with fuzzy borders of delimitation not only towards other syntactic categories but also substantial problems of sub-categorization within the adverbial domain. Operationalizing data is a difficulty that must be undertaken with great circumspection and careful accounting of methods and principles. Hasselgård takes an eclectic approach, devoting her second chapter to careful discussion of earlier research on adverbials and terminology. She adopts Quirk *et al*.’s classification into adjuncts, conjuncts and disjuncts rather than Biber *et al*.’s (1999) terms circumstantial, stance and linking adverbials, and she wisely disregards the problematic category of subjuncts. Instead, she includes “all time and degree adverbials along with focus and viewpoint adverbials among the adjuncts” (p. 23). The main categories she identifies are those of Space, Time, Manner and Contingency, followed by Respect, Degree and Extent, Participant, Situation, Comparison/Alternative, Focus and Viewpoint. These are then further subcategorized according to semantic criteria; thus for instance Space adjuncts are divided into Position, Direction, and Distance adjuncts. (Unfortunately the printing of Table 2.2 on p. 39 as three columns makes it look as if there were two levels of subcategorization.) Hasselgård supports her decisions with well-argued discussions of examples and also points out that “categories of adverbials are seldom clear-cut” (p. 31) and that overlapping and semantic blends are frequent. Each adjunct must be classified in context.

Realization categories are more straightforward: adjuncts can be single adverbs, prepositional phrases, noun phrases, finite clauses, non-finite clauses or verbless clauses. Hasselgård introduces two additional categories for pragmatic rather than theoretical reasons: adverb phrases and prepositional clauses (as in *by joining the movement*) because they can be expected to have different positional restrictions than simple adverbs or prepositional phrases. Chapter 2 ends with figures showing the distribution of realization categories and how semantic classes are distributed across them – the graphs are in principle excellent, but because of the small print, especially of the legends explaining the patterns, they are hard to read without a magnifying glass. This is a recurrent problem throughout the book; it could have been solved at least for pie charts if explanatory legends had been printed in a larger format.

Hasselgård continues to set the scene for her analysis in Chapter 3, where she classifies types of adverbial placement, a vexed topic for anyone trying to

render a systematic account of English word order (and a practical problem even for otherwise accomplished non-native speakers and writers). Hasselgård's system recognizes Initial, Medial and End positions, further subdividing Medial into M1, M2, and M3. In addition to these, she also introduces an innovation: the Cleft focus position, as in *…it will* ***be as a children's author*** *that he is remembered.* Except for this last type, borders are fuzzy as usual, but Hasselgård always makes a good case for her decisions. She also classifies sequences of adjuncts as *clusters* if they are continuous and as *combinations* if they are discontinuous. She further discusses syntactic relations between verb and adverbial, obligatoriness, and semantic scope of adverbials (sentence or predicate). At the end of the chapter, Hasselgård outlines the basic distribution of placement types in her material, showing that End position predominates with 77.4 percent, followed by Initial position with 12.4 percent. The various Medial positions and the minuscule Cleft focus type thus account for just over 10 percent together. Further diagrams cross-classify positions with semantic types and realizations and a table summarizes factors influencing placement – clause-internal, textual and thematic.

After Part I containing the three introductory chapters, the book has three more parts. Part II offers a detailed presentation of adjunct positions and combinations of them, and how they are influenced by considerations of theme, cohesion and information dynamics as well as other factors summarized in Table 3.3 on p. 62. The discussion is rich and thoughtful and underpinned by well-chosen examples with just the right amount of context, making it easy to follow. Here too Hasselgård is eclectic, drawing from different schools of thought – in my opinion a wise decision when dealing with a category as diverse as adjunct adverbials. The discussion of the role of conflicting or converging factors is of particular interest; one wonders if a multivariate analysis would be feasible when categories are as fuzzy as they are with adverbials and textual factors.

Part III of the book deals with the frequency and use of semantic types of adjuncts across process and text types and different positions. Again, the choice and discussion of examples are excellent, and Hasselgård gives well-reasoned and principled accounts for her findings and analyses. If the reading occasionally is somewhat repetitive, this is a necessary consequence of cutting back and forward between semantics and adverbial positions and looking at the problems from different angles.

Part IV contains a discussion of adjuncts across text types and a concluding summary of findings of the whole study. The six chosen text types prove to have very different distribution profiles for adjuncts, both as regards total frequencies and semantic categories. Thus the two spoken genres conversation and sports

commentary have little in common, and academic prose stands out as having a much wider variety of semantic categories of adjuncts than others. The final chapter brings up overlaps between adjunct types, and Hasselgård offers a graphic overview of their relationships. She also discusses and illustrates the relationship between adjuncts, conjuncts and disjuncts on the basis of her findings and ends by suggesting areas for further study, such as the use of adverbs in non-British varieties and in a wider variety of text types, the interaction between semantic types expressing e.g. causality and spatiality, and contrastive study comparing different languages. Another way of building on Hasselgård's findings would be to take a sociolinguistic approach and look at the use of adverbials by women and men, by different age groups and different socio-economic groups, and possibly observing linguistic change. And as I remarked above, it might be possible to carry out a more sophisticated statistical analysis to isolate the individual factors determining adverb placement.

I find little to quarrel with in this book, but I do have a question and a few critical remarks. The question concerns Hasselgård's count of adverbials, as she does not specify what she did about levels of embedding. On p. 113, example (67) is shown to contain a cluster of two adjuncts, which is fine for the discussion of the example in context, but how were the adjuncts counted in the corpus? As two or four? In a quantitative study this is an important question, but I could find no accounting for it in the initial chapter.

(67) He said *yesterday* || *after he won the stage* ***so brilliantly in the Pyrenees*** that…

In several cases (e.g. on p. 68) Hasselgård labels her descriptive figures showing distributional proportions *Probability for adjunct types to occur in ... position*, but obviously this is merely a description of the *distribution* in her corpus, and that term would have been better. Similarly, the word *frequency* is often used for mere totals, not for a frequency in a certain number of occurrences.

Hasselgård's style is studiedly impersonal and replete with constructions like "…the **cleft focus** position *has been added* to the positions outlined so far …it *has been desirable* to do so here…" (p. 44). Sometimes the result is funny, as when the author says (p. 303) that "no single study can hope to answer all questions related to [adverbial] syntax… [h]owever, *it* (my italics) can hope to stimulate further research…" But on p. 55 Hasselgård succumbs to the necessity of using *my* in "To *my* knowledge the distinction between clusters and combinations has not been used systematically before …" And on p. 106 she uses what I presume to be the inclusive *we* in "...to assess this claim *we* (added italics) shall

look at some examples…" – I wish she had stressed the fact she has taken many good decisions and made good moves more often.

The book is well produced and printed, and errors are few. *Stokholm* (p. 310) rankles with a Swedish reviewer of course, but the error in Table 13.1 on p. 291 is more unfortunate in that it gives the wrong total for adjuncts in end position; the number should be 3,542, not 4,470, which is the total number of adjuncts. Some examples of clusters seem to be missing the || sign separating individual adjuncts, e.g. (17) on p. 101. The index is slim and sometimes inaccurate; thus for instance the relational process type is said to be first mentioned on p. 206, not p. 190 ff. where it first occurs.

But my criticisms are mostly minor. Hilde Hasselgård has produced a ground-breaking book that all further research on adverbials must take into account. Future researchers will have a pair of very broad shoulders to stand on.

References

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Longman.

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

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Tottie, Gunnel. 1986. The importance of being adverbial: Adverbials of focusing and contingency in spoken and written English. In G. Tottie and I. Bäcklund (eds.). *English in speech and writing: A symposium* (Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia 60), 93–118. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Hans Lindquist. *Corpus linguistics and the description of English* (Edinburgh Textbooks on the English Language). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009. 240 pp. ISBN 978-0-7486-2615-1. Reviewed by **Ilka Mindt**, University of Potsdam.

The overall approach taken in this clearly structured textbook is to acquaint students at intermediate level with various possibilities of describing the English language. This is achieved by presenting examples of selected linguistic phenomena from corpora of English and by explaining their relevance for the description of English. In all chapters, Lindquist strictly follows a 'from-data-to-description' approach which is exemplified in the discussion of Chapter 3 below. This book is thus a valuable resource when it comes to describing the English language by means of corpus linguistics. The author addresses a wealth of different linguistic aspects in ten chapters. The first two chapters provide information on corpus linguistics and aspects of counting, calculating and annotating. Chapters 3 to 7 proceed from smaller units to larger ones: Lindquist starts with individual words, then discusses larger and more abstract units such as collocations, phrases, colligations, idioms and metaphors before he looks at grammatical issues, where morphology also comes into play. The last three chapters cover aspects of gender/sex, language change and "corpus linguistics in cyberspace".

Chapter 1 is entitled "Corpus linguistics". The author introduces corpus linguistics as a methodology and explains why corpora are a useful resource for studying the English language. He sketches how the first electronic corpora were compiled and comments on the importance of concordances and frequency data. Generative Grammar and an introspective approach are briefly characterized before the advantages of using corpus data for description and analysis are considered. Lindquist accounts for various types of corpora and data collections (spoken, written and parallel corpora, text archives and the web).

"Counting, calculating and annotating" are aspects addressed in Chapter 2. Lindquist starts by clarifying quantity and quality, which he sees as notions that must be combined. By considering a frequency list of the top 50 lemmas in the BNC, he discusses lemmatization, POS-tags, intricacies of form and function – *to* can either be a preposition or the *to*-infinitive marker – and type and token. He demonstrates the chi-square test and its calculation. Next, the term 'distribution' is introduced. 'Dispersion' is given as a synonym. This might cause confusion because 'dispersion' can be understood as relating to statistical phenomena measured by specific tests. Lindquist then deals with relative measures, such as

percentages and normalizations. The subchapter on "Part-of-speech tagging" is not concerned with the technical details of tagging but rather the usefulness and the problems of accessing a corpus with POS-tags. Lindquist gives the example words *can* and *tin*, and discusses search strings as well as search results. Parsing is only mentioned briefly without any example.

Chapter 3 concentrates on lexis. After a short description of the usefulness of corpora for dictionary making, the author focuses on the meaning of words. Lindquist's approach, which has been labelled above as a 'from-data-to-description' approach, is best exemplified here. By comparing the definitions of the verbal and nominal uses of *squeeze* in the *Longman dictionary of contemporary English* with a selected sample of concordance lines taken from a corpus – in this case the TIME corpus – Lindquist discusses the relevance of the use of corpus data for the description of English. The analysis is always related to the data, all examples presented are commented upon, and major obstacles concerning problems or difficulties (genre bias, representativity, selection of word forms, etc.) are addressed. In doing so, Lindquist exemplifies in excellent and clearly structured ways how corpus data can be tested against existing descriptions or ad-hoc formulated hypotheses. He then briefly introduces the concepts of semantic preference and semantic prosody, deals with lexical aspects of changes of words over time, how words spread between varieties of English and how corpus studies can be related to literary works.

In Chapter 4 on collocations and colligations a distinction is made between "the Firth/Sinclair type" of collocations, which are referred to as "window collocations", and Palmer's concept of collocation, labelled "adjacent collocations" (p. 73). Examples of window collocations are given together with a discussion of how the MI value, the Z-score and the log-likelihood formula influence the measurement of collocations. Here Lindquist does not go into mathematical details but demonstrates convincingly in how far these three statistics affect the measurement of collocation. The example *go to* followed by a noun is used to explain adjacent collocations. Readers might guess that a search for 'go to [n*]' in the BNC interface provided by Mark Davies has been performed. Lindquist gives a list of nouns in Table 4.8 (p. 79) and explains why these nouns are liable to occur frequently after *go to*. Students who read this subchapter are likely to come up with the question whether words that frequently follow as adjacent collocations can also be referred to as collocates – a term introduced and used in the subchapter on window collocations. In the above-mentioned table, phrases like *go to bed* or *go to sleep* are listed but also phrases like *go to the toilet* or *go to the police* occur. This might be confusing because the search string is then extended from 'go to [n*]' to 'go to the [n*]' without any explanation. My

search using the BNC interface provided by Mark Davies for ‘go to [n*]’ gives slightly different frequencies than those listed by Lindquist. *Go to sleep* occurs 328 times and not 329 times, *go to work* is found in 171 instances and not in 214 as mentioned in Table 4.8 etc. The ordering of the phrases is also not always according to the frequencies: *go to court* which is listed with a frequency of 93 occurrences (89 in my search) is given as occupying rank nine and should be given as rank seven. The discussion of the data given in Table 4.9 (p. 80), where three-word combinations ending in *bed* in the BNC are presented, does not seem to support Lindquist’s argument because of inconsistencies in the frequencies as well as the rankings. The phrase *of the bed* is listed in second position although it occurs with a frequency of 493 (458 in my search for [* * bed]) and the phrase *go to bed* which is found in 638 cases is listed in third position – instead of second position. All in all, it may be difficult for readers to clearly understand the distinction between window collocations on the one hand and adjacent collocations on the other.

Colligations are briefly addressed with reference to Fletcher’s “Phrases in English” (PIE), which is introduced in a later chapter (and has to my knowledge not been mentioned in Chapter 1). Colligations are explained as “the relation between a node word and grammatical categories such as prepositions or a *wh*-clause which co-occur frequently with it” (p. 87). Clever students might ask in how far Lindquist’s study discussed in the preceding subchapter on collocations in relation to a preposition followed by the noun *hand* is related to colligation. Colligations are only discussed briefly in the light of n-grams (which are treated in greater detail in Section 5.3 entitled “Recurrent phrases” (p. 97)) without any reference to pattern grammar or a relation to grammatical structures provided in dictionaries.

“Finding phrases” is the title of Chapter 5. Lindquist introduces the relevant terms, such as idioms, formulaic sequences, Sinclair’s open-choice and idiom principle. He uses the expression “‘funny’ idioms” (p. 91) to refer to idioms, i.e. to units “whose meaning cannot be deduced from its parts” (p. 93), probably to distinguish this phenomenon from the idiom principle. As the terms ‘idiom’ and ‘idiom principle’ are frequently confused, it would be more helpful for students to present a clear delimitation of the terms. Recurrent phrases are then discussed by providing examples from Altenberg’s study (1998) on the phraseology of spoken English and additionally by considering the database “Phrases in English”. The last section deals with a literary application of corpora, an issue which Lindquist, as he rightly argues, has already addressed with respect to keyword analysis in Chapter 3. This clearly shows that it is not always easy to restrict the application of corpus studies to one particular aspect – be it for example frequencies, key words or phrases. Rather, these aspects are often interrelated and need to be considered and discussed together.

In Chapter 6 on "Metaphor and metonymy" Lindquist concentrates to a large extent on metaphors and only deals briefly with metonomy. Metaphors are first explained, using the example *down the drain*, in regard to the terms 'vehicle', 'tenor' and 'ground', before in a following subchapter the cognitive approach to metaphors based on Lakoff and Johnson (1980) is introduced. Here, the terms 'source domain', 'target domain' and 'mapping' are elucidated in relation to examples. After these theoretical concepts have been introduced, Lindquist demonstrates how the cognitive concept of metaphor can be analysed in corpora, i.e. by searching for the source domain, by considering the target domain or by manual analysis.

Grammar is the topic of Chapter 7, where Lindquist considers morphological and syntactic aspects. With relation to frequencies, he discusses the use of *who* and *whom*, of *get*-passives and of adjective complementation. He demonstrates convincingly that corpora can be used to check and extend previous research.

Chapter 8, entitled "Male and female", is concerned with quantitative analyses of the distribution of terms which are clearly sex-marked such as *firemen* as opposed to those not explicitly marked for sex (e.g. *fire fighters*). Next, the premodifying adjectives of *man* and *woman* are investigated. Lindquist not only discusses how sex/gender is reflected in corpora but also focuses on the production side by considering whether there are specific usages in relation to the gender of the author in the BNC as far as colour terms are concerned. The hypothesis is that women tend to use more colour terms "because they are more interested in fashion, home decoration etc." (p. 159). The frequency results show that female authors indeed tend to use more colour terms than male authors. A possible explanation which Lindquist gives is that "female writers deal with different topics, where the description of colours is more relevant" (p. 159 f.). It would be vital to check in how far the use of colour terms is topic-related and in how far this corresponds to the gender of an author. A last section deals with hedging. With reference to Holmes (1986) a qualitative aspect is introduced that calls for a precise analysis of the functions of selected hedges.

Chapter 9 is on language change. Three types of language change are differentiated: "change in real time" (p. 167), which can be studied by using a diachronic corpus, "change in apparent time" (ibid.), which focuses on changes that (might) manifest themselves in different age groups, and language change based on comparing varieties of a language. The last mentioned type allows to "make the assumption that one [variety IM] is changing in the direction of another" (p. 168). Lindquist focuses explicitly only on changes in real time and to a lesser extent on changes observable when comparing varieties. He analyses the use of

likely in relation to word class and considers the distributions “in a number of frequent contexts in COCA and the BNC” (p. 169). In all of these contexts, *likely* is preceded by the modal *will*. It will probably be unclear to students why this restricted context (*will likely*) is chosen and in how far the results given are tenable for a comprehensive analysis of all adjectival and adverbial uses in British and American English. Next, a study on *beside*(*s*) based on Rissanen (2004) is presented that touches upon grammaticalisation. Frequency information taken from the *Oxford English dictionary* about verbal complementation is used in yet another study to demonstrate how changes in real time can be observed. The description of Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg’s study (2003) on the social stratification of third-person singular *–th* versus *–s* is the last study covered in this chapter.

The final chapter deals with “Corpus linguistics in cyberspace” and is not so much concerned with linguistic forms found in the new media (such as coding conventions in texting, turn-taking in chats, the use of emoticons etc.) but rather with the use of the internet as a corpus. Related to this is a discussion on how commercial search engines can be used for linguistic research. The problems regarding search results and representativity are addressed. One section deals with WebCorp, another gives a brief outline on how corpora can be compiled by using texts from the internet. Three other sections cover different fields of interest: in one of them Lindquist discusses how subject-verb agreement with collective nouns can be studied with regard to different varieties (India, Hong Kong, South Africa etc.). In the other two sections examples of studies are given where the web has been used as a reservoir for finding examples of phenomena that occur with low frequencies in the available corpora.

The book has a very clear structure as each chapter introduces the main topics of consideration and concludes with a brief summary stating the key linguistic aspects covered. Study questions that are related to the individual subchapters and a section on recommended readings supplement each chapter. As it is aimed at students of English at intermediate level, it is (and can be) taken for granted that several concepts and terms are known to the readers in order to take full advantage of this book. These include basic concepts of grammar (parts of speech, phrases, clause elements, complementation etc.) and lexical concepts (lemmas, meanings, lexical items, collocation, idioms, metaphor etc.) to name just a few. An aspect that is not explicitly (though implicitly) addressed is what characterizes or defines the term ‘corpus’. This is not a drawback as there are numerous introductions to corpus linguistics that cover this aspect. But it has to be kept in mind when making use of this book at university level.

The most impressive quality of Hans Lindquist's textbook is that it familiarizes readers with corpus linguistics by providing very student-friendly step-by-step analyses of clearly structured sets of data. He puts emphasis not only on quantitative distributions of frequencies but also on qualitative aspects of data analyses. The author guides his readers through corpus data that are either taken from already published research or have been assembled from corpora accessible via the internet. In on-line exercises (related to the ten chapters of the book) covering small research questions, students are given step-by-step instructions and are encouraged to use corpus data. The interfaces provided by Mark Davies are a prominent resource throughout the book. Lindquist's book could be used as a textbook for a course but it is also possible just to take individual chapters or even subchapters as course material.

All in all, *Corpus linguistics and the description of English* by Hans Lindquist is a very well-written textbook that is highly recommendable and will be a fruitful asset in teaching.

References

Altenberg, Bengt. 1998. On the phraseology of spoken English: The evidence of recurrent word combinations. In A.P. Cowie (ed.). *Phraseology. Theory, analysis, and applications*, 101–122. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Davies, Mark. 2004–. *BYU-BNC: The British National Corpus*. Available online at <http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc>.

Davies, Mark. 2008–. *The Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA): 410+ million words, 1990-present. Available online at <http://www.americancorpus.org>.

Fletcher, William. 2003/2004. *Phrases in English* (PIE). Available online at: <http://pie.usna.edu>.

Holmes, Janet. 1986. Functions of *you know* in women's and men's speech. *Language in Society* 15 (1): 1–22.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Nevalainen, Terttu and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. 2003. *Historical sociolinguistics: Language change in Tudor and Stuart England.* London: Longman.

Rissanen, Matti. 2004. Grammaticalisation from side to side: On the development of *beside*(*s*). In H. Lindquist and C. Mair (eds.). *Corpus approaches to grammaticalization in English*, 151–170. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Susanne Mühleisen. *Heterogeneity in word-formation patterns. A corpus-based analysis of suffixation with* -ee *and its productivity in English* (Studies in Language Companion Series 118). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010. 245 pp. ISBN 978-90-272-0585-8. Reviewed by **Anne Gardner**, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg.

Representing her post-doctoral thesis (*Habilitationsschrift*), Mühleisen's publication offers a comprehensive investigation of noun derivations involving the suffix *-ee*, combining both diachronic and synchronic perspectives. A prototypical formation with *-ee* would be *interviewee*, which contains a verbal base and refers to a person, with a thematic role of patient. Often, a corresponding derivation in *-er* is evidenced (in this case *interviewer*). Various instances are pointed out in the introduction (Chapter 1), which deviate from this pattern in that the referent is not human (e.g. *milkee* denotes a farm animal), or the formation does not express passivity and does not contain a pre-existing English verb (e.g. *refugee*). In her study, Mühleisen intends to explore the diversity (or heterogeneity) and productivity of *-ee* derivations by discussing phonological, syntactic and semantic issues, reviewing the historical development of the suffix and conducting a survey of potential nouns in *-ee* on the basis of the World Wide Web, with special attention to suffix usage in selected varieties of English. After a detailed outline of the following chapters, the introduction concludes with a reflection on the scope and scientific impact of the project.

In Chapter 2, Mühleisen critically assesses previous research and presents phonological, syntactic and semantic constraints on *-ee* formations as well as possible reasons for the heterogeneous character of the suffix; words used for illustration are taken from academic literature as well as her Web corpus, the methodology of which is briefly outlined at the beginning of the chapter. Only two phonological constraints seem to be in operation: *-ate* as part of the verbal base is truncated in certain contexts, e.g. to prevent formations such as **rehabilitatee* (cp. *rehabilitee*), and verb bases ending in a single vowel or diphthong are avoided to the effect that words like **eyeee* do not form part of the lexicon. However, parallel forms such as *donatee* and *donee*, and *sayee* or *bowee* with their 'pseudo-consonantal' markers <y> and <w> defy these limitations, which creates ambiguity for the speaker. Syntactic constraints or typical patterns in verb derivations can be stated as sense relations expressed in terms of sentence constituents – a basic *-ee* derivation could be circumscribed as 'one who is Ved' (*advisee*) where the human referent parallels a direct object to the verb (as in *I advise you to do this*); patterns with indirect objects (*promise*, 'one to whom a

promise is made'), objects with preposition (*flirtee*, 'one who is flirted with') and subjects (*waitee*, 'someone who is compelled to wait') are equally possible. Instances of ambiguity or polysemy can be observed when a derivation can be attributed to more than one of these categories or has moved from one pattern to another over time. After describing various attempts at postulating theories concerned with syntactic limitations, Mühleisen concludes that no single (synchronic) theoretical framework has yet been established which satisfactorily explains the diversity of derivation types with *-ee.* While two approaches to semantic constraints are discussed (a thematic role framework besides lexical conceptual structure and co-indexing of affixes), the author prefers to incorporate syntactic and semantic issues into the framework of prototype theory, which is flexible enough to include more typical and more marginal examples of *-ee* formations.

An account of the historical development of the suffix is given in Chapter 3. It first appeared in legal contexts in the fourteenth century in borrowings from French (originally substantivised past participles in *-é* or *-ée*); derivations usually contained a direct object function and were often correlative passives to agent nouns. When English began to replace French and Latin as the official language in the domain of law from the middle of the fourteenth century onwards, the nativisation of the suffix was instrumental in filling gaps in the lexicon. During the course of the fifteenth century derivations shifted towards an indirect object meaning, which continued into the sixteenth century. In the following century verbs came to be typically used as bases, direct object formations increased and the suffix was still predominantly used in the legal domain. This century saw the first attestations of a verbal base of Germanic origin (*writee* in 1611) and the semantic extension to a non-human referent (*patentee*, in an example from 1691, refers to the invention, not the inventor), as well as the beginnings of agentive and humorous use of *-ee* formations, and an overall generalisation of meaning. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries these trends intensified, and new formations arose in other varieties of English, such as American, Australian and Scots English. Mühleisen argues that the semantic and syntactic choices available to derivations in *-ee* which have developed and accumulated over time are to a certain extent responsible for ambiguities observable today.

Chapter 4 briefly enters on the notions of morphology versus lexicon (4.1), and creativity versus productivity (4.2), before introducing various types of productivity (4.3). Relevant to the current investigation is the concept that productivity is not absolute, but gradual, and that the productivity of *-ee* is assisted by the fact that the suffix, although often lacking transparency in meaning, is mostly used in a regular fashion and faces little rivalry from other word-forma-

tion processes which would yield the same semantic outcome. In her treatment of data from the fourteenth to the twentieth century, which is presented in Chapter 3 and the following subchapter (4.4), Mühleisen relies on type frequency and growth as an indicator for productivity and ascertains a continuous increase in productivity over the centuries. The records of twentieth-century derivations gained from various dictionaries and secondary literature show that the influence of French borrowings decreases, trends such as the rise of direct object and subject formations continue, that words related to the military were frequently created during the war years, and that *-ee* also features in compounds (*handshakee*). The circumstance that few examples for new derivations in *-ee* are listed in dictionaries is used as a stepping stone to touch on the questions of how new formations are established, and when a possible or potential word becomes an actual word.

Reasoning that the World Wide Web is the most up-to-date source on new *-ee* formations and as such forms an ideal basis on which to test potential derivations, Mühleisen elucidates the methodology underlying her Web search in Chapter 5. A list of 1,000 potential words was created by forming new *-ee* words which were not previously established in dictionaries or secondary literature, and which could be recognised as a derivation of a verb or of a noun in *-er*. The bases were chosen from the English lexicon at random to avoid a preference for words which suit the more typical requirements of *-ee* derivations. With the help of the Google search engine, a manual search was conducted for the potential words, their status as derivations verified, and their number of occurrence on the first 100 websites documented as falling into one of six frequency categories. Of the 1,000 potential words, 748 were attested on the Web; compared to the c. 500 *-ee* derivations confirmed for the past six centuries, this number seems to indicate a noticeable increase in productivity. Words occurring more frequently in the corpus tend to exhibit more prototypical characteristics of *-ee* formations, whereas those with only one or two attestations (here called ‘hapax legomena’) usually display fewer typical features, but a greater semantic diversity. Many ad-hoc formations can be found in more speech-based and interactional text types such as chats, and in the private or interpersonal domain.

Chapter 6 investigates the geographical distribution of a selection of derivatives on the basis of websites with domains representing the USA, Australia, New Zealand, India and Ireland. After demonstrating that the same *-ee* formation can carry different meanings in different varieties of English, Mühleisen focuses on the question of whether the word-formation process is more frequent in American English than in other varieties and concludes that the label ‘Americanism’ can only be assigned to individual lexemes and not to all newly formed

words *per se*. Australian English seems to show a partiality to this word-formation process, possibly owing to a tradition of using such words in legal contexts and the popularity of hypocoristics ending in *-ie*. An inquiry into 19 words found in the Web corpus reveals that some derivations are particularly frequent in certain varieties and may have distinct meanings in these varieties, as is the case with the legal terms *transportee* in Australian English or *retainee* in British English.

The main text closes with a short summary and an appeal for future word-formation studies to incorporate a diachronic perspective and investigate variation across varieties of English. The bibliography is followed by two appendices, the first listing previously established *-ee* formations and their sources in secondary literature, the second cataloguing the 1,000 potential words used for the Web search with an indication of their frequency of occurrence. A name and a subject index complement the work.

This publication fruitfully combines a range of linguistic approaches in order to shed new light on the history and recent usage of the suffix *-ee*, offers ample documentation with examples, citations and word lists, and contributes significantly to the number of known derivations in *-ee* (and to a lesser extent –*er*). One aspect which makes this book slightly difficult to read is, however, that the author frequently anticipates information which is only discussed in more detail at a later stage. This is particularly problematic with regard to the potential words explored in the Web search, which are used as examples from the very beginning. The frequency calculations based on the results of this search are referred to in Chapter 2 even though the methodology underlying the creation of these words and their analysis is, however, not explained more thoroughly until Chapter 5 – which necessitates a number of clarifying comments in earlier parts of the book. Despite various opportunities, the author neglects to mention that potential words are also accepted which show a correlative noun ending in *-ist*, not *-er*, as is the case with *therapee* or *therapeutee* (cf. *therapist*, *therapeutist*), for which no verbal base seems to exist in English. The structural problem is also apparent in Chapter 2, which is devoted to a synchronic description of the word-formation process, but which refers to aspects of the following diachronic chapter on various occasions. Since the inclusion of the diachronic perspective is highly relevant to the topic (and the author), as repeatedly stated, it might have been interesting, and perhaps more coherent with the tenor of the book, to unravel the diversity of *-ee* formations by starting at the (historical) beginning.

In the discussion of Americanisms in Sections 6.1 and 6.2, two methodological peculiarities attract attention: firstly, the figures from the .com domain are inexplicably used as a reference point for the other domains, even though it

is noted that this domain does not represent purely American language usage (nor does .org), as opposed to .us and .edu; secondly, the frequency of individual *-ee* derivations in other domains is given in percentages in relation to the .com domain, which is taken to represent 100 per cent. This entails that in some instances percentages greater than 100 occur, and it does not become apparent to what degree each Web domain contributes to the total number of attestations of a given word. Calculations of these proportions could modify the picture presented by Mühleisen or offer additional information; to give two examples: (1) the usage of *trainee* remains on roughly the same level in British English (.uk) in the years 2002 and 2006 (ca. 26%) and does not decrease when seen in relation to .com (75.7% > 52.2%); (2) *mentee* ('someone who is mentored') is shown to gain ground in British English in comparison to the .com domain; yet the fixed percentage for .com (100%) obscures the fact that *mentee* becomes more frequent in this domain as well (21.58% > 25.7%).

Somewhat distractingly, the text is sprinkled with editorial imperfections, slightly idiosyncratic language use and even grammatical mistakes, which could easily have been avoided. Nonetheless, this publication forms a useful addition to current discussions on derivations in *-ee* and word-formation in general, and with its wealth of material and innovative combination of linguistic methods it has the potential to inspire further research in these areas.

Günter Rohdenburg and **Julia Schlüter** (eds.). *One language, two grammars? Differences between British and American English* (Studies in English Language). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. xxiv + 461 pp. ISBN 978-0-521-87219-5. Reviewed by **Hans Lindquist**, Malmö University.

The starting point of the present volume is that "contrasts in the grammar of BrE and AmE have so far been largely ignored" (p. 2). Most studies that do exist, according to the editors, are brief and limited in scope and often not based on sound quantitative evidence. They mention Algeo (2006) as an exception, aptly characterizing it as a compendium of contrasts, but claim that the contributions to the present volume are more systematic and up-to-date as far as corpus methodology goes, focusing on "immediately competing grammatical alternatives" (p. 4). Apart from providing adequate descriptions, the volume also has the ambition to study the historical dimension and explore potential explanations.

One explanation that has been proposed in the literature, the colonial lag hypothesis, is problematized by several authors, most prominently by Marianne Hundt in her contribution "Colonial lag, colonial innovation or *simply* language change?". After reviewing previous work on British/American differences and presenting a number of case studies of her own (irregular verb morphology, concord with collective nouns and the mandative subjunctive) she proposes a new typology of differential diachronic development in BrE and AmE:

- 'true' colonial lag (but with Lass 1990 she prefers the word 'extraterritorial' and suggests the term 'extraterritorial (ETE) conservatism')
- 'true' extraterritorial innovation
- truly divergent patterns (where both varieties change, but in different directions)
- parallel developments (where both varieties change in the same direction)
- resurrection/revival, either in the extraterritorial variety or in the homeland
- 'kick-down developments', where "AmE starts out as more conservative but overtakes BrE as the change gains momentum".

Hundt ends by warning against using the term 'colonial lag' with reference to contemporary American English.

Next, Peter Erdman compares the use of compound verbs like *to baby-sit* and *to wire-tap* in AmE and BrE. Erdman finds certain differences between the two varieties, basing some of his arguments on a comparison of two American and two British dictionaries. For instance, with reference to the fact that the British dictionaries contain between 15 and 30 per cent fewer compound verbs than the American ones, he writes: "I take this difference as an indication of the diverging frequency of compound verbs found in the two varieties of English" (p. 46). However, this contrast might just as well be due to differing editorial principles in these dictionaries, and the hypothesis ought to be tested against corpus data. Although the frequency discussion based on dictionaries is methodologically questionable, the chapter contains interesting information on the history of compound verbs, their pronunciation and their spelling.

In the next chapter, Magnus Levin studies the well-known variation in the preterite and past participle forms of the verbs *burn*, *dream*, *dwell*, *kneel*, *lean*, *leap*, *learn*, *smell*, *spell*, *spill* and *spoil* by investigating the *New York Times* and *The Independent* for written English and the Longman Spoken American Corpus (LSAC) and the BNC for spoken English. Levin refers to the fact that there

is general agreement that *-ed* forms are preferred in AmE, while there is more variation between *-ed* and *-t* in BrE, but manages to complicate matters considerably by showing that each verb has its own story and that usage is influenced by a number of factors like frequency and aspect. For instance, in BrE, but not in AmE, there is a correlation between aspect and inflection, so that there is a higher proportion of *-ed* with durative uses of the verbs than with punctual ones. Levin argues that this functional motivation counteracts analogical levelling. The chapter contains many good observations supporting Hundt's thesis that the picture of British-American differences must not be over-simplified.

Britta Mondorf in her contribution studies the use of synthetic and analytic comparison in BrE and AmE. Working in the Paderborn tradition, focusing on complexity and its relation to processing, she investigates the choice of comparative form for 21 monosyllabic adjectives in British and American newspapers. There were two major differences between the varieties: AmE uses more analytic comparison (called "*more* support"), while BrE uses more comparative forms (synthetic + analytic) on the whole. Mondorf's proposed explanation for the American preference for analytic comparison is that Americans are more prone to use analytic variants "as a compensatory device in cognitively complex environments" (p. 107).

Julia Schlüter focuses on the interplay between phonology and grammar, showing that variation between the monosyllabic and disyllabic past participle variants *lit*/*lighted* and *knit*/*knitted* is influenced by the principle of rhythmic alternation. Interestingly, the short form *lit* has increased strongly in frequency in BrE since 1700, while the reverse is the case for *knit*. AmE lags behind in both changes, with the result that it is more regular in the case of *lit*/*lighted* and less so in the case of *knit*/*knitted*. The conclusion is that "it is indispensable to analyse each alleged case of 'colonial lag', regularization and colloquialization in considerable detail" (p. 129).

Eva Berlage discusses word-order variation between post- and prepositions in English, focusing on *notwithstanding*. It turns out that postposition of *notwithstanding* is twice as frequent in AmE (70.4%) as in BrE (34.8%). Diachronically, postpositional *notwithstanding* in AmE is an example of colonial revival. In addition, Berlage is able to show that the complexity of the NP influences the position of *notwithstanding*: the more complex the NP, the likelier it is that *notwithstanding* is preposed.

David Denison deals with argument structure in so-called Exchange verbs, particularly *substitute*, where a reversal of word order seems to be taking place, from *new for old* to *old for new*. Denison finds that in this change BrE is "mov-

ing faster than AmE for essentially social reasons: differences in the language of sports and perhaps in the reverence accorded to prescriptive ideas" (p. 165).

In one of his papers Günter Rohdenburg takes up the use of reflexive verbs and finds that the trend towards the zero variant, e.g. *wash* for *wash oneself*, has gone much further in AmE than in BrE. He also notes that reflexive verbs are used less on the whole, again with AmE in the lead.

Douglas Biber, Jack Grieve and Gina Iberri-Shea study noun phrase modification in newspaper reportage, finding that AmE and BrE have undergone a number of similar shifts in the preferred patterns of modification, generally with AmE in the lead. Shifts include an increase in premodification and a decrease in *wh*-relative clauses.

In his second paper, Günter Rohdenburg investigates nominal complements as in *conduct unbecoming* (*of*/*to*) *an officer*, noting that "with most types of constructions, AmE favours the formally less explicit or simpler variant without a preposition" (p. 210). However, there are a number of constraints and exceptions relating to individual verbs or groups of verbs.

Uwe Vossberg presents four case studies relating to what he calls "The Great Complement Shift" in English, i.e. the shift from *to*-complements to *-ing* complements in cases like *have no business doing*/*to do*. He finds that BrE and AmE follow the same trends, although at different speeds and with either BrE or AmE taking the lead, but also that there are occasional reversals, like *decline playing*/*to play*, where the change goes in the direction of more infinitives.

Johan Elsness investigates the semantic distinction made by the present perfect and the preterite in BrE and AmE. Basing his discussion on investigations of historical corpora, elicitation tests from the late 1980s and studies in the Brown family corpora, he concludes that AmE seems to have led the way in the decline of the present perfect.

Three papers deal with the subjunctive. Göran Kjellmer asks three questions: why was the mandative subjunctive revived in AmE, why did it return in BrE and why does *not* occur before the verb in negated subjunctive constructions like *that he not go*? He answers the first question by listing a number of linguistic and social factors that may have facilitated the change. To the second question, his answer is simply: American influence. The third question, finally, leads him to a series of very ingenious and convincing explanations based on structural parallelisms and ambiguities.

In the second paper on mandative subjunctives, William J. Crawford adds a new angle by focusing on the behaviour of individual lexical triggers and groups of triggers both within and across regional varieties, dividing them into strong, moderate and weak ones. Looking at the total frequencies of these triggers, he

finds that, although a trigger like *insist* often occurs with the subjunctive, it occurs much more frequently with other types of complementation, which in fact makes it a weak trigger, not a strong one. He also found that "verbs are the strongest triggers, followed by nouns and then adjectives" (p. 272). In his conclusion he notes that there is less contrast between BrE and AmE in the stronger triggers, and hypothesizes that there will be a change towards more subjunctives with the weaker triggers in BrE in the future.

Julia Schlüter's second chapter deals diachronically and synchronically with a less-studied form of the subjunctive: the present subjunctive in conditional clauses like *on* (*the*) *condition* (*that*) *the school change its name*. The diachronic data indicate that the subjunctive in this type of construction is a "true newcomer" (p. 291) in AmE, i.e. that it does not seem to be a dormant form that is revived, and Schlüter suggests two main reasons for its introduction: the American predisposition for using irrealis marking (through modals) rather than the indicative, and the increasing use of the mandative subjunctive with similar meaning. One interesting synchronic difference between AmE and BrE discovered by Schlüter is the semi-formulaic use in American journalistic prose of *on condition* in phrases like *on condition he not be named*, which is almost non-existent in BrE, where the indicative is preferred. Formulaicity in one variety can thus influence overall statistical differences between the varieties. Schlüter also covers the special status of the verb *be* and the influence of negation and choice of modal auxiliary on this construction.

D.J. Allerton's chapter on tag questions sticks out from the rest in being largely based on previous literature and the author's native speaker intuition rather than (corpus based) empirical investigations. One of his conclusions is that there is a general change away from concordant tags towards invariant tags like *right?, yeah?* and *innit?*

Karin Aijmer deals with the pragmatics of adverbs of certainty, using *sure* and *surely* as main examples. She notes that *sure*, *surely* and lexical bundles like *sure is*, *sure do* and *sure can* have developed a number of discourse functions, and that many of these differ between AmE and BrE. She stresses that these developments are influenced by social, cultural and regional factors and shows that *sure* and *surely* are used with a complex set of semantic and pragmatic meanings.

In her chapter, Gunnel Tottie asks the big questions "How different are American and British English grammar? And how are they different?" This is more or less what the whole volume is about, and Tottie's concluding answers "More different than we used to think" and "In more ways than we can anticipate" (p. 363) square fairly well with the results of the other studies. Tottie sup-

ports her argument with case studies in three areas carried out by herself and colleagues: lexico-grammar (changes in the constructions *substitute* X *for* Y / *substitute* X *with* Y and the alternation between *try and* and *try to*), paradigmatic choices (relative markers after *same*) and, finally, frequency and pragmatics (tag questions). In all cases there were distinct differences in the use of different variants between the varieties. In the first and last case there were also big differences in the total frequencies, indicating either that pragmatic needs differ between the varieties, so that certain things do not get expressed, or that these particular needs are expressed in other ways.

In the final chapter of the book, the editors present no fewer than 46 pilot studies in five main areas where differences between BrE and AmE have been detected: Adverbs and adverbials; Prepositions; Noun phrases; Predicates and predicatives; and Sentential structures. This impressive exposition will serve as a very rich source for future research on major and minor aspects of British and American English, especially now when several new large corpora of American English have been made available (the Corpus of Contemporary American English, COCA, and the Corpus of Historical American English, COHA). Furthermore, the authors try to categorize the contrasts between the varieties on the scales progressive/conservative, formal/colloquial, consistent/irregular and explicit/opaque. Stressing that the figures are based on an unsystematic selection of cases and that judgement is sometimes rough, they nevertheless note that in the 46 phenomena studied, AmE is more progressive in 35 and more colloquial in 32. When it comes to consistency and explicitness, however, there is no clear result. These pilot studies thus underline the impression given by the rest of the book, that, even if there are or have been cases of colonial lag (or extraterritorial conservatism), there are also many cases of colonial progressiveness (or extraterritorial innovation), and in addition there are a number of other scenarios.

The volume as a whole is carefully edited, cross-referenced and proofread, with separate lists of electronic corpora and dictionaries and an index of concepts and lexical items. The editors and their contributors have shown convincingly that grammatical contrasts between BrE and AmE is a highly complex and interesting field, intimately related to the study of language change, and the case studies illustrate a number of corpus-based methods with which these contrasts can be investigated. Rohdenburg and Schlüter (2009) will be the starting point for all future research on grammatical differences between British and American English.

References

Algeo, John. 2006. *British or American English? A handbook on word and grammar patterns.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lass, Roger. 1990. Where do extraterritorial Englishes come from? Dialect input and recodification in transported Englishes. In V. Law, S. Adamson, N. Vincent and S. Wright (eds.). *Papers from the 5th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Cambridge, 6–9 April 1997*, 245–280. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Graeme Trousdale. *An introduction to English sociolinguistics* (Edinburgh Textbooks on the English Language). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010. xiii + 152 pp. ISBN 978-0-7486-2325-9. Reviewed by **Angela Falk**, Uppsala University.

Trousdale's book, one of the latest in the series "Edinburgh Textbooks on the English Language – Introductory" is designed as a compact, research-oriented overview of variation in English. The main chapters are "What is 'English'?", "Communities, networks and individuals", "English and language planning", "Regional and social variation", "Change in English", "English historical sociolinguistics", "Language contact", "Dialect contact", and "Sociolinguistics and linguistic theory". The structure of the first nine chapters is highly symmetrical: each begins with a brief *overview* that directly addresses the readers and contextualizes some research questions or issues for them before Trousdale proceeds to a presentation of about a half-dozen *content sections*. He rounds off each chapter with a concise *summary* (one dense paragraph), before offering at least one relevant and focused *exercise* and some tips for *further reading*. There is also a two-page "Conclusion" (Chapter 10), in which Trousdale briefly retraces the overall path of the book. This final chapter is written in a style I would characterize as academically inspirational, as Trousdale encourages students to pursue thinking about "English in its social context" (p. 135) and wishes them enjoyment in their future studies in English sociolinguistics.

Before I highlight some content issues that will prepare undergraduates to pursue further study, I want to mention two fundamental design choices that will allow this textbook to fit very well in a university course in a department of

English. First, as mentioned, the book is indeed very *compact* (nine chapters, with the longest being 19 pages), and second, Trousdale's focus is entirely on research pertaining to the *English language*. These observations might at first seem to be banal. Yet I think they take on significance when we pause to survey the length and scope of some well-regarded textbooks available. Some introductory books, such as Spolsky (1998), Romaine (2000), and Trudgill (2001), may also be said to be compact (Spolsky's text, the briefest, is roughly the length of Trousdale's book); their scope, however, is purposely much wider than Trousdale's, as they highlight phenomena observed in many languages. Other textbooks, such as Meyerhoff (2006), Mesthrie *et al*. (2009), and Wardhaugh (2010), provide substantial coverage of sociolinguistic phenomena in the English language, but they give attention to patterns in dozens of other languages as well. The page counts reflect this, as the books in the latter category range from 350 to 500 pages.

As sociolinguists, we strive to find out about many empirical studies related to our research so that we ultimately can make comparisons across varieties and across languages. As teachers of beginning undergraduates, however, we realize that packaging information in manageable chunks is generally a reasonable pedagogical approach for students being introduced to a sub-field. Trousdale's book gives us a useful teaching resource because of the purposefully narrow focus on English sociolinguistics. The other textbooks mentioned above are indeed highly readable and impressive introductions; yet if some of them were to be adopted as the main textbooks in courses for first-year undergraduate students, the sheer length of the books could, unfortunately, be perceived as a block. Factored into this is the reality (at least in the setting where I teach) that a course module on sociolinguistics within the first- or second-term curricula would comprise only part of a term and would likely be taught in a limited number of lectures or seminar meetings, scheduled over the span of, say, a month. If I want students to reach a point later in their education when they can appreciate more advanced books, such as Chambers' book on sociolinguistic theory (2009) and Coupland and Jaworski's reader (2009), then students would need at least one book in their earlier coursework to help them reach that destination. Trousdale's book is a very informative and solid 'bridge' type of textbook.

The book is very capably written. I often found myself imagining that I could 'hear' the chapters as well-paced lectures. Chapter 5, "Change in English", stands out as a pedagogical pearl. In a section called "What is linguistic change?" (5.2), Trousdale presents extracts of some recipe texts in Middle English, early Modern English, and present-day English to illustrate ways English varies over time. While juxtaposing texts from different periods is of

course an approach many books use, Trousdale's choice to use recipe texts and his accompanying explanation of the similar and different features give added appeal, thanks to the clever use of a mozzarella salad recipe by Jamie Oliver (p. 60). I found myself returning to this section several times, admiring a presentation that will engage students – and likely charm them.

There is another discussion strand in Chapter 5 that is particularly appealing because it will encourage students to start thinking about research design. A succinct and well-informed presentation appears in Section 5.4 as "The linguistic behaviour of older and younger speakers in a community". In his characteristic efficient style, Trousdale introduces the concepts of the 'apparent-time hypothesis' and 'real-time data'. While we would expect to see this terminology explained in an introductory text, Trousdale manages to lead students further into the research terrain by bringing in some methodological considerations, all the while exemplifying solutions linguists have found to address various methodological challenges.

A couple of other parts of chapters deserve mention. A section in Chapter 4, "Regional and social variation", contains a thought-provoking presentation of space, including an explanation of 'Euclidean space', 'social space', and 'perceived space' (see "Synthesising regional and social variation", pp. 56–57). I also liked Trousdale's presentation of code-switching (Chapter 7, "Language contact"), especially the explanation of Rampton's 'crossing' (p. 99). Students will be drawn into this overview, which brings up some 'performative' dimensions of language, and they will especially enjoy discussing these concepts as part of the first two exercises at the end of the chapter.

The most theoretical chapter appears almost at the end of the book (Chapter 9, "Sociolinguistics and linguistic theory"), something I think is a good decision. I do not have many quibbles about the contents of the book, but I will mention one here. Trousdale briefly summarizes some viewpoints on the relationship between biolinguistics and sociolinguistics. Compared to other parts of his book, which I found to be uniformly crystal clear, the presentation of biolinguistics is perhaps underdeveloped in less than one page (p. 121) and yet verges on being overly complicated. Obviously, to produce such a compact volume, Trousdale had to circumscribe the topics he wished to treat (See "To Readers," pp. x–xiii, for an explanation). I think that devoting time to theoretical linguistics in this slim volume diffuses the focus, at least temporarily, for beginning-level students. Trousdale would need a much longer book to do justice to explaining the potential interface of biolinguistics and sociolinguistics.

Even so, Trousdale has written a research primer that will spark academic inquiry. His textbook is set to play a very prominent and important role in introducing sociolinguistic theory to students in departments of English.

References

Chambers, J. K. 2009. *Sociolinguistic theory. Linguistic variation and its social significance*. Rev. ed. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Coupland, Nikolas and Adam Jaworski. 2009. *The new sociolinguistics reader*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mesthrie, Rajend, Joan Swann, Ana Deumert and William L. Leap. 2009. *Introducing sociolinguistics*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Meyerhoff, Miriam. 2006. *Introducing sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge.

Romaine, Suzanne. 2000. *Language in society. An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spolsky, Bernard. 1998. *Sociolinguistics* (Oxford Introductions to Language Study). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trudgill, Peter. 2001. *An introduction to language and society*. London: Penguin.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. 2010. *An introduction to sociolingusitics*. 6th ed. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.