REVIEWS

Merkmale und Relationen: Diachrone Studien zur Nominalphrase des Deutschen. By Ulrike Demske. (Studia Linguistica Germanica, 56.) Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2001. Pp. xiii, 368. Hardcover. € 98,00.

Reviewed by CHRISTOPHER D. SAPP, *Indiana University*

This book, which was written as a *Habilitationsschrift*, began as a study of the so-called Saxon genitive (prenominal genitive) in German, but has come to encompass all the diachronic changes that have occurred in the German nominal system, especially to the left of the noun. The study attempts to give a synchronic analysis of the relationships within the noun phrase from a diachronic perspective. Moreover, data from other Germanic languages are taken into account, especially from English and the Scandinavian languages. All the changes in the German NP are attributed by Demske to a single change in the relationship between articles and nouns, from semantic to a morphologically motivated relationship (320). After the introductory chapter 1, chapter 2 deals with agreement within the nominal system, chapter 3 with possessive pronouns, and chapter 4 with the attributive genitive. The book concludes with some general implications for diachronic syntax.

Chapter 1, "Einleitung," gives an overview of previous analyses of the German nominal system, pointing out some of the problems with the NP analysis. Demske assumes the DP hypothesis, which claims that nominal phrases are not projections of nouns but rather of the functional category D(eterminer). The DP analysis overcomes the limitations of the NP analysis and is especially attractive for German, since case, number, and gender are primarily realized on the article rather than on the noun itself.

Chapter 2, "Grammatische Merkmale und Relationen," deals with the marking of the features case, number, gender, and definiteness on nouns, adjectives, and articles. First, Demske outlines the inflectional and agreement properties of the noun phrase in New High German (NHG), especially the problems of adjective inflection. Then she discusses some previous approaches within both the generative and the HPSG (head-driven phrase structure grammar) frameworks. Demske brings historical data from Old High German (OHG) and Early New High German (ENHG) into this discussion.

Unlike in NHG, where the choice of weak versus strong inflection on adjectives is determined by the inflection on the preceding article, in OHG weak adjectives marked definite NPs, and strong adjectives marked indefinite NPs. By ENHG, however, definiteness no longer determined adjective inflection, but the form of the preceding article did not either. Instead, one finds both weak and strong endings in all contexts (82). According to Demske, this state of affairs is a result of the loss of -*e* in weak endings (apocope), which led to confusion with the often endingless strong forms by children acquiring the language (86). Finally, by the late sixteenth/early seventeenth centuries, -*e* was restored in the written language, and the NHG manner of determining adjective endings emerged (89). Demske relates this change to the emergence and increasing use of definite articles, which developed from OHG demonstrative pronouns (127).

Demske seeks an analysis that is not only synchronically but also diachronically adequate, that is, one that can capture the crosslinguistic variation between adjective inflection semantically determined by definiteness (OHG and Scandinavian), and adjective inflection morphologically determined by the form of the article (NHG). Demske's analysis is in the HPSG framework, which assumes just one level on which syntactic, morphological, phonological, and semantic characteristics are represented as "feature bundles." In OHG, it is the article's semantic feature "definite" that selects an adjective with the feature "weak." But in NHG, the selectional properties of the article have changed so that an article with the morphological feature "strong" selects an adjective with the feature "weak" (100).

Chapter 3 is entitled "Possessivpronomina," and here Demske argues that adnominal possessives (Ger. *mein* or Eng. *my*, for example) are possessive articles in NHG. Demske distinguishes these from possessive pronouns (such as Ger. *meiner* or Eng. *mine*), which stand alone, can be modified, and can cooccur with a definite article. Demske attempts to explain the behavior of possessives by appealing to their history and relates the changes to other changes in the nominal system.

In OHG, possessives were formed from the genitive forms of the personal pronouns, plus (except for the 3fem.sg. and 3pl.) strong adjective inflection. In MHG, possessives are even more adjective-like: they can be definite or indefinite and thus take either weak or strong adjective inflection; they can cooccur with definite or indefinite articles; and they can precede or follow other adjectives or numerals. In NHG,

however, possessives have lost many of these adjectival traits: they are always definite; they inflect like the articles *ein* and *kein* and not like adjectives; they cannot cooccur with articles; and they must precede any adjectives with which they cooccur. According to Demske, this reanalysis from possessive adjective to possessive article, which took place in the fourteenth century (202), came about because possessive NPs are usually definite (158).

English underwent a similar development in the fourteenth century as well. Middle English had a possessive adjective with two allomorphs, *mî* before consonants and *mîn* before vowels. This was reanalyzed as a distinction between possessive articles (*my*) and possessive pronouns (*mine*). Similar variation is also found synchronically in the Scandinavian languages, with Icelandic having a possessive adjective and Swedish a possessive article.

Chapter 4, "Attributive Genitivphrasen," is the most substantial part of the book and treats the Saxon (prenominal) genitive (hereafter PNG). A common assumption is that genitives are base-generated following the N, and that some (possessives in German, animates in English) are moved leftward into Spec,DP. But Demske argues that German PNGs are not genitive DPs at all, but, like the possessive adjectives, have been reanalyzed as articles (207). PNGs are definite and are in complementary distribution with articles, and in German cannot be modified and may only be proper names.

In OHG, genitives are generally prenominal, but from the end of the OHG period through ENHG, prenominal genitives tend to be animate and postnominal genitives inanimate (as in English). Demske demonstrates that PNGs behaved like the possessive adjectives of the time, since they could cooccur with an article, be placed on either side of an adjective, and be semantically definite or indefinite (255–257). Finally, around 1700, animates also began to be found postnominally, leaving only names prenominally.

One consequence of the reanalysis of PNGs from genitive NPs to articles that Demske points out is the explosion of genitive compounds in ENHG, which were much rarer in earlier stages of the language. Once the PNG had been reanalyzed as a possessive, if an inanimate or generic genitive appeared prenominally, it would have to be interpreted as part of a compound (316). Thus a phrase like *wegen der Kirchen Ceremonien* 'because of the Church's ceremonies' would have to be reinterpreted from [[der Kirchen] Ceremonien] to [der [Kirchen Ceremonien]] (300).

The book concludes with chapter 5, "Die Modellierung diachroner und synchroner Variation," which places the findings of the book in the larger discussion about the nature of language change. Although some grammaticalization has taken place in the history of the German NP (as in, for example, the rise of the definite and indefinite articles), other changes, like the change in the use of weak and strong adjective endings, cannot be explained in terms of grammaticalization (326). The various changes in the nominal system are better explained as the result of a single reanalysis: the reanalysis of the relationship between a noun and its article from a semantically to a morphologically determined one (339).

The greatest merit of Demske's book is its excellent description of the history of various constructions in the German language, as well as the explanations for the changes. The classification of words, for example, whether possessives are adjectives, pronouns, or articles, is carefully argued with numerous examples from various stages. This is made even more useful by frequent comparisons with other medieval and modern Germanic languages, despite some minor errors with the data: incorrect forms in examples 136a on page 121 (Sw. *min stora hus* should be *mitt stora hus)* and 62a on page 170 (Port. *amigis* should be *amigos*), and an incorrect gloss for 145a on page 124 (Sw. *osten* should be glossed as *der Käse* 'the cheese', not simply *Käse* 'cheese'). In short, Demske gives these topics thorough diachronic, comparative, and synchronic coverage.

Unfortunately, the weakest part of each chapter is the synchronic analysis, because Demske's HPSG approach is little more than a description of the data in terms of feature bundles. For instance, claiming that there are "weak" and "strong" morphological features in the representations of adjectives, selected by some part of the representation of the preceding article, is simply restating the problem in formal terms. For this reason, although Demske's work is rich in description, it does not always approach explanatory adequacy.

In the scholarship on Germanic diachronic syntax within the generative framework, much more attention has been paid to the verbal system than to the nominal system. By focusing on changes in the NP/DP, this book makes a significant and welcome contribution to the understanding of historical German morphosyntax. It builds on earlier observations about changes in the noun phrase as well as more recent work on the grammaticalization of the articles, and situates these changes

in the context of more recent work on the morphosyntax of the modern Germanic languages.

Department of Germanic Studies
Ballantine Hall 643
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
[csapp@indiana.edu]

Studies in the history of the English language: A millennial perspective. Edited by Donka Minkova and Robert Stockwell. (Topics in English Linguistics 39.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002. Pp. vi, 496. Hardcover. € 98.00.

Reviewed by CHRISTOPHER M. CAIN, *Towson University*

Because academic conferences are typically the forums where new research is first presented to the scholarly public, the virtue of collections of conference papers is that they provide a vehicle for the dissemination of cutting-edge scholarship across a range of subjects in a much more timely manner than is usual through exclusive means of publication. It is a virtue that Donka Minkova and Robert Stockwell have enhanced by the remarkable speed with which the present volume has been made available. The thirty-ninth volume of Mouton de Gruyter's Topics in English Linguistics series contains many important essays, but the volume represents a rare example of an edited collection that stands out for its significance as a whole rather than serving as mere scaffolding to elevate a few exceptional contributions above all others. Obviously, much of the credit for this volume's excellence belongs to the authors of the essays themselves (as well as to the outside reviewers, whose names are listed on page sixteen of the foreword), but its impetus derives from Minkova and Stockwell's organization of the inaugural Studies in the History of the English Language conference (SHEL−1) held at UCLA in April 2000. For their initiative in creating a regular biennial conference on English historical linguistics in North America (SHEL−2 was held in April 2002 at the University of Washington)—the prior absence of which was made all the more glaring by the long-running success of the

International Conferences on English Historical Linguistics held in Europe (ICEHL−12 was held at the University of Glasgow in August 2002)—the editors deserve congratulations and thanks.

Studies in the History of the English Language contains a foreword (1–18) explaining the motivations for the conference, in addition to that of the present volume and its organization. A complete list of conference presenters and session chairs reveals the triumph of SHEL−1, having attracted many of the leading researchers in the field of English historical linguistics from North America and, indeed, from abroad as well. The primary focus of the book, which Minkova and Stockwell explain as "a sort of millennial stock-taking" (2), examines the history of the discipline and its current condition at the end of the millennium, with an eye toward plotting future avenues of research. The essays of the first section of the book, "Millennial perspectives" (19–182), entail some backward-glancing at the intellectual history of particular veins of research, synthesizing the major scholarly trends and making important suggestions for new approaches: "From etymology to historical pragmatics," by Elizabeth Closs Traugott; "Mixed-language texts as data and evidence in English historical linguistics," by Herbert Schendl; "Dialectology and the history of the English language," by William A. Kretzschmar, Jr.; "Origin unknown," by Anatoly Liberman; "Issues for a new history of English prosody," by Thomas Cable; "Chaucer: Folk poet or *littérateur*?," by Gilbert Youmans and Xingzhong Li; and "A rejoinder to Youmans and Li," by Thomas Cable. The envoy essay (449–471) by Richard W. Bailey, "A thousand years of the history of English," concludes the volume. The two other sections of the book group together include more heterogeneous contributions. The first of these, "Phonology and metrics" (183–300), contains the following: "On the development of English *r*," by Blaine Erickson; "Vowel variation in English rhyme," by Kristin Hanson; "Lexical diffusion and competing analyses of sound change," by Betty S. Phillips; "Dating criteria for Old English poems," by Geoffrey Russom; "How much shifting actually occurred in the historical English vowel shift?," by Robert Stockwell; and "Restoration of /a/ revisited," by David White. Finally, a section called "Morpho-syntax/Semantics" (301–447) includes the following: "Pragmatic uses of *shall* future constructions in Early Modern English," by Maurizio Gotti; "Explaining the creation of reflexive pronouns in English," by Edward L. Kennan; "Word order in Old English poetry and prose: The position of finite verbs and adverbs," by Ans van Kamenade; "The *have* perfect in

Old English: How close was it to the Modern English perfect?," by Jeong-Hoon Lee; "Reporting direct speech in Early Modern slander depositions," by Colette Moore; and "The emergence of the verb-verb compound in twentieth-century English and twentieth-century linguistics," by Benji Wald and Lawrence Besserman. The volume contains a name index and a very useful comprehensive subject index, and, although I noticed a number of typographical errors (none critical), the quality of this work in sum is of the highest standard.

Since the demands on space here preclude substantial comment on each essay and because the essays of the "Millennial perspectives" section are the obvious nuclei of the volume, I think it judicious to reserve the bulk of the present review for those core essays, while, unfortunately, necessity compels me to restrict further remarks to a mere sampling of the remainder. Traugott's essay (from her plenary address) opens the book with a description of a program of linguistic research in which diachronic analysis expropriates the preeminence usually afforded synchronic analysis within general linguistic theory. Research on grammaticalization as a process of morphosyntactic change, as established by Traugott and others (see Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeyer 1991; Hopper and Traugott 1993; and Lehmann 1995), highlights unidirectionality in language, the universals of language change (see Traugott 1982; Haspelmath 1997; Lass 2000; also Newmeyer 1998), demonstrating that, as Traugott states, "'directionalities' are not deterministic tendencies that require some change, and definitively not tendencies that live some reified existence as cognitive paths, trajectories, or whatever other metaphor might be used, but they are nevertheless powerful tendencies that demand historical thinking" (20). Her essay reconceptualizes grammaticalization as a process within a pragmatic/semantic matrix, suggesting that the developing field of historical pragmatics potentially reveals directionalities in grammaticalization as a function of "a subset of pragmatic-semantic, morphosyntactic, and phonological changes" (34) in which the lexical to functional category changes are not, ipso facto, directional, but "conceptualized as enabled by and resulting from speakers using the lexical items or constructions, such as *actually*, *as long as*, *any way*, *even*, *must*, *be going to* in the flow of speech" (35). Traugott closes her essay with an invitation to those working in English linguistics to engage cross-subdisciplinary questions ranging from language acquisition and language change, corpus linguistics, and linguistic categories to the

"nature of constructions" (38), language variation, and new formations of thought about the history of English.

Herbert Schendl's contribution surveys scholarship on "mixed-language" texts (or, as medieval mixed-language poetry is usually called, "macaronic" texts), describing approaches to them as literary, philological, linguistic, syntactical-grammatical, and functional-pragmatic. The long-recognized discourse function of "codeswitching" is embedded in the last of these, and sociolinguistic research on modern languages has provided a theoretical framework for approaching medieval mixed-language texts. Schendl emphasizes the multilingualism of medieval Britain, and he points out that both literary and linguistic scholarship almost always discount the large number of mixed-language texts as unsuitable for analysis and "predominantly seen as reflecting the insufficient language competence of some medieval writer or scribe" (51). Schendl's paper focuses on the emerging possibilities for serious study of these mixed-language texts from the viewpoint of recent functional-pragmatic approaches to discourse.

William A. Kretzschmar's essay supports the ever expanding realization that the study of processes of language variation and the study of processes of language change are mutually reinforcing activities that scholars of each undertake exclusively at the peril of the descriptive power of their research. Kretzschmar explains how dialectology is particularly relevant to historical linguistics, in the collection of survey data, in the patterns revealed through dialect analysis, and in the promise of quantitative correlational studies for the all-too-elusive linkage of linguistic variables with regional and social variables in historical linguistics. In keeping with this section of the book's millennial focus, Kretzschmar reviews the field of dialectology from Georg Wenker's survey of the German-speaking regions of Europe, published in 1895 as *Der Sprachatlas des deutschen Reichs*, by Wenker and Ferdinand Wrede. In this guided tour of the history of the discipline, Kretzschmar points out that dialectologists (with the notable exception of Hans Kurath, [see 83–88]) have long rejected the *Ausnahmslosigkeit der Lautgesetze* as the central postulate of Neogrammarian thinking, so that "the findings of dialectologists remain at odds with our traditional ways of thinking about sound change in historical linguistics." Kretzschmar further explains that survey data show that an asymptotic curve is "a basic fact about the distribution of linguistic types and tokens" (102), marking a clear difference with patterns predicted by uniform mechanical sound change,

and he proposes that "the new history of English language could well be the trace of variation" (105).

In "Origin unknown," Anatoly Liberman continues his "rambles through etymological thickets" (121), reporting on an area of research central to his work on an etymological dictionary of English. Liberman shows that many etymologies are hopelessly obscure, but that the etymologies of many words listed as of unknown origin in even cyclopean resources like the OED and the OEED "have in fact been explained very well, but the notes, reviews, articles, and even books offering ingenious conjectures have been missed by our leading etymologists" (120).

The highlight of the "Millennial perspectives" section (and, indeed, of the entire volume) is the exchange between Thomas Cable and Gilbert Youmans and Xingzhong Li in which the differences between "traditional" (or "literary") metrists and, what Cable calls, "generative" metrists (by which he means the tradition of generative prosodic analysis from Halle and Keyser 1966 to the present) are more sharply contrasted and vigorously argued than in any other single work of which I am aware. And here again we must credit the vision of the editors, who invited Youmans and Li's counterpoint essay, which was not presented at SHEL−1 and which motivated Cable's rejoinder. Cable's first paper, "Issues for a new history of English prosody," outlines a new analysis of the meter of Chaucer and Shakespeare that focuses on correcting what he believes to be "the effect of generative prosody on our perception of the poets' craft" (126). In Cable's estimation, the pervasive flaw of all theories of prosody since Halle and Keyser 1966 is the asymmetry of stressed and unstressed syllables as mapped to S or W positions within a theoretical metrical template for a line of verse. Cable's criticism of this feature of generative metrics represents a striking disconnect between traditional metrical analysis and metrical theorists, since, with the development of metrical phonology in Liberman and Prince 1977 and its extensions in more recent parametric metrical theory (e.g., Hayes 1995), the goal has been to capture the hierarchical (or asymmetrical) properties of stress—a goal that takes the representation of stress out of a linear segmental string, where the relationship of nonadjacent features is difficult to describe. Thus, the metrical tree model encodes the relational property of stress as the natural result of binary branching structures in which the S node is so designated because its sister node is W. For Cable, such a representation, when applied to the iambic pentameter of

the time between Chaucer and Donne, is arbitrary and results in an unsupportable position: that unstressed syllables are unregulated in English iambic meter. Rather, Cable states, "[i]t is misleading to say that either the stressed syllables or the unstressed syllables are unregulated with respect to W or S. They form a relationship of rising ictus, and it is exactly this relationship that the concept of the iambic foot captures" (136).

While Cable also devotes some attention to what he perceives as generative metrists' disinterest in metrical pauses and their overconcern for the caesura, the aim of Cable's essay is to demonstrate the differences of the internal structure of the line in Chaucer and Shakespeare, with the project of showing that foot salience is not a feature of Chaucer's line, contradicting the traditional claim that Chaucer wrote iambic pentameter verse. Continuing his earlier work (Cable 1991:151), in which he outlines the history of English meter as consisting of compound modes—syllabism, strong stress, and quantity in Old English; strong stress and foot meter in the Middle English alliterative revival; alternating meter and syllabism in Chaucer; and foot meter and syllabism from Sidney to Yeats—Cable contends that the metrical template for the two latter traditions alters, or in his terminology, "tilts," the grammatical principles of stress to accommodate a line of five rising feet, the fundamental feature of iambic pentameter, which, Cable argues, was "completely lost" (147) in the formulation of generative metrics.

Youmans and Li's "Chaucer: Folk poet or *littérateur*?" counters Cable's criticisms of generative metrics and contests his conclusions concerning the structure of Chaucer's line. While Cable's general complaint about generative metrics is that the abstract models proposed for metrical structure lose empirical descriptiveness when mapped onto an actual line of verse, Youmans and Li invoke the general principles and fundamental viewpoint of optimality theory (without launching a full-fledged OT analysis; see Prince and Smolensky 1993 and Kager 1999) in proposing a prototypical iambic pentameter line ([W 2S] [W 3S] // [W 2S] / [W 2S] [W 5S]) that expresses a hierarchy of metrical boundaries between syllables, words, subsidiary phrases, major phrases, and clauses or sentences. For Youmans and Li, the prototype iambic pentameter line is a "Platonic abstraction rather than a statistical norm or an aesthetic ideal. All actual lines of verse (and prose) deviate from this prototype to a lesser or greater degree" (155). OT, as a "constraint-based" analysis, takes as its basic theoretical postulate that outputs are

generated through the evaluation of a set of ranked violable constraints, where conflicting constraints are resolved by selecting the candidate structure with the fewest critical violations, and the continuing development of OT strives to better describe the gradient (that is, noncategorical) nature of language. Using statistical evidence gathered in Tarlinskaya 1976 and Li 1995, the authors demonstrate that deviation from the prototype in Chaucer's, Shakespeare's, and Milton's line is significantly similar, showing that deviation is largely restricted to the same metrical positions for all three and that, conversely, "all three poets constrain stress patterning most strictly at the ends of their lines (and hemistichs), and least strictly at the beginnings of their lines (and hemistichs)" (157). And Li (1995) demonstrates that the percentages of trochees in Chaucer's line (from a 3020-line sample) are most frequent at the beginning of the line and the beginning of the second hemistich. Furthermore, Youmans and Li report that 75% of the most prominent syntactic subdivisions in Chaucer's line (from Li's [1995] sample) occur at the end of even-numbered metrical positions, and statistics for syntactic inversions (which the authors describe as "Gascoigne transformations") show that not only do these deviations from normal word order shift rhymes to the end of the line (as expected for end-rhyme verse), but that those syntactic inversions with no effect on the rhyme correlate with metrically normative rules such as the Stress Maximum Principle and the Monosyllabic Word Constraint, so that, for Chaucer, 95% of the Gascoigne transformations result in prototypically normative rhyme or metrical schemes. These figures provide strong empirical evidence of a hierarchically arranged structure for stress patterning, and they suggest that foot-salience is a statistically normative feature of Chaucer's line as expressed by "tension" rules that measure the degree of deviation from the abstract prototype for the iambic pentameter line.

The impressive statistical analysis presented by Youmans and Li severely undermines Cable's controversial claim (which is unique to him) that "Chaucer's regularly alternating meter does not imply foot structure" (134), but his immediately following rejoinder (177–178) to Youmans and Li's contribution succinctly states what he believes to be the major differences in their approach to metrics—the necessity to locate five beats, or "taps," per line, the reality of the tilting effect of meter on the pattern of stresses to achieve five beats per line, the evidence of function words bearing ictus, the traditional association of poetic rhythm with isochrony, the irrelevance of constituent bracketing in

the determination of metricality, and the "clear distinction" (178) between what constitutes metricality and tension. Cable indicates that Youmans and Li's analysis is not as comprehensive as they suggest when he points out that Chaucer does not employ any initial trochees, or "inverted first feet," where the second metrical position is final -*e*, which would represent completely unambiguous evidence that Chaucer's line includes a kind of deviation from the metrical norm that is strikingly similar to that found in Shakespeare and Milton. This gap in Youmans and Li's analysis aside, the evidence they present is compelling, and the exchange highlights the persistence and continued relevance of an old debate (see Hogg 1994 and Koerner 1997) pitting two intellectual orientations against one another, which we can broadly characterize as a "linguistic-theoretic" approach versus an approach which can variously be called "linguistic-functional," or "traditional," "philological," or "literary." The tension between these two attitudes, which is far less a relationship of antipodes vying for control than one of siblings competing for the upper hand, acts as a remarkably useful counter-balance in English historical linguistics (for which we have a prodigious corpus), whereby analyses that seek to confirm the authors' theoretical biases at the expense of data are no more likely to be given credence than analyses positing interpretations of data that spurn the kinds of generalizations about language that theory makes possible. Cable's charge that "[t]he literary metrist would like the grammarians and phonologists to get their work done and then pass the results along, keeping the sausage-making out of the metrics" and that "[n]othing fancier than a stress-marked lexicon is needed" (180) unfortunately reiterates the weathered notion that the relationship of the prosodic hierarchy of natural language to the meter of verse is wholly ancillary, a position that Youmans and Li (and others) show to be improbable. On the other hand, Cable's short rejoinder, while, in effect, simply repeating his objections to generative metrics from his first essay, perspicuously identifies an empirical crack in Youmans and Li's analysis (the absence of inverted first feet with final -*e* in second position), an observation for which an empirically comprehensive analysis—the hallmark of a "good theory"—needs an explanation.

Richard W. Bailey's "A thousand years of the history of English" is a particularly apt conclusion to the volume, calling for a "renewed philology" and tracing the evolution of the philological disciplines through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Bailey points out how the

intellectual history of English language study is intertwined with cultural and social assumptions about language, tracing in reverse chronological order (a move designed to emphasize the pervasive ethnocentrism in the history of language study as a predestined ascent to the triumphal present) an ethnography of English historical linguistics from Henry Sweet's Victorian hand-wringing over fixed orthography and pronunciation to the Anglo-Saxon monk Byrhtferth's etymology of Latin *autumnus* as emblematic of the "widespread human conviction that words contain mysteries" (465). Bailey closes his contribution by suggesting that examination of our present assumptions and biases could result in a paradigmatic change in the theory and practice of English language history.

In the "Phonology and metrics" section, Blaine Erickson writes "On the development of English *r*," probing the history of the retroflex approximant [ɭ] and the nonretroflex continuant [ɹ] in American English as exceptionally rare phones crosslinguistically, which he analyzes as innovations rather than retentions from the set of Germanic rhotics. Geoffrey Russom's "Dating criteria for Old English poems" proposes a new set of metrical dating criteria for Old English verse from the perspective of Russom's own word-foot theory (see Russom 1987, 1998), in which metrical form is a direct projection from linguistic structure, an original but (regrettably) not widely employed modification of Eduard Sievers's five-types theory. Russom's analysis provides additional support to the linguistic dating criteria examined by Fulk (1992) by assessing the relative frequencies of verse types (which represents an extension of the analysis proposed by Russom [1998]) under the working assumption that diachronic linguistic change complicates the composition of Old English poetry in its native tradition. In "How much shifting actually occurred in the English vowel shift?," Robert Stockwell challenges the time-worn notion that the Great Vowel Shift is the classic example of a chain shift. Rather, Stockwell proposes that the lower front and back areas of the vowel space underwent a series of mergers (Stockwell and Minkova 1988) and that the diphthongization of /iː/ and /uː/ to /əj/ and /əw/ ("center drift") is self-evidently not a chain shift, since there is no displacement of contrastive vowels.

In the "Morphosyntax/Semantics" section, contributions include Maurizio Gotti's "Pragmatic uses of *shall* future constructions in Early Modern English," an examination of the future tense with the modal verb *shall* based on statistical analysis of parts of the Helsinki Corpus from

1640–1710 totaling 171,040 words, and on comparison with the pragmatic uses of *shall* discussed in period grammars. Edward Keenan's "Explaining the creation of reflexive pronouns in English" further exemplifies the impressive results of broad statistical analysis of corpora (see Keenan 2001). Keenan's history of the creation of reflexive pronouns in English engages two general forces of change (decay and inertia), two universal semantic constraints (constituency interpretation and anti-synonymy), and the anaphora system of Old English. He argues against the hypothesis that the creation of English reflexive pronouns results from grammaticalization and parameter resetting. In "The emergence of the verb-verb compound in twentieth century English and twentieth century linguistics," Benji Wald and Lawrence Besserman investigate the question of why such endocentric compounds (for example, *slam-dunk* and *crash-land*) have only become highly productive since the mid-twentieth century. The authors examine various problems of analysis, including headedness and the ambiguity of the lexical category of the first constituent; they trace the history of compounding (and the grammatical preconditions for VV) from Old and Middle English; and they perform a quantitative analysis of the evolution of V1 (which, in this context, designates the first constituent of a compound) and VV from late Middle English selected largely from dictionary entries, finding that V1 has been fostered through a series of changes beginning in the late Old English period that relaxed constraints against the formation of compound verbs.

Studies in the History of the English Language is an important volume not only because of the many impressive essays collected in it but also because it is a signal example of the vigor of the current state of English historical linguistics. The editors have endeavored to provide the community of English language scholars in North America with a regular forum for the presentation of current research, and they have provided the worldwide community of English language scholars with a guidebook that charts a course for new directions in the discipline. The book brings together work on English that most often only reaches a fragmented research community, such as through the American Dialect Society or the Society for Germanic Linguistics, and it thoroughly demonstrates the relevance of the social, cognitive, and theoretical emphases of the discipline to many of the larger aims of humanities research at the beginning of the twenty-first century—the discovery of patterns of human behavior and interaction, the examination of one's

own culture as the accumulation of successive generations' cultural production, and an increased understanding of constructions of identity and alterity through language.

REFERENCES

Cable, Thomas. 1991. The English alliterative tradition. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fulk, R. D. 1992. A history of Old English meter. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Halle, Morris, and Samuel Jay Keyser. 1966. Chaucer and the study of prosody. College English 28.187–219.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. From space to time: Temporal adverbials in the world's languages. (LINCOM studies in theoretical linguistics, 3.) Munich: LINCOM EUROPA.

Hayes, Bruce. 1995. Metrical stress theory: Principles and case studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünnemeyer. 1991. Grammaticalization: a conceptual framework. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hogg, Richard. 1994. Linguistics, philology, chicken, and eggs. English historical linguistics 1992, ed. by Francisco Fernández, Miguel Fuster, and Juan José Calvo, 3–16. (Current issues in linguistic theory, 113.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hopper, Paul, and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. Grammaticalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kager, René. 1999. Optimality theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keenan, Edward L. 2001. Creating anaphors: The history of reflexive pronouns in English. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Koerner, Konrad. 1997. Linguistics vs. philology: Self-definition of a field or rhetorical stance? Language Sciences 19.167–175.

Lass, Roger. 2000. Remarks on (uni)directionality. Pathways of change: grammaticalization in English, ed. by Olga Fischer, Anette Rosenbach, and Dieter Stein, 207–227. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lehmann, Christian. 1995. Thoughts on grammaticalization. Munich: LINCOM EUROPA. (First published in 1982 as Arbeiten des Kölner Universalienprojekts, 48. Cologne: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.)

Li, Xingzhong. 1995. Chaucer's meters. Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri.

Liberman, Mark, and Alan Prince. 1977. On stress and linguistic rhythm. Linguistic Inquiry 8.249–336.

Newmeyer, Frederick J. 1998. Language form and language function. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Prince, Alan, and Paul Smolensky. 1993. Optimality theory: Constraint interaction in generative grammar. Technical Report CU-CS-696-93, Deaprtment of Computer Science, University of Colorado at Boulder; Technical Report TR-2, Rutgers Center for Cognitive Science, Rutgers University.

Russom, Geoffrey. 1987. Old English meter and linguistic theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Russom, Geoffrey. 1998. *Beowulf* and Old Germanic metre. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stockwell, Robert P., and Donka Minkova. 1988. The English vowel shift: Problems of coherence and explanation. Luick revisited: Papers read at the Luick-symposium at Schloß Liechtenstein, ed. by Dieter Kastovsky and Gero Bauer, 355–394. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Tarlinskaya, Marina. 1976. English verse: Theory and history. The Hague: Mouton.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1982. From prepositional to textual and expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. Perspectives on historical linguistics, ed. by Winfred P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel, 245–271. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Department of English
Towson University
8000 York Rd.
Towson, MD 21252
USA
[CCain@towson.edu]

Das Verb "legen". Eine Untersuchung seiner räumlich-konkreten Bedeutungsvarianten. By Heidrun Schindler. (Linguistische Arbeiten, 434.) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2001. Pp. x, 240. Paper. € 60.00.

Reviewed by EVA SCHULTZE-BERNDT, *Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig*

This book, based on Heidrun Schindler's doctoral dissertation, is a corpus-based study of the range of meanings and uses of a single German verb, *legen* 'place in horizontal position'. As stated in the subtitle,

Schindler focusses on the concrete, spatial uses of the verb, although a brief discussion (10 pages) of its abstract uses is included as the last part of the book. Apart from two fairly brief chapters (37 pages in total) of an introductory and methodological nature, the main part of the book consists of a detailed subcategorization of subtypes and a discussion of the examples provided in illustration. The fairly informal semantic analysis—presented partly in prose and partly in the form of semantic networks—draws both on traditional treatments of valency and on prototype theory.

The main merit of this book lies in presenting a systematic overview of a large range of uses of a single high-frequency, multifunctional verb. The reader is provided with a wealth of information that (speaking from my own perspective) can be enlightening even to a native speaker of German. Thus, in addition to a discussion of the prototypical use of *legen* to indicate a caused change of location/position and its more salient uses in fixed expressions such as *(Eier) legen* 'lay (eggs)', Schindler also pays due attention to other major uses of the verb. Under various conditions, for example, *legen* may be used independently of a horizontal position of the object in the end state and the presence of a support relation. Thus, the verb may encode a change of inclination ("Neigungsveränderung," 74–75, 117, 171–172) as in *den Kopf schief legen* 'cock one's head to one side', the caused contact of a body part with a location (115–121), as in *sein Ohr gegen die Tür legen* 'put one's ear to the door', or the placement of the object referent in an (unspecified) location connected to an inherent function (146–152), as in *Kabel legen* 'lay cables'. Other distinctive variants of the verb include those with effected objects (133–138), and combinations of a more phraseological nature such as *etwas in Falten legen* 'pleat (material), wrinkle (face)' (130–132).

Schindler divides the uses of *legen* into trivalent (part I), bivalent (part II), and monovalent (part III) uses. Further subdivisions are based on a variety of criteria, including valency (for example, uses of the reflexive verb), the semantics of the verb itself (such as caused motion vs. caused change of object), and the semantics of the participants (human vs. animate vs. inanimate subject/object, for example). The application of these criteria occasionally appears pedantic and can lead to considerable redundancy, such as when human and other animate subjects are discussed in distinct subchapters even though this distinction appears to be of little relevance for the actual use of *legen*. The author provides some remedy by including a number of summarizing sections

and schematic overviews of semantic networks representing the connections between various uses. However, the reader would have profited from more crossreferencing between the sections. Generally, the book is written in a clear and readable style, although the abundance of footnotes is somewhat cumbersome and often unnecessary. This is partly due to Schindler's desire—understandable for any linguist who has worked with corpus data—to share as many jewels of her corpus as possible with the reader, resulting in frequent comments on particular examples that are of little relevance for the matter at hand.

The main shortcoming of the book, however, lies in the semantic analyses provided. In many places one would have wished for a more theoretically minded (though not necessarily formalist) approach. It is symptomatic that the more thorough discussions of problems of semantic analysis, in particular those that include a substantial review of the relevant literature, are devoted to questions of valency (the status of the obligatory locative "adjunct" [102–108] and the analysis of the reflexive verb [163–167]) and of aspectual character (the distinction between a stative and dynamic use of the verb [181–187]), rather than to questions of lexical semantics proper. Thus, Schindler barely addresses the distinction between the lexical semantics of the verb discussed and the pragmatic interpretation of sentences containing the verb. This is particularly striking in the case of the "prototypical" meaning of the verb identified by Schindler, that is, that which is claimed to lie at the center of a radial network of senses. This basic sense is represented in terms of a schema (42) invoking the successive stages of prestate (location of OBJ) – grasping (of OBJ by SUBJ) – transfer – caused contact and positioning of OBJ in a new location – end state (location of OBJ). The author herself discusses numerous examples that show that only the final components of 'caused contact and positioning' of the object referent (and perhaps the end state) are entailed by the verb. Still, she maintains that all phases mentioned above are lexically encoded by *legen* wherever they are part of the interpretation of the sentence. In other words, 'caused change of location' and 'caused change of position' are represented as distinct (if related) senses of the verb (as, for example, in the semantic network representation on page 114). I would argue, to the contrary, that 'caused change of position' suffices to characterize the purely semantic contribution of the verb in its basic spatial sense, all other "phases" being a matter of pragmatic enrichment based on world knowledge.

Similar objections could be raised throughout the book. For example, in the discussion of the sense of 'placement in a position for the purpose of fulfilling a function' (151–152), *legen* is claimed to take on various additional semantic features such as "[+expertly]" ([+*fachkundig*]) and to encode a "more complex activity" than that represented by the schema discussed above. Again, these interpretations could be more insightfully characterized as resulting from pragmatic enrichment. Likewise, Schindler identifies a causative sense of *legen* (108–111) in cases where the subject referent can only be understood as the causer, and not as the immediate agent of the displacement. Here and in the case of the so-called "instrumental voice" ("Instrumentalis-Diathese" [141–142]), that is, where the (inanimate) subject referent has to be interpreted as the instrument of the event, we are dealing with metonymic shifts in the interpretation of the subject referent (as suggested in passing by Schindler herself for some examples on page 142), rather than with distinct senses of the verb.

Somewhat surprisingly, Schindler pays relatively little attention to one of the central semantic components of the verb *legen*, the restriction on the position of the entity in the end state. The relevant section (46–62) does provide a brief discussion of the opposition of *legen* with the other major verbs of caused position, *setzen* and *stellen*. Drawing on previous work on German positional verbs, Schindler confirms the finding of other authors that *legen* functions as a default verb in many cases, since it encodes, for example, the positioning of animates without limbs, of flexible or completely symmetrical inanimates, and of a heterogenous collection of entities. The book could have been stronger, though, if the author had taken into account a larger variety of both object referents and end locations. Thus, only a single paragraph (65–66) is devoted to containers as end locations, although it could probably be shown that *legen* also functions as a default verb in this case, that is, that the verb may be used independently of the orientation of the object referent inside the container. The failure to pursue questions such as this is partly due to the inherent limitations of a corpus consisting mainly of written texts, which might have profitably been enriched with elicited data capturing more fine-grained aspects of the use of the verb.

Despite the shortcomings just mentioned, the book is a valuable source for readers interested in questions of lexical semantics, lexicography, phraseology, valency, and spatial language, and also for those with a professional interest in learning or teaching idiomatic

German. Readers prepared to draw their own conclusions from the data are provided with the kinds of insight that can only result from a painstaking analysis of a large corpus such as that undertaken by Schindler.

Department of Linguistics
School of Oriental and African Studies
Thornhaugh Street
Russell Square
London WC1H 0XG
United Kingdom
[schultzeberndt@eva.mpg.de]