An account of the history of negation in English is long overdue. Much has been written on various topics concerning negation, but until the appearance of Mazzon’s work, no comprehensive historical study has been undertaken. It is easy to understand why: it is a formidable task, as it requires a thorough grasp not only of the historical facts, but also of a large range of theoretical work, where negation has long been a favorite topic. Mazzon’s aim is far-reaching: she sets out not only to present the history of negation in English, but also to focus on methodological issues and to discuss the ‘possible applications of different theoretical frameworks’ (p. xiii) to the topic at hand – a tall order.

In spite of the ambitious nature of the task, Mazzon has produced a slender volume: 147 pages of text and another 30 pages consisting of a rich bibliography, comprehensive appendixes, and an index. There are six chapters. The first is devoted to ‘General and typological issues’, the second to ‘Negation in Old English and Early Middle English’, the third to ‘The Middle Ages and Early Modern English’, the fourth to ‘Present-day English negation’, the fifth to ‘Varieties of English’, and the sixth and final one to ‘Further theoretical considerations and conclusions’. Appendix I lists the primary sources used by Mazzon, and Appendix II contains a useful listing of negative forms, including many variants not included in the OED.

The basics of the history of negation in English are well known since Einenkell’s (1912) and Jespersen’s (1917) early work. Jespersen coined the expression ‘negative cycle’ for the process where an initial weak negative element is reinforced by another word, which later takes over the function as sentence negator. The classic example comes from French, where the three stages ne – ne...pas – pas are labeled NEG1, NEG2, and NEG3 by Mazzon. English has its own negative cycle: ne – ne...noht – not, as shown schematically below with made-up sentences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE1</td>
<td>je ne dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE2</td>
<td>je ne dis pas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE3</td>
<td>je dis pas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English has the added complications of do-support, neg-incorporation (as in n-obody, n-ever), and the rise and fall of negative concord or multiple negation as in I don’t say nothing. The basics of the development of negation in English are well known, or thought to be so. However, many problems have remained unsolved, and many supposed facts need to be revised in the light of recent research.
It is obvious that a work of this type and scope must rely to a large extent on work published by previous scholars, but Mazzon also presents new insights from her own large-scale research on Old English and Middle English texts in chapters 2 and 3. I will therefore devote more space to these chapters than to the others.

Chapter 1 introduces some of the most important concepts used in the study of negation: sentence negation versus constituent negation, scope, metalinguistic negation, expletive/paratactic negation, and the negative cycle. The position of the negative element, henceforth Neg, is discussed against the backdrop of the debate in the literature on English word order, and Mazzon also adds a typological perspective here. She concludes that ‘[t]he dispute between those who see modern English negation as post-verbal and those who consider it pre-verbal is largely a question of perspective’ (p. 14). Mazzon further discusses neg-incorporation (as in *nobody*, *never*) and the supposed tendency of languages with neg-incorporation to have negative concord (or multiple negation), a tendency she calls permeability. Her theoretical perspective is eclectic.

Chapter 2 deals with Old and Early Middle English and covers a time-span ending in 1200. Mazzon thus has a different periodization than standard works like *The Cambridge history of the English language*, which counts OE until 1066, something that may cause problems for those interested in making comparisons.

Mazzon opens the chapter by demonstrating the existence of no fewer than five different patterns of negation and word order, often co-occurring in the same text, and she points out that this ‘gives an idea of the complications inherent in any attempt at drawing generalizations about OE word-order’ (p. 21).

The most important and innovative parts of this chapter are based on Mazzon’s examination of a dauntingly large sample of Old English negative clauses, 39,173 in all, drawn from the Toronto electronic OE corpus as distributed by the Oxford Text Archive. She divides the material into original OE texts and translations from Latin, demonstrating that Neg tends to be adjacent to V in both types of text, but the tendency is stronger in original OE texts than in translations from Latin: 95% vs. 76%, respectively.

Mazzon then deals with variation in Old English negation, first of all the incidence of negative concord. She argues that previous discussions of an OE ‘norm’ for negation are usually simplistic and that both negative forms and strategies are much more varied than previously reported. She supports this statement by a table (2.2, p. 25), which when deciphered (clear tables are not Mazzon’s forte) shows several interesting facts: sentences with only one negator account for just under 60% in original OE texts, but for 90% in OE translations from Latin (which does not have negative concord). Most of the sentences with negative concord have only two instances of Neg (32% in original OE and 9% in translations from Latin), and sentences with three or more instances of Neg are very unusual: only 5% of all cases in originals and 1% in translations from Latin. (Mazzon also throws in some statistics on other types of negation here. They would have merited a separate table as they make the task of the reader unnecessarily complicated.)
After describing different negative forms in OE, Mazzon discusses neg-incorporation, i.e. the contraction of the negative particle ne with different linguistic elements that was widespread in OE and included cliticization on verbs to form nillan, nabban, nagan, nytan, etc. Mazzon discusses the important fact that these were never thoroughly lexicalized and that there was a kind of reversed merger when they disappeared, and she also brings up cases of nonapplication of incorporation, a laudable approach that many researchers fail to take. (Unfortunately, the table that supports her presentation is again frustrating with too many subcategories, and it leaves the reader baffled rather than enlightened.)

After a discussion of the diversity of texts and genres, including the influence of Latin, Mazzon goes on to discuss specific phenomena and the rules of OE negation. Again, in the section on negative concord, she takes the tack of examining the cases where concord could have taken place but didn’t – another example of her commendable adherence to the Labovian principle of accountability. Although the table supporting the text (2.4 on p. 37) is a small and manageable one this time, with only three columns, there are problems. Only percentages are given, but we are not told on what numbers it is based, and worse, there is a discrepancy between what the author says in the text and what the table shows.

Further sections deal with neg-attraction, the rule that prescribes Nobody came and proscribes *Anybody did not come in Present-day English, but which did not apply in Old English, and negative raising. Contra Fischer (1999), Mazzon argues, to my mind convincingly, that there were clear cases of neg-raising in OE. The effect of negative conjunction and disjunction on the survival of negative concord is discussed on the basis of Mazzon’s own research, again with a difficult table, but it seems clear that coordination did have an effect on its preservation. The final pages of the chapter are devoted to expletive negation and other rhetorical phenomena such as collocations destined to become negative polarity items (at all, any, etc.), and to nonsentential negation and negative affixation.

Chapter 3 covers the time-span from 1200 to 1700, again deviating from most major histories of English. In this chapter Mazzon follows up the topics broached in chapter 2. She first takes up the supposed prevalence of negative concord in Middle English. She points out that this is a misleading conception: ‘What did become more common (but then quickly declined) during ME is the NEG2 pattern proper, i.e. the Neg + V + Neg pattern, in which a “reinforcer” of the type nought/not was introduced and then came to supplant pre-verbal ne (NEG3)’ (p. 55). Mazzon sets out to demonstrate what really happened based on the study of a large number of texts – but she also points out that individual texts have their own idiosyncratic characteristics. In another set of dense and overloaded tables she demonstrates the existence of diachronic, register, and regional variation, showing that clauses with only one negator are always in the majority, increasing from 54% to 86% from the early to the late period of her time span, and being most prevalent in the register labeled theatre. There are substantial dialectal differences, with the West Midlands showing the lowest proportion of single negators (49%) and the North the highest (84%). Most importantly, Mazzon shows that
‘the ne...not type was never so widespread and “regular” as standard accounts of ME lead us to think’ (p. 57). She also shows that multiple negation declines partly because of the loss of incorporated verbs such as nabban.

Mazzon has also done an enormous job investigating a total of over 29,000 forms to see where there is neg-incorporation and where it is avoided – again adhering to the accountability principle. It is a pity that she presents her results in tables so overloaded with data as to make them practically inaccessible – thus table 3.2 on p. 59 contains valuable data on neg-incorporation with different grammatical categories, but is based in part on the total number of negative clauses and in part on the total number of negative forms, and requires major effort on the part of the reader to make sense.

Mazzon then continues her discussion of the phenomena of neg-attraction, negative raising, expletive negation, and negative polarity items, but in these cases she does not quantify, which is a pity. It would have been interesting to know how frequent these much-discussed phenomena were in actual usage, as Mazzon clearly has access to the data. The author again deals with the effect of negative coordination by means of neither, nor, ne etc., and finds that, although it tends to produce high proportions of multiple negation, the total number of such cases is low. There is also a section on constituent and affixal negation in the period treated.

A section entitled ‘Negation and the new sentence structure’ covers two of the most important phenomena in the history not only of negation but of the English language: the fixing of word order and the introduction and specialization of do-support. The treatment of these phenomena is mostly based on the research of other scholars, and they get short shrift from Mazzon on less than seven pages, without much discussion of the different views of the emergence of do-support, except for a brief overview on p. 54, where some earlier work is mentioned.1 There is a sad lack of regular examples of do-support to show the rise of this important feature, and Mazzon even goes so far as to say (p. 79) that ‘[t]he most interesting thing (as is often the case in linguistics) are the exceptions, which seem to concern a restricted set of predicates, e.g. say, doubt, care, know, fear, etc.’. In accordance with this pronouncement (with which I strongly disagree, especially in a work that purports to give an overview of a subject), her examples in this section are almost exclusively constructions that have become exceptional, like O, fear me not or Neuer was seene so black a day as this.

This disappointing section is followed by one of the most interesting of the book, where Mazzon discusses inter- and intratextual variation, as well as variation between authors of the same period. Here she shows her strength as a textual scholar and philologist, and one can only agree with her that ‘careful philological work . . . cannot really be avoided even in the age of computerized corpora’. I would like an even stronger formulation: careful philological work is more important than ever.

1 Mazzon also remarks (on p. 54) that it is ‘rather rare, among the languages of the world, to have such a grammatical word as do’; this may be so, but tun is alive and kicking in many German dialects, where it is not restricted to negative and interrogative clauses, however.
Chapter 4 consists of a careful review of existing literature on problems of negation in Present-day English that have fascinated a large number of linguists because of their apparently anomalous status or theoretical implications. Mazzon begins by attacking one of the popular myths concerning the disappearance of multiple negation: ‘the statement that is often found to the effect that multiple negation was excluded from the standard as a consequence of the grammarians’ attacks . . . is not correct, since the phenomenon had been on its way out of this variety for some time already’ (p. 92). She then continues to discuss the standard issues: the scope of negation, negative raising, negation with indefinites, quantifiers and comparatives, negative concord, coordination and cliticization of not, inversion, negation and modality, negative polarity items, and the many issues of the pragmatics of negation.

Chapter 5 of this tremendously ambitious work summarizes negation in varieties of English – British dialects, Celtic varieties, African-American varieties, ‘new Englishes’, and pidgins and creoles – all covered on fourteen pages. The sixth and final chapter begins with a discussion of the acquisition of negation in L1 and L2. Mazzon concludes, contra some earlier scholars, that the evidence of parallel developments in acquisition and general development of negation is inconclusive and that the historical development of negation ‘does not mirror . . . cognitive developments in the individual in any precise way’ (p. 139). She does find parallels between the development of negation in English and cognate European languages as concerns the placement of negation, the use of multiple negation, and the tension between the Neg-First and End-Weight principles.

Mazzon’s book is in many ways a major achievement, a must for any serious scholar of the history of negation in English, or indeed of negation in language in general. However, as will have been clear from my comments above, the most innovative parts are also the most frustrating, as Mazzon does not do her impressive research justice in the presentation of her results, especially in the text and tables of chapters 2 and 3. In spite of mostly good glosses to the OE examples,2 these chapters can only be digested with difficulty, even by dedicated scholars, and would be forbidding to anyone not well versed in the topic already. Interlinear glosses are scrapped in chapter 2, which will bother readers not familiar with Middle English dialects. There is thus a problem of audience, as the chapters based on the work of other researchers are much clearer and more accessible, but contain less news for the advanced scholar and are more geared towards a student audience. On the whole, Mazzon is at her best when presenting philological work and discussions of texts. Her prose is often Italianate, however, and she tends to use long and convoluted sentences discussing theoretical points without providing illustrative examples. An energetic copy-editor could have done wonders.

The bibliography is a true goldmine for future researchers on negation, and there are few inadvertencies. Hopper & Traugott (2003) should have been cited in a later edition; so should Trudgill & Hannah (2002), and the title of Einenkel’s (1912) work has been

2 There are a few mistakes; thus on p. 33 the author claims that naht can be interpreted as nahte, ‘a form of nabban’, but surely what we have to do with here is ne+agan.
distorted. (And, of course, I couldn’t help noticing that Tottie, 1991 was not included among the references, although it must have been the work referred to on p. 138.)
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Reviewed by Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Stanford University

1 Summary

Grammaticalization as economy is Elly van Gelderen’s fourth book on historical linguistics, building on The rise of functional categories (1993), Verbal agreement and the grammar behind its ‘breakdown’ (1997) and A history of English reflexive pronouns (2000). All seek to advance theoretical approaches to syntactic change, especially in English, from the perspective of generative syntax, most recently as developed within
the Minimalist program. In the book under review, van Gelderen continues a decade-
long project of interpreting grammaticalization phenomena in formal terms (see also,
e.g., van Kemenade, 1999; Roberts, 1993; Roberts & Roussou, 2003; Kiparsky, 2005).
The particular aims of the present book are two-fold. One is to argue that unidirectional
changes that have been identified in the grammaticalization literature are accounted
for by ‘a grammatical theory constrained by Economy Principles’ (p. 3). Specifically,
these principles are:

(a) The Head Preference or Spec to Head Principle: ‘Be a head, rather than a phrase’
(p. 11).
(b) The Late Merge Principle: ‘Merge as late as possible’ (p. 12). This principle is an
adaptation of Chomsky’s ‘merge over move’ (1995, 2001), reformulated as ‘Merge
late so that you don’t have to merge as well as move’ (p. 29). It results in innovative
base-generation (p. 130).

The second aim is to show that not all languages have a CP layer in addition to a
VP and IP layer, and that the CP layer may develop relatively late in the history of
a language. Data are derived primarily from English, but crosslinguistic support is
provided from other Germanic languages such as Dutch and German, as well as from
Arabic, Baka, Chinese, Egyptian, French, Greek, Ik, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Latin,
Nunggubuyu, Sanskrit, and Spanish, among others. The range of structures considered
(often in several chapters) is large, and it will be possible to refer to only a few here.

The book is divided into four parts. The first (chapters 1 and 2) introduces the
terminology and approach, probably rather too briefly for readers not familiar with
them. Some basic Spec to Head changes are exemplified, e.g. agreement markers
derived from pronouns, negative heads from negative specifiers, and article heads from
demonstrative specifiers. Some Late Merge changes, e.g. the development of auxiliaries
(Head to Head reanalysis), are also introduced as background to the rest of the book.

The second part (chapters 3 to 6) concerns aspects of the structure of the CP, the ‘outer
layer’ of the clause. Modifying Rizzi (1997) slightly, van Gelderen refers to a ‘split
CP’ consisting of ForceP (illocutionary force), optional TopicP (roughly speaking, old
information), optional FocusP (roughly, new information), and FiniteP (related to Tense
and Mood). One of van Gelderen’s concerns in chapters 3 and 4 is to show that not all
languages have CPs, and, if a language has a CP, not all clauses may have one, or have
a split CP. In particular, English nonfinite clauses and relatives do not have a split CP
since they are reduced. For example, in English TopicP cannot follow for in nonfinite
embedded clauses; see (1), where TopicP (her homework) is a preposed Object:

(1) (a) *I expect for [her homework] her to do.
    (b) *I expected [her homework] for her to do. (p. 46)

More importantly for the history of English, Indo-European did not have a CP (see
Kiparsky, 1995 on the development of CP in Germanic). Van Gelderen argues that in
some varieties of OE there is a split main clause CP. However, OE complementations
sometimes still evidence absence of embedded CP (p. 71), and, if embedded CP
is present, it is not split in embedded clauses. In ME ‘double complementizers are
introduced and the topic is placed in the embedded CP’ (p. 51), cf. the development of for, for that in the twelfth century as C (p. 53), and the appearance in the fourteenth century of ‘topic’ adverbials such as hardily ‘certainly’ after that, as in (2) (vG in citations is short for van Gelderen):

(2) Ther may swich cause ben . . . That hardily thou wolt thiselven saye . . .
   ‘There may such reason be . . . that certainly you want yourself to say.’ (Chaucer,
   *Troilus and Criseyde* 577.1305-06) [vG, p. 54])

By EModE, accumulated changes led to a structural differentiation: finite complements had split CP, but nonfinite ones did not (p. 75). Instances of the emergence of embedded CP elements in English include the development of *that*-complementizers and *that*-relativizers out of *that*-pronouns, and of *wh*-relatives out of *wh*-pronouns. These are analyzed as involving first the reanalysis of the demonstrative as a specifier of CP and then as a head in accordance with the Economy Principle of ‘Head over Spec’ (p. 99).

Having demonstrated shifts from Specifier to Head, van Gelderen moves on in chapter 5 to show that such elements as for, till, and that ‘become merged higher and change from Fin to Force . . . So the split CP is a result of the Late Merge Economy Principle’ (p. 101). An example is the shift c.1150 from use of for as a preposition to position before a subordinator as in (3):

(3) for þæt he hadde islehge moche of hire cunne
   ‘because he had slain many of their people’ (Layamon, Otho 5453 [vG, p. 104])

For then ‘almost immediately grammaticalizes to Force and triggers a split CP’ (p. 104). Chapter 6 concerns a number of additional shifts to Late Merge including the change to C from adverbs and prepositions (e.g., *þæh* ‘however’ > *þæh he* ‘although’, *like* ‘similar to’ (Prep) > quotative (C) (pp. 123–5)). Another example of Late Merge is said to be the incorporation of TopicP in later ME, as evidenced by the fact that the Xs have the same referent in most ‘as for X, X . . .’ constructions in Chaucer and the *Paston letters* (p. 117) as in:

(4) But as for me, I seye that yvele it sit.
   ‘But as for me, I see that it ill befits one.’ (Chaucer, *Clerkes tale* 143.460
   [vG, p. 116])

The third part (chapters 7 to 11) discusses similar changes, but at the levels of IP (agreement, tense, mood, and aspect) and VP-shell (including ‘inner aspect’ [Aktionsart], referred to in the book as E(xtent) Phrase, and lexical arguments). Given that the Minimalist categories are highly abstract and syntactic, van Gelderen opts for three positions in IP: TMA, in that order, in opposition to Bybee’s (1985) semantically based order MTA (p. 143). The well-known fact that most deontic modals (e.g. *mot-‘(to) have measured’ > ‘may’ > ‘must’, *cun-‘know’ > ‘can’) were preterite-presents (i.e. perfective, and stative) is used as one element in van Gelderen’s argument that in OE deontics were first full Vs and, when they developed auxiliary structure in OE (by head to head shift), they came to occupy ASP. The main reason for this analysis is to account for the requirement that, from OE to the present day, deontics select event
verbs and do not occur with *have/be* in ASP (pp. 162–3). This hypothesis will be further elaborated on below.

Part 4 (chapters 12 and 13) addresses issues of parameter setting and of counterexamples to the unidirectional changes that are the central focus of the book. With respect to parameter shifts, van Gelderen distinguishes local shifts within a specific layer, such as special marking of Tense or ASP, and ‘macroparameter’ shifts, such as the development of new grammatical layers (e.g. the shift from a language state in which no CP is present to one in which it is). She suggests the local shifts occur rapidly, while the macroparametric shifts are slow (p. 271). Rather than posit a large number of universal functional categories, such as Cinque (1999) proposes, whether or not they are realized in any particular language, van Gelderen suggests some languages are ‘more “lexically-oriented”, i.e. towards the VP, and others more “grammatically-oriented”, i.e. towards the IP’ (p. 252).

Unidirectionality has been the subject of much debate. For the most part, van Gelderen assumes and confirms unidirectionality, and does not consider counterexamples from a structural, internal point of view. An exception is the case of coordinators becoming subordinators and then coordinators again. In this case van Gelderen argues that because both coordinators and subordinators are ‘heads of functional projections . . . that are hierarchically similar, there is no Economy of Head over Spec or of Higher Head over lower Head involved’ and therefore a change in either direction can be expected (p. 126). Although Newmeyer’s (1998) critiques are mentioned (p. 3), they are not discussed, while Campbell (2001) is not in the bibliography; the much-studied but unsolved example of the development of the clitic genitive -s does not appear. Instead, van Gelderen is interested in ways that prescriptivism may slow down or even block Spec to Head change. One case in point is that of *wh*-relatives, which have been preferred in their specifier rather than in their later head form by some prescriptivists, as evidenced by rules regarding case marking and nonstranding. Thus (5a) is preferred over (5b):

(5) (a) I met the woman of whom I had seen a picture.
(b) I met the woman who I had seen a picture of. (vG, p. 80)

Another is prescriptive resistance to the split infinitive, a resistance which ‘favors the lower position’ of *to* (p. 129).

2 Evaluation

As I have indicated, *Grammaticalization as economy* is aimed to prove that the principles ‘Head over Spec’ and ‘Late Merge’ account for many types of change that have been cited as examples of grammaticalization and, more specifically, of unidirectionality toward ‘higher’ structures. The book is an important contribution to understanding unidirectionality from a formal perspective. It also has implications for synchronic analysis, since the variability and increase of functional categories over time that it emphasizes are used to challenge the assumption based on contemporary
languages that the elaborate cartography of parameters proposed within the comparative syntax program is universal. Alternative approaches to economy, such as language processing (e.g. Hawkins, 1999) or production (Wasow, 1997), are not considered.

One concern is that in building the argument around grammatical layers and change types within them, van Gelderen tends to skip around from synchronic to diachronic, from topic to topic, and from language to language, and is not always consistent from one subsection to another. For example, in part 2 we read a lot about whether or not the CP is split in OE, before discovering that an embedded CP may in fact not be present in OE; then the development of CP is illustrated from later English rather than from Indo-European on. Shifting back and forth like this, or from complementation (chapter 3) to relative clauses and then complementation again (chapter 4), leads to a fragmented view of any one series of changes diachronically; it also makes it difficult to verify particular analyses, or to be certain of the exact analysis proposed from stage to stage.

A particular case in point is the interesting hypothesis that deontics are in ASP, discussed in various chapters in part 3, a strategy that makes the development hard to track. The wide variety of examples of ASP and Aktionsart (E) adduced from different languages and different periods adds to the difficulty. The hypothesis with respect to English appears to be as follows. In early OE habb- ‘have’ was mainly a full V, but in some contexts, especially that of ge-marked participles, it sometimes functioned as an ‘inner aspect’ expressing perfective (p. 171) in E; ge- likewise had this function (p. 167). Both habb- and ge- came to be outer aspect markers (p. 177). Evidence for the outer aspect status of ge- is its occurrence before other aspectual derivational morphemes, as in ge-an-mett- ‘encourage’ (p. 219). By ME when full Vs with premodal deontic meaning became auxiliaries, they are said to have ‘pushed’ have out of ASP (p. 171), though in fact they simply competed with it (when, exactly, in van Gelderen’s view?) and came to be in complementary distribution (p. 177). Meanwhile ge- is said to have become bleached and to have lost Aktionsart meaning (though it may well have done so before the advent of the modals; see Kastovsky, 1992: 377, 380 on the difficulty of attributing meaning to most instances of ge-). Consistent with a syntactic analysis that pays little attention to meaning, van Gelderen says, ‘The evidence for the reanalysis to outer aspect is that ge- is lost early with modals’ (p. 169). Have continues to occur, but after deontics it loses its aspectual meaning and serves as the marker of past tense (‘presumably T’, p. 172). In this position have becomes a clitic (sometimes written a):

(6) it xuld a be sayd ‘it should have been said’ (Paston letters, 131, anno 1449, Margaret Paston [vG, p. 172])

This reanalysis of perfective have after deontics (and also after the epistemics, which come to be generated in M in ME by further head to head movement), and especially its appearance as a clitic in examples like (6), suggests to van Gelderen that in ME there was a parametric shift: in older English tense is ‘specially marked’, but in later English it is aspect that is specially marked. This parameter shift gives rise to the perfective–imperfective contrast (p. 177) by the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.
Several developments support this shift, including the occupation of E by the infinitive marker to (p. 209) and perception verbs such as see, hear in their evidential meanings, e.g.:

(7) in hande I saw hym holde | Two firy dartes
‘in (his) hand I saw him holding two fiery arrows’ (Chaucer, *Legend of good women* 594.166–7 [vG, p. 195])

As the translation suggests, this E position is by ME understood as not only perfective but also as imperfective. This contributed, along with infinitival to, to the parametric shift to ASP marking and the eventual rise of the progressive by the nineteenth century, according to van Gelderen (pp. 198, 210).

The book would have been far more useful to researchers on the history of English, and a far higher level of accountability would have been lent to the hypotheses, if at least one significant sequence of changes, such as that of the development of aspect sketched above (or of TopicP), had been traced from its beginnings to the present day rather than presented piece-meal, with each stage discussed in terms of the Economy Principles that are van Gelderen’s main concern.

Another concern is that sometimes the arguments are glossed over or a source is cited so quickly that they seem opportunistic rather than fully thought through. For example, with reference to a fifteenth-century example of Negative Raising, which Fischer (1998) says is the first with think:

(8) I cannot thinke that he hath informed us all truely. (*Paston letters*, from Fischer, 1998: 71 [vG, p. 69])

van Gelderen says it ‘would seem to imply all complements are split CP, going against the other evidence. Fischer, however, suggests other reasons for the CP not being available, and I’ll follow that account. Hence, it can be argued that a differentiation in complement types arises quite late’ (p. 69). One would like to know Fischer’s reasons, but more importantly this passage is inconsistent with van Gelderen’s general approach, which elsewhere does allow for variation – one example in OE with absence of embedded CP does not lead her to say that no embedded CP existed in OE. There was clearly some variation with respect to Neg-raising, as indeed there still is. Therefore, there is no motivation for saying that one example of Neg-raising ‘would seem to imply all complements are split CP’. Furthermore, van Gelderen has only a few pages earlier said ‘It is not clear that there exists a syntactic account for Negative Raising’ (p. 62). Another example of going over material too rapidly concerns evidence for the ‘introduction of’ TopicP in later ME (p. 117). There is no question that the nature and distribution of Subject changed in ME (well-known examples are the loss of impersonal verbs, and of syntactically motivated V2). But van Gelderen has not established that there was no TopicP in matrix clauses before later ME. In fact, tree structures for the early fourteenth-century *Cursor Mundi* have TopicP in the CP layer (p. 108).

Throughout, van Gelderen is careful to point out that it is often difficult to know exactly what the correct analysis should be. Much textual data is indeterminate; indeed, indeterminacy is often considered a prerequisite for change, so this ‘truth in advertising’
is very laudable and more of us should be equally careful. Nevertheless, credibility is diminished by the repeated expression of uncertainty mixed with a rather cavalier brushing off of alternative analyses that do not fit, or preempting of terminology, e.g. when van Gelderen claims that there are multiple ‘topics’ in OE (they may trigger V2), she says, ‘Note that I use “multiple topics” even though some could be topic and focus . . . and fit in a Rizzian structure’ (p. 112). Whether something is or is not a TopicP matters when Late Merge is invoked over Move.

An issue of some debate ever since the nineteenth century in historical linguistics has been whether changes leave ‘gaps’ that need to be filled (a ‘pull-chain’ effect), or whether they arise out of competition among forms that leads to one pushing another out (a ‘push-chain’ effect). In the grammaticalization literature the issue has been articulated in terms of a ‘cycle’ in which a form goes to zero and is replaced (an approach implied in Givón, 1979: 209, and modeled in Heine & Reh, 1984: 77) versus repeated introduction of new forms that compete and eventually may win out over earlier forms because they are used more frequently (Bybee, 2003). The ‘push’ view is supported by the variability found not only across but also within texts, by the indeterminacy of many examples, and by logic. For instance, if one were to posit that negative ne became lost before negative not appeared, one would be led to the implausible conclusion that some speakers did not have a way of expressing negative. As we have seen, van Gelderen would appear to appeal to ‘pushing out’ in her chapter on deontic modality and aspect. Perfective have is said to have been pushed out of ASP by deontics (p. 171). However, it was not: it came to be in complementary distribution with deontics, and in postdeontic position it was reanalyzed as past. Elsewhere she takes the gap-filling approach. In discussing embedded finite clauses she uses (3) to show that for, being in first position, is in Force, and ‘triggers a split CP’ (p. 104). In (3) that is in Fin, and remains there ‘at least till about 1500’ (p. 105). When for disappears: ‘Once the split CP is available and Force is not occupied by for, that moves there’ (pp. 105–6). This is a gap-filling argument, with grammatical elements conceptualized as counters moving on their own, rather than being reanalyzed by speakers and hearers. There is no discussion of competition, though there must have been some, considering that for is not always present, and that could therefore have been analyzed as either in Fin or in Force. This is presumably true of the situation in the Paston letters, from which (9) is drawn:

(9) And I told him that, as for such mony that shuld. . . , I wold. . .

‘And I told him that, as for such money that should. . . , I would. . . ’ (Paston letters no. 75, anno 1465 [vG, p. 106])

Indeed, that is said to be in Force in (9) (p. 106). Since (9) is from 1465, there is inconsistency with the claim just cited that that is in Fin ‘at least till about 1500’. Unless it can be shown that no relevant examples of for that and that coexisted in the same text or in texts of the same period and geographical origin, competition can be expected to have occurred. That might be the reason for the disappearance of a form, in this case for.
Like many Benjamins publications, the book is marred by a number of editorial lapses. For example, in the text there is reference on p. 119 to Heine & Traugott (1991) and Traugott & Hopper (1993), where the order of names has been reversed. In the bibliography and indices, Paul Hopper is listed as Mike Hopper. In the name index Juzhi Shi is listed as cited on p. 254, but the only shi on this page is actually the Navajo possessive form shi ‘my’, and in the language index there is a mysterious entry ‘middle’, which seems to index the ‘middle position’ between theoretical extremes (p. 9), Middle English (p. 15), the middle of the fifteenth century (p. 54), and other uses of ‘middle’. On p. 177 discussion of the development of OE ge- from Aktionsart to ASP is promised in chapter 11, but it actually occurs in chapter 10. Some glosses either have redundant information, e.g. pense ‘thinks/judges-3S’ (p. 81) or are inconsistent, e.g. two pages later the third person singular verb styra is simply glossed as ‘stirs’, not ‘stir-3S’ (p. 83).

These reservations aside, Grammaticalization as economy makes a large number of testable proposals and can therefore be expected to seed many research projects, and to give further depth to formal syntacticians’ engagement with grammaticalization and unidirectionality. It is to be hoped that more functionally oriented researchers who regard change not as change in grammars but as change in use (see e.g. Croft, 2000), will take up the challenge of interpreting van Gelderen’s hypotheses in terms of the interface between semantics/pragmatics and syntax in order to get a fuller understanding of how such new structures as CP come into existence as speakers and hearers reanalyze older structures and solve indeterminacies in the input.
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Reviewed by Erik Smitterberg, Stockholm University

In the Preface to *English in modern times*, Beal comments on ‘the scholarly neglect of the Later Modern English period by historical linguists’ (p. xi). Compared with the wealth of studies on the Old, Middle, and early Modern English periods, variation and change in late Modern English is indeed an underrepresented topic in the scholarly literature. As Beal points out, this situation is now changing, and late Modern English

---

1 I am grateful to Gunnel Melchers and Terry Walker for their comments on a draft version of this review.
is increasingly receiving the attention that the period deserves. Books such as Bailey (1996), Romaine (1998), Görlich (1999, 2001), Dossena & Jones (2003), Kytö, Rydén & Smitterberg (forthcoming), and Mair (forthcoming) testify to this recent interest in the language of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. However, partly because widespread scholarly interest in late Modern English is comparatively recent, textbooks on the history of the English language seldom address the late modern period in detail. Beal’s book thus fills a real need in that it has the potential not only to compensate for the limited attention late Modern English has received in other textbooks, but also to connect research and teaching by introducing students to recent findings in this field.

The back cover of the book states that English in modern times is ‘the first undergraduate text’ that covers the period 1700–1945 in its entirety, and that it ‘is essential reading for undergraduates and graduate students taking historical courses on the English language as well as other scholars who would like a handy guide to this period as a first step in their research’. An intended audience consisting chiefly of undergraduate students is also implied by Beal’s statement (p. xi, quoted from Beal, 1999) regarding the lack of an undergraduate textbook on eighteenth-century English comparable to Görlich (1991) for the early Modern English period. Consequently, in this review, I will focus on the suitability of English in modern times as an undergraduate textbook. However, since Beal has inserted a large number of references to previous studies, and since the book contains several in-depth sociolinguistic discussions, I will also comment on other aspects of the book, where relevant.

English in modern times is structured as follows. The Preface outlines the status of research on late Modern English. Chapter 1 introduces the period from a historical perspective. Chapters 2–7 are organized as three pairs, which address vocabulary, syntax and morphology, and phonology, respectively. In each pair of chapters, the former charts changes that have taken place, while the latter is concerned with descriptive and prescriptive sources such as dictionaries, grammars, and pronouncing dictionaries. The last chapter of the book focuses on nonstandard British varieties and on extraterritorial varieties. In what follows, I shall first address the chapters in the order in which they appear, presenting what I believe are strong and weak points of the particular chapters, and then conclude the review with comments that are relevant to several chapters, and an assessment of the book as a whole.

In the Preface, Beal attributes the recent increase in scholarly interest in late Modern English to two main factors: the increasing distance – symbolized by the millennium – between late Modern and Present-day English, and the interest in applying empirical (corpus-based), sociohistorical methodology to the study of past stages of the English language. Beal explicitly states that her approach is sociohistorical, and that ‘social changes in the Anglophone world need to be taken into account if we are to understand the linguistic changes taking place in Later Modern English’ (p. xiii).

As mentioned above, chapter 1 is chiefly historical in nature. Beal starts by exploring the history of the term ‘Modern English’ and the subdivision of this period into early and late. Somewhat surprisingly, she states that ‘[t]he starting-point of 1700 is particularly arbitrary’ and that ‘the beginning of our period is marked by the Restoration
no clear justification for why 1700 was nevertheless chosen as the beginning of ‘modern times’ appears to be given, except that ‘many would agree’ that this is the starting-point. However, on the whole this first chapter is excellent. In separate sections, the reader is provided with concise and lucid introductions to important historical developments during the period, with regard to areas such as politics, education, transport, and communication. The bulk of the account concerns British history, although some information on the history of other parts of the world is also included. In addition, Beal introduces links between societal and linguistic changes, thus emphasizing the sociohistorical outlook of the book, and cross-refers to later chapters where some of the developments mentioned are addressed in more detail.

Chapter 2 is devoted to developments in vocabulary. The first section contains a survey of how many words entered the English lexicon during each decade from 1660 to 1890, after which separate sections deal with the subperiods 1660–1800, 1800–1900, and 1900–1945. The period 1660–1700 is thus covered, although the chapter aims at identifying and explaining ‘trends in lexical innovation between 1700 and 1945’ (p. 33). The first section charts the overall increase in the English lexicon during the period under scrutiny; it also introduces important sources of data such as the Chronological English dictionary and the Oxford English dictionary (henceforth OED), and points out some advantages and limitations of these sources. In the second section, Beal lists several reasons for the decrease in eighteenth-century lexical innovation, such as linguistic conservatism regarding, for instance, French and Latin loanwords into English. However, she also shows that loanwords that were believed to fill a gap in the scientific lexicon did not attract criticism; this is illustrated by statistical information, which shows that peak years concerning the first citation of new words may coincide with the publication of important works. The third section of the chapter focuses on the lexically innovative nineteenth century. Beal shows that contemporaneous voices both criticized and welcomed the many loanwords in ways that echo the Inkhorn controversy of the early modern period. She also returns to the unreliability of some dictionary-based sources of data. The distribution of new words from one of the peak years (1835) according to etymological source is illustrated and commented on in detail. The final section of the chapter shows that a new resource, the OED online, which includes a greater number of recent citations, complements the sources drawn on for previous centuries. The results suggest that lexical innovation continues, but also that the First and Second World Wars did not lead to new loanwords to the extent that might have been expected, and that a good many new words are formed from native sources. Overall, this chapter is commendable in several respects: it links teaching to research by presenting findings and by encouraging readers to carry out investigations of their own; and it emphasizes the need to be cautious in the interpretation of results based on dictionaries.

Chapter 3 examines the monolingual English dictionaries produced during the late modern period. The chapter is divided into four sections, dealing with dictionaries

2 The legend to figure 2.1 (p. 14) claims that the figure covers the period ‘1661–1990’, but this appears to be a misprint for 1661–1890.
before Samuel Johnson, Johnson’s 1755 *Dictionary of the English language*, nineteenth-century dictionaries, and the development of what is today known as the *OED*. In the first section, Beal argues that dictionary-makers plagiarized earlier works, but also that they added new words, new types of words (from a focus on learned words to including, for instance, cant and everyday words), and new types of information, such as etymologies. The section dealing with Johnson’s dictionary puts his legendary achievement in perspective by showing that Johnson was part of a process in which dictionaries became more inclusive, with explicit principles regarding what words a dictionary should include and what types of definition should be given, and more firmly based on literary language, with quotations from prominent writers. It is rather the normative role played by Johnson’s dictionary that is claimed to make it unique. The third section demonstrates that Johnson’s dictionary remained influential throughout the nineteenth century, although there were innovations; for instance, the influence of Horne Tooke can be discerned in Charles Richardson’s and Noah Webster’s thinking. Three dictionary-makers are singled out for detailed treatment: Richardson, Webster, and William Dwight Whitney, whose *Century dictionary* came to be seen as a challenge to both Webster’s dictionaries and the *New English dictionary on historical principles* (later the *OED*), to which the last section of the chapter is devoted. The history of this enormous dictionary project is gone through in some detail. It is shown that, although the aim of the project was to produce a purely descriptive and inclusive dictionary, chiefly Standard English words were recorded, and recent lexical innovations in the field of science were not always included. Moreover, canonical works are overrepresented in the citations, some labels and comments that accompany words and their senses seem prescriptive, and there is some bias as regards the etymological descriptions, whereby Indo-European etymologies receive more attention than do other donor languages. However, Beal also emphasizes that the *New English dictionary* still came closer to inclusiveness than any previous dictionary, and that the flaws mentioned have been and/or are being remedied in subsequent editions. Chapter 3 stays true to the sociohistorical outlook of the book as a whole by emphasizing the connection between society and language. Beal states that ‘each dictionary is a product of its time, and is informed by the political, philosophical and linguistic preoccupations of its compilers’ (p. 65); for instance, Webster’s dictionary projects are connected to the emerging importance of the United States of America.

Syntactic change is the topic of chapter 4. The introductory section makes clear that late Modern English syntax has received little scholarly attention. Beal refers to Denison’s (1998) statements regarding the lack of research on late Modern English syntax and the statistical and stylistic rather than categorical nature of change in this period. After the introduction, the chapter contains two main subsections: 4.2 is devoted to ‘[r]egulation of variants resulting from changes in Early Modern English’ (p. 68), and 4.3 to innovations in late Modern English. The features addressed in 4.2

---

3 See also Rydén (1979: 34), who connects the apparent similarity between late Modern and Present-day English syntax with the neglect of the former, and states that changes that do take place in the late modern period ‘often concern surface structure diffusion and distribution rather than systemic reconstruction’.
are second-person pronouns, auxiliary *do*, and relativizers. Beal’s surveys show that although much of the change in these areas had been completed by 1700, there were still some patterns of usage where older forms such as *thou* lingered on in late Modern English. Beal’s account is clear and well informed. However, in my opinion, it would have added further to the value of chapter 4 if she had devoted less space to these changes, several of which were on the road to completion by 1700 and thus receive treatment in existing textbooks on early Modern English, and more space to the changes that constitute the topic of the next section.

Section 4.3 addresses changes that took place largely within the period covered by the book ‘despite the resistance of grammarians’ (p. 78). It is possible that the latter criterion is the reason why one important syntactic change taking place between c. 1700 and c. 1900 has been left out of Beal’s account, viz. the change from auxiliary *be* to auxiliary *have* in perfects of many intransitive verbs. It is true that this change was the target of little prescriptive evaluation (Rydén & Brorström, 1987: 206–10). However, this is a difference between early Modern and Present-day English that is considered important enough to be mentioned in many one-volume textbooks on the entire history of English, such as Algeo & Pyles (2004: 198), Barber (2000: 188), Fennell (2001: 145f.), and Odenstedt (2000: 114); moreover, there are several in-depth studies of this variant field, e.g. Rydén & Brorström (1987) and Kytö (1997). Against this background, a section that claims to outline ‘the major grammatical changes in Later Modern English (“major” in the sense of having been subjected to a reasonable degree of scholarly attention)’ (p. 86) should include this change. (It is not even mentioned in the subsection ‘Other changes’, where less thoroughly studied changes are discussed.) The inclusion of changes that did not attract overt evaluative comments would also make Beal’s account more comprehensive from a sociolinguistic perspective, as such changes might be expected to be led by women rather than by men (Labov, 2001: 292–3). It can of course be claimed that limitations of space preclude the author’s addressing every syntactic change in detail; however, as mentioned above, the sections on changes that were well underway by 1700 could have been reduced.

The changes in focus in section 4.3 concern the progressive, group-verbs (including stranded prepositions), and the subjunctive; several other changes are also mentioned in brief. Beal’s treatment of these changes is well informed, overall, but I have a few minor problems with her account. For instance, she discusses (p. 79) ‘[t]he introduction of *be* + -ing with adjectival complements in the nineteenth century’ and ‘the combination of *have* + been + -ing, which was rare before the twentieth century’. However, she must mean *be* + *being* and *have* + *been being*, respectively: progressives of some linking verbs other than *be* with adjectival complements have been noted before 1800 (Visser, 1973: §1840), and Visser (1973: §2148) considers perfect progressives fairly frequent from the fifteenth century on. In addition, as regards the other changes listed

---

4 In other parts of this section, Beal identifies ‘the *be* + -ing form’ as the progressive construction taken as a whole (e.g. p. 78).
by Beal, it is mentioned that scholars have hypothesized that periphrastic comparison of adjectives and adverbs has increased at the expense of inflectional comparison, and that corpus-based studies will hopefully be able to refute or support this hypothesis. However, among the corpus-based evidence that does exist, Kytö & Romaine (1997) indicate that, overall, it is rather the inflectional forms of adjectives that are gaining ground during the early and late modern periods. To her credit, Beal recognizes that ‘as new work in this field is emerging every year . . . I have to make a disclaimer that much of this chapter is provisional’ (p. 68). In addition, as in chapter 2, Beal makes valuable references to important sources of data for syntactic studies, in this case computerized corpora. (Indeed, it would have been a good idea to introduce some concordancer output in this chapter, as a parallel to the dictionary-based data and phonetic transcriptions presented in chapters 2 and 6, respectively.) Nevertheless, my overall impression is that chapter 4 is somewhat less accomplished than the other chapters of English in modern times.

In chapter 5, ‘Grammars and grammarians’, Beal takes issue with the idea that eighteenth-century grammars were ‘uniformly “prescriptive”’ (p. 90). An insightful section on the many reasons why the supply of and demand for grammars rose dramatically in especially the latter half of the 1700s sets the scene. Beal shows that the codification and implementation of the standard language were important concerns at this time, and that increased social mobility had created a linguistically insecure middle class whose members were anxious to use prescribed forms; there were even writers who regarded ‘the acquisition of “correct” grammar’ as an important step in ‘the education and hence liberation of the labouring classes’ (p. 98). Other political motivations are also taken up, as is the need for teaching materials in schools, where the English language was seen as increasingly important for people for whom a classical education was considered unnecessary. The second part of the chapter is devoted to an examination of the concepts ‘descriptive’ and ‘prescriptive’ as applied to eighteenth-century grammarians like Lowth. Beal argues that Lowth and many other grammarians from the 1700s were not as prescriptive as has been claimed by, for instance, Rydén (1984) and Aitchison (1991), and claims that ‘[w]hilst Lowth’s grammar is certainly normative, it is also descriptive’, as Lowth aimed at describing the usage of the aristocracy (p. 106). Separate subsections are devoted to the influence of Latin grammar, logic and reason, and prejudice, which were claimed by Rydén (1984) largely to determine the rules expressed in these grammars. The third section of the chapter focuses on nineteenth-century grammars. Beal takes up both the rise of philology as a scientific discipline and the continued publication of highly prescriptive works, e.g. handbooks, as a result of linguistic insecurity and social mobility (aspects

5 Beal refers to this study as Rydén (1981). However, I have consulted the collection of papers in which Rydén's paper appears, and it seems to have been published in 1984, which is also the year of publication stated on Mouton de Gruyter’s homepage. It is of course possible that 1981 is given as the year of publication in the copy Beal has used.
of description and prescription could also be combined in the same work). Like the rest of chapter 5, this section presents valuable findings in a reader-friendly format. However, I would have appreciated a reference to Dekeyser (1975), who examines a large number of grammars as regards their statements on number and case relations and notes a ‘decline of prescriptive stands’ from the period 1800–50 to the period 1850–1900, especially regarding case relations (Dekeyser, 1975: 266). Given that Dekeyser’s study is an explicit comparison of precept and usage, its outlook would seem to fit the perspective adopted by Beal. The following section is devoted to the early twentieth century, during which grammars are found to become more descriptive, but not wholly objective, because ‘all grammars, however scholarly, are products of their time, and reflect the prevailing ideologies’ (p. 120). The publication of prescriptive books is addressed here as well, and the combination of descriptive and prescriptive advice in H. W. Fowler’s *Modern English usage* receives special attention. As was the case for dictionaries in chapter 3, Beal’s account indicates that the amount of continuity in the late Modern English grammatical tradition has been downplayed in favour of ‘the binary opposition of prescriptive/descriptive’ (pp. 122–3).

Having dealt with vocabulary and syntax, Beal turns to phonology in chapter 6, the longest chapter of the book. Beal discusses both systematic changes to the inventory of phonemes and socially and/or lexically conditioned changes that affect the distribution of phonemes. After an introductory section, section 2 examines what (types of) evidence we have for late Modern English pronunciation. For most of the period under scrutiny only written evidence is available, which Beal classifies as direct if writers ‘whose overt intention is to inform readers about the language of their own period’ are drawn on for information, and as indirect if writers inadvertently provide ‘clues about their own or their contemporaries’ pronunciation’ (p. 126). Beal considers the former category as the more important one for the late modern period, because there is more direct evidence around, while the indirect evidence is ‘more patchy and less reliable’ (p. 127). She sees a parallel between grammars and works on pronunciation in that the prescriptive/descriptive dichotomy has been exaggerated for the latter category also, since even clearly normative works provide descriptive information on prestigious pronunciation. To demonstrate this, Beal focuses on John Walker’s *Critical pronouncing dictionary* (1791) as ‘a valuable source of information at least on what was considered prestigious pronunciation in late eighteenth-century England’ (p. 132).

The remainder of the chapter is chiefly concerned with changes in what was to become Received Pronunciation (RP). The section on phonological change focuses on segmental phonology and on ‘areas in which change is observable’ (p. 133). To illustrate these changes, Beal transcribes the same passage (the well-known fable of the North Wind and the Sun) according to the pronunciations given in Walker’s 1791 *Critical pronouncing dictionary* and Daniel Jones’s 1937 *English pronouncing dictionary*. This strategy is commendable from a teaching perspective, as the two transcriptions provide students with a clear illustration of phonological change between the late eighteenth and the early twentieth centuries. Several of these changes are then addressed in separate sections, such as the diphthongization of the *FACE* and *GOAT* sets of vowels, changes in
the bath, cloth, foot, and strut sets, yod-dropping in the goose and cure sets,\(^6\) the separation of schwa and the strut vowel, the distribution of schwa and the kit vowel in unstressed syllables, gradual loss of rhoticity and the introduction of intrusive /r/, /h/-dropping, including loss of /h/ in initial /hw/-clusters (Beal shows that these two developments are connected), and variation between /n/ and /ŋ/ in -ing. Some changes in individual words are also discussed, such as variation between /ai/ and /i/ in wind and between /au/ and /iː/ in obliged.\(^7\) A small subsection is then devoted to twentieth-century changes, such as the glottalization of /t/.

One very interesting feature of Beal’s account is that both change from above (e.g. substitution of /ŋ/ for /n/ in -ing) and change from below (e.g. weakening of non-prevocalic /r/) are taken up. The phonological features that are addressed also seem well chosen, and Beal’s account is admirably clear. In the section dealing with loss of rhoticity in RP, an account of the concomitant development of the centring diphthongs of RP would have been welcome, as these diphthongs constitute an important phonological difference between RP and many other varieties of English. However, a textbook must of course limit its coverage, and as no centring diphthongs occur in the transcribed passage, the omission is understandable. Another minor problem with Beal’s account, for which I find it more difficult to find a reason, involves phonetic transcription. In most transcriptions, an apostrophe (‘) is used to signal primary stress, instead of the usual IPA symbol (⟨⟩).\(^8\) Beal even uses (‘) to signal primary stress when she quotes Barber (1964) on, for instance, pp. 149, 152, and 166, whereas my edition of Barber (1964) has (⟨⟩). It may of course be that the edition of Barber (1964) which Beal has used has precisely these symbols. Nonetheless, as the use of an apostrophe may cause undergraduate readers unnecessary confusion, it would have been preferable to stick to standard IPA practice throughout.

Chapter 7 returns to direct evidence of pronunciation in the form of ‘pronouncing dictionaries and other guides to “correct” pronunciation’, but in this chapter Beal looks at their role ‘in defining and disseminating Received Pronunciation’ (p. 167). She argues that, although ‘[t]he notion of a “standard” pronunciation is necessarily more fluid than that of a standard grammar or orthography’ (p. 168), factors such as the rise of the middle classes in the eighteenth century created a market for guides to ‘proper’ usage in this field also. Pronunciations deemed incorrect were also stigmatized

---

\(^6\) Beal claims that this is evidenced by the word blue being /bluː/ in the 1791 version of the transcribed passage and /blu/ in the 1937 version (pp. 148–9). However, blue does not seem to occur in the transcribed passage, whereas blew occurs twice, transcribed by Beal as /blu/ in the 1791 version and as /bluː/ in the 1937 version (p. 134).

\(^7\) Beal indicates that obliged takes first-syllable stress in Walker’s transcription; however, a quotation from Pope (p. 162) where besieg’d and oblig’d are rhymed would seem to indicate that the second syllable is stressed in both words, as they would not form a true rhyme otherwise. I have not been able to access the original edition of Walker’s book, but the edition from 1874 that I had at my disposal has second-syllable stress in oblige (obliged is not listed separately).

\(^8\) In a few cases, an acute accent (⟨´⟩) is used instead: this is probably due to this symbol being used in some quotations from secondary sources, but it also occurs in Beal’s own text on p. 147. On p. 157, both (´) and (‘) are used to represent Barber’s (1964: 60) ⟨⟩ in a quotation involving the transcription /dia ˈlaːɡə av ˈdiːə/.
more clearly in this century than previously, as were nonstandard social and regional accents. Beal shows that, although these guides enjoyed great success in defining and disseminating the standard, they did not succeed in fixing English speech. Parallels with works on grammar are drawn, e.g. the publication in both fields of simple handbooks alongside more thorough – and expensive – accounts. Beal also shows that ‘younger women, whose value on the marriage market depended on their ability to exhibit “proper” behaviour in speech as in all aspects of life’ (p. 181) formed an important target group for these handbooks. The final section of this chapter addresses the rise of Received Pronunciation. Beal demonstrates how RP came to be associated with public schools. Pressure to conform to speech norms in these schools added to the social rather than geographical character of this accent, whose prestige was further increased by the employment of RP speakers by the BBC. The chapter is informative, concise, and lucid; like chapter 5, it indicates that the prescriptive/descriptive dichotomy with regard to contemporaneous sources is less clear-cut than has previously been argued.

In the eighth and last chapter of *English in modern times*, Beal moves beyond Standard English English, the focus of chapters 2–7, and devotes separate sections to regional British dialects and non-British varieties of English. The former section deals predominantly with phonological dialect differences. Beal discusses the value of evidence from normative publications and from literary sources as regards regional dialects. The nineteenth-century interest in the scholarly study of dialects is also treated in this section, as is the value of such studies. Paradoxically, nineteenth-century views of dialects as pure, valuable, and threatened gained ground at the same time as heavily normative handbooks continued to be popular. The latter section focuses on American (US and Canadian) English and Australian English: Beal discusses other varieties taken collectively in a separate subsection, with the rationale that their status as separate varieties before 1945 is less clear, and that there was comparatively little research carried out on developments in varieties such as New Zealand and South African English before 1950. (As Beal points out, a single volume could not include in-depth information on all extraterritorial varieties of English.) This section focuses on ‘the development of attitudes to and awareness of’ (p. 192) these varieties rather than on describing them.

My overall impression is that *English in modern times* is a timely and very valuable addition to the range of textbooks covering parts of the history of the English language. As I hope has been made clear above, the individual chapters are very valuable in themselves, although chapter 4 comes across as less accomplished than the others. Beal’s decision to juxtapose the development of the language itself and contemporaneous works on late Modern English in chapters 2–7 also seems sound, and contributes to the originality of the book. A particularly interesting feature of chapters 3, 5, and 7 is that they all indicate that the development of modern scholarly descriptions of the lexis, syntax, and pronunciation of English was more gradual and less abrupt than some previous accounts suggest, in particular as regards the prescriptive/descriptive dichotomy. The inclusion of contemporaneous voices throughout the book clearly helps
to create interest in the subject and thus increases the pedagogical value of the book. Beal’s inclusion of an impressive References section, a Name and Subject Index, and a Lexical Index is also praiseworthy.

However, there are also some features of the book that could be improved. First of all, the addition of assignments, study questions, and exercises at the end of each chapter would be a considerable advantage. Since comparatively few historical linguists who teach at universities are late Modern English specialists, teachers may otherwise be uncertain as regards how exactly to use the book in their courses. The addition of exercises that would encourage students to make use of the many resources which Beal lists could also be a starting-point for term papers, etc. On p. 209, Beal states that she hopes her account in section 8.2 ‘will inspire some readers to undertake a more thorough study’ of some of the available sources for the study of dialect differences, but in an undergraduate textbook I would prefer clearer directions concerning the ways in which students can use the book as a starting-point for their own investigations. Explicit suggestions for further reading on the individual topics taken up would also be welcome.

Secondly, while Beal’s writing is lucid and easy to follow, there are occasional problems with accuracy that another round of proof-reading could have remedied. A couple of these have already been touched on, and I will mention a few others below; however, as time limitations allowed only for spot-checks in this regard, I cannot claim that the list is representative of the book as a whole. Unless Beal has used another edition of Barber (1964) than the one I have at my disposal, there are three errors pertaining to a six-line quote from this book on p. 165: a ‘the’ is missing before ‘other’; Barber’s ‘voiceless’ is spelt ‘voiceles’ the first time it appears; and the pages are given as 69–70, while in my copy of Barber (1964) the relevant pages are 60–1. The heading of section 6.3.10 on p. 161 has the wrong heading style. On p. 155, a reference is given to Milroy (1982), but there is no work matching this reference in the References section; the same holds for the reference to Biber (2000) on p. 87. 9 In the References section, a few articles lack page numbers, e.g. the reference to Rissanen (1999) on p. 233. There are also a few apparent spelling mistakes in the text, e.g. ‘Teiken’ for Tieken (p. 73), ‘genetive’ for genitive (p. 87), ‘throughout’ for throughout (p. 137), and ‘/lv/’ for /lm/ (p. 140). 10 I take up these infelicities because readers without extensive experience of linguistics, such as the undergraduate students who appear to constitute the main target group of the book, are more likely to be misled by such errors than are graduate researchers.

In sum, then, English in modern times is a welcome and praiseworthy addition to existing scholarship on the history of English. It is hoped that future editions of the

---

9 It is likely that ‘1982’ should be 1992 in the reference to Milroy, since there is a book by James Milroy from 1992 in the References section. In contrast, as no study by Biber alone is included in the References section, that reference is difficult to account for.

10 Alternatively, Beal has chosen the wrong word to exemplify the /lv/ cluster: on p. 140, it is calm.
book will take into account forthcoming research on both British and extraterritorial varieties of the language, as well as address some of the problems outlined above.
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Reviewed by Gerald Nelson, University College London

This is a concise and very readable introduction to a vast topic. The authors succeed in covering a great deal of ground – both geographically and linguistically – in just over two hundred pages. The book is clearly aimed at undergraduate students of World Englishes, whose numbers are steadily increasing, as the study of this topic gains credibility, and makes its way onto university syllabuses. It is accompanied by a CD-ROM (sold separately) containing English speech recordings by seventeen speakers from around the world, including New Zealand, the Shetland Islands, Cameroon, St Lucia, Belgium, and China. The CD-ROM will certainly be useful in the classroom, where it can be used to illustrate the phonological features which are so clearly described in the text.

From a pedagogical point of view, this book has (at least) two very commendable features. In traditional fashion, it opens with a brief account of the ‘roots of English’ (chapter 1), which succinctly puts the concept of World Englishes in its historical
context. More importantly, chapter 3, entitled ‘Variation in English’, sets out the parameters of linguistic variation in terms of spelling, phonetics and phonology, grammar, lexis, and pragmatics. This is an important chapter, since it explains clearly the linguistic concepts and vocabulary which are fundamental to describing variation. In the section on phonetics/phonology, for example, the authors explain basic terms, including glottal, retroflex, and uvular, while the section on lexis shows students how to distinguish between localisms, foreignisms, heteronyms, and tautonyms. This chapter provides a useful and necessary foundation for the linguistic descriptions which follow.

The section on the pragmatics of variation is rather brief, and indeed this is one area of World Englishes which remains under-researched at present. The authors briefly discuss the pragmatics of terms of endearment, such as pet in Newcastle, love in London, and honey in the US. They point out that pragmatic differences are social and cultural as well as linguistic, which of course makes them particularly complex as areas of research. One of the most obvious areas of variation across Englishes is not referred to at all in this book, most likely because it has received little attention in the literature. This is idiomatic English, exemplified in such expressions as he kicked the bucket (in BrE) and he bought the farm (in AmE). Idioms such as these tend to be variety-specific, and they rarely transfer from one variety to another. Because they are semantically opaque, they present particular problems to learners of English, as well as to international communication, even among native speakers. Like the pragmatics of World Englishes generally, idiomatic variation remains an area for future research.

The main body of this book consists of descriptions of English varieties from around the world. The authors adopt the well-known ‘Three Circles’ model of World Englishes (Kachru, 1983), in which varieties are grouped into ‘Inner Circle’, ‘Outer Circle’, and ‘Expanding Circle’ varieties. Each section begins with a concise historical account of the country concerned, and then describes the variety in terms of its phonology, grammar, and lexis. Many of the descriptions are necessarily brief, and of course much fuller accounts are available elsewhere, notably in the Oxford guide to world English (McArthur, 2002) and in Kortmann & Schneider et al. (2005). Nonetheless, the descriptions are clear and informative, and will provide students with a good foundation for further study.

In discussing the Outer Circle, the authors include an interesting chapter entitled ‘Some common features of the “New Englishes”’, while the chapter on the Expanding Circle considers the use of English in the European Parliament, and in Europe generally, where a knowledge of English is a matter of high prestige in certain ‘subcultures’, notably rock music and hip-hop.

It has become conventional in accounts of World Englishes to conclude by speculating about the future. This book is no exception, and in a final chapter entitled ‘What’s next?’, the authors focus on three major causes of the spread of English throughout the twentieth century: the dominance of the US in world affairs, globalization, and information technology. Looking to the future, they see the first two of these continuing to influence the spread of English as they are doing now. However,
they suggest that information technology – the internet, in particular – may have a retarding effect on the spread of English in the future. This claim is supported by statistics which show a sharp decline, in recent years, in the number of websites written in English. The authors point out that many chatrooms are bilingual and involve a great deal of code-switching. They conclude that information technology ‘is not in itself an agency that supports the spread of English, and it may even be supportive of minority languages’ (p. 196).

As an undergraduate textbook, this is a very useful book indeed. The main text offers a great deal of material for classroom discussion, but this is further reinforced by an Appendix of ‘Reading questions’. These are based on each of the preceding chapters, and while some of the questions are no more than comprehension tests, others will provide useful starting-points for classroom discussion, or indeed for student essays. Among the more thought-provoking questions included are: ‘What do you think Standard English is?’ (p. 202), ‘Why is Estuary English attractive?’ (p. 204), and ‘Why has the need for a world lingua franca emerged in the twentieth century?’ (p. 210).
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