

REFERENCES

- HOHENBERG, PAUL M., and LYNN H. LEES. 1985. *The making of urban Europe 1000–1950*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MILROY, JIM. 2002. The legitimate language: Giving a history to English. *Alternative histories of English*, ed. by Richard Watts and Peter Trudgill, 7–25. London: Routledge.
- WEINREICH, URIEL; WILLIAM LABOV; and MARVIN HERZOG. 1968. Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. *Directions for historical linguistics*, ed. by Winfred P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel, 95–195. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Centre for Linguistics and Philology
 University of Oxford
 Clarendon Institute
 Walton Street
 Oxford OX1 2HG
 United Kingdom
 [amilroy@umich.edu]

Construction grammars: Cognitive grounding and theoretical extensions. Ed. by JAN-OLA ÖSTMAN and MIRJAM FRIED. (Constructional approaches to language 3.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005. Pp. 325. ISBN 1588115798. \$138 (Hb).

Reviewed by JÓHANNA BARDDAL, *University of Bergen*

As indicated by the title, this volume focuses on (i) the cognitive grounding of construction grammar (henceforth CxG), (ii) its theoretical extensions, and (iii) the plurality of construction grammar(s), with one (introductory) chapter on the first part, and four chapters on each of the two other parts. This is the third book in a new series on constructional approaches to language (CAL), a series that first and foremost aims at publishing innovative research on how CxG can be advanced and extended in new directions. The particular goal of this volume is in line with the aims of the series, namely to lay out the relation between CxG and cognition, broadly construed, to suggest possible theoretical extensions of CxG, and to explore the relationship between mainstream CxG and four other models of grammar that have either grown out of CxG or are compatible with it.

The introductory chapter (1–13) by the editors gives an overview of the historical background of CxG, its cognitive grounding, and a synthesis of the content of the eight following chapters, as well as a discussion of further possible advancement of the framework.

The first major part of the volume comprises chapters on argument linking, type shifting and coercion, syntactic change, and discourse-level constructions. ADELE E. GOLDBERG's chapter (17–43) discusses the interaction between lexical semantics, constructions, and discourse factors for argument linking and argument realization. When verbs instantiate constructions, arguments can be either added or omitted depending on speakers' communicative needs. Constructions thus capture not only higher-level generalizations, that is, the ordinary argument structure constructions and their profiled arguments, but also lower-level subregularities involving deprofiled and omitted participant roles. The chapter underlines that the unexpected discrepancies found between argument-linking realization and event composition can be argued to be motivated by factors such as discourse salience and politeness.

In her chapter on type shifting and coercion (45–88), LAURA A. MICHAELIS discusses lexical and constructional mismatches from the area of nominal syntax, argument structure, and aspect. When lexical items and constructions unify, the semantic restrictions of constructions override the semantics of lexical items. Two types of constructions show coercion effects, namely type-selecting constructions, which convey concord, and type-shifting constructions, which yield deri-

vations. When a relevant construction is not of the invoked type, implicit type shifting occurs. Regarding the issue of where sentence meaning comes from, the chapter argues for an intertwined constructional and lexical approach.

In 'Frames, profiles and constructions: Two collaborating CGs meet the Finnish permissive construction' (89–120), JAAKKO LEINO argues for a combined cognitive grammar and CxG representation of argument structure and sentence-level constructions. He points out that case markers in Finnish are not markers of grammatical relations but of semantic relations, and they must thus be accounted for accordingly. He demonstrates his notational apparatus with examples from the development of the Finnish permissive construction, which has changed from being a ditransitive with an infinitival adjunct to being a proper biclausal construction in the modern language. This case study demonstrates how the tools of CxG can be applied to account for the grammaticalization of sentence-level constructions.

In the chapter on construction discourse (121–44), JAN-OLA ÖSTMAN argues for a holistic approach to language that includes discourse-level constructions like headlines, contact ads, recipes, and dinner conversations, each being a conventionalized form-function correspondence with different kinds of semantic and grammatical constraints. Östman's nonreductionist view endorses the increased prominence of larger textual entities in current models of grammar, of which CxG is a particularly well-suited one. The chapter emphasizes that discourse patterns are conventionalized form-function correspondences, based on, and deeply rooted in, human cognition, exactly like sentence-level constructions.

The second major part of the volume comprises articles on embodied construction grammar, conceptual semantics, word grammar, and radical construction grammar. In 'Embodied construction grammar in simulation-based language understanding' (147–90), BENJAMIN K. BERGEN and NANCY CHANG give an overview of the main features of embodied construction grammar. They start with a presentation of the formalism, showing how it incorporates both formal structural features of constructions and the relevant conceptual structures. They illustrate how the formalism works with an example of the active ditransitive construction in English, and they show how sense disambiguation and metaphorical usage is dealt with in their model. They argue that the formalism of embodied construction grammar differs from mainstream CxG, as it is intended to reflect both linguistic analysis and the requirements of their simulation process, in addition to being computationally implementable.

In his chapter on conceptual semantics (191–242), URPO NIKANNE calls attention to the fact that the conceptual semantics' correspondence to constructions in CxG would be a set of correspondence rules between different levels of representations. In his model, constructions are separated from regular linking devices, with constructions capturing irregular and idiosyncratic linking, while regular linking is a device meant to capture the most general linking patterns of the language. Nikanne then shows how his model accounts for different possessive and case-marked adverbial constructions in Finnish, arguing that using the device that captures constructions to also account for general linking would yield unconstrained generalizations.

JASPER HOLMES and RICHARD A. HUDSON compare word grammar, a dependency theory without phrase structure, with CxG (243–72), and find that the differences between the two models are minimal. They argue that the arrow formalism, employed by word grammar, together with their network model, more adequately handles semantic structures and semantic relations than the nested boxes of CxG. They illustrate their point by rendering the *What's X doing W?* construction and the ditransitive construction in word grammar formalism, arguing for the superiority of that model. They emphasize, however, that the two models are generally compatible with each other, and that only minimal adjustments are needed to ensure complete consonance between the two frameworks.

In the last chapter of the volume (273–314), WILLIAM CROFT gives an outline of how his radical construction grammar differs from mainstream CxG. Radical construction grammar makes three claims about grammar: (i) sentence-level constructions are linguistic primitives, and word classes are derivatives of these; (ii) syntactic relations do not exist, only semantic relations,

symbolic relations, and syntactic roles. Traditional syntactic relations are derivatives of these and can thus easily be dispensed with; and (iii) there are no universal constructions, as all constructions are language-specific. The universals of language are functional/semantic/pragmatic and can be mapped onto conceptual space. Radical construction grammar takes mainstream CxG to its logical conclusions by arguing for the centrality of the sentence-level construction in linguistic description at the cost of lower-level atomic/schematic constructions.

Given the title of the book, it seems that the cognitive grounding of the framework could have been better grounded in the volume as a whole. The cognitive grounding of CxG is explicitly addressed in the introductory chapter but it is only briefly touched upon in some of the later chapters. This, of course, raises questions like 'What do we mean by cognition?' and 'Is a model of grammar not automatically a model of cognition?'. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines 'cognition' in the following way:

The action or faculty of knowing taken in its widest sense, including sensation, perception, conception, etc., as distinguished from feeling and volition; also, more specifically, the action of cognizing an object in perception proper.

This leads to two different definitions of linguistic cognition, namely: (i) speaker's knowledge of his/her language, and (ii) speaker's perception of his/her knowledge of his/her language, which may well be two different things. My impression, however, is that most current theories of grammar in fact model (iii) the linguist's knowledge of speaker's language, which in turn raises the question of how the three can be combined in a worthy enterprise. Given the aims of the volume, a further problematization of the notion of 'cognition' and 'cognitive grounding' would not have been out of place.

The aim of the first part of the volume is to outline possible theoretical extensions from CxG. Chs. 4 and 5 by Leino and Östman certainly do that by emphasizing how CxG can be applied to historical syntax, on the one hand, and discourse studies, on the other. Ch. 3 on type shifting shows how CxG can be extended to cover mismatches in lexical and grammatical meaning, mismatches that have hitherto been invoked as supporting frameworks that endorse a modular view of language. Ch. 2 on argument-linking realization illustrates how the main CxG device, the construction, can account both for the unexpected realization of extra arguments and the omission of obligatory ones. The chapter by Croft in the latter part of the volume also shows how typological facts can be accommodated within CxG. This part of the volume demonstrates that one of the hallmarks of CxG is undeniably its ability to be extended to cover both new sets of data and new fields of research. Therefore, with regard to possible extensions of CxG, the volume clearly delivers what is promised in its title and then some.

The latter part of the volume, as to some extent the first part, illustrates different types of formalism that can be implemented within CxG. One of the strengths of this volume is therefore, without a doubt, the excellent overview and comparisons of the different formalisms available for construction grammarians, both unification-based formalisms and others. It is inspiring to see so many academics raise themselves above their own theoretical models in order to bring to the fore the commonalities and joint aspects of various different, although seemingly related, frameworks, as is evident here. Although to be encouraged, such intellectual exercises are not very common within our discipline. This part of the volume is therefore a welcoming, and clearly a successful, outreach to theoretically neighboring communities of CxG, with the aim of facilitating further discussions and collaboration between different theoretical strands of today.

Another prominent feature of the volume is that in addition to the usual indices, it also contains an index of the constructions discussed in the different chapters. This is becoming more and more common in the works of construction grammarians and is found in all the volumes in the CAL series. Obviously, such an index is extremely useful not only for construction grammarians but also for other scholars working on particular constructions in the world's languages.

The editors have done an excellent job in editing this volume, both form-wise, as copyediting errors are minimal, and content-wise, as the volume is an unusually coherently structured whole, with several original contributions. Östman and Fried also deserve the highest praise for their

enthusiastic launching and continuance of this book series, which clearly counts as a major asset for the whole CxG community.

Department of Linguistics, Literary and Aesthetic Studies
University of Bergen
P.O. Box 7805
NO-5020 Bergen
Norway
[johanna.barddal@uib.no]

A grammar of Jingulu: An Aboriginal language of the Northern Territory. By ROBERT PENSALFINI. (Pacific linguistics 536.) Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, 2003. Pp. xix, 262. ISBN 0858835584. \$51.54.

Reviewed by JANE SIMPSON, *University of Sydney*

This grammar, published by the major publisher of Australian and Pacific language materials, is of an endangered and typologically interesting language. Jingili people live in the Northern Territory of Australia. Their country is on the border of Pama-Nyungan languages (normally suffixing) and non-Pama-Nyungan languages (often prefixing), and their language, Jingulu, shows features of both types. It is part of the proposed Mirndi family, a geographically discontinuous group whose genetic unity is still debated (Green & Nordlinger 2004). Pensalfini builds on an earlier descriptive study done when there were more speakers (Chadwick 1975). Chadwick presents Jingulu as a language with fiendishly complex morphology that interacts with an interesting regressive vowel harmony process (van der Hulst & Smith 1985). Since Chadwick's study, the language ecology of the area has changed, and Jingili people mostly speak Kriol, code-switching to Jingulu and Mudburra.

The bar has been raised as to what a reference grammar of a small language should contain (Himmelmann 1998). The grammarian is torn between the demands of the grammar-reading public (You mean there's nothing on weak crossover!), the likelihood that this grammar will be the main source of information on the language (Where's the stuff on gesture/kinship/speech events/information structure?), and the fact that most publishers don't sell texts and dictionaries of small languages.

P's grammar is characterized by bold analyses. He carried out fieldwork in the context of preparing an MIT Ph.D. dissertation, informed by minimalism, well aware of Rachel Nordlinger's work on a neighboring and genetically related language, Wambaya, informed by lexical functional grammar (Nordlinger 1998). So, naturally, he asks questions relevant to the theoretical concerns of the time. He carefully tries to gather data on multiple WH-questions; looks for ways to translate sentences with quantifiers and modals, with definiteness, and with indefiniteness; and looks at coordinate and reflexive constructions and complex constructions. These are hard questions and P is open about the difficulties that can arise, especially in a situation of language death. He is careful to note the absence of confirming or disconfirming data. The result is a richer understanding of what is happening in the language—for instance, the presence of a kind of indefinite suffix, quite unusual in Australian languages (203–5).

How does P face the challenge of language documentation? His field tapes and transcripts are held in a public archive (Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies), and a separate collection of texts and a dictionary has been submitted for publication. He appends eleven texts (Ch. 7, 241–58), including some that show code-switching into Kriol, and occasionally he gives illuminating Kriol glosses from his informants. This grammar comprises analysis of what his teachers said; he does not draw together the earlier records of the language. It is rich in example sentences, mostly from texts, but he follows too many Australian grammars in omitting the source for each example sentence. This is especially unfortunate in language-loss situations, since which speaker said which sentence is important for understanding the variation that P notes (although he is generally good about commenting on rarity).