

REVIEWS

David Deterding and Salbrina Sharbawi. 2013. *Brunei English. A New Variety in a Multilingual Society*. Dordrecht: Springer. xii + 170 pp.

Reviewed by Gabriela Anidora Brozba*

David Deterding and Salbrina Sharbawi's book on Brunei English is the fourth volume in the series Multilingual Education. The book consists of an introduction and seven chapters, followed by appendices, references and an index, all preceded by some explanations regarding the conventions used in the transcriptions and a list of abbreviations.

Chapter 1, "Introduction" (pp. 1-11), starts by briefly presenting the history of Brunei, its population, the languages spoken. The appropriate label for the English variety used in Brunei is also discussed. It illustrates what Schneider (2007: 50) calls the substitution of "English in X" by "X English", in his model the transition from phase 3 to phase 4 (i.e. from "nativization" to "endonormative stabilization"). This is followed by a discussion of the substantial variation characteristic of Brunei English (henceforth Brunei E) and a presentation of the data analyzed. These consist of spoken material from 53 formal interviews (38 female and 15 male participants) and the informal interview of Umi, data from the University of Brunei Darussalam Corpus of Spoken Brunei English (UBDCSBE), as well as written data from two local newspapers (*The Brunei Times* and *Borneo Bulletin*), texts from the "Kampong Ayer Cultural and Tourism Centre", and from the online forum "BruDirect".

As the title indicates, chapter 2, "Education in Brunei" (pp. 13-21), presents the history and status of the educational system in Brunei, with a focus on English-related educational policies.

The analysis in chapter 3, "Phonetics and phonology" (pp. 23-47), is based on the UBDCSBE data which consist of 53 readings of the "Wolf" passage, an identical number of five-minute interviews, and a more extensive interview with Umi, a 33-year-old female speaker, whose English is fluent (p. 10), but it also builds, among other materials, on written assignments by first-year undergraduate students (p. 39). The sections on segmental phenomena (pp. 24-41) illustrate and discuss: the tendency to replace the dental fricatives [θ] and [ð] with [t] and [d] respectively; the simplification of consonant clusters in word-final position; the occurrence of an intrusive [t] in word-final position; the realization as a glottal stop [ʔ] of /t/ and /k/ when they occur in word-final simple codas; obstruent word-final devoicing; some unexpected patterns of voicing (e.g. *racing* [reɪzɪŋ], p. 31); /l/-vocalization; /l/-deletion; the increasing incidence of post-vocalic /r/; the tendency to level the length distinction in the lexical sets (proposed by Wells 1982) KIT and FLEECE or FOOT and GOOSE, which appear to have merged into short vowels. It seems that first-year undergraduates sometimes confuse the FACE vowel with the TRAP vowel (see Fig. 3.2 on p. 39), while there is also a tendency to monophthongize the FACE and GOAT vowels. The authors also discuss the relatively rare occurrence of reduced vowels in Brunei E as well as some cases of spelling pronunciations and of idiosyncratic pronunciations (pp. 41-42). The remaining sections (pp. 41-47) deal with suprasegmental phenomena: lexical stress; rhythm; sentence stress; de-accenting; the sharp rise in pitch at the end of in the utterance (known as "uptalk" or "high rising terminal").

In chapter 4, "Morphology and syntax" (pp. 49-70), the authors first look at the occurrence or absence of inflectional suffixes (pp. 50-57) in count and non-count nouns (i.e. the plural suffix

* University of Bucharest, Department of English, brozba.anydora@gmail.com.

-s), as well as at the 3rd person singular suffix *-s* which reflects novel agreement patterns and which unexpectedly attaches to modal verbs as well (p. 58). Also addressed are issues such as the comparative merits of a phonological (in terms of cluster simplification, especially for the past tense suffix *-ed*) versus a morphological account of the deletion of the suffix *-s*, the pluralization of what are non-count nouns in native varieties of English, and variability in the use of these suffixes. The next four sections (pp. 59-64) discuss tenses, the use of *will* to refer to regularly occurring events, tentative *would*, the use of *do* in affirmative declarative sentences which do not express emphasis, the use of *already* as a perfective aspect marker, the substitution of present perfect by past perfect. In the remainder of the chapter (64-70), the authors examine the frequent occurrence of null subjects, subject-auxiliary inversion in embedded questions, the absence of determiners in general and the omission of articles for names of countries in particular, the use of affirmative answers to negative questions; the rather fuzzy boundaries between “Adj to V” and “Adj V-ing” constructions (p. 69) and the use of non-prepositional verbs with a preposition.

Chapter 5, “Discourse” (pp. 71-87), is divided into 16 subsections highlighting the most typical discourse patterns in Brunei E. Particular attention is paid to the use of discourse particles: those analyzed include *bah* – “perhaps the favourite particle for Bruneians” (p. 72), *lah*, *ah*, and *kan* (used to form questions). This is followed by a discussion of *yeah* as a discourse continuation marker, the relative use of *sort of* and *kind of*, and the various uses of the particle *tsk* (pp. 75-76). Topic prominence is discussed in relation to resumptive pronouns and *-wise* as a topic marker. Reduplication is also touched upon as well as what the author calls the “substantial tolerance for repetition of lexical items” (p. 79), explained by the presence of lexical doublets, tautological expressions, the use of the expression *and so forth* or a tendency for unnecessary explicitness. Finally, lengthy sentences (seen as reflecting influence from Malay) and run-on sentences are illustrated.

Chapter 6, “Lexis” (pp. 89-106), covers the lexical borrowings from Arabic, especially for religious terms, and from Malay, for a wide variety of semantic fields ranging from words belonging to a special register used in referring to or addressing the royal family to traditional local cuisine, dress codes or other culture-specific entities, calques (e.g. *four-eye meeting*, p. 98). The authors note the frequent use of initialisms (e.g. *KL* for Kuala Lumpur, p. 100), clippings and a special type of blends (probably influenced by Malay, where speakers blend the first parts of the words involved rather than the beginning of one of them and the end of the other, *aircon* or *promex*, p. 102). Also exemplified are shifts in the meaning or connotation of lexical items as well as special terms for participants in various sports.

In chapter 7, “Mixing” (pp. 107-116), the authors sketch some possible underlying reasons for recurrent patterns of mixing, among which they list: the “inability to think of a word” (p. 111), the need to explain something, the lack of equivalents for religious terms and food items, direct quotations or stylistic reasons. Attitudinally, it seems that in Brunei a speaker is expected to switch freely between English and Malay if he or she can speak both languages or else the respective linguistic behaviour would be deemed strange or even rude (p. 116).

Finally, chapter 8, “Brunei English in the world” (pp. 117-125), touches upon issues related to the intelligibility of Brunei E, some pedagogical implications, the future of Brunei E, and the status of Brunei E in light of Schneider’s (2003, 2007, 2011) dynamic model. The authors write that unlike Singapore English which “is assumed to be in the fourth stage of development” (p. 118), namely endonormative stabilization, Brunei E must be still during the third stage, i.e. nativization, since “English is not so widely adopted as a lingua franca in Brunei” (p. 119).

The “Appendices” (pp. 127-153) are subdivided into five parts: appendix A includes the bibliographical data of the female speakers in the UBDCSBE corpus; appendix B those of the male

speakers; appendix C is a rendition of the “Wolf” passage; appendix D contains the full orthographic transcripts of the .wav files of the recorded conversational data in the interview with Umi, of which illustrative excerpts are included in chapters 3-7, and appendix E provides details of the 15 discussion threads from the “BruDirect” online forum (identification code, title, the date of the initial post and the URL where it can be accessed).

The book is a clearly structured overview of Brunei E. The authors also constantly compare the characteristics of Brunei E to those of other varieties of English. The first author is a specialist in Singapore English, but comparisons are also drawn with other Asian Englishes such as Malaysian English or Hong Kong English. The description and analysis of linguistic features of Brunei E are placed in the larger context of World Englishes, including natively spoken varieties. The potential influence of local languages is given careful consideration. Also, words of caution appear several times throughout. An exception is the discussion of the absence of hypothetical conditional constructions which might seem categorical and cannot be falsified given the limited corpus available, an issue admittedly noted as a shortcoming by the authors themselves several times. The discussion of controversial sociolinguistic issues is both informative and objective.

Finally, the volume is beautifully edited and is almost typo-free, with the exception of “with” (p. 78) which should be *which*, “mature” (p. 110) which should read *nature, model* instead of “modal” (p. 120), and *prepositions*, not “propositions” (p. 124). A few other editorial flaws are related to the references: the entries for some chapters in edited books do not include the pages (e.g. Noor Azam Haji-Othman 2012b), and the notation for the first names of the referenced authors is at times inconsistent (e.g. “Hussainmiya, B. A.” but “Gupta, Anthea Fraser”). However, these are truly minor faults that do not diminish the value of the content or of the pioneering effort of the authors who have put together the first monograph on a variety of English that has not even been thought of or categorized as such by the specialized or the uninitiated.

In conclusion, this comprehensive and insightful book constitutes an invaluable addition and resource for researchers interested in New Englishes.

References

- Schneider, E. W. 2003. The dynamics of New Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language* 79: 233-281.
- Schneider, E. W. 2007. *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, E. W. 2011. *English around the World: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, J. C. 1982. *Accents of English*, vol. I, *An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Veronica Tomescu. 2013. *The Syntax and Acquisition of Particles in English, Hungarian and Romanian*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București. 219 pp.

Reviewed by Imola-Ágnes Farkas*

Following the earliest generative–transformational approach adopted by Emonds (1976) and Jackendoff (1977), the analysis of particles and particle constructions has given rise to much debate in the linguistic literature, attracting the attention of linguists, researchers, and language

* “Babeş-Bolyai” University, Faculty of Letters, Department of English Language and Literature, farkas_imola_agnes@yahoo.com, farkas.imola.agnes@gmail.com.

teachers. The present monograph proves that there are still certain issues concerning the syntax and acquisition of English, Hungarian and Romanian particles that have not been addressed so far.

The book is organized into four chapters, as well as a number of other sections: an "Introduction" precedes these main chapters; the "Conclusions", "Appendix", and "References" close the book.

The introductory pages, "Introduction" (pp. 1-6), show that the subject is worth writing about, explain which area(s) of the subject the author deals with, emphasize the novelty of the approach, and, last but not least, they show how the author organizes the study. In my view, however, the most important role of this introductory part is that it defines and explains the key term in the title. From the very beginning, the author makes it clear that she classifies as particles locative and directional elements traditionally considered to be adverbs in most Romanian grammars and dictionaries.

Chapter 1, "The syntax of particles" (pp. 7-76), meant to set the stage for the following chapter analyzing Romanian particles, touches upon all the relevant aspects related to particles and particle structures.

Based on some tests shedding light on the fact that particles and prepositions behave uniformly with respect to different syntactic tests, the author claims that particles should be considered intransitive prepositions and not adverbs. Consequently, the most important question concerns the category of preposition as functional or lexical. As is well-known, the distinction between lexical and functional categories is particularly pronounced in the case of prepositions, as they occupy an intermediate (and hence indeterminate) position, evincing properties characteristic of both lexical and functional categories. The author is in favour of considering the category of prepositions to be a non-homogeneous category endowed with both lexical and functional features.

A separate section details the semantics of particles and prepositions, with particular interest in their directional and locative dimension, on the one hand, and their aspectual features, on the other hand. The author adopts the decompositional model of the P domain, according to which a preposition (or a postposition) is decomposed into a set of (functional) projections. This model has a long tradition in the literature, but more recently it has received a different treatment owing to the cartographic and nanosyntactic approaches to the architecture of grammar; cf. Schweikert (2005), Svenonius and Pantcheva (2006), Svenonius (2008), Cinque and Rizzi (2010), Pantcheva (2011), *inter alia*.

As far as the syntactic structure of particle structures is concerned, we know that despite decades of intensive examination, theoretical accounts differ significantly and there is no consensus on the best analysis. And this needs no explanation, as (i) the meaning of the particle can be transparent or less transparent; hence, there are degrees of idiomaticity; (ii) there are degrees of closeness between the verb and the particle (i.e. the relationship between the verb and the particle is different in different particle constructions); (iii) the structure can be formed in the lexicon or in the syntax; (iv) the particle can be right-adjacent either to the postverbal DP or to the governing verb; (v) the V-DP-P and V-P-DP word-order variations exhibit different syntactic properties. The author adopts the small clause analysis put forth in Svenonius (1994, 1996) and emphasizes its superiority over the small clause analysis defended in den Dikken (1995). Hence, the analysis follows the proposal that particles are unergative (prepositions) and not unaccusative. Svenonius (1994, 1996) considers that small clauses are best analyzed as projections of functional heads. In his analysis, the V-DP-P and V-P-DP word-order variations result from whether the DP moves to the specifier position of this functional projection, or the particle moves to the head of the projection and leaves the DP *in situ*.

The final section of the chapter illustrates different English particle constructions together with all the questions and difficulties they bring.

Chapter 2, “Romanian particle constructions” (pp. 77-134), looks into particle constructions in Romanian. But what kind of particle constructions can we talk about if we know that this Romance language lacks both purely directional and resultative/aspectual particles? How can we talk about Romanian particles if the traditional distinction between resultative and idiomatic verb-particle constructions is unknown to Romanian? From the very beginning, the author takes a firm stand on the fact that certain locative and directional elements traditionally considered adverbs (of place) should be reconsidered and included in the class of particles. There are at least two pieces of evidence for such a position: (i) similarly to prepositions and contrary to adverbs (of manner), the elements in question are selected by prepositions, and (ii) they subcategorize either for a preposition or for a noun phrase.

The chapter opens with a discussion of some aspects of Romanian. A parallel is drawn between the absence of (directional) particles attached to manner-of-motion verbs and the absence of true (AP) resultative constructions. The author mentions some of the most important accounts that try to find an explanation for the lack of (true) resultatives: Snyder (2001), Baker (2003), Zubizarreta and Oh (2007), among others. As far as motion verbs are concerned, the analysis of their derivation and syntactic structure is based on recent accounts of Romanian motion constructions. This section contributes to a better understanding of the syntax and semantics of Romanian spatial prepositions, the subject of the following section. After analyzing what component of Location (i.e. Path, Source, Goal, or Place) is lexicalized in the elements under study, the author turns to a very sketchy presentation of some Romanian spatial preposition such as *la* ‘at’, *în* ‘in’, *pe* ‘on’, *spre* ‘towards’, etc. An important claim is that these and similar Romanian prepositions are ambiguous: while they are locative (i.e. stative) with non-motion verbs, they function as directional (i.e. dynamic) when they combine with motion verbs indicating displacement. In other words, while motion verbs which do not incorporate Path force the interpretation of the adjunct PP as Place, motion verbs which incorporate Path force the interpretation of the complement PP as Path.

An all-too-brief, but interesting section, is the one dedicated to pleonastic particle constructions (e.g. *a intra înăuntru* ‘enter/go inside’). The author shows that these structures are not redundant, as the added particle functions either as an intensifier or as a specifier of the location expressed by the main verb. They are cases of what Gruber (1965) calls optional incorporation.

The discussion of the syntax of particles and PPs casts light on the fact that they can appear either in complement position to the verb or as adjuncts.

Chapter 3, “The syntax of Hungarian particles” (pp. 135-157), introduces the reader to the syntax of Hungarian more generally and that of Hungarian particles more specifically. The discussion is based on É. Kiss (2002) and it briefly touches upon the projection of the particle, its syntactic position vis-à-vis the verb, and its semantics. The last section sheds light on the fact that not only do Hungarian particles function as aspectual, directional, or purely locative elements, but they can also change the basic meaning of the verb they are attached to; cf. *ismer* ‘know’ vs. *beismer* ‘acknowledge/admit/confess’.

The author takes up the Talmian typological distinction, already introduced in the previous chapters, between satellite-framed languages (e.g. Germanic languages including English, where Path is encoded by the satellite/predicate) and verb-framed languages (e.g. Romance languages including Romanian, where Path is encoded by the verb). From this perspective, Hungarian looks to be of the former type and this conclusion is supported by the results of a search on a verb corpus. A connection is established between Talmy’s (2000) descriptive generalization and Snyder’s (2001) strong association between complex predicates and root compounds, according to which the syntax of a language permits complex predicate constructions if and only if the morphology of that language freely permits compounding of open-class lexical items.

Chapter 4, “The acquisition of particles and locative expressions in Romanian and Hungarian” (pp. 158-193), is the most interesting chapter in my view. The first sections outline some of the main characteristics of the generative approach to language acquisition and explain some key terms such as “language faculty”, “internalized grammar”, “innateness”, “Plato’s problem”, “Descartes’ problem”, and “bootstrapping strategies”. The author assumes the Strong Continuity Hypothesis, which claims that structures found in child language are of the same basic form as structures found in adult language and functional layers in child grammar do not differ from functional layers in adult grammar. After a brief presentation of the acquisition of English, Hungarian and Dutch particles, the author turns to a comparison of the way the P elements are acquired in Hungarian and Romanian. The fact that Romanian and Hungarian directional particles are acquired at the same age proves that Romanian locative and directional elements under study in this book are particles and not adverbs.

In the final chapter, “Conclusions” (pp. 194-205), the author draws the book together with a synthesis of the main ideas presented.

The book is abundantly data-rich. The reader is struck by the richness of the data for all the three languages. The author provides ample linguistic examples to illustrate her point and focus the reader’s attention on the topic discussed.

Unfortunately, in the first chapters the extent or depth to be expected in the overall analysis is often not clear. In some cases, readers may feel that the author does not dig deep enough and the presentations may thus seem to remain somewhat simplistic.

Also, there are several editorial shortcomings. First, some titles mentioned in the text are not listed in the References: Kayne (1984, 1985) on p. 46, Snyder and Stromswold (1997) on p. 170, Strömquist et al. (1995) on pp. 170-171, Snyder (2001) on several pages, and others. Second, throughout the book, Pinker (1984) should read Pinker (1994), É. Kiss (2004) should read É. Kiss (2002), and Csirmaz (2002) on p. 169 should read Csirmaz (2004). The date of publication for Gruber is 1967 in the text (pp. 102, 120, 133), but 1965 in the References. Jackendoff (1985) and Jackendoff (1990) on p. 24 do not appear in the References, or they appear as Jackendoff (1983) and Jackendoff (1995) respectively, but then there is a mistake in the publication date. Third, when the author cites the works by Svenonius published in 1996, the sources are not always very precise. That is, the letter suffix is not always included in the parenthetical citation; cf. p. 38 or p. 43. This omission may sometimes lead to confusion, all the more so because both works deal with particle constructions.

These criticisms aside, this monograph makes two important contributions to the literature on particle constructions. First, it proposes to reconsider Romanian locative and directional elements as particles. Second, it presents a comparative Hungarian–Romanian analysis of particle acquisition. The literature may abound in comparative English–Romanian and English–Hungarian analyses, but, to my knowledge, such a comparative research has not been undertaken so far.

References

- Baker, M. 2003. *Lexical Categories. Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cinque, G., Rizzi, L. (eds.) 2010. *Mapping Spatial PPs: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 6. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- den Dikken, M. 1995. *Particles. On the Syntax of Verb-Particle, Triadic, and Causative Constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Emonds, J. 1976. *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax. Root, Structure-Preserving, and Local Transformations*. New York: Academic Press.
- É. Kiss, K. 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gruber, J. S. 1965. *Studies in Lexical Relations*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Jackendoff, R. 1977. *X-Bar Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Pantcheva, M. 2011. *Decomposing Path: The Nanosyntax of Directional Expressions*. PhD dissertation, University of Tromsø.
- Schweikert, W. 2005. *The Order of Prepositional Phrases in the Structure of the Clause*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Snyder, W. 2001. On the nature of syntactic variation: Evidence from complex predicates and complex word-formation. *Language* 77: 324-342.
- Svenonius, P. 1994. *Dependent Nexus. Subordinate Predication Structures in English and the Scandinavian Languages*. PhD dissertation, University of California at Santa Cruz.
- Svenonius, P. 1996. The verb-particle alternation in the Scandinavian languages. <http://www.hum.uit.no/a/svenonius/paperspage.html>.
- Svenonius, P. 2008. Projections of P. In A. Asbury, J. Dotlačil, B. Gehrke, and R. Nouwen (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics of Spatial P*, 63-84. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Svenonius, P., Pantcheva, M. (eds.). 2006. *Tromsø Working Papers on Language and Linguistics Nordlyd* 33. Special Issues on Adpositions.
- Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Zubizarreta, M. L., Oh, E. 2007. *On the Syntactic Composition of Manner and Motion*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics (BWPL)

ISSN: 2069-9239

Commenced publication: 1999

BWPL is published twice a year by the Centre for the Study of Language Development and Linguistic Communication, Department of English, University of Bucharest. It publishes work of current interest in all areas of theoretical and applied linguistics.

Contributions

Articles should be in English and must contain work which has not been previously published. They are peer-reviewed, and authors will be informed within three months of receipt of manuscripts whether these are accepted for publication.

Authors are requested to submit their papers electronically. Detailed *Guidelines for Authors* are available at <http://bwpl.unibuc.ro>.

Address for correspondence

Centre for the Study of Language Development and Linguistic Communication,
Department of English, University of Bucharest, 7-13 Pitar Moş Str., Sector 1, 010451
Bucharest, Romania.

Back issues

Single issues from previous volumes are available from the Centre for the Study of Language Development and Linguistic Communication.

Tiparul s-a executat sub c-da nr. 3662/2015
la Tipografia Editurii Universității din București
