

REVIEWS

R. L. Trask. 2010. *Why Do Languages Change?*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. xi + 198 pp.

Reviewed by Andrei A. Avram*

Why Do Languages Change is a posthumous work by R. L. Trask, revised for publication by Robert McColl Millar. As explicitly mentioned (p. ix), “it is not a textbook”, but it is rather intended to “act as a door to historical linguistics”.

The book consists of a “List of figures and tables” (p. viii), “A few words before we start” (pp. ix-x), “Acknowledgements” and “A note from the reviser” (p. xi), eight chapters, “Some final thoughts” (pp. 185-186), “Further reading” (pp. 187-189), and an “Index” (pp. 190-198).

Chapter 1, “How do languages change?” (pp. 1-18), illustrates the major types of language change: vocabulary changes (e.g. replacement of words), meaning changes (e.g. the connection between *grammar* and *glamour*), grammatical changes (e.g. the emergence of the so-called “progressive passive” as in *My house is being painted*), sound changes (e.g. /r/-dropping, the evolution of the vowels in words such as *cot* and *caught*, the so-called “Northern Cities Shift” in American English, the loss of the distinction between /hw/ and /w/ – with words like *which* and *witch* becoming homophonous), and the emergence and spread of the so-called “high-rise terminals (HRT)”, popularly known as “uptalk”.

In chapter 2, “Why are languages always changing?” (pp. 19-38), the author first debunks several more or less widespread myths and then proceeds to a discussion of the main factors, which – in the author’s opinion – account for language change. The latter are, in the order in which they are discussed: cultural changes, economy of effort, emphasis and clarity, politeness, misunderstanding, prestige and pretentiousness, structural reasons, analogy, and group identity.

Chapter 3, “Where do words come from?” (pp. 39-63), is an incursion in the domain of etymology. The principles and methods of etymology, as well as the difficulties encountered, are illustrated with a number of well-chosen case studies from English (e.g. *boy*, *battery*, *jazz*, *penguin*, *silhouette*).

In chapter 4, “Skunk-Leek – my kind of town: what’s in a name?” (pp. 64-83), the author introduces the reader to the field of onomastics. The discussion is based on the analysis of the origin and evolution of a large number of first names, surnames and place names.

Chapter 5, “Where does English come from?” (pp. 84-105), is a brief overview of the history of English, starting from Indo-European, via Proto-Germanic, up to the present day. Special attention is paid to the contribution of Old Norse, Norman French and Latin to the vocabulary of English.

Chapter 6, “Why is American English different from British English?” (pp. 106-129), is a summary of the main lexical, spelling, pronunciation and grammatical differences between British and American English. The pronunciation differences discussed are: what the author calls “non-prevocalic /r/”, /t/-tapping, *bath*-broadening, spelling pronunciation (e.g. *docile*, *fertile*, *missile*, *sterile*, in which the second syllable rhymes with *mile* in British English), unrounding of the *pot*-vowel, and stress retraction (compare e.g. British English *in'quiry* vs. American English *'inquiry*). The grammatical differences illustrated are: the subjunctive (e.g. British English *The report*

* University of Bucharest, Department of English, andrei2.avram@gmail.com.

recommends that he is promoted vs. American English *The report recommends that he be promoted*), the present perfect (e.g. British English *Have you eaten yet?* vs. American English *Did you eat yet?*), the agreement pattern of collective nouns (e.g. British English *The government has/have announced a tax cut* vs. American English *The government has announced a tax cut*), compound nouns (first member in the singular/plural in British English vs. in the singular in American English), *shall* (which only marginally survives in American English, as in *Shall I open the window?*), and a number of other minor ones (e.g. colloquial British English *different to* vs. colloquial American English *different than*).

In chapter 7, “Why is English spelling so eccentric?” (pp. 130-153), the author looks into the many inconsistencies and idiosyncrasies of English spelling. The topics covered include: the avatars of the adaptation to English of the Latin alphabet; the various traditions followed; outside influences exerted by languages such as Norman French, Latin and Greek as well as by the influx of loanwords from some 350 other languages; etymological spellings (including words of Old French origin such as *debt*, *doubt*, *reign*, the spelling of which reflects their remote Latin ancestors *debita*, *debitum* and *regnum* respectively), blunders (such as the <l> in *could*, which has never contained a [l]); the reasons why English spelling is rather unlikely to be reformed.

Chapter 8, “Which is the older language?” (pp. 154-184) focuses on the origin and “age” of languages. The author defends the point of view according to which “the overwhelming majority of human languages are [...] of the same age” (p. 184). He does, however, acknowledge the existence of cases which are or come pretty close to being exceptions. These are discussed in the sections on artificial languages (such as Esperanto, Interlingua or Volapük) pidgins (illustrated with examples from Russenorsk and Tok Pisin), creoles (illustrated with examples from Sranan), the so-called “mixed languages” (illustrated with examples from Michif), and Nicaraguan Sign Language.

To sum up, the book is informative and entertaining, replete with interesting examples illustrative of the many types of language change.

Not surprisingly, given that the book covers a wide range of topics, I do not always agree with some of the analyses and/or claims. Thus, the author writes (p. 28) that *going to* emerged as a means of expressing futurity in “early nineteenth century”¹. In fact, the first instances of this use of *going to* date from the 17th century. As noted by Nevalainen (2006: 95), “in the latter half of the seventeenth century, the progressive construction *be going to* developed a special meaning indicating future time”. Consider examples such as the following: *To be short, You see that My Magazine² is going to be taken from Me, being My Own proper Goods, directly against My will*, from 1642 (Deutscher 2005: 150); *S^r John Walter is going to be married to my Lady Stoel, w^{ch} will be very happy for him*, from 1695 (Nevalainen 2006: 95). Moreover, in the same century, Poole (1646: 26) mentions explicitly in his grammar of English that “‘going to’ is the signe of the Participle of the future, as [...] ‘I am [...] going to read’”. Finally, the first known attestation of the phonological reduction of *going to* is recorded in Scotland, in a text by Alexander Douglas: *Now Willie lad, I’m ganna gie twa or three directions* 1806 (Deutscher 2005: 151). The occurrence of this contracted form in the first decade of the nineteenth century is further proof that the grammaticalization of *going to* had started earlier, since phonological reduction is a late stage in the process of grammaticalization.

The use of “misunderstanding” (pp. 27-29) as a sort of cover term is a debatable decision. In light of the examples provided, what the author calls “misunderstanding” stands for grammaticalization (e.g. of *going to* into a means of expressing futurity, pp. 27-28), folk-

¹ Cf. also Trask (1996: 143): “this largely happened in the early nineteenth century”.

² The word means ‘arms depot’.

etymology (*brydguma* lit. ‘bride-man’ altered into *bridegroom*, p. 28), and semantic shift (e.g. *fortuitous* which is acquiring the meaning ‘lucky’, pp. 28-29). Different types of language change thus end up being lumped together under one single heading. Moreover, since grammaticalization cannot actually be construed as an instance of misunderstanding, the latter is also a misnomer.

With respect to the attitude of the English to borrowings, it is stated (p. 104) that “vocabulary purism is practically unknown for English”, and reference is made to only two writers who tried to revive the Germanic lexical stock of English: the 14th century monk Dan Michael³ (1340) and the 19th century poet William Barnes⁴. However, there is a somewhat longer list of authors who, particularly in the 16th century, denounced the use of borrowings and advocated the use of native English words instead (see Geers 2005). For instance, Sir John Cheke wrote in a 1557 letter to Thomas Hoby: “I am also of the opinion that our tung should be written cleane and pure, vnmixt and vnmangled with borowing of other tungen” (Crystal 2005: 292). Moreover, in his translation of the Gospel of Matthew and of part of the Gospel of Mark, Cheke used terms such as *biwordes* ‘parables’, *crossed* ‘crucified’, *foresayer* ‘prophet’, *gainrising* ‘resurrection’, *hundreder* ‘centurion’, *wiseards* ‘magi’ (see Crystal 2005: 293, Geers 2005: 101, Crystal 2007: 51). Some twenty years later, the author of the “Preface” to Edmund Spenser’s *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579) rather angrily commented that “they patched up the holes with peces and rags of other languages, borrowing here of the french, there of the Italian, euery where of the Latine, not weighing how il, these tongues accorde with themselues, but much worse with ours: So now they haue made our English tongue, a gallimaufrey or hodgepodge of al other speeches” (Crystal 2005: 291). Edmund Spenser himself tried to revive obsolete Anglo-Saxon words and also used dialectal words of Germanic origin, e.g. *algate* ‘always’, *eld* ‘old age’, *sicker* ‘certainly’, *whilere* ‘a while before’, *yode* ‘went’ (see Crystal 2005: 293, Geers 2005: 101). Consider also Raphe Lever, who tried to replace the Latin terminology of logic with coinages such as *endsay* ‘conclusion’, *naysay* ‘negation’, *saywhat* ‘definition’ (Geers 2005: 101).

The presentation of some of the pronunciation differences between British and American English is not entirely accurate⁵. The author discusses spelling pronunciation in the case of words in which “centuries ago, the consonant /t/ was lost [...] whenever it was preceded by /f/ or /s/ and followed by /n/ or /l/” (p. 121). Rather confusingly, the words listed are “*soften, fasten, hasten, castle, whistle, rustle, bustle, mistletoe*” (p. 121), which are instances of retention of <t>, although this no longer stands for [t]. The “revival” of the original [t] via spelling pronunciation should have been illustrated with e.g. *often*. Moreover, this spelling pronunciation does not appear to clearly distinguish British from American English. Wells (2000: 530) reports rather similar percentages: *often* is pronounced with [t] by 27% of the British English speakers, and by 22% of the speakers of American English. It is claimed (p. 123) that “British *garage* commonly rhymes perfectly with *marriage*”. However, this is not necessarily so, as shown by the variants and their frequency as indicated in pronunciation dictionaries. Thus, Wells (2000: 316) reports the following preferences expressed in opinion polls: [ˈgærɪdʒ] 38%, [ˈgæraːdʒ] 31%, [ˈgæraːɜ] 25%; therefore, for 56%, i.e. for the majority of British English speakers *garage* does not rhyme with *marriage*. Similarly, according to Roach et al. (2006: 209), the order of frequency of the pronunciations of *garage* is [ˈgæraːɜ], [ˈgærɪdʒ]. The author writes (p. 123) that “for Americans *codify* rhymes with *modify*, while for Britons it has the vowel of *code*”. However, *Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary* (1993: 221) indicates two pronunciations for the first syllable in *codify*, namely [ˈkɑ-] and [ˈkō-], which correspond to IPA [kɔ-] and [kəʊ-] respectively, the second of which therefore has the

³ Author of *The Aeynbite of Inwyf* [= The Remorse of Conscience].

⁴ Author of *An Outline of English Speech-Craft* [= An Outline of English Grammar] (1878).

⁵ The late R. L. Trask was a native speaker of American English.

vowel of *code*, as in British English. The author further writes (p. 123) that “British *beret* commonly sounds just like *berry*”. However, for British English several variants are recorded in pronunciation dictionaries. Wells (2000: 77) has [ˈberɛɪ], [ˈberɪ] and even [bəˈrɛɪ], as in American English, while Roach et al. (2006: 53) list [ˈberɛɪ] and [ˈberɪ]; of these, only [ˈberɪ] rhymes with [ˈberɪ], the pronunciation of *berry* (Wells 2000: 77, Roach et al. 2006: 54). Finally, the claim that “British *ballet* commonly rhymes perfectly with *rally*” (p. 123) fails to be confirmed: both Wells (2000: 63) and Roach et al. (2006: 209) only have [ˈbælɛɪ], which does not rhyme with [ˈræli], the only pronunciation of *rally* (Wells 2000: 630, Roach et al. 2006: 418)

The author writes (p. 171) that the pidgin “Russenorsk had just one [preposition]: the all-purpose *på* (primarily Norwegian, although there are similar Russian prepositions)”. Firstly, Russian only has one similar preposition, *po* ‘on’. Secondly, the Russenorsk preposition *po* is an example of a “lexical hybrid”⁶, obtaining from the encounter of the phonetically and semantically similar Norwegian *på* and Russian *po*.

There are a few editorial shortcomings. These include repetitions, e.g. “that celebrated Scrabble™ word *aa* (a kind of lava)” (p. 79), and “that great favourite of Scrabble™-players everywhere, *aa* ([a] type of lava)” (p. 144). More serious shortcomings, however, are the two cases when the source of the material reproduced is not mentioned. Thus, the Tok Pisin text, glosses and translation (pp. 172-173) are taken from Sebba (1997: 20-21), but the source is not acknowledged. Similarly, the Sranan text, glosses and translation (p. 175) are also taken from Sebba (1997: 150-152), again without any indication of the source.

The above critical remarks notwithstanding, *Why Do Languages Change?* is a well-written, and even entertaining, introduction to the fascinating field of historical linguistics.

References

- Crystal, D. 2005. *The Stories of English*. London: Penguin Books.
- Crystal, D. 2007. *Words Words Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deutscher, G. 2005. *The Unfolding of Language. The Evolution of Mankind's Greatest Invention*. London: Arrow Books.
- Geers, M. 2005. A comparative study of linguistic purism in the history of England and Germany. In W. V. Davies and N. Langer (eds.), *Linguistic Purism in the Germanic Languages*, 97-108. Berlin · New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, tenth edition. 1993. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Millar, R. McColl. 2007. *Trask's Historical Linguistics*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Mühlhäusler, P. 1997. *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*, expanded and revised edition. London: University of Westminster Press.
- Nevalainen, T. 2006. *An Introduction to Early Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Poole, J. 1646. *The English Accidence or, A short plaine, and easie way, for the more speedy attaining to the Latine tongue, by the help of the English*. Reprinted in 1974 in *English Linguistics 1500-1800*, vol. 5. London: Scolar Press.
- Roach, P., Hartman, J. and Setter, J. 2006. *English Pronouncing Dictionary*, 17th edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sebba, M. 1997. *Contact Languages. Pidgins and Creoles*. London: Macmillan.
- Trask, R. L. 1996. *Historical Linguistics*. London: Arnold.
- Wells, J. C. 2000. *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary*. Harlow: Longman.

⁶ A lexical item identified across languages (Mühlhäusler 1997: 135).

Mark Irwin. 2011. *Loanwords in Japanese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. vii + 276 pp.

Reviewed by Cristina Bălan*

Loanwords in Japanese is a general work on Japanese lexical borrowings, traditionally known as *gairaigo*. The book is written in an accessible way, is not committed to any particular theory and does require only basic knowledge in theoretical linguistics, such as phonology and morphology. It is a welcome contribution to the field, since, as the author himself mentions, the sole reference book on the topic in a Western language is Loveday (1996), published more than a decade ago. This monograph is a valuable source for further readings, written both in English and Japanese, in all the domains approached.

One aim of this volume is to offer a holistic and descriptively oriented account of the linguistic and sociolinguistic phenomena related to Japanese loanwords. As the summary shows, the book's coverage is impressive, and addresses the topic of Japanese loanwords from a variety of points of view: language contact (chapter 2), phonology (chapter 3), morphology, morphophonology and semantics (chapter 4), orthography (chapter 5) and language attitudes (chapter 6). It does successfully reach the objective of drawing the big picture of the Japanese lexical borrowings, both linguistically and extra-linguistically.

While not adhering to any particular theory, the book synthesizes the findings about to Japanese loanwords in well studied areas, such as phonology, morphophonology, or language contact and attitudes, by drawing on data and results especially from studies published in Japanese. This way, it achieves the goal of making available a rich amount of information to the linguists not knowledgeable of Japanese.

The book will appeal to a wide range of potential researchers and students. It contains a wide range of data, many being accompanied by thoroughgoing description and references, and should be inspiring for theoretical linguists interested in any of the discussed linguistic domains. For students, it is a very good introductory and reference book. It is noteworthy that the volume contains many concepts and notions in original script, *kanji* or *kana*, accompanied by detailed explanations in English, a fact that might be useful for the students of Japanese.

The first chapter (pp. 1-22) is a general introduction to the matters treated in the rest of the book. It starts with a brief view on language contact settings in Japan since the 16th century. It then offers a succinct report on the general works on Japanese loanwords. The chapter continues with a discussion of vocabulary stratification, assuming the existence of native, Sino-Japanese, mimetic, foreign and hybrid strata. With respect to the foreign stratum, the author dissociates between *gairaigo* (items borrowed after 16th century, having undergone phonological adaptation and being semantically accessible to the general speech community) and *gaikokugo* (not adapted to native phonology and/or semantically not accessible – in the sense of Itô and Mester 1995 and 1999 – or unassimilated foreign – according to the author). The following section deals with the quantitative distribution of vocabulary strata, via the analysis of a significant number of surveys scrutinizing written media, spoken word and dictionaries. The chapter closes by laying out the organization of the book.

* University of Bucharest, "Languages and Cultural Identities" Doctoral School, balan.cristina@hotmail.com.

The second chapter, “A history of Japanese loanwords” (pp. 23-70), is a history of Japanese loanwords, accompanied by robust sociolinguistic and language contact excursions. The author identifies several stages in language contacts: Iberian (i.e. Portuguese and Spanish), Dutch, minor pre-1914 contacts (Russian, French, German, English) and, after WWII, American English. Each of these language contacts are examined in turn, along such lines as incentives and motivation for contact, Japanese government attitudes, intensity of contact, and the semantic classes to which borrowings belong. Lengthy lists of loanwords are provided and discussed, which completes the picture of each language contact legacy. The chapter gives relevant information on key actors, the internal and international political situation, government policies related to foreign languages, etc., which have all played a role in fostering or, on the contrary, suppressing linguistic borrowing. The discussion also includes the few borrowings from the geographically proximate languages, Chinese, Korean and Ainu, which have contributed rather little in term of lexical loans, due to their lack of prestige in Japan. The chapter closes with a few remarks on the diachronically ever-changing conventions regarding the adaptation of foreign place names, and brand/corporate names.

Chapter 3, “Phonology” (pp. 71-136), lays out, as the author himself points out, a descriptive analysis of loanword phonology, along the following major lines: phonemicization, covering both the traditional and contemporary phonemic inventories of Japanese; adaptation strategies including phonic substitution, epenthesis (the author operates a distinction between vowel epenthesis and moraic obstruent epenthesis, as he defines consonant gemination), deletion; suprasegmental issues, namely the rules governing accent in loanwords; and, the post-adaptation phenomenon of truncation, defined by the author as mora-clipping. Particularly refreshing is the classification of *gairaigo* according to their borrowing routes: the author distinguishes auditory from orthographic loans, the former being the result of a direct language contact situation, and the latter being divided in “spelling” loans and “dictionary tradition” loans. While spelling loans clearly reveal orthography based inputs, e.g. E *radio* > J. *rajio* vs **reejio*, the dictionary tradition consists, as the author puts it, of “rules of adaptation established and standardized by Japanese scholars of foreign languages” (p. 78), in bilingual dictionaries compiled during the immediate decades after the Meiji Restoration (1868).

Chapter 4, “Morphology, morphophonology and semantics” (pp. 137-158), is dedicated to loanwords morphology, morphophonology and semantics. It starts by assessing the morphological categories of foreign items and the rather low degree of their integration into Japanese morphology, given that the bulk of borrowings functions as nouns (which have little morphology), and very few as adjectives, adverbs, verbs. Then the phenomenon of morphological reduction in loanword adaptation, e.g. E *lambswool* > J. *ramuūru*, is briefly discussed. Much of this chapter is devoted to the formation of loan compounds: compound clipping, e.g. E *hunger strike* > J. *hangā sutoraikū* > J. *hansuto*; ellipsis, e.g. E *supermarket* > J. *sūpā* + *māketto* > J. *sūpā*; the marginal phenomenon of portmanteau formation, e.g. E *freelance* + G. *Arbeiter* > J. *furīransu* + *arubaitā* > *furītā*. The related phonology includes aspects such as the number of morae contained in compound components (see also Avram 2005: 89-90 and 103-104), and phenomena driven by the ban against the superheavy syllable: pre-nasal shortening, e.g. E *soundtrack* > J. *saundo* + *torakku* > *santora*; vowel shortening, e.g. E *personal computer* > J. *pāsonaru konpyūtā* > *pasokon*; the avoidance of geminate consonants, e.g. E *net radio* > J. *netto rajio* > *netoraji*. Further, the chapter addresses the issue of the scantily attested sequential voicing at the level of *gairaigo* (see also Avram 2005: 141-142) and closes with a brief review of some semantic changes: broadening, narrowing, pejoration, and amelioration.

Chapter 5, “Orthography” (pp. 159-192), deals with the spelling of loanwords. It begins with a note on the scripts used in Japanese, both the traditional (*kanji* and *kana*) and the contemporary ones (Roman and, to a lesser extent, Greek alphabet, Arabic and Roman numerals) and offers a detailed account of orthographic customs in every stage of language contact in Japan,

illustrated by plenty of examples. The chapter continues by addressing the issue of script policies and the efforts to standardize the foreign words rendition in Japanese *kana*, essentially after the WWII. In this respect, the author devotes much space to closely reviewing two official documents containing recommendations on loanword *katakana* script, *Monbushō* (1955) and *Bunkachō* (1995), which is a valuable effort, since both documents are inaccessible to the Western audience not knowledgeable of Japanese. The chapter then presents the recent developments concerning the script of foreign items, namely the popular Roman alphabet, used in abbreviations, acronyms and even full words.

Chapter 6, “Attitudes to loanwords” (pp. 193-206), is about attitudes towards loanwords. The author examines the widely held criticism leveled at the deluge of foreign words in Japanese, by resorting to several nation-wide surveys conducted, for the most part, by the Japanese government (*Bunkachō Bunkabu Kokugoka* ‘the Agency for Cultural Affairs’). The aim of these surveys was to inspect the opinions and attitudes of general public and of government administrative bodies concerning questions such as how desirable the loanwords and their further increase is, how transparent their meaning is, the perception of the use of the Roman alphabet in rendering foreign items etc. The efforts of the another governmental body, *Gairaigo Inkai* ‘the Loanword Committee’, to produce replacements for *gairaigo* with a low level of awareness and comprehension are also reviewed in some detail. It is worth pointing to the current significance of the surveys referred to above, conducted during the last two decades.

The overall value of the book under review resides in its multifaceted, systematic and pertinent approach to the vast topic of lexical borrowings in Japanese. It significantly contributes to our understanding, particularly, of loanword phonology, language contact history in Japan, and the role played by orthography in the adaptation of western loans. The chapters tackling these issues are truly intriguing, for they demonstrate author’s minute analysis of wide range of data: loanword corpora (either his own, see p. 132), or compiled by National Institute for Japanese Language, surveys (see, for example, Table 1.5, p. 19), governmental script recommendations (*Monbushō* 1955, *Bunkachō* 1995). The relatively small size of chapter 6, devoted to attitudes towards loanwords, can be complemented with book-long treatments in English, such as Loveday (1996), Stanlaw (2004), Gottlieb (2005), and Daulton (2008). It should perhaps be noted that the book ends rather abruptly, without conclusions; still, any attentive reader should observe its sound organization and the self-dependent character of each chapter. The chapters can be read independently, since they look at different facets of lexical borrowings; nevertheless, the significant number of cross-references is proof of the volume’s internal coherence.

Apart from the rich data and detailed discussion, a major contribution to the general picture of loanwords is the documentation of the first written attestation of loans, as provided in two Japanese dictionaries (Arakawa 1977 and *Nihon kokugo daijiten* 2000-2002), and in Saitō (1967), for Dutch loans. The first written attestation indicated can be an extremely valuable resource for the linguists interested in diachronic phonology, but not acquainted with Japanese, since this kind of evidence is available in the Japanese language only.

The author’s detailed analysis also covers areas that have attracted little interest, such as: non-*kango* borrowings from Chinese, in section 2.5; the truncation phenomenon of mora splitting in compounds, e.g. *E mass communication* > *J. masu komyunikēshon* > *J. masu komi*, in section 4.3.1 (p. 148); the motivation for, the history of, and the interference induced among the English language learners by the semantically remodeled compounds (see also Shibatani 1990: 151), e.g. *E sign + party* > *J. sainpātii* ‘autograph session’, in section 4.4 (p. 156).

Also noteworthy are the three indexes: the first one contains all donor words occurring throughout the book; the following index contains all the *gairaigo*, rendered first in Roman transcription and then, in a separate list, in Japanese script; the third one is a comprehensive subject index.

A milestone of the book is the significance attributed to the role played by orthography in loanword adaptation. This claim is made explicit in section 3.2 (but also in chapter 5, dealing with script customs), on the borrowing routes: auditory and orthographic. In this connection, I would argue that it is somewhat misleading to include the dictionary tradition, under the orthography borrowing route. Certainly, dictionary tradition loans evince adaptation strategies that stand in contrast with the purely auditory loans, e.g. E *lemonade* > J. *ramune* vs J. *remonēdo* (see Smith 2006 for a discussion), and give evidence of the borrowers' fair knowledge of the source languages, but it would perhaps be useful to keep in mind that dictionary tradition was established by bilinguals, whose knowledge of the source language included orthography, but was not limited to it. Rather, as the author states, these *gairaigo* were introduced by a small subset, upper-class Japanese people, that had traveled overseas, and had contact with foreigners (p. 78); these facts were therefore fostering a knowledge going beyond the recognition of a foreign written word. Thus, it would perhaps be preferable to regard the dictionary tradition borrowing route as self-standing, while acknowledging, of course, the role played by knowledge of orthography of those that have established the currently productive rules of adaptation.

A final note concerns an inaccuracy. In the discussion regarding what constitutes an *gairaigo*, the author wrongly reproduces the differences between assimilated foreign items and unassimilated foreign ones, presumably made by Itô and Mester (1999): assimilated foreign items differ from lexical items belonging to the Sino-Japanese and native strata, states the author, "by virtue of permitting voiced obstruent geminates, although they still suffer from syllable constraints" (no complex syllable margins, no codas other than the first part of a geminate obstruent and the uvular nasal /N/), "from which 'unassimilated foreign' do not". This statement implies that unassimilated foreign do not observe the requirements of syllable structure constraints, which is false. This constraint is fundamental to Japanese phonology and crucially defines what a possible phonological structure in Japanese is.

I will conclude by stressing the fact that this kind of shortcoming is marginal in the book under review, and that it certainly does not undermine volume's overall quality. *Loanwords in Japanese* is an impressive achievement through its descriptive coverage, and detailed, pertinent and comprehensive analysis of a wide range of linguistic phenomena. It represents a valuable resource for students of Japanese, and for theorists of language contact and loan phonology.

References

- *** 2000-2002. *Nihon kokugo daijiten*. Tokyo: Shogakukan.
- Arakawa, S. (ed.). 1977. *Gairaigo jiten*. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten.
- Avram, A. A. 2005. *Fonologia limbii japoneze contemporane*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Bunkachō Bunkabu Kokugoka. 1995. *Kokugo ni kan suru yoronchōsa heisei 7-nen 4-gatsu*. Tokyo: Okurasho Insatsukyoku.
- Daulton, F. 2008. *Japan's Built-In Lexicon of English-Based Loanwords*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gottlieb, N. 2005. *Language and Society in Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Itô, J. and Mester, A. 1995. Japanese phonology. In J. A. Goldsmith (ed.), *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*, 817-838. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Itô, J. and Mester, A. 1999. The phonological lexicon. In N. Tsujimura (ed.), *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, 62-100. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Loveday, L. 1996. *Language Contact in Japan. A Socio-linguistic History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Monbushō. 1955. *Gairaigo no hyōki*. Tokyo: Meiji Tosho.
- Saitō, S. 1967. *Nihongo ni oyoboshita orandago no eikyō*. Tokyo: Shinozaki Shorin.
- Shibatani, M. 1990. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, L. J. 2006. Loan phonology is not all perception: Evidence from Japanese loan doublets. In T. J. Vance and K. A. Jones (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 14: 63-74.
- Stanlaw, J. 2004. *Japanese English Language and Culture Contact*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Natalie Schilling. 2013. *Sociolinguistic Fieldwork*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 323 pp.

Costin-Valentin Oancea*

The book at issue is part of the “Key Topics in Sociolinguistics” collection published by Cambridge University Press. The book consists of an Introduction (pp. 1-16), seven chapters (pp. 17-286), the “References” (pp. 287-302) and the “Index” (pp. 303-313).

The aims and the organization of the book are outlined in the “Introduction”, the main aim being to finally reveal the “secrets” of sociolinguistic fieldwork. The author also provides a brief overview of the sociolinguistic field methods, as they are “the best-kept secret of sociolinguistics” (Tagliamonte 2006: 17).

Chapter 2, “Designing the study” (pp. 17-65), focuses on the steps that must be followed in order to conduct a successful sociolinguistic fieldwork project. The chapter starts with a discussion of the speech community, “a socially-based unit of linguistic analysis” (Patrick 2002: 577) and what to take into account when designing a study. The second part of the chapter tackles the types of sampling and the criteria in selecting the speakers who are going to be interviewed. In the last part of the chapter the author discusses the problem of stratifying the sample (with a focus on the social categories: social class, gender, ethnicity, age), and also language change in real time. Some case studies are presented, e.g. Norwich revisited (Trudgill 1988), Martha’s Vineyard (Labov 1963, 1972; Blake and Josey 2003; Pope et al. 2007).

In Chapter 3, “Data collection methods” (pp. 66-133), the author astutely outlines several key issues in data collection methods. We learn not only how to design and conduct a sociolinguistic interview (which is the main tool used in variationist sociolinguistics) but also its limitations and critiques (“its unidimensional focus on only one factor affecting stylistic variation – standard – non-standard”). There is also a very important discussion of eliciting information on listeners perception (see also Campbell-Kibler 2010), something usually omitted in other textbooks. Included here is a discussion of the observer’s paradox and ways to avoid it, (e.g. Labov’s “death questions”). The last part of the chapter is dedicated to the ethnographical method of participant-observation, including some practical considerations (e.g. how to become a participant-observer).

Chapter 4, “Designing research on style” (pp. 134-176), examines stylistic variation, how to study it and more importantly how to obtain data reflecting different speech styles. Bell’s (1984) audience design approach, an important model for stylistic variation, is discussed at length. The author skilfully outlines several key issues of the so-called “first”, “second” and “third wave” studies (in the sense of Eckert 2012), stressing the importance of the latter in the study of stylistic variation.

Chapter 5, “In the field: Finding contacts, finding a place” (pp. 177-215), provides an insight into how to select the community you want to study and how to approach the people whom you want to interview. Although this is usually a daunting task, this chapter discusses some interesting methods, both practical and theoretical, of approaching the interviewees as well as the

* University of Bucharest, “Languages and Cultural Identities” Doctoral School, oancea_costin@yahoo.com.

role of the fieldworker in the community. On the other side of the coin, the author stresses the importance of being earnest when conducting a research project. The people who are to be interviewed should be informed of your research interests (of course, without giving too much details) and (if needed) sign a form by which they give their consent to be recorded. The key in conducting a successful sociolinguistic interview is flexibility.

Chapter 6, “Recording and record-keeping” (pp. 216-267), tackles an important, yet often neglected, aspect of data collection and storage. In the first part of the chapter the focus is on the technical specifications for recording equipment (i.e. types of recorders that can be used, the features that an audio recorder should have, types of microphones, video recorders and other devices) as well as valuable information about recording techniques which have proved successful and have yielded good quality recordings. The second part of the chapter is devoted to a discussion of efficient ways to organize and store the data (what to store, where to store it) so that it is easily accessible. Also briefly mentioned are tools for data transcription, extraction and analysis (for more information see Tagliamonte 2006) as well as maintaining confidentiality.

The last chapter, “Giving back to the community” (pp. 268-286), starts by discussing Labov’s (1982) principles for community involvement and their implementation (i.e. The Principle of Error Correction and The Principles of the Debt Incurred). The author raises the problem of linguistic discrimination and presents several case studies (Rickford 1997, Santa Ana 2009). The chapter also explores the role of the researcher in the field and how involved he or she should get in the community under study.

Natalie Schilling’s book *Sociolinguistic Fieldwork* is a valuable addition to the library of any researcher or student in sociolinguistics and a very good introduction for a neophyte who is trying to get acquainted with the methods and fieldwork techniques used in sociolinguistics. This book teaches anyone interested in sociolinguistics how to carry out a first-hand research in a community, the steps that must be followed as well as the things that must be taken into consideration. As the author points out, in the last decades there have been many alterations in the field of (variationist) sociolinguistics, in both methods and interpretation. Variationist sociolinguists have expanded their early focus on large urban populations to encompass a range of different types of communities, using a wide range of data collection methods. These data collection methods differ from community to community and the key term in conducting a good sociolinguistic interview is – as mentioned above – flexibility.

There is little one can object to, with, perhaps, the issue of the questions which form the sociolinguistic interview. These must be carefully chosen, as explicitly stressed by the author. However, despite Labov’s success with the “danger of death” question (p. 94), attempts by others with this question have not been so successful. I used it when I collected data from London teenagers (studying at Queen Mary, University of London) in 2012 and many of the interviewees answered “No” or “I can’t think of a situation right now”. Trudgill (1974) faced the same problem in his Norwich study and he suggested that perhaps the people from Norwich have less eventful lives than the people from New York City. Schlee (2011) faced the same problem in his analysis of the (ing) variable in the speech Polish immigrants living in London and Edinburgh.

The book is strewn with useful tips and anecdotes about students in the field, presenting studies carried out in different communities around the world. The author also provides valuable “inside” information about the research projects she has been involved in, something which few linguists do.

Natalie Schilling succeeds in revealing the “secrets” of sociolinguistic fieldwork, which is the purpose of this book. *Sociolinguistic Fieldwork* is a useful reference work for any researcher, student or anyone interested in how to conduct a successful sociolinguistic study. For achieving all of these things, the author must be congratulated.

References

- Bell, A. L. 1984. Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13: 145-204.
- Blake, R., Josey, M. 2003. The /ay/ diphthong in a Martha Vineyard community: What can we say 40 years after Labov?. *Language in Society* 32: 451-485.
- Campbell-Kibler, K. 2010. Sociolinguistics and perception. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4: 377-389.
- Eckert, P. 2012. Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41: 87-100.
- Labov, W. 1963. The social motivation of a sound change. *Word* 19: 273-309.
- Labov, W. 1972. Some principles of linguistic methodology. *Language in Society* 1: 97-120.
- Labov, W. 1982. Objectivity and commitment in linguistic science: The case of the Black English trial in Ann Arbor. *Language in Society* 11: 165-202.
- Patrick, P. L. 2002. The speech community. In J. K. Chambers, P. Trudgill, and N. Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 573-597. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Pope, J., Meyerhoff, M., Ladd, R., D. 2007. Forty years of language change on Martha's Vineyard. *Language* 83: 615-627.
- Rickford, J. R. 1997. Unequal partnership: Sociolinguistics and the African American speech community. *Language in Society* 26: 161-197.
- Santa Ana, O. 2009. "Did you call in Mexican?" The racial politics of Jay Leno immigrant jokes. *Language in Society* 38: 23-45.
- Schleef, E., Meyerhoff, M., Clark, L. 2011. Teenager's acquisition of variation. A comparison of locally-born and migrant teens' realisation of English (ing) in Edinburgh and London. *English World Wide* 32: 206-236.
- Tagliamonte, S. 2006. *Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, P. 1974. *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- Trudgill, P. 1988. Norwich revisited: Recent linguistic changes in an English urban dialect. *English World-Wide* 9: 33-49.

Adina Dragomirescu. 2013. *Particularități sintactice ale limbii române în context romanic. Supinul*. Bucharest: Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române. 293 pp.

Reviewed by Veronica Tomescu*

The book is a diachronic investigation on the Romanian supine, based on a broad and diverse corpus study, including for the most part early Romanian texts, original writings and translations ranging from the 16th to the 18th centuries, but also an assortment of examples from a few 19th century writers; finally, the author takes a brief look at modern Romanian and at the regional varieties of the language. The book is organized in four chapters followed by an Appendix containing the corpus.

Chapter 1, "Supinul românesc. Prezentare generală" (pp. 12-67), offers a syntactic and semantic description of the Romanian supine, stressing the fact that the supine is a specific feature of Romanian. The author adopts the classification of the supine forms proposed in Pană Dindelegan (1992): the nominal supine, usually headed by a definite determiner, selecting as its internal argument an inflectional or prepositional genitive, the categorially ambiguous prepositional supine, which lacks a complement for its disambiguation, and the verbal supine, again selected by a preposition, and with an overt object or more rarely subject, as proof of its verbal value. The author's preference for this classification is due to its transparency on the one hand and to its reflecting the diachronic evolution of the supine on the other, which, as the author shows in her extensive corpus research, followed the same route: from nominal to ambiguous to verbal supine.

* University of Bucharest, Department of English, veronicatomescu@yahoo.com.

The chapter also includes a succinct overview of the literature on the evolution of the supine. The assumption according to which the Romanian supine is derived from Latin is questioned, based on the scarcity of the structure in Latin, on the absence of the supine in Latin inscriptions from the Eastern Roman Empire, and on the differences between the Latin and the Romanian supine (Caragiu Marioțeanu 1962, Hill 2012). The author retains nevertheless the idea that the Romanian (nominal) supine originally derived from the Latin nominal supine.

The chapter concludes with an analysis from a minimalist perspective: the supine appears in exhaustive obligatory control structures (Landau 1999); alternatively, the supine may have a lexical subject, in which case it projects a Tense Phrase; the obligatory post-verbal position of the lexical subject correlates with the non-existence of clitics. The clarity of the explanations would however have been enhanced had this section been slightly less condensed or had the text been interspersed with syntactic representations; especially in contrast with previous sections where the functions of the supine are meticulously listed and illustrated.

Chapter 2, “Supinul din latină, din limbile slave și din albaneză” (pp. 68-84), opens with a clear presentation of the Latin supine, giving an account of its emergence in Latin and its disappearance in late Latin, when it was replaced by the infinitive or gerund. The author takes a brief look at Slavic, in order to challenge the supposition that the Romanian supine might have been a result of the contact between Romanian and Slavic. While the Romanian supine was not a direct outcome of the Slavic influence, the author nevertheless hesitates to completely refute the speculation that the Slavic supine followed by a genitive might have boosted the use of the nominal Romanian supine, especially due to translations. Any correspondence between the Romanian and the Albanian supine is also ruled out due to the late emergence of the latter.

Chapter 3, “Evoluția istorică a tiparelor cu supin. O nouă ipoteză asupra originii supinului verbal” (pp. 85-161), consists in an extensive corpus study meant to trace the evolution of the Romanian supine in the 16th–19th centuries and the emergence of new patterns, as well as the progressive specialization of the supine to the detriment of the infinitive.

The nominal supine is well represented in the earliest texts, as expected, since it is the only supine form which appears to have been inherited from Latin, as a productive word-formation mechanism. The author comments upon the existence in 16th century texts of feminine supines, alongside masculine/neuter forms which have survived into modern Romanian. The derivation of feminine supine forms dwindles into disuse in the 17th century. As for the verbal-nominal supine, it is hardly ever attested in the earliest texts.

The analysis reveals the gradual increase in the frequency of ambiguous supine forms and lists novel patterns, as they begin to be attested: e.g. the supine selected by a copula (16th century), the supine selected by an adjective or a preposition, by transitive and aspectual verbs (17th century), the hanging topic pattern, the supine after impersonal verbs, as well as the supine with purpose value, after motion verbs (18th century), etc. This latter form is in fact the equivalent of the Latin accusative supine: its emergence in 18th century Romanian after a gap of so many centuries is sufficient proof of its not having been inherited from Latin. The increasing frequency of the novel contexts in later centuries is commented upon. As for the 19th century, there is only one form here attested for the first time, a supine with imperative value.

Unusual contexts are highlighted: such as a fragment from a 17th century letter where the supine is selected instead of the infinitive by the verb *a trebui* – it appears to be a unique example. There is also a 16th century text (Coresi, *Carte cu învățătură*) which seemingly exhibits clitics on the supine – a fact unattested elsewhere; the author proposes the explanation that the alleged pronominal clitic might in fact have been a determiner, a transcription or interpretation error due to the editors (see References): a point worth investigating.

As for the verbal supine, it appears in the late 17th century, accompanied by a direct object or a subject. The verbal supine is first attested with great frequency in a dictionary – since most entries are written making use of the supine (both verbal and nominal); the same frequency is hardly to be expected in any other type of text. Indeed, when looking at the corpus presented in the

Appendix, we can notice that, while there are a great many examples in the above-mentioned dictionary, there are hardly any in the 18th century. One 19th century author who has a preference for this construction is Ion Creangă, who appears to have been the source for nearly all the verbal supine examples for this century.

A comparison is drawn between the infinitive and the supine in Romanian, regarding their frequency, from the 16th century onwards; the analysis of the corpus shows that the nominal infinitive is more widespread than the nominal supine, an imbalance which also holds for two contemporary texts that the author selected for purposes of comparison with present-day Romanian. As for the verbal supine, the author has attempted to see to what extent it has replaced the use of the infinitive. The author demonstrates that the same constructions which in Latin contained a supine (and which confusingly are a feature of modern Romanian) are in fact infinitive structures in early Romanian; she also insists that supine constructions in early Romanian were in fact parallel with synonymous infinitive constructions, proving that the supine was a relatively recent formation. Therefore the author concludes that the Romanian verbal supine originates from nominal supine forms reanalyzed as verbal. Romanian allows bare nouns after prepositions and hence prepositional nominal supines in Old Romanian may ultimately have been reanalyzed as verbal forms, due to the ambiguity resulting from the absence of the article.

The chapter makes for engrossing reading, especially due to the charm of the numerous examples.

Chapter 4, “Repartiția dialectală a supinului” (pp. 162-186), emphasizes the idea that the supine is only attested in Daco-Romanian, while it is absent in other dialects (with the exception of a few collocations in Megleno-Romanian). Next, the author’s aim is to disprove the hypothesis that the supine is absent in the northern regional varieties of Romanian on the basis of data extracted from linguistic atlases and a dialectal corpus from Bistrița-Năsăud. The chapter is again replete with many delightfully quaint examples.

Aside from its interest as a linguistic study, the book is also enjoyable reading due to the many examples and the chronological list of supine patterns, in “Anexă. Datarea tiparelor cu supin” (pp. 211-284). I mention, aside from the expected religious texts and chronicles and Dimitrie Cantemir’s famous *Istoria Ieroglifică*, a 17th century cookbook, a late 17th century dictionary – amusing for its antiquated definitions, a smattering of countercharms, a few phrases from a book on bee-keeping, and so on. I would like however to make one remark regarding the layout of the Appendix: it is organized as a table, with three columns, one for the verbal-nominal supine, one for the verbal supine (all very well so far) and a third column, labeled “Observații”, where all the nominal supine forms, the nominal infinitive forms, participles and (a few) collocations are squeezed in together. Readers might find it an improvement if the table were perhaps expanded across two pages with separate columns for all the forms, eliminating the cluttered and difficult to follow the “Observații” column.

The book can undoubtedly be recommended to anyone interested in the diachrony of the language; the work is certainly impressive from a descriptive point of view and offers much enjoyment to readers with a passion for old texts.

References

- Caragiu-Marioțeanu, M. 1962. Moduri nepersonale. *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* XIII (1): 29-43.
- Hill, V. 2012. The emergence of the Romanian supine, Ms., University of New Brunswick.
- Landau, I. 1999. Elements of control. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Pană Dindelegan, G. 1992. Supinul. In *Sintaxă și Semantică. Clase de cuvinte și forme gramaticale cu dublă natură (adjectivul, adverbul, prepoziția, formele verbale nepersonale)*, 128-136. Bucharest: Tipografia Universității din București.
- Pușcariu, S., Procopovici, A. (eds.) 1914. *Coresi, Carte cu învățătură*, vol. I, *Textul*. Bucharest: Atelierele Grafice Socec & Co.