RiCL Research in Corpus Linguistics

Review of Yáñez-Bouza, Nuria, Emma Moore, Linda Van Bergen and Willem B. Hollmann eds. 2019. *Categories, Constructions, and Change in English Syntax.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 978-1-108-41956-7. htps://doi.org/10.1017/9781108303576

Teresa Fanego
University of Santiago de Compostela / Spain

1. Introduction

This volume is part of the *Studies in English Language* series, edited by Merja Kytö for Cambridge University Press. In the introduction, Nuria Yáñez-Bouza, Emma Moore, Linda Van Bergen and Willem B. Hollmann write that the volume, "[w]hilst not a Festschrift" (p. 2), is a tribute to David Denison, Professor Emeritus of English Linguistics at the University of Manchester and former Smith Professor of English Language and Medieval Literature. Despite their denial, *Categories, Constructions, and Change in English Syntax* (henceforth CCChES) shares some of the features of memorial volumes: each of the four editors –as well as the assistant editor Ayumi Miura– was supervised by David Denison, and the contributors are friends and colleagues who have worked in close collaboration with Denison throughout his academic career.

The volume, however, differs from most Festschrifts in the quality of the individual contributions and their thematic coherence. Memorial volumes often consist of a wide range of essays of variable quality which, rather than being 'editorially integrated' (Reid 2009), lack thematic unity. In contrast, the essays collected here not only add substantially to our current knowledge of English syntax, but also engage deeply with the honouree's work by focusing on categorial and constructional description and change, two areas where Denison's research has left an enduring legacy.

2. Discussion

CCChES comprises an introduction ("Analysing English syntax past and present") by the four editors, plus fourteen chapters. The introduction opens with a touching and admirable summation of the significance of the honouree to both the editors and the field at large, and then clearly outlines the themes covered in the volume. This is structured into three parts: Part I is devoted to grammatical categories, Part II to constructions and constructional change, and Part III to comparative and typological approaches.

2.1. Part I: Approaches to grammatical categories and categorial change

Part I, comprising five chapters, addresses the fuzzy status of various grammatical categories, opening with John Payne's contribution "What is special about pronouns?" The focus here is on the use of personal pronouns as complements in an *of*-PP, as in *the brother of him*, an environment in which, according to Lyons's intuitive judgement (1986: 136), personal pronouns are ungrammatical or at least questionable, contrary to the alternative patterns with the *s*-genitive and the so-called oblique genitive, illustrated respectively in *his brother* and *that brother of his*. Lyons's observation provides the starting point for Payne's study; its goal is to provide a detailed empirical account of the *of*-PP construction based on late twentieth-century data retrieved from the *British National Corpus*. For this purpose, Payne extracted a random sample of 1,000 tokens of a search string consisting of any noun followed by *of* and a personal pronoun, of which, after manual filtering, 685 tokens were found to be instances of the *of*-PP construction under analysis. This confirms that personal pronouns can indeed occur as dependents in an *of*-PP, and can be employed in a wide range of semantic relations, with quantity (185 tokens), as in *a rare **lot** of them*, and theme (164 tokens), where the head noun is a nominalisation corresponding to a transitive verb, as in *the critical **evaluation** of it*, predominating. Personal pronouns as *of*-dependents are not excluded even with semantic relations which are known to be quite strongly predisposed towards the *s*-genitive (see Rosenbach 2002), as is the case with kinship, attested three times in Payne's random sample and illustrated in (1) below.

> (1) And **the father of them all** David Smith is represented by a selection of sculptures all this month. (EBT 2626)

On the other hand, a few of the semantic relations found with *of*-PPs are not available to the *s*-genitive construction, such as quantity (*the rest of you*/**your rest*) or content (*the idea of it*/**its idea*), among others. The quantitative and qualitative results thus confirm the claim made in earlier research by Payne (e.g. Payne and Huddleston 2002: 476–478; Payne and Berlage 2014) that the set of semantic relations available to the *of*-PP construction is a superset of those available to the *s*-genitive, so that a speaker's knowledge must also include the knowledge of the different variables that predispose towards one construction or the other.

Like Payne, Bas Aarts deals in Chapter 2 ("What *for*?") with Present-Day English (PDE) data. He revisits an issue briefly discussed in Aarts (2007: 219–222), namely the categorial status of *for* in sequences such as those in (2)–(3):

(2) *For* + NP: Hold it **for a moment**. (S1A-002 127)

(3) *For* + [NP *to* VP]: **For the roles to be reversed** would be a tragedy for many Conservative MPs and voters. (W2E-004 064)

Example (2) involves the use of *for* as a preposition governing a NP complement; (3), on the other hand, represents a usage in which *for* is most commonly analysed as a subordinator introducing an infinitival clause. *For* NP *to*-infinitivals have received considerable attention in the literature (Fischer 1988; Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1181–1183; De Smet 2009, among many others), the usual assumption being that they go back to structures such as (4), with an 'organic' *for*-NP dependent on an element outside the *to*-infinitive clause. Over the course of time the NP would have been reanalysed as part of the *to*-infinitive clause with which it happened to co-occur. This "meant that the preposition *for* lost whatever meaning it had and became an 'inorganic' infinitival subject marker" (De Smet 2009: 1743), enabling the extension of the construction to radically new environments, as in (5), where the new analysis of *for* as a subordinator is the only possible option (examples from Aarts 2019: 58–59):

(4) It is good [PP for a man] [not to touch a woman].

(5) It is a rare thing [for [a night to pass without one or other of us having to trudge off]].

Aarts offers a detailed account of the guises of *for* in a wide array of constructions and critically reviews the literature. He concludes by arguing that there are strong reasons in favour of categorising *for* as a preposition in all of its uses, an analysis that does away "with the overly complicated historical account in which *for* ceases to be a preposition

and becomes a subordinator" and "allows for a parsimonious and elegant parallel way" (p. 76) of treating the various kinds of constructions where *for* is used in PDE, such as those exemplified above, or cases in which *for* is followed by an *-ing* clause, as in (6); this is an environment where *for*, at any rate, is usually considered a preposition, since *-ing* clauses, unlike infinitives, share most features of NPs, including the ability to occur as prepositional complements (e.g., *On hearing the news, she telephoned her father*):

> (6) She hated herself **for allowing the policeman to intimidate her**. (W2F-009 100)

Some of Aarts's arguments in favour of a unified analysis are persuasive, but his proposal seems to leave a few loose ends. *For* NP *to*-infinitivals, for instance, can freely occur as preverbal (3) and extraposed subjects (5), but these two slots, by contrast, are not available either to *for* NPs or to *for* *-ing* clauses, as Aarts himself acknowledges (pp. 67; 75, footnote 14). If *for*, as he contends, is always a member of the category of prepositions, one would expect it to have the same distribution across all clause slots, whether it is followed by a noun phrase, an *-ing* form, or a *to*-infinitive.

Dan McColm and Graeme Trousdale turn to the recent history of English in "Whatever happened to *whatever*?" Their focus is on the use of *whatever* as a discourse marker (DM), as in (7):

> (7) All right. **Whatever**. I'll let Rush speak for millions and myself. (COCA, 2012; McColm and Trousdale 2019: 84)

Brinton (2017: 268–283) suggests that this usage is a late twentieth-century phenomenon, with two potential syntactic origins: the use of *whatever* as a general extender in a coordinate structure (e.g., *He wants to be a film star **or whatever***), and the chunk *whatever you* V, where *whatever* is followed by a second-person subject and a verb of cognition, volition, or speaking (e.g., *Whatever you please*). The latter type, Brinton argues, is the more likely source, because its discourse context is the same as that of the DM, namely dialogic and associated with a certain kind of speaker/writer stance, often irritability or exasperation. McColm and Trousdale complement the qualitative analysis of the development of *whatever* presented by Brinton (2017) with a quantitative study based on large random samples extracted from several synchronic and diachronic corpora. The results serve to confirm Brinton's hypothesis that chunks of the form *whatever you* V "have a significant role to play in the development of the discourse marker *whatever*, which typically serves as a distinct conversational turn" (p.

104). But in addition, McColm and Trousdale suggest that contexts involving the general extender have also contributed to the development of the discourse marker, since these –like the chunk *whatever you* V itself– often carry a certain attitude or stance, particularly one which appears to be dismissive of the addressee, as is the case in (8):

> (8) Well, Willoughby Pastures, –or **whatever your name is**–, you'll get yourself into the papers this time. (COHA, 1877; McColm and Trousdale 2019: 97)

In light of the above, they conclude that the diachrony of the DM *whatever* can be understood as an example of 'bolstering': while one construction may be the most likely source of a new form-meaning pairing, other constructions serve to strengthen the representation of the new pattern, "bolster[ing] it via a formal or functional alignment (or both)" (p. 81). One could point out here that the coining of a new label was perhaps not strictly necessary, since the notion of bolstering seems to be analogous to Van de Velde's (2014: 147) 'horizontal construction links'; these are also based on similarities in the form and/or meaning pole, and have been shown to play an important role in the synchronic network of constructions as well as in diachronic change (see further Hoffmann 2018).

In the chapter "Are comparative modals converging or diverging in English? Different answers from the perspectives of grammaticalisation and constructionalisation," Elizabeth Closs Traugott addresses the history of the comparative modals *better*, *rather* and *sooner* from the perspective of the construction grammar formalism laid out by Traugott and Trousdale (2013). In PDE, comparative modals differ semantically in that *rather* and *sooner* code preference, while *better* expresses advice. Traugott's goal is to revisit a topic inspired by Denison and Cort's research (2010) on the rise of 'bare' *better* (e.g., *You better go*), and especially to complement Van linden's (2015) study on the development of the three comparative modals in recent American English. For this purpose, Traugott traces their history in British English, using the *Middle English Dictionary* and several corpora of Early and Late Modern English. She concludes that *rather* and *sooner* emerged as preference modals by the sixteenth century; see (9):

> (9) Yett **haid** I **rether** dye for his sake.
> 'Yet I would rather die for his sake' (¿c1500 *Grevus Ys* (Sln 1584) 87; Traugott 2019: 114)

For *better* she identifies sporadic "preference readings" (p. 119) in the seventeenth century, and entrenchment as a modal auxiliary by the early eighteenth century (pp. 118, 126–127). She also finds that at this stage *better* had already specialised in its current advisory meaning, which is the only one attested in the 975 instances of *had better* recorded in her data from the *Old Bailey Corpus* (1720–1913). The evidence discussed by Traugott is rich and varied, but her chronology of the changes, which suggests a rather late and abrupt emergence of *better* as an auxiliary, can now be revised thanks to the availability of big corpora such as EEBO BYU (1470s–1690s; see Davies 2017). EEBO shows clearly that by the sixteenth century *better* was already well established both as a preference modal (10) and as an advice modal (11), this latter usage arising naturally out of the preference usage.

(10)   VXOR: what doest thou here in this countree, me thinke thou art a scot by thy tongue. MENDICUS: trowe me […], i **had better** bee hanged in a withie of a cowtaile, then be a rowfooted Scotte, for thei are euer sare and fase: (EEBO 1564 William Bullein, *A dialogue bothe pleasaunte and pietifull*)

(11)   now the time doth not serue any longer to geue men brickbattes for turfes, or to make them beleeue that the Moone is made of greene cheese: for euerie one will pretend now to know how the world walkes: therefore he **had better** haue held his tongue touching this matter: (EEBO 1579 Marnix van St. Aldegonde/John Stell/George Gilpin, *The bee hiue of the Romishe Church*)

The final chapter in Part I, "The definite article in Old English: Evidence from Ælfric's *Grammar*," is by Cynthia L. Allen, who addresses the question whether a category of definite article already existed in Old English (OE). Studies that take the point of view that OE had no definite article, or at least that definiteness marking was not obligatory, are numerous (e.g., van Gelderen 2007: 297; Watanabe 2009; Sommerer 2015: 112). Authors such as Crisma (2011), however, adopt a different position and argue that in prose writing, subject and object NPs, that is, referential NPs in argument function, were already regularly marked for definiteness in late OE. Allen's study, which is inspired by Crisma (2011), therefore focuses on subjects and objects; predicative NPs (e.g., *he wæs to **cyninge** gecoren* 'he was chosen as **king**'), which are non-referential, lack definiteness marking even in PDE, and thus do not constitute good evidence. As a source of data, Allen employs Ælfric's *Grammar* of Latin, an adaptation of the *Excerptiones de Prisciano*. Latin is a language without a category of definite article, and this allows Allen to show that in the English translations of Latin sentences Ælfric consistently adds the relevant form of *se* whenever a definite interpretation of the

original would be the most likely one. Her meticulous philological study thus confirms Crisma's claim (2011) that English had a definite article prior to the early Middle English (ME) stage that is most commonly accepted as the period when this category emerged. This finding is in agreement with the results independently arrived at by Sommerer (2018), on the basis of a quantitative analysis of the *Parker* and *Peterborough* chronicles; like Crisma (2011) and Allen (2019), Sommerer (2018: 300, 312) concludes that at some point between early and late OE definiteness marking became obligatory in all referential cases.

2.2. Part II: Approaches to constructions and constructional change

Like Part I, Part II consists of five chapters, and opens with Bettelou Los's study on "How patterns spread: The *to*-infinitival complement as a case of diffusional change, or '*to*-infinitives, and beyond!'." Los revisits her earlier work on *to*-infinitives (Los 2005) in the light of new insights about the spread of the gerund as a verb complement provided by De Smet (2013). Her goal is to investigate how De Smet's model of analogical change can account for the diffusion of *to*-infinitival complements in the early stages of English. She proposes the recognition of five developmental stages: Stage I involves verbs of spatial manipulation with meanings like PDE *force*. Stage II pertains to verbs such as OE *ontendan* 'kindle, set fire to', which extended their meanings metaphorically to 'fire someone up, inspire someone to do something'. In Stage III the *to*-infinitive spread to verbs with a similar directive meaning, namely the verbs of commanding and permitting. Importantly, this extension allowed the *to*-infinitive to acquire a more abstract meaning, similar to that of a subjunctive clause. The subjunctive clause "may have provided a new model, so that the *to*-infinitive started to appear with verbs that [...] had no directive meaning: they were verbs of intention with meanings of intending, hoping, trying, promising" (pp. 163–164). This is Los's Stage IV, which witnesses the diffusion of *to*-infinitives to verbs such as OE *giernan* 'yearn', *secan* 'seek' or *swerian* 'swear'. Towards the late fourteenth century, *to*-infinitives also became available with verbs of thinking and declaring, such as *believe*, *profess*, *say*, *think* and the like, in the so-called 'Exceptional Case-Marking' (ECM) construction, as in (12) below:

> (12)   *þat man […]* **is seid** *to have an heed*
> 'the man is said to have a head'
> (c1390, *Wyclifite Sermons*; quoted from Warner 1982: 136)

This is Stage V, which clearly "cannot be made part of any natural progression from the previous stages" (p. 168). On the basis of work by Dreschler (2015), Los suggests that this time the model for extension was an adjectival or participial construction with *to*-infinitival postmodification, as in (13), rather than a verbal construction:

> (13)   *& **wes iwunet** ofte to cumen wið him to his in.*
> 'and was wont often to come to him to his lodgings'
> (c1225(1200), cmjulia.96.12; Dreschler 2015: 176)

This type of pattern helps to make sense of the fact that from their earliest emergence in the ECM construction, *to*-infinitives occur frequently in passive sentences, such as (12) above. Following Dreschler (2015: 176–177), Los argues that the adjectival/participial construction provided a template for the emergence of ECM-passives. She acknowledges, however, that the availability of *to*-infinitives with verbs of thinking and declaring remains "the odd one out in the scenario" (p. 168) of diffusional change from one class of verbs to the next which her study envisages.

Ayumi Miura's chapter "*Me liketh/lotheth* but *I loue/hate*: Impersonal/non-impersonal boundaries in Old and Middle English" addresses impersonal constructions, one of the most extensively researched topics in English historical syntax (e.g., van der Gaaf 1904; Elmer 1981; Denison 1990, 1993: 61–102; Allen 1995; Möhlig-Falke 2012; Light and Wallenberg 2015; Miura 2015; Castro-Chao 2019, among many others). Miura (2015) investigated, with reference to ME, the range of factors determining the use of the verbs *like* and *loathe* as impersonal, as opposed to the use of *love* and *hate* as non-impersonal. In the present analysis Miura examines whether the generalisations made in her earlier study can be extended to the OE period, and to the near-synonymous phrasal impersonals *be/have lief* and *be loath*, which are usually neglected in the literature on impersonals, as pointed out by Denison (1990: 125). She shows, with data from several corpora, that causation is the most important factor for drawing the boundary between impersonal and non-impersonal predicates. The verbs *like* and *loathe* as well as the phrasal impersonals *be lief/loath* are all attested in both impersonal and causative constructions in OE and ME, whereas the non-impersonal verbs *love* and *hate* have apparently never been causative in their history. (14) is an example of the causative use of *be loath*, with the Cause argument appearing as nominative subject:

(14)   *seo ceorung*   ***is***   *swyðe **lað***   *Gode*
                  the murmuring   is   very loath   God-DAT
                  'the murmuring is very disgusting to God' (coaelive,ÆLS_[Pr_Moses];
                  quoted from Miura 2019: 181)

As regards *have lief*, which emerged in ME as a new phrasal impersonal, it is not attested in causative use, contrary to expectations, but Miura suggests, quite plausibly, that analogy with *be lief* "may have provided sufficient motivation for its impersonal use" (p. 189).

Laurel J. Brinton's chapter ("*That's luck, if you ask me*: The rise of an intersubjective comment clause") moves on to pragmatics, in a study that nicely ties in with McColm and Trousdale's analysis in Part I of the DM *whatever.* In previous work Brinton investigated the development into comment clauses of *if*-conditionals such as *if you will* (Brinton 2008), *if you choose/like/prefer/want/wish* (Brinton 2014), and *if I may say so* (Brinton 2017). In the present chapter she traces the related development of *if you ask me* from having a literal meaning in the protasis of a direct condition (*If you ask me, I'm required to give it*) to its use as a politeness marker attached to an expression of opinion or evaluation by the speaker (*Well, it is the trick of the trade, if you ask me*). Examples of *if you ask me* serving such a function are not attested until the late nineteenth century, but other members of the network of pragmaticalised *if*-conditionals examined by Brinton, such as *if I may say so*, appear fully formed as early as the sixteenth century. According to Brinton, the fact that in the history of English *if*-clauses repeatedly exhibit this process of change from content to procedural meaning, and from nonsubjective to (inter)subjective meaning, calls "for a better understanding of the construction in general" (p. 209). Of relevance here is recent work by Lastres-López (2020a; also 2020b: 50), who proposes a pragmaticalisation cline for *if*-clauses, based on data from English spoken discourse.

We turn now to Sylvia Adamson's contribution "Misreading and language change: A foray into qualitative historical linguistics," whose goal is "readjust[ing] the balance between quantitative and qualitative approaches" (p. 212) to the history of English. As a case study, she focuses on the relative pronoun system, which was subject to significant variability in the Early Modern English (EModE) period, prior to its regularisation during Late Modern English (LModE). She discusses at length the reactions from eighteenth-century grammarians to a passage in Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI* 3.2.161–165 where the relative *who* has a nonpersonal noun as antecedent (i.e., *the*

labouring heart, /Who […]), a usage which was common at the time (Fanego 2016: 188). Adamson's concluding observation that "the challenge for future researchers is to determine how far qualitative analysis can be methodised" (p. 233) is one which will appeal to all readers.

The last chapter in Part II ("The conjunction *and* in phrasal and clausal structures in the *Old Bailey Corpus*) is by Merja Kytö and Erik Smitterberg, who look at *and*-coordination in trial proceedings, as represented in two different periods (1753–1785; 1850–1881) of the *Old Bailey Corpus.* Their starting point is the finding in Biber *et al*. (1999: 81) that in PDE conversation, *and* tends to be a clause-level connector, while the opposite holds true for academic prose, where *and* is more typically used at the phrase level. Within these two categories of coordination, clausal and phrasal, Kytö and Smitterberg also include what they label *V and V* coordination, which they consider to be a subtype of the clausal uses. *V and V* coordination –more commonly referred to in the literature as 'pseudo-coordination' (e.g., Quirk *et al*. 1985: 978–979)– consists of "two movement verbs conjoined by *and* in a set pattern that […] could be understood to form one entity of action" (p. 240), for instance, in *I went and enquired in the places.* The data reveal two clear diachronic trends, both affecting "the two patterns that seem characteristic of orality in PDE" (p. 247), namely clausal coordination and *V and V* coordination. Clausal coordination becomes more frequent over time, a result which the authors interpret as indicating that trial proceedings may be incorporating rising numbers of oral features, as part of the process of colloquialisation (Mair 1997: 202–205) documented in other written genres in the modern period. The *V and V* pattern, in contrast, becomes much less frequent diachronically, so that the authors hypothesise "that such constructions were felt not to be suitable for a formal courtroom setting and thus increasingly avoided" (p. 247); this suggestion, however, is at odds with the fact that trial proceedings seem to have become more oral and colloquial, to judge from the growth in frequency of clausal coordination mentioned above. A search in the *Old Bailey Corpus* for V + infinitive sequences of the type *I **went see** one of the teachers, I **go get** the paper every morning*, etc. (see further Flach 2015) might have thrown light on the development of the *V and V* pattern itself: diachronic work by Bachmann (2013) and Ross (2018) shows that during LModE *V and V* coordinations steadily lost ground to V + infinitive combinations, as part of a process of increasing auxiliation.

2.3. Part III: Comparative and typological approaches

Part III comprises four chapters focusing on the comparison of British English with other varieties of English, and with Germanic and Romance languages. The first chapter, by Olga Fischer and Hella Olbertz, discusses "The role played by analogy in processes of language change: The case of English *have-to* compared to Spanish *tener-que.*" It offers an analysis of the development of the semi-modal *have-to*, which is compared to the Spanish construction with *tener-que*. The obligative semi-modal *have-to* is usually assumed to have gone through a slow grammaticalisation process involving various developmental stages (Krug 2000: 55–56): from a possession schema (*I have a letter*) to a possession schema + purpose/goal adjunct (*I have a letter to write*) to a final stage where *have-to* functions as a unit expressing the modal notion of obligation (*I have to write a letter*). In an earlier account of the origins of *have-to*, Fischer (1994) saw the word order change –whereby *have* and the *to*-infinitive became adjacent due to increased SVO order over the course of the ME period– as the only cause for the changes in *have-to*. In this chapter, as already noted in Fischer (2015), it is argued instead that the new construction with *have-to* was supported analogically by other ME constructions expressing necessity, notably constructions involving the verb NEED (e.g., *Me **nedith** not no lenger doon...* 'It is no longer necessary for me to do…') and verbo-nominal combinations of *have*, *be* and *must* with the noun *need* (e.g., *þei **had nede** to ride in þat contrey* 'they had a need to ride in that country'). These neighbouring constructions "all contributed to the 'necessity' meaning that *have-to* acquired […], a development that the traditional gradual semantic-pragmatic grammaticalisation account cannot really explain" (p. 260). Two studies directly relevant to the analysis of *have-to* presented in this chapter, but inexplicably not mentioned by the authors, are those by Loureiro-Porto (2009, 2010). These exhaustively trace the development, from early OE to the eighteenth century, of both the verb *need* and the synonymous verbo-nominal constructions *be/have need* and *be/have tharf*; *be/have tharf* combinations, which predate the phrasal patterns with the noun *need*, are very frequently attested (205 tokens) in Loureiro-Porto's data. The second part of Fischer and Olbertz's chapter presents the development of the Spanish modal construction *tener-que*, currently the most popular expression of necessity in Spanish; as in the case of English *have-to*, neighbouring possession-based periphrases (e.g., *haber/aver-de* 'have to') appear to have played an analogical role. In its emphasis on the importance of multiple sources in

the development of new constructions, this chapter is thus a nice follow-up to McColm and Trousdale's analysis, earlier in the volume, of the DM *whatever* as emerging out of several patterns that bolstered the new pattern via a formal or functional alignment.

In "Modelling step change: The history of *will*-verbs in Germanic" Kersti Börjars and Nigel Vincent look at the development of *will*-verbs on the basis of evidence from English, Danish, Dutch, Icelandic, and Swedish. All these languages have *will*-verbs that can be traced back to the Proto-Indo-European root **wel-* 'want, desire'. The chapter opens with a detailed description of the form and structure of the different *will*-verbs and of the categorial properties of their complements. After this the authors move on to meaning; in order to compare the semantics of *will* in the languages investigated, they use as a starting point the grammaticalisation cline in Bybee *et al*. (1994: 256), which envisages a development from Desire > Willingness > Intention > Prediction. In light of the evidence examined, Börjars and Vincent propose a reconceptualisation of the semantic connections as a three-stage cline of Desire > Intention > Prediction, with a "bifurcating diachronic route" (p. 302) from Desire to Willingness; this mirrors the fact that willingness is a meaning that naturally arises from any WANT verb, for instance English *want* (e.g., *Do you want to pass me the lunch menu?*), without necessarily developing further along the grammaticalisation path mentioned above. The observed changes are modelled within the theoretical framework of Lexical-Functional Grammar (Börjars and Vincent 2017).

Benedikt Heller and Benedikt Szmrecsanyi report on "Possessives world-wide: Genitive variation in varieties of English." This study, which complements Payne's study on genitive variation in Part I, combines the assumptions of Probabilistic Grammar (e.g., Bresnan 2007) with scholarship on World Englishes. The study addresses two questions: (a) the extent to which varieties of English have different grammars for genitive choice; and (b) what probabilistic constraints tend to make a difference across the varieties. Two genitive variants, the *s*-genitive and the *of*-genitive, are examined in nine different varieties of English from around the world: four Inner Circle varieties (Canada, Great Britain, Ireland, New Zealand), two advanced Outer Circle varieties (Jamaica, Singapore; see Schneider 2007) and three other Outer Circle varieties (Hong-Kong, India, Philippines). A key finding is that the *s*-genitive is more frequent in Inner Circle varieties than in L2 varieties of the Outer Circle. This difference is attributed to the well-known fact that contact varieties avoid synthetic structures, so

the hostility in Outer Circle varieties towards clitic *-s* may have to do with the mode of language acquisition in these varieties. As regards question (b) above, the varieties under scrutiny are found to fall into two groups: in Group 1 (British English, Indian English, Jamaican English, and Philippine English) possessor length appears to be the most important language-internal factor in genitive choice; in Group 2 (Canadian English, Hong-Kong English, Irish English, New Zealand English, and Singapore English) possessor animacy is the top-ranked constraint.

The final chapter in Part III and in the volume is also concerned with varieties of English. In "American English: No written standard before the Twentieth Century?" Christian Mair takes as a starting point Schneider's Dynamic Model (2007) for the emergence of new varieties of English. According to Schneider, American English is the only postcolonial variety which has fully completed the five stages of emancipation from British English which the Dynamic Model postulates. More specifically, the Spanish-American War of 1898, which resulted from a new sense of national self-confidence in the USA and signalled a growing willingness to play a role on the world stage, is taken by Schneider (2007: 291) as the boundary between Phase 4 (endonormative stabilisation) and Phase 5 (differentiation) of American English, with this latter phase thus covering the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Mair demonstrates, however, that Schneider's chronology of the emancipation of American English should be modified, and that the clear and consistent differentiation of British and American written standards has in fact to be placed "well into the twentieth century (and is in several instances still going on today)" (p. 337). This conclusion is supported by extensive evidence drawn from large and small corpora, and from linguistic features at the levels of orthography, morpholexis, and syntax. These include, among others, *-or/-our* (e.g., *color/colour*) and *-er/re* (e.g., *centre/centre*) spellings, the morpholexical variants *toward/towards* and *gotten/got*, and the complementation patterns of the verbs *help* and *prevent.* The chapter combines detailed philological analysis of the individual examples with the statistical profiling of large masses of text, an integrative approach in which David Denison has always excelled.

As I mentioned at the beginning, and despite the minor points I have raised throughout these pages, this carefully edited volume is an outstanding collection of papers that address major issues in the field of English syntax from both a synchronic

and diachronic perspective, and from a variety of methodological orientations, theoretical and applied. As such, it will no doubt attract the large readership it deserves.

REFERENCES

Aarts, Bas. 2007. *Syntactic Gradience: The Nature of Grammatical Indeterminacy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Allen, Cynthia L. 1995. *Case Marking and Reanalysis: Grammatical Relations from Old to Early Modern English.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bachmann, Ingo. 2013. Has *go*-V ousted *go-and*-V? A study of the diachronic development of both constructions in American English. In Hilde Hasselgård, Jarle Ebeling and Signe Oksefjell Ebeling eds. *Corpus Perspectives on Patterns of Lexis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 91–112.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English.* Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Börjars, Kersti and Nigel Vincent. 2017. Lexical-Functional Grammar. In Adam Ledgeway and Ian Roberts eds. *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 642–663.

Bresnan, Joan. 2007. Is syntactic knowledge probabilistic? Experiments with the English dative alternation. In Sam Featherston and Wolfgang Sternefeld eds. *Roots: Linguistics in Search of Its Evidential Base.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 75–96.

Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brinton, Laurel J. 2014. *If you choose/like/prefer/want/wish*: The origin of metalinguistic and politeness functions. In Marianne Hundt ed. *Late Modern English Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 271–290.

Brinton, Laurel J. 2017. *The Evolution of Pragmatic Markers in English. Pathways of Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Castro-Chao, Noelia. 2019. Changes in argument structure in Early Modern English with special reference to verbs of desire: A case study of *lust. Research in Corpus Linguistics* 7: 129–154.

Crisma, Paola. 2011. The emergence of the definite article in English: A contact-induced change? In Petra Sleeman and Harry Perridon eds. *The Noun Phrase in Romance and Germanic: Structure, Variation, and Change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 175–192.

Davies, Mark. 2017. *Early English Books Online. Part of the SAMUELS project.* https://www.english-corpora.org/eebo/

De Smet, Hendrik. 2009. Analysing reanalysis. *Lingua* 119/11: 1728–1755.

De Smet, Hendrik. 2013. *Spreading Patterns. Diffusional Change in the English System of Complementation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Denison, David. 1990. The Old English impersonals revived. In Sylvia Adamson, Vivien A. Law, Nigel Vincent and Susan Wright eds. *Papers from the 5ᵗʰ International Conference on English Historical Linguistics: Cambridge, 6–9 April 1987.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 111–140.

Denison, David. 1993. *English Historical Syntax: Verbal Constructions*. London: Longman.

Denison, David and Alison Cort. 2010. *Better* as a verb. In Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte and Hubert Cuyckens eds. *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 349–383.

Dreschler, Gea. 2015. *Passives and the Loss of Verb Second: A Study of Syntactic and Information-Structural Factors.* Utrecht: LOT Publications.

Elmer, Willy. 1981. *Diachronic Grammar: The History of Old and Middle English Subjectless Constructions*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Fanego, Teresa. 2016. Shakespeare's grammar. In Bruce R. Smith ed. *The Cambridge Guide to the Worlds of Shakespeare, Volume 1: Shakespeare's World 1500–1660.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 184–191.

Fischer, Olga. 1988. The rise of the *for NP to V* construction: An explanation. In Graham Nixon and John Honey eds. *An Historic Tongue: Studies in English Linguistics in Memory of Barbara Strang.* London: Routledge, 67–88.

Fischer, Olga. 1994. The development of quasi-auxiliaries in English and changes in word order. *Neophilologus* 78/1: 137–164.

Fischer, Olga. 2015. The influence of the grammatical system and analogy in processes of language change: The case of the auxiliation of have-*to* once again. In Fabienne Toupin and Brian Lowrey eds. *Studies in Linguistic Variation and Change: From Old to Middle English.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 120–150.

Flach, Susanne. 2015. *Let's go look at usage*: A constructional approach to formal constraints on *go*-VERB. In Peter Uhrig and Thomas Herbst eds. *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 231–252.

Hoffmann, Thomas. 2018. Review of Barðdal, Jóhanna, Elena Smirnova, Lotte Sommerer and Spike Gildea eds. 2015. *Diachronic Construction Grammar. Constructions and Frames* 10/1: 106–114.

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krug, Manfred. 2000. *Emerging English Modals. A Corpus-based Study of Grammaticalization.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lastres-López, Cristina. 2020a. Beyond conditionality: On the pragmaticalization of interpersonal *if*-constructions in English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 157: 68–83.

Lastres-López, Cristina. 2020b. Subordination and insubordination in Contemporary Spoken English: *If*-clauses as a case in point. *English Today* 36/2: 48–52.

Light, Caitlin and Joel Wallenberg. 2015. The expression of impersonals in Middle English. *English Language and Linguistics* 19/2: 227–245.

Los, Bettelou. 2005. *The Rise of the* To-*Infinitive*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loureiro-Porto, Lucía. 2009. *The Semantic Predecessors of* Need *in the History of English (c750–1710)*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Loureiro-Porto, Lucía. 2010. Verbo-nominal constructions of necessity with *þearf* n. and *need* n.: Competition and grammaticalization from OE to eModE. *English Language and Linguistics* 14/3: 373–397.

Lyons, Christopher. 1986. The syntax of English genitive constructions. *Journal of Linguistics* 22/1: 123–143.

Mair, Christian. 1997. Parallel corpora: A real-time approach to the study of language change in progress. In Magnus Ljung ed. *Corpus-Based Studies in English*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 195–209.

Miura, Ayumi. 2015. *Middle English Verbs of Emotion and Impersonal Constructions: Verb Meaning and Syntax in Diachrony*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Möhlig-Falke, Ruth. 2012. *The Early English Impersonal Construction: An Analysis of Verbal and Constructional Meaning*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Payne, John and Eva Berlage. 2014. Genitive variation: The niche role of the oblique genitive. *English Language and Linguistics* 18/2: 331–360.

Payne, John and Rodney Huddleston. 2002. Nouns and noun phrases. In Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey K. Pullum eds. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 323–523.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Reid, Dan. 2009. The great Festschrift makeover. *Addenda & Errata*. http://addenda-errata.ivpress.com/2009/03/the_great_festschrift_makeover.php (11 March, 2009.)

Rosenbach, Anette. 2002. *Genitive Variation in English: Conceptual Factors in Synchronic and Diachronic Studies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ross, Daniel. 2018. Small corpora and low-frequency phenomena: *Try and* beyond contemporary, standard English. *Corpus* 18: 1–40.

Schneider, Edgar W. 2007. *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sommerer, Lotte. 2015. The influence of constructions in grammaticalization. Revisiting category emergence and the development of the definite article in English. In Barðdal, Jóhanna, Elena Smirnova, Lotte Sommerer and Spike Gildea eds. *Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 107–137.

Sommerer, Lotte. 2018. *Article Emergence in Old English. A Constructionalist Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and Constructional Change.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van der Gaaf, Willem. 1904. *The Transition from the Impersonal to the Personal Construction in Middle English*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

van Gelderen, Elly. 2007. The definiteness cycle in Germanic. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 19/4: 275–308.

Van linden, An. 2015. Comparative modals: (Dis)similar diachronic tendencies. *Functions of Language* 22/2: 192–231.

Van de Velde, Freek. 2014. Degeneracy: The maintenance of constructional networks. In Ronny Boogaert, Timothy Colleman and Gijsbert Rutten eds. *Extending the Scope of Construction Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 141–179.

Warner, Anthony. 1982. *Complementation in Middle English and the Methodology of Historical Syntax. A Study of the Wyclifite Sermons*. London: Croom Helm.

Watanabe, Akira. 2009. A parametric shift in the D-system in Early Middle English: Relativization, articles, adjectival inflexion, and indeterminates. In Paola Crisma and Giuseppe Longobardi eds. *Historical Syntax and Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 358–374.

Reviewed by
Teresa Fanego
Facultade de Filoloxía
Universidade de Santiago de Compostela
Avda. de Castelao s/n
E-15782 Santiago de Compostela
Spain
e-mail: teresa.fanego@usc.es