

Tomasello, M.

2003 *Constructing a Language: A Usage-based Theory of Language Acquisition*.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tomasello, M. and K. Abbot-Smith

2002 A tale of two theories: A reply to Fisher. *Cognition* 83, 207–214.

Stefan Th. Gries and Anatol Stefanowitsch (eds.). *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics. Corpus-Based Approaches to Syntax and Lexis. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 172*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006, 352 pp., ISBN 978-3-11-019826-3. Paperback Euro [D] 36.95; US\$ 59.95.

Reviewed by Christina Sanchez-Stockhammer, Applied English Linguistics, University of Augsburg, Germany.

E-mail <christina.sanchez@phil.uni-augsburg.de>

1. Introduction

In the title of their book *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics*, the editors Stefan Th. Gries and Anatol Stefanowitsch conjoin two areas of linguistics whose combination does not immediately spring to mind: while cognitive linguistic research is usually based on tests and elicitation, corpora are more commonly used in other linguistic sub-disciplines such as syntax to describe particular patterns' distribution within texts. Yet even if corpus-based approaches have not enjoyed particular prominence in cognitive linguistics so far, as Gries maintains in his introduction, this highly recommendable book successfully demonstrates that the two aspects can usefully supplement each other.

The introduction also presents several assumptions underlying most or all of the papers in the volume:

- Cognitive Linguistics often makes reference to the way in which humans perceive, and interact with, the world.
- Linguistic knowledge is ultimately shaped by how language is actually put to use and the ways in which language use influences the representation and the processing of linguistic categories.
- There is no categorical difference between syntax and the lexicon.
- Syntactic arguments are routinely used to support semantic claims and vice versa.

Gries subdivides the nine papers into three different groups:

1. four papers (Divjak; Gries; Wulff; Hampe and Schönefeld) concerned with the semantic similarity of
 - (i) different words
 - (ii) different senses of a single word
 - (iii) words and different syntactic structures
2. three papers (Gilquin; Hollmann; Newman and Rice) concerned with how different aspects of causation and transitivity are manifested linguistically
3. two papers (Lemmens; Schönefeld) on the role of image schemas in cognitive linguistics and their corpus-based exploration.

2. Summaries of chapters

The first paper, “Ways of intending: Delineating and structuring near-synonyms” by Dagmar Divjak, attempts to shed light on the internal structure of a series of Russian near-synonyms. In order to determine how semantic information is divided between grammar and lexicon and which aspects of lexeme-specific meaning reside in constructional slots and collocational preferences, she studies near-synonyms yielded by elicitation tests with native speakers of Russian. In contrast to Western studies on synonymy, which often use diagnostic frames of the type *He was killed but I can assure you that he was not murdered*, Divjak follows the Russian line of research, which relies on a metalanguage made up of primitives that allow the comparison of different lexemes. She studies how three parameters along which verbs combining with an infinitive vary can be used to differentiate between the intentional verbs *planirovat’* ‘plan’, *dumat’* ‘intend, think (of)’, *namerevat’sja* ‘intend, mean’ and *sobirat’sja* ‘intend, be about’. Divjak finds that *planirovat’* differs from the other three verbs in that it can be combined both with an infinitive or a nominal object, whereas the situations expressed by *dumat’*, *namerevat’sja* and *sobirat’sja* cannot exist without a second process. The same groupings come about if usage with *that*-complement constructions and temporal distance between the events expressed by the finite verb and the infinitive are considered. Divjak concludes that in contrast to the full-fledged activity of planning, intending is an impulse to carry out an action that cannot occur at a time different from the intended action. On the basis of her findings, she excludes *planirovat’* from the group of near-synonyms and restricts the term *near-synonymy* to lexemes that show constructional similarity, whereas the term *semantically close verbs* is suggested for semantically similar but constructionally divergent verbs. For the second

part of her research, Divjak uses the sixteen-million-word section of the Amsterdam corpus containing 20th-century Russian literature to encode a total of 47 parameters for each of the Russian finite verbs *xotet'*, *dumat'*, *sobirat'sja* and *namerevat'sja*. Among these so-called ID tags (Atkins 1987: 23), which combine to form a *behavioral profile* (Hanks 1996: 79) are e.g. the correlation of aspect, mode and tense of the finite verb with the aspect of the infinitive and semantic paraphrases of the subject and infinitive (e.g. classification as *non-animate* or *physical activity* respectively). In total, the impressive number of 37,271 manually coded data points is submitted to Hierarchical Agglomerative Clustering; revealing that intention is typically displayed by human beings and concerns physical, mental and communicative activities. A comparison of the dendrogram computed on the basis of all values for all sentences and that obtained by using the formal makeup and frequency of the constructional slots only shows that the two structures are nearly identical—thus testifying to the importance of constructional similarity in the treatment of synonyms. In her concluding summary, Divjak formulates the need to supplement her linguistic data with cognitive data and suggests elicitation tests with native speakers to determine “how precisely the linguistic structure of a concept relates to the cognitive structure” (48).

Stefan Th. Gries, in his contribution “Corpus-based methods and cognitive semantics: The many senses of *to run*”, also uses ID-tags and clustering methods. He attempts to bridge the gap between corpus linguistics and cognitive linguistics by demonstrating how the former can be used in researching the latter. After a brief review of some cognitive-linguistic and corpus-based approaches, he introduces the two lexicographic approaches upon which his research relies most, namely the above-mentioned Atkins (1987) and Hanks (1996)—even though he is aware of the fact that clustering techniques only represent a very abstract idealization of the actual cognitive processes that underlie sense identification and distinction. In the empirical part of his paper, he discusses the 391 instances of *to run* from the British component of the International Corpus of English (ICE-GB) and their 424 equivalents from the American English Brown Corpus. These 815 citations are annotated with respect to 252 ID tags, yielding approximately 200,000 data points. The lexeme senses are identified manually, mainly on the basis of dictionaries and WordNet. Three subsections introduce the different uses of *to run* in intransitive, transitive and more idiomatic constructions. The various meanings are linked to each other by more or less convincing metaphors or other patterns of extension. As a cognitively-oriented approach would predict, most of the transitive uses are related to the intransitive uses by a transformation process, but unfortunately there is no discussion of the role played by par-

ticles such as *off*, *away* etc., which combine with *run* to form some of its many senses. For instance, the ‘to meet unexpectedly’ meaning present in *I ran into Pete* may be rather closely tied to the presence of the particle. The most important part of Gries’ paper consists of several case studies, such as the search for the prototypical sense of *to run*. Since ‘motion’ is the sense from which most other senses can be derived most economically in a radial network figure, one may be misled into attributing prototypical status to it. However, both general corpus data and the behavioral profile of *to run* indicate nearly unanimously that the most central sense is actually ‘fast pedestrian motion’. This finding is further supported by the fact that this is the earliest attested sense of *to run* both in individual language acquisition and in the history of the English language. In addition, this sense has the largest number of differently headed prepositional phrases and different ID tag attributes and is thus least marked. Gries concludes that this proves the utility of corpus data for prototype identification. He also demonstrates that corpus-based evidence can help to address the notoriously problematic issue whether two different citations represent distinct senses or merely modulations of a more general meaning: since there are many instances of *to run* with the meaning ‘fast pedestrian motion’ where both source and goal of the movement are present, one can argue that occurrences with only one of these two arguments should be lumped together. Corpus evidence can also be an aid in determining where a particular sense should be connected in a network, in the clustering of related word senses and in automatic sense identification. Gries therefore concludes that a behavioral profile is the most rewarding starting point for many cognitive-linguistic issues.

Stefanie Wulff’s paper “*Go-V* vs. *go-and-V* in English: A case of constructional synonymy?” addresses the question whether the English double verb pattern *go-V* (*Go find the books and show me*) is actually a truncated form of the superficially similar *go-and-V* (*I go and check the drinks*), as generative approaches have previously claimed, or whether this is not the case, as more functionally oriented researchers such as Shopen (1971) have argued in view of the much tighter semantic linkage between the two verbs in the constructions without *and*. If *go-V* were actually derived from *go-and-V*, one would expect the verbs that can be inserted into the shorter *go-V* pattern to be identical to or a subset of those used in the longer *go-and-V* pattern. Wulff follows a construction-based approach, and following Goldberg’s (1995) *Principle of No Synonymy*, which maintains that two syntactically distinct constructions must be semantically or pragmatically distinct, she expects that a significant number of verbs should occur in only one of the two constructions but not in the other, and that it should be possible to differentiate between these two groups of verbs with

respect to their semantics, thereby legitimating *go-V*'s and *go-and-V*'s status as constructions in their own right. Her research is based on 5,320 instances of *go-and-V* and 454 instances of *go-V* from the British National Corpus (BNC) comprising 492 and 115 different verb types respectively. These verbs are classified according to Vendler's (1967) *aktionsarten*, which distinguish whether the action described by the verbs extends in time or not and whether the verbs have a culmination associated with them at which a change of state takes place. In addition, the verbs are classified according to Levin's (1993) more fine-grained classification scheme comprising 49 different semantic classes, such as verbs of putting, image creation verbs etc. The application of Gries' (2001) ESCO analysis (=Estimation of Significant Collocate Overlap) reveals a significant overlap between the two constructions. As *go-and-V* shares far fewer of its collexemes (17.9%) with *go-V* than vice-versa (44.4%) and thus has a stronger individual identity, one can plausibly assume that the shorter pattern, which exhibits higher overlap, is derived from the longer pattern. However, the semantics of the two constructions are not identical, as a colostruational analysis reveals: *go-and-V* predominantly combines with verbs denoting accomplishments and achievements, such as *check* and *find*. This can be explained by the assumption that the construction is inherently dynamic with *go* initiating an event and the V_2 slot being filled with compatible information that describes the fulfillment of the action. When stative verbs occur in a *go-and-V* slot, they take on a more dynamic reading, e.g. *see*, which can be paraphrased as 'visit' in a sentence such as *I might go and see Aunt Violet*, whereas *go-V* rather prefers verbs that are already dynamic in their more prototypical senses. The fact that verbs relating to cleaning and bodily hygiene, such as *tidy* and *shower*, occur exclusively with *go-and-V*, and that *go-V* preferably takes atelic process verbs, adds further emphasis to the conclusion that the two constructions have different semantic profiles and are not truncated surface variants of each other.

The title of Beate Hampe and Doris Schönefeld's paper "Syntactic leaps or lexical variation?—More on 'Creative Syntax'" provides a link to their 2003 article "Creative syntax", in which they started to explore the syntactic creativity that can be observed when verbs are used with an argument structure that is more typically associated with that of other verbs. For instance, *bore* in *She bored them stupid* exhibits an extended verbal meaning and an unusual syntactic structure which could be said to be inherited from the verb *make*, thus representing what they call *syntactic blending* in analogy to the morphological phenomenon. The unusual, quasi-borrowed structure triggers the retrieval of at least one other verbal concept, thus serving as an iconic clue. Their suggestions diverge

from Goldberg's (1995) fusion model in the role they attribute to the ASC (argument-structure construction), namely as "a trigger to the activation of another verb (/class) as input to a blending process" (130). In the first part of their research, they carry out a collexeme analysis of all complex-transitive ASCs with adjectival object complements in ICE-GB to determine which verbs instantiate this construction significantly more frequently than would be expected on the basis of pure chance. The resulting 766 verb tokens yield 45 different verb types, of which *make*, *find* and *keep* turn out to be most closely associated with the construction in question. The use of *fear* in constructions such as *student feared drowned* is considered creative because emotion verbs do not normally denote this type of scenario with an attributive sense, but nonetheless as motivated, as the aspect of fear is so salient in a situation where someone is considered to be dead, and as the coercion power of the attributive verb class is seemingly strong enough to ascertain the correct interpretation. In the second part of their research, they follow the opposite perspective by checking all occurrences of the supposedly creative verbs *encourage*, *support*, *bore* and *fear* for unusual syntactic realizations in the BNC and by calculating the collocation strength between the verbs and the lexical heads of the complementing phrases. The instantiations of these verbs in complex-transitive patterns with prepositional phrases (caused-motion constructions) and adjectival phrases (resultative constructions) turn out to be rare and creative to various degrees. Interestingly, the original spatial motivation of the *to*-infinitive reappears in cases such as *to encourage birds to the garden*. The majority of the prepositions used with *encourage* are goal-directed, and the directional adverbials in constructions with the gerund (e.g. *friends often encourage each other into taking the drugs*) serve as metaphorical goals. By contrast, *support* is sometimes also used in a literal meaning (*he supported him out through the theatre door*), and all prepositions in its metaphorical uses are complemented by noun phrases denoting some sort of crisis. The use of *bore* with adjectival and prepositional phrases is clearly more entrenched than in the other verbs under consideration. Instances such as *X bore Y to tears/death* and *X bore Y stiff* can even be recognized as fixed expressions. *Fear* appears in the attributive pattern in less than one per cent of its occurrences, and only in the passive voice. Based on their observation that the newly acquired argument-slots of the creatively used verbs underlie strong collocational restrictions and that there are particularly strong master collocations, Hampe and Schönefeld hypothesize that syntactic creativity may originate in fully lexical and highly local processes of analogical variation, whereby the lexical manipulation of master collocations results in the observed "syntactic leaps" from one ASC to another.

While cognitivists tend to consider the prototype as the most salient exemplar of a category, corpus linguists often equate it with the most frequently attested item in a corpus. Gaëtanelle Gilquin's paper "The place of prototypicality in corpus linguistics: Causation in the hot seat" sets out to test whether these two assumptions really coincide with respect to English periphrastic causative constructions (e.g. *He makes me laugh*). She distinguishes two aspects of prototypicality in causative constructions: the ordering and nature of the participants. Following the principle of iconic sequencing (Haiman 1985), the most likely ordering of the participants in a periphrastic causative construction should reflect their ordering along the action chain and thus be CAUSER (the head, which transmits its energy), CAUSEE (which can consume the energy or transmit it further) and PATIENT (which absorbs the energy). Gilquin then outlines two other major cognitive models of prototypical causation: in the billiard-ball model, a "single, specific, physical CAUSER transmits energy to a single, specific, physical CAUSEE, which can absorb the energy or transmit it further to a single, specific, physical PATIENT" (164). Gilquin also adapts Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) model of direct manipulation for application to periphrastic causative constructions: "A single, definite, human CAUSER manipulates a single, definite, human CAUSEE, distinct from the CAUSER, into producing a volitional and material EFFECT, which can affect, or not, a single, definite and distinct PATIENT" (166). Based on Mair's (1994) observation that corpus examples reveal the "basic non-discreteness of categories", Gilquin points out that "it seems as if, almost by definition, corpus data reflect the cognitive notion of prototypicality" (168)—but then shows that several studies fail to prove the coincidence between salience and frequency. The empirical part of her paper is based on a subcorpus from the BNC containing 5 million words of spoken and written English respectively. All 3,574 constructions with the main periphrastic causative verbs (*cause*, *get*, *have* and *make*) are analysed according to the parameters of the three models. Gilquin's analyses, which rely on a strict definition of prototypicality (according to which prototypical members should manifest all features) show that the models presented in the literature only account for some 45% of all constructions, with the direct manipulation and the billiard-ball model accounting for merely 5% and 0.06% of the data respectively. As some properties, such as definiteness of the CAUSER, are quite common in *make* constructions, while others (e.g. volitionality of the EFFECT) are fairly infrequent and thus represent a bottleneck, acceptance of a looser definition of prototypicality, in which it is enough for the prototype to possess the greatest number of features, changes the picture somewhat. The medium also plays a role: there is a tendency for speech to come closer to prototypicality than

writing. Nonetheless, the discrepancy between the literature and the corpus data calls for an explanation—which Gilquin provides in the form of several hypotheses, e.g. that the models proposed in the literature may not be appropriate for the description of periphrastic causative constructions or that there is no such thing as prototypical causation. She concludes that the notion of prototypicality is far from straightforward and requires further investigation.

Just like Gilquin’s paper, Willem Hollmann’s contribution to the volume deals with periphrastic causatives. However, he focuses on their passivisability—as reflected in his title “Passivisability of English periphrastic causatives”. Based on the observation that some causatives (e.g. *make*) passivise (*Recruits were made to hop on the spot*), while others (e.g. *have*) do not (**Recruits were had to hop on the spot*), and yet others, such as *get*, are somewhere in between, he studies the connection between the passivisability of causatives and differences in meaning. His underlying assumptions are

1. that properties of transitivity featuring significantly more frequently in passive than active constructions with *make* as the least specific causative should also typically be present in other passivable causatives, and
2. that passive *make* will tend to be used for situations which are conceptually highly transitive.

Hollmann modifies Hopper and Thompson’s (1980) approach to transitivity to make it more suitable for the treatment of causatives. Examples of *make* in all its morphological shapes are extracted from the written part of the BNC and reduced to 400 constructions (100 tense-aspect combinations with active/passive and simple present/simple past each). These are then encoded with respect to the parameters of causality (full affectedness is maximally transitive), aspect (where the scales remain unchanged) and directness (presence of unity of time and space is maximally transitive). On the basis of his results, Hollmann formulates several implicational hierarchies of transitivity/passivisability of causatives with respect to the above-mentioned dimensions, which are possibly universal, e.g. “If a language allows passivisation of causative constructions towards the lower, less transitive end of the causation type scale then constructions toward the higher, more transitive end of the scale will also be passivable (all other things being equal)” (213). He finds that *get*, *have* and *persuade* prototypically portray inductive causation and are thus highly transitive, whereas *cause* is on the other end of this dimension and *force* and *make* are somewhere in the middle. Hollmann concludes that not all parameters may be equally important in determining the degree of transitivity.

The link between Hollmann and the contribution by Newman and Rice is provided by the phenomenon of transitivity. Their paper “Transitivity schemas of English EAT and DRINK in the BNC” investigates when and why the relatively basic verbs *eat* and *drink* enter into diathesis alternations, i.e. alternations in the syntactic expressions of arguments, such as the valency difference between *She ate an apple* and *She ate*, the first of which is *transitive* according to the traditional terminology because it has a direct object, and the second of which lacks such an object and is called *intransitive*. They find that overt valency is strongly tied to the verbs’ TAM (tense/aspect/mode) marking, the person/number/specificity of their subject and the semantic properties of their collocates. Newman and Rice do not assume these constructions to be derived from each other but rather regard them as worthy of study in their own right. In their discussion of unexpressed objects (an idea which they do not find compelling), they mention grammatical models by Huddleston (1988), Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Van Valin and LaPolla (1997) but not the valency model (cf., e.g., Herbst and Götz-Votteler 2007). Newman and Rice also refer to Hopper and Thomson’s model of transitivity when they draw attention to the fact that the presence or absence of an object is not the only relevant factor in considering the transitivity of a clause, but only one among ten parameters. In total, they examine 7,557 examples of the two lemmas from the spoken and written BNC and code them for source corpus, part of speech, inflectional class, and existence of a direct object. The subject noun phrases are in addition subclassified as specified or unspecified. They find a clear preponderance of EAT over DRINK in both modalities and conclude that this combined with priority of EAT in sequential ordering indicates experiential salience. Furthermore, DRINK is used intransitively proportionally more often than EAT. The specific interpretation of the former is ‘alcoholic beverage’, that of the latter ‘meal’. Newman and Rice also find that there are preferences for (in)transitive usage linked to particular inflections, e.g. a preference for intransitive use of EAT with 1st and 3rd person plural, which may be due to the fact that it is more natural for one person to eat a specific item of food than for a whole group. While intransitive usage of DRINK is associated with excessive consumption in lexicographic practice, they find that the idea of excessiveness is also salient in the object phrases of transitive uses of the verb—which they find worthy of inclusion in dictionaries. They conclude by developing Tomasello’s (1992) notion of a *verb island* further and by proposing the notion of an *inflectional island*. By this they understand that “syntactic/semantic properties tend to inhere in individual inflections of a verb in a register-specific manner” (255) and may not characterise the lemma as a whole.

Maarten Lemmens' paper "Caused posture: Experiential patterns emerging from corpus research" attempts to lay out the semantic network of Dutch causative posture verbs and to reveal their motivation. Historically, the Dutch cardinal posture verbs *zitten* 'sit', *liggen* 'lie' and *staan* 'stand' have the causative counterparts *zetten* 'set', *leggen* 'lay' and *stellen* 'put upright', to which they are related by systematic vowel alternation. Yet the paradigm has changed: *stellen* has been lost as the causative of *staan* (except in some mostly metaphorical usages), *zetten* fills this gap, and some paradigm-external verbs such as *steken*, *stoppen* and *doen* have taken over some of the meanings of *zetten* instead. His analysis of 7,550 sentences containing the above-mentioned verbs is based on two subcorpora from the *Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie's* corpus of Dutch comprising some 24.9 million words—predominantly Northern Dutch texts in the written register (for *doen* Google searches were carried out due to corpus restrictions). In line with the basic assumptions of Cognitive Grammar, he assumes that *liggen*, *zitten* and *staan* are each structured around a prototype, namely the three basic human positions, which are "experiential clusters" (Newman 2002) of attributes, and that their extended uses (which are actually more frequent in the corpus) can be explained by drawing on image schemata based on our everyday experience of these actions. In spite of their frequent mention in school grammars, the dimensions of horizontality and verticality turn out to be only secondary factors. The notion of horizontality plays a more important role for *liggen/leggen* than for *staan/zetten*. *Zitten* is often used to express the location of people without any trace of posture; the two subgroups (i) close contact and (ii) containment can be distinguished. The first of these may take *zetten* as the causative, but usually, more specific verbs with a meaning such as 'stick', 'nail' or 'hang' are used. Containment-*zitten* does not take causative *zetten*, but rather uses *steken* (which is associated with the partial containment of elongated objects in a container that is created by typically forceful insertion of the objects), *stoppen* (which is associated with the full containment of symmetrical or shapeless objects in pre-existing containers) and *doen* (the general activity verb 'do'). However, these uses seem to be subject to regional variation: in Belgian Dutch, *steken* has extended its use to full containment of non-elongated figures. Nonetheless, *zetten* can be said to be the default placement verb in modern Dutch, whose meaning has generalised to 'put an entity in its canonical position'—even if it is not as general as English *put*. It is also used to refer to people who are controllable and transplanted, e.g. fugitives who are expelled from a country. With standing being the most functional posture and also the start position for walking, *zetten* constructions often have an inchoative value.

Doris Schönefeld, in her paper “From conceptualization to linguistic expression: Where languages diversify”, further elaborates the notion of image schemas, i.e. “pre-conceptual representations of human bodily experience” (298) which can be assumed to be more or less universal. She analyses the collocations of the English, Russian and German posture verbs SIT, STAND and LIE in order to infer the habitual ways of conceptualisation in the different speech communities. She cites the example *Salz und Pfeffer stehen auf dem Tisch*—literally, German salt and pepper STAND on the table, while they SIT on it in English—and concludes that there is no predictable link as to what people understand to SIT, STAND or LIE, even if post-hoc motivations for the respective uses can usually be found. She assumes that though identical image schemas (BALANCE, VERTICALITY, CENTER-PERIPHERY, RESISTANCE, LINKAGE, CONTACT, COMPULSION, SUPPORT, SURFACE, FORCE, COUNTERFORCE, OBJECT, ENABLEMENT, COMPLEXITY) are used, they differ with regard to their salience in the languages under consideration. Each posture must be associated with two different image-schema profiles that combine these features, namely one from the point of view of the entity in a particular posture, and the other from the perspective of a potential viewer. Very often, the use of these verbs is extended from their prototypical use with human posture to other uses. For the empirical part of her paper, Schönefeld searches roughly 3 million words of English, German and Russian newspaper text from the BNC, the COSMAS corpus and Russian Internet corpora for occurrences of the three posture verbs. She finds that the German data contain significantly more occurrences of *stehen* ‘stand’ and *liegen* ‘lie’ than the other languages because of the German verbs’ frequent occurrences in non-literal senses. She explains the fact that SIT is strongly dispreferred with abstract objects as trajectors by a metaphorical mapping which results in the ad-hoc personification of abstract scenarios, giving them a human touch, e.g. in the example *music that would sit well in the Palm Court or the pier pavilion*. She deduces tentatively from the corpus data that

for SIT and (less so) for STAND, human posture serves as the source domain in metaphorical mappings to other concrete and particularly abstract domains, whereas in the case of LIE (and less so for STAND), the extensions seem to start out from the more abstract, though still concrete spatial concept of a horizontally elongated object (311).

In contrast to Newman (2001), who finds that the preposition occurring most frequently with the posture verbs is ON, Schönefeld’s results show the strongest preference for IN, but ON is also significantly preferred, so that both can be considered conceptually closer to the posture verbs than

other prepositions—even if, in general, the posture verbs do not enter the same kinds of collocation. Thus, the scene of sitting at a desk with books to read uses the preposition OVER in English and German (*to sit over the books*), but BEHIND in Russian. In these cases, two distinct image schemas—FRONT-BACK and NEAR-FAR—are foregrounded for the specification of the landmark with respect to the trajector. Schönefeld thus finds her claim corroborated that speech communities construe scenes differently by highlighting particular image schemas.

3. Critical evaluation and conclusion

Everybody who has edited a collection of papers knows how difficult it is to bring them into a reasonable structure. Gries and Stefanowitsch have succeeded well in this respect. For instance, the adjacent papers by Divjak and Gries involve a similar methodology, namely clustering, Lemmens and Schönefeld consider the same posture verbs from different angles, and there are enough cross-references in the book to make it appear a unified whole. In addition, all throughout the book, Gries is mentioned as an inspiration and help, particularly with statistical methods. He also contributed one article and the introduction. In spite of his presumably very significant contribution to the creation of the book, Stefanowitsch, the second editor, has only left few explicit traces, e.g. when he is referred to in the contributors' papers or in the reference sections.

On the whole, well-readable papers predominate in the volume. The book is not only very appealing because it presents many examples and visualises information in comprehensible figures and tables, but also very inspiring in that it introduces a vast range of statistical methods that can be applied in linguistic research. The research projects described in the book demonstrate that the corpus-linguistic techniques developed by Gries and Stefanowitsch can be fruitfully applied to research questions other than those for which they were originally used.

The reader is soon convinced that corpus-based research can make quite an important contribution to advances in cognitive linguistic research. However, Gries explicitly states that he does not advocate using corpus evidence alone; that it “can complement different research methodologies such as (psycho-)linguistic experiments, but it should not replace them” (87). In the same vein, more than one paper ends with the conclusion that the results obtained on the basis of corpus data should be corroborated by experimental evidence (e.g. Hampe and Schönefeld), and there are thus several papers presenting linguistic data that must be regarded as the basis for subsequent cognitive research rather than cognitive papers in the strictest sense (e.g. Wulff's extremely interesting article).

However, another expectation raised in the introduction, namely that syntax and the lexicon would be viewed from a holistic perspective, is fulfilled: several of the papers discuss phenomena on the borderline between these two traditional areas of linguistics.

I would also like to point out the laudable fact that a book with such a general title does not confine itself to the description of the lingua franca of the Western world alone, but that languages other than English are also treated in the research papers, e.g. Russian, German and Dutch.

During my reading, critical questions emerged from time to time—but they seem to have been anticipated by the authors, as they were convincingly addressed in the very next sentences. My only real criticism is that a considerable number of typographic mistakes have been overlooked in the volume—most notably, there are two that may even hinder understanding and/or transmit an erroneous content, namely *bore* instead of *bored* (128, 136) and German *stehen* instead of *legen* (262). The paper by Lemmens in particular could have been proofread more carefully in order to supplant *staan* by *stand*, *stoel* by *stool* etc. Also, some references are missing—e.g. those to Atkins (1987) and Johnson (1987) in Schönefeld's and Divjak's bibliographies. Yet that the heaviest criticism consists in such minor formal details speaks for itself, so that I can recommend the book wholeheartedly to any linguists working with corpora and/or in the domain of cognitive linguistics.

In his introduction, Stefan Th. Gries formulates his hope

that the methods and results introduced in this volume—many of them fairly new to the cognitive-linguistic community—will (i) stimulate new research questions and studies and (ii) help to set the stage for a major methodological paradigm shift in the direction of corpus work, which will hopefully yield increasingly objective and usage-based results.

This almost missionary zeal permeates practically all the articles. The numerous references that are made to R scripts which are freely available from Stefan Th. Gries—some even with direct reference to his internet site (which has moved to <http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/faculty/stgries/>) at the time of writing this review)—act as a further encouragement to pursue this new line of cognitive linguistic research.

Only time will tell whether the volume will indeed succeed in causing a paradigm shift in cognitive linguistics—but in any case, it would deserve to do so.

References

- Atkins, Beryl T. Sue
 1987 Semantic ID tags: Corpus evidence for dictionary senses. *Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference of the UW Centre for the New Oxford English Dictionary*, 17–36.
- Goldberg, Adele E.
 1995 *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gries, Stefan Th.
 2008 Homepage <<http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/faculty/stgries/>> [24 February 2009].
- Gries, Stefan Th.
 2001 A corpus-linguistic analysis of *-ic* and *-ical* adjectives. *ICAME Journal* 25, 65–108.
- Haiman, John
 1985 Symmetry. In Haiman, John (ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax. Proceedings of a Symposium on Iconicity in Syntax. Stanford, June 24–26, 1983*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 73–95.
- Hampe, Beate and Doris Schönefeld
 2003 Creative syntax. Iconic principles within the symbolic. In Müller, W. G. and O. Fischer (eds.), *From Sign to Signing. Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Iconicity in Language and Literature*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 245–263.
- Hanks, Patrick
 1996 Contextual dependency and lexical sets. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 1(1), 75–98.
- Herbst, Thomas and Katrin Götz-Votteler (eds.)
 2007 *Valency: Theoretical, Descriptive and Cognitive Issues*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hopper, Paul and Sandra A. Thompson
 1980 Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56, 251–299.
- Huddleston, Rodney
 1988 *English Grammar: An Outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.)
 2002 *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson
 1980 *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, Beth
 1993 *English Verb Classes and Alternations. A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Mair, Christian
 1994 Is *see* becoming a conjunction? The study of grammaticalisation as a meeting ground for corpus linguistics and grammatical theory. In Fries, Udo, Gunnel Tottie, and Peter Schneider (eds.), *Creating and Using English Language Corpora. Papers from the Fourteenth International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora, Zürich 1993*. Amsterdam, GA: Rodopi, 127–137.
- Newman, John
 2001 A corpus-based study of the figure and ground in *sitting*, *standing*, and *lying* constructions. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 36, 203–216.

- Newman, John
2002 A cross-linguistic overview of the posture verbs ‘sit’, ‘stand’, and ‘lie’.
In Newman, John (ed.), *The Linguistics of Sitting, Standing, and Lying*.
Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–24.
- Shopen, Timothy
1971 Caught in the act. *CLS* 7, 254–263.
- Tomasello, Michael
1992 *First Verbs: A Case Study of Early Grammatical Development*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr., and Randy J. LaPolla
1997 *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univer-
sity Press.
- Vendler, Zeno
1967 *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Gitte Kristiansen, Michel Achard, René Dirven, and Francisco J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (eds). *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006, 499 pp., ISBN 978-3-11-018951-3. Paperback Euro [D] 24.95; US\$ 36.95.

Reviewed by Guy Achard-Bayle, Paul Verlaine University, Metz, France.
E-mail <guy.achardbayle@wanadoo.fr>

Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspective is the first work appearing (in 2006) in a new series of works published by Mouton de Gruyter: *Applications of Cognitive Linguistics (ACL)*. Since that time eight other titles have been added to the series, the third of which, for example, *Ethnopragmatics*, edited by Cliff Goddard also in 2006, indicates how we are to understand “applications” in the series’ title, and in the title of the work I am reviewing.

In this review I shall proceed in four stages: firstly an overview of the publication, corresponding with the creation of a series; next I shall present an analysis of the whole summary and the contributions; after that, a selective and deeper analysis of a few passages or chapters; and finally my appreciation or assessment.

1. We must understand the term “applications” as all the domains which illustrate the theoretical foundations of cognitive linguistics (CL); and we must understand these “domains” both as fields of application and as connected disciplines within linguistics: for example the teaching and learning of foreign languages, signed language, etc.

The editors indeed start from the premise that theoretical CL has developed over the last twenty to thirty years on the basis of a restricted num-