SUÁREZ-GÓMEZ, Cristina 2006: *Relativization in Early English (950–1250): the Position of Relative Clauses*. Bern: Peter Lang. 149 pp.

The book under review is devoted to the phenomenon of relativisation in early stages of the English language. As suggested by the subtitle, the book is primarily concerned with the position of relative (here, adnominal) clauses in early English, considered with respect to the main clause. In addition, a number of intralinguistic and extralinguistic issues related to this central topic are discussed such as types of relative clauses, types of relativisers, relativisation strategies in different dialects and in different text types. The book consists of five parts: an introduction (Chapter 1), three major chapters (Chapters 2–4), and conclusions (Chapter 5).

By way of setting the scene for the discussion, Chapter 1 familiarises the reader with the scope of the study as well as its major aims. The author states that her aim is to consider the validity of the hypothesis that the development of relative clauses in English involved a change from extraposed structures, placed outside the main clause, to intraposed structures, placed inside the main clause and closely attached to the noun they modify. With this view in mind, she undertakes an examination of the data from two periods in which the change in question is hypothesised to have taken place, namely late Old English (i.e. 950–1050) and early Middle English (i.e. 1150–1250). The linguistic material which she uses is taken from *The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Diachronic and Dialectal* and embraces 518 examples from 19 texts (12 texts from late Old English and 7 texts from early Middle English).

In Chapter 2 the author provides some essential background regarding the phenomenon of relativisation in early English. Upon

defining relative clauses, she proceeds to discuss three specific relativisation strategies: pronominal (with the use of demonstrative pronouns *se, seo, þæt* or demonstrative pronouns plus indeclinable particles *seþe, seoþe, þætþe*), invariable (with the use of indeclinable relativisers *þe* or *þæt*), and a strategy without the use of overt relativisers. The three strategies are divided according to their degree of explicitness (Comrie 1981): pronominal relativisation counts as [+explicit], whereas relativisation by means of invariable and non-overt relativisers counts as [-explicit].

Chapter 3 reviews a selection of three approaches towards the development of relative clauses which have been proposed in the previous scholarship. The discussion starts with presenting the traditional Parataxis Hypothesis (O'Neil 1976), according to which relative clauses in Germanic evolved in three successive stages: parataxis (here, adjunction), NP topicalisation (here, pseudoembedding or left-dislocation with the use of a resumptive pronoun), and hypotaxis (here, embedding). Next, some space is devoted to the typological approach (Hock 1986, 1991), according to which relative clauses evolved in two stages, i.e. without the intermediate stage of NP topicalisation. Finally, a short outline is given of how the development of relatives has been rendered within the framework of grammaticalisation theory (Hopper & Traugott 2003).

Chapter 4 constitutes the empirical part of the study, in which the author presents the results yielded by the analysis of the corpus material. The obtained results are subsequently considered against the backdrop of the hypothesis, whereby the development of relative clauses involved a change from extraposed structures to intraposed (here, embedded) structures.

Taking the 'time' criterion as a major touchstone, the author shows that in the critical period between Old English and Middle English

there was indeed an increase in the ratio of embedded structures. Interestingly, this increase did not happen at the cost of extraposed structures but rather at the cost of left-dislocated structures. Apart from the 'time' criterion, a number of other criteria are taken into account and an attempt is made to relate them to the overall development of relativisation in the history of English. It turns out that these remaining criteria show some positive correlation with respect to the position occupied by relative clauses. It may be observed, for instance, that extraposed relative clauses tend to be introduced by [+explicit] relativisers (i.e. *se* and *seþe*), are usually of a non-restrictive type, have often objects as their antecedents (though in late Old English extraposed relatives with subject antecedents are also frequent), are relatively longer (and thus moved to the end of the clause, in tune with a principle of end-weight; Leech 1983), are favoured in homiletic texts (from both periods in question, which is taken to be indicative of conservativeness of homilies as a text type) and in texts from the Southern and Kentish dialects. By contrast, non-extraposed relatives (whether embedded or left-dislocated) tend to be introduced by [-explicit] relativisers (i.e. *þe* and *þat* [-agreement]), are usually of a restrictive type, have often subjects as their antecedents (at least in early Middle English), are relatively shorter (i.e. lighter), are favoured in religious treatises from early Middle English onwards (in late Old English this text type seems to favour extraposition) and in texts from East Midlands and West Midlands (the latter dialect patterns exceptionally in this respect because in terms of morphology and orthography it shows fairly conservative traits).

Finally, in Chapter 5 the author summarises the results of her study and formulates appropriate conclusions. This is followed by a rich list of references as well as an appendix containing the schema employed to code the data.

As for the critical evaluation, the volume under review deserves a number of flattering comments. One of its unquestionable virtues is a well-organised and clear presentation of the quantitative data. The author does her best to ensure that the reader is provided with a full set of statistics drawn from a meticulous corpus search. Numerous frequency tables and cross-tabulations are accompanied by comments which explain step by step the significance of the obtained results in the context of the central issue to which the book is devoted. Throughout, the language is lucid and devoid of redundancy.

Some minor imperfections of editorial nature may be pointed out, for instance, a wrong numeration of subchapters, some inconsistencies in calculations on p. 117 and p. 120 or typos (*Chapter 1* instead of *Chapter 2* on p. 20 or *morevover* instead of *moreover* on p. 123). It must be emphasised, though, that these oversights do not affect the value of the author's work as a whole.

All in all, Suárez-Gómez's contribution is a valuable source of information concerning the phenomenon of relativisation viewed from a diachronic perspective (for more results of the author's research into this topic see Suárez-Gómez 2005). The book can be recommended to everyone interested in the development of the English language, not only scholars but also less advanced readers.

Agnieszka Pysz
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

REFERENCES

Comrie, B. 1981: *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Elmer, H. A. & Hock, H. H. eds. *Stæfcræft. Studies in Germanic Linguistics*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.

Hock, H. H. 1986: Relative Clauses and Rebracketing in Old English. Paper presented at Germanic Linguistics II. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Hock, H. H. 1991: On the Origin and Development of Relative Clauses in Early Germanic, with Special Emphasis on *Beowulf*, in: Elmer, H. A. & Hock, H. H. eds. 54-89.

Hopper, P. & E. Traugott. 2003: *Grammaticalisation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Leech, G. 1983: *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman, London.

O'Neil, W. 1976: Clause Adjunction in Old English. *General Linguistics*, 17: 199-211.

Suárez-Gómez, C. 2005: Does Word-order Correlate with (Non-) Subordination? The Case of Relative Clauses in Early English. Paper presented at the 17th SELIM Conference. Universidade da Coruña.

৯৶