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manual is deficient in mostly editorial and typographic matters. Those readers in search of keys for the interpretation of English literature will put down her textbook more than satisfied.
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The book reviewed here is part of the series Studies in the History of Language Sciences, established as a companion to the journal Historiographia Linguística and contains thirteen papers. These papers are organised into four different sections. The first section is dedicated to the memory of the Austrian-born British scholar Thomas Frank and to his scientific and academic work. The second section includes three papers about the ‘History of the English Language’ based on literary texts. The author of the first paper, Susan Fitzmaurices, deals with the progressive aspect in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and with other related topics such as grammaticalisation and subjectivity. This paper offers an interesting insight into the origins and development of the progressive aspect during Old English besides providing a textual analysis of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Nicola Pantaleo, author of the second paper analyses the concept of wit in Piers Plowman through the dichotomy scientia/sapientia which he defines as ‘rational acquisition’ and ‘intuitive grasp of the truth’ respectively. The author also comments on some lexical associations with the terms wit and wisdom and provides a morphological classification (un-forms, root manipulation, affix-based and compound-based terms) of the vocabulary used in this literary work. The third paper of this section, ‘Relative Sentences in Middle English’ by Dieter Stein, is based on a syntactic analysis of relativisers in the Cely and Paston Letters. This article focuses on the change of relativisers from Old into Middle English, showing through several examples taken from these Letters how ‘pe’ was replaced by ‘that’ in the 13th century and finally by the wh-series of relativisers such as which, whom, whose and who. Stein focuses on the 15th century as most of the research done up to now concentrates on the later stages of the development of the English system of relativization. The author provides an in-depth analysis of over a thousand examples of relativisers in the Cely and Paston Letters, from which he concludes that the most important relativiser in both documents is ‘that’, closely followed by ‘which’. Stein also checks and examines the occurrences of three specific relativisers in both documents from the syntactic point of view, showing some interesting differences such as
the predominance of ‘that’ in the Cely corpus as a restrictive animate subject, whereas in the Paston Letters it usually plays the function of a restrictive inanimate object and that ‘who’ is mostly used as a subject in the Cely Letters as opposed to the Paston Letters, where it is used as a direct or oblique object. This author finally suggests that the widely accepted theory nowadays about the emergence of nominative ‘who’ as the last wh-item to enter the English language needs to be revised as it is not clear, according to him, that ‘who’ is the standard animate subject relativiser.

The third section (Part III) of the book deals with ‘Studies in the History of Linguistics’ and contains three articles. The first paper is about the interpretation of Historical sources focusing on ‘Word-order in English Rhetorical and Grammatical Treatises of the XVIth and Early XVIIth Centuries’. In this paper, Sornicola argues that different criteria are needed in order to analyse the diachrony and synchrony of a given language, as linguistic phenomena based on both synchrony and diachrony depends on ‘data interpretation’. She comments on how relevant rhetorical and grammatical works of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries are to the diachronical study of English Word Order. The author believes that Word Order in rhetorical treatises and grammars of this period cannot be considered a clearly-defined phenomenon without specific representations of the time. This way her paper criticises some of the conclusions previously reached by other scholars such as Kohonen and she even questions his approach. Sornicola analyses some treatises of that time such as Wilson’s The Arte of Rhetorique and others, and compares them with some Latin-based grammars such as the one written by Quintiliano. Sornicola’s conclusion is that both innovation and tradition are essential in the history of ‘descriptions’ of a language and that it is difficult to construct a diachronic typology as historical written sources do not always give direct answers to some essential questions on word order, flexibility, etc as opposed to a synchronic approach. In the second paper of this section, Gabriella Di Martino deals with the ‘New Science’ and the ‘New Language’ in Seventeenth Century England. Di Martino explains how the discovery of new territories and especially a new science affected the English Language and changed the prose written in the 17th century, when English had to struggle with Latin as the language of science. The initial approach of the author follows the traditional and sometimes excessively two-sided debate about the types of style used in England at that time: ‘the ornate sermon’ and ‘the plain and simple style’, and provides some features and names of famous scholars and institutions who participated in it: Bunyan, Bacon, Locke, Glanvill, The Royal Society, etc. This traditional view leads the author to assume that style had to focus on communication rather than expression. But the most interesting and relevant part of this paper comes at the end, when Di Martino provides an analysis, together with English examples of several linguistic processes traditionally used to solve the problem of lack of an appropriate terminology in science: nominalization, conversion, affixation, etc. The last paper takes us back to Saussure’s Cours de linguistique générale. E.F.K. Koerner reflects here on the comments made by Otto Jespersen about Sassurure’s book and compares the cultural and scientific background of both linguists, Jespersen and Saussure, as a clue to understand the criticism made by the first scholar about some of the ideas contained in the Cours, such as the distinction between
langue or system and parole or speech which Jespersen thought could not be clearly distinguished.

Finally, four papers make part of the last section of the book (Part IV), ‘Studies on History in Literary Texts’. In the first article, Stefano Manferloti deals with the figure of the director in Elizabethan theatre and focuses on *Macbeth*, providing several examples taken from this literary work where becomes evident the absence in Elizabethan theatre of a director in a modern sense as the whole text becomes a script and the actors have to perform spontaneously with just the directions implied throughout the text. In the second article, Uwe Baumann comments on the model set by Elyot in his book *Speculum Principis*, a model to be imitated by princes all over the world as represented in that book by Severus Alexander. The third paper deals with the images and metaphors about the union of England and Scotland taken from Ben Jonson’s *Hymenaei*. The author of this paper, Anna Cataldi, examines the role played by James I as a peacemaker between the English and the Scottish peoples and the images and metaphors about this union desired by the king between England and Scotland contained in Ben Jonson’s masque. In ‘How-to Literature’, the fourth and last paper, David Hart provides a brief outline of the history of medical texts written in the vernacular language from the 16th to the 19th centuries and compares the style and the expected audience of nine of them. Hart thus exemplifies the shift from the more personal narration and involved character of the 17th and 18th century texts to the more ‘information’ style of the 19th century ones. This shift is clearly manifested in the differences of clause structure between all those texts, with a progressive increase of nominalisation and different clause-structuring forms, predicative adjectives, etc.

This book contains a wide range of topics written by several scholars working in Historical Linguistics. The result is a collection of well documented papers, which provide plenty of examples and pave the way for future research on those topics. There is a General Index at the end of the book which, despite not being very extensive, has several keywords or entries that may be very useful for those who are only interested in some particular aspect. Students and scholars will find it very helpful as it is an excellent source of information on very specific aspects of Historical Linguistics and other related fields related, Comparative Linguistics, English Literature, etc.
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The book reviewed here represents a very interesting and relevant contribution to the field of text linguistics and text analysis from the systemic functional grammar perspective. The volume brings together a number of papers presented at the 7th International Systemic Functional Workshop held in Valencia, Spain, in July 1995. As the editors mention in the