## Ai Inoue
### *Present-Day Spoken English: A Phraseological Approach*
#### Kaitakusha, Tokyo 2007, pp. 271

Although research on phraseology has gained in popularity over last years, it should be emphasized that analyses of spoken language, which forms the centre of the stylistic system of any natural language, are not too frequent, even in the case of the English language, which is the contemporary *lingua franca*, so – one can assume – a well-studied language. Analyzing spoken English is a difficult task for a number of reasons, for instance, scarcity of material and methodological problems, to name but a few. Therefore, the book by Ai Inoue, *Present-Day Spoken English: A Phraseological Approach*, is a valuable contribution to the phraseological description of present-day spoken English, based on well-selected corpus materials; thus, on authentic language.

As the author states, "(...) the purpose of this study is to identify the polysemy and multifunction of PUs and phonetic characteristics of PUs with methods and SCP. Furthermore, it attempts to explain the relationship between PUs and the grammatical categories" (p. 24). The study is descriptive research and it is based on the theory of semantic syntax. In Chapter One, *Introduction*, apart from the information regarding the study itself, a historical overview of the development of English linguistics in Japan is presented. Two current trends in English linguistics are discussed briefly, too. The meaning-oriented studies presented are the ones conducted by A. Wierzbicka and those carried out by R. M. Dixon.

Chapter Two, titled *What Is Phraseology?*, discusses the origin and history of phraseology. First, the theoretical origin of phraseology is presented with a special focus on H. G. Widdowson's, J. Sinclair's and M. A. K. Halliday's views. Then, the historical origin of the sub-branch

of linguistics at issue is discussed. In terms of didactics it can be distinguished as early as in the early 1900s. Phraseology is recognized from three standpoints (p. 28), i.e. the pedagogical standpoint of H. E. Palmer and A. S. Hornby, initiated in Tokyo in the 1920s; the second is the one of V. V. Vinogradov and N. N. Amosova, in the 1930s, their understanding of phraseology is close of the contemporary approach; the third is the collocational study by the members of the Neo-Firthian schools of T. F. Mitchell, M. A. K. Halliday and J. Sinclair who analyzed phraseology with a focus on grammatical category. The placement of phraseology in English linguistics is presented clearly by means of a diagram. A lot of attention is paid to the transition of phraseological studies in monolingual dictionaries (pp. 30–66). The discussion starts with the presentation of achievements of H. E. Palmer and A. S. Hornby in the 1920s, followed by the discussion on selected works, e.g. the *Second Interim Report on English Collocations* (1933) and *A Grammar of English Words* by H. E. Palmer (1938). Then the presentation of phraseologial units in dictionaries is discussed, e.g. *Idiomatic and Syntactic English Dictionary* (1942) and *The Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English*, volume 1 (1975, 1983). The Russian influence on collocational dictionaries published in recent years is presented, too. Other dictionaries discussed are the following: *Longman Dictionary of English Idioms* (1979), *The Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English*, volume 2 (1983), Z. Kozłowska and H. Dzierżanowska's *Selected Collocations* (1982), *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English* compiled by M. Benson, E. Benson and R. Ilson (1986), S. Katsumata's *Kenkyusha's Dictionary of English Collocations* (1939, 1958, 1995), A. Makkai's *A Dictionary of American Idioms* (1975, 1987).

Chapter three, titled *The Present State of Phraseology*, discusses phraseology "referring to its recent trends, its field of study, its definition and terminology" (p. 69). The chapter contains a review of major current studies of phraseology, such as the ones by K. Yagi (1999, 2000, 2006, 2007), R. Moon (1998), K. Aijmer (2002), B. Altenberg (1998), M. Nishizawa, A. Inoue (2003), E. Kärkkäinen (2003), K. Yagi and A. Inoue (2004). Then terminology, category and definition of phraseology adopted in the study are presented, which is very important, since there are numerous terminological differences in various studies.

The source material and concepts used in the book are explained in Chapter Four, *Source Materials and Concepts*. Moreover, the chapter contains the presentation of "the methods and the means of how to clas-

sify the polysemy of PUs collected from the materials" (p. 111). The significance of using corpora in empirical research is emphasized and the corpus used for the research, *Larry King Live* Corpus, is presented. Then the taxonomy of collected units is discussed and exemplified. The polysemy of PUs is researched by means of analyzing "prosodic features, typically co-occurring words and phrases and position in the sentences of PUs" (p. 123). Concepts employed in the study are discussed, starting with concept categorization, followed by merging and semantic bleaching.

Chapter five, *The Polysemy of Proposition-Deleted PUs*, is devoted to the phenomena of the polysemy of proposition-deleted PUs. The unit *you know what* is discussed with a view to analyzing its polysemous character by using the three clues mentioned above. It was selected for the analysis, since it has a higher frequency than any other unit. Functions of the unit observed in the *Larry King Live* Corpus are discussed and exemplified, covering a number of its functions, e.g. the opener, the topic changer, the emphasizer, hesitation filler, mixture of the topic changer and the emphasizer, the information supplier. The PU's role of a substitute – not a discourse marker, but a noun phrase – is also discussed and exemplified. The expansion from the unit's core function to its extensive function is analyzed as well. Seven functions of the unit *you know what* observed in the research are compared to the uses of the item in BNC and Word-Banks*Online*. The comparison shows that only a few uses of the PU at issue are observed in the two corpora, which results from differences in *Larry King Live* Corpus, composed of spoken language, and the other two, which contain spoken sections consisting mainly of prepared speech and lectures. The functions of other proposition-deleted PUs, e.g. *no matter what, guess what, let me tell you what*, are also discussed, so that it could be determined whether they are polysemous or not.

The focal issue of Chapter Six, *Rousing PUs with Here and There*, is the polysemy of *here we go* and *here we go again*. The analysis, based on the theory of semantic syntax, shows that *here we go* has as many as six distinguishable functions (functioning to capture attention, to rouse people to do something, to express irritation, to show agreement, to state one has found something, to show something), while *here we go again* has two contrasting functions (used to rouse people to do something, to express irritation). The two units, which were chosen for the analysis, "yield the phenomena "concept categorization" and "merging" as

explained in Yagi (1999)" (p. 160). As the prosodic forms of *here we go* and *here we go again* were not obtained in the research study, according to the author, "There is room for more work to be done in this question" (p. 180).

The detectable functions of *let's say* and other similar PUs are discussed in Chapter Seven, titled *Let's Say and Other Similar PUs*. The distinguishable functions of *let's say* are clarified by means of the analysis of its typically co-occurring words and phrases, its position in the sentence and its prosodic features viewed from the standpoint of semantic syntax. The unit *let's say* in the *Larry King Live* Corpus has four functions which can be recognized, i.e. it is used to give an example, to introduce a metaphor, to formulate the revision of a former utterance and to perform the function of a hesitation filler. Each use has its own phonetic and syntactic characteristics. Moreover, it is worth emphasizing that the uses of *let's say* in BNC and Wordbanks*Online* are limited in comparison with those in the *LKL* Corpus.

The relations between PUs and grammatical categories are discussed in the next chapter, titled *Semantic Bleaching and Functional Conversion in the Case of "X and Do", "X to Do" and "X Do"*. The chapters starts with the presentation of examples of *go and do*, *go to do* and *go do* from the *LKL* Corpus, seemingly having the same meaning, yet, as the analysis proves possessing their own meanings and functions. The syntactic and semantic differentiation separating "X and do", "X to do" and "X do" (X = go, come) is clearly presented in Table 1 (p. 231). The uses of the units chosen in the *LKL* Corpus are also compared with those in the spoken sections of BNC and Wordbanks*Online*. Furthermore, the constructions at issue are analyzed in terms of tense and aspect.

Two main conclusions are presented in Chapter Nine, i.e. "based on semantic syntax, the polysemous nature of some repeatedly used PUs has been shown. Second, phonetic characteristics of PUs are closely related to their syntactic features". This chapter also contains brief summary of the book, discussing focal issues of all previous chapters.

The *References* section consists of four parts, covering corpora, dictionaries, papers and books, websites. It should be stressed that the bibliography is comprehensive and contains a number of publications, mostly in English and Japanese. It is followed by the *Index*, containing the following sections: *Names of Person*, *Book Titles*, *Terms*, *Phrases*, which facilitates finding the information one needs.

As mentioned before, the book is a very important study on phraseology of spoken English, providing well-discussed theoretical and methodological background of research on phraseology as well as an in-depth analysis of selected units. The phenomena presented are clearly explained and exemplified by means of authentic occurrences of the phrases in the *LKL* Corpus. Therefore, what is studied is language in actual use, which gives additional value to the study. The research done contributes to a more accurate phraseographic description of the units chosen for the analysis and gives some directions for phraseological analyses to be done.

*Joanna Szerszunowicz*
Uniwersytet w Białymstoku