

DÍAZ VERA, Javier E. ed. 2002: *A Changing World of Words. Studies in English Historical Lexicography, Lexicology and Semantics*. Rodopi: Amsterdam/New York, NY, 2002. Series: Costerus NS 14. 632 pp. ISBN: 90-420-1330-3.

This collection of articles is divided into five different sections, offering extensive coverage of lexicographical, lexicological and semantic issues within the field of English Historical Linguistics. The first section, 'Dictionaries of Early English', contains five articles which deal with the implementation of lexicographical tools using different methodologies. The broad consensus regarding the shortcomings of the OED (occurrences before 1150 are not recorded) is accompanied by a less general agreement on the need to consult written sources for the study of early English (since there are no native informants), and on the emulation of previous lexicographical works.

Despite this general agreement, the authors involved in these five chapters offer two different views on improving the present lexicographical studies:

a) The first three papers, which focus on OE vocabulary, advocate the use of the Functional Lexematic Model (FLM henceforth, as labelled by Faber and Mairal, 1999) to describe the lexicon of early English. The FLM is an enthusiastic defence of the model introduced in Spain by Leocadio Martín Mingorance in the 1980s, which attempts to combine semantics and syntax: 'Cosseriu's pragmatic semantics and Dik's syntagmatic formalism with the relevant contributions of cognitive semantics and the semantics of prototypes. And to all of them, the lexical component of the language should be onomasiologically organised in lexical fields; and, of course, it must be basic and prior to the grammatical component (Fernández, forthcoming).

The repetition in the introductory part of each paper of the origin and theoretical tenets of the model, along with the presentation throughout of the various principles it entails (Lexical Iconic Principle, Lexical Productivity Principle, Principle of Lexical Domain Membership, among others) leave the authors' sympathies plain. The papers are highly informative and offer a critical review of other models.

Another common characteristic the three papers share is that little reference is made when explaining or applying the model, to the sociocultural context of language or to any extra-linguistic elements. (However, Faber and Vázquez-González ('Adapting functional-lexematic methodology to the structuring of Old English verbs: A programmatic proposal' (78-108)) do seem to consider these aspects more relevant). In fact, Cortés Rodríguez and Mairal Usón ('A preliminary design for a syntactic dictionary of Old English on semantic principles' (3-46)) criticise the 'unsystematic character of the type of relations that often appear expressed within a domain' (7) in the Thesaurus of Old English (TOE henceforth) because these relations are 'based on associations of an extralinguistic nature rather than guided by semantic parameters' (7). Semantics, as the linguistic discipline where the relationship between language and society can best be detected, cannot exclude the relationship of language with the external world. Metaphor, metonymy, allusions, puns should also be explained in a 'lexical-semantic-syntactic' model, especially if syntax is semantically motivated, as Díaz Vera suggests in the second contribution to the volume, 'The semantic architecture of the Old English verbal lexicon: A historical-lexicographical proposal' (47-77).

b) Attention should also be drawn to the second group of articles. Some of the works criticised by the authors in favour of the FLM are presented by Kay and Wotherspoon ('Turning the dictionary inside out: Some issues in the compilation of a historical thesaurus' (105-135)) and Sylvester and Robertson ('Word studies on early English: Contexts for a thesaurus of Middle English' (136-159)) as pioneering projects in the lexical structuring of English: The Historical Thesaurus of English (HTE henceforth, TOE and Thesaurus of Middle English (TME henceforth). The HTE is presented by Kay and Wotherspoon as a multidisciplinary project (culture, history, language) in which semantic obsolescence, innovation and change can be observed. I would suggest that semantic obsolescence and innovation also refer to lexical obsolescence and lexical innovation. A clear division between the range of reference of both adjectives, semantic and lexical, should be established (Crespo 2005). Among the thesaurus' limitations, the authors include the lack of etymological information, punning and allusive uses, and the literary and written sources to which data must be restricted. The

advantages of these compilations emerge in cognitive semantic studies, particularly in those devoted to categorisation and classification.

The TOE and TME are just to complete the HTE. Sylvester and Roberts specify that the TME is based on the HTE and the MED. One of the main issues is taxonomy (to distinguish between central and peripheral terms) and allows us to examine connections between language and society: social changes may have a linguistic corollary in lexical innovation, the loss of words and conceptual modifications.

The TME has recently promoted word and word field studies, like some contributions in section 4, as semantic-field theory has attracted renewed interest.

The section entitled 'Early Dictionaries of English' contains two articles: Maurizio Gotti's 'The origin of 17th-century canting terms' (163-196) and Anne McDermott's 'Early dictionaries of English and historical corpora: In search of hard words' (197-226). The first article explores the first lexicographical sources devoted to the study of a diastratic variety of English, a jargon which lexically identifies the 'roguish sector of society' (167), as the author himself states. As well as including a list of canting publications from the 17th century, the author reveals the richness of this lexicon by explaining its characteristic word-formation processes.

Another concern of 17th-century lexicography is what McDermott calls the 'hard words' tradition. This article offers a general overview of the problems derived from the logical necessity of compiling words, old and new, more or less used by and known to native speakers (mainly technical and specialised terminology) and how and what to borrow from other languages so as to enlarge the vocabulary of English and refine it, when possible. After these observations, which, without doubt, hold some interest for the historical lexicographer, the author adds a brief enumeration of historical corpora highlighting the need to create more specialist corpora devoted to particular areas of discourse to allow a deep historical study.

This section is notably shorter than the first, creating an imbalance in the organisation of the volume. More contributions should have been included, outlining the early stages of English lexicography and its evolution.

The third section is entitled 'Semantic change and reconstruction'. These topics are presented using different approaches. The first article, 'The HORSE family: On the evolution of the field and its metaphorisation process' (229-254) combines both sociolinguistic and cognitive theory. De la Cruz Cabanillas and Tejedor Martínez offer, in the first part of their article, a sociolinguistically oriented view of what causes semantic change and loss of words relating to the field of horse denominations. Linguistic as well as non-linguistic reasons such as language contact are shown to play an important role in lexical-semantic change.

A detailed analysis of the cognitive approach is found in the next two articles: Malgorzata Fabiszak's 'A semantic analysis of FEAR, GRIEF and ANGER words in Old English' (255-274) and Caroline Gevaert's 'The evolution of the lexical and conceptual field of ANGER in Old and Middle English' (275-299). While the first author limits her study to the search for conceptual metaphors behind the emotion words proposed, the second attempts to provide quantitative support for cognitive analysis. In addition, she combines cognitivism and prototype semantics which is the basis of Päivi Koivisto-Alanko's paper. Two aspects of Gevaert's contribution should be highlighted: first, a sense of uncertainty over the mixed methodology used and the fact that, as she says, 'figures may be biased because it is sometimes very hard to determine whether an expression is used to refer to anger or to the concept of the overlapping domain and consequently whether it should be taken into account' (286). Overlapping is the key problem underlying semantic studies since it can be difficult to be objective and may depend on individual experience (Crespo 2005). Secondly, the author acknowledges covertly the role of extralinguistic factors in the evolution of the field under survey when she mentions 'humoral theory' as the cause of change from the second half of the 15th century.

As has been mentioned, prototype theory dominates the next paper. Koivisto-Alanko combines this proposal with semantic field theory in a diachronic study of abstract nouns. Like Gevaert, the author stresses the problem of delimitation in semantic fields. As in McDermott's work, there is a subsection about corpora in historical studies, though it receives only a brief treatment.

Semantic relations (Lyons, Leech) in a particular field are investigated from a different perspective in Romano Pozo's 'A morphodynamic interpretation of synonymy and polysemy in Old English' (332-352). The central issue of the Morphodynamic model, also known as Catastrophe Theory, is categorisation. The vague conceptual definitions offered in the two previous works are tackled here in greater detail. Notions of proximity, centrality and stable attractors are introduced in an attempt to produce a model capable of dealing with any difficulties of delimitation, according to the user.

Juan Gabriel Vázquez González resorts again to the FLM to investigate the field of landed property in Anglo-Saxon times in his paper, 'Using diachrony to predict and arrange the past: Giving and transferring landed property in Anglo-Saxon times' (353-371). The ambitious purpose presented in the introductory part of the paper, followed by a sudden presentation of data, is confirmed in the title of subsection 3, 'The reconciliation of linguistic and extralinguistic worlds', in which he states: 'We are convinced of the fact that extralinguistic data of whatever kind play a key role in the improvement of traditional lexicographical entries' (360). This conviction would appear to contradict the cursory treatment of sociocultural concerns in the papers in section 1 above on the same model.

The section devoted to 'Lexical Variation and Change in the history of English' comprises six papers devoted to word studies, field studies and the utility of corpora in Middle English lexicological research.

Merja Black Stenroos, in his paper entitled 'Words for MAN in the transmission of Piers Plowman' (375-409), focuses on scribal practices with regard to lexis to demonstrate that scribes copied alliterative words mechanically and, if a substitute was needed, an alliterating near-synonym was used. The behaviour of scribes transferring the word MAN also confirms the systematic nature of how any scribe used the lexicon and, also, the existence of word geography patterns.

Claire Clowie and Christianne Dalton-Puffer ('Diachronic word-formation and studying changes in productivity over time: Theoretical and methodological considerations' (410-437) explore the concept of productivity from two angles: quantitative and qualitative. The qualitative

notion includes lexical restriction and the analysis of 'aspects of textual organisation, style or register and pragmatics' (414-415). In the section devoted to productivity and diachrony the authors investigate two issues: that we cannot speak of productivity as such in diachronic terms, and the role of dictionaries and corpora, a topic that seems to be shared by most articles. As in previous papers, the OED is criticised on the grounds that its lack of representativity impedes an accurate estimate of the productivity of affixes. Nevertheless, the authors reason that the OED and the MED 'afford unique tools' to 'chart changes in the productivity of word-formation patterns' (419).

A cognitive approach to lexical variation is presented by Eulalio Fernández-Sánchez in 'The cognitive etymological search for lexical traces of conceptual mappings: Analysis of the lexical-conceptual domain of the verbs of POSSESSION' (438-463) in which the FLM is revisited. As in previous analyses grounded in cognitive assumptions, this chapter highlights the need for a closer examination of categorisation, the key conceptual topic the author investigates by applying the FLM to the field he proposes. The general aim is that 'the areas of meaning have a more solid basis and are not the product of intuition' (441). But the cognitive and prototype counterparts still play a role as 'lexical domains can be analysed as conceptual categories with more or less central members' (447).

Manfred Markus' interesting paper, 'The Innsbruck Prose Corpus: Its concept and usability in Middle English lexicology' (464-483), presents the above-mentioned corpus in which tagged full texts are included. It is worth highlighting the traps in lexical analysis he mentions: spelling variation and word boundaries, though the possible tools for this analysis, WordCruncher and WordSmith, are not new.

It is interesting also to mention the lines of further research he outlines: idiomatic phrases and pragmatic and stylistic features of the lexicon used to discern special text-types and the implications of cultural history, similar to recent research on language variation carried out by Irma Taavitsainen and her team in the University of Helsinki.

Michiko Ogura's paper contrasts with the rest from a formal point of view because it is not organised into different sections. Ogura's research confirms that there has been some lexical replacement in the field of emotion words,

though the change occurred gradually as both loanwords and native words form the range of lexical possibilities in Old and early Middle English literature.

The last paper, “‘Touched by an alien tongue’: Studying lexical borrowings in the earliest Middle English’ (500-521), by Janne Skaffari, analyses all the instances between 1150 and 1250 of loanwords in the texts contained in the Helsinki Corpus. Though her definition of loanwords is quite simplistic and her conclusions are not new, she makes two interesting suggestions in her survey which are valid for any empirical investigation: that a frequent occurrence of a loanword may be the product of reiteration rather than influence of a particular linguistic stratum, and that using a corpus of samples as research material instead of a single text may be justified on the grounds that ‘a single loanword may be so dominant in the text that it distorts the proportion between the different source languages’ (517).

The last section, ‘The Interface between Semantics, Syntax and Pragmatics’ comprises five papers. It discusses different possibilities for the interface between the three disciplines, something that, curiously enough, characterises the FLM (Fernández 2005).

The first paper, by Diana M. Lewis, is entitled ‘Rhetorical factors in lexical-semantic change: The case of at least’ (525-538). To examine the semantic change implicit in the adverb at least the author draws diachronic data from 1300 to 1899 and analyses the various types of at least which can be found in contemporary English. Based on all the semantic-syntactic patterns discussed she concludes that there are some modal-sentence polysemies that run parallel to semantic regularities through the subjectification of the adverb under survey. Contexts of usage and analogical processes have played a key role in this parallel development.

Silvia Molina-Plaza’s ‘Modal change: A corpus study from 1500 to 1710 compared to current usage’ (539-562) is the second paper. It is a comprehensive account of modality from both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. After a thorough revision of the patterns in present-day English she describes different structures expressing modality in letters written in early Modern English. She offers a detailed conclusion on the divergent use of modals (some meanings and forms have disappeared, others have just

changed) and the grammaticalisation process of modal verbs: 'due to the well-known principle of using old resources for new needs' (559).

The third article is entitled 'The rise of new meanings: A historical journey through English way of looking at' (563-571) and written by Anna Poch Higuera and Isabel Verdaguera Clavera. The semantic change of verbs belonging to the field looking at is carefully analysed, with special emphasis on the domains from which they originate. Like other contributions, the authors frame their research within the tenets of cognitive linguistics based on 'our understanding and organisation of the world' (563). The lexicalisation process of these verbs is intimately connected with the metaphorical analogy absorbed by them. The analogy develops between 'visual perception' and 'physical properties of objects', 'physical activities', 'the quick movement of objects or the brightness of light' (570), which consolidates a pattern of semantic widening from 'visual to abstract sense' (571).

Another comprehensive account on a syntactic issue is offered by Junichi Toyota in the last contribution to the volume, 'Lexical analysis of Middle English passive constructions' (572-610). The paper is divided into two parts: the first deals with the 'Description of the passive and related constructions'. Passivisation (form, functions) is here described in detail from a modern perspective and, given the length of the paper, only tangentially meets the expectations of a historical presentation (ME passive constructions and functions). The second part, 'Lexical analysis of ME passive constructions' contains an excessively long introductory part before providing a lexical analysis of the ME data. A first reading gives the impression that the paper is about modern English; a closer examination reveals some conclusions of a historical nature.

There are only a few minor printing errors: for instance, italics in the definite article of "The HORSE family", p.229; "on the some of the items", p. 241; "viceverse" p. 446. In spite of those slight misprints, the volume is, on the whole, a carefully assembled and thematically coherent (albeit not entirely balanced) work, of interest both to linguists in general and lexicographers/lexicologists in particular. It deals with several unifying and up-to-date topics: categorisation, the nature of lexical sources (dictionaries, thesauruses), the role of corpora in semantic description and the presentation



of different models or approaches under which to frame this description (the Functional Lexematic Model, cognitivism, prototype theory and the Morphodynamic model).

Filled with useful ideas, this volume is an undeniably inspiring and thought-provoking resource for historical research.

Begoña Crespo García  
Universidade da Coruña

#### REFERENCES

- Crespo B. 2005: *Aproximación sociohistórica al cambio semántico en lengua inglesa*. Septem ediciones, Oviedo.
- Fernández, F. 2005: Diachronic lexicographic heritage of twentieth century linguistics. Looking forward to the future. *Re-Interpretations of English. Essays on Language, Linguistics and Philology (II)*, Eds. Moskowich-Spiegel, Isabel and Crespo, Begoña. Universidade da Coruña, A Coruña, 163-202.

\* † \*