

Javier E. Díaz Vera, ed. 2002: *A Changing World of Words*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi. xx+610 pp.

María Chacón Chacón
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha
mariasantos.chacon@uclm.es

In the last few decades, linguistic theories have shifted towards lexically-oriented postulates. This lexical revival has allowed the development of new linguistic frameworks that advocate the integration of paradigmatic and syntagmatic aspects in a systematic and complementary way. However, until very recently, the developments just outlined have hardly influenced research in Historical Linguistics.

A Changing World of Words is a collective volume edited by Javier Díaz Vera which brings together, under different perspectives, the recent research of a wide range of scholars in English Historical Linguistics. The book opens with an austere introduction by the editor (“Lexicography, Semantics and Lexicology in English Historical Linguistics”), intended to give the reader an overview of the principles underlying this work which comprises a number of significant contributions to the fields of English historical semantics, lexicology and lexicography. The papers collected in the volume offer a large number of specific interests and approaches to the historical analysis of the English lexicon. The different tendencies and main approaches of these contributions are synthesised in five sections.

The first section, “Dictionaries of Early English” (1–160), begins with a paper by Cortés Rodríguez and Mairal Usón, “A Preliminary Design for a Syntactic Dictionary of Old English on Semantic Principles” (3–46). In this paper, the authors put forward the guidelines for the elaboration of a syntactic dictionary of Old English (OE) verbs based on semantic domains. The methodology adopted for this dictionary project is based on the Functional Lexematic Model (FLM) that integrates Coseriu’s Theory of Lexematics (Coseriu 1977) and Dik’s Functional Grammar (Dik 1989) with two main objectives: the specification of the semantic architecture of the lexicon of a given language and the representation of knowledge based on the definitions found in standard dictionaries.

Since we have no direct access to meaning definitions, the authors focus on the analysis of syntactic information in their application of the FLM principles to the creation of a dictionary of OE verbs. In the second part of this paper, they propose a complete analysis of the internal structure of the field of *change*, which includes both semantic and syntactic information on the verbs under this heading.

Following these same principles, Díaz Vera proposes in his paper “The Semantic Architecture of the Old English Verbal Lexicon: A Historical-Lexicographical Proposal” (47–77) a whole internal reconstruction of the verbal predicates that form the lexical subdomain of *touching* in OE. This analysis takes into account the dictionary definitions found in standard OE dictionaries. By combining this information with morphosyntactic and etymological data, a reconstruction of the internal structure of this lexical subfield and its macronet connections with other domains is proposed, which aims at covering all the grammatical aspects of this section of the Anglo-Saxon vocabulary. The type of dictionary described here is thus to be seen not as a mere list of words and meanings, but rather as a grammar of OE verbs.

A yet different way of structuring a dictionary of OE is described by Pamela Faber and Juan Gabriel Vázquez González. In their paper “Adapting Functional-Lexematic Methodo-

logy to the Structuring of OE Verbs: A Programmatic Proposal” (78–108), they explore the paradigmatic organisation of the OE lexicon. The authors use FLM principles to structure the lexical domain of *possession*, and specifically adapt FLM methodology to the analysis of OE. The paradigmatic structure of the verbs in this domain is informative in that it provides information about the evolution of the language through time. Furthermore, it underlines the importance of metaphor as a means of lexical creativity, and also encodes sociocultural relationships through its meaning parameters.

In “Turning the Dictionary Inside Out: Some Issues in the Compilation of Historical Thesauri” (109–35), Christian Kay and Irené Wotherspoon describe the editorial procedures used in the *Thesaurus of Old English* and the *Historical Thesaurus of English*, taking the reader from the original paper slips to the interlinked semantic classifications and the database which ultimately result. Issues of semantics and lexicography are discussed in the context of historical linguistics. They conclude by making reference to what they have learned from their experiences, and especially on what an onomasiologically-organised word-book can tell us about the way in which the lexicon has developed over the history of English.

Finally, Jane Roberts and Louise Sylvester offer a preliminary sketch of their future thesaurus of Middle English. In their paper “Word Studies on Early English: Contexts for a Thesaurus of Middle English” (136–59), they introduce this self-standing Middle English (ME) thesaurus. They discuss examples of new evidence for early ME, drawing their evidence in particular from the semantic fields of *agriculture* and *education*. In doing so, they intend to examine the dip in representation of word senses for the early ME period by comparison with OE and later ME and to consider links so far unexamined between the OE vocabulary and the evidence for OE to be found within the *Oxford English Dictionary*.

The second section, “Early Dictionaries of English” (161–226), includes two papers devoted to the lexical analysis of some of the earliest examples of lexicographic practice in England. Maurizio Gotti, in his paper “The Origin of 17th-Century Canting Terms” (163–96), takes into consideration the main processes of word-formation followed in the formation of the canting terms reported in the main lexicographic works of the 17th century. According to his findings, some of the compilers of these early canting dictionaries and glossaries showed a high degree of metalinguistic awareness of these word-formation processes.

In “Early Dictionaries of English and Historical Corpora: In Search of Hard Words” (197–226), Anne McDermott addresses the question of how, by using currently available resources, we can carry out research into the question of the provenance of “hard words.” Throughout this paper, McDermott questions the traditional view that most of these words were never an actual part of the language, but mere dictionary words. Her analysis of the earliest citations for these “hard words” recorded in the different editions of the *Oxford English Dictionary* shows that most of them have sources in earlier texts.

The third part of this volume, “Semantic Change and Reconstruction” (227–372), focuses on a wide range of problems related to the reconstruction of meaning and meaning change. This section opens with the paper “The HORSE Family: On the Evolution of the Field and Its Metaphorization Process” (229–54) by Isabel de la Cruz and Cristina Tejedor. The authors propose a reconstruction of the field in the later periods of the English language up to the present. In doing so, they take into account not only the mere descriptive meaning of the terms, but also concentrate on the process of metaphorization

that some of the items underwent throughout their development. According to their results, the original meanings have shifted to more metaphorical ones, which usually refer to human beings and denote an objectionable quality.

In “A Semantic Analysis of FEAR, GRIEF and ANGER Words in Old English” (255–74), Malgorzata Fabiszak adopts a cognitive perspective in order to analyse the vocabulary related to these three emotions in OE texts. By looking closely at the types of situations triggering them and at the individual and group reactions they produced, Fabiszak suggests that fear, grief and anger were deeply interwoven in the texture of Anglo-Saxon social life.

In a similar vein, in “The Evolution of the Lexical and Conceptual Field of ANGER in Old and Middle English” (275–99), Caroline Gevaert presents a reconstruction of this lexical field. The author includes both words literally meaning *anger* and metaphorical and metonymical expressions used to refer to this concept. Her analysis results in the reconstruction of a lexical field which is clearly dominated by the central metaphors *swell* and *heat*. In ME, the lexical field is restructured, so that the central *swell* metaphor gradually disappears and the *heat* metaphor is reinterpreted, possibly under the influence of the humoral doctrine.

In her previous research, Päivi Koivisto-Alanko studied the process of semantic change of the prototypical structure of the noun *wit* and its near-synonyms in late ME and early Modern English. In the present paper, “Prototypes in Semantic Change: A Diachronic Perspective on Abstract Nouns” (300–31), she intends to extend the diachronic perspective to Modern English in order to see whether the pattern of increasing subjectification in semantic change is still discernible in the field of cognition. Her findings indicate clearly that this semantic field has narrowed and that some of the changes studied earlier have been completed. However, as the author notes, the multiple senses of *wit* have not necessarily disappeared; they have been transferred to its former near-synonyms, some new words have entered the field and they appear to carry on the pattern of increasing subjectification in their semantic processes of change.

In the paper “A Morphodynamic Interpretation of Synonymy and Polysemy in Old English” (332–52), Manuela Romano takes up some problems related to the semantic notions of synonymy and polysemy and their relevance to historical lexicography. Her analysis opens with a description of some of the similarities between the behaviour of natural chaotic-complex systems and meaning, and between the morphodynamic and cognitive approaches to language and meaning. Thereafter, Romano proposes an interpretation of semantic fields as topographic landscapes in which different stable structures and catastrophic jumps determine their general behaviour or shape. She applies these theoretical principles to the semantic field of *friendship*. As the author affirms, this type of reconstruction (which includes both synchronic and diachronic aspects) has multiple applications to lexicographic research of older periods of a language.

In “Using Diachrony to Predict and Arrange the Past: Giving and Transferring Landed Property in Anglo-Saxon Times” (353–71), Vázquez González affirms that history is encoded in language, because as society evolved, social relationships became increasingly complex. The lexical domain of *possession* is a treasure house of sociocultural information about the evolution of social relationships as represented by the giving and transferring of property in Anglo-Saxon England. A case in point in his research is the transfer of landed property between a king and his *thegns*. In this way, the onomasiological structure of the OE lexicon is shown to reflect the evolution of social relationships in Anglo-Saxon times.

The fourth section, “Lexical Variation and Change in the History of English” (373–522), concentrates on the evolution of the English vocabulary, covering topics as diverse as neologism and word-loss, lexical borrowing and derivation, manuscript variation, etymological analysis and lexical structure.

In the paper “Words for *MAN* in the Transmission of *Piers Plowman*” (375–409), Merja Black Stenroos offers a pilot study inscribed within the Middle English Grammar Project, ongoing in Glasgow and Stavanger since 1997. The author analyses a single lexical set, words for *man*, in the scribal transmission of *Piers Plowman*. Her aim is to study the behaviour of Middle English scribes with regard to lexis. Black confirms in her research that the usage of any given scribe with regard to lexis is systematic, rather than random, and that geographical, rather than textually conditioned, patterns in the distribution of words do occur and can be studied.

In “Diachronic Word-Formation and Studying Changes in Productivity Over Time: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations” (410–37), Claire Cowie and Christianne Dalton-Puffer address the general question of how the dynamics of word-formation can be dealt with from a historical perspective. In order to do so, they examine the ways in which morphological productivity is amenable to study in a historical context from a mainly methodological perspective. By using empirical methods, the authors trace various processes of change in word-formation patterns undergone by English in different historical periods, covering the whole history of the language. They note that morphological productivity is not only a theoretical concept but a measurable property of word-formation rules, and thus they establish a theoretical basis for viewing productivity from a diachronic perspective.

Fernández Sánchez proposes in “Cognitive Etymological Search for Lexical Traces of Conceptual Mappings: Analysis of the Lexical-Conceptual Domain of the Verbs of POSSESSION” (438–63) a further application of the previously mentioned FLM to the analysis of lexical evolution. On this occasion, and with the main purpose of stressing the relevance of diachronic analysis to the cognitivist study of language, in particular, and to the comprehension and understanding of our cognitive system, in general, he tries to prove the existence of different levels of lexical categorisation through the etymological analysis of the linguistic categories that constitute the lexical domain of the verbs of *possession*.

In the next paper, “The Innsbruck Prose Corpus: Its Concept and Usability in Middle English Lexicology” (464–83), Manfred Markus discusses some possible applications of historical corpora to lexical studies. According to Markus, corpus-based research on ME lexis is progressively focusing on the analysis of individual words, often with an interest in their syntax. Normalised and tagged texts are especially useful for this type of research. The author offers several illustrative examples of words linked to various linguistic subsections with the following conclusions: more research is needed not only on ME syntax, but also on the syntax and semantics of fixed expressions and on their pragmatic and stylistic features.

Michiko Ogura’s contribution “Words of *EMOTION* in Old and Middle English” (484–99) focuses on different processes of lexical supersession that affected the OE vocabulary of emotions after the Norman Conquest. The texts analysed illustrate clearly the supersession and coexistence of words of *emotion* throughout the medieval period. Thus, although many Old French and Old Norse loanwords were already in use in the thirteenth century, they coexisted with native words of emotion for several decades,

contributing to increase the degree of lexical variety that characterises English medieval literature.

In “‘Touched by an Alien Tongue’: Studying Lexical Borrowings in the Earliest Middle English” (500–21), Janne Skaffari discusses a number of issues relating to corpus-based studies of vocabulary and lexical borrowings, with special reference to early ME. One of the central questions addressed here has to do with the capacity of synchronic material to reveal a diachronic perspective on the transitional period between late OE and ME.

The last section of this volume, “The Interface Between Semantics, Syntax, and Pragmatics” (523–72), includes four papers. The first is by Diana M. Lewis, “Rhetorical Factors in Lexical-Semantic Change: The Case of *At Least*” (525–38). Here, the author examines the importance of rhetorical purpose and rhetorical context in lexical semantic change; to show how *at least* has developed since ME from a purely scalar qualifier into a polysemous expression serving epistemic and evaluative functions in addition to the original representational function.

Silvia Molina studies in her paper “Modal Change: A Corpus Study from 1500 to 1710 Compared to Current Usage” (539–62) modal change in early Modern English and compares it to modality in present-day English, using as her data a corpus of private letters from the *Helsinki Corpus*. The modal tokens in her corpus illustrate the diachronic process of grammaticalisation where lexical verbs have progressively acquired grammatical values as modal verbs.

Anna Poch and Isabel Verdager’s contribution “The Rise of New Meanings: A Historical Journey through English Ways of *Looking At*” (563–71) includes a detailed analysis of how the English language has lexicalised a great number of verbs indicating *manner of*, especially in the field of visual perception. Troponyms of *look at* are studied in their paper. A preliminary diachronic survey shows that only some of those *manner-of-looking-at* verbs were present in the OE vocabulary, since most of them entered the English lexicon in the Middle and Modern English period. Their first documented sense is often not related to visual perception. The authors analyse the semantic evolution of these verbs from a cognitive perspective in order to show how the present state has been reached, highlighting the diverse semantic domains from which these verbs originate, and what factors have motivated the transfer of their senses from one domain to another.

Junichi Toyota’s paper “Lexical Analysis of Middle English Passive Constructions” (572–610) consists of a detailed corpus-based study of the lexical system of the passive voice in ME. Toyota focuses on the lexical influence on some functions of the passive, especially stativisation to disambiguate several types of stative and non-stative construction included under the heading *passive*: (a) verbal passive, (b) adjectival passive and (c) resultative, finding some lexical link to these distinctions. As the author states, these three different constructions seem to possess varying degrees of characteristics of the passive: thus, whereas verbal passive is considered wholly passive, adjectival passive is rather less passive, resultative construction representing an intermediate level between the two.

Some of the articles are worthy of special mention, in my view, due to the accurateness and exhaustiveness in their treatment of the theory and their approach to the case studies offered. I am referring to those by Cortés Rodríguez and Mairal Usón, Díaz Vera, Koivisto-Alanko, Skaffari among others, though the whole volume is characterised by its sobriety.

This is definitely a highly commendable book. It provides a huge representation of the work of a wide range of experienced and recognised scholars in different fields of historical

linguistics. The case studies, varied and illustrating, provide a large variety of possible approaches to this discipline, from how to structure a dictionary to how to use data and new tools. References are offered at the end of each paper so that the reader can deepen those aspects in which he is most interested. Furthermore, new perspectives are offered to study some aspects of those fields where more research is needed. New scholars and advanced students will find in this book an excellent guide to what is currently being investigated as well as new ideas of other possible approaches in the field of diachronic linguistics.

Works Cited

- Coseriu, Eugenio 1978: *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
Dik, Simon C. 1989: *The Theory of Functional Grammar*. Part 1: *The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Considerations In Javier E. Díaz Vera, ed. 2002: *A Changing World of Words*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi (410€37).
Crespo García, Begoña & Moskowich-Spiegel Fandiño, Isabel. 2005. Latin Forms in Vernacular Scientific Writing: Code-Switching or Borrowing? In MacConchie, Rod et al. (ed.), *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (Hel-Lex)* Somerville, MA: Cascadia Press. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.
Moskowich, Isabel. 2008. "To Lerne Sciences Touching Nombres and Proporcions" Message 1: *A Changing World of Words*: Díaz Vera (ed.) Date: Fri, 11 Oct 2002 13:03:23 +0000 From: E.van.Broekhuizen Subject: *A Changing World of Words*: Díaz Vera (ed.) Title: *A Changing World of Words*. Subtitle: *Studies in English Historical Lexicography, Lexicology and Semantics*. Series Title: *Costerus* Vol. 141 Publication Year: 2002 Publisher: Rodopi <http://www.rodopi.nl/> Editor: Javier E. Díaz Vera. Hardback: ISBN: 9042013303, Pages: XXI, 610, Price: EURO 125/USD 125 CONTENTS: Javier E. Díaz Vera : *Lexicography, semantics and lexicology in English historical linguistics*. 1. *Dictionaries of Early English*. Javier E. Díaz Vera. *Following Forceville* (2005, 2011), in this paper I show that the same conceptual models underlie the expression of Old English emotions in both the language and the visual modes. Kövecses (2000, 2005) and Stefanowitsch (2004, 2006) have shown that verbal expressions and idioms used to describe emotions can be traced back to a limited number of conceptual metaphors. (2002) *The evolution of the lexical and conceptual field of anger in Old and Middle English*. In J.E. Díaz Vera (Ed.), *A changing world of words: Studies in English historical lexicology, lexicography and semantics* (pp. 275-299). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Kövecses, Z. (1986) *A figure of thought*.