BOOK REVIEWS

Matti Rissanen, Marianna Hintikka, Leena Kahlas-Tarkka and Rod Mc-Conchie (eds.) 2007. *Change in Meaning and the Meaning of Change. Studies in Semantics and Grammar from Old to Present-Day English.* (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki, Tome LXXII) Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, xvii, 377 pp.

"Change in Meaning and the Meaning of Change" edited by Matti Rissanen, Marianna Hintikka, Leena Kahlas-Tarkka and Rod McConchie is a rewarding book. It is divided into two parts, namely 'Meaning and mind' and 'Meaning and grammar', preceded by a short preface and an introduction written by the editors and followed by a subject index (which might have been augmented) coupled with a list of corpora and dictionaries used in this work. Twelve authors contributed their articles – six to each of the two main parts of this book.

As the title of this book suggests, the leading idea holding the articles together is language change. Though in principle most of the articles are diachronic, the panchronic approach to language is conspicuous – in many a case the authors attempt to demonstrate why certain aspects of Present-Day English are of particular nature by having recourse to the historical changes determining it. The diachronic developments are amply illustrated and often supported by quantitative analyses using computerised corpora such as the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts, the Dictionary of Old English Corpus, the Middle English Compendium and others, which enabled and facilitated the production of variationist and frequentative investigation.

Apart from knitting diachronic and synchronic approaches to language studies together, this book shows that the differences between the classes of content words and function words are not as manifest as they are traditionally considered to be. This is especially evident in the 'Meaning and grammar' part in which the analyses are conducted in the framework of grammaticalisation. According to this theory, ordinarily content words acquire grammatical functions, hereby they become members of closed-class words. This necessarily calls for a developmental stage in which the distinctions between these two classes of words cannot be clear-cut. Furthermore, both lexical and grammatical words are shown to be subject to the same semantic processes such as extension and restriction of meaning or metaphorisation and metonymisation and these can also be observed in the 'Meaning and mind' chapter.

What additionally binds the articles together is their functional approach to linguistic change. It can be seen in, for instance, they weight given to communication as the paramount function of language, the development of grammar being contiguous with cognition or the tendencies in language being cognitive in character as far as Universal Grammar is concerned. Besides, in many articles in this volume the prominence is given to language use, which helps account for language changes because it includes pragmatics and discourse in the explanation.

The 'Meaning and mind' section starts with Ágnes Kiricsi's article 'The passionate mind and the rational heart: The location of the Old English mental faculty'. She describes the shift from active and emotional mental faculty (OE *mod* and *gemynd*) to a rational and passive conception of the mind. Originally, consciousness was thought to be located in the chest, but eventually it moved to where the life-surviving spirit resides, i.e. the head. Kiricsi's study is enhanced by invoking Greek and Latin traditional images of the mind as well as providing the frequencies of occurrence of *gemynd/minde/mod* in mediaeval English. However, Table 2 (p.18) does not present the frequencies for the ME3 and ME4 periods, instead the OE2 and OE3 data recur.

Päivi Koivisto-Alanko analyses the metaphoric development of *wit* in the article 'Change in progress: Blending theory meets historical semantics'. She attempts to demonstrate the role and application of subjectification, the cognitive metaphor theory and the blending theory in historical semantics when the meaning is in a state of change. Although Koivisto-Alanko's paper is predominantly theoretical, it seems that there are still some terminological/theoretical problems there, e.g. the word *analysis* (p. 39) covers too wide a range of meanings – in most of the cases it is probably used in the sense of 'reanalysis'. Koivisto-Alanko also uses the concept of invited inferences in order to explain the fact that the addressee interprets the more neutral, more established meaning correctly. According to Traugott and Dasher (2002 [2005]: 282), 'invited inferencing […] is the principal mechanism that drives semantic change' thus it is rather superfluous to employ the notion of invited inferencing where the addressee's correct interpretation is nothing but straightforward. I also need to mention a typing error in the references, i.e. *Marcin Grygiel* surfaces as *Marciel Grygiel* (p. 54, l. 5).[1]

Heli Tissari's article 'Compressing emotion to politeness: On *I fear* and *I'm afraid*' scrutinises the development of the epistemic meanings of the expressions *I fear* and *I'm afraid* ferrying distressing information. In the explanation of the semantic changes that have affected these expressions, she makes use of conceptual

---

[1] Other typographical errors, but of lesser importance, include:

p. XV, l. 23 – there is "*Correspon-dence*", should be "*Correspondence*"

p. 3, l. 3 – there is "the"vernacular", should be "the "vernacular"

p. 194, l. 29 – there is "*sub-ordination*", should be "*subordination*"

p. 216, l. 7 – there is "*HC*", should be "HC"

p. 256, l. 3 – there is "En-glish", should be "English"

p. 257, l. 21 – there is "According to him evidence …", should be "According to him, evidence …",

p. 289, l. 2 – there is "grammatical-isation", should be "grammaticalisation"

integration, abduction and subjectification. Heli Tissari (p. 72) accounts for the contraction of *I'm afraid so* to *fraid so* by invoking the process of pragmatisation. However, pragmatisation does not seem to satisfactorily offer an explanation for the phonetic reduction in this syntagm, while grammaticalisation does. A loss in phonetic substance is one of inherent grammaticalisation mechanisms (cf., e.g., Heine & Kuteva 2002: 2), and *fraid so* is not only used as a discourse marker, but is has been grammaticalised to the point where it performs the function of an affirmative particle. Finally, it appears that the word *under-studied* (p. 87) is misused – no dictionary defines it as 'not fully/thoroughly studied', and this is the sense intended by the author.

Sickness metaphors are the object study of Marianna Hintikka's article 'Sickness as metaphor in Early Modern and Present-Day English'. In it she tries to analyse possible historical developments of sickness-based metaphors within cognitive metaphor theory. Some popular diseases seem to have been conceptualised as either THREAT FROM WITHIN or THREAT FROM WITHOUT metaphors corresponding to our perception of the human body and society.

The primary focus of Seija Kerttula's article entitled 'Meanings shaped by neurophysiological emphases: A matter of taste' is a search for basicness of taste terms. She provides a quantitative analysis of taste-terms in English and Finnish and accounts for the basicness of some terms (*sweet*) by linking them to physiological factors, while the order of other, apparently discrepant, basic terms for taste in these languages (*bitter* and *salty*) are claimed to be culturally determined. Although important from the semantic theory perspective, Kerttula's article is more comparative than diachronic, and it is not even so much about meaning change but it is a quest to define central taste categories. In this respect, this paper stands out from the other articles in this volume. There is also an unclear reference (p. 120) to Rosch et al. (1973, 1975) – in the references part she is listed as the sole author of the two articles.

Alaric Hall contributed to this book his article 'Glosses, gaps and gender: The rise of female elves in Anglo-Saxon culture'. By analysing various Old English glosses for Latin words for 'nymph', Hall demonstrates that in the early Old English period there was no lexeme denoting a female, supernatural and unthreatening being in the language. The closest equivalent was *ælf*, but it denoted only males. In late Old English the denotation of *ælf* extended to include female beings, which is indicative of the shift of beliefs and, accordingly, culture of the Anglo-Saxon people. Even though it cannot be denied that glosses are a valuable source of information for a historical linguist, the author might have analysed the use of elves in context – the connotational meaning of OE *ælf* may shed some more light on the development of this lexeme. On a technical note, it is also difficult to refer to AHDWB (p. 150) as there is no AHDWB in the references section.

The 'Meaning and grammar' part commences with an article by Matti Rissanen 'The development of adverbial subordinators in early English'. Apart from providing an overview of the types of adverbial subordinators in mediaeval English, Rissanen concentrates on the development of this class of conjunctions in the Middle English period. The story of the emergence of subordination markers

involves either a loss or simplification of native phrasal subordinators and the rise of new linking forms, most of them being borrowed from or influenced by French. Rissanen (p. 199) might have mentioned that the next step in the grammaticalisation, i.e. the loss of *that* following *before*, constitutes an instance of a reduction of paradigmatic variability (Lehmann 1982 [2002]: Ch. 4). It appears that the structuralist idea of the functional load is used as an explanation for the substitution of *ere* for *before* (in addition to a greater phonetic substance, *before* had more uses, and occurred more frequently than *ere*) (p. 199) but, on the other hand, the loss of *buton* 'but' and *wiþuten* 'without' used as connectives indicating exception is attributed just to the heavy functional load of these linking words (p. 201). Slight miscalculations ought to be amended: in example 3 (p. 180) Roman numeral VI is translated as 'five' and in Table 1 (p. 190) 164 equals 50% rather than 53%.

Aune Österman's article '*Here* compounds in English: mere satellites of *there* compounds?' deals with the development of *here* compounds in grammatical functions. By collating *here* and *there* compounds she is able to propound that these compounds have not undergone the same paths of grammaticalisation – *here* compounds can perform metatextual and performative functions, whereas the metatextual function is practically not attested in *there* compounds. The text-deictic usage of *here* compounds stems from the fact that they occur with proximal expressions with reference to the speaker. Österman (pp. 221-222) could have advanced the discussion of the relation between the nominal use of *hereafter* and grammaticalisation. Should such cases, according to the author, be recognised as instances of degrammaticalisation/antigrammaticalisation or should they be treated as the effect of regular word-formation processes? In Table 1 (p. 215) the tokens with highest frequency are not marked bold as indicated in the legend.

The final stages of grammaticalisation, such as paradigmatisation and the ultimate loss of indefinite pronouns conveying totality in Old English are the central issue of Leena Kahlas-Tarkka's article 'Verging on totality? On 'minority indefinites' conveying totality in Old English.' She focuses on low frequency words based on the interrogative *hw-* stem and successfully demonstrates the processes of intensification, simplification, grammaticalisation and loss connected with the development of the 'minority indefinites' in Old English.

Indefinite pronouns are also the topic of Mikko Laitinen's study 'Epicene HE and THEY and the development of English indefinite expression during the period 1500–1800.' In it he explores the pronouns HE and THEY when they relate anaphorically to indefinite compound pronouns -ONE, -BODY and -MAN. By conducting a quantitative analysis of these combinations, he has shown that the plural pronoun replaced the singular pronoun in situations where the notional number remained undetermined and that anaphors are connected with their antecedents. Laitinen (p. 288) touches on obligatorification making reference to Croft (2000: 162) – this term, however, was coined earlier by Lehmann (1982 [2002]: 124). Laitinen (p. 288) also claims that the process of grammaticalisation of MAN could not have been completed on the grounds that *man* was used in the sense of 'male human being'. Nevertheless, this argumentation does not seem thoroughly convin-

cing on account of the fact that all grammatical markers have developed from erstwhile content words and the state of polysemy which may lead to divergence (cf. Hopper 1991: 22) is nothing but an expected development in grammaticalisation.

Matti Kilpiö's article 'Auxiliation in progress: Diachronic grammaticalisation changes in Old English and early Middle English *HAVE* perfects' examines the development of HAVE-perfect in the earliest periods of written English. He pays special attention to the relation between the loss of inflection of the past passive participle and word order change in which the object came to follow the participle. It turns out that the loss of inflection of the past participle preceded the word order change from OV to VO and, although both changes were conducive in the grammaticalisation of HAVE-perfect, it cannot be maintained that these two developments are interrelated.

The last article in the 'Meaning and grammar' part is '*Dis*-history: Modelling the introduction and diffusion of a borrowed prefix in Middle English' written by Rod McConchie. He performs an in-depth analysis of several lexemes containing the prefix *dis-* most of which entered the English language in the early Middle English period. McConchie attempts to apply the notion of linguistic reanalysis in order to explain the productive uses of the borrowed prefix. However, it appears that each lexeme has its own historical trajectory and the notion of reanalysis cannot satisfactorily be used in lexical studies.

All things considered, "Change in Meaning and the Meaning of Change" is a very stimulating book. Each article supplies new empirical data and new analyses of old language material. Quantitative analyses which recur throughout the book support the argumentation and findings of the authors whose level of discourse is unvaryingly very high. The benefit of selecting a single theme, i.e. semantic change, is that the same theoretical hypotheses can be evaluated with respect to the English language. This makes this volume a must-have textbook for a historical semanticist and grammarian.

Andrzej Łęcki

References

Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. 2002 *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopper, P. J. 1991 On some principles of grammaticalization. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization: Focus on Theoretical and Methodological Issues. Vol. I.* (Typological Studies in Language, 19, 1), 17-35. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lehmann, Ch. 1982 [2002] *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. (Second revised edition) ASSidUE 9. <http://www.bibliothek.uni-erfurt.de/target/assiduelink.html>

Traugott, E. C. & Dasher, R. B. 2002 [2005] *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carmen Mellado Blanco (Hg.): Theorie und Praxis der idiomatischen Wörterbücher [=Lexicographica Series Maior 135]. Tübingen: Niemeyer 2009, 255 S.

Das seit mehreren Jahren anhaltende rege Interesse an der Phraseologie und Phraseografie spiegelt sich in zahlreichen wissenschaftlichen Aktivitäten wider. Der vorliegende Sammelband ist im Rahmen eines Forschungsprojektes zur kontrastiven Phraseografie entstanden. Sein Ziel ist, „die positive Entwicklung der letzten Jahre im Bereich der Phraseografieforschung" (S. 1) zu dokumentieren. Dabei wird die immer noch bestehende Diskrepanz zwischen der theoretischen Untersuchung und der lexikografischen Praxis betont. Es wird auch auf die Frage eingegangen, „wie man den Nachholbedarf hinsichtlich der Qualität und Quantität idiomatischer Wörterbücher verringern könnte" (ebd.). Dass das Verhältnis zwischen Theorie und Praxis ein wichtiger und zugleich problematischer Aspekt in der phraseografischen Diskussion ist, signalisiert gleich der Titel der Einführung: „[...] Idiomatische Wörterbücher und Metaphrazeografie: zwei Realitäten, eine Herausforderung". Dieser Gedanke ist auch in mehreren Beiträgen präsent, vgl. etwa den von Burger (S. 23), Jesenšek (S. 65) oder von Steyer (S. 141).

Der Band enthält neben der Einführung, in der die Herausgeberin einen referierend-systematisierenden Überblick über den Inhalt des Bandes bietet, elf Beiträge, die zwei Themenbereichen: einsprachige und zweisprachige Phraseografie zugeordnet sind.

Im ersten Beitrag befasst sich Harald Burger mit semantischen Aspekten der lexikografischen Behandlung der Phraseologismen und versucht, die einsprachigen allgemeinen mit den phraseologischen Wörterbüchern diesbezüglich zu vergleichen. Besonders ausführlich geht er dabei auf die einzelnen Komponenten der Wörterbuchartikel ein, wie z.B. Markierungen, Paraphrasen und Beispiele bzw. Belege. Die Untersuchung zeigt einerseits, dass die Grundprobleme die beiden Wörterbuchtypen im gleichen Maße betreffen und auch dass sie in den Wörterbüchern nur partiell gelöst sind. Andererseits aber erweist sich die Darstellung der Semantik von Phraseologismen in den allgemeinen Wörterbüchern als schwieriger.

Im Beitrag „*Haben die Männer am Grill die Hosen an?*" *Phraseografie und Sprachwirklichkeit* schildert Stefan Ettinger, wie stark und schnell sich die prototypische Bedeutung eines Phraseologismus ändern kann. Auf der Basis von Korpusbelegen für den Phraseologismus "die Hosen anhaben" wird ersichtlich, dass sein Bedeutungsumfang heutzutage viel weiter ist und der Phraseologismus nicht nur in Bezug auf häusliche und familiäre Geschlechterbeziehungen, sondern auch in anderen Kontexten, wie z.B. Sport, Tiere oder öffentliches Leben (Firmen, Parteien), verwendet wird. Da eine Zusammenstellung der Bedeutungsparaphrasen aus den ausgewählten einsprachigen Wörterbüchern zeigt, dass dieser Bedeutungserweiterung in den Nachschlagewerken nicht Rechnung getragen wird, unterbreitet der Autor Vorschläge für eine aktualisierte lexikografische Beschreibung des Phraseologismus.