

## REVIEW

A review of Christine Dalton-Puffer and Nikolaus Ritt (eds.) 2000. *Words: Structure, meaning and function. A festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky*.

MALGORZATA FABISZAK AND EWELINA JAGŁA  
*Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań*

The festschrift's radiant smile welcomes the reader on the first page of the book and his spirit permeates the work till the last page. He is present both in references to his works, which have been the source of inspiration for many generations of linguists and in the personal reminiscences of the authors.

In "Old Irish *duilem* 'maker, creator'" Anders Ahlquist questions the etymology of the word, thus far viewed as a calque of Christian creator (Lambert 1996). Unlike Lambert (1996) he believes that the original meaning of the word must have been more concrete and supports his claim with a number of convincing arguments – morphological, semantic and theoretical.

John Anderson and Fran Coleman join forces in "The importance of being Leofwine Hora", where they test Anderson's hypothesis that names are purely referential, as the sources for names become de-lexicalised in the derivation on the data gathered by Coleman. The data consists of Old-English names and by-names, which have been a long-standing research interest of the latter.

Leiv Breivik and Toril Swan ("The desemantisation of existential *there* in a synchronic-diachronic perspective") continue the topic which Breivik has been dealing with over the past 20 years. In the present contribution they claim that *there* has functioned as a non-referring expression from the earliest recorded instances and explain its historical development through the processes of grammaticalisation and subjectification.

Uwe Carls ("Anti- and pro- in Indian English") analyses his own corpus of Indian English in regard to the use of the prefixes *anti-* and *pro-* in word-formation. He concludes that Indian English

"has not developed new types of anti- and pro- combinations. Instead, it makes frequent and creative use of existing types" (p. 41).

In his contribution ("The meaning of *naked* and a theory of metaphor") Hans Jürgen Diller proves that careful semantic analysis can uncover revealing details about the meaning of words. He discovers that the word *naked* is prototypically used of persons rather than bodies and typically tends to mean 'unclothed' rather than 'uncovered'. What I (MF) found most interesting was the comment on the co-occur-

rence of the word with words denoting emotions. It seems that it appears mostly in connection with negative emotions, such as aggression, hatred, ambition and distress, which might suggest that *naked* has negative connotations. On the other hand it can evoke both positive and negative reactions, ranging from shame, through embarrassment, defiance to an invitation or availability for intimacy (p. 56). As Diller says, it definitely involves the psychology of the carrier or the beholder, whose evaluation of the propriety of nakedness influences its connotational value. Diller also makes valuable theoretical comments concerning Goatly's (1997) conventional and unconventional colligation and Lipka's (1990) denotative and inferential features.

Dressler and Ladányi in their paper "On contrastive word formation: German and Hungarian denominal adjective formation" combine the theory of universal preferences with that of typological adequacy. In particular, they concentrate on the difference in morphological richness of productive morphological rules between agglutinating Hungarian and inflecting German. Methodologically the present study is closely related to Dressler's earlier work (Dressler et al. 1987, Dressler and Barbaresi 1994, Dressler and Ladányi 1998). Here the stress is on the qualitative analysis of morphological word-formation rules in the derivation of denominal adjectives. Careful analysis of data lends further insights into natural morphology and corroborates Dressler and Ladányi's earlier assumptions.

Andreas Fischer presents an interesting pilot study of a neglected field of research into terms of colour, i.e. verbs of colour, and concentrates on the verb *to green*. At this early stage of research, for technical reasons, the author focuses on two verb forms: *greened* and *greening*. The paper might serve as an outline for a semantic analysis of verbs of colour. The only reservation may be the use of the modifier *marginal* in the concluding lines

"I have shown how the ecological movement has led to the rejuvenation or renewal, in short the greening, of a once rather marginal colour term" (p. 81).

It remains unclear whether 'marginal' refers to the frequency of the verb in earlier records, which has not been discussed in the part devoted to historical data, or whether it refers to the number of senses this verb has developed. If so, the number of senses of other verbs of colour is not discussed either.

Jacek Fisiak's "ME *beck* in the Midlands: The place name evidence" is a descriptive linguistic study comparing the occurrence of ME *beck* in onomastic evidence with its occurrence as a ModE dialect word. The data allows the author to call for a revision of the concept of the Great Scandinavian Belt (Samuels 1985).

Manfred Görlach in his "Conceptual and semantic change in the history of English" calls for a more systematic approach to semantic change. He emphasises the difference between cultural history and psychology on the one hand and a history of a language on another. His approach is based on functional structuralist principles, which he deems most productive for historical semantic research. He stresses that

notional and semantic distinctions cannot be regarded as historically stable components. The paper finishes with a useful classification of reasons of semantic change.

Klaus Hansen in "The status of -s forms in Modern English" begins with an unnecessary reiteration of textbook information on the history of the Genitive in English. Then he embarks on a presentation of terms used to refer to the 's form by various grammarians. When doing so, he quotes references in an anti-chronological order, e.g. "This is why the examples discussed so far have been described as "determinative genitives" (Quirk et al. 1985: 326 f.) or 'specifying genitives' (Kruisinga<sup>5</sup> 1932: 55)" (p. 115). In footnote 5 the author states that most of Modern English examples come from British quality press, but then in a section devoted to the conditions for the selection between *of* and 's forms he discusses the differences between the spoken and the written language and the differences between various genres (which he calls text types). It remains unclear, what the discussion is based on, as no data on spoken language or other genres has been presented. The claim that "in the spoken language one has to use the *of*-phrase to make the phrase unambiguous" [between 's genitive and -s plural] (p. 119, emphasis mine MF) seems particularly strong, as no research on speakers' sensitivity to such ambiguity has been presented. The major difference between the spoken and written language is that in a face to face interaction meaning can be negotiated, ambiguities clarified. It would be quite illuminating if an investigation of the ratio of 's forms and *of* forms in the potentially ambiguous contexts appearing in spontaneous speech was indeed conducted. The degree of novelty of the article is aptly characterised by the author himself in his conclusion and footnote 8: "Summing up our discussion of these forms, it seems to be most appropriate to characterise them with regard to their predominant grammatical use as determinative phrases marked by enclitic 's<sup>8</sup>. (p. 121); footnote 8: This is basically also the essence of the discussion of the 's phrases by Quirk et al. (1985)".

Raymond Hickey ("Direction and location in Modern Irish") offers a consistent framework for a synchronic analysis of morphemes of direction and location in Modern Irish. An in-depth examination of what seems like an extensive range of examples allows the author to posit a semantic basis for the direction/location distinction, a basis which, he claims, remains transparent to present-day users of Irish.

Werner Hüllen ("John Locke, semanticist") demonstrates how much common ground contemporary semantics shares with 18<sup>th</sup> c. philosophy by example of the "Essay on human understanding" by J. Locke. The conscientious juxtaposition of the two shows the continuity of European thought concerning the relationship between language and the world.

In his "*Thou* in the history of English" Andreas H. Jucker advocates the use of a more dynamic approach to T/V use in the history of English and phrases it as follows: "In contrast to Modern English and the situation in Modern languages that have preserved a T/V distinction, politeness in Middle English, and Early Modern English was more negotiable. Today it is unusual to switch from T to V, and from

the use of a title and last name to first name, just on the basis of anger or contempt. In Middle English and in Early Modern English this appears to have been normal" (p. 158).

Barbara Kryk-Kastovsky's "Diminutives: an interface of word-formation, semantics and pragmatics" complements Dressler and Merlini-Barbatesi's solid study and shows that diminutives, especially in Polish, can have lexicalised denotative meanings which are markedly different from that of their source words. My personal reflection on diminution arising from this contribution is that it is even more "complex and multifarious" than the author has had space to prove as it is subject to not only regional (mentioned in the passing) but also family variation. What I (MF) have in mind is that while the double diminutive discussed on p. 172: *skarbeczek* seems perfectly natural, I have never used its source form: *skarbek*. Another diminutive from *skarb*, i.e. *skarbuś* would seem more common to me, but it employs a different diminutive forming suffix, not discussed in the paper.

Roger Lass in "Which end is your head on? Typological remarks on modern Persian" with the lightness and humour so characteristic of his style presents data on Persian head-parameter. The data may seem quite confusing from typological and genetic perspectives, but the author shows competently that it can be neatly explained on the grounds of language contact.

Leonhard Lipka's "Word-formation and (proper) names: A neglected field" is by far the most confusing paper in the collection. The author's aim seems to be to relate different classes of naming expressions to word-formation techniques, which sounds very promising. However, it is hard to tell if the goal is ever attained, since the organisation of the paper leaves the reader with an unsettling feeling of having to deal with a rather impressionistic collection of ideas, the sensation of which is further reinforced by the somewhat irregular use of italics. Needless to say, it makes the article fairly reader-unfriendly.

Magnus Ljung ("Text condensation in the press: the case of compound adjectival premodifiers") hypothesises that owing to space-constraint in hard-news writing, this type of writing should be rich in space-saving premodifiers. The analysis of the hard-news sections and sport-news stories in 5 weekday issues of *The Times* and *The New York Times* (1997) shows that although compound adjectival premodifiers are more frequent in hard-news, they represent a productive process in both newspaper genres (p. 212).

Stephen J. Nagle and Patsy L. Holmes ("On the semantics of the English double modals") present a very interesting study on Southern American English double modals. Following Perkins (1983) they use the conditionality continuum to describe the modals they focus on (*can*, *could*, *may*, and *might*) in terms of modality. They also adapt (and expand on) Perkins's notational system to define the conditioning environment in each case. And it is this notational system that appears to me to be the major drawback of this otherwise extremely valuable paper: for my part, I (EJ) am strongly against introducing quasi-mathematical symbols and formulas into lin-

guistic papers which, brief and precise though they seem, neither clarify nor add anything (except confusion) and consequently, require further verbal explanation on the part of the authors, which is exactly what happens here. Nevertheless, the authors succeed in presenting double modals as semantically systematized, complementing and... dictating their syntactic order (p. 231).

Terttu Nevalainen and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg ("The third-person singular *-(e)s* and *-(e)th* revisited: the morphophonemic hypothesis") investigate the historical change of *-th* to *-s* in the third person singular in Southern English, by analysing the distribution of the *-(e)th* and the *-(e)s* spelling variants in letters written by a number of the sixteenth century Londoners. The results of their research question the validity of Holmqvist's (1922) claim that *-s* was a generally accepted variant right from the beginning of the sixteenth century.

Next comes Matti Rissanen's interesting article on the grammaticalisation of according to ("Paths of loan-word grammaticalisation: the case of according to"). In the well-documented study Rissanen proves that "[t]he prepositionalisation of *according* to illustrates the pattern of loan-word grammaticalisation in Middle English. The word is borrowed with a fairly restricted meaning (...) the sense is rapidly generalised and becomes more abstract (...) and finally the new deverbal preposition is readily accepted in less formal and genre-specific context" (p. 258-9).

Herbert Schendl's quantitative analysis of the third person plural present indicative form in Shakespearean English ("The third person present plural in Shakespeare's First Folio: A case of interaction of morphology and syntax?") shows that the choice of the inflectional ending (the zero variant or the *-(e)s* variant) is dependent on the type of subject, which reflects roughly the 'Type of Subject Constraint' sub-rule of Montgomery's Northern Present Tense Rule (1994). Schendl concludes that

"Shakespeare's First Folio shows some interaction between morphology and syntax" (p. 273).

In her ingenious "The function of word-formation and the case of English *-cum-*" Gabriele Stein focuses on the *-cum-* formations in Modern English. In the first section of her paper, Stein produces a rather generous sample of such constructions found in fiction, and presents a critical overview of the treatment of the *-cum-* element in a number of dictionaries (*OED*, the *Concise Oxford dictionary of current English* (1995), the *New shorter Oxford English dictionary on historical principles* (1993), *Webster's third new international dictionary*, and *Collins Cobuild English language dictionary* (1987)). The author, who views *-cum-* as different from both affixes and co-ordinating conjunctions, proceeds to establish semantic relationships between the two elements of a typical *-cum-* formation. In the second part of the article, Stein discusses the functions of word-formation, and postulates her own interesting definition thereof.

In "What happened to Old English clitic pronouns and why?" Robert Stockwell and Donka Minkova discuss the fate of OE clitic pronouns, trying to establish the time and the reasons for decliticisation. An overview of pronoun placement in a number of Middle English texts shows clearly the results of decliticisation even in the earliest of them. The authors present three hypotheses which could explain the change: the Scandinavian influence hypothesis, which they find least convincing; the ambiguity of pronominal object positioning hypothesis; and an analogy resulting from the SVO word order.

Gunnel Tottie ("On the meaning of complement-*as*-constructions") deals with the ambiguity of complement-*as*-constructions. Apart from presenting a critical overview of the earlier discussion on the construction in Jespersen (1927), *OED* (second edition), and Quirk et al. (1985), as well as Kjellmer (1992), Tottie presents the results of his own study based on 53 contemporary examples found in fiction, newspapers and magazines, conducted in an attempt to see what factors influence the concessive, the causal, and the concomitant readings of complement-*as*-constructions. On the basis of his research Tottie also draws conclusions as to the origins of the complement-*as*-constructions, and postulates two different sources for the causal and the concessive constructions.

In "Eyes and ears" Werner Winter considers the presence of a diphthong in the Germanic forms for *eye*. Its development could be explained by the influence of *ear*, the diphthong in *eye* being a result of analogical reshaping, as "eye and ear is a non-identical, yet natural pair and (...) a semantically delimited paradigm (...) so that the postulated Germanic transfer of the diphthong in 'ear' to 'eye' falls well within the range of expectable" (p. 324). He then tries to explain along the same lines the irregularity of the Armenian plural form for *ears*, and postulates that it stems from the re-interpretation of *eye[dual]* as *elliptic 'ear[dual]'* (p. 325) in the same eye and ear phrase.

In conclusion, Christine Dalton-Puffer and Nikolaus Ritt, the editors of the volume managed to prepare a festschrift which closely reflects the research interests of the festschrifters. The majority of papers are valuable contributions revolving around such topics as historical linguistics (in particular Old English), morphology, morphophonology, semantics and, marginally, syntax. The book is of interest to those students of the discipline who make the word the core of their linguistic investigations.

#### REFERENCES

- Dressler, W. U., W. Mayerthaler, W. U. Wurzel and O. Panagl. 1987. *Leitmotifs in Natural Morphology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.  
 Dressler, W. U. and L. Merlini Barbaresi. 1994. *Morphopragmatics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.  
 Dressler, W. U. and M. Ladányi. 1998. "On grammatical productivity of word formation rules". *Wiener Linguistische Gazette* 62/63. 29-55.

- Eaton, R., O. Fischer, W. Koopman, F. van der Leek (eds.). 1985. *Papers from the 4<sup>th</sup> International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (Amsterdam, 10-13 April 1985)*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.  
 Fenton, A. and D. A. MacDonald (eds.). 1994. *Studies in Scots and Gaelic. Proceedings of the third international conference on the languages of Scotland*. Edinburgh: Canongate Academic.  
 Goatly, A. 1997. *The language of metaphors*. London: Routledge.  
 Holmqvist, E. 1922. *On the history of the English present inflections, particularly -th and -s*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.  
 Jespersen, O. 1927. *A Modern English grammar on historical principles*. Part III. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.  
 Kjellmer, G. 1992. "Old as he was: A note on concessiveness and causality." *English Studies* 74. 337-350.  
 Lambert, P-Y. 1996. *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien de Joseph Vendryes*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique and Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.  
 Lipka, L. 1990. *An outline of English lexicology*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.  
 Montgomery, M. 1994. "The evolution of verb concord in Scots". In Fenton, A. and D. A. MacDonald (eds.). 81-95.  
*The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. 1989. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
 Perkins, M. R. 1983. *Modal expressions in English*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.  
 Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.  
 Samuels, M. L. 1985. "The Great Scandinavian Belt". In Eaton, R. et al. (eds.). 269-281.