

From polysemy to semantic change: Towards a typology of lexical semantic associations. Ed. by MARTINE VANHOVE. (Studies in language companion series 106.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008. Pp. xiii, 404. ISBN 9789027205735. \$165 (Hb).

Reviewed by JOHN NEWMAN, *University of Alberta*

This volume is introduced in the foreword (vii) as the product of a project begun in 2002 at the Fédération de Recherche Typologie et Universaux Linguistiques of the French National Centre for Scientific Research. It consists of three parts: 'State of the art' (one chapter), 'Theoretical and methodological issues' (seven chapters), and 'Case studies' (six chapters). I focus here mainly on the first two parts where the more substantive theoretical issues are raised, without intending to diminish the value of the case studies.

In her chapter 'Approaching lexical typology', MARIA KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM provides a wide-ranging overview of the areas of research that constitute the field of lexical typology. She makes it clear that the types of words that are of primary interest in this connection are 'words as carriers of lexical meanings' (8), where *lexical* is presumably to be contrasted with *grammatical* (though *grammaticalizations* are mentioned later). Issues discussed include polysemy, denotation vs. descriptive meaning, and how words carve up some semantic space (e.g. body parts). One section is given over to the question of what meanings can or cannot be expressed by a single word in languages, for example, how many different lexemes a language uses to encode the meanings corresponding to *hand*, *arm*, *foot*, *leg*, *finger*, and *toe* (three in Russian, four in Japanese, a different combination of four in Rumanian, and five in Italian). A separate section deals with the related but different issue of what meanings can be expressed by one and the same lexeme, within one and the same synchronic word family, or by words historically linked. Here, too, body-part terms are discussed, but now with respect to questions that are concerned with identifying and motivating semantic shifts and grammaticalizations associated with examples such as *ts'i* 'mouth' giving rise to *tsi'i* 'in front of' (!Kung), body-part terms developing into reflexive-reciprocal-middle markers, and the polysemy of Samoan *lima* 'hand, five'. It seems very useful to include both kinds of paths within one overarching approach, as Koptjevskaja-Tamm does. Studying how a word such as Russian *ryka* denotes a certain part of the body is thereby integrated with the study of how a word meaning 'hand' (in another language) might change its meaning to 'arm' or might undergo some further derivational process to form a word meaning 'arm'. Having to decide between monosemy and polysemy approaches in describing the meaning of *ryka* becomes less important than identifying and motivating the commonalities between semantic change and the way in which words partition a domain. Koptjevskaja-Tamm also devotes a section to lexicon-grammar interaction involving a great variety of phenomena, for example, body-part terms as used in possessive constructions, kin terms in grammar, suppletion in verb paradigms, and membership of word classes. As she notes, some phenomena typically viewed as 'syntactic' might just as well be thought of as 'lexical' where the phenomena are lexically conditioned, and in that case a lexicon-grammar interaction is all-pervasive. Altogether, Koptjevskaja-Tamm's chapter helpfully draws together a vast amount of relevant research and weaves several different threads of scholarship into a coherent and original whole.

Part 2 begins with STÉPHANE ROBERT's 'Words and their meanings: Principles of variation and stabilization'. Semantic variation of form is viewed as a fundamental characteristic of languages (reflected, for example, in the pervasiveness of polysemy of isolated words) but one that is nevertheless regulated. For example, different metaphorical and metonymic kinds of extensions do not lead to random variation but result in a certain kind of stability whereby the extensions are governed by familiar mechanisms, for example, common schematic meanings and prototypes. Robert pays particular attention to processes at work at the utterance level, such as profiling of different active zones (*he cleaned the window* evokes a different active zone of window than *he opened the window*), constructional meaning, and the resolution of semantic conflicts and of how different meanings of words (or different LANGUAGE DEPTHS) are activated in context. BERNARD POTTIER's chapter, 'The typology of semantic affinities', attempts something similar by presenting an enumeration, in very abbreviated form, of the different mental processes relevant to explicating semantic relationships, and appeals to his own intriguing, though somewhat idiosyncratic,

geometric notation. PETER KOCH's 'Cognitive onomasiology and lexical change: Around the eye' seeks a comprehensive account of the cognitive and formal relations that hold between source and target concepts by utilizing a two-dimensional grid onto which any purportedly related pair of concepts can be placed.

NEILOUFAR FAMILY's 'Mapping semantic spaces: A constructionist account of the "light verb" *xorden* "eat" in Persian' introduces the idea of ISLANDS to impose some order on the array of uses found with a preverb + *xorden* construction. Islands are groupings of related constructional meanings such as 'affected', which in turn has nine subcategories. ALEXANDRE FRANÇOIS, in 'Semantic maps and the typology of colexification: Intertwining polysemous networks across languages', provides a methodology for building up semantic maps in which groups of related meanings as found with one word in a language are (emically) superimposed upon an (etic) array of all of the possible meanings attested with a core concept. It is similar to how one might show certain emic combinations of cells in the etic IPA chart of consonants. The idea of cataloguing types of semantic shift comes to the fore in the content and title of ANNA ZALIZNIAK's chapter, 'A catalogue of semantic shifts: Towards a typology of semantic derivation'. She discusses the formal structure of an entry in a catalogue of synchronic polysemies in different languages. The entries are justified by documented cases of a (regular, even if uncommon) shift through synchronic polysemy, diachronic evolution within one language or in a language descendant, meanings of cognates, and semantic change as part of word derivation. For example, an entry like 'to count' > 'to narrate' is supported by the meanings of the cognates in German and English (*Zahl* 'number' and *tale* 'story'), the derivationally related German word pair *zählen* 'to count' and *erzählen* 'to narrate', and the polysemy of Spanish *contar* 'to count; to narrate'.

BRUNO GAUME, KARINE DUVIGNAU, and MARTINE VANHOVE, in 'Semantic associations and confluences in paradigmatic networks', introduce an algorithmic method that results in a quantification of the semantic proximity of lexical units, a quantification that is accompanied by quite a dramatic visualization of the computationally calculated semantic associations through graphs (results can be seen at <http://Prox.irit.fr>). The authors turn to dictionary definitions as the basis for establishing some association between words. For example, the word *arbre* 'tree' occurs in the definition of *écorcer* 'to strip a tree of its bark' in the dictionary, so one can establish an arc in a graph from *écorcer* to *arbre*. When repeated for each entry in a dictionary, we end up with a graph of the whole dictionary, and graphs of different words can be combined to form larger graphs.

The case studies of Part 3 contain a great many individual examples of semantic shifts, polysemy, and the like in a variety of domains. The reader will be naturally curious as to why three of the six case studies (by EMILIO BONVINI, CHRISTINE HÉNAULT, and PASCAL BOYELDIEU) and the chapter by Family focus on the concepts of 'eat' or 'drink'. Interest in these concepts has grown in recent years (see e.g. Amberber 2002, Pardeshi et al. 2006, Croft 2009, and the chapters in Newman 2009).

While the volume may have its origins in one research project, the chapters present quite a diverse collection of theoretical positions and methods. Still, the volume as a whole fits comfortably within the realm of cognitive linguistics, especially in light of the editor's description of the case studies as taking into account 'as much as possible, as outlined in Robert's article, the role of cultural factors, co-textual and contextual environments, as well as universal cognitive findings, in establishing semantic associations' (x). There is a wealth of stimulating ideas presented here, both theoretical and methodological, and the volume is arguably all the more appealing for not being straight-jacketed into one mold or one methodology. Some of the chapters focus more on a relatively abstract, theoretical understanding of semantic relatedness (e.g. chapters by Robert and Pottier). Some chapters are more obviously 'typological' in the sense that they offer more explicit ways of plotting the linguistic facts of a language onto a 'map' or 'grid' (e.g. chapters by Koch and François). Both semanticists and typologists have much to gain from this volume.

It can be difficult to separate out word meanings from the meanings conveyed by a construction, a phrase, or a sentence. Indeed, some would argue that the surrounding context in which a word occurs is fundamental to understanding the meaning of that word. Some of the papers deal directly with discourse or larger constructional units (e.g. Robert, Family, and Bonvini). Most of the papers, however, are not centrally concerned with cooccurring text of the words being stud-

ied. The more one is interested in grammatical meanings, of course, the more one must turn to surrounding linguistic context in order to explicate the function of a grammatical form. It is no coincidence that Family's paper, concerned as it is with a grammaticalized light-verb use of 'eat' in Persian, is couched entirely in terms of constructions, but this is the only paper that proceeds in this way. Topics such as context and linguistic context are certainly acknowledged in the volume, but they are not given overall prominence. Relatedly, despite the many methods described in these papers, none of them makes use of more recent corpus-based approaches. The paper by Gaume and colleagues has *corpus linguistics* listed as the first of the keywords underneath the abstract and is certainly highly computational, but the 'corpus' used here refers to a large set of dictionary definitions of words rather than a corpus based on usage by speakers or writers. Family's data make use of 'several dictionaries and texts' without further elaboration, and her method makes only anecdotal use of the corpus, retrieving suitable examples when needed instead of adopting a more systematic corpus methodology. Certainly, interesting corpus-based methods are being developed to explore lexical semantics. Gries's (2006) corpus-based study of the polysemy of *run*, for one, is an example of corpus methods applied in a way that would fit in very well with the spirit of this volume.

Sometimes the terminology employed by the authors might cause a North American reader to stumble, for example, *orthonymy*, *orthosemy*, *polysemiosis*, and *proxemy*. There are also occasional infelicities in the use of English, but it would seem churlish to draw undue attention to these, given the intellectual depth of the whole volume. A severe lapse in editing of the indices, however, cannot be allowed to pass without comment. There are many instances of unwanted matching of an index entry to occurrences of the form used in an unrelated sense (somewhat ironic for a volume otherwise preoccupied with differentiating the senses of a word). For example, *Song* in the index of names correctly directs the reader to (*Jae Jung*) *Song* on p. 46, but mistakenly directs the reader also to the common noun *song* on pages 89 and 382. *Old* in the index of languages, appearing as a subcategorization of French, Icelandic, Norse, Russian, and Slavonic, directs the reader to instances such as *old words disappear* (6) and *your ring looks very old-fashioned* (84). Furthermore, *Old* under *Icelandic* references *Old French* on p. 108. These oversights do not interfere with the reading of the content, but do detract from the overall quality of a book that otherwise is a substantive and valuable contribution to the construction of a typology of lexical semantic associations.

REFERENCES

- AMBERBER, MENGISTU. 2002. Quirky alternations of transitivity: The case of ingestive predicates. *Linguistic universals and variation*, ed. by Mengistu Amberber and Peter Collins, 1–19. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- CROFT, WILLIAM. 2009. Connecting frames and constructions: A case study of *eat* and *feed*. *Constructions and Frames* 1.7–28.
- GRIES, STEFAN TH. 2006. Corpus-based methods and cognitive semantics: The many senses of *to run*. *Corpora in cognitive linguistics: Corpus-based approaches to syntax and lexis*, ed. by Stefan Th. Gries and Anatol Stefanowitsch, 57–99. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- NEWMAN, JOHN (ed.) 2009. *The linguistics of eating and drinking*. (Typological studies in language 84.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- PARDESHI, PRASHANT; PETER HOOK; COLIN P. MASICA; HAJAR BABAI SHINJI IDO; KAORU HORIE; JAMBALSUREN DORJKHAND; JOUNGMIN KIM; KANAKO MORI; DILEEP CHANDRALAL; OMKAR N. KOUL; HSIN-HSIN LIANG; YUTARO MURAKAMI; KINGKARN THEPKANJANA; QING-MEI LI; PRASAD VASIREDDI; and TERRY VARMA. 2006. Toward a geotypology of EAT-expressions in languages of Asia: Visualizing areal patterns through WALs. *Gengo Kenkyu* 130.89–108.

4-32 Assiniboia Hall
 Department of Linguistics
 University of Alberta
 Edmonton, Alberta
 T6G 2E7, Canada
 [john.newman@ualberta.ca]