

## BOOK REVIEWS

**N.I. Stolova.** *Cognitive Linguistics and lexical change. Motion verbs from Latin to Romance.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.331>

Reviewed by **Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano** (University of Zaragoza)

This book studies the semantic evolution of translocative motion verbs from Latin to Romance from a historical cognitive linguistics perspective. It is divided into ten chapters plus references and two indexes, one for language and language families and another for subjects and terms. It has two main goals: (i) to apply cognitive linguistics methodologies and theoretical tools (mainly, lexicalisation patterns and conceptual metaphor) to explain the onomasiological (Chapters 2–4) and semasiological (Chapters 5–7) evolution of motion verbs, and (ii) to bring useful insights from (Romance) historical linguistic practice into cognitive linguistic research (Chapters 8–9).

Chapter 1 outlines the main goals, explains key concepts (motion verb, lexical change), and contextualises the research to follow. This investigation examines how the structural and semantic characteristics of Latin motion verbs diachronically develop into Romance from both a general Pan-Romance stance as well as a language-specific level. Ten categories of translocative motion are examined: one general motion (neutral GO), six path-related (TOWARD, AWAY, INSIDE, OUTSIDE, UPWARD, DOWNWARD), and three manner-related (WALK, RUN, JUMP). Data mainly come from ten languages (Latin, Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, Romanian, Catalan, Occitan, Sardinian, Raeto-Romance), plus a few others (Aragonese, Sicilian).

Chapters 2 through 4 are devoted to the onomasiological study of Latin and Romance motion verbs. Chapter 2 provides the reader with the necessary methodological background to understand the onomasiological analysis to come in the following chapters. First, it sketches Koch and colleagues' three-dimensional grid for the study of lexical change (see, e.g., Blank, 2003; Koch, 2000a, 2004; Koch, & Marzo, 2007). The diachronic analysis of motion verbs rests on this grid and its three dimensions: cognitive-associative (relations such as identification or similarity), formal (morpholexical devices such as affixation), and stratificational (relations such as lexical borrowings). Second, it presents the basic ideas in Talmy's (2000) theory of lexicalisation patterns (satellite-framed and verb-framed) and discusses some of its main shortcomings and applications.

Chapter 3 offers “biographies” of the ten categories of motion verbs explored in this book. That is, a detailed and documented formal inventory of the lexical items encoding each type of motion in Latin and then, their development into Romance. This inventory reveals that, as expected, all motion categories both underwent some changes and retained some features in the number of motion lexical items and their structure. In other words, there is a combination of formal innovation and formal stability in each motion category. Furthermore, it shows that, although most directional verbs were satellite-framed in Latin (e.g., IN-IRE ‘in-go’) and verb-framed in Romance (e.g., Portuguese *subir* ‘go up’), there was also a group of verbs that did not respect this general tendency (e.g., Latin SCANDERE ‘to ascend’, French *s’en aller* ‘to go away’).

On the basis of the verb biographies described in the previous chapter, Chapter 4 establishes two different pathways for the evolution of motion verbs from Latin to Romance: lexical continuity (and loss) and lexical innovation. Adopting Stefenelli’s (1992) five types of lexical continuity (Pan-Romance, inter-Romance, regional, sporadic, and zero (loss)), Stolova explains why some verbs became Pan- / inter-Romantic whereas others were lost or reduced to regional or sporadic usage. She proposes two converging factors: the formal complexity of the verb and the cognitive salience of path information. Monomorphemic neutral and manner verbs that did not encode path such as IRE ‘to go’ or CURRERE ‘to run’ were kept. In the case of directional verbs, only those that were monomorphemic (e.g., VENIRE ‘to come’) or perceived as simple thanks to fusion with the stem or semantic bleaching (e.g., EXIRE ‘to go out’) were successfully kept across more Romance varieties. Latin directional compound verbs, on the other hand, were either lost (e.g., ABIRE ‘to go away’, CONSCENDERE ‘to go up’) or became restricted in use (e.g., PERVENIRE ‘to come’). As far as lexical innovation is concerned, after a detailed inventory of novel Romance verbs arranged according to the onomasiological grid, Stolova identifies two strategies to create new motion verbs. One follows the verb-framed pattern (i.e., path in verb) as in the deadjectival verb *artziai* ‘to go up’ (< Latin ALTUS ‘high’) in Sardinian or the denominal verb *pujar* ‘to go up’ (< Late Latin \*PODIARE < Latin PODIUM ‘elevated place’) in Catalan. The other follows the satellite-framed pattern (i.e., path in satellite) but with one difference: the source of satellites. Instead of using prepositions such as EX ‘out’ in EXIRE ‘to go out’, Stolova (p. 79) proposes that these new verbs rely on the reflexive pronoun SE and the deictic adverb INDE ‘thence’ as in Catalan *anar-se’n* ‘to go away’ (< AMBULARE ‘to walk’ + SE + INDE). Stolova also emphasises that these new innovative strategies in Romance were already present in Late Latin (see, Stolova, 2008). She argues that they resulted from the increasing usage, or in Pountain’s (2000, p. 5) terms, “capitalization”, of SE and the less general tendency to “incorporate the deictic adverbs IBI ‘there’ and INDE ‘thence’ into word-formation” (p. 82).

Chapters 5 through 7 explore the semasiological perspective, especially the metaphorisation and, to a much lesser extent, the grammaticalisation of motion verbs from Latin in Romance. Chapter 5 provides the reader with a succinct overview of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980, 1999) Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) and compiles a list of motion-related conceptual metaphors (pp.92–94). This chapter also touches on Traugott and her colleagues' (Traugott, 1985; Traugott, & Dascher, 2002; Traugott, & Trousdale, 2013) views on grammaticalisation. This morphosyntactic process is the source of new motion-based periphrases in Romance such as the GO-future in some varieties (e.g., Spanish *ir a* 'go to' + infinitive) and the *andare* 'to go' and *venire* 'to come' passive auxiliaries in Italian.

Chapters 6 and 7 examine the metaphorical semantic extensions in motion verbs. In Chapter 6, after reviewing 25 different motion-related conceptual metaphors, Stolova concludes that, unlike what happens in the onomasiological analysis, there is hardly any semasiological innovation. Most of the metaphors found in Romance were already common in Latin. Therefore, continuity is the key to explain the semasiological evolution from Latin in Romance. As Stolova suggests, this stability is only natural since metaphor is concerned with meanings, not with their formal encoding. The only two Pan-Romantic innovative semantic developments attested in Stolova's sources are discussed in Chapter 7. These are the conceptual metaphors VALIDITY IS MOTION and FUNCTIONING IS MOTION. The former is usually encoded with RUN verbs (e.g., Spanish/Portuguese *correr*, Italian *correre*, Catalan *córrer*, and Raeto-Romance *currer*) and thus, Stolova relates this metaphor with DIFFUSION IS MOTION and VALIDITY IS DIFFUSION in Latin. The latter is encoded with WALK and JUMP verbs (e.g., Spanish *andar* and *saltar*, Italian *caminare* and *saltare*, French *marcher* and *sauter*, Romanian *a umbla*, Occitan *sautar*). The chapter ends with some brief sections devoted to Ibero-Romance-specific novel semantic extensions, the role of borrowing in semantic innovations, and the ubiquity of motion-related metaphors. Stolova also includes a disclaimer about her findings: they are based on written evidence and therefore, they do "not necessarily indicate absence of some of these mappings in Latin spoken usage" (p.166).

Whereas the first six chapters apply cognitive linguistic methodology to account for lexical change in motion verbs in Latin and Romance, the final two chapters take the other standpoint. They explore how (Romance) historical linguistics can contribute to current debates on motion encoding in cognitive linguistics. Chapter 8 summarises the main findings coming from the preceding comparative-historical onomasiological analysis on motion verbs. It opens with a compilation of the 31 different patterns (plus illustrative examples) found in the emergence of motion verbs in Romance. The number and heterogeneous nature

of these patterns allow Stolova to put forward one of the main contributions to the typology of motion encoding: the multi-faceted explanation for the development from satellite-framed Latin into verb-framed Romance. Stolova argues that the shift in lexicalisation patterns is not a “one-way trajectory [...] but a street with three parallel threads” (p.185). In other words, there are three converging reasons for the evolution of Romance motion verbs: (i) the preference for simple rather than compound motion verbs, (ii) the maintenance of the prepositional satellite + verb pattern with a posterior reanalysis as a simple verb-framed form, and (iii) the preservation of the satellite-framed pattern but with innovative types of satellites beyond prepositions, such as pronouns and adverbs. Stolova further claims that the change in lexicalisation pattern in Romance was neither abrupt nor externally-driven. Both lexicalisation options started from within the family (in Late Latin), coexisted, and survived, in different degrees of productivity (e.g., Italian *verbi sintagmatici*), until today.

Chapter 9 focuses on the results from the comparative-historical semasiological examination of motion metaphors. Stolova suggests that knowledge about the intra-genetic diachronic evolution of conceptual meanings can shed some light on the debate around the universal vs. language-specific nature of conceptual metaphors.

Finally, Chapter 10 summarises the main findings and suggests future lines of collaboration between cognitive linguistics and historical linguistics.

*Cognitive Linguistics and lexical change. Motion verbs from Latin to Romance* is a wonderful and unmissable piece of high-quality work. Thanks to Stolova’s expertise in both (Romance) historical linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics, the book brings together two research perspectives that should have never been apart when discussing semantics (both forms and meanings). The book is clearly organised, beautifully written, and well-informed. It contains zillions of (glossed) illustrative examples as well as new explanations and much-needed clarifications on long-standing wrong assumptions about motion event typologies.

This book is a milestone in the diachronic study of motion events in Latin and Romance. Among its main findings, I will mention just three: (i) the significance of path information in the evolution of motion verbs, (ii) the co-existence of both lexicalisation patterns since Late Latin and in Romance, and (iii) the divergent pathways of change in diachronic onomasiology (mostly, innovation and loss) and semasiology (mostly, continuity).

It is for these reasons that any researcher working in these general domains – historical linguistics, Cognitive Linguistics, Romance languages – should read this book. I can provide at least one reason for each field. Historical linguists will discover interesting ways to explain why semantic changes are motivated and to further apply their rich knowledge on the diachronic evolution of particular

lexical items to a wider context. Cognitive linguists will find sound diachronic analyses to actually attest one of the main tenets in this framework: the diffuse character of the classical dichotomy between diachrony and synchrony. The study of present-day meaning requires the study of that meaning in previous stages and vice versa. Finally, specialists in Romance languages will see in this book a handy and complete reference source for the semantic field of motion. In one volume, this book compiles an extensive, and sometimes hard-to-find, list of bibliographical references, as well as detailed structural, semantic, and etymological information about Latin motion verbs and their development in both national and minority Romance languages. In this respect, I should note that I miss a specific motion verb index at the end of the book. Of course, this is not an absolute requirement; however, after all the painstaking work on these verbs, such an index could have been an incredibly useful tool to quickly access the rich information that now appears distributed throughout the book.

This book is also a ‘must’ for any researcher interested in motion events and ‘compulsory’ for those working within (or closely related to) the Talmian framework. Apart from the arguments provided above, I will highlight two further reasons why I think this book is crucial. These are mostly developed in Chapter 8, which is probably one of the best chapters in the book. First, it sheds light on the question of how and why satellite-framed Latin evolved into verb-framed Romance (see, also Iacobini, 2012, 2015). Second, it provides sound arguments to dismiss the classification of some Romance languages as “hybrid” (Kopecka, 2006; Pourcel, & Kopecka, 2005) or “mixed” (Koch, 2000b; Simone, 2008). Stolova clearly shows the adduced satellite-like features “attributed in earlier studies to Italian and French are abundantly found in other Romance varieties as well [... and] that the role of satellites in Romance languages is much more complex and geographically diffused than was originally thought” (p.184).

Stolova, while vindicating the extraordinary wealth of Romance historical data available, devotes the last lines in her book to make a plea: “that in the future more cognitively-oriented studies will focus their attention on the developments attested from Latin to Romance” (p.207). I will make this plea/hope mine and end this review much in the same vein: Let us really go back in time to explain the present and foresee the future in semantics. After all, this is at the heart of Cognitive Semantics.

## Funding

This research has been supported by grant FFI2017–82460–P from the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry, and Competitiveness and by the Government of Aragon (Psylex H11–17R).

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the Editors for their enormous patience and understanding.

## References

- Blank, A. (2003). Words and concepts in time: Towards diachronic cognitive onomasiology. In R. Eckardt, K. von Heusinger & Ch. Schwarze (Eds.), *Words in time: Diachronic semantics from different points of view* (pp. 37–65). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110899979.37>
- Iacobini, C. (2012). Grammaticalization and innovation in the encoding of motion events. *Folia Linguistica*, 46, 359–385. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2012.013>
- Iacobini, C. (2015). Particle-verbs in Romance. In P.O. Müller, I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen & F. Rainer (Eds.), *Word-formation. An international handbook of the languages of Europe* (pp. 626–658). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Koch, P. (2000a). Pour une approche cognitive du changement sémantique lexical: Aspect onomasiologique. In the Société de Linguistique de Paris (Ed.), *Théories contemporaines du changement sémantique* (pp. 75–95). Leuven: Peeters.
- Koch, P. (2000b). Indirizzi cognitivi per una tipologia lessicale dell'italiano. *Italianische Studien*, 21, 99–117.
- Koch, P. (2004). Diachronic onomasiology and semantic reconstruction. In W. Mihatsch & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Lexical data and universals of semantic change* (pp. 79–106). Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Koch, P., & Marzo, D. (2007). A two-dimensional approach to the study of motivation in lexical typology and its first application to French high-frequency vocabulary. *Studies in Language*, 31(2), 259–291. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.31.2.02koc>
- Kopecka, A. (2006). The semantic structure of motion verbs in French: Typological perspectives. In M. Hickmann & S. Robert (Eds.), *Space in languages: Linguistic systems and cognitive categories* (pp. 83–101). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.66.06kop>
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Pountain, Ch. J. (2000). Pragmatic factors in the evolution of the Romance reflexive (with special reference to Spanish). *Hispanic Research Journal*, 1(1), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1179/hrj.2000.1.1.5>
- Pourcel, S., & Kopecka, A. (2005). Motion expression in French: Typological diversity. *Durham & Newcastle Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11, 139–153.
- Simone, R. (2008). Verbi sintagmatici come categoria e come costruzione. In M. Cini (Ed.), *I verbi sintagmatici in italiano e nelle varietà dialettali: Stato dell'arte e prospettive di ricerca. Atti delle giornate di studio (Torino, 19–20 febbraio 2007)* (pp. 13–30). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Stefenelli, A. (1992). *Das Schicksal des lateinischen Wortschatzes in den romanischen Sprachen*. Passau: Richard Rothe.

- Stolova, N.I. (2008). From satellite-framed Latin to verb-framed Romance: Late Latin as an intermediate stage. In R. Wright (Ed.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif VIII: Actes du VIIIe Colloque International sur le Latin Vulgaire et Tardif, Oxford, 6–9 septembre 2006* (pp. 253–262). Hildesheim: Georg Olms; Zürich: Weidmann.
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Traugott, E. C. (1985). On regularity in semantic change. *Journal of Literary Semantics: An international review*, 14(3), 155–173.
- Traugott, E. C., & Dascher, R. B. (2002). *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, E. C., & Trousdale, G. (2013). *Constructionalization and constructional changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199679898.001.0001>

### Address for correspondence

Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano  
University of Zaragoza / IPH  
Departamento de Lingüística y Literaturas Hispánicas  
San Juan Bosco, 7  
E-50009 Zaragoza  
Spain