

Reviews and Notices

Halliday, M.A.K. & Colin Yallop, *Lexicology. A Short Introduction*. 2007. London and New York: Continuum. 128 pp. ISBN 082649479X. Price: £ 12.99.

The book under review is mainly intended for undergraduate students of Linguistics (back blurb). It consists of material previously (2004) published in *Lexicology and Corpus Linguistics* and corresponds to roughly the first half of that book. No changes have been made in the 2004 text, except that the last two sections of Chapter 1 have been promoted to chapter status (Chapter 3) and the bibliography has been thinned out. A Glossary and an Index (revised) have been retained. Halliday is one of the grand old men of linguistics; Yallop is, among other things, editor in chief of the fourth edition (2005) of *The Macquarie Dictionary* (of Australian English). The book consists of three chapters, which are not coauthored: Halliday is the author of 1 and 3, Yallop of chapter 2. It is a slender and attractive volume, with the text occupying 103 pages, its front and back covers decorated with part of a column from (surprisingly, given the authors' Australian background) an American dictionary.

The last fourteen pages of the book are used for the glossary, the list of references and the index. The glossary has some 50 entries, only about half of which are to be found also in the index. Useful though the other half may be, there is thus no direct relationship between those terms and the text of the book.

A distinction is usually made in linguistics between *lexicology* and *lexicography*, with lexicology defined as dealing with the organization of vocabulary in a fairly abstract sense and lexicography as having to do with the production of dictionaries, including the organization of the presentation of lexical entries. That distinction is not strictly observed in the book, and the definition of lexicology given by Halliday (p. 4) is a very broad one: "Lexicology is the study of content words, or lexical items." Sections such as "History of lexicology" (which deals with dictionaries in India, China, the Islamic world and "Europe" in the restricted sense of France, Germany, Italy, Russia and Spain) and "Evolution of the dictionary and the thesaurus in England" in Halliday's Chapter 1 might just as well have appeared in a handbook of lexicography. However, from the point of view of the prospective readership of undergraduates, this is not necessarily a drawback and the same holds for Yallop's section "Prescription" although it deals exclusively with grammar and has nothing to do with lexicology, even in the broad sense stated initially. Even the term that is so central to these authors' thinking about language, *lexicogrammar*, i.e. "a vast network of choices" in which "there is no exact point where the lexicologist stops and the grammarian takes over", has to be stretched in order to incorporate this section.

As for basic semantic terminology, it can be noted, without criticism, that Halliday in his highly readable introductory chapter, like the majority of linguists, uses the asymmetric pair *hyponym-superordinate term* (though not very explicitly) in preference to *hyponym-hyperonym*. His use of *collocation*, however, is less widespread; his definition is not primarily based on frequent juxtaposition of certain words or on fixed strings but on the likelihood that one word occurs in a text because another word is present (*pain* being extra frequent or at least more likely in a text where *injure* occurs).

Yallop's chapter makes interesting reading, but the focus on lexicology is not always clear. The anecdotal character of parts of his sections will probably go down well with the intended readership, as will the sheer range of languages touched upon. Some readers may not share his enthusiasm for the intricacies of botanical nomenclature (pp. 68–74), but what may be lost there will be gained through the eye-openers on Aboriginal kinship terms.

As for weaknesses, it should be noted that the present scene as regards dictionaries is not given a very up-to-date or balanced description. Although the CD version of *The Oxford English Dictionary* is described as an important innovation, there is no mention of the online version (launched in the year 2000), which is even more important since that is where the continuous updating is being done. Of the five major learners' dictionaries available as from 2002, only COBUILD and LDOCE are mentioned, and only in their early (pre-2000 or even pre-1995, "the year of the dictionaries") editions. Not that a survey is intended in the book, but Oxford's OALD could deserve mention as being the earliest, Macmillan's MED as being the latest and Cambridge's CIDE/CALD as having an innovative macro-structure. As regards corpora, the address given for *Bank of English* (p. 114) is useless in two ways: @ has been inserted in the web address in the position of a dot, and the Corpus is no longer at Birmingham University but has been moved to Collins, Glasgow. The address for information about the London-Lund Corpus (spoken English) is correct but it is difficult to see why it is included, since that corpus is never mentioned in the text. There may have been a mix-up with the full Survey of English Usage (from which the spoken material for London-Lund was extracted), which is mentioned in connection with the Brown University Corpus as an example of early corpus linguistics.

As far as the present reviewer can see, there are few factual errors in the text. On p. 22 there is a sweeping statement about the chronology of three what Halliday calls "spin-offs" of the *New/Oxford English Dictionary* ("numerous editions since the 1930s"). The term and the chronology are adequate for only one of them, viz. *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, which, according to its preface, is "an abridgement [of the New English Dictionary] officially authorized", published in 1933, five years after the last volume of the *NED*. As for the other two, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, compiled by the Fowler brothers, was first published in 1911 and their *Oxford Pocket Dictionary* in 1924, the latter being a spin-off of the former and both of them in principle independent of the *NED*. On p. 39 the Latin name for the muscle that can raise one's upper lip is given as *levator labii superior*, a form that gives a large number of hits in a Google search but which is nevertheless incorrect, since it means "the upper 'raiser' of a lip" instead of "the 'raiser' of the upper lip". The adjective must agree with its head, *labii*, and take a genitive suffix (-is), giving the structure and the form [levator] [labii superioris]. The full officially established name, as given by *Nomina anatomica*, is *musculus levator labii superioris*. On p. 47 it is pointed out that etymology should not force the meaning of *premises* to be "[things] sent beforehand"; the basic idea is correct and valuable, but the origin of *premises* is late Latin *praemissa* (neuter plural) used in property contracts in the sense of "aforementioned [things]", which makes the sense development less mysterious. On p. 95 two early one-million-word corpora are described as both composed of passages of five thousand words. This is true only for *Survey of English Usage*, which has 200 such samples, whereas the correct figure for *Brown* is two thousand words (and thus 500 samples). In the References the wording of a few entries may cause confusion. Chomsky's seminal *Syntactic Structures* appeared in 1957 in *Janua Linguarum* (Mouton), not as a publication by HarperCollins, and his *New Horizons* ... was indeed published by Cambridge University Press but not in Cambridge Massachusetts. Landau's *Dictionaries*... from 1989 is not the second edition but simply a Cambridge UK reprint of the 1984 publication by Charles Scribner's Sons. This comment would have been nitpicking if it had not been for the fact that Landau, in his preface to the "real" second edition 2001, emphasizes that instead of scanning the first edition he "elected to retype all of it" because that procedure would force him to "review every word". From a practical point of view, a student

who is recommended to read about corpora in the second edition and turns to the 1989 printing is bound to be disappointed, because the book was written 1981–82, before the second generation of corpora started appearing.

As for misprints, Malinowski, the anthropologist, is called Malinowksi at least twice, one instance being in the bibliography, both cases transferred from the 2004 publication in *Lexicology and Corpus Linguistics*. In the revised Index we find *tullio* for *Tullio* (de Mauro) and *neoligism* for *neologism*. An amusing misprint which almost makes one suspect a joke is *detonation* in the alphabetical position of *denotation* (which is thus in principle missing) in the Index.

To sum up, the mistakes and inadequacies that have been spotted here are of a kind that will annoy expert readers only. The target readership, undergraduates in Linguistics, will no doubt enjoy the book and experience a boost in their interest in words, but it should be remembered that this is not a handbook of lexicology *sensu stricto*. One should also question the policy of lifting chapters from a publication and transforming them into a separate book without updating and corrections.

Arne Olofsson

Duden, Richtiges und gutes Deutsch. Wörterbuch der sprachlichen Zweifelsfälle. 6. vollständig überarbeitete Auflage. Duden Band 9, 1053 Seiten. Mannheim 2008. ISBN-13: 978-3-411-04096-4.

Im Jahr 1965 erschien in der Dudenreihe als Band 9 *Hauptschwierigkeiten der deutschen Sprache* mit dem Untertitel „Wörterbuch der sprachlichen Zweifelsfälle“ (s. Gert Mellbourn, Neue Handbücher für den Deutschunterricht, *Moderna språk* 1966, S. 110 ff.). Die zweite Aufl. hieß *Zweifelsfälle der deutschen Sprache* mit dem Untertitel „Wörterbuch der sprachlichen Hauptschwierigkeiten“. Die dritte Aufl. 1985 wiederum hatte den wohl werbewirksameren Namen *Richtiges und gutes Deutsch* (Untertitel: „Wörterbuch der sprachlichen Zweifelsfälle“). Diese Aufl. wurde von mir in *Moderna språk* 1987, S. 257 ff. besprochen.

Der vorliegende wesentlich erweiterte Band wurde, „auf der Grundlage der neuen amtlichen Rechtschreibregeln“, von dem diesjährigen Dudenpreisträger, Professor Peter Eisenberg bearbeitet. Dieser war maßgeblich beteiligt an dem Kompromissvorschlag der Deutschen Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung, *Zur Reform der deutschen Rechtschreibung* (2002). Wenn auch vieles davon in der Neuregelung übernommen wurde, sind mehrere fragwürdige Neuerungen geblieben (s. *Lingua* 4, 2006, S. 8 ff.: „Der erneut revidierte Duden“). Eisenberg musste also nolens volens diese hinnehmen; in einigen Fällen bemüht er sich auch um eine Begründung. So heißt es z.B. unter *belämmert*:

„Das umgangssprachliche Adjektiv *belämmert* 'verlegen, betreten; übel, schlimm' (*Er macht ein belämmertes Gesicht, Die Sache ist ziemlich belämmert*) hat nichts mit *Lämmern* zu tun, sondern ist das Partizip II des niederdeutschen Verbs *belemmern* 'hindern, in Verlegenheit bringen'. Trotzdem wird es nach den neuen Regeln mit *ä* geschrieben, da der sprachliche Hintergrund nicht allgemein bekannt ist und das Wort deshalb mit *Lamm* in Verbindung gebracht wird“.

In sehr vielen Fällen stellt die Neuregelung Varianten zur freien Wahl. Demgegenüber erleichtert der neue Rechtschreibduden, wie in *Lingua* a.a.O. dankbar vermerkt wurde, die Entscheidung, indem er in manchen Fällen die eine Variante empfiehlt, so für zahlreiche Zusammensetzungen wie *allgemeinbildend, gewinnbringend, gleichlautend, nichtssagend, zufriedenstellend, Handvoll, hierzulande, sogenannt, zutage* usw.

Eisenberg nimmt zu diesen Fällen nicht Stellung. So heißt es z.B. unter *Hand* „Zusammen- und Getrennschreibung ist möglich bei: *eine Handvoll/Hand voll*

Salz, zwei Handvoll/Hand voll Erde, ein paar Handvoll/Hand voll Reis.“ Demnach sollen wohl auch Wortgruppen wie „eine Hand voll Kinder“, „eine Hand voll Häuser“ korrekt sein?

Wie im Rechtschreibduden fehlt unter *wohl* als Beispiel *wohlbekannt*, das natürlich nur zusammengeschrieben sein kann, falls nicht „vermutlich bekannt“ gemeint ist. Eigenartig ist die Zulassung von großem Buchstaben in den gegen die Grammatik verstoßenden Sätzen „du hast ganz Recht“ und „Sie haben ja so Recht“ (S. 752).

Unter dem neu hinzugekommenen ist der ausführliche Abschnitt über „Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern in der Sprache“ als Spiegelung der gesellschaftlichen Veränderung von besonderem Interesse. Erfreulich ist hier, dass von dem Unfug mit großem I im Wortinneren („KollegInnen“) abgeraten wird. Bezeichnend ist auch die Neuformulierung unter *Frau/Fräulein*: „Bei der Anrede oder zur Bezeichnung einer erwachsenen Frau wird *Frau* verwendet, und zwar unabhängig von Alter und Familienstand. *Fräulein* ist nicht mehr üblich, außer wenn die angesprochene Frau sich diese Anrede selbst wünscht“. In der Aufl. 1985 hieß es lediglich: „Bei der Anrede für eine erwachsene weibliche Person setzt sich *Frau* gegenüber *Fräulein* immer stärker durch, und zwar unabhängig von Alter und Familienstand“.

Neu ist auch der Begriff *Political Correctness*, „eine Anfang der 1990er Jahre an Universitäten der USA geprägte, umstrittene Bezeichnung für eine ‚richtige‘ Einstellung ...“, mit Beispielen wie *Sinti* und *Roma*, nicht *Zigeuner* (aber was aus dem „Zigeunerbaron“?) und *Tschechien*, nicht die NS-belastete Bezeichnung *Tschechei* (S. 891).

Im übrigen bleibt nur, auch diesen Band mit der Feststellung des ungarischen Germanisten János Juhász unseren Deutschlehrern zu empfehlen: „Der Unterricht einer Fremdsprache ist das Lehren von Normen“.

Gustav Korlén