

SHORT REVIEW

by Assoc. Prof. Hristina Deykova, Ph.D., Institute for Bulgarian Language “Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin”, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

for the dissertation of **Demina Yulianova Ivancheva**

on the topic **Origin and development of words expressing the emotion of anger in the Ibero-Romance languages**

for awarding the educational and scientific degree “doctor” in professional direction 2.1.

Philology, scientific specialty *General and Comparative Linguistics (Indo-European Linguistics)*

Demina Ivancheva's dissertation on “Origin and development of words expressing the emotion of anger in the Ibero-Romance languages” is 202 pages long and consists of an introduction, two theoretical chapters dedicated to etymology as a scholarly field and the basic concepts of emotion, a main analytical chapter, and a conclusion, bibliography (including cited literature and sources), dictionaries that have been used, biographical data (internet links to information about the authors of the sources used) and a list of abbreviations.

The Introduction (on pages 1 – 4) presents the aims and goals, and the object and the subject of the research along with the methodology. The aim is to present the etymology of words for ‘anger’ in the Ibero-Romance languages, and in particular in Portuguese and Spanish, tracing their semantic development in the history of both languages, from the earliest attested period to the present day. The chosen approach is prospective, therefore “attention is directed to historical lexicology”. The subject of the research covers the words denoting the emotion of anger in the respective languages – *cólera*, *fúria*, *furor*, *ira*, Port. *raiva* and Sp. *rabia*, Port. *sanha* and Sp. *Saña*, and Sp. *enfadar*. The main source are the etymological dictionaries, which feature the words under consideration, but a number of other lexicographic sources are also used, including historical dictionaries from different periods, historical and contemporary language corpora, which give an idea of the use and place of words in the lexical system of each of the languages during the individual periods. In terms of methodology, the author claims that the topic implies an interdisciplinary approach, and elsewhere in the text below (on page 28) she elucidates (citing A. Petrova) that this consideration arises from the nature of emotions and the difficulties in defining them, which, in turn, implies bringing data from other scientific and scholarly fields as well. The specified comparative-historical method is not applied in the work; in addition, the comparative-historical method is only one of the scientific methods in etymological research, therefore the reference to “the etymological method”, in general, is inaccurate. The semantic aspect of etymological analysis, aimed at semantic reconstruction, implies the application of other methods which were not sufficiently well elucidated. The method of semantic parallels, which is followed,

is not mentioned. On pages 27 – 28 is it specified that the work will not apply a cognitive approach. The dissertation compares the semantic development and the current state of the considered semantic field in two closely related Romance languages, and this implies the use of the contrastive method.

In the chapter dedicated to etymology as a scientific study (on pages 5 – 14), the three main aspects of etymological research are presented briefly and not quite consistently – the phonetic, word-forming and semantic aspects, and in view of the given topic, the greatest attention is paid to the semantic aspect and, accordingly, to the semantic reconstruction, which in its broader understanding implies the restoration not only of the primary meaning, but also of the individual stages in the semantic evolution of words. Bringing facts from the relatively well-documented history of words into the main analytical chapter makes it possible to trace the semantic changes in the historical development of words. The semasiological and onomasiological approaches in lexicology are briefly mentioned, without, however, clarifying their application in the semantic reconstruction, aimed, on the one hand, at restoring the primary meaning, and on the other, at the motivating feature of the names, including in semantic derivation. Attention is paid to the reconstruction of meaning, semantic development, polysemy, the main types of semantic change, with a detailed classification of the types of metaphor and metonymy (according to only one main source). Regarding polysemy, a clear distinction should be made between synchronic polysemy and diachronic semantic evolution (which Durkin is actually cited for), whereby different meanings of the same word are observed at different periods of its history.

In the chapter devoted to the basic concepts of emotion (on pages 15 – 30), the various theories and interpretations of emotion from ancient times to the present day in various branches of scholarly fields such as philosophy, psychology, sociology, etc. are considered, including in linguistics. The different points of view in clarifying the essence of emotion help in revealing the motivating feature of the names and establishing the main semantic patterns.

The main chapter (on pages 31 – 146) begins with a definition of the emotion of anger, after which the words for anger in the Indo-European languages are presented according to the work of Buck (1949), with a summary of the main semantic patterns in their development. It would be good to note, however, that Buck clarifies the semantic relations of the words in relation to the source meaning, and not the separate stages in the semantic development. The specific analyzes of the individual words in Portuguese and Spanish (*cólera, fúria, furor, ira*, Port. *raiva* and Sp. *rabia*, Port. *sanha* and Sp. *saña* and Sp. *enfadar*) follow with the individual parts structured in the same way: etymology of the words with an indication of the established semantic pattern, followed by tracing the history of the word and all its derivatives – first in Portuguese and then in Spanish, and a short comparative summary of the semantic development of words in both languages. The etymological interpretations of the words are given according to the available older and new etymological dictionaries. In the case of obscure words such as Port. *sanha* and Sp. *saña*, the existing etymological hypotheses are followed in detail (according to Malkiel). The derivation of multiple contextual uses of the words under consideration from various written sources – literary

and scientific, starting from the earliest evidence to the present day, allows the author to trace the development of the words over the centuries and their place in the lexical system and in the structure of this semantic field in each of the languages. In this sense, the work is a contribution to the historical lexicology of the two Ibero-Romance languages. The author has reviewed, collected and translated into Bulgarian a rich corpus of old and newer texts. In the case of older sources, footnotes provide information about the authors and their work, as well as about important written monuments for the history of both languages.

At the same time, however, some weaknesses in the interpretation of the material should be noted. The descriptive approach prevails. The relationships between individual meanings as well as the linguistic mechanisms of semantic changes, described in the theoretical part, are not sufficiently well clarified. For example, if the semantic development in *cólera* is ‘bilious fluid > anger’, what is the relationship between the meanings ‘acute infectious disease’ and ‘bilious fluid’ in Sp. *cólera* (inherited most likely from Lat. *cholera* with the indicated meaning ‘disease of the gall’, but also ‘bile, bilious fluid’ in late Latin according to other sources, as indicated also in the table on page 150 in the conclusion), provided that the original Gr. *χολέρα*, which is the etymon of the Latin word, means ‘cholera, nausea, vomiting’. Is the meaning of ‘bile, bilious fluid’ primary or secondary in this case? It is not entirely clear whether Port. *cólera* is attested with the meaning ‘bilious fluid’ and, if not, how the meaning of ‘anger’ had developed? Can we assume in this case an influence of Spanish on Portuguese, given the later appearance of the word in Portuguese? Or a semantic development ‘bilious disease > anger’ is also assumed, as noted on page 148 in the conclusion and shown in the table on page 153. What is the relationship between the given meaning of ‘anger’, ‘fit of anger’ and ‘furious man’ in Port. *fúria*? What is the exact relationship in terms of chronology and the type of semantic transition between the meanings ‘rabies, disease in dogs’ and ‘anger, fury’ in Port. *raiva* and Sp. *rabia*, for which on page 102 a semantic development ‘madness > anger’ is derived, saying that “madness... may be caused by the disease rabies, which occurs in dogs”? In some places, when citing semantic parallels from the Indo-European languages according to Buck, inaccuracies were noted due to the rich and complex information in the source: Lett. *traks* and Lith. *trakas* on page 53 and page 124 are not parallels but cognate words related to the Lettish word for rage *trakums* (Buck 1949: 1138). Similarly, probably due to clumsy expression, on page 86 for *ira*, where the semantic development ‘quick movement > anger, fury’ is given, the author has indicated as parallels ON *rās*, OE *ræs* ‘running, race’ instead of NHG *raserei*, Lett. *trakuot* ‘romp, rush, rage’ instead of Lett. *trakums*, ChSl. (which should be OChSl.) *tekq*, *tešti* instead of Cz. *vzteky* and Pol. *wściekłość*, which are the true semantic parallels (Buck 1949: 1138). Cf. also on page 124, where words for laughter in some IE languages are unfoundedly cited to “support” a possible semantic development ‘mockery > anger’. These and other similar oversights remain in the summary table at the conclusion on p. 153.

The conclusion (on pages 147 – 161) summarizes the results of the research, including three tables presenting the etymons of the words studied, the established semantic patterns supported by semantic parallels in other Indo-European languages, and a chronological

comparative table in which the individual words for anger in the two languages are presented, according to the time of their attestation. The last table allows for tracing the historical development of this lexical-semantic field, which has been enriched with new units over time in each of the two languages. Inferences are made about the semantic difference between the individual lexemes, which is related to the intensity of emotion, as well as about the possible cultural-historical reasons for the expansion of the use of the words in certain periods of the history of Spain and Portugal.

The scientific contributions of the dissertation are synthesized in six points and correctly reflect the results achieved in the research (on page 39 of the abstract).

Demina Ivancheva has the required number of three publications according to the minimum national requirements. The abstract correctly reflects the content of the dissertation.

Conclusion: Despite some weaknesses in the work and the remarks made, in general, the goals set in the dissertation have been achieved. The dissertation has a certain contribution to the field of historical lexicology of the Portuguese and Spanish languages and, more generally, to the typology of semantic changes within the considered lexico-semantic field. Based on this, I declare that Demina Yulianova Ivancheva can be awarded the educational and scientific degree “doctor” in professional direction 2.1. *Philology*, scientific specialty *General and comparative linguistics (Indo-European linguistics)*.

Sofia, April 19, 2024

Assoc. Prof. Hristina Deykova, Ph.D.