

Angelina RUSINEK

**CLOTHES AND PEOPLE GO TOGETHER: A HISTORICAL
INQUIRY INTO CROSSING THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN
CONCEPTUAL CATEGORIES¹**

The Polish saying goes *kobieta zmienną jest*, which – in imitation of its Italian original *la donna e mobile* – may be translated as *woman is prone to change*. As it would appear from the analysis carried out in the following pages, not only woman, but also the clothes she wears undergo different types of semantic alternations. More interestingly, on a variety of levels, and – therefore one is justified in saying – female garments change both their styles, as well as their meanings. Since the phenomenon of semantic change has recently aroused a great deal of interest among a vast number of scholars, it is vital to highlight that two semantic fields, that is the conceptual fields **HUMAN BEING** and **CLOTHES**, have become inextricably linked.² Another fact, which is both worthy of note and easy to explain, once fashion has wormed its way into women's hearts – standing for the token of the female world (the latest trends being blindly followed by women far more often than by men) – semantic shifts affecting the fields discussed here revolve around lexical items denoting female articles of clothing far more frequently than around those (naturally) related to men.

Thus, it turns out that several lexical items denoting garments, for example *skirt*, *pinafore*, *shawl* or *bloomer* have, with the passage of time, started to develop grounding links to the centre of the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEING**, developing the sense 'a woman'. The *OED* clearly evidences the phenomenon of the bi-directionality of semantic shifts from one field to another and this may be illustrated with such a sense alternation as that evinced by

¹ Let me take this opportunity and express my gratitude to **Prof. Grzegorz A. Kleparski** for his contribution to this paper.

² This paper is a largely modified and extended version of the pilot analysis outlined in Kleparski and Rusinek (2008).

capuchin that may be said to have shifted from the realm of **HUMAN BEING** to the attributive paths linked to the **CLOTHES**. The aim of this paper is to focus on a selection of the most intriguing cases of semantic shifts from the field **CLOTHES** to the field **HUMAN BEING** and vice versa.

To begin with, the available data seems to point to the fact that there exists a historically universal connection between the conceptual macrocategories **HUMAN BEING** and **CLOTHES**, and this connection is not only of physical but also of conceptual nature. The language data available documents the frequent historical rise of clothing metaphors related to various sectors of the two macrocategories. Thus, not only do the movements between the two macrocategories suggest rather fuzzy boundaries between the conceptual fields in question, but they also make a substantial contribution to both qualitative and quantitative language change. In line with the goals set to the works of Kleparski and Rusinek (2007) and Rusinek (2008), to name but a few, it is hoped that we will be able to provide evidence for the conceptual contiguity³ of the conceptual fields **CLOTHES** and **HUMAN BEING** by means of the apparatus introduced by Taylor (1990) and developed by Kleparski (1997) among others. Undoubtedly, in order to explore the semantic complexity of lexical categories linked to them, one needs to specify the nature of the values and elements presupposed by attributive paths of such domains as **DOMAIN OF PRODUCT [...]**, **DOMAIN OF WEARER [...]**⁴ and **DOMAIN OF FUNCTION [...]**, as well as to expand further analysis of ‘female garment’ to the attributive paths of **DOMAIN OF FABRICS [...]**, **DOMAIN OF CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE [...]**, and – last but not least – consider **DOMAIN OF COLOUR [...]**. It is evident, however, that due to a great variety of lexical categories related to the conceptual macrocategory **CLOTHES**, any fully-fledged investigation would, out of sheer necessity, involve a much wider range of conceptual domains.

Note that the semantic poles of such lexical categories as *skirt*, *pinafore*, *bloomers* and *shawl* may be said to have been historically grounded within the limits of the conceptual macrocategory **CLOTHES** and denoted a specific female garment. This is so, for the values presupposed by the attributive paths of

³ It is a noteworthy fact that the bi-directionality of semantic shifts concerning the macrocategory **HUMAN BEING** is possible not only on the level of **CLOTHES**. Having explored the process of the historical association of the semantic poles of a number of lexical categories originally grounded in the conceptual macrocategory **FEMALE HUMAN BEING** and plenty of microcategories of the conceptual macrocategory **ANIMAL**, such as, among others, *kitten*, *pussy*, *cow*, *heifer*, *hen*, *chicken*, *flapper* or *pintail*, Kleparski (1997) terms the process *reverse multiple grounding*.

⁴ The attributive path **DOMAIN OF WEARER [...]** in our earlier analyses was referred to as **DOMAIN OF USER [...]**. However, due to its greater precision, the label **DOMAIN OF WEARER [...]** shall be employed henceforth.

conceptual domains (henceforth: **CDs**) that constitute the aforementioned conceptual macrocategory, i.e. (**GARMENT**), (**FEMALE**) and (**BODY COVERING**) appear to be present in the semantics of all the historically attested senses mentioned above. Strange as it may sound, having observed the process of language change, it is possible to conclude that the values associated with the original semantic poles of these lexical items take place in a rather distant conceptual macrocategory, i.e. **HUMAN BEING** and, consequently, make them historically synonymous with *woman*.

On the other hand, note that the original historical meanings of such lexical categories as *cardinal*, *capuchin* and *Zouave* place them far outside the limits of the boundaries of the conceptual macrocategory **CLOTHES**. In fact, the original semantic poles of *cardinal*, *capuchin* and *Zouave* are grounded in the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEING**, and – more specifically – often used in the sense ‘man’. This is so because their semantic poles are highlighted for the attributive values (**HUMAN**) and (**MALE**). Thus, it is only through metaphorical transfer at a certain stage of the evolution of meaning that they became associated with the macrocategory **CLOTHES** and started to be used with reference to some sort of female garment. Let us start with the former direction of sense shifts, i.e. with those lexical categories the semantic poles of which were originally grounded in the **ORGANISING CONCEPTUAL CORE** (henceforth: **OCC**) of the conceptual macrocategory **CLOTHES** and, as a result of the process of historical change, acquired the status of a synonym of ‘woman’.

One of the most spectacular instances here is the historical polysemisation of *skirt* which, two centuries after it had become associated with a synonym of ‘female garment’, was recorded in the sense, among others of course, ‘woman’. According to the *OED*, the Scandinavian *skirt* (ON *skyrta*, Norw. *sjorte/sjurte*, Icel. *skyrta* meaning ‘shirt’), originally used in the sense ‘the lower part of a woman’s dress or gown, covering the person from the waist downwards’ (sense **A**: 1300>1899), must be ultimately related to that native *shirt*. Note that both *skirt* and *shirt* already existed with the same sense in OE *scyrte*, and only later did their meanings specialise. Sense **A** of *skirt* is well documented in literature from the beginning of the 14th century:

a1300) Sco lift hir *skirt* wit-vten scurn, And bar-fote wode sco þat burn.
1899) With a swift rustle of *skirts*, she was between the door and his chair.

The metaphorical transfer of meaning which *skirt* underwent during the course of E.Mod.E. was definitely of crucial importance for the body of historical synonyms of ‘woman’, for the word acquired the sense ‘a woman, especially an attractive one’ (sense **B**: 1560>1977). The triggering factor for the specialisation must have been the natural connotation of the type of attire with the female species. To put it somewhat poetically, so much did *skirt* become associated with

a woman that – quite understandably – it started to stand for a token of her attractiveness that, finally, it became her (very)self: The following contexts document the sense discussed here:

1560) Now thow thy tale hes tauld,..Bot not gottin thow wald, licht *skirt* for all thy skippis.

1977) They mustn't quarrel over a bit of *skirt*.

In terms of the mechanisms adopted here, one may say that the original semantics of OE *skirt*, (sense A,) involves the entrenchment link to the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF PRODUCT [...]** and – simultaneously – the process of the underlining of the appropriate value (GARMENT) attended by the highlighting of the locations (FEMALE), as well as (KEEPING WARM) and (COVERING LEGS) specified for the attributive paths of **DOMAIN OF WEARER [...]** and **DOMAIN OF FUNCTION [...]** respectively. On the other hand, for the specialised sense ‘attractive woman’, one must posit the operation of highlighting of the values (HUMAN), (FEMALE) and (ATTRACTIVE) presupposed by the attributive paths of, respectively, **DOMAIN OF BEING [...]**, **DOMAIN OF SEX [...]** and **DOMAIN OF PHYSICAL FEATURE [...]**. In this way, in E.Mod.E., the category,⁵ originally grounded in the OCC of the conceptual macrocategory **CLOTHES**, became linked to the OCC of the macrocategory **HUMAN BEING**.

Note that the semantic history of *pinafore* represents a category of evolution of both similar type and in a similar direction. The word is a Mod.E. compound of a verbal form *pin-* ‘to fasten’ and the adverbial suffix *-afore* (OE *on foran*) meaning ‘in front of’, owing to the fact that the garment was originally pinned to the front of a dress. One may say that originally the semantic pole of *pinafore*, i.e. ‘a covering of washable material worn by children and factory girls over the frock or gown to protect it from being soiled’ (sense A: 1782>1976) exhibits

⁵ Note that there are many figurative expressions here; *skirt* in the sense ‘the lower part of a woman’s dress or gown, covering the person from the waist downwards; also, especially in modern use, a separate outer garment serving this purpose’ contributed to the rise of such idiomatic expressions as: *to sit on one’s skirts*, which means ‘to press hard upon one, to deal heavily with’, and *to hide behind the skirts of*, meaning ‘to take for refuge behind, to use for protection’. However, we also have *skirt board*, i.e. ‘a board to iron skirts on’ or *skirt-dancing*, which is ‘a form of ballet dancing in which the steps are accompanied by the manipulation of long skirts or drapery’, etc. *Skirt* used in the sense ‘an attractive woman’, on the other hand, also appears to be quite productive in developing figurative expressions. Therefore, while *a bit of skirt* means merely ‘a woman’ and *skirt-chaser* is ‘one who pursues women with amorous attentions’, *skirt duty* is nothing but ‘acting in a way designed to attract men’. Note that also in the Polish language there exists an expression *latać za spódniczkami*, which can be translated as ‘to skirt chase’, though these are not the very skirts that men are after. According to the *Nowy Słownik Języka Polskiego* (henceforth: *NSJP*), there is also a fixed saying *trzymać się czyjejs spódnicy*, which seems to be a Polish equivalent of *to hide behind the skirts of*.

entrenchment links to the attributive paths of a number of CDs specifiable for the description of lexical categories that are grounded in the conceptual macrocategory **CLOTHES**, frequently denoting ‘female garment’. Also, due to the rise of its secondary sense ‘the wearer of a pinafore, especially a child or little girl’ during the course of the 19th century (sense **B**: 1836>Mod.E.), the semantic pole of the lexical category concerned may be said to have become secondarily grounded within the limits of the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEING**.

In terms of cognitive mechanisms, while the sense **A** involving the highlighting of such attributive values as (GARMENT), (MALE) and (FEMALE), (YOUNG), (WASHABLE), as well as (KEEPING CLEAN) ^ (COVERING BODY) ^ (COVERING THE FRONT) presupposed by the attributive paths of, respectively, **DOMAIN OF PRODUCT [...]**, **DOMAIN OF WEARER [...]**, **DOMAIN OF AGE [...]**, **DOMAIN OF FABRICS [...]**, as well as **DOMAIN OF FUNCTION [...]**, the secondary sense **B** is accountable in terms of activation of the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF BEING [...]** for which the attributive value (HUMAN) is activated, attended by the highlighting of such locations as (MALE) ^ (FEMALE), (YOUNG) and, last but not least, (APRON) entailed by the attributive paths of **DOMAIN OF SEX [...]**, **DOMAIN OF AGE [...]** and **DOMAIN OF ATTIRE [...]**.

Owing to the fact that the attributive value presupposed by the attributive path of the last domain involved here, i.e. (APRON) is still invariably linked to the values the salience of which accounts for the historically original sense, i.e. ‘a covering of washable material worn by children and factory girls over a frock or gown to protect it from being soiled’ and – what is more – the secondary meaning is ‘the wearer of a pinafore, especially a child or little girl’, one is quite within one’s rights to speak here both of the prominence of these attributive values that are conceptually distant from the field **HUMAN BEING**, as well as their inevitability for the account of the secondary sense **B**. Both senses are historically documented in the *OED* quotations, the former meaning of *pinafore* being recorded for the first time at the end of the 18th century:

1782) A *pin-a-fore* for Master Mortimer Delvile, lest he should daub his pappy when he is feeding him.

1974) Dark brown *pinafore* in fine corduroy worn with white cotton shirt.

while the secondary sense appears in the first half of the 19th century:

1836) The *pinafores* were gone to bed.

The etymological sources point out that – historically speaking – English *pinafore* has not been as morphologically productive as *skirt*, for its only

combinations are a few compounds, such as *pinafore dress*, *pinafore frock* or *pinafore gown*. Note that the Polish idiomatic saying *trzymać się czyjegoś fartucha* ‘to hold by somebody’s pinafore’ recorded by *NSJP* which is semantically related to English *to hide behind the skirts of*, shows that the Polish equivalent of *pinafore*, i.e. *fartuch*, may be said to have formed one idiomatic expression. Obviously, it should be highlighted that the secondary sense of *pinafore* is a result of a metaphorical transfer of the primary meaning itself. Thus, the rise of the metaphorical sense is explicable in terms of the formation of the entrenchment links of the semantic pole of *pinafore* to the attributive path specified for the **DOMAIN OF BEING** [...] that involves the highlighting of the attributive value (HUMAN), as well as **DOMAIN OF SEX** [...] and the activation of the value (FEMALE), the last one, in the case of ‘apron’, located in the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF WEARER** [...].

Last but not least, the prominence of the values activated for the sense ‘apron’ may have provided a link between the primary and the secondary sense of the category in question. In other words, probably due to the presupposed stereotypical association of aprons for the front part of the body with no one but women made the lexical category – originally grounded in the **OCC** of the macrocategory **CLOTHES** – operate in some regions of the macrocategory **HUMAN BEING** and acquire the female-specific sense. Although nowadays, in the 21st century, when many women immerse themselves in careers leaving men by the kitchen tables not only to have dinner, but also, more and more frequently, in order to prepare it, pinafores still tend to be associated with them rather than with their husbands.

The E.Mod.E. *shawl* continues Persian *sha-l* present in a number of European languages (Sp. *chal*, It. *Scialle*, Russ. *shali*), and it is documented in the sense ‘an article of dress worn by Orientals (commonly as a scarf, turban or girdle), consisting of an oblong piece of a material manufactured in Kashmir from the hair of the Tibetan shawl-goat’ (sense **A**: 1662>1903), yet not being gender-specific:

- 1662) The richer sort have..another rich Skarf which they call *Schal*, made of a very fine stuff, brought by the Indians into Persia.
 1903) A thick *shawl* in endless folds round their waists.

However, apart from being highlighted for the attributive values that determine the category’s position in the **OCC** of the conceptual macrocategory **CLOTHES**, the semantics of Mod.E. *shawl* shows the entrenchment links to the attributive paths of other CDs essential for the construal of the senses related to the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEING**, for the 20th century witnessed the rise of the female-specific sense ‘a common prostitute’ (sense **D**: 1922>Mod.E.):

1922) Blind to the world up in a shebeen in Bride street after closing time, fornicating with two *shawls*.

To account for the sense-threads of *shawl* one must speak of the highlighting of certain locations within the attributive paths of **DOMAIN OF PRODUCT [...]** and **DOMAIN OF WEARER [...]**, for which the values (GARMENT) and (MALE) ^ (FEMALE) are highlighted, **DOMAIN OF LENGTH [...]**, **DOMAIN OF FABRICS [...]**, as well as **DOMAIN OF FUNCTION [...]**. Taking into consideration the historically original sense A, one is justified when stating that it is accountable in terms of the highlighting of the value (LONG) for the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF LENGTH [...]**, the value (CASHMERE) within the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF FABRICS [...]**, along with the value (ORIENTALLY EMBROIDERED) and such values as (COVERING NECK) ^ (COVERING HEAD) ^ (DECORATION) prominent in the attributive paths of **DOMAIN OF CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE [...]** and **DOMAIN OF FUNCTION [...]**, correspondingly.

Note that the two senses that developed later seem to be mere specialisations of the original meaning. Therefore, the sense ‘an article of clothing worn in Europe and the West, chiefly by women as a covering for the shoulders or, sometimes, for the head in the form of an oblong piece of any textile with elaborate patterns’ (sense B: 1767>1902) requires a different location within the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF FABRICS [...]**, which may be formulated as (ANY FABRIC). However, the most prominent alternation is the fading into the background and the eventual loss of the value (MALE) presupposed by the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF WEARER [...]**, leaving the category female-specific. Eventually, apart from being entrenched in the relevant locations of the attributive paths of a number of CDs essential for the explication of its historical senses, the semantic pole of *shawl* as ‘an article of clothing worn round the neck as a protection from cold’ (sense C: 1834>Mod.E.), having lost its prominent highlighting for the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE [...]**, necessitates the postulation of the change in the highlighting within the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF FUNCTION [...]** with the now well-pronounced prominence of such values as (COVERING NECK) and (KEEPING WARM).

The material analysed here provides evidence of a significant change that took place during the course of the semantic evolution of the word. The polysemous *shawl*, originally grounded within the boundaries of the conceptual macrocategory **CLOTHES**, due to a socio-specific association of its first two senses with its most frequent wearers has undergone a metaphorical transfer, its semantic pole becoming eventually grounded in the **OCC** of the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEING**. To be more specific, through the rise of sense D, i.e. ‘a common prostitute’, the category acquired the female-specific sense.

With reference to such a multiple historical grounding, one should ask: *What was the ultimate trigger for the shift?* The cause may be sought in the nature of the conceptual link, which may have been provided by certain extralinguistic facts not directly present in the semantics of the word. Note, however, that it was a shawl that was, for some reasons, the garment most willingly worn by prostitutes. Therefore, one might stipulate that wearing a shawl somehow started to be mentally associated with the oldest profession in the world to such an extent that, with time, this extralinguistic fact triggered the sense alternation. Nevertheless, the cognitive account of this 20th century meaning merely involves the entrenchment link to the attributive paths of **DOMAIN OF BEING [...]** and **DOMAIN OF SEX [...]** with the relevant attributive values (HUMAN) and (FEMALE), both attended by the location (MERCENARY) presupposed by the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF SEXUAL ACTIVITY [...]**.

As stressed earlier, the historical connection between the two conceptual macrocategories, i.e. **CLOTHES** and **HUMAN BEING**, can be evidenced in yet another way, namely in what we refer to as the process of reverse multiple grounding. As the material analysed evidences, there exists a significant number of cases of sense shifts of lexical categories originally grounded in the **OCC** of the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEING** which, with time, started to exhibit grounding links to the macrocategory **CLOTHES**. Let us develop this issue with the case of a polysemous conceptual category *cardinal* of Romance origin (Lat. *cardinalis*), that made its first appearance in English in 1125. From the perspective of present-day English the semantics of *cardinal* may be related to various positions within different macrocategories. However, most frequently *cardinal* is linked to two conceptual fields. To start with, the semantic pole of Mid.E. *cardinal* seems to point to a well-pronounced entrenchment link to the attributive paths of those CDs the highlighting of relevant locations of which relates lexical categories to the **OCC** of the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEING**. Here, the semantics of *cardinal* is explicable in terms of entrenchment links to the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF BEING [...]** with the element (HUMAN) highlighted, as well as the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF SEX [...]**, for which the attributive value (MALE) is activated, attended by the activation of the attributive path within **DOMAIN OF RANK/SOCIAL STATUS [...]** for which (ECCLESIASTIC) is highlighted.

As mentioned above, historically speaking, many lexical categories linked to the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEING** through the presence – in their semantic structure – of the element (MALE DRESSED IN A GARMENT WITH A FEMALE ACCENT), over the course of time, started to develop a grounding link to the **OCC** of the conceptual macrocategory **CLOTHES**. The case of *cardinal* provides an example of this; the female accent may be realised in the form of the cassock worn by a cardinal, i.e. by ‘one of the

seventy ecclesiastical princes who hold the highest rank next to the pope and constitute his council' (sense A: 1125>onwards). Thus, in order to account for the primary sense-thread of *cardinal* one must posit entrenchment links to the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF ATTIRE [...]** with the value (CLOAK) highlighted, the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF FUNCTION [...]** specifying two locations (COVERING BODY) and (RELIGIOUS PRACTICES), attended by the values (LONG) and (SCARLET) prominent in the attributive paths of **DOMAIN OF LENGTH [...]** and **DOMAIN OF COLOUR [...]**. However, one feels also justified to posit an entrenchment link to the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF ACCESSORY [...]** with the value (CAPE) highlighted. The diachronically original sense of *cardinal* is documented in the following *OED* material:

1125) On þes ilces gæres sende se papa of Rome to ðise lande an *cardinal* Johan of Creme.

1647) Rochel..was then straitly besieged by the *Cardinal* Richelieu.

In sum, while Mid.E. *cardinal* is merely related to the macrocategory **HUMAN BEING**, for the Mod.E. period, one may justly speak of the category's extension of the grounding relation onto the macrocategory **CLOTHES**. In terms of extralinguistic conditions one may say that the 18th century women, having been blindly interested in fashion, and – therefore – keeping an eye on everything which might have seemed quite innovatory to them, decided to copy that sort of attire and modify its design and thus have their own cardinal in their wardrobes. This might have been the extralinguistic explanation how Mid.E. *cardinal* became 'a sort of cloak worn by ladies, originally of scarlet cloth with a hood' (sense B: 1745>1858).

Analysis of the historical polysemisation of the discussed lexical category seems to suggest a shade of the women emancipation process, which – as every social movement – involves not only riots, panics, fads and crowd behaviour, but also fashion and the promotion of social change. A question that one may ask in this context is: *How can one objectively determine which sense-thread of the category in question forms the basis for this extension?* One may conjecture that in the case discussed the ultimate trigger may have been the value (SCARLET) entrenched in the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF COLOUR [...]**, as well as by the relation to the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF ACCESSORY [...]** with a little change of location, for the modified value highlighted here is (HOOD). These, together with the values (COVERING TRUNK) ^ (KEEPING WARM), (SHORT), and – most significantly – the values (GARMENT) and (FEMALE) specified in the attributive paths of, correspondingly, **DOMAIN OF FUNCTION [...]**, **DOMAIN OF LENGTH [...]**, as well as **DOMAIN OF PRODUCT [...]** and **DOMAIN OF WEARER [...]** are responsible for the

construal of the secondary sense of *cardinal*,⁶ the historical presence of which is documented in the following quotations provided by the *OED*:

1745) You are capering about in your fine *cardinals*.

1826) The thickest and brightest red *cardinal* that ever came out of a woollen-draper's shop.

The analysis indicates that yet another lexical category primarily associated with the concept of 'male performing religious duties', and hence 'male dressed in a garment with a female accent', that is *capuchin* – although characterised in terms of different etymological roots – may be classified to a group of lexical categories that have undergone semantic change from 'man' into 'female garment'. Originally, in the 16th century French *capuchin* along with Italian *capuccino* were used to denote 'a friar of the order of St. Francis, of the new rule of 1528' (sense **A**: 1599>onwards). Thus, it is *capuche* (Fr. *capuche*, It. *cappuccino* meaning merely 'the hood of a cloak) that appears not only to be the root term of the lexical item concerned, but also – as we hope to show below – the salient value leading, consequently, to a sense shift of the lexical category in question.

One may say that the Mod.E. semantic pole of *capuchin* exhibits entrenchment links mostly to the same attributive paths as the lexical category *cardinal* does, that is those attributive paths of a number of CDs specifiable for the description of those lexical categories that are generically grounded in the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEING**, especially male, and baring – so to speak – a female element of the article of clothing. Apart from one value, the semantics of *capuchin* may be accounted in terms of identical values presupposed by the same set of attributive paths involved in the original semantics of *cardinal*. To be more specific, while the latter activates certain attributive values of the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF COLOUR [...]**, the former seems to push it rather to the peripheral regions of the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEING**. However, what should be emphasised is the fact that the semantics of *capuchin* requires one to posit a change in the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF ACCESSORY [...]** from (CAPE) into its modified form formalised as (HOOD). Worthy of note is the value (HOOD), which occurs to be the most salient feature of the primary meaning of *capuchin* that gave rise to its secondary sense, namely 'a female garment consisting of a cloak and hood' (sense **B**: 1706>1858). For this meaning the highlighting of the

⁶ Although *cardinal* has been present in English since 1125 the category has failed to develop many figurative expressions, although it forms part of many compound expressions, such as *cardinal-bird*, another term for *grosbeak*, 'a North American singing bird with scarlet plumage' or *cardinal-flower*, 'a flower of again North American origin known for the splendour of its scarlet blossoms'. Significantly, as far as these two are concerned, it is again the cognitive prominence of (COLOUR) value that may have been responsible for the rise of these names.

value (GARMENT) specifiable for the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF PRODUCT** [...], the values (KEEPING WARM) ^ (COVERING BODY) ^ (IMITATION) presupposed for the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF FUNCTION** [...] and the value (HOOD) entrenched in the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF ACCESSORY** [...], is attended by simultaneous highlighting of the value (FEMALE), which accounts for the core sense ‘female garment’. The quotations given below document the sense **A**:

1599) When impropriet gentles will turn *Capuchine*.

1876) The *Capuchin* missionary.

and the following ones illustrate sense **B**:

1706) Wrapping up their Heads in their Hooded-Gowns, they seemed to me to be Thieves disguised in *Capuchins*.]

1752) Within my memory the ladies..covered their lovely necks with a Cloak; this was exchanged for the manteel, this again was succeeded by the pelorine, the pelorine by the neckatee, the neckatee by the *capuchine*, which hath now stood its ground a long time.

As to the senses of *capuchin*-related compounds, one must admit that – although the word has not proved to be very productive, the two existing compounds, that is *Capuchin monkey*, as well as *Capuchin pigeon* turn out to be variations on the salience of the attributive value (HOOD). Thus, *Capuchin monkey* is ‘an American monkey with black hair at the back of the head, looking like a cowl’, whereas *Capuchin pigeon* is used in the sense ‘a sub-variety of the Jacobin pigeon, with a range of inverted feathers on the back of the head, suggesting a cowl or hood’.

Diachronic analysis shows that the history of the category *Zouave* is – simultaneously and somewhat paradoxically – similar, yet very much different to that of *cardinal* and *capuchin*. The Algerian word *Zouave* first appeared in English in 1830 in the sense ‘one of a body of light infantry in the French army, originally recruited from the Algerian Kabyle tribe of Zouaoua, but afterwards composed of French soldiers distinguished for their physique and dash, and formerly retaining the original Oriental uniform’ (sense **A**: 1830>1897). The sense is documented with the following 19th century context:

1897) In January, 1863, the French general Forey laid siege to Puebla...in one of the many assaults on the corner held by Diaz the *zouaves* broke into the first court-yard of his stronghold.

When we set the original semantic pole of *Zouave* against the network of CDs involved in the explication of lexical categories variously associated with

the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEING** we see that its semantic position is determined by the existence of entrenchment links to the relevant locations within the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF BEING [...]** and **DOMAIN OF SEX [...]**; the semantic pole of the category links to the highlighted elements (HUMAN) and (MALE). However, in contrast to the lexical categories *cardinal* and *capuchin*, the original sense of the category *Zouave* within the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF RANK/SOCIAL STATUS [...]** involves the activation of the location (SOLDIER), whereas the attributive value highlighted for the path of **DOMAIN OF ATTIRE [...]** is that of (UNIFORM). What is more, not only does this male-specific term involve the foregrounding of the entrenchment link to the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE [...]**, and the highlighting of the value (PHYSICALLY STRONG) coupled with (MARCHING), and the path of **DOMAIN OF ORIGIN/REGION [...]** with the element (FRANCE) attended by (ZOUAOUA), but it also presupposes a female-specific article of clothing. Thus, for the original sense-thread of Mod.E. *Zouave*, one is justified in claiming that it occupies a central position within the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE [...]**, i.e. the location (ORIENTALLY EMBROIDERED).

Bearing in mind that thirty years after the category *Zouave* had appeared in English in the sense ‘soldier’, it developed the sense ‘a woman’s short embroidered jacket or bodice, with or without sleeves, resembling the jacket of the Zouave uniform’ (sense B: 1859>1893) one may conjecture that there must have been some salient value of the primary meaning of the category that has set the mainstream direction of this particular alternation, documented by, among others, the following quotation:

1859) Nothing can be prettier for the interior than the little orientaljackets which we call to-day *Zouaves*.

Thus, apart from being entrenched in a location of the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE [...]**, i.e. (ORIENTALLY EMBROIDERED), the impetus behind the shift, due to the prominence of such values as (SHORT), as well as a combination of (KEEPING WARM) ^ (COVERING TRUNK) ^ (IMITATION) one feels justified to postulate an entrenchment relation to the attributive paths of both **DOMAIN OF LENGTH [...]** and **DOMAIN OF FUNCTION [...]**. Note that in present day English the secondary sense of *Zouave* is echoed in such combinations as *Zouave jacket* or *Zouave bodice*.

As a word of conclusion, one may say that – having assumed and employed the elements of cognitive orientation of language study – we have attempted to visualise and document both the fuzziness and historical

connection between the conceptual macrocategories **CLOTHES** and **HUMAN BEING**. Thus, on the basis of the historical occurrence of the process referred to as reverse multiple grounding as evidenced above, one is justified in stating that, due to a natural tendency to form emotionally and/or socially charged senses, such lexical categories associated with the contents of female wardrobes as *skirt* or *shawl* may be characteristic of migrations of semantic poles from the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF PRODUCT** [...] to the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF BEING** [...], whereas other cases of semantic evolution, such as the semantic poles of *cardinal* or *Zouave*, primarily linked to the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF BEING** [...], have been shown to have developed links to the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF PRODUCT** [...].

Even without resorting to Jones (1996), who says that *women had for centuries been associated with inconsistency and change*, one is tempted to say that women's supposed yearning for a search for everything that glitters and shines might – to a certain extent – be echoed in semantic shifts of an abundant number of lexical categories between the conceptual categories **HUMAN BEING** and **CLOTHES**. One could ask: *Why is this so?* It appears that any attempt to provide even a partial answer to this question must necessarily involve not only a diachronic semantic study, but also some research on psycho-sociological level. This does not stem merely from the fact that, as we hope to have shown – both literally and conceptually – people and clothes go together. Conceptually and historically they seem to criss-cross, melt and blend with each other.

References

Dictionaries and Encyclopedias

- The Oxford English Dictionary*. 1971. J. Murray, H. Bradley, Ch.T. Onions & W. Craig. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nowy Słownik Języka Polskiego*. 2003. E. Sobol, (ed.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Other works

- Jones, J. 1996. 'Coquettes and grisettes: Women buying and selling in ancient regime Paris' [in:] V. de Grazia & E. Furlough (eds) *The Sex of Things: Gender and Consumption in Historical Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kleparski, G.A. 1997. *Theory and Practice of Historical Semantics: The Case of Middle English Synonyms of GIRL/YOUNG WOMAN*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Kleparski, G.A. and Rusinek, A. 2007. 'Field theory and Diachronic Semantics' [in:] G.A. Kleparski, R. Kiełtyka, M. Pikor-Niedziałek (eds) *Aspects of Semantic Transposition of Words*. Chełm: Wydawnictwo TAWA, pp. 90–98.

- Kleparski, G.A. and Rusinek, A.** 2008. 'On the conceptual continuity of the field CLOTHES and HUMAN BEING [in:] G.A. Kleparski, A. Uberman (eds) *Galicja Studies in English*. Chełm: Wydawnictwo TAWA, pp. 83–112.
- Rusinek, A.** 2008. 'CLOTHES in the network of CDs: The case of *sweater*' [in:] R. Kiełtyka, D. Osuchowska, E. Rokosz-piejko (eds) *Language, Literature, Culture and Beyond. A Festschrift for Prof. Grzegorz A. Kleparski*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, pp. 145–152.
- Taylor, J.R.** 1990. *Linguistic Categorisation: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.