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Lecture 1

The object of Lexicology; connection of Lexicology with other branches of linguistics; language as a system of signs; synchrony and diachrony

Lexicology is a branch of linguistics. As the name itself implies (Greek – ‘lexis’ = word; ‘lexicos’ – having to do with words; ‘logos’ – a department of knowledge), lexicology has as its object of study the words, the vocabulary of a language (special lexicology, e.g. English lexicology), or vocabulary generally speaking, a part of language as one of the attributes of man, the means of communication between men in human society; in the latter case we have to do with General Lexicology, a branch of General Linguistics.

Being a branch of linguistics, lexicology is immediately connected with other linguistic disciplines: phonology, morphology, syntax, stylistics, language history, etc.

Lexicology is connected with phonetics, as the sound form of a word consists of phonemes or their allophones (variants of phonemes). Having no meaning of their own, phonemes serve to distinguish word meanings, e.g. [laik], [leik[, [luk], [læk], [læk], [li:k]. The sequence of phonemes in a word is also relevant to meaning, e.g. [tip] and [pit]; [bæk] and [kæb], [naut] and [taun], etc. The function of a different meaning, not only lexical but also grammatical may be fulfilled by stress, a super segmental phonetic element, e.g. ['friːkwənt], an adjective and [friˈkwent], a verb.

Lexicology is connected with stylistics through the opposition of stylistically neutral and stylistically colored words in a synonymic group, e.g. child (neutral), infant (literary), kid (colloquial), etc.

Lexicology is closely connected with grammar:

1- Words belong to this or that part of speech (lexico-grammatical groups of words)

2- Words function in speech in this or that of their grammatical word-forms, e.g. ‘These girls are prettier than their mother.’ ‘Her brothers studied at Oxford and Cambridge Universities.’ The word-forms in a sentence express certain relations between the things they stand for and certain grammatical meanings.

3- A grammatical form may become lexicalized, e.g. the word color (ფერი) has two different meanings in the plural: colors (ფერები) and colors (ბაირაღი) – the colors of a regiment in the army. Or the words manner and manners: ‘During his lifetime he painted his pictures in three different manners’ and ‘She has bad manners’ – her behavior is not cultivated.

4- On the other hand, grammatically equivalent word-forms (e.g. the plural of some nouns) may have different lexical meanings: e.g. brothers and brethren – both are plural forms of the noun
but 'members of a special society or a religious community'. Or, indexes and indices: both are plural forms of the noun index; but indexes means 'tables of contents' at the end of a book and indices, in scientific usage, means .

Lexicology is closely connected with the History of the English language, especially when it comes to etymology – as it's known about 70% of the English word-stock was borrowed from other language, such as Latin, Greek, Danish, French, etc.

As has been stated, Lexicology is one of the linguistic disciplines. In studying its object, the word and the entire vocabulary, Lexicology follows the concepts of linguistics. Consequently, it is necessary to consider some important points of linguistic theory.

Linguistic theory regards its object, language, as a system. Language is not a mere collection of units, not an enumeration of words and morphemes, phonemes and letters. Language is a unified whole, a system. What is understood as a system? It is a set of interconnected elements making up a unified whole. The structure of a system is a manifestation of the relations between the elements, the system’s inner organization.

So, if any system is a set of interconnected elements constituting a unified whole and any system has its inner organization, its structure, what are the elements constituting language as a whole and what is its structure?

We have to stress that language is a semiotic system (Greek: sema = sign), a system of interconnected signs.

A sign is an object of reality conventionally (by agreement) representing another object of reality and used to communicate some information. A sign is a bilateral (two-sided) unit, having a certain form and conventionally expressing a certain content, the information to be communicated. So, a sign has a plane of expression and a plane of content and in most cases there is no natural connection between the two sides. E.g. the traffic lights in the streets: red means stop, yellow – wait, green – go on.

The sign is not the only unit that communicates some information. This function can also be fulfilled by a symbol, also a bilateral unit having the plane of expression and the plane of content, but there is some natural connection between the two sides, e.g. a limousine is a symbol of wealth; a scepter - an ornamented staff carried by rulers on ceremonial occasions is a symbol of sovereignty.

In order to better understand, that in case of a sign there is no natural connection between the two sides – the plane of expression and the plane of content; and in case of a symbol the connection between the two sides is partially motivated (there is some natural connection
between the two sides): we could also explain the meaning of a symptom – also a bilateral unit having the plane of expression and the plane of content, but in this case there is natural connection between the two sides, e.g. high temperature is a symptom (expression) of an illness (content), smoke is natural expression of fire, etc.

In contradistinction to symbol and symptom, a linguistic sign, also a bilateral (two-sided) unit is the principal kind of communicative and informative sign carrying a definite bit of information and expressing this information conventionally. In most cases there is no natural connection between a word and the thing it stands for, e.g. a piece of furniture, usually with four legs and a flat top is denoted by the word ‘table’ in English, თაფლი in Georgian, стол in Russian. Why? Because there is no natural or even figurative connection between these sound forms and the meaning they convey. Notice, at the same time, that these are simple words, so-called root (mono-morphic) words, which are unmotivated. If some connection between the sound form and meaning is apparent, the word is said to be motivated; e.g. the Georgian word ‘ღვინის’ has motivated equivalents in Russian ‘подснежник’, the English ‘snowdrop’, the German Schneeglöckchen (little bell of snow).

We can notice that the Russian word is an affixal derivative, while the English and German words are compounds: these words are motivated not only figuratively but also morphologically.

Whether a word is motivated or not, any speaker of a definite language understands the information it contains and communicates.

The principal communicative-informative signs of language are the word and the sentence. They fulfill the function of nomination and predication that connect languages with thought and society.

What, then, is language? The sufficiently complete and widely accepted definition of language is as follows: a language is a system of interconnected signs, structured through the relations between these signs and having a double function: a) serving as a means of communication, of transmitting information from the speaker to the hearer and b) serving as a means of segmenting extra-linguistic, objective reality.

For communication, any linguistic community uses its own system of signs, its own language.

The function of segmenting extra-linguistic objective reality by different languages in different ways may be illustrated as follows: the notion of ‘a female relative, sister of one’s father or mother’ is understood in the English mind as one segment of reality and denoted by the word ‘aunt’. In the Georgian mind, two segments of reality are singled out: ‘the sister of one’s father’, ღჭმა, and the sister of one’s mother ღმამრი. Yet another segment of reality, ‘a female relative
by marriage, the wife of one’s uncle (another notion), is nominated by the word ბიცოლა. This shows that where the English see one segment of reality (aunt), Georgians see three (მამიდა, დეიდა, ბიცოლა).

Another example: it is a fact of reality that we humans are differentiated according to sex: men and women, boys and girls. In the Russian language this distinction is taken into account and the grammatical category of gender, expressed by masculine, feminine and neuter gender markers, covers the entire system of the noun, adjective, part of the verb and some other parts of speech (стол, комната, окно, хороший, хорошая, хорошее, пошел, пошла, мой, моё, мое). In English and Georgian there are no gender markers, there is no grammatical category of gender. The Georgian takes into account the opposition of animate and inanimate objects when he says მყავს and მაქვს, წევს and დევს while the Russian and English disregard this opposition.

Language is different from other semiotic (sign) systems in some other ways. First of all, language is the most complex of all semiotic systems. It is enough to compare it with the Morse Code, a conventional semiotic system used earlier in telegraph and radio communication, combination of long and short electric impulses (graphically represented by dashes ‘-‘ and dots ‘.’) that stand for the letters of alphabet, e.g. .– stand for ‘a’, - … stand for ‘b’, etc.

Secondly, most semiotic systems, like the Morse Code, once agreed upon to serve as a means of communication, do not develop. As for language, it emerges and develops in the process of functioning.

Thirdly, language is also, in its written or otherwise recorded form, a means of preserving information (books, microfilms, recordings on tape, etc.)

Fourthly, language is a means of rendering man’s psychological and emotional states and attitudes and of communicating them to others.

As stated above, a most important property of language is its development in the process of functioning. That is to say, language is a dynamic system which develops together with the development of human society, its physical and mental activities.

Consequently, in studying its object, language, linguistics cannot limit itself to applying the purely descriptive synchronic approach, determining the structure of the language system and building up its model.

The historic, diachronic approach to facts of language determines how the language system developed from its earliest known form to the present day. This is mainly the concern of language history, an important linguistic discipline.

It is the synchronic, descriptive approach that gives an overall picture of language, that helps to
determine the structure of the language system and build up its stratificational model (Latin ‘stratum’ = layer). This is one aspect of the synchronic approach. However, we have to remember the fact that the language system is constantly changing, developing. The speech of one generation of men is always a little different from that of the following generation. These differences are never considerable; otherwise the language would cease to function as a means of communication. As Vandryes, a French linguist said, a language may be likened to a river which never ceases flowing, even when it seems immobile under a sheet of ice; grammar is like the ice that covers a river and seems to have stopped it; but under the ice the river keeps flowing and in spring, throwing off the ice, it emerges in a new quality.

Of all the subsystems of language (the phonological, morphological, lexical and grammatical subsystems), it is the lexical subsystem that is most open to change, especially to growth. This is easily understandable: with the development of all the spheres of human activity, new concepts, new phenomena emerge, new objects are produced – and new words appear, new units of nomination.

The triangle of reference (also known as the triangle of meaning and the semiotic triangle) is a model of how linguistic symbols are related to the objects they represent. The triangle was published in The Meaning of Meaning (1923) by Ogden and Richards.
Questions for seminars per lecture:

I

1.- What does the word ‘Lexicology’ mean?
2.- Connection of lexicology with phonetics
3.- Connection of lexicology with grammar
4.- What is a system?
5.- Language as a system of signs
6.- Give definitions of sign, symbol, symptom
7.- Functions of language
8.- Do languages ‘segment’ reality?
9.- Synchronic and diachronic approaches to language study
10.- Semantic triangle
Lecture 2

Plane of expression and plane of content of language. Word as a basic unit of language

The modern approaches to linguistic studies are, as mentioned above, the diachronic or historical and synchronic or descriptive approaches. It has also been mentioned that the latter (the static-synchronic approach) gives an overall picture of the language system, determines its structure and builds up the stratificational model of it as a hierarchy of levels.

Another point to bear in mind is that language is a semiotic system (i.e. a system of signs), the most complex of all semiotic systems. A sign being a bilateral unit, having two facets (sides) – a certain form expressing a certain content, it follows logically that language also has two ‘sides’ – the plane of expression (the system of means of expressing the content of any utterance, i.e. any message communicated in oral or written form), and the plane of content. Both the plane of expression and the plane of content are structures showing a hierarchy of levels.

A widely accepted view is that the plane of expression is structured in three levels: the phonematic level, the morphematic level and the syntactic level.

Each of these three levels is characterized by the opposition of its minimum and maximum units, the latter being representative of the level.

On the phonematic level, the minimum units are the distinctive features differentiating one phoneme from another. E.g. the distinctive feature of voice serves to differentiate voiced and voiceless consonants, such as [k] – [g], [s] – [z], etc. Or, from the point of articulation monophthongs are differentiated from diphthongs.

The maximum units of the phonematic level are the phonemes. In speech, a phoneme is often manifested by one of its positional variants or allophones.

A phoneme is a specific kind of language unit: it has its acoustic form but it has no content, no meaning; consequently, it is not a bilateral unit, not a linguistic sign and the phonematic level is not a sign level. (The student should not be misled by the fact that one phoneme may constitute a word, such as, for example, the English interjections ‘Oh!’, ‘Ah!’ and the like.

Phonemes and their positional variants (allophones) constitute the units of the higher, morphematic level – morphemes and words and serve to differentiate them.

On the morphematic level, the morpheme is the minimum unit and the word is the maximum unit.

The morpheme, having not only its material acoustic form (or its graphic form) but also a
certain content, its meaning, is a bilateral unit, the minimum meaningful unit of language, i.e. the minimum linguistic sign. The morphemes are: roots, stems and affixes (prefixes and suffixes). The morphemes constitute the word, the maximum units of the morphematic level, the central (basic) units of language. The word, the maximum unit of the morphematic level is, at the same time, the minimum unit of the syntactic level (seeing that in certain situations one word may fulfill the function of communication, the main function of the sentence), e.g. ‘Where are you going?’ – ‘Home’. The syntactic level is more complex than the two lower levels (the phonematic and morphematic levels). That is why the binary opposition on the syntactic level is represented, on the one hand, by the word, the minimum unit, and, on the other hand, by two higher units of which the word is a constituent: the syntactic word-combination or syntagma (the intermediate unit of this level) and the sentence (the maximum unit of the syntactic level).

The word enters sentence structure through the intermediate unit of the syntactic level, the syntagma. Seeing that the basic feature of the sentence is predicativeness, the principal kind of syntagma is the predicative syntagma consisting of the subject and the predicate; syntagmas of the secondary order (in most cases) are the objective syntagma, the attributive syntagma and the relative syntagma (the predicate + the adverbials). If the predicate is expressed by a transitive verb (i.e. one, whose meaning cannot be fully realized without an object), the objective syntagma is an obligatory component of the sentence: without it the sentence would be semantically and structurally incomplete. For instance, ‘Tom bought’ − ? The sentence is the most important communicative unit, but in this case there is actually no communication, no information: the transitive verb ‘to buy’ requires an object.

The syntagmatic structure of a sentence may be illustrated as follows: ‘My friend bought a book yesterday’, where ‘friend bought’ is the predicative syntagma, ‘bought (a) book’ − the objective syntagma, ‘my friend’ is an attributive syntagma and ‘bought yesterday’ − a relative syntagma (the predicate + in this case, the adverbial of time).

The sentence, more often than not, presents a contradiction between structural completeness and its semantic, informational incompleteness. E.g. ‘He bought it from her some days ago’. This sentence is structurally complete; all parts of the sentence are there. But this sentence, taken separately, without a broader context, does not communicate complete information; it gives rise to several questions: who bought smth.? What did he buy? From whom? When exactly?

Consequently, the sentence is not, in many cases, the highest linguistic unit carrying semantically complete content in fulfilling the function of communication. It follows that complete information, in many cases, is communicated by a set of interconnected sentences, the
so-called ‘super-phrasal unity’, which brings us to another concept of text as the highest, fully informative unit of communication studied by the linguistics of text.

The following ‘chain’ of relations between the units of the three levels can be formulated as follows: the phoneme (a non-sign unit) constitutes the sound form of morphemes and words; the morphemes constitute the word; the word constitutes the syntagma and through it – the sentence; the sentence constitutes the super-phrasal unity and the latter – the text.

Thus, the basic stratificational model of the plane of expression is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonematic</td>
<td>Distinctive features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphematic</td>
<td>Morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the course of lexicology, we have to do with the units of the morphematic level, principally with the word. Units of the Phonematic level (non-sign level) will be mentioned only on connection with the word, e.g. with the sound form of words borrowed from other languages and some historical, non-productive ways of word formation, such as vowel interchange, e.g. sing – song; or advice – advise, etc.

The syntactic level is the province of grammar; the functioning of the word in the sentence or as a sentence is of interest to lexicology and will be discussed later. Such notions as super phrasal unity and text are not the object of lexicology either.

As regards the functions of a language unit, we may observe that the higher the level to which the unit belongs, the more complex is the function of the unit; that is, there exists a certain hierarchy of functions.

The phoneme having only the sound form but no content, is not a sign, it does not designate (point to) anything; neither does it nominate (name) anything. As mentioned above, its function is to distinguish words and to constitute the sound form of morphemes and words.
The morpheme fulfills the function of designation, pointing to something without naming it; e.g. the suffix ‘–ful’ designates the presence of a quality without naming it; the prefix ‘–un’ designates negation, but does not name that which is negated.

The word, the maximum unit of the morphematic level, has the function of designation, signification (reflecting a notion) and nomination (naming objects of reality): it points to, signifies and nominates an object. Besides that, the word can be transposed into the class of morphemes, the minimum units of the morphematic level. E.g. ‘friend’ is a word, but in ‘friendship’ it is a morpheme, a root or simple stem. The word can also function as a sentence, the basic unit of communication. E.g. ‘Fire!’ may communicate the information that something is on fire, or it may be, depending on the situation, an imperative sentence communicating the order to open fire.

The sentence not only nominates an object and conveys some information about it: it also nominates events, situations or phenomena taking place in objective reality.

Thus, as regards functions, units of language, from the lowest to the highest, also show a hierarchy.

Morphemes are of two kinds: lexical or word-building morphemes (e.g. ‘un-‘, a prefix; ‘-less’, a suffix; ‘writ-‘ a root or simple stem) and grammatical, or form building morphemes (e.g. the markers of the plural of nouns, -s, -en; verb form morphemes, the markers of the Past Tense and Past Participle of regular verbs, -ed, or of the third person singular in the Present Tense –s, etc). The combination of lexical morphemes (root, stem, affixes), makes up the lexical word e.g. un + read + able (prefix +simple stem +suffix), i.e. the word abstracted from grammatical function. The addition of a grammatical morpheme (marker) to a stem makes the grammatical word or word form.

Accordingly, the two sublevels are distinguished on the morhematic level: lexical and grammatical. Lexicology has as its object the lexical sublevel of the morphematic level, the lexical morpheme and the lexical word, its structure on the plane of expression and the plane of content and all the problems connected with the word and the vocabulary as a whole.

Questions for seminars per lecture:
II
1.- Plane of expression of language, its levels and units
2.- Main morphemes of a word
3.- What is a syntagma?
As stated above, the object of lexicology as a branch of linguistics is the word and the entire vocabulary of a language. The vocabulary is regarded not as a chaos that cannot be systematized but as ‘a system, constituted by interdependent elements related in certain specific ways’.

The word’s place in the stratificational model of the plane of expression of language has been mentioned: it is the maximum unit of the morphematic level and minimum unit of syntactic level. But how do linguists determine what the word is, what definition do they give it?

Some linguists considered the word as a minimum sentence (H. Sweet, L. Bloomfield), e.g. ‘Come!’, ‘Fire!’, ‘Help!’ Thus. According to this definition, a word is a minimum free form that occurs as a sentence. Another definition (E. Sapir) is both syntactic and semantic – a word is one of smallest, completely satisfying bits of isolated meaning into which the sentence resolves itself (i.e. into which the sentence can be divided).

We’ll take the definition by (Meillet), that says: ‘A word is defined by the association of a given meaning with a given group of sounds, capable of a given grammatical employment.’ If we add (as singled out above), that it can function alone (i.e. as a sentence), it will be a sufficient for our needs working definition.

The word is regarded as the basic unit of language for the following reasons:

1.- The word is a polyfunctional unit, it can fulfill any linguistic function: designation, signification, nomination, communication due to its mobility, in the sense that it is easily transposed from one level of language structure to another.

Transposed onto the level of morphemes, it functions as the designating unit, the morpheme: compare -‘their own selves’ where ‘selves’ is the plural form of the word ‘self’, and ‘themselves’, where it is almost an affix, or ‘selfish’, where it is the simple stem (root) of an affixal derivative. The root morpheme is the element that generates an entire word family: e.g. my own self, selfish, unselfishly, self-respect; or ‘child’ –root, designating unit, ‘child’ – monomorphic, root word; childhood, childish. Childlike – affixal derivatives; childbirth – compound word.

As the maximum unit of the morphematic level, the word (e.g. child, childhood) designates and nominates a certain segment (object, phenomenon) of reality; the word also expresses such elements of man’s inner world as emotions, feelings, attitudes to others, evaluation of people,
things, events, phenomena. Consequently, the word also fulfills expressive and stylistic functions.

Lexical meaning is complex, consisting of several components: denotational meaning (the obligatory, nominating part) and connotational meaning, which may or may not be present in the structure of a word’s meaning. Connotational meaning contains the emotional, evaluator, expressive and stylistic components of which one or two may be present, or which may all come together in the meaning of a word. (Similarity of denotational meaning is that which unites words into synonymic groups; the difference between synonyms is, in most cases, accounted for by difference in connotation, more rarely – by a difference in some elements of denotational meaning. Synonymy will be discussed in more details in one of the following lectures).

Denotational meaning reflects the structure of the nominated notion; e.g. such components of denotational meaning as: living being, human, female, young – make up the notion of ‘girl’. Whatever synonym of this word is used, it contains these elements of denotational meaning; the connotation will be different.

This might be illustrated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denotational meaning</th>
<th>Connotational meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>girl</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. living being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. human</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hussy</strong></td>
<td>emotionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. living being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. human</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(the convergence of several elements of connotation in the word ‘hussy’ differentiates it from the neutral ‘girl’; hussy is an impudent or immoral girl)

2. When transposed onto the higher, syntactic level, the word may function as a sentence. Some examples have already been given, one or two more will suffice: in colloquial speech, one word may provide the information asked for in a question: ‘Where did you go last summer?’ – ‘Nowhere’; which tells the listener as much as the sentence – ‘I didn’t go anywhere’. Or, ‘What are you looking for?’ – ‘Nothing’; which lets the one who asks understand that it’s none of his business, and the like.

3. Another circumstance which gives grounds to consider the word the basic unit of language is that, in contradiction to other language signs the word exists in two modifications: as a lexeme(a virtual, potential polysemantic sign in the system of nominations, of vocabulary) and as a lexico-semantic variant, an actual sign functioning in utterance.

An important point here is that polysemy is a property of the word only as a lexeme, a unit of vocabulary, in language paradigmatics. On the linear syntagmatic axis of speech only one meaning is realized. E.g. ‘Let’s have a run’. ‘There’s a run in my stocking’. ‘He can run fast’. ‘He will run this factory’.

When using such terms as ‘polysemy’, ‘polysemantic’, ‘denotative meaning’, ‘connotative meaning’, etc., we find ourselves in a part of linguistics which deals with the problem of meaning, with the plane of content of language which is termed ‘semasiology’ or ‘the science of meaning.’

In studying the word as a dialectical unity of form and content, the basic linguistic sign, we study its facts in detail, applying the synchronic-dynamic approach to the analysis of the acoustic/written form of the word (the aspect of its structure, its phonemic or morphemic composition), and to the analysis of word meaning, the content of the sign

In linguistics the level viewpoint is applied to the study of the word. It has already been mentioned, as regards the word’s plane of expression, that phonemes are the constituent of morphemes and through them – of the word.

At the same time, the content (meaning) of the words is represented in two aspects: that of the lexeme (i.e. the word as a complex, bilateral nominating unit of vocabulary) and that of the individual ‘lexico-semantic variants’ (LSVs) of the complex lexeme, variants that appear in context, on the syntagmatic axis of speech.

The overall level of analysis of word may be shown as follows:

The word ‘navigate’
1. Phonematic level – ['nævɪˌɡeɪt]
2. Morphematic level – navig+ate+s plane of expression, ‘-s’ is a grammatical morpheme
3. Lexico-semantic level – navigates (1) = sails on the sea
   navigates (2) = directs the course of a ship or aircraft
4. Lexematic level – complex of all the meanings, lexical and grammatical
A polysemantic word (lexeme) may present a very complex picture as regards the number of meanings, especially if its plane of expression is simple (monomorphic).

E.g., the word 'keep' has a large number of lexico-semantic variants (LSVs) that make up the semantic structure of the lexeme 'keep' as a virtual (potential) sign registered in a dictionary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexematic level</th>
<th>Lexico-semantic level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexeme</td>
<td>lexicoo-semantic variants (LSV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'keep', v-b</td>
<td>1. keep a promise (stand by it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual sign,</td>
<td>2. keep one’s birthday (celebrate it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract unit of</td>
<td>3. keep the goal at a football (protect it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary structure,</td>
<td>4. keep a thing (not lose it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalization of its</td>
<td>5. keep smth. in a place (put away in or on a shelf, Wardrobe, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realizations (various)</td>
<td>6. keep house (maintain it in order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses of the word on</td>
<td>7. keep a family (provide for it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The syntagmatic axis,</td>
<td>8. keep one’s bed, room (not leave it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In utterance</td>
<td>9. keep chickens, sheep (raise them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. keep talking (continue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. keep silent (remain in a state), etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels (orders) of a word’s semantic segmentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Level of semantically unsegmented word-signs, lexemes, units of vocabulary (1st)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Every LSV has its own content which is a constituent of the meaning of the lexeme. Every LSV is manifested on the syntagmatic axis, in utterance, in one of its grammatical word forms, in combination with other words that can combine with it semantically, according to certain grammatical models.

To sum up: the units of the lexematic level, the lexeme (i.e. the word as a complex of all its lexical meanings and grammatical word forms, is a virtual, potential language sign, a nominating unit of the vocabulary.

The unit of the lexico-semantic level is the lexico-semantic variant (LSV) whose content is one of the meanings of the word.

The third level (or order) is the level of actual usage, of functional usage in a certain context (actualization of an LSV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEXEME</th>
<th>STAIN</th>
<th>Lexico-semantic variants (LSVs)</th>
<th>Possible word-combinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content of LSV</td>
<td>Means of its manifestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-spot or mark of another color on surface</td>
<td>All the word-forms of the lexeme 'stain' together with lexically combinable words, in definite models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-something spoiling one's reputation</td>
<td>Word-form in the singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions for seminars per lecture:

III

1. - Word as a main unit of language
2. - Denotational and connotational meanings
3. - Levels/orders of a word’s semantic segmentation
4. What is LSV?
Lecture 4

Paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations of word; plane of content of language

The essence and basic explanation of such phenomena of language as polysemy and synonymy has been given. It is necessary now to present another important point that explains the organization of language-as-a-system and connects it with its function of communication, with the working of its units in speech. At the same time, these notions will enable us to understand the vocabulary of a language as a structured system.

It has been mentioned in connection with polysemy that every lexico-semantic variant of a polysemantic lexeme (generalized, abstract unit of vocabulary) finds its realization in utterance, on the syntagmatic axis. This term, as well as the term opposed to it, paradigmatic axis requires explanation.

A word does not exist in the mind of the speaker as an isolated unit: it is associated in the mind with other words, on the basis of this or that opposition. E.g. the word ‘good’ is associated with ‘fine’, ‘splendid’, ‘remarkable’, ‘brilliant’ and a large number of others; we may observe oppositions of intensity, of stylistic reference, etc.; ‘a good performance’ is opposed to ‘a splendid performance’ and ‘a brilliant performance’ in degree of intensity, ‘a good /splendid/ brilliant performance and a smashing/cool performance are opposed through their stylistic reference, colloquial, as opposed to slang in the latter case.

All these words and quite a number of others associated with the notion expressed by the word ‘good’ make up a ‘synonymic paradigm’ and such associative ties of a word with other words are termed ‘paradigmatic ties’.

Let us now have a closer look at the fundamental distinction between paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships in the lexicon (cf. Lipka 1972:32 f.). This distinction basically derives from the linear nature of linguistic substance. This linearity goes back to the fact that speech sounds follow each other in time. Successive linguistic elements that are combined were called "syntagme" by Saussure. In English, both syntag is used as equivalent terms. Elements that are in opposition or contrast in the same position in a syntagma are said to be in a paradigmatic relationship. One can also say that they can be substituted for each other and form a paradigm. The different relationships and the resulting two dimensions may be illustrated with the following simple example:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>He</th>
<th>can</th>
<th>go</th>
<th>tomorrow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She</td>
<td>may</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>ask</td>
<td>now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>could</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This example only demonstrates syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between words, i.e. between full linguistic signs. As we will see presently, the relations also obtain between larger linguistic units, such as morphemes and phonemes, and between higher units, such as clauses and sentences.

A paradigmatic relationship exists between linguistic units that can be substituted for each other in the same syntagma. Syntagmatic relations exist between elements of the language system that are combined i.e. that co-occur. On the lexical and syntactic levels, the result of such a combination is therefore often called *syntagma*.

For example, the speaker has seen a new performance at the theatre and expresses his opinion of it: depending on the degree of intensity of the aesthetic pleasure he has experienced, he will say, ‘the performance was good/ splendid/ …brilliant’, etc. If his opinion is negative, the paradigm antonymically opposed to the paradigm of ‘good’ will provide him with the material for selection: ‘bad’, ‘awful’, ‘terrible’ and the like.

In the speaker’s utterance, the word he has selected, realizes one of its meanings i.e. one of the lexico-semantic variants of the lexeme enters into linear, syntagmatic relations with other words in the utterance.

In the case of the verb ‘keep’ presented above, nine of its lexico-semantic variants may be regarded as manifestation of one lexico-semantic variant of a transitive verb realized in the structural pattern ‘V + N’. The tenth is another lexico-grammatical variant, a semi-auxiliary verb, part of a compound aspective predicate: ‘He keeps bothering me’.
Another point to bear in mind is that the mono-semantic property of a word in context does not exclude the complexity of each denotational meaning as it serves to signify complex notions having many features.

Let's now have a bit closer look at denotation and connotation:

**Denotation.** The conceptual content of a word is expressed in its denotative meaning. To denote is to serve as a linguistic expression for a concept or as a name for an individual object. It is the denotational meaning that makes communication possible.

**Connotation** is the pragmatic communicative value the word receives depending on where, when, how, by whom, for what purpose and in what contexts it may be used. There are four main types of connotations: stylistic, emotional, evaluative and expressive or intensifying. Stylistic connotation is what the word conveys about the speaker's attitude to the social circumstances and the appropriate functional style (*slay* vs. *kill*), evaluative connotation may show his approval or disapproval of the object spoken *of* (*clique* vs. *group*), emotional connotation conveys the speaker's emotions (*mummy* vs. *mother*), the degree of intensity (*adore* vs. *love*) is conveyed by expressive or intensifying connotation.

The interdependence of connotations with denotative meaning is also different for different types of connotations. Thus, for instance, emotional connotation comes into being on the basis of denotative meaning but in the course of time may substitute it by other types of connotation with general emphasis, evaluation and colloquial stylistic overtone. E.g. *terrific* which originally meant 'frightening' is now a colloquialism meaning 'very, very good' or 'very great': *terrific beauty, terrific pleasure*. The orientation toward the subject-matter, characteristic of the denotative meaning, is substituted here by pragmatic orientation toward speaker and listener; it is not so much what is spoken about as the attitude to it that matters.

Special procedures of componential analysis have been developed to determine the components of each meaning to represent this as a combination of elementary senses. These elementary senses are called **semantic components** or **somes**.

Componential analysis is convenient for determining the difference in meaning between words that constitute a synonymic paradigm. As there is always some difference in meaning between words in a synonymic paradigm, it is a mistake to say that synonyms are words that have the same lexical meaning.

Synonyms are words belonging to the same part of speech (the same lexico-grammatical group of words); consequently, their basic grammatical meaning is the same and need not be considered in the following table presenting the componential analysis of the synonyms – house, mansion, cottage, villa, hovel, a paradigm in which 'house' is the so-called **synonymic**
dominant, its denotational meaning being composed of elements (semantic components, semes) that are the equivalents of the essential features of the relevant notion (thing, human dwelling). The nucleus of denotational meaning is the element that is common to all the synonyms in the paradigm. The difference is in the elements of denotation, or of connotation, or in both kinds of semantic components. The five words mentioned above are only a small portion of the entire synonymic paradigm of ‘house’, but they will suffice to illustrate componential analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denotational meaning</th>
<th>Connotational meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nucleus of meaning</td>
<td>Additional components of denotational meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mansion</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cottage</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>villa</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hovel</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the analysis of word meaning shown above, the denotational meaning is shown to be the obligatory part, because it is through this part of meaning that the word nominates the object of reality reflected in the notion formed by the human mind. The mind singles out objects of reality through its essential features showing it to be different from other objects. It is enough to enumerate the set of distinctive features for the mind to form the notion which calls to mind the word that nominates the object. E.g. the essential, distinctive features: a thing, an ornament, round, for the finger – notion – word: ring (ბეჭედი; кольцо, etc.). Here we may notice two important points proving that the notion and the word are two different things: the former is a unit of thought, and the latter – unit of language. It can also easily be noticed that a notion is, in most cases, international, while the word is national.

If the plane of expression of language is a set of structural elements (phonemes, morphemes, words, etc.) of which we build up the plane of expression of utterance, the plane of content is a set of structural elements of which we build up the plane of content of utterance. Units of the
plane of expression are morphemes, words, syntagmas, sentences... Units of the plane of content are the meanings.

Speaking of the interrelation between the units of the plane of expression and those of the plane of content, we have to stress that there is no one-to-one correspondence between them. That is to say, a unit of the plane of expression may correspond to more than one unit of the plane of content. Even in a morpheme (a unit of the plane of expression) we may observe the convergence (coming together) of several units of meaning, e.g. the grammatical morpheme ‘-s’ in ‘reads’ contains the grammatical meanings of mood (Indicative), voice (active), tense (Present Indefinite), person (3rd person), number (singular). As for words, the case is still clearer. In the example above, the word 'keep', we have observed one unit of the plane of expression corresponding to several units of the plane of content.

Still, although the procedure of separation form and content is artificial, it is, in a way, convenient for the explanation of the phenomena of polysemy and synonymy on the basis of such separation:

**Polysemy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plane of expressions</th>
<th>Plane of content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>hand1 – part of the arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hand2 – pointer in a watch or clock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hand3 – factory worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hand4 – sailor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, one unit of the plane of expression corresponds to four units of the plane of content.

**Synonymy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plane of expression</th>
<th>Plane of content</th>
<th>Additional (connotative) units of meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>look</td>
<td>turn one’s eyes on smth.</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glance</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stare</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>fixedly, wide-eyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glare</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>angrily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, several units of the plane of expression correspond to one basic unit of the plane of content and are differentiated by additional units of meaning. The basic unit of meaning, as we have seen above, the nucleus of the denotational part of word meaning which may have some additional elements of meaning combined with it.
Questions for seminars per lecture:

IV

1.- What is syntagmatic axis?
2.- What is paradigmatic axis?
3.- What is ‘seme’?
4.- Polysemy and Synonymy.
Lecture 5

Semantic changes in words; metaphor and metonymy; hyperbole; litotes; Irony; euphemisms; results of semantic change

Semantic changes in words are easier to observe if the problem is approached diachronically, historically. The change can usually be traced through the periods of language history, accompanied, in most cases, by changes in the word’s sound form.

E.g. the OE ‘steorfan’ meant ‘to die. In ME ‘sterven’ was frequently associated with hunger as the cause of death; the collocation was ‘sterven of hunger’. In the XVI century the word meant ‘to die of hunger’. In modern English ‘to starve’ means ‘to be very hungry’ or ‘to go hungry for a long time’.

OE ‘cwic’ meant ‘living’, ‘lively’. Liveliness being associated in the mind with quickness of reactions, of movement, ‘quick’ is now a synonym of the borrowed word ‘rapid’.

After these examples illustrating the diachronic approach to the problem of semantic change, we should stress that language being a dynamic system, such changes can be observed in the language of today too. For example, the adjective ‘hot’ is used to mean ‘exciting’ in rhythm or mood, free in variations, as in ‘hot jazz’, ‘hot dancing’.

The word ‘bank’ is, in one of its meanings, an establishment where the clients’ money is kept and paid out to them when the need arises. The word extended its meaning to denote a storage place for any reserve supply (e.g. ‘blood-bank’, ‘data-bank’, etc.).

‘Ceiling’ and ‘floor’ have come to mean ‘the upper limit’ and ‘the lower limit’ of prices, of wages paid to working people.

The word ‘bird’, besides being a slang term for ‘girl’, also means the shuttlecock in badminton.

Many more examples could be mentioned but these are enough to demonstrate the fact that word-meaning is changeable, and that such changes can be observed in the English language of today.

The problem is: why does this happen? What is the nature of semantic change? What are the results of semantic change?

It is necessary to differentiate the causes of semantic change, the results and the nature of the process of change of meaning.

The causes of semantic change are, roughly speaking, of two kinds: extra-linguistic and linguistic.
Extra-linguistic causes of semantic change are the changes in the life of a linguistic community: the development of its economy, social structure, culture, technology, science, – shortly, any kind of changes brought about by the activities of human society.

For example, the word ‘manufacture’, a word of Latin origin (‘manu’=by hand’ + ‘factura’ = the making of smth., from ‘facere’ = to make) that came into English from French, meant originally ‘the making of something by hand’, ‘a handicraft’. Before machinery was invented and introduced, ‘manufacture’ was an enterprise in which the first step was made towards division of labor in industry, although all the production processes were carried out by hand. Today the word is a synonym of ‘factory’, where nothing is made by hand.

The word ‘vassal’ goes back to the feudal economic formation. Today ‘vassal state’ is a state obeying the dictate of another, more powerful state.

The word ‘pedagogue’ has a still longer history. It is of ancient Greek origin (Gr. ‘paidos’ = a boy + ‘agogos’ = one who leads) where the word ‘paidagōgos’ denoted a slave whose duty it was to take a young boy to his teacher or to school. Now the word is a synonym of ‘teacher’.

‘Coach’ used to mean a compostable closed carriage of a rich, usually aristocratic person; later it came to mean a public vehicle for carrying people from one town to another (especially the compound the compound ‘stage-coach’. In present-day English ‘coach’ is a large bus fulfilling the same function.

‘Car’, coming from the Latin ‘carra’ (a heavy four-wheeled vehicle drawn by horses or oxen) through the compound ‘motor-car’ means an automobile, while in the American English it is also a railway carriage, e.g. ‘a Pullman car’.

Another interesting example of semantic change brought about social and technological causes is the word ‘tank’ which at once brings to mind a powerful and terrible war machine. Before World War I, ‘tank’ meant merely a large container for liquid, gas, etc. The word came to be used by workers in military factories where the new machine was built. Being instructed not to mention their top-secret production, they used to say they were producing tanks and so a new meaning appeared to denote a new referent (object of reality).

Linguistic causes of semantic change are several processes going on within the language system. The study of these deals with changes due to the constant interdependence of vocabulary units in language and in speech.

One of the processes acting on the syntagmatic axis is ellipsis, i.e. omission of a word from a frequently used phrase. We have seen above ‘stage coach – coach’, which illustrates the interaction of the extra-linguistic and linguistic factors. Ellipsis may lead to change of not only
lexical meaning, but of grammatical meaning as well (the transposition of a word into another lexico-grammatical class of words, i.e. another part of speech). In ‘daily paper’, ‘weekly magazine/journal’, ‘monthly publication/magazine/journal’ the qualifying words are adjectives. By omitting the qualifying words we get ‘a daily’, a weekly’, etc, the adjective being transposed into the lexico-grammatical class of nouns containing the same information as the above collocations.

The same happens in the case of ‘Pullman car’, when somebody said ‘I travelled to Washington in a Pullman’; a ‘cut-price sale’ is now simply a ‘sale’, etc.

The semantic assimilation of borrowed words is another linguistic cause of change of meaning in native words.

Borrowing of words from other languages is a process conditioned by extra-linguistic causes – contacts between peoples, nations; trade, culture, war, conquests, etc.

Being assimilated by the borrowing language, borrowed words affect it (the language) and are, in turn, affected by it – purely linguistically. E.g. the OE ‘hærfest’ meant ‘autumn’ until the word ‘autumn’ came in with Norman French (11th century); as a result, the borrowed ‘autumn’ remained to denote the season, while the native ‘hærfest’ shifted its meaning: today ‘harvest’ is ‘ჰარშეფტი’, ‘ჰაროფტი’;

A change in connotational meaning occurred when the Old Norse (Scandinavian) ‘skye’ came into Old English (8th-9th century), where ‘heofon’ had the same denotational meaning as the borrowed word; both words co-exist in Modern English as synonyms differentiated by the stylistic component of connotational meaning: the borrowed ‘sky’ is neutral, while ‘heaven’ is a word of elevated literary style (cf. ცა – ზეცა).


The modern English word ‘beads’ comes from the OE ‘gebed’ = a prayer; this meaning was substituted by its Norman French synonym ‘preiere’ = ‘prayer’. The old meaning has survived on the margin of the English vocabulary in the collocation ‘to tell one’s beads’ where ‘tell’ is the last evidence of its old meaning, ‘to count’ and the whole phrase means ‘to count off the times a prayer has been repeated’ on a chaplet (კრიალოსანი, მძივები) of beads.

The OE ‘tīd’ and ‘tima’ both had the meaning of ‘time’ in their semantic structure. The old meaning of ‘tīd’ now survives in a poetic ‘eventide’ (evening), ‘Christmastide’ and a few other words; ‘tide’ now means the periodic rise and fall of the sea owing to the attraction of the moon;
‘tima’ is the present day ‘time’.

The Old French ‘countree’ mentioned above, besides ousting its OE synonym ‘eðel’, affected the latter’s synonymic paradigm in another way: OE ‘land’ meant ‘the solid part of the earth’s surface’ as opposed to ‘sea’, and also ‘the territory of a nation’ (whence OE ‘Englaland’, now ‘England’). ‘Countrée’ took upon itself the latter meaning (‘country’), while ‘land’ preserved this meaning only in such emotionally colored phrases as ‘my native land’, ‘distant lands’, etc.

**Linguistic analogy** may cause a change in meaning in a synonymic paradigm: if one synonym acquires a new meaning, the others will get the meaning by analogy; e.g. in ‘I couldn’t catch the meaning’, ‘catch’ means ‘to understand’; so we can say ‘I couldn’t grasp the main idea’, I don’t get you’, ‘get it?’

**The nature of semantic change (metaphor and metonymy)**

The linguistic causes of the process of semantic change affect the vocabulary of a language little by little, almost unnoticeably, as far as native speakers of the period are concerned. But a word may be consciously used with only a part of its meaning as, for example the German compound ‘Apfelwein’, i.e. ‘apple-wine’, where the second element of the compound word loses part of its meaning under the influence of the first element. Indeed, ‘wine’ is ‘a mildly-alcoholic drink made from grape-juice’ and the second element of the German compound ‘Apfelwein’ contains only the semantic component ‘mildly-alcoholic drink’. The same is true of the second elements in the English compound ‘coffee-bean’, etc.

At the same time, a word may be consciously used with only part of its meaning but some other elements of meaning be added; e.g. in the context ‘riding on a white ass (donkey), the latter word contains the semantic component ‘animal; in the context ‘that boy is an ass’, the semantic component ‘animal’ disappears, replace by some other – ‘a human being’, ‘male’, ‘young’. Such interplay of semantic components is what creates figurative uses of words, for instance, **metaphor and metonymy**. There are also changes of meaning based upon psychological associations that bring about the transfer of the name of an object of reality to another object.

A metaphor that has been in use for centuries loses its figurativeness, its metaphoric quality and becomes the name of a thing very loosely connected, if at all, with another thing it took its name from. Who thinks today of the metaphoric origin of the word ‘long’ or the word ‘short’ when we say ‘a long time’, ‘a short time’; who remembers that these words express a relation of ‘space’?

**Metaphor** is the transferring of the name of a thing to another thing, based upon some point of similarity between them.
In the case mentioned above ‘That boy is an ass’, the point of similarity between the animal and the human being is their stupidity. In most languages, a sly person may be metaphorically called ‘a fox’; a very unpleasant man may be called ‘a swine; any person who is exceedingly mean and perfidious is called ‘a snake’, or ‘a viper’. However, languages may differ in this respect: it all depends upon the attitude of the linguistic community to the creature whose name is thus used, upon the qualities that are ascribed to it. Compare the Georgian ‘ყოშო’ addressed to or used of a Girl and the English ‘cat’ which is no compliment, meaning ‘a spiteful, quarrelsome woman’. We can also compare metaphoric uses of other animal names in different languages (e.g. fox, bear, etc.)

Metaphor is based on different kinds of similarity:

a)-Similarity of some natural features, as in the case of ‘zoosemy’ mentioned above;

b)-Similarity of shape: a head of cabbage; the tongue of a shoe; the teeth of a saw; a crane (denotationally - წიწაქმი, metaphorically - ამწე); the blade of a leaf, a blade of grass (cf. blade of knife), etc.

c)-Similarity of position: the foot of a mountain, of a tree; the capital (head) of a column (in architecture), the crest of a mountain (cf. the crest of a cock), etc.

d)-Similarity of function: the tongue of a bell; the hand of a clock; the key to a problem; a pen (cf. Latin ‘penna’ or ‘pinna’, a quill (feather used as an instrument for writing), etc.

e)-Similarity of quality: a warm greeting; a cold greeting; an icy smile, tone, look, etc).

This is by no means a complete list of points of similarity that metaphor may originate from, but only an illustration of usual ‘language metaphors’ used in everyday speech as opposed to occasional metaphors created by writers in the written form of speech and distinguished by their freshness, unexpectedness, their unpredictability …

Metonymy reflects contiguity (closeness) of meaning that results from the association between two objects of reality if one is a part of the other, or in a certain way connected with it; e.g. ‘tongue’, used in the sense of ‘language’ as in ‘mother tongue’.

The name of a place may be used to denote the person or persons who occupy it: ‘to address the chair = to address the chairman; the hall was in an uproar = the people who were in the hall were shouting.

The name of a vessel is used to denote the contents: ‘to drink a cup’ as in ‘I’ve already drunk a cup; ‘to drink a bottle as in ‘He’s drunk two bottles’.

Here we can also class the metonymic use of proper names to denote things: ‘diesel’, ‘volt’,
‘ampere’, ‘mackintosh’, ‘sandwich’ – names of scientists or inventors, transposed into the class of common nouns; also geographical proper names, used as common nouns, e.g. ‘china’, ‘astrakhan’, a popular swimming suit ‘bikini’, ‘cachmere’, a soft cloth or shawl made from the wool of the Cashmere goat; ‘cheviot’, wool or cloth made from the wool of sheep bred in the Cheviot hills in England, etc.

Some other types of semantic changes are:

Hyperbole [hɪˈpɜrbələ] (exaggeration): ‘Haven’t seen you for ages’; ‘I’ve told you a hundred times’; ‘I’d just love to go there’; ‘that man is a giant’.

Litotes [laɪˈtəutɪz] (understatement): ‘The book is not uninteresting’; ‘their arrival was not unexpected’; ‘He’s no fool’, etc.

Irony: ‘You are a pretty sight!’ (an awful sight); ‘That was a clever thing to say! (a foolish thing) and the like.

Euphemism [ˈjuːfɛmɪz(ə)m] (from Greek ‘euphomismos’ – eu = well, pheme = speak). Certain notions that are unpleasant or unmentionable are substituted by words having less unpleasant connotations: deceased – dead; unbalanced – crazy, mad; perspiration – sweat; tight – drunk, etc.

The results of semantic change

The results of semantic change are observable in changes in a word’s denotational meaning (restriction/narrowing, otherwise termed specialization of meaning) and extension or broadening of meaning, otherwise termed generalization of meaning.

1. Restriction or narrowing of meaning:

OE ‘hund’ meant any kind of dog; today it is one breed of hunting dog – hound.

OE ‘dēor’ meant ‘wild beasts’, now – deer

OE ‘fuzol’ was any kind of bird; Mod. E. ‘fowl’ – a domestic bird

OE ‘mete’ denoted any food; today meat is only the flesh of animals used as food; the old meaning survives only in the compound ‘sweetmeat’.

OE ‘writan’ meant – to write, to scratch or score a mark on something; only the first meaning survives in ‘to write’

OE ‘cwene’ denoted any woman; today ‘queen’ is a king’s wife or a reigning sovereign: Queen Elizabeth, Queen Tamar.

2. Extension (broadening) of meaning:
‘To arrive’ (cf. French ‘arriver’, where ‘rive’ means ‘shore’, ‘bank’) denoted ‘coming by water, to shore; now the word means ‘to come to a place by water, by air, by land’)

‘To ship’ meant ‘to transport goods on a ship’; now goods are said to be shipped by any kind of transport’.

‘Place’ (lat. ‘platea = street) has a very broad meaning now, which developed gradually through the following meanings: a wide street, a square (in French this meaning is still living; ‘place’ regularly denotes a square in a city or town). The word place is polysemantic in modern English, as well as in French.

‘Box’ is the name of a small tree having very hard wood; (Lat. ‘buxus’) its wood was used to make caskets (small ornamental boxes) to keep jewels in; now the word means any case of wood or any other material, including plastics; also a box in a theatre.

Connotational meanings are also affected by semantic change. In this case, the result is elevation (amelioration) of meaning or degradation (pejoration) of meaning.

Both these changes are actually shifts in the word’s social implication, reflecting social attitudes to the things named.

1. Elevation (amelioration) of meaning

The word ‘cwene’ mentioned above shows both narrowing of denotational meaning and elevation of connotational meaning.

OE ‘cniht’ = a lad, a servant or soldier; now ‘knight’ is a title in the English nobility, a baron, also an honorary title granted for services to the country.

The word ‘minister’ means, in Mod. English a civil servant of high rank, or a clergyman; it is a borrowing from Latin where it meant ‘a servant’ (fr. Latin ‘minus’ = lesser. The verb ‘to minister’, however, has retained some of its original meanings: to give aid or service to smb., especially to the sick.

‘Marshal’, now the highest military rank, meant ‘a stable boy’, whose duty was to look after horses.

‘Chamberlain’ was a servant in charge of the chambers; now the word denotes a high-ranked official at the royal court in England.

2. Degradation (pejoration) of meaning

OE ‘zebur’ meant ‘a dweller’; then ‘a villager’; now ‘boor’ means an ill-mannered, rude fellow.

The word ‘Knave’, now a synonym of ‘rascal’, a dishonest fellow, comes from the OE ‘cnafa’ = a
boy, a servant; this degradation of meaning expresses the contemptuous attitude of the upper classes to the lower classes.

‘Accident’ was used to mean any kind of chance happening; at present it has acquired the meaning of an unfortunate happening, which, parallel to narrowing of its denotational meaning, has given it an unpleasant emotional connotation.

**Questions for seminars per lecture:**

1. Semantic changes in words
2. Causes of semantic change (extra-linguistic and linguistic)
3. Results of semantic change (restriction; extension; elevation; degradation;)
4. The nature of semantic change (metaphor and metonymy; hyperbole; litotes; irony; euphemisms;
Lecture 6

Word formation (word-building); main structural types of word; roots, 
Stems and affixes;

Word formation studies the ways in which words are generated in a language. In the study of word formation, we shall consider the ways of building ‘new’ words, not only in the sense of ‘what comes from what’, but also **how** words are formed in the English language.

The principal types of word formation are of two kinds:

1. – **Linear** types in which two or more morphemes are arranged in linear sequence on the syntagmatic axis. These types are:
   a) Affixal derivation (un+natur+al+ly)
   b) Composition or compounding (housekeeper, wall-paper)

2. – **Non-linear** types of word formation in which no such arrangement of morphemes is seen or is relevant:
   a) Conversion;  
   b) back-formation;  
   c) shortening (clipping or abbreviation);  
   d) consonant and vowel interchange (change in the morphemic composition of the roots of words);  
   e) – stress interchange;  
   f) vowel interchange + affixation (mixed type of word formation).

Examples of these types may be given here, though their detailed presentation is the object of the following lectures.

a) conversion: hand (n) – to hand (v); handcuff (n) – to handcuff (v). In the latter case the second word (the verb) seems to have been generated by adding one stem to another, i.e. by compounding. This is what the word looks like if analyzed morphemically; but word formation analysis makes it clear that the noun ‘handcuffs’ was formed by joining two noun stems, but the verb was produced by another, non-linear type of word formation, by conversion, i.e. by transposition or shifting into another part of speech.

b) back-formation: beg fr. Beggar. Housekeep fr. Housekeeper – a word-building type in which the derivational affix is ‘cut off’ to form a new word.

c) shortening: clipping – exam fr, examination; bus fr. Autobus, etc.; abbreviation: UNO, NATO, CNN, etc.

d) vowel and consonant interchange: gold – to gild; food – to feed; advice – to advise, etc.
e) stress interchange: ‘conduct – to con’duct; ‘affix – to af’fix;
f) vowel interchange + affixation is a mixed type of word formation. The phonemic composition of the root is changed (a non-linear process) and an affix is added (a linear process), e.g. wide – width; long – length.

It would not be out of place here to review some basic notions indispensable to the study of word formation.

The morpheme, the minimum unit of the morphematic level, is the smallest, further indivisible language sign. It is a constituent of words. However, a word may consist of only one morpheme (the root, or simple stem), e.g. ‘house’, ‘man’, ‘arm’, ‘hand’, etc. These are monomorphemic, or root words.

According to their function in word formation, morphemes are subdivided into roots, stems and affixes; the latter, depending on their position, are subdivided into prefixes (preceding the stem) and suffixes (following the stem).

In word formation studies, grammatical affixes are not taken into account (e.g. ‘-s’ noun plural marker; ‘-s’ marker of the 3rd person, singular, Present Indefinite; ‘-ed’ marker of the Past Indefinite and Participle II of regular verbs, etc.).


The stem is the basic word-forming morpheme, the underlying form in all the words derived from it.

The stem is said to be simple if it is homonymous to the root. E.g. in the word-family mentioned above in the words ‘manly’, ‘man’, ‘to man’, ‘mannish, ‘manful’ the stem is simple; in ‘manfully’, ‘unmanly’, ‘manliness’ the stem is derived. In ‘horsemanship’ the stem is compound.

The stem has part-of-speech meaning; consequently we distinguish noun-stems, verb-stems, etc.

Morphemes may be free or bound. A morpheme is said to be free if it is homonymous to a word and it can stand alone without changing its meaning. It follows, that affixal morphemes, which do not ‘stand alone’, are always bound.

In English, native (Germanic) stems are as a rule free, while borrowed stems are in most cases bound. We might quote an example which may be considered classical in manuals on English lexicology. The word ‘hearty’ has a synonym ‘cordial’, differentiated from ‘hearty’ by its stylistic reference (‘hearty’ is neutral as regards style, ‘cordial’ is literary; another synonym ‘cardiac’ is a
medical term). In ‘hearty’ the stem is free (heart-); in its synonym the stem ‘cord-’ (Latin) and ‘card-’ (Greek) are bound as they are not homonyms of English words semantically connected with ‘heart’. In ‘heartily’ and ‘cordially’ the stems ‘hearty’ and ‘cordial’ are both free as they are homonyms to words freely used in English. We might also mention such synonyms as ‘brotherly’ and ‘fraternal’; ‘motherly’ and ‘maternal’, ‘fatherly’ and ‘paternal’. The first words in these pairs derive from native free stems, while the second words derive from borrowed stems. Such cases are regarded as ‘lexical suppletion’, seeing that they are words of almost the same meaning derived from different stems (Cf. suppletive word-forms in the grammatical paradigm of some verbs and adjectives: go—went; be—is, was—were; good—better, bad—worse).

Morphemes may have variants distinguished by their sound form: these are allomorphs, positional variants of morphemes. Some allomorphs result from the process of phonetic assimilation (partial or complete) to the initial consonant of the stem, e.g. the negative prefix ‘-in’ occurs before stems beginning with vowels: inelegant, inorganic, inaccurate; before sonants it undergoes partial or complete phonetic assimilation, producing allomorphs: ‘im-’ (impossible, imperfect); ‘ir-’ (irregular, irresponsible); ‘il-’ (illegal, illiterate). The prefix ‘ad-’ (adapt; Lat. Ad+aptus= suitable) has the allomorphs ‘ac-‘ (accurate; Lat. Ad – ac+cura =care); ‘al-‘ (ad – al+litera) – alliteration; ‘af-‘ – affix (ad –af+figere=fix).

The root may also have allomorphs, e.g. long – length, wide – width, please [pliːz], pleasure [pleʒə], pleasant [plezənt]; clean [kliːn], cleanliness [klenlinis], etc.

Morphemes are a unity of form and content – the morpho-semantic unit contained in a morpheme.

The morpho-semantic units in morphemes are of two kinds – designators (root morphemes) and formators (affixes). The designators are determined by formators, in the sense that the affixes help to form the word. E.g. the root ‘writ-‘, determined by the formator (suffix) ‘-er’, ‘-ing’ produce different words – ‘writer’, ‘writing’. The root ‘writ-‘ designates a certain human activity; but what will it generate, the name of the action or the name of the doer, is not clear until the formators are added (‘-er’ pointing to the doer, ‘-ing’ pointing to the action). The generated words nominate the segment or process of reality through the semantic components in the word. E.g. ‘writer’: 1. – living being, 2. – person, 3. – doer of the action designated by the stem.

From the above it is clear that morphemes are less informative than the word, and functionally they are less potent: they have only the function of designation, but they do not nominate anything – this is the basic function of the word.

The formators (suffixes and prefixes) in many cases determine the part-of-speech meaning of
derivatives, or the meaning of a sub-class in a part of speech; e.g. ‘-ish’ forms adjectives built on the model (noun stem + ish) – girlish, childish; ‘-ness’ forms abstract nouns on the model (adj. stem + ness) – kindness, happiness.

Suffixes are mostly convertive, i.e. the resultant word formed by adding a suffix usually has a different part-of-speech meaning than the underlying form: ‘home’ (n.), ‘homeless’ (adj.), etc. Consequently, it is convenient to classify suffixes according to the lexico-grammatical classes of words (part of speech) they form.

As for prefixes, some of them are ‘convertive’ too, e.g. ‘pre-’, ‘war’ (n.), ‘prewar’ (adj.); ‘post-’, ‘war’ (n.), ‘post-war’ (adj.).

However, the same prefixes may be ‘non-convertive’: ‘view’ (n.), ‘pre-view’ (n.); graduate (n), postgraduate (n);

Some prefixes express negation: ‘in-’, ‘un-’, ‘dis-’, ‘a-’, e.g. unkind, disagree, atheism.

In classifying affixes, we have to consider their meaning, origin and productivity:

M. N. Orembovskaya gives a convenient classification of the principal English suffixes:

**Noun suffixes**

(T. – Teutonic, G. – Germanic, R. – Romanic, Gr. – Greek)

1. Denoting persons

-er – (T) – writer, Londoner
-or – (R) – actor, doctor
-ant, -ent (R) – student, inhabitant
-an, -ian (R) – American, librarian
-ess (R) – hostess, actress, stewardess
-ist (Gr) – artist, futurist

2. Abstract nouns

-dom (T) – freedom, kingdom
-hood (T) – childhood, womanhood
-ship (T) – friendship
-ing (T) – swimming, building
-ness (T) – goodness, kindness
-age (R) – marriage
-ance, -ence (R) – ignorance, obedience
-ment (R) – development
-tion (R) – dictation, devotion
-tude (R) – attitude
-ty (R) – liberty, poverty
-ure (R) – measure, pleasure
-ism (Gr) – heroism, altruism
3. Diminutive suffixes
-let (R) – leaflet, booklet
-et, -ette (R) – locket, pocket, cigarette, kitchenette.

Adjective suffixes
1.- full of
-ful (T) – hopeful, wonderful
-ous (R) – dangerous
2.- without
-less (T) – hopeless, homeless
3.- like
-ish (T) – childish, yellowish
-ly (T) – manly, wifely
-y (T) – windy, rainy
4. – of the nature of
-al (R) – political
-ary (R) – necessary, revolutionary
-ic, -ical (R) – artistic, historical
5.- capable of
-able (R) – eatable, comfortable
Verb suffixes

- en (T) – lengthen, soften
- ate (R) – graduate, celebrate
- ify, - fy (R) – simplify, terrify
- ize, - ise (Gr) – organize, popularize

Adverb suffixes

1. like
   - ly (T) badly; wonderfully

2. direction
   - ward(s) – forward; homeward(s)

Questions for seminars per lecture:

VI

1. Word formation: a) linear – affixal derivation; composition/compounding
2. b) Non-linear – conversion; back-formation; shortening; consonant & vowel interchange; stress interchange; vowel interchange + affixation
3. Roots and stems (designators and formators)
4. Prefixes and suffixes
Lecture 7

Word formation continued; linear types of word formation – affixal derivatives; Immediate Constituents & Ultimate constituents; transformational analysis

After the preliminary definition of such terms as ‘linear’ and ‘non-linear’ types of word formation, of kinds of morphemes and their functions in forming words, we may proceed to a discussion of various types of word formation.

The subject of this lecture is affixal derivation, a linear type of word-formation in which syntagmatic relations are manifested, in the first place, in the linear arrangement of morphemes. A word may be, from the viewpoint of derivational analysis a suffixal derivative or a prefixal derivative.

It has already been pointed out that suffixation, in English, is more typical of noun and adjective formation, while prefixation is more typical of verbs; however, adjective stems readily combine with negative prefixes, e.g. ‘kind’ – ‘unkind’.

The structure of a polymorphic word (i.e. a word consisting of more than one morpheme) may be analyzed through morphemic analysis, static synchronic approach to the problem.

If, however, the aim is to discover how a word was formed, to discover the last step in word formation, the dynamic-synchronic approach is applied.

In the first case, the aim is to discover only of what morphemes, and how many morphemes the word is made up. This is morphemic analysis. From this standpoint, an affixal derivative contains the root (the semantic nucleus, the designator, which may be homonymous to the stem, if the latter is simple, and one or more derivational affixes, formators, e.g. ‘disagreeable’ = dis+agree+able; ‘unnoticeable’ = un+notice+able (prefix+ simple stem+ suffix); ‘uninhabited’ = un+in+habit+ed (prefix+prefix+bound stem+grammatical suffix), etc.

Such an analysis revealing the morphemes a word consists of (its Ultimate Constituents), does not show us the process of derivation, nor does it reveal the structural model (pattern) of the word.

The process of derivation is revealed through analysis done according to the method of Immediate Constituents (ICs) which shows up the structural pattern of the analyzed word.

The method of IC analysis is fruitful as regards the study of word-formation, determining the structural patterns of words.
At each stage of analysis the word is segmented (divided) into two elements that make it up, into two Immediate constituents (ICs), each of which should be a meaningful unit, e.g. ‘disagreeable’ would be found to consist of two ICs – ‘dis + agreeable’, showing it to be a word of prefixal derivation, built on the pattern ‘pref. + derived adjective stem.

The word ‘helplessness’ = ‘helpless’ + ‘ness’, a word of suffixal derivation, built on the pattern ‘derived adjective stem’ + suffix.

In the above examples, the stems are derived; consequently, they too can be analyzed into their Immediate Constituents – ‘-agreeable’ = ‘agree’ + able’; ‘helpless’ = ‘help’ + ‘-less’; As a result, the words ‘disagreeable’ and ‘helplessness’ are analyzed into their Ultimate Constituents, which cannot be analyzed further: ‘dis’ + ‘agree’ + ‘-able’; ‘help’ + ‘-less’, + ‘-ness’. This shows their static morphemic structure and also the degree of derivation: ‘agreeable’, a derivative of the first degree; ‘disagreeable’ – a derivative of the second degree. ‘Helpless’ – a derivative of the first degree; ‘helplessness’- a derivative of the second degree.

Within a family of derived words springing from the same root, there may be words showing several degrees of derivation. Monomorphic words, whose stems are homonymous to their roots, show the ‘zero-degree’ of derivation, e.g. ‘add’; the first degree of derivation is seen in ‘add+ ition’; the second degree of derivation in - ‘add+ ition+ al’; the third degree in - ‘add +

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 2 \\
1 & 2 & 3
\end{array}
\]

Let us consider a few other examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-deg</td>
<td>Man-</td>
<td>man+ly (li)</td>
<td>man+li+ness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Man-</td>
<td>man+ful</td>
<td>man+ful+ly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Man-</td>
<td>man+ful</td>
<td>man+ful+ness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man-</td>
<td>man+hood</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A bound simple stem (root) may also produce several degrees of derivation: e.g. ‘schol-‘ (fr. Lat.
‘schola’, Gr. ‘skhole), which gives us our English word ‘school’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schol/school</th>
<th>first degree</th>
<th>second degree</th>
<th>third degree</th>
<th>fourth degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schol -</td>
<td>scholar</td>
<td>scholarly</td>
<td>scholarliness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schol -</td>
<td>scholar</td>
<td>scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schol -</td>
<td>scholast</td>
<td>scholastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schol -</td>
<td>scholast</td>
<td>scholastic</td>
<td>scholastical</td>
<td>scholastically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graphically this can be shown as:

-er (2)  
  -ize (1)  
  -ic (1)  
  -ity (2)  
  -al (2)  
  -ly (3)  
  Atom (0)  
  -ist (1)

In many cases, Immediate Constituent analysis, which requires that each of ICs should be a meaningful unit, presents certain difficulties – further analysis of an IC appears impossible on the synchronic plane.

E.g. in ‘incomprehensible’ the ICs are easily determined at the first stage of analysis: the negative prefix ‘in’- and the free derived adjective ‘-comprehensible’. Here we distinguish the adjective suffix ‘-ible’, but as for the bound stem ‘-comprehens-‘, it is synchronically unanalyzable. If we recognize that diachronic, historical analysis may be applied, in such cases we find its ICs, the prefix ‘com-‘ (allomorph of the Latin ‘cum’ = with), and the bound stem ‘-prehens-‘ (from the Latin ‘prehendere’ = to grasp). At the last stage of analysis, the Ultimate constituents (UCs) are: ‘in-‘+’com-‘+’prehens-‘+ -ible’.

Immediate Constituent analysis can be done proceeding from two principles: the root principle and the affix principle.

Proceeding from the root principle, let us analyze the word ‘blackness’: the element ‘black’ occurs in the root word ‘black’, in the affixal derivatives ‘blackness’, ‘blackish’; in the compound ‘blackboard’, in the compound derivative ‘black-eyed’, etc. We conclude that the element ‘black’ is the root, the semantic nucleus of an entire word-family; consequently, the word ‘blackness’ consists of the ICs ‘black-‘+’-ness, which are at the same time its Ultimate Constituents (SCs).
If we analyze the adjective ‘eatable’ and find the element ‘-able’ in a number of other adjectives, such as ‘readable’, ‘understandable’, ‘manageable’, etc., we conclude that ‘-able’ is a suffix, the word ‘eatable’ consists of the ICs ‘eat’+‘able’ and, like the other words above, is built on the pattern ‘verb stem’ + the suffix ‘-able’.

The important result of IC analysis is that it reveals the mechanism of derivation and at the first stage of analysis the structural pattern on which a word is built. Our example ‘incomprehensible’ shows the pattern ‘in- + adj. stem’ (free derived stem) which unites it with such words as ‘inexcusable’, ‘inexplicable’, ‘inexpressible’, ‘irresistible’, ‘inapproachable’, ‘inaccessible’, etc.

Another method of determining the structural pattern on which a word is built is the method of proportional opposition, of a set of binary oppositions.

For example, the following set of binary oppositions, making a proportional opposition-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Untruthful</th>
<th>unkind</th>
<th>unequal</th>
<th>unwomanly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truthful</td>
<td>kind</td>
<td>equal</td>
<td>womanly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reveals the structural pattern ‘un + adj. stem’, whether the stem is simple, such as ‘-kind’, ‘-equal’, or derived, such as ‘-truthful’, ‘-womanly’, etc.

The same holds true of the words built with the allomorphs (inelegant, impossible, irregular, illiterate, etc.). The pattern is ‘negative prefix + adjective stem.

A point which should be noted is the structural patterns and the part-of-speech meaning of words with the suffix ‘-ly’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quickly</th>
<th>regularly</th>
<th>elegantly</th>
<th>rudely</th>
<th>nicely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quick</td>
<td>regular</td>
<td>elegant</td>
<td>rude</td>
<td>nice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the structural pattern is ‘adj. stem + ly’, the word is an adverb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Womanly</th>
<th>manly</th>
<th>soldierly</th>
<th>daily</th>
<th>weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>soldier</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the structural pattern is ‘noun stem + ly’, the word is adjective.

There are cases, however, when the structure of a word with the suffix ‘-ly’ is not so clear, e.g. the adjective ‘comely’, one of the synonyms of ‘good-looking’, which does not, as it might seem, consist of the verb stem ‘come’ plus ‘-ly’. In modern English ‘comely’ seems to be a mono-
morphic, unanalyzable word. To discover its polymorphic structure, we have to apply the diachronic, historical approach, to find that the word goes back to the OE ‘cymlic’, from ‘cyme =
fine.

The adjectival structural pattern shown above ‘noun stem + ly’ as in ‘womanly’, ‘daily’ would seem, at first glance, to be semantically the same. Neither IC analysis, nor analysis by proportional opposition can reveal the semantic difference, if any, in similar structures.

Actually, the adjectival suffix ‘-ly’ carries different semes (minimum units of meaning) in ‘womanly’ and ‘daily’. The method of determining this difference is transformational analysis. It helps to reveal the difference in meaning in cases where the distributional formula of a word in two sentences is the same.

He made the boy a pipe.

He made the girl a star (film star).

Is the meaning of ‘made’ the same in these two sentences?

A transformation of the sentences will give the answer: if both transforms reveal the same meaning, or both make sense, the meaning of ‘made’ is the same.

He made the boy a pipe = He made a pipe for the boy.

He made the girl a star /= He made a star for the girl.

The second transform is different in meaning from the original sentence, so the meaning of ‘made’ is different.

The transformational method can be fruitfully applied to the analysis of words that have the same structural pattern, as in our example – (noun stem + ly), to find out whether the meaning of the suffix is the same in all cases.

If ‘monthly’ means ‘occurring every month’;

‘yearly’ means occurring every year

Does ‘womanly’ mean ‘occurring every woman’?

The first two transforms make sense, the third does not.

Conversely, if ‘womanly’ means ‘possessing the qualities of woman’; ‘soldierly’ means ‘possessing the qualities of a soldier’, does ‘yearly’ mean ‘possessing the qualities of a year’?

Since again the last transform makes no sense, it is clear that the structural pattern ‘noun stem + ly’ makes two different semantic groups of adjectives and ‘-ly’ has two different meanings.
In ‘womanly’, ‘manly’, ‘soldierly’, ‘gentlemanly’, the suffix ‘-ly’ is **qualitative** showing that the person denoted by the stem possesses this or that quality.

In ‘daily’, ‘weekly’, ‘monthly’, ‘yearly’, where the stem denotes a period of time, the suffix ‘-ly’ is **frequentative** it shows the frequency of occurrence, i.e. that something occurs every day, week, month, etc. as a ‘daily paper’, a ‘weekly/monthly magazine

**Questions for seminars per lecture:**

**VII**

1.- Affixal derivation: Immediate Constituents
2.- Ultimate Constituents
3.- Transformational analysis
In connection with affixal derivation, some other problems should be discussed. These are:

1. Polysemy and homonymy in affixes;
2. The problem of ‘unique’ roots;
3. The problem of bound stems;

1. Polysemy is proper not only to the word as the basic unit of language, but also to such morphemes as affixes.

Polysemy may be regarded as manifestation of the dynamic force of language, and also of the principle of linguistic economy: one linguistic sign is made to nominate several segments of reality (polysemy in words), or, in the case of affixes, a formator builds words belonging to several lexico-grammatical classes (parts of speech), or to several subclasses within the same class, etc.

Thus, the suffix ‘-ly’ serves to form either an adverb or an adjective, depending on the stem it follows, i.e. on the structural pattern of the word: (n. stem + ly) = adjective, e.g. ‘friendly’; (adj. stem + ly) = adverb, e.g. ‘quickly’. It has already been mentioned that in adjectives the suffix ‘-ly’ forms groups: qualitative, as ‘womanly’ and frequentative, as daily.

Suffixes are mostly convertive, i.e. they assign a word to a lexico-grammatical class of words (part of speech) different from the part-of-speech meaning of the stem; that is why, it is logical to classify them as noun-suffixes, adjective suffixes, verb suffixes, adverb suffixes.

The French suffix ‘-ess’ forms personal nouns, such as ‘hostess’, ‘stewardess’, ‘heiress’ and non-personal nouns denoting the female of some animals: ‘lioness’, ‘tigress’, ‘leopardess’. These are also different subclasses of nouns.

From the standpoint of polysemy, the Germanic productive suffix ‘-er’ is most interesting.

Combined with verb stems and some noun stems, it forms personal nouns that have different meanings:

a – persons, pursuing a certain trade, profession or calling, e.g. ‘driver’, ‘baker’, ‘gardener’, ‘singer’, ‘lawyer’, ‘writer’, etc.

b – persons, performing a certain action habitually or at a given moment, e.g. ‘reader’,
c – the suffix ‘-er’ is also used to form personal nouns denoting people living in a certain country, town or location, e.g. ‘Britisher’, ‘New-Englander’, ‘Londoner’, ‘villager’, etc.

d – added to compound stems, the suffix ‘-er’ forms derivational compounds, nouns with a variety of meanings, e.g. ‘machine-gunner’, ‘six-footer’, ‘old-timer’; it can also form names of some vehicles, e.g. ‘single-seater’, etc.

e – added to some verb stems, ‘-er’ forms nouns denoting instruments or mechanisms used for performing an action, e.g. ‘trailer’, ‘reaper’, ‘mower’, ‘fighter’, ‘bomber’, ‘transmitter’, etc.

Some prefixes are also polysemantic, e.g. the prefix ‘up-‘ forms verbs as well as nouns: ‘to uproot’, ‘ uprising’, ‘ upthrust’; here we can also find adjectives, such as ‘up-country’; adverbs ‘upstairs’, ‘uphill’, etc.

The prefix ‘un-‘ forms verbs denoting the reversal of an action, e.g. ‘to unbutton’, ‘to unhook’, ‘to untie’. It also forms adjectives, where it has a negative meaning, e.g. ‘unclean’, ‘unlawful’, ‘uneven’, ‘uninteresting’, etc.

The prefix ‘dis-‘ is a Romanic polysemantic prefix which forms adjectives that denote negation (absence) of a quality, e.g. ‘disagreeable’, ‘dissimilar’, ‘displeased’, etc.

In verbs it denotes opposition or reversal of the action, e.g. ‘to disregard’, ‘to disqualify’, ‘to dismount’, etc.

Homonymy also occurs in affixes, although it is rare as compared to polysemy.

For example, a case of lexico-grammatical homonymy: the suffix ‘-ed’ is a grammatical, form-building affix of the Past Indefinite and Participle II of regular verbs; its word-building homonym is the highly-productive ‘-ed’ which, added to noun stems, forms adjectives having several meanings: having the quality of thing denoted by the stem, e.g. ‘bearded’, ‘booted’, ‘spectacled’; or – characterized by, e.g. ‘talented’, ‘gifted’; covered with – e.g. ‘wooded’ (hills, mountains).

The suffix ‘-ed’ is especially productive in forming the so-called derivational compounds of the ‘broad-shouldered’ type, built on the model [adj. stem + n. stem] + ed (this will be discussed in detail in the lecture on compounding.


Another case of homonymy is the Old English prefix ‘-a’ and the Greek prefix ‘-a’; the former,
developed from the preposition ‘on’, builds statives (asleep, abed, afloat, ablaze, aflame) or adverbs (aloud, afresh, anew, afield); the Greek affix ‘a-’ is negative: ‘atheist’, ‘amoral’, ‘amorphous’, etc.

2 – The problem of unique roots

A few of English words present difficulties when regarded from the standpoint of Immediate Constituents analysis: are they synchronically analyzable into stem and affix or are they monomorphic? One of these is the word ‘pocket’; it is comparable with such words as ‘locket’, ‘cellaret’, ‘lionet’, where ‘-et’ is clearly a suffix attached to simple free stems (roots) ‘lock-’, ‘cellar-’, ‘lion-’, the suffix having diminutive meaning. As for the element ‘pock-’ in ‘pocket’, it has different meaning, serving to distinguish ‘pocket’ from the above words with the suffix ‘-et’. So, it would seem that it is a ‘unique’ root (i.e. occurring in only one word). However, we have to take into consideration its presence in the compound adjective ‘pock-marked’ (ნაყვავილარი, ჭრელი) and the existance of the word ‘poke’ = bag, esp. in the saying ‘to buy a pig in a poke’. Consequently, ‘pocket’ is analyzable into ICs: bound stem ‘pock-’ and the suffix ‘-et’.

Another root that is considered synchronically unique is ‘ham-’ in the word ‘hamlet’ (a small village); compared with ‘ringlet’, ‘cloudlet’, ‘streamlet’ and the like, ‘hamlet’ appears to be composed of a ‘unique’ root and the diminutive suffix ‘-let’. However, ‘-ham’ appears in place names, such as ‘Oldham’, ‘Oakham’, ‘Wickham’, etc. Besides, ‘ham’ is listed in Oxford Dictionary as a word, a historical remnant, meaning ‘town’ or ‘village’ from OE ‘hām’ = home.

3 – The problem of bound stems

Words consisting of bound stems are also a problem as regards Immediate Constituents analysis, which requires, as stated above, that both ICs should be meaningful units (see the above analysis of the word ‘incomprehensible’).

If we compare/oppose such words as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>detain</th>
<th>retain</th>
<th>contain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deceive</td>
<td>receive</td>
<td>conceive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are they monomorphic, unanalysable words? Here we can notice elements ‘de-’, ‘re-’, ‘con-’, similar in form to the prefixes in ‘demobilize’, ‘decentralize’, ‘rewrite’, ‘reorganize’, ‘condense’, ‘concentrate’. If the elements ‘de-’, ‘re-’, ‘con-’ in ‘detain’, ‘retain’, contain’ do not have the same meaning as in the above mentioned words, does it mean that they are devoid of meaning?

The Oxford English Dictionary lists such meanings of these elements:
‘de-‘—down (as in ‘depend’); away (as in ‘defend’ = fend off); completely (as in ‘declare’); reversal of the action (as in ‘decentralize’).

‘re-‘—again, back (‘remind’, ‘remake’); in return (‘refund’) opposition (‘rebels’), etc.

‘con-‘—one of the allomorphs of the Latin ‘cum-‘ = together.

Thus, the above mentioned units are morphemes (prefixes).

What are the second elements? What is the meaning, if any, of ‘-tain’ and ‘-ceive’?

‘-tain comes from the Latin ‘tenere’ = hold; ‘-ceive’ is from the Latin ‘capere’ = take.

Thus, the above words are analyzable, both in terms of units of the plane of expression and in the units of the plane of content. Consequently, they are polymorphic (bi-morphemic) words, built on the model ‘prefix + bound stem, and the bound stem may have a rather obscure meaning in modern English, if regarded purely synchronically.

Some linguists prefer to use the term ‘pseudo-morphemes’ to denote such forms; those who do not recognize ‘pseudo-morphemes’ or ‘bound stems’ regard such words as monomorphic, unanalyzable ones.

**Questions for seminars per lecture:**

**VIII**

1. Affixal derivation – polysemy and homonymy in affixes;
2. the problem of ‘unique’ roots
3. the problem of bound stems
Lecture 9

Compounding (word composition)

Some linguist consider that the process of compounding is a kind of 'compression' of a word combination into a single word, e.g. ‘burnt by the sun’ = ‘sunburnt’; ‘lamp for reading’ = ‘reading-lamp’; ‘case for suits’ = ‘suitcase’.

However, not all patterns of compound words correspond to word combinations. We might say that this is true especially as regards ‘unmotivated’, figurative compounds (e.g. ‘buttercup’ which is not a cup for butter, but the name of a flower - ბატონო), or as regards ‘reduplicative ‘compounds (e.g. tittle-tattle = gossip, idle talk, where the first element is merely a phonic variant, lending expressiveness to the whole and making ‘tittle-tattle’ an expressive compound word. These are marginal cases in the field of compounding. Seeing that the bulk of English compounds consists of compound words whose motivation is clear, their semantic links with word combinations are also clear enough.

Below we’ll discuss compound words from the point of view of their structure and meaning.

From the standpoint of static synchronic analysis (morphemic analysis) compound words consist of several morphemes, at least two of which are stems, e.g. ‘housewarming’ (ახალმოსახლეობის ღერძლება) = ‘house’ + ‘warm’ + ‘ing’; ‘night-watchman’ = ‘night’ + ‘watch’ + ‘man’.

From the standpoint of dynamic synchronic analysis (derivational analysis), compound words consist of two Immediate Constituents which may be of different structure: simple stems, e.g. ‘spaceship’ (n. + n.); ‘sky-blue’ (n. + adj.), etc. A simple stem + a derived stem, e.g. ‘penholder’ [n. stem + (v. stem + er)]; A compound stem + a derivational affix, making a so-called derivational compound, e.g. ‘fair-haired’ [(adj. + n.) + ed], a highly productive pattern in modern English.

Thus, we have to consider two principal types of compounds:

1. True compounds in which both ICs are stems, either simple, e.g. ‘weekend’ (n. + n.), or a simple stem + a derived stem, e.g. ‘office-management’ (n. + n.); ‘snow-covered’ (n. + Participle II), or a compound stem + a simple stem or derived stem, e.g. ‘flowerpot-stand’ [(n. + n.) + n.]; ‘aircraft-carrier’ [(n. + n.) + (v. + er)]

2. Derivational compounds, consisting of a compound stem + a derivational affix, e.g. ‘horsemanship’ [(n. + n.) + affix]; or the type of compound adjectives mentioned above, ‘fair-haired’; ‘high-heeled’, etc. [(adj. + n.) + ed].

In English there are compounds’ that contain a kind of linking element, e.g. ‘sister-in-law’;

The connective ‘-s’ may be of two origins: from the Old English Genitive case, as in ‘statesman’, ‘craftsman’, or from a plural form, as in ‘woodsman’, ‘salesman’, etc.

Classification of compounds

Functionally, compounds are classified according to their part-of-speech meaning; most English compounds are nouns or adjectives.

Within a part-of-speech, compounds are classified according to their structural patterns.

Compound nouns

workman, handball (n. + n.)
blackboard, bluebell (adj. + n.)
pickpocket, telltale (v. + n.)
reading-lamp, walking-stick (Ger. + n.)
afterthought, overshoe (adv. + n.)
passer-by, looker-on (n. + prep)
splash-down, round-up (v. + adv.), etc.

Compound adjectives

world-wide, age-old (n. + adj.)
sunburnt, henpecked (n. + Part. II)
peace-loving, fire-eating (n. + Part. I)
red-hot, dark-blue (adj. + adj.)
low-lying, good-looking (adj. + Part. I)
well-known, underdeveloped (adv. + Part. II)
low-down (adj. + adv.)

nearby, faraway (adv. + adv.)
Derivational compound adjectives

cloth-capped [(n. + n.) + ed]
left-handed [(adj. + n.) + ed]

Derivational compound nouns are rare, but still they should be mentioned:

first-footer, six-footer [(num. + n.) + er]
marksmanship [(n. + n.) + ship]

Compound verbs

waylay (n. + v.)
uprise (adv. + v.)
brainwash (n. + v.)

(This is by no means a complete list of possible patterns).

* * *

Some words that look like compounds if regarded from the static-synchronistic standpoint, are termed 'pseudo-compounds', because the process of their formation is not compounding, but either conversion from a true compound, or back-formation, e.g. 'to honeymoon' is formed by conversion the noun ‘honeymoon’ and ‘to blackmail’ – formed by conversion from the noun ‘blackmail’. ‘To baby-sit’ is formed by back-formation (clipping of the suffix) from the noun ‘baby-sitter’; ‘to tape-record’ – from ‘tape-recorder’, etc.

* * *

To sum up the problem of classification of compound words: besides classifying them according to their part-of-speech meaning and various structural patterns typical of this or that part of speech, several oppositions are to be taken into consideration.

A. Compounds are classified according to the way of joining the stems that make them up:


b- with a linking element: speedometer, gasometer, sportsman, Anglo-Saxon, tragic-comic, etc.

B. Another structural opposition in the field of compounding discriminates between true
compounds and derivational compounds:

a- True compounds or compounds proper are composed of two ICs, stems which may be simple, derived or compound: e.g. 'lampshade', 'door-handle' (2 simple stems); ‘cigar-holder’ (a simple stem + a derived stem), ‘cigarette-holder’ (2 derived stems); ‘wastepaper-basket’, ‘flowerpot-stand’ (a compound stem + a simple stem), etc.

b- Derivational compounds have, as the first IC, a compound stem resulting from the compression of a collocation (word combination) whose elements have the status of words, are transposed into the class of morphemes and compressed to make a compound stem to which a derivational affix is added. The process is as follows: three corners –[(three + corners) + ed], where ‘-ed’ is the second IC. This suffix (a homonym of the word-form-building suffix ‘-ed’ of regular verbs), being a formator of adjectives, makes derivational compound adjectives whose structural pattern is [(adj. stem + n. stem) + ed], or [(num. stem + n. stem) + ed]. The suffix ‘-ship’, a noun formator, builds derivational compound nouns on the following pattern: [(n.st. + n. stem) + ship], e.g. ‘horsemanship’.

C- Yet another opposition discriminates between co-coordinative (copulative, additive) compounds and subordinate compounds.

a- Co-ordinative compounds result from the compression of collocations in which neither of the components is subordinated to the other, e.g. ‘bitter and sweet’ – ‘bitter-sweet’ and the like. In such compounds the stems are loosely bound together, not as in the case of subordinative compounds.

Reduplicative compounds (phonetically varied or not) are classed with co-ordinative compounds. Such are words of the ‘fifty-fifty’, ‘pooh-pooh’, ‘sing-song’, ‘willy-nilly’, ‘walkie-talkie’ type.

b- It has been mentioned that most English compounds belong to the subordinative type and that they form the center of the field of compounding (composition), while co-ordinative compounds are marginal elements in the field.

D- compounds also show an opposition as regards their distributional pattern (i.e. the order in which the stems are placed). According to this criterion, compounds are syntactic and asyntactic.

Subordinative compounds may be:

a.- syntactic, if the order in which the stems are placed on linear syntagmatic axis follows the syntactic ruled according to which the corresponding words would be placed in an English sentence or phrase; e.g. ‘a tell-tale’ – to tell tales: ‘Don’t tell tales out of school’; ‘a pick-pocket’ to
pick pockets (He picks pockets in the buses), ‘a know-nothing’ – He knows nothing.

b- **asynctactic compounds** are those in which the order of the stems is different from the normal syntactic order of the corresponding words in a sentence or phrase, e.g. ‘backyard’ – a yard at the back of the house; ‘a pigsty’ – a sty for pigs; ‘a town-house’ – a house in town; ‘a cigarette-case’ – a case for cigarettes, etc.

Besides, in phrases an adjective cannot modify another adjective, a noun cannot modify an adjective or participle, whereas in compounds we may observe such patterns as (adj. stem + adj. stem) – ‘red-hot’, ‘blue-grey’, ‘dark-brown’, etc.; or (n. stem + adj. stem) – ‘snow-white’, ‘sky-blue’, ‘blood-red’, etc.; or (n. stem + Participle stem) – ‘snow-covered’, ‘forest-clad’, ‘ice-bound’, etc.

E- Applying the semantic criterion, we find the opposition of motivated and unmotivated compounds (figurative compounds):

a.- motivated compounds are those, whose meaning is clear from the lexical meaning of its components, e.g. ‘door-handle’, ‘hand-bag’, ‘watering-can’, ‘writing-table’, ‘dining-room’, etc.

In some compounds the motivation is not so clear (they might be termed ‘semi-motivated), e.g. ‘handcuffs’ (which are not cuffs, but metal rings on a chain placed on the wrists of a criminal); ‘flower-bed’ (which is not a bed, but a piece of ground specially prepared and shaped for growing flowers on); ‘a sweetmeat’ (which has nothing to do with meat but comes from OE ‘meta’ = food. In this meaning, ‘meat’ is preserved only in the proverb ‘One man’s meat is another man’s poison’).

b. – **Unmotivated compounds** are figurative, idiomatic in meaning: we cannot deduce the meaning of the whole from the lexical meaning of the components: e.g. ‘pineapple’ (a tropical fruit which has nothing in common with a pine tree, neither is it anything like an apple); ‘bluestocking’ (a pedantic woman affecting a taste for literature); ‘wall-flower’ (a girl or woman who is not invited to dance and has to sit at the wall); this compound is a homonym of a wall-flower, a tall-growing flower planted against the garden wall, - a motivated compound.

In some cases, a seemingly unmotivated compound is formed from an idiomatic phrase: e.g. ‘castle-builder’ (one who goes in for idle dreaming) originates from the phrase ‘to build castles in the air’; the above compound is motivated to anyone who knows the idiomatic phrase.

The motivation of a compound may be dependent on its distributional pattern: the order in which the components stand determine their motivation and through that – the meaning of the word: e.g. ‘ring-finger’, ‘finger-ring’; ‘bell-tower’ – a belfry, ‘tower-bell’ – a bell in a tower; ‘market-fruit’ – marketable fruit, i.e. fruit which is suitable to be sold in the ‘fruit-market’.
Cases in which there is a change in the distribution of components are extremely rare. As such a rarity we might quote an example in the Georgian language – the word ‘წივილ-კივილ’ does not change its meaning if the order of components is reversed - კივილ-წივილ.

The semantic classification of compounds

The semantic relations between the stems in a subordinative compound are in a way similar to the relations between words in the underlying phrases. It has to be borne in mind, however, that these are not the same syntactic relations that can only exist between words in the underlying phrase. Still, (according to Prof. I.V. Arnold) we can use the following terms:

a. functional or purpose relations: raincoat, reading-lamp, suitcase, etc.

b. place relations: seaboard, corner-room, garden-party, etc.

c. temporal (time) relations: night-duty, day-train, etc.

d. comparison: goldfish, sunflower, blockhead, stone-cold, rose-red, pitch-dark, etc.

e. material relations: glassware, waxwork, woodwork, metalwork, etc.

f. partitive relations: hillside, shirt-collar, door-handle, coat-pocket, etc.

g. sex relations: tom-cat, tabby-cat, jackass, jenny-ass, he-goat, she-goat, cock-sparrow, hen-sparrow, bull-elephant, cow-elephant, etc.

h. instrumental or agentive relations: windmill, hand-saw, steam-boat, etc.

Questions for seminars per lecture:

IX

1. Compounding – true compounds

2. Derivational compounds

3. Classification of compounds

4. Co-ordinative; re-duplicative; subordinative; syntactic; asyntactic; motivated; unmotivated;
Conversion is a non-linear type of word formation, i.e. a new word is generated by the underlying form without the addition of any other morphemes (either affixes or stems): e.g. ‘land’ – ‘to land’; ‘to burn’ – ‘a burn’ and the like.

Conversion results from the transposition of a word into another lexico-grammatical class of words (part of speech); the new word acquires the features of that part of speech, its paradigm (system of grammatical word-forms), its distribution (place in a sentence and ability to form this or that kind of syntagma), and its syntactic function. For example, the noun ‘land’ has the paradigmatic forms of the singular and plural, it may be part of attributive or objective syntagmas, e.g. ‘He has explored distant lands, where ‘explored … lands’ is the objective syntagma and ‘distant lands’ is the attributive syntagma. In this sentence ‘land’ is in the function of direct object. In another sentence, the same word may be part of the predicative syntagma and the attributive syntagma while functioning as the subject of the sentence: ‘These lands have not yet been explored.’ The verb ‘to land’ has the paradigmatic forms of a verb (mood, voice, tense forms) and it can make up predicative, objective and relative syntagmas while functioning as the predicate: ‘They landed on a desert island’, or ‘The pilot landed the plane safely’; ‘pilot landed’ – predicative syntagma; ‘landed the plane’ – objective syntagma; ‘landed safely’ – relative syntagma.

Conversion as a type of word-formation is typical of the English language and lends the language a great originality. In modern language there are about 7000 homonymous widely used lexemes belonging to different parts of speech.

Synchronic research has proved that conversion as a way of word-formation is especially productive in monosyllabic words which form a considerable part of the English vocabulary – this is another reason explaining the great number of conversion pairs in English. Conversion is, in fact, responsible for the appearance of most of the new verbs; the derivational affixes forming new verbs are very few (‘-ize’, ‘-fy’, ‘-ate’) and the verbs they form belong mostly to the literary or special technical-scientific vocabulary.

Besides this, the absence of affixes typical of a part of speech also favors conversion. A sound form taken separately cannot be assigned with certainty to a definite part of speech. E.g. ‘round’ is a noun in ‘We played a round of golf’; it is a verb in ‘You must round your lips in pronouncing [ou]; it is an adjective in ‘a round table’; an adverb in –We walked round and round in silence; it
is again a verb in ‘Fighting against the storm, the ship rounded the Cape of Good Hope’.

Although conversion is, as stated above, especially characteristic of monomorphic words, it is so productive in present-day English that it involves words of a more complex morphological structure, i.e. words built by linear process of affixation and compounding. Consequently, words generated by conversion may have simple stem (a star – to star), derived stem (to dislike – a dislike for somebody; commission – to commission), or compound stem (a machine-gun – to machine-gun; to airlift - airlift), etc.

The most frequent cases of conversion are:

1.- Formation of verbs from nouns (more rarely from other parts of speech), so-called ‘denominal verbs’, e.g. a hammer – to hammer; an ape – to ape, etc.

2.- Formation of nouns from verbs, so-called ‘deverbal nouns’, e.g. ‘to jump – a jump’, ‘to peel – a peel’, ‘to burn – a burn’, etc.

3.- Formation of nouns from adjectives (otherwise called ‘substantivized adjectives’). E.g. ‘the rich’, ‘the poor”, ‘the blind’, ‘the deaf and dumb’. Generally, formation of nouns from adjectives is a result of ellipsis (omission of a word from a word combination) combined with conversion, e.g. spare parts – spares; an intellectual man – an intellectual; a commercial tele-film – a commercial; a musical film – a musical.

Semantic relations in conversion pairs

Certain patterned relationships may be observed in conversion pairs:

**Denominal verbs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object (expressed by a noun)</th>
<th>Action characteristic of the object</th>
<th>Ape-to ape; nurse-to nurse; crowd-to crowd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental use of the object</td>
<td>Saw-to saw; file-to file</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition or addition of the object</td>
<td>Fish-to fish; powder-to powder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation of the object</td>
<td>Skin-to skin; peel-to peel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some patterns might be added to this table, e.g. place of action: land – to land; pocket – to pocket, etc.

If a word is polysemantic, it may belong to more than one of these groups: ‘I dusted the furniture’ – I removed the dust= deprivation of the object. ‘Snow had only dusted the street’ – there was only a slight powdering of snow = addition of the object.

Deverbal nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action (verb)</th>
<th>An instance of the action</th>
<th>To jump-a jump; to chat-a chat; to walk-a walk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An agent (doer) of the action</td>
<td>To gossip-a gossip; to bore-a bore; to switch-a switch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of the action</td>
<td>To forge-a forge; to drive-a drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object or result of the action</td>
<td>To purchase-a purchase; to burn-a burn; to cut-a cut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other non-linear types of word-formation

There are some other non-linear types of word-formation. These are:

A – **Shortening**, which is of two kinds:

   A – clipping, in which part of the generating word is clipped, e.g. ‘exam’ (examination);

   B – abbreviation, e.g. Mr. (from ‘mister,) and cases where the underlying form is not a word, but a collocation, each word in which is reduced to its initial latter, e.g. BBC, NATO, USA, etc.

B – Sound interchange, which is of two kinds:

   a – vowel interchange, e.g. ‘food’ (n) – ‘to feed’ (v)

   b – consonant interchange, e.g. ‘advice’ (n) – ‘to advise’ (v)
C – Stress interchange – e.g. ‘a ‘record (n) – ‘to re’cord’ (v)

D – Back-formation – e.g. ‘tape-recorder’ (n) – ‘to tape-record’ (v)

E – Sound imitation (onomatopoeia) [ˌɒnəˌmætəˈpiːə], e.g. whisper, murmur, etc.

Shortening, both clipping and abbreviation are highly productive ways of word formation in present-day English. This tendency may be explained, basically, by the principle of linguistic economy which manifests itself in expressing a certain amount of information in a more laconic way: on the syntactic level in elliptical sentences, e.g. ‘Never heard of it’ (I have never heard of it’); or by compressing collocations into compound words, e.g. ‘open-air games’ (games in the open air), ‘reading-lamp’ (lamp for reading), or by lending a word the function of a whole sentence (communication), e.g. ‘What did you say?’ – ‘Nothing’.

On the morphological level, linguistic economy reduces auxiliary verbs in analytical verb-forms to a minimum, e.g. ‘I’ve done it’, ‘He’ll go there’, etc. On the lexical level, linguistic economy reduces a whole word to a part of it (‘exam’) or to its initial letters (‘C’ in CNN stands for ‘Cable). Clipping is, then, the reduction of a whole word to a part of it which contains all its denotative meaning (the logical part of information), but differs from its prototype in connotation: a clipped word is usually colloquial, i.e. stylistically marked, while the prototype may be neutral as regards style, or it may have another stylistic coloring.

Shortened words behave like other monomorphic words in that they take the paradigmatic forms of the part of speech to which they belong, e.g. ‘That is the doc’s house’, or ‘I was vacing the room when my husband came’ (to ‘vac’ is denominal verb formed by conversion from ‘a vac’, the clipped form of ‘vacuum-cleaner).

Most clipped words in English are nouns. Clipped verbs are rare. Some of them are colloquial, while their prototypes are technical terms (a different kind of coloring), e.g. ‘to revolve’ – ‘to rev’ (He revved up the engine of his car).

Clipping in adjectives is also rare and is often accompanied by suffixation: ‘comfy’ (comfortable);

Depending on which part of the word is clipped, shortened words are the result of:

1. – aphaeresis [əˈfərəsis] or initial clipping, e.g. (tele)phone, (auto)bus, (motor)car; history – story; violoncello – cello, etc.

2. – apocope [əˈpɔkə(u)pt] or clipping at the end of a word (Gr. ‘apokopto’ = to cut off). This kind of clipping is most productive.

Examples of clipping by apocope are numerous: ‘ad’ (advertisement), ‘lab’ (laboratory), ‘coke’ (Coca-cola), ‘mac’ (Mackintosh), etc.
3. – syncope ['sɪŋkəpt] or medial clipping (clipping the middle of the words). There are not many words that are shortened in this way: ‘maths’ (mathematics), ‘pants’ (pantaloonos), ‘specs’ (spectacles), ‘cigs’ (cigarettes), ‘fancy’ (fantasy), etc.

4. – Another type is clipping at both ends, leaving only the middle part of the word: ‘flu’ (influenza), ‘fridge/frig’ (refrigerator), ‘tec’ (detective), etc.

5. A special type of shortening occurs as a result of three processes involving two words which do not form a subordinative word-combination: one undergoes apocope (clipping at the end), the other undergoes aphaeresis (clipping at the beginning) and the remaining first and second parts are compressed, resulting in what is called a blend or a ‘portmanteau’ word: e.g. ‘smoke’ and ‘fog’ produce ‘smog’, ‘smoke’ and ‘haze’ produce ‘smaze’, ‘breakfast’ and ‘lunch’ produce ‘brunch’, ‘transmitter’ and ‘receiver’ – ‘transceiver’, ‘transfer’ and ‘resistor’ – ‘transistor’.

Free collocations (especially attributive ones) also follow this pattern: e.g. ‘television broadcast’ – ‘telecast’, ‘cinematographic panorama’ – ‘cinerama’, ‘motorists’ hotel’ – ‘motel’, etc.

Abbreviations originate in the written form of speech but most cases pass into oral speech.

Abbreviation consists in reducing words to their initial letters, or entire collocations are abbreviated in this way. In the latter one, it is abbreviation on the syntactic level.

1.– Some abbreviations remain in graphic form and are read as full words. These are, for example ‘St.’ (Oxford St. = street); the same ‘St.’ may stand for ‘saint’ (St. John).

The names of the months are abbreviated to: Jan., Feb., Mar., etc. Other words are abbreviated only in writing: Mr., Mrs., Dr., Prof., etc.

Some abbreviations may be read alphabetically, or as words: ‘a.m.’ (Latin ‘ante meridiem’ = before noon), read ['ei'em] or ‘before noon’; ‘p.m.’ (Latin ‘post meridiem’ = after noon), read ['pi:'em] or ‘in the afternoon’, ‘in the evening’.

R.S.V.P. written at the end of letters to stand for the French polite form ‘Repondez, s’il vous plait’ (please, reply) is not supposed to be pronounced at all.

Some graphic abbreviations taken from Latin are usually pronounced as English words: ‘e.g.’ = for example (Latin ‘exempli gratia’); ‘i.e.’ = that is (Latin ‘id est’); ‘et.al.’ = and others (Lat. ‘et aliae’), etc.

2.– Abbreviated collocations reduced to initial letters read alphabetically: USA, CNN, NBC, NBA, etc. M.P. stands for ‘Member of Parliament’ and also for ‘Military Police’; TV = television.

Other abbreviations make up something like words and are pronounced as such: UNESCO

Shortening (clipping) and abbreviation are highly productive in present-day English. Shortening originates in oral speech and is later, in many cases, fixed in writing, retaining a colloquial coloring. Abbreviations originate in writing and are, in most cases, taken up in oral speech.

*                        *                          *

Sound interchange is not, synchronically speaking, a way of word-formation in modern English; it is a remnant of the past history of the language, no longer a productive way of forming words today. Sound interchange is of two kinds: vowel interchange and consonant interchange.

**Vowel interchange:** ‘song’ (n) – ‘to sing’ (v.); ‘full’ (adj.) – ‘to fill’ (v); ‘gold’ (n) – ‘to gild’ (v); ‘food’ (n) – ‘to feed’ (v). Vowel interchange may also show the opposition of different classes of verbs having the same root, e.g. ‘to fall’ (intransitive) and ‘to fell’ (transitive verb with causative meaning ‘to make something fall’).

**Consonant interchange:** ‘to use’ [z] – ‘use’ [s]; ‘to advise’ [z] – advice [s]; ‘to speak’ – ‘speech’; ‘to offend’ – ‘offence’. In some cases consonant interchange is accompanied by vowel interchange: to live [iv] – life [aɪf]; to breathe [iːð] – breath [eθ]; to bathe [eið] bath [aːθ].

**Stress interchange** (distinctive stress) distinguished Romanic verbs from nouns. As prof. Arnold points out, this fact may be explained historically: coming into the English language (from Latin) through French, borrowed verbs retained their French stress pattern with the final syllable accented, because such a stress pattern was known in English disyllabic verbs, such as ‘to believe’, ‘to become’, ‘to forget’, ‘to forgive’, ‘to forbid’, etc. As for English nouns, their final syllable was regularly accented and borrowed nouns followed this pattern. E.g. ‘to con’duct’ – ‘conduct’; ‘to ac’cent’ – ‘accent’; ‘to in’vul’ – ‘insult’; ‘to pre’sent’ – ‘present’; ‘to ex’port’ – ‘export’; ‘to pro’duce’ – ‘produce’; ‘to re’cord’ – ‘record’ and the like.

Stress interchange is not productive in modern English.

*                        *                          *

**Sound imitation (onomatopoeia)**

Sound-imitative words name a thing or an action by a more or less exact reproduction of a sound, associated with it and are motivated by this attempt to reproduce natural sounds. Every language has its own way of reproducing natural sounds: compare ‘whisper’, βουσμο,
Some onomatopoeic words imitate animal and bird sounds, e.g. ‘mew’ (of a cat), ‘bray’ (of the donkey), ‘neigh’ and ‘whinny’ (of the horse), ‘squeal’, ‘grunt’ (of the pig), ‘growl’ (of the dog), also ‘whine’ and ‘yelp’, etc.
The sounds of water are represented by ‘splash’, ‘slop’, ‘babble’, ‘bubble’, ‘gurgle’, etc.
Human speech sounds: ‘whisper’, ‘mutter’, etc.
When we speak of ‘clatter’ of dishes in the kitchen, or ‘tattle’ of carriage wheels; the ‘rumble’ of train or of distant thunder, the ‘croaking’ of frogs – we are using sound-imitative words.

* * *

Back-formation, a process that is still alive in present-day English is, in a way, the opposite of affixal derivation: in the latter affixes are added to stems, while in the former, an affix or part of a word mistaken for an affix, is clipped off to form a new word. In this way we get such pair as ‘burglar’ – ‘to burgle’, ‘cobbler’ – ‘to cobble’, ‘beggar’ – ‘to beg’, ‘automation’ – ‘to automate’, ‘baby-sitter’ – ‘to baby-sit’, ‘housekeeper’ – ‘to housekeep’, ‘tape-recorder’ – ‘to tape-record’.

* * *

Mixed type of word-formation is a non-productive historical way of word-formation involving two processes: non-linear – vowel interchange and linear – affixation.
Here we could also add adjectives formed from noun stems: ‘nation’ – ‘national’, ‘nature’ – ‘natural’ where the interchanging vowels are [ei] and [æ].

Questions for seminars per lecture:
X
1.- Non-linear types of word-formation
2.- Conversion
3.-Shortening/abbreviation
4.- Vowel and consonant interchange
5.- Stress interchange
6.- Back-formation
7. Onomatopoeia (sound imitation)
8.- aphaeresis; apocope; syncope;
Lecture 11

The structure of vocabulary – synonyms, antonyms, homonyms; word families; thematic groups; ideographic groups; semantic fields; hyponyms; hypernyms; taboos; euphemisms

On the plane of content, the vocabulary of a language is also recognized as a specifically structured system. E.M. Mednikova explains this by the fact that the basic elements of the language system do not exist in isolation. Between language units (such as word, among others) there exist certain ties and relationships, certain oppositions based upon the features differentiating one word from another. Putting it otherwise, every individual word, differing from others in certain features – semantic, stylistic and others – is connected with those other words just through these semantic, stylistic, etc. oppositions.

Some of the oppositions upon which the semantic classification of vocabulary is based are as follows:

1. the opposition of words having common nucleus of denotational meaning, but differing in additional components of denotational meaning in which the differential features may be the size of the referent, its location, purpose, quality, etc. (see lecture 4, pg. 19 – 23). Words grouped on the basis of this opposition, form ideographic synonymic paradigm (as will be shown below).

2. the opposition of words having a common denotational meaning but differing in components of connotational meaning (stylistic reference, emotional coloring, evaluation, intensity). Word groups based upon this kind of opposition form ideographic-stylistic synonymic paradigms (e.g. horse, steed, nag, screw; boy, kid, nipper; to leave, to depart; to begin, to commence, etc.).

3. the opposition of words having different denotational meaning, but the same sound or graphic form – homonymy.

4. the opposition of words having a contrary or contradictory meaning is the basis of antonymy.

Synonymy

Synonyms are words belonging to the same part of speech (the same lexico-grammatical group of words), a) having common nucleus of denotational meaning, but differing in additional components of denotational meaning (ideographic synonyms); or b) words having a common denotational meaning but differing in components of connotational meaning (stylistic reference, emotional coloring, evaluation, intensity) (ideographic-stylistic synonyms).

The examples of the above mentioned two types of synonyms have been given in lectures 3 and
4. Here are more examples: of the first type –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denotational meaning</th>
<th>Plane of expression</th>
<th>Nucleus of denotational meaning</th>
<th>Additional component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>1. Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. laying hold of smth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grasp</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Action</td>
<td>firmly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seize</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Action</td>
<td>suddenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grasp</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Action</td>
<td>roughly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This, as well as the above-given other examples, are clear enough to understand the basics of synonymy, but they are not enough. It is necessary to bear in mind the complex nature of word meaning, particularly its lexical meaning, consisting of two principal components – denotational and connotational meanings, the former being obligatory, objective nominating component, while connotational meaning may or may not be present.

The nucleus of denotational meaning is, in its turn, a complex of components, the essential features that constitute, in the human mind, the notion that is expressed in the word.

Connotational meaning, also additional, may contain emotional, evaluative, attitudinal, stylistic components of meaning, of which one or more may be present in the meaning of a word; they may converge, come together in a words lexical meaning.

An example of this is also given in lecture 3: the word 'girl' has only denotational meaning, expressing the notion whose essential features are: 1. Living being; 2. Human; 3. Female; 4. Young. The synonym 'hussy' has negative emotional and evaluative components of connotation, strong expressiveness and belongs to the colloquial style.

A set of words, having a common nucleus of denotational meaning and differentiated by either additional components of denotation, or by one or more components of connotational meaning, makes up a synonymous paradigm. Owing to their semantic proximity synonyms can be used correctly in speech only if the speaker knows the differentiating semantic shades and stylistic reference which limit the sphere of their usage. For example, a high-flown word belonging to
the literary style of speech would make a funny impression in colloquial speech, e.g. ‘a fair maid’ instead of ‘a pretty girl’; while the slangy equivalent ‘a nifty bird’ would make a bad impression in literary speech or writing. In this case, the use of synonyms is governed by the broad context, and also by the speech situation. Otherwise, synonyms are interchangeable in many contexts, which depend largely upon their combinability and semantic proximity.

Depending on the semantic components that differentiate them, synonyms are of two kinds:

1. If the difference lies in some additional denotational components, or emotional components accompanying the nucleus of denotational meaning, these are **ideographic** synonyms, making up a lexico-semantic paradigm.

Examples: dwelling, house, cottage, mansion, palace, hut, cabin, etc. Or the verbs: look, stare, gaze, gape, glare, glance, peep, peer, etc. The common denotational nucleus of these verbs is ‘turn one’s eyes in a certain direction’. ‘Look’ is the synonymic dominant.

   I looked at him – I turned my eyes on him
   I glared at him – I turned my eyes on him fixedly, but pensively
   I stared at him - I turned my eyes on him wide-eyed (in surprise, fright, rudely)
   I gaped at him - I turned my eyes on him fixedly, stupidly, open-mouthed
   I glared at him – I turned my eyes on him angrily
   I peered at him – I turned my eyes on him, straining and narrowing them (as short-sighted people do; we also peer when there is not enough light to see clearly; peering always implies straining the eyes);
   I peeped at him – I turned my eyes on him through a narrow opening (between the curtains, in a key-hole, etc.), usually prompted by curiosity.

(Note: the synonymic dominant should not be confused with what is called ‘generic term’, e.g. the word ‘animal’, covering a large group of words which are not synonyms: horse, lion, rat, frog and the like. This type of paradigmatic relation is termed ‘hyponymy’ or ‘inclusion’, all the animal names being included in the generic term ‘animal’)

2. If the difference between synonyms lies in the elements of connotational meaning, e.g. stylistic component (often together with such inherently stylistic features as emotional or expressive, or evaluative connotation), - these are ‘ideographic-stylistic’ synonyms, e.g. big, opposed to gigantic, colossal, titanic, Herculean, etc., or leave, opposed to abandon, desert, forsake….
Sources of synonymy

Modern English is rich in synonyms. A powerful source of synonymy is borrowing words from other languages. In the course of its history, the English have been in contact with many other peoples and have borrowed words from their languages; e.g. ‘heaven’ (OE heofon) and ‘sky’ (Scandinavian); ‘hide’ (OE hyd, the skin of an animal) and ‘skin’ (Scandinavian). There are borrowed pairs of synonyms, one of which is Greek and the other – Romanic: ‘hypothesis’ and ‘supposition’; ‘sympathy’ and ‘compassion’; ‘synthesis’ and ‘composition’, etc.

In triple groups of synonyms – native words and borrowings from French and Latin – we may often observe that the native English word is stylistically neutral, while the borrowed words are stylistically marked as literary. Compare the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>French borrowing</th>
<th>Latin borrowing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ask</td>
<td>to question</td>
<td>to interrogate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gather</td>
<td>to assemble</td>
<td>to collect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To end</td>
<td>to finish</td>
<td>to complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To rise</td>
<td>to mount</td>
<td>to ascend, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This does not mean that all borrowed words are literary: the Scandinavian ‘sky’ and the French ‘valley’ are stylistically neutral, while their native English synonym ‘heaven’ and ‘dale’ are literary.

Borrowing from variants of English is also a source of synonymy: e.g. the Scottish ‘lass’ – girl; glamour – charm; American English has also contributed synonyms to British English: ‘radio’ – ‘wireless’; ‘to mail’ – ‘post’; ‘sidewalk’ – ‘pavement’, etc.

However, borrowing is not and cannot be the only source of synonyms. A language has the power to enrich its vocabulary by making use of its own resources. The English language produces new words, new synonyms, e.g. ‘a pin-up’ – a pretty girl’ (usually on a magazine cover); this is especially frequent in the sphere of euphemisms and slang: ‘tight’ = ‘drunk’; ‘muttonhead’ = ‘fool’, etc.

Euphemisms, another source of synonyms from the resources of a language is the substitution of a more acceptable word to cover the unpleasantness of another, nominating an unpleasant or ‘impolite’ notion. E.g. ‘tight’ for ‘drunk’; ‘underprivileged’ – ‘poor’; ‘undernourished’ – ‘starving’, etc. Most unpleasant notions, such as death, crime, madness, stupidity, drunkenness and the like invite euphemistic substitution. A specific feature of euphemisms is that in time they lose their euphemistic character and a new one has to be provided, sometimes with the aid of borrowings;
e.g. ‘madness’, insanity’, ‘nervous breakdown’, the latter still retaining its more ‘acceptable’
character.

**Antonymy**

Antonyms are numerically small sets of words belonging to the same part of speech, the same
style of speech, whose denotative meanings express contrary or contradictory notions.

**Absolute antonyms** express contrary notions; on the plane of expression, their sound-forms are
entirely different, as they come from different roots, e.g. big – small; clever – stupid, etc.

**Derivational antonyms** express contradictory notions. They do not show polarity of meaning,
but simply negation, with the help of negative prefixes: kind – unkind; literate – illiterate;
appear – disappear, etc. In verbs, the negative prefix ‘-un’ does not denote negation but ‘reversal’
of the action: tie – untie; do – undo; button – unbutton, etc.

In some cases, however, the presence of a negative prefix does not make the word an antonym
of another word without that prefix; e.g. ‘to disappoint’ is not the antonym of ‘to appoint’; ‘to
discover’ is not the antonym of ‘to cover’ (here the antonym is ‘to uncover’; ‘to unman’ means
‘to make a man lose his nerve’, so it is not an antonym of ‘to man’ (to furnish with personnel,
such as the crew of a ship).

Derivational antonyms form binary oppositions: successful – unsuccessful; attractive –
unattractive, etc. Absolute antonyms usually attain polarity of meaning through a series of
gradual oppositions: e.g. ugly – plain – good-looking – comely – pretty – beautiful; or cold – cool
– warm – hot, where only the extreme members of the series are notably antonyms. However,
this is not always the case: absolute antonyms may also stand in the relation of binary polar
opposition, without any intermediate degrees of the notion expressed, e.g. clean – dirty; late –
early, etc.

Antonymy is typical of qualitative adjectives and their derivatives: glad – sad; gladness – sadness;
Antonyms also express oppositions in state, e.g. ill – well; asleep – awake and oppositions in
time: late – early; day – night; near – far, etc.

**Homonymy**

Homonyms are numerically small sets of words in which we observe the opposition of sameness
as regards sound-form (or graphic form) and difference as regards meaning.

Although the sound form (pronunciation) of homonyms is identical (except for the group of
homographs, discussed below), the meaning is understandable in context, e.g. ‘we often [rait]
dictations; you are quite [rait]; he has no [rait] to do such things; we won’t attend that religious [rait] (ceremony).

In sentence 1 the sound-form [rait] is clearly a verb, ‘write’; in sentence 2 it is an adjective, ‘right’; in sentence 3 it is a noun ‘right’; in sentence 4 – another noun, ‘rite’ and the lexical meaning of these words is clear to any speaker of English.

Homonymy presents certain difficulties from the linguistic point of view. How can we draw a demarcation line between homonymy and polysemy, i.e. between different meanings of one word and the meanings of two homonymous words?

The common features of lexico-semantic variants (LSVs) of a polysemantic word and of homonym – one sound form connected with different meanings – is evidently the basis of difficulty that sometimes arises in differentiating the cases of polysemy and homonymy; in assigning a certain word (sound form) to an LSV of a polysemantic word, or to an entirely different word, a homonym.

Reliable criteria

1. a different graphic form (spelling) of words having the same sound form (pronunciation), e.g. [nait] – night; [nait] – knight; [piːs] – peace, piece.

2. the etymological criterion (i.e. taking into consideration the origin of words borrowed from other languages in which they were not homonymous, but acquired the same sound form in English as a result of converging phonetic development): e.g. the Latin words ‘cadere’ (to fall) and ‘capere’ (to hold) through convergence of sound form produced the homonymous pair ‘case’1 (instance of a thing occurring, e.g. ‘a case of measles’, ‘a case of crime’) and ‘case’2 – ‘a large box’.

3. the same sound forms of words belonging to different parts of speech, e.g. [laɪt] – noun, adjective and verb: ‘I switched on the light’; ‘She was wearing a light dress’; ‘The passage was light enough for us to see our way’; ‘Will you light the fire?’

Still another criterion that is suggested and considered reliable in discriminating between homonyms and LSV of a polysemantic word is ‘no connection between the lexical meanings of a sound form’. E.g. [mætʃ] – ‘match’1 (thing for striking light) and ‘match’2 (a sports competition).

The classification of homonyms

Classification based upon the relationship of similarity or difference of sound or graphic forms of words different in meaning:

1. Homonyms proper are words different in meaning, belonging to the same or different parts
of speech but characterized by the same sound form (pronunciation) and graphic form (spelling). E.g. [bou] – ‘bow’1 (a weapon) and ‘bow’2 (a knot tied with two loops and two loose ends), both nouns; or ‘flat’1 and ‘flat’2, the first – a noun, the second – an adjective; e.g. ‘archery is a sport in which a bow and arrows are used to a target’; ‘the little girl had a blue bow in her golden hair’; ‘we are moving to a new flat’; in ancient times the earth was thought to be flat’.

There are many homonyms in English. ‘The bear is a large animal’ – ‘I can’t bear the sight of him’; ‘I must have my nails manicures’ – ‘Give me a hammer and some nails’; ‘Bank of a river’ – ‘Savings bank(where money is kept); ‘a lock and a key’ – ‘a lock of hair’; ‘a major in the army’ – ‘a major problem’ (a problem of great importance); ‘a spell of fine weather’ – ‘I always spell this word wrong’, etc.

2.- Homophones are words that have a different graphic form (spelling) and meaning, but the same sound form. E.g. [bau] – ‘bow’ – ‘he bowed to me politely’; ‘bough’ (a big branch of a tree); [rein] – ‘rain’, ‘reign’, ‘rein’; [rait] – ‘write’, ‘right’, ‘rite’;

I.V. Arnold gives an interesting illustration of homonymy: ‘The playwright on my right thinks it right that some conventional rite should symbolize the right of every man to write as he pleases. In this sentence the sound form [rait] occurs six times: 1.-a stem; 2.-a noun; 3.-an adjective; 4.-a noun (ritual, ceremony); 5.-a noun; 6.-a verb. The two nouns differ in meaning: ‘right’-2 (რიტ), ‘right’ 5 (უფლება);

3.- Homographs are words that are different in meaning and sound form (pronunciation), but have the same graphic form (spelling). E.g. ‘lead’ – [li:d] – verb; [led] – a noun, the name of a heavy, rather soft metal; ‘bow’ – [bou], a noun, as in ‘he drew the bow’; [bau] – a verb (to bend the head in a greeting) –‘He bowed to me’; ‘row’ – [rou] - ორე, and [rau] – a noisy quarrel, a great noise of many voices; ‘wind’ – [wind] - ტაფხო; [waind] – ‘to wind up a clock’; ‘tear’ – [tia] – a drop of water from the eyes; [teə] – ‘to tear up a piece of paper’;

The above classification is summed up in a table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homonyms</th>
<th>Homophones</th>
<th>Homographs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Different in all groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound form</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic form</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>different</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fast – adv.</td>
<td>Bough n.</td>
<td>Tear v. [teə]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of homonymy

The two sources of homonymy in present-day English are:

1. disintegration of polysemy, or in other words, the divergent (going in different directions) development meaning in LSV of a polysemantic word:

Disintegration of polysemy is seen in the two words ‘flour’ and ‘flower’: originating from the Latin flos, florem (flower), which produced the Middle English word ‘flour’ [flu:r] that had two meanings: a) a flower and b) the finest part of wheat, From the ME ‘flour’ we now have two homonyms – flower and flour. From the OE ‘beam’ (tree) we have a) beam – a ray of light and b) beam – a wooden or metal element of a building.

2. convergent development of sound form: words, that were phonetically different may develop the same sound form, e.g. the OE ‘ic’ (I) and ‘eaze’ (eye) have developed the same sound form [ai]. The OE ‘sunne’ (‘sun’ and ‘sunu’) are now homonyms pronounced [sʌn].

3. borrowing from other languages, accompanied by convergent development of sound form, also produces homonyms: the OE ‘writan’ and ‘riht’ produced the homonymous pair ‘write’ and ‘right’, to which another was added from the Latin ‘ritus’ (a ritual) – rite, the three words being now pronounced [rait]. From OE we have ‘rain’, from French – ‘rein’, from Latin – ‘regnum’ – reign’; all three are pronounced [rein].

Semantic field

Semantic field is a closely knit sector of vocabulary characterized by a common concept. The members of the semantic fields are not synonymous but all of them are joined together by some common semantic component. This semantic component common to all the members of the field is sometimes described as the common denominator of meaning, like the concept of kinship, concept of colour, parts of the human body and so on. The basis of grouping in this case is not only linguistic but also extra-linguistic: the words are associated, because the things they name occur together and are closely connected in reality.
In a semantic field, not all lexical items necessarily have the same status. Consider the following sets, which together form the semantic field of color terms (of course, there are other terms in the same field):

1. - blue, red, yellow, green, black, purple
2. - indigo, saffron, royal blue, aquamarine, bisque

The colors referred to by the words of set 1 are more 'usual' than those described in set 2. They are said to be less marked members of the semantic field than those of set 2. The less marked members of a semantic field are usually easier to learn and remember than more marked members. Children learn the term blue before they learn the terms indigo, royal blue, or aquamarine. Often, a less marked word consists of only one morpheme, in contrast to more marked words (contrast blue with royal blue or aquamarine). The less marked member of a semantic field cannot be described by using the name of another member of the same field, whereas more marked members can be thus described (indigo is a kind of blue, but blue is not a kind of indigo). Less marked terms also tend to be used more frequently than more marked terms; for example, blue occurs considerably more frequently in conversation and writing than indigo or aquamarine. . . . . Less marked terms are also often broader in meaning than more marked terms.

A general and intuitive description is that words in a semantic field are not necessarily synonymous, but are all used to talk about the same general phenomenon. Synonymy requires the sharing of a sememe or seme, but the semantic field is a larger area surrounding those. A meaning of a word is dependent partly on its relation to other words in the same conceptual area. The kinds of semantic fields vary from culture to culture and anthropologists use them to study belief systems and reasoning across cultural groups.

**Thematic (or ideographic) groups**

Thematic (or ideographic) groups are groups of words joined together by common contextual associations within the framework of the sentence and reflect the interlinking of things and events in objective reality. Contextual associations are formed as a result of regular cooccurrence of words in similar repeatedly used contexts. Thematic or ideographic groups are independent of classification into parts of speech. Words and expression are here classed not according to their lexico-grammatical meaning but strictly according to their signification, i.e. to the system of logical notions (e.g. tree - -grow - green; journey - train, taxi, bus - ticket; sunshine -brightly - blue - sky).

**Hyponym**
Hyponymy is the semantic relationship of inclusion existing between elements of various levels. Thus, e.g. vehicle includes car, bus, taxi; oak implies tree, horse implies animal; table implies furniture. The hyponymic relationship is the relationship between the meaning of the general and the individual terms.

**Hypernym**

A hypernym is a generic term which serves as the name of the general as distinguished from the names of the species-hyponyms. In other words the more specific term is called the hyponym. For instance, animal is a generic term as compared to the specific names wolf, dog or mouse. Dog, in its turn, may serve as a generic term for different breeds such as bull-dog, collie, poodle, etc.

**Euphemism**

Euphemism is a mild or indirect word or expression substituted for one considered to be too harsh or blunt when referring to something unpleasant or embarrassing i.e. a word used to cover up the unpleasantness of another, nominating an unpleasant or ‘impolite’ notion. E.G. ‘tight’ or intoxicated’ for ‘drunk’; underprivileged’ for ‘poor’; ‘in one’s birthday suit’ for ‘naked’; ‘in the family way’ for ‘pregnant’; ‘perspiration’ for ‘sweat’. Not only English language but other languages as well have a definite set of notions attracting euphemistic words. These are the notions of death, madness, stupidity, drunkenness, certain physiological processes, crimes and so on. A specific feature of euphemisms is that in time they lose their euphemistic character and a new one is to be provided, sometimes with the aid of borrowings.

**Questions for seminars per lecture:**

**XI**

1.- synonyms;

2.- antonyms;

3.- homonyms; word families;

4.- Semantic fields; thematic (ideographic) groups;

5.- hyponyms; hypernyms;

6.- euphemisms;
Lecture 12

Stylistically marked and stylistically unmarked words

Another sphere in which vocabulary reveals its systematic nature synchronically is its stylistic differentiation. Even J.B. Greenough and J.L. Kittredge, two professors of Harvard University, USA, co-authors of most interesting book on English vocabulary, are right in remarking that ‘Every educated person has at least two ways of speaking his mother-tongue. The first is that which is employs in his family, among his familiar friends and on ordinary occasions. The second is that, which he uses in discoursing more complicated subjects, and in addressing persons with whom he is less intimately acquainted’… ‘The difference between these two forms of language consists, in great measure, in a difference of vocabulary’.

When speaking about denotation and connotation, it has been mentioned in previous lectures that connotational meaning may contain stylistic, emotive, expressive and evaluative components which may all come together in the meaning of a single word.

In any synonymic paradigm we may observe words that are unmarked (neutral) as regards style, and others that are stylistically marked; e.g. to think – to presume; to know – to be cognizant of; to see – to behold; to stop – to pause; to watch – to observe; house – dwelling; though – however, etc. (the first words of these pairs are stylistically neutral). As regards stylistically marked words, their stylistic reference is determined by what is termed usual connotation, i.e. connotation that is proper to them as language units.

In the vocabulary of the English (as well as of any other language) certain layers of words belonging to this or that style can be singled out. Majority of words belong to the neutral style. The two large areas overlapping the neutral layer are the common literary and common colloquial vocabulary: this overlapping means that some of the words belonging to these two layers tend to pass into the neutral layer; thus, common literary words ‘enormous’, ‘immense’, ‘monstrous’, as synonyms of ‘big’ tend to become neutral and even to pass into the common colloquial vocabulary.

The literary vocabulary has, as its nucleus, special literary layer which consists of ‘learned’ words and official vocabulary. In ‘begin’ – ‘initiate’, ‘inner’ – ‘internal’, ‘show’ – ‘indicate’, ‘fatherly’ – ‘paternal’, ‘motherly’ – ‘maternal’, ‘home’ – ‘domestic’ we have pairs of synonyms the first of which is neutral, while the second is a ‘learned’ word of the special literary layer. Here also belong old connectives never used in ordinary speech, e.g. ‘hereby’ (by this), ‘whereupon’ (after which), ‘hereafter’ (after the present time), etc.
As for official vocabulary, as the term itself implies, it is used only on formal occasions, in all kinds of official documents, in business correspondence and the like. Here are a few examples: to dispatch (to send), obtain (get), summon (send for), to forward (to send on a letter, etc.), accommodation (room), etc. Within this group, some of the diplomatic vocabulary and the vocabulary of law should rather be considered to belong to special terminology.

On the margin of the special literary vocabulary we find such subgroups as poetic words, archaic words, special terms, foreign words, barbarisms, and literary nonce-words.

Poetic words are mostly archaic, i.e. words gone out of use. They have synonyms in modern English, e.g. ‘methinks’ – I think; ‘damsel’, ‘maiden’ – girl; ‘hither’ – here; ‘thither’ – there; ‘charger’, ‘steed’ – horse; ‘morn’ – morning; ‘eve’ – evening; ‘oft’ – often, etc. In modern poetry such words are usually avoided.

Words, that should rather be called ‘historical terms’ are sometimes included in the group of archaisms. However, they differ from the latter in that, being names of realia of the past, they have no synonyms in modern English. These are the names of the articles of clothing, such as ‘coif’ – a woman’s headdress; ‘stomacher’ – front of a woman’s dress; or such ancient articles of clothing as ‘chiton’, ‘peplum’, ‘toga’ and the like; also names of weapon and armament that are no longer in use, e.g. ‘armour’, ‘coat-of-mail’, ‘mace’, ‘lance’, ‘spear’, ‘halberd’, ‘battering-ram’, etc. Such words appear in historical novels; others, as special terms are used by archeologists.

Special terms are words nominating objects, phenomena, processes, concepts that are the subject matter of various branches of science, technology and arts. Some special terms of linguistics are: nomination, denotation, connotation, phoneme, allophone, morpheme, allomorph, signification, semantic, root, stem, affix, suffix, prefix, Immediate Constituents, and many others.

Foreign words do not belong to the English vocabulary. True, some of them perform terminological functions, e.g. ‘musical terms’ – soprano, tenor, concerto, violin, piano, cello, etc. Writers sometimes use foreign words for a kind of ‘speech characterization of their characters or for creating ‘local coloring’.

Barbarisms, although they are borrowed from other languages should not be confused with foreignisms. Barbarisms have synonyms in English and are registered in the body of dictionaries, whereas foreign words, if registered in dictionaries at all, are grouped in separate Addenda sections. Barbarisms are used in the speech of some people and are understandable to people of the same sort; e.g. ‘chic’ – smart, elegant; ‘bon mot’ – a witty saying; ‘double entendre’ – ambiguity, something that can be understood in two ways; ‘debut’ – first appearance on the stage or in society; ‘communiqué’ – official announcement, ‘détente’ – (relaxation of international tension). All these are borrowed from French. From Latin we have – ‘ad infinitum’
to infinity; ‘ad libitum’ – at pleasure; ‘in loco parentis’ – acting in place of parents, ‘pater familias’ – father of the family.

**Nonce words** are mostly coined in literary works to suit the occasion and if the public do not pick them up, they remain in a single case of usage, created ‘for the nonce’ = for this once. E.g. ‘to be wined and dined’, ‘I’m wived in Texas’; ‘Don’t you madam me!’ – ‘Don’t you address me as madam!’

**Slang** is a set of substandard words. In contrast to neutral vocabulary, slang words are imaginative, expressive, ‘serving to create fresh names for things that are frequent topics of discourse’. However, ‘fresh names’ soon go out of fashion. One should avoid using of the slang unless he is sure that the words he uses are still in use, or his speech will sound out-of-date. Slang words sometimes find their way into the common colloquial vocabulary. Such are, for instance – to bore, to bet, chap, odd, shabby; from US slang – teenager, graft, hitchhike, etc.

**Professionalisms** are groups of ‘occupational’ vocabulary, used by people of various trades, professions or callings – air force slang, football slang, sea slang, etc. Professionalisms are not intended for use as a kind of secret ‘code’. This differentiates them from **jargon** (thieves’ cant), a kind of ‘code’ used by underworld, meant to be incomprehensible to outsiders. A few examples will suffice – ‘grease’ = money; shiv = knife; barker = pistol, etc. As with the slang, jargon words often find their way to common colloquial vocabulary.

**Dialectal words** are words used by people living in certain parts of England; to these people, they are colloquial, e.g. ‘shoat’ – a little pig; ‘rooster’ – cock and the like.

Dialectal words are used by writers for ‘speech characterization’. Stressing that dialectal words are only found in emotive prose, I.R. Galperin suggests that this is the only thing that keeps them alive: the unifying tendency of the literary language dooms them to disappearance.

**Vulgarisms** are colloquialisms of a low or unrefined character, not acceptable to normal polite speech. Some of these, the so-called ‘four-letter words’ are, in fact ‘taboo’. Others, like ‘damn’, ‘hell’, etc. may be heard in emotional, careless, unrefined speech.

**Euphemism** refers to polite, indirect expressions which replace words and phrases considered harsh and impolite or which suggest something unpleasant.

A euphemism is “the substitution of a mild, indirect or vague term for one considered to be harsh, blunt, or offensive”. Sometimes called doublespeak, a euphemism is a word or phrase which pretends to communicate but doesn’t. It makes the bad seem good, the negative seem positive, the unnatural seem natural, the unpleasant seem attractive, or at least tolerable.
Here are some particularly amusing examples:

1. If you are offered a career change or an early retirement opportunity, a career or employee transition, or you are being involuntarily separated, or if personnel is being realigned or there is a surplus reduction in personnel, or the staff is being re-engineered or right sized, or if there is a workforce imbalance correction then: You’re fired!

2. You aren’t poor, you are economically disadvantaged.

3. You aren’t broke, you have temporary negative cash flow.

4. You do not live in a slum but in substandard housing, or in an economically depressed neighborhood, or culturally deprived environment.

5. When a geographical area is neutralized or depopulated that means the CIA killed people, just because.

6. You’re not buying a used car, you are purchasing a pre-enjoyed or pre-loved vehicle.

7. If you are a bank - bad, crappy debts are non- or under-performing assets.

8. Watch out if the company you work for says it is leveraging up, it means they are spending money they don’t have.

9. If you say you committed terminological inexactitude, or you relayed misinformation, misspoke or were economical with the truth, well that means you just told a whopper. A bold faced lie.

10. Here’s the one that really hurts. When you’re called postmenopausal, or mature, or senior – that means you’re old.

11. You are becoming a little thin on top (bald).

12. Our teacher is in the family way (pregnant).

13. He is always tired and emotional (drunk).

14. We do not hire mentally challenged (stupid) people.

15. He is a special child (disabled or retarded).
Regional variants of vocabulary

Here we have to discriminate between the Standard English of Great Britain, the official language of the country and contrast it to local dialects and variants of English.

Local dialects are the speech peculiar to some districts of the country and have no literary norm. The principal dialects in Great Britain are: the Northern, Midland, Eastern and Southern dialects.

The best known of the Southern dialect is Cockney, spoken in London, mostly by people whose standard of education is rather low.

Examples of Cockney dialect are given as ‘speech characterization’ in Bernard Shaw’s ‘Pygmalion’ and in some of Dickens’s novels. Cockney has certain phonetic peculiarities: confusing [v] and [w], e.g. ‘weryvell; [f] and [v] for [θ] and [ð], e.g. ‘fing’=thing; ‘faver’=father; misuse off [h], dropping it where needed and adding it where it shouldn’t be pronounced, e.g. [a:t] = heart, [a:d] = hard; [oum] = home; [ha:t] = art; [hend] = end; also the substitution of the diphthong [ai] for [ei], e.g. [daɪ] = day; [paipæ] = paper; [raɪn] = rain, etc.

Variants of English are peculiar to large areas, in fact, to entire countries where English is the national or official language. Variants of English are 1. Scottish, known especially through the poems of Robert Burns; Scottish has provided Standard English with such words as ‘bairn’ – child, ‘bonny’ – handsome, ‘lass’ – girl, ‘wee’ – tiny; ‘glamour’ – charm, etc.

2.- Irish English, especially presented in plays by Sean O’Casey, Shelagh Delaney and others. Some words from Irish English have been accepted by Standard English, e.g. ‘bog’, ‘whiskey’, ‘blarney’, etc.

3.- American English, is not a dialect, any more than Scottish or Irish English, as it also has its literary norm – standard American. There are several dialects of American English. Yet, it is not a separate language. Although the bulk of American English vocabulary is the same as that used in England, there are some points of difference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British</th>
<th>American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn</td>
<td>fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biscuit</td>
<td>cookie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap (for water)</td>
<td>faucet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift</td>
<td>elevator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel</td>
<td>package</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some words have different meanings in Britain and the USA:

- **Apartment:** B.E. = room; A.E.=flat
- **Corn:** B.E. = wheat; A.E.=maize
- **Dessert:** B.E. =fruit; A.E.=any sweet dish
- **Store:** B.E. = warehouse, A.E = shop, etc.

Some words are typical of America. The first settlers on the new continent had to borrow from the native Red Indian population names of animals, trees and other realia that were unknown in England, as well as great many place names: 'hickory' (a tree); ‘muskrat’, ‘opossum’, ‘raccoon’ (animals, etc.).

**Other variants of English** are: Australian English, New Zealand English, Canadian English, Indian English, each of which has its own literary standard. A few words from these variants have entered the Standard English vocabulary: Canadian 'shack' = hut; Indian English ‘bungalow’, ‘jute’, ‘khaki’, ‘pyjamas’; English: ‘boomerang’ (a weapon used by aboriginal population of Australia), ‘dingo’, (a wild dog), ‘kangaroo’, etc.

**Neologisms and archaisms**

So far we have been viewing the structure of the English vocabulary mainly from the synchronic aspect.

The English language is always evolving and changing, so if you were to read something that has many archaic words, it might feel like you are reading a different language. It is important to keep in mind that many people that used archaic words in their work were living in a different time period. Therefore, it was much easier for the reader or audience to understand than it is for you. Take William Shakespeare, for example. He lived right after the **Middle Ages** ended, which went from about the year 500 to around the year 1500. Since Shakespeare wrote about 100 years after the Middle Ages, he still incorporated a lot of terms from that period in his work.

Archaic words were used frequently during the Middle Ages and so Shakespeare's plays are full of them. This makes them challenging for us to understand. In fact, you can even take a class in high school or college that is solely focused on how to read and understand Shakespeare's work. Let's take a look at the first part of his famous Sonnet 18 in Romeo and Juliet:
Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?

Thou art more lovely and more temperate

With archaic words like thee, thou and hath, this can get a little tricky. In modern English, Sonnet 18 might read something like this:

Should I compare you to a summer's day?

You are more lovely and more pleasant.

**Neologisms** are words that have been formed recently, their appearance conditioned by the extra-linguistic factors of developments in social condition, in science, technology, culture and in everyday life.

How long should words or their meanings be regarded as new? According to I.R. Galperin, if a word, or a new meaning of an old word are fixed in a dictionary, we can no longer consider them as neologisms. This point of view seems acceptable. Neologisms are mostly formed after productive word-building models.

Every year The Washington Post runs an annual competition in which the readers of the newspaper are asked to submit alternative meanings to existing words. The results are often extremely amusing. Here are examples of Washington Post neologisms:

1. **Coffee** (n.), the person upon whom one coughs.
2. **Flabbergasted** (adj.), appalled over how much weight you have gained.
3. **Abdicate** (v.), to give up all hope of ever having a flat stomach.
4. **Esplanade** (v.), to attempt an explanation while drunk.
5. **Willy-nilley** (adj.), impotent.
6. **Negligent** (adj.), describes a condition in which you absentmindedly answer the door in your nightgown.
7. **Lymph** (v.), to walk with a lisp.
8. **Gargoyle** (n.), olive-flavored mouthwash.
9. **Flatulance** (n.) emergency vehicle that picks you up after you are run over by a steamroller.
10. **Balderdash** (n.), a rapidly receding hairline.
11. **Testicle** (n.), a humorous question on an exam.
12. **Rectitude** (n.), the formal, dignified bearing adopted by proctologists.
13. **Pokemon** (n), a Rastafarian proctologist.
14. **Oyster** (n.), a person who sprinkles his conversation with Yiddishisms.
15. **Frisbeetarianism** (n.), The belief that when you die, your Soul flies up
onto the roof and gets stuck there.

16. **Circumvent** (n.), an opening in the front of boxer shorts worn by Jewish men.

Examples of Popular Culture Neologisms:  
- **Brangelina**: used to refer to supercouple Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie.  
- **Metrosexual**: A man who dedicates a great deal of time and money to his appearance.  
- **Stitch ‘n’ bitch**: A gathering of individuals who chat or gossip while knitting or crocheting.
- **BFF**: Stands for best friends forever. Used to state how close you are to another individual.

**Chilax**: To calm down or relax, it is a slang term used when someone is starting to get uptight about something that is happening.

**Staycation**: A vacation at home or in the immediate local area.

**Questions for seminars per lecture:**

**XII**

1. - Stylistically marked and stylistically unmarked words
2. - Neutral, common literary and common colloquial words
3. - Official vocabulary
4. - Poetic words
5. - Historical terms
6. - Special terms
7. - Foreign words
8. - Barbarisms
9. - Nonce words
10. - Slang
11. - Professionalisms
12. - Dialectal words
13. - Vulgarisms; euphemisms
14. - Regional variants
15. - Neologisms and archaisms
Lecture 13

Idiomatic expressions (set expressions); Lexicography

The term refers to a set expression or a phrase comprising two or more words. An interesting fact regarding the device is that the expression is not interpreted literally. The phrase is understood as to mean something quite different from what individual words of the phrase would imply. Alternatively, it can be said that the phrase is interpreted in a figurative sense. Further, idioms vary in different cultures and countries.

Functions of Idiom

Writers and public speakers use idioms generously. The purpose behind this vast use of idioms is to ornate their language, make it richer and spicier and help them in conveying subtle meanings to their intended audience.

Not only do idioms help in making the language beautiful, they also make things better or worse through making the expression good or bad. For example, there are several idioms that convey the death of a person in highly subtle meanings and some do the same in very offensive terms. They are also said to be exact and more correct than the literal words and sometimes a few words are enough to replace a full sentence. They help the writer make his sense clearer than it is, so that he could convey maximum meanings through minimum words and also keep the multiplicity of the meanings in the text intact.

It has also been seen that idioms not only convey subtle meanings but also convey a phenomenon that is not being conveyed through normal and everyday language and also they keep the balance in the communication. Furthermore, they provide textual coherence, so that the reader could be able to piece together a text that he has gone through and extract meanings the writer has conveyed.

An idiom (also called idiomatic expression) is an expression, word, or phrase that has a figurative meaning conventionally understood by native speakers. This meaning is different from the literal meaning of the idiom's individual elements. In other words, idioms don't mean exactly what the words say. They have, however, hidden meaning

- "Kick the bucket"
- "Spill the beans"

The meaning of these expressions is different from the literal meaning or definition of the words of which they are made. Their meanings are however used figuratively. They mean respectively:
• "to die"
• "to tell people secret information"

A group of words established by usage as having a meaning not deducible from those of the individual words (e.g. over the moon, see the light).

**Definitions of Principal Concepts.**

Phraseological unit is a non-motivated word-group that cannot be freely made up in speech but is reproduced as a ready-made unit. Reproducibility is regular use of phraseological units in speech as single unchangeable collocations.

Idiomaticity is the quality of phraseological unit, when the meaning of the whole is not deducible from the sum of the meanings of the parts.

Stability of a phraseological unit implies that it exists as a ready-made linguistic unit which does not allow of any variability of its lexical components of grammatical structure.

In lexicology there is great ambiguity of the terms phraseology and idioms. Opinions differ as to how phraseology should be defined, classified, described and analyzed. The word "phraseology has very different meanings in our country and in Great Britain or the United States. In linguistic literature the term is used for the expressions where the meaning of one element is dependent on the other, irrespective of the structure and properties of the unit (V.V. Vinogradov); with other authors it denotes only such set expressions which do not possess expressiveness or emotional colouring (A.I. Smirnitsky), and also vice versa: only those that are imaginative, expressive and emotional (I.V.Arnold). N.N. Amosova calls such expressions fixed context units, i.e. units in which it is impossible to substitute any of the components without changing the meaning not only of the whole unit but also of the elements that remain intact. O.S. Ahmanova insists on the semantic integrity of such phrases prevailing over the structural separateness of their elements. A.V. Koonin lays stress on the structural separateness of the elements in a phraseological unit, on the change of meaning in the whole as compared with its elements taken separately and on a certain minimum stability.

In English and American linguistics no special branch of study exists, and the term "phraseology" has a stylistic meaning, according to Webster's dictionary 'mode

The term "idiom" generally implies that the essential feature of the linguistic units is idiomaticity or lack of motivation; criterion of differentiation is stability of the lexical components and grammatical structure of word-groups. The term "idiom" generally implies that the essential feature of the linguistic units is idiomaticity or lack of motivation.

The term "word-equivalent" stresses not only semantic but also functional inseparability of certain word groups, their aptness to function in speech as single words.
The essential features of phraseological units are: a) lack of semantic motivation; b) lexical and grammatical stability. As far as semantic motivation is concerned phraseological units are of expression, peculiarities of diction, i.e. choice and arrangement of words and phrases characteristic of some author or some literary work.

Difference in terminology ("set-phrases", "idioms", "word-equivalents") reflects certain differences in the main criteria used to distinguish types of phraseological units and free word-groups. The term "set phrase" implies that the basic criterion of differentiation is stability of the lexical components and grammatical structure of word-groups.

The term ‘idiom’ generally implies that the essential feature of the linguistic units is idiomaticity or lack of motivation.

The term ‘word-equivalent’ stresses not only semantic but also functional inseparability of certain word groups, their aptness to function in speech as single words.

Lexical and grammatical stability of phraseological units is displayed in the fact that no substitution of any elements whatever is possible in the following stereotyped (unchangeable) set expressions, which differ in many other respects; all the world and his wife, red tape, calf love, heads or tails, first night, to gild the pill, to hope for the best, busy as a bee, fair and square, stuff and nonsense, time and again.

In a free phrase the semantic correlative ties are fundamentally different. The information is additive and each element has a much greater semantic independence where each component may be substituted without affecting the meaning of the other: cut bread, cut cheese, eat bread. Information is additive in the sense that the amount of information we had on receiving the first signal, i.e. having heard or read the word cut, is increased, the listener obtains further details and learns what is cut. The reference of cut is unchanged. Every notional word can form additional syntactic ties with other words outside the expression. In a set expression information furnished by each element is not additive: actually it does not exist before we get the whole. No substitution for either cut or figure can be made without completely ruining the following: I had an uneasy fear that he might cut a poor figure beside all these clever Russian officers (Shaw). He was not managing to cut much of a figure (Murdoch). The only substitution admissible for the expression cut a poor figure concerns the adjective.

Semantic approach stresses the importance of idiomaticity, functional - syntactic inseparability, contextual - stability of context combined with idiomaticity.

In his classification of V.V. Vinogradov developed some points first advanced by the Swiss
linguist Charles Bally. The classification is based upon the motivation of the unit, i.e. the relationship existing between the meaning of the whole and the meaning of its component parts. The degree of motivation is correlated with the rigidity, indivisibility and semantic unity of the expression, i.e. with the possibility of changing the form or the order of components, and of substituting the whole by a single word. According to the type of motivation three types of phraseological units are suggested, phraseological combinations, phraseological unities, and phraseological fusions.

The Phraseological Collocations (Combinations), are partially motivated, they contain one component used in its direct meaning while the other is used figuratively: meet the demand, meet the necessity, meet the requirements.

Phraseological unities are much more numerous. They are clearly motivated. The emotional quality is based upon the image created by the whole as in to stick (to stand) to one's guns, i.e. refuse to change one's statements or opinions in the face of opposition', implying courage and integrity. The example reveals another characteristic of the type, the possibility of synonymic substitution, which can be only very limited, e. g. to know the way the wind is blowing.

Phraseological fusions, completely non-motivated word-groups, (e.g. tit for tat), represent, as their name suggests, the highest stage of blending together. The meaning of components is completely absorbed by the meaning of the whole, by its expressiveness and emotional properties. Phraseological fusions are specific for every language and do not lend themselves to literal translation into other languages.

Semantic stylistic features contracting set expressions into units of fixed context are simile, contrast, metaphor and synonymy. For example: as like as two peas, as old as the hills and older than the hills (simile); from beginning to end, for love or money, more or less, sooner or later (contrast); a lame duck, a pack of lies, arms race, to swallow the pill, in a nutshell (metaphor); by leaps and bounds, proud and haughty (synonymy). A few more combinations of different features in the same phrase are: as good as gold, as pleased as Punch, as fit as a fiddle (alliteration, simile); now or never, to kill or cure (alliteration and contrast). More rarely there is an intentional pun: as cross as two sticks means 'very angry'. This play upon words makes the phrase jocular.

There are, of course, other cases when set expressions lose their metaphorical picturesqueness, having preserved some fossilised words and phrases, the meaning of which is no longer correctly understood. For instance, the expression buy a pig in a poke may be still used, although poke 'bag' (cf. pouch, pocket) does not occur in other contexts. Expressions taken from obsolete sports and occupations may survive in their new figurative meaning. In these cases the euphonic qualities of the expression are even more important. A muscular and irreducible phrase is also memorable. The muscular feeling is of special importance in slogans and battle cries. Saint George and the Dragon for Merrie England, the medieval battle cry, was a rhythmic unit to which a man on a horse could swing his sword. The modern Scholarships not battleships! can be conveniently scanned by a marching crowd.
N.N. Amosova's approach is contextological. She defines phraseological units as units of fixed context. Fixed context is defined as a context characterised by a specific and unchanging sequence of definite lexical components, and a peculiar semantic relationship between them. Units of fixed context are subdivided into phrasemes and idioms. Phrasemes are always binary: one component has a phraseologically bound meaning, the other serves as the determining context (small talk, small hours, small change). In idioms the new meaning is created by the whole, though every element may have its original meaning weakened or even completely lost: in the nick of time 'at the exact moment'. Idioms may be motivated or demotivated. A motivated idiom is homonymous to a free phrase, but this phrase is used figuratively: take the bull by the horns' to face dangers without fear. In the nick of time is demotivated, because the word nick is obsolete. Both phrasemes and idioms may be movable (changeable) or immovable.

A.V. Koonin's classification is based on the functions of the units fulfilled in speech. They may be nominating (a bull in a china shop), interjectinal (a pretty kettle of fish), communicative (familiarity breeds contempt), or nominating-communicative (pull somebody's leg). Further classification into subclasses depends on whether the units are changeable or unchangeable, whether the meaning of the one element remains free, and, more generally, on the interdependence between the meaning of the elements and the meaning of the set expression.

Formal classification distinguishes set expressions that are nominal phrases: the root of the trouble; verbal phrases: put one's best foot forward; adjectival phrases: as good as gold; red as a cherry; adverbial phrases: from head to foot; prepositional phrases: in the course of; conjunctival phrases: as long as, on the other hand, interjectional phrases: Well, I never! A stereotyped sentence also introduced into speech as a ready-made formula which may be illustrated by: Never say die! 'never give up hope', take your time 'do not hurry'. This classification takes into consideration not only the type of component parts but also the functioning of the whole, thus, tooth and nail is not a nominal but an adverbal unit, because it serves to modify a verb (e.g. fight tooth and nail). Within each of these classes a further subdivision is as follows:

a) Set expressions functioning like nouns:
N+N: maiden name 'the surname of a woman before she was married'; brains trust 'a committee of experts' N's+N: cat's paw 'one who is used for the convenience of a cleverer and stronger person' (the expression comes from a fable in which a monkey wanting to eat some chestnuts that were on a hot stove, but not wishing to burn himself while getting them, seized a cat and holding its paw in his own used it to knock the chestnuts to the ground) Ns'+N: ladies' man 'one who makes special effort to charm or please women'. N+prp+N: the arm of the law, skeleton in the cupboard. N+A: blight errant (the phrase is today applied to any chivalrous man ready to help and protect oppressed and helpless people). N+and+N: lord and master 'husband'; all the world and his wife. A+N: high tea 'an evening meal which combines meat or some similar extra dish with the usual tea'. N+ subordinate clause: ships that pass in the night 'chance acquaintances'.

b) Set expressions functioning like verbs: V+N: take advantage V+and+V: pick and choose
V+(one's)+N+(prp): snap one's fingers at
V+one+N: give one the bird 'to fire smb'
V+subordinate clause: see how the land lies 'to discover the state of affairs'.
c) Set expressions functioning like adjectives: A+and+A: high and mighty
   (as)+A+as+N: as old as the hills, as mad as a hatter
d) Set expressions functioning like adverbs: N+N: tooth and nail
   prp+N: by heart, of course
   adv+prp+N: once in a blue moon
   prp+N+or+N: by hook or by crook
cj+clause: before one can say Jack Robinson
e) Set expressions functioning like prepositions: prp+N+prp: in consequence of

f) Set expressions functioning like interjections: these are often structured as
   imperative sentences: Bless (one's) soul! God bless me! Hang it (all)!

4. Phraseological stability is based upon:
a) the stability of use;
b) the stability of meaning;
c) lexical stability;
d) syntactic stability;
e) rhythmic characteristics, rhyme and imagery.

5. Proverbs, sayings, familiar quotations and cliches.
The place of proverbs, sayings and familiar quotations with respect to set expressions is a
   controversial issue. A proverb is a short familiar epigrammatic saying expressing popular
   wisdom, a truth or a moral lesson in a concise and imaginative way. Proverbs have much in
   common with set expressions, because their lexical components are also constant, their meaning
   is traditional and mostly figurative, and they are introduced into speech ready-made. Another
   reason why proverbs must be taken into consideration together with set expressions is that they
   often form the basis of set expressions. E. g. the last straw breaks the camel's back: the last straw;
   a drowning man will clutch at a straw: clutch at a straw; it is useless to lock the stable door
   when the steed is stolen: lock the stable door.

As to familiar quotations, they are different from proverbs in their origin. They come from
   literature and become part of the language, so that many people using them do not even know
   that they are quoting, and very few could accurately name the play or passage on which they are
drawing even when they are aware of using a quotation from W. Shakespeare.
The Shakespearian quotations have become and remain extremely numerous — they have
contributed enormously to the store of the language. Very many come from "Hamlet", for
example: Something is rotten in the state of Denmark; Brevity is the soul of wit; The rest is
silence; Thus conscience does make cowards of us all; There are more things in heaven and
earth, Horatio.

Some quotations are so often used that they come to be considered cliches. The term is used to
denote such phrases as have become hackneyed and stale. Being constantly and mechanically
repeated they have lost their original expressiveness. The following are perhaps the most
generally recognized: the acid test, ample opportunities, astronomical figures, the arms of Morpheus, to break the ice, the irony of fate, etc.

**HISTORY OF LEXICOGRAPHY**

**The History of British Lexicography**

Lexicography is an important branch of linguistics which covers the theory and practice of compiling dictionaries. The history of lexicography of the English language goes as far back as the Old English period where its first traces are found in the form of glosses of religious books with interlinear translation from Latin. Regular bilingual English-Latin dictionaries already existed in the 15th century.

The First unilingual English dictionary, explaining words appeared in 1604. Its aim was to explain difficult words. Its title was "A Table Alphabeticall, containing and teaching the true writing and understanding of hard usual English words borrowed from the Hebrew, Greece, Latin or French". The volume of 120 pages explaining about 3000 words was compiled by Robert Cawdrey, a schoolmaster.

The first attempt at a bigger dictionary including all the words of the language, not only the difficult ones, was made by Nathaniel Bailey. He published the first edition of Universal Etymological English Dictionary in 1721. It was the first to include pronunciation and etymology.

The first big explanatory dictionary "A Dictionary of the English Language in Which the Words are Deduced from Their Originals and Illustrated in Their General Significations by Examples from the Best Writers: In 2 vols." was compiled by Dr Samuel Johnson and published in 1755. The most important innovation of S. Johnson's Dictionary was the introduction of illustrations of the meanings of the words by examples from the best writers.

Pronunciation was not marked, because S. Johnson was very touch sure of the wide variety of the English pronunciation and thought it impossible to set up a standard there; he paid attention only to those aspects of vocabulary where he believed he could improve linguistic usage. S. Johnson's influence was tremendous. He remained the unquestionable authority for more than 75 years.

As to pronunciation, the first pronouncing dictionary was published in 1780 by Thomas Sheridan, grandfather of the great dramatist. In 1791 appeared The Critical Pronouncing Dictionary and Expositor of the English Language by John Walker, an actor. The vogue of this second dictionary was very great, and in later publications Walker's pronunciations were inserted into S. Johnson's text - a further step to a unilingual dictionary in its present-day form.

The Golden Age of English lexicography began in the last quarter of the 19th century when the English Philological Society started work on compiling The Oxford English Dictionary (OED), which was originally named New English Dictionary on Historical Principles (NED). It is still referred to as either OED or NED.

The objective of this colossal work was and still is to trace the development of English words from their form in Old English. Where they were not found in Old English, it was shown when
they were introduced into the language. The development of each meaning and its historical relation to other meanings of the same word is as well displayed. For words and meanings which have become obsolete the date of the latest occurrence is provided. All this is done by means of dated quotations ranging from the oldest to recent appearances of the words in question. The English of G. Chaucer, of the "Bible" and of W. Shakespeare is given as much attention as that of the most modern authors. The dictionary includes spellings, pronunciations and detailed etymologies. The completion of the work required more than 75 years. The result is a kind of encyclopedia of language used not only for reference purposes but also as a basis for lexicological research.

The First part of the Dictionary appeared in 1884 and the last in 1928. Later it was issued in twelve volumes and in order to hold new words a three volume Supplement was issued in 1933. These volumes were revised in the seventies. Nearly all the material of the original Supplement was retained and a large body of the most recent accessions to the English language added. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English was first published in 1911, i.e. before the work on the main version was completed. It is not a historical dictionary but one of current usage. A still shorter form is The Pocket Oxford Dictionary. The latest edition of OED was undertaken in 1905. The new enlarged version was issued in 22 volumes 1994. Two Russian borrowings glasnost and perestroika were included in it. This publication was followed by a two volume Supplement to hold new words.

Another big dictionary, also created by joined effort of enthusiasts, is Joseph Wright's "English Dialect Dictionary". Before this dictionary could be started upon, a thorough study of English dialects had to be completed. With this target in view W.W. Skeat, famous for his "Etymological English Dictionary" founded the English Dialect Society in 1873. Dialects are of great importance for the historical study of the language. In the 19th century they were very pronounced though now they are almost disappearing. The Society existed till 1896 and issued 80 publications.

**The History of American Lexicography**

Curiously enough, the first American dictionary of the English language was compiled by a man whose name was also Samuel Johnson. Samuel Johnson Jr., a Connecticut schoolmaster, published in 1798 a small book entitled "A School Dictionary". This book was followed in 1800 by another dictionary by the same author, which showed already some signs of Americanization. It was Noah Webster, universally considered to be the father of American lexicography, who emphatically broke away from English tradition and embodied in his book the specifically American usage of his time. His great work, The American Dictionary of the English Language, appeared in two volumes in 1828 and later sustained numerous revised and enlarged editions. In many respect N. Webster follows the lead of Dr S. Johnson (the British lexicographer). But he has also improved and corrected many of S. Johnson's etymologies and his definitions are often more exact. N. Webster attempted to simplify the spelling and pronunciation that were current in the USA of the period. He devoted many years to the collection of words and the preparation of more accurate definitions.
N. Webster realised the importance of language for the development of a nation, and devoted his energy to giving the American English the status of an independent language, distinct from British English. At that time the idea was progressive as it helped the unification of separate states into one federation. In the latest edition of Webster's International Dictionary of the English Language not Americanisms (words not used in America) but so called Britishisms were marked off.

N. Webster's dictionary enjoyed great popularity from its first editions. This popularity was due not only to the accuracy and clarity of definitions but also to the richness of additional information of encyclopaedic character, which had become a tradition in American lexicography.

Soon after N. Webster's death two publishers and booksellers of Massachusetts, George and Charles Merriam, acquired the rights of his dictionary from his family and started the publication of revised single volume editions under the name Merriam-Webster (1864, 1890, 1909, 1934, 1961). The staff working for the modern editions is a big institution numbering hundreds of specialists in different branches of human activity.


**The main problems in lexicography**

The problems of lexicography are connected with the selection of headwords, the number, the structure and contents of the vocabulary entry (in different types of dictionaries). The starting group of lexicographical problems deals with *selection*:

1) In the first place it is the problem of whether a general descriptive dictionary, whether unilingual or bilingual, should give the historical information about a word.
2) For the purpose of a dictionary, which must not be too massive, selection between scientific and technical terms is also a very important task.
3) It is a debatable point whether a unilingual explanatory dictionary should try to cover all the words of the language, including neologisms, nonce-word, slang, etc. and note with impartial accuracy all the words actually used by English people; or whether, as the great English lexicographer of the 18th century Samuel Johnson used to think, it should be preceptive, and (viewed from the other side) prohibitive. Dictionary-makers should attempt to improve and stabilize the English vocabulary according to the best classical samples and advise the readers on preferable usage. A distinctly modern criterion in selection of entries is the frequency of the words to be included. This is especially important for certain lines of practical work in preparing graded elementary textbooks.

The other problem which of the selected units have the right to a separate entry and which are to be included under one common head-word. These are, in other words, the issues of *separateness* and *sameness* of words. The first deals with syntagmatic boundaries of word-units
and has to solve such questions as whether *each other* is a group of two separate words to be treated separately under the head-words *each* and *other*, or whether *each other* is a unit deserving a special entry (compare also: *one another*).

As to the *sameness*, this deals with paradigmatic boundaries. How many entries are justified for *hound?* Concise Oxford Dictionary has two one *for* the noun, and the other for the verb: to chase (as) with hounds; the verb and the noun are thus treated as homonyms. Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary combines them under one head-word, i.e. it takes them as variants of the same word (hence the term "sameness"). The problem is even more complicated with variants belonging to the same part of speech. This involves differentiation between polysemy and homonymy.

The second group of problems deals with the structure and content of a dictionary entry in different types of dictionaries.

A historical dictionary (the Oxford Dictionary, for instance) is primarily concerned with the development of the English vocabulary. It arranges various senses chronologically, first comes the etymology, then the earliest meanings marked by the label *obs. – obsolete*. The etymologies are either comparative or confined to a single language. The development is illustrated by quotations, ranging from the oldest to recent usages of the word in question.

A descriptive dictionary dealing with current usage has to face its own specific problems. It has to give precedence to the most important meanings. But how is the most important meaning determined upon? So far each compiler was guided by his own personal opinion. An objective criterion would be statistical counts. But counting the frequency of different meanings of the same word is far more difficult than counting the frequency of its forms. It is therefore not by chance that up to now many counts have been undertaken only for word forms, irrespective of meaning. Also, the interdependence of meanings and their relative importance within the semantic structure of the word do not remain the same. They change almost incessantly, so that establishing their frequency would have to be repeated very often. The constant revisions necessary would make the publication of dictionaries very expensive. It may also be argued that an arrangement of meanings according to frequency would sometimes conceal the ties and relationship between various elements of the semantic structure.

A synchronic dictionary should also show the distribution of every word. It has been traditionally done by labelling words as belonging to a certain part of speech, and by noting some special cases of grammatically or lexically bound meanings. Thus, the word *spin* is labelled in The Concise Oxford Dictionary as v.t. & i, which gives a general idea of its distribution; its various senses are shown in connection with words that may serve as subject or object, e. g.: 2. (of spider, silkworm, etc.) make (web, gossamer, cocoon, or abs.) by extrusion of fine viscous thread... 10. *spun glass* (spun when heated into filaments that remain pliant when cold); *spun gold, silver* (gold, silver thread prepared for weaving...) This technique is gradually being improved upon, and compilers strive to provide more detailed information on these points. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary ... by A.S. Hornby, E.V. Gatenby and H. Wakefield supplies information on the syntactical distribution of each verb. In their Notes on Syntax the compilers state that one who is learning English as a foreign language is apt to form sentences by analogy,
which at times may lead him into error. For instance, the student must be warned against taking the use of the verb *tell* in the sentence *Please tell me the meaning* as a model for the word *explain*, because *Please, explain me the meaning* would be ungrammatical. For this purpose they provide a table of 25 verb patterns and supply the numerical indications in each verb entry. This gives the student the necessary guidance. Indications are also supplied as to which nouns and which semantic varieties of nouns may be used in the plural. This helps the student to avoid mistakes like *interesting informations.*

The third group of lexicographic problems is the problem of definitions in a unilingual dictionary. The explanation of meaning may be achieved by a group of synonyms which together give a fairly general idea; but one synonym is never sufficient for the purpose, because no absolute synonyms exist. Besides, if synonyms are the only type of explanation used, the reader will be placed in a vicious circle of synomyic references, with not a single word actually explained. Definitions serve the purpose much better. These are of two main types. If they are only concerned with words as speech material, the definition is called *linguistic.* If they are concerned with things for which the words are names, they are termed *encyclopaedic.*

American dictionaries are for the most part traditionally encyclopaedic, which accounts for so much attention paid to graphic illustration. They furnish their readers with far more information about facts and things than their British counterparts, which are more linguistic and more fundamentally occupied with purely lexical data with the grammatical properties of words, their components, their stylistic features, etc. Opinions differ upon the optimum proportion of linguistic and encyclopaedic material.

**Types of dictionaries**

The term dictionary is used to denote a book listing words of a language with their meanings and often with data regarding pronunciation, usage and/or origin. There are also dictionaries that concentrate their attention upon only one of these aspects: pronouncing (phonetical) dictionaries (by Daniel Jones) and etymological dictionaries (by Walter Skeat, by Erik Partridge, The Oxford English Dictionary).

For dictionaries in which the words and their definitions belong to the same language the term *unilingual* or *explanatory* is used, whereas *bilingual* or *translation* dictionaries are those that explain words by giving their equivalents in another language.

Unilingual dictionaries are further subdivided with regard to the time. Diachronic dictionaries, of which The Oxford English Dictionary is the main example, reflect the development of the English vocabulary by recording the history of form and meaning for every word registered. They may be contrasted to synchronic or descriptive dictionaries of current English concerned with present meaning and usage of words.

Both bilingual and unilingual dictionaries can be *general* and *special.* General dictionaries represent the vocabulary as a whole. The group includes the thirteen volumes of The Oxford
English Dictionary alongside with any miniature pocket dictionary. Some general dictionaries may have very specific aims and still be considered general due to their coverage. They include, for instance, frequency dictionaries, i.e. lists of words, each of which is followed by a record of its frequency of occurrence in one or several sets of reading matter. A rhyming dictionary is also a general dictionary, though arranged in inverse order, and so is a thesaurus in spite of its unusual arrangement. General dictionaries are contrasted to special dictionaries whose stated aim is to cover only a certain specific part of the vocabulary.

Special dictionaries may be further subdivided depending on whether the words are chosen according to the sphere of human activity in which they are used (technical dictionaries), the type of the units themselves (e.g. phraseological dictionaries) or the relationships existing between them (e.g. dictionaries of synonyms).

The first subgroup embraces specialised dictionaries which register and explain technical terms for various branches of knowledge, art and trade: linguistic, medical, technical, economical terms, etc. Unilingual books of this type giving definitions of terms are called glossaries.

The second subgroup deals with specific language units, i.e. with phraseology, abbreviations, neologisms, borrowings, surnames, toponyms, proverbs and sayings, etc.

The third subgroup contains synonymic dictionaries. Dictionaries recording the complete vocabulary of some author are called concordances. They should be distinguished from those that deal only with difficult words, i.e. glossaries. To this group are also referred dialect dictionaries and dictionaries of Americanisms.

Questions for seminars per lecture:

XIII

1.- What is an idiom (set expression)?
2.- Classification of idioms
3.- Free collocations vs. idiomatic phrases
4.- British lexicography
5.- American lexicography
6.- Main problems of lexicography
7.- Types of dictionaries