Министерство науки и высшего образования Российской Федерации
Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение
высшего образования
«Владимирский государственный университет
имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых»

О. А. СЕЛИВЕРСТОВА

LEXICOLOGY

ЛЕКСИКОЛОГИЯ

Учебно-практическое пособие

Владимир 2021

УДК 811.111
ББК 81.2(Англ)
С29

Рецензенты:
Кандидат филологических наук
доцент кафедры философии, истории, права и межкультурной коммуникации Владимирского филиала Финансового университета при Правительстве Российской Федерации
Н. А. Наумова

Кандидат педагогических наук
доцент кафедры русской и зарубежной филологии Владимирского государственного университета имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых
В. И. Горбатов

Издается по решению редакционно-издательского совета ВлГУ

Селиверстова, О. А.
С29 Lexicology = Лексикология : учеб.-практ. пособие / О. А. Селиверстова ; Владим. гос. ун-т им. А. Г. и Н. Г. Столетовых. – Владимир : Изд-во ВлГУ, 2021. – 108 с.
ISBN 978-5-9984-1197-7

Включает в себя теоретический материал, задания для самоконтроля, темы для дополнительного чтения, а также упражнения для практических занятий.

Разработано для студентов вузов, обучающихся по направлению 45.03.02 – Лингвистика.

Рекомендовано для формирования профессиональных компетенций в соответствии с ФГОС ВО.

Библиогр.: 15 назв.

УДК 811.111
ББК 81.2(Англ)

ISBN 978-5-9984-1197-7

FOREWORD

You have dealt with the lexical system of the language so far to convey ideas and express yourself. So, the English word stock has a tool of communication rather than an object of theoretical studies and research. The course of Lexicology seeks to open up a new world of word-study showing the lexical system from different perspective. Together we will look at the nature of a word as a phenomenon, its structure and formation; we will spend quite a bit of time and effort to discern its semantic structure from the standpoint of semasiology; we will travel back in time and space to trace etymology and evolution of word stock; will find out how languages borrow words from each other and if they give them back, and finally we will get acquainted with mysterious -glishes and reveal their secrets, as well as those of dialects.

Stay tuned! Keep your eyes glued and your mind open. Ask questions whenever you feel curious about something and have wonderful time exploring lexicology and term study!

Unit 1
INTRODUCTION TO LEXICOLOGY

Vocabulary studies go back to the very first reflections on language, but as a scientific study, lexicology is relatively new. D. Didro and d'Alamber first mentioned it in 1765 in a French encyclopedia. Nevertheless, lexicology is developing rapidly. The term *lexicology* comes from two Greek words – *lexicos* (relating to a word) and *logos* (learning). So, lexicology is a branch of linguistics studying the word and a system of words either in any human language (*general lexicology*), or in a given language like English, Russian or Swahili (*special lexicology*). It is well known that scientific investigation of words is done in all linguistic disciplines: Stylistics, Grammar, Phonetics, Sociolinguistics and Pragmatics. But lexicology has its own object – it studies semantics and word structure, word-stock system of a language. In other words, the object of lexicology is lexicon.

Today there are three major understandings of the term *lexicon*: lexicographic, lexicological and cognitological. In lexicography (the science and practice of dictionary compiling) the term lexicon is used to denote all the words of a particular language with their meanings presented in a dictionary, usually in a form of an alphabetical list. The word *lexicon* is very often used to denote a dictionary itself, especially of an ancient language (e.g. Lexicon of Greek, Lexicon of Hebrew, The Old English Lexicon). In traditional lexicology the term lexicon is viewed as a synonym for *lexical system*, *or lexis*, or *the vocabulary* of a language – one of the three language components alongside with grammatical and phonetic components that are studied by grammar (morphology and syntax) and phonetics (phonology). One should also be aware that lexicology as a separate branch of linguistics is more characteristic of European tradition.

In the American linguistic tradition going back to Bloomfield, *lexicon* was viewed as a list of irregularities that have to be memorized. American linguistic studies are developing a different (integral) model of a language, and problems of vocabulary, phonology and semantics are

usually treated within one branch of linguistics – grammar. Within this approach, however, the major emphasis is usually put on syntax. In cognitive science mostly developed by American scholars the term *lexicon* is viewed not as a mere physically visible or in some other way perceptible list of dictionary words that one should memorize. It is primarily a psychological reality, a very complicated, diversely and specifically organized part of a language structure we keep in our mind. It is mental lexicon – a part of our language competence that is close but not equivalent to an alphabetical list of words.

In modern lexicological and cognitive literature lexicon is believed to have a generative character and to include not only a list of units but also a list of rules according to which they are created.

Traditional lexicology primarily studies lexicon as a vocabulary component of a language understood as a specific semiotic structure and a system used for communication. Mental lexicon and vocabulary acquisition are studied in psycholinguistics, cognitive sciences and cognitive lexicology, a new field. It should also be mentioned that the division between special and general, descriptive and historical, traditional and cognitive lexicology and even between lexicology and lexicography is to a certain extent arbitrary. One cannot describe and explain the current organization of vocabulary in a language without the list of lexical units presented in dictionaries or without taking into account its development which is studied by historical linguistics. It is not possible to fulfill the tasks of specialized lexicology without the knowledge of language universals and major regularities discovered by general lexicology. It is hardly possible to study word meaning without making reference to general conceptual knowledge. Vice versa, general lexicology searching for lexical universals and major regularities cannot do without data on vocabulary organization of particular languages. Likewise, historical lexicology investigating changes cannot do without studying lexicon at several synchronic periods. Cognitive lexicology makes wide use of external knowledge of vocabulary systems gained by traditional lexicology and lexicography.

So, the object of our course is lexicon, or word-stock in modern English – one of the youngest world languages, the language spoken by more than 300 million people around the world as their native language and one of foreign languages most frequently taught as a compulsory subject at school.

The major aim of this course is systematic description of modern English word-stock, or vocabulary. The course will describe the characteristic features and the origin of English words, their specific morphological structures, the most important word building means and major ways of replenishing the English vocabulary, peculiarities of meaning of English words, their relation to one another in a language system and their combination with one another in speech, major standard variants of English, and traditions of British and American lexicography.

Lexical units

A lexical unit is a constituent unit of lexicon, no matter if it is understood as an external or internal lexical system, presented in a word-book or a theoretical dictionary stored in our mental lexicon. Each lexical unit has individual phonological, morphological, semantic and syntactic properties. Lexical units are two-faceted, having meaning and form, and readymade, registered in a dictionary and reproducible in speech. Thus, they differ from other linguistic units like single-faceted phonetic units (phonemes) – the smallest language units that do not have meaning of their own, and from two-faceted syntactic units (free word combinations or sentences), which are created according to syntax rules for every speech occasion and cannot be listed in any dictionary.

The smallest two-faceted ready-made lexical unit is a morpheme (e.g.: *pre-*, *work-*, *-er*). Lexicology deals mainly with derivational, or word building morphemes producing new words. Grammatical, or form building morphemes, or inflections, expressing number, gender, person or tense, are added to stems later, when all derivative processes are already complete (*work -er + -s*). They serve to express a grammatical form and a morphosyntactic category of the word (e.g.: the form-building morpheme-*s* expresses the plurality of the word workers and demands the plural form of

the following verb, e.g.: *are*). In some languages, like English, with a limited system of inflectional morphemes and an abundance of monomorphic words (*work, desk, sing*), derivational morphemes very often look like autonomous units coinciding with words into which a sentence can be segmented (*I like fruit*), and many linguists believe morphemes to be the central vocabulary units.

However, in inflectional, agglutinating or incorporating languages morphemes enjoy far less central and independent status (cf.: Дев-очк-а чит-а-ет книг-у in Russian, where the root morphemes are used together with word-forming or grammatical affixes, or the declension of the word) That is why the majority of linguists believe that morphemes in any language have their true significance only in relation to the words in which they appear, and that makes a word, not a morpheme, the central unit of lexicon.

The question, however, is what do we understand by the term *word* in lexicology? Word is the most typical, central two-faceted ready-made lexical unit and it is most easily apprehended psychologically and perceptually. However, no adequate definition of a word is available so far.

Orthographic definition of a word as any sequence of letters between spaces is not enough, because spelling just registers what is understood, and then, in many nonalphabetical languages, like Chinese, the characters give no clue as to where a word starts and where it ends.

Morphological definition of a word as a minimal free morpheme may also be criticized, as it is not always clear what a morpheme is and which morpheme should be called free, especially in some English compounds.

Conceptual definition of a word as a linguistic counterpart of a single concept is not enough either, as one and the same concept may be expressed by one or two words (e.g.: *die* and *join the majority*; *toothpaste, tooth-paste* and *tooth past*e). Vice versa, one word may express different concepts when it is polysemantic, and it is hardly possible to give any single definition of such complicated phenomenon as a word. Segmentation into words includes many strategies, phonetic and semantic, morphological and syntactic. The use of only one of them may lead to different results. A word may consist of one morpheme (*bag*) or several of

them attached by special derivation (word-formation) rules specific for each language (*anti-de-mobil-iz-ing feeling-s*). Sometimes segmenting a word into morphemes is not easy, but understanding the word as the central lexical unit allows us to locate morphosyntactic categories fused in one form.

As we can see, the term *word* is ambiguous. That is why instead of the ambiguous term *word* it is more convenient and preferable to use the term *lexeme* that unites different grammatical forms of a word. When we look up words in a dictionary, we search lexemes rather than words. And yet the term *word* is often used in lexicology to name a central lexical unit, and in this book, we shall use the term *lexeme*, the key term for lexicology as synonymous with the term *word*.

The biggest ready-made two-faceted lexical unit is called a set expression, or a phraseological unit, or an idiom. It is made up of at least two words, or lexemes, and the meaning of each is different from the meaning of the complex unit. These lexical units (morpheme, word and phraseological unit) differ in size, constitutive capacities, autonomy and ability to perform a naming function, one of the most important functions of a language.

Morphemes are the smallest lexical units, and phraseological units, or idioms, are the largest ones. Morphemes have the greatest constitutive capacity. They add much to the generative character of lexicon but they are not autonomous in naming concepts.

Lexical meaning in morphemes is of a general, not individual character as in words (it doesn‘t concern root morphemes though, they have highly individualized lexical meaning). Word, unlike morpheme, is an autonomous two-faceted ready-made lexical unit, and can be used in isolation to perform a naming function. Unlike an idiom, a word is the smallest autonomous two-faceted ready-made unit with a naming function that makes it the basic lexical unit. However, the difference between a morpheme and a word, a word and a phrase or an idiom is not always clear-cut (cf.: clever-er and more clever; make-up and make up; uppermost and upper class, clear-cut or clear cut). So far there are no technical tests or common-sense definitions that would be accurate enough to distinguish

between these units. So, the constituents of lexicon, or lexical units are lexemes, or words, word building morphemes and phraseological units, though there are no distinct boundaries between them.

All lexical units may be mono- and polysemantic, and conventional meanings of a lexical unit enter the lexicon, too. The rules that form lexicon and the kinds of interrelations within each type of a lexical unit are far less obvious. Establishing them is the greatest task of lexicology.

The term *vocabulary* is used to denote the system formed by the sum total of all the words and word equivalents [Arnold, 1986]. It is an adaptive system adjusting itself to the changing requirements and conditions of human communication and cultural surrounding. A lexicon is a list of words in a language or that a particular person knows – a vocabulary – along with some knowledge of how each word is used (a kind of mental dictionary).

A lexicon may be general or domain-specific; we might have, for example, of several thousand common words of English and German, or the lexicon of the technical terms of dentistry in some language. The words that are of interest are usually open-class or content words, such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives, rather than closed-class or grammatical function words, such as articles, pronouns, and prepositions, whose behavior is more tightly bound to the grammar of the language. A lexicon may also include multi-word expressions such as set phrases (by and large), phrasal verbs (tear apart), and other common expressions (Merry Christmas!).

Vocabulary of any language is not uniform. Word groups form vocabulary strata. Vocabulary stratification occurs according to the following criteria:

According to the sphere of use, vocabulary can be classified into:

1. neutral: *mother, dinner, book, lamp, watch, smile, red, young, etc.*;

2. stylistically marked, used in particular conditions and spheres, for example:

a) poetic vocabulary: *rosy-fingered (dawn), slumber (of death), amorous (causes), brethren, (noble) steed, sublime, behold, enchanted, the 2nd person singular pronoun thou (thy, thine)*;

b) professional vocabulary: *stocks, to lease, loan, interest rate, asset purchases, bridge bank, net income (banking)*;

c) dialects and regional variations of language: *can (Am) – tin (Br), eraser (Am) – rubber (Br), highway (Am) – motorway (Br), cookie (Am) – biscuit (Br), diaper (Am) – nappy (Br), fries (Am) – chips (Br)*;

d) sociolects: vocabulary used by different social classes, for example *dig (to understand/appreciate), tote, bad-mouth, gray dude (white man'),kitchen (referring to the particularly curly or kinky hair at the nape of the neck),* are from African American Vernacular English. This sociolect has contributed various words and phrases to other varieties of English, *including jazz, chill out, main, squeeze, soul, funky, and threads*;

e) ageisms, for example youth slang: *hammered, wreckage, battered, swilled, sloshed, polluted (intoxicated by drink or drugs*);

f) idiolects: the vocabulary specific of a certain person; some famous people's vocabularies (Raeganisms, Bushisms) have been of particular interest to the linguists.

According to emotional colouring, words can be neutral and emotionally coloured (or loaded): *bureaucrat vs public servant, anti-life / pro-abortion vs pro-choice, regime vs government.*

Diachronically, one can distinguish between:

1) neologisms: *blog, punked, adultolescence, to unfriend, to google, prequel, plus-size, consumerization, etc.*;

2) archaic words: *thee, steed, hereunto, thereof, alack, etc.*

According to their origin words can be

1) native: *father, stone, swear, work, sit, two, above, life, baby, back, etc.*;

2) borrowed: *machine, datum, alumnus, bourgeois*;

3) international: *telephone, president, organization, algebra etc.*

The lexical system of language is very dynamic. The boundaries between word groups are quite flexible. One and the same word can (with different meanings and uses) belong to different word strata.

As the vocabulary or the lexical system of the language forms the system of the language as other systems, its study in lexicology should not be separated from the other constituents of the system, so it has close ties

with other branches of linguistics. Lexicology is only one possible level of language analysis, others being phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics and none of them can be studied successfully without reference to the others. All these different levels of analysis interact with one another in various ways, and when we use language, we call on all simultaneously and unconsciously.

There is a relationship between lexicology and phonetics since phonetics is concerned with the study of the word, with the sound-form of the word. Lexicology is connected with grammar as words presented in a dictionary bear a definite relation to the grammatical system of the language because they belong to some part of speech and conform to some lexico-grammatical characteristics of the word class to which they belong. Lexicology is linked with the history of the language since the latter investigates the changes and the development of the vocabulary of the language. Stylistics studies such problems concerning lexicology as the problems of meaning, synonymy, differentiation of the vocabulary according to the sphere of communication.

The extra-linguistic factors that influence the usage and development of language are studied in sociolinguistics. It may be defined as the study of influence produced upon language by various social factors; this influence is particularly strong in lexicon as the word-stock of a language directly and immediately reacts to whatever happens in the social life of the speech community. The new language of cyberspace (‘cyber vocabulary’) can be a very good example of the process. In the 1980s and 90s, a wide range of cybercompounds relating to the use of the Internet and virtual reality appeared in the language: *cyberphobia, cyberpunk, cyberspace, cyberart, cyberhippy, cyberlawyer, cyberworld, cybermat, cybercop, cyberchar, cyber-community, cybernaut, cybrarian*. Many words discussing technology are coined with *byte, net, mega, web* and *digit*: digitized cyberads, gigabyte, megalomania. Thus, in contrast with phonology, morphology and syntax, lexicology is a sociolinguistic discipline, as it is based on establishing interrelations between the language, the social life and conventions of language use [Бабич, 2010].

Lexicology exists in different forms. The constituent parts of lexicology are its specific sub-branches: ***etymology, semantics, phraseology, lexicography,*** etc., each of which has its own aim of study, its own object of investigation, and its own methods of linguistic research.

General Lexicology carries out the general study of vocabulary, irrespective of the specific feature of any particular language and it studies linguistic phenomena and properties common to all languages, i.e. the so-called language and linguistic universals.

Special Lexicology investigates characteristic peculiarities in the vocabulary of a given language. Special lexicology may be *historical* and *descriptive. Contrastive Lexicology* works out the theoretical basis on which the vocabularies of different languages can be compared and described. The language is viewed in two basically different ways: historical (diachronic, Greek dia – 'through', chronos – 'time') and descriptive, which is synchronic (Greek syn – 'with, together'). *Historical Lexicology* or *Etymology* (Greek etumon 'primary or basic word, original form of a word') studies the evolution of the vocabulary and its elements: origin, change, development, linguistic and extralinguistic factors modifying their structure, meaning and usage. *Descriptive Lexicology* deals with the vocabulary of a given language at a given stage of its development. *Phraseology* is the branch of lexicology specializing in word groups which are characterized by stability of structure and transferred meaning. *Terminology* studies different sides of terms and lexicology gives methods and the scientific apparatus for that. *Lexicography* is the science and practice of compiling dictionaries; lexicology works out a serious scientific foundation for it. *Corpus semantics* studies how words are used in text and discourse and uses observations of use as evidence of meaning [Ilienko, 2020].

SELF-CHECK TASKS

1. ***Explain the meaning the following words and word combinations*****:** Syntagmatic relationships, paradigmatic relationships, general lexicology, special lexicology, corpus semantics, typology, external structure of the

word, internal structure of the word, lexicography, general lexicology, particular lexicology, lexicology, lexicon, phraseology, terminology, vocabulary, word, word-group.

2. ***Answer the following questions***

1. What does lexicology study?
2. What is lexicon? Speak about the three approaches.
3. What is a morpheme?
4. Why is it difficult to define *a word*?
5. What is a lexical unit?
6. What is the connection between lexicology and other branches of linguistics?
7. How can the term *word* be defined?
8. What groups of words can be distinguished according to the sphere of use, according to emotional colouring, according to their origin, diachronically?
9. What extralinguistic factors impact the word-stock of a language?
10. How is lexicology related to other branches of linguistics?

PRACTICE TASKS

Provide 2 – 3 examples of different groups of words other than given in the book.

According to the sphere of use, vocabulary can be classified into:

1. Neutral.
2. Stylistically marked:

a) poetic vocabulary;
b) professional vocabulary;
c) dialects and regional variations of language;
d) sociolects: vocabulary used by different social classes, for example;
e) ageisms;
f) idiolects.

According to emotional colouring:

1. Neutral.
2. Emotionally coloured (or loaded) vocabulary.

Diachronically, one can distinguish between:

1. Neologisms.
2. Archaic words.

FUTHER READING

1. Ayto, J. Twentieth Century Words / J. Ayto. – Oxford, OUP, 1999.
2. Crystal, D. English vocabulary. The Structure of the Lexicon: The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language / D. Crystal. – Cambridge University Press, 1995.
3. Fromkin, V. An Introduction to Language / V. Fromkin, R. Rodman. – Dryden Pr Pub, 1999.
4. Антрушина, Г. В. Лексикология английского языка / Г. В. Антрушина, О. В. Афанасьева, Н. Н. Морозова. – М. : ДРОФА, 2004.
5. Арнольд, И. В. Лексикология современного английского языка / И. В. Арнольд. – М. : Высш. шк., 1986.
6. Апресян, В. Ю. Языковая картина мира и системная лексикография / В. Ю. Апресян [и др.] ; [Ю. Д. Апресян (отв. ред.)]. – М. : Языки славянских культур, 2006.
7. Апресян, Ю. Д. Избранные труды / Ю. Д. Апресян. – М. : Шк. «Языки рус. культуры», 1995. – Т. 2: Интегральное описание языка и системная лексикография. – (Язык).
8. Бацевич, Ф. С. Очерки по функциональной лексикологии / Ф. С. Бацевич, Т. А. Космеда. – Львов : Світ, 1997.
9. Блумфилд, Л. Язык / Л. Блумфилд. – М. : Прогресс, 1968.

Unit 2
MORPHOLOGY. WORD FORMATION

The term *word* denotes the basic unit of a language of a given language resulting from the association of a particular meaning with a particular group of sounds capable of a particular grammatical employment [Arnold, 1986]. A word therefore is simultaneously a ***semantic*** and ***grammatical*** and ***phonological*** unit. It is the smallest unit of the language which can stand alone as a complete utterance. The phoneme, morpheme and sentence have their fixed place in the language system, whereas the word belongs both to the morphological and to the syntactical and lexical plans. The word is a bridge between morphology and syntax, making the transition from morphology to syntax gradual and imperceptible.

Every word is a semantic, grammatical and phonological unity. It is used for the purpose of communication and its content or meaning reflects human notions. Concepts fixed in the meaning of words are formed as generalized reflections of reality, therefore in signifying them words reflect reality in their content. The acoustic aspect of the word serves to name objects of reality. When a word first comes into existence, it is built out according to the existing patterns of the elements available in the language [Бабич, 2010]. “The word is the fundamental unit of language. It is a dialectal unity of form and content. Its content and meaning is not identical to notion, but it may reflect human notions, and in this sense may be considered as the form of their existence” [Арнольд, 1986].

The term word-group denotes a group of words which exists in the language as a ready-made unit, has the unity of meaning, the unity of syntactical function (as loose as a goose – ‘clumsy’, a predicative). The modern approach to word studies is based on distinguishing between the external and the internal structures of the word.

By the external structure we mean its morphological structure. All these morphemes constitute the external structure of the word. The internal structure of the word, or its meaning, is nowadays commonly referred to as the word’s semantic structure. Words can serve the purposes of human communication solely due to their meanings. The area of lexicology specializing in the semantic studies is called semantics.

Another structural aspect of the word is its unity. The word possesses both external (or formal unity) and semantic unity. Formal unity of the word is sometimes inaccurately interpreted as indivisibility. But the word is not strictly speaking indivisible. Yet, it component morphemes are permanently linked together in opposition to word-groups, both free and with fixed contexts, whose components possess a certain structural freedom [Антрушина и др., 2000].

On the syntagmatic level, the semantic structure of the word is analyzed in its linear relationships with neighbouring words in connected speech. A word enters into syntagmatic (linear) combinatorial relationships with other lexical units, that can form its context, serving to identify and distinguish its meaning as lexical units are context-dependent [Арнольд, 1986].

Using syntagmatic analysis we analyse syntax or surface structure – one element selects the other element either to precede or to follow it (e.g., the definite article selects a noun and not a verb). For example, in phrases *ironing board, bed and board, board of trustees, go on board* the word board acquires different meaning in different context.

On the ***paradigmatic*** level, the word is studied in its relationship with other words in the vocabulary system. A word enters into contrastive paradigmatic relations with all other words that can occur in the same context and can be contrasted to it. Therefore, a word can be studied in comparison with other words of similar meaning, of opposite meaning or of different stylistic characteristics. Paradigmatic analysis is the analysis of paradigms (e.g. substituting words of the same type or class to calibrate shifts in connotation).

Morphology

Morphology is a branch of linguistics that studies morphemes. The morpheme is the smallest meaningful non-segmentable parts of words. Lexicology is closely connected with morphology. Moreover, it includes part of morphology as its integral part because one of its objectives is investigating all meaningful units in a language.

Types of meaning in morphemes

Linguists have used the term morpheme for over a century. What part of a word can be called a morpheme remains a question, however. On purely formal grounds a morpheme is identified as a segment regularly recurring in other lexemes. But is cat- in cattle, or -able in table a morpheme? Definitely not, as the recurring segments must have the same meaning to be called a morpheme. Vice versa, semantically identical segments, having different distribution, may not have identical forms, as in price – precious. Morphemes are identified by a combination of structural, distributional and semantic criteria taking into account the meaning of the segment under consideration.

It is believed, that some word building morphemes may have lexical meaning, both ***denotational*** (especially revealed in root-morphemes, like in *girl-*) and ***connotational*** (the suffixes in piglet and horsy have diminutive and endearing meaning). Connotational meaning may range from positive to derogative.

Besides lexical meaning, many morphemes (except roots) may *possess part-of-speech meaning* (*govern-ment, teach-er*) as all words do.

In contrast to words and to inflectional endings like *-ed* for the Past Indefinite, word building morphemes do not possess grammatical meaning. For example, the root morpheme *-man-* in *man-ly, un-man-ly*, possesses neither grammatical meaning of case and number, nor part-of-speech meaning, while the word *a man* does.

Besides there ***is differential*** and ***distributional*** meaning. Differential meaning serves to distinguish one word from another (*over-cook, undercook, pre-cook*) and distributional meaning is the meaning of morpheme arrangement in a word (certain morphemes usually follow or precede the root as in *uneffective*, some morphemes may occupy different positions like in *ring-finger* and *finger-ring*, *pianoplayer* and *player-piano*, *billboard* and *board bill*. But difference in their arrangement provides differences in lexical meanings of the nominative units they form).

Types of morphemes

Semantically English derivational morphemes, which here are called morphemes for short, are divided into ***roots*** – lexical-semantic centres of words without which they do not exist, and affixes – ***prefixes*** and ***suffixes*** with modifying meaning. Both roots and affixes have definite lexical (denotational and connotational) types of meaning (*-dad-, -let, -y*). Some morphemes may have all major types of meaning characteristics, like *-ist* in *philologist*, while some have predominantly lexical (*over-*, *under-*) or functional meanings (*-ment, -dom*).

But some of the stem building morphemes called pseudo-morphemes are semantically deficient. Word segments like re- in *receive* or *con-* in *contain* bear no meaningful relation to the morphemes *re-* in *rewrite* and *con-* in *confirm*. They can hardly be ascribed definite lexical or functional meaning in modern English, though diachronically they were usually full morphemes in the language of origin (usually Latin or Greek). Only differential and distributional types of meanings are presented there. They may be observed in combinations with other segments forming meaningful words (cf.: *re-* in *retain*, *remain*; *con-* in *conclude*, *conceive*), and thus may be regarded as units similar to prefixes (pseudo-prefixes). The remaining segments of these words like -ceive in receive and -tain in contain are also observed in many other words (for example, perceive, detain) but as radical elements they are also problematic for the same semantic reason.

Structurally morphemes fall into three groups: ***free, bound and semi-free (semi-bound).*** A free morpheme coincides with a word form such as *friend* in *friendship*. The majority of English roots are free morphemes. A bound morpheme is always a part of a word (*friend-ship*). The major part of affixes and some roots, especially in loan words such as *histor-* in *history*, *cor-* in cord*ial*, or *not-* in *notion*, are bound. Some bound morphemes seldom or never occur in other words. They are unique morphemes (*ham-let, Notting-ham, Prince-ton*) and are mostly observed in native words that became partially demotivated.

Besides free and bound there are also semi-bound morphemes that can occur both as free and bound (*to do well* and *well-done, take a half of it* and *half-eaten*).

One more specific group of word segments is made up by the so-called ***combining forms*** that originally were Latin or Greek words or parts of words. These combining forms are observed in neoclassical compounds (*phonology, photographic*, *telephone*, *telegram*) that never existed in the language of borrowing. Their status in English is not quite clear yet. Some of the combining forms used as the first elements in complexes never occur as free words and thus look more like prefixes as *pan-* in *Pan-American, panchromatic, panleucomia*. Some of them are predominantly used as the second elements in complexes and look more like suffixes as *-algia* in *neuralgia, cardialgia*. The majority of them may be used both as the first and the second elements of complexes as graph- and log- in graphology and logograph, phonogram and gramophone. These elements in complexes do not have part-of-speech meaning but they have explicit lexical meaning and may be regarded as roots. Yet they are not free roots as in *finger-ring* and *ring-finger*. They also differ in derivational potential, semantics and structural independence from bound roots like *anx-* in *anxious*, *anxiety,* and hence their special status of combining forms.

There are also specific segments that recur in many words and vaguely suggest of their lexical meaning, like [fl] in words denoting movement: *flash, flicker, flame,* and *flare*. Yet they can hardly be called morphemes.

Variants of forms in morphemes (allomorphs)

In different contexts morphemes may have different phonemic shapes (cf.: *please – pleasure – pleasant*; *fuse – fusion; school – scholar*; *number – numerous*; *compel – compulsory*, *part – partial*, *etc.*). However, these differently sounding parts may be recognized as morphophonemic variants of the same morphemes due to semantic and distributional criteria. These representations, alternates of morphemes, are called ***allomorphs***.

Allomorphs may involve vowel and/or consonantal morphophonemic alternations as demonstrated in the given above examples. The conditions under which the same morpheme derives two or more differently sounding forms are still not quite clear. Many morphophonemic alternations and allophones as their results may be accounted for etymological reasons (cf.: peace [L fr. OFr] – pacifist [L]), phonological (sound change and the Great

Vowel Shift as in *divine – divinity*), analogical (*metricity* will be pronounced as *electricity*), and even exceptional factors (as in *equate – equation* where we observe *t – alternation* instead of the more productive alternation t – as in *relate – relation*).

It is necessary to be aware of this fact and to recognize a morpheme in its different phonemic shapes in different words while making morphological and derivational analyses of words.

Types of word-segmentability

There are three main types of word-segmentability:

1) ***Complete segmentability*** takes place when segmentation into morphemes (free or bound) does not cause any doubt for structural or semantic reasons as in *teach-er*. The constituent morphemes of the word recur with the same meaning in a number of other words: the free root morpheme – *teach-* is observed in the verb *to teach* and noun *teaching*, and the suffix -er takes place in many English words like *work-er, paint-er*. Segmentation into morphemes of such words as *stud-ent* and *nat-ive* may also be considered as complete. Though the roots in them are never free but bound morphemes they possess a clear lexical meaning and are recurrent in other words: *study, studio* and *nature, native, natural*.

2) ***Conditional word-segmentability*** is observed when segmentation is doubtful for semantic reasons, as the segments (pseudo-morphemes) regularly occurring in other words can hardly be ascribed any definite lexical meaning (*re-tain, de-tain; con-ceive, de-ceive, per-ceive, re-ceive; ac cept, ex cept, con cept, per cept, pre cept*).

3) ***Defective segmentability*** takes place in cases when segmentation is doubtful for structural reasons because one of the components (a unique morpheme) has a specific lexical meaning but seldom or never occurs in other words (*ham-let, pock-et, dis-may, straw-berry*).

Types of words based on their morphemic structure

All words can be classified as ***monomorphic*** or ***polymorphic*** according to the number of their morphemes.

Polymorphic words can be subdivided into ***monoradical*** and ***polyradical***. Monoradical words can be *monoradical suffixal* (teacher,

student), *monoradical prefixal* (overteach, overstudy), and *prefixal-radical* suffixal (superteacher, superstudent, beheaded).

Polyradical words can also be subdivided into *polyradical proper* (head-master, blackboard), *polyradical suffixal* (head-teacher, graduate-student, boarding-school, beekeeper), *polyradical prefixal* (super-headmaster), and polyradical prefixal-suffixal (super-headteacher, super-light-mindedness).

Derivation

Morphological analysis reveals the number of meaningful constituents in a word and their usual sequence. But it does not answer the question: How is the word constructed?

In some simple cases like singer the results of morphological analysis (the word may be classified as a monoradical-suffixal word) and of derivational analysis (the word is a suffixational derivative) are very similar. But in many cases they are not. Words having the same morphological structure like polyradical suffixal words *do-gooder* and *dress-maker* may be derived in completely different ways: by means of suffixation in *do-gooder: (do good)+-er or (v+adj)+-er*, but by means of word composition in *dress-maker: dress-+(make+-er) or n +(v+-er).* (Cf. also prefixal-radical-suffixal words unmanly and discouragement where the first word is derived by means of prefixation *un-+(man+-ly)* but the second one – by means of suffixation *dis-+courage+-ment).* So, it is important alongside morphological analysis of a word to carry out its derivational (word-formation) analysis in order to determine the type and arrangement of IC there i.e., to establish a word‘s derivative (derivational) structure. Restoring a derivative structure in a word helps to answer the question how new words are formed, or derived.

The difference between morphological and derivational analysis is not only in the aims and results of the procedure but also in the units they operate with. While the basic elements in morphological analysis are morphemes (the ultimate meaningful units in a word), the basic elements of a derivative structure of a word are immediate constituents – a derivational base and a derivational affix, as well as a derivational pattern

of their arrangement. A ***derivational base*** is the word constituent to which a rule of word-formation is applied.

Structurally, derivational bases fall into three classes:

1) bases that coincide with morphological stems of different degrees of complexity. A derivational base which is the starting point for new words may coincide with a simple morphological stem as the derivational base *father-* used for creation of the verb *to father* coincides with a simple morphological stem *father-* which is a starting pont for such noun forms as *fathers, father's*.

A derivational base may coincide with a derived morphological stem as *computer-* in *computer-ize* or even compound morphological stem as week-end- in the word weekender. This class of derivational bases is the biggest;

2) bases that coincide with word forms as the base known- in *un-known* or *dancing- in a dancing- girl*;

3) bases that coincide with word groups of different degrees of stability as the derivational base *narrow mind-* in *narrow-mind-ed* or *blue eye(s)-* in *blue-eye-d*, or *second rate-* in *second-rateness*. The important peculiarity of a derivational base in contrast to a morphological stem is that it is monosemantic.

Rules of word-formation are applied to a derivational base representing only one meaning of a polysemantic stem. For example, the derivational base *bed* in the compound word *a flower-bed* has only one meaning: *a flat or level surface as in a plot of ground prepared for plants* while the word *bed* is highly polysemantic.

Another component of a derivative structure is a ***derivational affix*** which is added to a derivational base. Derivational affixes (prefixes and suffixes) are highly selective to the etymological, phonological, structural-semantic properties of derivational bases. The suffix *-ance/-ence*, for example, never occurs after *s* or *z* (cf.: *disturb-ance*, but: *organiz-ation*). The prefix *in-* has limitations, too: they say *insecure, inconvenience* but *non-conformist, disobedience*. Or, even though the combining abilities of the adjectival suffix *-ish* are vast they are not unlimited: it is possible to

say, for example, *boyish*, *bookish*, even *monkeyish* and *sevenish*, but not, for example, *enemish*.

The conditions under which affixes of a certain type may be attached to a certain derivational base and the limits of possible use of affixes are still not clear and are being actively investigated. ***A derivational pattern*** – the third component of s derivational structure – is a regular meaningful arrangement of IC, which can be expressed by a formula denoting their part of speech, lexical-semantic class and individual semantics. For example: *pref + adj → Adj (adj + n) + -ed → Adj* or being written in a more abstract way not taking into account the final results: *pref + adj (adj + n) + suf* or vice versa, taking into account the final results and with individualization of some of the IC, like in: *re- + v → V* or *pref + read → V*.

Like derivational affixes, derivational patterns may be productive and nonproductive. For example, a number of patterns of different productivity are used to lexicalize concepts denoting a doer of an action*: v + -er → N* is a highly productive derivational pattern (*teach → teacher, build → builder, sing → singer)*; *n + -ist →N* is quite a productive pattern (*piano → pianist*, *art → artist*), but *n + -ian → N* (*Christ → christian*; *politics/policy → politian*; *comedy → comedian*) is active though not a productive pattern because a limited number of words are derived according to it.

One should also be aware that the meaning of a derived word is usually not a mere sum of meanings of all the constituents mentioned above, though it sometimes is, as in *doer – one who does*. Derived words usually have an additional idiomatic component of their own (word-formation meaning) that is not observed in either of the constituent components (cf.: the meanings of such derived words like *undo* infml *to loosen or unfasten*; e.g.: *Can you undo my dress at the back for me?'*; *a builder* is not just *the one that builds* but also *one that contracts to build and supervises building operations*.

Derived words enter the lexicon, both lexicographical and mental, mainly due to this idiomatic component that makes them semantically special, demands their memorization and provides easy retrieval from memory in use and quick recognition.

Derivative types of words

Derivationally all the words in a language are subdivided into ***simple (non derived) words*** *(or* ***simplexes****),* and ***derived*** *(or* ***complexes,*** *or* ***derivatives****).* The majority of the word-stock in any language is made up of derived words. The most common source lexeme for a derived word in English is nouns (*child* (n) – *childhood* (n) – *childless* (adj). Adjectives and verbs are quite active in deriving new words, too (e.g.: *green* (adj) – greenish (adj) – *greenness* (n); *write* (v) – *write off* (v) – *writer* (n)).

The least likely sources for a derived word are adverbs and the lexemes of minor word classes like articles and pronouns. In English there are three major types of word-formation: ***zero derivation***, or ***conversion***, ***affixation*** and ***composition***, or ***compounding***. There are also some minor types of wordformation: back-formation, shortening, blending, extension of proper names, and some others.

Derivatives may be qualified according to the latest type of word-formation process and the total number of derivational acts that were necessary for their formation. The number of derivational processes acts that took place in a word forms its degree of derivation. The ***monomorphic*** words *read, dead, table,* and even ***polymorphic*** words of conditional and defective types of segmentability like *deceive* or *hamlet* are simplexes. They are nonderived from the point of view of modern English because their derivational processes have either been deleted, forgotten and are no longer perceived, or their derivation has never taken place in English. The number and character of borrowed words with similar segments is not grounds for perceiving them as derived. The nouns *reader* (*v+-er→N*) and *reading* (*v+-ing→N*) as well as the adjective *readable* (*v+-able→Adj*) are complexes: they may be qualified as ***suffixational derivatives*** of the first degree of derivation (*v+suf*). The verb *reread* is a ***prefixational derivative*** of the first degree of derivation (prf+v). The noun *reading-lamp (a lamp to give light for reading)* by‘ is a compound of the second degree of derivation. There are two derivational processes – suffixation and composition, the last being composition – and it can be seen in the derivational pattern of the word: *(v+-ing)+n→N*.

However, there are similarly looking words which have different status. For example the word *reading* which is marked in dictionaries as a noun and that means that a word-formation process took place here. In contrast, *a dancing-girl* is a derivative of the first degree because *dancing* is only a form of the word to dance, not a separate word, and it is not registered in the dictionary as a special entry. The adjective *unpredictable*, according to its derivational pattern *un-+(v+-able)→Adj*, is a prefixational derivative of the second degree. Though the number of affixes in *un- +pre- +-dict-+able* is greater than in the word *(read-+ing)+lamp* discussed above, on the derivational level of analysis these words may be regarded to be equal in degrees of derivation because the derivational base predict is a simplex in modern English. The noun *aircraft-carrier* is a compound derivative of the third degree, the last derivational process being composition, and the previous two derivational processes being composition and suffixation: *(n+n)+(v+-er)→N*. The noun denationalization *{de- +[(n+-al)+-ize]}+-tion→N* appeared as the result of four acts of derivational processes and may be qualified as a suffixational derivative of the fourth degree of derivation. Since the prefix *de-* may also be attached to the noun with the suffix *-tion*, this word may also be qualified as a prefixational derivative of the fourth degree of derivation *de+{[(n+-al)+-ize]}+-tion→N* (cf.: its even more complicated morphemic structure including six bound morphemes: *de-, nat-, -ion, -al, -ize and -tion*).

Theoretically any derived word may become a basis for a new derivative. But in practice there are many restrictions on further derivation. For example, some affixes, like *-ness, -ship, -ity* close the derivational process: they do not allow other affixes to be added to the derivational bases. Furthermore, with each act of derivation the word loses its derivational potential. As a result of these restrictions and some other restrictions, the most common derivatives in English are derivatives of the first and second degree.

Word-formation in modern English

Affixation is the formation of new words by adding derivative affixes to derivational bases. Since the Old English period affixation has always been one of the most important resources of vocabulary replenishment, though affixes differ greatly in the number of the words they cause to be derived. According to the number of words they create all affixes may be classified into ***productive***, as *un-, re-, -er, -ish* and ***non-productive***, as, for example, the affixes *demi-, -ard, -hood*.

From the point of view of their current participation in word-formation processes the derivational affixes are divided into ***active and non-active***, or dead affixes as *for-* in *forgive, forbid, forget*.

Other classifications of affixes may also be made from the point of view: of their origin into ***native*** *(-dom, -hood, -ship; under-, over-, out-*) and ***borrowed*** *(-able, -ist, -ism; dis-, inter-, re-, non-),* of motivation into ***motivated*** *(-like, -some, under-)* and ***non-motivated*** *(-er, -ish, a-),* of their functional characteristics into ***convertive***, or class-changing affixes that change the words they are added to into another part of speech (*horse* (n) – *unhorse* (v), *bark* (n) – *debark* (v)), and ***nonconvertive***, or ***class-maintaining affixes*** (*moral* (a) – *amoral* (a), *president* (n) – *ex-president* (n)). According to the number of concepts standing behind them, they can be ***monosemantic*** (*-al* (adj) – *of relating to*, or *characterized by*) and ***polysemantic*** (*-ist* – 1. *one that performs a specified action* as in *cyclist*, or *produces a specified thing* as in *novelist*, 2. *one that specializes in a specified art or science or skill* as in *geologist*, 3. *one that adheres to or advocates a specified doctrine or system or code of behavior* as in *royalist*‘).

One should be aware that the meaning of an affix should be studied alongside the character of the derivational pattern of a derived word with which the affix is used. Thus the general meaning of the suffix *-er* in *doer* acquires a more specific meaning *person, animal or instrument that does* when it is added to the verbal derivational base like work in *worker*, or the meaning *the person belonging to a place* when it is added to the nominal base like in *Londoner, Britisher, sixth-former*.

Like any other lexical units, affixes may be homonymous like *-al* acting as an adjective-forming suffix as in *fictional* and a homonymous noun-forming suffix as in *rehearsal, arrival*.

As mentioned above, there are two major types of affixes in English that take into account their structural position in relation to the base they are added to: *prefixes* and *suffixes*. ***Prefixation*** and ***suffixation*** are similar but they are also highly specific word-formation processes that need separate analyses.

The number of ***prefixes*** in modern English is estimated to be from 50 to 80. The number of prefixes is approximate because the status of some of them is still not clear. The elements *over-* and *under-* are treated by some scholars as roots and complexes with them are regarded as compound words while combining forms like *hyper-*, *tele-*, *mini-* may be treated as prefixes.

Some scholars differentiate between ***derivational*** and ***non-derivational, stem-building*** prefixes that were borrowed as parts of certain words like *dis-* (apart, away) in *dissuade*, *distinguish*, or *apo-* (away from, separate) in *apocalypse, apocope, apochromatic, apogee*, and some do not. Some scholars distinguish between ***active*** in modern English prefixes and ***dead***, or ***non-active***, even if they were productive in the past, such as *a-* in *away, aback, aside*, and some do not.

All prefixes in English as well as in other languages may be traced back to originally free roots. From the etymological point of view, one may distinguish between ***native*** and ***borrowed prefixes***. In some native prefixes their relation to free roots can still be observed and they remain to be motivated by, for example, prepositions or adverbs (the most common sources for prefixes) as prefixes *over-* or *under-*. Loan prefixes with a specific meaning that were borrowed by English like the prefix *ante-* (before, preceding) as in *anteroom, antenatal* which came from Latin where they were used as adverbs usually are not traced back to their original free roots by modern English speakers.

The majority of all English prefixes are loans, only about a quarter for of them are native. So, the majority of prefixes in modern English do not have direct connection to free roots. Prefixes have been borrowed

throughout the history of the English language though as many native prefixes have dropped out of the system. In Old English, for example, 53 prefixes were registered, the majority of which denoted location. From the functional point of view prefixes may be classified as ***convertive*** and ***non-convertive***. Half of the 50 prefixes mentioned above are convertive – they convert, or convey a word into another part of speech (e.g.: *pref + n → V* as in *to embody, to encourage, to behead*). The rest of them are non-convertive – they only change, modify the lexical meaning of a word without changing its part-of-speech meaning (*pref+n → N as in president – vice-president*; *pref+v → V* as in *to agree – to disagree, calculate – miscalculate*; *pref+adj → Adj* as in *kind – unkind, normal – abnormal*).

Prefixes can be used to form new words of all parts of speech and according to the part-of-speech meaning the new word belongs to, they may be classified into ***noun-forming*** *(ex-husband, co-pilot),* ***adjective-forming*** *(international, co-educational, counterrevolutionary)* or ***verb-forming*** *(reconsider, demobilize).* Yet, most prefixation takes and has always taken place in English verbs, attaching new meanings to them or forming new verbs from other parts of speech (*to enrich, to enable, to reread, to disapprove, to unload,* and *to demobilize*).

The most productive prefixes used in the verbal system are: *be- (behead), en- (enable), dis- (discourage), over- (overdo), out- (outgrow), re- (rewrite), un- (uncover),* and *under- (underestimate).* More than 20 prefixes are involved in the process of new verb formation, forming 42 % of all prefixal derivatives in the language. But only 5 % of these verb-forming prefixes are exclusively verb-forming *(en-, be-, un-),* the rest being used to create words of other grammatical classes (cf.: *co-operate* and *co-pilot*).

Like any affixes, English prefixes may be added to derivational bases of a certain type, and classification of prefixes may be achieved to the part-of-speech meaning of the derivational base to which they are added. The following prefixes are deverbal – they may be attached to the verbal derivational bases *(pref+ v)*: *dis-, re-, under-, over-, de-, fore-, mis-,* etc. In the group of deadjectival prefixes (pref + adj) the following elements are enlisted: *a-, an-, anti-, be-, extra-, re-, in-, post-, pre-* etc. The list of

denominal prefixes *(pref+ n)* include *anti-, non-, pre-, post-, sub-, dis-, a-, and hemi-.*

However, feature of English prefixes is their mixed character – there is no strict borderline between deverbal, deadjectival and denominal prefixes and the same prefix can be attached to derivational bases with different part-of-speech meaning *(pref + v/adj/n) (disagree, disloyal, disadvantage).* Prefixes are used to add the following seven major types of meaning to the derivational base, and thus may be classified semantically:

- negation, reversal, contrary *(unemployment, incorrect, inequality, disloyal, amoral, non-scientific, undress, antifreeze, decentralize, disconnect)*;
- sequence and order in time *(pre-war, post-war, foresee, ex-president, co-exist)*;
- different space location *(inter-continental, trans-Atlantic, subway, superstructure)*;
- repetition *(rewrite, anabaptize 'to baptize again')*;
- quantity and intensity *(unisex, bilingual, polytechnical, multilateral)*;
- pejoration *(abnormal, miscalculate, maltreat, pseudo-morpheme)*;
- amelioration *(super-reliable, supermarket, ultramodern).*

Some prefixes are polysemantic and thus may be observed in several semantic classes. For example, the prefix *over-* denotes both location *(oversea, overhill)* and intensity *(over-careful, over-do).*

English prefixes, in this case, both stem building and word, building may also be classified according to their ability to achieve morphophonemic or spelling variation in different contexts. Some of them, and they are in the majority (more than 20), make up the group of unchanged forms that remain the same in all contexts. They are: *a- (asleep); ambi- (ambidexterous); auto- (autobiography); be- (behead); circum- (circumference); counter- (counter-clock); de- (decentralize); ex- (ex-president); hemi- (hemisphere); neo- (neo-fascism); non- (non-interference); mis- (misunderstand); out- (outcome); over- (overflow); para- (parapsychology); poly- (polylingual); post- (postscript); semi-*

(semicircle); super- (superstructure); trans- (transaction); ultra- (ultraviolet); un- (unintelligible); uni- (unilateral).

The second group includes changeable prefixes which exhibit their allomorphs or spelling variations in different contexts. Most of these allomorphs are stem-building morphemes that were borrowed along with the words in which they occurred, and they reflect regular phonemic variations in the language of borrowing: *a-/an- (not, without) ahistoric, anastigmatic; ab-/a-, abs- (from, away) avert, abstract; ad-/ac-/af-/ag-/al-/ap-/as-/at- (to, toward) administer, accustom, appear, agglutinate; bi-/bin- (two) bicycle, binoculars; co-/com-, cor- (with) compassion, coequal, correspondence; dis-/dif- (reverse) disarm, difference; ir-/il-/im- (non) illegal, impure, irregular.*

A special group of prefixes that should be considered carefully is made up of forms that are alike in spelling and/or pronunciation but have different meanings: *ante- (before) antedate; anti- (against) antifreeze; for- (away, off) forgo, forsake; fore- (ahead, before).*

Suffixation is the formation of words with the help of suffixes.

There are different classifications of ***derivational suffixes***. Etymologically, like any other lexical units, English suffixes may be ***native*** *(-ed, -fast, - fold, -er, -ful, -less, -like)* or ***borrowed*** *(-able/-ible, -ist, -ism, and -ant/-ent).* Native suffixes usually appear out of full words. Borrowing suffixes is a good index of the cultural prestige of the language of borrowing. They may also be classified according to the part-of-speech meaning of the derivational base to which they are added. Then one may distinguish between ***denominal suffixes*** *(n+suf)*: *-dom, -ess, -ian, -less,* etc., as in *kingdom, poetess, Italian, legless*, ***deverbal suffixes*** *(v + suf): -ee, -er, -ing, -able* as in *employee, teacher, translating, readable*, and ***deadjectival suffixes*** *(adj+suf): -ly, -ish, -ise/ize* as in *happily, greenish, materialize.*

A similar, though different method of classifying suffixes is by the part-of-speech meaning of the new word they form. Suffixation is used in forming words of all major parts of speech. There are ***noun-forming*** suffixes *(-er/-or, -dom, tion/-ation, -hood, -ism, -ment, -ness, etc.)*; ***adjective-forming*** *(-able/-ible; ate/-ite* as in *favourite), -ful, - ic/ical* as in

angelic, evangelical; *-ish, -ive* as in *mass-ive*; *-less, -ly* as in *friend-ly*, *-ous* as in *glorious*, *-some* as in *mettlesome*; *-y* as in *rainy*); ***verb-forming*** *(-en, -fy, -ize, -ate),* ***adverb-forming suffixes*** *(-ly, -ward as in coldly, -upward).* There are even ***numeral-forming*** suffixes *(-th, -teen, -ty, -fold).*

From the point of view of their ability to cause a functional shift, suffixes in English (as well as prefixes) may be ***convertive*** as *-ly* or *-ize*, and ***non-convertive*** as *-dom, -ie,* with no rigid boundary between them: the suffix *-er*, for example, may be both convertive as in *worker* and non-convertive as in *Londoner*.

Semantically suffixes are very diverse. They are used in creating names for different groups of concepts. Major lexical-semantic groups that include words with suffixes are:

In the system of nouns:

- agent or instrument: *-er, -ant, -ee, -ian,* and *-ist* (*worker, assistant, employee, communist; revolver*);
- the one who has a quality (with derogation): *-ard (drunkard), -ster (youngster, gangster), -ton (simpleton)*;
- feminine agent: *-ess, -ine, -ette (cosmonette, baroness)*;
- diminution and endearment: *-ie, -let, -y, -ling, -ette (booklet, horsy, duckling, kitchenette)*;
- abstract quality: *-ness, -th, -ancy/-ency (darkness, truth, fluency)*;
- result of an action: *-tion (creation), -ing (building)*;
- relatedness to a proper name: *-an, -ese (Indian, Japanese).*

In the system of adjectives:

- permission, ability or favour for a certain action: *-able/ible, -ary, -ent, -ive (readable, permissive)*;
- possession/deprivation of something: *-ed, -less (tired, brainless)*;
- ampleness, abundance of something: *-ful (wonderful)*;
- similarity: *-ish, -ic, -like, -some (bluish, Byronic, troublesome).*

In the system of verbs:

- to initiate something: *-ate (originate)*;
- to act with a certain (abstract) object: *-fy (glorify)*;
- to act towards a certain quality: *-en (shorten), -ize (equalize).*

Regardless of how productive some suffixes may be there are certain constraints on their productivity and ability to form a new word. For example, the borrowed suffix *-ant*, is added predominantly to a foreign base that is why the word *a buildant* with a native derivational base is hardly possible in English. Phonological factors prevent the adjective silly from forming the adverb *sillily*. Due to the prior existence of a word, a new suffixational derivative may hardly have a chance to survive: to steal but not *a stealer*, as there is the noun a thief in the English language.

Conversion is also referred to as ***zero derivation*** or ***null derivation***, and means word formation involving the creation of a new word from an existing word (of a different word class) without any affixes. Sometimes the term ***affixless word-derivation*** is used to emphasize the formation of a new word without a derivational affix. But this term does not permit us to distinguish it from sound- or stress-interchange (shift) that derived words without adding affixes, either.

Some linguists regard conversion as a kind of polysemy because it is regularly patterned and derived units are semantically related like the senses of a polysemantic word. But in contrast to polysemy, the new naming units created by conversion belong to different parts of speech – they are different words and not just new meanings.

Conversion, therefore, is rather a kind of homonymy, though a very specific kind – a patterned lexical-grammatical homonymy where the old and new lexemes are semantically related. So, conversion may be regarded as a lexical-semantic or morphological or even a syntactic means of word derivation by means of a functional change. In any event, conversion is one of the most productive ways of extending the English vocabulary.

While affixation has always been a productive means of word-formation in English, conversion became active only in the Middle English period and it is widely used in modern English. There was no homonymy between initial forms of words belonging to different parts of speech in Old English having a complex system of inflections. Due to loss of inflections in Middle English many of these words became lexical-grammatical homonyms (cf.: *love* (n) – *love* (v) in present-day English and their inflected equivalents *lufu* (n) and *lufian* (v) in Old English.

Another reason for the existence of conversion pairs in modern English is assimilation of borrowings. The modern English verb and noun *cry*, for example, had different forms in Old French from which they were borrowed: *crier* (v) and *cri* (n).

But the main reason that conversion pairs are so widely spread in present-day English is the word-forming process of conversion itself. Due to the limited number of morphological elements serving as classifying, marking signals of a certain part of speech, word-formation executed by changing the morphological paradigm is very economical and efficient (*knife – to knife, eye – to eye, water – to water, to run – run,* etc.). The majority of conversion pairs (more than 60 %) in modern English are the result of conversion.

When conversion is studied diachronically scholars distinguish between cases of conversion and other processes leading to the same results like loss of inflections or assimilation of borrowings. When studied synchronically this difference does not matter.

Any lexeme seems to be able to undergo conversion into a different grammatical class *(to up prices, to down his glass, a daily, etc.)* unless there are already some other words in the language to denote the same concept (one may say *sled* for *a vehicle for coasting down snow-covered hills* but not *to sled*, as there is a compound word for it – *to sledride*).

The clearest cases of conversion are observed between verbs and nouns, and this term is now mostly used in this narrow sense. For other cases of conversion modern linguistics usually applies the term ***transposition***.

Conversion is very active both in nouns for verb formation *(age → to age, doctor → to doctor, shop → to shop, gas → to gas)*, and in verbs to form nouns *(to catch → a catch, to smile → a smile, to offer → an offer)*. There are hardly any semantic constraints on nouns as the source for verbs or on verbs as the source for nouns, there are still some preferences. Thus, nouns as the source for converted verbs typically denote instruments *(iron → to iron)*, parts of body that are viewed as instruments *(eye → to eye)* and substances *(water → to water).*

Verbs used as the source for nouns derived by conversion typically denote movement *(to jump → a jump)* and speech activity *(to talk → a talk).* Linguists have proven, however, that the most active type of conversion in English is *n → v*, that is, conversion is more characteristic of English nouns. One can practically convert any noun into a verb if one has to communicate a particular message *(to knife, to eye, to fire-bomb).* You may, for example, even lamp the room – to install lamps in the room, though dictionaries do not register such a word. Conversion of verbs into nouns is less common in English because very often derivation of nouns from verbs there happens by means of affixation: *to arrive → arrival, to open → opening, to begin → beginning, to read → reading, to collect → collection.*

Compounding

A compound is a unit of vocabulary which consists of more than one lexical stem. On the surface, there appear to be two (or more) lexemes present but in fact the parts are functioning as a sing le item, which has its own meaning and grammar. So, *flower-pot* does hot refer to a flower and a pot but to a single object, it is pronounced as a unit, with a single main stress, and it is used grammatically as a unit (its plural, for example, is *flower-pots*, and not **flowers-pots).*

The unity of *flower-pot* is also signalled by the orthography, but this is not a foolproof criterion, if the two parts are linked by a hyphen, as here, or are printed without a space (solid), as in *flowerpot*, then there is no difficulty. But the form *flower pot* will also be found, and in such cases, to be sure we have a compound (and not just a sequence of two independent words), we need to look carefully at the meaning of the sequence and the way it is grammatically used.

This question turns up especially in American English, which uses fewer hyphens than does British English. Compounds are most readily classified into types based on the kind of grammatical meaning they represent. *Earthquake*, for example, can be paraphrased as 'the earth quakes', and the relation of *earth* to *quake* is that of subject to verb.

Similarly, a *crybaby* is also *subject + verb* (*the baby cries*), despite its back-to-front appearance. *Scarecrow* is *verb + object* (*scares crows*). Some involve slightly trickier grammatical relations, such as *playgoer*, *windmill*, *goldfish*, and *homesick.*

Shortening

One of the most active and productive minor types of word-formation is shortening subtraction of the original word or word group.

Lexical shortening may be of different types:

a) ***Clipping*** is creation of new words by shortening a word of two or more syllables or segments is called clipping. Clipping is mostly characteristic of noun derivation from nouns. Clipping may be ***initial***: *bus* (short for *omniBUS*, *phone* (short for *telePHONE*); ***final***: *pop* (short for *POPular*); ***both initial and final***: *flue* (short for *inFLUEnza)*; ***middle***: *maths* (short for *MATHematicS*).

Words derived by clipping are usually monosemantic but sometimes they may stand for several words with the same segment and thus be polysemantic (cf.: *nat* abbr 1. *national*, 2. *native, natural*).

b) ***Abbreviation***

Acronymy is the formation of words from the initial letters of a fixed phrase or title. Acronyms are pronounced as single wordsEstablished acronyms are *UNO* for *United Nations Organization.*

Initialisms are items which are spoken as individual letters, such as BBC and USA. The vast majority of abbreviations fall into this category.

Blending

A lexical blend, as its name suggests, takes two lexemes which overlap in form, and welds them together to make one. Enough of each lexeme is usually retained so that the elements are recognizable. Here are some longstanding examples, and a few novelties from recent publications. *motor + hotel = motel breakfast + lunch = brunch.*

Back-Formations

It is common in English to form a new lexeme by adding a prefix or a suffix to an old one. From happy we get unhappy; from *inspect* we get *inspector*. Editor, for example, looks as if it comes from edit, whereas in fact the noun was in the language first. Similarly, *television* gave rise to *televise*, *double-glazing* preceded *double-glaze*, and *baby-sitter* preceded *baby-sit*. Such forms are known as back-formations.

SELF-CHECK TASKS

1. ***Explain the meaning the following words and word combinations*:** affix, prefix, suffix, segmentavility, derivational basis, morphology, conversion, convertive (non-convertive) affixes, transposition, null derivation, dead affixes, compounds.

2. ***Answer the following questions***

1. Speak about a word as a unit of language.
2. What does morphology study?
3. What word-building models do you know?
4. What are different types of prefixes like?
5. What types of suffixes are there?
6. What are other terms for conversion?
7. What are the most productive models of conversion?
8. What are the reasons behind its productivity?
9. What is compounding? Provide an example and prove that it is a compound rather then two separate words.
10. What types of shortenings do you know?
11. What is blending?
12. What is back-formation?

PRACTICE TASKS

Provide examples for each type and subtype of word-building models, comment on the word structure.

FUTHER READING

1. Ayto, J. Twentieth Century Words / J. Ayto. – Oxford, OUP, 1999.

2. Crystal, D. English vocabulary. The Structure of the Lexicon: The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language / D. Crystal. – Cambridge University Press, 1995.

3. Fromkin, V. An Introduction to Language / V. Fromkin, R. Rodman. – Dryden Pr Pub, 1999.

4. Антрушина, Г. В. Лексикология английского языка / Г. В. Антрушина, О. В. Афанасьева, Н. Н. Морозова. – М. : ДРОФА, 2004.

5. Арнольд, И. В. Лексикология современного английского языка / И. В. Арнольд. – М. : Высш. шк., 1986.

6. Апресян, В. Ю. Языковая картина мира и системная лексикография / В. Ю. Апресян [и др.] ; [Ю. Д. Апресян (отв. ред.)]. – М. : Языки славянских культур, 2006.

Unit 3
MEANING. SEMANTICS AND SEMASIOLOGY

Meaning of a linguistic unit, or linguistic meaning is studied by ***semantics.***

Initially the idea of studying the meanings as a third component of language study alongside of etymology and syntax belongs to a German linguist Ch. K. Reisig (his works were published posthumously in 1839). He called the new field of research ***semasiology*** (from Gk. *semasia* "meaning" + logos "learning").

The necessity for this particular linguistic study was pointed out in 1897 by M. Breal who also coined the name for it. ***Semantics*** is very close to the philosophy of language and semiotics and widely uses their complex notions and terminology.

Today both terms (*semantics* and *semasiology*) are used to refer to the study of meaning. The term *semantics* however is also used to denote the scope of meaning of a word, thus being polysemantic itself.

There are different theories of linguistic meaning and different schools of semantics.

Meaning may be understood as conditions of truth. The proponents of logical semantics work out formulae for conditions in which sentences describing unreal situations like "The present king of France is bald" may be considered true and thus meaningful.

Meaning may be understood as intention – what the hearer (H) rationally determines the speaker (S) intends her/his meaning to convey, or as Leonard Bloomfield suggested in 1933, the situation with the speaker's stimulus and the hearer's response (behavioristic theory). This theory, however, is more relevant to pragmatics and psychology.

Linguistic meaning may be defined differently in various branches of semantics that study different types of linguistic units: syntactical semantics, semantics of text, and lexical semantics.

In descriptive linguistics, the word *meaning* is understood mainly as an object of study externalized by dictionary definition and associated with the physical phonetic or/and spelled form of a word. This abstraction is

useful for many important goals such as describing a given language, teaching, or contrastive studies. But it is rather useless for understanding what meaning is, or reconstruction of language ability and other endeavors. At present the most important approaches to defining *a word meaning* are ideational (or conceptual), referential and functional.

The ideational theory can be considered the earliest theory of meaning. It states that meaning originates in the mind in the form of ideas and words are just symbols of them. This tradition goes back to Aristotle and even further. The British empiricist philosopher John Locke in his "Essay Concerning Human Understanding" (1690) echoes Aristotle. He writes: "Words in their primary or immediate Signification stand for nothing, but the Ideas in the Mind…". He points out that ideas are private and individual, though the largest component of meaning derives from common perceptions of the world in which we live and our abilities to reason. Locke assumes that individual ideas preexist their linguistic expression.

A difficulty with the ideational theory that John Locke proposed is that it is not clear why communication and understanding are possible if linguistic expressions stand for individual personal ideas. Currently, the prevailing view is that meaning is a mental experience conveyed by linguistic expression.

Many linguists interested in the study of language as a human cognitive ability view meaning mainly as a psychological entity that exists in our minds, as a concept with specific structure. The difference between word meaning and concept, however, is that not all concepts are lexicalized, so word meaning may be regarded as a lexicalized concept.

However, some important questions remain unanswered within this framework. If the meaning of a word is a concept, then do people speaking different languages have different conceptual systems? Or, vice versa, if people speaking different languages have the same conceptual systems how does it happen that identical concepts are expressed by correlative words having different lexical meanings?

If a word‘s meaning is something different from the concept, then what is it and how is it related to the concept and the referent in the real

world? In some contemporary linguistic theories a distinction is made between lexical knowledge and encyclopedic knowledge, between semantic and conceptual levels of information, between word meaning and concept.

Another influential theory of a word meaning is known as referential. Early ***referential theory*** developed by Plato equated meaning with physical objects. This theory started with a famous "triangle of reference" presented by the German mathematician and philosopher Gottlob Frege (1848 – 1925).

The term "referent' in this theory is a philosophically neutral word understood as something to which the word refers. "Referent' is used for any physical object, quality, state, or action in the material world. However, referent is not meaning, and semantics, according to modern referential theory, should not be concentrated on the description of referents. Rather, it is the subject matter of sciences.

Within this theory, meaning is not identical to thought, or concept, either, though is very closely associated with it. Many different words having different meanings may be used to express the same concept as it is, for example, in the case with the concept of dying (die, pass away, kick the bucket or join the majority). Neither is meaning identical to a physical form of a word, or a symbol used to convey meaning, as many theories of sound symbolism suggest. Even though in all languages there are onomatopoeic words, restricted to naturally produced sounds such as whisper 'шептать', whistle 'свистеть'or roar 'реветь', etc., that seem to portray the underlying concept, these words obey language rules, and "the phonetic portrait' of the concept turns out to be different in different language systems (cf.: cock-a-doodle-do and кукареку)

Existence of different languages using different forms to denote the same concept (table, стол) shows that there is a conventional, arbitrary relationship between a symbol and a referent, and this arbitrariness is expressed by the broken base line in the "triangle of reference".

Within the referential frame, word meaning is understood as the interrelation of all three components of the semantic triangle: symbol, concept and referent, though meaning is not equivalent to any of them.

Referential theory makes important observations about the nature of word meaning and it is valid in many respects. Yet, it is not adequate to account for many specific features involved in word meaning. To improve referential theory, some linguists include one more component – the relation of the word to other conceptually related words. To understand the meaning of the word *cup*, for example, one should know its relation to the words *glass* and *mug*. Thus, the semantic triangle changes into a semantic square.

The third, most well-known theory of meaning is ***functional***. Functionalists (V. Mathesius, R. Jacobson, J. R. Firth et al.) believe that – the phonological, grammatical and semantic structures of a language are determined by the functions they have to perform in the societies in which they operate. Instead of trying to answer the question of what these structures, including meaning, are, functionalists study how they are used in specific contexts in order to determine their properties.

Functionalists study word meaning by making a detailed analysis of the way the word is used in certain contexts. But defining meaning as the function of a unit in certain contexts lacks formality and exactness. In modern linguistics many scholars do not agree with Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889 – 1951), a philosopher and a linguist, who stressed that the meaning of a word is its use in language because word‘s meaning may be formulated in a definition before the word is used. It is rather a word‘s meaning that determines its use and the use will determine whether the definition that previously has been formulated stands or falls.

Types of meaning

Word meaning typologies are very diverse. Taking into account the aspect of relation of a word as a linguistic sign to the components of the situation where it is used, scholars distinguish its ***referential meaning***, which is determined by the relation of a linguistic sign to the referent in the material world, ***significative meaning***, which is determined by the relation of a linguistic sign to a referent or a class of referents, ***pragmatic meaning***, which is determined by the relation of a linguistic sign to its user, the speaker‘s intention, and ***differential***, or systemic meaning, which is

determined by the relation of the given linguistic sign to other signs in the language system or speech.

Another typology is based on the idea of word meaning as a specific structure. It is assumed that the word includes such components, or types of meaning as the most abstract part of speech, or ***functional meaning*** (nouns, for example, usually denote thingness, adjectives – qualities and states), ***grammatical***, which is recurrent in identical sets of different words (she goes/works/reads, etc.), and ***lexical***, which is highly individual and recurs in all the grammatical forms of words (for example, the meaning of the verb *to work* is *to engage in physical or mental activity* that reveals in all its forms: *works, work, worked, working, will work*).

These types of meaning, however, are related. For example, the grammatical meaning of plurality may be expressed not only by means of grammatical affixes as in *chicken – chickens*, but lexically, too (cf. such collective nouns as *poultry*, *people*, *police*), and vice versa, lexical meaning may be supported by its grammatical forms as in the case of the countable noun chicken that becomes uncountable when it is used in the meaning of its flesh as food‘.

Lexical meaning, which is most important for lexicological goals, is not homogenous either. It includes ***denotational*** and ***connotational*** types. ***Denotational lexical meaning*** provides correct reference of a word or other lexical unit to its denotatum – an individual object or a concept. Denotational meaning of a word renders the most important part of the related conceptual content and thus makes communication possible. Denotational meaning is explicitly revealed in the dictionary definition (chair is a seat for one person typically having four legs and a back).

Connotational lexical meaning includes ideas or emotions than tend to be aroused by a linguistic term. Some connotations are very personal and easily changeable, characteristic of a person‘s individual experience. But some connotations, like emotive charge and stylistic reference, are stable and regularly arise in mind of all members of a specific language community, and they are the subject matter of lexicology. Emotive charge, both positive and negative, may be inherent in word meaning (like in *attractive, repulsive*) or may be created by prefixes and suffixes (like in

piggy, useful, useless). Dictionaries express it by special remarks preceding definitions, like diminutive or endearing, or by highly evaluative words used in definitions themselves, like in *repulsive* – arousing aversion or disgust‘.

Stylistic reference is also part of a word meaning, it refers the word to a certain style register. Words with no particular stylistic reference make up the group of neutral words that are opposed to colloquial and bookish, or literary words that are usually presented with corresponding notes in a dictionary. There are different subclassifications for nonneutral words. Colloquial words are usually subdivided into common colloquial, slang, professional, jargon and dialectal words. Bookish words may be subdivided into general literary, scientific, poetic and archaisms, barbarisms and foreign words.

Semantic changes

Meanings of lexical units, especially words change over time. They are far more unstable than sounds, grammatical forms, or syntactic arrangements. Very often semantic changes of words are accompanied by changes in their sound/written or grammatical form.

The causes for word meaning changes may be either extralinguistic or may be induced by the language system itself. We deal with ***extranlinguistic causes*** when word meaning changes due to change in the nature of the related object or in concepts about it. The meaning of the word *paper* nowadays is not connected anymore with *papirus – the plant from which it formerly was made, and this disconnection* is reflected in the modern definition of this word: *substance manufactured from wood fiber, rags,* etc., *used for writing, printing, drawing, wrapping, packing, etc.*

Linguistic causes for meaning change are also of great importance. One of them is ***differentiation of synonyms***. When a new word is borrowed it may become a perfect synonym for the existing one. Brought into competition with a foreign word the native word or both of them may change their meaning. They have to be differentiated; otherwise one of them will die. Thus, the word *land* in OE meant both *solid part of earth‘s surface* and *the territory of nation*. When the word country was borrowed

from Old French and became its synonym, the meaning of the native word *land* was narrowed *to solid part of earth*; its second meaning remained mainly in compound geographical names, like Scotland, England, Finland.

Linguistic analogy is another linguistic cause that is often responsible for changes in word meaning. If one of the members of a synonymic set acquires a new meaning, other members of this set change their meanings and by analogy acquire the same meaning, too. For example, in the set of synonyms to the notion *catch – grasp* and *get*, the dominant of this synonymic set catch acquired the new meaning *to understand*; then the other two synonyms grasp and get developed this new meaning, too.

Ellipsis is still another linguistic cause for change of meaning. It takes place when words habitually stick together and at some point the meaning of the whole phrase is transferred to one word only while the other is dropped out. Thus, in a phrase, one of them is omitted and its meaning goes to its partner. For example, the verb *to starve* (in OE *steorfan*) had the meaning *to die* and was habitually used in collocation with the word *hunger* (ME *sterven* of *hunger*). In the 16th century the verb itself acquired the meaning *to die of hunger*.

Nature of semantic change

The nature of change of word meaning is determined by the secondary application of the word form to name a different yet related concept. This secondary use of the word for lexicalizing a different though related category may be called lexical-semantic naming.

When associations of similarity become vehicles for lexicalization by the same word labels they are usually termed as metaphor (*face of a person* and *face of a clock*; *neck of a body* and *neck of a bottle*). ***Metaphor*** is based on hidden comparison that fixes common semantic features between the concepts. Thy similarity may be based on perceptible qualities? Such shape, size, color, function, etc.

When the associations of contiguity become vehicles for lexical-semantic naming of concepts coexisting in space and in time or related logically or contextually, they are usually referred to as ***metonymy***. Thus

the noun crown be used metonymically for monarch; the noun bench for judiciary.

The basic types of concept relations for metonymic naming are as follows:

- whole – part (We have 10 heads here);
- count – mass (We ate rabbit);
- material – object of it (She is jeans);
- container – contents (I ate three plates);
- object – a unit of measure (This horse came one neck ahead);
- figure – ground (The boy broke the window);
- place – people (The city is asleep);
- producer – product (We bought a hoover).

Metaphor and metonymy are observed in words of all parts of speech, like in verbs:

to fly 1. to move in or pass through the air with wings (birds fly), 2. to move through the air or before the wind (flags fly), 3. to move or pass swiftly (vacations fly);

in adjectives: *black* 1. of the colour black (a black dress), 2. having dark skin, hair and eyes (a black Irishman), 3. dressed in black‘.

So, the nature of word meaning change is provided by metaphoric or metonymic relations of two and more concepts lexicalized by the same word form.

Results of semantic change

Semantic changes may take place in the denotational component of word meaning. They are various and of a complex nature but we shall mention the most wide-spread ones and speak about ***restriction/narrowing*** of meaning, or ***specialization***, its ***extension/widening, or generalization***, as well as about a ***semantic shift*** including the shift to the opposite.

Restriction, or narrowing of meaning occurs when a word happens to denote a more restricted number of referents. For example, the noun mare in modern English denotes “a female horse” but in Old English it was applied both to female and male horses. Thus, the meaning got narrower.

The opposite kind of change in word meaning, when the word becomes applicable to a greater number of referents, is called ***extension***, or widening of meaning: *guy* and *cook*, for example, were not applied to women until the 16th century but now they are; *hoover*, *Macintosh*, *zerox*, *sandwich*, *boycott*, *lynch* were primarily used only to name certain persons but now they are applied to whole classes of objects or events. Very often extended meanings become more abstract, less detailed, more general than the original, hence the synonymic use of the term generalization for this process.

The word may change its meaning to the opposite. The shift to the opposite is observed, for example, in the adjective *fast* that originally meant *fixed* and now it also means *quick*. At some point the word may appear to have to opposite meaning within its system of meanings. This phenomenon is called ***enantiosemy***. An example of enantiosemy is the word *cleave* can mean *to cut apart* or *to bind together*.

Alongside changes of the denotational meaning some ***changes of connotational meaning*** may take place, too. Scholars speak about: ameliorative development, or ***amelioration***, when a word acquires favourable connotations (cf.: the former meaning of the word *minister is a servant*), or – pejorative development, also referred to as ***pejoration, or deterioration***, when a word finally takes on pejorative associations (cf.: accident now meaning *an unexpectant happening causing loss or injury* came from more neutral *something that happened*; *silly* previously meant *happy*).

Cases of change of meaning and their causes are of special interest for historical linguistics. What is important to understand here is that lexical meaning is not a stable category. It becomes especially evident when we view it diachronically. Word meanings registered in dictionaries are to a certain degree an abstraction because they change constantly, though not so quickly and radically to prevent people from misunderstanding the language.

Polysemy

Polysemy is a phenomenon describing the existence of several different but related meanings within the semantic structure of a word. Thus, there are ***monosemantic*** and ***polysemantic*** words in the word-stock of any language. The vocabulary of English is known as highly polysemantic with words having a flexible semantic structure easily adopting itself to extra-linguistic context. Monosemantic words are quite uncommon and are usually terms related to science.

The reasons for relatively high polysemy of English words are not clear yet. However, we may state the factors that contribute to polysemy, and all these factors take place in English. According to George K. Zipf‘s principle of least effort (1948) there is a direct correlation between the length of a word and its frequency, and between the frequency of usage and the degree of polysemy. So, communicatively the most important words are usually short, shorter words are more frequently used in speech, and the more frequently the word is used in speech the greater number of meanings it has. English words, being short, provide the ideal material for their frequent usage and hence for lexical-semantic naming leading to polysemy [Лещева, 2002]

However, we should distinguish between the meaning and the word usage. Any word used in context implies a particular meaning implied by the speaker and understandable by the addressee. Thus, polysemy is a phenomenon of language as system, but not of speech.

Diachronically, the meanings within the semantic structure of a word can be ***primary*** and ***secondary.*** The primary one is the initial meaning proper to a word, often going back to the Old English, while the secondary ones are derived meanings due to semantic changes described above. In the course of time some meanings may become obsolete.

Synchronically, all meanings of a word constituting its semantic structure at a certain period represent polysemy. According to the occurrence of meanings in various contexts we can speak about the ***central*** and ***marginal*** meanings. “The meaning that first occurs to our mind, or is understood without a special context, the one that can be representative of the whole semantic structure of a word, is called the basic, central, or

major meaning. It is placed first in synchronical dictionaries. Other meanings are called peripheral, or minor" [Лещева, 2002].

In the course of time the primary meaning of a word may become marginal, and vice-versa, the secondary meaning may become central.

The context is a key factor to specify the meaning used by the speaker. Linguists distinguish between ***lexical contexts*** and ***grammatical contexts.***

Based on the lexical context and the ability of a polysemantic word to be used together with other words and semantic word groups we can specify the exact meaning used. For example, the word *heavy* used with objects like *load* or *table* means "weighing a lot; difficult to lift or move", while when used with precipitations like *rain* or *snow* it means "more or worse than usual in amount, degree, etc.", and with words denoting people it can mean "doing the thing mentioned more, or more": *heavy drinker/smoker/sleeper* (www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com).

In grammatical context the importance is attached to the syntactic structure. Thus, if we use *make* with bare infinitive we mean "to force somebody to do something", when we use the structure *make+noun,* the meaning is most likely "to write, create or prepare something", while the structure *make+adj.+noun* will mean "o cause somebody/ something to be or become a particular kind of thing or person" (www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com).

Sometimes the lexical or grammatical context may not be enough to distinguish between the meanings of a polysemantic word. Then extralinguistic context can be helpful.

Homonymy is the existence of words identical in their sound form or spelling, but different in meaning.

In contrast to polysemantic words, homonyms do not appear in a language according to regular patterns. Their appearance may be accounted for by the following reasons:

1) changes in pronunciation and/or spelling. In English these changes were very active and they created a great number of homonyms. Thus, the

homonyms *sea* and *see* were in Old English before the time of the Great English Vowel Shift;

2) the loss of endings. Thus, the homonyms *love* and *to love* appeared there out the noun *lufu* and the verb *luvian*;

3) borrowings: *race* 1) *nation*‘ [Fr] – *race* 2) *running* [ON]);

4) shortenings: *fan* (shortened from *fanatic*) and *fan* (ME “*to stir up air”* from OE *fannian – to winnow (grain)* fr. L vannus);

5) development of a polysemantic word, often referred to as split polysemy, or disintegration of polysemy: *bachelor – 1. a young night who follows the banner of another*, 2. *the lowest university degree*, 3. *a male of a seal not having a mate during a breeding time*, can hardly be perceived as related nowadays.

Homonyms may be clasified according to the type of coincidence form. If the sound-form of semantically unrelated words coincides but their spelling is different, we refer to these words as ***homophones*** (*tail* and *tale*). When spelling is identical with sound-form being different, we call these words ***homographs*** (*live* [liv] v. and *live* [laiv] adj.). Homonyms identical in both spelling and pronunciation are treated as ***homonyms proper*** (the words *bank* 1. *an organization that provides various financial services* and *bank* 2. *the side of a river, canal*.

According to the type of meaning, we may distinguish ***lexical homonyms,*** which differ only in lexical type of meaning (*seal* (n) *a sea animal*; *seal* (n) *a stamp*), ***grammatical homonyms***, that differ only in grammatical meaning (*seals* – pl. *of sea animal* and *seal’s* – sing. Possessive Case of sea animal), and ***lexical-grammatical homonyms***, that differ both in lexical, part of speech and grammatical meaning but coincide in a sound and/or written form (*seal* (n) – *a sea animal*, and *seal* (v) – *to close tightly*).

Paradigmatic relationships between words

Paradigmatic relationships were first described by F. de Saussure, who termed them associative relationships, in opposition to syntagmatic relationships. There are two major groups of paradigmatic relations of lexical units are the relations of ***inclusion, or hierarchical relations***

(hyponymy and meronymy); and the relations of ***compatibility*** (synonymy and antonymy).

The ***hierarchical relations*** as the name suggests are based on the idea of inclusion. In other words, this relationship can be described as that the general and the specific, the subtype and the supertype. In this case, the ***hyponym*** stands for the subtype and the ***hypernym*** – for the supertype. For example, *a rose, a daffodil, a chamomile* are hyponyms of *a flower,* the latter being a hypernym. However, if we contrast *a flower* and *a plant, a flower* will be regarded as a hyponym, while *a plant* – a hypernym.

The second type of hierarchical relations between words is ***meronymy*** – the relations of parts to the whole (also referred to as ***partonomy***). The division of the human body into parts serves as a prototype for all part-whole hierarchies, where *finger* is a meronym of *hand,* and *hand* is a meronym of *arm*.

Alongside hierarchical relations between words, relations of compatibility – partial semantic overlapping of lexical units.

Synonymy implies compatibility based a certain identity or similarity. Synonymy is a relation between words rather than concepts. That is why synonyms may stand for the same concept but be different in stylistic register (*happen* and *befall*); dialect referrence (*autumn* and *fall*), emotional colouring, connotations, degree or size of the concept (idea) (*big* and *gigantic*) or in collocational restrictions (*to embellish, to garnish, to adorn, to decorate).*

From the semantic point of view (with regard to the equivalence of meaning) synonyms can be described as ***full*** or ***partial***. Full synonyms are words, whose semantic contents coincide completely (which is a rare occasion in a language). For example, both words *cat* and *feline* describe any member of the family Felidae. Partial synonyms are words only parts of whose meanings coincide, which means that they become synonyms only when used in one of their meanings or in certain combinations.

Synonymic words form ***synonym paradigms*** that consist of numbers of words with similar or identical meanings. Every synonym paradigm has ***a central member*** whose meaning is the simplest semantically, the most neutral stylistically and the least fixed syntagmatically. Linguists distinguish between semantic and stylistic synonyms. For example, in the paradigm *big, large, ample, sizeable, bulky, capacious*, ***big*** is a central member.

Another type is ***contextual synonyms***. The term may be used to describe synonymous with the same connotations that are usually revealed in the context.

Antonymy is a language universal, which means that pairs of words with opposite meanings exist in absolutely all human languages. Since there are different types of opposition in a language (polar opposition *cold↔hot*, reversible relationship: *buy↔sell*, directional opposition: *arrive↔depart*, complementary relationship *alive↔dead*, and some others), there are different groups of antonyms, too.

Gradable antonyms like *cold ↔ hot, dry ↔ wet* that allow us to make comparison (colder, hotter; drier, wetter) and imply a certain degree of uncertainty (when we say cold, what exactly do we mean?), besides, other adjectives may be placed on the scale between the two poles (*warm*).

There are ***complementary*** (sometimes they are called ***contradictory***) antonyms like *alive ↔ dead* (one can be either alive or dead, and cannot be more dead or less dead).

There are also two-way ***conversive*** (also referred to by some linguists as ***reversive***) antonyms that are mutually dependent and describe opposite attributes of the same situation (*buy and sell).*

Directional antonyms are generally adverbs or prepositions and include pairs such as *up/down, in/out, and clockwise/anticlockwise.*

Contextual antonyms may include seemingly non-opposite words, the opposition being made by the context, and they usually imply a choice of options. Thus, *work* and *play* may represent contextual synonyms, with other options being *sleep, walk, relax,* etc.

SELF-CHECK TASKS

1. ***Explain the meaning the following words and word combinations*:** Semantics, semasiology, ostensional theory, referential theory, functional theory, association of contiguity, metaphor, metonymy, restriction, extension, semantic shift, deterioration, amelioration.

2. ***Answer the following questions***

1) Is there any difference between semasiology and semantics?
2) What approaches to interpreting the term meaning are there?
3) What types of meaning do you know?
4) What causes changes of semantic structure?
5) What types of changes do you know?
6) What types associations bring about semantic change?
7) What results of semantic changes are described in the chapter?
8) What semantic changes can occur to the connotational meaning?

PRACTICE TASKS

1. Comment on the changes of denotational meaning and their result.

Camp – in Latin "open field, level space"; in 1520s "place where an army lodges temporarily"; now "place where people live temporarily in tents or temporary buildings".

Girl – in OE c. 1300, gyrle "child, young person"; now "a female child"

Art – in ME "skill in scholarship and learning", now "the use of the imagination to express ideas or feelings, particularly in painting, drawing or sculpture"

Barn – in OE "barley house"; now "a covered building for the storage of farm produce"

Keen – in OE "loud, shrill; of cold, fire, wind, etc. biting, bitter, cutting", now "sharp, sharp-pointed, sharp-edged"

Pray – in ME "ask earnestly, beg (someone)", now "to speak to God, especially to give thanks or ask for help"

Polar – in Latin *polus* "an end of an axis", now "from or found in the regions near the poles of the Earth"

2. Comment on the changes in the connotational meaning

Band – late 15c. “an organized group, originally especially of armed men”; now “a small group of musicians who play popular music together”

Cunning – in ME “conning, "learned, skillful, possessing knowledge”; now “killfully deceitful”

Gay – in early ME “wanton, lewd, lascivious”, in late ME “full of joy, merry; light-hearted, carefree”, now “(of people, especially men) sexually attracted to people of the same sex”, now slang “boring and not fashionable or attractive”

Fond – in ME “deranged, insane, foolish, silly, unwise”; now “having warm or loving feelings for somebody”

Smart – in OE “painful, severe, stinging; causing a sharp pain”; now “intelligent”

Minister – in OE “servant, valet, member of a household staff, administrator, musician, minstrel”; now “a senior member of the government”

3. Comment on the type of transfer of meaning

Coat (v.) in ME “to provide with a coat”, now “to cover or overspread with a substance”

Trail – in ME “trailing part of a robe, gown, etc.”, now “a long line or series of marks that is left by somebody/something”

Honey – a sweet, sticky yellow-brown substance made by bees; a way of addressing somebody that you like or love

Foot – “the lowest part of the leg, below the ankle”; “the base or bottom of something (the foot of the surrounding mountains)”

Jeans – denim fabric, trousers made of denim

Key – piece of metal with a special shape used for locking a door, starting a car, etc.; a thing that makes you able to understand or achieve something

Monkey – an animal with a long tail, that climbs trees and lives in hot countries; a child who is active and likes playing tricks on people

Silver – a shiny, grey-white precious metal; dishes, beautiful objects, etc. that are made of silver

(based on www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com and https://www.etymonline.com)

4. Find a word which has meanings synonymous to each word in a pair. Are they cases of polysemy or homonymy?

E.g. alter, money – change

- behaviour; to lead an orchestra
- not clear; loose consciousness
- serious; found in a cemetery
- unspecific; military officer
- a tree trunk; a ship's diary
- very small; a measurement of time
- acceptable or appropriate; pale in colour
- simple; flat land
- to say no; waste material
- to hit; to stop work

5. Find homophones for each pair of words.

E.g.: a) it's all around us – air; b) will inherit one day – heir

1. a) a round, flat piece of metal given as an award;
   b) to interfere
2. a) perfume;
   b) an American coin
3. a) just;
   b) the money paid for a journey
4. a) a manner of walking;
   b) used to close an opening in a wall, fence, field, etc.
5. a) condensation found in the morning;
   b) about to arrive
6. a) part of the body;
   b) to use or spend carelessly, to squander
7. a) to stop living;
   b) to color or stain something
8. a) underground part of a tree;
   b) a road or path from one place to another

6. Each of the newspaper headlines below has a double meaning. Rewrite the headlines to disambiguate them. Do you use grammatical or lexical context for clarifying?

1. Clinic gives poor free legal help
2. 20,000 at mass for Polish priest reported killed
3. Lebanon chief limits access to private parts
4. Trial ends in mercy killing
5. Owners responsible for biting canines
6. Woman off to jail for sex with boys
7. Sisters reunited after 18 years in checkout line at supermarket
8. Prison warden says inmates may have 3 guns
9. Safety experts say school bus passengers should be belted
10. Kids make nutritious snacks

(based on https://olymp.hse.ru/)

FUTHER READING

1. Ayto, J. Twentieth Century Words / J. Ayto. – Oxford, OUP, 1999.

2. Crystal, D. English vocabulary. The Structure of the Lexicon: The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language / D. Crystal. – Cambridge University Press, 1995.

3. Fromkin, V. An Introduction to Language / V. Fromkin, R. Rodman. – Dryden Pr Pub, 1999.

4. Антрушина, Г. В. Лексикология английского языка / Г. В. Антрушина, О. В. Афанасьева, Н. Н. Морозова. – М. : ДРОФА, 2004.

5. Арнольд, И. В. Лексикология современного английского языка / И. В. Арнольд. – М. : Высш. шк., 1986.

Unit 4
ETYMOLOGY OF ENGLISH WORD STOCK. NEOLOGISMS

It is true that English vocabulary, which is one of the most extensive amongst the world's languages contains an immense number of words of foreign origin. In order to understand the English word stock we should have a look at the history of the language which is closely connected with the history of the nation speaking the language.

In the first century B.C. most of the territory now known to us as Europe was occupied by the Roman Empire. Among the inhabitants of the continent were Germanic tribes. They were cattle-breeders and knew little about land cultivation. Their tribal languages contain only Indo-European and Germanic elements. Applicable to the language these words would be called ***native words*** and divided into the following groups:

1) words of the Indo-European origin (that have similar roots in other Indo-European languages). They commonly denote vital and frequently used concepts:

- kinship terms: *mother, father, son, daughter etc.*;
- words for nature objects and phenomena: *sun, moon, wind, water, star etc.*;
- names of certain plants and animals: *goose, wolf, cow, tree, etc.*;
- names of body parts: *ear, eye, lip, tooth, foot, etc.*;
- adjectives denoting physical properties and qualities: *hard, quick, slow, red, white, new*;
- numerals from 1 to 100;
- personal, demonstrative and interrogative pronouns: *I, you, my, this, that, etc.*;
- some common verbs: *do, be, sit, stand*.

2) words of Germanic origin (with roots common for German, Norwegian, Dutch and other Germanic languages):

- words denoting time periods: *summer, winter, time, week*;
- words for natural phenomena: *storm, rain, flood, ice*;
- words for items of clothing: *hat, shirt, shoe*;
- names of animals, birds and plants: *sheep, horse, cow, grass*;

- words for body parts: *head, arm, finger*;
- certain verbs: *bake, burn, drive, hear, keep, learn, make*;
- adjectives for cololur, size and other properties: *blue, broad, grey, dead, deep*;
- adverbs: *down, out, before.*

3) ***English proper words*** (they stand apart and have no cognates in other languages): *bird, boy, girl, lady, lord, etc.*

You can notice that a number of native words have irregular grammar forms, especially verbs. It shows that in the process of development old forms were so habitual for native speakers and reproduced so often that these words haven't undergone grammar changes typical for more recent word-stock.

The Roman invasion and a number of wars between the Germanic tribes and the Romans resulted in the fact that these two opposing peoples came into peaceful contact. Trade developed, and the Germanic people gained knowledge of new and useful things. The first among them were new things to eat. Before that the only products known to the Germanic tribes were meat and milk. It is from the Romans that they learnt how to make *butter* and *cheese* and, as there are naturally no words for these foodstuffs in their tribal languages, they used the Latin words to name them (Lat. *butyrum*, *caseus*).

It is also to the Romans that the Germanic tribes owe the knowledge of some new fruits and vegetables of which they had no idea before, and the Latin names of these fruits and vegetables enter their vocabularies reflecting this new knowledge: *cherry* (Lat. cerasum), *pear* (Lat. pirum), *plum* (Lat. prunus), *pea* (Lat. pisum), *beet* (Lat. beta), *pepper* (Lat. piper). It is interesting to note that the word *plant* is also a Latin borrowing of this period (Lat. planta).

Likewise, the Romans brought some household items, town facilities and names for them. Here are some more examples of Latin borrowings of this period: *cup* (Lat. cuppa), *kitchen* (Lat. coquina), *mill* (Lat. molina), *port* (Lat. portus), *wine* (Lat. vinum). All these Latin words were destined to become the earliest group of borrowings in the future English language.

In the 5th century A.D. several of the Germanic tribes (the most numerous amongst them being the Angles, the Saxons and the Jutes) migrated across the sea now known as the English Channel to the British Isles. There they were confronted by the Celts, the original inhabitants of the Isles. The Celts desperately defended their lands against the invaders, but had to retreat to the North and South-West (modern Scotland, Wales and Cornwall). Through their numerous contacts with the defeated Celts, the conquerors got to know and assimilated a number of Celtic words (e.g.: *bald, down, glen, druid, bard, cradle*). Especially numerous among the Celtic borrowings were *place names, names of rivers, hills*, etc. The Germanic tribes occupied the land, but the names of many parts and features of their territory remained Celtic. For instance, the names of the rivers Avon, Exe, Esk, Usk, Ux originate from Celtic words meaning *river* and *water*.

Ironically, even the name of the English capital originates from Celtic *Llyn + dun* in which *llyn* is another Celtic word for *river* and *dun* stands for *a fortified hill*, the meaning of the whole being *fortress on the hill over the river*.

Some Latin words entered the Anglo-Saxon languages through Celtic, among them such widely-used words as *street* (Lat. strata via) and *wall* (Lat. vallum).

The 7th century A. D. was significant for the christianisation of England. Latin was the official language of the Christian church, and consequently the spread of Christianity was accompanied by a new period of Latin borrowings. These no longer came from spoken Latin as they did eight centuries earlier, but from church Latin. Also, these new Latin borrowings were very different in meaning from the earlier ones. They mostly indicated *persons, objects and ideas associated with church and religious rituals*: *priest* (Lai. presbyter), *bishop* (Lai. episcopus), *monk* (Lat. monachus), *nun* (Lai. nonna), *candle* (Lai. candela).

Together with new religion and christian values, churches brought about education by establishing church schools which naturally enough lead to an influx of *educational terms*. So, the very word *school* is a Latin

borrowing (Lat. schola, of Greek origin) and so are such words as *scholar* (Lai. scholar(-is) and *magister* (Lat. ma-gister).

From the end of the 8th to the middle of the 11th century England underwent several Scandinavian invasions which inevitably left their trace on the English vocabulary.

Here are some examples of early Scandinavian borrowings: *call, take, cast, die, husband,* (< Sc. hus + bondi, i. e. “inhabitant of the house”), *window*. (< Sc. vindauga, i. e. “the eye of the wind”), *ill, loose, low, weak.* Some of the words of this group are easily recognisable as Scandinavian borrowings by the initial *sk*- combination: *sky, skill, skin, ski, skirt.*

Certain English words changed their meanings under the influence of Scandinavian words of the same root. So, the O.E. *bread* which meant *piece* acquired its modern meaning by association with the Scandinavian *brand*. The O. E. *dream* which meant *joy* assimilated the meaning of the Scandinavian *draumr* (cf. with the Germ. Traum *dream* and the R. дрёма).

The next wave of borrowings was brought about due to the Norman Conquest of 1066. With the famous Battle of Hastings, when the English were defeated by the Normans under William the Conqueror, we come to the eventful epoch of the Norman Conquest, the time when England became a bi-lingual country. The impact on the English vocabulary made over this two-hundred-year period is immense: French words from the Norman dialect penetrated every aspect of social life. The distinction between simple people and those of aristocratic origin became evident due to vocabulary they used. While in everyday life of the locals mostly native words and words of Latin origin which by that time had become an inherent part of the English language were mostly used, French became the language of court, business, justice and administration. Here is a very brief list of examples of Norman French borrowings.

- administrative words: *state, government, parliament, council, power*;
- legal terms: *court, judge, justice, crime, prison*;
- military terms: *army, war, soldier, officer, battle, enemy*;
- educational terms: *pupil, lesson, library, science, pen, pencil*.

Everyday life was although to a smaller extent but still affected by the powerful influence of French words. Numerous terms of everyday life were also borrowed from French in this period: *table, plate, saucer, dinner, supper, river, autumn, uncle, etc.*

Another important feature of this time is the appearance of two layers of vocabulary for seemingly related concepts. Thus, *swine, cow* and *sheep* of native origin acquired French counterparts to denote meat types: *pork, beef* and *mutton.*

Speaking about the word-stock of English we cannot skip the impact made by W. Shakespear, who according to different estimates, coined as many as 2.000 words which became part and parcel of the English language: *eyeball, puppy-dog, dauntless, besmirch, alligator, hob-nob.*

The Renaissance Period in England, like in other European countries, was marked by significant developments in science, art and culture, as well as by a revival of interest in the ancient civilisations of Greece and Rome and their languages. Hence, there was a considerable number of Latin and Greek borrowings. In contrast to the earliest Latin borrowings (1st c. B. C.), the Renaissance ones were rarely concrete names. They were mostly abstract words *(e.g. major, minor, filial, moderate, intelligent, permanent, to elect, to create).* There were naturally numerous scientific and artistic terms *(datum, status, phenomenon, philosophy, method, music).* The same is true of Greek Renaissance borrowings *(atom, cycle, ethics, esthete).*

The Renaissance was a period of extensive cultural contacts between the major European states. Therefore, it was only natural that new words also entered the English vocabulary from other European languages. The most significant again were French borrowings. This time they came from the Parisian dialect of French and are known as Parisian borrowings: *regime, routine, police, machine, ballet, matinee, scene, technique, bourgeois, etc*. Italian also contributed a considerable number of words to English: *piano, violin, opera, alarm, colonel.*

The Renaissance was follower by the era of rapid development of science across the world and in England in particular. New discoveries and inventions required new words to name them, new terms were coined

based on the basis of Latin roots: *gravity, electricity, pendulum, acid, cardiac, tonsils.* Slowly but surely Latin as the language of science gave way to English.

With the development of navy came the era of great geographical discoveries which, on the one hand, laid the foundation for the spread of English across the globe, and on the other hand, enriched the vocabulary with new words and concepts from other languages and counties. The same trend was noticeable with bringing English to America. Here are some examples:

India: *yoga, cummerbund, bungalow*

Africa: *voodoo, zombie*

Australia: *nugget, boomerang, walkabout*

America: *racoon, squash, moose*

Today the word-stock keeps up with the development of science and society. The pandemic of Covid-19 brought about a great number of new words thus enriching the vocabulary: covidiot, coronacation, infodemic, etc.

Borrowings and neologisms

One should bear in mind that there are different interpretations of the term *borrowing* in English‘. It may be understood as:

1) ***the process and the result of the process of adopting*** words, word combinations or morphemes from other languages (-able, -ment, parliament, and coup d'etat);

2) ***any word or word combination created in English on the basis of a foreign form***:

a) ***translation-loans*** – words and expressions from the material available in the language after the patterns characteristic of the given language, but under the influence of foreign lexical units. Quite a lot of them have Germanic origins (*superman* [from G Übermensch], *lightning-war* [from G Blitzkrieg], *masterpiece* [from G Meisterstück], *homesickness* [from G Heimweh], *standpoint* [from G Standpunkt]), though other languages contributed to this process too, for example, *mother tongue*

[from L lingua materna], *first dancer* [from L prima balerina]; *wall-paper* [from Russ стенная газета]; *the moment of truth* [from Sp el momento de la verdad];

b) ***semantic borrowings*** – the appearance of a new word meaning due to the influence of the related word in a foreign language. For example, the meaning "a subdivision of an executive department" appeared in the English word *bureau* under the influence of the related Russian word бюро as in *Политическое бюро*. Likewise, by analogy with the Russian word *товарищ* used as the form of address in the former USSR and some other socialist (communist) countries, the related English word *comrade* acquired a new meaning *communist*;

c) ***words coined from Greek or Latin roots*** – the longest and usually most difficult words in the English vocabulary where alongside with well familiar *photograph, telephone* there are many special terms like *otorhinolaryngology* or *sphygmomanometer*. The longest word registered in English texts so far is *nocalcalinocetaceoaluminosocupreovitriolic.*

There are certain structural features which enable us to identify some words as borrowings and even to determine the source language. We have already established that the initial sk usually indicates Scandinavian origin. You can also recognise words of Latin and French origin by certain suffixes, prefixes or endings.

I. Latin Affixes

Nouns suffixes:

-ion: *communion, legion, opinion, etc.*

-tion: *relation, revolution, starvation, temptation, unification, etc.*

Verbs suffixes:

-ate [eit]: *appreciate, create, congratulate, etc.*

-ute [ju:t]: *attribute, constitute, distribute, etc.*

-ct: *act, conduct, collect, connect, etc.*

-d(e): *applaud, divide, exclude, include, etc.*

The prefix dis-: *disable, distract, disown, disagree, etc.*

Adjectives suffixes
-able: *detestable, curable, etc.*
-ate [it]: *accurate, desperate, graduate, etc.*
-ant: *arrogant, constant, important, etc.*
-ent: *absent, convenient, decent, evident, etc.*
-or: *major, minor, junior, senior, etc.*
-al: *cordial, final, fraternal, maternal, etc.*
The suffix -ar: *lunar, solar, familiar, etc.*

Prefix dis-: *discourage*

II. French Affixes
Nouns suffixes:
-ance: *arrogance, endurance, hindrance, etc.*
-ence: *consequence, intelligence, patience, etc.*
-ment: *appointment, development, experiment, etc.*
-age: *courage, marriage, passage, village, etc.*
-ess: *tigress, lioness, actress, adventuress, etc.*

Adjectives suffixes
-ous: *curious, dangerous, joyous, serious, etc.*

Verbs prefix en-: *enable, endear, enact, enfold, enslave, etc.*

Speaking of borrowings, one should not confuse the terms *source of borrowing* and *origin of the word*. The term “source of borrowing” is more important for understanding the form and meaning of the word than its origin because the borrowed word usually bears the sound and graphic form and semantic properties characteristic of the language from which they were borrowed. The word *school,* for example, is borrowed into English from Latin [schola], retains its meaning and spelling, but is of Greek origin. In Greek it had a rather different meaning “leasure,

discussion, lecture, school". Native elements and borrowings in English can be summed up in the following table:

Native Lexical Units	*Borrowed Lexical Units*
1. Anglo-Saxon words: **a) Indo-European element** **b) Common-Germanic element** **c) continental borrowings**	**1. from Latin and Greek** **a) 7th c. A.D. due to Christianity;** **b) during Renaissance (15-17th c.)**
2. Celtic borrowings (5-6th c. A.D.)	**2. from Old Norse due to the Danish Invasion (8 –11th c.)**
3. Latin borrowings via Celtic (due to the Roman Invasion 55-56 B.C. – the 5th century)	**3. from French** **a) due to the Norman conquest (11-13th c)** **b) during Renaissance (15-17th c.)**
4. English proper element not traced to any other language (not earlier than 5th c. A.D)	**4. from other modern languages due to cultural and economic contacts**
5. Words later created in English on the basis of native elements	**5. Words later created in English on the basis of borrowed elements**

[Лещева, 2002]

Each time two nations come into close contact, certain borrowings are a natural consequence. The nature of the contact may be different. It may be wars, invasions or conquests when foreign words are in effect imposed upon the reluctant conquered nation. There are also periods of peace when the process of borrowing is due to trade and international cultural relations.

Sometimes foreign words are borrowed to fill a gap in vocabulary. When the Saxons borrowed Latin words for *butter, plum, beet,* they did it because their own vocabularies lacked words for these new objects. For the same reason the words *potato* and *tomato* were borrowed by English from Spanish when these vegetables were first brought to England by the Spaniards.

But there is also a great number of words which are borrowed for other reasons. There may be a word (or even several words) which expresses some particular concept, so that there is no gap in the vocabulary and there does not seem to be any need for borrowing. Yet, one more word is borrowed which means almost the same, – almost, but not exactly. It is borrowed because it represents the same concept in some new aspect, gives

a new shade of meaning or a different emotional colouring. This type of borrowing enlarges groups of synonyms and contributes to the expressive resources of the vocabulary. That is how the Latin *cordial* was added to the native *friendly*, the French *desire* to *wish*, the Latin *admire* and the French *adore* to *like* and *love*.

Assimilation of borrowings

The term ***assimilation*** is used to denote a partial or complete conformation of borrowings to the phonetic, graphic, morphologic standards of the language.

While studying assimilation of borrowed words we look at how they adjust themselves to their new environment and get adapted to the norms of the recipient language. They undergo certain changes which gradually erase their foreign features, and, finally, they are assimilated. Sometimes they become such a perfect fit to the word-stock that the foreign origin of a word is quite unrecognisable. It is difficult to believe now that such words as *dinner, cat, take, cup* are not English by origin. Others, though well assimilated, still bear traces of their foreign background. *Distance* and *development*, for instance, are identified as borrowings by their French suffixes, *skin* and *sky* by the Scandinavian initial *sk*, *police* and *regime* by the French stress on the last syllable.

According to the degree of assimilation, all borrowings can be divided into 3 groups:

1) completely assimilated;
2) partially assimilated;
3) unassimilated borrowings, often referred to as barbarisms.

Completely assimilated borrowed words comply with morphologic, phonetic and orthographic rules of the recipient language. Their morphological structure and motivation are transparent, so their affixes are easily recognized and can be found in other words of the same source of borrowing (e.g.: the French suffixes *-age, -ance, -ment*). Completely assimilated words are found in all layers of borrowings: *cheese* (1st layer of Latin borrowings), *husband* (Scand.), *animal* (Latin, borrowed during the revival of learning).

Partially assimilated words may be further subdivided into groups depending on the language system they do not fit. Borrowed words are adjusted in the four main areas of the new language system: the spelling (or graphic system), phonetic, the grammatical and the semantic.

a) Borrowings not assimilated graphically contain some spelling elements or symbols that are not typical for the recipient language. For example, words like *café, cliché* are easily recognized as loan words due to the last letter.

b) Borrowings not assimilated phonetically. The lasting nature of phonetic adaptation is best shown by comparing Norman French borrowings to later ones. The Norman borrowings have for a long time been fully adapted to the phonetic system of the English language: such words as *table, plate, courage, chivalry* bear no phonetic traces of their French origin. Some of the later (Parisian) borrowings, even the ones borrowed as early as the 15thc., still sound surprisingly French: *regime, valise, matinee, ballet*. In these cases, phonetic adaptation is not completed.

c) Borrowings unassimilated grammatically. Grammatical adaptation involves a complete change of the former paradigm of the borrowed word (i.e. system of the grammatical forms peculiar to it as a part of speech). If it is a noun, it is certain to adopt, sooner or later, a new system of declension; if it is a verb, it will be conjugated according to the rules of the recipient language. Yet, this is also a lasting process. Thus, English Renaissance borrowings have irregular plural forms: *datum (pl. data), phenomenon (pl. phenomena), criterion (pl. criteria)* whereas earlier Latin borrowings such as *cup, plum, street, wall* were fully adapted to the grammatical system of the language long ago.

d) Borrowings unassimilated semantically typically denote objects and notions, specific to the country of borrowing. They may denote clothes (*sari, sombrero),* vehicles (*rickshaw*) or specific food and drinks *(sherbet, pilau).* By semantic adaptation we can also mean adjustment to the system of meanings of the vocabulary. It has been mentioned that borrowing is generally caused either by the necessity to fill a gap in the vocabulary or by a chance to add a synonym conveying an old concept in a new way. Yet,

sometimes a word may be borrowed for no obvious reason, to find that it is not wanted because there is no gap in the vocabulary nor in the group of synonyms which it could conveniently fill. Quite a number of such "accidental" borrowings are very soon rejected by the vocabulary and forgotten. But there are others which manage to take root by the process of semantic adaptation. The adjective *large*, for instance, was borrowed from French in the meaning of *wide*. It was not actually wanted, because it fully coincided with the English adjective *wide* without adding any new shades or aspects to its meaning. This could have led to its rejection. However, *large* managed, to establish itself very firmly in the English vocabulary by semantic adjustment. It entered another synonymic group with the general meaning of *big in size*. At first it was applied to objects characterised by vast horizontal dimensions, thus retaining a trace of its former meaning, and now, though still bearing some features of that meaning, is successfully competing with *big* having approached it very closely, both in frequency and meaning.

Unassimilated words or barbarisms may look and sound strange and are mostly used in conversation. They are not assimilated in any way retaining properties of the source language: *addio, ciao (Ital.)*

International words are usually borrowed by several languages, and convey concepts which are significant in the field of communication.

Many of them are of Latin and Greek origin. Most names of sciences are international, e. g. *philosophy, mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, medicine, linguistics, lexicology*. There are also numerous terms of art in this group: *music, theatre, drama, tragedy, comedy, artist, primadonna.*

It is quite natural that political terms frequently occur in the international group of borrowings: *politics, policy, revolution, progress, democracy, communism, anti-militarism.*

Scientific and technological advances brought a great number of new international words: *atomic, antibiotic, radio, television, sputnik.* The latter is a Russian borrowing, and it became an international word (meaning a man-made satellite) in 1961, immediately after the first space flight by Yury Gagarin. In 2020 it was used to name the COVID-19 vaccine

(Sputnik-V) due to its internationally recognizable spelling and connotations.

The English language also gave a considerable number of international words to world languages. Among them, the sports terms: *football, volley-ball, baseball, hockey, cricket, rugby, tennis, golf, etc.*

Fruits and foodstuffs imported from exotic countries often transport their names too and, being simultaneously imported to many countries, become international: *coffee, cocoa, chocolate, coca-cola, banana, mango, avocado, grapefruit.*

It is important to note that international words are mainly borrowings. The outward similarity of such words as the E. *son*, the Germ. *Sohn* and the R. *сын* should not lead one to the quite false conclusion that they are international words. They represent the Indo-European group of the native element in each respective language and are ***cognates***, i.e. words of the same etymological root, and not borrowings.

Etymological Doublets are words originating from the same etymological source, but different in their phonetic shape, spelling and meaning. The words *shirt* and *skirt* etymologically descend from the same root. *Shirt* is a native word, and *skirt* (as the initial *sk*- suggests), is a Scandinavian borrowing. Their phonemic shape is different, and yet there is a certain resemblance which reflects their common origin. Their meanings are also different but easily associated: they both denote articles of clothing.

Such words may enter the vocabulary by different routes. Some of these pairs, like *shirt* and *skirt*, consist of a native word and a borrowed word: *shrew*, n. (E.) – *screw*, n. (Sc.).

Others are represented by two borrowings from different languages which are historically descended from the same root: *senior (Lat.) – sir (Fr.), canal (Lat.) – channel (Fr.), captain (Lat.) – chieftan (Fr.).*

Still others were borrowed from the same language twice, but in different periods: *corpse [ko:ps] (Norm. Fr.) – corps [ko:] (Par. Fr.), travel (Norm. Fr.) – travail (Par. Fr.), cavalry (Norm. Fr.) – chivalry (Par. Fr.), gaol (Norm. Fr.) – jail (Par. Fr.).*

Etymological triplets (i.e. groups of three words of common root) occur rarer, but here are at least two examples: *hospital* (Lat.) – *hostel* (Norm. Fr.) – *hotel* (Par. Fr.), *to capture* (Lat.) – *to catch* (Norm. Fr.) – *to chase* (Par. Fr.).

Neologisms

Anglo-Saxon forms, borrowings, and the use of affixes account for most of the English lexicon, but they do not tell the whole story. The general term for a newly created lexeme is a ***coinage***, but in technical usage, a distinction can be drawn between ***nonce words*** and ***neologisms***. A nonce word (from the 16th-century phrase for the *nonce*, meaning *for the once*) is a lexeme created for temporary use, to solve an immediate problem of communication.

D. Crystal describes an incident he evidently witnessed in person: “Someone attempting to describe the excess water in a road after a storm was heard to call it a *fluddle*. She meant something bigger than a puddle but smaller than a flood. The newborn lexeme was forgotten (except by a passing linguist) almost as soon as it was spoken. It was obvious from the jocularly apologetic way in which the person spoke that she did not consider *fluddle* to be a 'proper' word at all. There was no intention to propose it for inclusion in a dictionary. As far as she was concerned, it was simply that there seemed to be no word in the language for what she wanted to say, so she made one up for the nonce” [Crystal, 1995]. A ***neologism*** is a newly coined word that may be in the process of entering common use, but has not yet been accepted into mainstream language. Neologisms are often directly attributable to a specific person, publication, period, or event. A neologism stays new until people start to use it without thinking, or alternatively until it falls out of fashion, and they stop using it altogether. But there is never any way of telling which neologisms will stay and which will go.

Neologisms can be classified in different ways depending on the criteria which become the basis of classification. Thus, according to the origin and formation type we can speak about neologisms based on

1) word formation with the help of means and word-building models existing in a language: *affixation, conversion, compounding (or word-composition), shortening (including blending, clipping, abbreviations, acronyms), sound-imitation, back-formation, reduplication*;

2) semantic shift: *heel* – a tractor (old meaning: heel – the back part of foot);

3) borrowing: *telecast, telestar* (Greek), *sputnik.*

Zabotkina highlights three types of neologisms on the basis of their form and content:

1) neologisms proper where novelty of the form perfectly combined with novelty of the content: *audiotyping аудиопечатание; bio-computer компьютер, имитирующий нервную систему живых организмов*;

2) words that combine novelty of the form with the meaning that have already indulged in another form before: *sudser – мыльная пера; big C – (мед.) рак; (Af.), houtie – негр*;

3) semantic innovations where the new value is denoted by the form that already exists in the language: *bread – деньги; drag – скучища* (Заботкина, 1989).

Regarding the style, Galperin (1981) distinguishes three types of neologisms:

1) terminological coinages or terminological neologisms – those which designate new-born notions;

2) stylistic coinages – words coined by people who look for expressive statements;

3) nonce-words – words are created only to serve the particular occasion and do not live long (Galperin, 1981).

According to Peter Newmark and his book "A Textbook of Translation" there are twelve types of neologisms:

1) old words with new sense – old words that acquire new meaning; these words usually do not relate to new objects or processes that is why they cannot be connected with technology. For instance a word *revoulement* means 'return of refugee'; it can be also used for 'refusal of entry' and 'deportation'. In psychology this word denotes 'repression'. Therefore, it is a loose term, the understanding of which depends on its context;

2) new coinages;

3) derived words;

4) collocations with new meanings – collocations that eventually changed their meanings;

5) abbreviation – common type of pseudo-neologisms. The main feature of abbreviation is that we have to pronounce each letter individually: *CD* (compact disc or certificate of deposit), *PC* (personal computer or politically correct);

6) eponyms – any words that were gained from proper names and also brand names: *Pampers, Xerox, Zoom*;

7) transferred words – words with the meaning that are to a lesser degree dependent on their contexts. They are used more in media or product concepts rather than in technological ones. Furthermore, transferred words may be common to different languages. Examples: newly imported foodstuffs, various brands of clothes ('Adidas', 'Sari', 'Nike');

8) acronyms – are an expanding common peculiarity of all non-literary texts. In acronyms each letter stands for a word, however, unlike abbreviations, where each letter is pronounced individually, acronyms are pronounced as one word. Once the original form of the acronym is forgotten by people it becomes new independent word in the language system: *radar* used to stand for *radio detecting and ranging*;

9) collocations – are noun compounds or those made up af an adjective and a noun: *lead time, domino effect, acid rain*;

10) phrasal words – Newmark declares that "phrasal verbs: a) are often more economical than their translation; b) usually occupy the peculiarly English register between 'informal' and 'colloquial', whilst their translations are more formal: *work-out, trade-off, check-out, thermal cut-out, knockon (domino) effect, laid-back, sit-in*);

11) transferred words – words that have kept only one meaning of their original semantic system: *kung-fu, sari*;

12) pseudo-neologisms – is "a generic word stands in for a specific word, e.g. *longitudinaux (*restarts longitudinaux) – *longitudinal springs*; *humerale – humeral artery* (Newmark, 1988).

Furthermore, neologisms are classified by their stability:

- unstable – extremely new word that are known and used only by a particular subculture;
- diffused – words that reached a high level of spreading and already known to many people, but they are not still accepted (e.g., jargon or lingo);
- stable – words that are recognised, known and accepted by people for a long period of time. (e.g., words which have recently been added to print dictionaries, including popular slang dictionaries).

Another type of new words that tend to appear in a language due to extralinguistic reasons is called ***retronyms.*** Retronyms are new words or word combinations that are used to refer to an old object. They usually appear as a more specific name of an object whose original name has become associated with something else or is no longer unique. For example, before the invention of digital technology, the word *camera* was used to denote what we now call *a film camera*. So, from modern perspective, *film camera* is a retronym.

Archaic and obsolete stand apart from the general vocabulary. These are old words no longer used and replaced by other words in modern language. Foe example, instead of the archaic word *behold* we use *see* or *observe.* So, *behold* is considered an archaism. However there is a special group of words that have gone out of use, not because they were replaces by other words, but because the objects or phenomena they denote have gone out of use. These words are called ***historisms*** or ***obsolete words.*** It should be noted, that there is no universally accepted approach in linguistics as to the distinction between archaic and obsolete words, some linguists treat them as synonyms, while others mention the differences described above.

SELF-CHECK TASKS

1. ***Explain the meaning the following words and word combinations*:** etymology, native words, English proper words, borrowing, archaism, an obsolete word, an international word, coinage, retronym, assimilation of bowwowings.

2. ***Answer the following questions***

1) How can you account for the fact that English vocabulary contains such an immense number of words of foreign origin?
2) What is the earliest group of English borrowings? Date it.
3) What Celtic borrowings are there in English? Date them.
4) Which words were introduced into English vocabulary during the period of Christianization?
5) What are the characteristic features of Scandinavian borrowings?
6) When and under what circumstances did England become a bi-lingual country? What imprint features were left in English vocabulary by this period?
7) What are the characteristic features of words borrowed into English during the Renaissance?
8) What suffixes and prefixes can help you to recognize words of Latin and French origin?
9) What is meant by the native element of English vocabulary?
10) Which conditions stimulate the borrowing process?
11) Why are words borrowed?
12) What stages of assimilation do borrowings go through?
13) In what spheres of communication do international words frequently occur?
14) What do we understand by etymological doublets?
15) What are the characteristic features of translation-loans?
16) How does assimilation of borrowings happen? What types of assimilation are there?
17) What is a neologism? What types of neologisms do you know?
18) What is the difference between an archaic, an obsolete word and a retronym? What do they have in common?

PRACTICE TASKS

1. Subdivide all the following words of native origin into: a) Indo-european, b) Germanic, c) English proper.

Daughter, woman, room, land, cow, moon, sea, red, spring, three, I, lady, always, goose, bear, fox, lord, tree, nose, birch, grey, old, glad, daisy, heart, hand, night, to eat, to see, to make.

2. Group the words below in three columns: a) fully assimilated words; b) partially assimilated words; c) unassimilated words. Explain the reasons for your choice in each case.

Pen, bei, toreador, hors d'oeuvre, ballet, beet, butter, skin, take, data, cup, police, distance, monk, garage, phenomenon, caffe, bouquet, brioche, buffet, corps, corpus, shah, rajah, sheik, cheese.

3. Trace the origin of the following etymological doublets:

Host – guest; shadow – shade – shed; secure – sure; ward – guard; prize – price – praise – prix; corn – kernel – grain; capital – cattle.

4. Group neologisms according to their word-building models and speak about their motivation and meaning.

Anthropause, anti-mask, BCV (before coronavirus), blursday, body mullet, coronababies, coronacation, coronacut, coronageddon, COVID bubble, Covid-19, covideo-party, covidiot, domino distancing, doomscrolling, face naked, locktail, mask tan, mask up, maskne, mask-shaming, overdistancing, quaranteams, rona, sanny, SARS-CoV-2, zoombombing, zumping.

5. Find modern equivalents to the following archaic words and use corpora to provide examples of their use:

Affright, assay, behold, behoof, camelopard, carl, collogue, commend, dame, damsel, goodly, hither, knave, love apple, maid, morrow, naught, steed, thenceforth, thereunto, ween, wherefore, wright.

6. Provide examples of obsolete words.

FUTHER READING

1. Ayto, J. Twentieth Century Words / J. Ayto. – Oxford, OUP, 1999.

2. Crystal, D. English vocabulary. The Structure of the Lexicon: The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language / D. Crystal. – Cambridge University Press, 1995.

3. Fromkin, V. An Introduction to Language / V. Fromkin, R. Rodman. – Dryden Pr Pub, 1999.

4. Антрушина, Г. В. Лексикология английского языка / Г. В. Антрушина, О. В. Афанасьева, Н. Н. Морозова. – М. : ДРОФА, 2004.

5. Арнольд, И. В. Лексикология современного английского языка / И. В. Арнольд. – М. : Высш. шк., 1986.

6. Апресян, В. Ю. Языковая картина мира и системная лексикография / В. Ю. Апресян [и др.] ; [Ю. Д. Апресян (отв. ред.)]. – М. : Языки славянских культур, 2006.

Unit 5
VARIETIES AND DIALECTS OF ENGLISH

Dialect vs language. Standard norm

Each person in a certain language community speaks in a different way. The language used by a person is distinct in pronunciation, in preferences for certain words and even grammatical patterns. The language pattern of one‘s individual speech at a certain period of his life is called an ***idiolect.*** Characteristic forms of social groups‘ language are usually referred to as ***sociolects***. Sociolects arise within social groups and are determined by such factors as 1) geography, 2) socioeconomic status, 3) ethnicity/race, 4) age, 5) occupation, and 6) gender.

The systematic use of common patterns in grammar, vocabulary stock and pronunciation by people of a certain locality or a socially limited group makes up a ***dialect***. Several dialects with a literary norm as their centralizing core may be viewed as one language. The distinction between a language and a dialect is not clear cut. Sometimes for historical and political reasons two or more dialects may be referred to as different languages, like Swedish, Danish and Norwegian. Or vice versa, some completely different dialects may be called one language. This situation occurs in China, where speakers of different dialects may be almost unintelligible to each other but they share the same written language tradition based on ideographic characters, and on this written basis, they can communicate with each other and believe they speak the same Chinese language.

The most prestigious dialect is usually chosen as the standard, or standard norm of the language. It differs from other dialects, because it is not regional. Educated people usually use a standard norm although they live in different parts of the country and come from different social strata. Besides differences in idiolects, accents and dialects, there are essential differences between written and oral forms of a language, and each of these forms has its own standard norm. So, all languages exist in numerous variations. English is especially varied because of the great number of its

speakers, of its use on vast and distant territories, and of a large range of functions it performs.

Studies of the relationship between the social class and language are rather controversial. It is well known that speakers of the highest social class in Great Britain, for example, are supposed to speak Standard English. The so-called Standard English is a social dialect used by well-educated English speakers in different localities. It presupposes very little regional, ethnic or gender variation. One of its most obvious characteristics is RP – received, or accepted pronunciation among the best-educated members of the society. Though only a very small share of the English population speak it, this accent is taught to foreign learners due to its high social prestige. It gives foreigners the best chance of being understood. It is widely used on radio and television and is familiar to all the people. It is also the most thoroughly described British accent.

There used to be numerous studies on the impact of the class of people in the society on their accents and dialects. However, today this approach looks outdated, because the borderline between classes is blurred, and there are high chances of shifts between classes.

Occupational groups have their own characteristic vocabulary. Legal discourse, or legalese, and medical discourse, or medicalese, are good examples of occupational sociolects. The relation between language and sex, or gender, has attracted considerable attention in recent years. In some African, Asian and Native American language communities, like Koasati – a Muskogean language spoken in Louisiana, there are significant differences between words or their grammatical forms proscribed to men and to women when addressing each other or naming the same concept. Recent research, however, has found that women speak closer to the prestige standard. Women tend to use more phrases expressing hesitation like *maybe, perhaps, in my opinion or a kind of*, appreciative adjectives like *delightful, charming, cute, precious, darling, nice, great, lovely*, and politeness formulae like *Would you please open the door?* But men very often use politeness formulae when they want to sound friendly and cooperative.

Some feminist scholars, especially in the USA, point out to the subordinate status of women and they view some language phenomena (e.g. words like *policeman, businessman, anchorman*) as an indication of the second-class status of women reflected in the language, as a sign of a women‘s social status. Many social activists in the US have worked to change language norms to respond to their concerns. In the 80s such efforts were called *political correctness* (*PC*). In any event, the original aims of advocates of political correctness included writing women back into history and fighting against inequality, security, equal opportunities for all Americans regardless their race, ethnicity, class, gender, physical abilities, sexual orientation, age, and religious beliefs.

They argued that these linguistic changes would participate in creating a more equitable, caring society. For example, the semifree suffix *-man* should be used alongside with *-woman* when the refernt is female. Alternately, a gender-neutral term should be substituted for a gender specific term, for example, *firefighter* rather than *fireman* and *first-year student* instead of *freshman*, when it refers to women and men. Using the masculine pronouns, *he* and *his* as the universal norm is now considered incorrect. The most recent option is to use the pronoun *they* if the gender is unknown or is not important. It replaced the inconvenient *he/she* alternative. In 2019 Merriam-Webster announced *they* as the word of the year as a gender neutral pronoun.

The problems of language and gender, political correctness do not seem to be a lexicological problem of vocabulary varieties existing in a language at a certain period. Rather they are social problems of gender relations and sociolinguistic problems of language policy, though all these aspects of language study are interesting; they are related to words and contribute to understanding of what vocabulary is, and of forces driving its development.

Territorial variety of the English language and variants of English

From the point of view of territorial variety, English is a very special language, because it is spoken as a native language by more than

300 million people all around the world. English became the basis for many Pidgin and Creole languages – simplified systems with minimum morphology that serve only the most important functions of a language. ***Pidgin*** is a subsidiary language system spoken by people with no common language, it is a mixed language used for communication, and the vocabulary of one of the languages is more dominant than that of the others. ***Creole*** is the pidgin that has become a first language for some speech communities. English-based creoles are Antillan, Jamaican, Gullah, Hawaiian, Tok Pisin and some other creole languages on the tropical belt.

Nowadays English is widely used as a ***lingua franca*** – the language of communication between large numbers of people who do not share a common language. The most intensive exporting of English, which led to its becoming a world language, began in the 17th century with the first settlements in Northern America, and later in India, Canada, Australia, Africa and New Zealand. It developed several distinct dialects which later formed literary and standard norms of their own. Thus these dialects became ***variants*** of English. The best well-known and studied variants of the English language are British and American.

British variant of the English language

Within the British Isles, English exists and has always existed in a great variety of forms, ***Standard English*** being one of them. Historically Standard English goes back to a southern dialect that became influential in the 14th and 15th centuries due to London‘s important role in England. Standard English is the language variety considered the most suitable for use in broadcasting media and at schools and universities both in Britain and abroad. It is no longer a regional dialect. Regional, or local dialects are spoken mainly in rural parts of Great Britain. In England there are five major groups of dialects: ***Northern, Midland, Southern, Western*** and ***Eastern***. They can be traced back to the Germanic tribal languages of the 5th century. The area occupied by the Angles gave rise to Northumbrian (Northern) and Mercian (Midland) dialects. The area settled by Saxons (south of the Thames and west to Cornwall) gave rise to Essex dialect. In

the area of Jutish settlement (Kent and the Isle of Wight) people still speak Kentish dialect. But this is a very broad grouping of dialects. Every county, a shire, has its own peculiarities. These dialects differ in words, their meanings, pronunciation and even in grammar. For example, in the Lancashire dialect they use *nowt* for *nothing*, *summat* for *something*.

The words and meanings of all major dialects of the British Isles are recorded in Joseph Wright's English Dialect Dictionary (1896 – 1905) and in a more recent dictionary of several volumes Survey of English Dialects (1962 – 1968) edited by Harold Orton, as well as in the Linguistic Atlas of England edited by Harold Orton, et al. (1977). The number of dialectal words is gradually reducing because everyone in England now reads and listens to Standard English on radio, TV, films and newspapers. However, accents, pronunciation features characteristic of some population groups, are still evident in Birmingham, Liverpool, Glasgow, Newcastle, London, Yorkshire, Lancashire, and Northumbria.

Instances of dialectal grammar use, like irregular forms of the plural in nouns, double comparatives in adjectives or the use of -ed inflection in irregular verbs, occur regularly. The dialects of Scotland and Northern Ireland are a special case because they have institutionalized standard norms, dictionaries and published literature. That is why they may be regarded today rather variants of the English language than dialects.

American variant of the English language

The dominant language spoken in the USA is English. The English of Spenser and Shakespeare was brought to the USA from the British Isles in the seventeenth century by English colonists. The ratification of the Federal Constitution in 1787 by the thirteen colonies on the Atlantic seaboard established the US and it was a decisive moment in the history of American English. Geographically, historically and culturally separated from British Isles, English in the USA underwent some changes. Alongside changes the language of the USA preserved some of the words typical for the English language of the 17th century (e.g. *fall* instead of *autumn* which was introduced to the British English later while *fall* in this meaning died out).

The question of whether American English is a dialect, a variant, or a separate language has long been debated. Though the difference between language and dialect is very vague, there are no serious grounds to call American English a separate language. American English uses basically the same word-stock, grammar and phonological systems as British English, and that is why American English should be regarded as a variant of English, alongside Canadian, Australian, Indian variants which, unlike dialects that are restricted to spoken forms, have their own standard literary norms. Specific features of American English are observed in all language components:

- in phonetics it involves differences in vowel quality, intonation, specific word stress in some lexemes, pronunciation of some words, like, *for, farm, lord*, where *r* is still retained as a fricative, or *dance, fast, half* with a broad low front vowel; *beating* like *beading*, *matter* like *madder*;
- in grammar we can speak of heavy use of contractions like can't, don't) and Past Simple instead of Present Perfect in a number of cases;
- in orthography it is simplified spelling of some words with *-or* for *-our, -er* for *-re*, one consonant in *traveler, jewelry, -s-* for *-c-* in *defence, offence* and *practice* and other different simplifications like *catalog, check* or *program*).

But the most numerous and obvious are differences in vocabulary systems between the two variants though the greater part of lexical items are common to both variants of English. The USA, being a country of immigrants speaking different languages and dialects, and the country of improvisation and experimentation, is a place with a rich supply of linguistic expressive possibilities. American English adopted a lot of borrowings that displaced some British words, or filled in lexical gaps that became obvious to American people, or created new stylistically marked lexemes that are used alongside with the British. Some examples are:

- from Native Indian languages: *chipmunk, chocolate, hickory, hominy, moccasin, moose, muskrat, opossum, potato* (from West Indian Taino batata), *pow-wow, raccoon, sequoia, skunk, squash, succotash, totem, wigwam*;

- from French: *depot, gopher, lacrosse, portage, prairie, pumpkin, rapids, shant*;
- from Spanish: *alligator, canyon, cargo, barbeque, corral, bronco, cafeteria, cockroach, lasso, marijuana, mesa, patio, plaza, ranch, rodeo, sombrero, tornado, vanilla*;
- from Dutch: *boss, caboose, cookie, Santa Claus, sleigh, snoop, spook, stoop, waffle, wagon*;
- from German: *delicatessen, ersatz, frankfurter, hamburger, noodle, pretzel, sauerkraut, spiel*;
- from Italian: *spaghetti, ravioli, pizza, minestrone, tutti frutti, espresso*;
- from Yiddish: *gefilte fish, shtick, schnook, bagel, zaftig, schmo, schmaltz*;
- from West African languages: *jazz, boogie-woogie, goober, cooter, voodoo, okra*.
- From Japanese: *bonsai, sushi*.

More often than the British, Americans use minor means of word formation, such as

- acronyms (*O. K.* for "oll korrect" – the former spelling, *Jeep* from GP – a military vehicle for general purposes; *POW* for prisoner of war, *yuppies* for young upwardly-mobile professionals);
- clipping (*coon* for raccoon, *possum* for opossum, *still* for distillatory), backformation (sculpt from sculpture, enthuse from enthusiasm, resurrect from resurrection), blends (travelogue, sellathon),
- proper name extension (*pullman, diesel, Fahrenheit*).

They also actively use such major types of word-formation:

- composition (*backwater, homestretch, hired hand, sky-scraper*);
- conversion (*a try-out, to softpedal, to side-track, a showdown*).

Some affixes are more active in American than in British. For example, suffixes *-ette (usherette, drum-majorette, dinette, launderette), -ize (itemize, burglarize, winterize), -ee (trainee, parolee, escapee, retiree), -burger (cheeseburger, chickenburger, fishburger), -cian (mortician, beautician).*

Many Elizabethan English words remained in American English, while in British English they became obsolete and were replaced by some new names, for example, American *sick* for British *ill*, *faucet* for *tap, guess, reckon* for British *think, candid* for *white* (candid flames).

Vice versa, many British English words underwent semantic changes in American English. The word *bug*, for example, originally denoted insects in general, and in this meaning it is still used in American English, while in British English the word began to denote a more specified concept, *a bedbug. Laurel* was and still is used to denote *bay* in British English, and in American English it is used to denote *an evergreen magnolia*.

Different name creation activities and different uses of lexical items in these two language communities result in lexical-semantic differences of vocabulary systems in British and American variants of the English language that may be described along the following patterns:

1. Different words for common concepts.

There are many cases when the same concepts are named in Englishes by different words and phraseological units. For example, in American English *gas, or gasoline*, is equivalent to *petrol* in British English. *A car* in America has a *trunk* (BE boot), a *hood* (BE bonnet) and *fenders* (BE bumpers). What the Americans call *corn, elevator, truck, wind-shield, garbage-man, drugstore* the British call *maize, lift, lorry, windscreen, chemist's*. *Flat* is British and *apartment* is American, *cock* is British and *rooster* is American, *queue* is British and *line* is American, *railway* is British and *railroad* is American, *shop* is British and *store* is American.

2. Common words for different concepts.

Both Englishes have common word-stock but they may apply them in a slightly different way to refer to different concepts. For example, the Americans use *vest* for *a man's or woman's sleeveless garment worn under a suit coat*, but the British use this word to refer exclusively to a *man's underwear* (AE undershirt). *Robin* stands for *different thrush-like*

birds, hence in Britain *robin* is *a symbol of winter, of Christmas*, while in the USA it is *a symbol of spring*. Still another example is the word *pants*, a shortening of *pantaloons*, which is observed in both the variants. But in American English the word corresponds to British English *trousers* that are worn by both men and women. *Pants* in British English can only be referred to *man's short underpants*.

3. Some words in both Englishes stand for ideas of objects (events or qualities) that do not have counterparts in the other country.
They are names for geographical places, plants, animals, constructions, social events and institutions that can be found only in one of the countries. For example, *canyon, sequoia, gopher, senator, lynching, drive-in* (a cinema where you can see the film without getting out of your car) are mostly characteristic of American English, and *wicket, silly mid-off* (terms from the game of cricket) are characteristic of British English.

4. Lexical gaps in one of the variants for common concepts.
Not all concepts are lexicalized, and we usually become aware of that only when two languages or two variants of the language are compared. In American English, for example, there are words like *caboose* – a freight-train car attached usually to the rear mainly for the use of the train crew, or *zaftig* – plump, attractive woman'. But in British English these concepts are just rendered descriptively or by means of a quasy-equivalent, like guard's van (BE) the part of a train, usually at the back, where the man in charge travels'.

5. Stylistic or emotional colouring of correlative words in different variants may be different.
In American English, for example, *autumn* is bookish, while in British English it is neutral.

On the whole American usage is less formal than British. Differences between the two Englishes are gradually fading due to development of modern means of communication.

Dialects of American English

Dialect variation in American English derived mainly from original British dialect differences and from new geographic and social determinants. Now there are four major groups of dialects in the USA: Northeastern, Southern, Midwestern and Western. These are some examples of lexical differences between them:

Northeastern	***Southern***	***Midwestern***	***Western***
brook	Branch	Creek	creek
faucet	Spigot	Tap	hydrant
pail	Bucket	Pail	bucket/pail
tonic/soda	coke/cold drink	soda/pop	pop

The form of speech used by radio and television, mostly used in scientific and business discourse, is often referred to as General American, the language that may be also heard from Ohio through the Middle West and on to the Pacific Coast, and that may be described as the norm of American English. (Some scholars, however, object to this term and use Network Standard instead).

SELF-CHECK TASKS

1. ***Explain the meaning the following words and word combinations*****:** Idiolect, sociolect, dialect, political correctness, pidgin, creole, lingua franca, variant.

2. ***Answer the following questions***

1) What is the difference between an idiolect and a sociolect?
2) What do sociolects differ in?
3) What is the difference between a dialect and a variant of a language?
4) Why does English have so many variants across the world?

5) What accounts for the differences between British and American English?

6) That are the differences in phonetics, grammar, spelling?

7) What types of differences in vocabulary do linguists distinguish?

8) What regional dialects of American English do you know?

PRACTICE TASKS

Choose a language varieties other than British and American and characterize it according to the following plan:

1) the historical background behind the development of the variety;

2) extralinguistic factors that had an impact on its peculiarities;

3) phonetic features;

4) vocabulary;

5) grammar peculiarities;

6) speakers of it.

FUTHER READING

1. Швейцер, А. Д. Социальная дифференциация английского языка в США / А. Д. Швейцер. – М. : Наука, 1983.

2. Ярцева, В. Н. Развитие национального литературного английского языка / В. Н. Ярцева. – М. : Наука, 1969.

3. Aitchison, J. Linguistics / J. Aitchison. – London : Teach Yourself Books, 1992.

4. Chambers, J. K. Dialectology / J. K. Chambers. – Cambridge : CUP, 1980.

5. Flexner, S. B. Speaking Freely: A Guided Tour of American English from Plymouth Rock to Silicon Valley / S. B. Flexner, A. H. Soukhanov. – New York, Oxford : OUP, 1997.

6. Freeborn, D. Varieties of English. An Introduction to the Study of Language. Second Edition / D. Freeborn, P. French, D. Langford. – Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London : The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1993.

7. Holmes, J. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics / J. Holmes. – London and New York : Longman, 1994.

8. Hughes, A. English Accents and Dialects. An Introduction to Social and Regional Varieties of British English / A. Hughes, P. Trudgill. – London : Edward Arnold, 1979.

9. Long, D. Sociolinguistic Aspects of Japanese Loan words in English / D. Long // XVIth International Congress of Linguists. Abstracts. – Paris, 1997.

10. Marckwardt, A. H. American English / A. H. Marckwardt. – New York, Oxford : OUP, 1980.

11. O'Donnell, W. R. Variety in Contemporary English / W. R. O'Donnell, L. Todd. – London : G.Allen & Unwin, 1980.

12. Quirk, R. Grammatical and Lexical Variance in English / R. Quirk. – UK : Longman, 1999.

13. Strevens, P. British and American English / P. Strevens. – London : Cassell Ltd., 1978.

Unit 6
LEXICOGRAPHY

Lexicography is the art and science of compiling dictionaries. Its origin dates back to ancient China, Greece, and Rome. The later practice of compiling lists of words from religious texts to specify their meaning can be regarded as the forerunner of dictionaries.

With the invention of printing, many of dictionaries of many languages appeared in various countries. The 20th century made lexicography a highly scholarly subject due to the development of linguistics, including lexicology, and new technologies. The growth of academic societies has also contributed to its development.

The object of lexicography and lexicology is the same – vocabulary of a language. But lexicology is mostly interested in revealing structural and systematic features of vocabulary, while lexicography is mainly concentrated on compiling dictionaries – wordbooks with lists of vocabulary units and their specific semantic, structural and functional characteristics. Lexicology works out principles of vocabulary organization and thoroughly studies data about certain lexical units and lexical phenomena that are widely used in lexicography. In its turn, lexicography collects and preserves valuable information for lexicology. Thus, these branches of linguistics are interrelated.

We can speak now about two branches of lexicography. ***Theoretical lexicography*** provides theoretical framework for compiling dictionaries of various types. Thus, it develops semantic, orthographic, syntagmatic, and paradigmatic features of lexemes of the lexicon (vocabulary) of a language. ***Practical lexicography*** is in charge of implementing these principles in dictionaries.

Typically dictionaries contain the following information:

- ***pronunciation*** that specifies what sounds (phonemes) a word has, if it has more than one syllable how they are each stressed, and if the pronunciation is subject to any variation in connected speech (e.g. vowel reduction or change in stress);

- ***spelling*** specifies the letters that make up the word, any variant spelling, any possibility where the word may be broken at the end of a line;
- ***the structure of a word*** refers to its composition in terms of morphemes;
- ***meaning*** of a word is described as well as any relevant semantic relations (sense relations, collocation);
- ***grammar characteristics*** including a word class, describing the inflections that a word has and how it fits into the syntax of sentences;
- ***usage*** that specifies whether a word, or any of its meanings is restricted to particular contexts, often illustrated with examples;
- ***etymology*** that specifies the origin of the word and in case of borrowings, information about the source language can also be included into the entry.

Dictionaries can be classified into ***general*** dictionaries and ***restricted*** dictionaries. ***General dictionaries*** contain lexical units in ordinary use from various language layers, while ***restricted dictionaries*** include only a certain part of the word-stock (e.g. terminological, phraseological, dialectal dictionaries, dictionaries of new words, of foreign words, of abbreviations, etc.). ***An encyclopedic dictionary*** is a thing-book. It deals with every kind of knowledge about the world (general encyclopedia) or with one particular branch of it (special encyclopedia). In contrast to a linguistic dictionary, which is a word-book, some common words, like *mother, father, house, I, the, white, oh*, do not enter an encyclopedia, while many geographical names and names of prominent people make up an important part of it. Some words, like taxonomic names of plants, animals, and diseases enter both kinds of dictionaries, but information about them has a different character. The most well-known encyclopedias in English are The Encyclopedia Britannica (in 24 volumes) and The Encyclopedia Americana (in 30 volumes). Unlike encyclopedic dictionaries, linguistic dictionaries provide extensive information about each recorded word. In encyclopedic dictionaries the most extensive is extralinguistic information about a concept.

According to the information they provide, all linguistic dictionaries can be described as either ***explanatory*** or ***specialized***. ***Explanatory***

dictionaries provide information on all aspects of the lexical units: graphical, phonetical, grammatical, semantic, stylistic, etymological, etc. Most of these dictionaries deal with lexical units in Modern English: they are ***synchronic*** in their presentation of words. ***Diachronic*** dictionaries are concerned with the historical development of words. ***Specialized*** dictionaries deal with lexical units only in relation to some of their charactreristics, e.g. only in relation to their etymology, or frequency, or pronunciation. ***Pronouncing*** dictionaries record contemporary pronunciation norms and/or variants.

Etymological dictionaries trace present-day words to the oldest forms available, establish their primary meanings and give the parent form reconstructed by means of the comparative-historical method. In case of borrowings, they point out the immediate source of borrowing, its orogin and parallel forms in cognate language.

Dictionaries of word-frequency as the name suggests, inform their user about the frequency of lexical units in speech. Most of these dictionaries were compiled on the basis of corpora. Dictionaries of idioms include vast collections of phraseological units like collocations, proverbs, often accompanied by examples to illustrate their use.

Dictionaries of slang contain elements from areas of substandard speech such as vulgarisms, jargonisms, taboo words, curse-words, colloquialisms, etc.

Dictionaries of synonyms and antonyms provide information on all the lexical units that enter into the given semantic relations with the head word. In case of polysemantic words, synonyms and antonyms are given for each of the meanings.

A reverse dictionary is a list of words in which the entry words are arranged in alphabetical order starting with their final letters.

Translation dictionaries (sometimes also called parallel) contain vocabulary items in one language and their equivalents in another language.

Some dictionaries are created for a certain target group of people who are supposed to find it particularly useful. Especially popular are ***English learners' dictionaries***, designed to help learn the English

language. Some dictionaries even state the learner's level at which the dictionary is useful, for example Oxford Collocations Dictionary is designed for Upper-Intermediate to Advanced students. ***Collocation dictionaries*** help students write and speak natural-sounding English. Collocations are common word combinations such as speak fluently, meet a challenge and winning formula. They are essential building blocks for natural sounding spoken and written English. The dictionary shows all the words that are commonly used in combination with each headword: nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and prepositions as well as common phrases. A new word in dictionary-making is language activators.

The Language Activator takes you form a key word or basic idea, like good, and shows you more precise words or phrases with information on register, context and grammar structures thay are used in. An Activator provides detailed definitions that help students choose the correct word and corpus-based examples show words in typical usage, giving various collocations and phrases. The index at the back of the book enables easy cross-referencing. The development of the IT has lead to the creation of ***electronic computer dictionaries***. Such dictionaries are available on CDs and can be installed on your computer or are cloud-based and can be accessed via Internet. They provide quick search of words and are not limited in volume. Online dictionaries are very convenient for those who use the Internet of the permanent basis. An evident advantage of online dictionaries is that their content is constantly updated so the users enjoy the freshest version of the dictionary. Some dictionaries, especially translation online dictionaries are open and can be edited by users.

The history of British and American lexicography

The first word-books that appeared on the British Isles during the entire Anglo-Saxon and most of the Middle English period were ***lists of difficult Latin terms*** used in the Scriptures. These lists were accompanied by glosses in easier Latin or sometimes with Anglo-Saxon equivalents. Sometimes they were written between the Latin lines. No attempts were made to list the Anglo-Saxon words in some order. The first English dictionaries were published in the16th century, though none of them were

ever called *dictionaries*: various names were used, like *hortus garden* or *thesaurus hoard*. They included words organized in a systematic, usually alphabetic, to allow the user find words easily. They were bilingual foreign language word-books (English-French and French-English, English-Italian and Italian-English, English-Spanish and Spanish-English, English-Latin and Latin-English).

The 17th century saw the emergence of a monolingual English dictionary. In 1604 the first monolingual dictionary was published. It was ***A Table Alphabeticall***, designed to be a reference source of the true writing and understanding of difficult English words borrowed from the Hebrew, Greek, Latine, or French, etc. It was written by Robert Cawdrey, a schoolmaster. The dictionary had more than 2,500 entries containing words like *anathema, gargarize*. No modal verbs, pronouns or "obvious" words like *eat, cat* were included in it yet.

The Golden Age in the history of British lexicography began in the 18th century. Dictionaries of difficult words gave way to ordinary-word dictionaries focusing on literary usage. In 1702 John Kersey published his ***New English Dictionary*** and moved away from the "hard word" tradition. It included words of daily language and was aimed at "young scholars, tradesmen and the female sex to teach them to spell truly".

The best dictionary of this time was the ***Universal Etymological Dictionary*** by Nathaniel Bailey (1721). For the first time, a dictionary included etymology, usage including style information, syllabification, illustrative quotations (chiefly from proverbs) and even pronunciation – all types of information that is customarily provided in modern explanatory dictionaries. In 1730 N. Bailey and two collaborators published a more comprehensive work, containing 48,000 words, the Dictionarium Britannicum. It became the basis of S. Johnson's dictionary.

In 1755 Dr. Samuel Johnson, a poet, essayist and literary critic published his great ***Dictionary of the English Language*** in two volumes consisting of 2,300 pages with 40,000 entries. This work became the most authoritative text for several generations of Englishmen and was superseded only by the ***Oxford English Dictionary***. It took Johnson more than eight years to write it (instead of the intended three), and it was the

first English dictionary ever compiled by a writer of the first rank. The dictionary was a scholarly record of the whole language, based on a corpus of examples (an important innovation!) by the best authors of that time like Shakespeare, Milton, Pope, Addison, Bacon, Spenser (though many of them were reproduced from memory). Thus it became a prescriptive guide to the best usage of the English language for more than a century. Johnson‘s attempts to fix the language, his thorough choice of the words for inclusion, and high repute in which the dictionary was held established a lofty bookish style that was given the name of – Johnsonian‖ or – Johnsonese. S. Johnson was especially good at giving definitions; yet he sometimes gave in to his personal prejudices and humour. The most quotable example is that Dr. S. Johnson included a vexatious definition of *oats* because he meant to vex the Scots – “a grain, which in England is generally given to horses, but in Scotland supports the people”. Another example is based on the word *dull*. To illustrate the meaning of the adjective *dull* he wrote: “to make a dictionary is a dull work”.

Pronunciation was not registered in the dictionary because S. Jonhson was aware of a variety of pronunciations and realized that the task of standardizing them was impossible then. Various pronunciation dictionaries appeared later in the second half of the 18th century (among them are Thomas Sheridan‘s ***General Dictionary of the English Language*** – 1780, and John Walker‘s ***Critical Pronouncing Dictionary and Expositor of the English language*** – 1791). Proper names and extralinguistic items were mostly excluded, and this is still a characteristic feature of modern British lexicography. One more important innovation that S. Johnson made was to preface his Dictionary with an explanation of his aims and procedures. The preface also included a short history of the language and a grammar. There he made also an attempt to depart from prevailing prescriptive principles and take a descriptive approach. This departure from prescriptive to descriptive principles initiated a new era in lexicography.

In 1621 N. Bailey published his ***Universal Etymological Dictionary and the English people*** – shopkeepers, farmers, tradesmen began buying it. It became a best-seller and was reprinted thirty times. The book earned

enormous sums of money, and the publishers decided to write a "real dictionary". They hired Samuel Johnson to do the work. At that time, he earned a slim income in writing poetry, essays, but he spent most of his days in a tavern talking with friends. When Lord Chesterfield (a publisher) offered a down payment of 1,575 pounds to write a dictionary, Johnson accepted gladly. Being confident of his literary powers, Johnson offered to write a dictionary in 3 years. Friends warned him that this time wasn't enough. It had taken 40 French scholars 40 years to write a French dictionary, suggesting that he should change his mind "Nonsense, – Johnson replied, – any Englishman is the equal of 40 Frenchmen. Three years. That's all it will take!" His idea was to write a dictionary that could preserve the purity of a language, save it from corruption and decay, and hold back the flood of low terms he heard all around him on London streets and in the tavern. He introduced examples showing how authors used these words. The written word, he believed, was the keystone of a language.

In 1755 Johnson finished his work – ***A Dictionary of the English Language*** (it took him eight years, not three), and he was not satisfied with the work he produced. He realized that relying on his memory for definitions wasn't good enough for dictionary making. He no longer thought it possible to fix the language. It was people and spoken English, not books that determined how the language developed. The Dictionary was a huge success. Johnson's work was a landmark in the history of dictionary making. It was the first time anyone had put down on paper the words that made up the English language, and it set basic guidelines for the craft of dictionary making. Lexicographers for the next two centuries would follow the principles Johnson had established.

But a real turn away from prescriptive to descriptive dictionaries was made only in the 19th and 20th centuries. At this time three new concepts emerged in English lexicography:

1) the idea of compiling dictionaries on historical principles;

2) the replacement of prescriptive rules by a relatively systematic descriptive approach;

3) the idea of compiling independent national dictionaries reflecting English language development in the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the West Indies.

The idea of ***compiling dictionaries on historical principles*** belongs to Dean Richard Trench who in 1857 published his celebrated paper ***On Some Deficiencies in our English Dictionaries***. He put forward the idea of a new dictionary – A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles (NED) – 1884, that would exhibit each word and each meaning in a historical manner, arranging senses in chronological order, and which contain illustrative quotations from verified printed sources. Real work on the dictionary began in 1879 when James A. H. Murray, a Scottish schoolmaster and self-taught philologist, was persuaded to become the editor. Later three more editors were added to speed its work, yet the final volume appeared only in 1928 (by that time it was called ***The Oxford English Dictionary, or OED***). The dictionary, nicknamed "The King of Dictionaries", consisted of 12 volumes, 16,569 pages and contained 414,825 defined words. It traced the history of English words over 10 centuries. It included 5,000,000 quotations, and 2,000 readers provided most of them. Sense divisions were precise and detailed. Etymologies were the best available at the time. It was a 70-year project in which a wide network of volunteers and the editors' families were involved.

A supplement appeared in 1933, and four further supplements appeared between 1972 and 1986. In the late seventies a two-volume set in a much-reduced typeface was issued. This edition included a powerful magnifying glass. The first computerized edition of the OED on CD-ROM has been available since 1988 (Compact Edition of OED). It contains the original 12 volumes, without the Supplement, however. The words that were extinct by 1150 are not included in it, and it does not do justice to the OED.

While James Murray Johnson's and Webster's dictionaries recorded words used by people in England and America during their lifetimes, an Irish Archbishop, Dan Richard Trench, came up with an idea for a remarkable new dictionary, a dictionary of the entire English language, a record or biography of each word for as long as people kept written records. Work on that began at Oxford University in England with considerable participation of volunteers. In 1879 Sir James A. H. Murray became first of four editors. In his back yard he built – Scriptorium‖ where

he worked over the first edition of the Oxford English Dictionary. His two daughters, three assistant editors, helped him and 2000 volunteer readers. In 1928 – seventy-one years after Dean Trench had thought of the idea – the tenth and final volume, X-Y-Z, was published. (The Panama Canal during this time was dug, but it took only 10 years (1904 – 1914) to complete.)

The second trend in dictionary-making that emerged in the 19 – 20th centuries was ***the replacement of prescriptive rules*** by a relatively systematic descriptive approach. Prescriptive dictionaries arrange meanings chronologically. Elements of this approach are found, for example, in ***A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*** by H. W. Fowler (1926, revised in 1965) and in The Concise Oxford Dictionary (7th edition, 1982), though the latter does not employ chronological order. Descriptivists quickly identify new linguistic habits and record them without indicating that they might be unwelcome. In descriptive dictionaries archaic words and meanings are usually omitted, and the meanings are arranged in order of commonness or so-called logical order.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary (1961) is the most famous American dictionary considered an example of the descriptive approach, which is widely used in modern American lexicography.

The third trend of English language lexicography of the 19 – 20th century was ***the development of national lexicography*** in each English-speaking country. It is best reflected in the history of compiling dictionaries in the US. The first American dictionaries were little books containing words used or spelled in a different way in the US.

Noah Webster's first work, ***The American Spelling Book*** (1783), was not an exception though it was extremely popular and brought him money to write an explanatory dictionary. ***An American Dictionary of the English Language*** in two volumes was comparable to S. Johnson's dictionaries in its value, scope and clarity of definitions. Yet, it was strongly biased towards Americanisms, American way of life, had a rudimentary pronunciation system inferior to those already in existence and some problematic etymologies.

After Webster's death, his publishers commissioned a German scholar to rewrite Webster's etymologies and in 1864 the new dictionary gained international fame. The Webster's ***Third New International Dictionary of the English Language*** contains 450,000 entries in 2,662 pages and it aims to include all the words used in English since 1755. Noah Webster objected to the personal style of S. Johnson's dictionary In his view dictionary making allowed no compromise, permitted no weakness.

In 1806 Webster published ***A Compendious Dictionary of the English Language***. By Compendious he meant concise, brief, a summary‖. Of the 37,000 words in Webster's Dictionary about 5,000 were native to America. *Squash, skunk, raccoon, hickory, caucus, presidency, apple-sauce, and bullfrog* are examples. He also began recording words as he heard people use them. He also simplified spelling rules (*favor* instead of *favour, public, music* instead of *publick, musick*), dropped one *-l-* in *traveller,* and transposed the last two letters in English words like *centre,* used *hed* for *head*. Some of these changes were adopted, and some were rejected. "The Compendious" sold well, but it was only a warm-up for Webster's next project:

An American Dictionary of the English Language. He worked for it for the next 22 years; it was finished in 1828, when he was 70. The dictionary carried 12,000 American words not registered in Johnson's dictionary. There was a lot of criticism for including low words. Unlike his speller and first dictionary, though, Webster's two-volume dictionary did not sell well. Its price of $15 was more than people wanted to pay for a dictionary. Despite advanced age and dwindling funds, he started on yet a third dictionary.

For another 12 years, working alone in his study he revised his 2-volume work. In it he changed the spelling of words that people objected to (*wimin, tung*) as now he felt a dictionary should mirror the language as people used it, not as a dictionary maker would like to see it. In 1840 Webster finished his last dictionary. It contained 5,000 more words. But he couldn't find a publisher for his work. So, ever independent, ever walking his own path, he borrowed money from a bank, found a printer, and published it himself. He placed a price of $15 on his dictionary, but again people wouldn't pay it. Bankrupt and on his death bed three years later, the

old wordsmith suddenly sat up, told his grown children that a "crepuscule" was falling over him, settled back on his pillow, and died. He might have said "twilight", but he chose instead to pay a final loving tribute to special words.

Webster's children faced the problem of what to do with the unsold copies of his last dictionary and how to pay off the printer, George and Charles Merriam of Springfield, MA. The debt was paid off when the Merriam brothers bought the dictionary and legalized the name of Merriam-Webster.

On September 24, 1847, the two Merriam brothers brought out the first Merriam-Webster dictionary. Since that year, the company published new editions in 1864, 1890, 1909, and 1934. In 1961 the company published Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged. The language had grown enormously since Webster's day. The last word of 450,000 words in it was *zyzzogeton*, the word that would have delighted the old wordsmith.

Lexicography in Britain and lexicography in the USA have their own traditions and distinctly different identities. American dictionaries, for example, in contrast to the British tradition set by S. Johnson, present encyclopedic information: they provide pictures, entries for real people and fictious characters, many geographical entries and detailed taxonomies for flora and fauna. American dictionaries usually give information discriminating among synonyms while British usually just list synonyms. Yet, British and US dictionary producers have recently begun to cooperate and exchange principles for the sake of both. Some leading publishing companies, like Longman and Merriam-Webster, have entered partnerships, the result of which are new British American dictionaries: the Longman New Universal Dictionary (1982) and the Longman 144 Dictionary of the English Language (1984). Both of them made wide use of the text of the American Merriam-Webster English Collegiate Dictionary.

Another example of cooperation, this time from east to west, is in the field of learners' dictionaries: the Oxford Student's Dictionary of American English (1983) was based on the British Oxford Student's Dictionary of Current English (1978).

Modern dictionaries

In the 80‘s computer applications radically altered the painstaking manual methods of compiling dictionaries. Now there are numerous prestigious computerized language databases like British National Corpus, Cambridge International Corpus, Longman Written American Corpus, and Longman Spoken American Corpus, that guarantee a full, representative picture of written and spoken modern English. These corpora radically changed the potentials of lexicography concerning size, type and updating of dictionaries, and search for the entries. But computers are only convenient and effective tools that may help to achieve the tasks the compiler sets. A new dictionary is and has always been designed by lexicographers. The kind of a dictionary to be compiled depends mainly on the compiler’s professional intuition. The compiler should be aware of the achievements of academic lexicography, of market needs and funding sources because making a new dictionary is an expensive publishing operation. It requires enormous effort and is a time-consuming job for a team of professionals. Compilers of any dictionary face the same lexicographical problems. First of all, they need to decide: 1) which lexical units should be entered in a dictionary, 2) what information should be given about them, and 3) how to present the lexical items and information about them in the most efficient way. Handling these problems requires solid lexicological knowledge and an innovative mind. Different approaches to these decisions accounts for variances among dictionaries. If decision-making policies are scientifically grounded, they are thoroughly described in the dictionary preface. Let us consider these problems more thoroughly.

1. ***Lexical Units for Inclusion***. A lexicographer first should decide which items are to be included in the dictionary. A lexical unit chosen for inclusion in the dictionary may have the form of a single word (mug, cheese, or money). Besides words, other types of lexical units may be entered in a dictionary, too. These may include bound morphemes (pre-, -er, anx-, -o-) and multiword phraseological units. But lexicological questions often arise: what is a word, an affix or a phraseological unit, and what should be considered separate senses. The compiler should explain

his/her decisions to construct reliable entries. Furthermore, the compiler must decide how many lexical items to include. The number of nametags a language can store is endless. It is not known yet how many lexical units there are in a language, even in the well-studied English language, so a dictionary compiler should follow definite restrictions. Lexical units may be chosen on the basis of frequency of occurrence in oral or written speech, on the basis of their communicative importance, on the basis of their importance for a language learner or a native language user, his/her age or level of language proficiency. The principles upon which these choices are made should be explained clearly and implemented consistently.

2. *Lexically Relevant Information*. Dictionaries may provide all or some of the following types of information:

1. Information about the form of the unit (spelling and pronunciation).

2. The syntactic and grammatical class it belongs to by means of a part of speech label (for e.g., verb) and additional grammatical data (for e.g., transitive).

3. Inflections and grammatical forms (for e.g., for the verb build its forms built, built will be given).

4. Information about the meaning of the lexical unit.

5. Information about morphological derivatives. It may be given either in the same entry or scattered throughout the dictionary by means of run-ons.

6. Information about paradigmatic relations of the lexical unit. A dictionary may present the word‘s synonyms, antonyms, hyperonyms and hyponyms, converses, and even paronyms or confusables.

7. Syntagmatic information about the use of the lexical unit in a sentence, sometimes even selectional restrictions are given. This information may be given in the form of verbal illustration or formal patterns.

8. Information about the semantic field or some other group to which the lexical unit belongs. For the word horse, for example, other differently related words like its colour, its parts, or the equipment used for it may be given.

9. Information about stylistic registers of the lexical item.

10. Information about etymology of the lexical unit. Compilers may choose some of these types or add some other information in their dictionary according to their general dictionary-making policy.

3. ***The form of presentation of lexical units and relevant information about them***. Structure of the entry in some dictionaries, usually thesauri, presents entries are in onomasiological order, going from a notion to the name(s) it can be expressed by. This dictionary was designed for scholars interested in Philosophy of Language and in investigation of the mental lexicon structure. Those who would like to grasp the structure of the whole lexicon and begin their word search conceptually should start with the hierarchical arrangement of ideas, or conceptual categories, presented in the Synopsis of Categories. Roget singled out six major classes of categories:

1. Abstract Relations (existence, resemblance, quantity, number, time, order, power).

2. Space, including motion.

3. Material world, including properties of matter (solidity, fluidity, heat, sound, and others).

4. Intellect and its operations (like acquisition, retention, communication of ideas).

5. Volition (like choice, intention, action).

6. Sentiment (emotions, feelings, moral and religious sentiments.

These categories are further subdivided, and all in all there are several conceptual categories in the Roget's Dictionary that are expressed in English by thousands words of different parts of speech and word groups. Roget's dictionary was also aimed for authors who were struggling with difficulties of composition. Those who look for a particular word (e.g., dictionary) and semantically similar words should start their search with the alphabetical index of words provided by the dictionary. The word dictionary would lead them to the entry with names for the concept List in the conceptual categories [Number] and [Abstract relations] (word list, lexicon, glossary, thesaurus, vocabulary) and to the entry with slightly different names for the concept Book in the categories of [Written

language], [Communication] and [Intellect]: thesaurus, Roget's, storehouse or treasury of words, thesaurus dictionary, and synonym dictionary. Most dictionaries, however, practice semasiological approach in the organization of an entry, and information there goes from a name to the correspondent notion.

Lexical units in a typical dictionary are presented alphabetically. Presentation of linguistic information about lexical units, especially definitions, collocations, and paradigmatic relations is connected with numerous, sometimes unsurpassable, difficulties. Definitions are never perfect. Lists of collocations are never complete. Paradigmatic relations of each word demand special scientific investigation. Translations may help to identify the word's meaning but it does not communicate the information about its usage. Nevertheless, there should be certain principles that compilers should follow in order to make a reliable reference book.

Dictionaries usually take into account the form of lexical units. That is why they have a single entry for and polysemantic lexical units. In the case of homographs, however, their policy is different: each of them is usually given a separate entry because they are regarded as separate words. Homographs in dictionaries may be ordered historically, according to the frequency of their usage, or even according to the alphabetical order of the part of speech to which they belong (adjective before noun, before verb). Lexical units which are meanings of a polysemantic words may be arranged in the entry either historically (primary sense comes first), or semantically (major senses before minor), or on the basis of several principles.

Dictionaries differ in their treatment of morphological derivatives, too. Large dictionaries usually place each derivative with idiomatic meaning in a separate entry. In smaller dictionaries, however, main entries include derivatives as their subentries with or without explicit definitions. These are only some of the traditional problems a lexicographer faces while making a dictionary.

SELF-CHECK TASKS

1. ***Explain the meaning the following words and word combinations*****:**.

Theoretical lexicography, practical lexicography, encyclopedic dictionaries, linguistic dictionary, explanatory dictionary, specialized dictionary, synchronic dictionaries, language activator

2. ***Give English equivalents to the following words:***

Толковый словарь, орфоэпический словарь, орфографический словарь, фразеологический словарь.

3. ***Fill in the table with missing information. Provide a shord description of each dictionary.***

Date	Lexicographer	Dictionary
1604	Robert Cawdrey	
1702	John Kersey	
		the Universal Etymological Dictionary
1730	Nathaniel Bailey	Dictionarium Britannicum
	Samuel Johnson	Dictionary of the English Language
1780	Thomas Sheridan	General Dictionary of the English Language
1791	John Walker	
1884		A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles
1806	N. Webster	
1828		An American Dictionary of the English Language
1928		
1982	Webster	
1961		The Concise Oxford Dictionary (7th edition)
	H.W. Fowler	A Dictionary of Modern English Usage

4. ***Answer the following questions***

1) What is lexicography? What branches of lexicography are there?
2) What information may be included in a dictionary entry?
3) What two larger groups of dictionaries can we distinguish?
4) What types of linguistic dictionaries do you know? Which of them are uncommon for Russian as compared to English?
5) What is considered to be the starting point in the development of English lexicography?
6) What trends of lexicography of the 19^{th} -20^{th} century can we distinguish? How did they show?
7) What is lexicography like today?

PRACTICE TASKS

Choose a modern dictionary and characterize it according to the following plan:

1) Title and author(s), date of publishing;
2) Dictionary type;
3) Number of entries and the type of order they are presented in;
4) Structure of a dictionary entry (what information is provided);
5) Strong and weak points;
6) Conclusion (what is the target user like and how it could be used).

FUTHER READING

1. Берков, В. П. Двуязычная лексикография : учеб. для студентов вузов / В. П. Берков. – М. : Астрель ; АСТ ; Транзиткнига, 2004.

2. Дубичинский, В. В. Теоретическая и практическая лексикография / В. В. Дубичинский. – Вена, 1998.

3. Лебедева, Л. Д. Введение в курс английской лексикографии : учеб. пособие по англ. яз. / Л. Д. Лебедева. – М. : Высш. шк., 2008.

4. Jackson, H. Lexicology: Introduction / H. Jackson. – NY : Routlege, 2002.

5. Lexicography: An emerging international profession [ed. by Robert Ilson]. – Manchester : Manchester University Press, 1986.

6. Lexicography: Critical Concepts [ed. by R. R. K. Hartmann]. – NY : Routlege, 2003.

AFTERWORD

You have reached the final destination in your trip to the world of words. Now look around! You can see a whole lot of new things to discover, new tools to master your research and translation skills and new horizons for your professional development. Never stop learning and practicing, stay hunger… hungry for new knowledge and opportunities.

Keep calm and carry on!

REFERENCES

1. Лещёва, Л. М. Слова в английском языке. Курс лексикологии современного английского языка : учеб. пособие для студентов высш. учеб. заведений по специальности «Английский язык» (на англ. языке). – Минск : Академия управления при Президенте Республики Беларусь, 2002.
2. Ступин, Л. П. Словари современного английского языка / Л. П. Ступин. – Л. : Изд-во Ленинград. ун-та, 1973.
3. Суша, Т. Н. Лингвистические основы лексикографии : учеб. пособие на англ. языке / Т. Н. Суша. – Минск : МГЛУ, 1999.
4. Щерба, Л. В. Опыт общей теории лексикографии / Л. В. Щерба // Избранные работы акад. Л. В. Щербы.– Л. : Изд-во Ленинград. ун-та, 1958. – Т. 1.
5. Burchfield, R. The English Language / R. Burchfield. – Oxford, New York : OUP, 1985.
6. Hartmann, R. R. K. (ed.). Lexicography: principles and practice. – London : Academic press, 1983.
7. Ilienko, O. L. English Lexicology : tutorial / O. L. Ilienko [et. al.] ; National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv. – Kharkiv : Publishing House I. Ivanchenka, 2020.
8. Kraske, Robert. The Story of the Dictionary. – N. Y. : Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975.
9. WordNet: An Electronic Lexical Database (Ed. by Christian Fellbaum). – Cambridge, MA : The MIT Press, 1998.

APPENDIX

Course project formatting guidelines

1. Please submit your manuscript as an **.RTF** or a**. DOC file**
2. **Page size:** A4 (210×297 mm). Portrait layout.
3. **File name:** Your Last Name – underscore – Tutorial number. For example, Smith_4.
4. **Margins**: 3 cm at left, 2.5 cm at right, 2.5 at top and 3.0 at bottom.
5. **Font**: Times New Roman, **font size 12**, 1.5 line spaced.
6. **Paragraphs: 1.25 indented,** without extra spaces between them.
7. **Text justification.** Evenly between the margins. No hyphenation.
8. **All illustrations** (charts, drawings, diagrams, pictures, etc.) are to be captioned as Picture or Table and numbered. All illustrations should be placed directly in the manuscript.
9. **All lists <u>automatically numbered</u>**
10. **All examples** are to be ***italicized***. For more emphasis use **boldface**.

CONTENTS

Учебное издание

СЕЛИВЕРСТОВА Оксана Александровна

LEXICOLOGY

ЛЕКСИКОЛОГИЯ

Учебно-практическое пособие

Редактор А. А. Амирсейидова
Технический редактор Ш. В. Абдуллаев
Корректор О. В. Балашова
Корректор иностранного языка Н. А. Авдеева
Компьютерная верстка Л. В. Макаровой
Выпускающий редактор А. А. Амирсейидова

Подписано в печать 04.10.21.
Формат 60×84/16. Усл. печ. л. 6,28. Тираж 50 экз.
Заказ
Издательство
Владимирского государственного университета
имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых.
600000, Владимир, ул. Горького, 87.