MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

O. M. BEKETOV NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
of URBAN ECONOMY in KHARKIV

I. A. Kamienieva, Ye. S. Moshtagh

ENGLISH LEXICOLOGY

Lecture notes

for students of the specialty 035 – Philology

Kharkiv
O. M. Beketov NUUE
2021

Kamienieva I. A. English Lexicology : lecture notes for students of the specialty 035 – Philology / I. A. Kamienieva, Ye. S. Moshtagh ; O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv. – Kharkiv : O. M. Beketov NUUE, 2021. – 119 p.

Authors:

Kamienieva Iryna Adamivna, PhD in Philology, senior teacher of the department of foreign languages at O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv;

Moshtagh Yevheniia Serhiivna, PhD in Philology, associate professor of the department of foreign languages at O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv.

Reviewers:

Radchuk Olha Viacheslavivna, doctor of philology, associate professor of the department of Slavic languages at H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University;

Shumeiko Liudmila Vasylivna, PhD in Philology, associate professor of the department of foreign languages at O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv.

Recommended by the department of foreign languages (record №1 of 10.09.2021)

The lecture notes were compiled with the aim of helping students of the specialty «Philology» in preparation for classes, tests and exams in the course «Lexicology of the English language».

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The manual contains material on English Lexicology. It is written for students of English language / linguistics and may also be of interest to all readers who would like to gain some information about the vocabulary resources of Modern English.

The overall idea of the manual is to present just a core knowledge in English Lexicology which is meant to prepare students for carrying out further research on topics they are interested in.

In the manual the reader can find a short theoretical survey of the wide word theory and of the main problems associated with the English vocabulary with concise definitions of all essential issues. The structural division of the manual reflects the major distinctive areas of lexicology today and examines the following topics:

1. Language and Lexicology.
2. Lexicography.
3. Word – structure.
4. Enriching Vocabulary. Word – building (affixation, conversion, composition, shortening, secondary ways of word – building).
5. Word – groups and Phraseological units.
6. Semasiology. Word meaning.
7. Semantic Change.
8. Homonymy. Synonymy. Antonymy.
9. The Origin of English Words.
10. Variants and Dialects of English.

The Bibliography comprises all the resources used by the author and cited in the manual.

LECTURE 1
LEXICOLOGY AS A BRANCH OF LINGUISTICS. MAIN NOTIONS OF LEXICOLOGY. LEXICOGRAPHY

Plan

1. The Object of Lexicology. Links of Lexicology with other Branches of Linguistics.

2. Sub – branches of Lexicology.

3. Lexicography as a Branch of Lexicology.

4. The Brief History of Lexicography.

5. Corpora and Lexicography.

6. Types of Dictionaries. Dictionary Entry.

1 The Object of Lexicology. Links of Lexicology with other Branches of Linguistics

The English language has throughout its history accepted words from other languages with which it has been in contact. Though some languages avoid as far as possible the use of alien terms (they substitute them and when an expression for a new object or a new idea is needed they make it of native elements), England "has always welcomed the alien" [Hughes 2000], and many hundreds of words of non – English origin are now the essential part of the English vocabulary and it is quite difficult to distinguish it from the native stock if you do not know the etymology.

The term lexicology is of Greek origin (from lexis – word and logos – science). Lexicology is the part of linguistics which deals with the vocabulary and characteristic features of words and word – groups. The term word denotes the main lexical unit of a language resulting from the association of a group of sounds with a meaning. This unit is used in grammatical functions characteristic of it. It is the smallest unit of a language which can stand alone as a complete utterance. 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 syntacticalfunction, e.g. the word – group as loose as a

goose means clumsy and is used in a sentence as a predicative (He is as loose as a goose). Lexicology can be general and special. General lexicology is the lexicology of any language, part of General Linguistics. It is aimed at establishing language universals – linguistic phenomena and propeties common to all languages. Special lexicology is the lexicology of a particular language (English, German, Russian, etc.). Lexicology can study the development of the vocabulary, the origin of words and word – groups, their semantic relations and the development of their sound form and meaning. In this case it is called historical lexicology. Another branch of lexicology is called descriptive and studies the vocabulary at a definite stage of its development.

English belongs to the group of Germanic languages, i.e. English goes back to the same proto – language that is also the "mother" of Dutch, Low German, High German, Norwegian, Danish, Swedish, Icelandic. The group of Germanic languages, in turn, belongs to the Indo – European language family, like the Romanic languages (e.g. Portuguese, Spanish, French, Italian) and their "mother" Latin, the Celtic languages (e.g. Welsh, Irish, Scottish Gaelic), the Balto – Slavic languages (e.g. Polish, Czech, Croatian, Russian, Lithuanian) and others.

The date of the birth of English is normally given as 449, when the three Germanic tribes of the Angles, Saxons and Jutes are said to have settled over from the continental areas by the Northern Sea. The first written records of English can be dated back to the 7th century. The period from the mid – 5th century to around 1100 is referred to as Old English, the period from 1100 to around 1500 as Middle English, the period from 1500 to around 1750 as Early Modern English and the period thereafter as Modern English.

English is generally regarded as the richest of the world's languages with exceptionally large vocabulary and ability to borrow and accept words. Thus, according to their origin English words may be subdivided into two main sets: native words which belong to the original English word stock and known from the earliest available manuscripts of the Old English period and borrowings, words taken over from another language and modified in phonemic shape, spelling, paradigm or meaning according to the standards of the English language.

The English vocabulary has been enriched throughout its history by borrowing from foreign languages; this process has been going on for more than 1,000 years.

The fact that up to 80 per cent of the English vocabulary consists of borrowed words is due to the specific conditions of the English language development. Some important landmarks of British history that influenced the formation of the language:

a) Celtic tribes inhabiting Britain: Britons and Gaels; languages: Welsh, Cornish (now extinct), Irish, Scots, Manx;

b) the Roman conquest : 55–54 B.C. – 43 A.D. – permanent conquest of Britain under the emperor Claudius;

c) the Anglo – Saxon conquest: mid – 5th century – the invasion of Germanic tribes (Angles, Saxons and Jutes); the start of the history of the English language;

d) the Scandinavian conquest (the 8th – the 11th cent);

e) the Norman conquest: 1066;

f) the Renaissance period (Greek, Italian, Spanish, French (Parisian borrowings), Russian.

When the Normans crossed over from France most English people spoke Old English, or Anglo – Saxon – a language of about 30,000 words; the Normans spoke the mixture of French and Latin. It took about three centuries for the languages to blend into one. Latin and Greek have been the source of vocabulary since the 16th century. There are practically no limits to the kinds of words that are borrowed; words are employed as symbols for every part of culture.

Notion of word.

First, the word is a unit of speech which, as such, serves the purposes of human communication. Thus, the word can be defined as a unit of communication. Secondly, the word can be perceived as the total of the sounds which comprise it. Third, the word, viewed structurally, possesses several characteristics. The modern approach to word studies is based on distinguishing between the external and the internal structures of the word. By external structure of the word we mean its morphological structure. For example, in the word post – impressionists the following morphemes can be distinguished: the prefixes post – , im – , the root press, the noun – forming

suffixes –ion, – ist, and the grammatical suffix of plurality –s. The external structure of the word, and also typical word – formation patterns, are studied in the framework of word – building. The internal structure of the word, or its meaning, is nowadays commonly referred to as the word‘s semantic structure. This is the word‘s main aspect. The area of lexicology specialising in the semantic studies of the word is called semantics. One of the main structural features of the word that it possesses both external (formal) unity and semantic unity. A further structural feature of the word is its susceptibility to grammatical employment. In speech most words can be used in different grammatical forms in which their interrelations are realized. Thus, the word is a speech unit used for the purposes of human communication, materially representing a group of sounds, possessing a meaning, susceptible to grammatical employment and characterized by formal and semantic unity.

Each word or phrase in a lexicon is described in a lexical entry; exactly what is included into each entry depends on the purpose of the particular lexicon. The details that are given may include any of its properties of spelling and sound, grammatical behavior, meaning or use and the nature of its relationships with other words. A lexical entry is therefore a potentially large record specifying many aspects of the linguistic behavior and meaning of a word.

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, 9].

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. It is a small unit within a vast, efficient and perfectly balanced system [Антрушина 2000].

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 [Бабич 2008, 17].

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 2008, 18]. "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, 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, 23]. 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).

Paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations may be represented in a diagram as in Fig.1. This shows that every word may be considered in terms of two dimensions or axes of structure. The 'horizontal' or syntagmatic and the 'vertical' or paradigmatic. It is precisely in terms of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations that the meaning of English words can be determined.

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 influence usage and development of language which are dealt in sociolinguistics and may be defined as the study of influence produced upon language by various social factors; this influence is particularly strong in lexis 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 2008].

2 Sub – branches of Lexicology

Disciplines Lexicology is closely connected with other branches of linguistcs:

1. It is connected with Phonetics because the word’s sound form is a fixed sequence of phonemes united by a lexical stress.

2. Lexicology is connected with Morphology and Word – Formation as the word’s structure is a fixed sequence of morphemes.

3. It is connected with Morphology because the word's content plane is a unity of lexical and grammatical meanings.

4. The word functions as part of the sentence and performs a certain syntactical function that is why it is also connected with Syntax.

5. The word functions in different situations and spheres of life therefore it is connected with Stylistics, Socio – and Psycholinguistics.

But there is also a great difference between lexicology and other linguistic disciplines. Grammatical and phonological systems are relatively stable. Therefore they are mostly studied within the framework of intralinguistics. Lexical system is never stable. It is directly connected with extralinguistic systems. It is constantly growing and decaying. It is immediately reacts to changes in social life, e.g. the intense development of science and technology in the 20thcentury gave birth to such words as computer, sputnik, spaceship. Therefore lexicology is a sociolinguistic discipline. It studies each particular word, both its intra – and extralingiustic relations.

Lexicology is subdivided into a number of autonomous but interdependent disciplines:

1. Lexicological Phonetics. It studies the expression plane of lexical units in isolation and in the flow of speech.

2. Semasiology. It deals with the meaning of words and other linguistic units: morphemes, word – formation types, morphological word classes and morphological categories.

3. Onomasiology or Nomination Theory. It deals with the process of nomination: what name this or that object has and why.

4. Etymology. It studies the origin, the original meaning and form of words. 5. Praseology. It deals with phraseological units.

6. Lexicography. It is a practical science. It describes the vocabulary and each lexical unit in the form of dictionaries.

7. Lexical Morphology. It deals with the morphological stricture of the word.

8. Word – formation. It deals with the patterns which are used in coining new words.

LECTURE 2
MAIN NOTIONS OF LEXICOLOGY. LEXICOGRAPHY

Plan

1. Lexicography as a Branch of Lexicology.

2. The Brief History of Lexicography.

3. Corpora and Lexicography.

4. Types of Dictionaries. Dictionary Entry.

1 Lexicography as a Branch of Lexicology

In lexicology the word is studied as a part of the system. In lexicography it is studied as an individual unit in respect of its meaning and use from the practical point of its use by the reader of the dictionary for learning the language or comprehending texts in it or for any other purpose like checking correct spelling, pronunciation etc. A word may have different and varied characteristic, all of which may not be needed by a lexicographer. Their work is guided more by the purpose of the dictionary and the type of the audience. They present the words of the lexical system in a way so as to make it more practically useable in real life situation i.e. in actual speech. For example, lexicology may give the theoretical basis for enumerating different meanings of a polysemous word, but how these meanings are worded and presented in the dictionary is governed by the practical problems of utility of the dictionary for different types of readers.

The aim of lexicology is to study the vocabulary of a language as a system, so the treatment of individual units may not claim to be complete because the number of units is very larger. Its goal is systematization in the study as a whole but not completeness as regards individual units, so it cannot claim to be a perfectly systematic treatment. In lexicography, every entry is treated as an independent problem. Lexicologists present their material in sequence according to their view of the study of vocabulary. The lexicographers are mostly guided by the principle of convenience in retrieval of the data and arrange words usually in alphabetical order.

Practical lexicography is the art or craft of writing dictionaries.

Theoretical lexicography is the scholarly discipline of analyzing and describing the semantic relationships within the lexicon (vocabulary) of a language (metalexicography).

General lexicography focuses on the design, compilation, use and evaluation of general dictionaries, i.e. dictionaries that provide a description of the language in general use.

Specialized lexicography focuses on the design, compilation, use and evaluation of specialized dictionaries, i.e. dictionaries that are devoted to a (relatively restricted) set of linguistic and factual elements of one or more specialist subject fields.

The recent development of corpus linguistics (corpus linguistics deals mainly with compiling various electronic corpora for conducting investigations in different linguistic fields such as phonetics, phonology, grammar, stylistics, graphology, discourse, lexicon and many others) has given birth to **corpus – based lexicography** and new corpus – based generations of dictionaries.

Computational lexicography deals with the design, compilation, use and evaluation of electronic dictionaries.

All the "exercises" in the field of lexicography can be divided into two major areas: dictionary – making and dictionary research (practical lexicography vs. theoretical lexicography) as can be seen in Fig. 2 (from Hartmann [2003; 2]).

The term '**dictionary**' is used to denote a book that lists the words of a language in a certain order (usually alphabetical) and gives their meanings or equivalent words in a different language.

The word *dictionary* was coined on the basis of the Latin forms *dictionarius* or *dictionarium*, from *dictio* 'action of saying' or 'word', itself from the verb *dicere,* 'say'. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), *dictionarius* was used for the first time in 1225 by the poet and grammarian Joannes de Garlandia, or John of Garland(e) (1195–1272) as the title of his compilation of Latin vocables, sayings, and

maxims arranged according to their subjects, with glosses in French and English, published in Paris, for the use of learners [Bejoint 2010; 6].

2 The Brief History of Lexicography

The theory and practice of compiling dictionaries is called lexicography. The history of compiling dictionaries for English comes as far back as the Old English period, where we can find glosses of religious books (interlinear translations from Latin into English). Regular bilingual dictionaries began to appear in the 15th century (Anglo – Latin, Anglo – French, Anglo – German).

The first unilingual dictionary explaining difficult words appeared in 1604, the author was Robert Cawdry, a schoolmaster.

In 1775 an English scientist Samuel Johnson compiled a famous explanatory dictionary. Every word in his dictionary was illustrated by examples from English literature, the meanings of words were clear from the contexts in which they were used.

In 1884 the first volume of a dictionary including all the words existing in the language was published. It contained words beginning with A and B. The last volume was published in 1928. The dictionary was called NED(New English Dictionary) and contained 12 volumes.

In 1933 the dictionary was republished under the title The Oxford English Dictionary (OED), because the work on the dictionary was conducted at Oxford. The dictionary contained 13 volumes.

The American lexicography began to develop much later, at the end of the 18th century. The most famous American English dictionary was compiled by Noah Webster. He was an active statesman and public man and he published his first dictionary in 1806.

3 Corpora and Lexicography

Most current dictionaries no longer use invented examples but rely on corpora of authentic English. A corpus is "an extension of the traditional archive" [Čhermak 2003, 18], but its obvious advantage is the vast amount of data and the speed of their access.

The purpose of a language corpus is to provide language workers with evidence of how language is really used, evidence that can then be used to inform and substantiate individual theories about what words might or should mean. The words in a corpus come from books, magazines, newspapers, pamphlets, radio and television broadcasts. Traditional grammars and dictionaries tell us what a word *ought to mean*, but only experience can tell us what a word *is used to mean*. This is why dictionary publishers, grammar writers, language teachers, and developers of natural language processing software alike have been turning to corpus evidence as
a means of extending and organizing that experience.

The first widely – used computer – readable corpora were set up in the 1960s and 1970s. The Brown Corpus prepared at Brown University in the USA consists of one
million words of written American English. It was published in 1961 and sampled as text fragments of 2,000 words each. The Brown Corpus has inspired a whole family of corpora.

The LOB (Lancaster – Oslo – Bergen) Corpus was designed as the British equivalent of the Brown Corpus: one million words of written British English, also published in 1961, and sampled as text fragments of 2,000 words each, from informative texts, such as newspapers, learned and scientific writing, and imaginative fiction.

London – Lund Corpus was constructed at University College London and the University of Lund. This corpus is about 435,000 words of spoken British English, and contains 5,000 – word samples of the usage of adult, educated, professional people, including face – to – face and telephone conversations, lectures, discussions and radio commentaries.

The Bank of English Corpus created by COBUILD (Collins Birmingham University International Language Database) at the University of Birmingham by the late 1990s totaled about 330 million words, including fiction and nonfiction books, newspapers and samples of spoken English. The corpus is available in different forms: primarily the Bank of English itself, and a 50 – million – word sub – corpus which is available over the internet as CobuildDirect.

The British National Corpus is a 100 – million – word collection of samples of written and spoken language from a wide range of sources, designed to represent a wide cross – section of British English from the later part of the 20th century, both spoken and written. The written part of the BNC (90 %) includes, for example, extracts from regional and national newspapers, specialist periodicals and journals for all ages and interests, academic books and popular fiction, published and unpublished letters and memoranda, school and university essays, etc. The spoken part (10 %) consists of orthographic transcriptions of unscripted informal conversations (recorded by volunteers selected from different age, region and social classes in a demographically balanced way) and spoken language collected in different contexts. The latest edition is the *BNC XML Edition*, released in 2007.

The International Corpus of English (ICE) began in 1990 with the primary aim of collecting material for comparative studies of English worldwide. Twenty – four research teams around the world are preparing electronic corpora of their own national or regional variety of English. Each ICE corpus consists of one million words of spoken and written English produced after 1989. In the corpus variants and dialects of English are represented in different text categories (phone calls, classroom discussions, business interactions, parliamentary debates, legal presentations and unscripted speeches of the spoken discourse; student essays, social and business letters, academic and non – academic writing, press news reports, editorials, novels and stories of the written discourse).

Vienna – Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) is the first corpus of English as lingua franca (ELF) publicly. It comprises transcripts of naturally occurring face – toface interactions (interviews, press conferences, service

encounters, seminar discussions, meetings, panels, etc.) in English as a lingua franca. Currently it comprises one million words of spoken ELF interactions with some recordings of transcribed speech events which can be listened to.

The use of corpora in dictionary – making allows to make a dictionary in a much shorter period of time with up – to – date information about the language; thus the definitions are more complete and precise as a larger number of natural examples are examined.

4 Types of Dictionaries. Dictionary Entry

In many parts of the English – speaking world, dictionaries have achieved such prestige that people can mention 'the dictionary' as one of their institutional texts, rather in the same way that they might refer to Shakespeare and Bible. Such status means that a dictionary may easily be seen as the model of word – meanings, it is the appropriate model of words as a component of language or of word – meanings stored as an inventory in the human brain or mind (Yallop 2004, 24). So, lexicography is not just the writing and compiling of dictionaries. It involves "observing, collecting, selecting, and describing units from the stock of words and word combinations in one or more languages" [Svensen 1993; 1], moreover, as lexicography includes the development and description of the theories and methods which are to be the basis of the activity, it can be also defined as "the theory and practice of encoding and transmitting, intra – culturally or interculturally, information and knowledge concerning socialized linguistic forms of a given speech community and / or extralinguistic reality from the compiler to the user so as to effect the user's knowledge structure and perception of the world [Yong, Peng 2007, 11].

The practitioners of lexicography described the process of compiling dictionaries in different terms, from 'exciting' (Eric Partridge) and 'enjoyable' (James Hulbert), to 'difficult' (Ladislav Zgusta), 'tedious' (H.A. Gleason), 'like engineering' (Charles McGregor) and 'nothing less than the attempt to fashion a custom – made product on an assembly – line basis' (Sidney Landau).

One of the biggest challenges in this process is to treat each dictionary entry in such a way so that all the entries do not disagree and correspond to their relative importance in the language. Thus, a dictionary is "a reference tool, in a paper or electronic form, that provides information on the meaning and use of a representative sample of the lexical items of a language or of a variety of a language, where each item is treated in a separate paragraph and all the paragraphs are ordered for easy consultation" [Bejoint 2010, 34]. But the dictionary is not only used as a reference work, it also serves as a kind of "storage facility, a storeroom for a language in which we can find much of what once existed and which exists today" [Sterkenburg 2003, 6].

Dictionaries may be classified under different heads. According to the choice of items included and the sort of information given about these items dictionaries may be divided into two big groups – encyclopedic and linguistic, though it is not always easy to distinguish between linguistic and encyclopedic knowledge, to draw a neat line between them. One may argue on the terms as well – would it be perfectly correct to call encyclopedia a dictionary? Or this term may refer only to reference books highlighting the special features of lexical items?

Encyclopedias are scientific reference books dealing with every branch of knowledge, or with one particular branch, usually in alphabetical order. They are 'thing – books' that give information about the extralinguistic world, they deal with facts and concepts.

Linguistic dictionaries are 'word – books' the subject matter of which is lexical units and their linguistic properties such as pronunciation, meaning, origin, peculiarities of use, and other linguistic information. Linguistic dictionaries can be further divided into different categories by different criteria.

1. The nature (scope) of word lists: **general** (unrestricted) and **restricted** dictionaries. General dictionaries represent the vocabulary as a whole with a degree of completeness depending upon the scope and the bulk of the book in question. They can include frequency dictionaries, rhyming dictionaries, a thesaurus, etc. Restricted dictionaries cover only the certain specific part of the vocabulary and can be

subdivided depending upon whether the words chosen according to the sphere of human activity in which they are used, the type of the units themselves or the relations existing between them:

(1) technical terms for various branches of knowledge (medical, linguistic, economic, etc.);

(2) phraseological units, borrowings, dialect words, etc.;

(3) formidable array of synonymic dictionaries.

2. The kind of information: **explanatory** vs. **specialized** (*translation, pronouncing, etymological, ideographic dictionaries*, etc.). Specialized dictionaries deal with lexical units only in relation to some of their characteristics.

3. The language in which the information is given: **monolingual** vs. **bilingual** dictionaries. Bilingual dictionaries may have two principle purposes: reference for translation and guidance for expression.

4. The prospective user, e.g. *advanced learners of English, children, students*, etc. If a dictionary is aimed at a young user, it is normally characterized by an appropriate selection of the vocabulary, limited amounts of information, often the use of pictures and colours. There is a big range of dictionaries that are aimed at the learners of English as a second or foreign language; the dictionaries aimed at a native speaker adult user might be termed the general – purpose dictionary and owned by quite many people [Jackson 2002, 24].

5. **Diachronic vs. synchronic**. Synchronic dictionaries are concerned with the present – day meaning and usage of words. Diachronic dictionaries reflect the development of the English vocabulary by recording the history of form and meaning for every word registered. They can be divided into etymological (focusing on the origin of the words and expressions and their formal, orthographic and phonetic, development) and historical (focusing on the changes that have occurred in both the form and the meaning of a word within a specific language for a period of time from which there is a historical evidence at hand). In many historical dictionaries, historical and etymological perspectives are combined.

6. The form of dictionaries: '**hard**' (paper) and '**soft**' (electronic) dictionaries. Electronic dictionaries fundamentally differ in form, content and function from conventional word – books and they offer many advantages compared to hard – copy dictionaries. Among the most significant differences are: 1) the use of multimedia means; 2) the navigable help indices in windows oriented software; 3) the use of sound, animation, audio and visual elements as well as interactive exercises and games; 4) the varied possibilities of search and access methods that allow the user to specify the output in a number of ways; 5) the access to and retrieval of information are no longer determined by the internal, traditionally alphabetical, organization of the dictionary, but a nonlinear structure of the texts; 6) the use of hyperlinks which allow easily and quickly to cross – refer to words within an entry or to other words connected with this entry. The advantages of electronic dictionaries are practically the speed with which they can be consulted and, as mentioned before, the multiple search routes. One can find the opposite meaning through the antonym or find a particular synonym by consulting the list of synonyms. By consulting the analytical definitions, one can find many words that belong to the same upper or lower classes, i.e. hyperonyms, synonyms.

Many dictionaries on CD – ROM contain much more material than their hard – copy counterparts, such as audio and video material, pronunciation and a corpus of authentic texts, to name but a few. An electronic dictionary in the form of a databank can also be edited on a daily basis, allowing changes to be made, neologisms to be added and obvious errors to be corrected. Such a dictionary is unmistakably dynamic [Piet van Sterkburg 2003, 5].

The dictionary entries are organized as follows [Halliday, Teubert, Yallop, Čermakova 2004]:

1. The **headword** or **lemma**, often in bold or some other special font; lemma is the base form under which the word is entered and assigned its place: typically, the 'stem', or simplest form (singular noun, present \ infinitive verb, etc.). Other forms may not be entered if they are predictable (such as the plural *bears*, but the irregular past forms of the verbs are given. In a language such as Russian, where the stem form

of a word typically does not occur alone, a particular variant is chosen as a lemma: nominative singular for nouns, infinitive for verbs, etc.

2. Its **pronunciation**, in some form of alphabetic notation.

3. Its word class ('part of speech'); usually one of the primary word classes (verb, noun, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, propositions, conjunctions, determiner / article). To this class specification may be added some indications of a subclass, for example count or mass noun, intransitive or transitive verb.

4. Its **etymology** (historical origin and derivation); the etymology may include not only the earliest known form and the language in which this occurs but also cognate forms in other languages. Some dictionaries may also include a suggested 'proto – ' form, a form not found anywhere but reconstructed by the methods of historical linguistics; proto – forms are conventionally marked with an asterisk.

5. Its **definition**; the definition takes one or both of two forms: description and synonymy. The description may obviously need to include words that are 'harder' (less frequently used) that the lemmatized word. Some dictionaries, such as the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, limit the vocabulary that they use in their descriptions. With synonymy, a word, or little set of words of similar meaning is brought in, often giving slightly more specific senses. All definition is ultimately circular; but compilers try to avoid very small circles, such as defying *sad* as *sorrowful*, and then *sorrowful* as *sad*.

6. **Citations** (examples of its use) refer to definitions or senses, show how the word is used in context. They may illustrate a typical usage, or use in wellknown literary texts, or the earliest recorded instances of the word. There may also be various 'fixed expressions' (idioms and cliches), where the expression functions like a single, composite lexical item (*bear fruit, bear in mind*).

Compound words, like *cutthroat*, and derivatives, like *cutting* or *uncut*, are often entered under the same lemma; in that case, compounds will appear under the first word (*cutthroat* under *cut*, *haircut* under *hair*) and derivatives under the stem (both *cutting* and *uncut* under *cut*). Though, dictionaries can adopt varying practices. In some dictionaries, compounds are given separate lemmata, and sometimes a

derivational affix is used as lemma and derivatives grouped under that (for example, *antibody, anticlimax, antidote*, etc. all under *anti* –).

Most dictionaries follow this general structure, but variations are of course found. For example, etymological information may come at the end of the entry rather than near the beginning.

In thesaurus, by contrast, there is no separate entry for each word. The word occurs simply as part of a list; and it is the place of a word in the whole construction of the book that tells you what it means. In the thesaurus the words are organized not on the basis of form but on the basis of meaning (that is not grammatical classes but semantic classes). The most illustrious example of a nonalphabetical dictionary in English is *Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases* by Peter Mark Roget, a co – author of the seventh edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. The Thesaurus, begun in 1810 and published in 1852, contained about 40,000 words. It has been re – edited several times since then in many different forms, paper or electronic, with additions and deletions but the same organization. *Roget* is not a registered trademark anymore, and many versions have been produced by different publishers that do not have much in common with the original, except the name. That only proves the citation [Murrey 2004, 3] that the English dictionary "like the English Constitution, is the creation of no one man, and of none age it is a growth that has slowly developed itself down the ages "As we can see from above, a dictionary is a "reference tool, in paper or electronic form, that provides information on the meaning and use of a representative sample of the lexical items of a language or of variety of a language, where each item is treated in a separate paragraph and all the paragraphs are ordered for easy consultation" [Bejoint 2010, 34].

LECTURE 3 WORD – FORMATION IN MODERN ENGLISH

Plan

1. Morpheme. Classification of Morphemes.

2. Morphemic Types of Words.

3. Types of Word – Segmentability.

1 Morpheme. Classification of Morphemes

Before we turn to the studies of the ways of word building in English we should analyze the structure of the English word.

Words consist of morphemes. The term '**morpheme**' is derived from Greek '*morphe*' – 'form' + – *eme*. The Greek suffix – *eme* has been adopted by linguists to denote the smallest unit (*phoneme*, *sememe*).

The branch of linguistics which studies morphemes and their arrangement in forming words is called **morphology**.

The morpheme is the smallest meaningful unit of a language, which has lexical or grammatical meaning or carries information about meaning and function. It is thus the smallest linguistic sign, having both form and meaning, tied together arbitrarily or conventionally. It is important to remember that morpheme is neither a meaning nor a stretch of sounds, but a meaning and a stretch of sounds joined together. Morphemes cannot be segmented into smaller units without losing their constitutive essence, i.e. two – facetedness – association of a certain meaning with a certain sound – pattern. Morphemes occur in speech only as constituent parts of words but not independently.

The case for an element to be regarded as a morpheme is strengthened if it does not just exist within a single word, but recurs in others with a recognizably related meaning. When examining the credentials of any element, we should look for its recurrence elsewhere as corroboration [Coates 1999, 4]. A morpheme may be involved in regular patterns of interchange: – *er* in *calmer* gains credibility as a morpheme not only because it is what is left over when you remove the meaningful

calm, but also it interchanges with *– er* in a regular meaningrelationship found in hosts of other adjectives too (*fatter, larger* and so on).

Typical morphemes are meaningful, recur in a language's vocabulary and may recur in regular interchanges.

The combination of lexical and grammatical morphemes does not produce new words or lexemes, but only new word – forms. The addition of morphemes for plural or past tense is an almost unlimited grammatical process – it is inflectional morphology (or inflexion) as opposed to word – formation. The remaining lexical morpheme which does not occur independently is usually called a **stem**.

Morphemes may have different phonetic shapes. In the word – cluster *please, pleasing, pleasure, pleasant* the root morpheme is represented by different phonetic shapes. All the representations of the given morpheme are called **allomorphs** or **morpheme variants**. They are the positional variants occurring in a specific environment, when, for example, two linguistic variants cannot appear in the same environment, e.g.: stems, ending in consonants take as a rule *–ation* (*liberation*); stems ending in *pt* though, take *–tion* (*corruption*) and the final *t* becomes fuse with the suffix. The example of allomorphs among prefixes is *im – , ir – , il – and in –* (*impossible, irregular, illegal, indirect*).

Morphemes can be classified from the semantic point of view and from the structural point of view. Semantically morphemes fall into two types:

1) **root – morphemes** (or radicals) are the lexical nuclei of words. The root – morpheme is isolated as the morpheme common to a set of words making up a word – cluster;

2) **non – root morphemes** include inflectional morphemes (or inflections) and affixational morphemes (or affixes). Inflections carry only grammatical meaning and are thus relevant only for the formation of word – forms, whereas affixes are relevant for building various types of stems. (A stem is the part of a word that remains unchanged throughout its paradigm). Lexicology is concerned only with affixational morphemes. Affixes are divided into prefixes and suffixes.

A **prefix** is a derivational morpheme preceding the root – morpheme and modifying its meaning.

A **suffix** is a derivational morpheme following the root and forming a new derivative in a different part of speech or a different word class.

While suffixes and prefixes are very common in English, there are also rare cases of affixes that cannot be considered prefixes or suffixes, because they are inserted not at the boundary of another morpheme but right into another morpheme (e.g.: *abso – bloody – lutely*, where *– bloody –* interrupts the morphemes *absolute* and *– ly*). Such intervening affixes are called **infixes**.

The part of a word which an affix is attached to is called a **base**. The term root refers to bases that cannot be analyzed further into morphemes or when we explicitly refer to the indivisible central part of a complex word. The derived word is often referred to as a **derivative**.

2 Morphemic Types of Words.

Structurally morphemes fall into three types.

1. A **free morpheme** is defined as one that coincides with the stem or a word – form (homonymous to word – form): *boy, sport*.

2. A **bound morpheme** occurs only as a constituent part of the word, affixes are bound morphemes for they always make the part of the word.

An affix should not be confused with the combining form which is also a bound form, but can be distinguished from an affix historically. Combining forms were borrowed from Latin or Greek, in which they existed as free forms, and most of them are international: ***aqua****culture,* ***aqua****marine,* ***aqua****relle,* ***poly****clinic,* ***poly****mer,* ***stereo****phonic,* ***stereo****scopic,* ***hydra****nth,* ***cycl****ic,* ***graph****ic*, ***tele****vision.*

3. **Semi – bound** (**semi – free**) **morphemes** (or **semi – affixes**) are morphemes that can function in a morphemic sequence both as an affix and as a free morpheme. The most frequent of semi – affixes is *– man*, as its combining activity is very high and one might compile a very long list of words: *seaman, postman, fireman, countryman, clergyman, yes – man*, etc. A great combining capacity characterizes

such elements as *– like (godlike, unladylike, suchlike), – proof (waterproof, soundproof, bombproof), – worthy (seaworthy, noteworthy, trustworthy), mini – (miniskirt, minibar, mini – planet) midi – (midi – coat, midi – carrier, midicomputer), over – (overdone, overload, overnight),* alongside with these there are also *–wise (clockwise), – way(s) (likeways), – monger (fishermonger), – wright (playwright).*

In morphemes different types of meaning can be singled out depending on the semantic class morphemes belong to. Root – morphemes possess lexical, differential and distributional types of meaning. Affixational morphemes have lexical, part – of – speech, differential and distributional types of meaning. Both rootmorphemes and affixational morphemes are devoid of grammatical meaning.

The **lexical meaning** of root – morphemes differs from that of affixational morphemes. Root – morphemes have an individual lexical meaning shared by no other morphemes in the language. The lexical meaning of affixational morphemes is, as a rule, of a more generalizing character.

As in words, lexical meaning in morphemes may also be analyzed into denotational and connotational components. The connotational component may be found not only in root – morphemes but in affixational morphemes as well. Endearing and diminutive suffixes, such as *– ette* (*kitchenette, leaflet*); *– ie* (*dearie, girlie*); *– ling* (*duckling, wolfing*) bear a heavy emotive charge. Stylistic reference may also be found in morphemes of different types. For example, the affixational morphemes *– ine* (*chlorine*), *– oid* (*rhomboid*) are bookish.

Differential meaning is the semantic component that serves to distinguish one word from all others containing identical morphemes. In words consisting of two or more morphemes, one of the constituent morphemes always has differential meaning.

Distributional meaning is the meaning of the order and arrangement of morphemes making up the word. It is found in all words containing more than one morpheme.

In most cases affixational morphemes are indicative of the part of speech to which a derivational word belongs. For example, the affixational morpheme *– ment* (*movement*) is used to form nouns, while the affixational morpheme *–less* (*careless*)

forms adjectives. Sometimes the part – of – speech meaning of morphemes predominates. For example, the morpheme *–ice* in the word *justice* serves principally to transfer the **part – of – speech meaning** of the morpheme *just –* into another class and namely that of the noun.

According to the number of morphemes words are classified into:

1) monomorphic or root – words which consist of only one rootmorpheme;

2) polymorphic words which according to the number of root – morphemes are classified into:

1) monoradical and

2) polyradical.

Monoradical words fall into three subtypes:

a) radical – suffixal words, i.e. words consisting of one – root morpheme and one or more suffixal morphemes (*acceptable, acceptability*);

b) radical – prefixal words, i.e. words consisting of one – root morpheme and a prefixal morpheme (*outdo, unbutton*);

c) prefixo – radical – suffixal words, i.e. words consisting of one root, prefixal and suffixal morphemes (*disagreeable, misinterpretation*).

Polyradical words fall into two types:

a) polyradical words which consist of two or more roots with no affixational morphemes (*book – stand, lamp – shade*);

b) polyradical words which contain at least two roots and one or more affixational morphemes (*safety – pin, light – mindedness, pen – holder*).

The process of dividing words into morphemes is called *segmentation*, or morphological segmentation.

3 Types of Word – Segmentability.

Three types of morphemic segmentability of words are distinguished: complete, conditional, defective [Зыкова 2007, 55–56].

Complete segmentability is characteristic of a great number of words, the morphemic structure of which is transparent enough, as their individual morphemes

clearly stand out within the word and can be easily isolated. The morphemes making up words of complete segmentability are called **morphemes proper** or full **morphemes**.

Conditional segmentability characterizes words whose segmentation into constituent morphemes is doubtful for semantic reasons. In the words *retain, detain, receive, deceive* the sound clusters [*ri* –] [*di* –] seem to be singled out quite easily due to their recurrence in a number of words. On the other hand, they have nothing in common with the phonetically identical morphemes *re* – , *depart* which are found in the words *rewrite, reorganize, decode, deorganize*. Neither the sound clusters [*ri* –], [*di* –] nor the *[– tein*], [– *si:v*] possess any lexical or part – of speech meaning of their own. The types of meaning that can be ascribed to them is differential and distributional.

Defective segmentability is the property of words whose component morphemes seldom or never occur in other words. One of the component morphemes of these words is a unique morpheme in the sense that it does not recur in a different linguistic environment.

This brief information shows the importance of morphology in lexicology.

In fact, the construction of words and parts of words, and the distinction between the different types of words are based on morphological analysis making morphology particularly relevant in the discussion of word formation [ibid].

Basic criteria of semantic derivation within conversion pairs There are different criteria if differentiating between the source and the derived word in a conversion pair.

1. The criterion of the non – correspondencebetween the lexical meaning of the root – morpheme and the part – of – the speech meaning of the stem in one of the two words in a conversion pair. This criterion cannot be implied to abstract nouns.

2. The synonymity criterionis based on the comparison of a conversion pair with analogous synonymous word – pairs (e.g. comparing to chat – chat with synonymous pair of words to converse – conversation, it becomes obvious that the

noun chat is the derived member as their semantic relations are similar). This criterion can be applied only to deverbal substantives.

3. The criterion of derivational relations. In the word – cluster hand – to hand – handful – handy the derived words of the first degree of derivation have suffixes added to the nominal base. Thus, the noun hand is the center of the word – cluster. This fact makes it possible to conclude that the verb to hand is the derived member.

4. The criterion of semantic derivation is based on semantic relations within the conversion pairs. If the semantic relations are typical of denominal verbs – verb is the derived member, but if they are typical of deverbal nouns – noun is the derived member (e.g. crowd – to crowd are perceived as those of 'an object and an action characteristic of an object' – the verb is the derived member).

5. According to the criterion of the frequency of occurrence a lower frequency value shows the derived character. (e.g. to answer (63%) – answer (35%) – the noun answer is the derived member).

6. The transformational criterion is based on the transformation of the predicative syntagma into a nominal syntagma (e.g. Mike visited his friends. – Mike's visit to his friends. – then it is the noun that is derived member, but if we can't transform the sentence, noun cannot be regarded as a derived member – Ann handed him a ball – XXX).

LECTURE 4
ETYMOLOGICAL SOURCES OF WORDS IN ENGLISH

Plan

1. Words of native origin and their characteristics.

2. Foreign elements in Modern English. Scandinavian borrowings, classical elements – Latin and Greek, French borrowings.

3. Ukrainian – English lexical correlations.

1 Words of native origin and their characteristics.

Native Words. By the Native Element we understand words that are not borrowed from other languages. Many of the common words of Modern English are native or Old English words (home*, stone, meat, drive, ride sing, six, you ,we,* etc.). The Native Element is the basic element, though it constitutes only up to 20–25 % of the English vocabulary.

Diachronically native words can be sub – divided into three main layers:

1. Indo – European elements. Since English belongs to the Germanic branch of the Indo – European group of languages, these words form the oldest layer and the basic word – stock of all Indo – European languages. The words belonging to this layer can be divided into definite semantic groups:

a) words expressing family relations (kinship terms): *father, mother, son, daughter, brother;*

b) words naming objects and phenomena of nature: *sun, moon, star, wind, water, hill, stone;*

c) words naming parts of the body: *foot, eye, ear, nose, tongue, tooth, heart, lip;*

d) names of trees, birds, animals: *tree, birch, cow, wolf, cat, goose, wolf, corn;*

e) names describing basic actions: *come, know, sit, work, bear, do, be, stand;*

f) words expressing physical properties and qualities: *right, quick, glad, sad, red, white, hard, new;*

g) numerals from one to one hundred: *one, two, three, ten, twenty, eighty, hundred;*

i) pronouns (personal, demonstrative, interrogative: *I, you, he, my, that, who* (*they* is a Scandinavian borrowing).

2. Common Germanic words. The Common Germanic stock includes words common for German, Norwegian, Dutch, Icelandic. They also constitute a very large layer of the vocabulary:

a) words naming parts of the body: *head, arm, finger*;

b) words naming periods of time: *summer, winter, time, week*;

c) words for objects and phenomena of nature: *storm, rain, flood, ground, sea, earth;*

d) words denoting materials and artifacts: *bridge, house, shop, coal, iron, lead, cloth*;

e) words naming different garments: *hat, shirt, shoe*;

f) words naming animals, birds, plants: *sheep, horse, fox, crow, oak, grass*;

g) verbs: *buy, drink, find, forget, go, have, live, make*;

i) pronouns: *all, each, self, such*;

j) adverbs: *again, forward, near*;

k) prepositions: *after, at, by, over, under, from, for*.

Native words are characterized by a wide range of lexical and grammatical valency, a developed polysemy, a great word – building power and the capacity of forming phraseological units.

2 Foreign elements in Modern English. Scandinavian borrowings, classical elements – Latin and Greek, French borrowings.

Borrowed words. English is generally regarded as the richest of the world's languages and it owes its exceptionally large vocabulary to its ability to borrow and absorb words from outside. "The English language is the sea which receives tributaries from every region under heaven", observes

Ralph Waldo Emerson. English has taken over words from most of the other languages with which it has had contact. A borrowing (a loan word) is a word taken over from another language and modified in phonemic shape, spelling, paradigm or meaning according to the standards of the English language.

Borrowing may be direct or indirect (through another language). Many Greek words came into English through Latin and many Latin words through French.

1. Latin borrowings (Latin – Continental, Latin – Celtic, Latin connected with the adoption of Christianity):

a) military terms: *wall, street, pitch*;

b) trade terms: *pound, inch*;

b) containers: *cup, dish*;

c) food: *butter, cheese*;

d) words connected with building: chalk, pitch;

e) names of towns: *Manchester, Lancaster* (*caster* – 'camp');

f) clerical terms: *dean, cross, alter, abbot, church, devil, priest, anthem, school*.

Some scientists point out three periods of Latin borrowings in Old English:

(1) Latin – Continental borrowings,

(2) Latin – Celtic borrowings, and

(3) Latin borrowings connected with the adoption of Christianity.

Military and trade terms, names of containers and food, words connected with buildings belong to the first period. These were concrete words that were adopted in purely oral manner, and they were fully assimilated in the language.

Such words as *port, mountain* and *fountain* were borrowed from Latin through Celtic. With the adoption of Christianity mostly religious or clerical terms were borrowed.

Latin words can still be found in uses as diverse as the English translation of Freud (the *ego* and the *id*) and the mottoes of army regiments (such as *Ubique* 'everywhere', the motto of the British Royal Artillery). Some Latin phrases are indeed everywhere, even if no longer fully understood (Yallop 34). Notable examples are *etc*., the abbreviation form of *et cetera*, 'and the rest'; *e.g.*, short for *exempli gratia*, 'for the sake of example'; and *a.m.* and *p.m.* (*ante meridiem, post meridiem*). Latin has been regularly used in anatomical description (*levator labii superior*, 'the upper lip raiser' muscle, or *corpus callosum*, the 'callous (hard) body in the brain), and in botany and zoology (*quercus* 'oak' for a genus of trees, or *felis* 'cat' for the genus of animals that includes domestic cats and some closely related species). When a profession has sought an erudite vocabulary to mark off its supposed area of competence, it has usually looked for classical languages for its jargon. The law, for example, has taken a lot of words from Latin such as *ad litem* ('in a lawsuit'), *bona fide* ('with good faith'), *corpus delicti* ('body of offence'), *and ultra vires* ('beyond

one's legal power'), *ejusdem generis* ('of the same kind'), *in personam* ('against the person'). *De facto, in camers, sine die, sub judice* are also known in legal context.

Latin is considered one of the principal languages that affected the vocabulary of English. Scandinavian words were borrowed most freely between the ninth century and the twelfth, French words from twelfth to fourteenth, but Latin words have been making their way into English throughout almost the whole period of its history, first into the spoken language, later into written English (through religion, literature and science).

2. Greek borrowings often came into English by way of Latin or French: *athlete, acrobat, elastic, magic, rhythm, martyr*.

Latin and Greek words are used to denote names of sciences, political and philosophical trends and have academic and literary associations. Most of such borrowings are of the Middle English period and connected with the Great Revival of Learning: *formula, inertia, maximum, memorandum, veto, superior, per capita, dogma, drama, theory, pseudonym.* Medicine has taken a lot from Greek as well: an inflammatory disease ends in *–itis* (*bronchitis, peritonitis*), a surgical removal ends in *–ectomy* (*hysterectomy*, *vasectomy*), the medical care of particular groups ends in *–iatrics* (*geriatrics*, *paediatrics*).

Many words were borrowed in the sixteenth century when interest in classic culture was at its height. Directly or indirectly, Greek contributed *athlete, acrobat*, *elastic, magic, rhythm,* and many others.

There are some classical borrowings in modern English as well: *anemia, aspirin, iodine, atom, calorie, acid, valency*, etc. There are words formed with the help of Latin and Greek morphemes (root or affixes): *tele, auto*, etc. Words like *altimeter, electroencephalogram, hydrophone* and *telespectroscope* have been built from Latin and Greek elements to deal with relatively recent technological innovations. "It has become so customary to use such elements as building blocks, that Latin and Greek are often combined in hybrid forms, as in Greek *tele* – with Latin *vision*, or Latin *appendic* – with Greek *–itis*" [Yallop 2004, 34].

Such twentieth – century concepts as *social security, multimedia, globalization, privatization, interdisciplinarity* and *interdiscursivity* attract classical naming of Latin and Greek origin.

3. French borrowings fall into several semantic groups as well:

a) government terms: *govern, administer, assembly, record, parliament*;

b) words connected with feudalism: *peasant, servant, control, money*;

c) military terms: *assault, battle, soldier; army, siege, defense, lieutenant*;

d) words connected with jury: *bill, defendant, plaintiff, judge, fine*;

e) words connected with art, fashion: *dance, pleasure, lace, pleat, beauty, figure, chic, prestige, cartoon, elite, avant – garde, entourage*.

Early French borrowings were fully assimilated; the opposite tendency is to be discerned in the later French borrowings. During the seventeenth century there was a change in the character of the borrowed words. From French, English has taken lots of words to do with cooking, the arts, and a more sophisticated life – style in general (*leisure, repertoire, resume, cartoon, critique, cuisine, chauffer, questionnaire, coup, bidet, detente*).

French borrowings of the period of the Norman Conquest have become part and parcel of the English vocabulary. The number of borrowings were so large that it was made possible to borrow morphemes and form word – hybrids, e.g.: *god – goddess (– ess* of French origin was added to the English stem), *short – shortage*, *bewilder – bewilderment*, *baker – bakery*. French stems can form hybrids with the English affixes: *beauty – beautiful*, *trouble – troublesome*.

English has continued to borrow words from French right down to the present, and as the result over a third of modern English vocabulary derives from French.

4. Scandinavian borrowings: *take, leg, hit, skin, same, both, though, they, them, their, cake, egg, kid, wish, want, craft*.

The impact of Old Norwegian on the English language is hard to evaluate. Nine hundred words are of Scandinavian origin. There are probably hundreds more we cannot account for definitely, and in the old territory of the Danelaw in northern

England words like *beck* ‘stream’ and *garth* ‘yard’ survive in regional use; words beginning with *sk –* like *sky* are also Norse.

In many cases Scandinavian borrowings stood alongside their English equivalents. The Scandinavian *skirt* originally meant the same as the English *shirt*. The Norse *deyja* ‘to die’ joined its Anglo – Saxon synonym, the English *steorfa* (which ends up as ‘starve’). Other synonyms include: *wish* and *want*, *craft* and *skill*, *rear* and *raise* [Бабич 2008].

5. Borrowings from other languages. Over 120 languages are on record as sources of the English vocabulary: Japanese (*karate, judo, tycoon*); Arabic (*algebra, algorithm, fakir, giraffe, sultan, harem, mattress*; Turkish (*yogurt, kiosk, tulip*), Farsi (*caravan, shawl, bazaar*); Italian (*piano, alto, incognito, bravo, ballerina, motto, casino, mafia, artichoke*); German (*blitz, hamburger, kindergarten, seminar, waltz*); Portuguese (*marmalade, cobra*); Spanish (*siesta, patio, mosquito, comrade, tornado, banana, guitar*); Dutch (*dock, limp, pump. yacht, cruise, gin, cookie*); Finnish (*sauna)*; Russian (*balalaika, tundra, robot*).

One more point to be mentioned is the indirect way of coming to the language of a large number of borrowings, not by direct contact with the language which is their source, but through an intervening language.

In this way many of the earlier Italian words came to English through French, the Italian of the Renaissance having reached France first, and thence having passed into English. The Earliest borrowings from the east came into English through Latin, many of them having already passed through Greek before reaching Latin. Most of such words are the objects of trade and culture. The word *pepper*, for instance, came first from some eastern language into Greek, thence into Latin and thence into English; *elephant* was first Egyptian, then Greek, Latin, French, and finally English; *camel* was originally Semitic, and this too passed through Greek and Latin before reaching English. *Albatross* is based ultimately on a Phoenician word which drifted successfully into Greek, Arabic and Portuguese, and then into English. *Apricot* began a long history in Latin, from which it passed in succession to Greek, Arabic, Spanish,

French, and English. *Silk* has been Chinese, Greek, Latin, and finally English [ibid, 6].

There are practically no limits to the kinds of words that are borrowed. Words are employed as symbols for every part of culture. When cultural elements are borrowed from one culture to another, the words for such cultural features often accompany the feature. Also, when a cultural feature of one society is like that of another, the word of a foreign language may be used to designate this feature in the borrowing society. In English a material culture word *rouge* was borrowed from French, a social culture word *republic* from Latin, and a religious culture word *baptize* from Greek [Бабич 21]. Such words become completely absorbed into the system, so that they are not recognized by speakers of the language as foreign. "Many of the words we shall have to class as 'foreigners' will seem at first sight 'true – born Englishmen', for they have been part of our vocabulary for centuries, but they have only a 'certificate of naturalization' not a right by birth." [Sheard 1954, 183].

We may distinguish different types of borrowing from one foreign language by another: (1) when the two languages represent different social, economic and political units and (2) when the two languages are spoken by those within the same social, economic, and political unit. The first of these types has been usually called 'cultural borrowing', while the second type has been termed 'intimate borrowing' [Бабич 2008, 22].

Assimilation of borrowings is the adaptation of borrowed words to the system of the receiving language in pronunciation, in grammar and in spelling. According to the degree of assimilation all borrowed words can be divided into three groups:

1. completely assimilated borrowings, that correspond to all the standards of the language, follow all morphological, phonetical and orthographic standards, take an active part on word – formation, they are morphologically analyzable; borrowings of this type may be found in all the layers of older borrowings (*cheese, face, husband, animal*);

2. Partially assimilated borrowed words may be subdivided depending on the aspect that remains unaltered into:

a) borrowings not completely assimilated graphically (*ballet, buffet, cliche, cafe, bouquet*);

b) borrowings not completely assimilated phonetically (*machine, cartoon, police, prestige, regime, bourgeois)*;

c) borrowings not assimilated grammatically (*crisis – crises, phenomenon – phenomena*);

d) borrowings not assimilated semantically as they denote objects and notions peculiar to the country they came from (*sari, sombrero, rickshaw, sherbet).*

3. Unassimilated borrowings or barbarisms are words from other languages used by English people in conversation and in writing but not assimilated in any way, and for which there are corresponding English equivalents (*addio, ciao, coup – d'etat, ennui, eclat, en regle, par excellence, a priori, ad hoc*). Such words and phrases may be printed in italics, or in inverted commas, and so forth.

Borrowed words can be classified according to the aspect which is borrowed:

1) translation borrowings (loans) are words and expressions formed from the material already existing in the language but according to the pattern taken from the source language (*pipe of piece, masterpiece, wall newspaper, five – year plan*);

2) semantic borrowings are understood as the development in an English word of a new meaning under the influence of another language (*pioneer*).

Basically, the word – coiner can either adopt a foreign form (importation, loans) or pattern the formation with the own language material on a foreign form (substitution, calques). In English language history we have a clear preference for substitutions in Old English, and a growing degree of importations in later stages of English.

1. Importation means that we simply adopt (and often adapt) a foreign word instead of running through the entire word – finding process (e.g. Italian, Spanish *mouse* for 'a computer mouse').

In English language history the most important donor languages for loans are Latin (in various waves from the late 6th century until today: Ecclesiastical Latin, Medieval Latin, and with many Greek elements Neo – Latin), Old Norse (8th to 11th

centuries, first in spoken language – which is why most Scandinavian words do not appear in English texts until the 11th century), and French (11th to 15th centuries).

2. Substitution means that at some part in the word – finding process you look at the equivalent in the foreign language or variety and then try to take your own material to copy the formation in the foreign language or variety (calques).

There are several ways of modelling indigenous coinages on a foreign designation.

1) if the foreign term is a composite form, you simply translate the single elements with the semantic equivalents of your own language; this is called *loan translation* (e.g. German *Welt – anschauung* → English *world view*; English *skyscraper* → French *gratte – ciel,* Italian *gratta ·cielo,* Spanish *rasca ·cielo)*;

2) if the foreign term is a composite form, you look at the iconeme behind the formation and try to render this iconeme somehow with indigenous language material; this is called *loan rendering*, or *loan rendition* (e.g. English *sky ·scraper* → German *Wolken ·kratzer* (literally 'cloud scraper');

3) if the foreign term is not a composite form, you look at the entire semantic range of the word and then search for indigenous equivalents of the other senses of the foreign word and then provide your indigenous word with the same semantic range; this is called *loan meaning* (e.g. English *mouse,* German *maus*, French *souris*, Spanish *ratyn* for 'computer mouse').

It is, of course, not always clear whether there is a foreign model or whether the designation is an independent coinage.

Substitution may be partial if one part of a foreign composite is directly borrowed and the other part is translated. These formations are occasionally also referred to as loan blends (e.g. English *Saturday* ← Latin *Saturni dies*).

Sometimes a word is not borrowed in its exact original construction (e.g. German *Happy End* ← English *happy ending).* Sometimes a word is coined with foreign material although this very formation with the foreign material does not exist

in the donor language itself; in these instances we speak of *pseudo – loans* (e.g. English *difficult* could also be termed a back – derivation from the true Gallicism *difficulty* instead of an importation of French *difficile*. French and Italian *footing* was coined for English *jogging*, German and Dutch *hometrainer* for English *exercise bicycle*).

Etymological Doublets. International Words

Etymological Doublets. It happens frequently in the course of the history of the English language that a word is borrowed more than once. For example, the Latin word *uncial* was adopted by Germanic as a measure of length, and appears in Old English as *ynce*, Modern English *inch*; a few centuries later English borrowed a word again, this time in its Romance form, **untsia*, which becomes in Old English *yntse,* used as a measure of weight; the French descendent, *unce*, *once*, of Romance **untsia*, came into Middle English, again as a measure of weight, and has become Modern English *ounce*; all these were popular loans, but the final version, *uncial*, borrowed in the 17th century from Latin *unciālis*, the adjective of *uncia*, is definitely a learned loan.

English has a particularly large number of these repeated borrowings due to the fact that numerous borrowings from Latin in the Early Middle Ages were followed by even more plentiful adoptions from French, which developed from Latin, and further by continued contact between English and French.

Even within the Middle English period a word could be borrowed twice from different dialects of French. Not very many original Latin words appear in all these forms in Modern English, since a new borrowing has often ousted an earlier one, but a large number may be still found, cf. *catch, chase, captive; mint, money; wine, vine(yard); drake, dragon; master, magistrate; trivet, tripod; castle,chateau*, etc.

As we can see form the examples above, if a word was borrowed twice into the language, it can have different forms and meanings, and we will have to differentiate different words with different spelling and meanings, though historically they come back to one and the same word.

These are the words of the same root but came into the language by different ways:

1) one of the doublets is native, the other is borrowed (*screw* (n) – Scandinavian, *shrew* (n) – English);

2) both doublets may be borrowed from different languages, but these languages must be co – generic (*captain* – Latin, *chieftain* – French, *canal* – Latin, *channel* – French);

3) etymological doublets may be borrowed from the same language but in different historical periods (*corpse* – Norman, *corps* – Parisian);

4) both doublets are native, but one originates from the other (*history – story, fantasy – fancy, shadow – shade*).

International words are defined as words of identical origin and which occur in several languages as the result of simultaneous borrowings and convey notions significant in communication. We can single out several groups:

1) names of sciences of Latin and Greek origin: *philosophy, mathematics, chemistry, biology, medicine, linguistics*;

2) terms of arts: *music, theatre, drama, tragedy, comedy, artist*;

3) political terms: *politics, policy, revolution, progress, democracy, communism;*

4) scientific and technological words: *antibiotic, atomic, television, sputnik, bionics, gene*;

5) sports: *football, volley – ball, baseball, hockey, cricket, rugby, tennis, golf*;

6) foodstuffs: *coffee, chocolate, banana, coca – cola, mango, avocado, grapefruit.*

The English language contributed a considerable number of international words to world languages. International words are mainly borrowings.

Words can be classified according to the period of their life in the language. We can have archaisms, words which have come out of active usage, and neologisms, words which have recently appeared in the language.

Archaisms and Historisms

Archaisms are words which are no longer used in everyday speech, which have been ousted by their synonyms. Archaisms remain in the language, but they are used as stylistic devices to express solemnity.

Most of these words are lexical archaisms and they are stylistic synonyms of words which ousted them from the neutral style: steed (horse), slay (kill), perchance (perhaps), betwixt (between). These lexical archaisms belong to the poetic style. When the causes of the word‘s disappearance are extra – linguistic, e.g. when the thing is no longer used, its name becomes a historism. Historisms are very numerous as names for social relations, institutions, objects of material culture of the past. here belong such transport means as brougham, berlin, fly, gig; also such vehicles as prairie schooner, also such boats as caravel, galleon, and such weapons as breastplate, crossbow, arrow, vizor.

Neologisms

At the present moment English is developing very swiftly and there is so called neology blowup. The two greatest influences on the formation, adaptation and use of English words over the last forty years have been the United States of America and the progress of different branches of science and means of communication: television, cinema and printed material.

New words can appear in speech of an individual person who wants to express his idea in some original way. This person is called originator. New lexical units are primary used by university teachers, newspaper reporters.

Neologisms can develop in three main ways. a lexical unit existing in the language can change its meaning to denote a new object or phenomenon. In such cases we have semantic neologisms, e.g. the word umbrella developed the meanings авиационное прикрытие, политическое прикрытие. A new lexical unit can develop in the language to denote an object or pfenomenon which already has some lexical unit to denote it. In such cases we have transnomination, e.g. the word slum was first substituted by the word ghetto, then by the word – group inner town. A new lexical unit can be introduced to denote a new object or phenomenon. In this case we have a proper neologism, many of them are cases of new terminology.

Semantic Groups of Neologisms

1. We can point out the group of neologisms connected with computerization: a)new words used to denote different types of computers: PC, super – computer, multi – user;

b) new words used to denote parts of computers: hardwear, softwear, monitor, display, key – board;

c) new words used to denote computer languages: BASIC, Algol, FORTRAN;

d) new words used to denote notions connected with work on computers: to blitz out, to computerize, computerization.

2. In the sphere of liguistics we have such neologisms as: machine translation, interligual and many others.

3. In the sphere of biometrics we have computerized machines which can recognize characteristic features of people seeking entrance: finger – print scanner, eye – scanner, voice verification.

4. In the sphere of machine computers we have the following neologism teleminatory unit.

5. With the development of social activities neologisms appeared as well. yuthquake, pussy – footer, Euromarket, Eurodollar, Europol.

6. In the modern English society there is a tendency to social stratification, as a result there are phraseologisms in this sphere as well: belonger – представитель среднего класса, приверженец консервативных взгдядов. There are also abbreviations: muppie (middle – aged urban professional people), gruppie (grown up).

7. There are a lot of immigrants now in the UK. As a result neologisms partial and non – partial were formed.

8. In the language of the teenagers there are the following neologisms: Drugs! (OK!), sweat, branch, task.

9. With the development of professional jargons a lot of words ending in speak appeared in English: artspeak, sportspeak, video – speak, cable – speak, education – speak.

10. There are semantic neologisms belonging to everyday life: starter, macrobiotics, longlife milk, fridge – freezer, hamburgers (food); catsuit, slimster, string (clothing); thongs, backsters (footwear); bumbag, sling bag, maitre (bags).

Ways of Forming Neologisms

According to the ways neologisms are formed they can be classified into: phonological neologisms, borrowings, semantic neologisms and syntactical neologisms. Syntactical neologisms are divided into morphological (word – building) and phraseological (forming word – groups).

Phonological neologisms are formed by combining unique combinations of sounds. they are called artificial: yeck/yuck (interjections used to express repulsion). These are strong neologisms. Strong neologisms include also phonetic borrowings: perestroika (Russian), solidarnosc (Polish), geige (Chinese perestroika). Morphological and phraseological neologisms are usually built on patterns existing in the language, therefore they do not belong to the group of strong neologisms. Among morphological neologisms there are a lot of compound words of different types: free – fall (резкое падение курса акций), rubber – neck (a tourist who remains in the coach and is not curious about the country), call – and – recall (вызов на диспансеризацию), bioastronomy (search for life on other planets), bugger – mugger (secrecy), x – rated (about films terribly vulger and cruel), Amerenglish (American English), tycoonography (a biography of a business tycoon).

There are also abbreviations of different types: resto, teen, dinky (dual income no kids yet), HIV, SINK (single independent no kids), nimby (not in my backyard). There are many neologisms formed by means of affixation: pro – life (prohibiting abortions), slimster, folknik, disimprove.

Phraseological neologisms can be subdivided into phraseological units with transferred meaning: to buy into (to become involved), fudge and dudge (avoidance of definite decisions) and set non – idiomatic expressions: boot trade, pathetic wage, a whizz kid (a very clever and ambitious young man, who makes a quick progress in his career).

3 Ukrainian – English lexical correlations

Lexical correlations are defined as lexical units from different languages which are phonetically and semantically related. The number of Ukrainian – English lexical correlations is about 6870.

The history of the Slavonic – German ties resulted in the following correlations: beat – бити, call – голос, day – день, widow – вдова, young – юний.

Semantically Ukrainian – English lexical correlations are various. They may denote everyday objects and commonly used things; *brutal* – брутальний, *cap* – капелюх, *cold* – холодний, *ground* – грунт, *kettle* – котел, *kitchen* – кухня, *lily* – лілія, *money* – монета (назва походить від латин. *Moneta* "богиня домашнього добробуту), *quart* – кварта, *sister* – сестра, *wolf* – вовк etc. Some Ukrainian – English lexical correlations have common Indo – European background: *garden* – город, *murder* –мордувати, *soot* – сажа.

Beside Ukrainian – English lexical correlations the Ukrainian language contains borrowings from modern English period e.g. брифінг, короткий інструктаж – *briefing;* диск – жокей, ведучий програми – *disk* – *jockey;* ескапізм, ухилення від соціальних проблем – *escapism;* істеблішмент, організація суспільно – державних установ країни – *establishment;* хіт парад, конкурс популярних пісень – *hit parade;* кітч, халтура – *kitch;* мас – медіа, засоби масової інформації – *mass media;* серіал, багатосерійна телепередача – *serial.*

Assimilation is the process of changing the adopted word. The process of assimilation of borrowings includes changes in sound form morphological structure, grammar characteristics, meaning and usage.

Phonetic assimilation comprises changes in sound form and stress. Sounds that were alien to the English language were fitted into its scheme of sounds, e.g. In the recent French borrowings *communique, cafe* the long [e] and [e] are rendered with the help of [ei]. The accent is usually transferred to the first syllable in the words from foreign sources.

The degree of phonetic adaptation depends on the period of borrowing: the earlier the period is the more completed is this adaptation. While such words as *«table», «plate»* borrowed from French in the 8th – 11th centuries can be considered fully assimilated, later Parisian borrowings (15th c.) such as *regime, valise, cafe"* are still pronounced in a French manner.

Grammatical adaption is usually a less lasting process, because in order to function adequately in the recipient language a borrowing must completely change its paradigm. Though there are some well – known exceptions as plural forms of the English Renaissance borrowings – *datum* pl. *data, criterion* – pl. *criteria* and others.

The process of semantic assimilation has many forms: narrowing of meanings (usually polysemantic words are borrowed in one of he meanings); specialisation or generalisation of meanings, acquiring new meanings in the recipient language, shifting a primary meaning to the position of a secondary meaning.

Completely assimilated borrowings are the words, which have undergone all types of assimilation. Such words are frequency used and are stylistically neutral, they may occur as dominant words in a synonymic group. They take an active part in word – formation.

Partially assimilated borrowings are the words which lack one of the types of assimilation. They are subdivided into the groups: 1) Borrowings not assimilated semantically (e.g. *shah, rajah).* Such words usually denote objects and notions peculiar to the country from which they came.

2) Loan words not assimilated grammatically, e.g. nouns borrowed from Latin or Greek which keep their original plural forms *{datum – data, phenomenon – phenomena).*

3) Loan words not completely assimilated phonetically. These words contain peculiarities in stress, combinations of sounds that are not standard for English *(machine, camouflage, tobacco).*

4) Loan words not completely assimilated graphically (e.g. *ballet, cafe, cliche).*

Barbarisms are words from other languages used by the English people in conversation or in writing but not assimilated in any way, and for which there are corresponding English equivalents e.g. *ciao* Italian – *good – bye* English,

The borrowed stock of the English vocabulary contains not only words but a great number of suffixes and prefixes. When these first appeared in the English language they were parts of words and only later began a life of their own as word – building elements of the English language *(age, – ance, – ess, – merit).* This brought about the creation of hybrid words like *shortage, hindrance, lovable* and many others in which a borrowed suffix is joined to a native root. A reverse process is also possible.

Inmany cases one and the same word was borrowed twice either from the same language or from different languages. This accounts for the existence of the so called etymological doublets like *canal – channel* (Latin – French), *skirt – shirt* (Sc. – English), *balsam – balm* (Greek – French).

International words. There exist many words that were borrowed by several languages. Such words are mostly of Latin and Greek origin and convey notions which are significant in the field of communication in different countries. Here belong names of sciences *(philosophy, physics, chemistry, linguistics),* terms of art *(music, theatre, drama, artist, comedy),* political terms *(politics, policy, progress).* The English language became a source for international sports terms *(football, hockey, cricket, rugby, tennis)*

LECTURE 5 THE WAYS OF WORD FORMATION

Plan

1. Productive ways of word – formation. Affixation. Suffixation. Classification of Suffixes. Prefixation. Classification of Prefixes. Word – composition. Classification of compound words. Conversion. Shortening.

2. Non – productive means of word formation. Blending. Back – formation. Onomatopoeia. Sound and stress interchange.

1 Productive ways of word – formation. Affixation. Suffixation. Classification of Suffixes. Prefixation. Classification of Prefixes. Word – composition. Classification of compound words. Conversion. Shortening.

Word – formation – the process of forming words by combining root and affixal morphemes according to certain patterns specific for the language (affixation, composition), or without any outward means of word formation (conversion, semantic derivation). Word – formation is one of the main ways of enriching vocabulary. There are four main ways of word – building in Modern English: affixation, composition, conversion, shortening.

Affixation is defined as the formation of words by adding derivational affixes to different types of bases. It has been productive in all periods of the history of English.

Derived words formed by affixation may be the result of one or several applications of word – formation rule and thus the stems of words making up a word – cluster enter into derivational relations of different degrees. The zero degree of derivation is ascribed to simple words, i.e. words whose stem is homonymous with a word – form and often with a root – morpheme, e.g. atom, haste, devote, anxious, horror, etc. Derived words whose bases are built on simple stems and thus are formed by the application of one derivational affix are described as having the first degree of derivation, e.g. atomic, hasty, devotion, etc. Derived words formed by two consecutive stages of coining possess the second degree of derivation, etc., e.g. atomical, hastily, devotional, etc.

Affixation includes suffixation and prefixation. As a rule, prefixes modify the lexical meaning of stems to which they are added. In a suffixal derivative the suffix does not only modify the lexical meaning of the stem it is added to, but the word itself is usually transferred to another part of speech.

Distinction is naturally made between prefixal and suffixal derivatives according to the last stage of derivation, which determines the nature of the pattern that signals the relationship of the derived word with its motivating source unit, cf. unjust *(un – +just),* justify, *(just*+ + – ify), arrangement *(arrange* + – ment), non – smoker (non – + *smoker).*

Words like reappearance, unreasonable, denationalise, are often qualified as prefixal – suffixal derivatives. The reader should clearly realise that this qualification is relevant only in terms of the constituent morphemes such words are made up of, i.e. from the angle of morphemic analysis.

From the point of view of derivational analysis such words are mostly either suffixal or prefixal derivatives, e.g. sub – atomic = sub – + *(atom* + + *–ic),* unreasonable = un – + *(reason* + – *able),* denationalise = de – + + *(national* + – *ize),* discouragement = *(dis* – + *courage)* + – ment.

A careful study of a great many suffixal and prefixal derivatives has revealed an essential difference between them. In Modern English suffixation is mostly characteristic of noun and adjective formation, while prefixation is mostly typical of verb formation. The distinction also rests on the role different types of meaning play in the semantic structure of the suffix and the prefix. The part – of – speech meaning has a much greater significance in suffixes as compared to prefixes which possess it in a lesser degree. Due to it a prefix may be confined to one part of speech as, e.g, enslave, encage, unbutton or may function in more than one part of speech as, e.g., over – in overkind *a,* to overfeed *v,* overestimation *n;* unlike prefixes, suffixes as a rule function in any o n e part of speech often forming a derived stem of a different part of speech as compared with that of the base, e.g. careless *a* – cf. care *n;* suitable *a* — cf. suit *v,* etc.

Furthermore, it is necessary to point out that a suffix closely knit together with a base forms a fusion retaining less of its independence than a prefix which is as a general rule more independent semantically, cf. reading – ‘the act of one who reads’; ‘ability to read’; and to re – read — ‘to read again.'

Suffixes can be classified into different types in accordance with different principles.

1. Origin: Romanic (e.g. *– age, – ment, – tion*), Native (e.g. *– er, – dom, – ship*), Greek (e.g. *– ism, – ize*), etc.

2. Productivity: productive suffixes (*– er, – ing, – ness, – ation, – ee, – ism, – ist, – ance, – ry, – or, ics*), non – productive suffixes *(– some, – th, – hood, – ship, – ful, – ly, – en, – ous*).

3. Lexico – grammatical character of the base suffixes are usually added to:deverbial suffixes (speak*er*, read*er*, agree*ment*, suit*able*); denominal suffixes (hope*less*, hope*ful*, violin*ist*, tire*some*); deadjectival suffixes (wid*en*, quick*ly*, redd*ish*, lonel*iness*).

4. Part of speech they form: noun – forming suffixes (writ*er*, bond*age*, knight*hood*, tender*ness*, friend*ship*, assist*ance*, free*dom*, hous*ing*); adjective forming

suffixes (read*able*, norm*al*, phonet*ic*, depend*ent*, shape*d*, hope*ful*, whit*ish*, posit*ive*, courage*ous*); numeral – forming suffixes (seven*fold*, fif*teen*, fif*th*, for*ty*); verb – forming suffixes (activ*ate*, intens*ify*, harmon*ize*, establ*ish*).

5. Generalizing denotational meaning: agent of an action (bak*er*, assist*ance*); collectivity (official*dom*), diminutiveness (girl*ie*, duckl*ing*), etc.

6. Stylistic reference: neutral (read*able*, hous*ing*); with stylistic value (posi*tron*, aster*oid*, etc.)

Prefixation is the formation of words with the help of prefixes. The interpretation of the terms prefix and prefixation now firmly rooted in linguistic literature has undergone a certain evolution. For instance, some time ago there were linguists who treated prefixation as part of word – composition (or compounding). The greater semantic independence of prefixes as compared with suffixes led the linguists to identify prefixes with the first component part of a compound word. At present the majority of scholars treat prefixation as an integral part of word – derivation regarding prefixes as derivational affixes which differ essentially both from root – morphemes and non – derivational prepositive morphemes. Opinion sometimes differs concerning the interpretation of the functional status of certain

individual groups of morphemes which commonly occur as first component parts of words. H. Marchand, for instance,

analyses words like to overdo, to underestimate as compound verbs, the first components of which are locative particles, not prefixes. In a similar way he interprets words like income, onlooker, outhouse qualifying them as compounds with locative particles as first elements.

There are about 51 prefixes in the system of Modern English wordformation. According to the available word – counts of prefixal derivatives the greatest number are verbs – 42.4%, adjectives comprise 33,5% and nouns make up 22.4%. To give some examples. – prefixal verbs: to enrich, to coexist, to disagree, to undergo, etc.; prefixal adjectives: anti – war, biannual, uneasy, super – human, etc.; prefixal nouns: ex – champion, co – author, disharmony, subcommittee, etc.

It is of interest to mention that the number of prefixal derivatives within a certain part of speech is in inverse proportion to the actual number of prefixes: 22 form verbs, 41 prefixes make adjectives and 42 – nouns.

Proceeding from the three types of morphemes that the structural classification involves two types of prefixes are to be distinguished:

1) those not correlated with any independent word (either notional or functional), e.g. un – , dis – , re – , pre – , post – , etc.; and

2) those correlated with functional words (prepositions or preposition like adverbs), e.g. out – , over – , up – , under – , etc.

Prefixes of the second type are qualified as **semi bound morphemes** , which implies that they occur in speech in various utterances both as independent words and as derivational affixes, e.g. ‘over one’s head’, ‘over the river’ (cf. to over*lap,* to over*pass*); ‘to run out’, ‘to take smb out’ (cf. to out*grow,* to out*line);* ‘to look up’, ‘hands up’ (cf. *upstairs,* to up*set);* ‘under the same roof, ‘to go under’ (cf. to under*estimate*, under*current),* etc.

It should be mentioned that English prefixes of the second type essentially differ from the functional words they are correlated with:

a) like any other derivational affixes they have a more generalized meaning in comparison with the more concrete meanings of the correlated words (see the examples given above); they are characterised by a unity of different denotational components of meaning — a generalised component common to a set of prefixes and individual semantic component distinguishing the given prefix within the set.

b) they are deprived of all grammatical features peculiar to the independent words they are correlated with;

c) they tend to develop a meaning not found in the correlated words;

d) they form regular sets of words of the same semantic type.

Of late some new investigations into the problem of prefixation in English have yielded interesting results. It appears that the traditional opinion, current among linguists, that prefixes modify only the lexical meaning of words without changing the part of speech is not quite correct with regard to the English language. In English there are about 25 prefixes which can transfer words to a different part of speech in comparison with their original stems. Such prefixes should perhaps be called conversive prefixes, e.g. to begulf (cf. gulf *n),* to debus (cf. bus *n);* to embronze (cf. bronze *n),* etc. If further investigation of English prefixation gives more proofs of the conversive ability of prefixes, it will then be possible to draw the conclusion that in this respect there is no functional difference between suffixes and prefixes, for suffixes in English are also both conversive (cf. hand — handless) and non – conversive (cf. father — fatherhood, horseman — horsemanship, etc.).

Some recent investigations in the field of English affixation have revealed a close interdependence between the meanings of a polysemantic affix and the lexico – semantic group to which belongs the base it is affixed to, which results in the difference between structural and structuralsemantic derivational patterns the prefix forms. A good illustration in point is the prefix en – .

When within the same structural pattern en – +*n* —> *V,* the prefix is combined with noun bases denoting articles of clothing, things of luxury, etc. it forms derived verbs expressing an action of putting or placing on, e.g. enrobe (cf. robe), enjewel (cf. jewel), enlace (cf. lace), etc.

When added to noun bases referring to various land forms, means of transportation, containers and notions of geometry it builds derived verbs denoting an action of putting or placing in or into, e.g. embed (cf. bed), entrap (cf. trap), embark (cf. bark), entrain (cf. train), encircle (cf. circle), etc.

In combination with noun bases denoting an agent or an abstract notion the prefix en – produces causative verbs, e.g. enslave (cf. slave), endanger (cf. danger), encourage (cf. courage), etc.

Unlike suffixation, which is usually more closely bound up with the paradigm of a certain part of speech, prefixation is considered to be more neutral in this respect.

It is significant that in linguistic literature derivational suffixes are always divided into noun – forming, adjective – forming, etc. Prefixes, however, are treated differently. They are described either in alphabetical order or subdivided into several classes in accordance with their origin, meaning or function and never according to the part of speech.

Prefixes seldom shift words from one part of speech into another and both the source word and its prefix derivative mostly belong to the same part of speech.

Prefixes can be classified according to the following principles.

1. Origin: Native (*be*fool, *mis*understand, *over*estimate, *un*academic), Romanic (*in*sufficient), Greek (*syn*thesis).

2. Productivity: productive (e.g. *re*do, *anti*biotic).

3. Lexico – grammatical character of the base: deverbal (*re*do, *over*do, *out*cast); denominal (*un*button, *de*train, *ex* – wife); deadjectival (*un*pleasant, *bi*annual).

4. Part of speech they from: verb – forming prefixes (*en*close, *be*friend, *de*throne); noun – forming prefixes (*non* – smoker, *sub* – branch, *ex* – wife); adjective – forming prefixes (*un*just, *il*legal, *ir*regular); adverb – forming prefixes (*un*fortunately, *up*road).

5. Generalizing denotational meaning: negative prefixes (*un*grateful, *non*political, *in*sufficient, *dis*loyal, *a*moral); reversative prefixes (*un*button, *de*mobilize, *dis*connect); pejorative prefixes (*mis*understand, *mal*treatment, *pseudo* –

scientific); prefixes of time and order (*pre* – war, *post* – war); prefix of repetition (*re*think); locative prefixes (*trans*atlantic, *super*structure).

6. Stylistic reference: neutral (*un*just); with stylistic value (*super*structure).

Suffixation is the formation of words with the help of suffixes. Suffixes usually modify the lexical meaning of the base and transfer words to a, different part of speech. There are suffixes however, which do not shift words from one part of speech into another; a suffix of this kind usually transfers a word into a different semantic group, e.g. a concrete noun becomes an abstract one, as is the case with child – childhood, friend — friendship, etc.

Chains of suffixes occurring in derived words having two and more suffixal morphemes are sometimes referred to in lexicography as compound suffixes: – ably = – able + – ly (e.g. profitably, unreasonably); – ically = – ic + – al + – ly (e.g. musically, critically); – ation = – ate + – ion (e.g. fascination, isolation) and some others.

Compound suffixes do not always present a mere succession of two or more suffixes arising out of several consecutive stages of derivation. Some of them acquire a new quality operating as a whole unit.

There are different classifications of suffixes in linguistic literature, as suffixes may be divided into several groups according to different principles:

1. The first principle of classification that, one might say, suggests itself is the part of speech formed. Within the scope of the part – of – speech classification suffixes naturally fall into several groups such as:

a) noun – suffixes, i.e. those forming or occurring in nouns, e.g. – er, – dom, – ness, – ation, etc. (teacher, Londoner, freedom, brightness, justification, etc.);

b) adjective – suffixes, i.e. those forming or occurring in adjectives, e.g. – able, – less, – ful, – ic, – ous, etc. (agreeable, careless, doubtful, poetic, courageous, etc.);

c) verb – suffixes, i.e. those forming or occurring in verbs, e.g. – en, – fy, – ise (– ize) (darken, satisfy, harmonise, etc.);

d) adverb – suffixes, i.e. those forming or occurring in adverbs, e.g. – ly, – ward (quickly, eastward, etc.).

2. Suffixes may also be classified into various groups according to the lexico – grammatical character of the base the affix is usually added to. Proceeding from this principle one may divide suffixes into:

a) deverbal suffixes (those added to the verbal base), e.g. – er, – ing, – ment, – able, etc. (speaker, reading, agreement, suitable, etc.);

b) denominal suffixes (those added to the noun base), e.g. – less, – ish, – ful, – ist,

– some, etc. (handless, childish, mouthful, violinist, troublesome, etc.);

c) de – adjectival suffixes (those affixed to the adjective base), e.g. – en, – ly, – ish, – ness, etc. (blacken, slowly, reddish, brightness, etc.).

3. A classification of suffixes may also be based on the criterion of sense expressed by a set of suffixes. Proceeding from this principle suffixes are classified into various groups within the bounds of a certain part of speech. For instance, noun – suffixes fall into those denoting:

a) the agent of an action, e.g. – er, – ant (baker, dancer, defendant, etc.);

b) appurtenance, e.g. – an, – ian, – ese, etc. (Arabian, Elizabethan, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, etc.); c) collectivity, e.g. – age, – dom, – ery (– ry), etc. (freightage, officialdom, peasantry, etc.);

d) diminutiveness, e.g. – ie, – let, – ling, etc. (birdie, girlie, cloudlet, squireling, wolfling, etc.).

4. Still another classification of suffixes may be worked out if one examines them from the angle of stylistic reference. Just like prefixes, suffixes are also characterised by quite a definite stylistic reference falling into two basic classes:

a) those characterised by neutral stylistic reference such as – able, – er, – ing, etc.;

b) those having a certain stylistic value such as – oid, – i/form, – aceous, – tron, etc.

Suffixes with neutral stylistic reference may occur in words of different lexico – stylistic layers e.g. agreeable, cf. steerable (steerable spaceship); dancer, cf. transmitter, squealer; 1 meeting, cf. monitoring (the monitoring of digestive processes

in the body), etc. As for suffixes of the second class they are restricted in use to quite definite lexico – stylistic layers of words, in particular to terms, e.g. rhomboid, asteroid, cruciform, cyclotron, synchrophasotron, etc.

5. Suffixes are also classified as to the degree of their productivity.

As is known, language is never stable: sounds, constructions, grammatical elements, word – forms and word – meanings are all exposed to alteration. Derivational

affixes are no exception in this respect, they also undergo semantic change. Consequently many commonly used derivational affixes are polysemantic in Modern English. The following two may well serve as illustrations. The noun – suffix – er is used to coin words denoting 1) persons following some special trade or profession, e.g. baker, driver, hunter, etc.; 2) persons doing a certain action at the moment in question, e.g. packer, chooser, giver, etc.; 3) a device, tool, implement, e.g. blotter, atomiser, boiler, eraser, transmitter, trailer, etc.

The adjective – suffix – y also has several meanings, such as 1) composed of, full of, e.g. bony, stony; 2) characterised by, e.g. rainy, cloudy; 3) having the character of, resembling what the base denotes, e.g. inky, bushy.

The various changes that the English language has undergone in the course of time have led to chance coincidence in form of two or more derivational affixes. As a consequence, and this is characteristic of Modern English, many homonymic derivational affixes can be found among those forming both different parts of speech and different semantic groupings within the same part of speech.

Conversion. Typical Semantic Relations in Conversion

Conversion (**zero – suffixation, transposition**) is one of the principal ways of forming words in modern English. It is highly productive in replenishing the English word – stock with new words. Conversion consists in making a new word from some existing word by changing the category of a part of speech; the morphemic shape of the original word remains unchanged. The new word acquires a meaning, which differs from that of the original one though it can be easily associated with it. The

converted word acquires also a new paradigm and a new syntactic function, which is peculiar to its new category as a part of speech.

Conversion is a characteristic feature of the English word – building system. It is also called affixless derivation or zero suffuxation. Conversion is the main way of forming verbs in Modern English. Verbs can be formed from nouns of different semantic groups and have different meanings because of that:

a) verbs can have instrumental meaning if they are formed from nouns denoting parts of a human body, tools, machines, instruments, weapons: to eye, to hammer, to machine – gun, ti rifle;

b) verbs can denote an action characteristic of the living being: to crowd, to wolf, to ape;

c) verbs can denote acquisition, addition, deprivation: to fish, to dust, to paper;d)verbs can denote an action performed at the place: to park, to bottle, to corner.

Verbs can be converted from adjectives, in such cases they denote the change of the state: to tame, to slim.

Verbs can be also converted from other parts of speech: to down (adverb), to pooh – pooh (interjection).

Nouns can also be converted from verbs. Converted nouns can denote:

a) instant of an action: a jump, a move;

b) process or state: sleep, walk;

c)agent of the action expressed by the verb from which the noun has been converted: a help, a flirt;

d) object or result of the action: a find, a burn;

e) place of the action: a drive, a stop. Sometimes nouns are formed from adverbs: ups and downs.

Conversion is usually restricted to words containing a single morpheme, though in some cases conversion can even apply to compounds.

Among the main varieties of conversion are:

1) verbalization (the formation of verbs), e.g. *ape (n) → to ape (v)*;

2) substantivation (the formation of nouns), e.g. *private (adj) → private (n)*;

3) adjectivation (the formation of adjectives), e.g. *down (adv.) → down (adj.);*

4) adverbalization (the formation of adverbs), e.g. *home (n.) → home (adv.).*

The two categories of parts of speech especially affected by conversion are nouns and verbs (these are two undisputable cases of conversion). Verbs converted from nouns are called denominal verbs. If the noun refers to some object of reality (animate or inanimate) the converted verb may denote:

1) action characteristic of an object: *ape* n. → *ape* v. 'imitate in a foolish way';

2) instrumental use of an object: *whip* n. → *whip* v. 'strike with a whip';

3) acquisition or addition of an object: *fish* n. → *fish* v. 'to catch or try to catch a fish';

4) deprivation of an object: *dust* n. → *dust* v. 'remove dust from sth';

5) location: *pocket* n. → *pocket* v. 'put into one's pocket'

Nouns converted from verbs are called deverbal substantives. If a verb refers to an action, the converted noun may denote:

1) instance of the action: *jump* v. → *jump* n. 'a sudden spring from the garden';

2) agent of an action: *help* v. → *help* n. 'a person who helps';

3) place of the action: *drive* v. → *drive* n. 'a path or road along which one drives';

4) result of the action: *peel* v. → *peel* n. the outer skin of fruit or potatoes taken off';

5) object of the action: *let* v. → *let* n. 'a property available for rent'.

The causes that made conversion so widely spread are to be approached diachronically.

Nouns and verbs have become identical in form firstly as a result of the loss of endings. When endings have disappeared phonetic development resulted in the merging of sound forms for both elements of these pairs, e.g. *carian* (v), *caru* (n) → *care* (v, n); *lufu* (n), *lufian* (v) → *love* (n, v).

Thus, from the diachronic point of view distinction should be made between homonymous word – pairs, which appeared as a result of a loss of inflections, and those formed by the conversion.

Conversion can be combined with other word – building processes, such as composition, which is described below.

As one of the two words within a conversion pair is semantically derived from the other, it is of great theoretical and practical importance to determine the semantic relations between words related through conversion. Summing up the findings of the linguists who have done research in this field we can enumerate the following typical semantic relations.

I Verbs converted from nouns (denominal verbs).

This is the largest group of words related through conversion. The semantic relations between the nouns and verbs vary greatly. If the noun refers to some object of reality (both animate and inanimate) the convertedverb may denote:

1) action characteristic of the object, e.g. ape *n* – ape *v* – 'imitate in a foolish way'; butcher *n* – butcher *v* – 'kill animals for food, cut up a killed animal';

2) instrumental use of the object, e.g. screw *n* – screw *v* – 'fasten with a screw'; whip *n* – whip *v* – 'strike with a whip';

3) acquisition or addition of the object, e.g. fish *n* – fish *v* – 'catch or try to catch fish'; coat *n* – 'covering of paint' – coat *v* – 'put a coat of paint on';

4) deprivation of the object, e.g. dust *n* – dust *v* – 'remove dust from something'; skin *n* – skin *v* – 'strip off the skin from'; etc.

II Nouns converted from verbs (deverbal substantives).

The verb generally referring to an action, the converted noun may denote:

1) instance of the action, e.g. jump *v* – jump *n* – 'sudden spring from the ground'; move *v* – move *n* – 'a change of position';

2) agent of the action, e.g. help *v* – help *n* – 'a person who helps'; it is of interest to mention that the deverbal personal nouns denoting the doer are mostly derogatory, e.g. bore *v* – bore *n* – 'a person that bores'; cheat *v* – cheat *n* – 'a person who cheats';

3) place of the action, e.g. drive *v* – drive *n* – 'a path or road along which one drives'; walk *v* – walk *n* – 'a place for walking';

4) object or result of the action, e.g. peel *v* – peel *n* – ‘the outer skin of fruit or potatoes taken off; find *v* – find и —– ’something found,” esp. something valuable or pleasant’; etc.

In conclusion it is necessary to point out that in the case of polysemantic words one and the same member of a conversion pair, a verb or a noun, belongs to several of the above – mentioned groups making different derivational bases. For instance, the verb dust belongs to Group 4 of Denominal verbs (deprivation of the object) when it means ‘remove dust from something’, and to Group 3 (acquisition or addition of the object) when it means ‘cover with powder’; the noun slide is referred to Group 3 of Deverbal substantives (place of the action) when denoting ‘a stretch of smooth ice or hard snow on which people slide’ and to Group 2 (agent of the action) when it refers to a part of an instrument or machine that slides, etc.

Basic Criteria of semantic derivation follows from the foregoing discussion that within conversion pairs one of the two words has a more complex semantic structure, hence the problem of the criteria of semantic derivation: which of the two words within a conversion pair is the derived member?

The first criterion makes use of the non – correspondence between the lexical meaning of the root – morpheme and the part – of – speech meaning of the stem in one of the two words making up a conversion pair. In cases like pen *n* – pen *v,* father *n* – father *v,* etc. the noun is the name for a being or a concrete thing. Therefore, the lexical meaning of the root – morpheme corresponds to the part – of – speech meaning of the stem.

This type of nouns is regarded as having a simple semantic structure. The verbs pen, father denote a process, therefore the part – of – speech meaning of their stems does not correspond to the lexical meaning of the roots which is of a substantival character. This distinction accounts for the complex character of the semantic structure of verbs of this type. It is natural to regard the semantically simple as the source of the semantically complex, hence we are justified in assuming that the verbs pen, father are derived from the corresponding nouns. This criterion is not universal being rather restricted in its application. It is reliable only when there is no doubt that

the root – morpheme is of a substantival character or that it denotes a process, i.e. in cases like to father, to pen, a fall, a drive, etc. But there are a great many conversion pairs in which it is extremely difficult to exactly determine the semantic character of the root – morpheme, e.g. answer *v* – answer *n*; match *v* – match *n*, etc. The non – correspondence criterion is inapplicable to such cases.

The second criterion involves a comparison of a conversion pair with analogous word – pairs making use of the synonymic sets, of which the words in question are members. For instance, in comparing conversion pairs like chat *v* – chat *n;* show *v* – show *n*; work *v* – work *n,* etc. with analogous synonymic word – pairs like converse – conversation; exhibit – exhibition; occupy – occupation; employ – employment, etc. we are led to conclude that the nouns chat, show, work, etc. are the derived members. We are justified in arriving at this conclusion because the semantic

relations in the case of chat *v* – chat *n;* show *v* – show *n*; work *v* – work *n* are similar to those between converse – conversation; exhibit – exhibition; employ – employment.

Like the noncorrespondence criterion the synonymity criterion is considerably restricted in its application. This is a relatively reliable criterion only for abstract words whose synonyms possess a complex morphological structure making it possible to draw a definite conclusion about the direction of semantic derivation. Besides, this criterion may be applied only to deverbal substantives *(v –> n)* and not to denominal verbs *(n –> v)*.

Of more universal character is **the criterion based on derivational relations** within the word – cluster of which the converted words in question are members. It will be recalled that the stems of words making up a word – cluster enter into derivational relations of different degrees. If the centre of the cluster is a verb, all derived words of the first degree of derivation have suffixes generally added to a verbbase. The centre of a cluster being a noun, all the first – degree derivatives have suffixes generally added to a noun – base.

Proceeding from this regularity it is logical to conclude that if the firstdegree derivatives have suffixes added to a noun – base, the centre of the cluster is a noun, and if they have suffixes added to a verb – base, it is a verb.2 It is this regularity that the criterion of semantic derivation under discussion is based on. In the word – cluster hand *n* — hand *v* — handful — handy — handed the derived words have suffixes added to the nounbase which makes it possible to conclude that the structural and semantic centre of the whole cluster is the noun hand. Consequently, we can assume that the verb hand is semantically derived from the noun hand. Likewise, considering the derivatives within the word – cluster float *n* — float *v* — floatable — floater — floatation — floating we see that the centre is the verb to float and conclude that the noun float is the derived member in the conversion pair float *n* — float *v*. The derivational criterion is less restricted in its application than the other two described above. However, as this criterion necessarily involves consideration of a whole set of derivatives it can hardly be applied to word – clusters which have few derived words.

Of very wide application is **the criterion of semantic derivation** based on semantic relations within conversion pairs. It is natural to conclude that the existence within a conversion pair of a type of relations typical of, e.g., denominal verbs proves that the verb is the derived member. Likewise, a type of relations typical of deverbal substantives marks the noun as the derived member. For instance, the semantic relations between crowd *n* — crowd *v* are perceived as those of an object and an action characteristic of the object, which leads one to the , conclusion that the verb crowd is the derived member; likewise, in the pair take *v* — take *n* the noun is the derived member, because the relations between the two words are those of an action and a result or an object of the action — type relations of deverbal substantives, etc. This semantic criterion of inner derivation is one of the most important ones for determining the derived members within a conversion pair, for its application has almost no limitations.

To sum up, out of the four criteria considered above the most important are the derivational and the semantic criteria, for there are almost no limitations to their

application. When applying the other two criteria, their limitations should be kept in mind. As a rule, the word under analysis should meet the requirements of the two basic criteria. In doubtful cases one of the remaining criteria should be resorted to. It may be of interest to point out that in case a word meets the requirements of the noncorrespondence criterion no additional checking is necessary.

Modern English vocabulary is exceedingly rich in conversion pairs. As a way of forming words conversion is extremely productive and new conversion pairs make their appearance in fiction, newspaper articles and in the process of oral communication in all spheres of human activity gradually forcing their way into the existing vocabulary and into the dictionaries as well. New conversion pairs are created on the analogy of those already in the word – stock on the semantic patterns described above as types of semantic relations.

Conversion is highly productive in the formation of verbs, especially from compound nouns. 20th century new words include a great many verbs formed by conversion, e.g. to motor — 'travel by car'; to phone — 'use the telephone'; to wire — 'send a telegram'; to microfilm — 'produce a microfilm *of;* to tear – gas — 'to use tear – gas'; to fire – bomb — 'drop fire – bombs'; to spearhead — 'act as a spearhead for'; to blueprint — 'work out, outline', etc. The term conversion is applied then only to cases like doctor *n* — doctor *v;* brief *a* — brief *v* that came into being after the disappearance of inflections, word – pairs like work *n* — work *v* being regarded exclusively as cases of homonymy.

Conversion is not an absolutely productive way of forming words because it is restricted both semantically and morphologically.

With reference to semantic restrictions it is assumed that all verbs can be divided into two groups:

a) verbs denoting processes that can be represented as a succession of isolated actions from which nouns are easily formed, e.g. fall *v* — fall *n;* run *v* — run *n;* jump *v* — jump *n,* etc.;

b) verbs like to sit, to lie, to stand denoting processes that cannot be represented as a succession of isolated actions, thus defying conversion. However, a careful

examination of modern English usage reveals that it is extremely difficult to distinguish between these two groups. This can be exemplified in such pairs as to invite — an invite, to take — a take, to sing — a sing, to bleed — a bleed, to win — a win, etc. The possibility for the verbs to be formed from nouns through conversion seems to be illimitable.

There is another interpretation of the relationship between conversion and sound (stress) – interchange in linguistic literature. As sound – and (stress –)interchange often accompanies cases of affixation, e.g. courage – courageous, stable – stability, it seems logical to assume that conversion as one of the types of derivation may also be accompanied by sound – (stress –)interchange. Hence, cases like breath – to breathe; to sing – song; present – to present; increase – to increase, etc. are to be regarded as those of conversion.

2 Non – productive means of word formation. Blending. Back – formation. Onomatopoeia. Sound and stress interchange.

Back – formation (regressive derivation) is the derivation of new words by subtracting a real or supposed affix from existing words (often through misinterpretation of their structure), e.g. *an editor > to edit, enthusiasm > to enthuse* etc.

The earliest attested examples of back – formation are *a beggar > to beg; a burglar > to burgle; a cobbler > to cobble*.

The most productive type of back – formation in present – day English is derivation of verbs from compounds that have either *–er* or *–ing* as their last element, e.g. *sightseeing > to sightsee; proofreading > to proofread; mass – production > to mass – produce; self – destruction > to self – destruct*; *a baby – sitter > to baby – sit* etc.

One of the characteristic features of the English vocabulary is a large number of shortened words. It is a feature of English to use laconic structures in syntax and in morphology as well as in the lexical system.

As we know, due to the leveling of endings in the Middle English period, the number of short words grew and the demand of rhythm dictated the appearance of more and more such words. That is one of the main reasons why there are so many monosyllabic words in English now.

As for borrowed words, they have undergone the same process of shortening in the course of assimilation as most of native words are monosyllabic. Shortened borrowed words sound more English than their long prototypes. Shortenings have been recorded since 15th century and shortening is more and more productive now.

All shortenings (or contracted or curtailed words) can be divided into two large groups: *lexical and spelling shortenings.*

Lexical shortenings

1. **Clipping** (part of the word is clipped, cut off) is a process that shortens a polysyllabic word by deleting one or more syllables.

a) **aphaeresis** is clipping of the first part of the word, dropping the beginning of the word. Sometimes it is a new word and in other cases it is the same word but belongs to another sphere of speech: *history – story, telephone – phone, omnibus – bus, motor – car – car, defence – fence, example – sample.*

b) **syncope** – the middle of the word is clipped, shortening by dropping the letter or unstressed syllable in the middle of the word: *market – mart, mathematics – maths, spectacles – specs.*

Syncope is common in poetry, e.g. *e'er, n'er* – rhythm dictates the necessity.

Syncope is common in proper names: *Catherine – Kate; Louise – Lucy*.

c) ← is shortening by dropping the last letter or syllable: *permanent wave – perm, zoological garden – zoo, examination – exam, graduate – grad, advertisement – ad, champion – champ, photograph – photo, laboratory – lab, public house – pub, gymnastics – gym*.

d) combination of aphaeresis and apocope: *influenza – flu, refrigerator – fridge, avant – guard – van, van – guard, professor – fess*.

Sometimes truncation and affixation can occur together, as with formations expressing intimacy or smallness, so – called diminutives: *Mandy* ← *Amanda, Andy* ← *Andrew, Patty* ← *Patricia*.

2. **Initial shortening** is the process of making a new word from the initial letters of a word – group. There are two ways of reading shortened words:

a) alphabetical pronunciation (the letters are spelt out) – **initialisms:**

TUC – Trade Union Congress

BBC – British Broadcasting Corporation

RAF – Royal Air Force

SOS – Save Our Souls

MP – Member of the Parliament or Military Police

P.M. – Prime Minister

ATM – Automated Teller Machine

HIV – Human Immunodeficiency Virus

HTML – Hyper Text Markup Language

FAQ – Frequently Asked Questions

In initial shortenings we can see the formation of plural and the possessive case: *MPs, MP's*. Affixes can be added: *ex – POW* ('prisoner of war'); the verb paradigm can be retained: *okays, okayed, okaying*.

b) **acronyms** (from Gr. *acros* – 'end' + *onym* 'name'). Acronyms are formed by taking the initial letters of the words in a phrase and pronouncing them as a word.

This type of word formation is especially common in names of organizations and in terminology. *NATO* [ˈneɪtəʊ] stands for North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, *UNO* [ˈjuːnəʊ] – United Nations Organisation, *UNESCO* [juːˈnɛskəʊ] – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, *AIDS* [ˈeidz] – acquired immune deficiency syndrome, *NASA* [ˈnasə] – National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such commonly used words as *radar* [ˈreɪdɑː] (from 'radio detecting and ranging'), and *laser* [ˈleɪzə] ('light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation') originated as acronyms.

Sometimes the two ways of reading shortened words are combined, like in *CD – ROM* [ˌsiːdiːˈrɒm] – (Compact Disc – Read Only Memory), *H – bomb* [ˈeɪtʃbɒm], *V – J Day* [ˌviːˈdʒeɪdeɪ] (Victory over Japan) – they are called compound shortened words.

In lexical shortenings we can see the change of the spelling to preserve the pronunciation: *library – libe, microphone – mike, bicycle – bike*.

«Acronyms present a special interest because they exemplify the working of the lexical adaptive system. In meeting the needs of communication and fulfilling the laws of information theory requiring a maximum signal in the minimum time the lexical system undergoes modification in its basic structure: namely it forms new elements not by combining existing morphemes and proceeding from sound forms to their graphic representation but the other way round – coining new words from the initial letters of phrasal terms originating in texts» [Арнольд 1986, 143].

Spelling shortenings

Spelling shortenings have existed in the English language since Old English. They came into English from Ancient Greece and Roman Empire.

1) Latin:

a.m. (ante meridian) – ‘in the morning’

p.m. (post meridian) – ‘in the afternoon’

cf. (confere) – ‘compare’

i.e. (id est) – ‘that is’

ib (id) (ibidem) – ‘in the same place’

e.g. (example gratia) – ‘for example’

ff. (felice) – ‘the following pages’

loc.cit. (locus citato) – ‘in the passage cited’

L (libra) – ‘pound’

s. (solidis) – ‘shilling’

viz (videlicet) – ‘namely’

2) Native spelling shortenings

a) forms of address: *Mr, Mrs, Ms*

b) units of weight, time, distance, electricity: *min, sec., in, m, p, ft, v, cm*

c) military ranks, scientific degrees: *capt., c – in – c, BSc, BA, MA, MSc, PhD*

d) names of offices: *Govt., Dept.*

For spelling shortenings it is typical to have homonyms: *p* can mean *page, particle, penny, post, president.*

When a shortened word appears in the language, the full form may

1) disappear: *avanguarde – vanguard, van; mobile vulgus – mob, fanaticus – fan;*

2) remain, but have different meaning: *courtesy – curtsy; to espy – to spy;*

3) remain but belong to another part of speech: *to estrange – strange;*

4) remain and belong to some other style: *doc – doctor, prof – professor.*

In most cases the shortened word belongs to the colloquial style and the full form to the neutral style, though there are some cases when the shortened form belongs to the neutral style and the full form – to the bookish style: *cinema – cinematograph, bus – omnibus, taxi – taximotor, cab – cabriolet.*

Blending

Blendings or blends (fusions, portmanteau words) are words that are created from parts of two already existing items, usually the first part from one and the final part of the other:

brunch from *breakfast and lunch*

smog from *smoke and fog*

spam from *spiced ham*

chunnel from *channel and tunnel*

motel from *motor hotel*

aerobicise from *aerobics* and *exercise*

bit from *binary and digit.*

The process of formation is also called telescoping, because the words seem to slide into one another like sections of a telescope.

We can distinguish additive and restrictive blends. The additive type is transformable into a phrase consisting of the respective complete stems combined by

the conjunction and, e.g. *smog < smoke and fog*, *Frenglish < French and English, transceiver < transmitter and receiver.*

The restrictive type is transformable into an attributive phrase where the first element serves as modifier of the second: *medicare < medical care, positron < positive electron*.

Some words are on the borderline between compounding and blending. It combines all of one word with part of the other: *workaholic, medicare, Eurotunnel, slanguage, guesstimate.*

Onomatopoeia (sound – imitation)

Onomatopoeia (from Gr. *onoma* 'name' and *poiein* 'to make') – **sound – imitation** is the formation of words from sounds that resemble those associated by the object or action to be named, or that seem suggestive of its qualities. Sound imitating or onomatopoetic words are motivated with reference to the extra – linguistic reality, they are echoes of natural words.

Examples of such onomatopoeic words in English include *cock – a – doodle – do, quack, croak, mew, meow, moo, low, lullaby, twang, babble, blob, bubble, flush, gush, splash, whiz.* Some names of animals, birds and insects are produced by sound – imitation: *crow, cuckoo, humming – bird, whip – poor – will, cricket.*

Thus, we can classify onomatopoeic words according to the source of sound:

1) verbs denoting sounds produced by human beings in the process of communication: *babble, chatter, giggle, grunt, grumble, murmur, whisper*, etc.;

2) sounds produced by animals, birds and insects: *buzz, cackle, croak, crow, hiss, honk, howl, moo, mew, neigh, purr, roar*, etc.;

3) verbs imitating water, metallic things, forceful motions: *bubble, splash, clink, tinkle, clash, crash, whip, whisk*, etc.

Back – formation (reversion, disaffixation)

Back – formation is a process that creates a new word by removing a real or supposed affix from another word in a language. The process is based on analogy. Words that end in *–or* or *–er* have proven susceptible to backformation in English, for example: *beg* from *beggar*, *butle* form *butler*, *cobble* from *cobbler*, *burgle* form

burglar, *sculpt* from *sculptor*, etc. Nouns with productive suffixes can also be involved in back – formation process: *enthuse* from *enthusiasm, donate* from *donation, orientate from orientation, self – destruct* from *self – destruction.*

Back – formation continues to produce new words in modern English, for instance the form *attrit* was formed from *attrition*, the verb *lase* from *laser*, *liposuct* from *liposuction*.

As we can see form the examples above, the most productive type of backformation in present – day English is derivation of verbs.

Sound interchange (gradation)

Sound interchange (**gradation**). Sound – interchange is the formation of a word due to an alteration in the phonemic composition of its root: *speak – speech, blood – bleed*, *food – feed*, *strong – strength*, *advice – advise*, *life – live.* As it can be seen from the examples, the change may affect the root vowel or the root consonant. It may also be combined with affixation like in *strong, adj. > strength*. This type of word – building is not productive at all in the present day English, and synchronically it should not be considered as a method of wordbuilding at all, but "rather as a basis for contrasting words belonging to the same word – family and different parts of speech or different lexico – grammatical groups" [Арнольд 1986, 1145].

Distinctive stress (distinctive change)

Distinctive stress (**distinctive change**) is the formation of a word by the means of the shift of the stress in the source word: *'increase (n) – in'crease (v), 'absent (adj) – ab'sent (v).*

Normally disyllabic nouns and verbs and adjectives and verbs of Romanic origin that have a distinctive stress pattern.

The distinctive stress is not a productive way of word – building, nor does it provide a very effective means of distinguishing words (there is, for example, a large group of disyllabic loan words that retain stress on the same syllable both in verb and nouns: *accord, account, advance, amount, concern, exclaim,* etc.).

There is a host of possibilities speakers of a language have at their disposal to create new words on the basis of existing ones.

LECTURE 6 SEMASIOLOGY AS THE BRANCH OF LINGUISTICS

Plan

1. Semasiology and Semantics. Referential, Functional and Information – Oriented Definitions of the Meaning.

2. Types of Meaning.

3. Aspects of Lexical Meaning.

1 Semasiology and Semantics. Referential, Functional and Information – Oriented Definitions of the Meaning

By definition Lexicology deals with words, word – forming morphemes (derivational affixes) and word – groups or phrases. All these linguistic units may be said to have meaning of some kind: they are all significant and therefore must be investigated both as to form and meaning. The branch of lexicology that is devoted to the study of meaning is known as **Semasiology**.

It should be pointed out that just as lexicology is beginning to absorb a major part of the efforts of linguistic scientists semasiology is coming to the fore as the central problem of linguistic investigation of all levels of language structure. It is suggested that semasiology has for its subject – matter not only the study of lexicon, but also of morphology, syntax and sentential semantics. Words, however, play such a crucial part in the structure of language that when we speak of semasiology without any qualification, we usually refer to the study of word – meaning proper, although it is in fact very common to explore the semantics of other elements, such as suffixes, prefixes, etc.

Meaning is one of the most controversial terms in the theory of language. At first sight the understanding of this term seems to present no difficulty at all – it is freely used in teaching, interpreting and translation.

The scientific definition of meaning however just as the definition of some other basic linguistic terms, such as word sentence, etc., has been the issue of interminable discussions. Since there is no universally accepted definition of meaning

we shall confine ourselves to a brief survey of the problem as it is viewed in modern linguistics both in our country and elsewhere.

Linguistic semantics involves all aspects of meaning in natural languages, from the meaning of complex utterances in specific contexts to that of individual sounds in syllables.

The definition of lexical meaning has been attempted more than once in accordance with the main principles of different linguistic schools. F. de Saussure considered meaning to be the relation between the object and the notion named, and the name itself. In Bloomfieldian approach meaning is the situation in which the word is uttered. At present there is no universally accepted definition of meaning, or rather a definition reflecting all the basic features of meaning and being at the same time operational. Nevertheless, different definitions of meaning help to sum up the general characteristics of the notion comparing various approaches to the description of the content side of the language. Most Russian scholars agree that lexical meaning is the realization of concept or emotion by means of a definite language system [Арнольд 1986].

There are three main categories of definitions of meaning which may be referred to as

– referential or analytical definitions of meaning;

– functional or contextual definitions of meaning;

– operational or information – oriented definitions of meaning.

Referential or analytical definitions of meaning. Referential or onomasiological approach studies the meaning as the interdependence between words and their referents, that is things and concepts they name (various names given to the same senses). The essential characteristic of **the referential approach** is that it distinguishes between the three components closely connected with meaning:

1) the sound – form of the linguistic sign;

2) the concept underlying this sound – form;

3) the referent, i. e. the part or aspect of reality to which the linguistic sign refers.

The functional approach to meaning maintains that the meaning of a linguistic unit can be studied only through its relation to other linguistic units. According to the given approach the meanings of the words *a step* and *to step* is different because they function in speech differently. *To step* may be followed by an adverb, *a step* cannot, but it may be proceeded by an adjective. The position of a word in relation to other words is called **distribution of the word**. As the distribution of the words *to step* and *a step* is different, they belong to different classes of words and their meanings are different.

The same is true of different meanings of one and the same word. Analyzing the function of a word in linguistic contexts and comparing these contexts, we conclude that meanings are different. For example, we can observe the difference of meanings of the verb *to take* if we examine its functions in different linguistic contexts, *to take a seat* ('to sit down') as opposed to *to take to smb.* ('to begin to like someone'). The term '**context**' is defined as the minimum stretch of speech necessary and sufficient to determine which of the possible meanings of a polysemantic word is used [Ginzburg 1979, 24].

The functional approach is sometimes described as contextual as it is based on the analysis of various contexts. In the functional approach which is typical of structural linguistics semantic investigation is confined to the analysis of the difference or sameness of meaning: meaning is understood as the function of a linguistic unit.

The operational or information – oriented definitions of meaning are centered on defining meaning through its role in the process of communication. Thus, this approach studies words in action and is more interested in how meaning works than in what it is.

Within this approach, meaning is defined as information conveyed from the speaker to the listener in the process of communication. This definition is applicable both to words and sentences and thus overcomes one of the alleged drawbacks of the referential approach. The problem is that it is more applicable to sentences than to words and even as such fails to draw a clear distinguishing line between the direct

meaning and implication (additional information). Thus, the sentence *Ann came at 6 o'clock* besides the direct meaning may imply that *Ann 'was two hours late; failed to keep his promise; came though he did not want to; was punctual as usual, etc.'* In each case the implication would depend on the concrete situation of communication and discussing meaning as information conveyed would amount to the discussion of an almost infinite set of possible communication situations. The distinction between the two layers in the information conveyed is so important that two different terms may be used to denote them. **The direct information** conveyed by the units constituting the sentence may be referred to as meaning while **the information added** to the extralinguistic situation may be called sense [Зыкова 2007].

When comparing the two approaches described above in terms of methods of linguistic analysis we see that the functional approach should not be considered an alternative, but rather a valuable complement to the referential theory. It is only natural that linguistic investigation must start by collecting an adequate number of samples of contexts.1 On examination the meaning or meanings of linguistic units will emerge from the contexts themselves. Once this phase had been completed it seems but logical to pass on to the referential phase and try to formulate the meaning thus identified. There is absolutely no need to set the two approaches against each other; each handles its own side of the problem and neither is complete without the other.

The Causes of Semantic Changes

The meaning of a word can change in the course of time. Transfer of the meaning is called lexico – semantic word – building. In such cases the outer aspect of a word does not change.

The causes of semantic changes can be extra – linguistic and linguistic: the change of the lexical meaning of the noun pen was due to extra – longuistic causes. Primarily pen comes back to the latin word penna (a feather of a bird). As people wrote with goose pens the name was transferred to steel pens which were later on used for writing. Still later any instrument for writing was called a pen.

On the other hand, causes may be linguistic, e.g. the conflict of synonyms when a perfect synonym of a native word is borrowed from some other language one of them may specialize in its meaning. The noun tide in Old English was polysemantic and denoted time, season, hour. When the French words time, season, hour were borrowed into English they ousted the word tide in these meanings. It was specialized and now means regular rise and fall of the sea caused by attraction of the moon. The meaning of a word can also change due to ellipsis: the word – group a train of carriages had the meaning of a row of carriages, later on of carriages was dropped and the noun train changed its meaning, it is used now in the function and with the meaning of the whole word – group.

Semantic changes have been classified by different scientists. The most complete classification was suggested by a German scientist Herman Paul. It is based on the logical principle. He distinguishes two main ways where the semantic change is gradual (specialization and generalization), two momentary conscious

semantic changes (metaphor and metonymy) and secondary ways: gradual (elevation and degradation), momentary (hyperbole and litotes).

2 Types of Meaning

It is more or less universally recognised that word – meaning is not homogeneous but is made up of various components the combination and the interrelation of which determine to a great extent the inner facet of the word. These components are usually described as types of meaning. The two main types of meaning that are readily observed are the grammatical and the lexical meanings to be found in words and word – forms.

Word – meaning is not homogeneous. It is made up of various components. These components are described as types of meaning. The two main types of meaning are the grammatical meaning and the lexical meaning. Still one more type of meaning is singled out. It is based on the interaction of the major types and is called the part – of – speech (or lexicogrammatical) meaning.

The grammatical meaning is defined as an expression in speech of relationship between words. The grammatical meaning is the component of meaning

recurrent in identical sets of individual forms of different words, as, for example, the tense meaning in the word – forms of the verbs: *asked, thought, walked;* the case meaning in the word – forms of various nouns: *girl's, boy's, nights';* the meaning of plurality which is found in the word – forms of nouns: *joys, tables, places.* The grammatical meaning is more abstract and more generalized than lexical meaning and it unites words into big groups as we can see from the above – mentioned examples.

In a broad sense it may be argued that linguists who make a distinction between lexical and grammatical meaning are, in fact, making a distinction between the functional (linguistic) meaning which operates at various levels as the interrelation of various linguistic units and referential (conceptual) meaning as the interrelation of linguistic units and referents (or concepts).

In modern linguistic science it is commonly held that some elements of grammatical meaning can be identified by the position of the linguistic unit in relation to other linguistic units, i.e. by its distribution. Wordforms speaks, reads, writes have one and the same grammatical meaning as they can all be found in identical distribution, e.g. only after the pronouns he, she, it and before adverbs like well, badly, to – day, etc.

It follows that a certain component of the meaning of a word is described when you identify it as a part of speech, since different parts of speech are distributionally different.

Comparing word – forms of one and the same word we observe that besides grammatical meaning, there is another component of meaning to be found in them.

Unlike the grammatical meaning this component is identical in all the forms of the word. Thus, e.g. the word – forms go, goes, went, going, gone possess different grammatical meanings of tense, person and so on, but in each of these forms we find one and the same semantic component denoting the process of movement. This is the lexical meaning of the word which may be described as the component of meaning proper to the word as a linguistic unit, i.e. recurrent in all the forms of this word.

The lexical meaning of the word is the meaning proper to the given linguistic unit in all its forms and distributions. The word – forms *go, goes, went, going, gone*

possess different grammatical meanings of tense, person, number, but in each form they have one and the same semantic component denoting 'the process of movement'.

Both the lexical and grammatical meanings make up the word – meaning as neither can exist without the other. That can be observed in the semantic analysis of correlated words in different languages. The Russian word *сведения* is not semantically identical with the English equivalent *information* because unlike the Russian *сведения* the English word does not possess the grammatical meaning of plurality which is part of the semantic structure of the Russian word.

In some parts of speech the prevailing component is the grammatical type of meaning. For example, in the verb *to be* the grammatical meaning of a linking element prevails: *He is a teacher.*

The lexico – grammatical meaning the common denominator of all the meanings of words belonging to a lexico – grammatical class, it is the feature according to which they are grouped together [Арнольд 1986, 39].

It is usual to classify lexical items into major word – classes (nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs) and minor word – classes (articles, prepositions, conjunctions, etc.).

All members of a major word – class share a distinguishing semantic component which though very abstract may be viewed as the lexical component of part – of – speech meaning. For example, the meaning of ‘thingness’ or substantiality may be found in all the nouns e.g. table, love, sugar, though they possess different grammatical meanings of number, case, etc. It should be noted, however, that the grammatical aspect of the part – of – speech meanings is conveyed as a rule by a set of forms. If we describe the word as a noun we mean to say that it is bound to possess a set of forms expressing the grammatical meaning of number (cf. table — tables), case (cf. boy, boy’s) and so on. A verb is understood to possess sets of forms expressing, e.g., tense meaning (worked — works), mood meaning (work! — (I) work), etc.

The part – of – speech meaning of the words that possess only one form, e.g. prepositions, some adverbs, etc., is observed only in their distribution (cf. to come in (here, there) and in (on, under) the table).

One of the levels at which grammatical meaning operates is that of minor word classes like articles, pronouns, etc.

Members of these word classes are generally listed in dictionaries just as other vocabulary items, that belong to major word – classes of lexical items proper (e.g. nouns, verbs, etc.).

One criterion for distinguishing these grammatical items from lexical items is in terms of closed and open sets. Grammatical items form closed sets of units usually of small membership (e.g. the set of modern English pronouns, articles, etc.). New items are practically never added.

Lexical items proper belong to open sets which have indeterminately large membership; new lexical items which are constantly coined to fulfil the needs of the speech community are added to these open sets.

The interrelation of the lexical and the grammatical meaning and the role played by each varies in different word – classes and even in different groups of words within one and the same class. In some parts of speech the prevailing component is the grammatical type of meaning. The lexical meaning of prepositions for example is, as a rule, relatively vague (independent of smb, one of the students, the roof of the house). The lexical meaning of some prepositions, however, may be comparatively distinct (cf. in/on, under the table). In verbs the lexical meaning usually comes to the fore although in some of them, the verb to be, e.g., the grammatical meaning of a linking element prevails (cf. he works as a teacher and he is a teacher).

The essence of **the part – of – speech meaning** of a word is revealed in the classification of lexical items into major word – classes (nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs) and minor word – classes (articles, prepositions, conjunctions, etc).

All members of a major word – class share a distinguishing semantic component which, though very abstract, may be viewed as the lexical component of part – of – speech meaning. For example, the meaning of thingness or substantiality

may be found in all the nouns, e.g. *table, love, sugar,* though they possess different grammatical meaning of number and case.

The grammatical aspect of part – of – speech meaning is conveyed as a rule by a set of forms. If we describe the word as a noun we mean to say that it is bound to possess a set of forms expressing the grammatical meaning of number *(table – tables)* and case (*boy – boys).*

The part – of – speech meaning of the words that possess only one form, e.g. prepositions, some adverbs, etc. is observed only in their distribution, e.g. *to come in (here, there); in (on, under) the table.*

3 Aspects of Lexical Meaning

In the general framework of lexical meaning several aspects can be singled out. They are: the denotational aspect, the connotational aspect and the pragmatic aspect.

The denotational aspect of lexical meaning is the part of lexical meaning which establishes correlation between the name and the object, phenomenon, process or characteristic feature of concrete reality (or thought as such), which is denoted by the given word. The term 'denotational' is derived from the English word *to denote* which means 'be a sign of' or 'stand as a name or symbol for'. For instance, the denotational meaning of *booklet* is 'a small thin book that gives information about something'.

It is through the denotational aspect of meaning that the bulk of information is conveyed in the process of communication. The denotational aspect of lexical meaning expresses the notional content of a word. The denotational aspect is the component of the lexical meaning that makes communication possible.

The connotational aspect of lexical meaning is the part of meaning which reflects the attitude of the speaker towards what he speaks about. Connotation conveys additional information in the process of communication.

Connotation includes:

- ***the emotive charge*** is one of the objective semantic features proper to words as linguistic units that forms part of the connotational component of meaning, for example, *daddy* as compared to *father*.

- ***evaluation***, which may be positive or negative, for instance, *clique* (a small group of people who seem unfriendly to other people) as compared to *group* (a set of people);
- ***imagery***, for example, *to wade* – to walk with an effort (through mud, water or anything that makes progress difficult). The figurative use of the word gives rise to another meaning, which is based on the same image as the first – *to wade through a book;*
- **intensity / expressiveness**, for instance, *to adore – to love*;

The correlation of denotational and connotational components of some words is shown in Table 2.

Table 2 – The correlation of denotational and connotational components

Word+part of speech	**Denotational component**	**Connotational component**	**Type of connotation**
lonely, *adj.*	alone, without company	melancholy, sad	emotive connotation
notorious, *adj.*	widely known	for criminal act or bad traits of character	evaluative connotation, negative
celebrated, *adj.*	widely known	for special achievement in science, art, etc.	evaluative connotation, positive
to glare, *adj.*	to look	1. steadily, lastingly	connotation of duration
		2. in anger, rage, etc	emotive connotation; connotation of cause
to glance, *v.*	to look	briefly, passingly	connotation of duration
to stare, *v.*	to look	steadily, lastingly in surprise, curiosity, etc.	emotive connotation; connotation of cause
to gaze, *v.*	to look	steadily, lastingly in tenderness, admiration	emotive connotation
o shiver, *v.*	to tremble	1. lastingly	connotation of duration
		2. usu with the cold	connotation of cause

The above examples show how by singling out denotational and connotational components we can get a sufficiently clear picture of what the word really means. The schemes presenting the correlation of two components of the words also show that a meaning can have two or more connotational components.

The given examples do not exhaust all the types of connotations but present only a few: emotive, evaluative connotations, and also connotations of duration, cause, etc.

The pragmatic aspect is the part of lexical meaning that conveys information on the situation of communication. Like the connotational aspect, the pragmatic aspect falls into four closely linked together subsections.

1. **Information on the 'time and space' relationship of the participants.** Some information which specifies different parameters of communication may be conveyed not only with the help of grammatical means (tense forms, personal pronouns, etc), but through the meaning of the word. For example, the words *come* and *go* can indicate the location of the speaker who is usually taken as the zero point in the description of the situation of communication.

The time element when related through the pragmatic aspect of meaning is fixed indirectly. Indirect reference to time implies that the frequency of occurrence of words may change with time and in extreme cases words may be out of use or become obsolete. Thus, the word *behold* – 'take notice, see (smth. unusual)' as well as the noun *beholder* – 'spectator' are out of use now but were widely used in the 17th century.

2. **Information on the participants and the given language community**. The language used may be indicative of the social status of a person, his education, profession, etc. The pragmatic aspect of the word also may convey information about the social system of the given language community, its ideology, religion, system of norms and customs. Let us consider the following sentences:

a) *They chucked a stone at the cops, and then did a bunk with the loot.*

b) *After casting a stone at the police, they absconded with the money.*

Sentence A could be said by two criminals talking casually about the crime afterwards. Sentence B might be said by the chief inspector in making his official report.

3. **Information on the tenor of discourse**. The tenors of discourse reflect how the addresser (the speaker or the writer) interacts with the addressee (the listener or reader). Tenors are based on social or family role of the participants of communication. There may be situation of a mother talking to her small child, or about her children, or a teacher talking to students, or friends talking to each other.

4. **Information on the register of communication**. The conditions of communication form another important group of factors. The register defines the general type of the situation of communication grading the situations in formality.

Three main types of the situations of communication are usually singled out: ***formal, neutral*** and ***informal***. Thus, the pragmatic aspect of meaning refers words like *cordial, fraternal, anticipate, aid* to formal register while units like *cut it out*, *to be kidding, stuff, hi* are to be used in the informal register.

LECTURE 7 ENGLISH VOCABULARY AS A SYSTEM

Plan

1. Homonymy. Classification of Homonyms. Sources of Homonyms.

2. Types of Semantic Relations (Proximity, Equivalence, Inclusion, Opposition. Hyponymy. Paronymy.

3. Synonymy. Classification of Synonyms. Lexical and Terminological Sets. Lexico – Semantic Groups and Semantic Fields.

4. Antonymy. Classification of Antonyms.

1 Homonymy. Classification of Homonyms. Sources of Homonyms

Homonyms (from Greek '*homos*' means 'the same', '*omona*' means 'name') are the words, different in meaning and either identical both in sound and spelling or identical only in spelling or sound. Modern English is rich in homonymous words and

word – forms; it is sometimes suggested that the abundance of homonyms in Modern English is to be accounted for by the monosyllabic structure of the commonly used English words. The most widely accepted classification of them was suggested by W.W. Skeat:

1. Homonyms proper (or perfect homonyms.
2. Homophones.
3. Homographs.

Homonyms proper are words identical in pronunciation and spelling: *ball* as 'a round object used in game', *ball* as 'a gathering of people for dancing; *bark* (verb) means 'to utter sharp explosive cries'; *bark* (noun) is 'a noise made by dog or a sailing ship', etc.

Homophones are words of the same sound, but of different meaning, for example: *air – heir, arms – alms, steal – steel, rain – reign, scent – cent,* etc.

Homographs are words different in sound and in meaning but accidentally identical in spelling:

Bow [bou] – 'a weapon made from a long curved piece of wood, used for shooting arrows' / [bau] – 'a forward movement of the top part of the body, especially to show respect'.

Lead [li:d] – 'the first position at a particular time during a race or competition'/ [led] – 'a soft heavy grey metal'.

Another classification was suggested by A.I. Smirnitsky who added to Skeat's classification one more criterion: grammatical meaning. Homonyms fall into three groups:

1) lexical (no link between their lexical meanings), e.g. *fair – fare*, *bow – bow*);

2) grammatical (belong to different parts of speech), e.g. *milk – to milk*, *practice – to practise*;

3) lexico – grammatical, e.g. *tear* (n) – *tear* (v), *bear* (n) – *bare* (a).

According to this classification, we distinguish between full homonyms and partial homonyms. Full homonyms are identical in sound and in all their forms and paradigms; partial homonyms are identical in sound in several forms.

One of source of homonyms is a phonetic change, which a word undergoes in the course of its historical development. As a result of such changes, fewer or more words, which were formerly pronounced differently, may develop identical sound forms and thus become homonyms.

Night and *knight,* for instance, were not homonyms in Old English as the initial "k" in the second word was pronounced. The verb *to write* in Old English had the form *to writan* and the adjective *right* had the form *recht* or *riht*.

Another source of homonyms is borrowing. A borrowed word may, in the final stage of the phonetic adaptation, conclude the form either with a native word or another borrowing. So in the group of homonyms '*rite n – to write – right adj.*' the second and third words are of native origin, whereas '*rite*' is Latin borrowing (Latin *ritus*).

Word building also contributes significantly to the growth of homonymy, the most important type of it being conversion. Such pairs of words as *comb* (*n) – comb* (*v)*; *pale* (*adj). – pale* (*v)*; *make* (*v) – make* (*n)*, etc. are numerous in vocabulary. Homonyms of this type refer to different categories of parts of speech and called lexico – grammatical homonyms.

Shortening is a further type of word – building, which increases the number of homonyms. For example *fan* (an enthusiastic admirer of some sportsmen, actor, singer, etc.) is a shortening produced from *fanatic*. Its homonym is a Latin borrowing '*fan*' – an element for waving and produce some cool wind.

The noun, for instance, '*rep*', a kind of fabric, has four homonyms: *rep = repertory*; *rep = representative; rep = reputation; rep = repetition*.

One of the most complicated problems in semasiology is to define the place of homonyms among other relationships of words, it is hard to determine clearly where polysemy ends and homonymy begins. In a simple code each sign has only realized in natural language. When several related meanings are associated with the same form, the word is called polysemantic. When two or more unrelated meanings are associated with the same form, these words are homonyms. When two or more forms

are associated with the same or nearly the same meaning, they are called the synonyms.

2 Types of Semantic Relations (Proximity, Equivalence, Inclusion, Opposition. Hyponymy. Paronymy

Linguistics views the language system as consisting of several subsystems all based on oppositions, differences, sameness and positional values [Арнольд 1986]. Regardless of exactly how one conceives of word meaning, or word senses, because they pertain in some manner to categories on the word itself, lexical relationships between word senses mirror, perhaps imperfectly, certain relationships that hold between the categories themselves.

The 'classical' lexical or semantic relationships pertain to identity the meaning, inclusion of meaning, part – whole relationships, and opposite meaning.

Throughout the course, we will use the following terminology for these basic types of semantic relations: proximity, equivalence, inclusion and opposition.

Semantic **proximity** implies that words however different may enter the semantic relations if they share certain semantic features, e.g. words *red* and *green* share the semantic features of 'colour'. Two or more words are synonymous (with respect to one sense of each) if one may substitute for another in a text without changing the meaning of the text. This may be construed more or less strictly; words may be synonymous in one context but not in another; often, putative synonyms, will vary in connotation or linguistic style, and this might or might not be considered significant. More usually, synonyms are actually merely near – synonyms. A higher degree of semantic proximity helps to single out synonyms while a lower degree of proximity provides for a description of broader and less homogeneous semantic groups.

Semantic **equivalence** implies full similarity of meaning of two or more language units. Equivalence should be distinguished from equality and identity, as it is the relation between two elements based on the common feature due to which they belong to the same set [Арнольд 1996, 23]. Semantic equivalence is very seldom

observed in words and is claimed to be much oftener encountered in case of sentences (*She lives in Paris – She lives in the capital of France*).

Semantic equivalence of words is unstable, it tends to turn into the relations of semantic proximity (the realization of the economy principle in the language which 'does not need' words different in form and absolutely similar in meaning.

Inclusion exists between two words if the meaning of one word contains the semantic features constituting the meaning of the other word. The semantic relations of inclusion are called hyponymic relations which may be viewed as the hierarchical relationship between the meanings of the general and individual terms. The general terms – *red, vegetable* – are referred to as classifiers or **hyperonyms**. The more specific term is called the **hyponym** (*scarlet, vermilion, crimson; potato, cucumber, carrot*) is included in a more general term (hyperonym).

The inclusion relationship between verbs is sometimes known as troponymy, emphasizing the point that verb inclusion tend to be a matter of 'manner': *to murmur* is to talk in a certain manner [Fellbaum 1998]. Inclusion relationships are transitive, and thus form semantic hierarchies among word senses; words without hyponyms are leaves and word without hypernyms are roots. (The structures are more usually networks than trees, but we shall use the word 'hierarchy' to emphasis the inheritance aspect of the structures.

The individual terms contain the meaning of the general term in addition to their individual meaning which distinguishes them from each other. Thus, we can define hyponymy as a paradigmatic relation of sense between a more specific or subordinate lexeme, and a more general, or superordinate, lexeme. Hyponym is a core relationship within a dictionary; it expresses basic meaning relationships in the lexicon.

The part–whole relationships **meronymy** and **holonymy** also form hierarchies. Although they may be glossed roughly as *has – part* and *part – of*, we again avoid these ontologically biased terms. The notion of part–whole is overloaded; for example, the relationship between *wheel* and *bicycle* is not the same as that of

professor and *faculty* or *tree* and *forest*; the first relationship is that of functional component, the second is group membership, and the third is element of a collection.

There is one more interesting example which shows that two words with a common hypernym will often overlap in sense – that is, they will be **nearsynonyms.**

Consider, for example, the English words *error* and *mistake*, and some words that denote kinds of mistakes or errors: *blunder, slip, lapse, faux pas, bull, howler,* and *boner* [Fellbaum 1998, p.8–9]. How can we arrange these in a hierarchy? First we need to know the precise meaning of each and what distinguishes one from another. Fortunately, lexicographers take on such tasks, and the data for this group of words is given in *Webster's New Dictionary of Synonyms*:

Error implies a straying from a proper course and suggests guilt as may lie in failure to take proper advantage of a guide.

Mistake implies misconception, misunderstanding, a wrong but not always blameworthy judgment, or inadvertence; it expresses less severe criticism than *error*.

Blunder is harsher than *mistake* or *error*; it commonly implies ignorance or stupidity, sometimes blameworthiness.

Slip carries a stronger implication of inadvertence or accident than *mistake*, and often, in addition, connotes triviality.

Lapse, though sometimes used interchangeably with *slip*, stresses forgetfulness, weakness, or inattention more than accident; thus, one says a *lapse* of memory or a *slip* of the pen, but not vice versa.

Faux pas is most frequently applied to a mistake in etiquette.

Bull, howler, and boner are rather informal terms applicable to blunders that typically have an amusing aspect.

At first, we can see some structure: *faux pas* is said to be a hyponym of *mistake*; *bull, howler,* and *boner* are apparently true synonyms – they map to the same word sense, which is a hyponym of *blunder*. However, careful consideration of the data shows that a strict hierarchy is not possible. Neither *error* nor *mistake* is the more – general term; rather, they overlap. Neither is a hypeornym of the other, and both, really, are hyperonyms of the more – specific terms. Similarly, *slip* and *lapse* overlap,

differing only in small components of their meaning. And a *faux pas*, as a mistake in etiquette, is not really a type of mistake or error distinct from the others; a faux pas could also be a lapse, a blunder, or a howler.

This example is in no way unusual. On the contrary, this kind of cluster of near synonyms is very common, as can be seen in *Webster's New Dictionary of Synonyms* and similar dictionaries in English and other languages. Moreover, the differences between the members of the near – synonym clusters for the same broad concepts are different in different languages. The members of the clusters of near – synonyms relating to errors and mistakes in English, French, German, and Japanese, for example, *do not line up neatly with one another* or translate directly [ibid]; one cannot use these word senses to build ontology of errors.

These observations have led to the proposal that a fine – grained hierarchy is inappropriate as a model for the relationship between the senses of near – synonyms in a lexicon for any practical use in tasks such as machine translation and other applications involving fine – grained use of word senses. Rather, what is required is a very coarse – grained conceptual hierarchy that represents word meaning at only a very coarse – grained level, so that whole clusters of near – synonyms are mapped to a single node: their core meaning. Members of a cluster are then distinguished from one another by explicit differentiation of any of the peripheral concepts that are involved in the fine – grained aspects of their denotation (and connotation). In the example above, *blunder* might be distinguished on a dimension of severity, while *faux pas* would be distinguished by the domain in which the mistake is made.

Paronyms are words that are kindred both in sound form and meaning and therefore liable to be mixed but in fact different in meaning and usage and therefore only mistakenly interchanged (*to affect – to effect; prosecute – persecute, moral – morale; human – humane, alternate – alternative, consequent – consequential, continuance – continuation, ingenious – ingenuous*, etc.)

The contrast of semantic features helps to establish the semantic relations of **opposition**, which implies the exclusion of the meaning of one word by another and that the referential areas of the words are opposed. A lexical opposition can be defined

as a systematically relevant relationship of partial difference between two partially similar words [Арнольд 1986]. Words that are opposites, generally speaking, share most elements of their meaning, except for being positioned at the two extremes of one particular dimension. Thus *hot* and *cold* are opposites – **antonyms**, in fact – but *telephone* and *Abelian group* are not, even though they have no properties in common (that is, they are "opposite" in every feature or dimension).

There are two types of relations of semantic opposition: polar opposition and relative opposition. Polar oppositions are based on the semantic feature uniting two linguistic units by antonymous relations: *beautiful – ugly, young – old*. Relative oppositions imply that there are several semantic features on which the opposition rests. For example, the verb *to leave* means 'to go away from' and its opposite, the verb *to arrive* denotes 'to reach a place, esp. the end of a journey'. It is quite obvious that the verb *to leave* implies certain finality and movement in the opposite direction from the place specified. The verb *to arrive* lays special emphasis semantically on 'reaching something'. Cruse A. distinguishes several different lexical relations of oppositeness, including **antonymy** of gradable adjectives, **complementarity** of mutually exclusive alternatives (*alive–dead*), and directional opposites (*forwards–backwards*) [Cruse 1986].

In addition to the "classical" lexical relationships, there are many others, which may be broadly thought of as **associative** or **typicality** relations. For example, the relationship between *dog* and *bark* is that the former is a frequent and typical agent of the latter. Other examples of this kind of relationship include typical instrumentality (*nail–hammer*), cause (*leak–drip*), and location (*doctor–hospital*). Synonymy, inclusion, and associative relations form the basis of the structure of a **thesaurus**. While general – purpose thesauri, such as *Roget's*, leave the relationships implicit, others, especially those used in the classification of technical documents, will make them explicit with labels such as *equivalent term, broader term, narrower term*, and *related term*.

Thus, according to the basic types of semantic relations the linguistic units may be classified into synonyms and antonyms.

3 Synonymy. Classification of Synonyms. Lexical and Terminological Sets. Lexico – Semantic Groups and Semantic Fields

A characteristic feature of a vocabulary of any language is the existence of synonyms, which is closely connected with the problem of meaning of the word.

The most complicated problem is the definition of the term 'synonyms' (Greek *same* + *name*). There are a great many definitions of the term, but there is no universally accepted one. Traditionally the **synonyms** are defined as words different in sound – form, but identical or similar in meaning in some or all contexts.

The problem of synonymy is treated differently by Russian and foreign scientists. Among numerous definitions of the term in our linguistics the most comprehensive and full one is suggested by I.V. Arnold: "Synonyms are two or more words of the same meaning, belonging to the same part of speech, possessing one or more identical meaning, interchangeable at least in some contexts without any considerable alteration in denotational meaning, but differing in morphemic composition, phonemic shape, shades of meaning, connotation, affective value, style, emotional coloring and valence peculiar to one of the elements in a synonymic group" [Арнольд 1986].

The semantic difference between synonyms is supported by the difference in valency and distribution. Valency is a permanent discrimination characteristic that always accompanies the differentiation in the semantic characteristics.

The outstanding Russian philologist A.I. Smirnitsky suggested the classification of synonyms into 3 types:

1. Ideographic synonyms (or denotational) are words conveying the same notion but differing in shades of meaning: *to understand – to realize, to expect – to anticipate, to look – glance – stare – peep – gaze, healthy – wholesome – sound – sane, to walk – to pace – to stride – to stroll.*

2. Stylistic synonyms are words differing only in stylistic characteristics: *to begin – to commence, enemy – opponent – foe – adversary, to help – to aid – to assist, terrible – horrible – atrocious.*

Very often we cannot draw a strict line between ideographic and stylistic synonyms, as they are interwoven. Difference of the connotational component is accompanied by some variation of the denotational meaning of synonyms, that is why it would be more consistent to subdivide synonymous words into ideographic, stylistic and ideographic – stylistic synonyms, e.g., *intelligent – shrewd – clever – bright – sagacious*.

3. Absolute (perfect, complete) synonyms are words coinciding in all their shades of meaning and in all their stylistic characteristics. Absolute synonyms are not common in a language. In Russian, e.g., *лётчик – пилот – авиатор*; in English, e.g. *pilot – airman – flyer – flyingman*. Examples of these type of synonyms can be found mainly in special literature among technical terms peculiar to this or that branch of knowledge, e.g.: *noun* and *substantive*, *flection* and *inflection* in linguistics.

4. Phraseological synonyms are used in different collocations: *language – tongue* (only *mother tongue*).

In the group of synonyms a dominant word is normally differentiated quite easily (*to look – to glare – to stare – to peep – to peer*). The dominant synonym is usually characterized by high frequency of usage, broad combinability, broad general meaning and lack of connotations.

English is very rich in synonyms. There are about 8,000 synonymic groups in modern English. “Having thrown its doors wide open to Latin and Romance loan words English has greatly enriched its synonymic resources, obtaining delicate shades of meaning and ensuring variety on a scale no other European language can equal [Ullmann 1962]. English is rich in synonyms for the historical reason; its vocabulary has come from two different sources, from Anglo – Saxon on one hand and from French, Latin and Greek on the other. Word borrowing, word derivation, semantic change, and other processes keep going on all the time, making English rich in synonyms [Бабич 2008; 78]. Native words (Anglo – Saxon) are often shorter, less learned and neutral, for example: *begin* (Native, neutral) – *commence* (French, between bookish and colloquial) – *initiate* (Latin, formal).

In each synonymic group, the most general word can be identified. Thus, in the group of adjectives *fashionable – chic – elegant – dressy – modish – smart – stylish – trendy* the word *fashionable* can stand for any of the others; it is called the synonymic dominant.

Synonymy has its characteristic patterns in each language. Its peculiar feature in English is the contrast between simple native words stylistically neutral, literary words borrowed from French and learned words of Greco – Latin origin: *to ask – to question (Fr.) – to interrogate (Lat.); belly – stomach (Fr.) – abdomen (Lat.); gather – assemble (Fr.) – collect (Lat.); empty – devoid (Fr.) – vacuous (Lat.), end – finish (Fr.) – complete (Lat.); rise – mount (Fr.) – ascend (Lat.); teaching – guidance (Fr.) – instruction (Lat.)* [Арнольд 1986, 204].

Euphemisms. Euphemisms (from a Greek word meaning 'to use words of good omen': *eu* – 'well' + *pheme* – 'speaking') are words or expressions thatspeakers substitute for taboo words in order to avoid direct confrontation with topics that are embarrassing, frightening, uncomfortable, etc. Such substitution is a mild or vague connotation for rough and unpleasant expressions: *to expire, to pass away, to depart, to join the majority, to kick the bucket* instead of *to die*.

Lexical groups. Word denoting different things correlated on extralinguistic grounds form lexical sets (*lion, tiger, leopard, puma, cat* refer to the lexical set of 'the animals of the cat family').

Words describing different sides of one and the same general notion are united in a lexico – semantic group (*pink, grey, blue, white* from the lexicosemantic group of 'colours').

If the underlying notion is broad enough to include almost all – embracing sections of the vocabulary we deal with semantic fields (the words *cosmonaut, spacious, to orbit* belong to the semantic field of 'space'). The broadest semantic fields are sometimes referred to as conceptual fields.

Field theory was put forward by a number of German and Swiss scholars in the 1920s and 1930s. However, according to Lyons, its origin can be traced back at least to the middle of the nineteenth century and more generally to the ideas of Humboldt

and Herder. According to lexical field theory, the vocabulary of a language is essentially a dynamic and well – integrated system of lexems structured by relationships of meaning. The system is changing continuously by the interaction of various forces such as the disappearance of previously existing lexems, or the broadening or narrowing of the meaning of some lexems. The system is mainly characterized by the general – particular and part – whole relationships, which hold not only between individual lexems and the lexical fields within which they are best interpreted, but also between specific lexical fields and the vocabulary as a whole [Jackson and Amwella 1998]. One of the early theorists, Jost Trier, puts it like this: "Fields are living realities intermediate between individual words and the totality of the vocabulary; as parts of the whole, they share with words the property of being integrated in a large structure and with the vocabulary the property of being structured in terms of smaller units" [ibid]. Trier argued that individual words acquire their meaning through their relationship to other words within the same semantic field – that is contrast and inclusion – and any extension of the sense of one word would automatically narrow the sense of the neighbouring words.

We should understand the difference between semantic and lexical fields here. A semantic field will vary from one language to another and from one period to another, depending on the way the speakers conceptualize the world around them. In order to be able to communicate about concepts, we impose a set of lexemes over the semantic field – a lexical field – but it is possible that one lexical field may not cover all parts of a semantic field. But, even more commonly, more than one lexical field will be used for any one semantic field, resulting in overlaps between fields (both lexical and semantic).

4 Antonymy. Classification of Antonyms

Antonyms (Greek 'opposite' + 'name') are words grouped together on the basis of the semantic relations of opposition. By antonyms we usually indicate the words of the same category of speech which have contrastive meanings (*light – dark, hot – cold*).

Antonymy is not equally distributed among parts of speech. Most antonyms are adjectives as qualitative characteristics are easily compared and contrasted. Verbal pairs of antonyms are fewer in number (e.g. *to open – to close, to live – to die*). Nouns are not rich either (e.g. *friend – enemy, love – hatred*). Antonymic adverbs can be divided into two groups: 1) adverbs, derived from adjectives (*warmly – coldly*) and 2) adverbs proper (*now – then, ever – never*).

There are different classifications of antonyms.

Structurally, antonyms can be divided into antonyms of the same root (*to do – to undo, hopeful – hopeless*); and antonyms of different roots (*rich – poor, to die – to live*).

Semantically, antonyms may be classified into contraries contradictories, incompatibles, conversives and vectoral antonyms.

V.N. Comissarov classified antonyms into two groups: absolute (root) antonyms (late – early) and derivational antonyms (to please – to displease, honest – dishonest). Absolute antonyms have different roots and derivational antonyms have the same roots but different affixes. In most cases negative prefixes form antonyms (un – , dis – non –). Sometimes they are formed by means of antonymous suffixes: – ful and –less (painful – painless).

The difference between derivational and root antonyms is also in their semantics. Derivational antonyms express contradictory notions, one of them excludes the other: active – inactive. Absolute antonyms express contrary notions. If some notions can be arranged in a group of more than two members, the most distant members of the group will be absolute antonyms: ugly, plain, good – looking, pretty, beautiful, the antonyms are ugly and beautiful.

Leonard Lipka in the book Outline of English Lexicology describes three types of oppositeness:

a)complementarity: male – female. The denial of the one implies the assertion of the other, and vice versa;

b)antonyms: good – bad. It is based on different logical relationships;

c)converseness: to buy – to sell. It is mirror – image relations or functions: husband – wife, above – below, pupil – teacher.

L. Lipka also gives the type which he calls directional oppositions: up – down, consequence opposition: learn – know, antipodal opposition: North – South, East – West.

L. Lipka also points out non – binary contrast or many – member lexical sets. In such sets of words we can have outer and inner pairs of antonyms: excellent, good, average, fair, poor.

Not every word in a language can have antonyms. This type of opposition can be met in qualitative adjectives and their derivatives: beautiful – ugly, to beautify – to uglify. It can be also met in words denoting feelings and states: to respect – to scorn, respectful – scornful and in words denoting direction in space and time: here – there, up – down, before – after.

If a word is polysemantic, it can have several antonyms, e.g. the word bright has the antonyms dim, dull, sad.

Contraries are antonyms that can be arranged into a series according to the increasing difference in one of their qualities. Contraries are gradable antonyms; they are polar members of a gradual opposition which may have intermediate elements (*cold – cool – warm – hot*).

Contradictories represent the type of semantic relations that exist between pairs like, for example, *dead – alive, single – married*. Contradictory antonymsare mutually opposed, they deny one another; they form a private binary opposition and are the members of the two – term sets.

Incompatibles are antonyms which are characterized by the relations of exclusion. The use of one member of the set (*morning, afternoon, evening, night*) implies the exclusion of the other member of the group. Incompatibles differ from contradictories as incompatibles are members of the multiple – term sets while contradictories are members of two – term sets.

Conversives (conversive antonyms, converse terms, relational opposites) are words which denote one and the same situation as viewed from different points of

view, with a reversal of the order of participants and their roles: *husband – wife, teacher – pupil, to buy – to sell, to lend – to borrow, before – after, north – south*. In a conversive pair, one of the antonyms cannot be used without suggesting the other. If there is a person who is buying something, then there is a person who is selling something to them. *If I am your wife then you are my husband; if you are above me then I am below you*.

Vectorial (or directional) antonyms are words denoting differently directed actions, features, etc.: *up – down, to rise – to fall, to arrive – to depart, clockwise – anticlockwise, to button – to unbutton, to appear – to disappear, to increase – to decrease, to learn – to forget*.

Sometimes linguistic units combine two opposite meanings in its semantic structure; it is called **enantiosemy** (or **autoantonymy**). Such words are scarce in the language (e.g. *odor* n. 1) an agreeable scent, fragrance; 2) a disagreeable smell). Unlike antonymy, enantiosemantic words have different lexical and syntactical valency.

In British and American English enantiosemantic words may develop opposite meanings, e.g. *public school* in the USA is a state school, whereas in Britain it means a private school.

Not every word has an antonym, though practically every word has a synonym. Words of concrete denotation have no antonyms (*table, blackboard*).

Unlike synonyms, antonyms do not differ either in style, emotional coloring or distribution.

Antonyms are words of the same part of speech having common denotational component of meaning but expressing contrasting points of the same notion. They have the same grammatical and lexical valency and often occur in the same contexts; they represent an important group of expressive means of the language.

LECTURE 8. PHRASEOLOGY

Plan

1. Collocability. Word – Groups. Lexical and Grammatical Valency. Motivation in Wordgroups.

2. Types of Phraseological Units.

3. Types of Transference of Phraseological Units.

4. Origin of Phraseological Units.

5. Proverbs, Sayings, Quotations.

1 Collocability. Word – Groups. Lexical and Grammatical Valency. Motivation in Wordgroups

Phraseology is usually presented as a sub – field of lexicology dealing with the study of word combinations rather than single words. It appeared in the domain of lexicology and is undergoing the process of segregating as a separate branch of linguistics. The reason is clear – lexicology deals with words and their meanings, whereas phraseology studies such collocations of words (phraseologisms, phraseological units, idioms), where the meaning of the whole collocation is different from the simple sum of literal meanings of the words, comprising a phraseological unit.

These multi – word units are studied in a wide range of linguistic research and a considerable arsenal of empirical approaches has been used to identify phraseological units: metaphor theory and conceptual integration theory in the processing of figurative phraseological units, natural language processing (automatic extraction of phraseological units), phraseology in language acquisition, comprehension and education in language teaching, interpretation of phraseologisms in terms of culture, including differences in cultural knowledge and the speaker's motivation of idiomatic meaning, etc.

Classification of phraseological units developed by Burger [Burger 1988] in many ways echoes with Mel'čuk's and Cowie's: propositional units including

proverbs and idiomatic sentences are classified as ‘formulae’ or ‘pragmatic phrasemes’ as both the criteria of function in the discourse and function in the sentence are used (Fig. 6). Communicative phraseological units or routine formulae fulfill an interactional function: they are typically used as text controllers to initiate, maintain and close a conversation or to signal the attitude of the addressor (*well, I mean*). Unlike Cowie and Mel’čuk, Burger creates a third category of structural phraseological units which includes wordcombinations that establish grammatical relations, e.g. concerning, *as well as*.

However, he regards structural phraseological units as the smallest and least interesting category and does not go into detail.

Although the approaches to phraseological units study are different, some parameters are typically implicated in the research [Gries 2008, 3]:

1) the nature of the elements involved in a phraseologism;

2) the number of elements involved in a phraseologism;

3) the number of times an expression must be observed before it counts as phraseologism;

4) the permissible distance between the elements involved in phraseologism;

5) the degree of lexical and syntactic flexibility of the elements involved;

6) the role that semantic unity and semantic – non – compositionality / nonpredictability play in the definition.

The aptness of a word to appear in various combinations is described as its **lexical valency** or **collocability**. The noun *job,* for example, is often combined with such adjectives as *backbreaking, difficult, hard; full – time, part – time, summer, cushy, easy; demanding; menial,* etc. Lexical valency acquires special importance in case of polysemy as through the lexical valency different meanings of a polysemantic word can be distinguished, for instance, cf.: *heavy table (safe, luggage); heavy snow (rain, storm); heavy drinker (eater); heavy sleep (sorrow, disappointment); heavy industry (tanks).*

The range of the lexical valency of words is linguistically restricted by the inner structure of the English word – stock. Though the verbs *lift* and *raise* are usually treated as synonyms, it is only the latter that is collocated with the noun *question.*

Words habitually collocated in speech tend to constitute a cliche, for instance, the noun *arms* and the noun *race.* Thus, *arms race* is a cliche.

The lexical valency of correlated words in different languages is different, cf.: in English *pot flowers* – in Russian *комнатные цветы.*

Grammatical valency is the aptness of a word to appear in specific grammatical (or rather syntactic) structures. The minimal grammatical context in which words are used when brought together to form word – groups is usually described as the pattern of the word – groups. For instance, the verb *to offer* can be followed by the infinitive *(to offer to do smth.)* and the noun (*to offer a cup of tea).*

The verb *to suggest* can be followed by the gerund *(to suggest doing smth.)* and the noun *(to suggest an idea).* The grammatical valency of these verbs is different.

The grammatical valency of correlated words in different languages is not identical, cf.: in English *to influence a person, a decision, a choice* (verb + noun) – in Russian (verb + preposition + noun).

The term **'syntactic structure (formula)'** implies the description of the order and arrangement of member – words in word – groups as parts of speech. For instance, the syntactic structure of the word – groups *a clever man, a red flower* may be described as made up of an adjective and a noun, i. e. A + N; of the word – groups *to take books, to build houses* – as a verb and a noun, i. e. V + N.

The structure of word – groups may also be described in relation to the head – word. In this case, it is usual to speak of the pattern but not of formulas.

For example, the patterns of the verbal groups *to take books, to build houses* are to take + N, to build + N. The term **'syntactic pattern'** implies the description of the structure of the word – group in which a given word is used as its head.

According to the syntactic pattern, word – groups may be classified into predicative and non – predicative. Predicative word – groups have a syntactic structure similar to that of a sentence, e.g. *he went, John works.* All other wordgroups

are called non – predicative. Non – predicative word – groups may be subdivided into subordinative (e.g. *red flower, a man of wisdom)* and coordinative (e.g. *women and children, do or die).*

Structurally, all word – groups can be classified by the criterion of distribution into two extensive classes: endocentric and exocentric.

Endocentric word – groups are those that have one central member functionally equivalent to the whole word – group, i. e. the distribution of the whole word – group and the distribution of its central member are identical. For instance, in the word – groups *red flower, kind to people,* the head – words are the noun *flower* and the adjective *kind* correspondingly. These word – groups are distributionally identical with their central components. According to their central members word – groups may be classified into: nominal groups or phrases (e.g. *red flower),* adjectival groups (e.g. *kind to people),* verbal groups (e.g. *to speak well),* etc.

Exocentric word – groups are those that have no central component and the distribution of the whole word – group is different from either of its members. For instance, the distribution of the word – group *side by side* is not identical with the distribution of its component – members, i. e. the component – members are not syntactically substitutable for the whole word – group.

Types of meaning in word – groups. The meaning of word – groups can be divided into: 1) lexical and 2) structural (grammatical) components.

1. **The lexical meaning** of the word – group may be defined as the combined lexical meaning of the component words. Thus, the lexical meaning of the word – group *red flower* may be described denotationally as the combined meaning of the words *red* and *flower.* However, the term 'combined lexical meaning' is not to imply that the meaning of the word – group is a mere additive result of all the lexical meanings of the component members. The lexical meaning of the word – group predominates over the lexical meanings of its constituents.

2. **The structural meaning** of the word – group is the meaning conveyed mainly by the pattern of arrangement of its constituents. For example, such word – groups as *school grammar* (школьная грамматика) and *grammar school*

(грамматическая школа) are semantically different because of the difference in the pattern of arrangement of the component words. The structural meaning is the meaning expressed by the pattern of the word – group but not either by the word *school* or the word *grammar.* It follows that it is necessary to distinguish between the structural meaning of a given type of a word – group as such and the lexical meaning of its constituents.

The meaning of the word – group is derived from the combined lexical meanings of its constituents and is inseparable from the meaning of the pattern of their arrangement.

Motivation in word – groups. Semantically all word – groups can be classified into motivated and non – motivated. A word – group is **lexically motivated** if the combined lexical meaning of the group is deducible from the meanings of its components, e.g. *red flower, heavy weight, teach a lesson.* If the combined lexical meaning of a word – group is not deducible from the lexical meanings of its constituent components, such a word – group is **lexically non – motivated**, e.g. *red tape* ('official bureaucratic methods'), *take place* ('occur').

The degree of motivation can be different. Between the extremes of complete motivation and lack of motivation there are innumerable intermediate cases. For example, the degree of lexical motivation in the nominal group *black market* is higher than in *black death,* but lower than in *black dress,* though none of the groups can be considered completely non – motivated. This is also true of other words – groups, e.g. *old man* and *old boy* both of which may be regarded as lexically motivated though the degree of motivation in *old man* is noticeably higher.

It should be noted that seemingly identical word – groups are sometimes found to be motivated or non – motivated depending on their semantic interpretation. Thus, *apple sauce* is lexically motivated when it means 'a sauce made of apples' but when used to denote 'nonsense' it is clearly non – motivated.

Completely non – motivated or partially motivated word – groups are described as phraseological units or idioms.

A phraseological unit can be defined as a reproduced and idiomatic (nonmotivated) or partially motivated unit built up according to the model of free word – groups (or sentences) and semantically and syntactically brought into correlation with words. Hence, there is a need for criteria exposing the degree of similarity/difference between phraseological units and free word – groups, phraseological units and words.

2 Types of Phraseological Units

Phraseological units are word – groups that cannot be made in the process of speech, they exist in the language as ready – made units. They are compiled in special dictionaries. Like words, phraseologocal units express a single notion and are used in a sentence as one part of it. American and British lexicographers call such units idioms.

Phraseological units can be classified according to the ways they are formed, according to the degree of motivation of their meaning, according to their structure and according to their part – of – speech meaning.

I. Ways of forming phraseological units.

A.V. Koonin classified phraseological units according to the way they are formed. He pointed out primary and secondary ways of forming phraseological units.

Pramary ways of forming phraseological units are those when a unit is formed on the basis of a free word – group:

a)the most productive in Modern English is the formation of phraseological units by means of transferring the meaning of terminological word – groups, e.g. in cosmic terminology we can point out the following phrases: launching pad – in its direct meaning стартовая площадкаin its transferred meaning – отправной пункт;

b)a large group of phraseological units was formed from free word groups by transferring their meaning (simile, contrast, metaphor), e.g. granny farm – пансионат для престарелых, as old as the hills – старый как мир, Troyan horse – компьютерная программа предварительно составленная для повреждения компьютера;

c)phradeological units can be formed by means of alliteration, e.g. a sad sack – несчастный случай, culture vulture – человек, интересующийся искусством;

d)by means of rhyming, e.g. by hook or by crook – by any possible means, high and dry – left without help;

e)by using synonyms, e.g. to pick and choose – to be terribly choosy, really and truly – quite honestly;

f)by means of expressiveness, e.g. My aunt! Hear, hear!

g)by means of distorting a word group, e.g. odds and ends was formed from odd ends;

h)by using archaisms, e.g. in brown study means in gloomy meditation where both components preserve their archaic meanings;

i)by using a sentence in a different sphere of life, e.g. that cock won‘t fight can be used as a free word – group when it is used in sports (cock fighting) but it becomes a phraseological unit when it is used in everyday life;

j)when we use some unreal image, e.g. to have butterflies in the stomach – испытыватьволнение;

k)by using expressions of writers or politicians in everyday life, e.g. corridors of power (Snow).

Secondary ways of forming phraseological units are those when a phraseological unit is formed on the basis of another phraseological unit:

a)conversion, e.g. to vote with one‘s feet was converted into vote with one‘s feet;

b)changing the grammar form, a sentence, e.g. Make hay while the sun shines was transferred into Make hay while the sun shines;

c)analogy, e.g. Curiosity killed the cat was transferred into Care killed the cat;

d)contrast, e.g. thin cat – a poor person was formed by contrasting it with fat cat – a rich person;

e)shortening of proverbs or sayings, e.g. by means of clipping the middle of the proverb You can‘t make a purse out of a sow‘s ear the phraseological unit to make a sow‘s ear was formed with the meaning to make a mistake;

f)borrowing phraseological units from other languages, either as translation loans, e.g. living space (German), or as phonetic borrowings sotto voce (Italian).

II. Semantic classification of phraseological units

Phraseological units can be classified according to the degree of motivation of their meaning. This classification was suggested by acad. V.V. Vinogradov for Russian phraseological units. He pointed out three types of phraseological units:

a)fusions where the degree of motivation is very low, we cannot guess the meaning of the whole from the meanings of its components, e.g. on Shank‘s mare (on foot); in Russian: бить баклуши;

b)unities where the meaning of the whole can be guessed from the meanings of its components, but it is transferred (metaphorically or metonimically), e.g. to play the first fiddle (to be a leader in something), old salt (experienced sailor);

c)collocations where words are combined in their original meaning but their combinations are different in different languages, e.g. cash and carry – self – service shop, in a big way (in great degree).

III. Structural classification of phraseological units

Prof. A.I. Smirnitsky worked out a detaiked structural classification of phraseological units, comparing them with words. He points out one – top units which he compares with affixed words because affixed words have only one root morpheme. he points out two – top units which he compares with compound words because in compound words we usually have two root morphemes.

Among one – top units he points out three structural types:

a)units of the type to give up (verb + postposition type);

b)units of the type to be tired;

c)prepositional – nominal phraseological units. These units are equivalents of unchangeable words: prepositions, conjunctions, adverbs, e.g. on the doorstep – quite near, on the nose – exactly, in the course of – during.

Among two – top units A.I. Smirnitsky points out the following structural types:

a)attributive – nominal, e.g. a month of Sundays, grey matter;

b)verbal – nominal, e.g. to read between the lines; to speak BBC; c)phraseological repetitions, e.g. now or never, part and parcel.

IV. Syntactical classification of Structural classification of phraseological units

Phraseological units can be classified as parts of speech. This classification was suggested by I.V. Arnold. Here we have the following groups:

a)noun phraseological units denoting an object, a person, a living being, e.g. bullet train, a latchkey child;

b)verb phraseological units denoting an action, a state, a feeling, e.g. to break the log – jam, to get on somebody‘s coattails, to be on the beam;

c)adjective phraseological units denoting a quality, e.g. loose as a goose, dull as lead;

d)adverb phraseological units, e.g. with a bump, in the soup;

e)preposition phraseological units, e.g. in the course of, on the stroke of;

f)interjection phraseological units, e.g. Catch me! Well, I never!

In I.V. Arnold classification there are also sentence equivalents: proverbs, sayings and quotations, e.g. The sky is the limit, What makes him tick, I am easy. Proverbs are usually metaphorical, e.g. Too many cooks spoil the broth, while sayings are, as a rule, non – metaphorical, e.g. Where there is a will there is a way.

According to Rosemarie Glaeser, a **phraseological unit** is a lexicalized, reproducible bilexemic or polylexemic word group in common use, which has relative syntactic and semantic stability, may be idiomatized, may carry connotations, and may have an emphatic or intensifying function in a text [Glaeser 1998].

The term **set – phrase** implies that the basic criterion of differentiation is stability of the lexical components and grammatical structure of word – groups. The term **idiom** generally implies that the essential feature of the linguistic units under consideration is idiomaticity or lack of motivation. The term **word – equivalent** stresses not only the semantic but also the functional inseparability of certain word – groups and their aptness to function in speech as single words [Гинзбург и др., 1979].

In traditional approach to phraseology adopted by Russian scholars like Vinogradov and Amosova the scope of phraseologisms is restricted to a specific subset of linguistically defined multi – word units and seeing phraseology as a continuum along which word combinations are situated, with the most opaque and fixed ones at one end and the most transparent and variable ones at the other or from free combinations to pure idioms [Cowie 2001]. The most important aspect of this approach is to identify linguistic criteria for distinguishing one type of the phraseological unit from another. The most idiomatic units are often presented as the most 'core'.

One more approach pioneered by Sinclair identifies phraseological units not on the basis of linguistic criteria, but on lexical co – occurrences. As this approach is frequency – based, it generates a wide range of word – combinations encompassing sequences like frames, collocational frameworks, colligations and largely compositional recurrent phrases [Granger and Paquot 2008, 29]. Many of the units that were traditionally considered as peripheral or falling outside the limits of phraseology have now become central as they have revealed themselves to be pervasive in language, while many of the most restricted units (idioms, proverbs) have proved to be highly infrequent [Moon 1998]. In Sinclair's model of the language, phraseology is central: phraseological items, whatever their nature, take precedence over single words [Sinclair 1987]. Sinclair summarized the results of corpus investigations in the Principle of Idiom: "a language user has available to him or her a large number of semi – preconstructed phrases that constitute single choices, even though they might appear to be analyzable into segments" [Sinclair 1991, 100] and suggested that for normal texts, the first mode of analysis to be applied is the idiom principle, as most of text is interpreted by this principle.

One more feature which should be mentioned is the cultural value of phraseological units. Phraseology is a particularly fruitful point of focus for 'linguo – cultural' analysis as cultural meanings have to be taken into account when we deal with restricted lexical connotation.

According to the degree of idiomaticity phraseological units can be classified into three big groups: phraseological fusions, phraseological unities and phraseological collocations.

Phraseological fusions are completely non – motivated word – groups, e.g. *as mad as a hatter* – 'utterly mad'; *white elephant* – 'an expensive but useless thing'.

Phraseological unities are partially non – motivated as their meaning can usually be perceived through the metaphoric meaning of the whole phraseological unit, e. g. *to bend the knee* – 'to submit to a stronger force, to obey submissively'; *to wash one's dirty linen in public* – 'to discuss or make public one's quarrels'. The boundary between unities and fusions is, of course, not clear – cut, but varies according to the linguistic and cultural experience of the individual.

Phraseological collocations are not only motivated but contain one component used in its direct meaning, while the other is used metaphorically, e.g. *to meet the requirements, to attain success.* In this group of phraseological units some substitutions are possible which do not destroy the meaning of the metaphoric element, e.g. *to meet the needs, to meet the demand, to meet the necessity; to have success, to lose success.* These substitutions are not synonymical and the meaning of the whole changes, while the meaning of the verb *meet* and the noun *success* are kept intact.

The current definition of phraseological units as highly idiomatic word – groups which cannot be freely made up in speech, but are reproduced as ready – made units as been subject to severe criticism by linguists of different schools of thought. The main objections and debatable points may be briefly outlined as follows:

1. The definition is felt to be inadequate as the concept **ready – made units** seems to be rather vague. In fact this term can be applied to a variety of heterogeneous linguistic phenomena ranging from word – groups to sentences (e.g. proverbs, sayings) and also quotations from poems, novels or scientific treatises all of which can be described as readymade units.

2. Frequent discussions have also led to questioning this approach to phraseology from a purely semantic point of view as **the criterion of idiomaticity** is

found to be an inadequate guide in singling out phraseological units from other word – groups. Borderline cases between idiomatic and non – idiomatic word – groups are so numerous and confusing that the final decision seems to depend largely on one's "feeling of the language". This can be proved by the fact that the same word – groups are treated by some linguists as idiomatic phrases and by others as free word – groups. For example, such word – groups as take the chair – 'preside at a meeting', take one's chance – 'trust to luck or fortune', take trouble (to do smth) – 'to make efforts' and others are marked in some of the English dictionaries as idioms or phrases, whereas in others they are found as free word – groups illustrating one of the meanings of the verb to take or the nouns combined with this verb.

The impracticability of the criterion of idiomaticity is also observed in the traditional classification of phraseological collocations. The extreme cases, i.e. phraseological fusions and collocations are easily differentiated but the borderline units, as for example phraseological fusions and phraseological unities or phraseological collocations and free word – groups, are very often doubtful and rather vaguely outlined. We may argue, e.g., that such word – groups as high treason or show the white feather are fusions because one finds it impossible to infer the meaning of the whole from the meaning of the individual components. Others may feel these word – groups as metaphorically motivated and refer them to phraseological unities.

The term **idiomaticity** is also regarded by some linguists as requiring clarification. As a matter of fact this term is habitually used to denote lack of motivation from the point of view of one's mother tongue.

A word – group which defies word by word translation is consequently described as idiomatic. It follows that if idiomaticity is viewed as the main distinguishing feature of phraseological units, the same word – groups in the English language may be classified as idiomatic phraseological units by Russian speakers and as non – idiomatic word – groups by those whose mother tongue contains analogous collocations. Thus, e.g., from the point of view of Russian speakers such word –

groups as take tea, take care, etc. are often referred to phraseology as the Russian translation equivalents of

these word – groups *(пить чай, заботиться)* do not contain the habitual translation equivalents of the verb take. French speakers, however, are not likely to find anything idiomatic about these word – groups as there are similar lexical units in the French language (cf. prendre du thé, prendre soin). This approach to idiomaticity may be termed interlingual as it involves a comparison, explicit or implicit of two different languages.

The term **idiomaticity** is also understood as lack of motivation from the point of view of native speakers. As here we are concerned with the English language, this implies that only those word – groups are to be referred to phraseology which are felt as non – motivated, at least synchronically, by English speakers, e.g. red tape, kick the bucket and the like. This approach to idiomaticity may be termed intralingual. In other words the judgement as to idiomaticity is passed within' the framework of the language concerned, not from the outside. It is readily observed that classification of factual linguistic material into free wort – groups and phraseological units largely depends upon the particular meaning we attach to the term **idiomaticity**. It will be recalled, for example, that habitual collocations are word – groups whose component member or members possess specific and limited lexical valency, as a rule essentially different from the lexical valency of related words in the Russian language.1 A number of habitual collocations, e.g. heavy rain, bad mistake, take care and others, may be felt by Russian speakers as **peculiarly English** and therefore idiomatic, whereas they are not perceived as such by English speakers in whose mother tongue the lexical valency of member words heavy, bad, take presupposes their collocability with rain, mistake, care.

3. **The criterion of stability** is also criticised as not very reliable in distinguishing phraseological units from other word – groups habitually referred to as phraseology. We observe regular substitution of at least one of the lexical components. In to cast smth in smb's teeth, e.g. the verb cast may be replaced by fling; to take a decision is found alongside with to make a decision; not to care a

twopenny is just one of the possible **variants of the phrase**, whereas in others the noun twopenny may be replaced by a number of other nouns, e.g. farthing, button, pin, sixpence, fig, etc. It is also argued that stability of lexical components does not presuppose lack of motivation. The word – group shrug one's shoulders, e.g, does not allow of the substitution of either shrug or shoulders; the meaning of the word – group, however, is easily deducible from the meanings of the member – words, hence the word – group is completely motivated, though stable. Idiomatic word – groups may be variable as far as their lexical components are concerned, or stable. It was observed that, e.g., to cast smth in smb's teeth is a highly idiomatic but variable word – group as the constituent member cast may be replaced by fling or throw; the word – group red tape is both highly idiomatic and stable. It follows that stability and idiomaticity may be regarded as two different aspects of word – groups. Stability is an essential feature of set – phrases both motivated and non – motivated. Idiomaticity is a distinguishing feature of phraseological units or idioms which comprise both stable set – phrases and variable word – groups. The two features are not mutually exclusive and may be overlapping, but are not interdependent.

Stability of word – groups may be viewed in terms of predictability of occurrence of member – words. Thus, e.g., the verb shrug predicts the occurrence of the noun shoulders and the verb clench the occurrence of either fists or teeth. The degree of predictability or probability of occurrence of member – words is different in different word – groups. We may assume, e.g., that the verb shrug predicts with a hundred per cent probability the occurrence of the noun shoulders, as no other noun can follow this particular verb. The probability of occurrence of the noun look after the verb cast is not so high because cast may be followed not only by look but also by glance, light, lots and some other nouns. Stability of the word – group in clench one's fists is higher than in cast a look, but lower than in shrug one's shoulders as the verb clench predicts the occurrence of either fists or teeth. It is argued that the stability of all word – groups may be statistically calculated and the word – groups where stability exceeds a certain limit (say 50%) may be classified as set – phrases.

Predictability of occurrence may be calculated in relation to one or, more than one constituent of the word – group. Thus, e.g., the degree of probability of occurrence of the noun bull after the verb take is very low and may practically be estimated at zero. The two member – words take the bull, however, predict the occurrence of by the horns with a very high degree of probability.

Stability viewed in terms of probability of occurrence seems a more reliable criterion in differentiating between set – phrases and variable or free word – groups, but cannot be relied upon to single out phraseological units. Besides, it is argued that it is practically impossible to calculate the stability of all the word – groups as that would necessitate investigation into the lexical valency of the whole vocabulary of the English language.

3 Types of Transference of Phraseological Units

Phraseological transference is a complete or partial change of meaning of an initial (source) word – combination (or a sentence) as a result of which the word – combination (or the sentence) acquires a new meaning and turns into a phraseological unit. Phraseological transference may be based on simile, metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, etc. or on their combination.

1. Transference based on **simile** is the intensification of some feature of an object (phenomenon, thing) denoted by a phraseological unit by means of bringing it into contact with another object (phenomenon, thing) belonging to an entirely different class (e.g. English and Russian phraseological units: *(as) pretty as a picture – хорошая как картинка, (as) fat as a pig – жирный как свинья, to fight like a lion – сражаться как лев, to swim like a fish – плавать как рыба).*

2. Transference based on **metaphor** is a likening of one object (phenomenon, action) of reality to another, which is associated with it on the basis of real or imaginable resemblance. For example, in the phraseological unit *to bend somebody to one's bow* meaning 'to submit someone' transference is based on metaphor, i.e. on the likening of a subordinated, submitted person to a thing (bow) a good command of which allows its owner to do with it everything he wants to.

3. Transference based on **metonymy** is a transfer of name from one object (phenomenon, thing, action, process, etc.) to another based on the contiguity of their properties, relations, etc. The transfer of name is conditioned by close ties between the two objects; the idea about one object is inseparably linked with the idea about the other object. For example, the metonymical transference in the phraseological unit *a silk stocking* meaning 'a rich, well – dressed man' is based on the replacement of the genuine object (a man) by the article of clothing which was very fashionable and popular among men in the past.

Synecdoche is a variety of metonymy. Transference based on synecdoche is naming the whole by its part, the replacement of the common by the private, of the plural by the singular and vice versa. For example, the components *flesh* and *blood* in the phraseological unit *in the flesh and blood* meaning 'in a material form' as the integral parts of the real existence replace a person himself or any living being, see the following sentences: *We've been writing to each other for ten years, but now he's actually going to be here in the flesh and blood. Thousands of fans flocked to Dublin to see their heroes in the flesh and blood.* Synecdoche is usually found in combination with other types of transference, e.g. metaphor: *to hold one's tongue* – 'to say nothing, to be discreet'.

4 Origin of Phraseological Units

According to their origin all phraseological units may be divided into two big groups: native and borrowed.

The main sources of **native phraseological units** are:

1) terminological and professional lexics, e.g. physics: *center of gravity* (центр тяжести), *specific weight* (удельный вес); navigation: *cut the painter* (обрубить канат) – 'to become independent', *lower one's colours* (спустить свой флаг) – 'to yield, to give in'; military sphere: *fall into line* (стать в строй) – 'conform with others';

2) British literature, e.g. *the green – eyed monster* – 'jealousy' (W. Shakespeare); *like Hamlet without the prince* – 'the most important person at event is absent' (W. Shakespeare); *fall on evil days* – 'live in poverty after having enjoyed

better times' (J. Milton); *a sight for sore eyes* – 'a person or thing that one is extremely pleased or relieved to see' (J. Swift); *How goes the enemy?* (Ch. Dickens);

3) British traditions and customs, e.g. *baker's dozen* – 'a group of thirteen'. In the past British merchants of bread received from bakers thirteen loaves instead of twelve and the thirteenth loaf was merchants' profit;

4) superstitions and legends, e.g. *a black sheep* – 'a less successful or more immoral person in a family or a group'. People believed that a black sheep was marked by the devil; *the halcyon days* – 'a very happy or successful period in the past'; according to an ancient legend a halcyon hatches / grows its fledglings in a nest that sails in the sea and during this period (about two weeks) the sea is completely calm;

5) historical facts and events, personalities, e.g. *as well be hanged for a sheep as a lamb* – 'something that you say when you are going to be punished for something so you decide to do something worse because your punishment will not be any more severe'; according to an old law a person who stole a sheep was sentenced to death by hanging, so it was worth stealing something more because there was no worse punishment; *to do a Thatcher* – 'to stay in power as prime minister for three consecutive terms (from the former Conservative prime minister Margaret Thatcher)';

6) phenomena and facts of everyday life, e.g. *carry coals to Newcastle* – 'to take something to a place where there is plenty of it available'. Newcastle is a town in Northern England where a lot of coal was produced; *to get out of wood* – 'to be saved from danger or difficulty'.

The main sources of **borrowed phraseological units** are:

1) the Holy Script, e. g. *the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing* – 'communication in an organization is bad so that one part does not know what is happening in another part'; *the kiss of Judas* – 'any display of affection whose purpose is to conceal any act of treachery' (Matthew XXVI: 49);

2) ancient legends and myths belonging to different religious or cultural traditions, e.g. *to cut the Gordian knot* – 'to deal with a difficult problem in a strong, simple and effective way' (from the legend saying that *Gordius,* king of Gordium, tied an intricate knot and prophesied that whoever untied it would become the ruler of

Asia. It was cut through with a sword by Alexander the Great); *a Procrustean bed* – 'a harsh, inhumane system into which the individual is fitted by force, regardless of his own needs and wishes' (from Greek Mythology, *Procrustes* – a robber who forced travelers to lie on a bed and made them fit by stretching their limbs or cutting off the appropriate length of leg);

3) facts and events of the world history, e.g. *to cross the Rubicon* – 'to do something which will have very important results which cannot be changed after'. Julius Caesar started a war which resulted in victory for him by crossing the river Rubicon in Italy; *to meet one's Waterloo* – 'be faced with, esp. after previous success, a final defeat, a difficulty or obstacle one cannot overcome (from the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo 1815)';

4) variants of the English language, e.g. *a heavy hitter* – 'someone who is powerful and has achieved a lot' *(American); a hole card* – 'a secret advantage that is ready to use when you need it' *(American); be home and hosed* – 'to have completed something successfully' *(Australian);*

5) other languages (classical and modern), e.g. *second to none* – 'equal with any other and better than most' (from Latin: *nulli secundus); for smb's fair eyes* – 'because of personal sympathy, not be worth one's deserts, services, for nothing' (from French: *pour les beaux yeux de qn.); the fair sex* – 'women' (from French: *le beau sex); let the cat out of the bag* – 'reveal a secret carelessly or by mistake' (from German: *die Katze aus dem Sack lassen); tilt at windmills* – 'to waste time trying to deal with enemies or problems that do not exist' (from Spanish: *acometer molinos de viento); every dog is a lion at home* – 'to feel significant in the familiar surrounding' (from Italian: *ogni cane e leone a casa sua).*

5 Proverbs, Sayings, Quotations

A **proverb** (from Latin *pro* 'forward'+ *verb* 'word') is a collection of words that has been disseminated forth, and states a general truth or gives advice [Бабич 2008; 105]. *You can take the horse to the water, but you can't make him drink. If you sing before breakfast, you will cry before night. A new broom sweeps clean.* A

←(from Old English: *say* (tell) + *ing* gerund suffix) is any common, colloquial expression, or a remark often made. *Charity begins at home. It takes two to tango.*

A.V. Koonin includes proverbs in his classification of phraseological units labeling them communicative phraseological units [Кунин 1972]. As the quotient of phraseological stability in a word – group is not below the minimum, it means that we are dealing with a phraseological unit.

Phraseological units rather frequently originate from the proverbs making it difficult to draw any rigid or permanent border – line between them. Compare the following examples: *the last straw ← The last straw breaks the camel's back*; *birds of a feather ← Birds of a feather flock together*; *spill the milk ← There is no use crying over the spilt milk.*

Proverbs and saying possess such characteristics of phraseological units:

1) they are introduced in speech ready – made;

2) their components are constant;

3) their meaning is traditional and mostly figurative;

4) many proverbs and sayings are metaphorical (*Time is money. Little drops make the mighty ocean. Rome wasn't built in a day. Words can cut like a knife. Make hay while the sun shines*).

Others like J. Casares and N.N. Amosova think that unless they regularly form parts of other sentences it is erroneous to include them into the system of language, because they are independent units of communication. N.N. Amosova even thinks that there is no more reason to consider them as part of phraseology than, for instance, riddles and children's counts. "This standpoint is hardly acceptable especially if we do not agree with the narrow limits of phraseology offered by this author. Riddles and counts are not as a rule included into utterances in the process of communication, whereas proverbs are. Whether they are included into an utterance as independent sentences or as part of sentences is immaterial. If we follow that line of reasoning, we shall have to exclude all interjections such as *Hang it (all)!* because they are also syntactically independent" [Арнольд 1986, 179].

Familiar quotations come from literature and gradually become part of the language. Lots of quotations come from Shakespeare: *Something is rotten in the state of Denmark. To be or not to be: that is the question. I must be cruel, only to be kind. The rest is silence. Frailty, thy name is woman.* The Shakespearean quotations have become and remain extremely numerous and they contributed enormously to the store of the language.

Some quotations come from Alexander Pope, the English poet and satirist: *Who shall decide when doctors disagree? To err is human. To forgive divine. A little learning is a dangerous thing.*

Some quotations are so often used that they come to be considered cliches: *the acid test, astronomic figures, to break the ice, consigned to oblivion, the irony of fate, stand shoulder to shoulder, swan sing, the arms of Morpheus, to usher in a new age, to pave the way to a bright new world*, etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aitchison J. Words in the Mind: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon / J. Aitchison. – Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
2. Atkins B.T., Rundell M. The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography / B.T. Atkins, M. Rundell. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
3. Beijont H. The Lexicography of English / H. Beijont. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
4. Clark S., Pointon G. Word for Word / S. Clark, G. Pointon. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
5. Coates R. Word Structure / R. Coates. – London: Routledge, 1999.
6. Cowie A. P. The Oxford History of English Lexicography. Volumes I, II. General Purpose Dictionaries / A.P. Cowie. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
7. Cowie A. P. Phraseology. Theory, Analysis and Applications / A. P. Cowie. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
8. Fontenelle T. Practical Lexicography: A Reader / T. Fontenelle. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
9. Grezga J., Schoner M. English and General Lexicology. Materials for Lexicology Seminars / J. Grezga, M. Schoner. – Ingolstadt: Katolische Universitat Eichstatt, 2007.
10. Halliday M.A.K., Yallop C. Lexicology / M.A.K. Halliday, C. Yallop. – Trowbridge: Cromwell Press, 2007.
11. Hughes G. Words in Time: A Social History of the English Vocabulary / G. Hughes. – Blackwell, 1989.
12. Hughes G. A History of English Words. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.
13. Jackson H. Lexicography: an Introduction / H. Jackson. – London: Routledge, 2002.
14. Lipka L. English Lexicology: Lexical Structure, Word Semantics and Word Formation / L. Lipka. – Narr: Tubungen, 2002.

15. Meunier F., Granger S. Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching / F. Meunier, S. Granger. – John Bemjamins B.V., 2008.
16. Антрушина Г. Б. English Lexicology. Лексикология английского языка : учебное пособие для студентов / Г. Б. Антрушина, О. В. Афанасьева, Н. Н. Морозова – М.: Дрофа, 2000.
17. Арнольд И. В. Лексикология английского языка / И. В. Арнольд. – М.: Высшая Школа, 1986.
18. Бабич Г. Н. Lexicology: A Current Guide / Г. Н. Бабич. – М .: Флинта. Наука, 2008.
19. Гинзбург Р. З. Лексикология английского языка: учебник для институтов и факультетов иностранных языков / Р. З. Гинзбург. – М.: Высшая школа, 1979.
20. Зыкова И. В. Практический курс английской лексикологии. A Practical Course in English Lexicology / И. В. Зыкова. – М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2007.
21. Иванова Е. В. Лексикология и фразеология современного английского языка / Е. В. Иванова. – СПб, 2015.
22. Кунин А. В. Фразеология современного английского языка / А. В. Кунин. – М.: Международные отношения, 1972.
23. Лещева Л. М. Слова в английском языке. Лексикология современного английского языка: учебное пособие / Л. М. Лещева. – Минск, 2002.
24. Минаева Л. В. Лексикология и лексикография английского языка: учебное пособие / Л. В. Минаева. – М.: АСТ, Астрель, 2007.
25. Харитончик З. А. Лексикология английского языка: учебное пособие / З. А. Харитончик. – Минск, 1992.

Навчальне видання

КАМЄНЄВА Ірина Адамівна,
МОШТАГ Євгенія Сергіївна

ЛЕКСОЛОГІЯ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ

КОНСПЕКТ ЛЕКЦІЙ

(для студентів спеціальності 035 – Філологія)

(англійською мовою)

Відповідальний за випуск *О. Л. Ільєнко*

За авторською редакцією

Комп’ютерне верстання *І. А. Камєнєва*

План 2021, поз. 202 Л

Підп. до друку 14.09.2021. Формат 60 × 84/16.
Електронне видання. Ум. друк. арк. 6,9.

Видавець і виготовлювач:
Харківський національний університет
міського господарства імені О. М. Бекетова,
вул. Маршала Бажанова, 17, Харків, 61002.
Електронна адреса: office@kname.edu.ua
Свідоцтво суб’єкта видавничої справи:
ДК № 5328 від 11.04.2017.