MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE STATE UNIVERSITY
“UZHHOROD NATIONAL UNIVERSITY”
UKRAINIAN-HUNGARIAN EDUCATIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTE
HUNGARIAN PHILOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Nataliia Varha

ENGLISH LEXICOLOGY

Лексикологія англійської мови

AZ ANGOL NYELV LEXIKOLÓGIÁJA

Uzhhorod - 2024

УДК 811.111’37(076)

В-18

Варга Наталія Іванівна. Лексикологія англійської мови (для студентів 3 курсу галузі знань 03 Гуманітарні науки спеціальності 035 Філологія предметної спеціальності 035.071 Філологія. Угро-фінські мови та літератури (переклад включно), перша – угорська освітньо-професійної програми «Угорська мова та література. Англійська мова. Переклад»). Навчально-методичний посібник / *Уклад*. Н. Варга. Ужгород. ДВНЗ «УжНУ», 2024. – 144с.

Рецензенти:
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент Зикань Х.І.,
кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент Шпеник С.З.,
кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент Попович І.Є.

Затверджено на засіданні Вченої ради
Українсько-угорського навчально-наукового інституту
ДВНЗ «Ужгородський національний університет»
Протокол № 7 від 26 березня 2024 року.

© Варга Н.І, 2024р.
© ДВНЗ «Ужгородський національний університет», 2024р.

CONTENTS

ВСТУП…….…………………………………………………… 4

LECTURE1. Lexicology as a Branch of Linguistics.
Main Notions of Lexicology…..…………..……………………. 5

LECTURE II. The Etymology of English Words. Words of Native Origin…………………………………………….……………….……... 11

LECTURE III. The Etymology of English Words. Reasons for Borrowing Process. Assimilation of Borrowings …………………... 20

LECTURE IV. Word-Formation in Modern English …..………… 27

LECTURE V. Homonyms ...……………………………………… 37

LECTURE VI. Synonyms ……………………………………….. 41

LECTURE VII. Antonyms. Euphemisms. Neologisms …..……….. 50

LECTURE VIII. Semantic Change. Polysemy …………………… 56

THE LIST OF QUESTIONS FOR EXAMINATION …………... 63

INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH TASKS …………………………….. 66

TEST FOR SELF-CONTROL …………………………………... 105

APPENDIX ………………………………………………………. 117

The suggested scheme of lexicological analysis ………………… 117

Main terms of lexicology ……………………………………….. 118

Affixation ……………………………………………………….. 128

References ………………………………………...…………… 144

ВСТУП

Навчально-методичний посібник «Лексикологія англійської мови» призначений для студентів 3 курсу галузі знань 03 Гуманітарні науки спеціальності 035 Філологія предметної спеціальності 035.071 Філологія. Угро-фінські мови та літератури (переклад включно), перша – угорська освітньо-професійної програми «Угорська мова та література. Англійська мова. Переклад» й укладений відповідно до навчальної та робочої програм з навчальної дисципліни «Лексикологія англійської мови».

У посібнику подаються:

1. Списки основної та додаткової навчально-методичної літератури з дисципліни.
2. Конспекти лекцій.
3. Плани практичних занять, що включають:
- питання для обговорення;
- основну тематичну термінологію, яку необхідно засвоїти;
- таблиці, схеми;
- теми рефератів;
- вправи та практичні завдання;
- літературу до теми заняття.
4. Перелік питань, що виносяться на екзамен.
5. Індивідуальні науково-дослідні завдання.
6. Теми для самостійного опрацювання.
7. Тест для самоконтролю.
8. Додатки:
- схему лексикологічного аналізу тексту;
- словник, що містить трактування основних лексикологічнихтермінів;
- англійські словотворчі префікси та суфікси з характеристикою щодо етимології, продуктивності, значення.

Навчально-методичний посібник «Лексикологія англійської мови» варто застосовувати під час підготовки та роботи напрактичному занятті, а також для самостійної та індивідуальноїроботи студентів у ході опанування курсом «Лексикологія».

LECTURE 1

Lexicology as a Branch of Linguistics.
Main Notions of Lexicology.

1. Lexicology as a branch of linguistics. Its interrelations with other sciences .
2. The word as the fundamental object of lexicology. The nature of the word.
3. Levels of study in lexicology.

1. Lexicology as a branch of linguistics. Its interrelations with other sciences.

Lexicology (from Gr lexis "word" and logos "learning") is a part of linguistics dealing with the vocabulary of a language and the properties of words as the main units of the language. It also studies all kinds of semantic grouping and semantic relations: synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, semantic fields, etc.

In this connection, the term *vocabulary* is used to denote a system formed by the sum total of all the words and word equivalents that the language possesses. The term *word* denotes the basic unit of a given language resulting from the association of a particular meaning with a particular group of sounds capable of a particular grammatical employment. A *word* therefore is at the same time a semantic, grammatical and phonological unit. So, the subject-matter of lexicology is the word, its morphemic structure, history and meaning.

There are several **branches of lexicology**. The general study of words and vocabulary, irrespective of the specific features of any particular language, is known as *general lexicology*. Linguistic phenomena and properties common to all languages are referred to as language universals. *Special lexicology* focuses on the description of the peculiarities in the vocabulary of a given language. A branch of study called *contrastive lexicology* provides a theoretical foundation

on which the vocabularies of different languages can be compared and described, the correlation between the vocabularies of two or more languages being the scientific priority.

Vocabulary studies include such aspects of research as *etymology, semasiology and onomasiology*. The evolution of a vocabulary forms the object of historical lexicology or e*tymology* (from Gr. etymon "true, real"), discussing the origin of various words, their change and development, examining the linguistic and extra-linguistic forces that modify their structure, meaning and usage.

Semasiology (from Gr. semasia "signification") is a branch of linguistics whose subject-matter is the study of word meaning and the classification of changes in the signification of words or forms, viewed as normal and vital factors of any linguistic development. It is the most relevant to polysemy and homonymy.

Onomasiology is the study of the principles and regularities of the signification of things / notions by lexical and lexico-phraseological means of a given language. It has its special value in studying dialects, bearing an obvious relevance to synonymity.

Descriptive lexicology deals with the vocabulary of a language at a given stage of its evolution. It studies the functions of words and their specific structure as a characteristic inherent in the system. In the English language the above science is oriented towards the English word and its morphological and semantic structures, researching the interdependence between these two aspects. These structures are identified and distinguished by contrasting the nature and arrangement of their elements.

Within the framework of lexicology, both *synchronic* (Gr syn "together", "with" and chronos "time") and *diachronic* or historical (Gr dia "through") approaches to the language suggested by the Swiss philologist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) are effectively realized. Language is the reality of thought, and thought develops together with the development of a society, thus the language and its

vocabulary should be studied in the light of social history. Every new phenomenon in a human society in general, which is of any importance for communication, finds a reflection in the corresponding vocabulary. A word is considered to be a generalized reflection of reality; therefore, it is impossible to understand its development if one is ignorant of the changes in socio-political or everyday life, manners and culture, science of a linguoculture it serves to reflect. These extra-linguistic forces influencing the evolution of words are taken into the priority consideration in modern lexicology.

With regard to special lexicology the synchronic approach is concerned with the vocabulary of a language as it exists at a certain time (e.g., a course in Modern English Lexicology). The diachronic approach in terms of special lexicology deals with the changes and the development of the vocabulary in the course of time. It is special historical lexicology that deals with the evolution of vocabulary units as time goes by. The two approaches should not be contrasted, as they are interdependent since every linguistic structure and system actually exists in a state of constant development so that the synchronic state of a language system is a result of a long process of linguistic evolution.

2. The word as the fundamental object of lexicology.

The real nature of a word and the term itself has always been one of the most ambiguous issues in almost every branch of linguistics. To use it as a term in the description of language, we must be sure what we mean by it. To illustrate the point here, let us count the words in the following sentence: You can’t tie a bow with the rope in the bow of a boat. Probably the most straightforward answer to this is to say that there are 14. However, the orthographic perspective taken by itself, of course, ignores the meaning of the words, and as soon as we invoke meanings we at least are talking about different words bow, to start with. Being a central element of any language system, the word is a focus for the problems of phonology, lexicology, syntax, morphology, stylistics and also for a number of other language and speech sciences.

Within the framework of linguistics the word has acquired definitions from the syntactic, semantic, phonological points of view as well as a definition combining various approaches. Thus, it has been syntactically defined as “the minimum sentence” by H.Sweet and much later as “the minimum independent unit of utterance” by L.Bloomfield. E. Sapir concentrates on the syntactic and semantic aspects calling the word “one of the smallest completely satisfying bits of isolated meaning, into which the sentence resolves itself”. A purely semantic treatment is observed in S. Ullmann’s explanation of words as meaningful segments that are ultimately composed of meaningful units. The prominent French linguist A. Meillet combines the semantic, phonological and grammatical criteria: “A word is defined by the association of a given meaning with a given group of sounds susceptible of a given grammatical employment”. Notions fixed in word meanings are formed as generalized and approximately correct reflections of reality, thus, signifying them words objectivize reality and conceptual worlds in their content. So, *the word* is a basic unit of a language resulting from the association of a given meaning with a given cluster of sounds susceptible of a certain grammatical employment.

The nature of the word. Taking into consideration the above, let us consider the nature of the word. First, the word is a *unit of speech w*hich 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 the word is based on distinguishing between the *external and the internal structures of the word.* By the *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. All these morphemes constitute the external structure of the

word post-impressionists. 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. Words can serve the purposes of human communication solely due to their meanings.

Another structural aspect of the word is its *unity*. The word possesses both its *external (*or formal) unity and *semantic* unity. The formal unity of the word is sometimes inaccurately interpreted as indivisibility. The example of *postimpressionists* has already shown that the word is not, strictly speaking, indivisible, though permanently linked. The formal unity of the word can best be illustrated by comparing a word and a word-group comprising identical constituents. The difference between a blackbird and a black bird is best explained by their relationship with the grammatical system of the language. The word blackbird, which is characterized by unity, possesses a single grammatical framing: blackbirds. The first constituent black is not subject to any grammatical changes. In the word-group a black bird each constituent can acquire grammatical forms of its own: the blackest birds I've ever seen. Other words can be inserted between the components which is impossible so far as the word is concerned as it would violate its unity: a black night bird.

The same example may be used to illustrate what we mean by semantic unity. In the word-group a black bird each of the meaningful words conveys a separate concept: bird – a kind of living creature; black – a color. The word blackbird conveys only one concept: the type of bird. This is one of the main features of any word: it always conveys one concept, no matter how many component morphemes it may have in its external structure. c) 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. So, the formal/structural properties of the word are 1) i*solatability* (words can function in isolation, can make a sentence of their own under certain circumstances); 2) *inseparability/unity* (words are characterized by some

integrity, e.g. a light – alight (with admiration); 3) a certain *freedom of distribution* (exposition in the sentence can be different); 4) *susceptibility to grammatical employment*; 5) a word as one of the fundamental units of the language is a double facet unit of form (its external structure) and meaning (its internal/semantic structure).

To sum it up, a word is the smallest naming unit of a language with a more or less free distribution 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.

3. Levels of study in lexicology.

Modern approaches to this problem are characterized by two different levels of study: *syntagmatic and paradigmatic.*

On the *syntagmatic level*, the semantic structure of the word is analyzed in its linear relationships with neighboring words in connected speech. In other words, the semantic characteristics of the word are observed, described and studied on the basis of its typical contexts.

On the *paradigmatic level*, the word is studied in its relationships with other words in the vocabulary system. So, a word may be studied in comparison with other words of a similar meaning (e. g. work, n. – labor, n.; to refuse, v. – to reject v. – to decline, v.), of opposite meaning (e. g. busy, adj. – idle, adj.; to accept, v. – to reject, v.), of different stylistic characteristics (e. g. man, n. – chap, n. – bloke, n. — guy, n.).

Consequently, the key problems of paradigmatic studies are synonymy, antonymy, and functional styles. One further important objective of lexicological studies is the study of the vocabulary of a language as a system. Revising the issue, the vocabulary can be studied synchronically (at a given stage of its

development), or diachronically (in the context of the processes through which it grew, developed and acquired its modern form). The opposition of the two approaches is nevertheless disputable as the vocabulary, as well as the word which is its fundamental unit, is not only what it is at this particular stage of the language development, but what it was centuries ago and has been throughout its history.

LECTURE 2

The Etymology of English Words. Words of Native Origin.

1. A brief survey of the history of English language.
2. The etymological structure of English vocabulary. Words of native origin.

It is true that English vocabulary, which is one of the most extensive amongst the world's languages contains an immense number of words of foreign origin. Explanations for this should be sought in the history of the language which is closely connected with the history of the nation speaking the language. In order to have a better understanding of the problem, it will be necessary to go through a brief survey of certain historical facts, relating to different epochs. By *etymology* of words is understood their origin.

The first century B. C. Most of the territory now, known to us as Europe is occupied by the Roman Empire. Among the inhabitants of the continent are Germanic tribes, "barbarians" as the arrogant Romans call them. Theirs is really a rather primitive stage of development, especially if compared with the high civilisation and refinement of Rome. They are primitive cattle-

breeders and know almost nothing about land cultivation. Their tribal languages contain only Indo-European and Germanic elements. The latter fact is of some importance for the purposes of our survey.

Now comes an event which brings an important change. After a number of wars between the Germanic tribes and the Romans these two opposing peoples come into peaceful contact. Trade is carried on, and the Germanic people gain knowledge of new and useful things. The first among them are new things to eat. It has been mentioned that Germanic cattle-breeding was on a primitive scale.

Its only products known to the Germanic tribes were meat and milk. It is from the Romans that they learn how to make butter and cheese and, as there are naturally no words for these foodstuffs in their tribal languages, they are to use the Latin words to name them (Lat. *butyrum, caseus).* It is also to the Romans that the Germanic tribes owe the knowledge of some new fruits and vegetables of which they had no idea before, and the Latin names of these fruits and vegetables enter their vocabularies reflecting this new knowledge: *cherry* (Lat. *cerasum), pear* (Lat. *pirum), plum* (Lat. *prunus), pea* (Lat. *pisum), beet* (Lat. *beta), pepper* (Lat. *piper).* It is interesting to note that the word *plant* is also a Latin borrowing[1] of this period (Lat. *planta).*

By a *borrowing* or *loan-word* we mean a word which came into the vocabulary of one language from another and was assimilated by the new language.

Here are some more examples of Latin borrowings of this period: *cup* (Lat. *cuppa), kitchen* (Lat. *coquina), mill* (Lat. *molina), port* (Lat. *portus), wine* (Lat. *vinum).*

The fact that all these borrowings occurred is in itself significant. It was certainly important that the Germanic tribal languages gained a considerable number of new words and were thus enriched. What was even more significant was that all these Latin words were destined to become the earliest group of borrowings in the future English language which was — much later — built on the basis of the Germanic tribal languages. Which brings us to another epoch, much closer to the English language as we know it, both in geographical and chronological terms.

The fifth century A. D. Several of the Germanic tribes (the most numerous amongst them being the Angles, the Saxons and the Jutes) migrated across the sea now known as the English Channel to the British Isles. There they were confronted by the Celts, the original inhabitants of the Isles. The Celts desperately defended their lands against the invaders, but they were no match for the military-minded Teutons and gradually yielded most of their territory.

They retreated to the North and South-West (modern Scotland, Wales and Cornwall). Through their numerous contacts with the defeated Celts, the conquerors got to know and assimilated a number of Celtic words (Mod. E. *bald, down, glen, druid, bard, cradle).* Especially numerous among the Celtic borrowings were place names, names of rivers, bills, etc. The Germanic tribes occupied the land, but the names of many parts and features of their territory remained Celtic. For instance, the names of the rivers Avon, Exe, Esk, Usk, Ux originate from Celtic words meaning "river" and "water".

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

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

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

Additionally, in a class of their own were educational terms. It was quite natural that these were also Latin borrowings, for the first schools in England were church schools, and the first teachers priests and monks. So, the very word *school* is a Latin borrowing (Lat. *schola,* of Greek origin) and so are such words *as scholar (Lai. scholar(-is)* and *magister* (Lat. *ma-gister).*

From the end of the 8th c. to the middle of the 11th c. England underwent several Scandinavian invasions which inevitably left their trace on English vocabulary. Here are some examples of early Scandinavian borrowings: *call,* v., *take,* v., *cast,* v., *die,* v., *law,* п., *husband,* n. (< Sc. *hus* + *bondi,* i. e. "inhabitant of the house"), *window* n. (< Sc. *vindauga,* i. e. "the eye of the wind"), *ill,* adj., *loose,* adj., *low,* adj., *weak,* adj.

Some of the words of this group are easily recognisable as Scandinavian borrowings by the initial *sk-* combination. E. g. *sky, skill, skin, ski, skirt.*

Certain English words changed their meanings under the influence of Scandinavian words of the same root. So, the O. E. *bread* which meant "piece" acquired its modern meaning by association with the Scandinavian *brand.*

The O. E. *dream* which meant "joy" assimilated the meaning of the Scandinavian *draumr (cf.* with the Germ. *Traum* "dream"*).*

With the famous Battle of Hastings, when the English were defeated by the Normans under William the Conqueror, we come to the eventful epoch of the Norman Conquest. The epoch can well be called eventful not only in national, social, political and human terms, but also in linguistic terms. England became a bi-lingual country, and the impact on the English vocabulary made over this two-hundred-years period is immense: French words from the Norman dialect penetrated every aspect of social life. Here is a very brief list of examples of *Norman French borrowings.*

Administrative words: *state, government, parliament, council, power.*

Legal terms: *court, judge, justice, crime, prison.*

Military terms: *army, war, soldier, officer, battle, enemy.*

Educational terms: *pupil, lesson, library, science, pen, pencil.*

Everyday life was not unaffected by the powerful influence of French words. Numerous terms of everyday life were also borrowed from French in this period: e. g. *table, plate, saucer, dinner, supper, river, autumn, uncle,* etc.

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

The Renaissance was a period of extensive cultural contacts between the major European states. Therefore, it was only natural that new words also entered the English vocabulary from other European languages. The most significant once more were French borrowings. This time they came from the Parisian dialect of French and are known as *Parisian borrowings.* Examples: *regime, routine, police, machine, ballet, matinee, scene, technique, bourgeois,* etc. (One should note that these words of French origin sound and "look" very different from their Norman predecessors. We shall return to this question later .

Italian also contributed a considerable number of words to English, e. g. *piano, violin, opera, alarm, colonel.*

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

The historical survey above is far from complete. Its aim is just to give a very general idea of the ways in which English vocabulary developed and of the major events through which it acquired its vast modern resources.

Phenomenon, philosophy, method, music, etc. were borrowed into English from Latin and had earlier come into Latin from Greek.one would certainly expect the native element to prevail. This anomaly is explained by the country's eventful history and by its many international contacts.

On a straight vocabulary count, considering the high percentage of borrowed words, one would have to classify English as a language of international origin or, at least, a Romance one (as French and Latin words obviously prevail). But here another factor comes into play, the relative frequency of occurrence of words, and it is under this heading that the native Anglo-Saxon heritage comes into its own. The native element in English comprises a large number of high-frequency words like the articles, prepositions, pronouns, conjunctions, auxiliaries and, also, words denoting everyday objects and ideas (e. g. *house, child, water, go, come, eat, good, bad,* etc.).

English vocabulary consists of two layers – the native stock of words and the borrowed stock of words. The native words are further subdivided into those of Indo-European stock, those of Germanic origin and those of the English proper origin.

Some Especially Frequent Borrowed Affixes

Latin Affixes

The prefix –dis	disable, disagree, disown, etc.
The suffix -able	curable, capable, adorable, etc
The suffix -ate	congratulate, create, appreciate, etc
The suffix –ute	contribute, constitute, attribute, etc.

The remnant suffix -ct	conduct, collect, act, etc.
The remnant suffix –d(e)	applaud, include, divide, etc
The suffix -ant	constant, important, arrogant, etc
The suffix -ion	opinion, legion, union, etc.
The suffix –tion	temptation, relation, revolution, etc.
The suffix -ent	absent, evident, decent, etc.
The suffix -or	junior, major, senior, etc.
The suffix -al	fraternal, maternal, cordial, etc
The suffix -ar	familiar, solar, lunar, etc.

French Affixes

The suffix -ance	arrogance,endurance
The suffix -ence	intelligence,patience
The suffix -ment	apointment,development
The suffix -age	courage, marriage
The suffix -ess	tigress,atcress
The suffix -ous	curious ,dengerous
The prefix -ens	enable,enslave

2. The Etymological Structure of English Vocabulary. Words of Native Origin.

Now let us turn to the native element, the original stock of the English vocabulary. It consists of three groups, only the third being dated: the words of this group appeared in the English vocabulary in the 5th c. or later, that is, after the Germanic tribes migrated to the British Isles. As to the Indo-European and Germanic groups, they are so old that they cannot be dated. It was mentioned in

the historical survey opening this chapter that the tribal languages of the Angles, the Saxons, the Jutes, by the time of their migration, contained only words of Indo-European and Germanic roots plus a certain number of the earliest Latin borrowings.

By the Indo-European element are meant words of roots common to all or most languages of the Indo-European group. English words of this group denote elementary concepts without which no human communication would be possible. The following groups can be identified.

I. Family relations: *father, mother, brother, son,daughter.*

II. Parts of the human body: *foot, nose, lip, heart.*

III. Animals: *cow, swine goose.*

IV. Plants: *tree, birch, corn*

V. Time of day: *day, night*.

VI. Heavenly bodies*: sun, moon, star.*

VII. Numerous adjectives: *red, glad , sad*

VIII. The numerals from one to a hundred.

IX. Pronouns- personal ,(except *they ,* which is a Scandinavian borrowing), demonstrative.

X .Numerous verbs: *be, stand, sit,know.*

The Germanic element represents words of roots common to all or most Germanic languages. Some of the main groups of Germanic words are the same as in the Indo-European element.

I. Parts of the human body :*head, hand, arm, finger.*

II. Animals: *bear, fox, calf.*

III. Plants: *oak, fir, grass*.

IV. Seasons of the year: *winter, spring, summer*.(*Autumn* is a French borrowing)

V. Landscape features: sea, plant.

VI Human dwellings and furniture: *house, room, bench.*

VII. Sea –going vessels: *boat, ship.*

IX. Adjectives: green*, blue, grey, white, small, thick, high, old, good.* .

X. Verbs: *see, hear, speak, tell, say, answer, make, give, drink.*

It haIt has been mentioned that the English proper element is, in certain respects, opposed to the first two groups. Not only can it be approximately dated, but these words have another distinctive feature: they are specifically English having no cognates[2] in other languages whereas for Indo-European and Germanic words such cognates can always be found, as, for instance, for the following words of the Indo-European group.

Star: Germ. *Stern,* Lat. *Stella,* Gr. *aster.*

Sad: Germ, *satt,* Lat. *satis,* R. *сыт,.*

Stand: Germ, *stehen,* Lat. *stare, R. стоять.*

Here are some examples of English proper words. These words stand quite alone in the vocabulary system of Indo-European languages: *bird, boy, girl, lord, lady, woman, daisy, always.*

It should be taken into consideration that the English proper element also contains all the later formations, that is, words which were made after the 5th century according to English word-building patterns both from native and borrowed morphemes. For instance, the adjective 'beautiful' built from the French borrowed root and the native suffix belongs to the English proper element.

LECTURE 3

The Etymology of English Words.
Reasons for Borrowing Process.
Assimilation of Borrowings.

1. Reasons for Borrowing Process.
2.Assimilation of Borrowings.
3. Types of Borrowings.

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

These latter circumstances are certainly more favourable for stimulating the borrowing process, for during invasions and occupations the natural psychological reaction of the oppressed nation is to reject and condemn the language of the oppressor. In this respect the linguistic heritage of the Norman Conquest seems exceptional, especially if compared to the influence of the Mongol-Tartar Yoke on the Russian language. The Mongol-Tartar Yoke also represented a long period of cruel oppression, yet the imprint left by it on the Russian vocabulary is comparatively insignificant.

The difference in the consequences of these evidently similar historical events is usually explained by the divergence in the level of civilisation of the two conflicting nations. Russian civilisation and also the level of its language development at the time of the Mongol-Tartar invasion were superior to those of

the invaders. That is why the Russian language successfully resisted the influence of a less developed language system. On the other hand, the Norman culture of the 11th c. was certainly superior to that of the Saxons. The result was that an immense number of French words forced their way into English vocabulary. Yet, linguistically speaking, this seeming defeat turned into a victory. Instead of being smashed and broken by the powerful intrusion of the foreign element, the English language managed to preserve its essential structure and vastly enriched its expressive resources with the new borrowings.

But all this only serves to explain the conditions which encourage the borrowing process. The question of *why* words are borrowed by one language from another is still unanswered.

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

But there is also a great number of words which are borrowed for other reasons. There may be a word (or even several words) which expresses some particular concept, so that there is no gap in the vocabulary and there does not seem to be any need for borrowing. Yet, one more word is borrowed which means almost the same, — almost, but not exactly. It is borrowed because it represents the same concept in some new aspect, supplies a new shade of meaning or a different emotional colouring . This type of borrowing enlarges groups of synonyms and greatly provides to enrich the expressive resources of the vocabulary. That is how the Latin *cordial* was added to the native *friendly,* the French *desire* to *wish,* the Latin *admire* and the French *adore* to *like* and *love.*

2. Assimilation of borrowings. Assimilation is the process of changing the adopted word. The process of assimilation of borrowings includes changes in

sound form of 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 the more completed 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 the 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 frequently 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

3. Types of Borrowings.

International Words It is often the case that a word is borrowed by several languages, and not just by one. Such words usually con-

vey concepts which are significant in the field of communication.

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

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

20th c. scientific and technological advances brought a great number of new international words: *atomic, antibiotic, radio, television, sputnik.* The latter is a Russian borrowing, and it became an international word (meaning a man-made satellite) in 1961, immediately after the first space flight by Yury Gagarin.

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

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

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

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

Such words as these two originating from the same etymological source, but differing in phonemic shape and in meaning are called *etymological doublets.*

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

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

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

— *travail* (Par. Fr.), *cavalry* (Norm. Fr.) — *chivalry* (Par. Fr.), *gaol* (Norm. Fr.) — *jail* (Par. Fr.).

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

A doublet may also consist of a shortened word and the one from which it was derived (see Ch. 6 for a description of shortening as a type of word-building): *history — story, fantasy — fancy, fanatic — fan, defence — fence, courtesy — curtsy, shadow — shade.*

Translation-Loans

The term *loan-word* is equivalent to *borrowing.* By translation-loans we indicate borrowings of a special kind. They are not taken into the vocabulary of another language more or less in the same phonemic shape in which they have been functioning in their own language, but undergo the process of translation. It is quite obvious that it is only compound words (i. e. words of two or more stems) which can be subjected to such an operation, each stem being translated separately: *masterpiece* (from Germ. *Meisterstück), wonder child* (from Germ. *Wunderkind), first dancer* (from Ital. *prima-ballerina).*

Lecture 4

Word-Formation in Modern English

1. Morphological Structure of a Word.

2 The Main Structural Types of Modern English Words

3.Major Types of Modern English Word Building.

1.**Morphological Structure of a Word**. The word consists 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 significant or distinctive unit. The morpheme may be defined as the smallest meaningful unit which has a sound form and meaning, occurring in speech only as a part of a word. In other words, a morpheme is an association of a given meaning with a given sound pattern. But unlike a word it is not autonomous. Morphemes occur in speech only as constituent parts of words, not independently, although a word may consist of a single morpheme. Nor are they divisible into smaller meaningful units.

According to the role they play in constructing words all morphemes are subdivided into two large classes: *roots* (or *radicals)* and *affixes.* The latter, in their turn, fall into *prefixes* which precede the root in the structure of the word (as in *re-read, mis-pronounce, unwell)* and *suffixes* which follow the root (as in *teach-er, cur-able, diet-ate). Stem* is part of the word consisting of root and affix. In English words stern and root often coincide. *Word formation is the* creation of new words from the elements existing in the language. Together with borrowing, word-building provides for enlarging and enriching the vocabulary of the language.

A root is the lexical nucleus of a word bearing the major individual meaning common to a set of semantically related words, constituting one word

cluster/word-family (e.g. learn-learner-learned learnable; heart-hearten, dishearten, hear-broken, hearty, kind-hearted etc.) with which no grammatical properties of the word are connected

Unlike a root, a *stem* is that part of the word that remains unchanged throughout its paradigm (formal aspect). For instance, heart-hearts-to one's heart's content vs. hearty-heartier-the heartiest. It is the basic unit at the derivational level, taking the inflections which shape the word grammatically as a part of speech. There are three types of stems: simple, derived and compound. *Simple stems* are semantically non-motivated and do not constitute a pattern on analogy with which new stems may be modeled (e.g. pocket, motion, receive, etc.). Simple stems are generally monomorphic and phonetically identical with the root morphemes (sell, grow, kink, etc.). *Derived stems* are built on stems of various structures, they are motivated, i.e. derived stems are understood on the basis of the derivative relations between their immediate constituents and the correlated stems. Derived stems are mostly polymorphic (e.g. governments, unbelievable, etc.). *Compound stems* are made up of two immediate constituents, both of which are themselves stems, e.g. match-box, pen-holder, ex-film-star, etc. It is built by joining two stems, one of which is simple, the other is derived. The derivational types of words are classified according to

2. The main Structural Types of English Words. *T*here are some structural types of words in English: 1) *simple words* (single root morphemes, e.g. agree, child, red, etc.);

2) *derivatives* (affixational derived words) consisting one or more affixes: enjoyable, childhood, unbelievable). Derived words are extremely numerous in the English vocabulary. Successfully competing with this structural type is the so-called root word which has only a root morpheme in its structure. This type is widely represented by a great number of words belonging to the original English stock or to earlier borrowings (house, room, book, work, port, street, table, etc.).

3} words made by conversion (e. g. to hand, v. formed from the noun hand; to can, v. from can, n.; to pale, v. from pale, adj.; a find, n. from to find, v.; etc.);

3) *compound* words consisting of two or more stems (e. g. dining-room, bluebell, mother-in-law, good-for-nothing, etc.). Words of this structural type are produced by the word-building process called composition;

4) *derivational compounds* in which phrase components are joined together by means of compounding and affixation (e.g. oval-shaped, strong-willed, care-free);

5) *phrasal verbs* as a result of a strong tendency of English to simplification (to put up with, to give up, to take for, etc.) .

3.Major Types of English Word Building . *Word building (word-formation*) is the creation of new words from elements already existing in a particular language. Every language has its own patterns of word formation. Together with borrowing, word-building provides for enlarging and enriching the vocabulary of the language. The process of ***affixation*** consists in coining a new word by adding an affix or several affixes to some root morpheme – principal, promotion . The role of the affix in this procedure is very important and therefore it is necessary to consider certain facts about the main types of affixes.

From the etymological point of view affixes are classified into the same two large groups as words: native and borrowed. Borrowed affixes s. p 11-12.

Some Native Suffixes

Noun-forming	-er	worker, *miner,* teacher, painter, etc.
	-ness	*coldness, loneliness, loveliness,* etc.
	-ing	feel*ing*, mean*ing*, sing*ing*, read*ing*, etc.
	-dom	free*dom,* wis*dom,* king*dom,* etc.
	-hood	child*hood*, man*hood*, mother*hood*, etc.
	-ship	friend*ship*, companion*ship*, master-*ship*, etc.

	-th	leng*th*, bread*th*, heal*th,* tru*th,* etc.
	-ful	care*ful,* joy*ful,* wonder*ful,* sin*ful,* skil*ful,* etc.
	-less	care*less*, sleep*less*, cloud*less*, sense-*less,* etc.
	-y	coz*y,* tid*y,* merr*y,* snowy, show*y,* etc.
	-ish	Engli*sh*, Spani*sh*, reddi*sh*, childi*sh*, etc.
	-ly	*lonely, lovely, ugly, likely, lordly, etc.*
	-en	*wooden, woollen,* silken, golden, etc.
	-some	hand*some,* quarrel*some*, tire*some*, etc.
Verb-forming	-en	wid*en*, redd*en*, dark*en*, sadd*en*, etc.
Adverb-forming	-ly	warm*ly,* hard*ly*, simp*ly*, careful*ly*, cold*ly, etc.*

Semantics of Affixes

Meanings of affixes are specific and considerably differ from those of root morphemes. Affixes have widely generalised meanings and refer the concept conveyed by the whole word to a certain category, which is vast and all-embracing. So, the noun-forming suffix *-er* could be roughly defined as designating persons from the object of their occupation or labour *(painter* — the one who paints) or from their place of origin or abode *(southerner* — the one living in the South). The adjective-forming suffix *-ful* has the meaning of "full of", "characterised by" *(beautiful, careful)* whereas *-ish* may often imply insufficiency of quality *(greenish* — green, but not quite; *youngish* — not quite young but looking it).

The semantic distinctions of words produced from the same root by means of different affixes are also of considerable interest, Compare: *womanly* —

womanish, flowery — flowered — flowering, starry — starred, reddened — reddish, shortened — shortish.

The semantic difference between the members of these groups is very obvious: the meanings of the suffixes are so distinct that they colour the whole words.

Womanly is used in a complimentary manner about girls and women, whereas *womanish* is used to indicate an effeminate man and certainly implies criticism.

Flowery is applied to speech or a style, *flowered* means "decorated with a pattern of flowers" (e. g. *flowered silk or chintz*) and *flowering* is the same as *blossoming* (e. g. *flowering bushes or shrubs*).

Starry means "resembling stars" (e. g. *starry eyes)* and starred — "covered or decorated with stars" (e. g. *starred skies).*

Reddened and *shortened* both imply the result of an action or process, as in *the eyes reddened with weeping* or *a shortened version of a story* (i. e. a story that has been abridged) whereas *shortish* and *reddish* point to insufficiency of quality: *reddish* is not exactly red, but tinged with red, and a *shortish* man is probably a little taller than a man described as short.

Conversion. The process of coining new words in a different part of speech and with a different distribution characteristic but without adding any derivative element, so that the basic form of the original and the basic form of the derived word are homonymous, is called conversion. In other words, it is the formation of a new word through changes in its paradigm.

Conversion is not only a highly productive but also a particularly English way of word-building. Its overwhelming productivity is considerably encouraged by certain features of the English language in its modern stage of development. The analytical structure of Modern English greatly facilitates processes of making words of one category of parts of speech from words of another. So does the simplicity of paradigms of English parts of speech. A great number of one-

syllable words is another factor in favor of conversion, for such words are naturally more mobile and flexible than polysyllables.

The two categories of parts of speech especially affected by conversion are nouns and verbs. *Verbs* made from nouns are the most numerous amongst the words produced by conversion: e. g. to hand, to back, to face, to eye, to mouth, to nose, to dog, to wolf, to monkey, to can, to coal, to stage, to screen, to room, to floor, to blackmail, to blacklist, to honeymoon, to towel, to tattoo, and very many others.

Nouns are frequently made from verbs: do (e. g. This is the queerest do I've ever come across. Do – event, incident), go (e. g. He has still plenty of go at his age. Go – energy), make, run, find, catch, cut, walk, worry, show, move, etc.

V*erbs* can also be made from a*djectives*: to pale, to yellow, to cool, to grey, to rough (e. g. We decided to rough it in the tents as the weather was warm), etc.

Other parts of speech are not entirely unsusceptible to conversion as the following examples show: to down, to out , the ups and downs, the ins and outs, like, n. (as in the like of me and the like of you, the whys and wherefores, etc.

There are certain *regularities* in conversion associations. For instance, in the group of verbs made from nouns some of the regular semantic associations are as indicated in the following list:

1.The noun is the name of a tool or implement, the verb denotes an action performed by the tool: to hammer, to nail, to pin, to brush, to comb, to pencil.

2. The noun is the name of an animal, the verb denotes an action or an aspect of behavior considered typical of this animal: to dog, to wolf, to monkey, to ape, to fox, to rat. Yet, to fish does not mean "to behave like a 21 fish" but "to try to catch fish". The same meaning of hunting activities is conveyed by the verb to whale and one of the meanings of to rat; the other is "to turn in former, squeal (sl.)"

3. The name of a part of the human body — an action performed by it: to hand, to leg (sl.), to eye, to elbow, to shoulder, to nose, to mouth. However, to face does not imply doing something by or even with one's face but turning it in a certain direction. To back means either "to move backwards" or, in the figurative sense, "to support somebody or something".

4. The name of a profession or occupation – an activity typical of it: to nurse, to cook, to maid, to groom.

5. The name of a place – the process of occupying the place or of putting smth/smb. in it (to room, to house, to place, to table, to cage)-

6. The name of a container – the act of putting smth. within the container (to can, to bottle, to pocket).

7. The name of a meal — the process of taking it (to lunch, to supper).

8. Acquisition or addition of the object – to fish.

Composition.

This type of word-building, in which new words are produced by combining two or more stems. Compounds, though certainly fewer in quantity than derived or root words, still represent one of the most typical and specific features of English word-structure.Compounds are not homogeneous in structure. Traditionally three types are distinguished: neutral, morphological and syntactic.

Neutural compounds have also some types:

In *simple neutral compounds*: the process of compounding is realised without any linking elements, by a mere juxtaposition of two stems, as in *blackbird, shop-window, sunflower, bedroom, tallboy,* etc.

Compounds which have affixes in their structure are called *derived or derivational compounds*. E. g. *absent-mindedness, blue-eyed, golden-haired,*

broad-shouldered, lady-killer, film-goer, music-lover, honey-mooner, first-nighter, late-comer, newcomer, early-riser, evildoer. The productivity of this type is confirmed by a considerable number of comparatively recent formations, such as *teenager, babysitter, strap-hanger, fourseater* ("car or boat with four seats"), *doubledecker* ("a ship or bus with two decks").

The third subtype of neutral compounds is called *contracted compounds*. These words have a shortened (contracted) stem in their structure: *TV-set (-program, -show, -canal,* etc.), *V-day (Victory day), G-man (Government man* "FBI agent"), *H-bag (handbag), T-shirt,* etc.

Morphological compounds are few in number. This type is non-productive. It is represented by words in which two compounding stems are combined by a linking vowel or consonant, e. g. *Anglo-Saxon, handiwork, handicraft, craftsmanship, spokesman.*

In *syntactic compounds* we once more find a feature of specifically English word-structure. These words are formed from segments of speech, preserving in their structure numerous traces of syntagmatic relations typical of speech: articles, prepositions, adverbs, as in the nouns *lily-of-the-valley, Jack-of-all-trades, good-for-nothing, mother-in-law, sit-at-home.* Syntactical relations and grammatical patterns current in present-day English can be clearly traced in the structures of such compound nouns as *pick-me-up, know-all, know-nothing, go-between, get-together* . The last word (meaning "a detective story") was obviously coined from the ungrammatical variant of the word-group *who (has) done it.*

Compound nouns can be coined according to the following patterns:

N+N (e.g. night-club, airhostess, etc (this pattern is the most productive);

Adj + N (e.g. deadline, sweet-heart, etc.) V + N (e.g. push-cart, fly-wheel, etc.)

Ving + N (e.g. living room, blotting paper);

N + V-ing (e.g. law-breaking, horseracing).

Compound adjectives are built up after such patterns: N + A (e.g. show-white, sky-blue);

A + A (e.g. red-hot, social linguistic);

A + N-ed (e.g. long-legged, navy-eyed);

N + V-ed (e.g. crisis-ridden, hand-made)

N/A/Adv/Pron + V-ing (e.g. peace-making, joy-causing, easy-going, everlasting, self-denying)

Compound adverbs, pronouns, connectives are represented by an insignificant number of words (e.g. anything, inside, upright, somebody, otherwise, moreover, elsewhere, anything, by means of, etc.)

Another focus of interest is the semantic aspect of compound words, that is, the question: can the meaning of a compound word be regarded as the sum of its constituent meanings?

To try and answer this question, let us consider the following groups of examples.

(1) *Classroom, bedroom, working-man, evening-gown, dining-room, sleeping-car, reading-room, dancing-hall.*

This group seems to represent compounds whose meanings can really be described as the sum of their constituent meanings. They are called *non-idiomatic compounds.*

The shift of meaning becomes much more pronounced in the second group of examples.

(2) *Blackboard, blackbird, football, lady-killer, pickpocket, good-for-nothing, lazybones, chatterbox.*

In these compounds one of the components (or both) has changed its meaning: a blackboard is neither a board nor necessarily black, football is not a ball but a game, a chatterbox not a box but a person, and a lady-killer kills no one but is merely a man who fascinates women. It is clear that in all these compounds the meaning of the whole word cannot be defined as the sum of the constituent meanings

Similar enigmas are encoded in such words as *man-of-war* ("warship"), *merry-to-round* ("carousel"),

The compounds whose meanings do not correspond to the separate meanings of their constituent parts are called *idiomatic compounds,* in contrast to the first group known as *non-idiomatic compounds.*

Shortening (or contraction) as comparatively new way of word-building has achieved a high degree of productivity nowadays, especially in American English. Shortenings are produced in two different ways. The first is to make a new word from a syllable (rarer, two) of the original word. The latter may lose its beginning (as in *phone* made from *telephone, fence* from *defence),* its ending (as in *hols* from *holidays, vac* from *vacation, props* from *properties, ad* from *advertisement)* or both the beginning and ending (as in *flu* from *influenza, fridge* from *refrigerator).*

The second way of shortening is to make a new word from the initial letters of a word group: *U.N.O.* ['ju:neu] from *the United Nations Organisation, B.B.C.* from the *British Broadcasting Corporation, M.P.* from *Member of Parliament.* This type is called initial shortenings. They are found not only among formal words, such as the ones above, but also among colloquialisms and slang. So, *g. f.* is a shortened word made from the compound *girl-friend.*

Both types of shortenings are characteristic of informal speech in general and of uncultivated speech particularly. Here are some more examples of informal

shortenings. *Movie* (from *moving-picture), gent* (from *gentleman), specs* (from *spectacles).*

LECTURE 5

Homonyms

1. Definition of Homonyms. Classification of Homonyms. Paronyms.
2. Sources of Homonyms.

1. Definition of homonyms. Classification of homonyms. Homonyms are words which are identical in sound and spelling, or, at least, in one of these aspects, but different in their meaning (e.g. bank, n. – a shore; bank, n. – an institution for receiving, lending, exchanging, and safeguarding money; ball, n. – a sphere; any spherical body; ball, n. – a large dancing party. English vocabulary is rich in such pairs and even groups of words. Their identical forms are mostly accidental: the majority of homonyms coincided due to phonetic changes which they suffered during their development.

The most widely accepted classification of homonyms is that recognizing homonyms proper, homophones and homographs. *Homonyms proper* (or perfect, absolute) are words identical in pronunciation and spelling but different in meaning (e.g. back n. "part of the body" – back adv. 45 "away from the front"- back v. "go back"; bear n. "animal" – bear v. "carry, tolerate"). *Homophones* are words of the same sound but of different spelling and meaning (e.g. buy v. – by prep.; him pr. – hymn n.; piece n. – peace n.; rite n. – write v. – right adj.). The following joke is based on a pun which makes use of homophones: "Waiter!"

"Yes, sir." "What's this?" "It's bean soup, sir." "Never mind what it has been. I want to know what it is now." *Homographs* are words different in sound and in meaning but accidentally identical n spelling (e.g. bow [bau], v. – to incline the head or body in salutation; bow [bou], n. – a flexible strip of wood for propelling arrows; lead [li:d], v. – to conduct on the way, go before to show the way; lead [led] n. – a heavy, rather soft metal).

*Homoform*s are words identical in some of their grammatical forms (e.g. to bound (jump, spring) – bound (past participle of the verb bind); found (establish) found (past participle of the verb find). Homonyms may belong both to the same and to different categories of parts of speech. Obviously, a classification of homonyms should reflect this distinctive feature. Also, the paradigm of each word should be considered, because it has been observed that the paradigms of some homonyms coincide completely, and of others only partially.

Partial homonyms are subdivided into three subgroups:

a) Simple lexico-grammatical partial homonyms are words which belong to the same category of parts of speech. Their paradigms have one identical form, but it is never the same form (e.g. found, v. ↔ found, v. (Past Ind., Past Part, of to find); lay, v. ↔ lay, v. (Past Ind. of to lie)).

b) Complex lexico-grammatical partial homonyms are words of different categories of parts of speech which have one identical form in their paradigms (e.g. rose, n. ↔ rose, v. (Past Ind. of to rise); left, adj. ↔ left, v. (Past Ind., Past Part, of to leave); bean, n. ↔ been, v. (Past Part, of to be)).

c) Partial lexical homonyms are words of the same category of parts of speech which are identical only in their corresponding forms (e.g. lie (lay, lain), v. ↔ lie (lied, lied), v.; hang (hung, hung), v. ↔ to hang (hanged, hanged), v.)

Paronyms are words that are alike in form, but different in meaning and usage. They are liable to be mixed and sometimes mistakenly interchanged. The term paronym comes from the Greek para "beside" and onoma "name" (e.g. precede ↔ proceed; preposition ↔ proposition; popular ↔ populous; grateful ↔ gracious; shit ↔ shoot: Oh, shoot, I forgot to buy milk (Longman)).

3. **Sources of Homonyms**.

There are several sources of homonyms:

a) phonetic changes which words undergo in the course of their historical development. As a result of such changes, two or more words which were formerly pronounced differently may develop identical sound forms and thus become homonyms (e.g. night and knight were not homonyms in Old English as the initial k in the second word was pronounced, and not dropped as it is in its modern sound form: OE. kniht (cf OE nihi). A more complicated change of form brought together another pair of homonyms: to knead (OE cnēdan) and to need (OE nēodian);

b) conversion which serves the creating of grammatical homonyms (e.g. iron →to iron, work→ to work, etc.); c) shortening is a further type of word-building which increases the number of homonyms (e.g. fan, n. in the sense of "an enthusiastic admirer of some kind of sport or of an actor, singer" is a shortening produced from fanatic. Its homonym is a Latin borrowing fan. n. which denotes an implement for waving lightly to produce a cool current of air. The noun rep, n. denoting a kind of fabric has three homonyms made by shortening: repertory → rep, n., representative → rep, n., reputation → rep, n.);

d) borrowing is another source of homonyms. A borrowed word may, in the final stage of its phonetic adaptation, duplicate in form either a native word or another borrowing (e.g. ritus Lat. → rite n. – write v. – right adj.; pais OFr → piece, n. –

pettia OFr → peace n.); e) words made by sound-imitation can also form pairs of homonyms with other words (e.g. bang, n. "a loud, sudden, explosive noise" – bang, n. "a fringe of hair combed over the forehead"; mew, n. "the sound a cat makes" – mew, n. "a sea gul" – mew, n. "a pen in which poultry is fattened" – mews "small terraced houses in Central London").

I. Consider your answers to the following.

1. Which words do we call homonyms?

2. Why can't homonyms be regarded as expressive means of the language?

3. What is the traditional classification of homonyms? Illustrate your answer with examples.

4. What are the main sources of homonyms? Illustrate your answer with examples.

5. In what respect does split polysemy stand apart from other sources of homonyms?

6. Prove that the language units board ("a long and thin piece of timber") and board ("daily meals") are two different words (homonyms) and not two different meanings of one and the same word. Write down some other similar examples.

7. What is the essential difference between homonymy and polysemy? What do they have in common? Illustrate your answer with examples.

LECTURE 6

Synonyms

1.Definiition of Synonyms. Synonymic Dominant.

2. Criteria of Synonymy

3.Classification of Synonyms.

4.Sources of Synonymy

1.Definiition of Synonyms. **Synonymic Dominant.** Attempts to study the inner structure of the vocabulary have revealed that in spite of its heterogeneity the English word stock may be analyzed into numerous sub-systems whose members have some features in common, thus distinguishing them from the members of other subsystems. Words can be classified in many ways. One way of semantic classifying is based on the semantic similarity (or polarity) of words or their component morphemes. The terms usually used to denote these two types of semantic relatedness are synonymy and antonymy.

S*ynonyms* are traditionally described as words different in sound-form but identical or similar in meaning. This definition has been severely criticized on the following points: 1) it cannot be applied to polysemantic words (e.g. the verb to look is usually regarded as a synonym of to watch, to observe, etc. but in its other meanings it is not synonymous with this group but rather with the verbs to seem, to appear); 2) it is hardly possible to speak of similarity of lexical meaning as a whole as it is only the denotational component that may be described as similar (e.g. to die and to pass away are considered synonymous, but the stylistic reference is completely different); 3) it is impossible to speak of identity in meaning as a criterion of synonymy since identity of meaning is very rare even among monosemantic words.

The duality of synonyms is, probably, their most confusing feature: they are somewhat the same, and yet they are most obviously different. Synonyms add precision to each detail of description and the correct choice of a word from a group of synonyms may color the whole text. They are one of the language's most important expressive means.

The principal function of synonyms is to represent the same phenomenon in different aspects, shades and variations. A carefully chosen word from a group of synonyms is a great asset both on the printed page and in a speaker's utterance. It was Mark Twain who said that the difference between the right word and just the right word is the difference between the lightning and the lightning-bug. Thus, synonymy is the coincidence in the essential meaning of words which usually preserve their differences in connotations and stylistic characteristics.

The synonymic dominant is the most general term potentially containing the specific features rendered by all the other members of the group. The words face, visage, countenance have a common denotational meaning – the front of the head which makes them close synonyms. Face is the dominant, the most general word; countenance is the same part of the head with the reference to the expression it bears; visage is a formal word, chiefly literary, for face or countenance.
The semantic structure of a synonymic dominant is quite simple: it consists only of denotative component and it has no connotations. All (or, at least, most) synonymic groups have a "central" word of this kind whose meaning is equal to the denotation common to the entire synonymic group (e.g. to surprise — to astonish — to amaze - to astound; to shout - to yell - to bellow - to roar; to shine - to flash - to blaze - to gleam - to glisten - to sparkle - to glitter - to shimmer — to glimmer).
The dominant synonym expresses the notion common to all synonyms of the group in the most general way, without contributing any additional information as to the manner, intensity, duration or any attending feature of the referent. So,

any dominant synonym is a typical basic-vocabulary word. Its meaning, which is broad and generalized, more or less covers the meanings of the rest of the synonyms, so that it may be substituted for any of them.

The characteristic features of the dominant synonym are the following: 1) high frequency of usage; 2) broad combinability (ability to be used in combinations with various classes of words); 3) broad general meaning; 4) lack of connotations. In a great number of cases the semantic difference between two or more synonyms is supported by the difference in valency (e.g. the verbs win and gain – both may be used in combination with the noun victory: to win a victory, to gain a victory but with the word war only win is possible: to win a war).

2. Criteria of synonymy.

In contemporary research on synonymy semantic criterion is frequently used. In terms of componential analysis synonyms may be defined as words with the same denotation, or the same denotative component, but differing in connotations, or in connotative components. A group of synonyms may be studied with the help of their dictionary definitions (definitional analysis). In this work the data from various dictionaries are analyzed comparatively. After that the definitions are subjected to transformational operations (transitional analysis). In this way, the semantic components of each analyzed word are singled out.

In the respect of synonyms *the criterion of interchangeability* is sometimes applied. According to this, synonyms are defined as words which are interchangeable at least in some contexts without any considerable alteration in denotational meaning. But this is possible only in some contexts, in others their meanings may not coincide (e.g. the comparison of the sentences the *rainfall in April was abnormal and the rainfall in April was exceptional* may give us grounds for assuming that *exceptional and abnormal* are synonyms. The same adjectives in a different context are by no means synonymous, as we may see by

comparing my son is exceptional and my son is abnormal). This criterion of interchangeability has been much criticised. Almost every attempt to apply it to this or that group of synonyms seems to lead one to the inevitable conclusion that either there are very few synonyms or, else, that they are not interchangeable, cf:

He glared at her (i.e. He looked at her angrily).

He gazed at her (i.e. He looked at her steadily and attentively; probably with admiration or interest).

He glanced at her (i.e. He looked at her briefly and turned away).

He peered at her (i.e. He tried to see her better, but something prevented: darkness, fog. weak eyesight).

These few examples are sufficient to show that each of the synonyms creates an entirely new situation so sharply differing from the rest that attempts at "interchanging" anything can destroy the utterance devoiding it of any sense at all. Consequently, it is difficult to accept interchangeability as a criterion of synonymy because the specific characteristic of synonyms, and the one justifying their very existence, is that they are not, cannot and should not be interchangeable. In conclusion, let us stress that even if there are some synonyms which are interchangeable, it is quite certain that there are also others which are not. A criterion should be applicable to all synonyms and not just to some of them. Otherwise it is not acceptable as a valid criterion.

According to the criterion of interchangeability in context synonyms are classified into *total, relative and contextual. Tota*l synonyms are those members of a synonymic group which can replace each other in any given context, without the slightest alteration in denotative meaning or emotional meaning and connotations. They are very rare. Examples can be found mostly in special literature among technical terms and others (*fatherland – motherland; suslik - gopher; noun — substantive; functional affix -, inflection; scarlet fever – scarlatina.)*

Some authors class groups like *ask - beg - implore, or like - love ~ adore, gift - talent - genius, famous - celebrate - eminent* as relative synonyms, as they denote different degree of the same notion or different shades of meanings and can be substituted only in some contexts. *Contextual* or context-dependent synonyms are similar in meaning only under some specific distributional conditions. It may happen that the difference between the meanings of two words is contextually neutralized (buy and get would not generally be taken as synonymous, but they arc synonyms in the following examples – I'll go to the shop and buy some bread and I'll go to the shop and get some bread).

A more modem and a more effective approach to the classification of synonyms may be based on the definition describing synonyms *as words differing in connotations.* It seems convenient to classify connotations by which synonyms differ rather than synonyms themselves. It opens up possibilities for tracing much subtler distinctive features within their semantic structures.

I. The connotation of *degree or intensity* can be traced in such groups of synonyms as to surprise - to astonish - to amaze - to astound; to satisfy - to please - to content - to gratify - to delight - to exalt; to shout — to yell — to bellow — to roar; to like — to admire — to love — to adore — to worship.

II. In the group of synonyms to stare - to glare - to gaze - to glance - to peep - to peer, all the synonyms except to glance denote a lasting act of looking at somebody or something, whereas to glance describes a brief, passing look. These synonyms may be said have a *connotation of duration* in their semantic structure. Other examples are: to flash (brief) - to blaze (lasting); to shudder (brief) - to shiver.

III. The synonyms to stare - to glare - to gaze are differentiated from the other words of the group by *emotive connotations*, and from each other by the nature of the emotion they imply. Here one should be warned against confusing words

with emotive connotations and words with emotive denotative meanings (e. g. to love - to admire - to adore - to worship; angry -furious — enraged; fear - terror — horror).

IV. The *evaluative connotation* conveys the speaker's attitude towards the referent, labeling it as good or bad. So in the group well-known -famous - notorious - celebrated, me adjective notorious bears a negative evaluative connotation and celebrated a positive one. Cf: a notorious murderer, robber, swindler, coward, lady-killer, flirt, but a celebrated scholar, artist, singer, man-of-letters.

V. The *causative connotation* can be illustrated by the examples to sparkle and to glitter: one's eyes sparkle with positive emotions and glitter with negative emotions. The causative connotation is also typical of the verbs to shiver and to shudder, in whose semantic structures the cause of the act or process of trembling is encoded: to shiver with cold, from a chill, because of the frost; to shudder with fear, horror, etc. (also to blush from modesty, shame or embarrassment) and to redden (from anger or indignation)

VI. The *connotation of manner* can be singled out in some groups of verbal synonyms The verbs to stroll - to stride - to trot - to pace - to swagger - to stagger - to stumble all denote different ways and types of walking, encoding in their semantic structures the length of pace, tempo, gait and carriage, purposefulness or lack of purpose.

VII. The verbs to peep and to peer are *connotations of duration and manner*. But there is some other curious peculiarity in their semantic structures. One peeps at smb./smth. through a hole, crack or opening, from behind a screen, a half-closed door, a newspaper, a fan, a curtain, etc. It seems as if a whole set of scenery were built within the word's meaning. Of course, it is not quite so, because "the set of

scenery" is actually built in the context, but, as with all regular contexts, it is intimately reflected in the word's semantic structure thus demonstrating the connotation of attendant circumstances. This connotation is also characteristic of to peer: one peers at smb./smth. in darkness, through the fog, through dimmed glasses or windows, from a great distance; a shortsighted person may also peer at things. So, in the semantic structure of to peer are encoded circumstances preventing one from seeing clearly.

VIII. The synonyms pretty, handsome, beautiful are more or less interchangeable. Yet, each of them describes a special type of human beauty: beautiful is mostly associated with classical features and a perfect figure, handsome with a tall stature, a certain robustness and fine proportions, pretty with small delicate features and a fresh complexion. This connotation may be defined as the *connotation of attendant features.*

IX. *Stylistic connotations* stand somewhat apart for two reasons. Firstly, some scholars do not regard the word's stylistic characteristic as a connotative component of its semantic structure. Secondly, stylistic connotations are subject to further classification, namely: colloquial, slang, dialect, learned, poetic, terminological, archaic, cf. (Meal). Snack, bite (coll.), snap (dial), repast, refreshment, feast (formal). These synonyms, besides stylistic connotations, have connotations of attendant features: snack, bite, snap all denote a frugal meal taken in a hurry; refreshment is also a light meal; feast is a rich or abundant meal. Or (to leave). To be off, to clear out (coll.), to beat it, to hoof it, to take the air (si,), to depart, to retire, to withdraw (formal). According to whether the difference is in denotational or connotational component synonyms are classified into ideographic and stylistic. Ideographic synonyms denote different shades of meaning or different degrees of a given quality. They are nearly identical in one or more denotational meanings and interchangeable at least in some contexts, e.g. beautiful – fine - handsome - pretty. Beautiful conveys, for instance, the

strongest meaning; it marks the possession of that quality in its fullest extent, while the other terms denote the possession of it in part only. Fineness, handsomeness and prettiness are to beauty as parts to a whole (also compare constituents of the synonymic group choose, select, opt, elect, pick). Pictorial language often uses poetic words, archaisms as stylistic alternatives of neutral words (e.g. bliss for happiness, steed for horse, quit for leave). In many cases a stylistic synonym has an element of elevation in its meaning (e.g. face - visage, girl — maiden). Along with elevation of meaning there is the reverse process of degradation (e.g. to begin- to fire away, to eat — to devour, to steal ~ to pinch, face — muzzle).

4.Sources of synonymy Scholars distinguish the following sources of synonymy:

1. Synonyms which originated from the native language (e.g. fast-speedy-swift; handsome-pretty-lovely; bold-manful-steadfast).
2. Synonyms created through the adoption of words from dialects (e.g. mother – minny (Scot.); dark-murk (O.N.); charm – glamour (Scot.); long distance call (AE) - trunk call (BE); radio (AE) - wireless (BE)).
3. Synonyms that owe their origin to foreign borrowings (e.g. help-aid (Fr); heaven – sky (Sc.); freedom – liberty (L.)).The peculiar feature of synonymy in English is the contrast between simple native words stylistically neutral, literary words borrowed from French and learned words of Greco-Latin origin.

Native	French Borrowing	Latin borrowings
to ask	to question	to interrogate
to end	to finish	to complete

4. Synonyms created by means of all word-forming processes productive in the language. It must be noted that synonyms may influence each other semantically

in two opposite ways: one of them is dissimilation or differentiation, the other – the reverse process, i.e. assimilation. Many words now marked in the dictionaries as "archaic" or "obsolete" have dropped out of the language in the competition of synonyms, others survived with a meaning more or less different from the original one. This process is called *synonymic differentiation* and is so current that is regarded as an inherent law of language development. Cf.: soil French borrowing - a strip of land. eorpe, land, folde OE synonyms – the upper layer of earth in which plants grow. → *soil, earth, ground* - the mould in which plants grow.

I. Consider your answers to the following.

1. Say why synonyms are one of the language's most important expressive means. Illustrate your answer with examples.

2. Synonyms are sometimes described as words with "dual" characteristics. What is meant by this?

3. The meanings of two apparent synonyms may be in a way opposed to each other. Why are such words still regarded as synonyms? Give examples.

4. How are synonyms traditionally defined? On what criterion is this definition based? Which aspects of this definition are open to criticism?

5. How can synonyms be defined in the terms of componential analysis? On what criterion is this definition based?

6. Show how the dual nature of synonyms can be clearly seen if they are regarded through semantic criterion.

7. Why is the definition of synonyms based on the criterion of interchangeability open to question? Illustrate your answer with examples.

8. What is the modern approach to classifying synonyms? Illustrate this classification with examples.

9. What connotations differentiate the verbs to peep and to peer; the adjectives pretty, handsome and beautiful?

LECTURE 7

Antonyms. Euphemisms. Neologysms.

1. Definition of Antonyms
2. Euphemisms. Neologysms.

1. Definition of Antonyms

Antonyms may be defined as two or rarely more words of the same language belonging to the same part of speech identical in style and nearly identical in distribution, associated and used together so that their denotative meanings render contrary or contradictory notions.

Antonymy is not evenly distributed among the categories of parts of speech. Most antonyms are adjectives, which seems to be natural because qualitative characteristics are easily compared and contrasted: *high - low, wide — narrow, strong — weak, old—young, friendly - hostile*.

Verbs take second place, so far as antonymy is concerned. Yet, verbal pairs of antonyms are fewer in number: to *lose - to find, to live - to die, to open - to close, to weep - to laugh.*

Nouns are not rich in antonyms, but even so some examples can be given: *friend'- enemy, joy - grief, good - evil, heaven - earth, love - hatred*. Antonymic adverbs can be subdivided into two groups:

a) adverbs derived from adjectives: *warmly - coldly, merrily - sadly, loudly - softly;*

b) adverbs proper: *now - then, here - there, ever - never, up - down, in - out.*

Nowadays most scholars agree that in the semantic structures of all words, which regularly occur in antonymic pairs, a special antonymic connotation can be singled out. We are so used to coming across hot and cold together, in the same contexts that even when we find hot alone, we cannot help subconsciously registering it as not cold, that is, contrast it to its missing antonym. The word possesses its full meaning for us not only due to its direct associations but also because we subconsciously oppose it to its antonym, with which it is regularly used, in this case to hot. Therefore, it is reasonable to suggest that the semantic structure of hot can be said to include the antonymic connotation of "not cold", and the semantic structure of enemy the connotation of "not a friend" .

A careful examination will reveal three kinds of oppositeness of meaning represented by the following pairs of antonyms. Consider: a) *narrow-wide, small-large, tall-short*; b) *alive-dead, male-female, open-shut; c) over-under, receive-give, wife-husband.*

The antonyms represented in the group a) are called gradable antonyms. They are adjectives which do not refer to absolute qualities, but which may be subject to comparison or qualification.

The antonyms represented in the group b) are called complementary antonyms. It means that the denial of one member of the pair implies the assertion of the other member

The antonyms represented in the pairs in c) are called converses or relational opposites. One member of the pair refers to the converse relation referred to by

the other member (e.g. if the bathroom os over the hall, then the hall is under the bathroom). A relation exists between the antonyms such that one is the converse of the other: they represent two (opposite) perspectives on the same relation. This type of antonymy is quite distinct from the other two and there appears to be no overlap.

2.Euphemisms. Neologysms.

There are words in every language which people instinctively avoid because they are considered indecent, indelicate, rude, too direct or impolite. As the "offensive" referents, for which these words stand, must still be alluded to, they are often described in a roundabout way, by using substitutes called euphemisms. This device is determined by social conventions which are sometimes apt to be over-sensitive, see "indecency" where there is none and seek refinement in absurd avoidances and pretentiousness.

Numerous euphemisms are used to avoid the so-called social taboos and are inspired by social convention. To illustrate, the word l*avatory* has, naturally, produced many euphemisms. Here are some of them: *powder room, washroom, restroom, retiring room, (public) comfort station, ladies' room), gentlemen's (room), water-closet, w. c., public conveniences.*

Pregnancy is another topic for "delicate" references. Here are some of the euphemisms used as substitutes for the adjective pregnant: *in an interesting/delicate condiition, in the family way, with a baby coming, (big) with child, expecting*. The apparently innocent word *trousers,* not so long ago, had a great number of euphemistic equivalents, some of them quite funny: *unmentionables, inexpressibles, indescribables, unwhisperables, you-mustn't-men-tion 'ems, sit-upons*.

Nowadays, however, nobody seems to regard this word as "indecent" any more, and so its euphemistic substitutes are no longer in use. A landlady who refers to

her *lodgers as paying guests* is also using a euphemism, aiming at half-concealing the embarrassing fact that she lets rooms.

There are many words which are easy targets for euphemistic substitution. These include words associated with *drunkenness (e.g. intoxicated (form.), under the influence (form.), tipsy, mellow, fresh, high, merry, flustered, overcome, full (coll.), boiled'(sl.), fried'(sl.), tanked (sl.), tight (sl.), stiff (sl.), pickled (sl.), soaked'(sl.), sheets to the wind (sl.), high as a kite, half-seas-over (sl.), under the surface, etc.); being in prison (to be in chokey, to be in the jug; to be involved in correctional facilities); unemployment (redundancies, downsizing, rightsizing); drugs (grass, mushrooms, acid, snow, speed); homelessness (shopping bag people – people who wander city streets with all their possessions in shopping bags* (Collins)).

Euphemisms may, of course, be used due to genuine concern not to hurt someone's feelings (e.g. a *lia*r can be described as *a person who does not always strictly tell the truth* and a *stupid man* can be said *to be not exactly brilliant*; *parotitis instead of mumps; H1N1 virus instead of swine flu; deceased instead of dead; to make smb a widow/a widower instead of to kill smb4; sanitary engineer instead of waste collector*).

Superstitious taboos have given rise to the use of another type of euphemisms. The reluctance to call things by their proper names is also typical of this type of euphemisms, but this time it is based on a deeply-rooted subconscious fear. Superstitious taboos have their roots in the distant past of mankind when people believed that there was a supernatural link between a name and the object or creature it represented.

Therefore, all the words denoting evil spirits, dangerous animals, or the powers of nature were taboo. If uttered, it was believed that unspeakable disasters would result not only for the speaker but also for those near him. That is why all creatures, objects and phenomena threatening danger were referred to in a descriptive way. So, a dangerous animal might be described as the *one-lurking-*

in-the-wood and a mortal disease *as the black death*. Euphemisms are probably the oldest type of synonyms, for it is reasonable to assume that superstitions which caused real fear called for the creation of euphemisms long before the need to describe things in their various aspects or subtle shades caused the appearance of other synonyms.

The Christian religion also made certain words taboo. The proverb Speak of the devil and he will appear must have been used and taken quite literally when it was first used, and the fear of calling the devil by name was certainly inherited from ancient superstitious beliefs. So, the word devil became taboo, and a number of euphemisms were substitutes for it: *the Prince of Darkness, the black one, the evil one, dickens (coll.), deuce (coll.), (Old) Nick (coll.). The word God, due to other considerations, also had a great number of substitutes which can still be traced in such phrases as Good Lord!, By Heavens!, Good Heavens.' (My) goodness!, (My) goodness gracious!, Gracious me!*

Even in our modern emancipated times, old superstitious fears still lurk behind words associated with death and fatal diseases. People are not superstitious nowadays and yet they are reluctant to use the verb to die which has a long chain of substitutes (e. g. *to pass away, to be taken, to breathe one's last, to depart this life, to close one's eyes, to yield (give) up the ghost, to go the way of all flesh, to go West (sl.), to kick off '(sl.), to check out (sl.), to kick the bucket (sl.), to take a ride (sl.), to join the majority)*

Mental diseases also cause the frequent use of euphemisms. A mad person may be described as insane, mentally unstable, unbalanced, unhinged, *not (quite) right (coll.), not all there (coll.), off one's head (coll.), off one's rocker (coll.), wrong in the upper storey (coll.), having bats in one's belfry (coll.), crazy as a bedbug (coll.), cuckoo (si.), nutty (si.), off one's nut (si.), loony (si.), a mental case, a mental defective, etc.* A clinic for such patients can also be discreetly referred to as, for instance, *an asylum, sanitarium, sanatorium, (mental) institution, and, less discreetly, as a nut house (sl.), booby hatch (sl.), loony bin*

(sl.), etc. To sum it up, the use of euphemisms and their very existence are caused either by social conventions or by certain psychological factors. Most of them have peculiar stylistic connotations in their semantic structures.

Talking about *neologisms*, it should be emphasized that the vocabulary is an adaptive system. To adapt means to undergo modifications in functions and structure so as to be fit for a new use, a new environment or a new situation. The concept of adaptive system permits us to study language as a constantly developing but systematic whole. The adaptive system approach gives a more adequate account of the systematic phenomena of a vocabulary by explaining more facts about the functioning of words and providing more relevant generalizations, because we can take into consideration the influence of extra-linguistic reality. The study of the vocabulary as an adaptive system reveals the pragmatic essence of the communication process, i.e. the way language is used to influence the addressee.

The adaptivity of the vocabulary can be observed by its results – by studying new words or neologisms. New notions come into being and require new words to name them. They are created irrespective of their scale of importance. They may concern some social relationships such as a new political form, or short-lived concepts, such as fashions in dancing, clothes, manners. In every case either the old words are appropriately changed in meaning or new words are borrowed, or more often coined out of the existing language material either according to the patterns and ways already productive in the language at the given stage of its development or creating new ones.

Thus, *a neologism* is a newly coined word or phrase or a new meaning for an existing word or a word borrowed from another language. The intense development of industry and science, social and cultural evolution have called forth the invention and introduction of a huge number of new words and changed the meaning of old ones (e.g. *aerobics, pulsar, software, hardware, black hole, feedback, hyper-market, isotope, chat show, generation Y, yumpie (young*

upwardly mobile professional person), ,m, Webcast wedding (a wedding broadcast by Internet), stress puppy, hurry sickness, breatharianism, pescephobe, WMWM (white married working mom), wasband (ex-husband), ageful (elderly), etc).

LECTURE 8

Semantic Change. Polysemy

1. Semantic Structure of the Word.
2. The Factors Accounting for the Semantic Change.
3. Types of Transference.
4. Polysemy.

1.Semantic Structure of the Word.

Word meaning is liable to change in the course of the historical development of language. Words acquire new meanings while some of the old ones die away. When the new meaning replaces the older or exists side by side with it as part of semantic structure of a polysemantic word, it enriches the vocabulary qualitatively. When it exists side by side with the older meaning, but is no longer associated with it, so that the semantic development results in the emergence of a new word, this contributes to the quantitative growth of the vocabulary. The break of the word "club" into a pair of homonyms ("*stick with one end*" and "*association of people meeting periodically*") gave a new lexical unit to the English vocabulary.

The branch of linguistics which specialises in the study of meaning is called *semantics.* The modern approach to semantics is based on the assumption that

the inner form of the word (i. e. its meaning) presents a structure which is called the *semantic structure* of the word.

Grammatical meaning is defined as the expression in speech relationships between words. For eg. The meaning of plurality in the words students, books, windows.

Lexical meaning is the realization of concept or emotion by means of a definite language system. The conceptual content of the word is expressed by its denotative meaning. It is the denotational meaning that makes communication possible.

Connotation is the pragmatic communicative value of the word receives depending on where, when, how, by whom for what purpose it may be used. There are four types of connotations: stylistic (we speak here about the appropriate functional style – slay – kill)), emotional (conveys the speakers emotions – mummy – mother), evaluative (show approval or disapproval of the spoken object – celebrated -well-known-notorious), intensifying (The degree of intensity is expressed) adore – love).

2. **The factors accounting for semantic change** may be divided into two groups:

1. Extra-linguistic.
2. Linguistic.

By extra-linguistic causes we mean various changes in the life of the speech community, changes in economic and social structure, in ideas, scientific concepts, way of life and other spheres of human activity as reflected in word meaning.

The progress of scientific knowledge has brought new notions attached to new meanings for many words, such as: *atom, atomic energy, solar system*, etc.

The change in emotional attitude to the referent is found, for instance, in the so-called *degradation of meaning*. *Knave* is a good example of this process. In Old

English the word *cnafa* first meant a boy, then a servant-boy, later a male servant, then it acquired the meaning of a man of humble birth or position and finally the word acquired a derogatory meaning – a tricky deceitful person.

Some changes of meaning can be described by purely *linguistic causes* – factors acting within the language system. The most common is so-called ellipsis. If in a phrase, made up of two words one of the word is omitted, its meaning is transferred to its partner. For example, the verb *to starve* originally meant "to die". It was habitually used in the collocation *starve of hunger,* then the second element was dropped but its meaning was transferred to the verb *starve*. The verb "to die" came to be used in a more general sense.

Similar semantic change may be observed in Modern English when the meaning of one word is transferred to another because they habitually occur together in speech. For example, we usually say "a weekly" and mean "a weekly newspaper".

Results of the semantic change may be observed in the changes in the denotative meaning of the word (extension and narrowing of meanings) or the alteration of its connotative meaning (elevation and degradation of meaning).

Extension of meaning is a semantic process when a word comes to be applied to a greater number of referents.

For example, the word salary comes from Latin *salarium,* which meant the money given to Roman soldiers to buy salt with. As we know now the word means "fixed payment paid regularly for services".

Other examples of extension:

Camp – originally a military camp; now "a place where people live in tents or hunts for some time".

Box – originally it was a small container for drugs, jewels and money; now any container.

Narrowing of meaning is the process contrary to extension. It is a semantic process when a word comes to apply to a fewer number of referents. Examples of narrowing:

Meat – (originally) edible flesh;

Hound – (originally) dog;

Worm – any reptile or insect

Poison – a drink

The process of narrowing occurs when a proper noun is used as a common noun.

For example:

city – the City (in London);

peninsula – the Peninsula (Iberian Peninsula).

The process of narrowing may be also present when an abstract noun becomes a concrete noun (e.g. beauty – a beautiful girl).

Elevation of meaning is the improvement of the connotative component of meaning.

For example, *minister* – (originally) a servant or an attendant;

fame – report, common talk, rumour.

Such changes are not always easily accounted for, but on the whole social changes are of importance for words that acquire better meanings.

Degradation of meaning is the acquisition by the word of some derogatory emotive charge.

For example:

knave – (originally)a boy;

silly – happy;

idiot – a private person.

3. Types of Transference.

Transference Based on Resemblance (Similarity*)* This type of transference is also referred to as *linguistic metaphor.* A new meaning appears as a result of associating two objects (phenomena, qualities, etc.) due to their outward similarity.

The noun *eye,* for instance, has for one of its meanings "hole in the end of a needle" (R. *ушко голки),* which also developed through transference based on resemblance. A similar case is represented by *the neck of a bottle.*

The noun *star* on the basis of the meaning "heavenly body" developed the meaning "famous actor or actress". Nowadays the meaning has considerably widened its range, and the word is applied not only to screen idols (as it was at first), but, also, to popular sportsmen (e. g. *football, stars),* pop-singers, etc.

The meanings formed through this type of transference are frequently found in the informal strata of the vocabulary, especially in slang . The slang meanings of words such as *nut, onion (= head), saucers (= eyes), hoofs* (==*feet)* and very many others were all formed by transference based on resemblance.

Transference Based on Contiguity Another term for this type of transference is *linguistic metonymy.* The association is based upon subtle psychological links between different objects and phenomena, sometimes traced and identified with much difficulty. The two objects may be associated together because they often appear in common situations, and so the image of one is easily accompanied by the image of the other; or they may be associated on the principle of cause and effect, of common function, of some material and an object which is made of it, etc.

The meaning of the adjective *sad* in Old English was "satisfied with food" (cf. with the R. *cum* which is a word of the same Indo-European root). Later this

meaning developed a connotation of a greater intensity of quality and came to mean "oversatisfied with food; having eaten too much". Thus, the meaning of the adjective *sad* developed a negative evaluative connotation and now described not a happy state of satisfaction but, on the contrary, the physical unease and discomfort of a person who has had too much to eat. The next shift of meaning was to transform the description of physical discomfort into one of spiritual discontent because these two states often go together.

The meaning of the noun *hand* realised in the context *hand of a clock (watch)* originates from the main meaning of this noun "part of human body". It also developed due to the association of the common function: the hand of a clock points to the figures on the face of the clock, and one of the functions of human hand is also that of pointing to things.

Another meaning of *hand* realised in such contexts as *factory hands, farm hands* is based on another kind of association: strong, skilful hands are the most important feature that is required of a person engaged in physical labour.

Meanings produced through transference based on contiguity sometimes originate from geographical or proper names. *China* in the sense of "dishes made of porcelain" originated from the name of the country which was believed to be the birthplace of porcelain.

Tweed ("a coarse wool cloth") got its name from the river Tweed and *cheviot* (another kind of wool cloth) from the Cheviot hills in England. The name of a painter is frequently transferred onto one of his pictures: *a Matisse — a painting by Matisse.*

4. Polysemy.

Polysemy – is a plurality of meaning. It is a semantic universal characteristic of most words in many languages, but it is more characteristic of the English vocabulary due to the monosyllable character of English words and

predominance of root words. The greater the relative frequency of the word, the more polysemic it is.

Different meanings of a word are referred to as lexico-grammatical variants of the word. All the lexico-grammatical variants of the word taken together form its semantic structure or semantic paradigm. Thus, in the semantic structure of the word "youth" three lexico-grammatical variants can be distinguished:

–the state of being young (an abstract uncountable noun);

– a young man (a countable noun);

– young men and women (a collective noun).

The main source of the development of regular polysemy is metaphoric and metonymic transference of meaning, which is commonplace and appears to be fundamental in living languages.

Degradation and elevation of meaning play a certain role in making words polysemantic. Word "story", for example, got additional meaning due to the degradation of meaning when the word became more negative than positive in its uses. (*Don`t tell me stories* (lies).

The opposite process – the elevation of meaning – may lead to polysemy as well.

A word may have both a **direct** and a **figurative** meaning.

The meaning is **direct** when it nominates the referent without the help of the context. The meaning is **figurative (or secondary**) when the object is named and at the same time characterized through its similarity with another object. In polysemy the secondary, derived meaning is connected with the primary meaning.

THE LIST OF QUESTIONS FOR EXAMINATION

1. Course of Modern English Lexicology: its aims and significance.
2. Two approaches to the study of language: synchronic anddiachronic.
3. Motivation. Definition. Types.
4. Research methods used in Lexicology.
5. Fundamental issues of general Linguistics. Definition oflanguage, word, paradigm.
6. Theoretical principles to the vocabulary study.
7. The volume of the vocabulary and its use.
8. Various lexical strata of the English vocabulary.
9. Variants and dialects. Social dialects (slang). Geographical dialects (Cockney).
10. The basic wordstork. The total volume of English vocabulary.
11. Stylistically neutral words.
12. Special terminology.
13. Specific literary layer of the English vocabulary. Poeticwords, archaic words.
14. Slang words.
15. Professionalisms. Jargonisms.
16. Neologisms. Their place in the vocabulary system of the English vocabulary.
17. Etymological characteristic of the Modern Englishvocabulary. Native and borrowed words.
18. Words of native origin. Semantic characteristic of nativewords.
19. Classification of borrowings according to the borrowed aspect.
20. Classification of borrowings according to thedegree of assimilation.

21. Latin borrowings. Periods of borrowing from Latin.
22. The Norman-French elements in the English vocabularysystem. Periods of borrowings.
23. Italian and Spanish borrowings.
24. German and Holland borrowings.
25. The structure of English words. Definition of morpheme,root, affix.
26. Productive ways of word-formation.
27. Affixation. Suffixation. Prefixation.
28. Composition. Classification of compound words.
29. Conversion.
30. Shortening of words. Abbreviations.
31. Non-productive ways of word-formation. Sound-interchange.
32. Non-productive ways of word-formation. Stress shifting.
33. Non-productive ways of word-formation. Sound imitation.
34. Non-productive ways of word-formation. Blending.
35. Lexical and grammatical meaning.
36. Change of word meaning. Specialization and generalization.
37. Change of word meaning. Metaphor and metonymy.
38. Change of word meaning. Degradation and elevation.
39. Change of word meaning. Hyperbole and litotes.
40. Meaning and polysemy. Semantic structure of polysemanticwords.
41. Synonymy.
42. Euphemisms.
43. Antonymy.
44. Homonymy. Sources of homonymy. Classification of homonyms.
45. Different approaches to the classification of phraseological units.
46. Proverbs and sayings as specific types of phraseological units.
47. Lexicography as a science of compiling dictionaries.

48. Types of dictionaries.
49. History of British lexicography.
50. History of American lexicography

INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH TASKS

1. Choose any topic and prepare a report (10 points).

1. Neologisms in Modern English.
2. Terminology in Modern English.
3. The opposition of stylistically marked and stylistically neutralwords.
4. Semasiological peculiarities of non-standard lexical units inModern English.
5. The development of English vocabulary at the end of XX –the beginning of XX centuries.
6. Etymological analysis of Modern English vocabulary.
7. Semantic and communicative characteristics of French /Latin / Italian / Spanish / German / Scandinavian borrowings.
8. Compound words in Modern English.
9. Morphological structure of English words.
10. Conversion and similar phenomena.
11. Synonymic prefixes in the English language.
12. The role of suffix -er in the lexical and grammatical meaningsof a word in Modern English.
13. Morphological characteristics of English adjectives (nouns,verbs).
14. Lexical meaning and semantic structure of English words.
15. Polysemy of English verbs.
16. Structural and cognitive aspects of English metaphor.
17. Homonymy in Modern English.
18. Semantic characteristics of synonyms in Modern English.
19. Verbal phraseological units in Modern English.
20. Systemic and functional characteristics of English proverbs.

21. Semantic peculiarities of English and Ukrainian proverbs.
22. Semantic relations in Phraseology.
23. Historical development of English Lexicography.
24. The development of American Lexicography.
25. Classification of dictionaries.
26. The main problems of Lexicography.

2. Study the following works of English and American linguists and answer the questions in written form (1 work – 5 points).

A. William de Groot

CLASSIFICATION OF WORD-GROUPS

Introduction

The classification of word-groups is a much neglected subject. Most syntactic descriptions of a language distinguish different types of word-group without making a systematic attempt to classify them. They usually distinguish the so-called subject-predicate group, the coordinative group, and a variety of others, such as verb-object, prepositional phrase, et cetera. [...]

In his book *Language* Leonard Bloomfield presents the following classification, illustrated by means of examples taken from English:

A. Endocentric constructions,

1. coordinative (or: serial), and 2. subordinative (or: attributive);

B. exocentric constructions. [...]

Bloomfield's classification is made by means of criteria of distribution, i. e. syntactic use, in about the following way.

A group is called coordinative, if it has the same distribution as two or more of its members: *boys and girls; bread and butter; coffee, tea, and milk.*

A group is called subordinative, if it has the same distribution as one of its members: *fresh milk, very fresh.* In *fresh milk* the member *milk* is called the 'head', and *fresh* the 'adjunct'.

Coordinative and subordinative groups are called 'endocentric'.

A group is called exocentric, if it has a distribution different from either of the members, e. g. *John ran; with John; if – John ran away, (greater) than – Johh.* [...]

Distinguishing between types of word-group

In dealing with classifications of word-groups, one has to bear in mind constantly, first, that each language has a system of its own, and, second, that – whatever criterion of classification we apply – the number of distinguishable types varies considerably from one language to another. I shall illustrate this by giving what I consider a fairly complete listof the main types existing in Chinese, Latin, and English.

ENGLISH. The number of main types is about 14, and some of them can be sub-divided according to part of speech of the members.

A. COORDINATIVE GROUP. *Men, women, (and) children; laughed, cried, shouted; red, white, and blue (flowers);and/or; before or after (the war).*

B. NON-COORDINATIVE, NON-PREDICATIVE GROUPS.

1) Descriptive groups, so-called modified with modifier. This category falls into several sub-types, first, accordingto the part

of speech of the modified, and, second, according to the part of speech, or the part of speech anda certain morphological category of the modifier, e. g. the possessive of a noun *(John's house).*

The head is:

A noun: *John the Baptist; red flowers; barking dogs; two flowers; these flowers; a flower; John's house; the above remark; flowers from Paris; the children who were ready; also I; even John.*

(Most of these groups can be made predicative by putting the adjunct after the noun, and setting it off by breaks *: *John, the Baptist, died; the dogs, barking furiously, (ran into the garden); the children, who were ready, (left).* Such predicative groups are classified below under C 2) b) 'head with appositive').

An adjective: *very happy.*

A numeral: *nearly seven.*

An adverb: *very happily.*

A verb; the adjunct may be an adverb, *walk carefully;* a prepositional phrase, *walk in the garden;* a subordinate clause, *walk, if you like.*

2) Transitive verb with 'resultative' adjective (or equivalent noun), *(he) painted (the door) green; take off (your coat); (they) made (him) president.* (This group is usually a 'split group', the object being put between verb and adjective).

3) Intransitive verb with 'descriptive' adjective, *(he) left – angry; having left – angry, (he became ill); (he) came home – wet.*

4) Connective groups:

a) Coordinating conjunction with a word of any part of speech, *(Mary) and– John; (Mary) or – John; neither – Mary* (nor John);

Subordinating 'conjunctive':

1. Preposition with personal pronoun in the objective case (or equivalent noun, etc.), *with him, with John.*

2. Subordinating conjunction with clause, *if – John wentaway.*

5) Copulative verb (or equivalent) with complement: *(he) was – ill; (she) was elected – president.*

6) Verb with object (i. e. personal pronoun in the objective case, or equivalent), *(I) saw – him.*

(The equivalent of the verb may be 'verb with object'. If so, its object is called 'indirect object', (/) *gave him the book. Him* is object of *gave the book,* and called 'indirect' object.

The equivalent of the object may be a group of a special type, 'objective with verbal', which is classified next, under 7), *(I) saw him come down the stairs.)*

7) Objective with verbal, *(I saw) him – come down the stairs; (I saw) him – coming down the stairs.* So-called 'accusative with infinitive'.

8) Auxiliary verb with verbal (i. e. with infinitive, ed-form, or ing-form), (7) *have – seen; (I) am – seeing; (I) shall – see, (I) will – see; (I) do – see, (I) didn't – see.* So-called 'compound verbs'.

9) Clause with attitudinal adjunct; the adjunct is:

a) An adverb, *he will probably come; fortunately, they were away at the time.*

b) A so-called conjunction, *this, however, is a debatable point; the books were, of course, left in the library.*

c) A 'final', *lie will come, eh? you aren't ready, are you?*

C. PREDICATIVE GROUPS

1) Independent, i. e. frequently used as the whole word-content ofa

sentence. We call it 'the clause'. One member is a personal pronoun in the subjective case (or equivalent: noun, etc.), the other member is a so- called 'finite verb', *he – left, dogs – bark.*

2) Dependent, i. e. normally not used as the whole word-content ofa sentence:

a) Subjective with verbal, so-called 'absolute construction' *he– being a bachelor, (his sister stayed with him); human nature – being what it is, (you couldn't have expected anything else);*

Head with appositive. The appositive is set off by breaks. It usually follows the head: *the boy, angry, (left); John, the Baptist, (died);the children, who were ready, (left).* (Cf. *the angry boy; John the Baptist; the children who were ready (left).*

The preceding lists were intended to show, first, how, at a first and preliminary stage of investigation and description, distinctions can be made between types of word-group within the same language, and,second, that the result is not the same for different languages. There is a noticeable difference in the types of groups, and in the number of groups. As to the last point, we stated that Chinese has four types, none of which present clearly distinguishable sub-types, whereas Latin has about sixteen, and English about fourteen main groups, some of which fall into a number of clearly distinguishable sub-types.

Consequently, the procedure applied so far was only a matter of preliminary distinction. The next question, i. e. the problem of the criteria applied, and the problem of classification, will be dealt with in the following chapter.

The problem of classification

Man hat die Telle in der Hand,

Fehlt, leider, nur das geistige Band.

In dealing with classification of word-groups, or of units of any other kind in a given language, it is not unfrequently overlooked, first, that units of any kind can be classified in different ways, second, that a classification is intended to serve a certain purpose, and, third, that the merits of a given classification depend (a) upon the importance of the purpose, and (b) upon whether it serves the purpose, or not.

What I have in mind, with regard to word-groups, is illustrated – at least in some respects – by the preceding.

It is obvious that Ries, Bloomfield, and Trubetzkoy classify word-groups in different ways; apparently, different criteria are used for distinction. In none of the three cases is the purpose for which the classification is made clearly stated. [...]

Distribution

It is one of the merits of Bloomfield to have shown the importanceof distribution as a criterion for classifying word-groups. Before discussing distribution as a feature of types of groups, I should like to formulate two objections to Bloomfield's procedure.

From Bloomfield's own point of view, it would, in my opinion, have been more logical and fruitful to start with a distinction between different distribution of the groups themselves, instead of starting with different distribution of members. The result of the latter procedure is that his category of 'exocentric constructions' is a catch-all, comprising, for instance, the

predicative group *John ran* and the connective group *with John.* If the distribution, of the groups themselves had been taken into account first, especially by noticing that *John ran* is a 'favorite sentence-form', the predicative group would have received its unique position in English syntax. [...]

A minor objection concerns the terms 'endocentric' and 'exocentric', which I consider unnecessary neologisms, but this question depends, perhaps, on the other question whether a special name is desirable for what I have called the catch-all, or not.

Other objections, concerning the value of his procedure from the point of view of structural linguistics, will be discussed below.

In dealing with distribution as a feature of groups, I distinguish between the distribution of the group, and the distribution of its members.

1) Distribution of the group.

For this purpose we have to distinguish the various types of distribution of *syntactic units* in general. A syntactic unit is either a *word* or a *word-group.*

There are only two main types of syntactic distribution. The unit is used either as an independent, or as a member of a word-group.

An *independent* is used either as the whole word-content of a sentence, *Alas Mary! John died,* or as a part of it, *Alas, Mary, John died.*The last sentence has three independents. They are not members of a word-group. They are not, for instance, members of a coordinative group. The criterion, in this case, is that the use of coordinating conjunctions would be impossible: *Alas and Mary and John died;* this distinguishes the combination from the coordinative group *Eat, drink, be merry,* into which coordinative conjunctions may be inserted: *Eat, drink,and be merry. Eat, or drink, or be merry.*

A *member of a word-group* is either a head, or an adjunct, or a conjunct, or

a coordinate. The difference is defined in terms of syntactic omissibility of members of the group. As syntactic omissibility is a matter of degree, no rigid lines of demarcation can be drawn betweenthe three categories, but the distinction itself is of fundamental importance. The test to be applied is the omission test.

A *head* is defined as a member that cannot be omitted without affecting the structure of the rest of the sentence, whereas the other member can be omitted in the same sense. In the sentence / *have fresh milk,* the word *milk* is head of the group *fresh milk. I have milk* is possible, / *have fresh* is impossible.

An *adjunct* is defined as the omissible member of a group of which the other member is not omissible, e. g. *fresh* in *fresh milk.*

A *conjunct* is defined as a non-omissible member of a group of which the other member is equally non-omissible, e. g. both *John* and *ran* in *John ran,* or both *with* and *John* in *with John.*

A *coordinate* is defined as a member of a word-group of which each member is omissible. Examples are *men, women,* and *children* in the group *men, women, children(cried).*

It is obvious that each of these five types of distribution, andseveral combinations of them, is a typical feature of some type of group in some language. [...]

2) Distribution of members of the group

This is Bloomfield's basic criterion in classifying word-groups.

It is obvious that it is a typical feature of many types of groups. For examples I may refer to the discussion of Bloomfield's classification in the *Introduction,*

In the following I shall use the terms coordinative group(consisting of coordinates, as defined above), adjunctive group (consisting of a head and an adjunct), and conjunctive group (consisting of two conjuncts). I believe

that this terminology is preferable to the use of endocentric and exocentric constructions. Its disadvantage is that 'coordinative' is used both in a structural and in a purely distributional sense. As, however, the two concepts in practice apply to exactly the same groups, I do not believe that there will be any ambiguity.

Classification according to meanings

It can, in my opinion, hardly be doubted that the word-groups of a given language can be classified according to their meanings no less satisfactorily than- according to any other kind of feature. There are, of course, as everywhere in a language, borderline cases. I have already re- marked that the degree-character of omissibility creates many borderline cases in the application, of criteria of distribution. There are equally borderline cases between parts of speech, between syntactically free and fixed order, and so on.

For establishing meanings as features of types of groups, we have to start from the fundamental distinction between *attitudinal* and *referential meanings.*

The distinction is fundamental, among other things, because it pervades the whole structure of a language system on all its main levels. An *attitudinal meaning* is defined as the expression of an attitude of the speaker to something, e. g. *alas.* A *referential meaning* is defined as merely denoting, or referring to, something, either by naming it *(John, boy, red, arrive, with, if),* or by pointing it out *(he, this, so).*

The attitude expressed is either 'intellectual', i. e. a belief in the' existence or non-existence of something *(Vivit. He lives.),* or 'non-intellectual', e.g. an emotion *(alas),* a wish to draw somebody's attention (the vocative, *Brule),* a wish that the hearer do something (the impera- tive, *vent),* et cetera.

The same distinction largely parallels the difference between the two

constituents or 'levels' of the sentence, i. e. words and intonation (or,better, sentence-form), in that intonation is never referential, but always attitudinal, and words are referential and/or attitudinal. Merely refer- ential are *John, boy, red,* etc. Merely attitudinal are *yes* and *no* (intellectual, expressing a belief in truth or falsity of a statement), and *alas* (expressing an emotional attitude). Both referential and attitudinal are vocatives *(Brute),* imperatives *(veni),* and, in languages such asSanskrit, Greek, and Latin, the finite verb, *venio, venit* (expressing a belief; *venit,* I believe that he is coming).

On the level of the parts of speech, the distinction parallels the difference between interjections on the one hand, and, with a few exceptions, all other parts of speech on the other.

On the level of morphology, it distinguishes, in the system of the cases of the noun in Latin, the vocative from all other cases; in the morphological system of the verb, the imperative and the finite verb from, the infinitive and participles.

Even on the level of the vocabulary it plays a certain role, e. g. in the difference between *children* and *brats,* and between *poor* in thesense of without money, *a poor man,* and for the expression of anattitude of the speaker, *poor man!*

The distinction is of no less importance with regard to features of word-groups. It may well be that all languages have an opposition between predicative, i. e. attitudinal, and non-predicative groups. The group *dogs bark* is clearly attitudinal, predicative, and the group *barkingdogs* is clearly referential, It may be added that a similar distinction mustbe made between different uses of the same type of group, for instance between referential use of *me miseram* in *vocat me miseram,* and attitudinal use of the same group in *Me miseram!* (accusative of exclamation). [...]

On the basis of this fundamental distinction, we may distinguish different kinds of attitudinal, and different kinds of referential meanings as features of groups. I need merely recall the 'enumeration', presentedby

coordinative groups, 'description' by the group modified-modifier, 'relation to something' by connective groups, and so on.

I shall give one example of a type of group that has features on several levels, as distinguished above, in order to illustrate my points, first, that in a complete description of a language all these features should be described, and, second, that, in a given language, the groupcan satisfactorily be defined in terms of one, or a limited number of different" features.

My example is the coordinative group in English.

A typical auditory feature of the group, which it has in common with only very few other groups, is the segmentation by means of breaks, in English script indicated by commas. It may be noticed that thebreak is less marked, or optional, before a coordinative conjunction, e. g.before *and* in *men, women and children (cried),* but this is of secondary importance. The group has a unique auditory feature in what may be described as 'even stress' on all members.

The members of the group are not separable (unless by 'insertion', defined as a separate attitudinal expression: *Men, I think, women, and children, cried).*

It is typical of the group that the order of its members is syntactically irrelevant: *children, women, men cried.*

It is a unique feature of the group that it may have more than two members.

It is typical of the group also that, with very few exceptions which can easily be formulated *(Mother and I went away),* the part of speech ofthe members is the same. Even some morphological categories are the same, e. g. the case of the personal pronoun *(I saw him and her),* the case of the noun *(John's and Mary's books),* and the general category of the verb *(singing and swinging).* There are very few groups in~ English of which both members may be the same part of speech: *(a) bird's nest,*

(I) shall see (him), very happily, but in all of them there is some difference, so that I believe that, in English, the coordinative group can satisfactorily and completely be defined in terms of the part of speech and the morphological category of the members.

Distribution is a unique feature of the group also in that eachmember is omissible. A difficulty, however, arises here by the fact that 'omissibility' or, in Bloomfield's terminology, 'the same' or 'not the same distribution as that of the whole group' is a matter of degree. This is one of the weak points in the use of the criterion of distribution, which Ishall not discuss in detail. To give one example: in *milk and scones wereon the table,* strictly speaking neither *milk* nor *and scones* nor even *scones* is omissible, and neither *milk* nor *and scones* has exactly thesame distribution as the group *milk and scones.*

Last, but not least, meaning-is a unique feature of the group, which may be formulated by saying that it presents an enumeration of similar things. However we wish to formulate this feature of meaning, there can hardly be any doubt about the fact that it is typical of this type of group, and of no other.

Meaning, form, and distribution

In order to avoid misunderstandings, and to warn against overestimating the importance of distribution as a criterion for structural classification, I wish to say here a few words on a subject to which I intend to return in more detail, namely the relations between meaning, auditory form, and syntactic distribution.

I have called both form and distribution 'correlates of meaning'. Generally speaking, we may say that form is a *means* to convey meaningand that distribution is mainly the *result* of two factors: the meaning of the given word or group, and the semantic structure of the sentence, the 'sentence-

pattern', in the given language. The word or word-group is useable, or not useable, or useable under certain conditions only, as a certain member of a certain sentence pattern, if its meaning agrees with the semantic function of that member. The key fits, or does not fit, into the lock.

Consequently, both form and distribution are indicative of meaning, both to the hearer, and to the linguist. This is why I have calledform and distribution 'identificational features' of word-groups.

Neither form nor distribution are completely reliable indicators of meanings, or of similarities and dissimilarities between meanings.

Two words, for instance, may have the same form, but a different meaning, if they are homonyms, e. g. *hair* and *hare.* They may have a different form, but the same meaning, 'if they are 'exact synonyms', e. g. *gorse* and *furze.*

Distribution is not a reliable indicator either, because it js not only the result of meaning and sentence-pattern, but also of 'disturbing factors', such as arbitrary idiom, and what may be called 'personal idiom', as poetical licenses.

Moreover, not all words that have the same syntactic distribution have the same meaning, e. g. on the lexical level, words belonging to thesame part of speech: *Peter* and *John; red, blue,* and *yellow; boy* and *girl,* and, conversely, not all words with different distribution have a differentmeaning, e. g. *grosse,* and *grosser* in German *der grosse Mann* and *ein grosser Mann.* [...]

AIDS TO THE STUDY OF THE TEXT

1. *What is the criterion of Bloomfield's classification of word-groups?*
2. *What is the difference between coordinative and subordinative groups in Bloomfield's classification?*

3. What are the distinguishing features of endocentric andexocentric word-groups?

4. Enumerate the main types of word-groups in English.

5. Are the types of groups and the number of groups the same in different languages?

6. What is understood by the term 'head' of the word-group?

7. What are the author's objections to Bloomfield's classification?

8. Review the definition of the terms adjunct, conjunct,coordinate in the author's classification.

9. What criterion of classification of word-groups does the author suggest?

10. How does the author understand the criterion of classification according to meaning?

Arthur G. Kennedy

CURRENT ENGLISH

CONVERSION AND CONFUSION OF THE PARTS OF SPEECH

One of the chief results of the foregoing attempt at a systematic classification of the eight parts of speech and their various subdivisions should be a realization that all words do not lend themselves at all times to clear-cut distinctions. Words shift from one part of speech to another by the process of conversion; at times a word becomes a sort of hybrid, functioning as two different parts of speech at the same time and fusing them together; and sometimes a word is so utilized that this fusion or confusion produces uncertainty in the mind of the speaker or writer. [...] When Sweet used the

word *conversion* in his New English Grammarin 1892, he was one of the first grammarians to employ the term in its more restricted grammatical sense and perhaps one of the first to revolt against a tendency to put every word into a hard-and-fast classification as a part of speech. Since that time there has been a more general recognition of the shifting character of the Modern English parts of speech and of the almost puzzling flexibility that this one characteristic of Current English gives to the language. [...]

A. Conversion

Conversion has already been defined as "a shift from one part of speech to another." But this functional change has also been observed in a shift from one kind of noun to another, or one kind of verb to another, or one kind of adverb to another; and it seems logical to regard conversion as functional change not only between the parts of speech butalso within each part of speech. It should be insisted also that conversionand derivational change are two distinct processes; derivational change by the use of prefixes and suffixes shifts words between the parts of speech, and also within each, by producing different forms, as, for example, the adjective *wide,* the noun *width,* and the verb *widen,* whereas conversion makes no change in the form of a word but only in its general functions. And, finally, it is necessary to recognize various stages of conversion; in 'The *poor* are with us always' the adjective is not completely converted into a noun, but in 'He sold his *goods* finally' the adjectival value of *good* has disappeared so completely that the wordcan take the plural ending -s like any other noun. When a word has changed its function to such an extent that it is capable of taking on new inflectional endings, then the process of conversion may be considered complete. Moreover, conversion may be regarded as complete when a word has been substantivized to the point where it can be modified by adjectives, as in *the others, a lunatic, good reading;* or verbalized to the point where it

can be modified by adverbs, as in *telephone soon, motor often.*

a) Interchange of nouns and verbs in Current English is so commona form of conversion, as in *a run* and *to run, a try* and *to try,* 'to make *a go* of it' and *to go,* that further discussion should be unnecessary.

b) The substantivation of adjectives has always been an important process in English and is active today. Some of the earlier substantivations have been so long established as nouns that English- speakers no longer realize that they ever were adjectives; in many instances, however, the substantival use of the adjective is only temporary, and as soon as the need is past, the word reverts to its usual adjectival function. [...]

There are two stages in the substantivation of adjectives: the more complete, when the word can be declined like any other noun; and the less complete, when declension is not yet possible. The most advanced stage has been reached by the old native or borrowed adjectives in*aliens, the ancients, belles, the commons, elders, goods, innocents, negro spirituals, nobles, pagans, privates, a quarterly, the ritual, sides* (early meaning as adjective 'wide'), and *thoughs.* All the collective names like *American, Asiatic, Bostonian,* and *Chinese* are substantivizedproper adjectives. Many older participles are today nouns, such as *a compact, the deceased, a drunk, dug-out, fact, fiend, friend, a grownup, The Illustrated, her intended, left-overs, Occident, Orient,* and *primate.* Sometimes even the compound adjectives are so completely substantivized as to be capable of declension, as, for instance, *Black and Tans, hand-mades, two-year-olds.*

Adjectives are usually still in the indeclinable stage when they become collective nouns like *the aged, the dead, the halt and the blind, the infirm, rich and poor, the wealthy, young and old.*

c) The interchange of concrete, abstract, and collective nouns, such as *battery, circle,* and *shaving,* has already been commented upon. The verbal

nouns in *-ing* often take the plural -s endings when they become concrete, as in *earnings, filings, findings, shavings, sweepings.*

d) The verbal noun in *-ing,* often known as the gerund, is sometimes confused with the verbal adjective, known as the participle. Ordinarily there is no reason for confusion when the gerund is used in nominative constructions, asin *'Seeing* is *believing*[1]*;* but in objective constructions, after a verb or a preposition, there is often a fusion of adjectival (participial) and nominal (gerundial) functions which causes uncertainty regarding both the proper classification of these *-ing* words and the correct syntactical uses of them. [...]

e) Commonization is merely the process of making a common noun (or a verb or a common adjective) out of a proper noun (name). Since it has added largely to the English vocabulary, it will be considered in detail later. But it is too important a phase of conversion tobe entirely passed over in this present survey. At first some familiarname of history or literature is used figuratively, and a man is called a gay *Lothario,* a *Shylock* of greed, or a *Solomon* of wisdom. If the idea needs frequent expression, the term becomes more and more common, until we find embedded in the English vocabulary such words as *a guy* (from *Guy Fawkes), to hector* or *maudlin* (from *Magdalen).* So place- names likewise yield common nouns, giving, for example, *buncombe,* spelled also *bunkum* (from *Buncombe County,* North Carolina), *currants* (from *Corinth), wienies* (from German *Wien,* English *Vienna).*

f) When the relative and interrogative pronouns *which* and *what,* the demonstratives *this, that, yon,* and *yonder,* and various indefinites like *many, some,* and *each* are used as modifiers of nouns, the conversion may be regarded as complete and the term *prenominal adjective* an appropriate one. They are pronouns when they stand in place of norms, and adjectives when they modify nouns, and it is always possible to distinguish clearly between

the two functions.

g) The varying use of *who, which,* and *what* as relatives introducing subordinate clauses, as in 'I saw the man *who* brought it', and as interrogatives introducing questions, as in *'Who* brought it?', may wellbe considered in a discussion of conversion, since their functional shift changes their pronominal classification.

The same thing may be said of those compound pronouns like *myself* and *themselves* which function as intensives when they follow in apposition, as in 'I *myself* will go' or 'I will go *myself,* but as reflexives when they become the objects of verbs, as in 'They have hurt *themselves'.*

[...]

d) When the same form is used for both adjective and adverb as in the case of *better, high, low, right, well,* and *wrong,* only the function of the word determines which part of speech it is. So the adjective of 'He looks *well'* is converted into an adverb of manner in 'He sings *well'.*

e) The auxiliary verbs *be, have, do,* and *will* can be converted into notional verbs by a simple change of construction. As long as they are used with verbal forms, as in *be going, have finished, do wish, will come,*they are auxiliary, or helping, verbs; but when they are used with nouns, pronouns, adjectives, or adverbs, as in *be sick, be away, have need, do well,* and *will a thing,* they become notional verbs.

f) Active verbs are converted into passives when they are used in such a manner as to indicate that the subject is really acted upon, as in 'How *did* it *clean?'* and 'It *dyes* beautifully.'

g) When a preposition such as *about, by, down, in, on,* or *over* has an object, as in *'in* the box', its prepositional status is unquestioned; but when it has no object, as in 'Come *in',* it is certainly an adverb. [...]

h) The gradual conversion of adverbs of manner like *awfully, likewise, simply,* and *surely* into adverbs of degree or of assertion is a fairly

common process in English. From the careful use of the word *simply* as an adverb of manner in 'He spoke *simply,* and clearly' it is buta step to the colloquial use of it to show degree of intensity in 'He was *simply* wild'. [...]

i) Several conjunctions become prepositions when they are followed by objects instead of clauses or other coordinate constructions. Some grammarians call the coordinating conjunction *but* a preposition in'I saw no one *but* his father', although others consider it still a conjunction; certainly *for* is a preposition in 'tea *for* seven'. Likewise the subordinating conjunctions *after, as far as, before, ere, since,* and *until* become prepositions in such constructions as *after dark, before night,* and *until noon.* It is this interchangeable character of these words, no doubt, that is responsible for the objectionable use of the prepositions *except, like,* and *without* as conjunctions in such sentences as 'Don't take it *except (unless)* I give you permission', 'He plays *like (as)* I do', and 'Hecouldn't come *without (unless)* I brought him'.

AIDS TO THE STUDY OF THE TEXT

1. *What does Kennedy understand by the term 'conversion'?*
2. *What difference does Kennedy see between conversion and derivational change?*
3. *What is understood by complete and partial conversion?*
4. *What types of functional change does Kennedy distinguish?*
5. *What does Kennedy understand by commonization?*
6. *Does Kennedy make any distinction between a word as a unity of all its forms and the dictionary form of the word (e. g. try v., tries, tried, trying, etc.; try n, a try)?*

J. A. Sheard

THE WORDS WE USE

INTRODUCTION

[...] A chronological investigation most obviously begins with the native tongue, that was brought to these islands in the fifth century bythe Germanic tribes who eventually overran the native Britons. Theimportance of this purely Germanic basis is often overlooked, largely because of the great number of foreign words incorporated in our present-day vocabulary. But an examination of actual usage, as opposed to mere presence in a dictionary, shows how important the native words are. The next step will be to discuss the foreign words which have found a way into our language from those early days, and see not only which words they have displaced, when the object or idea was already known, but also what effect they have had on the native element.

Our method, then, will be to take the old Germanic element as the basis, and regard everything else as foreign. But it is not easy at first to grasp what this means. 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. When, under thisheading, such familiar words as *candle, lace, inch, mile, ounce, rose, school, street* and *wine* are mentioned, it will be realized that we shall need to classify under foreign borrowings, or loan-words, to use the technical term, many more words than the ordinary reader has been accustomed to consider under that heading, and some, at least, which areusually looked upon as native words. [...]

The influence of a foreign language may be exerted in two ways, through the spoken word, by personal contact between the two peoples, or through the written word, by indirect contact, not between the peoples

themselves but through their literatures. The former way was more productive in the earlier stages, but the latter has become increasinglyimportant in more recent times. Direct contact may take place naturally in border regions, or by the transference of considerable numbers of people from one area to another, either by peaceful immigration, settlement, or colonization, or through invasion and conquest. It mayalso take place, though to a more limited extent, through travel in foreign countries and through residence abroad, for trade or other purposes, of relatively small numbers of people.

The type of word borrowed by personal contact would undoubtedlyat first be names of objects unfamiliar to the borrowers, or products and commodities exchanged by way of trade. If the contacts were maintained over a long period, then ideas concerned with government, law, religion, and customs might be absorbed, and perhaps the names ofthese would be adopted. Only in the case of nations in relatively advanced stages of civilization would there be much influence exerted through the written word; concrete objects would come first, then abstract ideas learnt from what might actually be seen from their effects in everyday life and abstract ideas through the indirect contact achieved by books would come much later. [...]

THE NORMANS

[...] It is impossible to understand the effect of the influence of French in the Middle English period without knowing the historical and social conditions operative at the time, the relations between conquerors and conquered, the language used by the two races, their respective standards of culture. Moreover, the question of dominant and submerged races, of superior and inferior cultures, is an important factorin the way one language may influence another, and so this factor must of necessity be considered in this particular case, where the effect is so obvious.

In spite of Latin, Celtic, and Scandinavian influence, the general character and vocabulary of Old English in the middle of the eleventh century was essentially what it had been five centuries before, but in 1066 came the Norman Conquest, an event which had more influenceon the English language than any other from outside. [...]

There is an important difference between the influence now to be examined and the earlier foreign influences. The native language wasnot completely driven out, leaving little impression on the language of the conquerors, as had happened when the Angles and Saxons conquered the Britons, nor modified by a related language, as in the case of the Scandinavian invasion, but instead a second language was established in the country, in use side by side with the native language. The comparison may be carried further; Scandinavian first came into, and influenced chiefly, the north and north-east, whereas French was most influential in the south and south-east, a fact which became of increasing importance as a standard English language gradually developed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Scandinavian modified the existing language through related words and constructions, but French introduced entirely new words. Scandinavian made its way into the everyday speech of the people, whereas, although many French words eventually became part of our everyday speech, and can hardly be recognized today as foreign loan-words, the French element was in the main composed of words reflecting a high state of culture, and influenced at first chiefly the language of the upper classes. Or we may look at the question from another angle: English had held its ground easily against the competition of the native Celtic of the subject race; it had had little competition from Latin, as a spoken language; it had been but little affected by the closely-related Scandinavian, the language of a conquering people, probably because the conquest did not last long and was closely followed by another conquest, and also because the peoples and languages were closely related. But now we find English facing the

competition of an entirely different language, that of a conquering people who were able to maintain their position as distinctly foreign rulers for a comparatively long period. [...]

... English, which before the Conquest had been the official language of the country, used by all classes of people, and in which an important literature had been written, became merely the language of a subject lower class. In addition, the knowledge of French gave access to a rich literature. For nearly three centuries much of the literature written in England was written in French, translated from French, or strongly influenced by French models, and so it is not strange that the literary language was enriched by many French words, and these gradually made their way into familiar speech, so that today a large part of our vocabulary consists of words introduced from French in the four centuries following the Conquest. The influence which French exerted on our language is seen in all aspects of life, social, political, andreligious, and hardly any walk of life was unaffected by it. Had the Conquest not taken place it may be that English would have developed along entirely different lines, keeping in the main its Germanic characteristics, particularly as regards vocabulary, much as the German and Scandinavian languages have done, and therefore lacking the tremendous number of Romance words which are now an accepted part of our language. [...]

...It may be interesting to consider the general implication of sucha large adoption of French loan-words into English. The first point to be emphasized is that here we are not dealing with completely new ideas introduced from a different type of civilization and culture, but ratherthe imposing by a dominant race of their own terms for ideas whichwere already familiar to the subject race. Such a state of affairs obviously means that/there will arise pairs of words, the native and the foreign term, for the same idea, and a struggle for survival between the two, so that one of the words was eventually lost from the language, or else survived only with some differentiation of meaning.

Let us first take examples of native words replaced by French words; it is possible to compile a very long list, so here we must confine ourselves to a few, merely by way of illustration. ...*cynelic* was replaced by *royal, cynestol* by *throne, cynehelm* by *crown.* [...] *Dema* was replaced by *judge, firen* by *crime, sacu* by (law) *suit*. [...] Much of the loss of Old English vocabulary can be accounted for by the influx of French words for the same or a similar idea in the Middle Englishperiod.

Sometimes both the words have survived side by side, but in that case there has usually been some differentiation of meaning. [...] Although *dema* had given way to *judge* we still use the, verb *deem* [...], the unmutated form related to *dema* – judge, and *deman* – to judge. [...] There are many examples of these pairs of words, one a native word, the other a Romance loan, originally of either identical or similar meaning, with some distinction made today, such as [...] *freedom* and *liberty, happiness* and *felicity, help* and *aid, hide* and *conceal,* [...] *love* and *charity, meal* and *repast, wedding* and *marriage, wish* and *desire* [...], and we should find that the native word has a more emotional sense, is homely and unassuming, whereas the loanword is colder, aloof, more dignified, more formal. Sometimes, though very rarely, the native word may have the higher tone, as in *deed* and *act* or *action.* An obvious example to illustrate this point is the native *stink* and *stench* alongside *perfume* and *scent.* [...]

Sometimes the word may have disappeared from the standard language and yet have survived in regional dialect. OE *earn* was replaced by *uncle,* yet *erne* still survives in Scots dialect; *flitan* disappeared from the standard language, but some dialects retain *ftite* – to struggle, contend, especially with words.

This large-scale adoption had two other effects on our vocabulary. We saw that in the Old English period many ideas new to the English were expressed by a native form derived from a combination of native material, such as *bocere, sundor-halza, prowung,* and many others. Another

characteristic of Old English had been its ability to form many derivatives from a single root, thus extending the vocabulary at will by forming noun, verb, adjective or adverb, once the basic root was available. The adoption of these numerous French words in the Middle English period marks the beginning of the decline of these two native characteristics. In spite of the wholesale change in the character of the vocabulary, this change in the nature of the language is perhaps the greatest effect of French, and later Latin, influence. We have an entirely new approach to language, which is now expanded chiefly byborrowing, not creating [...]

PROFIT AND LOSS

[...] It was emphasized that all words of foreign origin were to be regarded as loans, no matter how well they might be established in the language, but now that we are considering the question from the point of view of improvement of the language, and as the question of the type of word will arise, and the difference between native and foreign words, we should bear in mind that the earliest Latin, Scandinavian, and French words have been so well assimilated that they seem to be almost as English as the native words – for the ordinary man there is a great dealof difference between such words as *mile, ounce, law, face,* and *beef* on the one hand, and *hypochondriac, orthodontics,* and *schizophrenia* on the other – and often the early loans are as short, expressive, and convenient as the native words. There is, then, a difference between the two types of loan-words, and the position of the former group lies perhaps midway between that of the original native word and the easily- recognized loan-word of later times, so that there is perhaps not the widegulf between native word and loan-word, the hard and fast division into two sharply-differentiated types, that might be expected. We have indeed, in the ultimate analysis, native words and borrowed words, but itwould seem that, apart from actual origin, there is a

good deal in common between some of the loan-words and our native words. Thishas been recognized from the very beginning of the purist reactionagainst loan-words, for very rarely has there been objection raised to these earlier, well-assimilated loan-words, especially from Scandinavian and French, but only to the later, longer, usually learned borrowings.

Another point must also be borne in mind in discussing the effectof all this borrowing on our language. If we are to base our reasoning on a study of the forms recorded in the dictionary it is very easy to overestimate the effect of the foreign words. The actual number of na- tive words in any of our large standard dictionaries is extremely small compared with the number of foreign borrowings recorded, and even if we were to confine our examination to those words in common use we should still find the native material outnumbered by about four to one. On the other hand, if we were to take a piece of English written on the popular level, or, better still, a passage of familiar conversation, we should find the proportions about reversed. It has been estimated thatless than fifty words, all of them native words, suffice for more than halfour needs, if we count every word used, including repetitions. Theproportion of native words to foreign will naturally vary with the subject-matter, and a present-day article on some aspect of scientific knowledge would naturally contain a higher proportion of loan-words than, say, a simple essay on a walk through the countryside, yet even in the scientific article the native words would probably outnumber the borrowings, if each word is counted every time it is used. [...]

Since the general opinion is that English has, in the main, benefited from the adoption of so many foreign loanwords, the advantages which have accrued from the use of these borrowings maybe taken first, and the obvious one is the wealth of synonyms whichhave been created by the adoption of a foreign word – in some cases, words, from more than one foreign language – to express an idea for which English already had a word. Some of these are what we may call perfect synonyms, those in which it is

very difficult to detect any difference at all in the meaning; others are not quite so exact, and there is some differentiation, though perhaps only in usage; a third group shows marked differences within the same basic idea, differences which arise from desynonymization, a process which we might expect to take place in any language which possesses several words for the same idea. [...] There is a tendency for the words to diverge somewhat in meaning, while still retaining the original basic idea, and the result of this is extremely advantageous, for the language is thereby enabled to express subtle differences in the same thought. Sometimes the differentiation may go no further than the use of a particular word in one context andits approximate synonym in another. [...]

AIDS TO THE STUDY OF THE TEXT

1. *What does the author understand by the term 'native words'?*
2. *In what meaning does he use the term 'foreign words'?*
3. *In what ways may the influence of a foreign language beexerted?*
4. *What type of word is in the author's opinion usuallyborrowed by personal contact and by indirect contact?*
5. *What was the general character of Old English in 1066?*
6. *What were the historical and social conditions operative at thetime of the French influence?*
7. *In what way did the French influence differ from the earlier influences?*
8. *How does the author characterize the general effect of theNorman Conquest upon the English language?*
9. *What was the outcome of the struggle between native andFrench synonyms'?*
10. *What is the author's opinion as to the effect of the large-scale*

adoption from French on the means of vocabulary extension in English?

11. *What groups of borrowed words docs the author distinguish?*
12. *What is the proportion of native words to foreign in thedictionary and in speech?*
13. *How does the author regard the abundance of synonymscreated by borrowing in English?*

Harold Whitehall

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENGLISH DICTIONARY

The evolution of the English dictionary is rooted in the general evolution of the English language. In this development the chief pressures were exerted by the steady increase in the word stock ofEnglish. Such an overall increase as this made the dictionary necessary. The pressure of vocabulary, however, has always been influenced and reinforced by the intellectual climate of each successive period of the language.

The beginnings of dictionary history are neither national nor concerned with any of the national languages. They are concerned with the international language of medieval European civilization: Latin. Our first word books are lists of relatively difficult Latin terms, usually thoseof a Scriptural nature, accompanied by glosses in easier or more familiarLatin. Very early in the Anglo-Saxon period, however, we find glosses containing native English (i. e. Anglo-Saxon) equivalents for the hard Latin terms, and it may be that two of these – the *Leiden* and *Erfurt Glosses* – represent the earliest written English we possess. Such glosses, whether Latin-Latin or Latin-English, continued to be compiled during the entire Anglo-Saxon and most of the Middle-English period.

The next stage of development, attained in England around 1400, was the collection of the isolated glosses into what is called a glossarium, a kind of very early Latin-English dictionary. As it chances, our first example of the glossarium, the so-called *Medulla Grammatica* written in East Anglia around 1400, has never been printed; but two later redactions were among our earliest printed books. [...]

The first onset of the Renaissance worked against rather than in favor of the native English dictionary. The breakdown of Latin as an international language and the rapid development of international trade led to an immediate demand for foreign-language dictionaries. The first of such works [...] was rapidly followed [...] by the best known of all such works, Florio's Italian-English dictionary (1599). Meanwhile, the first great classical dictionary, Cooper's *Thesaurus* (1565), had already appeared. [...] It should be noted, in passing, that none of these various word books of the 16th century actually used the title *dictionary* or *dictionarium.* They were called by various kinds of fanciful or half- fanciful names, of which *hortus* 'garden' and *thesaurus* 'hoard' were particularly popular.

During the late 16th century, the full tide of the Renaissance had been sweeping a curious flotsam and jetsam into English literary harbors. Constant reading of Greek and Latin bred a race of Holofernes pedants who preferred the Latin or Greek term to the English term.Their principle in writing was to use Latino-Greek polysyllables in a Latino-English syntax. Their strange vocabulary – studded with what some critics call 'inkhorn' terms – eventually affected English so powerfully that no non-Latinate Englishman could ever hope to read many works in his own language unless he was provided with explanations of elements unfamiliar to him. The *Dictionary of Hard Words* the real predecessor of the modern dictionary, was developed to provide precisely such explanations. It is significant that the first English word book to use the name *dictionary,* Cokeram's *The English Dictionary* (1623), is subtitled *An Interpreter of Hard Words.* [...] If

the 16th was the century of the foreign-language dictionary, the 17th was the century of the dictionary of hard words.

Between 1708 and 1721, hard-word dictionaries began to be replaced by word books giving ever-increasing attention to literaryusage. [...]

The first word book to embody the ideals of the age was Nathaniel Bailey's *Universal Etymological Dictionary of the English Language,* originally published in 1721 [...] This, one of the most revolutionary dictionaries ever to appear, was the first to pay proper attention to current usage, the first to feature etymology, the first to give aid in syllabification, the first to give illustrative quotations (chiefly fromproverbs), the first to include illustrations, and the first to indicatepronunciation. An interleaved copy of the 1731 folio edition was the basis of Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary* of 1755; through Johnson, it influenced all subsequent lexicographical practice. The position of dictionary pioneer, commonly granted to Johnson or to Noah Webster, belongs in reality to one of the few geniuses lexicography ever produced: Nathaniel Bailey.

Johnson's *Dictionary* (1755) enormously extends the techniques developed by Bailey. Johnson was able to revise Bailey's crude etymologies [...], to make a systematic use of illustrative quotations, to fix the spelling of many disputed words, to develop a really discriminating system of definition, and to exhibit the vocabulary of English much more fully than had ever been attempted before. [...] It(his two-volume work – *Ed.*) dominated English letters for a full century after its appearance and, after various revisions, continued in common use until 1900. As late as 90s, most Englishmen used the word *dictionary* as a mere synonym for Johnson's *Dictionary;* in 1880 a Bill was actually thrown out of Parliament because a word in it was not in "the Dictionary".

One of the tasks taken upon himself by Johnson was to remove "improprieties and absurdities" from the language. [...] The dictionaries of the second half of the 18th century extended this notion particularly tothe

field of pronunciation. [...] Various pronunciation experts edited a series of pronunciation dictionaries. Of these, the most important are [...]Thomas Sheridan's *General Dictionary of the English Language* (1780), and John Walker's *Critical Pronouncing Dictionary and Expositor of the English Language* (1791). [...]

If the chief contributions of the 18th century to dictionary making were (1) authoritative recording of literary vocabulary and (2) accurate recording of pronunciation, those of the 19th were unmistakably (1) the recording of word history through dated quotations and (2) the develop- ment of encyclopedic word books. Already in 1755, Samuel Johnson hadhinted in his preface that the sense of a word 'may easily be collected entire from the examples'. During the first twenty-five years of the century, the researches of R. K. Rask, J. L. C. Grimm, and F. Bopp clearly defined the historical principle in linguistic. It was only a question of time, therefore, before someone combined Johnson's perception with the findings of the new science of historical linguistics. That person was Charles Richardson, who, in his *New Dictionary of the English Language* (1836), produced a dictionary completely lackingdefinitions but one in which both the senses and the historical evolution of the senses were accurately indicated by dated defining quotations. Richardson's work leads directly to the great *New English Dictionary on Historical Principles,* first organized in 1858, begun under Sir James Murray in 1888, and completed under Sir William Craigie in 1928. Withits supplement (1933), the *New English Dictionary or Oxford English Dictionary* (N. E. D. or O. E. D.) covers the vocabulary of English witha completeness of historical evidence and a discrimination of senses unparalleled in linguistic history. [...]

Since the publication of the O. E. D., the only important British dictionary has been Henry Cecil Wyld's *Universal Dictionary of the English Language* (1932), a work of somewhat restricted vocabulary coverage but one which may well point the way to the dictionary of the future. Wyld has

discarded the older logical definitions for definitions ofa more functional nature; his examples delve deeply into idiom; his etymologies are of a completeness and modernity unparalleled in any medium-sized word book. [...]

The modern American dictionary is typically a sing', compact volume published at a relatively modest pricontaining: (1) definitive American spellings, (2) pronunciation indicated by diacritical markings,
(3) strictly limited etymologies, (4) numbered senses, (5) some illustrations, (6) selective treatment of synonyms and antonyms, (7) encyclopedic inclusion of scientific, technological, geographical, and biographical items. [...]

The first American dictionaries were unpretentious little schoolbooks based chiefly on Johnson's *Dictionary* of 1755 by way of various English abridgments of that work. [...] The most famous work ofthis class, Noah Webster's *Compendious Dictionary of the English Language* (1806) was an enlargement of Entick's *Spelling Dictionary* (London, 1764), distinguished from its predecessors chiefly by a few encyclopedic supplements and emphasis upon its (supposed) Americanism. The book was never popular and contributed little either to Webster's own reputation or to the development of the American dictionary in general.

The first important date in American lexicography is 1828. The work that makes it important is Noah Webster's *An American Dictionaryof the English Language* in two volumes. Webster's book has many deficiencies – etymologies quite untouched by the linguistic science of the time, a rudimentary pronunciation system actually inferior to that used by Walker in 1791, etc. – but in its insistence upon American spellings, in definitions keyed to the American scene, and in its illustrative quotations from the Founding Fathers of the Republic, it provided the country with the first *native* dictionary comparable in scope with that of Dr. Johnson. [...] Probably its greatest contribution to succeeding American dictionaries was

the style of definition writing – writing of a clarity and pithiness never approached before its day.

The first American lexicographer to hit upon the particular pattern that distinguishes the American dictionary was Webster's lifelong rival, Joseph E. Worcester. His *Comprehensive Pronouncing, and ExplanationDictionary of the English Language* (1830), actually a thoroughly re vised abridgment of Webster's two-volume work of 1828, was characterized by the additions of new words, a more conservative spelling, brief, well-phrased definitions, full indication of pronunciation by means of diacritics, use of press marks to divide syllables, and lists ofsynonyms, a cause it was compact and low priced, it immediately came popular – far more popular, in fact, than any of Webster's own dictionaries in his own lifetime. [...]

In the field of unabridged dictionaries, the most important accretionis the *Century Dictionary* (1889), edited by the great American linguist, William Dwight Whitney, and issued in six volumes. [...] At the moment, the most important advances in lexicography are taking placein the field of the abridged collegiate-type dictionaries.

Meanwhile the scholarly dictionary has not been neglected. Once the *New English Dictionary* was published, scholarly opinion realized the need to supplement it in the various periods of English and particularly in American English. The first of the proposed supplements, edited by Sir William Craigie and Professor J. R. Hulbert, is the *Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles,* completed in 1944. This was followed by a *Dictionary of Americanisms,* edited by Mitford M. Mathews and published in 1951. A *Middle English Dictionary,* a *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue,* and a *Dictionary of Later Scottish* are in preparation, and work on the *American Dialect Dictionary* of the American Dialect Society is now finally under way.

AIDS TO THE STUDY OF THE TEXT

1. *What is the beginning of dictionary history connected with?*

2. *Note the names by which earlier word-books were called.*

3. *What is meant by a glossarium? When did the first works of this kind appear?*

4. *What historical conditions produced foreign-languagedictionaries and hard Word dictionaries?*

5. *What are the chief contributions of the 18th and 19th centuries to dictionary-making?*

6. *To whom does the author attach the position of dictionary pioneer?*

7. *What other outstanding names does the history of English dictionary-making know?*

8. *When and how did the concept of the legislative function of dictionaries originate?*

9. *What information does the author give about the history and merits of the New English Dictionary!*

10. *What makes Wyld's dictionary the only important British dictionary since the publication of the NED?*

11. *What features distinguish the typical modern American dictionary?*

12. *What does the article tell us about the contribution of Noah Webster and J. Worcester to American lexicography?*

13. *What supplements to the NED have been published and are now in preparation?*

Bergen Evans

BUT WHAT'S A DICTIONARY FOR?

The storm of abuse in the popular press that greeted the appearance of *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* is a curiousphenomenon. Never has a scholarly work of this structure been attacked with such unbridled fury and contempt. [...] What underlies all thissound and fury? [...]

So monstrous a discrepancy in evaluation requires us to examine basic principles. 'Just what's a dictionary for? What does it propose to do? What does the common reader go to a dictionary to find? [...]

Before we look at basic principles, it is necessary to interpose two brief statements. The first of these is that a dictionary is concerned with words. Some dictionaries give various kinds of other useful information. Some have tables of weights and measures on the flyleaves. Some list historical events, and some, home remedies. And there's nothing wrong with their so doing. But the great increase in our vocabulary in the past three decades compels all dictionaries to make more efficient use oftheir space. And if something must be eliminated, it is sensible to throw out these extraneous things and stick to words. [...]

And so back to our questions: what's a dictionary for, and how, in 1962, can it best do what it ought to do? The demands are simple. The common reader turns to a - dictionary for information about the spelling,pronunciation, meaning, and proper use of words. He wants to know what is current and respectable. But he wants – and has a right to – the truth, the full truth. And the full truth about any language, and especially about American English today, is that there are many areas in which cer-tainty is impossible and simplification is misleading.

Even in so settled a matter as spelling, a dictionary cannot always be

absolute. *Theater* is correct, but so is *theatre.* And so are *traveled* and *travelled, plow* and *plough, catalog* and *catalogue,* and scores of other variants. [...] The fact here is that there are many words in our language which may be spelled, with equal correctness, in either of two ways.

So with pronunciation. A citizen listening to his radio might notice that James B. Conant, Bernard Baruch, and Dwight D. Eisenhower pronounce *economics* as ECKuhnomiks, while A. Whitney Griswold, Adlai Stevenson, and Herbert Hoover pronounce it EEKuhnomiks. He turns to the dictionary to see which of the two pronunciations is "right" and finds that they are both acceptable.

Has he been betrayed? Has the dictionary abdicated its responsibility? Should it say that one *must* speak like the president of Harvard or like the president of Yale, like the thirty-first President of the United States or like the thirty-fourth? Surely it's none of its business to make a choice. Because so widespread and conspicuous a use of two pronunciations among people of this elevation shows that there *are* two pronunciations. Their speaking establishes the fact which the dictionary must record. [...]

The average purchaser of a dictionary uses it most often, probably, to find out what a word "means". As a reader, he wants to know what an author intended to convey. As a speaker or writer, he wants to know what a word will convey to his auditors. And this, too, is complex, subtle, and forever changing.

An illustration is furnished by an editorial in the Washington *Post* (January 17, 1962). ... The editorial charges the Third International with "pretentious and obscure verbosity" and specifically instances its definition of "so simple an object as a door".

The definition reads: A movable piece of firm material or a structure supported usu. along one side and swinging on pivots or hinges, sliding along a groove, rolling up and down, revolving as one of four leaves, or

folding like an accordion by means of which an opening may be closed or kept open for passage into or out of a building, room, or other covered enclosure or a car, airplane, elevator, or other vehicle.

[...] The writer takes the plain, downright, man-in-the-street attitude that a door is a door and any damn fool knows that.

But if so, he has walked into one of lexicography's biggest booby traps: the belief that the obvious is easy to define. Whereas the opposite is true.' Anyone can give a fair description of the strange, the new, or the unique. It's the commonplace, the habitual, that challenges definition.[...]

Anyone who attempts sincerely to state what the word *door* means in the United States of America today can't take refuge in a log cabin. There has been an enormous proliferation of closing and demarking devices and structures in the past twenty years [...].

Is the entrance to a tent a door, for instance? And what of the thing that seals the exit of an airplane? Is this a door? Or what of those sheets and jets of air that are now being used, in place of old-fashioned oak and hinges, to screen entrances and exits? Are they doors? And whatof those accordion-like things that set off various sections of manymodern apartments? [...]

[...] I go to the Second International, which the editor of the *Post* urges me to use in preference to the Third International. Here I find thata door is:

The movable frame or barrier of boards, or other material, usually turning on hinges or pivots or sliding, by which an entranceway into a house or apartment is closed and opened; also, a similar part of a pieceof furniture, as in a cabinet or bookcase.

This is only forty-six words, but though it includes the cellar door, it excludes the barn door and the accordion-like thing.

So I go on to the Third International. I see at once that the new definition is longer. But I'm looking for accuracy, and if I must sacrifice brevity to get it, then I must. And, sure enough, in the definition which raised

the Post's blood pressure, I find the words "folding like an accordion". The thing is a door [...].

AIDS TO THE STUDY OF THE TEXT

1. *What encyclopedic material do American dictionaries often contain?*
2. *Which of the two opposing lexicographical principles, the descriptive or the prescriptive, is accepted by Webster's Third New International Dictionary?*
3. *What is the difficulty in defining "simple" words? How does the Dictionary solve the problem?*

TEST FOR SELF-CONTROL

1. Lexicology as a brunch of linguistics investigates:

A. sentences;

B. words;

C. grammar structures.

2. The system showing a word in all it's word-forms is called

A. language;

B. word-form;

C. paradigm.

3. Linguistic relationship between words are classified into:

A. paradigmatic and synchronic;

B. syntagmatic and paradigmatic;

C. syntagmatic and diachronic.

4. A minimum meaningful language unit is:

A. root;

B. word;

C. morpheme.

5. The primary element of the word, its basic part whichconveys its fundamental lexical meaning is:

A. suffix;
B. root;
C. morpheme

6. The principal and basic unit of the language system is:

A. word;
B. root;
C. sentence.

7. The variants of one and the same morpheme are:

A. affixes;
B. allomorphs;
C. prefixes.

8. Affixes can be divided into:

A. roots and morphemes;
B. stems and suffixes;
C. suffixes and prefixes.

9. The relationship existing between the morphemic or phonemic compositions and structural pattern of the word and itsmeaning is called:

A. motivation;
B. paraphrasing;
C. substitution.

10. Root morphemes may be :

A. productive and non-productive;
B. free and bound;
C. productive and dead.

11. The motivation in which there is a certain similarity between the sounds that make up the word and those that make up the sense is:

A. phonetical;
B. semantic;
C. morphological.

12. Affixes are subdivided into:

A. free and bound;
B. productive and non-productive;
C. productive, non-productive and dead.

13. Affixation is:

A. a complete or partial repeating of a word;
B. the creation of new words by means of affixes;
C. adding the suffixes after the root.

14. A minimum meaningful language unit is:

A. root;
B. morpheme;
C. word.

15. Words which can name different objects of reality, thequalities of these objects and actions or the process in which they take part are called:

A. form words;
B. term;
C. notional words.

16. Motivation which is on coexistence of direct and figurative meaning is:

A. morphological;
B. semantic;
C. phonetical.

17. Auxiliary verbs, prepositions, conjunctions and relative adverbs are:

A. terms;
B. form words;
C. notional words.

18. When grammatical meaning is not taken into considerationwe obtain the so called:

A. ideographic groups;
B. semantic groups;

C. lexico-grammatical groups.

19. The most vital part of the vocabulary includes:

A. literary-bookish words;
B. stylistically neutral words;
C. terms.

20. Any word of word-group used to name the notion characteristic of some special field of knowledge, industry or cultureis:

A. term;
B. archaism;
C. neologism.

21. Words or word-combinations borrowed from another language almost without any change in form are:

A. poetical words;
B. neologisms;
C. barbarism.

22. Composition is:

A. adding derivational morphemes before the root;
B. the way of forming new words by joining no less then twostems together;
C. the creation of new words by means of affixes.

23. The term "etymology" means:

A. the science of the word;
B. the meaning of the word;
C. the origin of words.

24. A word taken from another language and modified in phonetic shape, spelling, paradigm or meaning according to thestandards of the English language is:

A. etymological doublet;
B. native word;
C. borrowed word.

25. Words which dropped out of the language altogether are called:

A. archaisms;
B. obsolete words;
C. barbarisms.

26. Any word formed according to the productive structural patterns, or borrowed from another language and felt by the something new is called:

A. borrowed word;
B. neologism;
C. colloquial word.

27. A word that belongs to the original English stock as known from the earliest available manuscripts of the Old English period is:

A. international word;

B. borrowed word;

C. native word.

28. Blending is:

A. a complete or partial repeating a word;

B. the way of forming new words by blending separate parts oftwo words into one, while the primary meaning served;

C. the way of word-building in which the word loses one ormore sounds.

29. Words connected with the productive activities of peopleunited by a common occupation or profession are:

A. terms;

B. neologisms;

C. professionalisms.

30. The theory and practice of compiling dictionaries is called:

A. lexicography;

B. lexicology;

C. phraseology.

31. Words and expressions created by various social groupsand classes are:

A. slang words;

B. jargon words;

C. dialect words.

32. The native words are subdivided into words of the:

A. Indo-European stock and Latin origin;

B. Latin and French origin;

C. Indo-European stock and common Germanic origin.

33. A book which contains the collection of words arranged alphabetically is called:

A. dictionary;

B. text-book;

C. vocabulary.

34. In Great Britain there are:

A. three variants and four main dialects;

B. two variants and five main dialects;

C. five variants and four main dialects.

35. Cockney is one of the best known:

A. Northern dialects;

B. Eastern dialects;

C. Southern dialects.

36. The most stable part of the vocabulary is called:

A. standard English;

B. basic word-stock;

C. total volume of the English vocabulary.

37. The language from which the words were taken intoEnglish is called:

A. source of borrowing;

B. origin of borrowing;

C. semantic loan.

38. Derived words are composed of:

A. two root morphemes;

B. one root morpheme and one suffix;

C. one root morpheme and one or more derivational morpheme.

39. The brunch of lexicology that is denoted to study ofmeaning is known as:

A. Lexicology;

B. Semasiology;

C. Phraseology.

40. The second great stratum of Latin words came into English:

A. through French after the Norman Conquest;

B. during and after the Revival of Learning, the Renaissance;

C. at the end of the VI – th century.

41. The greatest stream of Latin words poured into English:

A. at the end of the VI – th century;

B. during and after the Renaissance;

C. after the Norman Conquest.

42. French borrowings penetrated into English:

A. in 2 ways;

B. in 3 ways;

C. in 4 ways.

43. The morpheme is:

A. the ultimate constituent element which remains after theremoval of all affixes;

B. common element of the word family;

C. minimum meaningful language unit.

44. Two main types of meaning are:

A. the grammatical and the lexical meanings;

B. the stylistical and the lexical meanings;

C. the grammatical and semantic meaning.

45. Two words of the same language which were derived from different roots the same basic words which go back to one and the same source are called:

A. international words;
B. etymological doublet;
C. loan words.

46. Words of identical origin that occur in several languages as a result of simultaneous borrowings from one source called:

A. etymological doublet;
B. international words;
C. loan words.

47. Compound words contain at least:

A. one root morpheme and one derivational morpheme;
B. one root morpheme;
C. two root morpheme.

48. Word-building is:

A. the process of creating new words;
B. the process of borrowing new words;
C. the process of dropping out words from the language.

49. Morphological type of word-building is subdivided into:

A. 4 ways;

B. 5 ways;

C. 3 ways.

50. A way of word-building when we form a new word byadding suffixes or prefixes is called:

A. affixation;

B. suffixation;

C. prefixation.

APPENDIX

THE SUGGESTED SCHEME OF LEXICOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

1. **Etymology of the words.** Identify native and foreign words in the text (of Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, etc, origin). Determine the type of assimilation (phonetic, grammatical, lexical), the degree of assimilation (complete, partial, lack of assimilation).

2. **Word-formation.** Find productive and non-productive ways of word-formation in the text. Find derived and compound words in the text. Determine the type of word-derivation (affixation or conversion). State morphemic structure of the derived words, types of morphemes. Determine the type of compound words (compound proper, derivational compounds, words of secondary derivation). Find other cases of word formation in the text.

3. **Free word-groups.** Pick out from the text some free word- groups, determine their type according to the syntactic connection between the components. Classify the selected free word-groups according to the part of speech the head-word belongs to. Define the context (grammatical, lexical) for the headword in the selected word- groups.

4. **Phraseological units.** Find the phraseological units in the text. Making use of semantic, contextual und functional classification of phraseological units. Define their types.

5. **Semantics.** Find the meanings of words in free word-groups which you've selected for the analysis. Using the dictionary state whether the

words are used in their main or derived meanings. Determine the context (lexical of grammatical) which helps to actualize the meaning of the polysemantic words.

MAIN TERMS OF LEXICOLOGY

Abbreviation, the process and the result of forming a word out of the initial elements (letters, morphemes) of a word combination.

Antonyms, a) words which have in their meaning a qualitative feature and can therefore be regarded as semantically opposite; b) words contrasted as correlated pairs.

Antonymy, semantic opposition, contrast.

Back-formation (regression), forming the allegedly original stem from a supposed derivative on the analogy of the existing pairs, i. e. the singling-out of a stem from a word which is wrongly regarded as a derivative.

Blend (blended, or portamanteau, word), the result of blending.

Blending, combining parts of two words to form one word.

Borrowing, resorting to the word-stock of other languages forwords to express new concepts and to name new objects, phenomena, etc.

Cliché, a stereotyped expression mechanically reproduced in speech.

Clipping, the process and the result of curtailing (the cutting off ofa part) off a word to one or two, usually initial, syllables.

Collocation, such a combination of words which conditions the realization of a certain meaning.

Colligation, morphosyntactically conditioned combinability of words as means of realizing their polysemy.

Combinability (occurrence-range), the ability of linguisticelements to combine in speech.

Composition, such word-formation where the target wordis formed by combining two or more stems.

Compound derivative (derivational compound), the result of parasynthetic word-formation, i. e. a word which is formed by asimultaneous process of derivation and composition.

Connotation, supplementary meaning or complementary semantic and/or stylistic shade which is added to the word's main meaning and which serves to express all sorts of emotional, expressive, evaluative overtones.

Consubstantionalism, the phenomenon of a word of the general language and a term having the same material form.

Context, a) the linguistic environment of a unit of languagewhich reveals the conditions and the characteristic features of its usage inspeech; b) the semantically complete passage of written speech sufficient to establish the meaning of a given word (phrase).

Conversion (internal derivation, derivation without affixation), a special type of derivation where the wordforming means is the paradigmof the word itself, i. e. derivation which is achieved by bringing a stem into a different formal paradigm.

Deformation of idiom, the violation of semantic integrity of a phraseological unit or idiom proper by actualizing the potentialmeanings of its elements.

Denotation, the expression of the main meaning, meaning proper of a linguistic unit in contrast to its connotation.

Derivation, such word-formation where the target word is formed by

combining a stem and affixes.

Derivational morpheme, an affixal morpheme which, when added to the stem modifies the lexical meaning of the root and forms a new word.

Diachrony, the historical development of the system of languageas the object of linguistic investigation.

Etymological doublet, one of a pair of (or several) words more or less similar in meaning and phonation, appearing in language as the result of borrowing from the same source at different times.

Homographs, different words coinciding in their orthographic expression.

Homonyms, two (or more) different linguistic units within one sound- and orthographic complex, i.e. displaying diversity on the contentplane and identity on the expression plane.

Homonymy, the coincidence in the same sound form (phonetic coincidence) and orthographic complex of two (or more) different linguistic units.

Homophones, words with different morphological structure which coincide in their sound expression.

Hybrid, a word different elements of which are of etymologically different origin.

Idiom proper, a phraseological unit with pronounced stylistic characteristics owing to which an element of play is introduced into speech.

Idiomatic, having the qualities of a phraseological unit, i. e. when the meaning of the whole -is not deducible from the sum of the meanings of the

parts.

Language, a semiological system serving as the main and basic means of human communication.

Level, a stage in scientific investigation of language which is determined by the properties of the units singled out in a consistent segmentation of the flow of speech (from the lowest, to the highest).

Lexical morpheme, generalized term for root and derivational morphemes, as expressing lexical meanings in contrast to flexional (morphemes) that express grammatical meanings.

Lexical set, 1) a group of words more or less corresponding in their main semantic component, i.e. belonging to the same semantic field; 2) a group of words having the same generic meaning.

Lexeme, a word in all its meaning and forms, i.e. a variant of a lexeme in a given speech-event.

Loan translations (calques), borroving by means of literally translating words (usually one part after another) or word combinations, by modelling words after foreign patterns.

Main meaning of a word, meaning which to the greatest degree is dependent upon or conditioned by its paradigmatic links, while such meanings as display a greater degree of syntagmatic ties are secondary.

Main nominative meaning, the main, direct meaning of a word, immediately referring to objects, phenomena, actions and qualities in extralinguistic reality (referent) and reflecting their general understanding by the speaker.

Meaning, the reverberation in the human consciousness of an object

of extralinguistic reality (a phenomenon, a relationship, a quality, a process) which becomes a fact of language because of its constant indissoluble association with a definite lunguistic expression.

Metalanguage, a language of the second order, a specific semiological system which is used to speak about language, i.e. a language the subject of which is the content and the expression of a human language.

Monosemy, the existence within one word of only one meaning.

Morpheme, the smallest (ultimate) recurrent unit of the system of expression directly related to a corresponding unit of the system ofcontent.

Morphological segmentation, the ability of a word to be divided into such elements as root, stem and affix.

Narrowing of meaning, the restriction of the semantic capacity of a word in the course of its historical development.

Neologism, a word or a word combination that appears or is specially coined to name a new object or express a new concept.

Nominative-derivative meanings, other meanings in a polysemantic word which are characterized by free combinability andare connected with the main nominative meaning.

Occasional word, a word which cannot be considered a permanent member of the word-stock: although it is, as a rule, formed after existing patterns, it is not characterized by general currency but is an individual innovation introduced for a special occasion.

Onomatopoeia, formation of words from sounds that resemble those associated with the object or action to be named, or that seem suggestive of its qualities.

Opposition, a difference between two (or more) homogeneousunits which is capable of fulfilling a semiological function, i.e. a semiologically relevant difference.

Paradigmatics, 1) associative (non-simultaneous) relationship of words in language as distinct from linear (simultaneous) relationship of words in speech (syntagmatics); 2) an approach to language when the elements of its system are regarded as associated units joined by oppositional relationship.

Parts of speech, classes into which words of a language are divided by virtue of their having a) a certain general (abstract, categorical) meaning underlying their concrete lexical meaning; b) a system of grammatical categories characteristic of this class; c) specific syneactic functions; d) special types of form-building and word formation.

Phraseological unit, a word combination in which semantic unity (non-separability) prevails over structural separability, or in which global nomination is expressed in a combination of different units.

Polysemy, diversity of meanings; the existence within one word of several connected meanings as the result of the development and changes of its original meaning.

Potential word, a derivative or a compound word which does not actually exist (i. e. has not appeared in any text), but which can be produced at any moment in accordance with the productive word- forming patterns of the language.

Productive, able to form new words which are understood by the speakers of a language.

Productivity, the ability of being used to form (after specific patterns) new, occasional or potential words which are readily understood by the

speakers of a language.

Referent, the object of thought correlated with a certain linguistic expression. Also: the element of objective reality as reflected in our minds and viewed as the content regularly correlated with certain expression.

Reproductivity, regular use in speech as the principal form of existence of a linguistic unit.

Semantic extension (widening of meaning), the extension of semantic capacity of a word, i.e. the expansion of polysemy, in the course of its historical development.

Semantic field, par of reality singled out in human experience and, theoretically, covered in language by a more or less autonomous lexical microsystem.

Semantic isolation, the loss by a word, or word combination, of productivity and the acquisition of idiomatic qualities.

Semantic level of analysis, that level of analysis on which linguistic units are studied bi-aspectually: both as units of expressionand units of content, i.e. – in lexicology – the direct relationship of a word and its referent is investigated.

Semantics, the meaning of words, expressions or grammatical forms.

Semasiology, the branch of linguistics which studies the semantics of linguistic units.

Sociolinguistics, branch of linguistics studying causation between language and the life of the speaking community.

Synchrony, a conventional isolation of a certain stage in the development of language as the object of linguistic investigation.

Synchronic, representing one conventional historical stage in the development of language.

Synonyms, two or more words belonging to the same part ofspeech and possessing one or more identical or nearly identical denotational meanings, interchangeable in some contexts.

Synonymy, the coincidence in the essential meanings of linguistic elements which (at the same time) usually preserve their differences in connotations and stylistic characteristics.

Syntactic formula, a non-idiomatic sequence of words which structurally resembles a set expression.

Syntagmatics, linear (simultaneous) relationship of words in speech as distinct from associative (non-simultaneous) relationship of words in language (paradigmatics).

Term, a word or a word combination of a special (scietific, technical,etc.) language.

Terminology, the sum total of terms for a specific branch of science, technology, industry, etc., forming a special layer in the word- stock of a language which most readily yields to systematization, standardization.

Text (corpus), an actually existing (in oral or written form) sentence, conglomeration of sentences, etc. (up to a complete work of literature, etc.).

Vocabulary, the totality of words in a language.

Word combination, a non-predicative unit (or elements) of speech which is, semantically, both global and articulated, or a combination of two or more notional words (with accompanying sincategorematic words or without them) serving to express one global concept.

Word-formation, the process of forming words by combining root and affixal morphemes according to certain patterns specific for the language.

Word-forming pattern, a structural and semantic formula, displaying a sequence of elements which is regularly reproduced inspeech.

AFFIXATION

Prefixation

a-1	Germanic, semi-productive. It comes from the Old English preposition *on*. It occurs in adjectives and the words of the category of state. It means "of, "on": *asleep, ashore, anew*.
a-2	Greek, non-productive. It has the negative meaning: *amoral, anomalous*.
ab-	Romanic, non-productive. It means "from", "away": absent. Before *m, p, v* it's shortened to *a-;* before *c, t - ahs-,* e.g.: *abstract*.
ad-	Romanic, non-productive. It has positional variants *ac-, af-,ag-, al-, an-, ap-, ar-, as-, at-, a-*. It means "motion forward", "addition to": *admit, adjoin*.
after-	Germanic, productive. It means "after": afternoon.
amphi-	Greek, non-productive. It means "on both ends", "of bothkinds": *amphitheatre.*
ante-	Latin, non-productive. It means "prior to": antediluvian.
and-	Greek, productive. It means "against", "opposed": *anti-aircraft, anti-war*.
arch-	Greek, semi-productive. It means "chief, "extreme": *archbishop, arch-father*.
be-	Old English, semi-productive. It means "around", "completely", "away», «making", "furnish with": *beset,bedeck, betake, b pretty, befriend, becloud, bedew*.
bi-	Latin, productive. It means "two": *bilabial.*
by-	Old English, semi-productive. It means "near", "close", "secondary": *by-stander, by-product*.

circum-	Latin, non-productive. It means "around", "about": *circumfluent, circumscribe*.
com-	Latin, semi-productive. It means "with", "together": combine. It has positional variants: *col-* (before *I), cor-* (before *r), con-* (before *c, d, g,j, n, q, s, t,* v), *co-* (before vowels and *h, w): collaborate, correct, cooperate*.
contra-	Latin, productive. It means "against", "contrary", "opposite": *contradict*.
de-	Latin, productive. It means: I) "away", "off": detrain; 2) "to do the reverse": *decode, demobilize*.
di-/dis-	Greek, non-productive. It means "twice", "double": *dissyllabic*.
dia-	Greek, non-productive. It means "through", "across": *diagram, diameter*.
***dis-**₂*	French or Latin, productive. It may denote: 1) negation: dissimilar; 2) opposition: disroot; 3) to deprive of: *discrown*.
en-	French from Latin – Greek, non-productive. It means: 1)"to put into or on": *enthrone*; 2) "to make, to cause to be": *endanger*. It has a positional variant –em: *embody*.
***ex-**₁*	Latin – Greek, productive. It means: 1) „from", „out of": *expel*; 2) „beyond": *excess*; 3) "thoroughly": *exterminate*. Ithas positional variants *ef-, e-: efferent, emerge*.
***ex-**₂*	It means "former": *ex-president, ex-champion*.
extra-	Latin, productive. It means "outside", "beyond": *extraordinary*.
fore-	Old English, semi-productive. It means "before": *forefather, foretell*.
forth-	Old English, non-productive. It means "forth":

	forthcoming.
hyper-	Greek, non-productive. It means "over", "above": *hypersensitive*.
hypo-	Greek, non-productive. It means: 1) "under", "beneath": *hypodermic*; 2) "less than": *hypothyroid*.
in-1	Old English, non-productive. It means "in": *insight*.
in-2	Latin, productive. It means "not": *inactive*. It has positional variants: *im-* (before *p, b, w*, e.g.: *impossible*), *il-*(before *l*, e.g.: *illegal*), *ir-* (before *r*, e.g.: *irregular*).
inter-	French or Latin, productive. It means "mutual", "between": *international*.
intra-	Latin, semi-productive. It means "on the inside", "within": *intraspesiac*.
intro-	Latin, dead. It means "in", "into", "inwards": *introduce*.
mid-	Old English, semi-productive. It means "middle": *midday*.
mis-	Old English, productive. It means "wrong(ly)", "bad"(ly): *misunderstand, mishear*.
non-	French from Latin, productive. It means "not": *non-effective, non-aggressive*.
ob-	Latin, non-productive. It means "to", "toward", "before": *object*; "opposed to", "against": *obnoxious*; "upon", "over": *obfuscate*; "completely", "totally": *obsolete*. Ithas positional variants *o-, oc-, of-, op-*, e.g.: *occur, offer, oppress*.
on-	Old English, non-productive. It means "on": *onset*.
out-	Old English, productive. It means "out", "exceeding": *outside, outsleep*.

over-	Old English, productive. It means “more than necessary”: *overwork*.
per-	Latin, non-productive. It means ”throughout”, “away”, “over”: *perceive, persuade*.
poly-	Greek, non-productive. It means “many”: *polyglot*.
post-	Latin, semi-productive. It means “after”, “behind”: *post-war*.
pre-	Latin, semi-productive. It means “preceding”: *pre-school, pre-war*.
pro₁-	Greek, non-productive. It means “before”: *prostrate*.
pro₂-	Latin, semi-productive. It means “moving toward”: *progress*; “substituting”: *pronoun*; “acting in behalf of”: *pro-fascist*.
re-	Latin, productive. It means: 1) “back”: *repay*; 2) “again”, “anew”: *re-count*.
retro-	Latin, productive. It means “back”, “backward”: *retrospective*.
semi-	French or Latin, semi-productive. It means: 1) “half”: *semi-final*; 2) “partly”, “not fully”: *semiskilled*.
sub-	Latin, productive. It means: 1) “under”: *subsoil*; 2) “lower in rank or position”, “of a lesser degree”: *subordinate*; 3) “forming a decision into smaller parts”: *sub-title, subgroup*. It has positional variants: *sue-*(before
	c), *suf-* (before, *f*), *sug-*(before, *g*), *sum-*(before *m*), *sup-* (before *p*), *sur-* (before *r*), *sus-* (before *c, p, t*): *suspect*.
super-	Latin, productive. It means “above”, “over”: super-*natura*l; “higher in rank”: *supervisor*.
trans-	Latin, semi-productive. It means “across”, “over”, “on the other side”, “beyond”: *transatlantic*.

ultra-	Latin, productive. It means “beyond”, “exceeding”: *ultra-modern*.
un-	Old English, productive. It means: 1) “not”: *unhappy*; 2) “back”: *unfasten*.
under-	Old English, semi-productive. It means: 1) “below”: *undershirt*; 2) “in a subordinate position”: *under-graduate*; 3) “below standard”: *underdeveloped*.
up-	Old English, semi-productive. It means “upward”: *uplift*.
vice-	Latin, semi-productive. It means “second in rank”: vice-president.
with-	Old English, non-productive. It means “away”, “against”: *withdraw, withstand*.

Suffixation

Noun suffixes

-ade	Latin, non-productive. It means: 1) ”the act of”: blockade; 2) ”the result or product of”: *lemonade.*
-age	Old French → Latin, non-productive. Nouns in –agedenote process, action, the result of the action or have a collective meaning: *assuage, pilotege, postage, leakade,leafage*.
-al	Middle English → Old French, semi-productive. Nouns in –ad denote the act of doing: *arrival, refusal*.
-an₁	Latin, non-productive. It means “belonging to”, “following a system or doctrine”: *republican*.
-an₂	Latin, productive. It means “born in”, “living in”: *American*.
-ance, ***-ence***	Middle English from French → Latin, non-productive. They form nouns of action and nouns
	indicating state or quality: *guidance, assistance, obedience*.
-ancy, ***-ency***	Latin, non-productive. They form nouns of action and nouns denoting state or quality: *brilliancy, vacancy, emergency*.
-ant, ***-ent***	French from Latin, non-productive. They are used to form agent-nouns: *servant, merchant, student*.
-ar	Latin, non-productive, forms agent-nouns: *beggar*.
-ard	Old French from German, non-productive, forms nouns. Meaning “one who does something not admirable”: *drunkard, coward*.

-asm	Greek, non-productive, forms abstract nouns: *enthusiasm*.
-ast	Greek, non-productive, forms agent-nouns: *gymnast, enthusiast*.
-ate, -at	Latin, non-productive, forms nouns denoting function or person: *mandate, advocate, diplomat*.
-cy	Romanic, non-productive, forms nouns denoting state, condition, office: *diplomacy, bankruptcy, curacy.*
-dom	Old English, productive, forms nouns denoting state, condition, rank, dominion of: *freedom, wisdom, kingdom, dukedom, Christendom*.
-ee	French from Latin, productive, forms nouns designatingthe recipient of the action: *payee, employee*.
-eer	French from Latin, non-productive, forms agent-nouns: *engineer*.
-er	Old English, productive, forms nouns denoting: 1) persons following some trade or occupation: *baker, driver*; 2) persons doing some action: *bather, believer*; 3) persons living in some locality: *Londoner, foreigner*; 4) things which do what the stem denotes: *cutter*.
-ery, -ry	Middle English from Old French, productive, forms nouns denoting state, condition, a general collective sense: *slavery, husbandry, poetry, pottery, jewelry,* *surgery*.
-ess	French from Latin → Greek, productive, forms femininenouns: *actress, poetess, lioness, Jewess*.
-ette, -et	French, semi-productive, forms diminutive nouns: *kitchenette, cigarette*.

-hood	Germanic, semi-productive, forms nouns denoting state, quality, condition: *childhood falsehood*.
-ic	Greek or Latin, non-productive, forms nouns having the meaning "of the nature of: *cynic, skeptics*.
-ice	Old French from Latin, non-productive, forms nounsdenoting act, quality, condition: *service, justice*.
-ics	Latin, non-productive, forms nouns denoting art, scienceor a specified activities or practice: *phonetics, statistics*.
-ie, -y	Germanic, productive, form diminutives: *birdie, girlie, auntie, granny, Billy*.
-ier, -yer	French from Latin, non-productive, equivalent to ***-eer***:*cashier, grenadier, lawyer*.
-ine₁, -ina	Greek, non-productive, is used to form feminine nouns: *heroine, zarina*.
-ine₂, -in	Romanic, non-productive, forms abstract nouns and nouns indicating derivative products: *medicine, doctrine,bulletin*.
-ing₁	Old English, non-productive. It means "belonging to", "of the kind of, "descended from": *shilling*.
-ing₂	Old English, productive. It is used to form verbalnouns denoting: 1) process, actions: *bleeding, breathing*; 2) the result of the action: *building*; 3) theplace where some action happens: *dwelling, lodging*.
-ion	Latin, non-productive, forms abstract nouns: *union, opinion, session*.
-ism	Greek, productive. Nouns in *-ism* denote: 1) theories,teachings, dogmas: *Darwinism, fatalism*; 2) social trends and formations: *capitalism, nationalism*; 3) trends in arts and literature: *modernism, futurism*; 4) policies:

	radicalism; 5) human qualities: *egoism, dandyism*.
-ist	Greek, productive. It forms nouns denoting a person who practices some method or art or who adheres to some doctrine, system, cause: *artist, dramatist, economist, communist, fascist, reformist, modernist*.
-ite	Greek, semi-productive. It forms nouns denoting: I) followers of different persons, inherent of different parties, trends, religions: *laborite, Islamite*; 2) inhabitantsof some locality or persons occupying certain seats: *kainite, pittite*.
-kin	Middle English, non-productive. It forms diminutive nouns: *lambkin, catkin.*
-let	Latin, productive, forms diminutive nouns: booklet.
-ling	Old English, productive, forms diminutive nouns: *duckling, firstling, princeling*.
-ment	French from Latin, non-productive. It forms nounsdenoting state, quality, condition, action, process orthe result of the action: *development, pavement, judgment, agreement*.
-ness	Germanic, productive. Nouns in -ness denote some abstract quality, state or condition: *kindness, darkness,oneness, sameness, forgiveness*.
-oid	Greek, productive. It means "like", "in the form of: *metalloid, spheroid*.

-or	Latin, non-productive. It forms nouns denoting: 1) profession, occupations: *actor, doctor*; 2) persons performing some actions: *narrator*; 3) things connected with the actions expressed by the stem: *elevator, ventilator*.
-ory	Latin, non-productive. Nouns in *–ory* denote "a place or thing for": *dormitory, directory*.
-o(u)r, -eur	French from Latin, non-productive. It forms nouns denoting state: *amateur, favour, behavior*.
-ship	Middle English from Germanic, semi-productive. It forms nouns denoting state, condition, quality, one'ssocial position or dignity: *friendship, authorship, professorship*.
-ster	Middle Low German, non-productive. Nouns in *–ster* denote "a person who is, does or creates": *songster, spinster, roadster, gangster, youngster*.
-stress	Old French from Latin, non-productive, forms femininenouns: *songstress, seamstress*.
-th	Old English, non-productive, forms nouns of state or quality from adjectives: *length, width, strength*.
-tion	Latin, productive. Also, ***-ation, -cion, -ion, -sion, -xion.***It forms nouns from verbs and denotes action, state or result: *dictation, resolution, revolution, organization, conversion*.
-(i)tude	Old French from Latin, non-productive. It forms nounsdenoting state, quality, condition: *safety, activity, liberty, poverty, cruelty.*
-ure	French and Latin, non-productive. Nouns in *–ure* denote: act, process, state, result of an action or rank: *culture,picture,*

	seizure, figure.
-y	Latin, Greek, French, Germanic; non-productive. It forms nouns denoting the result of an action: *augury, perjury*.

Adjective suffixes

-able, -(i)ble	Latin, productive. Adjectives in *able* mean: “capable”, able to be…-ed: *eatable*; “characterized by”, “fit for”, “causing”: *comfortable.*
-acious	Latin, non-productive. Adjectives in -*actious* mean “full of”: *audacious*.
-ian, -ane	Old French from Latin, non-productive. Adjectives inthese suffixes denote “belonging or pertaining to”, “typical of”, “following some teaching”: *Roman, European, Shakespearian, humane*.
-ant, ent	French from Latin, non-productive. Adjectives *m-ant/-ent* mean "busy with", characterized by": *radiant*.
-ary, ory	Latin, non-productive. They form adjectives meaning belonging to", connected with": *reactionary, legendary, contradictory*.
-ate, -ete ***-ite, -ute, -t***	Latin, non-productive. They form adjectives having the meaning "of or characteristic of,"having or filled with": *accurate, complete,* *exquisite, absolute, abject*.
-ed	Old English, very productive. Adjectives in *-ed* mean "having", characterized by": *gifted, bearded long-legged*.
-en	Old English, non productive. It form relative adjectives meaning "made of: *silken, wooden*.
-ern	Middle and old English, non-productive. It is met only infour words: *eastern, western, northern, southern*.

-ese	Old French from Latin, non-productive. Adjectives in – *ese* signifi *"of",* "pertaining to", "originating in": *Chinese, Japanese*.
-esgue	French and Italian of Germanic origin, non-productive. It forms adjectives denoting "in the manner or style of", "like": *picturesque, grotesque*.
-fold	Middle English from Germanic, non-productive. It isused with numerals to form adjectives, denoting multiplication: *twofold, manifold*.
-ful	Middle and Old English, productive. Adjectives in ***-ful*** mean "full of, "abounding in": *hopeful, powerful*.
-ic, -ic, -al	Greek, Latin and French; non-productive. Adjectives in ***- ic*** denote "of, "of *the* nature of, "pertaining to", "belonging to": *Celtic, gigantic, titanic*. The suffix ***-ic*** is often coupled with the suffix ***-al***, thus forming one semantic unit (the form in ***-ical*** sounds more conversational): *classic - classical, poetic - poetical*.
-ine	Latin from Greek, non-productive. It forms adjectives denoting "of, "like", "pertaining to", "characterized by": *infantine*.
-ish	Middle English from Greek, productive. Being added to adjectives it means "somewhat», that is it denotes a weaker degree of the quality expressed by the stem: *whitish, fattish*. When added to nouns it means "having the nature of, "looking like": *boyish, womanish*.
-ive, -ative	Latin, non-productive. Adjectives in ***-ive*** denote "having a tendency to", "having the nature, character orquality of: *native, declarative, restrictive, talkative*.

-less	Middle English from Old English, productive. It means "without","not having", "free from": *hopeless, senseless*.
-like	Middle and old English from Gothic, productive. Adjectives in ***-like*** mean "looking like», «inherent to», «characteristic of»: *businesslike, womanlike*.
-ly	Germanic, productive. Adjectives in ***-ty*** denote: 1) "like", "characteristic of, "suitable to": *manly*; 2) "rather": cleanly, sickly, poorly; 3) "happening every..."*weekly, monthly*.
-ose	Latin, non-productive. It means "full of: *bellicose, morose*.
-ous	Middle English from old French → Latin → Greek, non-productive. It means "full of, "possessing the quality of, "like": *joyous, envious, religious*.
-some	Middle English from Germanic, non productive. It means "like», «possessing the quality of: *bothersome*.
-ward	Old English, semi-productive. It denotes direction: *eastward, inward*.
-y	Old English, highly productive. It has two meanings. When added to nouns and, rarely, to verbs, it means "looking like", "characterized by", "having the color of: *windy, chatty, bloody*. When added to adjectives it means "lacking some quality": *pinky, baldy, greeny*. Also, *-ey*.

Verb suffixes

-ate	Latin, non-productive. Its meaning is ill-defined. It forms causative verbs: *agitate, graduate, vaccinate,navigate, advocate*.
-en	Old English, productive. It forms verbs from nouns and adjectives. It means "to make", "to make like": *brighten,broaden, darken, moisten, strengthen*.
-er	Germanic, non-productive, e.g.: *glimmer, twitter*.
-(I)fy	French from Latin, non-productive. It has the followingsenses: "to make», «to produce", "to bring to a certain state": *electrify, specify, terrify, simplify, intensify*.
-ish	Old English from Germanic and Greek, non-productive,e.g.: *establish, finish*.
-ize, -ise	Greek, as well as French and Germanic; productive. Verbs in ***-ize/-ise*** mean "to make», «to conform to", "to provide with», to cover with", e.g.: *organize, materialize, generalize, symmetrize, jargonize*.
-ute, -ite	Latin, non-productive, e.g.: *attribute, execute, contribute, unite, expedite*.

Adverb suffixes

-fold	Old English, semi-productive. It means "times": *tenfold*.
-long	Germanic, non-productive. It is added to the stems ofnouns, e.g.: *headlong, sidelong*.
-ly	Germanic, productive. It forms adverbs of manner andtime, and adverbs denoting repetition: idly, carefully, daily, weekly.
-s, -ce	Middle and Old English, non-productive: *once, twice,besides*.
-ward(s)	Old English, semi productive. It denotes the direction: *forward(s), backward(s), upward, inward*.
-wise, -ways	Germanic, non-productive. It's added to noun andadjective stems: *crosswise, clockwise, crabways*.

REFERENCES

1. Верба Л.Г. Порівняльна лексикологія англійської та української мов. – Вінниця: Нова книга, 2003.

2. Квеселевич Д.І. Сасіна В.П. Практикум з лексикології сучасної англійської мови. – Вінниця: Нова книга, 2003.

3.Ніколенко А. Г. Лексикологія англійської мови – теорія і практика. – Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2007.

4.McArthur Tom. The Oxford Guide to World English. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

5.Peters Pam. The Cambridge Gide to English Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004

6.Wales K.A. Dictionary of Stylistics. – London: Longman,2001.

7.Wells J.C. Accents of English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.