Podejście leksykalne – teoria i praktyka

humanistica 21

Redakcja:
Elżbieta Sternal
Ludmiła Kilewaja
Joanna Burzyńska-Sylwestrzak
Tomasz Fojt

Sekretarz naukowy redakcji:
Martyna Sternal

Rada Naukowa:
Andrzej Kątny (UG),
Małgorzata Czermińska (prof. UG)
Aleksander Kiklewicz (UWM),
Tadeusz Danilewicz (UG),
Desmond Graham (prof. University of Newcastle upon Tyne),
Andrzej Sitarski (UAM), Janina Gesche (Uniwersytet
Sztokholmski), Walencina Gabdulina (Ałtajska Akademia
Pedagogiczna), Alla Kamalova (UWM), Alina Masłowa
(Mordowski Uniwersytet Państwowy), Natalia Niżniowa
(Białoruski Uniwersytet Państwowy),
Lyudmila Safronova (Kazachski Narodowy Uniwersytet
Pedagogiczny imienia Abaja), Paul Wilson (Uniwersytet
Łódzki), Wojciech Klepuszewski (prof. PK)

Projekt okładki i stron tytułowych:
Małgorzata Chrzan, Joanna Burzyńska-Sylwestrzak

Wersja elektroniczna jest prymarna

Nakład 200 egz.
Wykonanie: Drukarnia J.J. Maciejewscy – Przasnysz

The lexical approach – theory and practice

Spis treści:

Podejście leksykalne – teoria i praktyka

Marcin Stanowski

Tadeusz Danilewicz

Jacek Tadeusz Waliński

Michail L. Kotin

Людмила Килевая

Tomasz Fojt

Contents:

The lexical approach – theory and practice

Słowo wstępne

Choć tradycyjne rozgraniczenie pomiędzy leksykonem i gramatyką jest coraz częściej kwestionowane w teorii języka, to większość badaczy przyjmuje mniej lub bardziej wyraźne rozróżnienie na systemowy komponent gramatyczny, na który składa się ograniczona liczba reguł, opisujących dopuszczalne sposoby generowania fraz czy zdań, oraz otwarty zbiór idiosynkratycznych elementów, które składają się na słownictwo danego języka. Podziałowi na system gramatyczny i zasób słowny języka często towarzyszy założenie, że gramatyka jest rdzeniem systemu językowego, a leksykon zaledwie dodatkiem. Najbardziej kategorycznie pogląd ten został wyrażony przez reprezentanta amerykańskiego językoznawstwa strukturalnego, Leonarda Bloomfielda w znamienitej pracy z zakresu lingwistyki ogólnej pod tytułem *Język*: „Leksykon jest w rzeczywistości dodatkiem do gramatyki, listą podstawowych nieregularności" (1933: 274, tłumaczenie własne).

Ujęcie języka jako uporządkowanego systemu reguł nie pozostało bez konsekwencji, tak dla teorii języka, jak i dla praktyki badawczej w zakresie językoznawstwa i dla nauczania języka. Zainteresowanie językoznawców skupiało się na formalnych aspektach języka, które są najbardziej podatne na analizę z uwagi na swoją regularność i powtarzalność. Praktyka glottodydaktyczna odwoływała się do metod rozwijających przede wszystkim kompetencje gramatyczne. Stosunkowo mniejszą uwagę poświęcano słownictwu.

Wyraźny wzrost zainteresowania słownictwem nastąpił w latach osiemdziesiątych dwudziestego wieku. Niebagatelną rolę w przesunięciu uwagi językoznawców na jednostki leksykalne o różnym stopniu złożoności miał rozwój technologii komputerowej i jej zastosowanie w analizie języka naturalnego. Postęp w rozwoju komputerowych baz danych pozwolił na tworzenie zasobnych korpusów językowych, zawierających dużą ilość

autentycznego materiału językowego. Wraz z korpusami powstawały elektroniczne narzędzia, służące przeszukiwaniu dużych zbiorów tekstów w celu ekscerpcji miarodajnych próbek językowych. Ułatwiony dostęp do dużej ilości danych językowych i stosowanie efektywnych narzędzi ich przetwarzania, w połączeniu z zastosowaniem analizy statystycznej, pozwoliły na dostrzeżenie wzorców ujawniających się w danych frekwencyjnych, niedostępnych analizie intuicyjnej, na przykład związków kolokacyjnych, opartych na częstym współwystępowaniu elementów leksykalnych w tekstach. Łatwiejsza stała się analiza języka formulicznego czy obserwacja wariantywności frazemów i innych wieloelementowych połączeń leksykalnych o różnym stopniu zespolenia. Znaczącą rolę w rozwoju zainteresowania słownictwem odegrał pionier językoznawstwa komputerowego John Sinclair. Kierowana przez Sinclaira placówka badawcza COBUILD, założona w 1980 roku, zrewolucjonizowała podejście do badań językowych poprzez innowacyjne wykorzystanie technologii korpusowej. Nowatorskie podejście przyniosło owoce w postaci licznych prac badawczych oraz słowników opartych na danych korpusowych.

W zakresie glottodydaktyki, istotnym osiągnięciem uczestników projektu COBUILD była propozycja sylabusa leksykalnego, w którym zasób słowny języka odgrywał dominującą rolę. Wśród podstawowych przesłanek przyświecających budowie sylabusa leksykalnego było nie tylko założenie, że w pierwszej kolejności uczniowie powinni poznawać słownictwo używane najczęściej przez rodzimych użytkowników danego języka, ale też postulat równoczesnego przyswajania konstrukcji, w jakich słowa są używane oraz typowych dla nich połączeń wyrazowych i kolokacji. W obszarze dydaktyki nauczania języków obcych, w 1993 roku Michael Lewis zaproponował podejście leksykalne w książce pod tym samym tytułem. Podobnie jak w przypadku programowej koncepcji sylabusa leksykalnego, rozwijanie kompetencji leksykalnej również stanowi zasadę organizującą

proces uczenia języka w ramach podejścia leksykalnego, przy czym Lewis proponuje traktować jako jednostki leksykalne również ciągi wieloelementowe (tak zwane *language chunks*). Za traktowaniem takich ciągów jako 'całostek językowych' przemawia fakt, że w akcie komunikacji są one stosowane bez opóźnienia, co pozwala przypuszczać, że nie są generowane w sposób kompozycyjny, ale raczej są przechowywane w pamięci długotrwałej i wydobywane jako całości. Przykładami całostek językowych mogą być złożenia wyrazowe (np. *bajkopisarz, białoczarny*), frazeologizmy czy frazemy (*drzeć koty, mokra robota, z dużej chmury mały deszcz*), kolokacje (*spełnić oczekiwania, darzyć sympatią*), formuły i wyrażenia formuliczne (*za górami, za lasami, gdybym był na twoim miejscu...*), powiedzenia i przysłowia oraz inne odmiany zwrotów prefabrykowanych.

W zakresie teorii języka, wyniki badań nad leksykalnym zasobem języka dają asumpt do dyskusji nad definicją jednostki leksykalnej i delimitacją jej granic; w glottodydaktyce, skłaniają do krytycznej refleksji nad naturą kompetencji leksykalnej użytkownika języka i skutecznymi sposobami jej rozwijania. Efektem rozważań nad stylem nauczania języków obcych jest pierwszy artykuł zawarty w niniejszym tomie. Autor wprowadza w nim rozróżnienie na style nauczania i style uczenia się, a następnie przedstawia cechy leksykalnego podejścia do nauczania języka. Kolejna część tekstu omawia oczekiwania kompetencyjne wobec nauczycieli, którzy stosują podejście leksykalne w dydaktyce języka angielskiego. Drugi tekst dotyczący uczenia się i nabywania drugiego języka koncentruje się nad przyswajaniem wieloelementowych jednostek leksykalnych o zróżnicowanym stopniu skonwencjonalizowania (utartych zwrotów, idiomów, kolokacji). W oparciu o dane na temat roli funkcji kognitywnych w uczeniu się języka oraz dane pochodzące z badań nad akwizycją języka, Autor wskazuje na zasadność podejścia opartego na uzusie językowym

w uczeniu leksyki języka obcego. Zawarty w trzecim artykule niniejszego tomu krytyczny przegląd podejść do opisu czasowników sposobu ruchu stanowi podstawę do rozważań nad wyborem modelu, który byłby najbardziej adekwatny w kontekście nauczania języka angielskiego. Opowiadając się za modelem opartym na schematyzacji w obrębie struktury zdarzeń, Autor konkluduje, że dostępne obecnie opisy czasowników z tej grupy mają ograniczoną stosowalność w praktyce dydaktycznej. Kolejny tekst poddaje dyskusji podobieństwa i różnice pomiędzy dwoma rodzajami nominacji: taksonomiczną i deiktyczną. W celu określenia relacji między badanymi modelami nominacji, Autor wykorzystuje metodę funkcjonalną, analizę struktury semantycznej, oraz reanalizę w procesie gramatykalizacji. Analiza odwołuje się zarówno do perspektywy synchronicznej, jak i diachronicznej. Na podstawie zestawienia jednostek leksykalnych i leksykalno-gramatycznych, Autorka kolejnego artykułu poddaje w wątpliwość klasyfikację języków wschodniosłowiańskich opartą na kryterium genealogicznym. Autorka wskazuje na zasadność ponownej oceny tradycyjnej klasyfikacji w oparciu o kryteria morfologiczne i aksjologiczne. Tekst zamykający niniejszy tom przedstawia analizę wzorców leksykalno-gramatycznych właściwych dla czasownika *incite*. Analiza opiera się na danych korpusowych i odwołuje się do pojęcia jednostki leksykalnej w ujęciu Johna Sinclaira. W konkluzjach Autor wskazuje na zasadność włączania parametru aksjologicznego do opisu badanej jednostki leksykalnej w praktyce leksykograficznej i w nauczaniu słownictwa języka angielskiego.

Tomasz Fojt
Elżbieta Sternal

Marcin Stanowski

ORCID: https://orcid.org/

e-mail: mstanowski@ult.edu.pl

How to transform your teaching style? Towards teaching lexically

Jak zmienić styl nauczania? W kierunku leksykalnego stylu nauczania

Abstrakt

Artykuł omawia tematykę stylów uczenia i nauczania. Autor zwraca uwagę na rozróżnienie pomiędzy wspomnianymi stylami. Sugeruje odejście w dydaktyce od dopasowywania treści i metod do obalonych przez naukę "stylów uczenia się" i skupienie się raczej na wypracowaniu leksykalnego stylu nauczania, który ma zapewnić obniżenie lęku u uczniów uczących się języka angielskiego jako obcego. Artykuł przedstawia zalety nauczania leksykalnego. Podkreśla walory nauczania języka takim, jaki on występuje w obecnym świecie, zauważając, że język obcy, zwłaszcza ten nauczany w szkole publicznej, powinien służyć praktycznym zastosowaniom komunikacyjnym i odzwierciedlać stan języka używanego przez rodzimych użytkowników. W oparciu o literaturę, autor proponuje strategie i techniki nauczania języka, które mogą ułatwić akwizycję języka, ale też doprowadzić do zmiany sposobu myślenia o języku obcym. Aby to było możliwe, nauczyciel winien jest dążyć do uaktualniania swojej wiedzy metodycznej, zapoznania się z propozycjami lingwistów, trenerów nauczycieli takich jak, Kryszewska, Dellar czy Selivan, co więcej wypracować nowy styl nauczania.

Słowa kluczowe: podejście leksykalne, styl uczenia się, styl nauczania

Abstract

The article discusses the subject of teaching and teaching styles. The author draws attention to the distinction between the aforementioned styles. He suggests a shift in teaching from matching content and methods to scientifically incorrect "learning styles", and rather focusing on developing a lexical style of teaching in order to reduce the anxiety in students learning English as a foreign language. The article presents many advantages of the lexical approach. It emphasizes the value of teaching the language as it exists in the present world, noting that a foreign language, especially one which is taught in a public school, should serve practical communication applications and reflect the state of the language used by native speakers. Based on the literature, the author proposes language teaching strategies and techniques that may facilitate language acquisition, but also lead to a change in the way of thinking about a foreign language. For this to be possible, the teacher should strive to update his or her methodological knowledge, become acquainted with the suggestions of linguists, teacher trainers such as Kryszewska, Dellar or Selivan and, what is more, adopt a new teaching style.

Keywords: lexical approach, learning style, teaching style

1. Continuous professional development (CPD) of teachers of English as a foreign language

Whatever people do professionally, they usually strive for at least satisfactory result. When it comes to professions of public trust, the need for efficiency should be the matter beyond discussion.

Polish teachers are believed to be willing to upgrade their methodology as Key Findings from the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) from 2013 state that 94% of teachers in Poland participate in different forms of professional development activities.

A growing awareness of the necessity to adapt to teaching in more and more heterogeneous groups should make teachers seek new ways to teach in order to better individualise and personalise their classroom performance.

Although plenty new notions in education have been continuously generated by psychology, pedagogy and linguistics, not all of them integrated in each and every educational system around the world. English Language Teaching (ELT) seems to be more abundant in various teaching methods, approaches and techniques comparing to other non-linguistic subjects at school. Since regional (voivodship-based or city) in-service teaching centres and private continuous professional development institutions offer a wide range of both long-term courses and workshops, teachers have a plethora of opportunities to upgrade their teaching knowledge and skills.

Additionally, a brief search for ELT teachers' groups in Facebook shows more that 100 of all kinds of support, methodology or sharing materials groups whose members offer 24/7 guidance on teaching matters as well as serve as a shoulder to cry on for many teachers desperate for developing new strategies or simply being heard.

The question that arises is whether teachers of English use the opportunities of CPD courses and whether the "sharing is caring" approach visible on the Internet forums and groups affects efficiency of teaching.

2. Learning styles vs teaching styles

As the title of this article mentions a "teaching style", it is worth commenting on both "teaching style" as well as "learning style", which for many years have been regarded as evidence-based and official guidelines

and which recently have appeared to be a myth propagated in educational circles for a long time.

The concept of learning styles refers to the idea that people learn best when the material is targeted to match their individual sensory preferences. The most popular classification divides students into three types: visual, auditory, and kinaesthetic learners. According to this division a "visual learner" perceives best through visual content, while an "auditory learner" finds visual content less helpful than auditory material. However, described as such, learning styles have been discredited for lacking the scientific evidence. An overwhelming majority of scholars claims that no scientific evidence backs this hypothesis of learning styles (Kirschner 2017, Simmonds 2014).

While all students can develop subjective preferences for studying a given material, studies deny that students learn better through or thanks to a certain learning style. As a result, academics increasingly summon educators to replace this and many other "neuromyths", such as Multiple Intelligences or Denisons's Kinesiology with resources and strategies rooted in evidence from cognitive and adult learning theory. For decades, teachers of English have been taught to take learning styles into serious consideration and adapt their teaching to cater for certain modalities in students' cognition.

Many critics of learning styles believe now that actually such a devotion to the concept by many educators could have led to teaching certain students in only one particular way, disregarding other more successful approaches. Other detrimental effects of following learning styles could be that many educators who insist on the extensive use of lectures because they believe they have a lot of "auditory learners" in their classes diminish this way the impact of retrieval practices or other active techniques. Labelling students as "visual" or "kinaesthetic" ones leads as well to students believing that they are not

able to learn in any other way than by using mind maps, flashcards or by taking parts in "drama activities". Thus, the learning styles approach unnecessarily caused disrespect towards eclectic teaching and treating a student as a whole (Coffield, 2007).

Contrary to the "learning styles" concept, the idea of teaching styles has never been claimed to be an official dogma.

Most teachers would probably agree that in some way everyone has their our own unique "style". Some educators are calm and quiet. Teachers just like all people differ in terms of energy levels, temperament, attitude to discipline and organisation. Some teachers follow a "rag bag" model of a lesson, some are advocates of a flipped approach.

While discussing teaching style we may mean teacher's status, patterns of behavior, mode of performance and attitude towards self and others, as well as preferences when it comes to the choice of methodology approaches or methods. Most sources quote authoritarian, laissez-faire, democratic, paternal, consultative or participatory style.

An authoritarian teacher forms the objectives on their own and takes responsibility for the group; gives directions, commands and orders with which the students must comply. They often criticize students in order to change their behavior from unacceptable to acceptable.

Contrary to the above-mentioned authoritarian style, the laissez-faire style seems to be seen as unorganized and ineffective. A teacher provides few or no goals for learning. Since such a teacher is not a leader, they generate a lot of confusion and discipline problems may occur with students who are not prepared to learn autonomously.

A democratic style teacher encourages group participation, accepts students' ideas and above that praises them very often for their action, independent

thinking and pro-social behaviors. As a result, learners become more autonomous, they learn more and exhibit a more constructive attitude.

A characteristic feature of consultative and participatory styles is that a teacher to a great extent pays attention to students' choices and preferences. What is more, they develop an atmosphere of mutual respect, try to get to know their students well and promote cooperation within a group (Peacock, 2001).

Whatever teaching style is used, it is evident in numerous studies (Hayati et al., 2021) that a teaching style affects students' performance. More and more widespread is the notion that a successful teacher should possess a rich repertoire of high impact strategies and be willing and able to adapt their teaching process accordingly to students' needs.

Emerging new approaches to foreign language teaching often propose more effective ways of reaching students. One of the more current trends in ELT is the Lexical Approach which promises the reduction of language learning anxiety in students as well as offers more natural ways of presenting a language to students and certain retrieval techniques which make learning more effective. While teachers are learning the concept of the Lexical Approach and attempting to use it in the classroom, they unconsciously form a new style of teaching, one that focuses on lexical chunks and how they function the way that a native speaker would use them.

3. Towards the Lexical Approach

The Lexical Approach is a way to teach language which assumes that language is made up of lexical chunks and that the key to fluency in any language is the adequate use of such phrases. The idea behind the lexical approach is that "Language is grammaticalised lexis, not lexicalised grammar" (Lewis, 1993).

According to Lewis, grammar translation, audiolingual or even communicative approaches to teaching do not seem to be particularly effective as they rely on methods of distinguishing lexical and grammatical units based on strictly artificial criteria. Focusing on single words and isolated grammatical concepts makes the learner less proficient and in way less able to understand and use idiomatic expressions used naturally by native speakers.

Lewis points out that strings of words are stored as meaningful units much longer than single words. Therefore, according to an English researcher, the basic criterion for distinguishing lexical teaching units should be not only the frequency of coexistence but also to what extent they are fixed phrases. For example, how would you grammatically deconstruct phrases like "by the way" or "make a decision"? In such cases, grammar becomes an afterthought. However, native speakers know they are valid because they "sound" good.

Chunking is indeed a memory enhancement technique. Grouping common co-occurring words and treating them as one larger whole allows the brain to process more information. Chunking allows to teach immense quantities of information rapidly. Instead of processing each word in a sentence individually, what each word means and how each grammatically relates to the next word, students deal with fragments. Instead of building word for word fluency, students do it one phrase at a time.

Another advantage of this way of teaching is that it raises consciousness of a foreign language. It caters for the process of noticing the lexical item, which is an initial but fundamental step when dealing with new vocabulary and grammar.

4. How to become a lexical teacher?

In order to become a lexical teacher, one should adopt certain beliefs about a language and develop a set of methodological preferences for techniques, activities, error correction methods as well as passion to investigate the Lexical Approach. All of these will form a unique style of teaching which will be represented in certain way of dealing with a language and teaching in the classroom.

The lexical approach eliminates the grammar / vocabulary dichotomy and instead presents language fluency as the ability to adapt base expressions easily and quickly to different situations. We build sentences and communicate using thousands of these phrases. Thus, language teaching should reflect this reality in the classroom in order to make education more life-like.

When a teacher adopts a lexical approach to teaching, they affect not only their teaching style but also change the way in which they perceive the language. Since grammar is not taught in a traditional grammar translation method or even a communicative approach way, it is not therefore put in the centre of attention and loses its stigma. Students tend to be scared of grammar material at a lesson while being taught in a traditional way, which may lead to language learning anxiety and series of inhibitions while acquiring certain grammatical notions. That affects not only learning grammar but is overgeneralised on the whole approach to a foreign language learnt at school (Szyszka, 2011).

Many lexical teachers report that starting teaching lexically lowered students' anxiety towards grammar as they do not perceive it as something exclusive from a language but an inherent part of the system of communication (Dervic, M., Bećirović, S. 2020).

This way of teaching only superficially disregards grammar, however its scope is shifted from "big" grammar of tenses, modalities and aspects to the "small"

grammar of collocations and phrases, as Lewis says: "The lexical approach implies a diminished role of the grammar of sentences, at least to sub-intermediate levels. In contrast, it is associated with an increased role for the grammar of words (collocation and related) and the grammar of the text (supersense)" (Lewis, 1993, 194-195).

In order to become a "lexical teacher" we should adopt and consciously use at least some methodological implications of the lexical approach. Since students should be exposed to natural language from early stages in order to acquire fixed phrases in context, it is advisable to place emphasis on receptive skills, of which listening is especially essential.

What is more, according to the Lexical Approach, language is not learnt by learning individual sounds and structures and then combining them, but by increasing the ability to break down wholes into parts. Therefore, we can also communicatively use whole phrases without understanding their constituent parts. Whereas context plays a significant role in teaching lexis almost in any other method or approach, the Lexical Approach hints that a co-text is equally important. Co-text, understood as the linguistic environment of a word, rather than the non-verbal environment in which a word is used, shows a student how a word is used in combination with other words in an utterance. Even without providing a situational context, a student is able to understand the phrase i.e., use it in a conversation with other students in class.

If one ventures to become a lexical teacher, then they probably would acquire a liking for non-linear notation formats, such as mind maps, word trees and other graphic organisers which are an inherent part of the Lexical Approach. What is of the greatest importance, almost all known exercise types, to which teachers of English as a foreign language have become accustomed, can be used in a "lexical approach" lesson

as long as they meet two criteria. First of all, they need to include "significant" lexical phrases. This is so because the Lexical Approach advocates teaching a language "as it is" not as it is prescribed by grammarians. For this reason, a teacher might want to be able to analyse the language with the use of linguistic corpus tools in order to be aware of the "significance" of chunks. Another requirement would be the repeated presentation of lexical units together with important collocations in order to show the use of the phrases and make them easier to remember (Lewis, 1993).

When it comes to dealing with an error, it is worth noting that an error is not stigmatised in the Lexical Approach and understood as a natural way towards accuracy, whereas reformulation should be a natural response to the student's error.

Many lexical approach practitioners, such as Hugh Dellar or Leo Selivan, advocate using on-line interactive games such as Quizlet as a way to practise lexical chunks in order to cater for the retention of vocabulary. In conclusion, it is worth adopting a "lexical" style of teaching as it seems it may reduce students' fear of a language but also may boost more natural way students use a foreign language. Thanks to the Lexical Approach a foreign language, especially one which is taught in a public school, may feel less as a school subject and more as means of true communication.

However, the language approach cannot be mastered by a teacher without the deep study of a contemporary language and without being familiar with the works of Lewis or teacher trainers such as Dellar or Selivan. Moreover, it will be only possible once a teacher adopts a series of classroom habits and assumptions of the language itself.

5. Conclusions

Once a teacher starts teaching lexically, not only will they better understand the importance of lexical inferencing in the vocabulary learning process, but they will also be able to examine how words are acquired in a more natural, not "school-like" way. This involves a long, complex process of which an important aspect is retention of the chunks. Thus, an educator will be better equipped to teach lessons that are more memorable to students.

Apart from perception and motivation to learn a language, a significant aspect is also retention, and this may be achieved by numerous repetitions, as lexical chunks need to be encountered several times before they are learnt. Students' memory may be aided by stimulating students' personal involvement, as words are most likely to be remembered if they have some personal association for the learner. Therefore, students should be encouraged to use newly learnt phrases in contexts relevant to them. The Lexical Approach may be realised in communicative activities and teacher-led conversations but also through more traditional lexical activities such as translation, phrases matching and sentence transformation tasks, but also in text analysis for the search of collocations.

References

Coffield, F, Moseley, D, Hall, E, Ecclestone, K. 2004. *Learning Styles and Pedagogy in Post-16 Learning. A Systematic and Critical Review.* London: Learning and Skills Research Centre.

Dervic, M., Bećirović, S. 2020. *Prerogative of the lexical approach in communicative language teaching.* 7. 10.5281/zenodo.3748039.

Hayati, N., Surat, S., & Noer, M. A. 2021. "Relationship

of Teaching Style Towards to Elementary School Achievement of Students". *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 10(2): 89-99.

Kirschner, P. A. 2017. "Stop propagating the learning styles myth". *Computers & Education*, 106: 166-171.

Lewis, M. 1993. *The Lexical Approach*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Peacock, M. 2001. "Match or mismatch? Learning styles and teaching styles". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(1): 1-20.

Selivan, L. 2018. *Lexical Grammar*. Cambridge University Press

Simmonds, A. 2014. *How neuroscience is affecting edu cation: Report of teacher and parent surveys*. Wellcome Trust

Szyszka, M. 2011. "Foreign language anxiety and self-perceived English pronunciation compe-tence". *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *1*(2): 283-300. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2011.1.2.7

Thornbury, S. 1997. "Reformulation and reconstruct-tion: tasks that promote 'noticing'". ELT Journal 51(4): 326-334.

Tadeusz Danilewicz

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0745-098X

e-mail: tdanilewicz@gmail.com

A Usage-based Approach to Language and the Process of Learning and Acquisition of L2 Constructions

Podejście do języka oparte na uzusie i process uczenia się i akwizycji konstrukcji drugiego języka

Abstrakt

Artykuł omawia zastosowanie podejścia do języka w oparciu o uzus w procesie uczenia się i akwizycji konstrukcji w drugim języku. Konstrukcje językowe to kolokacje o różnym stopniu skonwencjonalizowania, poczynając od zwrotów idiomatycznych, poprzez zakorzenione zwroty językowe, aż po bardziej swobodne kolokacje np. fraza nominalna NP. Kompetencja językowa to umiejętność korzystania z ustrukturyzowanego zbioru konstrukcji w którym jest miejsce zarówno dla konstrukcji, którymi rządzą abstrakcyjne reguły oraz konstrukcji nieregularnych, które są w zdecydowanej większości. Podejście do języka w oparciu o uzus podkreśla fundamentalną rolę pamięci w procesie uczenia się i akwizycji regularnych i nieregularnych konstrukcji w drugim języku. Akwizycja wczesnych konstrukcji leksykalnych sugeruje, że odgrywają one bardzo istotną rolę w asocjacyjnym charakterze ludzkiego poznania. Podejście do języka w oparciu o uzus oferuje wiele możliwości badania doświadczenia znaczenia w drugim języku.

Abstract

The paper discusses an implementation of a usage-based ap-
proach to the process of learning and acquisition of L2 con-
structions. Constructions are understood as collocations of
various degrees of conventionalisation: from idiomatic expres-
sions (e.g. *sell out to someone*) - fixed phrases (e.g. *to be
sqeamish at/about*) to less fixed collocations like an NP. Lin-
guistic competence is perceived as the mastery of construc-
tions which eventually build up *the structured inventory* (a sort
of a list) that represents the speaker's knowledge of language.
Linguistic constructions or units are seen as *emergent cogni-
tive routines* that are activated and motivated by an L2 concep-
tual system. Higher frequency and intensity of language expe-
rience results in a higher degree of cognitive routinisation that
affects the processing of the unit. The usage-based approach
is an emergence-based memory system in which there is no
need for a separate system of rules that are independent of
constructions in the system. The successful learning and ac-
quisition of early lexical constructions seems to be a funda-
mental process of human associative cognition. The concep-
tual structures associated with lexical constructions are
viewed as *prompts* for complex processes of conceptualization,
i.e. the experience of meaning in L2. The usage-based ap-
proach seems to offer a lot of opportunities for linguistically
aware L2 educators to investigate various aspects of experienc-
ing meaning in L2.

The article discusses a usage-based approach to
language and cognition whose assumptions and re-
search tools appear to account for various aspects of
constructing meaning. Instead of looking at language as
a set of stored units (constructions) which are operated

on by a set of stored rules or procedures that produce some output, second language units (words, phrases, etc.,) are seen as *emergent* cognitive routines activated and *motivated* by a second - language conceptual system. Cognitive routines are assumed to emerge due to the frequency and intensity of second language experience. The emerging cognitive routines appear to enable an L2 learner to achieve the fundamental aim of L2 learning, i.e. to learn *to experience meaning in the target language.*

A usage-based approach to language holds that language constructions *emerge* from language use. Knowledge of language is knowledge *how* language is used and language constructions or language units are seen as *emerging cognitive routines.* Language *learning* and *acquisition* is understood as the *extraction* of linguistic constructions or units from patterns in the usage events experienced by the language learner. Constructions are collocations of various degrees of conventionalisation: from idiomatic expressions (e.g. *kick the bucket*) - fixed phrases (e.g. *to be squeamish at/about*) to less fixed collocations like an NP.

The set of constructions or language units eventually build up the *structured inventory* (a sort of a list) that represents the speaker's language system or knowledge of language. The list is enormous as it includes constructions of varying degree of complexity: from simple morphemes, lexical items and phrases to sentences. In other words, emerging linguistic competence is conceived of as the mastery of language units; from the highly canonical ('core grammar' e.g. making plural forms of countable nouns) through the so-called mixed constructions (with both unique and regular properties, e.g. the –er construction as in *the bigger they are, the better they are*) to non-canonical or concrete (peripheral) expressions like *spick-and- span.*

From the perspective of an L2 learner, peripheral or non-canonical language units need to be learned individually as they require additional cognitive effort and practice to become easily accessible to the language user. The assumption is that becoming a competent language user involves a lot of learning hence the role of innate structures specific to language is minimized.

It is quite a common phenomenon for an L2 learner to master both a general rule (such as e.g. making past tense forms of regular verbs) and a number of specific examples like e.g. *fathered, uncovered*, etc., that are easily accessed without activating the general pattern. Since rules in English are productive to a certain degree, the majority of language units or constructions need to be learned and acquired in a piecemeal fashion by an L2 learner.

Fouconnier (1994) observes that there is a long tradition in linguistics of studying first the 'simplest', the most 'typical' constructions, then building a theory from this 'core' fragment, and only later extending the analysis to 'creative' instances of language use. In a usage-based approach, however, irregular word forms appear to occur among the more frequent language units or constructions. Following Bybee (2000), *frequency* has an indispensable role in any explanatory account of language. Irregular inflectional forms are quite consistently found among the higher frequency words in the lexicon. For example, it is not surprising that the verb with the most irregular person verb forms in English is the frequent verb *be.* It also needs to be stressed that *was/were* are the only past forms in modern English that distinguish person.

Since instances of producing and understanding language are especially significant in the structuring of the linguistic system, they are also important in successful learning i.e. acquisition of language. In a usage-based model, children are assumed to learn

and acquire concrete linguistic expressions imitatively and then - using general cognitive skills - children categorize, schematize and combine the newly learned expressions and structures.

The hypothesis that knowledge of language emerges from language use provides an opportunity for cognitive linguists to engage with social-interactional nature of language i.e. assume a maximally broad approach to the experience of meaning and the ways the amazing phenomenon is reflected in language use. Speakers can be said to construe their experience for the purpose of communicating that experience to others, which in turn has broader social-interactional purposes; and hearers likewise invoke a construal of the utterance for those broader purposes. In other words, the output, i.e. the language produced by speakers is at the same time the input for hearers. This means that linguistic processing is *bidirectional,* i.e. involving both language production and comprehension viewed as two inseparable processes.

There are a number of examples of research that focus on the process of learning at the forefront of language acquisition. Tomasello (1992, 2000) suggests that most young children's early language is organized around concrete item-based linguistic schemas (the verb-island hypothesis). It should be stressed that the early lexical constructions (called formulas) are verb-specific rather than some abstract rules. In the next stage of development children gradually start to construct more adult-like linguistic constructions or language units in a piecemeal fashion. The successful learning and acquisition of early lexical constructions seems to be a fundamental process of human associative cognition. The conceptual structure associated with lexical constructions can be viewed as *prompts* for complex processes of conceptualization, i.e. the experience of meaning.

A usage-based approach to language holds that language is not an autonomous cognitive faculty. This means that the cognitive processes that are used in productive and receptive language skills are not fundamentally different from the cognitive processes like visual perception or reasoning. For example, *the process of inferring* means comprehending meaning *beyond* the L2 input. A conventional meaning of a specific language unit or construction often varies relative to context. For example, in a very simple construction like adjective + noun, the adjective appears to assign a fixed property to the noun it modifies, e.g. *brown shoes,* the fixed property *brown* is assigned to *shoes.* There should also be a fixed property associated with the adjective *safe* that modifies a noun. However, Fouconnier and Turner (2003) observe that in the uses of *safe* in the context of a child playing at the beach with a shovel, there is no fixed property that *safe* assigns to the child (The child is *safe*), the beach (*The beach is safe)* or the shovel (*The shovel is safe*). The adjective *safe* prompts us to evoke the imaginary scenario of *danger* with roles like victim (child), location (beach) and instrument (shovel). The adjective *safe* can be said to eliminate the danger in a way.

Many experienced L2 teachers have always recognized the significance of introducing sequenced or structured language input in that L2 units are introduced gradually in meaningful sequences and with an eye to the frequency of occurrence, i.e. usefulness of the individual language unit. This also means that the so-called fixed or idiomatic language units appear to have a special status and hence they should not be treated as exceptions but rather as the most significant aspect of any natural language.

It should be observed that the experience of form and meaning pairing could be more significant than frequency of occurrence, however. For example, the definite article THE is probably the most frequent word

in English yet its successful learning and acquisition in L1 and L2 is rather late.

Sometimes even the full context is insufficient in determining the association between form and meaning. For example, Ionin (2008) observes a subtle contrast in the use of THE related to definiteness and specificity.

[+definite, +specific]
1. I want to talk to **the** owner of the store – She is my neighbor and I have an urgent message for her.
[+definite]
 2. I want to talk to **the** owner of the store whoever that is.

The successful learning and acquisition of the subtle contrast in the use of the definite article could be a real challenge. The perspective of a usage-based approach to language holds that the representation of linguistic knowledge is essentially the same as the representation of any other conceptual structures. Therefore, there is no need to draw a distinction between linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge, between acquisition and learning, between habits (cognitive routines) and rules, between competence and performance. Language is viewed as a *structured inventory of regular and peripheral language units.* Furthermore, peripheral or irregular language units or constructions occur among the more frequently used language forms. Since the model is an *emergence-based system,* it does not need a separate system of rules independent of units in the system. The model allows for the learning of *both* regular and irregular (peripheral) language units in a uniform way, i.e. without relegating the so-called exceptions to the lexicon. The emerging cognitive routines can be said to motivate our linguistic behavior and they enable L2 learners to construct and experience meaning in L2. A usage-based approach to language seems

to offer a lot of opportunities to highlight various aspects of experiencing meaning in L2 and help L2 teachers make informed decisions in relation to L2 input.

References

Fauconnier, Giles and Mark Turner. 2002. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.

Goldberg, Adele. 2006. *Constructions at Work. The Nature of Generalisations in Language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ionin, Tania. 2008. "Sources of linguistic knowledge in the second language acquisition of English articles". *Lingua.* 118: 554-576.

Langacker, Ronald. 2001. "A dynamic usage-based model" In Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn (ed), *Usage-Based Models of Linguistics*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3-48.

Tomasello, Michael. 1992. *First Verbs: A Case Study of Early Grammatical Development.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomasello, Michael. 2003. *Constructing a Language. A usage-based Theory of Language Acquisition.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jacek Tadeusz Waliński

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9027-2250

e-mail: jacek.walinski@gmail.com

Towards a lexical-semantic typology of English motion manner verbs for EFL

W kierunku leksykalno-semantycznej typologii angielskich czasowników sposobu ruchu w kontekście nauczania języka angielskiego

Abstrakt

Tekst przedstawia przegląd wybranych zagadnień istotnych dla opracowania wyczerpującej typologii *czasowników sposobu ruchu* w kontekście dydaktyki języka angielskiego jako języka obcego. Wychodząc od ogromnej złożoności semantycznej w obrębie sposobów ruchu, przedstawione zostały dotychczasowe modele proponowane do ich opisu, w tym podejścia dekompozycyjne, schematyzacja w obrębie struktury zdarzeń oraz użycie naturalnego metajęzyka semantycznego. Dodatkowo, biorąc pod uwagę ogromną polisemię czasowników tego typu, można zauważyć, że choć proponowane do tej pory kategoryzacje poznawczo-semantyczne stanowią niezwykle cenny dorobek naukowy, nie są ukierunkowane na praktyczne zastosowania w nauczaniu języka angielskiego.

Słowa kluczowe: semantyka leksykalna, zdarzenia ruchu, kategoryzacja, czasowniki ruchu, sposób

Abstract

This study offers a review of selected issues relevant to a comprehensive typology of motion manner verbs, that is, verbs whose lexical semantics specifies a manner in which motion takes place, in the context of teaching/learning English as a foreign language (EFL). Starting with an overview of the inherent complexity involved in motion manner semantics, it presents different models offered for a semantic explication of motion manner, including decompositional, event schematic, and Natural Semantic Metalanguage approaches. Additionally, by demonstrating a colossal polysemy of motion manner verbs, it shows that while cognitive semantic categorizations proposed so far are highly valuable, they might still be inadequate for practical applications in EFL.

Keywords: lexical semantics, motion events, categorization, motion verbs, manner

1. Introduction

The notion of *motion manner* has been approached in lexical semantic studies in many different ways. A basic distinction between *movement* and *displacement* in motion events dates back to Descartes, who (in his *Principles of Philosophy:* 1644/1985, Part II, 24) defines *movement* as the means of obtaining *displacement*, which is a change of location pursued in motion. This distinction was later recapitulated by Tesnière, who in his *Elements of structural syntax* (1959/2015) presented the following example to illustrate the difference.

A squirrel walking in its wheel is performing a movement that can be very fast, but the wheel is not fastened to its axle and so moves under the squirrel's feet such that the squirrel does not obtain any displacement and always ends up in the same spot. His fate is comparable to that of a cycling mannequin who pedals incessantly on a suspended bicycle in a sports shop window. The

wheels spin in midair because they have no contact with the ground. The cyclist makes a movement, but he undertakes no displacement (Tesnière: 1959/2015, 311).

What the above-quoted passage indicates is the possibility of disassociating *movement* from *displacement*, for instance, by sitting immobile in a train compartment throughout the entire journey. If the problem is reduced to its essentials, displacement is *extrinsic* to a motion event. It focuses on the space in which a change of location occurs. On the other hand, movement is *intrinsic*, which means that the nature of movement is tied to the physical conditions of its subject.

A basic conceptualization of an object in motion involves the schema of PATH, which was proposed by Lakoff (1987, 267) among basic *kinesthetic* image schemas (without regard to the characteristics of the object or the details of the trajectory it follows, cf. Jackendoff: 1983, Ch. 9). Lakoff (1987) argues that the basic experience of motion can be described more thoroughly with a SOURCE–PATH–GOAL schema, which reflects that "Every time we move anywhere there is a place we start from, a place we wind up at, a sequence of contiguous locations connecting the starting and ending points, and a direction" (Lakoff: 1987, 275).

Talmy (1985; 2000, 25) sketches a prototypical motion event similarly as a situation which "consists of one object (*Figure*) moving or located with respect to another object (the reference object or *Ground*)". The basic schema of *Motion event* has four core components, which apart from the above-mentioned Figure and Ground, include also Motion and Path. The *Path* is a path followed or site occupied by the Figure object with respect to the Ground. The component of *Motion* "refers to the presence per se of motion or locatedness in the event" (Talmy: 2000, 25), despite the fact that in the latter motion as such does not occur. Moreover, Talmy (2000, 35–36) distinguishes two types of motion

found in motion events: *translational motion*, in which "an object's basic location shifts from one point to another in space"; and *self-contained motion*, in which "an object keeps its same, or 'average' location", e.g. oscillation, rotation, expansion, contraction, etc.

Moreover, Talmy (1985; 2000, 26) distinguishes an associated *Co-event*: "a motion event can be associated with an external Co-event that most often bears the relation of Manner or of Cause to it". Thus, besides the above-mentioned four internal components of the core schema of motion, the *Manner* component reflects the way in which the motion takes place, and the *Cause* is the cause of its occurrence. Talmy (1985, 139–140) explains that the assessment of whether Manner or Cause is conflated in a verb depends on the verb's basic reference to what the Figure does or to what the Agent/Instrument does. For instance, "Tom rolled the keg" expresses Manner since the verb basically refers to what the Figure (keg) did. On the other hand, "Tom pushed the keg" expresses Cause because the verb refers to what the Agent (Tom) did.

2. Complexity of motion manner semantics

In his early publication on the lexicalization patterns of motion events, Talmy (1985, 128) defines *manner of motion* as "a subsidiary action or state that a Patient manifests concurrently with its main action or state". Taking a critical outlook on this provision, Slobin (2006, 62) points out it is rather generic and may serve as an umbrella term for a number of various aspects, for instance *motor pattern*, e.g. hop, jump, skip; *rate of motion*, e.g. walk, run, sprint; *attitude*, e.g. amble, saunter, stroll; *force dynamics*, e.g. step, tread, tramp, and so forth.

Dodge and Lakoff (2005) point out that motion descriptions often convey information which expands be-

yond certain basic cognitive semantic schemas of motion. For instance, sentences such as "She *sprinted*" or "We *strolled* arm in arm" do not specify the properties of the movers or their destinations. Instead, *sprint* indicates that the mover is running fast and *stroll* indicates that the mover is walking slowly and leisurely. Some verbs of this type describe basic manners of human gait, e.g. *amble, march, saunter, stride*, etc., others describe types of running, e.g. *jog, run, sprint,* etc., yet some others refer to various forms of jumping, e.g. *jump, hop, leap*, etc. Dodge and Lakoff (2005, 68) assume that different types of semantic information related to mover, gait, speed, effort, and body part can be approached as elements constituting collectively a more complex schema, which they label LOCOMOTION. They assume that this schema enables us, for instance, to infer that if a person is *trudging,* they are not *running*, but moving in a manner more effortful than it would be if they were *strolling*, and so on.

In a similar vein, Oakley (2007, 231–232) notes that diagrams used for image-schematic representation of motion in cognitive linguistic literature (e.g. Dewell: 1994; Langacker: 1987; 2008; Mandler: 1992) typically employ simple lines to mark a trajectory, e.g. straight or curved. He emphasizes that in such scenarios the manner of motion remains largely underspecified. Moreover, lexical semantic studies tend to overlook basic distinctions between SELF-MOTION and CAUSED MOTION, as well as ANIMATE MOTION and INANIMATE MOTION recognized by Mandler (1992; 2004) as fundamental to our conceptions of motion.

Jackendoff (2012, 1142) also emphasizes the need to identify various manners of motion. He points out that English verbs used to refer to different manners of motion can be ascribed to several subcategories, which include: (1) types of motion that can be attributed to any sort of object, e.g. *bounce, float, glide, roll, slide,* etc.; (2) types of locomotion, e.g. *fly, run, swim, slither, walk,*

etc.; (3) specific types of bipedal locomotion, e.g. *waddle, dance, stagger, shuffle, limp, jog, sprint,* etc.; (4) types of motion without changing overall position, e.g. *rotate, shake, twirl, wave, wiggle,* etc.; (5) types of shape change, e.g. *elongate, grow, shrink, widen, twist,* etc. He emphasizes that spatial conceptual structure must provide means for encoding and identifying each of these motion types.

Slobin (1997, 459) proposes to distinguish "a 'two-tiered' lexicon of motion manner verbs: the neutral, everyday verbs – like *walk, fly,* and *climb*, and the more expressive or exceptional verbs – like *dash, swoop,* and *scramble.* In English, which belongs to the Satelite-language group (see Talmy: 1985; 2000 for a broader discussion), they are accompanied by a large collection of the second-tier verbs, which elaborate manner details. Slobin (2004; 2006) suggests that in English the first-tier verbs can be approached as classificatory with reference to distinguishing basic types of creatures: birds *fly*, fish *swim*, humans *walk,* snakes *slither,* etc.

Slobin (2004, 255) summarizes the situation in lexical semantic studies of motion manner rather pessimistically: "*Manner* covers an ill-defined set of dimensions that modulate motion, including motor pattern, rate, rhythm, posture, affect, and evaluative factors". Mani and Pustejovsky (2012, 48) are less vocal in their criticism, noting only that "Using the notion of 'manner' to distinguish types of movement in language has been a mixed bag, at best".

3. Decompositional semantic approaches to motion manner

As a proponent of decompositional representations, Jackendoff (1983; 1990) discerns different classes of motion verbs whose members differ primarily by information about manner. In his initial publication, Jackendoff (1983) assumes that verbs of locomotion,

such as *walk, run, lope, jog, sprint, scurry* share a common element, which is basically movement in physical space. At the same time, these verbs represent a particular visual and/or motor pattern that specifies a characteristic gait and/or speed. However, he sees their semantic distinctions as quite difficult to pin down other than impressionistically: "In this respect they resemble the color words, which also are grammatically homogeneous and can be really distinguished only by ostension" (Jackendoff: 1983, 149).

However, in his subsequent book, Jackendoff (1990) offers a solution for the distinction between different verbs of motion manner. He proposes to distinguish two basic components of lexical meaning: (1) *Conceptual Structure*, which captures the syntactically relevant aspects of a word's meaning and (2) *3D model representation*, which he proposes to ground in Marr's (1982/2010) theory of vision. The theory assumes that visual categories can be encoded in the format of 3D model structures, which include a viewpoint-independent geometric representations composed of a part-whole structure and an axis around which it structured (see Jackendoff: 1996b; 2012; Landau & Jackendoff: 1993; Marr & Vaina: 1982). Jackendoff (1990, 34, 88) argues that this approach should enable us to distinguish between verbs such as *run*, *jog*, and *lope*, which are syntactically parallel, that is, share the same conceptual structure, but at the same time differ in the 3D model representations. Because for Jackendoff it is the conceptual structure that constitutes the proper object of semantic enquiry, further inquiries into the manner of motion have been largely abandoned in his later studies.

Jackendoff's (1990) approach to the manner of motion has been criticized by Taylor (1996), who argues that the difference between *jogging* and *running* cannot be distinguished exclusively on the basis of the 3D model representations, that is, in terms of the shape of movements that a person makes. He suggests that a full account of

the semantics of these verbs should be characterized against a *stereotyped conception* (or an *idealized cognitive model* in Lakoff's (1987) terms). On this account, the activity of jogging is associated with a certain lifestyle, which emphasizes fitness and physical well-being among its values and attitudes. This lifestyle, which is embraced typically by middle class members in affluent societies, provides a number of characteristics of jogging, as opposed to running.

> The jogger jogs for exercise; jogging is not a competitive activity; one does not jog to beat a world record, or even to beat one's fellow joggers. Neither does one jog in order to arrive at some destination. (If the stereotypical jogger needs to get some place, he takes the BMW.) Of course, when jogging, the jogger has to jog somewhere, in the sense that he has, perforce, to jog along some route, and past various places along this route. But the specific route, and the specific places that the jogger passes, are quite incidental to the activity *per se* (Taylor: 1996, 26).

On the other hand, running has a much broader range of uses. Essentially, it is a manner of locomotion whose essential aspect is speed. Although one can run for exercise, which provides a degree of overlap between the verbs *run* and *jog*, typically one runs to a place because they need to get there quickly, which provides the basis for running as a competitive sporting activity. In broader terms, Taylor's (1996) study demonstrates that at a more fine-grained level of analysis the differences between the verbs of motion manner cannot be fully accounted for by coupling the syntactically relevant aspects with the 3D model representations.

In his reply, Jackendoff (1996a) admits that he overlooked the syntactic difference between "run/*jog a race". He explains that he proposed to use Marr's (1982/2010) model because it offered a detailed and perceptually motivated solution to encode these aspects of word meaning

that expand beyond the standard feature decomposition. He adds that this line of formal investigation has not been actively pursued after Marr's premature death (Jackendoff: 1996a, 104).

The problem of mapping different motion manners onto different geometric and topological properties was taken up more recently by Mani and Pustejovsky (2012). In their computational approach to motion semantics, manner is not considered a unique factor in characterizing motion, but instead is viewed as a specification or modification of other basic semantic components: "There is no manner field in defining motion. The characterization of manner is merely the modification of other aspects of the motion frame" (Mani & Pustejovsky: 2012, 49).

As an important part of their proposal of formal description, they adopt the model called Region Connection Calculus 8 (RCC-8) used for defining static spatial relations (Randell, Cui, & Cohn: 1992). It identifies eight jointly exhaustive and pairwise disjoint relations between two spatial regions X and Y, such as: (1) Disconnected (DC); (2) Externally Connected (EC); (3) Partial Overlap (PO); (4) Equal (EQ) – X and Y occupy the exact same Euclidean space; and so on. On the basis of the RCC-8 topological constraints that hold between the Figure and Ground during the movement, Mani and Pustejovsky (2012, Ch. 2.4) propose to differentiate different manner predicates. For example, while the verb *slide* is characterized by the mover being Externally Connected (EC) with respect to the earth, for the verb *fly* the mover is Disconnected (DC) with respect to the earth. Additional manners can be distinguished by taking into account whether the topological relation is constant throughout the process of motion.

One must take into account, however, that the formal description of motion manner semantics proposed by Mani and Pustejovsky (2012) was developed for the sake

of a straightforward componential model of representation applicable in computational applications. Some qualitative properties of motion such as *speed* or *effort* are not covered in their approach, although these are considered worthwhile topics to be tackled in future studies (Mani & Pustejovsky: 2012, 144–145).

4. Motion manner verbs as semantic root modifiers

Another important line in the lexical semantic studies of motion verbs has been carried out by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1991; 1992; 2005; 2013; 2014; Rappaport Hovav & Levin: 1998; 2010). Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2005; Rappaport Hovav & Levin: 1998) assume that the semantic structure of verbs can be decomposed into two basic components: a generic component representing an event type, such as ACT/DO, CAUSE, BECOME, GO or STAY, which they term *event schema*, and an idiosyncratic component of verb meaning, which they term *root* (cf. Jackendoff: 1990). A root's most important property is its ontological type, which includes a relatively small set of properties such as *state, result, thing, surface/container, manner*, and *instrument*. Roots may be integrated into event structures in two ways: a root may fill an argument position associated with a primitive predicate or it may serve as a modifier of a predicate (Levin & Rappaport Hovav: 2005, 70–75).

Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2005, 72) propose that modifier roots might be appropriate for distinguishing verbs of motion manner, such as *walk, run, skip*, and *jog*. Because manners can be viewed as modifiers of activity predicates, a root of the ontological type "manner" is represented as a modifier. A common representation for the verbs of manner is [x ACT<MANNER>], e.g. *jog*: [x ACT<JOG>]. On this account, all manner of motion verbs share the basic event structure template consisting of the predicate ACT and a manner root.

Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2010) propose that a verb root can only be associated with a single category in an event schema: "a root has only one ontological category even if the meaning components that determine its categorization are themselves very complex" (Rappaport Hovav & Levin: 2010, 34). Although a root of manner can involve many meaning components, it is still associated with a single ontological category because the actual content of the root does not matter. For instance, the motion manner verb *tango*, which basically means to perform this specific dance, is obviously associated with more lexical entailments than the verb *dance* itself. However, from the perspective of their common ontological category tango is no more complex than dance: both are manner verbs.

5. Motion manner in Natural Semantic Metalanguage

Another attempt at a systematic description of motion manner verbs was proposed by Goddard, Wierzbicka, and Wong (2017; see also Goddard: 2011, Ch. 9.1), who offer the methodology of Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) (Wierzbicka: 1996; 2006; Goddard: 2008; 2011; Goddard & Wierzbicka: 2014) for examination of motion manner verbs across languages. They present detailed semantic explications of the conceptual semantics of two manner verbs *walk* and *run* in English and their nearest counterparts in German. They argue that earlier attempts taken by other researchers (e.g. Jackendoff: 1990), use metalanguage that is "too dependent on technical or English-specific concepts to plausibly represent the naive conceptualisation of ordinary speakers" (Goddard, Wierzbicka, & Wong: 2017, 304).

They assume that verbs of human locomotion can be expected to follow a semantic template similar to other physical activity verbs (see Goddard: 2011, Ch. 9), which falls into four broad sections: (1) Lexicosyntactic Frame,

(2) Prototypical Scenario, (3) Manner, and (4) Potential Outcome. On this account, verbs *walk* and *run* share a common Lexicosyntactic Frame, which is based around the prime DO with its obligatory primary argument ('someone X') coupled with a second component MOVE that specifies a result of the action being carried out. For both walking and running the frame is: *someone X is doing something somewhere for some time; because of this, this someone is moving in this place during this time as this someone wants*. Also the Potential Outcome, which describes the consequence of the activity continuing for some time is parallel for these verbs: "*this someone can be far from the place where this someone was before*".

For instance, Goddard, Wierzbicka, and Wong (2017) argue that two elements differentiate the verbs *walk* and *run* from each other. One is the Prototypical Scenario. Although for both verbs it is getting to another place, for walking it is "*after some time*", whereas for running "*after a short time*", which emphasizes a sense of urgency involved in running (see Taylor: 1996, 26–28). The other element differentiating these verbs in the NSM descriptions is the Manner section, which describes a coordinated set of body-part movements and the effect they have on the body as a whole. Following earlier Nida's (1975, 120) and Miller and Johnson-Laird's (1976, 551–552) observations, the explications in NSM differ with respect to the foot movement pattern. In walking, "*one foot touches the ground*" and "*during this time the other foot moves for a short time above the ground*", and then "*touches the ground in another place…in front of this someone's body*". In contrast, while running, "*one foot moves for a very short time above the ground*", then it is "*in front of this someone's body*", and then "*it touches the ground for a very short time*", which emphasizes the feet moving quickly above the ground. For both *walk* and *run* their respective Manner explications specify that the activity has an iterative

structure, i.e. someone "*does something with the legs many times*", which causes them to move repetitively (Goddard, Wierzbicka, & Wong: 2017, 317–318).

Goddard, Wierzbicka, and Wong (2017) argue that the NSM approach provides a methodology suitable for the semantic analysis of fine-grained differences among the verbs of motion manner across languages, which Jackendoff (1990) puts outside the scope of description in propositional symbolic terms. Although the proposed semantic explications are rather convoluted, Goddard, Wierzbicka, and Wong (2017) emphasize that they are meant to provide a cognitively realistic account of a way of conceptualizing different manners of motion. They add that typically most of the semantic detail implicit in the meaning of motion manner verbs is processed in everyday speaking and thinking of fluent language users as chunks, without conscious attention to the semantic content.

6. Polysemy of motion manner verbs

What makes the development of a universal lexical-semantic typology of motion manner verbs additionally difficult is their ubiquitous polysemy. Starting with examining definitions of the verb in six dictionaries, Fillmore and Atkins (2000) demonstrate polysemy of the verb *crawl*. They list the following senses of the verb illustrated with abridged examples drawn from the BNC: (1) of person: dragging body, e.g. "with a last effort he crawled up the path"; (2) of person: on hands and knees, e.g. "I crawled smartly after him"; (3) of baby: manner of motion, e.g. "the moment a child can crawl, everything..."; (4) of traffic: move slowly, e.g. "cars crawl along at fifteen miles per hour"; (5) of insects, crabs, etc.: manner of motion, e.g. "a beetle began to crawl up his leg"; (6) of snakes, worms, etc.: manner of motion, e.g. "larvae of worms crawl up the blades of grass"; (7) of person: grovel, fawn, e.g. "the way you crawl to them makes me

sick"; (8) of place: be swarming with, e.g. "the area was crawling with caterpillars"; (9) of skin, etc.: creeping sensation, e.g. "his skin crawled and his hair prickled on his neck".

They point out that even these nine different sense distinctions taken from dictionaries fail to distinguish some other senses of the verb *crawl* that crop up in the corpus data. For instance, (10) other types of non-human creatures, such as cats, hedgehogs, or injured animals may be said to crawl, e.g. "A cat can crawl through any hole it can get its head through"; (11) inanimate entities, such as clouds, fog, steam, or darkness may be said to crawl, e.g., "Darkness crawled through the suburbs like a flood of black ink"; (12) the verb can be used to emphasize the abject nature of the event, e.g. "They had nothing for it but to crawl back to Mr Scully"; (13) people travelling in slowly moving vehicles may also be said metonymically to be crawling, e.g. "Nicola took over an hour to crawl the three miles from Holhorn"; (14) the verb is also used to emphasize the slowness of activities, e.g. "The party's share of the vote crawled up to barely 35 per cent"; (15) periods of time may be said to *crawl by*, or *crawl past*, if they seem to be interminable, e.g. "The weeks crawled by...", "The morning crawled past".

What can be observed in the above-listed senses of *crawl* is that they refer to different objects. Essentially, senses 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 13 refer to humans. Senses 5, 6, 10 refer to animate creatures. Senses 4, 8, 11, 14, 15 refer to inanimate entities. However, within this basic distinction there are some important differences. With reference to human gaits, the verb may be used to refer to adults (1 and 2), specifically to babies (3), social aspects (7, 12), body parts (9), or, by a metonymical extension, to vehicles (13). Moreover, with reference to animals, the verb may be used to refer to insects, which have more than four legs (5), snakes, which do not have

legs at all (6), and four-legged animals (10). With reference to inanimate entities, the verb may relate to concrete objects (4), places (8), shapeless objects (11), activities (14), and abstract notions (15).

In broader terms, the above-reviewed study demonstrates that the meanings of motion manner verbs are centered around certain prototypes rather than discrete categories with sharp borders. Fillmore and Atkins (2000, 100) emphasize that trying to classify word-meanings in respect to cases where the prototype fits and then classifying the varieties of departures from the prototype is a "slippery work" because there are no objective criteria for the analysis of a word into senses. For this reason, without access to empirical linguistic data, it is impossible to state unequivocally which of the senses of a given verbs of motion manner can be relevant, through metonymical and metaphorical extensions, to a particular scenario.

7. Conclusion

What emerges from the above-reviewed proposals of systematic categorization of motion manner semantics in English is that despite many years of studies the manner of motion still remains a relatively underdeveloped area of lexical-semantic studies (cf. Slobin: 2004, 255; Mani and Pustejovsky: 2012, 48). The most conspicuous problem is the lack of fully systematic criteria allowing for systematization of motion verbs (see Ibarretxe-Antuñano: 2019 for a recent attempt at developing a semantic grid for typological classification of motion ideophones). Arriving at a systematic set of principles for a typology of English verbs of motion manner is definitely a formidable task since, as pointed out by Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976, 526–531), the criteria available for distinguishing motion verbs in English "generate numerous borderline cases and gray areas". Typically,

certain motion verbs inherit some conceptual and formal properties from others, which makes conceptual distinctions difficult to draw precisely (see Wilkins & Hill: 1995).

None of the above-reviewed approaches to a systematic description of motion manner semantics has been widely accepted without criticism. The decompositional approaches proposed by Jackendoff (1990; 1996b) and Mani and Pustejovsky (2012) offer extremely concise models of representation, which are highly useful for computational applications. On the other hand, such technical/geometrical solutions are of limited use in the practice of explaining English verbs of motion manner in second language acquisition (see Taylor, 2008 for a broader discussion on the role prototypes in the conceptualization of language users).

On the other end of the spectrum of representation models is the fairly straightforward approach of reductive paraphrases offered by the NSM approach (Wierzbicka: 1996; 2006; Goddard: 2008; 2011; Goddard & Wierzbicka: 2014). It attempts to articulate the semantic complexity of manner motion verbs component by component. However, what it boils down to is paraphrasing natural language meanings in the metalanguage of semantic primes, which may sound rather awkward to learners of English, especially at advanced levels of proficiency, when the distinctions among specific verbs of motion come to play an important role.

What appears to offer a fairly optimal solution for applications in EFL is the event schematic model proposed by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2005; 2013). Approaching verbs of motion manner as root modifiers that share the basic conceptual template while referring to a specific activity might be the most plausible solution for explaining conceptualizations to ordinary learners of English. However, within this framework the only comprehensive typology of English motion manner verbs dates back to the proposal published by Levin in 1993

(see Waliński, 2018 for an example of application). As it nears the 30th anniversary, it is apparent that a more fine-grained typology would be desirable, especially for the purpose of teaching and learning English as a foreign language.

References

Descartes, Rene. 1644/1985. "Principles of Philosophy." *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, translated by John Cottingham et al. Cambridge University Press, 177–292.

Dewell, Robert B. 1994. "*Over* Again: Image-Schema Transformations in Semantic Analysis." *Cognitive Linguistics* 5(4): 351–80.

Dodge, Ellen, and George Lakoff. 2005. "Image Schemas: From Linguistic Analysis to Neural Grounding." In: Beate Hampe (ed), *From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics*. Mouton de Gruyter, 57–91.

Fillmore, Charles J., and Beryl T. S. Atkins. 2000. "Describing Polysemy: The Case of 'Crawl.'" In: Yael Ravin and Claudia Leacock (eds), *Polysemy: Theoretical and Computational Approaches*. Oxford University Press, 91–110.

Goddard, Cliff. 2011. *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction*. 2nd ed., Oxford University Press.

Goddard, Cliff (ed.). 2008. *Cross-Linguistic Semantics*. John Benjamins.

Goddard, Cliff, and Anna Wierzbicka. 2014. *Words and Meanings: Lexical Semantics across Domains, Languages and Cultures*. Oxford University Press.

Goddard, Cliff, Wierzbicka, Anna, and Wong, Jock. 2017. "'Walking' and 'Running' in English and German: The Conceptual Semantics of Verbs of Human Locomotion." *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 14(2): 303–36.

Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide. 2019. "Towards a Semantic Typological Classification of Motion Ideophones: The Motion Semantic Grid." In: Kimi Akita and Prashant Pardeshi (eds.), *Iconicity in Language and Literature*, John Benjamins, 137–66.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1983. *Semantics and Cognition*. MIT Press.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1990. *Semantic Structures*. MIT Press.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1996a. "Conceptual Semantics and Cognitive Linguistics." *Cognitive Linguistics*, 7(1): 93–129.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1996b. "The Architecture of the Linguistic-Spatial Interface." In: Paul Bloom (ed.), *Language and Space*. MIT Press, 1–30.

Jackendoff, Ray. 2012. "Language as a Source of Evidence for Theories of Spatial Representation." *Perception*, 41(9): 1128–52.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*. University of Chicago Press.

Landau, Barbara, and Ray Jackendoff. 1993. "'What' and 'Where' in Spatial Language and Spatial Cognition." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 16(02): 217–65.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites.* Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar A Basic Introduction.* Oxford University Press.

Levin, Beth. *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation.* 1993. University of Chicago Press.

Levin, Beth, and Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1991. "Wiping the Slate Clean: A Lexical Semantic Exploration." *Cognition*, 41(1–3): 123–51.

Levin, Beth, and Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1992. "The Lexical Semantics of Verbs of Motion: The Perspective from Unaccusativity." In: Iggy M. Roca (ed.), *Thematic Structure*. De Gruyter, 247-270.

Levin, Beth, and Malka Rappaport Hovav. 2013. "Lexicalized Meaning and Manner/Result Complementarity." In: Boban Arsenijević et al. (eds.), *Studies in the Composition and Decomposition of Event Predicates*. Springer, 49–70.

Levin, Beth, and Malka Rappaport Hovav. 2014. "Manner and Result: A View from *Clean*." In: Rob Pensalfini et al (eds.), *Studies in Language Companion Series*, vol. 147. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 337–58.

Mandler, Jean M. 1992. "How to Build a Baby: II. Conceptual Primitives.". *Psychological Review*, 99(4): 587–604.

Mandler, Jean M. 2004. *The Foundations of Mind: Origins of Conceptual Thought*. Oxford University Press.

Mani, Inderjeet, and J. Pustejovsky. 2012. *Interpreting Motion: Grounded Representations for Spatial Language*. Oxford University Press.

Marr, David. 1982/2010. *Vision: A Computational Investigation into the Human Representation and Processing of Visual Information* [Originally Published in 1982, San Francisco: W.H. Freeman]. MIT Press.

Marr, David, and Lucia Vaina. 1982. "Representation and Recognition of the Movements of Shapes." *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 214(1197): 501–24.

Miller, George A., and Phil N. Johnson-Laird. 1976. *Language and Perception*. Harvard University Press.

Nida, Eugene A. 1975. *A Componential Analysis of Meaning. An Introduction to Semantic Structures*. Mouton.

Oakley, Todd. "Image Schemas." 2007. In: Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford University Press, 214–35.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka, and Beth Levin. 1998. "Building Verb Meanings." In: Miriam Butt and Wilhelm Geuder (eds.), *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*. CSLI Publications, 97–134.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka, and Beth Levin. 2010. "Reflections on Manner/Result Complementarity." In: Malka Rappaport Hovav et al. (eds.), *Lexical Semantics, Syntax, and Event Structure*. Oxford University Press, 21–38.

Slobin, Dan Isaac. 1997. "Mind, Code, and Text." In: Joan L. Bybee et al. (eds.), *Essays on Language Function and Language Type: Dedicated to T. Givón.* John Benjamins, 437–67.

Slobin, Dan Isaac. 2004. "The Many Ways to Search for a Frog: Linguistic Typology and the Expression of Motion Events." In: Sven Strömqvist and Ludo Th. Verhoeven (eds.), *Relating Events in Narrative, Vol. 2: Typological and Contextual Perspectives*. Lawrence Erlbaum, 219–57.

Slobin, Dan Isaac. 2006. "What Makes Manner of Motion Salient? Explorations in Linguistic Typology, Discourse, and Cognition." In: Maya Hickmann and Stéphane Robert (eds.), *Space in Languages: Linguistic Systems and Cognitive Categories*. John Benjamins, 59–81.

Talmy, Leonard. 1985. "Lexicalization Patterns: Semantic Structure in Lexical Forms." In: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. 3: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*. Cambridge University Press, 57–149.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics, Vol. II: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring.* MIT Press.

Taylor, John R. 1996. "On Running and Jogging." *Cognitive Linguistics*, 7(1): 21–34.

Taylor, John R. 2008. "Prototypes in cognitive linguistics." In: Peter Robinson and Nick C. Ellis (eds.), *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language*. Routledge, 39–65.

Tesnière, Lucien. 1959/2015. *Elements of Structural Syntax [First Published in 1959 as Éléments de Syntaxe Structurale]*. Translated by Timothy John Osborne and Sylvain Kahane. John Benjamins.

Waliński, Jacek Tadeusz. 2018.*Verbs in Fictive Motion*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1996. *Semantics: Primes and Universals*. Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2006. *English: Meaning and Culture*. Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, David P., and Deborah Hill. 1995. "When ˝go˝ Means ˝come˝: Questioning the Basicness of Basic Motion Verbs." *Cognitive Linguistics*, 6(2–3): 209–60.

Michail L. Kotin

ORCID: https://orcid.org/ 0000-0003-0604-5464

e-mail: michailkotin1@gmail.com

Taxonomie und Deixis bei der Nomination

Taxonomy and deixis in nomination

Abstrakt

Przedmiotem artykułu są wybrane zagadnienia dotyczące relacji pomiędzy dwoma modelami nominacji. Pierwszy wzór nominacyjny jest klasyczną z punktu widzenia strukturalizmu dychotomią między formą a semantyką znaku, warunkującą taksonomiczny charakter denotatów. Drugi zaś wzór warunkuje relację znaku językowego nie do denotatów, lecz do zjawisk, których kodowanie w języku polega na tzw. „geście wskazującym", np. zaimków, ale również innych części mowy. Wspólną cechą takich jednostek jest przewaga semantyki *relacjonalnej* nad znaczeniem denotatywnym. Podstawowym problemem badawczym są zatem wspólne i różniące się cechy nominacji taksonomicznej i deiktycznej. Analiza bazuje na założeniach teoretycznych językoznawstwa funkcjonalnego, a także teorii gramatykalizacji. Stosowane metody badawcze to analiza struktury semantycznej; metoda funkcjonalna; metoda tzw. „re-analizy" w badaniach nad procesami gramatykalizacji i degramatykalizacji. Problem badawczy jest rozwiązywany w drodze synchronicznej i diachronicznej analizy odpowiedniego materiału empirycznego.

Słowa kluczowe: taksonomia, mereologia, deiksa, nominacja, gramatykalizacja, degramatykalizacja.

Abstract

The paper deals with selected aspects of the relation between two models of nomination. The first pattern of nomination is from the classical point of view of structuralism a dichotomy between form and semantics of a sign which determines the taxonomic character of denoted entities. The second one determines the relation of a language sign not to its denotations, but rather to phenomena, whose encoding is based on the so called "deictic gesture", e.g. pronouns, but also other parts of speech. The common feature of such entities is the predomination of relational semantics over denotative semantics. The basic research problems are, thus, common and different features of taxonomic and deictic nomination. The analysis is based on theoretical assumptions of the functional linguistics, as well as the theory of grammaticalization. The research methods are the analysis of semantic structure; the functional method; the method of so called "re-analyses" in investigations of grammaticalization and de-grammaticalization processes. The research problem is being solved by the synchronic and diachronic analyses of the empirical material.

Keywords: taxonomy, mereology, deixis, nomination, grammaticalization, de-grammaticalization.

1. Einleitung und Zielstellung

Die in der Linguistik als klassisch geltende Definition des Sprachzeichens von F. de Saussure (vgl. Saussure 1916/2005: 73-75) bezieht sich auf autonome lexikalische Entitäten, deren Relation zu den bezeichneten Dingen der Außenwelt eine gewisse Ikonizität von Zeichen und Ding voraussetzt. Freilich handelt es sich nicht um Ikonizität im Sinne einer naturgegebenen Korrelation zwischen akustischer Form (*signifiant*) und deren Begriffswert (*signifié*), die de Saussure eindeutig als arbiträr einstuft (vgl. Saussure 1916/2005: 75-77). Dieses Problem verdient freilich eine gesonderte Behand-

lung. Hier und weiter soll darunter dagegen eine Widerspiegelung der assoziativen „vertikalen" Hierarchie der Dinge in der Paradigmatik der Lexeme verstanden werden (vgl. Saussure 1916/2005: 134-136), etwa bei der Relation zwischen Hyperonymen und Hyponymen im Wortschatz (vgl. u. v. a Harm 2015: 71-73), die der taxonomischen bzw. mereologischen Logik der Weltordnung entspricht (vgl. Bunt 1985, Ridder 2002): *Natur – Lebewesen – Tier – Säugetier – Nagetier – Maus – Feldmaus*. Jedoch ist eine begrifflich konzipierte Taxonomie zwar eine wichtige, aber keinesfalls eine unveräußerliche Eigenschaft sprachlicher Zeichen. Neben taxonomisch geordneten Zeichen gibt es nämlich Zeichen, die pure Relationen kodieren, ohne sie den taxonomisch definierbaren Klassen von Begriffsbezeichnungen zuzuweisen. Dazu gehören nicht nur klassische Entitäten mit deiktischer Semantik, welche diverse Zeiggesten versprachlichen, wie Pronomina oder Lokal- bzw. Temporaladverbien wie *dieser, jener, hier, dort, jetzt, dann* etc. (vgl. u. v .a. Brugmann 1904: 8, Rauh 1984: 29, Wunderlich 1985: 67, Diewald 1991: 94; 133). Auch Substantive, Adjektive und Verben können durchaus relationale Semantik besitzen, indem sie keine logisch begründeten Taxonomien, sondern vielmehr deiktisch konzipierte Relationen kodieren. Dazu gehören solche Lexeme wie z.B. die Verwandtschaftsbezeichnungen, aber auch Wörter vom Typ *Freund, Feind, Nachbar* etc.; Adjektive des Typs *eklig, hässlich, sympathisch, fremd, verwandt* etc.; Verben wie z.B. *kommen* und andere Entitäten ohne explizit kodierte logisch-taxonomische Werte. Die dahinter stehenden Quasi-Taxonomien sind nämlich scheinbar und weisen keine Merkmale auf, die sie sonstigen begrifflich-ideographischen Klassen von Lexemen zuweisen lassen. Die im vorliegenden Beitrag präsentierte Analyse hat zum Ziel, essentielle Differenzen zwischen taxonomischen und deiktischen Nominationsmustern zu ermitteln, wobei ein Bezug deiktischer

Nomination zur Grammatikalisierung bzw. Degrammatikalisierung beim Sprachwandel hergestellt wird.

2. Zum Unterschied zwischen Taxonomie und Deixis bei Nomination

Eingangs soll die hier anvisierte Opposition an recht anschaulichen und einfachen Beispielen demonstriert werden:

(1) Wer ist das? Ein Mann / eine Frau / ein Kind / ein Hengst / eine Stute / ein Fohlen (Füllen).

(2) Wer ist das? Ein Vater / eine Mutter / ein Sohn / ein Freund / ein Feind.

Es fällt auf, dass die Nomina unter (1) sich problemlos in hierarchische Klassen einordnen lassen, die taxonomischen Wert besitzen. Ein *Mann* lässt sich z.B. als 'erwachsene Person männlichen Geschlechts' definieren, und die Substantive *Frau* bzw. *Kind* lassen sich ihrerseits durch Änderung von jeweiligen semantischen Merkmalen (respektive 'weiblich' und 'nicht erwachsen') beschreiben; bei *Pferden* wird statt 'Person' das Merkmal 'Tier' mit weiteren subklassifizierenden Merkmalen wie z.B. 'Säugetier', 'Huftier' etc. eingesetzt. Vertikal lassen sich diese Substantive „nach oben" als Ko-Hyponyme von Hyperonymen wie *Mensch* oder *Tier* einordnen, die ihrerseits Kohyponyme vom Hyperonym *Lebewesen* sind, etc., und „nach unten" als Hyperonyme von Wörtern wie z.B. *Deutscher, Französin / Bauer, Bäuerin / Junge, Mädchen / Rappe, Schimmel, Fuchs / Wallach, Ross, Gaul* usw. Die „lexikalische Nische", welche jedes dieser Lexeme ausfüllt, ist aus der Sicht der mereologischen Taxonomie von Teil und Ganzem, Klasse und Art gut nachvollziehbar.

Bei (2) haben wir dagegen mit einer anderen Art von Bedeutungen zu tun, bei der Relationen kodiert werden, die sich primär nicht auf andere Lexeme, sondern auf eine satzexterne Instanz (den Sprecher) oder eine satzinterne Instanz (den Bezugsreferenten) beziehen. Zwar

kann man das Substantiv *Vater* ebenfalls in semantische Merkmale zerlegen, ja dies wird sehr häufig gerade an derartigen Lexemen als vermeintlichen Paradebeispielen demonstriert: [+belebt], [+human.], [+männlich], [+erwachsen], [+hat Kinder]. In der Tat scheint die Definition von *Vater* als 'erwachsene männliche Person, die ein oder mehrere Kind(er) hat' völlig korrekt und vollständig zu sein. Doch ist diese Definition zwar korrekt, aber deutlich insuffizient. Es gibt nämlich nur wenige Kontexte, in denen dieses Substantiv „taxonomisch" verstanden wird, z.B. *Mein Nachbar ist Vater geworden; Da geht ein junger Vater mit dem Kinderwagen* etc. In den meisten Kontexten wird dieses Nomen aber in Begleitung anderer Lexeme verwendet und stellt in derartigen Äußerungen eine Relation zu einer anderen Person her: *Mein Vater ist Schuldirektor; Lisas Vater ist 45 Jahre alt; Der Vater meiner Kollegin sammelt Briefmarken; Sie hat mit dem Vater von Hans gesprochen* etc. In derartigen Äußerungen ist *Vater* relational zu verstehen, nämlich als eine Person, die mit einer anderen Person verwandt ist und somit nicht allgemein 'Vater' ist, sondern ausschließlich als engster Verwandter dieser konkreten Person 'fungiert'.

Allgemein sind Verwandtschaftsbezeichnungen jedoch nicht reine Deiktika, da sie – unter anderem dank ihrer lexikalischen Feldstruktur – zwar in der Regel keine feste denotative Semantik aufweisen, aber dennoch ihre eigene, wenngleich relational begründete, Taxonomie besitzen. Viel stärker ist die deiktische Komponente bei Wortpaaren wie *Freund – Feind* ausgeprägt. Die taxonomisch begründete begrifflich-ideographische Semantik ist entsprechend schwächer vertreten: *Der Freund von meinem Feind ist mein Feind.* Im Gegensatz zu *Gestern ist ein Vater von zwei Kindern verhaftet worden* ist der Satz *?Gestern ist ein Freund verhaftet worden* ohne eine deutliche relationale Referenz sinnlos. Dies gilt übrigens für einige Lexeme des lexikalischen Feldes 'Verwandtschaftsbezeichnungen'. Es genügt im oben

angeführten Satz mit dem Subjekt *Vater* dieses durch *Bruder* zu ersetzen, um sich zu vergewissern, dass selbst bei Verwandtschaftsbezeichnungen gewisse Lexeme sich einer begrifflich festen Taxonomisierung entziehen: *Gestern ist ein Bruder verhaftet worden.*

Einige Nomina sind relationale (quasi deiktische) Entitäten, die außerhalb von lexikalischen Feldern oder Oppositionen stehen. Derartige „deiktische Einzelgänger" haben ebenfalls rein relationale Semantik und kodieren somit vielmehr eine Zeiggeste im Sinne Brugmanns (1904) als Gegenstände oder Personen. Ein Musterbeispiel für derartige Entität ist das Nomen *Nachbar*, welches eine Person bezeichnet, deren Identifizierung lediglich aus der Perspektive der begleitenden Referenzgröße möglich ist: *mein, dein, sein, Peters Nachbar; der Nachbar von Sabine.* Hier handelt es sich um ein typisches Beispiel der genuinen, d.h. lokalen, Deixis, da die kodierte Person lediglich über die räumliche Nähe zu einer anderen Person identifiziert wird. Man kann mit gewissen Einschränkungen behaupten, dass das Substantiv *Nachbar* ein spezifischer Indikator der nahen Deixis ist. Die Einschränkungen betreffen freilich den grundsätzlichen Unterschied zwischen den Markern der eigentlichen spatialen Deixis (wie die Synsemantika *hier, da*) und den relationalen Nomina (wie die Autosemantika des Typs *Nachbar*), der darin besteht, dass bei den letzteren zusätzlich semantische Komponenten hinzu kommen, welche der Entität ein gewisses Denotat zuweisen lassen (etwa '+ANIM' oder '+HUM'). Dieses ist aber von einer prinzipiell anderen Natur als übliche Denotate von Lexemen, die sich taxonomischen Klassen zuordnen lassen und vertikale Hierarchien von Merkmalen und den Lexemen selbst (als Merkmalbündeln) voraussetzen. Dagegen ist z.B. *Nachbar* kein Glied taxonomisch organisierter hierarchischer Ketten von Lexemen mit begrifflich-ideographischer Semantik, vgl. *Gestern ist irgendein Nachbar verhaftet worden.* Doch

das Fehlen dieser wichtigen Eigenschaft macht relationale Nomina nicht zu Deiktika *sui generis*. Dies ist insbesondere darin zu sehen, dass die relationale Deixis relationaler „Vollwörter" im Gegensatz zu den eigentlichen Deiktika nicht an die satzexterne Instanz (Sprecher- bzw. Narrator-Origo) gebunden ist, sondern durchaus auch eine Relation zu einem satzinternen Glied herstellen kann, vgl.: *mein Nachbar* vs. *der Nachbar des Lehrers*. Interessanterweise gibt es im Fall von *Nachbar* doch eine essentielle relational-semantische Opposition zwischen der Singular- und der Pluralform. Im zweiten Fall wird nämlich die Relation via Pluralität als Signal für Teilung eines gemeinsamen „nahe liegenden" Raumes hergestellt: *?Der Nachbar ging/Die Nachbarn gingen ins Kino*. Im ersten Fall ist ein Bezug auf eine dritte Instanz obligatorisch: *Mein Nachbar / Der Nachbar von Sabine ging ins Kino*. Im letzteren Fall ist die Korrelation zwischen den denotierten Entitäten reziprok und bedarf daher keiner obligatorischen externen Instanz, auch wenn diese durchaus denkbar ist: *Meine Nachbarn gingen ins Kino* vs. *Die Nachbarn* [voneinander] *gingen ins Kino*.

Den relationalen Nomina kann also denotative Bedeutung wohl doch nicht abgesprochen werden, aber sie hat eine prinzipiell andere Struktur wegen eines spezifischen onomasiologischen Bezugs, welcher primär relational ist und eine externe Instanz voraussetzt, um legitimiert zu werden. Diese Feststellung ist zunächst recht trivial, aber die Folgen daraus bedürfen einer genaueren Betrachtung. Im Gegensatz zu anderen Lexemen sind relationale Nomina keine Glieder mereologisch aufgebauter taxonomischer Ketten und verhalten sich *in dieser Hinsicht* ähnlich zu den üblichen Deiktika wie z.B. Pronomina oder Lokaladverbien, ohne dabei jedoch ihre denotativen Eigenschaften völlig zu verlieren. Deshalb können sie einerseits nicht als nicht-nominative (d.h. deiktische) Entitäten behandelt werden und anderer-

seits sonstigen autosemantischen Lexemen gleichgestellt werden, denen taxonomische, mereologisch konzipierte Hierarchien zu Grunde liegen. Die oben behandelten Substantive *Freund, Feind, Nachbar* bzw. *Vater, Mutter, Bruder, Schwester* und andere Verwandtschaftsbezeichnungen sind somit ihrem Wesen nach relational-deiktische Autosemantika, die einerseits den denotativ-taxonomischen Autosemantika und andererseits den deiktischen Synsemantika gegenüberstehen.

3. Relationale Autosemantika

Oben wurden an ausgewählten Beispielen die relational-deiktischen Substantive behandelt. Es wurde u.a. gezeigt, dass sie gewissermaßen an der Grenze zwischen taxonomisch konzipierten Lexemen und deiktischen Entitäten liegen, da sie einerseits autosemantisch sind (in dem Sinn, dass sie spezifische denotative Bezüge kodieren), zugleich aber keine üblichen Begriffe bezeichnen, welche hierarchischen taxonomischen Klassen zugeordnet werden, d.h. eine mereologische Struktur von Bezeichnungen der Ober- und Unterbegriffe haben. Als Begriffsbezeichnungen sind gerade die Substantive am besten dazu geeignet, die essentiellen Differenzen zwischen Taxonomie und deiktischer Relationalität zu veranschaulichen. Nichtsdestoweniger gibt es auch ausgeprägt deiktische Verben und Adjektive, und natürlich erst recht deiktische Adverbien.

Das typische deiktisch-relationale Verb ist *kommen*. Es steht im Deutschen (aber auch z.B. im Englischen) den taxonomischen Verben wie *gehen, fahren, laufen, schwimmen, fliegen* gegenüber, welche verschiedene Arten von Bewegung ausdrücken und Ko-Hyponyme des Hyperonyms *sich bewegen* sind. Dieses steht seinerseits dem Verb *ruhen* gegenüber, dessen Ko-Hyponyme die Verben *liegen, stehen, sitzen, hängen* u.a. sind. Im Gegensatz dazu ist *kommen* nicht spezifiziert und bedeutet nicht etwa die Art und Weise, auf die ein

bestimmter Zielpunkt erreicht wird, sondern lediglich das Erreichen dieses Zielpunkts als solches (vgl. Fillmore 1966: 219-227). In anderen Sprachen, so im Polnischen, wird das Eintreffen allerdings je nach Art und Weise der Bewegung zum Zielpunkt hin differenziert, vgl. *przyjść, przyjechać, przypłynąć, przylecieć,* sodass eine den Bewegungsverben symmetrische Taxonomie vorliegt. Diese ist durch das Vorhandensein der morphologisch kodierten Kategorie des Verbalaspekts in der Slavia bedingt, wodurch das entsprechende Verbalpräfix *przy-* nicht nur das Erreichen des Ziels, sondern auch den Abschluss der Handlung bezeichnet. Dadurch werden spezifische Aspektpaare gebildet, bei denen das Präfix sowohl als Aspektmarker der Perfektivität als auch als lexikalischer Modifikator fungiert.[1] Die entsprechenden Verbalpaare drücken somit taxonomisch differenzierte Bewegungsarten aus, während die Präfigierung für die Markierung von Abschluss (Ergebnis) der – zielgerichteten – Bewegung zuständig ist. In den Sprachen ohne „slawischen" Verbalaspekt kodiert das relational-deiktische 'kommen' dagegen lediglich den spatialen Endpunkt einer *jeden* Bewegung. Der Abschluss ist dabei durch die lexikalische Semantik von 'kommen' als *Achievement* laut Zeno Vendlers Klassifikation (vgl. Vendler 1957) automatisch bezeichnet. Dieser sprachspezifische Unterschied zeigt, dass die Grenze zwischen deiktischer Relationalität und taxonomisch-mereologischer Denotation – insbesondere gerade bei Verben – nicht immer universell und sprachübergreifend ist und unter bestimmten Bedingungen durchaus beweglich sein kann.

Bei den Adjektiven und attributiv verwendeten Partizipien sind Taxonomie und Relationalität fast genauso deutlich wie bei Substantiven ausgeprägt, vgl. den essentiellen Gegensatz zwischen solchen Adjektiven wie

---

[1] Die Verben *przyjeżdżać, przychodzić, przypływać, przylatywać* sind sekundär gebildete Imperfektiva, deren Imperfektivität suffixal kodiert wird.

grün, rund, scharf, belebt, hölzern einerseits und *bekannt, fremd, interessant, beliebt* etc. andererseits. Drücken die Lexeme der ersteren Gruppe Eigenschaften aus, die sich problemlos taxonomischen Eigenschaftsklassen zuordnen lassen und daher über mereologisch konzipierte Hierarchien definierbar sind, kodieren die Entitäten der letzteren Gruppe paarweise organisierte Relationen, deren Bewertung über die individuelle Einstellung der Origo oder eines virtuell angesetzten Beobachters erfolgt und je nach dieser Instanz in ihr Gegenteil umschlagen können.

4. Zur historischen Entwicklung deiktischer Nomination (am Beispiel des Substantivs *Freund*)

Obwohl nun die absolute Mehrheit der Autosemantika taxonomische Relationen kodieren, stehen deiktische Implikationen historisch bzw. genealogisch gesehen gerade am Anfangspunkt des Nominationsprozesses – wegen dem Origobezug. Die Origo als „Nullpunkt" der Deixis (vgl. Bühler 1934/1982: 102-103) bewerkstelligt nämlich den genuinen Bezug der zu benennenden „Sache" auf die Nenner-Instanz. Daher steht die deiktische Nomination wohl am Anfang des Benennungsaktes. Eine mögliche Rekonstruktion dieses Prozesses kann am folgenden Beispiel demonstriert werden.

Das Substantiv *Freund* ist – genauso wie sein Antonym *Feind* –, wie oben bereits gezeigt wurde, ein typisches Lexem mit deiktisch-relationaler Bedeutung. Es drückt ein deiktisches Verhältnis aus, das entweder direkt origobezogen sein kann (*Otto ist mein Freund*) oder einen vermittelten relationalen Bezug indiziert (*Otto ist Peters Freund*). Diese Bedeutung wird im Duden-Wörterbuch (vgl. Duden ²1989: 538) wie folgt definiert:

> jemand, der einem anderen in Freundschaft verbunden ist, ihm nahe steht: ein guter F. von mir; mein F. Klaus; mein bester F.; wir sind -e; ich bin

> sein F. […] F. werden; viele -e haben, besitzen; un-
> ter -en sein usw.

Auffällig ist, dass das konkrete Nomen *Freund* in dieser Paraphrase über das abstrakte Nomen *Freundschaft* erklärt wird, wobei der Duden in der Paraphrase des Abstraktums *Freundschaft* keine Zirkeldefinition enthält (vgl. Duden ²1989: 539):

> auf gegenseitiger Zuneigung beruhendes Verhältnis der Menschen zueinander: eine innige F.; die F. zwischen den Kindern; uns verbindet eine tiefe F.; mit jmdm. F. schließen etc.

Bei komplexen (zusammengesetzten und abgeleiteten) Wörtern werden die Bedeutungsdefinitionen (wenn sie überhaupt gleichstämmige Wörter nutzen) in aller Regel umgekehrt erstellt, d.h. vom Simplex zum Derivat oder Kompositum. Es wäre kaum denkbar, dass z. B. das Substantiv *Schule* über den *Schüler* und nicht umgekehrt definiert wäre. Der Grund für die abweichende Bedeutungserklärung von *Freund* und *Freundschaft* ist offenkundig. Es fehlt bei *Freund* das taxonomisch konzipierte Denotat, was im üblichen Fall eine angemessene Definition via Aufzählung mereologisch relevanter Merkmale ermöglicht. Als relationales Nomen benötigt *Freund* eine „deiktische Begleitung" (*Da geht mein, dein, unser Freund, Da geht ein Freund von mir*) oder ein Attribut, das den deiktischen Bezug des Substantivs *Freund* betont (*Da geht Peters Freund, Da geht der Freund von Peter*). Das Substantiv *Freund* ist somit zwar ein konkretes Substantiv, das aber eine abstrakte Relation kodiert, deren Träger bezeichnet wird (vgl. meine Ausführungen hierzu in Kotin 2005: 238-240). Es gilt also die Faustregel, dass nicht die Freundschaft eine Beziehung zwischen Freunden ist, sondern umgekehrt Freunde Träger der Freundschaft sind.

Historisch ist nun *Freund* (ahd. *friunt*) das substantivierte Partizip I von dem germanischen schwachen Verb der 2. Klasse mit der Bedeutung 'lieben', 'gern haben', das im Gotischen als *frijôn* bezeugt ist. Got.

frijônds 'Freund', also eigentlich der Liebende, gehört zu der gemeingermanischen Deklinationsklasse partizipialer Ableitungen der sog. *nd*-Stämme.

Neben *frijôn* 'lieben' bedeutete got. *fijan* 'hassen', wovon nun das substantivierte Partizip I *fijands* 'Feind', also eigentlich der Hassende (ahd. *fiant*), stammt.
Das Verb *frijôn* ist wiederum eine Ableitung mittels des stammbildenden Suffixes *-ô- zu ide. *-â-. Die übliche Herleitung vom Adjektiv *frei* basiert auf der genuinen Semantik des ahd. *frî* und seiner Entsprechungen in anderen germanischen Sprachen, also 'lieb', 'erwünscht', noch früher 'geschützt' und ursprünglich 'zu der Sippe, also zu den Lieben, gehörend; eigen' (vgl. u.a. Kluge 1999). Auf das Adjektiv *frî* geht bekanntlich nach der gängigen Hypothese die Stammesbezeichnung *Franken* zurück.

Das Relational-Deiktische am Konzept 'Liebe' besteht zweifelsohne in der Bezeichnung einer „origoinklusiven" (vgl. Diewald 1991: 34; 133) bzw. „origonahen" (vgl. Krasuchin 2004: 156) Deixis, also der spatialen Semantik der Nähe. Ist diese Nähe emotional positiv konnotiert, erhält das entsprechende Sprachzeichen die für emotive Ausdrücke typischen Merkmale (vgl. Fries 2011: 22-23), nämlich: der emotionalen Polarität (in diesem Fall „positiv"), der emotionalen Erwartung (in diesem Fall „erwünscht") sowie der emotionalen Intensität (in diesem Fall neutral bis stark). Diese sind jedoch deutlich sekundär. Primär ist dagegen das genuin spatiale Konzept origonaher Deixis, etwa 'bei mir' bzw. 'neben mir'. Derartige Konzepte werden nun aber bekanntlich rein deiktisch kodiert, und zwar nicht durch Autosemantika, sondern durch deiktische Synsemantika. Mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit kann der germanische Stamm etymologisch zu den slawischen Präpositionen bzw. Präfixen wie etwa russ. *npu, npu*-; poln. *przy, przy*- in der Bedeutung 'bei, neben; hierher ' gestellt werden. Davon zeugt nicht nur eine recht plausible Entspre-

chung der phonetischen Form, sondern auch die Semantik bei der Bildung der Substantive mit der Bedeutung 'Freund, Kollege' von diesem deiktischen Stamm in der Slavia. Russ. *приятель*, poln. *przyjaciel* sind von der genannten Präpostion, dem Verbalstamm, der im Altkirchenslavischen die Form *-ja-ti* 'nehmen' hat, und dem Suffix der Nomina agentis *-tel'* bzw. *–ciel* gebildet. Zweifelsohne sind russ. *приятель*, poln. *przyjaciel* und dt. *Freund* bzw. seine germanischen Entsprechungen (engl. *friend*, got. *frijônds* und alle anderen) etymologisch verwandt. Die völlige lautliche Übereinstimmung im Wurzelmorphem ist hier absolut deutlich; *p=f* ist die Entsprechung, die als erste, oder germanische, Lautverschiebung bekannt ist.

Die entgegengesetzte, origoexklusive (Diewald) bzw. origoferne (Krasuchin) deiktische Perspektivierung, wird durch andere deiktische Marker ausgedrückt. Am Slawischen können wir dies wiederum besonders deutlich sehen, vgl. die russischen Präfixe *пере-, пре-* 'durch', 'vorbei', *про-* 'weg' in *пересечь* 'überqueren', *преодолеть* 'überwinden', *пройти* 'vorbeigehen', *прогнать* 'vertreiben'. Besonders anschaulich sind hier die russischen Verben *прийти* 'kommen' vs. *прейти* 'vorbeigehen', *пройти* 'vorbeigehen, verlaufen' und ihre Entsprechungen in anderen slawischen Sprachen zu demselben Verbalstamm mit der Bedeutung 'gehen'; oder auch die polnischen Adjektive poln. *przyszły* 'künftig' vs. *przeszły* 'vergangen', ebenfalls zum Stamm mit der Bedeutung 'gehen'. In etwas verwischter, diachron jedoch leicht erschließbarer Form treten dieselben Verhältnisse bei dt. *ver-*, *vor-* und *für* (vgl. auch got. *fair-*, *faura(-)/faur(-)* und *fra-*) auf, die bekanntlich miteinander und mit o.g. russischen und polnischen Präpositionen bzw. Präfixen etymologisch verwandt sind und auf verschiedene Ablautstufen der ide. Wurzel **per-* zurückgehen.

Freund ist also ursprünglich konzipiert worden als eine Person, die eine andere Person insofern 'liebt', als

sie diese in ihren engsten Kreis aufnimmt bzw. in ihre Nähe kommen lässt. Es ist somit davon auszugehen, dass die autosemantische, dabei aber eine nicht mereologisch bzw. taxonomisch konzipierte Entität (das Substantiv *Freund*), genealogisch auf den rein deiktischen Stamm zurückgeht.

5. Schlussbemerkung: Interpretation aus der Sicht des Sprachwandels

Aus der Sicht der Theorien des Sprachwandels, insbesondere der Erklärung von Phänomenen, die unter den Begriffen Grammatikalisierung und Degrammatikalisierung in der modernen Linguistik behandelt werden, kann hier folgende Interpretation der oben skizzierten Entwicklung vorgeschlagen werden. Neben Grammatikalisierungsprozessen, die darin bestehen, dass im Ergebnis der historischen Entwicklung eine „Statusminderung" des Volllexems vorliegt, welches zu einem Hilfswort oder gar einem grammatisch gebundenen Morphem wird, gibt es entgegengesetzte Prozesse der Degrammatikalisierung bzw. Lexikalisierung. Im letzteren Fall wird die ursprünglich grammatische (unselbständige) Entität in ihrem Status „erhöht", indem sie zum Volllexem wird. Die erste Entwicklungsrichtung wird als Entwicklung „down the cline" bezeichnet, die zweite dagegen als Entwicklung „up the cline" (vgl. Harnisch 1998: 81, 2004: 215; Harnisch / Krieger 2017: 95). Beispiele für die Entwicklung „nach unten" (Grammatikalisierung, Statusminderung) sind u.a. die Entstehung von Präpositionen bzw. Präfixen oder Suffixen aus Vollwörtern, die Entstehung des bestimmten Artikels aus dem Demonstrativpronomen und des unbestimmten Artikels aus dem Numerale *ein*, die Entwicklung von *haben* vom Vollverb zum Hilfsverb etc. Degrammatikalisierung bzw. Lexikalisierung kommen viel seltener vor. In diesem Fall entstehen Volllexeme aus grammatischen Entitäten (Statuserhöhung). Die Geschichte von *Freund* ist eines

der Paradebeispiele hierfür. Wichtig ist dabei zu betonen, dass die in ihrem Status erhöhten Entitäten dennoch essentielle Spuren genuiner deiktischer Semantik beibehalten, was sich darin äußert, dass sie sich keinen für sonstige Volllexeme typischen taxonomischen Hierarchien zuordnen lassen.

Literatur

Brugmann, Karl. 1904. *Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen – Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung.* Leipzig: Teubner.

Bühler, Karl. 1982. *Sprachtheorie - Die Darstellungs funktion der Sprache.* Stuttgart: Fischer (Nachdruck von 1934).

Bunt, Harry. 1985. *Mass Terms and Model-Theoretic Semantics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Diewald, Gabriele. 1991. *Deixis und Textsorten im Deutschen.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Duden. 1989. *Universalwörterbuch.* 2., völlig neu bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage. Hg. von Günther Drosdowski u. a. Mannheim-Leipzig-Wien-Zürich: Dudenverlag.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1966. "Deictic categories in the se mantics of 'come'". Foundations of Language 2, 219-227.

Fries, Norbert. 2011. „Über die allmähliche Verfertigung emotionaler Bedeutung beim Äußern". In: Michail L. Kotin / Elizaveta G. Kotorova (Hg.). Die Sprache in Aktion. Pragmatik – Sprechakte – Diskurs. Heidelberg: Winter, 15-32.

Harm, Volker. 2015. *Einführung in die Lexikologie.* Darmstadt: Deutsche Buchgemeinschaft.

Harnisch, Rüdiger. 2004. „Verstärkungsprozesse. Zu einer Theorie der Sekretion und des Rekonstruktionellen Ikonismus". Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik 32, 210-232.

Harnisch, Rüdiger / Krieger, Manuela. 2017. „Prozesse *up and down the cline* und die Frage der (De-) Grammatikalisierung. In: Martin Eberl et al. (Hg.). *Grammatikalisierung in interdisziplinärer Perspektive*, München: JournaLIPP, 85-97.

Kluge, Friedrich. 1999. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 20. Aufl., bearb. von Walter Mitzka. Berlin: de Gryuter 1967; 23., erw. Auflage, bearb. von Elmar Seebold, Berlin-New York: de Gruyter.

Kotin, Michail L. 2005. Die *Sprache in statu movendi.* Sprachentwicklung zwischen Kontinuität und Wandel. Erster Band. *Einführung – Nomination – Deixis.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Krasuchin, Konstantin G. 2004. *Vvedenije v indojevropejskoje jazykoznanije*. Moskau: Akademija.

Rauh, Gisa. 1984. „Aspekte der Deixis". Sprachwissen schaft 9: 23-84.

Ridder, Lothar. 2002. *Mereologie. Ein Beitrag zur Ontologie und Erkenntnistheorie*. Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 2005. *Cours de linguistique générale.* Genève: Arbre d'Or. [Erstausgabe 1916. Paris: Mouton].

Vendler, Zeno 1957. "Verbs and times". The Philosophical Review 66/2, 143-160.

Wunderlich, Dieter. 1985. „Raum, Zeit und das Lexikon". In: Harro Schweizer (Hg.). Sprache und Raum. Psychologische und linguistische Aspekte der Aneignung und Verarbeitung von Räumlichkeit. Ein Arbeitsbuch für das Lehren von Forschung. Stuttgart: Metzler, 66-89.

Людмила Килевая

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5477-8756

e-mail: kilevaya@mail.ru

Лексика славянских языков в свете их лингвистической классификации

Vocabulary of Slavic languages in the light of their linguistic classification

Abstrakt

W artykule zaprezentowano nowe podejście do podziału tradycyjnie przyjętej klasyfikacji języków należących do grupy języków słowiańskich. Grupa języków wschodniosłowiańskich skupia język rosyjski, język białoruski i ukraiński. Zdaniem autorki takie łączenie jest nieuzasadnione, ponieważ jest niezgodne z aksjologicznym i morfologicznym kryterium. Autorka udowadnia w artykule niesłuszność takiego podziału.

Słowa kluczowe: języki wschodniosłowiańskie, leksyka, klasyfikacja języków, kryterium aksjologiczne

Abstract

The article presents a new approach to the traditional classification of Slavic languages. The group of East Slavic languages includes Russian, Belarusian and Ukrainian. According to the author, such a classification is unwarranted be-

cause it is inconsistent with the axiological and morphological criteria. In the article, the author demonstrates that such a classification is invalid.

1. Введение

Принцип антропоцентризма современной постмодернистской парадигмы предопределяет новый взгляд на интерпретацию утвердившихся в традиционной лингвистике языковых фактов. В этот контекст объективно встраивается классификация славянской ветви индоевропейской семьи языков. Базирующаяся на генеалогическом критерии устоявшаяся классификация практически полностью игнорирует морфологический критерий классификации языков, а аксиологический критерий сводит к общему историческому началу русского, белорусского и украинского народов. При этом не принимаются во внимание дальнейшие историко-культурные пути этих народов, обусловившие ментальные и языковые расхождения между русским народом, с одной стороны, и белорусским и украинским народами – с другой. Сказанное обусловливает актуальность обозначенного исследования.

Цель настоящей статьи – обосновать актуализацию аксиологического и морфологического критериев классификации славянских языков на основе принципа антропоцентризма.

Предметом исследования явились лексические единицы русского, белорусского и украинского языков и историко-культурные факты их носителей.

В качестве фактического материала использовался лексический и лексико-грамматический состав русского, белорусского и

украинского языков с учетом историко-культурной ретроспективы их развития.

Цель и обозначенная проблематика исследования обеспечивают применяемые в нем научные методы. Доминирующими среди них явился метод семантического анализа, используемый при определении лексического и лексико-грамматического значений анализируемой лексики; метод сопоставительного анализа, применяемый при сопоставлении наименований предметов и родовой принадлежности слов анализируемых языков. Кроме того, в рамках лингвокультурологического метода исследования в отдельных случаях привлекался прием контент-анализа , используемый при проекции анализируемой лексики на историко-культурный контекст.

2. К постановке проблемы

В лингвистической литературе, согласно располагаемым данным, отсутствует единообразное мнение относительно классификации славянских литературных языков. До настоящего времени не обозначен единый критерий их разграничения, а именно: помимо принятых ранее генеалогического и типологического (морфологического) критериев, в современном языкознании выдвигается критерий аксиологический (ценностный), с чем трудно не согласиться.

Как известно, генеалогический критерий опирается на происхождение языка, типологический – на его структурно-грамматические характеристики, в то время как аксиологический, или ценностный, критерий предполагает анализ языковых единиц на основе экстралингвистических факторов. В этом случае источником интерпретации служит историко-культурная и национальная

идентичность носителей языков, на основе которых они формировались.

В свете аксиологического критерия классификации славянских языков учеными выдвигается несколько базовых факторов ее обусловленности. Интерес в этом отношении представляет конфессиональный подход, отраженный в трудах польской исследовательницы Анны Далевской-Грэнь (Dalewska-Greń: 2020). Обоснованность данного подхода базируется на трудах ученых, в которых язык и религия рассматриваются в их тесной взаимозависимости. Под таким углом зрения представлены эти две категории в исследовании Н.Б. Мечковской. Ученый пишет: «Язык и религия: две семиотики, два образа мира, две стихии в душе человека, уходящие корнями в подсознание, два самых глубоких, несхожих и взаимосвязанных начала в человеческой культуре» (Мечковская: 1998, 36).

В классификации Анны Далевской-Грэнь представлены две группы языков внутри славянской ветви в соответствии с дихотомическим подходом деления христианства на два направления: Slavia Latina (Romana) i Slavia Orthodoxa. Согласно ученому, такое деление языков отражает принадлежность стран и языков к двум разным сферам влияния. Это основывается на том, что религия, как культурно-цивилизационный признак, была и до настоящего времени остается основным показателем степени развития славянских народов, а роль костелов – католического и православного – представляет собой доминирующее условие формирования нации. Письменный язык в определенной степени являет код «свой», поскольку он использовался в области литургии, литературы и делопроизводства. На территории Slavia Latina таким письменным, литературным, языком был латинский язык, на территории Slavia Orthodoxa – язык

старославянский. Оба эти языка сыграли огромную роль в процессах нормализации отдельных славянских языков.

Вместе с тем нельзя утверждать безупречность данного подхода к классификации славянских языков, на что обращают внимание целый ряд ученых (Мечковская: 1998, 37). В частности, он не отвечает группе южнославянских языков с точки зрения того, что на территории функционирования этих языков народы Болгарии, Македонии, Сербии и Черногории принадлежат к Slavia Orthodoxa, в то время как Словения и Хорватия – к Slavia Latina. Однако, как нам представляется, полностью игнорировать данный подход было бы неверным. Как справедливо подчеркивает Н.Б. Мечковская, «язык и религия относятся к тем факторам, которые определяют народный менталитет и при этом влияют на формирование как индивидуально-неповторимых, так и некоторых общих с другими народами, групповых черт». Это свидетельствует о том, что обозначенный подход следует учитывать в контексте аксиологического критерия классификации славянских языков.

Как уже подчеркивалось, современное языкознание эпохи постмодернизма является ориентированным на анализ языковых фактов в соотношении ′язык – общество – культура′. Следы устойчивости либо изменения человеческого мышления и человеческой деятельности оно ищет в единицах языковых систем. В настоящее время проводятся наблюдения над различными этническими группами, описываются ценности в их обычаях, традициях и стилях жизни, в стереотипах коммуникативного поведения представителей этих групп в разных ситуациях. В связи с этим представляется эффективным интерпретация славянских языков в контексте историко-культурного развития их носителей. На это в свое

время указывал известный историк и филолог Николай Трубецкой, особо подчеркивая тот факт, что «правдивый литературный язык является инструментом духовной культуры и предназначен для обработки, развития и углубления не только верифицированной литературы, но и научной, философской, религиозной и политической мысли» (Трубецкой: 1995, 141).

Как известно, на развитие любого языка влияют как внутренние, так и внешние, историко-культурные, факторы. К внутренним из них относится эволюция лексико-грамматической системы языка, к внешним – главным образом социокультурные аспекты развития. Иными словами, внешние факторы языкового развития ориентируются на историко-культурное развитие носителей того или иного языка, что обосновывает значимость аксиологического критерия классификации славянской ветви.

Согласно аксиологическому критерию, классификация славянских языков должна осуществляться с учетом их национально-культурных особенностей. По свидетельству польской исследовательницы Б. Очковой и ее соавторов, «язык является не только предметом лингвистических исследований, анализа и классификации. Он является также созданием, которое пробуждает сильные эмоции среди его пользователей, так как он связывается и трактуется наравне с понятиями, принадлежащими к канонам наивысших ценностей – таких как народ, отчизна, свобода» (перевод автора статьи) (Oczkowa, insz.: 2017). В качестве примера ученые приводят судьбу сербского и хорватского языков, необоснованно объединенные на определенной стадии своего развития, в течение ста лет, в единый сербскохорватский язык. Применительно к этим языкам учитывался только лингвистический критерий, но подвергались

игнорированию сознание и воля данного языкового общества, его убеждение в собственной исключительности и в особенностях своего языка. Отсюда ученые делают вывод о том, что оценочный критерий имеет большее значение для классификации литературных языков, нежели генеалогический и типологический критерии. Национальная идентичность и исключительность языков отражается в текстах, так как они содержат в своем составе понятия и символы, передающие собственные языковые коды, в которых в имплицитной форме отражается идентичность народа.

Вместе с тем утверждение, согласно которому в традиционной классификации славянской ветви аксиологический фактор полностью игнорировался, представляется несправедливым.. Другое дело, что в языкознании прошлого столетия он основывается на пропагандируемой в культуроведении и в историко-культурных исследованиях идее о высокой степени культурной интеграции белорусов, русских и украинцев, что вытекает из идеи «Москва есть третий Рим». Как видим, домирующим фактором в данном случае оказывается геополитический. Таким образом, продолжающееся в современной лингвистике традиционное деление славянской ветви на три группы, заключающееся в объединении в восточнославянскую группу русского, украинского и белорусского языков, не вписывается не только аксиологический критерий, но и в критерий языковой, в частности лексический. Отсюда возникает проблема, требующая разрешения.

Анализируя обозначенную проблему в аксиологическом аспекте, следует подчеркнуть, что формировавшаяся к X веку древнерусская народность с единым древнерусским (восточнославянским) языком в его диалектной разновидности уже в конце XIII века распадается на

несоотносимые в ментальном и языковом плане русскую, украинскую и белорусскую народности с соответствующими им языками. Согласно Н.С. Трубецкому, в период XV, XVI и первой половины XVII веков становление и развитие культуры Западной Руси и культура Руси Московской имели максимальные различия, что обусловливается ролью польской культуры в европеизации культуры украинской (Трубецкой: 1995, 362) и в несколько меньшей степени белорусской.

Разные исторические пути развития способствовали различиям в культуре, а в связи с этим и в способе мышления славянских народов, что не могло не наложить своего отпечатка на их языки. Аксиологический критерий предопределяет тот факт, что языковые различия не являются обычными творениями разных названий вещей как таковых – они представляют собой результат иного видения этих вещей носителями языка (Колесов: 2004). Наиболее отчетливо это отражается в сфере словарного состава.

3. Славянская лексика в ее единстве и различиях

Следует подчеркнуть, что описание результатов произведенного анализа фактического материала требует определенной оговорки, связанной с начальным этапом данного исследования. Это предполагает учет определенной доли погрешности в представленных промежуточных данных. Всего было собрано около 4000 единиц лексики. В настоящей статье анализом охвачено около 700 лексем русского языка и в таком же количестве соотносимых лексем белорусского, украинского и польского языков, извлеченных из их толковых словарей, что в целом составляет примерно 2800 лексических единиц. В рамках настоящей статьи в качестве

иллюстративного материала в совокупности использовано 178 языковых единиц.

Сопоставительный анализ словарного состава сопоставляемых языков обнаруживает различия в эквивалентности их лексики на уровне около 80%. При этом белорусские и украинские лексемы практически полностью идентичны по звуко-буквенному оформлению соответствующим лексемам польского языка. Приведем следующий иллюстративный материал: русское: *вещь, зонтик, юбка, полотенце, мусор, болезнь, большой, красный* – с одной стороны; украинское: *річ, парасоль, спідниця, рушник, сміття, хвороба, великий, червоний*; белорусское: *рэч, парасоль, спадніца, ручнік, смецця, хвароба, вялікі, чырвоны*; польское: *rzecz, parasol, spódnica, ręcznik, śmiecie, choroba, wielki, czerwony* – с другой стороны.

Нетрудно заметить, что приведенный фактический материал исследования свидетельствует о противопоставлении русских лексем группе единообразных лексем белорусского и украинского языков и о соответствии последних польскому языку. Оговорки требует лишь часть белорусской лексики, совпадающей с лексемами русского языка. В этом случае мы имеем дело с белорусским феноменом, специфика которого заключается в том, что в процессе развития белорусского языка в контексте общерусской культуры как некоей абстракции конкретно-национальное «белорусское русло тоже всегда существовало, но всегда было слабее» в отличие от малорусского, то есть украинского, русла (Трубецкой: 1995, 369).

Вместе с тем о содержательной и формальной идентичности белорусской и польской лексики свидетельствует огромный массив (примерно 2800 лексем) сопоставляемого фактического материала, например (лексемы подаются в последовательности:

белорусская лексема – польская лексема): *сцежка – ścieżka, рабіць – robić, варунак – warunek, троху – trochę, добра – dobra, ганьба – gańba, гвалт – gwałt, пярун – piorun, няхай – niech, лепей – lepiej, існаваць – isnować, чакаць – czekać, ашукаць – oszukać, утрымаць – utrzymać, падкрэсліць – podkreślić, але – ale, плётки – plotki, падатак – podatek, адсотак – odsetek, цыбуля – cebula, журавіна – żurawiny, ажыны – jeżyna, парэчка – porzeczki, папера – papier, аловак – ołówek, ровар – rower, гэрбата – herbata, феранкі – feranki, папапет – parapet, будынак – budynek , сумленне – sumienie, вяселле – wesele, страйк – strajk, запалка – zapałka, сшытак – zeszyt , рэч – rzecz* и другие.

Русские лексемы в значительно своей части представляют собой заимствования, в том числе тюркизмы, на что указывают, в частности, исследования казахстанского поэта и ученого Олжаса Сулейменова (Сулейменов). Анализируя древнерусское произведение «Слово о полку Игореве», поэт-исследователь выявляет в нем значительное количество тюркизмов, что позволило ему в книге «Аз и Я» обозначить туранский элемент в лексическом составе русского языка. Уверенный в правоверности полученных результатов, Олжас Сулейменов в качестве эпиграфа к своей книге выбирает следующие строки, принадлежащие поэту С. Маркову:

В великом "Слове о полку", как буйная трава,

Вросли в **славянскую** *строку* **кипчакские** *слова.*

В целом сопоставительный анализ располагаемой нами лексики свидетельствует о примерно 80 процентах несоответствия русской лексики словарному составу белорусского, украинского и польского языков. Русские лексемы, являясь заимствованиями, проецируют на компонент «чужой», что является зеркальным

отражением ментальных черт русского человека. Об этом свидетельствуют исследования таких русских философов, как А.Н. Бердяев (Бердяев: 2004), Н.С. Трубецкой (Трубецкой: 1995) и др. Не случайно Н.С. Трубецкой усматривает в русской ментальности славянский и туранский элементы в равных соотношениях. Ученый подчеркивает, что «в этнографическом отношении русский народ не является исключительно представителем «славянства». Русские вместе с угро-финнами и с волжскими тюрками составляют особую культурную зону, имеющую связи и со славянством, и с «туранским» Востоком, причем трудно сказать, которые из этих связей прочнее и сильнее» (Трубецкой: 1995, 138). В ментальных предпочтениях как составляющих культуры русского народа проявляются как славянские, так и тюркские элементы.

Представляется необходимым лишь оговорить, что лексемы русского и польского языков с идентичным звуко-буквенным составом, имеющие совершенно несоотносимые между собой значения, то есть представляющие собой омонимы, в настоящей статье не рассматриваются. Отметим лишь, что они формируют русско-польскую омонимию, интерпретируемую в лингвистическом переводоведении как ложные друзья переводчика, например: польское: *gadać – разговаривать* (ср.: русское: *гадать –* 'предсказывать будущее'); польское: *sklep – магазин* (ср.: русское: *склеп –* 'постройка с внутренним помещением для гроба'); польское: *magazyn – склад* (ср.: русское: *магазин –* 'постройка для продажи товаров'); польское: *kawior – икра* (ср.: русское: *ковер –* 'тканое изделие для покрытия пола или украшения стен'); польское: *zapomnić – забыть* (ср.: русское: *запомнить –* 'сохранить в памяти'); польское: *dywan – ковер* (ср.: русское: *диван –* 'предмет мебели'); польское: *lustro – зеркало*

(ср.: русское: *люстра* – 'потолочный осветительный прибор'); польское: *kaczka* – *утка* (ср.: русское: *качка* – 'качание судна на волнах'); польское: *plotka* – *сплетня* (ср.: русское: *плетка* – 'инструмент для битья'); польское: *uroda* – *красота* (ср.: русское: *урод* – 'некрасивый до безобразия человек'); польское: *wesele* – *свадьба* (ср.: русское: *веселье* – 'радостное настроение'); польское: *prosto* – *прямо* (ср.: русское: *просто* – 'несложно'); польское: *brak* – *отсутствие* (ср.: русское: *брак* – 'супружеские отношения') и др.

Представленные лексические особенности свидетельствуют о справедливости выдвигаемой учеными гипотезы о культурной и языковой идентичности белорусского, украинского и польского литературных языков в противоположность русскому литературному языку. Лексика русского языка, согласно исследователям, в большей мере идентична лексике болгарского языка, что обусловливается историко-культурной перспективой развития их носителей. Как отмечает Н.С. Трубецкой (Трубецкой: 1995, 179), в X-XII вв., в период, когда Болгарское Царство было разделено и вновь объединено, на болгарский литературный язык значительное влияние оказал старославянский язык в его русской редакции, то есть церковнославянский язык. Ученый особо указывает на то, что в эпоху «возрождения новоболгарского прежние литературные и языковые традиции были забыты так сильно, что болгарские писатели и публицисты этого времени были не в состоянии их возродить и прибегали к русской литературной традиции. Болгарский литературный язык этого времени был, можно сказать, болгаризованной формой русского литературного языка». Это значительное влияние на болгарский язык отмечается и в дальнейшей перспективе.

4. Категория рода как лексико-грамматическое различие в славянских языках

Лексико-грамматические системы рассматриваемых славянских языков в сопоставительном аспекте также указывают на то, что «русский народный характер... решительно не похож на народный характер других славян» (Трубецкой 1995: 138). Это проявляется, в частности, при сопоставлении родовых различий между существительными русского языка и соответствующими существительными украинского, белорусского и польского языков. Как показывает анализ, существительные, имеющие грамматическое значение женского рода в русском языке, соответствуют однокорневым существительным украинского, белорусского и польского языков, которые, однако, относятся к мужскому роду. Приведем следующий иллюстративный материал: русское *берлога, насыпь, собака, тетрадь, медаль* – жен.р., но: украинское *барліг, насип, собака, зошит, медаль*; белорусское *бярлог, насып, сабака, сшытак, медаль* – муж.р., польское *barłog, nasyp, pies, zeszyt, medal.* Эта же тенденция наблюдается применительно к разнокорневым существительным, у которых в русском языке преобладает женский род, противопоставленный соответствующим существительным мужского рода в украинском, белорусском и польском языках, например: русское *грязь, крыша,* украинское *бруд, дах,* белорусское *бруд, дах,* польское *brud, dach.*

Причина тяготения русских существительных к женскому началу, как представляется, кроется в характерных свойствах русского менталитета. В частности, о «вечно бабьем в русской душе» пишет в своих философских трактатах Н.А. Бердяев (Бердяев: 2004). Опираясь на исследования ученого-философа, женскую ипостась русского человека и его

языка подчеркивает также российский исследователь В.В. Колесов. Он пишет: «Русские пространства обширны, а Время – мужской символ – еще и не начиналось. Устойчивой святости по вертикали (иерархия уровней) русские предпочитают женское развертывание вширь, тяготение вдаль. А в мышлении «мужской» голове «женское» сердце. Не маскулинность огня, но женственность воды описываются как символическая стихия русского духа». Кроме того, ученый отмечает, что «…загадочность русской души объясняется той же женской глубиной» (Колесов: 2004, 161). Это свидетельствует о доминировании женского начала в русском характере, отраженном в грамматической категории рода русского языка.

5. Заключение

Произведенный анализ отдельных фрагментов русского, белорусского и украинского языков в сопоставительном аспекте, обусловленных ментальными различиями их носителей, свидетельствует о том, что объединение данных языков в одну восточнославянскую группу носит, в силу единого территориального источника происхождения, генеалогический характер. Однако данная классификация не соответствует постмодернистскому подходу к анализу языковых явлений, предполагающему участие в них носителя языка – человека. Иными словами, традиционная классификация славянской ветви, презентуемая современным языкознанием, не отвечает доминирующим критериям объединения языков в единую группу – критериям морфологическому и аксиологическому. Из этого вытекает необходимая полемика по обозначенной проблеме группового перераспределения языков славянской ветви.

Библиография

Бердяев, Н.А. 2004. Русская и польская душа. В: Бердяев Н.А. *Философия свободы.* Москва: ФОЛИО, 407-412.

Dalewska-Greń, Hanna. 2020. *Języki słowiańskie.* Warszawa: WydawnictwoNaukowe PWN.

Колесов, В.В. 2004. *Язык и ментальность.* Санкт-Петербург: «Петербургское Востоковедение».

Мечковская, Н.Б. 1998. *Язык и религия.* Москва: Агенство ФАИР, 23-40.

Oczkowa Barbara, Szczepańska Elżbieta i Kwoka Tomasz. 2017. *Słowiańskie języki literackie: Rys historyczny.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Сулейменов, Олжас. *Аз и Я. Книга благонамеренного читателя.* Интернет-источник. Режим доступа: [opentextnn.ru/old/man/index.html@id=711]

Супрун, А.Е. 2020. *Лексическая типология славянских языков.* [Электронный ресурс]. Минск: Белорусский государственный университет.

Трубецкой, Н.С. 1995. *История. Культура. Язык.* Москва: Прогресс.

Tomasz Fojt

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9681-0830

e-mail: tfojt@ult.edu.pl

The axiological parameter of the lexical item *incite* – a corpus-based study

Aksjologiczny parametr jednostki leksykalnej *incite* – badanie oparte na danych korpusowych

Abstrakt

W badaniu przeanalizowano leksykalno-gramatyczne wzorce kookurencji właściwe dla czasownika incite. Analizę przeprowadzono w oparciu o pojęcie jednostki leksykalnej w ujęciu Sinclaira (1996, 1998, 2004). Analiza opiera się na danych korpusowych pozyskanych z Brytyjskiego Korpusu Narodowego. Analiza obejmuje identyfikację rdzenia jednostki leksykalnej, oraz jej kolokacji i koligacji w celu określenia semantycznej preferencji i prozodii semantycznej badanego czasownika. Uzyskane wyniki wskazują na zasadność włączania parametru aksjologicznego do charakterystyki jednostki leksykalnej incite w praktyce leksykograficznej i w nauczaniu leksyki języka angielskiego.

Słowa kluczowe: aksjologia, jednostka leksykalna, preferencje semantyczne, prozodia semantyczna

Abstract

The study examines the patterns of lexico-grammatical co-selection associated with the verb *incite*. The analysis is carried out in line with the lexical item approach as conceived of by Sinclair (1996, 1998, 2004). It is a corpus-based study

which makes use of the samples extracted from the British National Corpus. The analysis includes the identification of the core of the lexical item as well as its colligation and collocation profiles with a view to identifying the semantic preference and semantic prosody of the verb. The results highlight the need for the inclusion of the axiological parameter in the characterisation of the lexical item in lexicographic and teaching practice.

Keywords: axiology, lexical item, semantic preference, semantic prosody

1. Introduction

According to the definition offered by the *Dictionary.com LLC* (2021), the verb *incite* means "to stir, encourage, or urge on; stimulate or prompt to action". However, even a cursory survey of contextualised uses of the verb in a corpus reveals that it is primarily used to talk about encouraging actions or activities which are valued negatively. This points to a potential validity of including the axiologically charged component of meaning in the definition of *incite* or in the information on the usage of the verb. The research reported in this study supports this argument.

The reason to adopt the lexical item approach to examine the dimensions of use of the verb *incite* comes from the two observations made by Sinclair in connection with the corpus-driven exploration of the nature of meaning in language:

> "a. many, if not most meanings, require the presence of more than one word for their normal realization;
> b. patterns of co-selection among words, which are much stronger than any description has yet allowed for, have a direct connection with meaning" (Sinclair 2004: 133).

The first statement suggests that the basic units of meaning are not necessarily coextensive with words; the second points to the role of the co-text in contributing to the semantics of meaning units. Taken together, the two observations inspired Sinclair's search for extended units of meaning and eventually led him to postulate the lexical item as a unit of meaning (Sinclair 1996, 1998, 2004). In Sinclair's conception, the lexical item can be constituted by one or more words, not necessarily continuous, admitting of structural variation and referring to a single concept. The lexical item is organised around a stable core, which can be thought of as an entry point to a systematic arrangement of information conveyed by the lexical item, but it is by no means limited to the core. Equally important are patterns of co-selection between words, observable when significant amounts of data are analysed and describable in terms of preferences rather than rules which admit of no exceptions. The analysis offered in this study endorses Sinclair's recommendation that so "strong are the co-occurrence tendencies of words, word classes, meanings and attitudes that we must widen our horizons and expect the units of meaning to be much more extensive and varied than is seen in a single word" (Sinclair 2004: 39). The observation makes him postulate the following components of the lexical item apart from the core: collocations (co-occurrence tendencies of words), colligations (co-occurrence tendencies of word classes or other grammatical categories), semantic preference (semantic affinity of co-occurring elements) and semantic prosody (uniform attitudinal function of the elements contributing to the lexical item). The components of the lexical item are discussed in the section below.

2. The composition of the lexical item

One dimension of the importance of collocates is that they impart semantic prosody to the words with

which they collocate (Louw 1993: 157). The view is supported by Xiao and McEnery (2006: 107) who compare the notion of connotation with that of semantic prosody and conclude that the latter "can only be collocational". Hence, the identification of the collocations of *incite* is a prerequisite to the analysis of its semantic prosody.

Since their introduction by Firth (1957), the notions of collocation and collocability have been conceived of predominantly in statistical terms. Although an early definition of collocation by Greenbaum as a "frequent co-occurrence of two lexical items in the language" (1974: 82) does not specify any threshold value which would determine the minimal frequency of co-occurrence for a lexeme to be counted as a collocate, the definition by Hoey (1991: 6-7) stipulates that a potential collocate must co-occur with another lexeme "with greater than random probability in its (textual) context". Manning and Schütze (1999: 151) couch the requirement for recurrent co-occurrence in terms of conventionality: "A collocation is an expression consisting of two or more words that correspond to some conventional way of saying things". A number of statistical tests can be used to distinguish collocations from random co-occurrences[2] and many text analysis tools designed to process corpus data offer also a choice of the statistical measures of the collocational strength between lexemes. Each of these tests has its advantages and disadvantages and a range of optimal applicability dependant on the size and nature of the data set. There is, however, an approach to collocation analysis which does not simply look into the unstructured co-occurrence frequencies but instead takes into consideration the syntactic relationships between lexemes. Choueka (1988) defines collocation in terms of syntax-based units: "A collocation is a sequence of two or more consecutive

---

[2] For instance, mutual information, Pearson's chi-square, log-likelihood, Frager and McGowan coefficient, or cubic association ratio.

words that has characteristics of a syntactic and semantic unit whose exact and unambiguous meaning or connotation cannot be derived directly from the meaning or connotation of its components". This approach is motivated by the assumption that a close syntactic relationship between lexemes implies a close semantic relationship. What follows, an analysis of the syntactically significant collocations is more informative about the semantics of the lexical item. Some researchers introduce a terminological distinction between a purely statistical lexical co-occurrence (which can be thought of as a more generic phenomenon) and a linguistically motivated conception of the relationship in which the components of a collocation are bound syntactically: "It is probably best to restrict the collocations to the narrower sense of grammatically bound elements and use the term *association* and *co-occurrence* for the more general phenomenon of words that are likely to be used in the same context" (Manning and Schütze 1999: 185). In the case of the research into the lexical item *incite*, this approach is all the more useful as it allows an exhaustive extraction and analysis of all the syntactically relevant collocations (cf. the methodological remarks at the beginning of the analytical section).

Another component of the lexical item postulated by Sinclair is colligation. In its most general use, colligation refers to an association between a lexeme and a grammatical category (Sinclair 1998: 15, Tognini-Bonelli 2001: 89-90, 163). For instance, Tognini-Bonelli observes that *all but* in the exceptive sense is significantly often found to combine with superlatives and indefinite numerals (2001: 25-27), as in[3]:

1) *This will flatten the stomach, not to mention all but the most robust of deckchairs.*

---

[3] Unless otherwise indicated, all samples used in the research or as examples come from the British National Corpus available at https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/.

2) *But it had been proved to the satisfaction of all but a few sceptics that …*

Investigating colligation, Sinclair demonstrates the mutual attraction between the verb *budge* and modal auxiliary verbs (2004: 142-148) – see examples (3) and (4). In the same publication, he uses corpus data to show that the expression *naked eye* is frequently preceded by a preposition and the definite article (2004: 30-47) – examples (5) and (6).

3) …*he won't budge until he receives compensation.*

4) *The doors wouldn't budge.*

5) …*it's too faint to be seen with the naked eye.*

6) …*differences that are invisible to the naked eye.*

Hoey (2005: 43-58) extends the concept of colligation to include not only the attraction between a lexical item and a grammatical context but also the relationship between a lexical item and its syntactic function and its position in a phrase, clause or discourse.

An obligatory component of the lexical item is its semantic prosody. Semantic prosody is the kind of distribution of meaning that is attendant on the collocational preferences exhibited by a given lexeme. Thus, it depends crucially on its lexical environment. Louw (1993: 157) defines it as a "consistent aura of meaning with which a form is imbued by its collocates". Semantic prosody is, thus, a feature of the word and its co-text – it extends over more than one element in a syntagmatic string.

In a later formulation, Louw points to the evaluative aspect of semantic prosody, which "…refers to a form of meaning which is established through the proximity of a consistent series of collocates, often characterisable as positive or negative, and whose primary function is the expression of the attitude of its speaker or writer towards some pragmatic situation" (2000: 60). The function of expressing evaluative attitude is acknowledged in most definitions of semantic prosody. At the very outset of his research on semantic prosody,

Sinclair makes it clear that the evaluative quality is pivotal to this phenomenon: "… semantic prosody (. . .) is attitudinal, and on the pragmatic side of the semantics/pragmatics continuum (1996: 87). Ellis et al. (2009: 90) follow suit, defining semantic prosody as "the general tendency of certain words to co-occur with either negative or positive expressions". The evaluative aspect is also central to a more elaborate characterisation of semantic prosody offered by Hunston and Thompson:

> "The notion of semantic prosody (or pragmatic meaning) is that a given word or phrase may occur most frequently in the context of other words or phrases which are predominantly positive or negative in their evaluative orientation (. . .). As a result, the given word takes on an association with the positive, or, more usually, the negative, and this association can be exploited by speakers to express evaluative meaning covertly" (Hunston and Thompson 1999: 38).

A now-classic example of a uniform semantic prosody is provided by Stubbs' (1995: 23-55) analysis of the lexical environment of the verb *cause.* The verb is attributed unfavourable prosody on account of its consistent co-occurrence with lexemes referring to negatively evaluated entities. Samples (7-9) illustrate the point.

> 7) *… a skull fracture caused by a blow to the nose …*
>
> 8) *… a kind of ear infection which caused giddiness …*
>
> 9) *… the crippling liver pains caused by drinking bad wate*r…

The last of the major structural categories that constitute the lexical item is semantic preference, defined by Sinclair as "the co-occurrence of words with semantic choices" (2004: 174). For instance, according to Sinclair, the expression *naked eye,* mentioned above in connection with its colligation properties, is characterised by

the semantic preference of *visibility* (2004: 42). Semantic preference is capable of a wide range of realisations[4]. In the case of the lexical item *naked eye*, it manifests itself through the use of verbs related to seeing (most frequently, the verb *see*) and adjectives referring to (degree of) visibility (typically, the adjective *visible*). Thus, semantic preference can be seen as a consistent co-occurrence of a lexical unit with semantically related items (words from a particular semantic field), by which an association is formed between formal patterning and words from a certain semantic field. Stubbs (2001: 65) defines it accordingly as "the relation, not between individual words, but between a lemma or word form and a set of semantically related words".

All the structural categories discussed above will be analysed in the section below with reference to the verb *incite* with a view to providing its full characterisation as a lexical item and determining its axiological charge.

3. The structural characteristics of the lexical item *incite*

The samples were extracted from the British National Corpus with the use of the dedicated search and retrieval architecture[5]. Given the relatively low frequency of the occurrence of the lexeme, an exhaustive extraction was possible. After retrieval, the samples were manually cleaned. The resulting data set consists of 195 samples.

The analysis proceeds through the following steps. First, the core of the lexical item is identified. Then, the co-occurrence of words with grammatical choices is examined to determine the colligation patterns associated with the lexical item *incite*. This is followed by a colloca-

---

[4] Sinclair declares that semantic preference "requires us to notice similarities of meaning regardless of word class" (2004: 174).
[5] Available at https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/.

tional analysis. The analysis of colligations and collocations makes it possible to establish the semantic preference and semantic prosody of the lexeme in question.

The core of the lexical item is constituted by the lexeme *incite* used transitively, so the possible word forms include: *incite, incites, incited,* and *inciting.* The core is the least variable constituent of the lexical item under discussion and as such it "constitutes the evidence of the occurrence of the item as a whole" (Sinclair 2004: 141).

Predictably, the pattern of co-selection at the grammatical level reveals a strong colligation with nouns or noun phrases functioning as the direct object of *incite.* All the samples extracted from the BNC involve transitive uses of the verb, but there occur three variants of the complementation: the direct object, the direct object with a complementation in the form of the preposition phrase, and the complex transitive uses with the infinitive phrase complementation. The three patterns of lexico-grammatical co-selection are discussed below.

The colligation that is most strongly represented in the corpus is that involving the simple complementation in the form of the direct object, as in (10) below. The number of samples with the simple transitive complementation is 122, which amounts to 62.56% of the total number of samples.

10) *Army was stopped from marching because of fears that it would incite a disorderly rabble …*

As for the semantic roles of the entities expressed by the noun phrases in the position of the direct object, they are either those of *effected* object or *affected* object. Quirk and Greenbaum (1973: 174-175) define the effected object as one that "refers to something which exists only by virtue of the activity indicated by the verb". An entity expressed by the effected object comes into existence as a result of the action expressed by the verb, as in (11) where *juvenile crime* results from *irresponsible policy.*

11) … *irresponsible policy which will incite juvenile crime …*

The semantic notion of affectedness, on the other hand, assumes some degree of alteration in the participant expressed by the direct object. The participant exists before the verb's action takes place, but it is changed by this action. In (12), the change consists in the alteration of the emotional state of the *perpetrators*, presumably predisposing them to committing crime.

(12) *The jury ruled that the perpetrators of the crime had been incited by the racist teachings of Metzger …*

The samples with effected objects dominate overwhelmingly in the data set including simple transitive complementation: as many as 110 samples involve effected objects and only in 12 samples the participants are affected. The semantic properties of the entities expressed by the objects of *incite* are discussed in more detail in the section on semantic prosody.

Another colligation identified in the data set is a variant of the transitive pattern in which the complementation involves a prepositional phrase. It is singled out because the distribution of the semantic roles over the clause elements is different than in the patterns discussed above. The prepositional phrase can be headed by the preposition *to* (14 samples), *into* (4 samples) or *against* (2 samples), as shown in (13-15). The total number of samples representing this co-occurrence of grammatical choices amounts to 20.

13) *… there was no evidence that he had incited members of the group to violence.*

14) *… his enemies were bribed and incited into action by his own father …*

15) *In order to incite her husband against her stepson …*

The last colligation characteristic of the verb *incite* involves its complex transitive uses with infinitive

phrase complementation, represented by samples (16-17):

16) … *that he had not deliberately incited Zoser to kill, …*

17) *Any person who incites others to commit an offence under this section shall be guilty of…*

The number of samples representing the complex transitive pattern amounts to 53. The lexico-grammatical realisations of this type are characteristic of causative verbs combining with the infinitive phrase that designates the action or state caused (Quirk et al. 1985: 1204). The semantic properties of the lexical item are discussed in the section on semantic preference and semantic prosody.

The collocational profile of lexical item *incite* is determined in two steps. The automatic, unrestricted search for collocates of *incite* in the BNC yields the results that suffer from the disadvantages characteristic of small-size data sets. As the number of samples is relatively small, the set of collocates is bound to include random lexemes whose contribution to the characterisation of the lexical item *incite* is of little significance. Table 1 shows the 10 most strongly related collocates of *incite* (arranged according to the MI scores), with the collocation span set to three words to the left and right of the node word.

No.	collocate	MI
1	Blida	12.96
2	provocateurs	12.64
3	heterosexually	12.11
4	crystallizing	11.64
5	abducting	11.64
6	30-strong	11.53
7	unreasoning	11.53
8	lascivious	11.16
9	mullahs	11.04

10	risings	11.04

Table 1. The collocates of *incite* with the highest MI scores (results obtained from the BNC www.english-corpora.org/bnc/).

The set of the collocates of *incite* identified in the automatic search includes low frequency words, e.g. *provocateurs* or *mullahs* or the proper name *Blida*. The Mutual Information scores shown in Table 1 are not informative because they are strongly influenced by the frequency: relatively high MI scores are achieved by low-frequency words. A data set as small as the one used in this study is bound to generate results which are susceptible to such skewing.

Because of the disadvantages following from the limited size of the data set, a decision has been made to investigate the syntactically relevant collocates of *incite*. It has been decided to investigate the collocates which occur either in the position of the direct object of the verb or the complement, on the assumption that close syntactic relationship between clause elements reflect close semantic relationships. As such, the examination of these relationships is most likely to provide insight into the meaning and usage of *incite*. Table 2 shows those syntactically relevant collocates that occurred at least twice in the data set. They constitute more than a half of the collocates in the relevant syntactic position.

No.	collocate (object or complement)	frequency
1	hatred	20
2	violence	14
3	riot(s)	9
4	crime	8
5	offence	6
6	act/action (contrary to, with force, etc.)	5

7	participate (in an illegal activity)	4
8	revolt	4
9	revolution	4
10	displeasure	3
11	mutiny	3
12	pickets	3
13	rebellion/rebel	3
14	desire	2
15	disturbances	2
16	fears	2
17	inquiry/inquire	2
18	rage	2
19	strike	2
20	trouble	2
21	unrest	2

Table 2. The syntactically relevant collocates of *incite* (objects or complements with the minimum frequency of 2).

The contribution of the colligational and collocational profiles to the characterisation of the lexical item *incite* are discussed in the section below.

4. Semantic preference and semantic prosody

The collocational data provides the basis for an analysis of semantic preference and semantic prosody. The lexemes that prevail among the syntactically relevant collocates are those naming violent attitudes or states, violent or illegal behaviour (e.g. *hatred, violence, riot, crime, offence, mutiny*). This co-occurrence of lexical choices defines the semantic field associated with the lexical item in question, i.e. its semantic preference.

The semantic prosody of *incite* is determined by the consistent co-occurrence of a series of collocates which are imbued with predominantly negative meaning. When determining the value of the semantic prosody, the meaning of the lexemes which function as the direct

objects or complements are taken into consideration. As mentioned above, this is motivated by the close relationship of these elements with the verb. In some cases, however, their semantic prosody is difficult to ascertain. This is especially true of samples which include light verb constructions which make little semantic contribution to the predication, as in (18), where the verb *do* denotes an unspecified action. In such cases, the co-text was explored to find clues which would make it possible to determine unequivocally whether the action or state denoted by the semantically light construction is positively or negatively valued. If the information in the co-text turned out insufficient, the sample was counted as neutral. Other cases which required the analysis of the co-text involved nominal expressions, as in (19), where the semantic prosody of the otherwise neutral noun phrase *a procession* needs to be determined on the basis of the expanded context available in the corpus.

18) *…. section 14(4) or for taking part in such a gathering or inciting another to do so, would be able to argue that what …..*

19) *… and knowingly failing to observe a condition imposed, or inciting another to participate in such a procession.*

A separate difficulty in determining the semantic prosody is constituted by non-literal uses of words, exemplified in (20). The noun *rebellion* in this sample is not used to mean a violent action against authorities. Instead, it describes figuratively the disarray caused to the hairdo by the agent of the action. Establishing the values of the semantic prosody of figurative uses also often needed reference to expanded context which made it possible to identify the evaluative prosody ascribed to them.

20) *Cornelius scratched his head inciting further wavy rebellions.*

The analysis reveals that the greatest number of samples (165 out of 195) are characterised by negative

semantic prosody. For instance, in samples (21) and (22) below, this is determined by the negative meanings of the direct object noun phrase and the infinitive complementation respectively. The number of samples involving negative valuation amounts to 84.62% of the samples analysed in the study.

21) *… irresponsible policy which will incite juvenile crime …*

22) *… that he had not deliberately incited Zoser to kill, …*

Only 7 samples (3.59% of the data set) can be unequivocally ascribed positive valuation, which indicates that the dominant evaluative prosody associated with *incite* is negative. Instances of positive prosody are shown in (23) and (24). The motivation for ascribing positive valuation to these samples is that the concept of growth associated with the rise of grass in (23) is generally positively valued; also *caresses* incited in (24) refer to gentle and loving touching, which is generally appreciated by human beings. Sample (23) comes from fiction prose and involves figurative use of words: the agent of the action is personified spring; this, however, does not influence the positive valuation attributed to the use of *incite* in this sentence.

23) *Already it was whispering at the roots of grass, inciting it to rise, breathing on sheltered primroses, …*

24) *… inviting and inciting the continuation of his caresses.*

The samples for which neither positive nor negative semantic prosody can be determined are ascribed neutral prosodic values (see sample 25 below). There are 23 samples involving neutral evaluative prosody in the data set.

25) *The article, then, is exploratory rather than de finitive, inciting theory rather than assuming it, …*

Table 3 below shows the distribution of negative, neutral and positive prosodic values in the samples analysed in the study. The results of the analysis suggest that the dominant semantic prosody associated with the verb *incite* is negative.

Evaluative prosody	Number of samples	%
negative	165	84.62
neutral	23	11.79
positive	7	3.59
total	195	100%

Table 3. Proportions of prosodic values in the data set.

5. Conclusions

In Sinclair's conception of meaning units (1996, 1998, 2004), the lexical item is constituted by patterns of lexico-grammatical co-selection. The co-selection patterns identified for *incite* in this research reveal the semantic preference of the verb to occur with objects and complements sharing the semantic features of 'violent attitudes or states' or 'violent or illegal behaviour'. The analysis of the syntactically relevant collocations reveals that the semantic prosody of *incite*, while not completely uniform, is nevertheless predominantly unfavourable (negative in more than 84% of the samples). In the context of lexicography and second language learning, such results argue for an inclusion of the prosodic component in the usage information associated with the verb *incite* if not in its definition.

References

Ellis, Nick C., Eric Frey, and Isaac Jalkanen. 2009. "The psycholinguistic reality of collocation and semantic prosody (1): Lexical access", in Ute Römer and Rainer Schulze (eds), *Exploring the lexis-grammar*

interface [Studies in Corpus Linguistics, 35]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 89-114.

Firth, J. 1957. *Papers in Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greenbaum, Sidney. 1974. "Some verb-intensifier collocations in American and British English". *American Speech*, 49: 79–89.

Hoey, M. 1991. *Pattern of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoey, M. 2005. *Lexical Priming: A New Theory of Words and Language*. London: Routledge.

Hunston, Susan and Geoffrey Thompson (eds). 1999. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Louw, Bill. 1993. "Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies", in M. Baker, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds), *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 157–175.

Louw, Bill. 2000. "Contextual prosodic theory: bringing semantic prosodies to life", in C. Heffer and H. Saunston (eds), *Words in Context: In Honour of John Sinclair*. Birmingham: ELR, 48–94.

Manning, Christopher D. and Hinrich Schütze. 1999. *Foundations of Statistical Natural Language Processing*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Quirk, Randolph and Sidney Greenbaum. 1973. *A Concise Grammar of Contemporary English*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.

Sinclair, John. 1996. "The search for units of meaning". *Textus*, 9 (1): 75–106.

Sinclair, John. 1998. "The Lexical Item", in: Edda

Weigand (ed.), *Contrastive Lexical Semantics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1-24.

Sinclair, John. 2004. *Trust the text. Language, corpus and discourse*. London and New York: Routledge.

Stubbs, Michael. 1995. "Collocations and semantic pro files. On the cause of the trouble with quantitative studies". *Functions of Language*, 2 (1): 23–55.

Stubbs, Michael. 2001. *Words and Phrases: Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tognini-Bonelli, Elena. 2001. *Corpus Linguistics at Work*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Xiao, Richard and Tony McEnery. 2006. "Collocation, Semantic Prosody, and Near Synonymy: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective". *Applied Linguistics*, 27 (1): 103–129.