Ludmila Minaeva

ENGLISH

Lexicology
and
Lexicography

Людмила Владимировна Минаева
Лексикология и лексикография английского языка

Аннотация
Книга дает представление студентам об основах лексикологической теории применительно к материалу английского языка, описывает принципы и методы лексикологического анализа, знакомит с постулатами учебной лексикографии, а также способствует выработке навыков пользования одноязычными толковыми и двуязычными переводными словарями.

В пособие включены упражнения и задания, предполагающие анализ текстов и развитие навыков пользования словарями.

Пособие предназначено для студентов и аспирантов факультетов иностранных языков и филологических факультетов университетов, изучающих английский язык как специальность, а также для студентов, занимающихся по программе «Переводчик в сфере профессиональной коммуникации».

Издание на английском языке.

Содержание

Людмила Владимировна Минаева English. Lexicology and Lexicogfaphy / Лексикология и лексикография английского языка

Preface

Given the great complexity of English vocabulary it is a formidable task to write a book on *English Lexicology and Lexicography.* My aim has been twofold: firstly, to 'transpose' as consistently as possible available lexicological knowledge from the written form of speech into the oral one by considering the dialectical unity of the two forms of speech on the level of lexicology, and, secondly, to outline the main aspects of English lexicography in terms of dictionary use by learners of EFL.

It has always been one of the tenets of Russian linguistics that the two forms of speech, written and oral, cannot be separated, that they together form a dialectical unity. The oral form is primary. This fact is borne out by the existence of a great number of languages which in spite of their having no written form are, nevertheless, adequately performing the communicative functions corresponding to the development of the particular speech community. It does not mean, of course, that the written form of speech is of no importance. As society develops and especially as cultural traditions become more and more prominent writing comes to the fore. The written form of speech becomes particularly important for certain registers, for instance, the register of scientific discourse. But if what we are after is the study of speech in all its entity we should always take into account both of its forms.

The study of the spoken word, the word as it actually appears in speech, is thus carried out with the help of the method of lexicological phonetics. This branch of phonetics investigates the different phonetic means which serve as the expression plane of lexical units as elements of the vocabulary each of which is endowed with the ability to refer individually to certain elements of extralinguistic reality. Lexicological phonetics, then, concentrates on those phonetic means which alone can enable the lexicologist to single out his ultimate units – the running words to be later lemmatized as 'lexemes' – and explain their 'semantic structure' as actually realized in speech.

Thus, in the first part of the book I have explained the methodology of lexicological research in oral speech by using as examples those facts and materials which have been newly discovered and developed in the process of recent investigations in the field. I have tried to present the material systematically beginning with morphophonemic structure of the word and gradually working up to include the involved problems of meaning equivalence and phraseology.

The second part of the book is devoted to English lexicography. Various people want to learn foreign languages and, as is well known, the best and most reliable language arbiter for those who study them in non-native environments are primarily dictionaries. However, in the past two decades the number and variety of dictionaries have increased astonishingly and the dictionary user is often at a loss: which dictionary is preferable for which purposes. I hope that the book will both guide students of English through lexicographic woods and help them to acquire necessary dictionary reference skills.

The book grew in part from my difficulties as a teacher. Hence the third part which consists of tasks and exercises aimed at checking students' knowledge of lexicological theory, on the one hand, and developing dictionary reference skills, on the other.

I have received a lot of help and encouragement from my colleagues at the Faculty of Foreign Languages of Moscow State University who are interested in lexicography. I owe a particular debt to Professor Galina Ivleva and Professor Alevtina Morozova for their detailed reviewing of the manuscript. I am also grateful to all the students I have taught. Like all teachers, I have learned more from them over the years than they have learned from me.

I have refrained from adding names of all those who have helped me but I hope that the staff of the Department of Speech Communication of Moscow State University will accept my thanks.

Part 1.
Lexicology

Chapter 1.
The Word as the Basic Linguistic Unit

1. The Size-of-Unit Problem

We begin with the word as a linguistic unit because one of the tenets of Russian linguistics has always been the assumption that it is the word which is the basic unit of language. The theory of the word was created by V.V. Vinogradov, L.V. Scerba, A.I. Smirnitsky and other Soviet linguists in the 1940s and was based mainly on the written form of language.

V.V. Vinogradov, A.I. Smirnitsky, and others were mainly concerned with the division of the written text into ultimate syntactic units – 'words', thus differing widely from the descriptivists, who approached the size-of-unit problem (the term 'size-of-unit' itself was devised by them) in terms of so-called 'free forms' as against 'bound' ones.

Descriptivists did not seek to distinguish, consistently and conclusively, between language and speech, 'running' words and their emic counterparts, lemmatisation and one-to-one analysis of ultimate syntactic units, etc. Russian linguists who were involved into prodigious lexicographic activity approached the 'problem of the word' in a different way. It was proved that to a greater or less degree, all lexical units possess the qualities of both 'separability' and 'separateness', i.e. the word differs from the morpheme, on the one hand, and the word-combination, on the other, and can be singled out in the flow of speech as an independent unit.

It becomes possible to single out words in the uninterrupted flow of speech if we apply the criterion of grammatical whole-formedness to categorematic words and that of residual separability to syncategorematic ones. Thus, as far as the former is concerned the application of the criterion can be illustrated in

the following way. The word *sun* has both the lexical meaning expressed by

the stem *sun-* («the star that shines in the sky during the day and gives the earth heat and light») and the categorial meaning of the noun, the part of speech

it belongs to. Consequently, it possesses the grammatical categories of case

and number. Otherwise stated, it is grammatically formed. The stem *sun-* in *sundial, sunshade, sunflower, sunstroke,* etc., on the contrary, is devoid of these properties and in this respect differs from the full-fledged word *sun.* To show the difference between the word and the word–combination we can compare two sequences: *place-name* and *(the) name of (a) place.* It does not require a close examination to see that they are identical in terms of their lexical meaning, they denote basically the same thing. But grammatically they are quite different.

In the word *place-name* both elements form one global whole, and together possess the categories of case and number (for example, *place-names*, not *pla-ces-names*), whereas in the word-combination each component is grammati-cally independent, i.e. *(the) name-s of the place-s, (the) name of (the) place-s,* etc.

If categorematic words can be singled out in the flow of speech because of their grammatical whole-formedness, that is positively, syncategorematic ones are separable negatively, or due to their residual separability. Thus, to state that the definite article *the* is not a morpheme but an independent word it is necessary to compare it with *the place, the name, the sun,* etc. In these sequences the

units *place, name, sun* are independent words and thus can be singled out positively. Then we have to admit that *the* is not a part of the word but a separate word.

Of course, it should be borne in mind that there are words *and* words. Different syncategorematic words possess the quality of residual separability to a greater or lesser degree. But by and large it is possible to conclude that even syncategorematic words which sometimes at first sight look like morphemes are independent lexical units.

It does not require a very close examination of pertinent facts to see that even in abstract poetry, for example, ultimate segments can be divided from one another in writing (or in printing, as the case may be) by empty spaces. Thus, even in nonsense poetry:

> 'Twas brillig and the slithy toves
> Did gyre and gimble in the wabe.
> All mimsy were the borogoves,
> And the mome raths outgrabe.

not only categorematic words, but syncategorematic ones, as well, are regularly and neatly divided from the rest of the ultimate 'pieces of nonsense' by empty spaces.

But in the oral form of language this is much more difficult to achieve, for here it is not a question of conventional 'empty spaces' but of (so far) ill-defined 'cessation of phonation'. It is common knowledge that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the 'gaps', which separate words on the printed page, and the pauses, which normally interrupt the flow of speech. Words do 'flow' and are fused together. This is the reason why so many linguists were far from clear on the subject of lexical articulation in oral speech.

The matter is further complicated by the fact that the division of the flow of speech into words creates related but somewhat different problems in different languages. Thus, for instance, it is obvious that the word in English, or Russian is far more independent and 'self-contained' than in French. If we compare the following three phrases: *Whĭn rŭading a nĭwspaper, читаягазету, en lisant le journбl* — we shall see that in English and Russian each word has its own stress while in French the word tends to be engulfed, as it were, by a larger unit.

To solve the problem of lexical articulation in the oral form of language we must begin by dwelling on the system of 'levels' of linguistic investigation.

Attention has repeatedly been drawn to the existence of three interrelated levels of research in so far as natural human speech is concerned: the feature level, the semantic level, and the metasemiotic level. At each of these levels we are dealing with the sum total of different units and categories.

We begin with the feature level, where we try and discover those parameters on which the semiologically relevant 'diacritic' oppositions are based. On this level the flow of speech is segmented into a number of discrete sounds. Thus, for instance, the sentence: *How do you think we ought to start*? is naturally apprehended by the ear as a sequence of phonemes:

(haudq jqTINkwI LtqstQ: t).

The 'broad transcription' is a kind of phonetic orthography. It would be pointless, in this context, to attempt anything like a true phonetic representation even of the shortest fragments of speech. A sequence of this kind can give no idea of the size or nature of lexical units which constitute it.

This does not mean to say, of course, that a close study of the phonotactic regularities of a language is of no importance. It is common knowledge that in every language there are definite combinations of sounds which occur on word boundaries. Thus, as is well known, long vowels and diphthongs do not precede final (N); (e, x, A, P) do not occur finally; (N) does not occur initially; no combinations are possible with (C, G, p, z),

(r, j, w) can occur in clusters only as non-initial elements; such initial sequences as (fs, mh, stl, spw) are unknown, etc. Finally, only (l) may occur before non-syllabic (m, n); (h, r, j, w) do not occur in the type of phonemic analysis here used; terminal sequences as (kf, Sp, lp, Zbd) are unknown, etc.

Nevertheless, phonotactic rules can be applied only to a limited number of cases. It follows that the analysis of the flow of speech on the feature level cannot yield satisfactory results as regards its lexical articulation.

Next comes the semantic level, on which all linguistic units are considered in terms of their ability to pass on different kinds of information. As far as the sound aspect of speech on this level is concerned, all the taxonomies are based on syntactic prosody which serves to express syntactic relations as actually realized in oral form of language, for example:

	0 Yesterday · children · got.up.very \early.	
	0 Yesterday · children.got.up.very /early?	
	7 Yesterday? || 0 Children. got · up.very 6early.	

A change in prosodic arrangement changes the purport of the utterance. (The metalanguage of prosodic description see in: *Minaeva, L.V.* Word in Speech and Writing. M., 1982, p. 96—97.) But it does nothing to prove that the different contours (whose global syntactic function is so obvious) are really and actually divisible (or 'segmenatable') into the ultimate syntactic units we insist on regarding as the 'main units of language'.

The segmentation of the flow of speech at this level brings out parts of the sentence. Various syntactic bonds are expressed with the help of pauses of different length. The most versatile of syntactic bonds – the completive one – has three pauses which serve to single out

a) direct object:

I shall say | a few very brief words about Gray…

b) prepositional object:

He comes just before the new period where you get a poetry much more animated | by emotion.

c) adverbial modifier:

The words are very often poetical words or archaic words a lot of them are not used | in English speech | today.

The two principal parts of the sentence are connected by means of the predicative bond, which is the pivotal element of the sentence for it constitutes the latter as such. The corresponding predicative pause is used to perform the actual division of the sentence, for example:

This brings us naturally | to the more general problem of the scope and the aim of philology…

The flow of speech is often interrupted by pauses in quite unexpected places, for example:

At the | last lecture we made | several very important points. One, | we tried to explain to | the students that when | a student comes to the University | he or she | does not expect or should not expect to be provided with ready-made knowledge..|.

This highly specific functioning of pauses is psychologically determined and has no constraints. But as can be clearly seen from the prosodic notation it has very little to do with the segmentation of the flow of speech into words.

It would be natural to conclude from what has just been expounded that the word as a lexical unit does not exist in the oral form of language. Nothing, however, could be further from the truth. The analysis in terms of lexicological phonetics gives us every reason to insist that the lexical articulation is real and can be established objectively by the simple process of shifting (or raising) the operations to the metasemiotic level of research.

By means of suprasynatactic prosody which is concerned with the metasemiotic functioning of speech sounds every single word can be brought into prominence within the natural flow of

speech by using logical stress and timbre II, as the basic parameters of this level of prosodic investigation, for example:

|| You \are my.friend, are you 7 not? ||
|| 0 How · is it that. you · cannot \see. ||
|| I have 0 eight or · ten \other · cases, shall we · say,
ma6turing.||
slowly
br> <br
|| The 0 lady was a 4 charming corres 6 pondent. ||
very slowly
br> <br
|| For 0 Sherlock · Holmes she was · always \the / woman. ||
||\ Why, 7 damn, it's 4 in the 7 child. |
slowly

On the metasemiotic level the speaker is free to realize all the potential junctures which are at his disposal to make the purport of the utterance as clear as possible, for example,

|| But | 0 what · matters to \me | is 0 not whether it is · true or / not | but that I be\lieve it to be / true, | or rather 0 not that I be \lieve it, |but that |
\I believe it..|.

Examples could be multiplied indefinitely. But those already adduced will suffice to show that not a single word of any kind that is normally and conventionally brought out (by means of 'empty spaces') in the written form of language could fail to acquire lexical prominence on the metasemiotic level, to prove its lexical independence and phonetic separability.

Having made this point, we must immediately qualify it by saying that although the word can, in principle, be brought out in the flow of speech, the lexical articulation is different in different registers. To illustrate this statement let us analyse the following versions of two passages from «Julius Caesar» by W. Shakespeare:

1
|| 0 Friends, |. Romans, | \countrymen, \lend me · your / ears; ||
I 0 come to \ bury 6 Caesar, | not to 6 praise him. ||
The 0 evil that · men \ do| 0 lives 6 after them, ||
The / good |is 0 oft in. terred with their 6 bones; ||
slowly
0 So · let it be with 6 Caesar. || The 0 noble · Brutus
slowly quickly
Hath / told you | 0 Caesar was am\ bitious;
quickly
|| If it 0 were / so, | it was a 4 grievous 6 fault, ||
And \ grievously hath 0 Caesar 6 answer'd it. ||
|| If 0 you have / tears, | pre\pare to \shed them 6 now. ||
0 You · all · do \ know| this 6 mantle: | 0 I re /member |
The 0 first \ time | 0 ever · Caesar put it 6 on; ||
'T was on a 0 summer's /evening, in his\tent, ||
'That \ day |he over. came the 6 Nervii.
|| \ Look! in this \place| 0 ran. Cassius' · dagger 6 through: ||
0 See what a \rent |the 0 envious \Casca 6 made: ||
Through \this| the 0 well-be. loved \Brutus 6 stabb'd; ||
And as he 0 pluck'd his · cursed. steel a. way, |
\Mark | how the 0 blood of · Caesar \follow'd it. |

As 0 rushing out of \doors, |to be re · solv'd |
If \ Brutus 0 so un\kindly. knock'd or 6 no; ||
For \Brutus, |as you \know, |was 0 Caesar's 6 angel: ||
0 Judge, O \ you \ gods!| how 4 dearly. Caesar 6 loved him. ||
0 This was the. most | un\kindest \cut of 6 all; ||
For 0 when the · noble · Caesar saw \him / stab, |
In\gratitude, more \strong than \traitors' / arms, |
\Quite 6 vanquish'd him: || \then \burst his \mighty / heart; ||
And, in his 0 mantle · muffling · up his /face, |
quickly
0 Even at the · base of \ Pompey's. statua, |
quickly
Which. all the · while · ran/blood, || 0 great \Caesar 6 fell, ||
slowly
O! 0 what a \fall was 6 there, | 0 my 6 countrymen; || |
Then /I, |and /you, |and \all of us 0 fell 6 down, |
Whilst 0 bloody · treason \flourish'd 6 over us. ||
2
|| /Friends, | /Romans, | /countrymen, | lend me your 6 ears; ||
quickly
I /come |to 4 bury Caesar, |. not to /praise him. ||
The 0 evil that · men /do| 0 lives \after them, ||
The 3 good is · oft in· terred with their 6 bones; ||
· So · let it /be |with 6 Caesar. || The 0 noble \Brutus |
Hath. told you · Caesar was am 6 bitious; ||
If 0 it were /so, | it 0 was a · grievous 6 fault, ||
/And | 0 grievously hath · Caesar 6 answere'd it. ||
|| If 0 you | · have | · tears, | pre· pare | to 6 shed them 6 now. ||
tr> <tr
You 0 all do /know| · this 6 mantle: || I re 0 member
The. first /time |ever. Caesar put it 6 on; ||
'T was on a 0 summer's 6 evening, | in his 6 tent, |
slowly
That day he over 0 came the 6 Nervii. ||
\ Look! | in 4 this /place | 0 ran ' Cassius' \dagger 6 through: ||
0 See what a /rent |the 0 envious \Casca / made: ||
tr> <tr
· Through 6 this| the 0 well-beloved \Brutus 6 stabb'd; ||
And as he 0 pluck'd his · cursed. steel a/way,
quickly
0 Mark how the · blood of · Caesar \follow'd it. ||
quickly
As 0 rushing · out of. doors, to be re/solv'd
quickly
If/Brutus|. so un. kindly · knock'd or 6 no; ||
quickly
For \ Brutus, |as you 6 know,| was 0 Caesar's \ angel: ||
1n
0 Judge, O 6 you 6 gods!| how \dearly · Caesar 6 loved him. ||

· This /was |the most |. un\kindest · cut of 6 all; ||
For 0 when the · noble /Caesar | 0 saw · him /stab,
In 0 gratitude, | 0 more /strong |than 0 traitors' 6 arms, |
h > <h
0 Quite \ vanquish'd him:. then \ burst |his \mighty 6 heart; ||
quickly
And, in his /mantle | 0 muffling up his /face,
quickly
0 Even at the · base of · Pompey's /statua,
quickly
Which. all the · while · ran 6 blood, | \great | 0 Caesar 6 fell. ||
slowly
O! what a \fall was 7 there, | 0 my 6 countrymen; ||
Then, /I |and/ you, and \ all of /us | 0 fell 6 down,
0 Whilst|. bloody|/ treason| 0 flourish'd 6 over us. ||

The two versions cited above represent two different registers: the pragmalinguistic register ((1) and the register of fiction (2). The difference between the alternatives indicated by the notation of the two versions is that the former is less varied than the latter. One of the most striking features of the register of fiction is the use of various voice qualities for the emphasis in the flow of speech, for example:

|| 0 See what a /rent | the 0 envious \Casca 6 made; ||
tr> <tr
|| For 0 when the · noble /Caesar | 0 saw · him /stab, |
In 0 gratitude | 0 more /strong |than 0 traitors' 6 arms, |
h> <h
0 Quite \vanquish'd him:
quickly
|| If 0 you | · have | · tears, | pre · pare | to 6 shed them 6 now. ||
tr> <tr

The prosodic arrangement in the proper sense of the term (pitch-movement, loudness, pitch-range, tempo) is no less expressive. The register of fiction makes ample use of combinations of prosodic parameters, whereas the pragmalinguistic register chooses only one parameter for the same purpose, for example:

1.0 Judge, O \you \ gods! |how 4 dearly. Caesar 6 loved him. ||
2. Whilst 0 bloody · treason \ flourish'd 6 over us. ||
1n
1. 0 Judge, · O 6 you 6 gods! |how \ dearly · Caesar 6 loved him. ||
2. 0 Whilst |. bloody|/ treason | 0 flourish'd 6 over us. ||

Enough has been said to demonstrate the difference in the lexical articulation of speech in two registers in terms of suprasyntactic prosody. But the reader will have realized that in the immediately preceding discussion, we have deliberately not taken account of the fact that prosody is closely connected with the segmental structure of the utterance. In what follows we shall dwell, however briefly, on this aspect of the lexical articulation of speech. But before that, it is essential to make a digression.

It is a generally accepted fact that language as an emic system and speech as an etic system lend themselves to analysis in terms of completely different units. The units of language are the phoneme, the morpheme and the construction, whereas the units of speech are the syllable, the word and the sentence. To gain a deeper insight into the nature of articulation of speech it is necessary to understand the correlation of the two principal units of speech, the word and the syllable. It

goes without saying that looked from the speechological point of view their correlation should be explained against the background of the rules and regularities of articulation of a concrete language, because, as has been shown above, there is a world of difference between languages in so far as the articulation of speech is concerned.

We should begin by stating that in contrast with the word which is a bilateral unit the syllable is unilateral because it carries no meaning of its own, that is, the expression plane of this unit is not in one-to-one correspondence with the content plane. It is, therefore, natural that the study of the syllable should be based on the theory of psycholinguistic stereotypes.

There is every reason to believe that people would not be able to produce speech unless they knew how to encode their message. To do that they must have at their command a certain set of rules with the help of which one semiotic system (the content of psycholinguistics) can be «translated» into another semiotic system (the natural human speech). Thus, the speaker avails himself of two codes: the inner code of language and the outer code of speech.

It should be emphasized in this connection that in actual speech the form of the word is subject to various constraints as far as its enunciation is concerned. It follows that we can speak of what can be described as the word stereotype, the word thus becoming the focus of two different aspects of speech formation. On the one hand, the word consists of separate sounds, on the other, it is a combination of morphemes. At the same time the word stereotype depends to a great extent on the syllable stereotype because the latter is the basic articulatory unit.

The syllable is a term which has repeatedly evoked various controversies. Very much has already been written and said concerning the antropophonic character of syllables, their phonological structure and suprasegmental peculiarities. So far, however, the syllabic articulation of speech in different registers and its interdependence with lexical articulation have been the object of very little study. One way of embarking upon the analysis of articulation of speech is to ask what is the role of tempo in this case.

It has been conclusively shown that at the rate of 320—330 syl/min the potentialities of articulation of speech which we have, so far, regarded as typical of English in contrast with French, are never realized. When speaking with this tempo the speaker tends to 'telescope' his utterances in a way which makes them practically indistinguishable from French, for example:

|| Well, I 0 have to confess to you at this point that when
I 0 very first heard that song I didn't \like it very much.
In\deed you may not be able to be\lieve that but it's
\grown over the 6 years. |Probably has with you 6 too.
| 0 Elton · John /there |and 0 'Crocodile 6 Rock' | I'd 0 also
slowly
like to re\mind you 0 early on in the programme, for a
6 change, that if you'd. like to be included in the show, it'd
be my 0 absolute de^light |to have you a/board. ||
slowly

As has been shown above the lexical articulation in English is fully realized on the metasemiotic level: the word does stand out in the flow of speech. But under certain conditions the word in English, to say nothing of the syllable, is engulfed by the environment. When the tempo exceeds 320—330 syl/min the actual enunciation of English speech has very much in common with French in spite of the 'emic' difference between the two as outlined above: syllables, and, consequently, words tend to fuse. Long words are apt to drop out some syllables, whereas short syncategorematic words are often reduced either to one or two phonemes or a bundle of distinctive features.

It should be added in this connection that this process does not necessarily influence the intelligibility of speech. Psycholinguists have conclusively proved that the enthropy being

favourable one can leave out up to 50% of speech material and nevertheless be understood. The 'telescoped' word in this case can be reconstructed judging by the context, verbal or extralinguistic.

It would be natural to conclude from what has been expounded and illustrated above that full lexical articulation of speech beyond the metasemiotic level is hardly feasible. This is not, however, the case. By studying different registers we can come to the conclusion that a clear-cut lexical and syllabic articulation of the flow of speech is the indispensable property of the most important registers, their phonetic core. A case in point is the register of oratory, for example, tempo – 130 —180 syl/min:

|| To/day, «0 science has brought · all the · different · quarters of the

· globe. so \close to/gether |that it is im\possible to \isolate them «0 one from a 6 nother. ||

To 0 day we are · faced with the · pre-eminent 6 fact |that, 0 if civilization is to sur 6 vive,| we 0 must \cultivate the · science of · human re\lationships| – the a 0 bility of. all \peoples, |of 0 all \kinds,| to 0 live to· gether and \work to · gether,| in the 0 same 6 world, |at 6 peace. ||

In the cited example each word carries a stress of its own. This inevitably leads to an unambiguous division of the flow of speech into syllables. When the speaker tries to single out every word he says he cannot do it unless he realizes the syllabic stereotype of the language he is speaking. Of paramount importance, thus, is the accentual system of the English language. This problem, however, requires a more detailed discussion.

By lexical stress we mean bringing out one of the syllables by means of a sudden change in the melodic curve accompanied and enhanced by increased intensity and duration. In English there are several types of stress: primary, secondary, even, unifying, etc. The unifying stress is lexically the simplest case when one of the syllables is the accentual centre of the word, for example: *explain* (ik ' splein), *phonetic* (fqV ' netIk), *importance* (Im ' pO: tns), etc. The weak unstressed syllables cling, as it were, to the strong one.

Very often, however, the accentual pattern of the word is more complex. There are a great many words which have two *(distribution*

(' dIstrI ' bju: Sn), *segregation* (' segre ' geISn), *precursor* (' pri: ' kE: sq), etc.), three *(unceremonious* ('An ' serI ' mqVnjqs), *supererogation* (' su: pqr ' erq ' geISn), *autobiographic* (' O: tqV ' baIqV ' grжfIk), etc.) stresses. The matter is complicated by the fact that English consonant clusters with resonants are syllabic by nature and as a result acquire a secondary stress, for example, *table* (' teI ' bl), *mumble* (' mAm ' bl), *subtle* (' sA ' tl), etc.

When the tempo of speech is slowed down to 130—180 syl/min all the stresses become particularly conspicuous. Let us consider the following passage representing the register of poetry in terms of its syllabic articulation:

They, looking back, all the eastern side beheld
Of Paradise, so late their happy seat,
Waved over by that flaming brand, the gate
With dreadful faces thronged and fiery arms.
Some natural tears they dropped, but wiped them soon;
The world was all before them, where to choose
Their place of rest, and Providence their guide.
They hand in hand with wandering steps and slow,
Through Eden took their solitary way.

~ — ' ~ — ' ~~ — ' ~ — ' ~ — '
~ — ' ~ — ~ — ' ~ — ' ~ — '
~' — ' ~ — — — ' ~ — ' ~ — '
~ — ' ~ — ' ~ — ' ~ — ' ~ — '
~ — ' ~ — ' ~ — ' ~ — ' ~ — '
~ — ' ~ — ' ~ — ' ~ — ' ~ — '

~ – ’ ~ – ’ ~ – ’ ~ – ~ – ’
~ – ’ ~ – ’ ~ – ’ ~ – ’ ~ – ’
~ – ’ ~ – ’ ~ – ’ ~ – ’ ~ – ’

If we are looking for the ideal cases of syllabic articulation we can hardly do better than concentrate on poems like the one cited above. These poems, it should be noted, are comparable with the register of oratory because both are normally uttered word by word, and there is no other way of producing them.

Granted that it is plausible to say that to pronounce the word is to realize its syllabic stereotype, it does not follow that each syllable carries a stress of its own. Of course, there may be cases when a usually unstressed syllable acquires a secondary stress owing to the general rhythm and meter of the poem. Thus, the word *solitary* in the last line of the poem under analysis as an emic unit has only one stress (’ sQlItqrI). But under the influence of the rhythmical arrange-ment of the utterance it acquires the secondary stress on the third syllable (’ sQlI ’ terI). As a result the division of the word into syllables presents no problem.

Cases of this kind, however, are comparatively rare. Most of the time the syllable stereotype becomes prominent because when the tempo is slow the speaker can easily make use of stress gradation within the word.

It is a matter of common observation that between the primary stress and unstressed syllables there exists a transition of force. Thus, for example, in *Providence, wandering, Paradise,* etc. the primary stress is on the first syllable, the second syllable is not stressed at all and the last syllable carries a very weak stress. This point should be borne in mind in view of the syllabic articulation of the flow of speech.

It follows that we can draw a clear distinction between the registers where neither words or syllables are brought into prominence and the registers where the separability of words and singling out of syllables go hand in hand. There is every reason to assume that the difference between two articulations is not qualitative but quantitative. This is why tempo comes to the fore.

2. The Identity-of-Unit Problem

The term 'identity-of-unit problem' corresponds to the Russian 'проблема тождества слова' which was first introduced by V.V.Vino-gradov. Following V.V.Vinogradov A.I.Smirnitsky, Olga Akhmanova and Ksenija Levkovskaja went on with studies of the 'identity-of-unit problem' in Russian, English and German.

It is often implied, if not actually asserted, that the word is a 'sign' pure and simple because its expression plane is in one-to-one correspondence with its content. But in actual fact the 'law of the sign' is hardly ever observed in natural human language. Polysemy – non-uniqueness of the content plane with singleness of expression, homonymy – different words identical in their expression planes, synonymy – words which have nothing in common as far as their expression is concerned but the content of which may be shown to be nearly the same – are among the most widely recognized instances of the violation of the 'law of the sign' in the lexis of a language. The above-named linguists have worked out a consistent theory of various departures from the presumed one-to-one correspondence of expression and content within the same word – that is, violations of the 'law of the sign' without impairing the word's globality as a separate lexical unit.

We shall begin our discussion of lexical variation with phonetic variation which is of three kinds:

1) automatic, 2) accentual, 3) emic.

Automatic variation comprises the phonetic variants due to assimilative processes on word-boundaries. This kind of variation is most frequently observed in the case of syncategorematic

words. The following set of examples illustrates the phonetic modifications of the conjunction *and* in different environment:

normal and natural (nLmql n2жtSrql)

now and then (naV n2 pen)

bread and butter (bredm bAtq)

king and queen (kINkwi: n)

It follows that syncategorematic words are prone to vary their expression plane under the influence of their immediate phonetic environment. This does not, however, destroy their lexical and semantic globality.

The second kind of phonetic variation is found in the case of several co-existent accentual patterns of the same word. Although, in the case of words like *necessary – necessary, contrary – contrary, territory – territory, dictionary – dictionary,* etc. (the stressed syllable is underlined) accentual variation is usually attributed to diatopy (British and American variants of pronunciation), the non-uniqueness of expression is also found within British English, for example, *aristocrat – aristocrat, confisca-tory – confiscatory, contemplative – contemplative, intercessor – intercessor, protean – protean,* etc.

Accentual variation, if discreetly handled, is conducive to more elaborate poetic form, for example:

complete

…that thou dead corpse again in *com*plete steel;

how many make the hour full comp*lete*…

contract

…how shall we then dispense with that con*tract*;

a *con*tract of true love to celebrate…

outrage

…with this immodest clamorous out*rage*;

do *out*rage and displeasure to himself…

perfume

…the *per*fume and supplience of a minute, no more;

to take per*fumes*? distil preserve? yea so…

revenues

…by manors, rents, re*ve*nues I forego;

long withering out a young man's *re*venue…

sojourn

…that if they come to *so*journ at my house;

so*journ* in Mantua; I'll find out your man…

The evidence of the above examples suggests that this kind of accentual variation in poetry is determined by exigencies of the metre, the poet selecting and arranging the variants in a way best suited to the rhythmical organization of his lines.

Of particular interest, in this connection, is the fact that in English there exist even-stressed words like *upstairs, broad-shouldered, blue-eyed, Chinese,* etc. The thesis that each component of such a word carries a stress of its own can, however, be refuted by the fact that in the flow of speech this accentual pattern is never retained. The point is that the accentual structure of even-stressed words depends entirely on their immediate environment in speech, for example: *Let's go up**stairs**. An**up**stairs room. He is a **broad**-shouldered man. The man was broad-**shoul**dered. A pretty **blue**-eyed girl. The girl was blue-**eyed**. Can you speak Chi**nese**? This is a **Chi**nese grammar.* There is every reason to believe that even-stressed words may be said to be non-existent because when taken in isolation and pronounced with equal stress on both components, the words would sound unnatural and artificial.

The third kind of phonetic variation depends on the coexistence of several 'emic' versions of the outer side of the word, for example:

Asian (eISn, – sIqn, – zIqn, – zqn)

begin (bI ' gIn, bq ' gIn)

cathedra (kq ' Ti: drq, kж ' tedrR, kж ' Tedrq, kq ' tedrR)

ceramic (sI ' rжmIk, sq ' rжmIk, kI ' rжmik, kq ' rжmIk)

direct (dI ' rekt, dq ' r-, daI ' r-)

elastic (I ' lжstIk, I ' lRstIk)

explain (Ik ' spleIn, qk ' spleIn)

fascism (' fжSIzqm, ' fжsIzqm)

usage (' ju: zIG, ' ju: sIG)

Vietnam (' vjet ' nжm, ' vjet ' nRm)

Examples of this kind can be multiplied infinitely the moment we turn to any pronouncing dictionary of modern English.

Next comes morphological variation. By morphological variant we mean those cases in which one of the morphemes within a word becomes meaningless, i.e. it does not carry the meaning which is normally assumed to belong to it. In Olga Akhmanova's «Очерки по общей и русской лексикологии» (М., 1957) this complex phenomenon is explained by means of the following examples: *ежегодный – ежегодний, длинношерст-ный – длинношерстый, обклеи-вать – оклеивать, будний – будничный,* etc., on the one hand, and *бычий – бычачий, петуший – петушиный,* etc., on the other. In the former case it is difficult to draw a line between phonetic and morphological variants, whereas in the latter, examples of morphological variation in Russian appear to be sufficiently convincing.

As far as English is concerned we rely mainly on A.I.Smirnitsky's «Лексикология англий-ского языка». He distinguishes two kinds of morphological variation: grammatical morphological and lexical morphological. Thus, *learn – learnt, learn – learned, bandit – banditi, bandit – bandits* are examples of grammatical morphological variation, while pairs in *–ic, – ical* such as *stylistic – stylistical, mathematic – mathematical,* etc. are examples of lexical morphological variation.

So much by way of general background to the notion of morphological variation. But there are obvious problems which arise the moment we try to penetrate deeper into the question. The fact is that what has just been said about lexical morphological variation can be accepted only if one of the component morphemes within a word can be shown to have lost its meaning and thus to become a unilateral unit. It is common knowledge that words and morphemes are bilateral units. The balaterality of words and morphemes is regularly contrasted with the unilaterality of units of the diacritic level – phonemes and letters. If bilateral units are founded on the unity of expression and content which forms the basis of what is described as 'individual reference', unilateral units are set up on the basis of a different category – the category of 'otherness'. Thus, for instance, in (pIl) – (bIl), (set) – (sжt), (kQt) – (gQt), (p) – (b), (e) – (ж), (k) – (g) are semiologically relevant sounds and they serve to distinguish the words *pill* and *bill, set* and *sat, cot* and *got.* These sounds have no meaning of their own and signal the otherness of the above word pairs.

To reiterate, in the case of morphological variation we are confronted with the situation when generally a bilateral unit becomes unilateral the difference between the contrasted words ceasing to be morphological. A case in point is adjectives in *–ic, – ical.* In *public, politic, poetic, periodic, specific,* etc., and *formal, usual, structural, functional, casual,* etc., the suffixes *-ic* and *-al* function as regular full-fledged morphemes. But in pairs like *academic – academical, stylistic – stylistical, mathematic – mathematical, morphologic – morphological,* etc. the situation is drastically different. The suffix *-al* carries no meaning of its own. As a result, we can no longer regard these units as separate words and must treat them as morphological variants of one and the same word.

So far the discussion of morphological variation has been deliberately, though tacitly, restricted to only one aspect of the problem, namely the correlation of unilateral and bilateral units. But we cannot lose sight of the relationship between morphological variants and other lexicological categories, such as synonymy and homonymy. To illustrate the point let us adduce a few examples: *классовый – классный, ананасный – ананасовый*. At first sight it may seem that these pairs of two words are identical but in actual fact they have nothing in common. *Классный* and *классовый* are homonyms pure and simple because they are derived from two homonymous words *класс*-1 and *класс*-2 whereas *ананасный* and *ананасовый* are derived from one and the same word and can be treated as morphological variants because there is no noticeable semantic difference between them. It follows that although structurally these pairs of words seem to be identical, from the point of view of their content plane they belong to different categories – homonymy and polysemy. The difference between homonymy and polysemy is something that we shall come back to in a later chapter. It is sufficient for our present purpose to emphasize the fact that when dealing with seemingly indistinguishable cases we should take into consideration quite a few factors.

Let us now return to the relationship between morphological variation and synonymy. We cannot arrive at really reliable results unless we come to perfect understanding of the category of synonymy because morphological variation very often brings up synonymy. Thus, for example, *academic – academical, mathematic – mathematical* are morphological variants while *economic – economical, historic – historical* are synonyms. This fact is borne out by the impossibility of bringing together in synonymic condensation the former (**This is an academic and academical subject)* and the acceptability of a phrase like *This is a historic and historical place where the first shot was fired* meaning that it is both 1) historically important and 2) a part of history.

The above discussion is by no means exhaustive, for much still remains to be done. Now we should turn to another kind of lexical variation – the semantic one. All along we have dealt with the expression plane (phonetic and morphological variants). Semantic variants are modifications of the content plane.

When we turn to the content plane and semantic variation we are immediately confronted with some metalinguistic complications. What we describe as 'semantic variation' is much better known by the name of polysemy, we nevertheless insist on the term 'semantic variation' because this metalinguistic expression helps to elucidate some moot points in the theory of the identity-of-unit problem. For one thing, using the term 'polysemy' would logically imply preference for 'polyphony' to denote phonetic variation. The latter, however, would be misleading because it is now used in linguostylistics to denote simultaneous realization of several lexical-semantic variants of the same word. Secondly, as will be shown below, semantic variation goes hand in hand with prosodic variation, that is different inherent or adherent prosodic features. We must, therefore, decide in favour of the term 'semantic variation' which corresponds very neatly to phonetic, morphological and prosodic variation.

Although we are satisfied with the results of the metalinguistic discussion we are fully aware of the enormous difficulties which will have to be contended with the moment an attempt is made to exemplify semantic variation. The fact is that there is a strong tendency in the literature on the subject to deny semantic variation altogether. Some linguists state that every time a word is used in a different meaning a homonym is created. This view has affected, to some extent, modern learner's lexicography. Thus, for example, in «Cambridge International Dictionary of English» the entry of a polysemantic word is organized in such a way that the head word is printed every time a new meaning is singled out. Special guide words following the head word indicate the difference:

Bed *furniture* / bed/ *n* C – a large rectangular piece of furniture, often with four legs which is used for sleeping…

Bed *bottom* /bed/ *n* C – the bottom or something that serves as
a base…

Bed *area of ground* /bed/ *n* C – a piece of ground used for planting flowers

Although, of course, this type of the entry outlay is very user-friendly because it facilitates the process of finding different meanings of the word in question in a long entry, it should be emphasized that this approach destroys the globality of the word as a separate linguistic unit and replaces polysemy by homonymy.

There is no reason, however, to substitute homonymy for semantic variation in cases of this kind because there are scientifically reliable methods of drawing a line between polysemy and homonymy which will be considered below. The point to be emphasized here is that the notion of semantic variation implies the globality of the word when used in different meanings. To illustrate semantic variation let us consider the following examples:

1. Do you like your tea sweet?

2. What a very sweet name.

Sweet 1 means 'tasting like sugar or honey' while *sweet 2* is 'pleasant or attractive'. Both variants are registered by all the dictionaries as belonging to the same entry. Although there is a slight semantic difference between the two variants it is not big enough to split up the word into two lexical units.

Throughout this chapter we have been mainly concerned with the specific character of the correlation of expression and content planes in natural human language and concluded that phonetic and morphological variants are not directly correlated with semantic variants. The relationship that holds between prosodic and semantic variants is different. Special studies have shown that correspondence between 'meaning' and 'form', expression and content is regularly established by means of prosodic contrasts. Thus, for example, the semantic variants of *sweet 1* and *sweet 2, to melt 1* and *to melt 2, noble 1* and *noble 2* are clearly distinguishable on the expression plane by the opposition of the following prosodic patterns:

1. || 0 Do you · like your. tea 7 sweet? ||

2. || 0 What a · very \ sweet. name. ||

slowly

1. || 0 Mary-Ann made · short 7 pastry «that 0 melted in the 6 mouth. ||

2. || My 0 heart \melted as I. sorted him 6 out. ||

slowly

1. || He is a 0 man of · noble 6 birth. ||

2. || 0 What a 4 noble. nature you have, 7 Gwendolen. ||

Thus, there is every reason to assume that if the arguments put forward above are valid, they show that it is possible, in principle, to discover objective criteria on which to base the semantic variation of words.

Although so much has been achieved and the general approach to the identity-of-unit problem is now outlined clearly enough, very much remains to be done before it ceases to be a 'problem'.

Chapter 2.
Morphological Structure of a Word

1. Item and Arrangement

The branch of linguistics which concerns itself with the structure of words as dependent on the meaning of the constituent morphemes is called morphology. Morphemes are of two kinds: lexical and grammatical. Morphological analysis enables us to gain a deeper insight into the mutual relationship of lexical and grammatical morphemes within the word, on the one hand, and the productivity of word-building patterns, on the other.

The word is a unit which is both lexical and grammatical. This is the reason why we must begin with morphological analysis in the broader sense of the term, that is, to include both the grammatical and the lexical aspects of morphology. The difference between the two may be explained as follows: grammatical morphology is 'allomorphic' but 'sememic' while lexical morphology is 'morphemic' and 'semic' (*Raun Alo*. Grammatical Meaning.Verba docent: Juhlakirja Lauri Hakulisen

60-vuotispaivaksi. Helsinki, 1959, p. 346—348).

The prefix 'allo-' is used in linguistic terminology to describe variants of the same unit. For example (-s) and (-z) are allomorphs of the morpheme of the third person singular Present Tense Active Voice. For instance, 'he sobs' (-z) vs 'he sips' (-s) – (-s) and (-z) are variants of the same morpheme in the sense that they are the same grammatical element, functioning as two different variants of the same unit. Another example: 'He was *guided* by John' (-d); 'The cup was *broken*' (-n); 'He was *stopped*' (-t) – (-d), (-t); (-n) are the three allomorphs of the Past Participle.

The suffix '-emic' means 'belonging to the system', '-etic'– 'occurring in actual speech'. Grammatical morphemes are allomorphic and sememic: they can be understood only as part of the whole system of grammatical oppositions. Thus, for instance, (-s) and (-z) are the allomorphs of the morpheme of the third person singular, when attached to a verbal stem. But when they are attached to a nominal stem they denote plurality (as in *books, beds)*. Thus, taken in isolation (-s) and (-z) do not convey a distinct grammatical meaning, for it becomes clear only against the background of the entire system of grammatical oppositions.

With lexical morphemes the situation is quite different. The suffix

– *less,* for example (as a lexical morpheme) is morphemic because there are no variants, no allomorphs. On the other hand, its meaning is understood as such, without recourse to the emic level. Lexical morphemes, therefore, are described as 'semic'.

When we turn to the study of lexical morphemes we have to admit that quite a few questions still remain open. One of the problems can be formulated as follows: how can we discover what parts the word consists of? Obviously, one of the criteria is a close one-to-one correspondence between expression and content. Very often it is easy to establish the way the word is divided into parts on the basis of the unity of the given form and the given meaning. Thus, for instance, in cases like *child-less, water-y, yellow-ish* etc., no special problem arises, because their inner form is transparent.

But when we turn to the great number of words already existing in the language, then, obviously, what we have to decide is whether in each particular case we are dealing with a monomorphemic or polymorphemic word. A case in point is English *cranberry. Cranberry* in the system of the English language is part of a long series of words each denoting a particular variety of *berries.* But in contrast with *blueberry* and *blackberry,* for example, which are readily divided

into two morphemes, *cranberry* looks like a monomorphemic word, because *cran-* has got nothing to do with *cran* meaning 'measure for fresh herrings' (=37.5 gallons).

Quite a number of great linguists concerned themselves with this problem. Of special interest is a famous work of Georgij Vinokur 'Заметки по русскому словообразованию'. (М., 1946) concerning the segmentability of words like *малина* and *клубника.* The solution offered by A.I.Smirnitsky, however, seems to be the most acceptable of all. A.I.Smirnitsky was sure that morphological analysis is assured if a sufficiently clear-cut lexical morpheme is powerful enough to induce meaningfulness in the rest of the word. It follows that *cran-, мал-, клубн-* are morphemes because *-berry* and *– ин, – ик* are.

As far as the controversy between G.O.Vinokur and A.I.Smirnitsky is concerned we would venture to suggest that it can be accounted

for by the fact that while the former concentrated on ITEM AND ARRANGEMENT, the latter dealt with the other aspect of morphology, i.e. ITEM AND PROCESS.

It follows that in the case of lexical morphology we must distinguish between the two aspects of investigation. When we analyse words in terms of 'item and arrangement' we deal mainly with the ways of segmenting the already existing lexical material. When, however, we concentrate on the productivity of certain patterns, on discovering their potentialities we pass on to the level of 'item and process'.

Let us now see how the above principles can be applied to some actual facts of English lexical morphology. In Russian the terms 'по одному ряду' or 'по двум рядам' are used to distinguish between words which are segmentable either 'one way, or 'both ways'. Thus, for example, the word *beautiful* is segmentable into *beauti-* and *-ful,* because, on the one hand, there are plenty of words with (0 bju: tI) as the stem (or root morpheme) – *to beautify, beauteous, beautician,* etc., and even a larger number of words like *hopeful, careful, wonderful,* etc., on the other.

Graphically the 'both ways' relationship may be represented as follows:

beautiful

beauty, careful,

beauteous, wonderful,

to beautify, hopeful,

beautician, etc.plentiful, etc.

The 'one way' relationship was discussed above in connection with the *-ин-* and *-berry* derivatives. *Blueberry, blackberry* are examples of 'both ways'. *Raspberry, gooseberry* leave us with a vague impression of a meaningful first part, while in the case of *cranberry* the relationship is obviously 'one way' and 'meaningfulness' for *cran-* is either not there at all, or is 'induced' by the morphological power of the second (or

– berry) element.

Even greater difficulties have to be contended with because of the 'de-etymologization' and various morphonological processes which take part within a word. To give the reader an idea of what it actually looks like when we deal not with isolated, hand-picked words, but with an actual utterance, it is essential to analyse a chunk of speech as actually produced by an ordinary user of the language. The following sentence can serve as an example:

One eminent American linguist when asked about the difference between the two morphologies suggested a set of fanciful, but interesting terms.

One in terms of 'item and arrangement' is connected with words like *oneself, anyone, once,* etc. In *eminent* the element *– ent* is easily singled out, because there are so many adjectives ending in *-ent (prominent, evident,* etc.). But for *-ent* to be regarded as a suffix in this case the idea of an 'induced' morpheme will have to be re-introduced, for all existing derivatives *(eminence, eminently,* etc.) are derived from *eminent* as the stem: nothing shorter than *eminent* ever appears in the derivatives.

In *American* the root morpheme is clearly *Americ-,* for it is from the noun *America* that the adjective was originally derived. There are other names of nationalities in which the root morpheme is followed by *-an,* such as *Mexican, Australian, Hungarian,* etc. In the case of *linguist* at first sight the word presents no morphological problems. The morpheme *-ist*

is easily understood as a noun-forming suffix, which recurs in words like *scientist, physicist, philologist,* etc. Analysis in this case is, however, complicated by the fact that the first part of the word *(ling-)* never figures as a separate morpheme.

When is a syncategorematic word. The morphonology of words of this kind presents special difficulties owing to the fact that they change their pronunciation under the influence of different speech situations. Thus, for example, when speech is emphatic, (w) is abandoned and (m) is used instead: (men). The slovoform *asked* is morphologically peculiar because of the tendency to say (Rst) instead of (Rskt). When we try to think of derivatives with which this stem is connected we find that we can hardly go beyond *askable* (?), with a question-mark. The suffix

– able was regarded as merely an 'absolutely productive' suffix used to form adjectives from verbal stems – thus: *read – readable, teach – teachable,* etc. Special research, however, has shown that this is a case of overlapping of the two morphologies – the lexical and the grammatical ones (*Гвишиани, Н.Б.* Полифункциональные слова в языке и речи. М., 1979, с. 146—165).

The, which comes next, is a syncategorematic word. The morpho-nology of all syncategorematic words is connected mainly not with their actual morphemic structure but with the way they function in different syntactic positions. The definite article *the* may be used either in its strong or its weak form. According to grammar books the strong form of the definite article is (DI). If we turn to the analysis of the oral form of speech as it really is, we shall see that most of the time it is used in one of its weak forms. Next comes the adjective *different,* which is connected with *difference, differential, differentiate.* Morphonologically it is a good example of the t/s/S gradation of consonants and the q/e gradation of vowels accompanied by changes in the accentual structure. In *differentiate* and *differential* the stress is shifted to the third syllable.

As far as the word *between* is concerned we should point to the fact that it is obviously derived from *two* (or *twain,* see: *Mark Twain).* With *morphology* we have to face problems of a more general character. Is it a 'derivative', a word derived from the 'stem' *morph–* by means of a suffix according to a 'derivational' pattern or a compound made by juxtaposition of two root-morphemes? It has often been pointed out that *– ology* means 'science'.

Suggest is clearly connected with *suggestive, suggestion* with morphonological gradation. For *set* most important is the way the noun *set* is connected with the corresponding verb, an interesting case of conversion. In connection with *of* two points should be mentioned. Firstly, *of* being a syncategorematic word its actual form always depends on its syntactic function in a sentence. Secondly, the preposition *of* (Pv) should not be confounded with the adverb *off* (Pf). *Fanciful* is an adjective, derived from the nominal stem (fжnsI) with the help of the adjective-forming suffix *-ful.* Quite a number of adjectives are formed in this way: *care – careful, beauty – beautiful, shame – shameful.*

When performing the item-and-arrangement analysis above we used a 'typographical' text. But it is a well-known fact that traditional orthography is very misleading. This is the reason why we fall back on phonetic transcription when we want to gain a deeper insight into the morphonological structure of our units. When working with the oral form of language we inevitably come to the conclusion that we cannot stop with segmental phonetics: different prosodic and paralinguistic phenomena, which are invariably superimposed on the word in speech should be also taken into account. As far as the morphological analysis of words is concerned, the parameter of internal juncture cannot be overestimated.

By juncture we mean a pause which is accompanied by various modifications of preceding and following sounds. There are open junctures and internal ones. As to the former we can

consider them to be syntactically relevant, for they occur at the end of breath-groups, sentences and supraphrasal unities. Otherwise stated open junctures are indispensable for syntactic segmentation of the flow of speech. Whereas internal juncture can be described as morphological.

Generally internal juncture is observed in compound words. «Thus, the phonetic sequence (pi: stLks) (with secondary accent on the syllable containing (L) may mean *pea stalks* or *peace talks* according to the situation of the word boundaries (i.e. (i: – st) or (i: s – tL)). In this case if the boundary occurs between (s) and (t), the identity of the words *peace* and *talks* may be established by the reduced (i:) (in a syllable closed by a fortis consonant) and by the slight aspiration of (t) (initial in a syllable carrying a secondary accent)); on the other hand, if the boundary occurs between (i:) and (s), this may be signaled by the relatively full length of (i:) (in the open word-final syllable) and by the unaspirated allophone of

(t) (following (s) in the same syllable) as well as by the stronger (s).» (*Gim — son, A*. An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English. 1970, p. 299.)

As a rule the morphological (internal) juncture is not realized on morpheme boundaries of ordinary words like, for example, *indefinitely,* but under specific circumstances on the metasemiotic level it can be observed, for instance:

«Oh, you definitely suspect somebody then?»

«*In*definitely, would be a better word for it,» said slowly Mr. Parker with a smile.

In the example cited above the word *indefinitely* is split up into two morphemes *in-* and *-definitely* by means of the prolongation of the sound (n), a high level tone on the prefix and increased loudness.

One more example:

«They gave it me,» Humpty Dumpty continued thoughtfully, as he crossed one knee over the other and clasped his hands round it, «they gave it me – for an un-birthday present.»

«I beg you pardon?» Alice said with a puzzled air.

«I'm not offended,» said Humpty Dumpty.

«I mean what is an *un*-birthday present?»

The negative prefix *un-* is brought out in the flow of speech by means of the logical stress, which makes the internal juncture become conspicuous.

Thus, we can conclude that in the oral form of language a word lends itself to morphological articulation on the metasemiotic level, when the internal juncture is realized to the full. These observations are very important because they prove the objective existence of 'item and arrangement'.

2. Item and Process

The difference between 'item and arrangement', on the one hand, and 'item and process', on the other, consists in the latter being concerned with the making of new words, while the former concerns itself with the analysis of already existing lexical units. Item and process approach is aimed at understanding the principles of what is usually described as word-building. How do people set about making new words?

It may seem to be stating the obvious that the vocabulary of any particular language consists of monolithic, indecomposable units – words, which by definition are supposed to be ready made. We would not be able to communicate effectively unless everyone of us had at his command a considerable number of those lexical units which can be combined in various ways. But new words keep being coined all the time without hampering communication. New words may be of different types and produced for different purposes. When we analyse them we should take into consideration various social, extra-linguistic and physical prerequisites. In other words, we should clearly distinguish between semantic and metasemiotic recurrence.

On the one hand, there are many new words which can be classified as neologisms, i.e. words which have been coined to denote new concepts or things, resulting from the development of the social life of the speech community in question. Thus, for example, there are a number of words referring to the media or to people and things relevant to the media which appeared not long ago:

Britpop – is used to refer to young singers, groups and their songs: *The Spice Girls, Oasis, Blur Pulp*, and *All Saints*, among many others. With the help of *Brit-* used as a prefix the following words have been coined: *Britrock, Britrap, Britlit* (trendy novels written by young people), and *Britpic* (British films such as *Brassed Off* and *The Full Money*).

A number of words have been coined to describe television programmes. There used to be news, education, documentaries and many programmes for entertainment. Now there are programmes which are entertaining but which also give you information, called *infotainment.* This is formed from 'information' and 'entertainment'. There are other words like this: *edutainment, docutainment, infom-mercial, rockumentary.*

It is interesting to observe how neologisms gradually make their way to the basic vocabulary under the influence of changing social life of the speaking community. For instance the word *tea-garden (*a garden where tea and other refreshments are served to the public) was part of the wordlist in the first three editions of the «Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English». Then in the fourth edition it was substituted for by *milk bar* (bar for the sale of drinks made from milk, ice-cream and other light refreshments). And in the sixth edition (published in 2000) a new word was introduced – *cybercafй (*a cafй with computers on which customers can use the Internet, send electronic mail, etc.).

There are plenty of dictionaries of English neologisms which provide us with all the necessary information as to how many new words appeared and were assimilated by the language at a certain period of time.

On the other hand, word building is represented by occasional words i.e. words which are coined because their creators seek for expressive utterance, for example, *husbandiliness* in

«Burlap in return adored his private phantom, adored its beautiful —
ly Christian conception of matrimony, adored his adorable husban —
diliness»

or *ladderless* in

«Be a leggy girl in Berkshire stockings. Ladderless.»

Both types of word building can be best described and understood in terms of 'lexical-morphological category', that is to say, a type of relationship when no constraints whatsoever are imposed on the formation of pairs of words, which differ from each other both on the plane of content and the plane of expression.

As has been repeatedly stated the term 'category' as applied to linguistics is not infrequently employed to denote not the fundamental concepts, but the actual 'dimensions' of linguistic phenomena. In what follows the term 'category' will be used in this sense: the most general properties and relationships of the language. The lexical-morphological categories, then, are those linguistic categories of the most general character which are realized in the semantic opposition according to a certain distinctive feature of two or more words on condition that the same opposition is observed in other pairs or even larger groups of words and find systematic expression.

It is clear that the concept of lexical-morphological category has a direct bearing on the so-called 'productivity' of various word-building patterns. It has been stated time and again that an affix can be considered to be productive if it is used to coin new words. Thus, the following English affixes are generally described as productive: *de-, re-, pre-,*
non-, un-, anti-, -ness, – less, – er, -ation, – able, – ish, etc.

Here immediately a question is bound to arise: are we justified in introducing a new term if the science in question has already a well-developed metalinguistic system. At first sight it may

seem that there is very little difference, if any, between the concept of 'productivity' and that of 'lexical-morphological category'. Nothing, however, could be further from the truth. 'Lexical-morphological category' is not just a special metalinguistic description but a scientific proposition which enables us, firstly, to gain an insight into the relationship between two aspects of morphology and, secondly, raise lexical morphology to the status of a science, because by describing and explaining the underlying fundamental concepts we can arrive at a scientifically tenable theory of word building.

Incidentally the concept of 'productivity' never appears in discussions of grammatical morphology. It is taken for granted that grammatical morphology deals only with productive processes and categories. Whereas in the case of lexical morphology the word 'productivity' is used to indicate that certainly not all the lexical processes are 'productive', and 'productivity' is a characteristic of a certain part of lexical processes which are covered by the term 'item and arrangement'. Lexical-morphological category, on the contrary, establishes a new alliance between the two aspects of morphology because in this case their common features come to the fore.

The concept of lexical-morphological category was first put forward by A. I. Smirnitsky, who came to the conclusion that pairs like *write – rewrite, read – reread, type – retype,* etc. display a regularity which is similar to the properties of grammatical categories. Oppositions of this kind are regularly reproduced in speech, the resulting complexes being entirely lexical in character.

So much importance being attached to lexical-morphologiacl category the subject should be discussed in detail. We shall begin by considering the category of quality. This category is constituted by the opposition of the substantival and the adjectival representations of quality, for example: *black – blackness, happy – happiness, kind – kindness, quiet – quietness,* etc.

We should first of all look at a list of the marked members of the opposition. This is the essential first step because our task consists in finding out whether any constraints, morphonological or semantic, are superimposed on the realization of the category. Copious facts of the substantival representation of the category in question collected and carefully investigated give conclusive evidence of the fact that there are various consonant clusters on the border between the stem and the suffix *-ness,* including those which so far have not been registered or inventorised for example:

(mpn) – *limpness, plumpness, dampness;*
(mbln) – *humbleness;*
(mpln) – *simpleness, ampleness*;
(skn) – *briskness, picturesqueness, statuesqueness;*
(sn) – *closeness, coarseness, crossness, grossness, looseness;*
(stn) –– *fastness, firstness, justness, modestness, moistness;*
(bln) –– *doubleness;*
(kn) – *blankness, frankness;*
(n) – *longness, wrongness;*
(Nktn) – *indistinctness;*
(Ngln) – *singleness;*
(Tn)– *uncouthness, loathness;*
(ptn) – *abruptness, aptness, corruptness, inaptness;*
(pln) – *crippleness*;
(Gn) – *hugeness, largeness, savageness, strangeness;*
(zn) – *citizenness, crimsonness, diffuseness, profuseness,* etc.

The evidence of the facts adduced above shows that the morpho-nological composition of words in *-ness* is not confined to any limited number of clusters. It will be natural to conclude, therefore, that no morphonological constraints whatsoever are imposed on the lexical-

morphological category of quality in English. As far as its expression plane is concerned it can be freely realized in speech.

When we turn to the content plane of the lexical-morphological category under discussion we find that different stems can indiscri-minately serve as the basis of the process under consideration, for example:

root-morphemes – *sadness, brightness, closeness, whiteness, keenness;*

derived adjectives – *heartlessness, aimlessness, childlikeness;*

compound adjectives – *school-girlishness, bowleggedness;*

forms of degrees of comparison – *betterness, nearestness and dearest-ness;*

predicative adjectives – *aloneness, aloofness, awareness;*

past participle – *unexpectedness, forgottenness, unwashedness;*

ing-stems – *astonishingness, insultingness, interferingness.*

It should be pointed out that the actual existence of the lexical-morphological category is easily demonstrated not only with the help of new formations derived from words but also from word-combinations, for example:

He had an idea – partly out of childish *let's-try-and-seeness,* partly out of a book on dynamic symmetry…

The book has all the suspence and *I-can't-put-it-downness* we have come to expect from him.

You talk as if no one else in the world had ever used a brush. D'you sup-pose that I don't know the feeling of worry and bother and *can't-get-at-ness*?

What was her attraction? I suppose *all-of-a-pieceness* was her strength.

Do you remember his *on-top-of-the-worldness*?

It requires but little reflection to see that formations of this kind can be indexed solely, or even primarily, in terms of stylistics. Thus we can conclude that the lexical-morphological category is realized to the full only on the metasemiotic level.

Now let us turn to the lexical-morphological category of 'action – agent'.

As is well known categories are always constituted by the opposition of no less than two categorial forms. In the case of the nouns in *-ness* we observe the zero form of the adjective and the marked *-ness*-form of the noun. In the case of 'action – agent' category we can observe the zero form of the verb and the marked – *er*-form of the noun, for example, *to do – doer, to read – reader, to manage – manager,* etc.

As was pointed out above, the lexical-morphological category is realized to the full only on the metasemiotic level. All these considerations hold true also in the case of the lexical category in question, for example:

She was both doer and sufferer: she inflicted pain and participated in it.

I am sorry to be a bringer of bad news, but I feel it is my duty.

But in assuming that the knocker who had just knocked on the door was Sir Warkin Bassett, I had erred.

It should be added in this connection that the lexical-morphological category of 'action – agent' can be realized even when there are words in *-er* which have lost the connection with the verbal stem. Thus, for instance, in spite of the fact that there are words like *admirer* 'man who is in love with a woman', *believer* '*a* person with religious faith', *waiter* 'man who waits at table in a restaurant, hotel dining-room, etc.' and so on it is quite possible to use homonymous formations which represent the categorial meaning as the substantival representation of the lexical-morphological category under discussion, for example:

He was a blatant admirer of Napoleon.

And, I gathered from her remarks, she had ceased entirely to be a believer in that notebook's existence.

All waiters for the 475 plane, pass to the next hall, please.

Side by side with the lexical-morphological categories of quality and action-agent there are the category of caritivity (the marked categorial form comprises adjectives in -*less*, for example, *child – childless*) and the category of simulation (the marked categorial form is represented by adjectives in – *like*, for example, *lady – ladylike*). Each category has some specific features (*Тер-Минасова, С.Г.* Синтагматика функци —

ональных стилей и оптимизация преподавания иностранных языков. М., 1986, с. 67—86) but there is one common feature: the lexical-morphological category is realized to the full only on the metasemiotic level when an occasional word is coined.

Derivation, compounding and other means of creating new words are used to coin neologisms and occasional words. Neologisms are those words which have been coined to denote a new concept or thing, resulting from the development of the material and social life of the speech community. For example, the suffix -*ism* which forms nouns showing action or condition (*baptism, criticism, heroism)* two decades ago was used to coin the words which denoted new tendencies in British and American society — *afroism (*adherence to Africun culture), *sexism* (discrimination against people of a particular sex, especially women), *ageism* (discrimiation of old people).

Occasional words appear when the writer/speaker wants to achieve various stylistic effects and produce an impact on the reader/listener. The vast majority of new formations as realizations of lexical-morpho-logical categories belong to this class of words. Let us consider a few examples of the category of simulation and that of caritivity:

1. Artists, of course, were notoriously **Hamlet-like**, and to this extent one must discount for one's father, even, if one loved him.

2. James made a great effort, and rose to the full height of his **stork-like** figure.

3. Get a beautiful new figure under expert individual supervision! **Dietless** slimming!

4. Be a leggy girl in Berkshire stockings. **Ladderless**.

The above examples illustrate occasional words used in the registers of fiction and advertising, the two registers which are based on the function of impact. Occasional words help the authors to enhance the connotativeness of the text.

In this connection it is important to emphasize once again that unfortunately the printed word often does not enable the linguist to get an insight into the different phenomena of language, derivation is not an exception. One of the ways of differentiating between semantic and metasemiotic derivations will consist in using the methods of prosodic analysis. In what follows we shall try to establish certain correlations between new words and their prosodic arrangement in speech.

The method of prosodic analysis has proved to be very effective while investigating the functioning of a word both on the semantic and the metasemiotic levels. The studies of the interdependence of word-meanings and their prosodic organization have shown that in actual speech the prosody of words possessing a certain inherent or adherent connotation is different from that of the more neutral or less emphatic words.

What has been expounded above will justify us in regarding the specific prosodic phenomena which manifest themselves whenever a word is used metasemiotically as an important approach to the analysis of new formations. The difference between semantic and metasemiotic derivation becomes absolutely clear-cut because the latter is accompanied by a special kind of sound phenomena, whereas the former formations serve as the neutral background against which the expressive occasional words 'shine' particularly brightly.

Let us consider a few contexts with occasional words in − *y* and − *ish* as well as new formations of the 'baby-sit' type,

1. ‖ «4Yes,» |sighed Hannah, |«that's the 0 main · trouble with · having 6money. ‖ It 0 makes · people · want to · say \'Pooh'. ‖ And €mostly| they are 0 too \decent to 7 say it | but they 0 keep thinking it | and 0 wanting

to say it | un 0 til their · mouths and · noses · get a · sort of 4 poohy
ex 6 pression.» ||
slowly
2. || At the 0 very · bottom of his 7 soul | he was an 0 outsider and
anti 6 social | and he ac 0 cepted the · fact 6inwardly | 0 no matter how
' Bondstreety he was on the 6 outside. ||
3. || – 0 When you · say '· Ho, · ho', 7 twice |in a 0 gloating · sort
of 7 way |and the 0 other · person · only 7 hums, |you 0 suddenly 7 find, just as you be · gin
to · say it the \ third 7 time|, that,|. well|, you. find… ||
– \ What? ||
– 0 That it \ isn't | – said 6 Pooh. ||
– 0 Isn't \ what? ||
|| Pooh \knew · what he 6 meant | but 0 being a · Bear of · Very · Lit —
tle 7 Brain | 0 couldn't · think of the 6 words. ||
– \Well, |it 0 just 4 isn't | – he 0 said again. ||
– You 0 mean it · isn't ho– 7 ho-ish any 3 more?| – said / Piglet
7 hopefully. quickly
|| 0 Pooh · looked at him adꞙmiringly| and. said that. that was · what he 6 meant. ||
4. || So, 0 after 7 all | you are 6 husband-hunting? ||
slowly
5. We were ꞙflat-sitting and then 4 pet-sitting for our 7 friends. ||
slowly slowly

It does not require a very close examination to see that these examples display certain prosodic characteristics of considerable importance. Speakers use a great variety of prosodic features when pronouncing the words under investigation. Pitch, loudness, tempo and pausation vary on a large scale. In order to emphasize the fact that these utterances are not simply matter-of-fact statements but express various metasemiotic connotations, the speakers use modifications of loudness and tempo. The pitch-range variations include high falling tones sometimes narrower tones which are in sharp contrast with the normal contours that precede them. Alongside these parameters we should mention the use of short pauses before the words under analysis. A combination of these prosodic features create the picture of timbre II which is the expression plane of occasional words.

It should be noted that prosodic emphasis of this kind by no means depends on the position of the word in question in a sentence. To prove it we shall adduce the following examples:

1. || 0 Don't I · look 7 pretty? || It's for \you, 6 Dart. || You. must be 6 sick of · seeing me all 6 frowzy and \ dishpanny. ||

2. || 0 Don't I · look ' pretty? || It's for \you, 6 Dart. || You. must be 6 sick of · seeing me all 6 frowzy and un 6tidy. ||

From a comparison of these examples we can conclude that in this case the prosodic arrangement of the last word does not depend on the position in the sentence. The reader/listener will make a great mistake if he understands the word *dishpanny* literally only in accordance with the meanings of the components. The word is used by the author not only to convey information proper ('untidy') but also to achieve a certain stylistic effect. In other words, both the content and the expression of the word *dishpanny* serve to create a new metacontent. Therefore, although used in identical position the words *dishpanny* and *untidy* are pronounced differently on the suprasegmental level.

It follows from the above that there are clearly established ways of realizing a certain linguistic pattern. We may, therefore, conclude by stating that the objective existence of lexical-

morphological categories which are realized to the full on the metasemiotic level is borne out by marked prosody.

Chapter 3.
The Semantic Structure of a Word

1. Lexical Meaning as a Linguistic Category

Language is primarily a means of communication, the most important means of communication. This is why the main category of linguistics is meaning.

Let us begin by briefly recapitulating what the theoretical background of this category is. The problem consists first of all in understanding very clearly the nature of linguistic meaning. When people try to answer this question, they very often turn to various definitions of meaning elaborated by philosophers, psychologists, logicians, anthropologists, etc. It is deplorable that, as a rule, in this case no distinction is made between the 'term' (the name) and the actual 'thing' (the phenomenon) under analysis. Leaving on one side those definitions of meaning which are relevant to philosophy, logic, etc. we shall concentrate on those features of the phenomenon in question which are of paramount importance to linguistics.

Linguistic meaning is the specific kind of 'content' produced (or engendered) by the reverberation in the human consciousness of objective reality which constitutes the inner (semantic) structure of linguistic units and with respect to which their expression, the sounds in which they are materialized, is the outer (or phonetic) structure. From the above definition it is evident that the category of linguistic meaning cannot be understood or explained unless insight is gained into the nature of linguistic expression, the form of linguistic units. As will be shown below, the study of linguistic form is absolutely indispensable to the interpretation of meaning in language.

There are two kinds of linguistic meaning – the lexical (material) and the grammatical (categorial) meaning. The former is characteristic of separate words which are referable to certain referents, whereas the latter is of a more abstract character and becomes obvious only against the background of meaningful oppositions. It should be added in this connection that 'meaning' should be properly used only of words and phrases. Sentences carry 'purports'.

If we turn to lexical meaning we should emphasize that it is a reverberation in the human consciousness of 'objects' of reality (phenomena, relationships, qualities and processes) which (the reverberations) becomes a fact of language because (only when) a constant and indissoluble connection is established between the reverberation and a certain sound (or sound complex). Thus, the particular reverberation becomes the content of the word, with respect to which its sound-form expression functions as a 'sound-envelope' – indispensable not only because it is the physical expression of the content and the vehicle for communicating it to other people, but also because without it the given lexical meaning could not come into being, exist and develop. Lexical meaning is the meaning of the main material part of the word which reflects the concept the given word expresses and the basic properties of the thing (phenomenon, quality, state) it denotes.

Here immediately the question is bound to arise: how much of the concrete concept, what part of the general notional category is comprised in each particular word? In order to answer this question one should go more deeply into the relationship between form and meaning, expression and content in word-stock.

First, there is in every language a certain lexical subsystem, which is more or less indifferent to the linguistic form in which it exists. Thus, for example, in cases like *two, seventy-five,* or *one hundred and two,* etc. we deal with those subdivisions of the word-stock of the language, for which in a civilized society there is a well-established secondary semiotic system (2, 75, 102). Whenever we have something, which exists in other civilized societies in the form of a secondary semiotic system we have to admit that although there is a certain difference between these lexical subsystems

(French: *deux, soixante quinze, sent-deux;* Russian: *два, семьдесят пять, сто два*) it is, by and large, immaterial.

The second type can be conveniently exemplified by the 'arm – hand' situation. We look at the upper limb of the human body which has been 'reverberated' by the human mind since time immemorial, and find that in English it is divided into two parts: *hand* and *arm.* In Russian the whole limb is indiscriminately called *рука.* The difference between *рука,* on the one hand, and *arm* and *hand,* on the other, clearly indicates that the meaning of words is the particular reverberation which consists in slicing up, cutting up reality in this or that way. In our case, the Russian language does not cut it up and has only one word – *рука,* while the English language cuts it up into two parts – *hand* and *arm.* This is, comparatively speaking, a simple case of relationship between form and content because in this case we can actually see what happens. We look at the object and say: this is the arm and this is the hand, or this is the leg, and this is the foot, while in Russian the whole limb is merely *рука* or *нога.* What in English is called 'little finger' is monolexemically expressed in Russian as *мизинец.* Conversely, in English we do not speak of *a big finger* but *a thumb.*

The situation becomes far more complicated when we reach the third category – words like *fancy, disdain, horrible, terror,* etc. because their referent, that is the object of thought correlated with a certain linguistic expression, is not directly cognoscible. The content of these words is such a complex combination of different 'reverberations' that to understand the difference between *to fancy* and *to like,* or *horrible* and *terrible* a serious lexicological investigation has to be carried out.

This is the reason why some people say that words of this kind in general cannot be referred to anything in objective reality, that in this case it is not a question of reverberation, but of primacy of language, of 'mind' before 'matter'. Nothing, however, can be further from the truth. The difference between 1, 2 and 3 is just in the different **kinds** of reverberation, degrees of complexity of reverberation.

From what has been said above we are justified in concluding that the expression plane of the word 'cuts out', as it were, a certain piece of conceptual material and thus signals an independent lexical unit. Thus, for example, when a sequence of sounds like (bOI) is 'pronounced' by a tape-recorder it lacks meaning. It becomes meaningful only when a link is established between the sound complex and a piece of 'conceptual material'. When *boy* is associated with the content 'male child' it becomes a fact of the English language.

It follows from what has just been said that the indissoluble connection between content and expression is of paramount importance because it is crucial for the linguistic interpretation of the concept of 'meaning'. Different expressions emphasize the fact that the meanings under consideration do exist, do function and develop in different linguistic systems.

This point can be easily illustrated by the following sets of examples:

(1)

to sit on a chair

сидеть на стуле

to sit on the floor

сидеть на полу

to sit in an arm-chair

сидеть в кресле

to sit at a table

сидеть за столом

to sit at a deskc

сидеть за письменным столом

to sit on a horsec

сидеть на лошади

(2)

My luggage is still sitting in London.

Мой багаж все еще лежит в Лондоне.

The vase sits in the centre of the table.

Ваза стоит в центре стола.

They served a French *gateau* sitting in a thin puddle of asparagus sauce.

Они подали французский паштет, плавающий в спаржевом соусе.

Udaipur, deeper in Rajastan, a lake-side town, sits in a circle of hills.

Удайпур – город, расположенный на берегу озера в глубине Раджастана, находится в окружении холмов.

There is no sign that he has withdrawn his resignation – it still sits there.

Нет никаких признаков того, что он забрал свое заявление об отставке – оно все еще там.

At first sight it may seem that *to sit* and *сидеть* have the same meaning (see the examples under 1), but the detailed analysis of their semantics in concrete contexts shows that the English verb is entirely different from its Russian counterpart (see the examples under 2).

The following examples borrowed from fiction give more evidence of the difference between the two verbs:

1… but most wonderful that she should so dote on Sir Benedick, whom she hath in all outward behaviour seemed ever to abhore…

– Is't possible? Sits the wind in that corner?…

– А всего удивительней то, что она с ума сходит по Бенедикту, которого, судя по ее поведению, она всегда ненавидела…

– Возможно ли? Так вот откуда ветер дует!

2… Farewell, Old Gaunt.

Thou goest to Coventry, there to behold

Our cousin Hereford and fell Mowbray fight:

O! sit my husband's wrongs on Hereford's spear,

That it may enter butcher Mowbray's breast!

… Прощай! Увидишь скоро

Ты в Ковентри, как там на поединке

Сойдутся Херефорд и гнусный Маубрей.

О! Пусть несчастья мужа моего

С копьем кузена Херефорда вместе

Убийце Маубрею вонзятся в грудь.

3. But, Lords, we hear this fearful tempest sing,

Yet seek no shelter to avoid the storm;

We see the wind sit sore upon our sails,

And yet we strike not, but securely perish.

Но, лорды, мы внимаем свисту бури,

Укрыться же не ищем от нее.

Глядим, как вихрь рвет наши паруса,

И смерти ждем, сложивши руки праздно.

4. And looks commercing with the skies,

Thy rapt soul sitting in thine eyes;

There held in holy passion still,

Forget thyself to marble…

И зеркало души крылатой,

Был холодней, чем мрамор статуй,

Твой лик нездешний до тех пор,

Пока впёренный в небо взор
Сама и нежно, и сурово
К земле не обратишь ты снова.

But even when it is quite clear that we deal with words which are in one-to-one correspondence one should not be misled into thinking that the lexical meanings of juxtaposed words are identical. The thing is that one of the aspects of lexical meaning is formed by the images the word evokes in the speaker's mind. Such associations are accumulated in the sociolinguistic connotation of a word. This can be easily illustrated by the following pair of words: *champagne* and *шампанское*. According to the «Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English» *champagne* is «an expensive French white wine, containing a lot of bubbles, usually served on special occasions». The meaning of the Russian word is defined by Ozhegov as follows: «игристое белое виноградное вино, насыщенное углекислым газом в результате вторичного брожения». Thus, in contrast with the English *champagne* the Russian *шампанское* is neither French, nor very expensive. As for 'special occasions' one should be reminded that right after the antialcoholic decree in the eighties *шампанское* was the only wine on sale and people drank it on all occasions. It follows from what has just been said that cultural associations evoked by the two words are quite different and these, too, keep them clearly apart.

One more example. From the definition of *hot-water bottle* given in the «Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English» we learn that it is «a rubber container that is filled with hot water and **put in a bed to make it warm**». Its Russian equivalent *грелка* is associated not with cosiness and comfort but with ache and disease.

The situation becomes still more complicated if either denotational and connotational components of the lexical meaning is ideologically marked, that is reflects the moral code of the speech community in question, its system of values, determined by socio-historical factors.

As not all speakers of the language share the same interpretive frames there exists the possibility of misunderstanding between speakers belonging to different cultures but using the same language as a means of communication. A case in point is religious or political terminology because these lexical subsystems are ideologically marked.

For example, in many cases in Russian society the word *демократия* is understood primarily in terms of its association with Western material consumption and its opposition to communism. Hence the use of such derrogatory word-combinations with the word in question and its derivatives as *обанкротившаяся демократия, демократические игры, так называемые демократы*. In the West, however, *democracy* is associated primarily with freedom and justice and has no negative connotations.

The word *democracy* has been part of the English language for a very long time. The word *glasnost* could be called a neologism. It was borrowed from the Russian language in the 1980s and is associated with the policies of Michael Gorbachev. The Russian word *гласность* can be traced back to the word *голос* and it presupposes that news is widely announced and everybody is well informed. The English *glasnost* is defined in a monolingual dictionary of English in the following way «(in the former Soviet Union) the policy of more open government and a wider spread of information in public affairs». The dictionary emphasizes that the concept in question is associated with the policies of the former Soviet Union and that it implies the readiness of a government to discuss its decisions with people. However it does not mean that the government becomes accountable to people. In effect, this is addressing the problem the wrong way.

Modern cognitive semantics distinguishes three types of knowledge: linguistic underlying the prototypical meaning of the word, conceptual determining linguistically conditioned lexical meanings and encyclopedic which forms the background conceptual structure of the word. All the three are culture specific and this makes the word a unique linguistic unit (*Ferenc Kiefer*, Linguistic, Conceptual and Encyclopedic Knowledge: Some Implications for Lexicography. Budapest, 1988).

Adherents of logical semantics, who ignore the dialectical unity of content and expression in the word, approach the problem of the lexical meaning of the word in a very simplistic way. One of their methods is based on the assumption that the question may be solved only by means of a one-sided division of a word into a number of semantic components ('componential analysis'). This approach which appeared to be tenable when applied to kinship and colour terms is still restricted to those very limited thematic groups the members of which do not rely on linguistic expression and could just as well be distinguished from one another by formulae or other kinds of extralinguistic notation. Thus, for example, the 'things' themselves in the case of words like *mother, father, sister, brother,* etc. can be easily conceived as mere sums of elementary components: *male – female, direct lineability – colineal lineability – ablineal lineability* and five generation components g1, g2, g3, g4, g5. *Uncle* then can be presented as: *male + colineal lineability + g2.*

Now it has become clear that componential analysis only appears, at first sight, to be an attractive way of handling semantic relations. But it raises far too many difficulties at all workable. Special investigations in the field show that the method in question has been a complete failure even in the case of kinship and colour terms (*Palmer, F.R.* Semantics.

A New Outline. London, 1976, p. 91). It follows that the logical approach of componential analysis cannot be used in linguistic investigation of natural human languages. Linguistic investigation requires much finer 'tools' than those used by componential analysis: in this case simplification should in principle be ruled out.

2. Polysemy

The reason why any word may potentially have more than one meaning (be polysemantic) is obvious: the reality of the world is infinite, while the resources of even the richest language are limited. Thus, language keeps stretching out its lexical units to cover new phenomena of objective reality. The speaker observes certain similarities between objects and acquires the habit of using words metaphorically. When the metaphor becomes habitual it is included as a lexical-semantic variant in the word's semantic structure.

This, however, is not merely a theoretical question, but one that is of the greatest practical significance to the compiler of dictionaries. How do we know that this or that word is polysemantic and what are the criteria used to arrive at the final decision? And how does a lexicographer know that he (or she) is dealing with different meanings of the same word and not different words (homonyms)?

To demonstrate the complexity of the problem let us turn to the dictionary entries of the adjective *fine* in different dictionaries. Even a cursory glance reveals that the meaning of the adjective in question is differently interpreted in three learner's dictionaries of the same size: The «Cambridge International Dictionary of English» (CUP, 1995) regis-ters four meanings of *fine*:

1. satisfactory,
2. good,
3. thin,
4. sunny.

The «Harrap's Essential English Dictionary» (Chambers Harrap Pub-lishers, 1995) singles out eight meanings of the adjective in question:

1. You describe something as **fine** if you think it is splendid or excellent.
2. **Fine** articles are of high quality.
3. The weather is **fine** when it is not raining.
4. You say you are **fine** when you are well.
5. You say something is **fine** if it is OK, satisfactory, or acceptable.
6. Threads that are **fine** are thin and narrow.

7. **Fine** particles are very small.

8. **Fine** means very precise, exact, slight or subtle.

The «Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English» describes twelve meanings of the same adjective:

1. very good, of high quality,

2. very well, in good health,

3. acceptable, satisfactory,

4. attractive,

5. delicate,

6. (of weather) bright, not raining,

7. very thin,

8. difficult to see or describe,

9. with small grains,

10. (of person) that you have a lot of respect for,

11. (of words, speeches) sounding important and impressive but unlikely to have any effect,

12. (of metals) containing only a particular metal and no other substances that reduce the quality.

Now, why the discrepancy? First, because the word is a global lexical unit, and all the attempts at splitting it up, one way or another, are not borne out by readily observable 'overt' facts, and, second, because we are still not very clear about the methodology of semantic analysis. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the method of semantic analysis remains very problematic. Lexical semasiology remains one of the most controversial areas in spite of the number of papers and books on the subject being very considerable.

In the preceding chapter the attempt to base all analysis of lexical meaning on the idea of semantic components has already been mentioned. The conclusion we reached was that so far the results have left much to be desired as far as actual lexicographic work is concerned. The methods based on logical approach to lexis have been so unproductive because very little attention was given to the methods actually used by Russian lexicographers and lexicologists.

The fundamental approach to the study and description of lexical meaning was elaborated by V. V. Vinogradov. He analysed the overall meaning of a word in terms of: nominative, nominative-derivative, colligationally and collocationally conditioned and phraseologically bound meanings.

The nominative meaning denotes the objects of extralinguistic reality in direct and straightforward way, reflecting their actual relations. Thus, for example: *to carry* whose nominative meaning is 'to support the weight of and move from place to place' normally combines with nouns like *a box, a chair, a heavy stone, a baby,* etc., *sweet* — 'tasting like sugar or honey' – with *candy, milk, jam, cake, tea, coffee,* etc.

The nominative meaning is the basic of all the other meanings of the word. It is said to be 'free' because no linguistic constraints are imposed on its realizations. The word may have several 'free' meanings but they all depend on the nominative one: that is why they are called 'nominative-derivative', for example: *sweet* in the nominative-derivative meaning of 'pleasant, attractive' goes with *face, voice, singer, little boy, temper,* etc.

Side by side with the 'free' meanings of the word there are linguistically conditioned (or 'bound') meanings which can be of two kinds: colligationally conditioned and collocationally conditioned. The former can be illustrated by the uses of the verb *to keep.* When used with nouns like *hens, bees, pigs,* etc. the verb means 'own or manage especially for profit'. The verb *to keep* has an altogether different meaning, namely 'continue doing something' when it is used with a gerund, for example: *Keep smiling! Why does she keep giggling*? etc.

The colligationally conditioned meaning is determined by the morpho-syntactic combinability of the word, while the collocationally conditioned meaning depends on its lexical-

phraseological ties. One of the collocationally conditioned meanings of the adjective *heavy* is 'more than usual size'; it is realized in speech when *heavy* is brought together with words like *crops, pain, blow,* etc.

Very often a colligationally or collocationally conditioned meaning is realized only in one or two set-phrases. It is then said to be 'phraseologically bound'. A case in point is the verb *to love* in the expression *'d love to,* for example, *I'd love to meet them; I'd love to come with you; I'd love to help them.*

This approach to the semantics of the word is perfectly reliable because it is based on linguistic criteria which signal all the modifications of the semantic core of the word. Our discussion of different kinds of lexical meaning would not be complete if we did not mention one more meaning which so far has not received all the attention it deserves. It has become increasingly obvious that in the majority of cases the meaning of a word cannot be specified and explained with reference only to objective reality and its reflection in human consciousness. In every language there exists a considerable number of words which lend themselves to semantic analysis only against the backdrop of other words. Thus, for example, the meaning of words like *cop,egghead, to peeve,* etc. can be properly understood and analysed only against the background of words like *policeman, theorist, to vex,* etc. This is what academician V.V.Vinogradov called 'expressive-synonymic meaning'.

We must now turn to another aspect of the problem. In the previous chapters very much attention has been paid to the analysis of prosodic peculiarities of the word as a linguistic unit. Let us see whether the method of lexicological phonetics, the method based on the unity of content and form, can yield any fruitful results when applied in the sphere of semantic investigation.

The starting point for the present part of the present book is the fact that language 'stretches out' its units to cover new facts and phenomena of objective reality. The speaker observes certain similarities between objects of extralinguistic reality and attempts to use a word metaphorically to cope with the particular requirements of the moment. Even a cursory glance reveals that expressive-emotional-evaluative overtones affect the prosodic arrangement of words. Thus, for example:

I. *delicate 1* – 'fine exquisite'; *delicate 2* – 'requiring careful treatment or skilful handling':

1. || 0 Delicate · lace ruffles. fell over the. lean. yellow 7 hands | that were 0 so over. laden with 6 rings. ||

2. || I have 0 come to consult you on a 0 very \delicate / matter, M. Poi7 rot. ||
slowly

II. *material* — '(contrasted with spiritual) made of, connected with, matter or substance'; *material* — 'important, essential':

1. || He had 0 not. broken · down the · artifacts into ma. terial 6 groups: |
7 earthenware, 7 stone, 7 bone, 7 ivory, | but 0 lumped to. gether. everything from a par. ticular 6 area.||

2. || I would. have you \ know | that. my \sentiments
have under. gone so ma 4 terial a 7 change since that 7 period. ||
slowly

III. *common 1* — 'usual and ordinary'; *common 2* — 'vulgar, of inferior quality or taste':

1. || He will have a 0 pilot's · whistle upon. which he will 7 blow, | and he will ŕ wear in · every re. spect a · common \pilot's 6 uniform. ||
n n

2. || She · must have been 4 dreadfully 6 common. ||
h> <h

IV. *cold 1* — 'of low temperature'; *cold 2* — 'unkind, unfriendly':

1. || He 0 loved to · kneel. down on the. cold 7 marble. pavement, | and 0 watch the 6 priest. || l n

2. || 0 If it 7 does, | 0 give it a 0 cold · look «and 0 walk 6 through it. ||

V. *divine 1* — 'of from or like God or a god'; *divine 2* – 'excellent, very beautiful':

1. || In/stead «she 0 slipped to her · knees be. fore her 7 icon, | an

0 exquisite · albeit · solemn · Virgin · Mary in · deep. purple 7 robe and 7 hood, | and 0 prayed for di. vine 6 guidance. ||

2. || She 0 does one. very 6 well, | and it 0 ought to be di\vine in the

0 country just 6 now. || slowly

VI. *vital 1* — 'of, connected with, necessary for, living';

Vital 2 — 'supreme, indispensable':

1. || He was 0 wounded into a · vital ' part. ||

2. || It was to over 0 looking this 0 vital 6 point that my \own. downfall in 7 Leicester · Square was 6 due. ||

It does not require a very close examination to see that there is a drastic difference between the two sets of examples of each word insofar as their prosody is concerned. The nominative and the nominative-derivative meanings can be distinguished because of the accompanying regular prosodic modifications. Within each set the examples, though not identical in their suprasegmental arrangement, have one thing in common. When used in the nominative meaning the word does not violate the laws of syntactic prosody, whereas the nominative-derivative meaning is invariably accompanied by the modifications of suprasynatctic prosody. Otherwise stated, the prosody of the word varies a good deal from one context to another, and between different syntactic positions, but it is evidently neutral in the former case and emphatic in the latter one.

Thus, there is every reason to believe that the prosody of the word obeys the general rule of linguistic variation: the prosodic invariant which corresponds to a meaning of the word can be 'distilled' from the innumerable prosodic variants serving as the expression plane of concrete uses of the word in the same meaning.

Let us now turn to colligationally conditioned meaning. In V.V.Vi-nogradov's article the difference between nominative and colliga-tionally conditioned meanings is illustrated by the following oppositions: the nominative meaning of the verb *разобраться* 'to unpack' is opposed to the colligationally conditioned meaning 'to investigate, to examine', the nominative meaning of the verb *отозваться* 'to answer' is realized by the absolute syntactic position, whereas its colligationally conditioned meaning 'to speak of' is confined to the prepositional construction *отозваться о ком/чем.*

When we apply this method to English material we are immediately faced with a number of complex problems and the very first difficulty to be mentioned is obviously the problem of distinguishing between colligationally conditioned meanings proper and phraseological units of different kinds (see Chapter 10. Phraseology).

If, for example, we take the adjective *ill* which can occur attributively and predicatively, it may seem that we are dealing with colligationally conditioned meanings, for instance:

She has been ill for a long time.

The child remained ill for ten days.

She did not permit herself to fall ill.

I want not even a shadow of ill feeling to exist between your husband and myself.

He found much to offend his ideas to decorum and confirmed his ill opinion of that man.

It's perfectly allowable, when untinctured by ill humour or roughness.

Theoretically speaking the difference in meanings can be ascribed to the difference in colligation but in actual fact it is not always the case. The thing is that *to fall ill* is a phraseological unit which means 'to become ill'. On the other hand, *ill feeling, ill opinion* and *ill humour* are on the verge of becoming an unstable compound and not infrequently hyphenated. Thus, both types of meanings tend to become phraseo-logically bound and the concept of colligation in this case can be applied with a grain of salt.

Another example, the verb *to bear*. The nominative meaning of *to bear* is 'to carry', for example, *to bear a heavy load*. Does it change when the colligation changes? Can we say that the difference between *to bear* as 'to carry' and *to bear* as 'to endure, to tolerate' is colligationally conditioned? Indeed, the latter is usually realized with *can* or *could* especially in negative or interrogative constructions, for example:

I can't bear the sight of that old man.

The pain was almost more than I could bear.

She could not bear to see animals treated cruelly.

She can't bear to be laughed at.

But we can just as well come across the nominative meaning of the verb being realized in the same construction, for instance, *I can't bear a heavy load, I don't feel well*. Thus, the change in colligation does not result in any semantic changes. The difference in meaning becomes obvious only against the opposition of contexts in terms of prosody. *To bear* as 'to carry' is generally neutral, whereas *to bear* as 'to endure, to tolerate' is prosodically marked.

The evidence of the above examples proves that prosody is one of the most important factors without which it would be impossible to demonstrate the objective existence of the word not only in conventional orthographic text but in the actual flow of speech as well. The methods of prosodic analysis, however, ought to be applied very carefully lest the investigator should read into the word what is not there. To illustrate this point let us turn to the verb *to love*.

We have already spoken of the utter unacceptability of rough-and-ready 'segmentation' of the living global units (the words of a natural human langua-ge) and have claimed that the analysis of these units should be effected with care. Otherwise stated, we can understand what a word really means only if

its different semantic facets are revealed gradually, in a chain-like succession.

Thus, in the present case, first come those collocations where *to love* is combined with words denoting persons or with nouns like *country, painting,* or *music*. Thus, for instance:

love one's parents *(She loved her mother very much)*;

love children *(He loved his son)*;

love a person of the opposite sex *(Each thing that happened made me love you more)*;

love music *(She loves good music)*.

We also find instances in which there is no object following the verb *to love,* as in:

She had loved and been deceived…

In all these cases *to love* is used to express a strong affection or a deep feeling for somebody or something. This meaning of the verb can be described as its main nominative meaning. It includes a number of nuances, because every time different kinds of strong affectionate feelings are expressed, they are engendered by feelings of blood ties, tenderness, patriotism.

As far as prosody is concerned, investigation of a large number of actual uses of this word has shown that in all cases of this kind prosody is neutral, for example:

|| 0 All her · pupils 6 love her. ||

|| 0 Hugh · loved his · daughter 6 dearly… |

|| I 0 think they would a\muse you, | and, of /course, they would 6love you. ||

The word *to love,* meaning 'to have a strong affection for smb., smth.', when used with neutral prosody is usually part of serious, or matter-of-fact statement. No specific or particular prosody is called for.

Next comes another kind of *love* and a different 'intonation' of the word as in:

|| And I \love you, 7 Maisie, | he. said in 7 whisper… |

|| I \ love you. || I've \always. loved you | from the 0 first

slowly

· moment I 6 met you…|.

This is a separate and special use of the word in direct speech. It has little to do with the preceding set of uses, although *to love* here also means 'to have a strong affection'. This use of the verb is treated situationally different because it occurs in direct speech when people confess in their deep feelings towards one another. Cases of this kind should be treated separately, because of their peculiar prosodic pattern.

Then comes the nominative-derivative meaning of the verb. It is no longer possible to define it as 'to have strong affection'; *to love* is 'to be very fond of something, to enjoy something'. When used in this meaning, the verb is always prosodically marked:

|| He 0 said «he 0 dearly \ loved a. bit of 7 cheese. ||

slowly

|| I 0 always \love a. chat. ||

|| I \love. dancing with at· tractive /people…|

It is extremely important to understand the difference between words brought into prominence for metasemiotic consideration (as in cases where, for example, deep feelings towards a member of the opposite sex are expressed) and those where the specific prosody is the only possible means of realizing one of the meanings (as in *love soup* or *love to tease somebody).*

Every single word can be used emphatically, it depends on how emotional the speaker is. The emphatic prosodic arrangement (if used at all) is something additional, something which comes over and above the basic semantic structure. But there are meanings which normally can be realized only with marked prosody.

There are also cases where *to love* occurs with a conditional auxiliary *(should, would)* as a special kind of clichй modal phrases:

|| I'd 0 love to 6 meet them…|.

|| I'd 0 love to 6 help you…|

Another example of phraseologically bound meaning is the use of *love* not with words denoting persons but those denoting plants and animals, for example:

|| 0 Plants · love 7 sunlight. ||

|| 0 Central Asia 0 wild 7 pheasants | 0 love im. penetrable 6 jungles. ||

The phraseologically bound meaning here is 'be in need'. In oral speech it is expressed by means of neutral prosody.

Let us now try to apply our methods to the analysis of the different meanings of the verb *to pray.* The nominative meaning of the verb is 'to commune with God' and is expressed colligationally by means of absolute syntactic position, for example:

|| They 0 knelt ' down and 6 prayed. ||

|| I 0 pray · every 6 morning. ||

|| 0 Do you. often /pray? |

Then comes the meaning 'offer thanks, make requests known', which is confined to the colligation *to pray for something/somebody,* for example:

|| The 0 farmers are. praying for 6 rain. ||

|| I 0 prayed for for 6 giveness. ||

|| I 0 prayed for her · every 6 day. ||

|| The 0 mother · prayed for her 6 baby. ||

The evidence of the adduced examples shows that here we can observe an interesting interaction of colligation and collocation. Subtle modifications of meaning depend on the words which are brought together in the same colligation.

The two meanings discussed above are not prosodically marked. The situation is drastically different in the case of *to pray* as 'to ask somebody as a favour'. This meaning finds its manifestation in the colligation *to pray somebody for something/to do something,* for example:

|| I 0 pray you to think 6 again. ||

slowly

|| We \pray you that the · prisoner may be. set 6 free. ||

|| I \pray you to · show 6 mercy. ||

slowly

The meaning in question is generally accompanied by marked prosody. It should be emphasized right away that emphatic prosody in this case is due to the socio-linguistic character of the meaning (the meaning is hardly ever used nowadays for it is slightly high-flown) but not to its colligation.

If we compare the pronunciation of *pray* in the above examples with *pray* in the following sentences we shall see that the prosody of the word in question has changed once again:

|| Pray, 0 ask the · lady to come 6 out here. ||

|| And 0 may I \know, pray, 4 what / lady has the · credit

slowly

of in. spiring. such re 3 flection? ||

Pray here is a formal request equivalent *to please.* The semantic debasement of the verb finds its immediate manifestation in modifications of prosody: *pray* does not carry a stress of its own.

It follows from what has been expounded above that the semantic structure of the verb *to pray* is revealed in its prosodic variation.

The lexical-prosodic research of different classes of words has made it possible to establish at least five prosodic invariants which form the opposition of unmarked, neutral and marked types of prosodic variation. Neutral prosodic invariant is determined not by the semantics of the word but by its syntactic properties. As far as unmarked variation is concerned it is represented by what can be described as 'zero prosodic invariant' which is observed when the word in one of its meanings has no prosodic contour of its own. A case in point is *pray 4* adduced above.

The zero prosodic invariant is also typical of *oh*, *ah* and *well* when they function as voiced pauses rather than interjections, for example:

1. || Oh, that's \nonsense, / Algy. ||

2. Have you studied that card? ||Well, \tell me,| ' does anything /strike you about it? ||

3. || Ah, ' what's in the \bottle, /boy? ||

As can be seen from the above examples *oh*, *ah* and *well* are prosodically suppressed: they have no stress of their own and are pronounced very quickly with diminished loudness. The effect produced is that of a parasitic sound.

Marked prosodic variation is represented by three invariants: positive, negative and intensifying. The three invariants are marked because they make the word stand out in the flow of speech. But the prominence of the word is expressed by different combinations of prosodic parameters. Thus, the positive prosodic invariant (widened pitch range, emphatic pitch movement, increased loudness, slow tempo) is the expression plane of those meanings which are inherently charged with meliorative expressive-emotional-evaluative overtones. For example, the nominative meaning of *advantageous, beautiful, charming, to delight, excellent, fun, happy, perfect, remarkably, superb, wonderful* etc. and the nominative-derivative meaning of *angel, to bless, gallant, galaxy, honey, to love, sweet,* etc. are accompanied by the positive prosodic invariant.

We deal with the negative prosodic invariant when we come across those meanings of words which are endowed with pejorative expressive-emotional-evaluative overtones. Thus, for example, the expression plane of the nominative meaning of *absurd, cowardice, horrible, filth, insolent, miserable, odious, ugly, wickedness,* etc. and the nominative-derivative meaning of *bitter, dry, coldness, ghastly, hollow, morbidness,* etc. can be described in terms of the negative prosodic invariant – narrow pitch range, emphatic pitch movement, increased loudness, slowed down tempo, tense articulatory setting.

The intensifying prosodic invariant (raised placing of the tone in pitch range and slow tempo) can be observed in words like *absolutely, entirely, enormous, huge, mighty, totally, utterly,* etc.

It should be apparent by now that it is no easy task to discover the actual semantic structure of the word as manifested in the oral form of language. Prosodic analysis, although needlessly complicated at first sight, is very useful because of the great number of words whose semantic structure is disclosed in the subtle modifications of their prosodic contour. With words like *terrific, fantastic,* etc., for example, any attempt at displaying a correspondence between prosody and lexical semantic variation is complicated by subtle variations of prosodic parameters. To illustrate this let us consider the adjective *fantastic.* We shall begin, as usual, with the nominative meaning: 'wild and strange, grotesque':

|| The 0 lamp · cast fan · tastic. shadows on the ' wall and 6 staircase. ||

slowly

|| 0 Suddenly he re 7 marked | that 0 every · face that he · drew. seemed to have a fan · tastic · likeness to · Basil 6 Hallward. ||

slowly

Here *fantastic* is pronounced with a level tone, decreased loudness and slow tempo which, together, may be regarded as serving to enhance the concept of 'mystery'.

Going down the scale, we arrive at the nominative-derivative meaning: 'impossible to carry out, absurd', for example:

1. || 0 No \argument, 7 Jeeves. | 0 No dis 6 cussion. || Whatever

n n

fan\tastic ob. jection you may have 7 taken to it, | I \wear this / jacket. ||

2. || I could 0 not understand | 0 how it was 0 possible for her to · like being. kissed by an. old 6 man, | and the fan\tastic. notion. passed through my 6 mind. || slowly

The expressive-emotional-evaluative features of *fantastic* are realized with the help of a falling tone, narrow pitch-range and slow tempo. This testifies to the assertion that the word may be endowed with inherent connotations in its different meanings. It should be added in this connection that it is often difficult to distinguish between a case of *fantastic 1* and a case of *fantastic 2.* Certain contexts are, of course, obvious. No one would hesitate to identify them in the examples cited above. Between the two clear extremes, however, the scale of variation is continuous. As far as these border-line cases are concerned, the prosodic analysis has proved to be quite practicable.

The matter is further complicated by the fact that *fantastic 3* is also connotative, for example:

1. || She 0 cried \out: | «Panaghia 6 mou, „0 Holy. Mother of 6 God, | what a fan 4 tastic 6 sight!" ||

slowly

2. || 0 Here we can · find · 200 fan 4 tastic / fashions at · every 6 price. ||

The pronunciation of *fantastic 3* 'marvellous, wonderful' differs markedly from the prosody which is typical of the other two meanings. The adjective is uttered with a high falling tone, increased loudness and slow tempo. It should also be noted that the meaning in question is sociologically determined and is used mainly by people belonging to the younger generation. Not infrequently it occurs in the register of advertizing.

The importance of prosodic analysis consists in the fact that it proves without a shadow of doubt that lexical material must be handled with care: preconceived logical ideas have very little to do with it. What we require is real understanding of all the subtleties of a word actual functioning in speech. By using proper linguistic methods we may hope to draw finer distinctions between the different lexical-semantic variants of words, their polysemies appearing as delicate 'chain-wise' traceries.

So far we have concentrated on keeping the different meanings of words carefully apart. But in fiction we very often come across contexts in which two or even three lexical semantic variants

are simultaneously realized. At first sight it may seem paradoxical but if we bear in mind what has been said about the globality of a word then the 'polyphonic' approach becomes perfectly well-grounded.

Very often a master of style excels in using the globality of a word for stylistic purposes. Generally speaking the verb *to move,* for example, has two different meanings:

move 1 – 'change position in motion', for example:

1. Move your chair nearer to the fire.

2. It was calm and not a leaf moved.

and *move 2* — 'affect with pity', for example:

1. His meeting with Adrian Singleton had strangely moved him.

2. It was terribly pathetic. But I was not moved a bit.

In the following passage the overlapping of *move 1* and *move 2* produces a comic effect:

In that instant she put a rouge-pot, a brandy-bottle and a plate of broken meat into the bed…..she put her hand to her heart with a passionate gesture of despair, burning her face for a moment on the bed.

‖ The 0 brandy-bottle in/side 0 clinked · up against the · plate which

· held the · cold 6 sausage. ‖ · Both were 0 moved, no. doubt, by the exhi– · bition of · so much 6 grief. ‖ slowly

Moved is marked off in the utterance by a high level tone and slow tempo. Such prosodic arrangement undoubtedly makes for enhancing the connotation which comes into play.

It follows that in actual speech the word functions as a global unit and the play on its different meanings becomes possible because the reader/listener is aware of this property of the word.

3. Enantiosemy and Homonymy

In the foregoing part of the present manual the general problems of semantic analysis of words have been explained and clarified. In this chapter we are going to concentrate on the specific problems – the correlation of expression and content in the case of enantiosemy and homonymy.

As far as the first of these categories is concerned, in general outline the question may be formulated in the following manner. It has often been stated by different philologists that one and the same word can be used in two exactly opposite or 'polar' meanings. Thus, for instance, if we were to consider the words *nice* and *pretty* in the following passage this assumption might seem to be correct:

But that Harold Pinker, a clerk in Holy Orders, a chap who buttons his collar at the back, should countenance this thing appals me. He knows she has got that book. He knows that she is holding me up with it. But does he insist on her returning it? No! He lends himself to the raw work with open enthusiasm. A *nice* lookout for the Totleigh-in-the-Wold flock, trying to keep on the straight and narrow path with a shepherd like that! A *pretty* example he sets to this Infants' Bible Class of which he speaks! A few years of sitting at the feet of Harold Pinker and imbibing his extraordinary views on morality and ethics and every bally child on the list will be serving a long stretch at Wormwood Scrubs for blackmail.

If we confined ourselves to the written version of this text, we would be unable to understand that in this case *nice* and *pretty* have acquired the meanings of 'nasty' and 'disgusting'. It transpires only when the text is transposed into its oral form and the prosody of a rise-fall, narrow pitch-range and slow tempo is actually realized.

The point we are now going to make is that a word, although meliorative on the segmental level, can acquire a pejorative meaning if it is pronounced with an altogether different prosody. Otherwise stated, enantiosemy is realized by means of a specific prosodic structure of the utterance as a whole. Enantiosemy is created by the incompatibility of lexis and prosody, that is to say the

direct meaning of the word and the purport of the intonation with which it is spoken. The word *precious* is a case in point.

The adjective *precious* means 'of great value and beauty', e.g. *the precious metals, precious stones,* etc. But *precious* can also be used as an evaluative adjective, for example, *Bless the precious boy!* or *Her children are very precious to her,* where it means 'dearly loved'. *Precious 1* usually requires neutral prosodic invariant (a level tone, normal tempo and loudness), while *precious 2* is realized by means of the positive marked prosodic invariant. Both *precious 1* and *precious 2* are meliorative adjectives.

In a sentence like *That precious father of his* the prosodic variant of *precious* is quite different from the intonation of *precious 1* and *precious 2*. Here we deal with *precious 3* which is a pejorative adjective, it is enunciated with a mid-falling tone, breathiness and a half-unit pause before it. This is the negative marked prosodic invariant which is incompatible with the meliorative connotation, expressed by *precious 1* and *precious 2. Precious 3* is, therefore, an instance of the enantiosemic use of the adjective.

What has been said above applies not only to words but also to set-expressions. Let us take, for example, the set-expression *to be in one's glory,* which means 'to be at the peak of one's fame'. The meaning of the expression when pronounced with neutral prosody is clearly meliorative. In the following example, however, *in all his glory* is used sardonically:

…and then, | I'll \answer for it, | you'll 0 see your

n n

· nephew in \all his \glory. ||

slowly

The prosody of *in all his glory* is the following: a mid-falling tone of narrow interval and slow tempo. This prosodic arrangement is typical of words with pejorative connotation. We can, therefore, conclude that all evaluative words or word-combinations can function enantiosemically when accompanied by the appropriate variety of prosodic arrangment.

Quite a few enantiosemic uses of words have become habitual and are now registered as such in dictionaries, for example:

Fine: A fine specimen! A fine kettle of fish.

Nice: You've got us into a nice mess.

Pretty: A pretty kettle of fish.

Glorious: What a glorious mess!

It should be emphasized that enantiosemy is not confined to certain types or classes of words. Enantiosemy may be observed in words belonging to different thematic groups and different parts of speech. But all the enantiosemic uses of words display one common feature: they all express the attitude of the speaker to the subject of conversation, the subjective evaluation of what is taking place. Hence the importance of evaluative connotation for enantiosemic studies. To gain an insight into the interaction between prosodic and lexical characteristics in the case of enantiosemy, one should turn to the opposition of two kinds of connotation: positive and negative.

The reader should not be misled into thinking, however, that incompatibility of lexis and prosody invariably results in enantiosemy. It can produce different kinds of stylistic effects. Thus, for instance, a particular example of irony, created when the speaker assumes the role of the 'devil's advocate', presenting a view of things, or opinion, which, in the nature of things he himself cannot share. A case in point is the following passage from «The School for Scandal»:

Mr. Premium, the plain state of the matter is this: I am an extravagant young fellow, who wants to borrow money; you I take to be a prudent old fellow, who has got money to lend. I am blockhead enough to give fifty percent sooner than not have it; and you, I presume, are rogue enough to take a hundred if you can get it.

The irony is expressed by means of the particular prosodic interpretation, the importance of which for the effect achieved is obvious. If this text were presented in isolation, it could have been interpreted in a variety of ways. By using different kinds of prosodic arrangment, the reader could express anger or indignation – although the lexical meaning as expressed by the words and their combinations could, at first glance, seem to be incompatible with these connotative purports.

Instances of this kind can be multiplied infinitely especially if what we are after is a complete set of different shades of meaning coming under the title of 'irony' and the corresponding forms of prosodic expression. The difference between enantiosemy and irony is very subtle, because these categories are among the most difficult to analyse being hard to perceive, transcribe and 'measure'. An adequate treatment of the interaction of these categories is outside the scope of the present manual. It is essential, however, to draw the reader's attention to the fact that in both cases very much depends on the prosody of the utterance.

It follows from what has just been said that words originally endowed with positive connotations can acquire negative connotations under certain circumstances, provided they are pronounced with the appropriate prosody.

It should be noted in this connection that enantiosemy should not be confounded with homonymy. The word *pretty,* for example, in *What a pretty girl* is not a homophone of *pretty* in a phrase like *A pretty story, indeed.* To make this point clearer let us consider homonymy in detail.

The concept and the term have been familiar from time immemorial. There exists a number of different classes of words which could, one way or another, be described as homonyms. In this chapter we shall confine ourselves to the study of lexical homonymy, leaving on one side the complexity of the grammatical relationships between homonyms of the *to find – found* vs. *to found – founded* type. Our discussion will be confined to head-words of dictionary entries.

It is a matter of common observation that many English homonyms came into being owing to convergent sound development – the so-called 'etymological homonyms'. But this is by no means the only source. Homonymy can also develop as 'the next step in polysemy': in the course of time a lexical-semantic variant may become a separate word when all associative links with the nominative meaning are obliterated. These two types of homonymy may be illustrated by the following examples.

In the etymological dictionary we find four homonyms for *sound.* We shall begin with *sound 1* 'that which is for may be heard, auditory effect'. This *sound* is traceable to ME *soun* and it goes back to French *son. Sound 1* is a Romance word, and like many other Romance words it goes back to Latin *(sonus).*

The final *d* of *sound 1* must not be confounded with that of *sound 2* 'to probe'. *Sound 2* can be traced back to ME *sounden, sonden* and then to French *sonder.* So, in contrast with *d* in *sound 1* which was acquired by the word quite accidentally, *d* in *sound 2* was part of the original French word and was then preserved in English.

Sound 3 'sea water' is a Germanic word. It goes back to OE *sund* which meant 'swimming straight' and has nothing in common with other *sounds.*

Sound 4 'unhurt, uninjured' which was first registered in the 17 th century, is assumed to be derived from OE *g.esund.*

Etymological information shows that originally there were two Romance words and two Germanic ones which became identical in expression owing to various phonetic processes which took place in the course of the historical development of English. In this case we are in possession of firmly established facts.

The matter is far more complicated in the case of homonymy as the 'limit' of polysemy. The borderline between polysemy and homonymy is unstable. The fact is that polysemy, as has been shown above, consists in the 'stretching' of the expression of a word until at a certain moment new lexical-semantic variants become mutually incompatible semantically, morphologically, in

44

terms of word-combination, style, frequency of occurrence, usage, etc. In what follows we shall demonstrate a method of descriminating between polysemy and homonymy using the word *band* as an example.

The word *band* heads a long dictionary entry:

1. flat, thin strip of material, esp. for fastening things together or for placing round an object to strengthen it;

2. flat, thin strip of material forming part of an article of clothing;

3. strip or line different from the rest in colour or design, on something;

4. group of persons doing something together under a leader and with a common purpose;

5. group of persons who play music together;

6. (radio; short for wave-band) range of frequencies that may be turned in together.

If this material is carefully scrutinized it becomes apparent that *band* is far from being semantically uniform.

There is every reason to believe that *band 1, band 2* and *band 3* are closely connected. Although the 'real objects' ('real things') denoted by these units are factually different, their semantic affinity is obvious. All of them bear on the same idea – 'a long-shaped flat piece of something'

– a flat strip of material, as in *iron bands round a barrel,* or *papers kept together with a rubber band;*

– a ribbon as in *the hat he held in his hand was surrounded with a crape band;*

– a bar of colour as in *a white plate with a blue band round the edge.*

Owing to these shared properties different objects can be denoted by one and the same word without impairing its identity.

An altogether different state of affairs transpires in the case of *band 4* and *band 5*. The meanings of these units have drifted so far away from the nominative meaning 'flat, thin strip of material', that they ceased to be lexical semantic variants of the same word and are felt to be separate words or 'homonyms'. It goes without saying that we can re-establish the semantic link between *band I* and *band II* in terms of their historical development: *band I* is used to bind things, whereas *band II* implies something that brings different individuals together. Synchronically, however, *band I* and *band II* are no longer compatible.

The fact that they are homonyms is borne out by their derivatives and typical word-combinations. Thus, for instance:

Band I
bandage, to bandage;
band-box;
band-collar;
band-fish;
band-saw;
white, blue, yellow, etc. band;
an iron, steel, hay, faggot, india-rubber, etc. band;
a band of iron, a band of steel;
a band passed under her chin;
a band is broken for ever;
to wear a band.
Band II
band-master;
bandstand;
bandsman;
jazz-band;

string-band;

a German (American) band;

brass band, dance band, a military band, a regimental band;

a band of brothers;

a band of marauders, a band of strugglers;

the band began to play;

the band had arrived;

to hear a band, to drill one's band.

It is well known that the lexical core of the word is 'elastic' and can be stretched out to cover various situations in extralinguistic reality. But here we have every reason to assume that, at this point, part of the word *band* has broken off and a new word has come into being.

There is one more *band* which is most emphatically one more homonym. We mean *band III* — '(radio, short for waveband) range of frequencies that may be turned in together'. In this case the gap between the nominative meaning and the transferred one becomes too wide. These meanings belong to two separate words. This can be very well illustrated by the word-combinations in which this meaning most naturally occurs, for example: *the 19-meter band. Band III* is moreover a technical term and therefore belongs to a different register of English.

The net result of the foregoing analysis is that the sound complex (bжnd) serves as the 'expression' for three homonyms: *band I* (with three meanings), *band II* (with two meanings) and the monosemantic *band III*.

We have every reason to state that the diachronic and synchronic approaches to the problem of homonymy present a dialectical unity. The application of these methods enables us to gain an insight into homonymy as a linguistic phenomenon.

In this connection we cannot but dwell at some length on a strange misapprehension of the relationship between homonymy and polysemy which can be found in some publications which state that «the difference between homonymy and polysemy is easier to explain in general terms than it is to define in terms of objective and operationally satisfactory criteria» and that, for instance, the etymological criterion is of no significance because «useful though it may be to have readily accessible in our standard dictionaries whatever information is available about the origins and history of particular words, this information is, or should be, irrelevant in the synchronic analysis of languages. For the native speaker is generally unaware of the etymology of the words that he uses and his interpretation of them is unaffected /…/ by whatever knowledge of their historical derivation he may happen to possess.» (*Lyons John,* Semantics. Cambridge, 1977, p. 2, 550).

John Lyons is also very sceptical about the criterion of «relatedness of meaning», because «the relatedness of meaning appears to be a matter of degree; and it has yet to be demonstrated, and may not in fact be demonstrable /…/ It has often been pointed out that some native speakers will claim to see a connection between an ear of corn and the part of the body that is denoted by the noun *ear,* while other native speakers will deny that any such connection exists». His conclusion, then, is this: «Until it has been demonstrated that intuitions of the kind (the native speaker's intuition of relatedness of meaning. – *L. M.)* with empirically decidable differences in the use of words, the linguist might well decide that it is preferable to leave the theoretical status of the distinction between homonymy and polysemy unresolved».

If we consider this issue in terms of linguistic theory the fact that 'native speakers' cannot apply scientific linguistic categories to analysis of their speech is totally irrelevant. True, it is not always easy to distinguish between polysemy and homonymy. But the doubtful categorisation of some lexical units does not impugn the *principium divisionis* stipulated above. Thus, if we compare *ear 1* and *ear 2* in terms of their derivations, their syntactic and lexical syntagmatics and spheres of their occurrence, it will become quite clear that no ambiguity can arise in this case.

As far as *ear1* 'organ of hearing' is concerned, dictionaries adduce the following phraseological units:

be all ears,
fall on deaf ears,
feel your ears burning,
give one's ears,
go in at one ear and out (at) the other,
have an ear to the ground,
(have) a word in somebody's ear,
have/win somebody's ear(s),
over head and ears,
prick up one's ears,
turn a deaf ear (to),
set (persons) by the ears,
up to one's ears in work,
wet behind the ears;
and compound words:
ear-ache,
ear-drop,
ear-drum,
ear-mark,
ear-piece,
ear-phone,
ear-ring,
ear-shot,
ear-trumpet,
ear-wax.

Ear 2 in contrast with *ear 1* has no illustrative phraseology except for one highly specialized expression – *corn in the ear*. It will not be an exaggeration to say that this is the only expression in which *ear 2* 'seed-bearing part of a cereal' has been listed lexicographically as actually occurring in speech. It follows that *ear 1* and *ear 2* are quite different both diachronically and synchronically.

The net result of the above discussion would be that confounding polysemy and homonymy at the present stage of linguistic investigation is hardly admissible. Besides, by so doing the investigator would easily lose sight of their realization in speech. The fact that in some modern monolingual dictionaries of English the difference between separate meanings of the same word and independent homonyms is not clearly presented (see, for example, the «Cambridge International Dictionary of English») cannot be regarded as a scientific proof of the identity of polysemy and homonymy. This is a lexicographic device which facilitates the search of various senses of the word in the dictionary entry.

Let us now turn to analysis of homonymy in the flow of speech. Like so many other phenomena and categories of language homonymy has so far been studied as part of the system of lexicological regularities discernible within the confines of traditional orthographical texts. But, as has already been shown, the ontology of linguistic categories is realized to the full only when the transposition into oral speech has been effectively carried out. The same applies to homonymy. The importance of prosodic analysis becomes particularly evident in the case of word-play.

Thus, in the following examples the pun is based on the contamination of homophones:
1. Pardon me, Julius! – Here wast thou bay'd brave hart;
Here didst thou fall; and here thy hunters stand,
Sign'd in thy spoil, and crimson'd in thy death, —

|| 0 O world! thou. wast the forest to this 6 hart; ||

And \this, in 7 deed, O 0 world! the \heart of thee. || —

2. How like a deer, strucken by many princes,

Dost thou here lie!

..|.and the third, »

Sir 0 Thomas \Grey, · knight of Nor 6 thumberland, | —

n

/ Have, for the · gilt of /France «– O 6 guilt in 6 deed! —

h> <h

Con 0 firm'd con 6 spiracy with. fearful 6 France; ||

In the adduced passages the opposition of homophones becomes more conspicuous in oral speech owing to the opposition on the suprasegmental level. *Hart* and *gilt* are pronounced neutrally whereas *heart* and *guilt* are brought into prominence by means of changes in pitch-range, a falling tone and increased loudness.

It follows from what has been said that homonyms are brought out only when they are played upon. The homonyms *light 1* and *light 2* when used in isolation are pronounced neutrally, for example,

1. || I am\ sorry, | ex 4 ceedingly 6 sorry, | that you have 0 ever been

in 6 formed of what 0 may, «in a mis\taken 7 light, «have 0 given you un6easiness. ||

2. || I have to 0 say that he is a · man of · light 6 character. ||

But when they are brought together they acquire a different 'intona-tion', for example:

Bassanio: We should hold day with the Antipodes,

If you would walk in absence of the sun.

Portia: || 0 Let me / give 7 light, |but 0 let me · not be«4 light;

For a light wife doth make a heavy husband…

In contrast with homonymy enantiosemy, as has been shown above, does not exist without modifications in prosody.

It is clear from this small selection of examples that 'homonymic condensation' is primarily used for stylistic purposes. The expressive-emotional-evaluative overtones which are superimposed on lexical meaning of homonyms are prosodically marked. Thus, homonyms are brought out in the flow of speech only if they clash.

4. Paronymy

The study of homonymy in speech is further complicated by paronymy. By paronyms we mean words which because of similarity of sound or partial identity of morphemic structure can be erroneously or punningly used in speech, for example, *proscribe – prescribe, affect – effect, allusion – illusion, ingenious – ingenuous,* etc. It will be helpful at this point to adduce an example of paronymy as it is manifested in speech:

«Well, watch out, that's all I say to you, watch out. I happened to know that Bassett is making overtures to him.»

«How do you mean, overtures?»

«He is trying to steal him from you.»

I reeled and might have fallen, had I not been sitting at the time.

«*Incredulous*!»

«If you mean *increadible*, you are wrong.»

This example shows that paronyms cannot be called variants of one and the same word, they are, no doubt, different words. Here is one more example which proves this point:

«Why, your father has got some nonsense in his head that he's the son of a poor gentleman that dies the other day,» said Mrs. Squeers.

«The son of a gentleman!»

«Yes, but I don't believe a word of it. If he is a gentleman's son at all, he's a *fondling*, that's my opinion.»

Mrs. Squeers intended to say *foundling*, but as she frequently remarked when she made any such mistake, it would be all the same a hudred years hence; with which axiom of philosophy, indeed, she was in the constant habit of consoling the boys when they laboured under more than ordinary ill usage.

In this case again *fondling* is not a variant of the word *foundling*, although the difference between the expression of the two units appears to be very small, but a completely different word. As has been shown above there are plenty of cases when the change on the expression plane may be just as great (or even greater) without the word losing its globality or lexical identity.

In this connection the following question is bound to arise: what is the relationship between paronyms and all the adjacent groups of words, that is synonyms, homonyms, morphological and phonetic variants of the word. As has been shown above, the study of all the cases of flagrant violations of the law of the sign should be based on the profound semantic analysis. Thus, for example, it becomes quite clear that *illusion* and *allusion* are different words whereas *begin* (bq'gin) and *begin* (bI'gIn) are phonetic variants of the same word although the difference is confined to the opposition of two sounds (q) and (I) in both cases. The criterion is the semantic core of the juxtaposed units. *Illusion* and *allusion* are not synonyms because their meanings are absolutely incompatible. These observations make it possible to state that paronyms are most of the time quasi-nonhomographic homonyms. The introduction of the term 'paronyms', then, could be justified only if it could be shown to be a derivative of 'paronymic attraction'.

This well-established concept can be defined as follows: a certain similarity in the expression of two words which 'attracts' the words to one another despite either of them being a completely different word insofar as both their meanings and history are concerned. In other words, the entirely mechanical likeness (or shadow of a likeness) creates a certain amount of mutual attraction between words and thus paves the way for certain stylistic effects, for example:

1. «But I want some reading – some fine bold reading, some splendid book in a *gorging* Lord-Mayor's-Show of wollumes» (probably meaning *gorgeous,* but misled by association of ideas); «as'll reach right down your pint of view and take time to go by you.»

2. «And how many hours a day did you do lessons?» said Alice, in a hurry to change the subject. «Ten hours the first day,» said the Mock Turtle: «nine the next, and so on.»

«What a curious plan!» exclaimed Alice.

«That's the reason they're called *lessons*,» the Gryphon remarked, «because they *lessen* from day to day.»

3. «And if you are not doubly *fast* with my break*fast* I shall *fasten* my boot on the posterior portion of your miserable anatomy.»

Examples could be multiplied but these will serve well enough to illustrate the use of paronymic attraction for various stylistic purposes. It is noticeable that paronymic attraction can very frequently manifest itself in malapropisms (example 1), folk etymology (example 2) and puns (example 3).

It should be emphasized in this connection that like so many other phenomena and categories of language, paronyms and paronymic attraction were mostly studied within the confines of orthographic texts. If we turn to the actual manifestations of paronymic attraction in speech and take into consideration its sound form we shall see that it is possible to keep apart its different types. Thus, the puns are accompanied by modifications of prosodic parameters, for example:

n n

||The 4 growing 4 British /Empire | – some 4 called it \Brutish /Empire |
slowly
– had 4 suffered 4 two 4 major \setbacks in 4 recent \decades. ||

The pun is effected by the use of the paronyms 'British' and 'brutish'. The expression of the one is similar to that of the other, and this device of sound similarity enhances the semantic alliance of the words in question. Prosody, on the contrary, emphasizes their opposition: 'Brutish' is said with a falling tone, narrow pitch-range, louder and slower than the immediate context. The result achieved is two-fold: the listener's attention is drawn to the word 'Brutish' and its negative connotation is reinforced.

Another manifestation of paronymic attraction, as has been shown above, is malopropism. The concept of 'malapropism' which goes back to Mrs. Malaprop from R. Sheridan's «Rivals». Malapropism is based on contamination of bookish words which uneducated people are not familiar with, for example:

Abs: Ask the lady, sir.
Mrs. Malaprop: || \Oh, \mercy! – I'm ' quite \analysed for my \part. ||
slowly

Mrs. Malaprop is quite sure that she knows how the word 'to analyse' should be used (in actual fact what she wanted to say was 'I'm quite paralysed'). More than that, she thinks that the use of words like that makes her speech more learned and impressive. This is the reason why she intentionally brings them out in the flow of speech by means of logical stress (a high falling tone, increased loudness and slow tempo).

In contrast with puns and malapropisms folk etymology is not prosodically marked because, for one thing, the speaker is not aware that he makes a mistake and, secondly, to him it is just an ordinary word. As far as this type of paronymic attraction is concerned it can be exemplified by the following passage:

«These other gentlemen, I presume, are legatees, are they?» inquired Pell with a congratulatory smile.

||«\√Sammy| is a 4 leg-at-\ease,» |re 4 plied Mr. \Weller,| «these other gentl'm'n is friends of mine.»

No doubt, the most interesting case of paronymic attraction is a deliberate play upon words with similar sound forms. Most of the time it results in a comic effect, for example:

1. I suppose Stiffy's sore about this … what's the word?… Not v*aseline… Vacillation,* that's it.

2. Apparently it's disappeared, and Spode has got the extraordinary idea that I've pinched it and am holding it… what's the word… Not *incognito* …
Incommunicado, that's it. He thinks I'm holding it incommu-nicado.

3. *Mrs. Bryant:* Blust me if you ent the meanest ole sod that walks this earth. Your own daughter and you won't let her use your oven. You bloody ole *hypercrite.*
Mr. Bryant: You pay the bills and then you call names.
Mrs. Bryant: What I ever seen in you God knows. Yes! An' he never warn me. Bloody ole *hypercrite.*

As for the last example it should be noted that the word *hypercrite* does not exist and is used here as a nonce-word. *Hypercrite* and *hypocrite* are also incompatible morphonologically.

It would be wrong to believe, however, that paronymic attraction is confined to imaginative prose writing. The actual possibilities of individual creativity in paronymic attraction are enormous. It is quite obvious that a good speaker who is linguistically minded may avail himself of the innumerable connotations paronymic attraction offers him in order to make his speech more effective and varied. By way of illustration here are a few passages demonstrating the use of paronymic attraction in different registers.

Poetry

1) Open here I flung the shutter, when with many **a flirt and flutter**

In there stepped a stately raven of the saintly days of yore.

2) Oh, the bells, bells, bells!

What a tale their terror tells of despair!

How they **clang and clash** and roar.

Advertising

1) From **sensible to sensational**. Lancome. Paris.

2) Shired satisfaction. **Lean and Luxe.**

Headlines in newspapers amd magazines

1) Good **Cooks** and Old **Books**.

2) It's no **Ms-tery**. Call me **Ms**.

Scientific writing

1. A writer is limited to the vocabulary as it is in his period, except in so far as he himself **adopts and adapts** new derivatives or actually invents new words.

2. …these effects come about through a hightened awareness of the way language can be used **to explore and express** realities other than that which is communally accepted as the most socially convenient.

It is evident from the examples adduced above that the term 'paronymic attraction' is extended beyond its traditional application. Here it denotes various cases of play upon words whose sound forms are similar or partially identical. Sound similarity can be confined to one phoneme only:

Clifford had never been primarily out of money, though he made it where he could, for money is the **seal and stamp of success**;

a phonestheme:

Way off ahead of you, at the horizon where the cotton fields are blurred into the light, the slab will **glitter and gleam** like water, as though the road was flooded;

or a morpheme:

My dear evangelist, this confusing of **person and personalities** is in bad taste.

This brings us to the problem of the limit of paronymic attraction as a stylistic device. Here we are at once in deeper water: it is quite clear that accidental or pseudo paronymic attraction may suddenly appear in one's speech without the speaker actually realizing what he has done inadvertently. One example illustrating this kind of situation will suffice:

Close to the window where he could get more than his **fare share of fresh air** …

So the question arises how to tell an accidental paronymic attraction from a deliberate one. To answer this question we should subject various cases of paronymic attraction to prosodic analysis. Then it becomes clear that deliberate paronymic attraction displays a complex interaction of segmental and suprasegmental phenomena. Here are a few examples borrowed from imaginative prose writing and scientific discourse:

1. || So he \scraped and \scratched and \scrabbed and \scrooged | and /then | he he 0 scrooged a\gain | and /scrabbed and /scratched and /scraped | 0 working \busily with his 4 little \paws… |

2. || 0 Little Becky's /soul \swelled with 0 pride and de\ light at these \honours; | she 4 saw the \fortune, \fame and \fashion before her. ||

3. || I have 4 dwelt at such 4 length on the e 4 xistence and per\sistence

of overstatemnet in 4 English /writing,| because I think it is 4 too readily

as/sumed | that under 4 statement is the characte 4 ristic 4 English \mode. ||

4. || Our \purpose /here is |…to sug 4 gest the com 4 plexity and com\pleteness of the 4 theory…

slowly

Here we can observe how the phonetic similarity of the expression of words brought together contributes to their semantic *rapprochement,* which is further enhanced by the unifying emphatic prosody. Paronymic attraction is brought out in the flow of speech by various combinations of prosodic parameters.

In the following set of examples the unity of segmental and suprasegmental features serves to achieve much greater expressivity than could be done by some other linguistic means:

1. || 0 *Style* is, 4 certainly, a fa\miliar 4 word to \many of us; | but

n n

un\/ fortunately | to 4 say that sty 4 listics 4 simply 4 studies \/style | does 0 not

4 clarify 4 matters \greatly. ||

h> <h

2. || She 0 seemed as if she would like to \say 4 something, | no doubt, to reaf 4 firm her \gratitude,| but his 4 stance of 4 brisk /waiting | made her, | after 4 one 4 last 4 lingering 4 look into his /eyes | 0 move \past him. ||

slowly

Paronymic attraction is reinforced by the use of a sequence of falling tones, variations of loudness, tempo and pitch-range. It is not hard to see that prosodically marked paronymic attraction enables the writer to pass on some extra, purely aesthetic information.

Thus, we can conclude that no study of paronymic attraction cannot be complete without due attention to the prosodic arrangement of this linguistic device in the flow of speech.

5. Synonymy

In this chapter we are going to discuss the question of the existence (or, possibly, non-existence) in a language of words which are commonly called 'synonyms'. The problem arises when we begin to analyse the actual facts of language. When we study words of a language in terms of their meanings we come to the conclusion that it is very difficult (or even impossible) to find two words whose meanings would be exactly the same. Human language does not tolerate complete synonymy, that is overal semantic identity of two or more words. To illustrate this let us consider the following passage:

«He seemed particularly cheerio, you know,» said the Hon. Freddy.

«Particularly what?» inquired the Lord High Steward. «Cheerio, my Lord,» said Sir Wigmore with a deprecating bow.

«I do not know whether that is a dictionary word,» said his lordship entering it upon his notes with meticulous exactness, 'but I take it to be synonymous with 'cheerful'.»

The Hon. Freddy appealed to, said he thought he meant more merry and bright, you know.

«May we take it that he was in exceptionally lively spirits,» suggested Counsel.

«Take it in any spirit you like,» muttered the witness, adding more happily, «Take a peg of John Begg.»

«The deceased was particularly lively and merry when he went to bed,» said Sir Wigmore, frowning horribly, «and looking forward to his marriage in the near future. Would that be a fair statement of his conditions?»

The Hon. Freddy agreed to this.

This example shows very clearly how synonymy is apprehended by a natural user of the language. Synonymy simply does not figure in his 'lexical world'! A young man fails in his attempt to find another word with the same meaning, because no two words are ever semantically identical. The Hon. Freddy is a good-for-nothing member of the 'golden youth' whose English is a caricature of the 'society slang' of the 1930 s. He does not take the trouble to 'behave' in court: when called upon to give evidence, he just goes on talking in his ordinary flippant manner. Sir Wigmore tries to

'translate' his evidence into proper official style. Although in the end poor Freddy had to give in, he was never quite happy about it, because *cheerio* does not mean quite what they finally decided upon. When discussed in this way and analysed into would-be semantic components, each of which is expressed by a separate long word, the actual meaning and connotations of *cheerio* are entirely forgotten.

Attention has repeatedly been drawn to the fact that complete synonymy, the absolute semantic identity of words is not observed in natural human languages. We do not concern ourselves at the moment with meaning equivalence in terms of interlinguistics. The latter deals with the optimization of rational sign-systems, automatic indexes, artificial semiotic systems for man-machine intercourse and different mediator languages. It is unfortunate that in man-made semiotic systems of this kind absolute synonymy is by no means infrequent. A case in point is terminology.

When working on dictionaries of terms the meaning equivalence of different metalinguistic expressions is discoverable by referring them to the same descriptor. Thus, for example, the term 'word-combination' in the «Dictionary of Linguistic Terms» by Olga Akhmanova serves as descriptor for the following expression: *dependent grammatical unity, sintagma, non-predicative sintagma, word-group, collocation.*

The situation is quite different in natural human languages. As has been shown above, on closer inspection one begins to doubt whether meaning equivalence should at all be applied to natural languages. Nevertheless, we should not rashly exclude synonymy altogether. To clarify the point let us analyse the following passage from «David Copperfield»:

«My dear Copperfield,» said Mr. Micawber, «this is luxurious. This is a way of life which reminds me of the period when I was myself in a state of celibacy, and Mrs. Micawber had not yet been solicited to plight her faith at the Hymeneal altar.»

Micawber's speech portrayal abounds in highfaluting words and expressions. Of particular interest, for example, is the sentence *This is luxurious.* We may begin by pointing out that, if it is not a question of speech portrayal of a special kind, when the author's intention is to present a comical character, but a question of neutral, ordinary usage, then *luxurious* should be regarded as absolutely misplaced. We should always bear in mind that the neutral style of English never displays a tendency towards very elaborate meliorative or pejorative expressions. It is usually assumed that English people generally tend to 'understate'. Thus, for example, when the Frenchman said *ravissant* or *charmant* the Englishman confined himself to *fine* or *it is not half bad.* The word *luxurious* from the point of view of the 19th century usage was so pompous that it could only be used in Micawber's speech portrayal as a conspicuous feature of his way of talking.

If we were to abstract ourselves from these considerations and turned to the concrete confrontation of actual separate words, what words could be used instead of the adjective *luxurious*? It is possible to substitute *wonderful* or *splendid* for *luxurious* but they are certainly less expressive.

The situation is far more involved in the case of the word *celibacy.* Is there anything, a momolexemic unit, a 'synonym' which could be substituted for *celibacy* in this context? Obviously if we did linguostylistic exercises and had to think of paraphrastic expressions, then we could say *when I was unmarried,* or *when I was single,* or *when I was a bachelor.* Of course, there are many ways of expressing this thought in English, because the idea implied is definitely within the confines of the cultural background of the language in question. But does this process have any bearing on the general problem of synonymy (or meaning equivalence) in natural human languages?

There is very much along these lines which as yet remains unexplained. It is evident, however, that unless the investigator has a clear idea of the main principles on which meaning equivalence in natural human languages is based, it will be impossible to understand what synonymy really is.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that at least three different strands must be unravelled in the rather tangled skein which makes up the concept of meaning equivalence: 1) which of several 'synonymous' words or word-combinations (as far as information pure and simple is concerned) would be chosen by the 'natural' user of the language under the circumstances;

2) how does the imaginative writer in question use these words or word-combinations for particular metasemiotic purposes;

3) how to discriminate between the pairs or triplets, etc. of monolexemic units which can be brought together emically, that is not within the same text. It is quite clear that the last aspect is in a class of its own because the discrimination of synonyms can be carried out only on the emic level.

But let us return to our text. In what came before, the situation could be briefly summed up in the following way. First, there was the monolexemic unit *luxurious* and we could easily think of its monolexemic synonyms and discriminate between them in terms of their semantics. Then, there was the word *celibacy* for which there were no synonymous monolexemic units in the language, and which could only be paraphrased with the help of circumlocutions. The matter is far more complicated in the case of *to plight one's faith at the Hymeneal altar,* because here it is no longer a question of discriminating between separate words but discriminating between idiomatic phraseological units.

The phraseological unit *to pledge one's troth,* the word-combination *to take a vow,* or the word *to promise* may seem at first sight to be 'synonymous' to *to plight one's faith.* But the moment we abstract ourselves from the general information, expressed by these units, we cannot fail to notice that *to plight one's faith* and *to pledge one's troth* are opposed to *to take a vow* in terms of stylistic colouring, while *to promise* has an altogether different meaning.

From what has been said above it becomes clear that the problem of synonymy is closely connected with ideography, on the one hand, and the stylistic choice and use of words, on the other. When we look at the extract under discussion from the point of view of ideography (that is from the point of view of the information expressed in the passage in question and possible ways of rendering it differently) our task is more or less simple. We can easily transpose this passage into neutral English: *when I myself was not yet married and Mrs. Micawber had not yet been proposed to.* But it will take far more time and effort to explain the general artistic effect achieved, the metasemiotic value of choice of different ways of saying basically the 'same thing'.

Thus, from a linguistic point of view synonyms are those members of a thematic group which a) belong to the same part of speech and b) are so close to one another semantically that to be able to use them correctly in speech we require exact knowledge of the shades of meaning and stylistic connotations, which distinguish them from one another.

A commendable first step, as has already been mentioned, is the division of 'synonyms' into 'ideographic' and 'stylistic' ones. This division was based on 'meaning equivalence across registers'. Unfortunately, we should admit that the definition of meaning equivalence in terms of 'ideographic' and 'stylistic' synonyms is fairly vague. Even to this day when explaining the nature of stylistic synonyms people almost invariably fall back on the same triads: *kid – child – infant; dad – father – parent,* etc. with usually very little fresh material and proper discrimination between synonyms and members of the same thematic group.

On the other hand, as far as ideographic synonymy is concerned, we cannot say that the situation is any better. The material collected in the so-called 'dictionaries of synonyms' is enormous but the strings of 'synonyms' are as different as can be. They are adduced as a matter of course, without any attempt at justification. Thus, for example, no user of 'dictionaries of synonyms' would be surprised to find the following verbs 'strung together' within the same 'synonymic line', the 'laughter' verbs, as it were: *to laugh, to chuckle, to giggle, to snigger, to titter* and *to guffaw.*

We have given them the name of 'laughter' verbs, because in all monoligual dictionaries they are explained with *laugh* as the unique beginner or 'terme d'identification', thus:

	OALD	LDCE
to chuckle	to laugh in a quiet way with closed mouth (indicating satisfaction or amusement)	to laugh in a quiet way
to giggle	to laugh in a nervous and silly way	to make giggles (a form of laughter which is repeated in an uncontrolled manner esp. by young girls)
to snigger	to laugh in a half-suppressed way (esp. at smth improper, or in a cinical way)	to laugh in a disrespectful more or less secret way
to titter	to give a silly, half-suppressed little laugh	to laugh very quietly from nervousness or badly controlled amusement
to guffaw	to give a noisy laugh	to laugh loudly and perhaps rudely

The meaning of *to laugh* is defined in the «Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English» (OALD) as «make sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, joy, contempt, etc.». In the «Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English» (LDCE) *to laugh* is «to express amusement, happiness, careless disrespect, etc. by making explosive sounds with the voice».

Immediately the question is bound to arise: if one chuckles does it mean that *he makes sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, etc. in a quiet way with closed mouth*? or if he titters, then *he makes sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, joy, contempt, etc. very quietly from nervousness or badly controlled amusement*? or if he giggles then *he makes sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, joy, contempt, etc. in a nervous and silly way*?

If we assume that synonyms are those words which belong to the same thematic group and are so close semantically that keeping them apart requires subtle discrimination, these words are certainly not synonyms. The psychosomatic processes reflected in all these different 'noises' are not directly referrable to «making sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, joy, contempt, etc.». Even *to laugh* and *to guffaw* which seem to be so close semantically are

in reality very far apart. To begin with they are both onomatopoeic, with completely different etymologies: *to laugh* goes back to OE *hlxhhan, hliehhan,* while *to guffaw* is of Scottish origin. In fact all the rest of the words are onomatopoeic in their own right. A closer look at their semantics shows that what we are really concerned with is a variety of different emotional states, not «sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, joy, contempt, etc.». Their being conventionally brought together as 'synonyms' can be accounted for by the still firmly established logical approach to semantic analysis in general.

So far we have confined ourselves to the 'dictionary' level. But how is it possible to overcome the logical approach of our 'lexicographic abstractions'? The only way is to turn to speech and try to sort out the facts as they present themselves tangibly, as they really are. But from what was expounded above it could be concluded that in actual speech 'synonyms' are mainly used for fun?

This, however, is most emphatically not the case. Synonymy does figure in speech in what can be described as 'synonymic condensation'. The term is used to denote situations «when writers and/or speakers bring together several words from one and the same thematic group (or „words which bear on the same idea") to enhance the purport, to make more detailed and more refined a certain underlying sense, to add conviction and force to their statements or, simply, to make for greater prosodic prominence of a 'thing-meant'.

The essential and unalterable reason why this phenomenon deserves our special attention is found in the fact that synonymic condensation is firmly rooted in the English language. As has been shown elsewhere, constructions of this kind were frequent in Early Middle English because «it was customary to explain a French word by adding to it a native synonym» (*Ullmann, Stephen.* Semantics. «An Introduction to the Science of Meaning». Oxford, 1977, p. 148). Later on these word-combinations were used for a different purpose – to improve the style of the utterance. In Modern English there are many set-expressions which follow this pattern, for example, *safe and sound, lord and master, first and foremost,* etc.

It would, however, be wrong to believe that this type of construction is the only instance of synonymic condensation. Owing to its rhythmical structure synonymic condensation has become a powerful stylistic device which very often comprises more than two words. In what follows we shall consider different kinds of synonymic condensation in terms of rhythm, prosody and semantic equivalence. (*Морозова, А.Н.* Лексикологическая равнозначность в речи. Куйбышев, 1985.) While doing this, we shall try to answer the following questions: 1) when do we stop stringing together words merely because they bear on the same idea? 2) how does synonymic condensation function in speech? 3) what are the relationships between its components and how are they manifested in speech?

Let us begin with the first question. Extensive studies of synonymic condensation have yielded interesting results concerning the number of components. It may vary from two to twelve, for example:

|| She re 0 turned to her /soup with the · most. perfect · calm and · quiet on her face. ||

|| «I know nothing of the kind,» retorted Perker firmly.

The meaning of *to laugh* is defined in the «Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English» (OALD) as «make sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, joy, contempt, etc.». In the «Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English» (LDCE) *to laugh* is «to express amusement, happiness, careless disrespect, etc. by making explosive sounds with the voice».

Immediately the question is bound to arise: if one chuckles does it mean that *he makes sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, etc. in a quiet way with closed mouth*? or if he titters, then *he makes sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, joy, contempt, etc. very quietly from nervousness or badly controlled amusement*? or if he giggles

then *he makes sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, joy, contempt, etc. in a nervous and silly way*?

If we assume that synonyms are those words which belong to the same thematic group and are so close semantically that keeping them apart requires subtle discrimination, these words are certainly not synonyms. The psychosomatic processes reflected in all these different 'noises' are not directly referrable to «making sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, joy, contempt, etc.». Even *to laugh* and *to guffaw* which seem to be so close semantically are in reality very far apart. To begin with they are both onomatopoeic, with completely different etymologies: *to laugh* goes back to OE *hlxhhan*, *hliehhan*, while *to guffaw* is of Scottish origin. In fact all the rest of the words are onomatopoeic in their own right. A closer look at their semantics shows that what we are really concerned with is a variety of different emotional states, not «sounds and movements of the face and body, showing amusement, joy, contempt, etc.». Their being conventionally brought together as 'synonyms' can be accounted for by the still firmly established logical approach to semantic analysis in general.

So far we have confined ourselves to the 'dictionary' level. But how is it possible to overcome the logical approach of our 'lexicographic abstractions'? The only way is to turn to speech and try to sort out the facts as they present themselves tangibly, as they really are. But from what was expounded above it could be concluded that in actual speech 'synonyms' are mainly used for fun?

This, however, is most emphatically not the case. Synonymy does figure in speech in what can be described as 'synonymic condensation'. The term is used to denote situations «when writers and/or speakers bring together several words from one and the same thematic group (or „words which bear on the same idea") to enhance the purport, to make more detailed and more refined a certain underlying sense, to add conviction and force to their statements or, simply, to make for greater prosodic prominence of a 'thing-meant'.

The essential and unalterable reason why this phenomenon deserves our special attention is found in the fact that synonymic condensation is firmly rooted in the English language. As has been shown elsewhere, constructions of this kind were frequent in Early Middle English because «it was customary to explain a French word by adding to it a native synonym» (*Ullmann, Stephen.* Semantics. «An Introduction to the Science of Meaning». Oxford, 1977, p. 148). Later on these word-combinations were used for a different purpose – to improve the style of the utterance. In Modern English there are many set-expressions which follow this pattern, for example, *safe and sound, lord and master, first and foremost,* etc.

It would, however, be wrong to believe that this type of construction is the only instance of synonymic condensation. Owing to its rhythmical structure synonymic condensation has become a powerful stylistic device which very often comprises more than two words. In what follows we shall consider different kinds of synonymic condensation in terms of rhythm, prosody and semantic equivalence. (*Морозова, А.Н.* Лексикологическая равнозначность в речи. Куйбышев, 1985.) While doing this, we shall try to answer the following questions: 1) when do we stop stringing together words merely because they bear on the same idea? 2) how does synonymic condensation function in speech? 3) what are the relationships between its components and how are they manifested in speech?

Let us begin with the first question. Extensive studies of synonymic condensation have yielded interesting results concerning the number of components. It may vary from two to twelve, for example:

|| She re 0 turned to her /soup with the · most. perfect · calm and · quiet on her face. ||

|| «I know nothing of the kind,» retorted Perker firmly.

«It does not rest with Dodson and Fogg, you know the men, my dear

w w

sir, as well as I do. || It · rests \ solely, \wholly and en 4 tirely 6 with you». ||

|| He had 0 often · suffered from in\gratitude, \insolence and 6 treachery. ||

w w

|| Do you 0 think, because I am \poor, ob 4 scure, 4 plain and 4 little,

I am also 4 soulless and 3 heartless? ||

|| Her 0 age is · that which is \suitable for my 7 wife, | but she is \bossy, im\perious, domi 4 neering, irritable and re 6 sentful. ||

—> quickly

|| But · since in \fact we \see | that · avarice, \anger, \envy, \pride,

4 sloth, 4 lust and stu 7 pidity | · commonly · profit. far be. yond hu 4 mility

—> quickly

w w

\chastity, \fortitude, \justice and 4 thought | and 0 have to · choose to be

· human at /all.|.. 4 why 7 then, «perhaps, we must 0 stand \fast a little | − 0 even at the · risk of · being 6 heroes. ||

|| To the>eye it is \fair en. ough, 7 here; | but · seen in its in>tegrity, | under the 7 sky, and by the>daylight, | it is a 0 crumbling · tower of \waste, mis\ manage-ment, ex 6 tortion, debt, \mortgage, op 6 pression, \hunger, \nakedness,

—> very quickly

and 6 suffering. ||

The further we go as far as the number of homogeneous parts is concerned, the more obvious becomes the looseness of the semantic relationship between them. But this looseness of the semantic relationship, as will be shown below, is compensated for by the 'tightness' of the prosodic organization.

Synonymic condensation should be kept apart from attributive word-combinations. The difference between the two types of constructions becomes particularly conspicuous in oral speech. Let us consider the following utterances:

1. || I con 0 sider you a \viper, | I 0 look upon you, /Sir, as a · man who has · placed himself be.yond the. pale of so 6 ciety, «by his most au\dacious, dis\graceful and a\bominable. public. conduct. ||

2. || 0 June · paused for a / moment \ to · look at her 7 self in the 0 little · old-fashioned · silver 7 mirror above the · oaken 7 rug chest… |.

As is well known all the syntactic bonds depend on different junctures for their expression plane. Thus, for instance, the attributive bond is realized with the help of the plus juncture (potential or virtual pause). The different kinds of completive bond have three different types of pauses to serve as their expression plane, etc.

So far very little research has been done to gain an insight into the physical realization of the copulative bond which is of particular interest in the present context, because both in the case of synonymic condensation and the construction of homogeneous parts it is the copulative bond which is the syntactic device. Nevertheless, even at the present stage of this investigation we appear to be justified in claiming that attributive and copulative bonds (although in written speech they seem very much alike) are prosodically different.

In contrast with the other bonds, copulative bond expresses coordination, not subordination, its most important prosodic expression depending on pitch-movement. Thus, the most general conclusion which may be made as far as the pitch characteristics are concerned is as follows: synonymic condensation is pronounced with a succession of falling tones (example 1 above), whereas attributive word-combinations with several attributes are said with an ordinary descending scale (example 2 above).

One more point should be made in this connection. Prosody helps to keep apart two types of copulative bond underlying synonymic condensation and other constructions with homogeneous parts. Synonymic condensation is generally accompanied by emphatic prosody, for example:

|| >Mary, a \good, \faithful and ex\ceptional 7 wife, |. never · thought to re· proach her 6 husband. ||

|| He re. mained \ kindly, «sympa\thetic, „\pleasant, "

slowly

and 6 amiable. ||

slowly

|| 0 Am I a \nasty, 4 cruel, 4 selfish, bad 3 man? ||

These are convincing examples in so far as there is a certain 'directionality' in the prosodic arrangement of the synonymic group. This keeps it clearly apart from ordinary word-combinations bearing neutral prosody.

Nothing is 'condensed' in the case of a construction with homo-geneous parts: it is a mere enumeration of facts or objects and as a result prosody remains neutral, for example:

|| His 0 face was \swarthly, «0 almost Ori 6 ental «with /large, /dark,

· languorous 6 eyes..|.

|| We 0 found him \sure e 7 nough, | a 7 huge, 7 coarse, 0 red-faced, scor– · batic 6 man…|

|| The in 0 terior of the · wayside 7 inn | – the 0 Fox and \ Goose, + \ not that it>matters | – was like the in 0 teriors of · all · wayside \inns, | 0 dark and 7 cool | and 0 smelling of 7 bear, «7 coffee, «7 cheese, «7 pickles and the 0 sturdy. English 6 peasantry. ||

Thus, it can be taken for granted that the study of synonymic condensation should not be divorced from its prosodic and rhythmical organization. To go a little more deeply into this, we shall confine our analysis only to two-member constructions.

Morris Croll has shown that the cadences in English translations of divine texts often include two-word rhythmical groups, the words being not infrequently synonyms connected by the conjunction *and*, for example: *sundry and manifold, wills and affections, almighty and everlasting, defended and comforted, honour and glory, nature and property,* etc. He states that two words «are used instead of a single one for the sake of vocal amplitude and beauty». The typical case is when the two words are exact synonyms, but even when they are not synony-mous, the phrase is often evidently «a mere melodic unit». (*Croll, M.* «Style, Rhetoric and Rhythm.» New Jersy, 1966, p. 304 —338). Phrases of this kind are mainly used in final positions or, at least, before pauses.

Synonymic condensation may follow different rhythmical patterns:

Planus: 5—2, 6—2 in which there are accents on the fifth and second or sixth and second syllables accordingly, counting from the end of the phrase, for example: *wrong and misleading, convenient and helpful, unique and specific, elusive and mysterious, comparing and contrasting, skilled and experienced,* etc.

Tardus: 6—3, 7—3, for example, *limits and boundaries, importance and significance, variety and diversity, nuances and subtleties,* etc.

Velox: 7– 4—2, 8 – 4—2, 8 – 5—3, 9—5—3, for example, *elusive and undefinable, assessment and evaluation, global and monolithic, separate and individual,* etc.

The use of synonymic condensation marks off the border line between the theme and the rheme, for example:

|| One of the reasons why linguistic meaning is still made to be something *elusive and undefinable* | is the now widely spread tendency to substitute for linguistic work different philosophical, psychological, and logical disquisitions, presented as the latest in 'linguistic theory'. ||

Synonymic condensation makes the rheme more prominent, for example:

|| It should also be taken into account that the relationship between synchrony and diachrony| is very *subtle and delicate*. ||

or is used to emphasize the most important element of the utterance, for example:

But after all because the marks of punctuation are only conventional signs meaning different things to different readers and writers, and because in prose, as in verse, fashions in punctuation are, like other fashions, continually changing, it is easy to over-estimate its *importance and significance*.

Synonymic condensation may be used to reinforce the opposition of some elements, for example:

While he was anxious to avoid *pedantry and affectation* in his writing, he was equally anxious to avoid what was *mean and low*.

Such parallelism is also often observed within paragraphs, for example:

It should be noted that the border-line between the two types of word-combination is very often *blurred and unclear*. Still we think that the above considerations are of great importance because they bring us a little closer to understanding an author's *purposes and intentions* as expressed by 'free' word-combinations.

In all the examples adduced above synonymic condensation adds greatly to the rhythmical effect of the sentence or the whole passage, on the one hand, and performs various syntactic functions, on the other.

The rhythmical structure of synonymic condensation demonstrates a close connection between rhythm and length of its components. Thus, for instance, the shorter monosyllabic word, as a rule, comes first, for example: *all and everything, beg and implore, calm and quiet, close and intimate, dim and obscure, errors and shortcomings,* etc. This rhythmical regularity can be also observed in the case of 'paired' monosyllabic words: the second component is longer because of the long vowel or the diphthong, for example:

dread and awe, dread and fear, good and kind, want and need, yearn and crave, etc.

This rule, however, is not without exceptions. It is possible to come across cases when the shorter word comes second, for example:

1. || 0 Well, | 0 ever since · dear. Uncle ' Jack. first con\fessed to us that he had a. younger 7 brother | | who was \very \ wicked and \bad, |

slowly

4 you, of 7 course, have · formed the 0 chief. topic of conver. sation between my. self and Miss 6 Prism. ||

2. || He \seems to be a. most consci 6 entious and po 6 lite young. man upon my 6 word…|.

n n

3. || Mr. 0 Bob 7 Sawyer, medical ' student at. Guy's 7 Hospital,

7 London, «had about him that. sort of. slovenly \smartness and \swaggering 6 gait, «which is peculiar to fa 0 cetious · young. gentlemen |

h n

who «. smoke in the · streets by 7 day, |. shout and. scream in the · same

(q) slowly

by /night, «and. call \waiters | by their. Christian 6 names. ||

In these examples we can observe an artificial lengthening of the second component by means of its prosodic arrangement. In the first utterance the word *bad* is said with a falling tone and slow tempo, in the second sentence the adjective *polite* is pronounced with a falling tone and increased loudness, in the third example the verb *scream* is enunciated within a high diapason and slowly.

Thus, we are justified in concluding that prosody is used to increase the 'weight' of shorter words in order not to impair the overall rhythmical law which was formulated above.

The rhythmical structure of synonymic condensation can be reinforced by alliteration, assonance, rhyme, etc. These peculiarities of synonymic condensation are easily observed in numerous idiomatic phrases, for example, *hale and hearty, might and main, modes and manners, rack and ruin, stress and strain,* etc. At the same time we should admit that there are many non-idiomatic word-combinations in which all the above segmental means are realized to the full, for example, *weak and weary, stock and store, subtle and slight, secure and safe, turn and twist, simple and straightforward,* etc.

Within the sounds which are regularly repeated in synonymic condensation sonants and sibilants occupy a privileged position. The reason is obvious: the volume of resonants contributes greatly to the general rhythmical and euphonic organization of speech, for example, *the moaning and the groaning of the bells, the jingling and the twinkling of the bells, the jangling and the wrangling, sign and symbol, one and only ontology,* etc. Particularly striking is the sonority of resonants in emotionally coloured speech, where their production sometimes verges on singing. The regular recurrence of resonants creates, especially in poetry, a peculiar rhythmical effect, which is enhanced by synonymic condensation, for example:

Here is a child who clambers and scrambles,

All by himself and gathering brambles…

The repetition of separate sounds is not the only sound phenomenon to be taken into account in the study of synonymic condensation. Other phenomena including the phonesteme and the morphemic structure of words can be observed. Let us analyse a few examples.

1. Banners yellow, glorious, golden,

On its roof did float and flow

(This – all this – was in the olden

Time long ago)…

2. They clacked and clashed o'Scotlan's Bard,

They glibly talked of 'Rabbie'.

3. Oh, the bells, bells, bells!

What a tale their terror tells of despair!

How they clang, and clash, and roar!

The evidence of the above examples suggests that the phonestemes *fl-* and *cl-* are used not only for enhancing the meaning, but mainly for creating a particular rhythmical and sound effect. Once this point is concealed, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that synonymic condensation is, in principle, devoid of any semantic relevance. Nothing, however, can be further from the truth. By adding the second component the speaker clarifies and specifies the meaning expressed by the first one. The specific sound orga-nization in its turn makes for a greater semantic affinity. Thus, the expression and content planes of synonymic condensation create one indivisible whole.

Now let us consider our material in terms of interaction of semantics and prosody. As usual we should present the material in the form of a chain-like arrangement, because the object of our investigation is a living language.

If we take a broader look at two-member synonymic condensation we shall see that there are two polar cases and a number of intermediate ones. The two extremes are: phraseological units which are formed after the pattern of synonymic condensation and word-combinations whose members have the same connotation. Let us begin with phraseological units.

… ‖ and at 0 three o'clock this after 7 noon | they. all /stood |. high and \dry, +. safe and \sound, «. hale and \hearty | upon the. steps of the

Blue 6 Lion. ‖

In the cited example, we find all the appropriate prosodic means, employed to show that each combination in question has become a phraseological whole which is used in present-day English as a word-equivalent. The conjunction *and* is reduced to one of its weak forms, the stress-pattern

reminds one of very long words which have several stresses. It should be noted in passing that the author 'condenses' phraseological units in this utterance which results in a stylistic effect.

The opposite, polar case is illustrated by the following example:

|| /«Ma,» «. whispered the 7 other, | who was 0 much \older than her

7 sister, | and 0 very in\sipid + and artificial, «0 Lord · Mutanhed has been intro 6 duced to me. || I 0 said «I · thought «I \wasn't engaged, 7 Ma.» ||

It does not require a close examination to see that in this case the author brings together words which are not synonyms in the proper sense of the word but just bear on the same very general idea. The two words placed side by side, however, serve to achieve much greater expressivity than could be done by each of them separately. But as they are not connected semantically and are brought together only because they have the same connotation, the link between them is reinforced by prosodic arrangement. The second component is brought out by means of a mid-falling tone and increased loudness.

Between the two polar ones all the rest of the material can be 'accommodated':

1. || But the 0 village was very · peaceful and \quiet..|.

2..|.it was the · most in\vigorating 6 sight that can be / possibly be

i 6 magined | to be 0 hold him «0 gather up his /hat, /gloves and /handker —

chief, | with a. glowing · countenance, | and re 0 sume his · station in the. rank,| with an 0 ardour and en\thusiasm that · nothing could a 6 bate. ||

slowly

3…|. the 0 lonely and \desolate 7 widow · dried her tears…|.

The prosodic notation used here shows that the prosody of the different utterances becomes progressively more expressive.

We attach so much importance to synonymic condensation because this construction is used when the speaker wants to convey a certain meaning equivalence. This is accounted for by the fact that every time the speaker seeks to describe one concept but since a single word cannot 'mould' this concept he puts together a few words and makes the 'plurality' of words into the 'singularity' of concept by superimposing a specific prosodic and rhythmic organization on them. Besides, it should be always borne in mind that synonymy like homonymy, presupposes comparison, or juxtaposition of words. To establish the fact of synonymy we must have at least two lexical units. Hence the importance of synonymic condensation in which several words are brought together in the most natural way.

Chapter 4.
Phraseology

1. Phraseology in Speech

The vocabulary of any developed language consists of words and word equivalents which are not created by the speaker but used as ready-made units. Such units are primarily characterized by the contradiction which exists between the semantic integrity of the whole and the formal independence of its parts. It is very difficult to establish a sharp boundary between free word-combinations which are generated by the speaker in the process of speech and set expressions used as ready-made. As a rule, it can be shown that there are different degrees of 'setness', or different degrees of restrictions. This is the object of investigation of phraseology – the branch of linguistics which studies the ways of bringing words together in the flow of speech.

In this section of the book we shall focus on some issues that have been on the periphery of phraseology in recent years. Their importance lies in their topicality rather than in the position they hold in phraseological studies. I refer to investigations aimed at discovering prosodic modulations which form part of the expression plane of 'multi-word units' that display various degrees of semantic opaqueness, namely:

– idioms proper (e.g. *to put the cart before the horse, a skeleton in the cupboard, to kill two birds with one stone*, etc.);

– phraseological units, that is invariable word-combinations (e.g. *as a matter of course, to take for granted,* etc.);

– restricted collocations, that is word-combinations which allow some substitution, but where is still some arbitrary limitation on choice (e.g. *to run a company,* not **to conduct a company*; *to fix (or set) a price*, but not **to stick a price,* etc.);

– commonplace free collocations (*green grass, heavy box, to run quickly, to speak loudly,* etc.);

– innovative or nonce collocations, that is word-combinations which demonstrate practically unlimited combinatorial possibilities of words (e.g. *green ideas, to wear tea,* etc.).

As every sentence of English has associated with it an appropriate prosodic structure, which is determined not only by the underlying syntactic bonds but also by semantic properties of its lexical components, we can say that recurrent multi-word units as word equivalents cannot but account for some prosodic modulations accompanying an utterance.

It should be noted, however, that in view of the confused, and at times acrimonious discussion of the properties of word-combinations that has been taking place among linguists, it is as well to emphasize that the point at issue is an essentially theoretical one that cannot even be formulated except within the framework of a categorial approach to units in question, which is discussed below. Unless we make the initial assumption that various properties of multi-word units can be represented as realizations of more abstract entities – that is, categories – it hardly makes sense to enquire which of their features are associated with specific prosodic modulations.

It is reasonable to assume that instead of a set of prosodic parameters for every single unit under discussion, there are certain universal criteria of choosing contour to match semantic properties, and that the application of these criteria allows a wide range of variation, in the way in which the latter can be determined by the context.

In the study of multi-word units, then, we can rely upon a system of categories reflecting their basic features. Each category is based on the opposition differentiating between the positive and negative realizations of certain properties. «There must always be some marked members of this

or that category, those which realize the given category to the full, and some unmarked members – negative realizations.» (*Alexandrova, O.V., Ter-Minasova, S.G.* English Syntax. (Collocation, Colligation and Discourse). M., 1987, p. 70.)

Five categories have been listed and discussed in detail by N.B.Gvishia-ni (1979). They are:

– the category of connotativeness vs. non-connotativeness which is constituted by the opposition between multi-word units performing the emotive function (that of impact) – the marked member – versus the referential unit (the function of message) —the unmarked mem-ber (C);

– the category of reproducibility or 'ready-madeness' (cf.prefab-rication), which is based on the opposition between (a) multi-word units that are regularly reproduced in speech, those that are fixed and closely bound – the marked member; and (b) 'occasional' multi-word units that are specially created to evoke some emotional or evaluative reaction on the part of the reader or listener, and to draw attention to something special – the unmarked member (R);

– the category of idiomaticity which is constituted by the opposition of opaque (marked member) and nonopaque (unmarked member) multi-word units (I);

– the category of conceptual determination presupposes that there is a certain conceptual motivation underlying every multi-word unit. The category is constituted by the opposition of multi-word units whose linguistic expression is compatible with the normal conceptual relationship of things (marked member) versus multi-word units which do not depend on the physical experience of the speaker (unmarked member) (CD);

– the category of sociolinguistic determination is based on the opposition of multi-word units which are sociolinguistically conditioned; that is the interrelation between their components is determined not only by lexical-phraseological and conceptual factors, but also by peculiarities of the social life, tradition and culture of the speech community (marked member) versus sociolinguistically neutral multi-word units (unmarked member). It should be emphasized that «this category can be realized only in those cases where the sociolinguistic aspect looms large, when it rises above all the categories, when it adds some connotations to word-combinations, when to understand a word-combination one requires some background knowledge.» (*Alexan-drova, O.V., Ter-Minasiva, S.G.* 1987, p. 81). (SD)

The application of the categorial approach makes it possible to view a multi-word unit from various angles at once, and at the same time to use the principle of gradience.The table presents the results of the categorial analysis of a few multi-word units.

N		C	R	I	CD	SD
1.	*blue stocking*	+	+	+	-	+
2.	*to talk turkey*	+	+	+	-	+
3.	*to meet one's Waterloo*	+	+	+	-	+
4.	*to be as pleased as a punch*	+	+	+	-	+
5.	*a skeleton in the cupboard*	+	+	+	-	+
6.	*first night*	-	+	+	-	+
7.	*to make way*	-	+	+	-	-
8.	*to take advantage*	-	+	+	-	-
9.	*by means of*	-	+	+	-	-
10.	*as a matter of course*	-	+	+	-	-

N		C	R	I	CD	SD
11.	*heavy snow*	-	+	+	+	-
12.	*to talk sport*	-	+	+	-	+
13.	*to hold a meeting*	-	+	+	-	+
14.	*to deliver goods*	-	+	+	-	+
15.	*to appreciate fully*	-	+	+	-	+
16.	*blue sky*	-	+	-	+	-
17.	*heavy suitcase*	-	+	-	+	+
18.	*to talk loudly*	-	+	-	+	-
19.	*to read books*	-	+	-	+	+
20.	*sound of music*	-	+	-	+	-
21.	*eloquent hat*	+	-	-	-	+
22.	*suitable paralysis*	+	-	-	-	-
23.	*a pretty broad-minded club*	+	-	-	-	+
24.	*God-forsaken eatery*	+	-	-	-	+
25.	*an astonished piece of toast*	+	-	-	-	+

It follows from the above table that idiom proper (1-5) are connotative, cliched, semantically global multi-word units which are generally sociolinguistically determined. Phraseological units (6-10) are similar to idioms proper as far as the marked realization of two categories are concerned – they are cliched and idiomatic. But phraseological units are devoid of connotation and many of them are not sociolinguistically determined.

Restricted collocations (11—15) are also characterized by ready-madeness and idiomaticity but to a less degree than idioms proper and phraseological units (as is indicated by the crosses in bold print in the table). The idiomaticity of restricted collocations becomes evident when they are contrasted with their equivalents in a different language. Thus, «for the Russian speaker who wants to express the concept *obrashchat' vnimanije* it seems odd that the corresponding English expression is *to pay attention* because the verb *to pay* is associated by him with giving money for goods, services, etc., i.e. with the Russian verb *platit*.» (*Alexandrova, O.V., Ter-Minasova, S.G.* 1987, p. 42).

Commonplace free collocations (16—20) demonstrate natural combinability of their referents and for this reason they are frequently used in speech. Hence their partial prefabrication: the more frequently the multi-word unit is used, the more closely its components are bound together.

Innovative word-combinations (21—25), on the contrary, are absolutely unpredictable. They are not conceptually integral and not idiomatic either. Their main feature is connotation, because in this case we can observe a deliberate violation of the conceptual basis of collocability which results in a range of expressive, emotional or evaluative overtones. Some of them may be sociolinguistically determined because the speaker or writer plays upon culturally embedded words.

In approaching the analysis of multi-word units in the way demonstrated in this chapter, we have not been indulging in a pedantic taxonomic exercise. We began by viewing different multi-word units in relation to the five categories because in terms of the distinction between connotative and non-connotative multi-word units we can account for the prosodic emphasis of innovative, occasional word-combinations in the following sentences, for example:

1. (a) || 4 Why, 0 then, | 0 was he lunching the 0 girl in /
this 0 God-forsaken ^eatery? ||
(b)… the 0 Drones is | what I would call| a
quickly
0 pretty·broad-minded 4 club. ||
slowly
(c) His 0 eyes 6widened, | and an as 0 tonished
piece of 0 toast 4 fell from his 6 grasp. ||
(d) The 0 painter. led the way at. once to his
4 masterpiece; | and for 0 some. minutes they
stood before it in a | 0 suitable | pa 6 ralysis. ||
br> <br
slowly

It is enough to compare the prosody of the above sentences with the one of their modified versions.

2. (a) 4 Why, then, | 0 was he lunching the 0 girl in this
Chi 0 nese 6 restaurant? ||
(b)… the 0 Drones is | what I would call | a 0 very
quickly
interesting 6club. |
(c) His 0 eyes 6widened | and a 0 big. piece of toast 4 fell from his 6grasp.||
(d) The 0 painter. led the way to his 4 masterpiece;|
and for 0 some. minutes they. stood before it in. deep 6silence. ||

To see that *God-forsaken eatery*, *a pretty broad-minded club*, *an astonished piece of toast*, and *a suitable paralysis* in contrast with their non-connotative counterparts are brought into prominence by means of variations of loudness, tempo, pitch-movement and pausation.

It is not only connotative occasional word-combinations that are prosodically marked in this way. So, too, are idioms proper, for example:

1. «… There isn't a Forsyte now who appeals to me.» «Not young
Mr. Nicholas? He's at the Bar. We've given 'im briefs.» || «He'll 0 never. set the. Thames on ^fire.» ||
>spr <spr

2. It will be my endeavour to give a reasonably up-to-date and representative account of a fast-moving science without discarding the valuable results of earlier research | and \/ also| without 0 trying to put

0 new 6wine into 0 old ' bottles.||

slowly

3. 0 Great 4 Scott. || I believe I've been

0 barking up the · wrong 6tree. ||

4) I 0 gather from Mrs. Bergfeld that you're on the ^rocks. ||

The point is that idioms proper are heavily fraught with metaphor which calls for prosodic modulations that make them stand out in the flow of speech. In the examples given above various combinations of prosodic features perform the stylistic function, and they enhance the expressive, emotional, evaluative overtones which are part and parcel of the inner structure of idioms proper.

An idiom depends on the balance struck between two forces, that of semantic opaqueness and that of structural separateness. The interaction of the two forces makes the idiom a powerful rhetorical device and discourse organizer.

If we consider how idioms can be studied in relation to discourse we can identify two main areas: one is the use of idioms to focus the listener's or reader's attention on aspects of the message that are most important, the other is concerned with making the narration more colourful. Examples include:

1. Secondly, some personal pronoun subjects are inversible in English and in French: *il dit – dit-il* — he says – says he.

Whereas inflexional endings in Latin can never be inverted. || It is thus a 0 bundantly \ clear | that 0 English and 0 French. form-words are 0 not on. all 4 fours with 0 Latin in ' flexions | and have a 0 great deal

4 more inde 7 pendence than the 4 latter.||

2. || A0 merican fi. nancials have a 0 tiger by the 4 tail ||

slow

in con 0 sumer 4 credit. || Any attempt to curtail it seriously would lead to a drastic reduction in effective mass consumer-power during the curtailment.

3. —… Here is a case in point, a way in which word can get across the Atlantic and get used. Now, I happen to like your *trifles* and your *fools* as deserts, as 'sweets'. We prepare them in our household. Then when we have guests and we serve them, we use the English terms for them. This familiarizes a number of people, you see, with two English words. They may even serve them themselves and this is just the beginning of a long chain where a word gets a much wider range of use.

– || 0 Well, I 0 hope they. suffer your. fools 4 gladly,|7 Al.

spr> <spr

4. We all know the great danger in offering an interpretation of a work of art, and this is that it simply involves the critic reading into

a particular work his own preconception – | as we say in English | —

quickly

the par 0 ticular 0 bee in his \bonnet.|| There has been a good deal of this, as

slowly

far as «Hamlet» criticism is concerned.

Of course, in the first two passages the use of the idioms *to be on all fours*, and *to have a tiger by the tail* is not only instructive but also entertaining. In the other two examples, however, the speaker's aim is simply to make the narration less dry, less academic, to give listeners a possibility to relax.

It should be pointed out that when idioms are aimed at giving clarity, force and beauty to the argument they are often deformed and help to frame the paragraph, for example:

Then 0 Jasper. Gibbons was ar. rested for being. drunk and dis

4 orderly in Picca 4 dilly | and (…) she 4dropped him, |but 0 not like a. hot

po4 tato. || quickly

quickly

She 0 dropped him with 0 infinite 4 gentleness,| as 3 softly | as the 4 tear that

slowly slowly

she doubtless 0 shed when she. made up her. mind to do something

re 4 pugnant to her / nature; | she 0 dropped him with 0 so much 4 tact,| with

slowly

0 such a sensi 4 bility| that 0 Jasper. Gibbon perhaps. hardly 4 knew he was |

4 dropped.||

In this case much of the coherence of the paragraph comes from the fact that the components of the deformed idiom are prosodically prominent, the resulting prosodic pattern making the paragraph one global whole.

It would be absurd to hope to describe, or even to determine all the different combinations of prosodic parameters we encounter when coming across idioms proper in the flow of speech. At the same time it must be admitted that there is regularly so high a degree of prosodic emphasis of idioms proper in the flow of speech that it can be generalized in the form of marked prosodic invariants which keep idioms proper and phraseological units clearly apart. The latter do not carry any expressive emotional overtones and for this reason are not accompanied by prosodic modulations which perform the stylistic function, for example:

1. Acqui 0 sition takes place as 0 part of under 4 standing, | 0 taking part in | com 0 municating a 7 bout | and 0 being com. municated with| about 0 daily. personal 4 life. ||

2. There is 0 no 7 doubt that 0 this ap 7 proach is in 0 keeping with the 0 anti-authori. tarian, learner-centred edu. cational 7 outlook which is 0 sweeping through. much of the 6 world. ||

In the above examples the prosodic realization of the phraseological units *to take place* and *to be in keeping* falls within the scope of the grammatical function of prosody.

It should be noted, however, that many phraseological units are gambits with fixed accentual structures which cannot be changed by the speaker. The same word may be part of several phraseological units with different accentual structures and be either stressed or not. Consider the word *way* in the following sentences:

1. At the 0 party he. looked the other 4 way | and 0 didn't even come

4 up to me. ||

2. To 4 my way of 7 thinking this is an im 4 portant / point. ||

3. It was 4 Susan who 0 shouted at Mrs. 4 Simpson, | 0 not the. other way 4 round. ||

In the first example *way* as part of the phraseological unit *to look the other way* meaning 'to pretend not to see smb/smth' is stressed, whereas in the other two phraseological units which are gambits *way* is not stressed. In example (2) the stress is shifted to *my*, in example (3) *other* carries the secondary stress and *round* the primary one.

Here are some other examples of phraseological units with fixed accentual patterns, some of them functioning as gambits:

for 0 one thing – used for introducing a reason;

a case in 0 point – a clear or typical example;

on the 0 one hand... on the №other hand – used to indicate contrasting points of view;

0 all things con№sidered – used to introduce or comment on a

judgement that is made after taking all the facts into account;

by 0 all means – yes, of course;

by 0 no means, not by 0 any means – not at all;

(as) a matter of 0 course – as a regular habit or usual procedure.

So much for the prosody of multi-word units.

Another aspect of phraseology which deserves our attention is its role and functions in the dictionary. The consideration of this issue makes it possible to gain a deeper insight into a correlation of the word and context, meaning and use, emic and etic properties of the word and its equivalents.

2. Phraseology in the Dictionary

Obviously, if we are linguists, if what we are doing is English philology, we are bound to learn to cope with words, to find a way of handling them, which is incomparably more difficult than, for example, discovering and describing grammatical categories the number of which is strictly limited.

As for words, we cannot arrive even at an approximate number of units actually in use. Nowhere can we find exact data to prove that this or that person or this or that community uses so many hundreds or thousands of words? Attempts have, however, been made to apply statistical analysis to the study of vocabularies used, for instance, by this or that social group. But the results have been so contradictory and unconvincing that they simply could not be used in scientific work.

To discover the object of our research we should turn to dictionaries especially as we are well provided for with a number of reliable English word-books. But even the best and biggest dictionaries, as has been shown above, are often inconsistent as far as the organization and presentation of lexical material is concerned. Lexicographers frequently base the dictionary entry on the use of words in different contexts, thus presenting a number of 'meanings' whose actual existence is far from proved.

Outstanding Russian lexicographers have repeatedly drawn attention to the still prevalent mistake of non-discrimination of the meanings and the various uses of words. In what follows we shall tackle this all-important problem and view it through the prism of different kinds of lexicographic phraseology.

When we carry out the semantic analysis of words the only source of information is an enormous collection of files, which in the case of a large monolingual academic dictionary comprise millions of entries. Words are registered by lexicographers in as many texts as possible where they regularly occur within typical utterances. These contexts or phrases are generally included in historical dictionaries of the «New English Dictionary» type. Only by analysing and comparing various uses of the word which have already been registered we can arrive at its meanings, that is its semantic structure as a linguistic unit.

But when we speak about linguistics in general and lexicology in particular we must not forget about the indissoluble connection between the language and speech, between what has been done, registered and achieved and what is on the point of being done or produced. Side by side with the registered uses of words which are collected in historical dictionaries there is the never ceasing process of speech, the endlessly recurring usage of language. The crucial point, then, is to find a way of adapting the data of the files to the requirements of dictionary entries.

To solve this problem we should dwell at some length on those phrases which form the greater part of a dictionary entry. If we look at lexicographic material we shall see that there is a crossplay of a number of phrases with the lexeme in question. They are generally described as 'philological phraseology', that is, the already registered uses of the word in various written and spoken texts. This forms the basis of a word semantic analysis.

The different meanings thus arrived at are then described with the help of what is best denoted as 'semiotic phraseology', that is the definitions which have been worked out by the lexicographer. These phrases belong to the domain of interlinguistics and are, in a way, opposed to those phrases which are part of general usage. Phrases of this kind, as a rule, are somewhat stilted and may produce a comic effect, if used in everyday speech. To illustrate this point let us turn to a passage

from «Gulliver's Travels», where we find a description of the contents of Gulliver's pockets as given by the Lilliputians:

After the strictest Search, we found only one great Piece of coarse Cloth, large enough to be a Foot-Cloth for Your Majesty's chief Room of State. In his right Waistcoat-Pocket, we found a prodigious Bundle of white thin Substances, folded one over another, about the Bigness of three Men, tied with a strong Cable, and marked with black Figures; which we humbly conceive to be Writings; every Letter almost half as large as the Palm of our Hands. In the left there was a sort of Engine, from the Back of which were extended twenty long Poles, resembling the Pallisado's before Your Majesty's Court; wherewith we conjecture the Man Mountain combs his Head. In the large Pocket on the right side of his middle Cover we saw a hollow Pillar of Iron, about the Length of a Man fastened to a strong Piece of Timber, larger than the Pillar; and upon one side of the Pillar we saw huge Pieces of Iron sticking out, cut into strange Figures: which we know not what to make of. In the smaller Pocket on the right Side, were several round flat Pieces of white and red Metal, of different Bulk: Some of the white which seemed to be Silver, were so large and heavy, that my Comrade and I could hardly lift them. In the left Pocket were two black Pillars irregularly shaped: we could not, without Difficulty, reach the Top of them as we stood at the Bottom of his Pocket: One of them was covered, and seemed all of a piece; but at the upper End of the other, there appeared a white round Substance, about twice the bigness of our Heads: Within each of these was inclosed a prodigious Plate of Steel which, by our Orders, we obliged him to show us, because we apprehended they might be dangerous Engines. He took them out of their Cases, and told us, that in his own Country his Practice was to shave his Beard with one of these, and to cut his Meat with the other. There were two Pockets which we could not enter: These he called his Fobs. Out of the right Fob hung a great Silver Chain, with a wonderful kind of Engine at the bottom. We directed him to draw out whatever was at the End of that Chain; which appeared to be a Globe, half Silver, and half of the transparent Metal. He put this Engine to our Ears, which made an incessant Noise like that of a Water-Mill. And we conjecture it is either some unknown animal or the God that he worships. From the left Fob he took out a Net almost as large enough for a Fisherman, but contrived to open and shut like a Purse, and served him for the same Use:

We found therein several massy Pieces of yellow Metal, which if they be of real Gold, must be of immense Value.

The text is downright comic. But it does give the reader an idea of the nature of definitions, their semiotic character. At the same time we must admit that it would be a mistake to believe that definitions generally cannot be expressed by means of natural languages and should be based on special semiotic system. Lexicographic definitions may be described as 'semiotic phraseology' to indicate that in this case word-combinations serve a particular purpose – a logical description of the semantics of the word.

Having established the semantic structure, and worked out the definition, the lexicographer concentrates on 'illustrative' phraseology, that is word-combinations or sentences made up to show how the word is actually used in speech, the descriptive approach no longer dominating over the prescriptive one.

It follows that the difference between 'philological' and 'illustrative' phraseology is purely functional: there are no phrases which could be regarded as belonging solely (or exclusively) to the former or the latter, they can all be used as philological material and presented as proof of the actual existence of the word (or its different meanings), as proof of the word actually being part of the word-stock of the language in question.

This brings us to a very difficult issue of the use of quotations for lexicographic purposes.

3. Illustrative Phrases in the Dictionary

Quotations have been employed by lexicography since time immemorial. Their forms and functions, however, have been subject to modification depending on the lexicographic tradition, purposes of the dictionary and intentions of its compiler. Our objective is to consider the phraseological features of quotations which underlie the above modifications.

The history of dictionary making for the English language goes as far back as the Old English period, where its first traces are found in the form of glosses of religious books with translations from Latin. In the 15th century regular bilingual English-Latin and Latin-English dictionaries started to appear in order to enable the dictionary users to read scientific and religious books written in Latin. The compilers foresaw the necessity to include quotations in the dictionary and for a very long time they were implicitly presented there. The authors included some entries containing references to lexicographic and literary works in order to confirm the existence of the word in the language. A case in point is «Glossagraphia» (1656) by Thomas Blount where one can find the names of the authors and the titles of their books which served the basis of the dictionary.

Why did he do this? Blount, more than his predecessors, seems to have thought of language as a living, growing organism changing from year to year. He considered change inevitable. This is exactly the reason why he decided to indicate the literary sources, where the words, registered in his dictionary, can be found.

References to classical authors are also presented in Thomas Cooper's «Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae» (1565).

'Implicit' quotations in these dictionaries proved to the user that the words in the wordlist had not been invented by the compiler but existed in the language of that period. Later quotations together with idioms, proverbs and catch phrases were introduced in the dictionary as examples.

In the 18 th century quotations were more regularly used in the dictionary. Nathaniel Bailey's «Universal Etymological English Dictionary» (1721), one of the most popular of all dictionaries before Johnson, can serve as an example. The author included quotations from Spenser, Chauser, Shakespeare, which were used as examples, illustrating the meanings of words.

But the first dictionary in which quotations were employed as illustrative phraseology was «A Dictionary of the English Language in Which the Words are Deduced from Their Originals and Illustrated in Their General Significations by Examples from the Best Writers» (1775) by Dr. Samuel Johnson. His objective was to produce a normative dictionary, in which quotations would demonstrate the actual use of words for they were borrowed from the works of best writers whose language is immaculate.

It took Samuel Johnson and his assistants 7 years to collect quotations, illustrating the life of the words which he was going to include into the dictionary. The information that we have of this method of collecting data is that he read books and marked the words which he wanted to illustrate and his six assistants copied the sentences in which they occurred on slips of paper. These were later put in alphabetical order and so made available for use as examples. S.Johnson then picked out the most striking in his opinion phrases, that were to serve as examples of the typical use of the word.

In his dictionary S.Johnson did not cite writers prior to the 16 th c., public opinion in his days being that in the 17 th c. and early 18 th c. the English language had reached the highest mark of its perfection. The dictionary is a prescriptive one, its aim was to preserve the purity of the English language of that time. Unfortunately Johnson did not date his quotations and in many cases did not give the title of the works from which they were taken. About 11,400 examples used in the dictionary perform the following important functions:

a) they prove that the word is not a fiction of the lexicographer's brain but a fact of language;

b) they reinforce sense distinctions;

c) they help the user to gain a deeper insight into the collocational, colligational and stylistic peculiarities of the lexeme;

d) they point to the chronological limits of the language period under discussion.

The most commendable feature of Johnson's dictionary was the full treatment of the various senses of words, to illustrate which he used a variety of quotations.

Samuel Johnson, however, only mentioned the authors whose language he considered to be immaculate and for this reason invaluable for the user of the dictionary, but never gave any specific references for his illustrative phrases.

It should be emphasized in this connection that the use of quotations taken from masterpieces was typical of the European lexicography of 16—18 c. Thus, for example, the Dictionary of Academicians Kruska, that was compiled in Italy at the end of the 16 th. c. was characterized by professor Giovanni Nenchoni, president of the Academy, as historical and normative. It contains a great number of quotations to collect which a lot of work was done. The method of collecting information bears a strong resemblance to S.Johnson's method. A list of books to be read was prepared, and then assigned to academicians. While reading they had to write out quotations on standard slips, which were later passed on to the Secretary, who worked on the entry and used quotations to illustrate the meanings of the word.

In the 18 th c. (1726—1739) the Spanish Royal Academy compiled its monolingual dictionary called «Diccionario de Autoridades», the most commendable feature of which is that it reflects the whole lexical wealth of the language of that time. Quotations from Spanish literature, history, philosophy and lexicography were employed in order

– to confirm the existence of such a meaning in the Spanish language,

– to illustrate the typical context, in which the word may occur.

In France in 1964 Paul Rober published a dictionary, in which definitions were illustrated by literary quotations to demonstrate the word and its relations with other words in the language.

As is well known the common lexicographic practice is the use of naturally occurring contexts. At the early stages of compiling a dictionary citations are part of the 'philological phraseology' that is phrases that have already become part and parcel of the philological thesaurus of the given language. Later on part of this philological thesaurus is used to illustrate the different meanings of words and thus becomes 'illustrative phraseology'. It should be emphasized that if in monolingual normative dictionaries the function of illustrative phraseology is prescriptive, in historical ones, for example the «Oxford English Dictionary» it is of documenting. In the latter case quotation enables us to trace the process of the word semantic development and determine the historical relations between its meanings.

With the development of learner's lexicography the place and role of quotations in the dictionary changed drastically. In spite of the fact that the aim of learners' dictionaries is to provide the user with the models to follow they do not employ quotations in S.Johnson's sense (that is phrases borrowed from literary works of distinguished writers) as examples. All illustrative phrases are either what Palmer called 'skeleton-type examples' or 'sentence-sample examples' which were specially made up by the compilers to meet the needs of the foreign learner of the English language. The «Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English» (1978) was less consistent in this respect but still it will not be an exaggeration to say that quotations as citations of authentic texts gradually disappeared from the learner's dictionary.

Quotations were brought back to the learner's dictionary by corpus linguistics. The «Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary» (1987) was exclusively based on examples which have genuinely occurred in the language. At present all learners' dictionaries borrow their examples from respective corpora, but neither of the authentic illustrative phrases can be classified as a quotation in the proper sense of the term. Corpora explicitly show that «individuals say particular things in a particular way because they have heard others say similar things in the same or similar

ways» (Tannen, 1987, p. 309), and these 'others' do not necessarily have to be great writers, scientists, philosophers or politicians. Thus, in spite of the fact that the vast majority of illustrative phrases in modern learners' dictionaries are citations from authentic texts it is impossible to associate them with their authors and classify them as quotations because they are 'public property'.

Thus, we are justified in distinguishing between a citation, that is any passage cited, and a quotation, that is a passage taken from a book, play, speech and repeated by a person who is not the original author in order to support his/her opinion or argument. Citations are widely used in modern lexicography as commonplace free collocations illustrating the typical usage of the corresponding head-word. Quotations, on the contrary, are more phraseologically bound and are generally excluded from dictionaries entries.

To determine the place of quotations in illustrative phraseology it is necessary to compare them with other phrases, that are regularly included into the entry, that is idioms and commonplace free collocations.

From the very outset it should be pointed out, that there is no wall of partition between idioms and quotations. For ex., the idiom *the world is one's oyster* is registered in «Longman Dictionary of Idioms» with Shakespeare indicated as the source («The Merry Wives of Windsor»,

act II, sc. 2). The idiom *be no chicken* is registered in the dictionary as John Swift's citation from «Polite Conversation». The idiom *fit like a glove* is registered as T.Smollett's citation from «The Expedition Of Humphery Clinker», a letter to sir Walkin Phillips.

To become an idiom a quotation, or its part, has to undergo a certain process, during which it may loose its authorship. It can no longer provoke steady associations with the literary work, from which it was borrowed. Moreover, it is no longer necessary, because in order to understand these citations one does not need to know the whole literary work or even the passage, in which it occurs. In order for a citation to become an idiom it should be:

– aphoristic

– solid

– stable.

This enables a quotation to experience the process of semantic transformation.

Thus, on the one hand, citations border with idioms. On the other, it borders with commonplace free collocations, or citations, that is phrases with no author. Whether a quotation has absolute indisputable authorship is the main criterion that distinguishes it from a commonplace free collocation. In our minds a quotation is always linked to a certain person or source. Its value is that it is a reference to an authoritative opinion. We perceive the quotation as exact reproduction of the text, belonging to another person, we know this person and want to lean upon his authority. Its reproducibility is supported by quotation marks which are generally used to emphasize its formal globality and phraseological stability.

The difference between quotations and other phrases used in learners' dictionaries becomes obvious if we apply the method of the categorial analysis described above. A quotation may demonstrate language idiomaticity and represent restricted and open collocations typical of the language in question. This is the reason why they have been used as illustrative examples in dictionaries for natives over the years. At the same time we have to admit that many quotations are connotative and culture specific. There is very much in them that learners have to disentangle before they can focus on the lexical unit itself and the way it should be used in speech. This makes the use of quotations as illustrative phrases impractical.

But the most important feature of quotations is their sociolinguistic nature. Any quotation is associated, if not directly connected, with the text it belongs to and its author, his or her knowledge, wisdom or wit.

Thus, in the «Oxford Dictionary of English» we are dealing with quotations proper, because all the authors are indicated there. In contrast, the compilers of COBUILD insist that all of the

examples used in it are authentic; but these illustrative examples do not have authorship, and as a result cannot be called quotations.

The purpose of a learner's dictionary is to give universal illustrative phrases, that will not be overloaded with cultural information. They should be understood by the learner who does not possess a considerable amount of background knowledge. The user should not be an expert in science, literature, music, etc. to understand the examples. If the illustrative phrase is overloaded with extralinguistic information, which is irrelevant for decoding the word meaning, it will lead to a false understanding and interpretation of this very meaning, and as a result the learner will not be able to use this phrase correctly in speech of his/her own.

This is the reason why many critics of authentic examples insist that quotations should be eliminated from the illustrative phraseology of a learner's dictionary, because when a phrase is borrowed from a literary text, it can, on the one hand, be connotative and on the other socio-linguistically determined, which in any case will distract the user from the meaning of the word to illustrate which it is summoned.

In modern learners' dictionaries, such as the CIDE, on the contrary the sociolinguistic determination of quotations makes it possible to use them as part of the cultural component of the language. They provide the user with encyclopaedic knowledge, that is «knowledge associated with the word but which is not immediately relevant to linguistic structure» (Kiefer, 1990). It therefore enables the user to recognize quotations in texts and trace them back to their sources. The overall objective of this is to allow the learner to understand and enjoy the text containing quotations.

In this case special dictionaries of quotations become indispensable. Thus, for instance, the «Oxford Dictionary of Quotations» contains over 20 000 quotations taken from a variety of sources. In the foreword there are references to the authors and the thematic classification of quotations used in the dictionary. Firstly, it contains a great number of quotations from literary works (not only English and American literature but Russian and Soviet as well). Secondly, there are quotations from works on psychology and philosophy. The compilers included many quotations from scientific works as well. One may come across quotations from songs and anthems, political speeches and newspapers, magazines and the Bible.

Dictionaries of quotations, of course, are of great philological value, but they do not take into consideration the interests of foreign learners. Dictionaries of quotations as well as defining dictionaries should fall into two categories:
– dictionaries for native speakers,
– dictionaries for foreign learners.

It is assumed that a native speaker reads a lot and if he lacks background knowledge (philological literacy), she/he is then forced to consult a dictionary of quotations. It is quite natural, however, that a foreign learner does not possess the native speaker's background knowledge. That is why we can only welcome the attempt that was made by the «Cambridge International Dictionary of English» to bring back quotations to the learner's dictionary, but with a new purpose.

In the CIDE, like in many other learner's dictionaries, there is a section in the entry where the user can find idioms and phraseological units. The use of different types and usage labels indicates that these are special lexical units which cannot be employed as phrases, illustrating the actual use of the headword. In contrast with other learner's dictionaries, however, in the CIDE entry there is a section where the compilers register the quotations associated with the headword. In this case quotations are excluded from illustrative phraseology, the objective of which is to show how the word actually functions in speech. Quotations develop and enrich the user's background knowledge.

To illustrate our point let us consider the way the word *end* is presented in the CIDE. The entry of this word gives the user

– linguistic knowledge, that is the definition of the nominative meaning of the word (*end* – the point in space or time beyond which smth. no longer exists, or part of smth. that includes this point);

– typical contexts, illustrating the actual use of the word.

The contexts are free word-combinations, that were chosen by compilers of the CIDE from the Corpus of the Cambridge International Survey. In spite of the fact that these phrases are authentic, their authors are not registered, because the conceptual knowledge, introduced with the help of these phrases is by no means original and is the component of fluency in the language as a means of communication.

All word-combinations function as illustrative phraseology, showing the learner how to use the word *end* in speech. For example: *We damaged the end of the piano when we moved it. · This cable should have a plug at one end and a socket at the other.· Get to the end of the queue and wait your turn like everyone else.· There is no point continuing with these negotiations as they have clearly reached the end of the road (=cannot continue*). All examples illustrate typical contexts in which the word under discussion can occur in speech and help the user to gain a deeper insight into its meanings as registred by the language.

Apart from illustrative phraseology, at the end of the entry we find Sir Winston Churchill's famous phrase:

«Now this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But, it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning.»

When a native speaker hears the word *end* it reminds him of the famous quotation, because it frequently occurs in literary and scientific works. Yet a foreign learner has no such associations and for this reason it is necessary to include the quotation into the dictionary. Without this cultural information the user's notion of the word would be poorer.

Thus, quotations are to broaden the encyclopedic knowledge of the learner, bringing it nearer to the background knowledge of the native speaker. Quotations together with idioms perform a very important function of building up the learner's phylological thesaurus.

Part 2.
Lexicography

Chapter 1.
An Outline of British and American Lexicography

1. The Beginning of Dictionary Making in Britain

The historical roots of British lexicography go back to 7th-8th centuries when Latin was a means of international communication in Europe and the most important texts, first and foremost biblical ones, were written in this language. To facilitate their reading and translation English monks produced glosses based on interlinear translations from Latin. All religious texts were supplemented with such lists of Latin-English equivalents – glossaries. One of the first glossaries is the «Leiden Glossary» in which the pairs of equivalents are arranged in the order of their occurrence in the text.

It took seven centuries to achieve fully alphabetical order in glossaries. By that time (14th c.) it became clear that glossaries could not satisfy the growing reference needs of their users. It was necessary to make regular Latin-English dictionaries which would not be confined to 'hard' Latin words in a particular text but include as many Latin-English equivalents as possible. Such an attempt was made by compilers of «Medulla Gramatice» – the first Latin-English dictionary which appeared in the15th century. Later on «Medulla Gramatice» served the basis for the first printed bilingual dictionary «Ortus (Hortus) Voca-bulorum».

Latin-English and English-Latin dictionaries were very popular down to the end of the 16th century but already by the middle of the century Latin began to lose its status of an international language and English lexicographers turned to new West-European languages. Among the most well-known bilingual and polylingual dictionaries of this period are «A World of Words, or Most copious, and exact Dictionarie in Italian and English» by John Florio (1598), «A Dictionarie French and English» by Claudius Hollyband (1593), «Alvearic or Tripple Dictionarie, English, Latin, French» by J. Baret (1573).

It should be mentioned in this connection that dictionary-making methodology was gradually evolving over the period of nine centuries, and various lexicographic conventions were adopted. The structure of the entry became fairly complex and the reader could extract more and more information about the lexis of the target language. Lexicographers commented on the morphological structure of the word (derivational affixes were singled out in 1538), its origin and field of usage, took into account synonymy and dialectal differences, used different modes of definition, examples, usage notes and even illustrations to make their dictionaries user-friendly.

One of the aims of scholarly works and also smaller didactic volumes was to help their readers to master West-European languages. It follows that bilingual lexicography has always been pedagogically orientated and the use of the general bilingual dictionary seems to stay as long as translation plays a dominant role in foreign language education.

2. Monolingual Lexicography

The first monolingual dictionary of English «A Table Alphabetical, containing and teaching the true writing, and understanding of hard English words, borrowed from Hebrew, Greek, Latin or

French, etc.» by Robert Cawdrey was published in 1604. As can be seen from its title the dictionary concentrated on those words which could cause problems for native speakers of English. Robert Cawdrey who was a schoolmaster aimed at extending the vocabulary of those who spoke only English and did not know foreign languages.

Dictionaries of hard words dominated in the 17th century and gradually they became fairly sophisticated reference book which could be written only by professionals. Thus, for example, «Glossagraphia: or a Dictionary, Interpreting all such Hard Words whether Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, Teutonik, Belgich, British or Saxon; as are now used in our refined English Tongue. Also the Terms of Divinity, Law, Physics, Mathematics… with Etymologies, Definitions, and Historical Observations on the same» by Thomas Blount (1656) comprised not only borrowings but also many terms of different branches of science. Thomas Blount devised very short and precise definitions, he indicated the origin of the word and its field of usage, and sometimes he mentioned the name of the author, who had used the word in question.

The first attempt at a dictionary whose word-list comprised words of different degrees of complexity, both native and non-native was made by Nathaniel Bailey who in 1721 published «An Universal Etymological English Dictionary». Two editions of this dictionary (1721 and 1727) served the basis for his famous «Dictionarium Britanicum» (London, 1730) which had 48,000 entries. Nathaniel Bailey made a few lexicographic innovations: he was the first to indicate the stressed syllable in head-words and to use sayings and proverbs in order to make the senses more explicit. In the dictionary there are over 500 pictures illustrating many technical terms.

Nathaniel Bailey's dictionary is the most important achievement of English monolingual lexicography before Samuel Johnson's Dictionary which produced an enormous impact on British and American lexicography of the eighteen-nineteenth centuries. It will not be an exaggeration to say that Samuel Johnson's Dictionary was revolutionary in many respects.

Samuel Johnson worked on the dictionary for nine years. The dictionary was a fantastic achievement of English lexicography. Similar normative-defining dictionaries had already been compiled for French and Italian. Johnson confessed that these dictionaries had set an example for him. But he was aware of both their merits and faults, and critically approached the underlying lexicographic principles.

«A Dictionary of the English Language in Which the Words are Deduced from Their Originals and Illustrated in Their General Significations by Examples from the Best Writers» (London, 1775) had two parts. The first part consisted of «Preface», «The history of the English language» and «The grammar of the English language», the second part was the dictionary corpus, comprising 40,000 entries. A central concern of S.Johnson's research of the lexicon was the study of current English and selection of those words which could be considered to be the norm. Otherwise stated, S.Johnson's Dictionary was a prescriptive one.

The most important innovations of the Dictionary were a) clear differentiation of senses (separate meanings were neatly arranged and enumerated); b) each meaning was illustrated by quotations from «the best writers».

About 114,000 examples used in the Dictionary perform the following important functions: a) they prove that the word is not a fiction of the lexicographer's brain but a fact of language; b) they reinforce sense distinctions; c) they help the user to gain a deeper insight into the collocational, colligational and stylistic peculiarities of the headword; d) they point to the chronological limits of the language period under discussion.

S.Johnson planned to use quotations in chronological order to show how the semantic structure of the word was changing over a certain period of time. But this idea could be implemented into practice only in the «Oxford English Dictionary», originally called the «New English Dictionary» (1888—1928).

The OED is the most comprehensive and authoritative dictionary of the English language. It was compiled by the English Philological Society. The work began in 1857, the first volume was published in 1888, the last one – in 1928, and a Supplement – in 1933. The second edition of the OED which recorded the language of the 20th century was published in 1989. Now the OED consists of twenty volumes and the number of entries amounts to more than 325,000.

The purpose of the dictionary was to record the history of all the English words since 1150. The dictionary registers different spellings of the word, its etymology, modern pronunciation, grammatical information and the account of usage over the period of the word existence. Each use is illustrated by a selection of quotations which give the user an idea of the chronological sequence of development of the word semantics. The dictionary indicates the subject field for which this or that use is characteristic and provides senses with stylistic labels. The OED comprises not only literary English words but also scientific and technical words, neologisms and a great number of obsolete, archaic, and dialectal uses.

The Oxford University Press published different abridged versions of the OED «for those who were interested in the history of the English language from the days of King Alfred». They are based on the same principles as the OED: the historical record of the English lexicon and the use of key quotations. «The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary» is the best known one.

The number of dictionaries of English published in Great Britain in the 20th century is so great that it is impossible even to mention all the titles to say nothing of describing dictionaries in detail. The most popular one-volume general-purpose dictionaries are «The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English», the «Collins Concise Dictionary», Chambers English Dictionary, the «Longman Dictionary of the English Language» etc. All of them contain detailed guidance on the understanding and the general use of current idiomatic English.

General-purpose dictionaries cannot satisfy those who are in need of expert guidance on some specific aspects of English. They can consult numerous dictionaries which provide the user with special information of various kinds. Special philological dictionaries are legion: pronuncia-tion, etymology, usage, synonymy, idioms, slang, and many other linguistic phenomena are treated in dictionaries of this kind.

3. American Lexicography

The first American dictionaries of English were based on British dictionaries of the 18th century. Curiously enough, the first American dictionary was made by a Connecticut schoolmaster whose name was Samuel Johnson in 1798. «A School Dictionary» by S.Johnson had only 4,150 entries and did not differ from British dictionaries. In 1800

S.Johnson together with John Elliot published a new dictionary «A selected, pronouncing accented dictionary» which was also a learner's dictionary. It has a reference section containing some information on grammar, etymology and derivation. The word-list comprised not only native English words but also a few borrowings from Indian languages.

A truly American dictionary was compiled by Noah Webster. His two volume «American Dictionary of the English Language» was published in 1828 and had 70,000 entries. Noah Webster's dictionary contained many Americanisms, that is words borrowed from Indian languages and Spanish which became part and parcel of the American variant of English in the 19th century. Webster's definitions were more precise and scientific than those in S.Johnson's Dictionary oriented at the language of the best British writers. Webster also tried to simplify the spelling and pronunciation that were current in American English of the period. A very important feature of this dictionary is a number of Supplements providing the user with a wealth of various encyclopaedic information.

After Webster's death in 1843 George and Charles Merriam, publishers from the state of Massachusetts, bought the copyright for his famous dictionary, and now its shorter versions are published under the name of *Merriam-Webster*. The latest revised edition «Webster's Third New International Dictionary» has 460,000 entries, and lays special emphasis on present-day English. It has more quotations but less encyclopaedic information than the previous edition.

Chapter 2.
Learners' Monolingual Dictionaries

1. Learners' Lexicography in Britain

The development of the learner's lexicography in Great Britain goes back to the 1930s. The first monolingual dictionary of English for foreign learners was compiled by M.West and J.G.Endicott in 1935 («New Method English Dictionary». London: Longmans Green). The dictionary had about 30,000 entries. The compilers made a successful attempt to define these words with the help of a vocabulary consisting of only 1,490 words. This facilitated the use of the dictionary by a foreigner with limited knowledge of English.

In 1942 in Japan A.S.Hornby, E.V.Gatenby and H.Wakefield published the «Idiomatic and Syntactic English Dictionary» (Tokyo: Kaitakusha) which was later retitled «Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English» (OALD) and became the most authoritative reference book for foreign learners of English all over the world.

Until 1978 the OALD was the only learner's dictionary of English. Then the «Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English» (LDCE) appeared and in the late 1980s one more learner's dictionary was published – the «Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary» (COBUILD). 1995 could be called a 'lexicographic year': three new editions of English learner's dictionaries (OALD 5, LDCE 3 and COBUILD 2) and two new dictionaries – «Cambridge International Dictionary of English» (CIDE) and «Harrap' Essential English Dictio-nary» (HEED) came out almost simultaneously. The HEED, however, has not reached the Russian market yet. This is the reason why, in what follows, we shall dwell on the other four dictionaries whose new editions (OALD 6, LDCE 4 and COBUILD 3) came out in 2000—2002, and discuss the features which unite and distinguish them. We shall consider them against the background of general principles of learners' lexicography.

To gain a deeper insight into typical features of a learner's dictionary let us first compare the entries for the word *gun* in the «Concise Oxford Dictionary» (COD) and the «Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary» (OALD).

The Concise Oxford Dictionary

gu-n *n. & v.* (-nn-). 1. *n.* Metal tube for throwing missiles with gunpowder or other propellant; piece of ordnance, cannon, rifle, carbine, pistol; **big** ~, (sl.) important person;**blow great ~s,** (of wind) blow violently; **give** (engine, motor vehicle) **the** ~, (colloq.) cause acceleration of; **going great ~s,** proceeding vigorously towards success; **son of a** ~, (colloq.) contemptible person (also joc.); SPIKE1 person's *guns* **stick to** one's ~s, maintain one's position under attack (lit. or fig.). 2. Starting-pistol; **beat** or **jump the** ~, start before the signal is given, (fig.) act before permitted or agreed or proper time. 3. Device for discharging insecticide, grease, electrons, etc., in desired direction. 4. Member of shooting-party; *gunman. 5. **~rboat,** small vessel of shallow draught and with relatively heavy guns *(~boat diplomacy,* diplomacy supported by use or threat of military force); *gun-CARRIAG-E;* **~-cotton,** explosive used for blasting, made by steeping cotton in nitric and sulphuric acids; ~ **crew,** team manning gun; ~ **dog,** dog trained to follow sportsmen who use guns; *~-**fight,** (colloq.) fight with firearms; **~-fire,** firing of gun(s), esp. (Mil. & Naut.) of morning or evening gun to show time, or independent firing by each gun of a battery; **~-harpoon** (propelled from gun, not by hand); **~-layer,** one whose task is to aim large gun; **~-lock,** mechanism by which charge of gun is exploded; **~'man,** man armed with gun, assassin using gun; **~-metal,**

alloy of copper and tin or zinc (formerly used for guns), dull bluish-grey colour; ~ **moll,** (sl.) gangster's mistress, woman criminal with gun; **~-pit,** excavation to protect guns and gun crews; **~-play,** use of firearms, gun-fight; **at ~rpoint,** under threat of injury by a gun; **~rpowder,** (1) explosive of saltpetre, sulphur, and charcoal, *(Gunpowder Plot,* 5 Nov. 1605 to blow up Parliament), (2) fine green tea of granular appearance; ||~rroom, (1) room for sporting-guns etc. in house, (2) compartment in warship fitted up for junior officers or as lieutenants' mess-room (orig. for gunner and his mates); **~-runner, – running,** (person engaged in) illegal introduction of firearms into country;

~rshot, (1) shot fired from gun, (2) range of gun (o;// *of, within, gunshot)*; **~-shy,** (esp. of sporting dog) frightened at report of gun;

«~-site, (usu. fortified emplacement for gun; **~-slinger,** gunman; **~rsmith,** maker and repairer of small firearms; **~-stock,** wooden mounting of gun – barrel. 6. Hence *(heavily* etc.) /^nED2 (-nd), ~rless, *adjs.* 7. *r.t.* Shoot at; shoot *(down);* accelerate (engine etc.). 8. *v.i.* Go shooting; ~ **for,** seek with gun, (fig.) seek to attack, harm, or destroy. (ME *gunne, gonne,* perh. f. **Gunna* pet-form of Scand. *Gunnhildr* woman's name.)

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English

gun /gAn/ *n* 1 (C) any type of weapon that fires bullets or shells (shell 4a) from a metal tube: *fire a gun ° threaten sb with a gun ° Look out, he's got a gun! ° a warship with 16-inch guns ° anti-aircraft guns ° a toy gun ° a gun battle between rival gangs.* See also airgun, handgun, machine-gun. ☐ picture.

2 the gun (sing) the signal to begin a race, made by firing a starting pistol(i): *Wait for the gun!* 3 (C) (esp in compounds) a tool that forces out a substance or an object: *a 0grease-gun ° a 0 staple-gun.* 4 (C) (US *infml*) a person who carries a gun in order to shoot people: *a hired gun.* **IDM going great guns** ☐ great,**jump the gun** ☐ JUMP1 **spike sb's guns** ☐ spike *v.* **stick to one's guns** ☐ STICK2.

> **gun** *v* (-nn-)**phr v be 0gunning for sb** *(infml)* to be looking for an opportunity to criticize sb/**gun sb 0down** *(infml)* (usu passive) to shoot sb, esp killing or seriously injuring them: *He was gunned down as he left his home.*

· **0gun dog** *n* a dog trained to help in the sport of shooting, eg by collecting birds that have been shot. **0gun-metal** *n* (U) a metal that is a mixture of copper and tin or zinc: *gun-metal grey* (ie a dull, bluish-grey colour).

gunboat /0gAnbqVt/ *n* a small warship carrying heavy guns or missiles.

· **0gunboat di0plomacy** *n* (U) political negotiation supported by the threat of force.

gunfire /0gAnfaIq(r)/ *n* (U) the firing of a gun or guns or the sound of this: *hear the crack of gunfire ° A burst of gunfire came from our left.*

A close comparison of the two entries reveals many interesting similarities and differences. In both cases the headword is printed in bold type, the word is provided with the indication of the word-class – *n* (OALD) and *n.& v.* (COD) printed in italics, different senses of the word are separated from one another by numbers and each sense is defined. In both entries there are idioms, compounds and phrasal verbs but their presentation is different: in the OALD there are special signs which make it easier for the user to find them in the entry.

What are other differences? The way the pronunciation is given differs: the OALD uses International Phonetic Alphabet symbols whereas the COD has transcription without respelling. If the COD occasionally illustrates a sense of the word, the OALD does it regularly and provides the user with plenty of examples. In addition, the OALD specifies grammatical information necessary for correct uses of the word in different senses (1. – (C) – countable, 2. (sing) – singular).

The COD entry contains some etymological information which is absent in the OALD. But the latter finds it necessary to give users an idea of different types of the gun and draws their attention to some of its parts which are clearly seen in the picture.

Another difference is its treatment of derived words. The COD includes them in the same entry, the OALD treats them as separate entries.

It follows that the learner's dictionary avoids difficulties and strives for clearer presentation of various linguistic information. Here are the design features of learner's monolingual dictionaries as described by R.R.K.Hart-mann («The Dictionary as an Aid to Foreign-Language Teaching», 1989):

1) the word-list is selected according to criteria of frequency and usefulness;

2) the definitions are geared to the more limited vocabulary of the foreign learner;

3) the different senses of the headword are clearly descriminated;

4) collocational detail is provided, usually by example sentences;

5) grammatical coding is detailed and explicit;

6) phonetic transcription is international;

7) stylistic information is given, typically by usage labels;

8) textual transparency is considered desirable;

9) historical etymological information is (usually) avoided;

10) cultural information is (occasionally) provided, e.g. by pictures.

A detailed reference guide to the language, the learner's dictionary, then, can help learners to build their active vocabulary, produce more accurate written work, make bright speeches and improve their reading comprehension and translation skills.

It follows from what has been expounded above that the reference needs of their users are the ultimate justification for dictionaries. «If the users happen to be learners of foreign languages, dictionary compilers have special responsibilities and opportunities to select and present the information in ways appropriate to their particular reference skills» (*Hartmann, R.R.K.* The Dictionary as an Aid to Foreign-Language Teaching. 1989). Thus, the most important characteristic of learner's lexicography is its anthropocentric nature. The underlying principal of the learner's dictionary is its pedagogical orientation.

2. Advantages and Disadvantages of Learners' Monolingual Dictionaries of English

Now let us see how the above principles are implemented in four most popular British learners' dictionaries of English mentioned above.

First of all it should be mentioned that the dictionaries under analysis concentrate on the common core standard vocabulary of English. They cover from 60,000 to 80,000 basic words and phrases in American and British English. The number of entries varies from dictionary to dictionary depending on whether derivatives and some compounds are included in the same entry as the root word or are treated as separate headwords.

In contrast with general purpose dictionaries for natives the four learners' dictionaries are characterized by clear definitions written in simple language. More than that, the OALD, the LDCE and the CIDE have special defining vocabularies consisting of a limited number of words by means of which all the words and phrases registered by the dictionary are defined.

As far as the COBUILD is concerned the definitions are written in full sentences, in «natural straightforward English so that they are comprehen-sible to every user». For example, this is how the verb *to indicate* is defined in the dictionaries under discussion:

OALD

indicate /rIndIkeIt/ *v* 1(a) ~ sth (to sb) to show sth

LDCE

indicate

3 > YOUR WISHES/INTENTIONS (T) to say or do something to make your wishes, intentions, etc clear

CIDE

in-di-cate *(obj)|* show | /rIn-dI-keIt/ *v* to show, point or make clear in another way

COBUILD

indicate

2. If you **indicate** an opinion, an intention, or a fact, you mention it in an indirect way.

It should also be mentioned that in the LDCE and the CIDE there is a special system of 'signposts' which guides the user to the meaning he/she is looking for.

As is well known, extensive grammatical information is a must in a learners' dictionary because in contrast with natives foreigners cannot be satisfied with a mere 'address' of the word-class membership, they require much more information to be able to use the word properly in speech of their own. This is the reason why the four dictionaries put special emphasis on the description of grammar. To illustrate the different policies used by the dictionaries under discussion, to clarify grammatical information let us consider the way the verb *to indicate* is treated in the four dictionaries.

The OALD and the LDCE have elaborate systems of grammar codes (underlined in the entries below) which help the user to gain a deeper insight into grammatical functioning typical of the word, for example:

OALD

indicate /rIndIkeIt/ *v* 1(a) ~ sth (to sb) to show sth: (**Vn**) *a sign indicating a crossroads ahead* (**Vpr.** *wh*) *With a wave of his hand he indicated to me where I should sit.* (**V.** *that*) *She indicated that I should wait a moment.* (**also V.** *wh***,Vnpr,Vpr.** *that*). (b) to be a sign of sth; to suggest that sth is possible or likely: (**Vn**) *A red sky at night often indicates fine weather the following day.* (**V.** *that*). *Was there any evidence to indicate that he planned to return?* (c) to give the specified reading or measurement on a scale: (**Vn**) *The speedometer was indicating 95 mph.*

LDCE

indicate1 FACTS (**T**) to show that a particular situation exists or that something is likely to be true: *The survey results seem to indicate a connection between poor housing conditions and bad health.* | **indicate that** *This indicates that rape is more widespread than people believe.*

In the latest editions of these dictionaries grammar codes were simplified and became more explanatory. Still, in order to use grammar codes more or less automatically the user has to memorize them.

In the COBUILD grammatical notes are moved to the extra column in the margin. The terms used to describe syntactic patterns are explained in the dictionary and the user can find them following alphabetical order. It should be noted, however, that they are fairly transparent and can be easily understood, for example:

indicate VERB

V that

V n

V wh

The CIDE approaches the problem of grammar presentation in a different way. This dictionary tries to combine the etic and emic aspects of grammar, that is the entry comprises both, a number of sentences and the abstract pattern which can be derived by the user from the above sentences, for example:

in-di-cate *(obj)* | show | /rIn-dI-keIt/ *v* to show, point or make clear in another way · *The label on the packet* 65 *indicated all the ingredients in the biscuits.* · *Data obtained from exploratory*

investigations indicate large amounts of oil below the sea-bed in this area. · *Please indicate which free gift you would like to receive.* (+ ***wh*-word**) · *Initial results indicate* (that) *the election result is* 70 *going to be very close.* (+ ***(that)*** **clause**) · *She indicated to me* (that) *she didn't want me to say anything.* (+ ***(that)*** **clause**)

Thus, it is evident that progress has certainly been made since the time grammatical information was first introduced into learners' dictionaries. Still, very much remains to be done to make the presentation of this kind of data consistent and easily accessible for the user.

Even if you know a typical colligation it is not enough to be able to use the word correctly. The dictionary user should be also informed about its typical collocations. All learners' dictionaries pay due attention to the idiomatic character of language and try to provide users with ready-made contexts, which can become part of their vocabulary. The user can learn about the collocational peculiarities of the word either from definitions, like in the COBUILD, for example:

6. When drivers **indicate,** they make lights flash on one side of their vehicle to show that they are going to turn in that direction or from example sentences and word-combinations that illustrate its possible contexts in speech. This is how the verb *to indicate* in the meaning 'to signal that one's vehicle is going to change direction' is illustrated in the dictionaries under analysis:

OALD
Why didn't you indicate? He indicated (that) he was turning right.
LDCE
Don't forget to indicate before you pull out.
COBUILD
He told us when to indicate and when to change gear.
CIDE
He was indicating left but he turned right. · *Slow down as you approach the junction and indicate which way you're going to turn.*

It should be emphasized in this connection that the OALD frequently prefers series of word-combinations and thus provides the user with a wide range of standard collocations, for example:

facility – a piece of equipment, a building, a service, etc. that is provided for a particular purpose:*sports facilities, washing/postal/shopping/banking facilities, facilities for study (eg libraries)*

The CIDE and especially the COBUILD adduce full sentences, which make the word usage explicit. The LDCE combines both ways of indicating the special character of collocations.

In this connection the old controversy about the respective merits of authentic examples and examples made up by lexicographers should be touched upon. Examples provide both, an opportunity and a challenge to a lexicographer. On the one hand, given that there are clear and distinct meanings, which can be singled out within the word, it is theoretically possible to find authentic contexts or to make up artificial ones illustrating semantic, grammatical, pragmatic and socio-cultural features of the word in question. However, it should be emphasized in this connection that in learners' dictionaries examples serve two functions: they prove that the word is actually part of the word-stock of the given language and they are viewed as models to be imitated by users in speech of their own. So, the lexicographer's task is no easy one: the example has to be polyfunctional.

Thus, the opportunities are well known to the lexicographer and the challenge consists not in the theory but in the actual implementation of the theory in the dictionary. One important aspect of this activity involves an analysis of criteria to be adopted when selecting authentic contexts from a corpus. Scholars from the COBUILD project state that the examples should be typical, natural and authentic. But the trouble is that examples may be typical of British English and at the same time contain a vast amount of irrelevant for a foreign learner socio-cultural information. Or they may

sound natural to native speakers of English who may be so deeply imbued with their own culture that they have difficulty in knowing what information is culture specific.Thus, for instance:

foundation stone

The Princess of Wales laid the foundation stone for the extension of the Cathedral. (COBUILD)

Sometimes examples contain socio-cultural information which is ideologically relevant, for instance:

persecute

The Communists began by brutally persecuting the Catholic Church. (COBUILD)

It does not require a close examination to see that the example does not clarify the meaning of *persecute* especially if we take into account that this is the second illustrative phrase in the entry after the sentence: *Mr. Weaver and his family have been persecuted by the authorities for their beliefs.*

Of course, one should always bear in mind that there are many words which are inherently charged with socio-cultiral connotation. In this case if illustrative examples are properly chosen they make the socio-cultural connotation explicit and enrich the user's encyclopaedic knowledge, for example:

pagan – belonging to a religion which worshipped many gods and which existed before the main world religions: *The pagan festival of Easter was converted into the Christian festival of Easter, celebrating Christ's Resurrection.* (CIDE)

It follows that not all examples adduced in the dictionary entry may be useful and help the learner of English to make his/her speech more stylistically correct and idiomatic.

Another common feature of all the dictionaries under analysis is the system of style labels and usage notes, which help the user to match the word and context of situation.

It is well known that unlike the native speaker of the language who intuitively knows when to use a more formal or a more colloquial word, how to switch from written to spoken English, which register is appropriate in this or that case the foreign learner is often at a loss because he may be unaware of all the pragmatic subtleties involved. If the learner cannot use the language in such a way as to maintain and appropriately change his/her position in various communicative situations the result is that of a cultural lag. Modern dictionaries, however, have tried to solve this problem and with the help of style labels which provide the user with necessary information. The OALD, for example, treats the word *histrionic* in the following way:

histrionic – (*usu derog)* (of behaviour) very dramatic and intended to attract attention.

In the COBUILD the user will see the label 'pragmatics' in the Extra Column pointing to the explanations of how words express the speaker's intentions and attitudes. For example, the word *passive* is described in the following way. The label 'pragmatics' draws the user's attention to the following definition:

passive – If you describe someone as passive, you mean that they do not take action but instead let things happen to them: *used showing disapproval*.

It should be emphasized in this connection that the label 'pragmatics' is also important because it helps the user to choose a proper prosodic contour which matches the connotation expressed.

In addition to style labels in the OALD and the LDCE one can find special reference devices indicating the difference between oral and written English. This is how it is done in the LDCE:

Side by side with syntagmatic patterning the four dictionaries provide the user with paradigmatic information. To this end the OALD, the LDCE and the CIDE introduced 'usage notes', whereas COBUILD makes use of extra column, for example, in the entry of *old-fashioned* next to the meaning 'believing in old days, ideas, customs' there is its synonym *traditional*

introduced by the sign =. Whereas next to the meaning 'out of date' we find its antonym *modern* introduced by the crossed sign ☐.

Learners' dictionaries contain some encyclopaedic information, which can be either linguistic or non-linguistic. The latter comprises various data concerning geography, flora and fauna, on the one hand, and institutions, customs, systems and people of English speaking countries, on the other. The former is part and parcel of the inner side of the word.

Non-linguistic encyclopaedic information is traditionally presented in the form of tables, charts, pictures and maps. In the OALD, for example, there are special encyclopaedic pages in the middle of the dictionary. It was done deliberately: many teachers of EFL noticed that students hardly ever look at the back of the dictionary for encyclopaedic information. Now, colourful pages containing very useful socio-cultural data attract the user's attention immediately.

One should also mention tables of weights and measures (OALD, LDCE, CIDE), lists of geographical names (OALD, LDCE), common forenames (OALD), military ranks (OALD, LDCE), maps (OALD) and illustrations of trees, flowers, wild animals, etc., at the end or in the main part of the dictionary. They give the user a fuller picture of the cultural background of the English language.

It should be pointed out in this connection that both the OALD and the LDCE have parallel encyclopaedic editions («Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary». Encyclopaedic Edition; the «Longman Dictionary of Language and Culture»), which combine detailed linguistic information on the English language with explanations of the cultural allusions and connotations needed by advanced foreign learners to achieve fluency in this language.

An important lexicographic innovation contributing to the user's encyclopaedic knowledge was made by the compilers of the CIDE: many entries in this dictionary comprise well-known quotations from popular songs, books, films and television programmes. They are closely connected with headwords and, together with idioms, they form part of the frame of corresponding words (see above Part 1, Chapter 5. Phraseology).

For example, the frame of the verb *to buy* is created not only by all the components of business transactions reflected in its definition but also by the title of a famous song by the Beatles «Can't buy me love» which is firmly rooted in the mind of the native speaker of English. The entry of *peace* in the meaning 'no violence' includes the title of the song by John Lennon and the Plastic Ono Band «Give Peace a Chance» and a quotation from Neville Chamberlain's speech after the Munich Agreement with Hitler: «I believe it is peace for our time… peace with honour.»

To finish our analysis of the four dictionaries we should mention a few extra features, which keep them apart. It is but natural that each dictionary contains something that makes it different from its 'rivals'. Thus, for instance as far as the CIDE is concerned we should point to its 'false friends pages'. The dictionary tries to be as international as possible and to this end it provides false friends information for 14 European and Oriental languages. Here is a passage of the page where English and Russian are contrasted:

accord	аккорд	musical cord
accumulator	аккумулятор	storage battery
actual	актуальный	present, current, topical
advocate	адвокат	solicitor, barrister
affect	аффект	fit of passion
agitate	агитировать	to campaign, to persuade

Another innovative extra feature of the CIDE is a phrase index intended to make it easier for the user to find the headword under which a phraseological unit or idiom is dealt with.

The CIDE, the LDCE and the OALD attempt at incorporating some linguistic information into the body of the dictionary in the form of study pages or linguistic portrait entries. The OALD does it in the most rational way because here important linguistic information (for example, «What is collo-cation?») is combined with some didactic explanations («Colloca-tions in this dictionary»).

It follows from what has been expounded above that monolingual learners' dictionaries give clear and simple information on the meaning and use of essential English vocabulary items, help students to breakthrough from a basic survival vocabulary to greater spoken fluency and confidence in the written word and benefit students by teaching them English culture.

Chapter 3.
Bilingual Dictionaries

1. Confrontation of Words in Bilingual Dictionaries

Bilingual lexicography is at present a well established branch of linguistics, and we possess not only enormous numbers of bilingual and multilingual dictionaries of all kinds, but also comprehensive manuals on the subject. Yet it would be a mistake to believe that all the problems of bilingual lexicography have already been satisfactorily solved. This is the reason why the bilingual dictionary is always the centre of lexicographers' attention.

If we look at bilingual dictionaries from the user's perspective the first thing to be mentioned is this: bilingual general-purpose dictionaries, like monolingual ones, are directed at natives and foreign learners. The difference is in a more generous treatment of the part which represents the user's foreign language. Here are samples of the entries for *motive* in the English-Russian dictionary edited by Kenneth Katzner and the one edited by Olga Akhmanova and Elizabeth Wilson, the former is intended for native speakers of English, the latter – for Russian learners of English:

Kenneth Katzner

motive *n* мотив; побуждение.

Olga Akhmanova, Elizabeth Wilson

motive (rmqVtIv) *n* мотив; побуждение.

And here are samples of the entry for *мастер* in the twin Russian-English dictionaries of the same authors:

Kenneth Katzner

мастер (*pl* мастера) *n* 1. skilled craftsman. Сапожный мастер, shoemaker. Мастер по ремонту (+*gen*), repairman (*TV, washing machine, etc*). 2. master. Мастер рассказа, master storyteller. 3. fore-man. Мастер на все руки, jack-of-all-trades.

Olga Akhmanova, Elizabeth Wilson

мастер 1. (*на заводе*) foreman, skilled workman 2. (*знаток чего-л.*) expert; он ~ своего дела in his own field he is a past master; ~ спорта master of sports (a highly qualified athlete); ~ на все руки ~ Jack of all trades.

It does not require a very close examination to see that the English-Russian dictionary by Kenneth Katzner in contrast with that by Olga Akhmanova and Elizabeth Wilson does not transcribe the English word. It is taken for granted that the English speaker does not need this information.

In the Russian-English dictionary Kenneth Katzner gives the plural form of the noun in question and indicates the genitive case of nouns following the word-combination *мастер по ремонту*. If we took other entries we would see that they contain all irregularities in Russian verb conjugations and noun declensions. All this information is known by the Russian speaker and this is why it is not found in Olga Akhmanova's dictionary.

As for the correlation of L1 and L2 words within an entry it should be pointed out that the bilingual dictionary is always the projection of one language in terms of the other. Thus, for example, if we take Olga Akhmanova's dictionary we shall see that an L1 word has generally two L2 equivalents:

English-Russian Dictionary
modern
современный
новый

Russian-English Dictionary
современный
modern
contemporary

This feature of bilingual dictionaries is accounted for by partial semantic equivalence of juxtaposed English and Russian words. If, for example we compare the semantic structures of the English word *heart* and the Russian word *сердце* we shall see that in some senses they do not coincide.

Heart – 1. Part of body, the organ in the left side of the chest that pumps blood around the body;

2. feelings, emotions;

3. the most important part of something;

4. centre;

5. the smaller leaves in the middle of the cabbage

6. a thing shaped like a heart;

7. (hearts) one of the four sets of cards

сердце – 1. Центральный орган кровообращения в виде мускульного мешка (у человека в левой стороне грудной полости);

2. *перен.* Этот орган как символ переживаний, чувств, настроений человека;

3. *перен.* Важнейшее место чего-либо, средоточие.

In such cases the lexicographer has to turn to other words which would help to render the senses of the L1 word in the target language. Thus, the entry for *heart* in an English-Russian dictionary could look like this:

Heart — 1. сердце,

2. душа;

3. суть, сущность;

4. центр, средоточие;

5. кочерыжка;

6. в форме сердечка;

7. (в картах) червы.

and the entry for *сердце* in a Russian-English dictionary could be as follows:

Сердце – (в разн. знач.) heart.

If we turn to phraseology we shall find ourselves in deeper waters because even if the nominative basic meanings of the juxtaposed words coincide their collocations have little in common. Thus, for example, the word *brush* is translated as *щетка*. This equivalent, however, occurs only in one of the following pairs of equivalent collocations:

a brush for clothes – платяная **щетка**

to give one's clothes a good brush – хорошо почистить платье

to paint with a full brush – писать широкими мазками

Turner's magic brush – волшебная кисть Тернера

It follows from what has just been said that every time when a lexicographer compiles a bilingual dictionary he/she has to solve the problem of partial equivalene of two lexical systems.

2. Reversibility of Bilingual Dictionaries

The translator usually checks if the translation he/she has found in one part of the bilingual dictionary is also present in the other part. So, immediately a question is bound to arise: is it at all possible to expect regular reversibility in bilingual lexicography? Are there any constraints imposed on this kind of lexicographic confrontation?

Of course, one should always bear in mind that even today the making of bilingual dictionaries remains an arduous and unrewarding task, because there is never time enough for people to do the work properly. Instead of spending at least a week on the semantic confrontation of two or three English and Russian words the lexicographer is expected to complete the whole of the volume in a matter of couple of years. For this extralinguistic reason reversibility has never been aimed at. But is it at all possible to compile a twin bilingual dictionary in which one part would be the mirror of the other? Let us look at some groups of words which, presumably, would be the easiest to handle. A case in point is colour terms, a thematic group which has been studied in detail.

It does not require too much painstaking analysis to see that there exists a reasonable number of reversible colour terms:

белый	white	белый
черный	black	черный
желтый	yellow	желтый
зеленый	green	зеленый
сиреневый	lilac	сиреневый
фиолетовый	violet	фиолетовый
алый	scarlet	алый
лазурный	azure	лазурный

But there is all the difference in the world between basic colour terms (*white, black, yellow,* etc.) and words like, for example, *сиреневый – lilac* and *фиолетовый – violet*. If *фиолетовый* is correctly translated as *violet* and *сиреневый – lilac*, then what is the English for *лиловый* which in monolingual Russian dictionaries is defined as the colour of lilac or violet?

It is quite clear that the moment we abandon basic colour terms all kinds of difficulties arise. As for *сиреневый, лиловый, фиолетовый* and *lilac* and *violet* the trouble is that these words are on the periphery of the colour vocabulary and very few Russian speakers, especially men who are less sensitive to colours than women, can explain the difference between *сиреневый* and *лиловый*, on the one hand, and *лиловый* and *фиолетовый*, on the other. Here the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors come to the fore.

Besides, even if we take such colour terms which at first sight seem to be reversible it transpires that the corresponding collocations are incompatible. For example, *brown* and *коричневый* may seem absolute equivalents because in both languages there exists this notion and there is a separate word for it. But a closer study of various uses of the words shows that in actual fact they have little in common. In order to describe the colour of eyes, for example, the English use *brown* and *hazel,* whereas in Russian the word-combination *коричневые глаза* simply does not exist. There is only *карие глаза*. More than that the Russian adjective *коричневый* is never used to describe the human and horse's hair. We use *каштановый* for the human hair, and *буланый, гнедой* for the horse's hair. In English *chestnut* describes the colour of both human and horse's hair whereas the use of *bay* and *sorrel* is confined only to the description of the horse's hair.

It should be emphasized in this connection that the word-combinations *brown eyes* and *hazel eyes* are cliche'd and idiomatic. Consequently, the colour terms *brown* and *hazel* do not function here as separate full-fledged words but are engulfed, as it were, by the word-combination as a whole.

We face a different problem in the case of compounds:

кремовый	cream-coloured
песочный	sand-coloured
сизый	dove-coloured

The above words are not reversible in a shorter bilingual dictionary for the following reason: the name of every single object of nature, so long as it has its distinctive colour, can be used as a colour term but the morphology of such words in English and Russian is quite different. More than that, the pattern with the element-*coloured* is not at all universal (for example, is seems to be much more natural to say *olive-green* and not *olive-coloured*). It follows that a lack of consistency in the description of two languages is caused, among other things, by their lexical morphology. Not every word may be granted the entry status.

The objection to the mechanical empirical collating of the twin dictionaries is further corroborated by the analysis of some other thematic groups. If, for instance we turn to the thematic group 'Fauna' we shall see that here there are very many reversible words:

аист	stork	аист
акула	shark	акула
бабочка	butterfly	бабочка
барсук	badger	барсук
блоха	flea	блоха
воробей	sparrow	воробей

The only real difficulty about viewing these words in terms of reversibility is that we should decide, which of some non-equivalent names of birds, animals and fish must be included in the dictionaries. A case in point is the word *белуга* which is translated in the Russian English part as *white sturgeon,* but of course, nothing of the kind is mentioned in the English-Russian part. *Белуга* is a very rare species of fish which is found in the Black, Azov, Caspian and Adriatic seas. So, the word is rather a zoological term than part of general literary language.

It should also be emphasized in this connection that the given word is alien to Anglo-Saxon culture and for this reason has no proper English equivalent.

Culturally embedded words (for example, *смотрины, дача, поддёвка* in Russian, and *darts, sheriff, pub* in English) are generally transliterated and provided with an explanation in the foreign language entry. Such words are unique and for this reason reversibility is impossible.

So far we have considered those words which have tangible referents. The situation is no less difficult in the case of more abstract words. Let us turn to what can be described as the general scientific vocabulary, that is words most naturally used to impart intellective information, irrespective of whether the information is strictly scientific and pertains to exact or natural sciences, or whether the information is connected with findings, observations and generalizations in the broader field of the Humanities.

It is usually assumed that the main function of scientific prose is to prove certain points or assumptions; define and explain this or that phenomenon; pass on and sum up information; arrive at certain conclusions. Otherwise stated, the process of scientific research finds its reflection in the general scientific vocabulary.

Within the general scientific vocabulary there is, of course, a considerable number of rather long set phrases (gambits) which are important for the construction of discourse. They are said to be 'set' because they are not created in the flow of speech, but included as ready-made units, for example, *it is a well known fact that…, it should be noted that…, it should be added that…, as has been mentioned above…* These phrases, however, are complex equivalents of the word and are, for

this reason, are not considered in terms of reversibility. For the purposes of the present discussion we shall confine ourselves to the analysis of monolexemic units.

The moment we turn to the study of the general scientific vocabulary as represented in the twin dictionaries, we cannot fail to observe that this lexical subsystem is more readily reversible than the ones considered above:

закон	law	закон
уровень	level	уровень
материал	material	материал
метод	method	метод
вывод	conclusion	вывод
естественный	natural	естественный
детальный	minute	детальный
противопоставлять	oppose	противопоставлять
организовывать	organize	организовывать
оправдывать	justify	оправдывать

Conceivably the strongest single factor that has affected reversibility in this part of vocabulary is the existence of what Benjamin Whorf suggested to describe as the Average West European (AWE). Both in Russian and English the general scientific lexis forms a typical and very important aspect of the AWE. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the general scientific vocabulary is the basis of internationalizing the languages of the world.

However, even this fairly consistent part of the dictionaries under analysis presents some problems. The thing is that English words of Romance and Greek origin (and it is these words that form the basis of general scientific lexis in both languages) are semantically more complex than their Russian counterparts. It results in providing the majority of English words with two Russian equivalents: an etymologically allied word and its native synonym, for example:

aspect – аспект, вид

phenomenon – явление, феномен

It should be added that Russian words of Romance origin are stylistically marked and their continual use may make one's style pompous and gobbledegookish.

The difference between Russian equivalents is reflected in collocations which are not always registered by dictionaries. Thus, if we compare the entries for the adjective *social* in Akhmanova's and Katzner's English-Russian dictionaries we shall see that the adjective in question is provided with two equivalents which are used in different collocations:

social – социальный, общественный

social insurance – социальное страхование

social welfare* – социальное обеспечение

social origin – социальное происхождение

social sciences* – общественные науки

social labour – общественный труд

social consciousness – общественное сознание

The collocations marked by * are registered by Akhmanova,

whereas Katzner does not explain the difference between the Russian adjectives.

As far as the Russian-English section of the dictionary under discussion is concerned it is more consistent in the lexicographic treatment of etymologically identical words. In the vast majority of cases the Russian word is translated with the help of its etymon but this does not lead

to the reversibility. On the contrary there is an obvious discrepancy between English-Russian and Russian-English sections in presenting etymons, for example:

English-Russian section

argument – спор, дискуссия; довод

figurative – образный; переносный

Russian-English section

аргумент – argument

фигуральный – figurative

It follows from what has been expounded above that reversibility presents many problems because there are words *and* words. The greater part of the vocabulary does not lend itself to reversibility because of the clash of two cultures and differences in language structures.

3. Dictionary Word and Text Word

Another factor which influences the amount and nature of information in the entry is the size of the dictionary: the smaller the dictionary the more primitive the structure of the entry. Thus, for example, the entry for *cap* in the Pocket English-Russian dictionary edited by G.V.Chernov (eight thousand entries) treats the word in question as monosemantic and contains its two Russian equivalents. In Akhmanova's shorter English-Russian dictionary (twenty thousand entries) the entry distinguishes two meanings of the same word and adds the idiom *if (или where) the cap fits, wear it.* The medium-sized English-Russian dictionary compiled by V.K.Mьller (seventy thousand entries) treats the word as having eight meanings and in the entry there are six idioms. In the entry for the same word in the New English-Russian dictionary edited by Y.D.Apr'es'an (about 150,000 entries) there are sixteen meanings some of which are technical and fourteen idioms. Compilers provide the user with a number of examples which could not be included in the entry of dictionaries of a smaller size.

Whatever the size of the dictionary the user often fails to find an equivalent which would fit into the context of a text he has to translate, and gets irritated. The thing is that L2 equivalents should never be mistaken as **the** translation of an L1 item. Instead the user is to take them as a very concrete piece of advice about how and in which direction to look for possibly more appropriate L2 equivalents. As has been shown above it is next to impossible to equate words belonging to different lexical systems.

It is worth reminding the reader that translation is creative work, 'variation on the theme', whereas dictionaries are based on consistent confrontation of lexical systems. To prove that Olga Achmanova and Dmitrij Melenchuk made the following experiment (*Akhmanova, O., Melenchuk, D.* The Principles of Linguistic Confrontation. M., 1977, p. 12—21). The original English text and its Russian translation were confronted against the background of the back translation of the latter into English. Thus, the opening lines of «Vanity Fair» by W.M.Thackeray can be presented in the following way:

The original text

While the present century was in its teens, and on one sunshiny morning in June, there drove up to the great iron gate of Miss Pinkerton's academy for young ladies, on Chiswick Mall, a large family coach, with two fat horses in blazing harness, driven by a fat coachman in a three-cornered hat and wig, at the rate of four miles an hour.

Russian translation

Однажды, ясным июньским утром, когда нынешний век был зеленым юнцом, к большим чугунным воротам пансиона для молодых девиц под началом мисс Пинкертон, расположенного на Чизийской аллее, подкатила со скоростью четырех миль в час вместительная

семейная карета, запряженная парой откормленных лошадей в блестящей сбруе, с откормленным кучером в треуголке.

Back translation into English

Once, on a serene June morning, when the present century was still a green youth, to the big cast-iron gate of the boarding school for young girls under the guidance of Miss Pinkerton, situated on Chiswick Avenue, drove up at a speed of four miles an hour a capacious family coach, harnessed with a pair of fattened horses in glittering harness, with a well-fed coachman in a cocked hat and wig.

As the authors quite justly write the translation gives the reader an idea of the story «what it actually says does not make the effort needed to try and render the functional perspective, the general structure, the cadence, the syntax, the words, the assonance, etc.»

It is not our purpose to criticize the translation of the above passage. It should be mentioned, however, that if we look up the words *fat*, *academy*, *large* etc. in a bilingual dictionary we shall find a few Russian equivalents, none of which was used by the translator of the English text. The translator looked for synonymous words or expressions which, in his opinion, best suited the Russian version of the text.

It follows from what has been said above that the L2 equivalent in a bilingual dictionary gives a very general idea about the sense of the L1 item, and it is for the user to decide whether the «dictionary word» or one of its synonyms fits into the context in question.

Chapter 4.
Dictionary Use

Dictionaries are today being thrown onto the market at a rate that is unsurpassed in human history. The advances in learning theory, and more specifically the theories about how people learn second or foreign languages have influenced EFL lexicography which in its turn has stimulated expanded research in the fields of dictionary criticism and dictionary use.

Up to fairly recently there has existed what can be described as a 'vicious triangle' – 1) learner of a foreign language, 2) lexicographer, 3) teacher – each 'angle' of which is dissatisfied by the other two: learners find dictionaries less than attractive objects because they fail to extract relevant information. Lexicographers believe that insufficient use of the dictionary may be attributed to inadequate instruction by teachers. Teachers regard many dictionaries too sophisticated for their students.

True, in some cases there is a gap between the sophistication of some features of dictionary design and the user's often rudimentary dictionary reference skills. This is why lexicographers welcome feed-back from dictionary-users, analyse their attitudes and expectations, investigate the user's profile. Obtained data help to match the dictionary structure and the user's language needs.

The most comprehensive research aimed at the assessment of the effectiveness of dictionaries was conducted under the auspices of EURALEX (Atkins, Beril, T., Knowles, Frank, E. Interim Report on the EURALEX/AILA Research Project Into Dictionary Use. In: T.Magay and J.Zigбny (eds.). BudaLEX'88 Proceedings. Papers from the EURALEX Third International Congress. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1990). Over 1000 of students of EFL, native speakers of French, German, Italian and Spanish took part in this investigation. The researchers set out to look at what foreign learners of English actually do when they use a dictionary, that is how effective dictionaries are in helping students to carry out various operations (comprehension of L2, self-expression in L2). They wanted to find out whether bilingual and monolingual dictionaries are equally effective aids; what attitude students have to these two types of dictionaries; and how much instruction is being given in use of dictionaries.

Among other interesting and revealing statistical data the following set of figures is of particular significance for the present discussion. In spite of a generally recognized principle of foreign language teaching methodology that at some point between beginning a foreign language and (say) talking a University degree in it, dictionaries will have to be introduced as an aid to learning, of all the informants 60,4% had never been taught how to use a dictionary; 26,7% had had some instruction, but not precise nor systematic, and only 12,9% had had precise and systematic instruction in dictionary skills. It follows that one of the reasons for insufficient use of the dictionary is lack of instruction by teachers.

Another reason is that most of the time language learners are not aware of the range of dictionaries available and their purposes. In order to improve the situation teachers and lexicographers should act hand in hand and develop dictionary pedagogy and learner's lexicography

(*Морковкин, В.В., Кочнева, Е.М.* Ориентация на пользователя как доминанта учебной лексикографии. In: Hannu Tommola, Krista Varantola, Tarja Salmi-Tolonen, Jurgen Schopp (eds.). EURALEX'92 Proceedings. Volume 1. Tampere, 1992, p. 81—88.).

According to D.Heath who formulated the principles of dictionary pedagogy learners fail to use a dictionary to the best advantage because (1) they have a vague idea of what information can be retrieved from the dictionary; (2) they know next to nothing about lexicographic ways of presenting this information; (3) they believe that what they have produced is correct. This is why the dictionary pedagogy should comprise: 1) the 'what'(informing learners about the services

provided by the dictionary), 2) the 'how'(consultation techniques), 3) the 'when'(helping learners to develop a sense of the limits of their own competence in the foreign language) (*Heath, D., Herbst, T., Kuchrek, R.* Dictionary Techniques. Praktische Worterbucharbeit mit dem DCE. Workbook. Munchen: Langenscheidt-Longman GmbH., 1989).

Dictionary pedagogy puts forward the following key requirements: 1) learners should be introduced to dictionary use, and 2) they should constantly practice consultation techniques relating to different speech skills, that is text interpretation and text production. The introductory stage has three aspects: 1) a gradual introduction to the structure of the dictionary entry, 2) 'rules' generalizing important features of consultation technique, and 3) exercises which help the learner to master the above rules.

What has been said above underlies various dictionary workbooks that is manuals and user guides which aim at instructing learners in dictionary use. A detailed analysis of 40 such activity books has made it possible to create a checklist of dictionary skills (*Stark, M.P.* Dictionary Workbooks. A Critical Evaluation of Dictionary Workbooks for the Foreign Language Learner. Exeter Linguistics Studies. Volume 16, Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1990, p. 197):

1. Establishing which lexical item poses a problem;

2. Finding a lexical item in the dictionary macrostructure:

a) Mastering the alphabetical ordering of headwords;

b) Finding a lexical item in an entry with a different headword;

c) Finding a multi-word lexical item;

d) Choosing among homonyms, grammatical or semantic information;

e) Choosing among different senses in a polysemous entry;

f) Using more than one list in the microstructure of a dictionary;

3. Finding a piece of information in the microstructure:

a) Finding information about the spelling of words;

b) Finding information about the pronunciation of words;

c) Finding information about the usage;

d) Finding information about grammar of words;

e) Finding information about the meaning of words;

f) Finding related words;

g) Finding information about the history of words;

h) Using the equivalents proposed by the bilingual dictionary;

4. Choosing the appropriate dictionary according to the type of lexical item and to the type of information needed;

5. Knowing what to expect and what not to expect from dictionaries in general and from each dictionary in particular.

In a more general and schematic way the procedure of the dictionary use in the process of, for example, reading a text can be presented in the following way. (*Hartmann, Reinhard, R.K.* Learner's references: from the monolingual to the bilingual dictionary. In: Hannu Tommola and Krista Varantola, Tarja Salmi-Tolonen and Jurgen Schopp (eds.). EURALEX'92 Proceedings.Volume 1, Tampere, 1992, p. 67):

In

Stage one – select appropriate reference work

Stage two – determine problem word

Stage three – determine its canonical form

Stage four – search for appropriate headword

Stage five – determine appropriate sub-entry

Stage six – extract relevant information

Stage seven – relate to original context

Stage eight – success:

Yes – **out** No – **stage one**

In conclusion it should be stressed that international students studying EFL will undoubtedly benefit from the use of learner's dictionaries. But to make the process of dictionary use more effective they should develop dictionary reference skills. The earlier it is done the better.

Part 3.
Tasks and Exercises

Chapter 1.
Lexicology

1. The Size-of-Unit Problem

Exercise 1. **Read the passage given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

Lying on the floor of the flat-car with the guns beside me under the canvas I was wet, cold, and very hungry. Finally I rolled over and lay flat on my stomach with my head on my arms. My knee was stiff, but it had been very satisfactory. Valentini had done a fine job. I had done half of the retreat on foot and swum part of the Tagliamento with his knee. It was his knee all right. The other knee was mine. Doctors did things to you and then it was not your body any more. The head was mine, and the inside of the belly. It was very hungry in there. I could feel it turn over on itself, the head was mine, but not to use, not to think with, only to remember and not too much remember.

I could remember Catherine but I knew I would get crazy if I thought about her when I was not sure yet I would see her, so I would not think about her, only about her a little, only about her with the car going slowly clickingly, and some light through the canvas, and by lying with Catherine on the floor of the car. Hard as the floor of the car to lie not *thinking* only feeling, having been away too long, the clothes wet and the floor moving only a little each time and lonesome inside and alone with wet clothing and hard floor for a wife.

You did not love the floor of a flat-car nor guns with canvas jackets and the small of vaselined metal or a canvas that rain leaked through, although it is very fine under a canvas and pleasant with guns; but you loved someone else whom now you knew was not even to be pretended there; you seeing now very clearly and coldly – not so coldly as clearly and emptily. You saw emptily, lying on your stomach, having been present when one army moved back and another came forward. You had lost your cars and your men as a floorwalker loses the stock of his department in a fire. There was, however, no insurance. You were out of if now. You had no more obligations. If they shot floorwalkers after a fire in the department store because they spoke with an accent they had always had, then certainly the floorwalkers would not be expected to return when the store opened again for business. They might seek other employment; if there was any other employment and the police did not get them.

E. Hemingway

1. Apply the criterion of grammatical whole-formedness to the analysis of the opening sentence and show that the word is separable in the flow of speech.

2. Apply the criterion of residual separability to the analysis of any sentence and show the difference between morphemes and syncate-gorematic words.

3. Comment on the difference between the noun *floor* and the stem *floor–* using examples, taken from the text. Find other examples illustrating the difference between words and morphemes.

4. What is the difference between *a riot-car* and *a fine job* in terms of lexical articulation? Discuss their accentual patterns.

Exercise 2. **Read the passage given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

As the last car drove away the doctor and his daughters and Paul and Grimes walked up the drive together towards the Castle.

«Frankly the day has been rather a disappointment to me,» said the Doctor. «Nothing seemed to go quite right in spite of all our preparations.»

«And expense,» said Dingy.

«I am sorry, too, that Mr. Prendergast should have had that unfortunate disagreement with Mrs. Beste-Chetwynde's coloured friend. In all the ten years during which we have worked together I have never known Mr. Prendergast so self-assertive. It was not becoming of him. Nor was it Philbrick's place to join in. I was seriously alarmed. They seemed so angry, and all about some minor point *at* ecclesiastical architecture.»

«Mr. Cholmondicy was very sensitive,» said Flossie.

«Yes, he seemed to think that Mr. Prendergast's insistence on the late development of the rood-screen was in some way connected with colour prejudice. I wonder why that was? To *my* mind it showed a very confused line of thought. Still it would have been more seemly if Mr. Prendergast had let the matter drop, and what could Philbrick know of the matter?»

«Philbrick is not an ordinary butler,» said Dingy. «No, indeed not,» said the Doctor, «I heartily deplore his jewelry.»

«I didn't like Lady Circumference's speech,» said Flossie. «Did you?»

«I did not,» said the Doctor; «nor, I think, did Mrs. Clatterbuck. I thought her reference to the Five Furlong race positively brutal. I was glad Clatterbuck had done so well in the jumping yesterday.»

«She rather wanders from the point, doesn't she?» said Dingy. «All that about hunting, I mean.»

«I don't think Lady Circumference is conscious of any definite divisions in the various branches of sport. I have often observed in women of her type a tendency to regard all athletics as inferior forms of fox hunting. It is not logical. Besides, she w*as* nettled at some remark of Mr. Cholmondicy's about cruelty to animals. As you say, it was irrelevant and rather unfortunate. I also resented the references to the Liberal Party. Mr. Clutterbuck has stood three times, you know. Taken as a whole, it was not a happy speech. I was quite glad when I saw her drive away.»

«What a pretty car Mrs. Beste-Chetwynde has got!» said Flossie, «But how ostentatious of her to bring a footman.»

«I can forgive the footman,» said Dingy, «But I can't forgive Mr. Cholmondicy. He asked me whether I had ever heard of a writer called Thomas Hardy.»

«He asked me to go to Reigate with him for the week-end,» said Flossie, «in a rather sweet way, too!»

«Florence, I trust you refused?»

«Oh, yes,» said Flossie sadly. «I refused.»

They went up the drive in silence. Presently Dingy asked.

«What are we going to do about those fireworks you insisted on buying? Everyone has gone away.»

«I don't feel in a mood for fireworks,» said the Doctor. «Perhaps another time, but not now.»
Evelyn Waugh

1. Read the sentence «I don't think Lady Circumference is conscious of any definite division in the various branches of sport» and show the difference between segmentation of the flow of speech in the written and oral forms by means of traditional orthography and broad transcription.

2. Write out sentences in which words are brought out by means of logical stress and read them.

3. What words in the text under analysis are singled out by emphatic prosodic contour?

4. Comment on the prosodic arrangement of intensifiers which occur in the text.

Exercise 3. **Read the passage given below. Answer the questions and fulfil the tasks which follow it.**

«The first race will be a mile. Prendy, will you look after them? I want to see if Philbrick and I can fix up anything for the jumping?»

«But what am I to do?» said Mr. Prendergast.

«You make each group run to the Castle and back and take the names of the first two in each heat. It's quite simple.»

«I'll try,» he said sadly.

Paul and Philbrick went into the pavilion together.

«Me, a butler,» said Philbrick, «made to put up tents like a blinking Arab!»

«Well, it's a change,» said Paul.

«It's a change for me to be a butler», said Philbrick. «I wasn't made to be anyone's servant.»

«No, I suppose not.»

«I expect you wonder how it is that I come to be here?» said Philbrick.

«No,» said Paul firmly, «nothing of the kind. I don't in the least want to know anything about you, d'you hear?»

«I'll tell you,» said Philbrick, «it was like this.»

«I don't want to hear your loathsome confessions; can't you understand?»

«It isn't a loathsome confession,» said Philbrick. «It's a story of love. I think it is without exception the most beautiful story I know. I daresay you have heard of Sir Solomon Philbrick?»

«No,» said Paul.

«What, never heard of old Solly Philbrick?»

«No, why?»

«Because that's me. And I can tell you this. It's a pretty well-known name across the river.You've only to say Solly Philbrick, of the „Lamb and Flag", anywhere south of Waterloo Bridge to see what fame is. Try it.»

«I will one day.»

«Mind you, when I say *Sir* Solomon Philbrick, that's only a bit of fun, see? That's what the boys call me. Plain Mr. Solomon Philbrick I am, really, just like you or him», with a jerk of the thumb towards the playing-fields, from which Mr. Prendergast's voice could be heard crying weakly: «Oh, do get into line, you beastly boys,» but *Sir* Solomon's what they call me. Out of respect, see?»

«When I say, 'Are you ready? Go!' I want you to go,» Mr. Prendergast could be heard saying. «Are you ready? Go! Oh, why *don't* you go?» And his voice became drowned in shrill cries of protest.

«Mind you,» went on Philbrick, «I haven't always been in the position that I *am* now. I was brought up rough, damned rough. Ever heard speak of «Chick» Philbrick?»

«No, I'm afraid not.»

«No, I suppose he was before your time. Useful little boxer, though. Not first-class, on account of his drinking so much *and* being short in the arm. Still, he used to earn five pound a night at the Lambeth Stadium. Always popular with the boys, he was even when he was so full, he couldn't hardly fight. He was my dad, a good-hearted sort of fellow but rough, as I was telling you; he used to knock my poor mother about something awful. Got jugged for it twice, but my! he took it out of her when he got out. There aren't many left like him nowadays what with education and whisky the price it is.»

Evelyn Waugh

1. Write out sentences from the above passage containing italicized words and discuss their prosody.

2. Adduce examples of prosodically marked words determined by their inherent connotation.

3. What is the difference between *a blinking Arab* and *a loathsome confession* in terms of the correlation of connotation and prosody?

4. The word *butler* occurs twice in the text. In the first sentence it is brought out in the flow of speech while in the second – it is said neutrally. Why?

Test Questions

1. What is meant by 'separability' and 'separateness' of a word?

2. What criteria are applied to single out categorematic and syncategorematic words?

3. Can we speak of isomorphism between written and oral forms of speech in so far as lexical articulation is concerned?

4. When and how is the word brought out in the flow of oral speech?

2. The Identity-of-Unit Problem

Exercise 1. **Read the passage given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

In civilian clothes I felt a masquerader. I had been in uniform a long time and I missed the feeling of being held by your clothes. The trousers felt very floppy, I had bought a ticket at Milan for Stresa. I had also bought a new hat. I could not wear Sim's hat but his clothes were fine. They smelled of tobacco and as I sat in the compartment and looked out of the window the new hat felt very new and the clothes very old. I myself felt as sad as the wet lombard country that was outside through the window. There were some aviators in the compartment who did not think much of me. They avoided looking at me and were very scornful of a civilian of my age. I did not feel insulted. In the old days I would have been insulted them and picked a fight. They got off at Jallarate and I was glad to be alone. I had the paper but I did not read it because I did not want to read about the war. I was going to forget the war. I had made a separate peace. I felt damned lonely and was glad when the train got to Stresa.

At the station I had expected to see the porters from the hotel but there was no one. The season had been over a long time and no one met the train. I got down from the train with my bag. It was Sim's bag, and very light to carry, being empty except for two shirts, and stood under the roof of the station in the rain while the train went on. I found a man in the station and asked him if he knew what hotels were open. The Grand Hotel des Iles Borromees was open and several small hotels that stayed open all the year. I started in the rain for the Iles Borromees carrying my bag. I saw a carriage coming down the street and signalled to the driver. It was better to arrive in a carriage. We drove up to the carriage entrance of the big hotel and the concierge came out with an umbrella and was very polite.

I took a good room. It was very big and light and looked out on the lake. The clouds were down over the lake but it would be beautiful with the sunlight. I was expecting my wife, I said. There was a big double-bed, a letto matrimoniale, with a satin coverlet. The hotel was very luxurious.

E. Hemingway

1. Look up the words *masquerader, aviator, separate, except, to expect, concierge, luxurious* in an English pronouncing dictionary, transcribe them and comment on the phonetic variants of these words.

2. What phonetic variants has the noun *hotel*? Can you adduce simi-lar examples of phonetic variation?

3. What phonetic variants has the conjunction *and*? Comment on its variation in the text under analysis.

4. Write out other cases of automatic phonetic variation.

Exercise 2. **Read the passage given below, answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

In front of the house where we lived the mountain went down steeply to the little plain along the lake and we sat on the porch of the house in the sun and saw the winding of the road down the mountain side and the terraced vineyards on the side of the lower mountain, the vines all dead now for the winter and the fields divided by stone walls, and below the vineyards the houses of the town on the narrow plain along the lake shore. There was an island with two trees on the lake and the trees looked like the double sails of a fishing boat. The mountains were sharp and steep on the other side of the lake and down at the end of the lake was the plain of the Rhone Valley flat between the two ranges of mountains; and up the valley where the mountains cut it off was the Dent du Midi. It was a high snowy mountain and it dominated the valley but it was so far away that it did not make a shadow.

When the sun was bright we ate lunch on the porch but the rest of the time we ate upstairs in a small room with plain wooden walls and a big stove in the corner. We brought books and magazines in the town and a copy of *Hoyle* and learned many two-handed card games. The small room with the stove was our living-room. There were two comfortable chairs and a table for books and magazines, and we played cards on the dining-table when it was cleared away. Mr. and Mrs. Juttingen lived downstairs and we would hear them talking sometimes in the evening and they were very happy together too. He had been a head waiter and she had worked as maid in the same hotel and they had saved their money to buy this place. They had a son who was studying to be a head waiter. He was at a hotel in Zurich. Downstairs there was a parlour where they sold wine and beer, and sometimes in the evening we would hear carts stop outside on the road and men come up the steps to go in the parlour to drink wine.

E. Hemingway

1. Speak on the automatic phonetic variation adducing examples from the text under analysis.

2. The word *two-handed* has two accentual variants. Which variant is used in the text? Adduce analagous examples of your own.

3. Look up the verb *to learn* in a dictionary and discuss it in terms of grammatical variation. What other cases of the same kind do you know?

4. Are there any examples of prosodic variation of the word in the text under analysis?

5. Comment on the accentual variation of the word *downstairs* in the text under analysis.

Exercise 3. **Read the passage given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

Nothing more was said about Mr. Golspie, but on her way home Miss Matfield could not help thinking about him. She always had a book with her for the journey on the 13 bus to and from the office, but the jogging and the crowding, and the changing lights did not make reading easy, especially on the return journey to West Hampstead, and frequently she spent more time with her own thoughts than she did with those of her author. On this particular evening

Mr. Golspie claimed her attention, almost to the exclusion of anybody or anything else. She could not make up her mind about him, had no label or pigeonhole ready for him, and this annoyed her, for she liked to know exactly what she felt and thought about people; to be able to dismiss them in a phrase. The fact that Mr. Golspie spoke to her everyday, if only for a few minutes, gave her work to do, was sufficient to make her anxious to determine her attitude towards him. Men, with their thick skins and yawning indifference, might be able to work with people for years and not know or care anything about them as persons, but this drab stuff about «governors» and «colleagues» could find no place to stay in Miss Matfield's mind. In the talk among the girls in the Club, all the men who dictated letters to them became immense characters, comic, grotesquely villainous, or heroic and adorable. Their femininity, frozen for a few hours every day at the keyboard of their machines, thawed and gushed out in these perfervid personalities. Behind their lowered eyes, their demure expressions, as they sat with their notebooks on hard little office chairs, these comic and romantic legends buzzed and sang, to be released later in the dining-room, the lounge, the tiny bedrooms of

the Club. Thus, something had to be done about Mr. Golspie, who would have appeared to most of the girls, as Miss Matfield knew only too well, a gigantic find, a mine of glittering material. So far he had merely passed as «weird», but that would not do. It had not sufficed in Miss Matfield's private thoughts since the first two days.

J.B. Priestley

1. Write out even-stressed words and discuss their accentual variation in different contexts.

2. Find examples of phonetic variation proper. Consult an English pronouncing dictionary by Daniel Jones.

3. All the words in – *ic* in the text have forms in – *ical*. Are these units separate words or lexical morphological variants?

4. What words in the text can be discussed in terms of semantic variation? Which of them have prosodic variants?

Test Questions

1. What kinds of lexical variation do you know?

2. What is the difference between automatic, accentual, and emic kinds of phonetic variation?

3. Are morphemes in morphological variants unilateral or bilateral units?

4. What is the correlation between semantic and prosodic variants?

5. When do lexical variants become different words?

3. Item and Arrangement

Exercise 1. **Read the passage given below and complete the tasks which follow it.**

Her dreams that night were endless and uneasy; she rose heavy and unrested, and went at once to the study of Whitaker's Almanac. A Forsyte is instinctively aware that facts are the real crux of any situation. She might conquer Jon's prejudice, but without exact machinery to complete their desperate resolve, nothing would happen. From the invaluable tome she learned that they must each be twenty-one; or someone's consent would be necessary, which of course was unobtainable; then she became lost in directions concerning licenses, certificates, notices, districts, coming finally to the word «perjury». But that was nonsense! Who would really mind their giving wrong ages in order to be married for love. She ate hardly any breakfast, and went back to Whitaker. The more she studied the less cure she became; till, idly turning the pages, she came to Scotland. People could be married there without any of this nonsense. She had only to go and stay there twenty-one days, then Jon could come, and in front of two people they could declare themselves married. And what was more – they would be! It was far the best way; and at once she ran over her schoolfellows. There was Mary Lambe who lived in Edinburgh and was «quite a sport!» She had a brother too. She could stay with Mary Lambe, who with her brother would serve for witnesses. She well knew that some girls would think all this unnecessary, and that all she and Jon need do was to go away together for a week-end and then say to their people: «We are married by Nature, we must now be married by Law». But Fleur was Forsyte enough to feel such a proceeding dubious, and to dread her father's face when he heard of it. Besides, she did not believe that Jon would do it; he had an opinion of her such as she could not bear to diminish. No! Mary Lambe was preferable, and it was just the time of year to go to Scotland. More at ease now, she packed, avoided her aunt, and took a bus to Chiswick. She was too early, and went on to Kew-Gardens. She found no peace among its flower-beds, labelled trees, and broad green spaces, and having lunched off anchovy paste sandwiches and coffee, returned to Chiswick and rang June's bell. The Austrian admitted her to the «little meal-room». Now that she knew what she and Jon were up against, her longing for him had increased tenfold, as if he were a toy with sharp edges or dangerous paint such as they had tried to take from her as a child. If she could not have her way, and get Jon for good and all, she felt like dying of privation. By hook or crook she must and would get him! A round, dim mirror of very old glass

hung over the pink brick hearth. She stood looking at herself reflected in it, pale, and rather dark under the eyes; little shudders kept passing through her nerves. Then she heard the bell ring, and stealing to the window, saw him standing on the door-step smoothing his hair and lips, as if he too were trying to subdue the fluttering of his nerves.

John Galsworthy

1. Comment on the difference between grammatical and lexical morphemes using examples taken from the text.

2. Discuss the peculiarities of 'the one way' and 'the both ways' relationship using examples from the text.

3. Discuss the words *invaluable*, *unobtainable* and *preferable* in terms of the dialectical unity of grammatical and lexical morphologies.

4. Find in the text the words which can serve as examples of gradation.

Exercise 2. **Read the passage given below, fulfil the tasks which follow it.**

Mr. Bodiham was sitting in his study at the Rectory. The nineteenth-century Gothic **windows**, narrow and pointed, admitted the light **grudgingly**; in spite of the brilliant July weather, the room was sombre. Brown varnished book-shelves lined the walls, tilled with row upon row of those thick, heavy **theological** works which the second-hand **booksellers** generally sell by weight. The mantelpiece, the overmantel, a towering structure of spindly pillars and little shelves, were brown and varnished. The writing desk was brown and varnished. So were the chairs, so was the door. A dark red-brown carpet with patterns covered the floor. Everything was brown in the room, and there was a curious brownish smell.

In the midst of this brown gloom Mr. Bodiham sat at his desk. He was the man in the Iron Mask. A grey tallic face with iron cheekbones and narrow iron brow; iron folds, hard and **unchanging**, ran **perpendicularly** down his cheeks; his nose was the iron beak of some thin, delicate bird of rapine. He had brown eyes, set in sockets rimmed with iron; round them the skin was dark, as though it had been charred. Dense wiry hair covered his skull; it had been black, it was turning grey. His ears were very small and fine. His jaws, his chin, his upper lip were dark, iron-dark, where he had shaved. His voice, when he **spoke** and especially when he raised it in preaching, was harsh, like the grating of iron hinges when a seldom used door is opened.

It was nearly half past twelve. He had just come back from church, hoarse and weary with preaching. He preached with fury, with passion, an iron man beating with a flail upon the souls of his congregation. But the souls of the faithful at Crone were made of india-rubber, solid rubber; the flail rebounded. They were used to Mr. Bodiham at Crone. The flail thumped on india-rubber, and as often as not the rubber **slept**.

That morning he had preached, as he had often preached before, on the nature of God. He had tried to make them understand about God, what a fearful thing it is to fall into His hands. God – they thought of something soft, sad, merciful. They blinded themselves to facts; still more, they blinded themselves to the Bible. The passengers on the «Titanic» sang «Nearer my God to Thee» as the ship was going down. Did they realize what they were asking to be brought nearer to? A white fire of **righteousness**, an angry fire…

A. Huxley

1. Speak on the realization of the open juncture borrowing examples from the text.

2. Write out those cases where the internal juncture is realized to the full and discuss their prosody.

3. Discuss the word-combination *brownish smell* in terms of the correlation of connotation and prosody and comment on its morphological articulation.

4. Subject the words in bold type to morphological analysis.

Exercise 3. **Read the passage given below. Answer the questions and fulfil the tasks which follow it.**

He packed his two bags, gathered up his paints, dismantled his easel and prepared to leave the Ruche, for it had become abundantly clear that he too had fallen victim to the quantitative theory, the slam-bans method of painting first and thinking afterward. He would have to reflect the immensely beautiful but equally private world which he alone knew and he alone could transcribe to canvas.

He glanced about the room with an amused nostalgia, remembering the excitement with which he had entered it the first time; if Wichita had been his infancy, the Beehive had been his irrepressible adolescence. His eyes swept the stacks of canvases against the wall. He had made a thousand errors, traversed fields where he did not belong, only to learn that none of the going techniques or theories were for him. He could not copy, join, absorb, fall in line. What he finally put on canvas would be pure John Noble, recognizable across a sea of buffalo grass. His would be a lonely art, not tied up with any age, school or theory; but how could it be otherwise: was he not a lonely man?

With a quick gesture he took his penknife from his pocket and set to work destroying the paintings, even as he had his hundreds of sketches for Cleopatra back in Wichita.

After considerable searching he found a studio which occupied the entire top floor at 7 Rue Belloni. It had had many users before him, but he managed to conceal most of the past with a quick coat of paint. There was a good-sized skylight facing north, but this north light was both dark and cold. He thought, a north light like this can set a man back fifty years in painting.

He had told no one about his studio, not even Gerald Adams or Charbert, his closest friends at the Beehive. He was therefore all the more astonished when the door opened while he was painting the ceiling, and he heard a soft voice say:

«Tiens, tiens, what a big empty barn.»

He gazed down at Maud from the top rung of the ladder, his broad brush dripping paint onto the floor. She stared back at him boldly, then shrugged her shoulders and laughed.

«If you don't want me to know where you live, you'll have to go back to Wichita.»

«See here,» he exclaimed, «I want this kept absolutely quiet.»

She ignored his spluttering as unworthy of answer, then began looking about the studio and the small adjoining kitchen. He climbed down the ladder and followed her around hostilely.

Irving Stone

1. Write out the opening sentence of the passage and speak on the distinction between grammatical morphemes and lexical ones using examples from this sentence.

2. What is the difference between the morphological structure of the words *painting* and *ceiling*?

3. Find in the passage under analysis the cases of morphological gradation and comment on them.

4. What principle of morphological analysis can be applied to the word *recognizable* («…recognizable across a sea of buffalo grass»)? Represent it graphically.

Test Questions

1. What is the difference between leaxical morphology and grammatical morphology?

2. What is meant by the 'one way' and 'both ways' principles of segmantation of words?

3. What is 'internal juncture'?

4. When and under what circumstances is internal juncture realized in monolexemic words?

4. Item and Process

Exercise1. **Find in the texts given below words ending in – *er* and complete the tasks.**

«Their day is passing, and their type, not altogether for the advantage of the country. There were pedestrians, but they too were sound. I am the fourth Jolyon Forsyte – a poor holder of the name —»

«No, Dad,» said Jolly, and Holly squeezed his hand.

«Yes,» repeated Jolyon, «a poor specimen, representing, I'm afraid, nothing but the end of the country…»

John Galsworthy

Mr. Moon, with the air of a man who has remembered something which he had overlooked, shoved a sock in his guest's mouth and resumed his packing. He was what might be called an impressionist packer. His aim appeared to

be speed rather than neatness. He bundled his belongings in, closed the bag with some difficulty, and, stepping to the window, opened it. Then he

climbed out on to the fire-escape, dragged the suitcase after him and was gone.

P.G. Wodehouse

Much has been written on the subject of bed-books. The general consensus of opinion is that a gentle, slow-moving story makes the best opiate. If this be so, dear old Squiffy's choice of literature had been rather injudicious. His book was «The Adventure of Sherlock Holmes», and the particular story which he selected for perusal was the one entitled «The Speckled Band». He was not a great reader, but when he read, he liked something with a bit of zip to it.

P.G. Wodehouse

From within, through the open transom, came the rhythmical snoring of a good man taking his rest after the labours of the day. Mr. Brewster was always a heavy sleeper.

P.G. Wodehouse

Still, you're doing fine. You only need patience. Everything comes to him who waits. Archie sat up, electrified. «I say, by Jove, that's rather good, what! Everything comes to him who waits, and you're a waiter…»

P.G. Wodehouse

She remembered with sudden vividness how nice she herself had looked in those old days when her heart was set on Philip Bosinney, that dead lover, who had broken from her to destroy for ever Irene's allegiance to this girl's father. Did Fleur know of that, too?

John Galsworthy

Archie was not an abnormally rapid thinker, but he began at this point to get a clearly defined impression that this lad, if invited, would waive the formalities, and consent to join his meal.

P.G. Wodehouse

The Rev. Thomas was a man of extreme nervous temperament. He was, par excellence, a fusser, and when he fussed, his digestive apparatus collapsed and he suffered agonizing pains.

Agatha Christie

«I've made nothing that will live!» thought Jolyon.

«I've been an amateur – a mere lover, not a creator. Still, I shall leave John behind me when I go. What luck that the boy had not been caught by that ghastly war!»

John Galsworthy

1. Write out formations in – *er* which have homonymous words with lexicalized meaning and comment on their correlation.

2. Find passages in which words in – *er* function on the semantic level. Comment on them.

3. Comment on passages with metasemiotically marked words in – *er*.

4. What is the lexical category of simulation constituted by? Give examples of the marked member of the opposition from the passages given above.

5. Comment on the sociolinguistic determination of the marked member of the category in question.

6. Give other illustrations of the category under consideration.

Exercise 2. **Read the passages given below and complete the tasks which follow them.**

She had been changing her frock, and was still imperfectly clothed; a striking figure before her glass. There was a certain magnificence about her arms, shoulders, hair, which had darkened since he first knew her, about the turn of her neck, the silkiness of her garments, her dark-lashed, grey-blue eyes – she was certainly as handsome at forty as she had ever been.

John Galsworthy

The last of the old Forsytes was on his feet, moving with the most impressive slowness, and an air of perfect concentration on his own affairs, backward and forward between the foot of his bed and the window, a distance of some twelve feet.

John Galsworthy

She was looking forward to her young half-brother with a mother-liness not exhausted by Val. A three-day visit to Robin Hill, soon after their arrival home, had yielded no right of him – he was still at school; so that her recollection, like Val's, was of a little sunny-haired boy, stripped blue and yellow, down by the pond.

John Galsworthy

To Forsyte imagination that house was now a sort of Chinese pill-box, a series of layers in the last of which was Timothy. One did not reach him, or so it was reported by members of the family who, out of old-time habit or absent-mindedness would drive up once in a blue moon and ask after their surviving uncle.

John Galsworthy

«I say, there seems to be something on your mind. What's the trouble?»

«The waiter shrugged his shoulders, as if indicating an unwillingness to inflict his grievances on one of the tipping classes.»

P.G. Wodehouse

It amazed Archie through the whole of a long afternoon to reflect how swiftly and unexpectedly the blue and brilliant sky of life can cloud over and with what abruptness a man who fancies that his feet are on solid ground can find himself immersed in Fate's gumbo.

P.G. Wodehouse

At the pianola, Henry Wimbish, smoking a long cigar through a tunnelled pillar of amber, trod out the shattering dance music with serene patience. Locked together, Gombault and Anne moved with a harmoniousness that made them seem a single creature, two-headed and four-legged.

A. Huxley

Mr. Bodiham touched lightly on Solomon's temple. From thence he passed to temples and churches in general. What were the characteristics of these buildings dedicated to God? Obviously, the fact of their, from a human point of view, complete uselessness. They were unpractical buildings «carved with knops». Solomon might have built a library —indeed, what could be more to the taste of the world's wisest man?

A. Huxley

Huddled in her grey fur against the sofa cushions, she had a strange resemblance to a captive owl, bunched in its soft feathers against the wires of a cage. The supple erectness of her figure was gone, as though she had been broken by cruel exercise; as though there were no longer any reason for being beautiful, and supple, and erect.

John Galsworthy

1. Write out the realizations of the lexical-morphological category of quality from the passages given above and discuss the content and expression planes of these words.

2. What are the constituents of the category in question? Use examples from the texts given above.

3. Are there any constraints whatsoever imposed on the realization of the lexical-morphological category of quality?

4. Comment on the substantival and adjectival realization of the lexical-morphological category of quality using examples from the texts given above.

Exercise 3. **Read the passages given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow them.**

Irene uncovered her lips, and both her hands made a writhing gesture in front of her breast. Soames seized them.

«Don't!» she said under her breath. But he stood holding on to them, trying to stare into her eyes which did not waver. Then she said quietly:

«I am alone here. You won't behave again as you once behaved.»

«Dropping her hands as though they had been hot irons, he turned away. Was it possible that there could be such relentless unfor —

giveness!»

John Galsworthy

He sighed drowsily. The atmosphere of the auction room was close; you weren't allowed to smoke; and altogether he was beginning to regret that he had come. The service continued. Objects of various unattractiveness came and went, eulogized by the officiating priest, but coldly received by the congregation.

P.G. Wodehouse

What she did not like in George was his essential Georgeness.

P.G. Wodehouse

From time to time he sang slightly, and wondered idly if Lucille would put the finishing touch upon all-rightness of everything by coming to meet him and sharing his homeward walk.

P.G. Wodehouse

The young ladies were pretty, their manners winning, their dispositions unexceptionable; but there was a dignity in the air, a touch-me-not-ish-ness in the walk…

Ch. Dickens

I have already paid tribute above (Chapter 3) to the consistency and 'openness' of the 'allo-emic' terminology, following the text of the preface to my dictionary.

Olga Akhmanova

Recognizing the meaninglessness of words, in isolation, he (M. Twain) argued that no one can tell what a word spells when he sees it off by itself.

C.M. Babcock

Detail is restrained – a textured stitch to point-up a graceful collar, the setting of pockets or the placing of a button. Small things that add up to just-rightness.

«Vogue»

1. Find new formations in – *ness* and comment on their prosody.

2. Write out cases where words in – *ness* are used for stylistic purposes and comment on them.

Test Questions

1. What is meant by 'Item and Process'?

2. What is the definition of the 'lexical-morphological category'?

3. What is the difference between the concepts of 'productivity' and 'lexical-morphological category'?

4. What lexical-morphological categories of the English language do you know?

5. Lexical Meaning as a Linguistic Category

Exercise 1. **Read the passage given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

«Paul, dear,» she said one day as hand in hand, after a rather fearful encounter with a swan, they reached the shelter of the lake house. «I can't bear to think of you going back to that awful school. Do, please, write and tell Dr. Fagan that you won't.»

The lake house was an eighteenth-century pavilion, built on a little mound above the water, they stood there for a full minute still hand in hand on the crumbling steps.

«I don't quite see what else I could do,» said Paul. «Darling, I could find you a job.»

«What sort of job, Margot?» Paul's eyes followed the swan gliding serenely across the lake; he did not dare to look at her.

«Well, Paul, you might stay and protect me from swans, mightn't you?» Margot paused and then, releazing her hand, took a cigarette-case from her pocket. Paul struck a match. «My dear, what an unsteady hand. I'm afraid you're drinking too many of Peter's cocktails. That child has a lot to learn, yet about the use of vodka. But seriously I'm sure I can find you a better job. It's absurd your going back to Wales. I still manage a great deal of my father's business, yon know, or perhaps you didn't. It was mostly in South America in – in places of entertainment, cabarets and hotels and theatres, you know, and things like that. I'm sure I could find you a job helping in that, if you think you'd like it.»

Paul thought of this gravely.

«Oughtn't I to know Spanish?» he said. It seemed quite a sensible question, but Margot threw away her cigarette with a little laugh and said:

«It's time to go and change. You are being difficult this evening, aren't you?»

Paul thought about this conversation as he lay in his bath – a sunk bath of malachite – and all the time while he dressed and as he tied his tie he trembled from head to foot like one of the wire toys which street vendors dangle from trays.

Evelyn Waugh

1. Write out words which demonstrate different degrees of complexity of the correlation of meaning and form.

2. Discuss the words in the text which can be referred to a certain piece of extralinguistic reality. Compare them with their Russian counterparts.

3. What words in the text under analysis have no Russian equivalents?

4. *Fearful* and *awful* are translated into Russian as *ужасный*. Is there any difference between them?

5. Does the word *job* coincide with the word *работа*? Adduce examples illustrating their use in speech. Consult dictionaries.

Exercise 2. **Read the passage given below. Answer the questions and fulfil the tasks which follow it.**

Bewildered, Mr. Smeeth laid down the receiver and walked over to his desk. He had hardly time to collect his thoughts and to begin to wonder whether he ought to say something to the others, when the door flew open, almost like a vertical trap-door, to shoot into the middle of the office, where it suddenly stopped dead, the figure of a man. It was Goath. His ancient overcoat was still hanging from his shoulders as if it hardly belonged to him, but, on the other hand, his bowler-hat, instead of being at the back of his head, was now tilted forward, giving him an unusual and almost sinister look. His face was purpler than ever; his eyes were glaring; and his mouth was opening and shutting, as if he were an indignant fish. To say of Goath that he had been drinking was to say nothing, for he was obviously always drinking, but this time he had plainly had more than usual

or had been mixing his liquors. And his appearance, his manner, everything about him, was so extraordinary that everybody in the office stopped work at once to look at him.

J.B. Priestley

1. Look through the text word by word and say which of them are monosemantic.

2. What words express monolexemically those notions which in Russian are expressed polylexemically? Compare the lexical meanings of 1) *head* and *голова*; 2) *face* and *лицо*; 3) *mouth* and *рот*; 4) *fish* and *рыба*.

3. What type of the correlation of meaning and form is exemplified by *to wonder*, *sinister*, *indignant* and *extraordinary*?

***Exercise 3*. Discuss the following groups of words from the point of view of the correlation of content and expression in English and Russian.**

1. treble clef (скрипичный ключ); bass clef (басовый ключ); sharp (диез), flat (бемоль); natural (бекар);

2. wood, forest, timber;

3. to see, to understand.

***Exercise 4*. Discuss the meaning of the words in bold type in terms of the problem 'concept – meaning'.**

1. a) She put her hat on the **table**.

b) They were at **table** when we called.

c) His jokes amused the whole **table**.

d) He keeps a good **table**.

2. a) She wore a **green** dress.

b) **Green** wood does not burn well.

c) I'm afraid he is still **green** at his job.

d) He lived to a **green** old age.

Test Questions

1. What is the difference between meaning and purport?

2. Why is meaning a fact of language?

3. What is the difference between lexical meaning and grammatical meaning?

4. What is the difference betwee meaning and concept?

5. What types of relationship between the content and form of the word do you know?

6. Polysemy

***Exercise1*. Read the text given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

At ten o'clock on his wedding morning Paul returned to the Ritz. It was raining hard, and he felt tired, unshaven generally woebegone. A number of newspaper reporters were waiting for him outside his suite, but he told them that he could see no one. Inside he found Peter Beste-Chetwynde, incredibly smart in his first morning-coat.

«They've let me come up from Llanabba for the day,» he said. «To tell the truth, I'd rather pleased with myself in these clothes. I bought you a buttonhole in case you'd forgotten. I say, Paul, you're looking tired.»

«I am, rather. Turn on the bath for me like an angel.»

When he had had his bath and shaved he felt better. Peter had ordered a bottle of champagne and was a little tipsy. He walked round the room, glass in hand, talking gaily, and every now and then pausing to look at himself in the mirror.

«Pretty smart,» he said, «particularly the tie; don't you think so, Paul? I think I shall go back to the school like this. That would make them see what a superior person I am. I hope you notice

that I gave you the grander button-hole? I can't tell you what Llanabba is like this term, Paul. Do try and persuade Mamma to take me away. Cluterbuck has left, and Tangent is dead, and the three new masters are quite awful. One is like your friend Potts, only he stutters, and Brolly says he's got a glass eye. He's called Mr. Makepeace. Then there's another one with red hair who keeps beating everyone all the time, and the other's rather sweet, really, only he has fits. I don't think the doctor cares for any of then much. Flossie's been looking rather discouraged all the time. I wonder if Mamma could get her a job in South America? I'm glad you're wearing a waistcoat like that. I nearly did, but I thought perhaps I was a bit young. What do you think? We had a reporter down at the school the other day waiting to know particulars about you. Brolly told a splendid story about how you used to go out swimming in the evenings and swim for hours and hours in the dark composing elegiac verses, and then he spoilt it by saying you had webbed feet and a prehensile tail, which made the chap think he was having his leg pulled. I say, am I terribly in the way?»

Evelyn Waugh

1. Write out the words which are used in their nominative-derivative meaning. Comment on their prosody.

2. Look up the words *case*, *to care*, *leg*, *way* in a dictionary and discuss their use in the text under analysis.

3. The verb *to see* is used twice in the text. Is it used in the nominative meaning or not?

4. Write out the words which being used in their nominative meaning are prosodically marked. What determines the use of the marked prosodic variant in this case?

Exercise 2. **Read the text given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

After a while I got up and started along the bank. I knew there was no bridge across the river until Latisana. I thought I might be opposite San Vito. I began to think out what I should do. Ahead there was a ditch running into the river. I went toward it. So far I had seen no one and I sat down by some bushes along the bank of the ditch and took off my shoes and emptied them of water. I took off my coat, took my wallet with my papers and my money all wet in it out of the inside pocket and then wrung the coat out, I took off my trousers and wrung them too, then my shirt and underclothing. I slapped and rubbed myself and then dressed again. I had lost my cap.

Before I put on my coat I cut the cloth stars off my sleeves and put them in the inside pocket with my money. My money was wet but was all right. I counted it. There were three thousand and some lire. My clothes felt wet and clammy and I slapped my arms to keep the circulation going. I had woolen underwear and I did not think I would catch cold if I kept moving. They had taken my pistol at the road and I put the holster under my coat. I had no cape and it was cold in the rain. I started up the bank of the canal. It was daylight and the country was wet, low and dismal-looking. The fields were bare and wet, a long way away I could see a campanile rising out of the plain. I came up on to a road. Ahead I saw some troops coming down the road. I limped along the side of the road and they passed me and paid no attention to me. They were a machine-gun detachment going up toward the river. I went on down the road.

E. Hemingway

1. Write out from the above passage polysemantic words and comment on those which are used in their nominative meaning.

2. Discuss the semantic structure of the adjective *cold* and the noun *cold*. Comment on their use in the text.

3. Look up the verbs *to put*, *to start* and *to pay* in a dictionary and comment on their semantic structure. In what meaning are these verbs used in the text under analysis?

4. Are there any words in the text which are used in their nominative-derivative meaning?

Exercise 3. **Read the text given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

Their seats were down at the front – Turgis had never sat in such seats before – and it would all have been perfect if it had not been for two little incidents. The first occurred when Lena, during the second turn, a silent juggling affair, announced that she would like some chocolates.

«Can you get hold of that girl there,» she said. «She always has some nice boxes.»

«Nice boxes! How much are they?» he asked miserably.

«Well, you are a mean pig! How much are they? I like that, and after I've paid for the seats, too!»

«I'm sorry,» he stammered, «but – you see – I've only got one and sixpence.» He had paid tuppence on the bus, getting there.

«One and six!» Lena laughed. It was not an unfriendly laugh, but it was not a very sympathetic one either. «That's worse than I was, before you brought that money, yesterday. It doesn't matter, though. I don't know that I do want any chocolate. But would you spend your wonderful one and six if I asked you to?»

«Yes, I would. Of course I would. If I'd» he added, as the curtains swept down on the smiling jugglers, «if I'd hundreds and hundreds of pounds, I'd spend them all if you asked me to. I would, honestly.»

«Oh, it's easy to say that,» said Lena, not displeased, however, at his fervent tone. She gave him a brilliant glance, and no doubt remarked that his face was flushed and his eyes were at once hot and moist, as if he stared through a steam of embarrassed adoration.

Unfortunately, not all her brilliant glances were reserved for him, and that fact formed the basis of the second disturbing incident. There was a young man, a rather tall handsome chap with wavy hair, who was sitting with a girl in the row in front of them and a little to their right. Turgis had noticed that this fellow was turning round a good deal whenever the lights went up and that every time he did so his glance always came to rest finally on Lena. After this had happened several times he noticed that she was returning his glance. At last, during the interval, he caught her smiling, yes, actually smiling at the chap, instantly, he felt miserable, then angry, then miserable again. He could stand it no longer. «Do you know that chap there?» he asked, trying to appear light and easy.

«Which one? What are you talking about?»

«Well, you keep smiling at *him* – I mean, that one there, the chap who's just had a permanent wave, by the look of hint.»

«Oh, the one who keeps looking around. He seems to think he knows me, doesn't he? He's rather attractive, as a matter of fact.»

«Well, I suppose as long as you think so, it's all right, isn't it?» said Turgis bitterly. He could feel a pain, a real pain, as bad as toothache, somewhere inside him.

«He doesn't attract me,» he mumbled. «If you ask me, he looks a rotten twister – bit of a crook or something.» But in his heart he knew that the chap was taller and stronger and better-looking and better-dressed and altogether more important than he was, and he could have killed him for it.

«He doesn't at all,» said Lena. Then she laughed and made a face at him. «You're jealous, that's all. And you oughtn't to be jealous, it isn't nice. I'll smile at him again now. I think he's lovely.»

When she said that and looked so determinedly in that fellow's direction, Turgis was filled with a desire to take hold of her there and then dig his nails into her soft flesh, and hurt her until she screamed. He was suddenly shaken with the force of this desire, which was like nothing he had known before. But at that moment this little game of glancing and smiling came to an end, and the person who put a stop to it was the girl with the other man. She turned round too – and good luck to her, thought Turgis – then frowned and said something to her companion, and after that there was no more turning round and Lena divided her attention between the stage and Turgis, who was left in a queer state of mind and body.

J.B. Priestley

1. What words are used in their phraseologically-bound meaning?

2. Look up the verbs *to stand* and *to keep* in a dictionary and define the type of their meaning in the text under analysis. Describe their prosody.

3. Write out all the evaluative adjectives and discuss them in terms of expressive-synonymic meaning. What prosodic variant is used in this case?

4. What other words in the text can be discussed in terms of expressive-synonymic meaning?

***Exercise 4*. Describe the semantic structures of the following words in terms of V.V.Vinogradov's theory. Consult a dictionary.**

head (n), chair (n); know (v), establish (v), fantastic (a), precious (a)

***Exercise 5*. Establish the types of meaning realized in the following sentences.**

1. It was **warm**, but not hot yesterday. Come and get **warm** by the fire. She always gave me a **warm** welcome.

2. Please, **keep** the children quiet. If your hands are cold, **keep** them in your pockets. Please, **keep** the fire burning. She was tired but **kept** dancing. She can **keep** nothing back from her friends.

3. My cat has caught two **birds** today. He's a queer bird.

Test Questions

1. What is polysemy?

2. What are the main types of lexical meaning?

3. What is meant by prosodic invariant?

7. Enantiosemy and Homonymy

***Exercise 1*. Read the text given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

Occasional little pains, however, were nothing compared with the relief of seeing the firm busy again. There had been times when he had almost hated going to the bank, or he had felt that even the cashiers were telling one another that Twigg & Dersingham were looking pretty rocky, but now it was a pleasure again. «Just going round to the bank, Turgis,» he would say, trying not to sound too important. (Not that it mattered with Turgis, who really thought Mr. Smeeth was important. But once or twice, when he had said something like this, he had caught a certain look, a kind of gleam, in Miss Matfield's eye. With that young madam you never knew.) Then he would button up his old brown overcoat, which had lasted very well but would have to be replaced as soon as he got a rise, put on his hat, fill his pipe as he went down the steps, stop and light it outside, the Kwik-Work Razor Blade place, and then march cozily with it down the chilled and smoky length of Angel Pavement. Everywhere there would be a bustle and a jostling, with the roadway a bedlam of hooting and clanging and grinding gears, but he had his place in it all, his work to do, his position to occupy, and so he did not mind but turned on it a friendly eye and indulgent ear. The bank, secure in its marble and mahogany, would shut out the raw day and the raw sounds, and he would quietly, comfortably wait his turn, sending an occasional jet of fragrant T.Beneden towards the ornamental grill.

«Morning, Mr. Smeeth,» they would say. «A bit nippy, this morning. How are things with you?» And then, if there was time for it, one of them might have a little story to tell, about one of those queer things that happen in the City. Then back again in the office, at his desk, and very cozy it was after the streets. The very sight of the blue ink, the red ink, the pencils and pens, the rubber, the paper fasteners, the pad and rubber stamps, all the paraphernalia of his desk, all there in their places, at his service, gave him a feeling of deep satisfaction. He felt dimly too that this was a satisfaction that none of the others there, Turgis, the girls, young Stanley, would ever know, simply because they never came to work in the right spirit. His own two children were just the same. They were all alike now. Earn a bit, grab it, rush out and spend it, that was their lives.

J.B. Priestley

1. What words in the text have

a) homonyms (lexical and lexical-grammatical);

b) homophones.

2. Write out etymological homonyms and comment on the history of their development.

3. Apply the method of synchronic analysis to show that *bank 1 – берег* and *bank 2 – банк* are homonyms.

4. Read the text and discuss the prosodic arrangement of those words which have homonyms.

Exercise 2. **Read the text given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

I rowed all night. Finally my hands were so sore I could hardly close them over the oars. We were nearly smashed up on the shore several times. I kept fairly close to the shore because I was afraid of getting lost on the lake and losing them. Sometimes we were so close we could see a row of trees and the road along the shore with the mountains behind. The rain stopped and the wind drove the clouds so that the moon shone through and looking back I could see the long dark point of Castagnola and the lake with white caps and beyond, the moon on the high snow mountains. Then the clouds came over the moon again and the mountains and the lake were gone, but it was much lighter than it had been before and we could see the shore. I could see it too clearly and pulled out where they would not see the boat if there were custom guards along the Pallanza road. When the moon came out again we could see white villas on the shores of the slopes of the mountains and the white road where it showed through the trees. All the time I was rowing. The lake widened and across it on the shore at the foot of the mountain on the other side we saw a few lights that should be Luino. I saw a wedge-like gap between the mountains on the other shore and I thought that must be Luino. If it was we were making good time. I pulled in the oars and lay back on the seat. I was very, very tired of rowing. My arms and my shoulders and back ached and my hands were sore.

«I could hold the umbrella,» Catherine said. «We could sail with that with the wind.» «Can yon steer?»

«I think so.»

«You take this oar and hold it under your arm close to the side of the board and steer and I'll hold the umbrella.»

I went back to the Stern and showed her how to hold the oar. I took the big umbrella the porter had given me and sat facing the bow and opened it. It opened with a clap. I held it on both sides, sitting astride the handle hooked over the seat. The wind was full in it and I felt the boat suck forward while I held as hard as I could to the two edges. It pulled hard. The boat was moving fast.

E. Hemingway

1. What types of homonymy (lexical, lexical-grammatical, grammatical) can be observed in the text under analysis?

2. Show that the verb *to row* and the noun *row* are etymological homonyms. Consult an etymological dictionary.

3. What other examples of etymological homonymy can be observed in the text?

4. Dictionaries register *bow 1* 'piece of wood curved by a tight string, used for shooting arrows' and *bow 2* 'front or forward of a ship or boat from where it begins to curve'. What kinds of homonymy do they illustrate? Quote examples of your own.

Exercise 3. **Read the text given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

When I came back to the front we still lived in the town. There were many more guns in the country around and the spring had come. The fields were green and there were small shoots on the vines, the trees along the road had small leaves and a breeze came from the sea. I saw the town with the hill and the old castle above in a cap in the hills with the mountains beyond, brown

mountains with a little green on their slopes. In the town there were guns, there were some new hospitals, you met British men and sometimes women, on the street, and a few more houses had been hit by shell-fire. It was warm and like the spring and I walked down the alleyway of trees, warmed from the sun on the wall, and found we still lived in the same house and that it all looked the same as when I had left it. The door was open, there was a soldier sitting on a bench outside in the sun, an ambulance was waiting by the side door and inside the door, as I went in, there was the smell of marble floors and hospital. It was all as I had left it except that now it was spring. I looked in the door of the big room and saw the major sitting at his desk, the window open and the sunlight coming into the room. He did not see me and I did not know whether to go in and report or go upstairs first and clean up. I decided to go on upstairs.

E. Hemingway

1. Find in the text the following words and slovoforms, consult a dictionary and describe the types of homonymy they represent: *spring, leaves, new, sun, found, left, sea, floors, see, side.*

2. Show that *spring* 1 – *весна* and *spring* 2 – *прыжок* are homonyms. Apply the method of synchronic analysis.

3. Can homonymy be regarded as a defect of language development? Does it hamper communication? Quote examples from the text.

Test Questions

1. What is enantiosemy?

2. What is the difference between enantiosemy and homonymy?

3. What is the defference between etymological homonymy and homonymy as the 'limit of polysemy'?

4. What is the difference between homonyms, homophones and homographs?

5. What does the synchronic analysis of homonyms consist in?

8. Paronymy*

Exercise 1. **Read the following passages and comment on the expression plane of the word-combinations in bold type. Which examples illustrate the paronymic attraction based on the repetition of a) a separate phoneme; b) a morpheme; c) a phonestheme?**

The painter came **gliding and glowing** in. His hair **slipping back**, his eyes **sliding off**.
John Galsworthy

There are things he feels – there are things here which – well, which are things. Something **unreasoning**, **unreasonable** is upon him; when he tries to define it with the precision of a practical man, it eludes him, slips away.
John Galsworthy

Out of oneself! Out into **soundless**, **touchless**, **sightless space**! The very idea was ghastly, futile!

A touching there the bedrock of reality, the bottom of his Forsyte spirit, Soames rested for a moment.

When one ceased, all ceased…
John Galsworthy

A shattering peal of thunder blundered overhead; and down came the rain, **slashing and sluicing**.
John Galsworthy

Gumbril, Theodore Junior … speculated in his **rapid and rambling** way about the existence and the nature of God.
A. Huxley

Exercise 2. **Read the following passages and comment on the stylistic functions fulfilled by the paronymic attraction.**

Only good master, while we do aware
This virtue and this moral discipline,
Let's be no stoics nor no
Stocks, I play; —
W. Shakespeare

Style is certainly a familiar word to many of us; but unfortunate-ly to say that stylistics simply studies style does not clarify matters greatly.
David Crystal & Dereck Davy

He remembered, too, some cautious and cautionary allusions by 'old Forsyte'.
John Galsworthy

The rich were out of her reach and the poor were beneath her contempt.
I. Shaw

«Money isn't no object whatever to me,» said the lady, «so much as living in a state of retirement and obtrusion (seclusion)».
Ch. Dickens

Exercise 3. **Describe the prosodic arrangement of paronymic attraction in the following passages. Comment on the interaction of segmental and suprasegmental phenomena in these cases.**

|| \Bene 7 factors! || Well, 0 what \benefactors / are they? || 0 Are
slowly
they 0 not \male 7 factors? ||
W. Shakespeare

|| You would be sur 0 prised how · many · titled 7 gentlemen are looking for a \fortune to line their un\fortunate pockets.
slowly
H. Tucker

|| It was enough to stop him for a month. His pen, as he told me, was like the ugly orange feet. The people had contracted for a 7 swan, | and he was going to deliver a«4 swine. ||
slowly
R. Crichton

Test Questions
1. Why is paronymy considered to be a violation of the 'law of the sign'?
2. What is meant by paronymic attraction?
3. What stylistic function does paronymic attraction perform in the fiction?
4. What segmental peculiarities of paronymic attraction do you know?
5. Why is the prosodic analysis of paronymic attraction so important?

9. Synonymy

Exercise 1. **Read the text given below. Answer the questions and fulfil the tasks which follow it.**

During the subsequent interval, Mrs. Dersingham had not the heart to return to the dining-room, though she did just look in, put her face round the door and smile apologetically at everybody and say that it was too absurd and annoying and that the two of them, she and Mrs. Pearson, would be back in a few minutes. She spent the rest of the time superintending the salvage work outside the dining-room door and helping to find enough fresh plates to warm. She felt hot, dishevelled and miserable. She could have cried. Indeed, that was why she did not slip upstairs to her bedroom

to look at herself and powder her nose, for once there, really alone with herself, she was sure she would have cried. Oh, it was all too hateful for words!

«There!» And Mrs. Pearson stood before her, breathless, flushed and happy, and whipped off the lid of a silver dish.

«Oh,» cried Mrs. Dersingham in the very reek of the omelette, a fine large specimen, «You angel! It's absolutely perfect.»

«I remembered we had some eggs, and then remembered we had a bottle of mushrooms tucked away somewhere, so I rushed upstairs and made this mushroom omelette. It ought to be nice. I used to be good with omelettes.»

«It's marvellous. And I don't know how to thank you, my dear.» And Mrs. Dersingham meant it. From that moment, Mrs. Pearson ceased to be a merely foolish if kindly neighbour and became a friend, worthy of the most secret confidences. In the steam of the omelette, rich as the smoke of burnt offerings, this friendship began, and Mrs. Dersingham never tasted a mushroom afterwards without being reminded of it.

«Don't think of it, my dear,» said Mrs. Pearson happily, for her own life, after months of the dull routine of time-killing had suddenly become crimson, rich and glorious. «Now have you got the plates ready? You must have this served at once, mustn't you? Where's that silly girl? Gone to bed? All right, then make the cook serve the rest of the dinner. She must have everything ready by this time. Call her, my dear. Tell her to bring up the plates.» And they returned at last to the dining-room, two sisters out of burning Troy.

Alas, all was not well there. Something had happened during the interval of waiting. It was not the women, who were all sympathetic smiles and solicitude: Mrs. Trape even dropped the ventriloquial effect, actually disturbed the lower part of her face, in order to explain that she knew, no one better, what it was these days, when anything might be expected of that class; and Miss Verever, though retaining automatically some peculiarities of tone and grimace, contrived to say something reassuring. No, it was not the women, it was the men. Mr. Golspie looked like a man who had already said some brutal things and was fully prepared to say some more; Major Trape looked very stiff and uncompromising, as if he had just sentenced a couple of surveyors to be shot, Mr. Pearson gave the impression that he had been faintly tee-teeing on both sides of a quarrel and was rather tired of it; and Mr. Dersingham looked uneasy, anxious, exasperated. There was no mistaking the atmosphere, in which distant thunder still rolled. The stupid men had to wait for the more substantial part of dinner, they had felt empty, then they had felt cross, and so they had argued, shouted, quarrelled, not all of them, perhaps, but certainly Mr. Golspie and Major Trape. Probably at any moment, they would begin arguing, shouting, quarrelling again. Mrs. Dersingham, very tired now and with a hundred little nerves screaming to be taken out of all this and put to bed, would have liked to bang their silly heads together.

J.B. Priestley

1. Write out cases of synonymic condensation and discuss their prosody.

2. Look up the words – components of synonymic condensation in a dictionary and comment on their semantics.

3. Analyse the segmental structure of synonymic condensation.

4. Discuss the rhythmical organization of synonymic condensation.

Exercise 2. **Read the text given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

According to all the literary formulas, the wife of Mr. Smeeth should have been a grey and withered suburban drudge, a creature who had long forgotten to care for anything but a few household tasks, the welfare of her children, and the opinion of one or two chapel-going neighbours, a mere husk of womanhood, in whom Mr. Smeeth could not recognize the girl he had once courted. But Nature, caring nothing for literary formulas, had gone to work in another fashion with Mrs.

117

Smeeth. There was nothing grey and withered about her. She was only in her early forties, and did not look a day older than her age, by any standards. She was a good deal plumper than the girl Mr. Smeeth had married, twenty-two years before, but she was no worse for that. She still had a great quantity of untidy brown hair, a bright blue eye, rosy cheeks, and a ripe moist lip. She came of robust country stock, and perhaps that is why she had been able to conjure any amount of bad food into healthy and jolly womanhood. By temperament, however, she was a real child of London, a daughter of Cockaigne. She adored oysters, fish and chips, an occasional bottle of stout or glass of port, cheerful gossip, hospitality, noise, jokes, sales, outings, comic songs, entertainments of any kind, in fact the whole rattling and roaring, laughing and crying, world of food and drink and bargaining and adventure and concupiscence. She liked to spend as much as she could, but apart from that would have been quite happy if the Smeeths had dropped to a lower social level. She never shared any of her husband's worries and was indeed rather impatient of them, sometimes openly contemptuous, but she had no contempt, beyond that experienced by all deeply feminine natures for the male, for the man himself. He had been her sweetheart, he was her husband; he had given her innumerable pleasures, had looked after her, had been patient with her, had always been fond of her; and she loved him and was proud of what seemed to her his cleverness. She knew enough about life to realize that Smeeth was a really good husband and that this was something to be thankful for. (North London does not form any part of that small hot-house world in which a good husband or wife regarded as a bore, perhaps as an obstacle in the pass of the partner's self-development.) Chasity for its own sake made no appeal to her, and she recognized with inward pleasure (though not with any outward sign) the glances that flirtatious and challenging males, in buses and shops and tea-rooms, threw in her direction. If Mr. Smeeth had started any little games – as he frankly confessed – she would not have moaned and repined, but would have promptly «shown him» what she could do in that line. As it was, he did not require showing. He grumbled sometimes at her extravagance, her thoughtlessness, her other slapdash housekeeping, but in spite of all that, in spite too, of the fact that for two-and twenty years they had been cooped up together in tiny houses, she still seemed to him an adorable person, at once incredible and delightful in the large, wilful, intriguing, mysterious mass of her femininity, the Woman among the almost indistinguishable crowd of mere women.

J.B. Priestley

1. Write out word-combinations with adjectives in pre-preposition and discuss them in terms of the opposition of attributive word-combinations and synonymic condensation.

2. Specify the expression plane of attributive word-combinations as opposed to synonymic condensation.

3. Are there any examples of homogeneous parts of the sentence which do not create a synonymic condensation?

4. Discuss synonymic condensation and attributive word-combinations as functioning in written and oral speech.

***Exercise 3*. Read the text given below. Answer the questions and complete the tasks which follow it.**

«Come along, Dad!» cried Mrs. Smeeth, pouring out the Rich Ruby Port for the ladies. «Buck up. Join in the fun.» She had herself a rich ruby look, for what with eating and drinking and shouting and laughing and singing, her face was crimson and almost steaming. Unfortunately,

Mr. Mitty overheard her. «That's right,» he roared, drowning every other voice in the room. «Come on, Pa. Take your turn. No shirking. Take your turn, Pa. Show us a conjuring trick.»

«Oh, shut up, Fred,» Mrs. Mitty screamed, pretending to chide him, as usual, and really drawing attention to his astonishing drollery. «You've gone far enough.»

Mr. Smeeth could not do any conjuring, but if he had been given unlimited powers, he knew one trick he would have liked to perform that instant, a trick that involved the immediate

disappearance of Mr. Fred Mitty. It was Saturday night, the little party was in full swing, and they were all in the front room, all that is except the Mitty girl and Edna, who had gone out together for an hour or so, probably round to the pictures. In addition to the Mitty pair, there were Dalby and Mrs. Dalby (whose sister told fortunes with cards). Mr. Smeeth had seen the room when it had had more people in it, but he had never known it when it had seemed so full. He had always thought of Dalby, who lived at 11, Chaucer Road, was a bandy-legged insurance agent, and fancied himself as a wag and a great hand at parties, as a noisy chap, but compared with Fred Mitty he was quiet and decent and merely another Smeeth. It had not taken Mr. Smeeth ten minutes to discover that he disliked Mitty intensely, and every thing that Mitty had done and said since (and for the last hour or so he had insisted on calling Mr. Smeeth 'Pa') had only increased that dislike, which did not stop short at Fred, but extended to Mrs. Mitty and the girl, Dot. He had never known three people he had disliked more.

Mrs. Smeeth's cousin was a fellow in his early forties who had probably not been bad-looking once in a cheep flashy style. He had curly fair hair, very small, light-coloured greedy eyes, a broken nose, a large loose mouth that went all out to one side when he talked. He reminded Mr. Smeeth at once of those cheap auctioneer chaps who take an empty shop for a week or two and pretend they are giving everything away. Mr. Mitty's complexion seemed to be permanently rich and ruby, and it had evidently cost somebody a good deal in its time, though – as Mr. Smeeth assured himself, vindictively – not necessarily Mr. Mitty himself, who clearly brought out visiting with him a colossal thirst and appetite. He was a funny man, a determined wag, and the noisiest Mr. Smeeth had ever known. He shouted all the time, just like one of those cheap auctioneers. His jokes gave you a pain in the stomach and his voice a headache. Moreover, he seemed to

Mr. Smeeth quite obviously a silly boaster, a liar, and a man not to be trusted a yard. Such men frequently ally themselves to quiet little women, but Fred Mitty – fortunately for some quiet little woman – had found a female of his own kind. Mrs. Mitty, who had a long blue nose and hair that was bright auburn at the ends and grey-brown near the roots, was as brassy as her husband. Her scream accompanied his roar. If she said anything playful to you, she hit your nearest rib with her bony elbow; and if you said anything playful to her, she slapped you on the arm. Here she differed from Fred, who banged you on the back and poked you in the ribs, unless you were a woman and not too old, and then he bugged you or invited you to sit on his knee. Dot, the solitary offspring of this brassy pair, was all legs and golden curls and a hard blue stare. She talked of becoming a film actress. Mr. Smeeth, who did not know much about Hollywood, but nevertheless had a horror of the place, told her quite sincerely that he hoped she would get there, and added, with perfect truth, that she reminded him of those Broadway girls on the pictures. Edna of course – the silly child – had been fascinated at once by Dot; and as for Mrs. Smeeth, who really had no more sense about people at times than a baby, she seemed to be infatuated with all three of them.

J.B. Priestley

1. Find the examples of stylistic and ideographic synonymy in the text under analysis.

2. Read those sentences in which there are attributive word-com-binations with more than one attribute and describe their prosody.

3. What is the difference between *a bandy-legged insurance agent* and *a long blue nose* in terms of prosody? Find other examples of the same kind.

4. Account for the comma in the word-combination *very small, light-coloured greedy eyes.*

5. Describe the prosody of the sentence «She had herself a rich ruby look…». What is the function of the conjunction *and* in this sentence?

Test Questions

1. Give the definition of synonymy.

2. What types of synonyms do you know?

3. What is meant by synonymic condensation?

4. What is the difference between the synonymic condensation and the attributive word-combination?

5. What rhythmical regularities are peculiar to synonymic conden-sation?

10. Phraseology

Exercise 1. **Read the text given below. Answer the questions and do the tasks that follow it.**

On the day of Paul's arrival in London he rang up his **old friend** and arranged to dine with him at the Queen's Restaurant in **Sloane Square**. It seemed quite natural that they should be seated at the table where they had discussed so many subjects of **public importance**, budgets and birth control and **Byzantine mosaics**. For the first time since the disturbing evening of the Bollinger dinner he felt at ease. Llanabba Castle with its sham castellations and **preposterous inhabitants**, had sunk into the oblivion that waits upon even the most **lurid nightmares**. (…) For an evening at least the shadow that has flitted about this narrative under the name of Paul Pennyfeather materialized into the **solid figure** of an intelligent, well-educated, well-conducted young man. A man who could be trusted to use his vote at a **general election** with discretion and proper detachment, whose opinion on a ballet or a **critical essay** was rather better than most people's, who could order a dinner without embarrassment and in a creditable **French accent**, who could be trusted to see to luggage at foreign railway-stations and might be expected to acquit himself with decision and decorum in all the emergencies of **civilized life**. This was the Paul Pennyfeather who had been developing in the **placid years** which preceded this story.

Evelyn Waugh

1. Find phraseological units in the above text and discuss them in terms of

a) A.I.Smirnitskij's classification and

b) V.V.Vinogradov's classification.

2. What is the difference between the expressions *to sit at the table* and *to sink into the oblivion*?

3. Apply the method of categorial analysis to the attributive word-combinations in bold type.

4. Comment on the prosody of attributive word-combinations in the utterance beginning with «Llanabba Castle with its sham castel-lations….»

Exercise 2. **Read the text given below. Answer the questions and do the tasks that follow it.**

At dinner Margot talked about matters of daily interest, about some jewels she was having reset, and how they had come back all wrong; and how all the wiring of her London house was being overhauled because of the fear of fire; and how the man she had left **in charge of** her villa at Cannes had **made a fortune** at the Casino and **given her notice**, and she was afraid she might have to go out to arrange about it; and how the Society for the Preservation of Ancient Buildings was demanding a guarantee that she would not demolish her castle in Ireland; and how her cook seemed **to be going off her head** that night, the dinner was so dull; and how Bobby Postmaster was trying to borrow money from her again, **on the grounds** that she had misled him when she bought his house and that if he had known she was going to pull it down he would have made her pay more.

Evelyn Waugh

1. What is the difference between *to talk about* and *to go out* in the above passage? Write out examples of phrasal verbs.

2. Discuss the expressions in bold type in terms of Smirnitskij's classification of phraseological units.

3. Write out verbal word-combinations of the V+ N type and apply to them the categorial method of analysis.

4. Are there any free word-combinations in the passage under analysis?

Exercise 3. **Comment on the use of idioms proper in the the following texts.**

1. «I suppose you might say all's well that ends well.»

«Very apt, sir.»

I mused again.

«All the same, your methods are a bit rough, Jeeves.»

«One cannot make an omelette without breaking eggs, sir.»

«Omelette! Do you think you could get me one?»

«Certainly, sir.»

P.G. Wodehouse

2. «For all I know, she may be coming on the next train.»

«No, she's not. He headed her off.»

«You had that straight from the horses's mouth?»

«Direct from her personal lips.»

I drew a deep breath. This certainly put a brighter aspect on the cloud wreck. In fact, it seemed to me that 'Hallelujah' about summed it up, and I mentioned it.

P.G. Wodehouse

3. «Is that really so? You are pulling my leg!»

«I am not pulling your leg, nothing can induce me to pull your beast-ly leg.»

P.G. Wodehouse

Test Questions

1. What is meant by 'phraseological unit'?

2. What does the categorial method of analysis consist in?

3. What results does the prosodic analysis of phraseological units and idioms proper yield?

4. What is 'deformation of an idiom'?

5. What types of phraseology can be singled out in the dictionary?

Chapter 2.
Lexicography

1. Getting to Know the Dictionary
(prelimenary tasks and exercises)

Exercise 1. **Arrange in alphabetical order**
a) the following names of animals and birds:
__ crocodile__hen
__ fox__bull
__ cat__frog
__ mouse__hedgehog
__dog__giraffe
__ parrot__snake
b) the following names of fruit and vegetables:
__melon__pineapple
__banana__water-melon
__orange__kiwi fruit
__apple__nut
__cucumber__lemon
__plum__garlic
c) the following placenames:
__Leeds__Plymouth
__Coventry__Derby
__Oxford__Nottingham
__Bristol__Weston
__Glasgow__Hastings
__Exeter__Manchester
d) the names of the following nationalities:
__French__Norwegian__Nepalese
__Chinese__Burmese__American
__German__Japanese__Italian
__Russian__Czeck__Swiss
e) the names of the following English writers:
__Thackeray, William Makepeace
__Dickens, Charles
__Shaw, George Bernard
__Wilde, Oscar
__Shakespeare, William
__Maugham, (William) Somerset
__Goldsmith, Oliver
__Austen, Jane
__Christie, Agatha
__Brцnte, Charlotte
f) the names of the Presidents of the United States:
__Linkoln, Abraham__Adams, John

__Adams, Quincy John__Roosevelt, Theodor

__ Jefferson, Thomas__Nixon, Richard, M.

__Wilson, Woodrow__Roosevelt, Franklin D.

__Hoover, Herbert C.__Clinton, Bill

Exercise 2. **Read the groups of words below. Write each group in alphabetical order.**

a) feel, deck, pan, open, chap, speech, vote, butter, abbey, keep;

b) breast, fog, chair, brain, broker, table, umbrella, notebook, blossom, bar, meet, class, brute;

c) season, letter, computer, lace, loss, pen, porter, book, little, plane, tree, luxury, post, form;

d) strap, dictionary, soap, sir, top, struggle, size, page, last, work, stretch, strong, sleep, strict, snake, clock, strike

Exercise 3. **Make words by putting letters in alphabetical order. The first one was done for you.**

cea ace zitnhc _____

uby _____ poho _____

kooc _____phisc _____

ordo _____malsot _____

lobwe _____

Exercise 4. **Think of a word which can be inserted between two words without breaking alphabetical order.**

a) apple – cucumber, cat – mouse, red – pink, fast – quick, kiss – love, chair – table, jump – run, speak – tell, shirt – trousers, bonnet – hat;

b) cake – charm, fight – frost, go – guy, hot – hunt, mark – memory, plate – push, ray – remark, sit – short, tee – track, walk – white;

c) kick – kiss, still – stop, hear – herb, tenor – terrific, fresh – friend, bless – blow, lily – little, modern – moon, ready – rein, teach – text;

d) card – carpet, plan – plastic, mild – million, pile – pilot, free – fresh, roof – root, spade – spark, thick – third, welfare – Welsh, opponent – oppress.

Exercise 5. **Work in pairs. One student opens a monolingual or a bilingual English-Russian dictionary and reads guide words, that is words printed at the top of each page of the dictionary which show the first and last words on the page. The other student thinks of a word that will appear on either of those pages.**

Exercise 6. **Make a word chain by writing in the links the letters of the 14 words whose Russian equivalents are given to you. Begin at the top and move clockwise around the circle. Each word overlaps with the next word: that is the final two letters of each word are the first two letters of the following word. (The number of letters in each word is shown in parentheses after each clue.)**

ответ (6)

стирать (резинкой) (5)

море (3)

каждый (4)

подбородок (4)

внутри (6)

мертвый (4)

добавленный (5)

воспитывать (7)

слеза (4)

арест (6)

останавливаться (4)

опера (5)

бежать (3)

Exercise 7. **What are the guide words in your dictionary between which you can find the following words?**

desire, leak, seal, character, inform, peach, resume, spectrum, tile, uniform

Exercise 8. **Below there is a list of names under which small and large business trade. How many of them can be found in your dictionary? What do they mean?**

Hairdresses: The Cutting Room, Clipso, Scissors, The Clip Joint;

Wine and Food: Cellar, The Water Hole, The Flying Pizza, The Upper Crust (bakery), The Breadboard;

Women's Wear: Dressage, Dress-well, French Dressing, Rag Trader.

Exercise 9. **The following are the names of current or former pop groups. How many of these words, in your opinion, can be found in the dictionary? Tick those which you think are part of the language and then check them in your dictionary.**

Genesis__

Wings__

Rolling Stones__

2. Getting to Know the Dictionary (Lexical Units and Structure of the Dictionary)

Exercise 1. **Look up the words in bold type in the following sentences in your dictionary. How many headwords are there with that spelling? Do they belong to the same part of speech?**

1.**Dry** your hands on this towel.

2. I saw a **break** in the fence.

3. I have twenty tests to **mark** today.

4. Mary heard the happy **sounds** of children at play.

5. The dog was watching my every **move**.

6. What is for **sweet**?

7. I'll **place** you under arrest.

8. My son has **sound** teeth.

9. Don't **touch** my things!

10. He's paid **double** for the same job.

Exercise 2. **Read the following passage. Look up the words in bold type in your dictionary. How many headwords are there with the same spelling? Do they belong to the same part of speech?**

This is your **room**. The **Home** Office regulations insisted that we should be on an upper storey with barred windows. We have had to put the **bars** in specially. They will be **charged** for in the **bill**.

From: «**Decline** and **Fall**» *by D.H. Lawrence.*

Exercise 3. **Are the words in bold type in the same entry or not?**

1. He remembered, too, some **cautious** and **cautiounary** allusions by old Forsyte.

John Galsworthy

2. And if you are not doubly **fast** with my breakfast I shall **fasten** my foot on the posterior portion of your miserable anatomy.

John Fowles

3. There are things he feels – there are things here – well, which are things. Something **unreasoning**, **unreasonable** is upon him; when he tries to define it with the precision of a practical man, it eludes him, slips him away.

John Galsworthy

Exercise 4. **What comes first in your dictionary? Are these words in the same entry or not?**

cooly__or cooler__

disproof__or disprove__

frog-spawn__or frog-march__

lawful__or lawmaker__

harden__or hardly__

sweetbread__or sweetness__

Exercise 5. **Translate the following words into English. What groups of derivatives and compounds can you form? Consult first a Russian-English dictionary and then a monolingual dictionary of English.**

заядлый курильщик —

председатель —

оплот —

кольчуга —

материк —

цепочка —

спальный вагон —

тамбурная строчка —

ароматическая смесь —

Exercise 6. **Make up compounds by bringing together stems. The first one is done for you. Consult a monolingual dictionary.**

bus keeper

door phone

cars top

ear drain

house name

bell drop

brain pull

brand party

floppy store

side hold

book disk

free walk

Exercise 7. **What words below denote things which can be bought in a shop? Consult a monolingual dictionary.**

shoehorn shoemaker

dress rehearsal shoe-lace

ball-gown shirt-front

shoe-tree dress shirt

night-gown shoeshine

dress-circle shirtwaist

Exercise 8. **Translate the following words into Russian. What words denote things necessary to serve tea or coffee?**

tea-caddy —tea-clipper —

tea-cosy —tea-kettle —

high tea —coffee grinder —

coffee-cup —tea-garden —

table-cloth —coffe-room —

coffee-grounds —tea-house —
table-water —table-talk —
table-mat —table-towel —

Exercise 9. **Give Russian equivalents of the following phrasal verbs with *out* and *off*.**

lean
switch – on
keep
cheer
blow – up
sum
peg
talk – out
turn
call
show – off
slag

Exercise 10. **Can you complete these phrasal verbs? When you have finished, check your answers in a monolingual dictionary of English.**

1. I thought the nurse was looking __ you.

2. Police are looking __ the disappearance of a quantity of uncut gems.

3. Most people aren't good enough to play in first-class matches; they have to be content to look __.

4. We were allowed to look __ their new plant near Coventry.

5. He looked __ the living-room window at a rain-soaked garden.

6. He comes back with an enormous dictionary, sits down and

looks __ the word.

Exercise 11. **There are many idioms which contain words denoting plants. Complete each of the sentences below with the correct idiom. Underline the word that is the headword of the entry of a monolingual dictionary you found the idiom. Translate the sentences into Russian. Do Russian equivalents contain words denoting plants?**

1. Sometimes things are very difficult. Life is not all __.

2. Mary led Sam __. She kept promising to marry him, but in the end she left him for John.

3. Susan's ready to __. She's travelled all over the world, but now she wants to settle in one place.

4. The police were determined to __. It took them several weeks but they finally discovered the cause of the fire.

5. Don't __. Tell me exactly what it is you want to say.

6. John's__. He's much nicer than any of his brothers.

7. Sally's done very well in her job. She's at __ in her profession.

8. You should act quickly. Don't let __.

9. I feel as if all our hard work is beginning top__. The results are really worth the effort we put in!

10. The teacher realized that the class might cause trouble, but managed to__.

(the grass grow under your feet; nip in the bud; the top of the tree; the pick of the bunch; a bed of roses; beat about the bush; put down roots; bear fruit; get to the root of the matter; up the garden path)

Exercise 12. **Look at the following idioms which describe people or a way of behaving. Look them up in a monolingual dictionary and decide whether they are describing something good or bad. Write plus (+) or minus (-).**

126

as cool as a cucumber__
grin and bear it__
be in a rut__
drop a brick/ clanger__
take somebody to the cleaners__
have an open mind__
be on the ball__

Exercise 13. **Which colours go with which words to make compounds or idioms? Check your answers in a monolingual dictionary.**

red

black	-handed	blue
	-matter	
	-lie	
	-market	
	-collar	
yellow	-elephant	green
	in the	
	-herring	
	-fingers	
	-pages	
grey	-paper	pink
	-card	

white

Exercise 14. **Give English equivalents of the following Russian proverbs. Under what headword is the equivalent registered?**

делать из мухи слона —
дело в шляпе —
лес рубят – щепки летят —
у страха глаза велики —
большому кораблю – большое плаванье —
на всякого мудреца довольно простоты —
сорока на хвосте принесла —
с глаз долой из сердца вон —
копейка рубль бережет —

Exercise 15. **Study the Preface to your dictionary and fill in the Dictionary Quiz below.**
Dictionary Quiz
1. Examples showing how words are used are given
a) in brackets__
b) in italic type__

2. Are phrasal verbs
a) printed in thick type__
b) shown by a symbol__
3. Where will you find information about placenames
a) in Appendix__
b) on special pages__
4. Are there any study pages in your dictionary
yes__
no__
5. Where will you find additional information on the usage of words
a) in notes
b) on colourful pages
6. Are labels printed
a) in brackets__
b) in italics__
7. Are idioms
a) printed in bold type__
b) shown by a symbol__
c) shown by a label__
8. Are compounds within the entry
a) printed in bold type__
b) shown by a symbol__
c) shown by a label__
9. Is grammatical information
a) shown by a code within the entry__
b) in grammatical notes in the extra column__
c) shown by means of examples and patterns within the
entry__
10. Is there any information on related words
a) yes__
b) no__

3. Dictionary and Language (Phonetics and Orthorgraphy)

Exercise 1. **Cross out the consonants that are not pronounced. Consult your monolingual or pronoucing dictionary.**
lamb – debt – gnat – comb
sign – hour – knit – might
bomb – hymn – hustle – palm
receipt – thumb – sight – sandwich
Exercise 2. **Look up the following words in your monolingual or pronouncing dictionary and make pairs of the words beginning with the same sound.**
week, chess, sugar, champagne, pain, wrong, photo, chorus, authentic, wince, rhythm, ketchup, cease, poetry, saddle, choke, orbit, finance, knee, numeral
Exercise 3. **Make rhyming pairs of words. Consult your monolingual or pronouncing dictionary.**
part – tough
lease – though
cough – half

mow – piece
ruff – toff
lust – fast
laugh – start
cast – crust

Exercise 4. **How many of the following words have / u:/ in their pronunciation? Consult your monolingual or pronouncing dictionary.**

coup__flood__food__
lute__cut__foot__
due__chew__nude__

Exercise 5. **Which words have /i:/ in their pronunciation? Which letters can be used to represent the /i:/ sound? Consult you monolingual or pronouncing dictionary.**

aegis__flew__pauee__
peony__deer__meatre__
eagle__niche__earwig__

Exercise 6. **Using a monolingual dictionary transcribe the following words and show the difference between American and British variants of their pronunciation:**

British American

data_____ _____
exploratory_____ _____
dictionary_____ _____
lieutenant_____ _____
office_____ _____
territory_____ _____
last_____ _____
disadvantage_____ _____
diphthong_____ _____
clothes_____ _____

Exercise 7. **Using a monolingual or pronouncing dictionary indicate the accentual structure of the following words by underlining the stressed syllables (two lines for the primary stress and one line for the secondary stress).**

tuberculosis – demonstration
futuristic – sympathetic
candilabrum – archbishop
architectural – reafforest
silhouetteel – ectrolysis

Exercise 8. **Using a monolingual or pronouncing dictionary indicate the accentual structure of the following compounds by underlining the stressed syllables (two lines for the primary stress, one line for the secondary stress).**

flight recorder – leading article
bowler hat – savings account
universal joint – cooling-off period
break-dancing – barn dance
household troops – handmade

Exercise 9. **Using a monolingual or pronouncing dictionary show the difference in the pronunciation of the words below:**

conduct (n) – conduct (v)
progress (n) – progress (v)
contract (n) – contract (v)

produce (n) – produce (v)
increase (n) – increase (v)

4. Dictionary and Language (Grammar and Lexis)

Exercise 1. **Write the following nouns in plural. Consult your monolingual dictionary.**

banjo_____table_____
way_____orange_____
analysis_____sheep_____
face_____louse_____
effigy_____foot_____
ox_____antenna_____
potato_____tomato_____
fangus_____syllabus_____
formular_____abbey_____
curriculum_____criterion_____

Exercise 2. **Divide the following words into countable, uncountable and nouns which can be both countable and uncountable.**

C – U – C/U
anger
cheese
cloth
thought
jelly
capacity
coffee
energy
evil
beach
bush
paint
salad
finance
dream
election
tea
labour
wood
history
medicine
issue
paper
smile
truth
newspaper
respect
courage
address

Exercise 3. **Use the correct form of the verbs in the sentences below. Check in the dictionary to see whether the noun is countable or uncountable.**

1) The news (were/was) bad.
2) My hair (feel/feels) dirty.
3) How much money (is/are) there in your bank account?
4) The traffic (was/were) heavy.
5) New machinery (has/have) been installed.

Exercise 4. **Link the sentence openings on the left with appropriate endings on the right, using the verbs below to fill in the gaps. You can use a verb more than once. Consult your monolingual dictionary.**

1. Draughts (a) __ not yet come up with a cure.
2. Mumps (b) __ played on a board with black and white squares.
3. News (c) __ an illness which is very dangerous to pregnant woman.
4. Genetics (d) __ about 1 cm a month.
5. Spaghetti (e) __ vigorous exercise.
6. Research into cancer (f) __ in about 8 minutes.
7. German measles (g) __ a swallen neck.
8. Hair (h) __ fast.
9. Aerobics (i) __ the study of genes.

Exercise 5. **Write comparative and superlative forms of the following adjectives. Consult your dictionary.**

comparative superlative

nice _____ _____
plain _____ _____
good _____ _____
great _____ _____
brave _____ _____
funny _____ _____
big _____ _____
risky _____ _____
little _____ _____
famous _____ _____
clever _____ _____
curious _____ _____

Exercise 6. **Divide the following adjectives into three groups:**

a) attributive, b) predicative, c) adjectives which can be either. Check your answers in the dictionary.

afraid, knotty, due, frigid, gradual, alone, ramshackle, scant, honest, dim, asleep, content, speculative, sick, maximal, sure, outdoor, sorry, polar, principal, aware, devoid, famous, preconceived

Exercise 7. **Divide the following verbs into three groups:**

a) transitive verbs, b) intransitive verbs, c) verbs which can be both transitive and intransitive. Check your answers in the dictionary.

cry, bear, sigh, expire, fidget, dance, claim, flourish, convince, damage, equal, kneel, smile, dream, shiver, grant, issue, laugh, surrender, droop, lack, process, release, bleed, tease

Exercise 8. **Some of the verbs in the sentences below are used with infinitive, some with gerand, and some with both. Choose the correct variant and then check your answers in the dictionary.**

1. Snow began (to fall/falling) again.

2. We are determined to continue (to work/working) together.

3. Peter stopped for a while and then began (to move/moving) around the room.

4. The plants want (to be watered /watering) daily.

5. Mary enjoys (to play/playing) tennis.

6. I know that she's stopped (to smoke/smoking).

Exercise 9. **Choose the correct preposition from the list below for each of the following words. Check your answes in the dictionary.**

appeal – in

insure – of

detract – for

culminate – against

conceive – with

spy – to

attend – on

flirt – from

Exercise 10. **Consult your dictionary and explain the difference between:**

to consist of and *to consist in*

to die of and *to die for*

to gasp at and *to gasp for*

Exercise 11. **In each of the lists below there is one word that should not be there. Can you find it?**

Example: cat, dog, fish, horse. Answer: *fish* – because it lives in water and is not a mammal. Look up the definitions of the words in your monolingual dictionary.

1. football, chess, tennis, cricket

2. milk, juice, water, wine

3. ship, train, boat, submarine

4. skating, singing, swimming, rowing

5. fry, bake, chop, roast

6. provide, donate, borrow, supply

7. snap, nudge, pat, stroke

8. wail, weep, titter, whimper

9. bond, cent, dime, nickel

10. mauve, marvellous, magenta, tangerine

Exercise 12. **Look up the words for a) the parts of the face and b) the parts of the body in an English-Russian dictionary and match them with Russian equivalents from the list below. Give their English definitions using a monolingual dictionary.**

a) brow – устье реки

eye – ушко иглы

nose – циферблат

mouth – колос

face – нахальство

cheek – нюх

ear – выступ скалы

b) head – гвоздь

calf – мера длины

foot – стрелка (часов)

palm – руководитель

neck – теленок

nail – горлышко (бутылки)

trunk – пальма

hand – чемодан

Exercise 13. **Match each word in the first column with its correct definition in the second column. Consult a monolingual dictionary.**

a) «bird words»:

birdie a foolish – or inept person

chicken – objectionable or worthless

turkey – lower the head or body to avoid

cuckoo – collision with an object

duck – repeat by rote

parrot – a gof score of one stroke less than par

for the birds – timid, cowardly silly, a little crazy

b) «animal words»:

hog – to reveal secret information

buffalo – full of spite, malicious

bear – timid, fearful

mousey – nonsense

catty – to confuse or baffle

rat – to take selfishly

bull – something difficult

Exercise 14. **We can say *a carton of milk* and *a bottle of wine*. What words go together with the following nouns? Consult a monolingual or combinatory dictionary.**

a __ of flowers

a __ of sweets

a __ of grapes

a __ of chocolates

a __ of bread

a __ of tights

a __ of jam

a __ of soap

Exercise 15. **The answers to the riddles in the first column are two words (an adjective and a noun) that rhyme. *Example:* What is an over weight rodent? *Answer:* A fat rat! Check your answers looking up the words in the second column in a monolingual dictionary.**

What is a beautiful cat? – Boss

What is an unusual seat? – Kitty

What is a comical rabbit? – Child

What is an irritated employer? – Crowd

What is an angry boy? – Bunny

What is a bashful insect? – Chair

What is a large hog? – Lad

What is an uncontrollable boy or girl? – Pig

What is a joyful father? – Fly

What is a noisy group of people? – Dad

Exercise 16. **Each item in the first column links with another in the second column to form a common phrase or expression. How many pairs can you match? Consult a monolingual or combinatory dictionary.**

in a – machine

out of – writing

on the – dried

in – doors
above – hurry
gift – the way
cut and – clear
answering – all
cristal – wine
lead – disappointed
family – sense
sense of – business
moral – humour
bitterly – shop
dry – move

Exercise 17. **Complete the following sentence using common phrases and typical collocations. Consult a monolingual or combinatory dectionary.**

1. In the end he paid for the meal but he made a… fuss about it.
2. With… luck we'll finish on time.
3. Meals will be served outside on the terrace, weather…
4. I have a… headache.
5. I think you should begin legal… against your business part-ner.
6. Do you have at least a mental… of how your new house will look like?
7. He has taken to teaching like a duck to…
8. The wind hit him as he… the corner.
9. I fainted and the next… I knew I was in the hospital.
10. A few minutes later the storm…, and we had to stop the
game.

Exercise 18. **List the following words and phrases beneath the most likely user – computer programmer, lawer, American, today's teenager. Use the labels in a monolingual dictionary to help you.**

load, window, mouse, eraser, freehold, prat, sidewalk, tort, normalcy, candy, bookstore, lessee, uncool, moneys, menu, drugstore, vacation, legit, press clipping, stroppy, thereto, QC

Exercise 19. **There are different British and American words for the same things in the kitchen. Show which is which using the abbreviations** *Brit.***and** *Amer***. Check your answers in a monolingual dicitionary.**

cooker – stove –
scale – scales –
fish slice – spatula –
cake tin – muffin tin –
silverware – cutlery –
can opener – tin opener –
tea towel – dishcloth –
wastebasket – bin –
baking tray – cookie sheet –
breadbin – breadbox –
faucet – tap —

Exercise 20. **«Translate» the following sentences from British English into American English paying attention to the words in bold type. Consult a monolingual dictionary.**

1. John has engaged a **flat** on the **fifth** floor of a new building. Since there is usually a long **queue** at the **lift** he frequently walks upstairs.

2. Jane purchased new **trackies** in a shop just south of the **roundabout** on Prince Street. She then locked them in the **boot** of her **motorcar** while she went to the **cinema**.

3. While travelling along the **motorway**, the **lorry** suffered a **puncture**. The day being warm, the driver stripped to his **vest** to begin repairs.

5. Dictionary and Speech

Exercise 1. **Read the following texts. Look up the words in bold type in a monolingual dictionary and write the correct definition for each one.**

1. On the day of Paul's arrival in London he rang up his old friend and **arranged** to dine with him at the Queen's Restaurant in Sloane Square. It seemed quite **natural** that they should be seated at the table where they had discussed so many **subjects** of **public** importance, budgets and birth control and Byzantine mosaics. For the first time since the **disturbing** evening of the Bollinger dinner he felt at ease. Llanabba Castle with its **sham** castellations and **preposterous inhabitants**, had sunk into the oblivion that waits upon even the most lurid **nightmares**. (…) For an evening at least the **shadow** that has flitted about this **narrative** under the name of Paul Pennyfeather materialized into the **solid** figure of an **intelligent**, well-educated, well-conducted young man. A man who could be trusted to use his vote at a general election with **discretion** and proper **detachment**, whose opinion on a ballet or a critical essay was rather better than most people's, who could order a dinner without **embarrassment** and in a creditable French accent, who could be trusted to see to luggage at foreign railway-stations and might be expected to **acquit** himself with decision and decorum in all the **emergencies** of civilized life. This was the Paul Pennyfeather who had been developing in the **placid** years which preceded this story.

2. The studio was filled with the **rich** odour of roses, and when the light summer wind **stirred** amidst the trees of the garden there came through the open door the **heavy** scent of the lilac, or the more **delicate** perfume of the pink-flowered thorn.

From the corner of the divan of Persian saddle-bags on which he was lying, smoking, as was his **custom**, innumerable cigarettes, Lord Henry Wotton could just catch the **gleam** of the honey-sweet and honey-coloured blossoms of a laburnum, whose **tremulous** branches seemed hardly be able **to bear** the burden of a beauty so flame-like as theirs; and now and then the fantastic shadows of birds in flight **flitted across** the long tussore-silk curtains that were stretched in front of the huge window, producing a kind of **momentary** Japanese effect, and making him think of those **pallid** jade-faced painters of Tokyo who, through the **medium** of an art that is necessarily immobile, seek **to convey** the sense of swiftness and motion. The **sullen** murmur of bees shouldering their way through the long unmown grass, or circling with monotonous **insistence** round the dusty gilt horns of the **straggling** woodbine, seemed to make the stillness more oppressive. The dim roar of London was like bourdon note of a distant organ.

3. The use of language **primarily** and **predominantly involves** making noises with our speech organs and receiving other people's speech noises through our ears. It is not a necessary condition of a language **existence** that it should have a written form or indeed any form other than talk. All natural languages had very long history as **solely** speech before they were ever written down or became **associated** with rules of spelling and punctuation. Many languages exist in the world today which have still never been written down. Most of the changes that **affect** languages in time and **space** (the difference between Chaucer's English and our own, for instance, or the difference between British and American English) are to be explained in terms of language as *spoken* and *heard*. Most of the difficulties we **experience** in using language in what we have called here its more '**exotic**' ways (writing an essay, for example) arise from the fact that our **chief competence** in the use of language lies in talking it.

Exercise 2. **Read the following texts. Choose the right word for each context to complete the text below. Look up the words in bold type in a monolingual dictionary.**

1. So far we can **say/talk/speak/tell**, all human **languages/tongues** are equally perfect as instruments of communication that is **each/every** language **appears/looks/sees** to be as well **equipped/provided** as **some/any** other for saying the things its speakers **wish/desire/want** to say. It may or may not be appropriate to talk about **naive/primitive** peoples or cultures, but that is another matter. Certainly, not all groups of people are equally competent in nuclear physics or psychology or the **agriculture/cultivation** of rice or the printing of batik cloth. But this is not the **mistake/fault/error** of their language. The Eskimos, it is said, can speak about snow with far more **accuracy/precision/neatness** and **subtlety/delicacy** than we can in English, but this is not because the Eskimo language (one of those sometimes miscalled 'primitive') is inherently more **accurate/precise/neat** and **subtle/delicate** than English. This example does not **illustrate/imply/involve** a/an **affect/defect/effect** in English, a show of unexpected 'primitiveness'. The position is simply and obviously that Eskimos and the people who speak English live in **various/different** environments and **adapt/adopt** their languages accordingly. The English language would be just as rich in **terms/means/ways** of different kinds of snow, **preferably/presumably/predominantly**, if the environments in which English was habitually used made such **differentiations/differences/distinctions** important.

2. Seventeen seventy-six, the year that we **connect/associate** with the signing of the Declaration of Independence, also **marked/noted/noticed** the publication in England of one of the most **influential/affecting/affectionate** books of our time, *The Wealth of Nations*. Written by Adam Smith, it **called/earned/named** the author the **title/nickname/pen-name** «The father of economics».

In Smith's view, a nation's **richness/wealth/well-to-do-ness** was dependent upon production, not agriculture alone. How much it produced, he **trusted/believed/suspected**, depended upon how **well/better/best** it **combined/cooperated/collaborated** labour and the other factors of production. The more **efficient/effective/efficacious** the combination, the **bigger/greater/larger**

the output, and the **bigger/greater/larger** the nation's wealth.

The **heart/head/hand** of Smith's **economic/economical** philosophy was his belief that the **economy/economics** would work best if left to function on its own without government **rule/regulation**. In those circumstances, self-interest would **lead/make** firms to produce only those **produce/products/production** that **consumers/clients/suppliers** wanted, and to produce them at the lowest possible **price/cost**. They would do this, not as a means of benefiting society, but as an **effort/effect/affect** to outperform their competitors and gain the greatest **profit/benefit/income**. But all this self-interest would benefit the society as a **whole/hole** by providing it with more and better goods and services, at the lowest **price/cost**.

3. The **apparent/obvious/evident** solidity and permanence of custom and tradition are, of course, strong **characteristics/traits** of British culture. But they are **greatly/highly/exclusively** deceptive, for the **institutes/institutions/bodies** which appear to **embody/include/embrace** the permanence of these traditions are not **static/stable/fixed**. The monarchy is a good example, since although it had already been **confined/limited** by the constitutional revolution of 1688, its function began to change **radically/rationally/racially** in the nineteenth century and has been changing ever **since/from/yet**. In the nineteenth century, Queen Victoria's German husband, Albert, recognized more readily than his wife the **functional/fundamental/furious** changes **participating/taking part/taking place** in society. If the monarchy had a future, it should no longer **seek/grope/look for** support from the rapidly **destroying/declining/defaulting** old aristocracy (which had been important politically in the eighteenth century), but **fall/concentrate** on the **increasingly/insistingly/initially** powerful **town/urban/city** classes created by the Industrial Revolution. Albert

and Victoria began that process by making royalty more **publican/public/publicizing**, and consciously offered to the nation a **model/sample/example** of family life. The **mediocre/middle/ intermediate** and working classes of Britain's growing towns and cities loved it.

Exercise 3. **Read the following sentences. Use your general purpose dictionary, synonym dictionary or thesaurus to find a word that could replace the word is bold type. Then find a word that is opposite in meaning.**

Example: The fruit shriveled in the hot sun.

Synonym: withered.

Antonym: flourished.

1. The **foundation** of the old hotel was damaged in the earthquake.

2. The discovery of DNA has led to many **breakthroughs** in finding cures for hereditary diseases.

3. The man who was **leading** the group through the jungle had been raised there.

4. A **former** Olympic ice-skater has accepted the position of instructor at the skating-rink.

5. The towering decorated tree in the city square was a **marvellous** sight to see.

6. The prairie grass **vanished** in a summer storm of locusts.

7. The two countries decided that a **mutual** trade agreement was the solution to the problem.

8. The beaming child had a look of total **innocence** about her.

9. Consumers are **reluctant** to change their spending habits.

10. A musty atmosphere **permeated** the room.

Exercise 4. **Read the following English texts and their translations into Russian. Look up the words in bold type in a bilingual dictionary and comment on the difference between dictionary words and text words.**

1. a) At the time of this story I was living in Canada. It was **towards** the end of the Second World War, and I was **nearly** sixteen – a rather **uncomfortable mixture** of child and woman, Canadian and English. My mother and I had been evacuated five years before to Sascatoon, Saskatchewan – euphemistically known as the **Hub** City of Prairies – and had only during the last two **grown accustomed** to the **flat** sameness of the wheatfields, the vast **space** between towns broken by the **stark**, jutting grain elevators, white in the dry clear air.

We had even grown fond of Sascatoon itself; but it was always with relief that we escaped, during the **baking hot** months of the summer holidays, to one of the scattered lakes north of Prince Albert. **Pushed** like thumb-prints into the all-but-unexplored Northern forests, the sheltered **rims** of these lakes **accommodated** occasional groups of log **cabins** in which farmers, woodsmen and summer visitors shared the peace and beauty of the woods with the teeming **wild life** that belonged there.

b) В то время, когда происходит действие этого рассказа, я жила в Канаде. Это было в конце второй мировой войны, мне было около шестнадцати – довольно беспокойное соединение ребенка и женщины, канадки и англичанки. Нас с мамой эвакуировали в Саскатун, Саскачеван, – его эвфемистически именовали «сердцем прерий» – пять лет назад, и только в последние два года мы притерпелись к равнинному однообразию полей пшеницы, громадным просторам, раскинувшимся меж городами, которые прорезали лишь резкие очертания вздымавшихся элеваторов, белых в сухом, прозрачном воздухе.

Мы даже полюбили сам Саскатун; но в знойные месяцы летних каникул неизменно с облегчением покидали его, отправляясь к одному из озер, разбросанных к северу от города Принц-Альберт. Своим расположением озера эти напоминали отпечатки пальцев, влепленных среди почти неизведанных северных лесов, на их защищенных лесами берегах небольшими группами ютились бревенчатые хижины, обитатели которых: фермеры, лесорубы, дачники – наслаждались красотой и тишиной лесов, а в придачу – всякой живностью, какая там водилась.

2. a) Llanabba Castle **presents** two quite different aspects, according as you approach it from the Bangor or the **coast road**. From the **back** it looks very much like any other large **country house**, with a great many windows and a terrace, and a **chain** of glass-houses and the roofs of innumerable nondescript kitchen buildings **disappearing** into the trees. But from the front – and that is how it is approached from Llanabba station – it is **formidably feudal**; one drives past at least a mile of machicolated wall before reaching the gates; these are **towered** and **turreted** and decorated with heraldic **animals** and a workable **portcullis**. Beyond them at the end of the avenue stands the Castle, a **model** of mediaeval **impregnability**.

b) Замок Лланаба выглядит по-разному в зависимости от того, как к нему подъезжать – со стороны Бангора или от идущей вдоль побережья железной дороги. С тыла это ничем не примечательный загородный особняк – много окон, терраса, бесчисленные теплицы среди деревьев, ветхие кухоньки и сарайчики. Но с фасада – а фасадом Лланаба выходит на шоссе, ведущее со станции – это грозная средневековая крепость. Вы едете добрую милю вдоль крепостной стены с бойницами и наконец оказываетесь у ворот. Ворота увенчаны башен-кой, украшены разнообразными гераль-дическими зверями и снабжены вполне исправной решеткой, которая может подниматься и опускаться. К замку – внушитель-ному олицетво-рению феодальной неприступности – ведет широкая аллея.

3. a) There was a time when the only thing students **worried about** was their **mock** statistics **paper** and **world peace**. Money, though always a concern, was rarely something **to stir** the **passions**. First, they had **higher-minded** things to think about. Then **cash had a habit** of turning up as soon as they left university and walked into **lucrative** jobs in finance and law.

Now it is different. In Britain and the Netherlands grants **barely** cover the cost of **basic food** and accommodation, and young people are receiving more of their financing through loans which must be repaid once they find the jobs that are becoming ever **scarcer on the ground**.

b) Было время, когда студентов заботили только их курсовая по статистике и мир во всем мире. Презренный метал редко становился предметом, разжигающим страсти. Во-пер-вых, у студентов были более возвышенные темы для размышлений. Во-вторых, у денег было обыкновение появляться, как только студенты оканчивали университет и получали доход-ные места.

Теперь все иначе. В Великобритании и Нидерландах стипендий едва хватает на оплату жилья и скромного питания, и молодые люди вынуждены финансировать свое образование за счет специальных займов. Их нужно вернуть, как только будет найдена работа, а свобод-ных мест становится все меньше.

Exercise 5. **Read the following Russian text and its translation into English. Look up the words in bold type in a bilingual dictionary and comment on the difference between dictionary words and text words.**

Говорили, что на **набережной** появилось новое **лицо**: дама с **собачкой**. Дмитрий Дми-трич Гуров, проживший в Ялте уже две недели и привыкший тут, тоже стал интересоваться новыми лицами. Сидя в **павильоне** у Верне, он видел, как по **набережной** прошла молодая дама, невысокого роста, блондинка, в берете, а за ней **бежал** белый шпиц.

И потом он встречал ее в **городском саду** и на **сквере**, по нескольку раз в день. Она гуляла одна, все в том же берете, с белым шпицем; никто не знал, кто она, и называли ее просто так: дама с **собачкой**.

They were saying a new face had been seen on the esplanade: a lady with a pet dog. Dmitry Dmitrich Gurov, who had already spent two weeks in Yalta and regarded himself as an old hand, was beginning to show an interest in new faces. He was sitting in Vernet's coffeehouse when he saw a young lady, blond and fairly tall, wearing a beret and walking along the esplanade. A white Pomeranian was trotting behind her.

Later he encountered her several times a day in the public gardens or in the square. She walked alone, always wearing the same beret, and always accompanied by the Pomeranian. No one knew who she was, and people called her simply «the lady with a pet dog».

Exercise 6. **The following texts have been translated into Russian by a lazy student. There are a number of mistakes in the list of Russian equivalents. Find the mistakes and write the correct word. Consult a bilingual dictionary.**

1. Linguists who **speculate** (1) about the word meaning are fond of **remarking** (2) that one of the qualities setting human language above **systems of communication** (3) used among animals is that it is not **limited** (4) to dealing with the immediately visible in the immediate present. Men can **debate** (5) the **motives** (6) of someone, whose **identity** (7) is not known, in doing something which they have not **personally** (8) **observed** (9), to a victim whom they have never met. By contrast, a gibbon's alarm call ringing through a forest in East Asia will apply to a very imminent danger. And many accept that dogs, for example, can remember events and **personalities** (10) for years, we do not believe that they can tell other dogs about them. In fact, **by contrast** (11) with animal species, **human** (12) beings have even greater freedom in that they can talk and write about things that never have existed and never will, as in **fantasies** (13), **folk stories** (14) and some science **fiction** (15).

1. спекулировать
2. делать ремарку
3. система коммуникации
4. лимитировать
5. дебатировать
6. мотив
7. идентичность
8. персонально
9. обозревать
10. персоналии
11. по контрасту
12. гуманный
13. фантазия
14. народная история
15. фикция

2. The law is one of the most traditional **areas** (1) of national life and the **legal** (2) profession has jealously **protected** (3) its **position** (4) against outside **attack** (5). Its main **virtue** (6) is its independence from the system of government and as such, a safeguard of **civil** (7) **liberties** (8). Its main vice lies in its resistance to reform, and the maintenance of its own **privileges** (9) which may be contrary to **public** (10) interest.

1. ареал
2. легальный
3. оказывать протекцию
4. позиция
5. атака
6. виртуальный
7. цивильный
8. либеральность
9. привилегия
10. публичный

Exercise 7. **Look up the words in bold type in a bilingual dictionary, choose the meaning which fits the context, then translate the whole text into Russian.**

1. Captain McGregor looked up from his last **entry** in the **log**. The **swell** had increased. The waves now began to break against the **bows** of the «Ariadne» with a force that caused the windows of the **bridge** to rattle at each crashing impact.

The clouds which had begun to **mass** on the horizon during the afternoon had now built up into a great **bank** that almost obliterated the western half of the sky. Every sign indicated the onset of a typhoon. McGregor's anger against the weather and against his **mate** seemed to be growing at the same rate. His voice was **sharp** with irritation when he called down, «Mr. Stubbs, will you would come up here a minute, please?»

2. Living **in the country** is not really idyllic for **the low wage earner**. Usually it means great distances to travel to all the facilities that **a town dweller tends to take for granted**. When I first moved out of London **it took me a long time to get accustomed to the fact** that the doctor was about five miles away, having always lived **within the walking distance** of the surgery. As **an expectant mother** I found it quite alarming to discover it was impossible to reach the nearest **maternity unit** in less than 50 minutes **driving flat out**; **twice as long** if one had to wait for an ambulance. For many people the distance is even greater.

3. Almost from their feet stretched ripe corn, dipping to a small dark **copse** beyond. A **plain of fields** and **hedges** spread to the distant grey-blue **downs**. In a silver streak to the right could be seen the **line of the river**.

Exercise 8. **Read the following texts and comment on its cultu-ral content. Use the «Longman Dictionary of English Language**

and Culture» or the «Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary» (Encyclopedic edition) to explain the words and expressions in bold type.

1. Across the street there is a permanent settlement of dissatisfied people and crazies, living in cardboard boxes, protesting at the **Central Intelligence Agency** controlling their thoughts from outer space. (Well, wouldn't you?) There was also a guy **panhandling** for **quarters**. Can you believe that? Right there in our nation's capital, right where **Nancy Reagan** could see them from her bedroom window.

Washington's most famous feature is the Mall, a broad grassy strip of parkland which stretches for a mile or so from the **Capitol** building at the eastern end to the **Lincoln Memorial** at the western side of the **Potomac**. The dominant landmark is the **Washington Monument**. Slender and white, shaped like a pencil, it rises 555 feet above the park. It is one of the simplest and yet handsomest structures I know, and all the more impressive when you consider that its massive stones had to be brought from the Nile delta on wooden rollers by Sumerian slaves. I'm sorry, I'm thinking of the Great Pyramids in Giza. Anyway, it is a real feat of engineering and very pleasing to look at. I had hoped to go up it, but there was a long line of people, mostly restive school children, snaked around the base and some distance into the park, all waiting to squeeze into an elevator about the size of a telephone booth, so I headed east in the direction of **Capitol Hill**, which isn't much of a hill at all.

2. Basil's decision to go into the **City**, announced to an incredulous family in his last undergraduate year at **Oxford**, had not been an idle threat. He had joined a **merchant bank** on graduating and after only three years' employment was already earning more than his father, who had related this fact to Robyn at **Christmas** with a mixture of pride and resentment. Basil himself had not been at home for Christmas, but skiing in **St Moritz**. It was in fact some time since Robin had seen her brother because for their parents' sake, they deliberately arranged their visits home to alternate rather than coincide, and they had little desire to meet elsewhere. She was struck by the change in his appearance: his face was fatter, his wavy corn-coloured hair was neatly trimmed, and he seemed to have had his teeth capped – all presumably the results of his new affluence. Everything about him and his girlfriend signified money, from their pastel-pale, luxuriously thick

sheepskin coats that seemed to fill the threshold when she opened the front door to the red **C-registration BMW** parked at the kerb behind Charles's four-year-old **Golf**.

Exercise 9. **The following letters are written in a mixture of formal and informal styles. Rewrite the business letter in a consistently formal or unmarked style and the friendly letter in an informal style. Consult register labels in monolingual dictionaries.**

1. Mrs. Jane Hobbs
Personnel Officer
Robert Donaldson and Partners
14, Manton Terrace
London, W
2 July 2002
Hi, Jane,

I've just seen your advertisement for a Bi-lingual Administrative Assistant, in last Friday's *Guardian*, and though it would be a good idea to apply for this post.

I am twenty-six years old and possess a Bi-lingual Secretary's Diploma. At present I'm toiling for a publishing company in Vienna, but for personal reasons I would like to return to the UK.

When I was at school I specialized in languages and passed advance examinations in French, German and Italian. On leaving school I went to Hammersmith Secretarial College where I obtained my diploma. After finishing my course I spent a year in Italy where I worked as a receptionist and continued to study Italian.

Mr. Joseph Keller, the Senior Manager of IPCO International, Vienna has agreed to give you any further information you require about my work.

I look forward to hearing from you.
Best wishes,
Sally Brook.

2. S.S.Glory of Greece
Sweet,

This is Algiers. Not very eastern. In fact it abounds in full of frogs. So it is all off with Arthur. I was right about him at first. But who I am engaged to is Robert, which is much better for all, concerned really particularly Arthur on account of what I said originally. First impressions are always right. Yes? No? Robert and I drove about all day in the Botanic gardens. And Goodness! He was Decent! Bertie got plastered and had a row with Mabel – Miss P. Again – so that's all right too. And Robert's lousy girl spent all day on board (with second officer). Mum bought a shawl. Bill told Lady M. about his disillusionment and she told Robert, who said: «Yes, we all know.» So, Lady M. said it was very unreticent of Bill and she had very little respect for him, and didn't blame his wife. Or the foreigner.

Love,
Miss Mary Spencer.

Exercise 10. **Read the following passages from a) a business presentation and b) a lecture. They are written in a mixture of styles. Rewrite them in a consistently unmarked style.**

1. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

First of all I'd like to express my gratitude to you for joining us today. I see that you're all ears. I hope that by the end of the day you'll think your precious time has been well spent.

I'm going to talk today about a new product, a new range of fax machines, and how by selling them, we can all make a lot of dough. And that I guess is the most exciting thing about it: how we can make a healthy profit.

To begin with I'll give you some statistics. One in three organizations in the UK has a fax machine. Well, of course, what it means that two out of three organizations don't have a fax. So, I would suggest to you that in fact the home market has hardly been touched.

Let me give you an example which serves a perfect illustration of what I have just expounded. I walked into a chain store in Leeds the other day and it was my intention to buy a *Walkman* because my son was eager to have one. I wanted some information on that blinking thing, but the man who was trying to sell it to me didn't have a promotional leaflet. So, I said, why, on earth, don't you ask your office to fax that information to you. But the chap didn't have a fax machine! More than that, in the course of our negotiation it transpired that none of 500 branches of that particular chain store was equipped with a fax machine. Think of that potential, a potential of 500 machines just from this one organization!

Now, I'll be very much obliged to you if you look at the screen. Here I've listed the most important benefits of our new models.

2. Hi, guys,

last time we saw how separation in space – geographical or social – could cause a language to assume considerable variation. Today we'll continue our discussion and concentrate on British and American variants of English.

The modes of infiltration are fairly obvious. Personal contact has increased terrifically: in 1910, the vast majority of Britons had never spoken to an American; by 1990, few had not. Even fewer, of course, had not heard an American by 1990; the overwhelming mass of the British population hear Americans every evening – now on TV, but already from the early 1930s in the cinema. You may not believe me but American influence through the written word seems to be even more powerful.

Let me just mention a very ordinary example. A British linguist happened to notice a headline in the *Daily Mirror* in the mid 1950s: 'Rocks thrown at French General'. The source was an American news agency but who was to be alerted to this by two letters 'AP' (Associated Press). The *Daily Mirror* at that time a daily sale of five million and it is likely therefore that around ten million British readers absorbed that headline: ten million who were thus propelled along the road to learning that you no longer needed to be a fairy-tale giant to throw *rocks*. The linguist duly reported the headline to a class of British students the next day and they shared his interest. Ten years later, in the mid 1960s, he repeated the story to a similar group of 19-year-olds and they could not see the point of what he was saying. In other words, already to young people in 1965 the American sense of 'rocks' as small throwable stones was thoroughly familiar, the older British restriction forgotten or never known.