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0. At least three different tendencies can be distinguished in the use of the term semantics:

0.1 *Linguistic semantics*, which has to do with the scientific study of linguistic meanings, in principle is concerned with all kinds of linguistic meaning, including grammatical meaning; traditionally, however, it is first and foremost the study of lexical meaning which has been associated with semantics. The survey given in this article will refer exclusively to this type of semantics.

0.2 The *semantics of logicians*, as it is defined by R. Carnap (1942) and, to some extent, by Ch. W. Morris (1938), affects only one of three possible aspects within the range of questions raised by semiotics: 'If we abstract from the user of the language and analyze only the expressions and their designata, we are in the field of semantics.' The other two are: 'If in an investigation explicit reference is made... to the user of a language, then we assign it to the field of pragmatics.' 'And if, finally, we abstract from the designata also and analyze only the relations between the expressions, we are in (logical) syntax.'

0.3 *General semantics*, a trend initiated by A. Korzybské (1933), which has had since 1943 as its most important mouthpiece the journal ETC.: A Review of General Semantics,* is a technique for correcting certain abuses of language such as the uncritical use of ill-defined abstractions (Ullmann 1962:10); it proposes to fight against alleged detrimental consequences of the 'power of language over thought' in human society. P. Guiraud (1962) characterizes this approach as 'une psycho-socio-logique du signe'. This trend, however, has rightly been severely criticized from various sides (e.g. Black 1949:221–26; Schlauch 1943:130–2; and Coseriu 1958:113 and 1962:esp. 237–8 fn. 6).

* The sections on E. Coseriu's structural semantics (esp. 4.2.2) were written by H. Geckler alone, who therefore assumes complete responsibility for the statements contained therein.

1 Carnap 1942:9. Cf. Morris 1938:21: 'Semantics deals with the relation of signs to their designata and so to the objects which they may or do denote.' In later works Morris modified his position; cf. his definition of meaning: 'those conditions which are such that whatever fulfills them is a denotatum will be called a significatum of the sign' (1955:17).

Among the comprehensive summaries of semantics, none treats all three directions with equal completeness. The works by Ullmann, Regnell, Guiraud, and George, however, give at least some information about 'the semantics of logicians' and on 'general semantics'.

As already indicated above, the following discussions will deal exclusively with 'linguistic (lexical) semantics'.

Before briefly illuminating a quite specific situation of linguistic semantics as it existed before the various types of a structural semantics came into being, we must first of all make a few preliminary observations on terminology and on the delimitation of the object we are considering.

During the course of the development of linguistics since the end of the nineteenth century, the terms semasiology and semantics both came to be used to designate that linguistic discipline which is concerned with the study of linguistic, especially lexical meanings. Nowadays, this competition has been resolved in favor of the term semantics (Read 1948, Ullmann 1951).

The term semasiology was introduced into linguistics before 1829 by K. Reisig (1839) and became current in Germany more than elsewhere, but did also to some extent spread from there to Anglo-American territory. This usage can be followed from G. Stern (1931) to H. Kronasser (1952) and finally to K. Baldinger (1957), whose survey seems to stand at the end of this typically German philological-linguistic tradition. The term semantics, which has served since the 1950s in international linguistic terminology as the undisputed designation for this discipline, was to originate in France. M. Bréal first used this technical term (1883) and it was immediately taken over by A. Darmesteter (1887), but the real breakthrough for this terminological innovation came as a consequence of Bréal's well-known monograph of 1897: Essai de sémantique (Science des significations).

While Bréal defined semantics very generally as 'la science des significations', as opposed to phonetics ('la science des sons') (1897: 8; fn. 1 — see 3rd ed.), Darmesteter, entirely in the spirit of the time, conceived of semantics as 'la science des changements de signification dans les mots' (1887: 88, fn. 1 — see 7th ed.).

In works on linguistics written in German, Bedeutungswissenschaft appeared as a terminological constant at least since the time of K. Reisig throughout the entire nineteenth century, and in the twentieth century as well from H. Sperber (1923) up to E. Gamillscheg (1951) and H. Kronasser.

Now there was no lack of attempts to differentiate the terms semantics and semasiology. But they remained only attempts, for at times both terms were used as synonyms according to the authors' preferences, or else only one of the two terms was used for the entire discipline within a particular philological-linguistic tradition. J. R. Firth (1957a: 27, fn. 2), for example, made the following suggestions for differentiating the terms: 'Taking advantage of what Coleridge called the "desinonymizing" process, I would use the term "semasiology" for the historical study of changes of meaning. Another suggestion is that phonetics and semantics be regarded as branches of general linguistics, the corresponding fields in special grammar being phonology and semasiology. The terminological parallelism implicit in this quotation, i.e. phonetics is to phonology as semantics is to semasiology, or, phonetics is to semantics as phonology is to semasiology, was followed to some extent (Hamp 1966: 48, 54), but without any lasting effect. Since the relationship between phonetics and phonology had not been uniformly defined before the papers of the Prague school appeared, no uniform delimitations for semantics and semasiology were forthcoming either.

A distinction between semantics and semasiology based on such considerations will not be made here. We call the entire discipline of the science of lexical meanings semantics, which can be either of descriptive-synchronic (analytic) or of historical-diachronic orientation. By semasiology we mean only a sub-discipline with a very limited range of application: semasiology takes the word qua significant as a point of departure and investigates the contents (meanings) associated with it in its multiplicity and their change (polysemy and change of meaning), while onomasiology proceeds from the contents (signifiés) or concepts — in practice even, in part, from the objects of extralinguistic reality itself — and studies the various significants (designations) which can designate the content in question (in diachronic perspective = Bezeichnungswandel).
The traditional study of meaning, whether it was called semantics or semasiology, had, as practice, changes in meaning, i.e. our historical-diachronic semantics, as its focal point. By comparison, there are far fewer efforts towards a descriptive-synchronic semantics in linguistic tradition. A few such studies will be discussed in connection with the precursors of structural semantics in 3.2. — Among the achievements in the realm of descriptive semantics must be counted lexicographical practice insofar as it concerns dictionaries ordered according to concepts. This point will not be further treated here. We also find a descriptive approach in onomasiology, which has been developed — in opposition to semasiology in the narrower sense of the term — as another kind of sub-discipline within the field of semantics. Onomasiology (cf. fn. 10 above) will not be discussed here either.

1.2.0 In the following discussion we will restrict ourselves to a brief panorama of a specific situation which had important historical consequences for linguistic study. Before the appearance of the various forms of a structural semantics, linguistic semantics within North American linguistics was in an extremely peculiar situation, which can be explained chiefly by means of the following factors:

1.2.1 North American structuralism in the wake of L. Bloomfield and particularly of his followers was shown to have been hostile toward meaning. In his striving to bring to linguistic analysis the rigor of the methods of the natural sciences, and guided by mechanistic-behavioristic premises, L. Bloomfield encountered a difficult obstacle, namely linguistic meaning:

In order to give a scientifically accurate definition of meaning for every form of a language, we should have to give a scientifically accurate knowledge of everything in the speakers' world. The actual extent of human knowledge is very small, compared to this.... The statement of meanings is therefore the weak point in language-study, and will remain so unless human knowledge advances very far beyond its present state. In practice, we define the meaning of a linguistic form, wherever we can, in terms of some other science. (Bloomfield 1965: 139-40; cf. 1943, 1960.)

According to this, the investigation of lexical meaning, and therefore semantics, would lie outside of the actual domain of linguistics.

Under the weighty influence of Bloomfield's Language (first published New York 1933), 'semoeaphobia' (A. Reichling) crystallized among the North American structuralists, and with it came the tendency to eliminate lexical meaning from


However, a line which starts with E. Sapir and continues via B. L. Whorf to the ethnolinguists must be clearly separated from Bloomfield's line.

15 A fundamental discussion of the principles of the mechanistic approach in linguistics can be found in E. Coseriu 1954.

linguistic analysis, as for example in the work of B. Bloch and G. L. Trager (1942; 6, 68) and, most consistently, in the work of Z. S. Harris (1963), who believed he had found a reliable basis for the formal description of language in distribution, which could dispense with any reference to meaning:

However, this differentiation of life and rite on the basis of meaning is only the linguist's and the layman's shortcut to a distributational differentiation. In principle, meaning need be involved only to the extent of determining what is repetition. If we know that life and rite are not entirely repetitions of each other, we will then discover that they differ in distribution (and hence in 'meaning'). It may be presumed that any two morphemes A and B having different meanings also differ somewhere in distribution: there are some environments in which one occurs and the other does not (Harris 1963: 7, fn. 4).

Since the beginning of the 1950s, voices were increasing among the very structuralists in the USA to rethink the problem of meaning within the framework of linguistic analysis. It was the contribution of Ch. C. Fries (1954; cf. Fowler 1965) to have checked, according to the texts, the hostility towards meaning ascribed to Bloomfield, which in the meantime had become almost a myth, and to have brought back a proper perspective. Bloomfield's efforts to achieve statements in physical rather than 'mentalistic' terms do not lead to the conclusion that he 'ignores meaning' or that 'he takes no account of meaning' (Fries 1954: 59).

"With Bloomfield, no serious study of human language can or does ignore "meaning"." (p. 60). Basically, North American structuralism had, according to Fries, arrived at its 'repudiation of meaning' through 'inferences drawn from a somewhat superficial reading of (Bloomfield's) discussions of mentalism and mechanism' (p. 58). However, one gets the impression that Fries was primarily attacking expressions with which others had characterized Bloomfield's procedure, since he could not do away with the fact that Bloomfield simply excluded the investigation of lexical meaning from the field of linguistics.

To be sure, Bloomfield acknowledged the importance of the content-level for the study of language (one need only refer to his terminological framework in Language, 1965: 264), but he saw no way for it to be methodically studied according to a rigorous linguistic approach. In Bloomfield's linguistic system, 'meaning' always shows up as a point of reference but he does not make 'meaning' an object of linguistic investigation. Because of methodological scruples which originated in a falsely understood, rigorous scientific ideal, he sacrificed the investigation of lexical meaning. M. Schlau (1946) pointed to the fact that the hostile attitude with respect to 'meaning' and 'mentalism' corresponded to an early phase of behavior.

16 Cf. also Harris 1954. A comprehensive discussion on the theme "The importance of distribution versus other criteria in linguistic analysis" with two reports by P. Elderkin and H. Spang-Hansen, as well as numerous contributions to the discussion by leading linguists can be found in the Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguistisk, 156-213 (Oslo 1958). Cf. further on this topic: H. Frei 1954 and P. Naest 1961.
ism which Bloomfield took over without later taking into account the differentiated further development of this theory.

Already in E. Haugen's 'Presidential Address' to the Meeting of the Linguistic Society in Chicago (on Dec. 29, 1950), criticism of the attitude of many North American structuralists to the question of meaning comes through: 'The minimizing of meaning as a factor in linguistic description was at first a healthy reaction against the misuse of meaning in establishing linguistic categories, but has now become almost a fetish with some linguists. It is curious to see how those who eliminate meaning have brought it back under the covert guise of distribution' (1951: 219). In 1951 an article by E. A. Nida appeared, with the title (unusual for the situation then current in North American structuralism): "A system for the description of semantic elements" (Nida 1951). This study suggests, for the first time, a comprehensive and coherent terminology for the description of meaning.16

Although the well-known North American introductory linguistics handbooks by Ch. F. Hockett (1958), H. A. Gleason, Jr. (1961), A. A. Hill (1958), and R. A. Hall, Jr. (1964), still give only minimal space to semantics, this development slowly reversed during the fifties, so that concepts such as 'meaning' and 'mentalism', which were then regarded as dirty words, have once again become respectable in the most widespread North American scholarly circles. We owe the definite victory over this attitude of hostility towards meaning, which had completely paralyzed investigation in the area of lexical content for many years, to the onset of generative linguistics against the already undermined position of doctrinaire Bloomfieldianism.21

1.2.2 A second important factor is the equation, often found in North American linguistics, of 'meaning' and 'thing-mean' (cf. A. Gardiner (1951: 29-35)), i.e., a reduction of the linguistic content to extralinguistic reality, whether it be as thing (cf. for instance Bloomfield's example salt - sodium chloride (NaCl) (1965: 139), or whether it be as situation (Ch. W. Morris, on the other hand, arrives at a distinction between thing and meaning). Thus, this erroneous view also underlies Bloomfield's definition of meaning:

We have defined the meaning of a linguistic form as the situation in which the speaker utters it and the response which it calls forth in the hearer (ibid.).

---

16 Based his distinctions on L. Bloomfield and on E. A. Nida, J. H. Greenberg provides, somewhat later (1954), a likewise coherent contribution to the terminology of semantics (esp. 7-8).
18 The most comprehensive discussion of meaning known to us in the North American linguistic publications of this time can be found in Pike 1954-60: ch. 16 and particularly in E. A. Nida 1964: 30-119.
19 N. Chomsky's estimation of the role of 'meaning' and 'intention' for linguistic analysis has undergone basic changes from his first publications up to the present time.
21 Trager 1950. In more recent times, however, we can discern an altered conception in Trager. The investigation of lexical meaning in 'semology' is again included within the framework of linguistics (1963).
22 We will return in another context to the more recent studies by M. Joos, S. M. Lamb, U. Weinreich, and the semantics of transformational-generative linguistics.
assessed e.g. by U. Weinreich as 'tide-turning papers' with respect to the 'concept of semantic component'. In the investigation of certain clearly delimited areas of vocabulary (especially systems of kinship relations, disease names, names of colors, folk taxonomies, etc.) in various languages (often in North American Indian languages) these scholars, partly with predominantly anthropological-ethnological interests, partly with predominantly linguistic interests, have created an apparatus for linguistic analysis that has no equal in the field of North American linguistics. We have found the most precise formulations in F. G. Lounsbury's Report to the 9th International Congress of Linguists (Cambridge, Mass., Aug. 27-31, 1962), and would like therefore, to cite some representative definitions from it. Lounsbury regards the system of kinship terms in a given language as a 'semantic field' and states:

A kinship vocabulary can be regarded as constituting a paradigm. It can be subjected to a kind of analysis similar to that given other paradigmatic sets in a language (1964: 1073).

Thus, he conceives of the semantic field as a paradigm; cf. our definition of the lexical field as a lexical paradigm in 4.2.2. Lounsbury defines the paradigm as follows:

We shall regard as a paradigm any set of linguistic forms wherein: (a) the meaning of every form has a feature in common with the meaning of all other forms of the set, and (b) the meaning of every form differs from that of every other form of the set by one or more additional features. The common feature will be said to be the root meaning of the paradigm. It defines the semantic field which the forms of the paradigm partition. The variable features define the semantic dimensions of the paradigm (1964: 1073-4).

Lounsbury makes the following statement on 'componential definitions':

A term belonging to a paradigm can be defined componentially in terms of its coordinates in the paradigm. The definition represents a bundle of features ... The componential definition of a term is the expression of its significatum (1964: 1074).

Although we are not going to pursue this line further here, we assume that this brief outline will have shown clearly enough how close ethnomorphological componential analysis (specifically, in the case of Lounsbury) is to the most modern structural semantics of European tradition (cf. 4.2).

1963a: 148. Cf. also Pike 1954-60: III.98: 'The most significant recent attempt to treat meaning structurally lies, in my judgment, in the work of Lounsbury (1956), and Goodeough (1956). They have each, independently, attempted to illustrate semantic analysis by way of kinship systems.'


27 However, it must be remarked here that L. Weisgerber had concerned himself, long before the ethnomorphologists, with certain of their preferred areas of research (e.g. kinship terms, names of colors).

28 The concept of the 'semantic dimension' has been further developed and applied in H. Geckeler (1971a: ch. VIII).

LINGUISTICS AND SEMANTICS

1.2.3.2 Another, though less important contribution to descriptive semantics, this time from the field of psychology in the U.S., is represented by the psycho-semantics of Ch. E. Osgood and his circle. Here, with the help of the so-called 'semantic differential', meanings are supposed to be measured. What is then in fact measured is not linguistic meaning, but rather the reactions of hearers to linguistic utterances, i.e. not further differentiated reactions, which are delimited by means of prescribed oppositional pairs of adjectives. The purely linguistic value of such investigations may be assessed as relatively minor, since only the area of connotative meanings (Rosello 1962: 38) is here appealed to. This, however, can become important for stylistic analysis.

2.0 The more recent and most recent developments in semantics have, respectively, been understood to be structural or have been termed structural. Three possible types of 'structural' semantics can be distinguished:

2.1.0 'Structural': understood as the structure, or better, as the configuration of associations of one sign with other signs in the vocabulary. These associations depend on similarity or on contiguity between signifiants, or between signifiés, or between signifiants and signifiés. Associations may, however, be based on the co-presence of things in extralinguistic reality, too.

2.1.1 F. de Saussure (1964: 173-5), in his treatment of the 'rapports associatifs', analyzed French enseignement as an example of a 'série associative' or 'famille associative' (we can here omit Saussure's well-known schema). In this, he comes to the following important conclusions:

Dans il y a tantôt communauté double du sens et de la forme, tantôt communauté de forme ou de sens seulement. Un mot quelconque peut toujours évoquer tout ce qui est susceptible de lui être associé d'une manière ou d'une autre... les termes d'une famille associative ne se présentent ni en nombre défini, ni dans un ordre déterminé... Un terme donné est comme le centre d'une constellation, le point où convergent d'autres termes coordonnés, dont la somme est indéfinie (Saussure 1964: 174).

2.1.2 F. de Saussure's 'rapports associatifs' or 'séries associatives' certainly

19 Cf. Ch. E. Osgood, G. J. Suci, and P. H. Tannenbaum 1957. This work was preceded by a series of articles by Osgood; cf. on this topic, R. Wells 1957. On this approach see U. Weinreich 1958, and the answer to this by Osgood (1959), with rejoinder by Weinreich (1959). Cf. also the comprehensive discussion by J. B. Carroll (1959).

20 By semantic differentiation, then, we mean the successive allocation of a concept to a point in the multidimensional semantic space by selection from among a set of given scaled semantic alternatives (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum 1957: 26).

21 On these two terms, cf. Ullmann 1963: 220-44.

22 E. de Fautour Tovar (1967) proposes, with respect to Saussure, an expanded schema of association which proceeds from Ogden and Richards' semiotic triangular model; this more complex schema, however, contains questionable relations.
formed the point of departure for Ch. Bally's 'champ associatif' (1940:195-7). Bally characterizes this particular type of a field as follows:

Les signes qui déterminent plus particulièrement la valeur de celui qu'ils entourent dans le mémoire forment son 'champ associatif': notion toute relative, puisque tout, dans la langue, est, au moins indirectement, associé à tout... Le champ associatif est un halo qui entoure le signe et dont les franges extérieures se confondent avec leur ambiançe (1940:195).

Although Bally regards this field-type as belonging to the level of the language-system (langue) on the one hand, he accords it no complete intersubjective validity on the other hand. As an illustration of his field-type he cites the famous example boeuf:

Le mot boeuf fait penser: 1) à vache, taureau, veau, corne, rumine, bœuf, etc., 2) à l'abattoir, charcuterie, etc., 3) à viande, abattage, boucherie, etc., enfin 4) il peut dégager, et dégage en français des idées de force, d'endurance, de travail patient, mais aussi de lenteur, de lourdeur, de passivité (1940:196).

2.1.3 The 'champs morpho-sémantiques', introduced by P. Guiraud (1956), also represent associative configurations. He defines such a morpho-semantic field as 'le complexe de relations de formes et de sens formé par un ensemble de mots' (1962:82); such fields can assume gigantic dimensions: the field 'chat', which Guiraud presents as an illustration, contains, at an early stage of the analysis, about 2,000 words, but even after a process of elimination still about 300. Thus, the word chat stands at the centre of a vast constellation which is made up of materially-founded and content-founded associations.

2.1.4 Finally, G. Matoré's 'champ notionnel' (1962) is likewise based on a configuration of associations. The most important constituent elements of the hierarchical arrangement of Matoré's 'champ notionnel' are the 'mots-témoins' and the 'mots-clés', wherein the 'mots-clés' stands at the center of the field. Matoré's delimitations are not of a linguistic, but of a sociological nature. His procedure concerns 'den Sprachgebrauch, mehr noch die Situationen und Themen des Sprachens, die Einstellung gegenüber den gemeinen Sachen, nicht eigentlich die Sprache' (Coseriu 1967a:21). Matoré's notional fields are so extensive that they pose the problem of the situating of the words within the total vocabulary.

28 Guiraud published further examples of such fields in a series of articles, especially in BSL.
29 Matoré's study (1955) gives the theoretical basis for his conception of the 'champ notionnel' after a practical application had already appeared (1953).
30 Cf. Matoré's schema of the 'champ notionnel d'ART et de TECHNIQUE vers 1765' (1953:102).
31 ‘Le mot-témoin est le symbole matériel d’un fait spirituel important; c’est l’étènement à la fois expressif et tangible qui concrétise un fait de civilisation’ (1953:6-6).
32 ‘Nous donnerons à l’unité lexicologique exprimant une société le nom de mot-clé. Le mot-clé désignera donc non une abstraction, non une moyenne, non un objet, mais un sentiment, une idée, vivants dans la mesure même où la société reconnaît en eux son idéal’ (1953:68).

2.1.5 Within the various subtypes of his 'champs linguistiques', the Czech linguist O. Dufcháček (1959) also includes the 'champs associatifs'. These fields are based on associations either on the level of expression or on the content-level, or on associations from a combination of the two levels.

2.1.6 A critical estimation of the forms of associative configurations briefly discussed in 2.1.1-5, which are usually regarded as belonging to a structural semantics, must, from the standpoint of a proper structural semantics such as we will subsequently present (4.2.2), include the following three points: a) The associations, if they are not of an infinite character, then at least reach an uncontrollable extent. b) The associations are largely individual and to this extent neither predictable nor systematic. c) The associations are not necessarily dependent on the language; they can also be based on the real context of things.

2.1.7 The chief emphasis of the investigations into associative relations is in the area of description, but noteworthy attempts have also been made in diachronics. S. Ullmann (1957), on the basis of investigative results by W. von Wartburg (1962:117-124) has 'structurally interpreted the changes which have occurred in the sphere of Lat. costa-femur-crus in the Romance languages. In this, he arrives at the following conclusion: 'one might . . . lay it down as a postulate of etymological research to replace each word within its associative field' (1957:295).; Coseriu 1964:147). G. Matoré (1953), too, takes the historical dimension of language into consideration when he demonstrates the change of the 'champs notonnels' with respect to the change of the 'mots-témoins' and especially of the 'mots-clés'.

2.2.0 'Structural': understood as the structure of the interpretation of a signifiant. Here we are dealing with a semasiological point of view: Which signifié is (or which signifiés are) to be assigned to a particular signifiant (disambiguation)?

2.2.1 This is the procedure usually applied in lexicographical practice, even though today there is at least a tendency to typographically mark as different dictionary entries homonyms (better: homophones) which are in fact separate lexical units.

2.2.2 The semantics of transformational grammar, as it was first conceived by J. J. Katz and J. A. Fodor (1963) and then further developed especially by Katz (1966, 1967), is based on the approach outlined in 2.2.0. The TG type of
semantics will not be further discussed here. For criticism concerning the principles of the semantics of TG, see E. Coseriu 1967b: 493-4, fn. 3; 1968a: 4-7; 1968b: 36-8; and 1970a. See also brief discussion and critical evaluation of the semantics of TG in H. Geckeler 1971a: VII.5; and H.-M. Gauger 1969.

2.3 'Structural': understood as structure in an analytical respect, as the structuring of the content-level by means of functional lexical oppositions. The analysis of lexical meanings leads to the decomposition of the contents into smaller elements, i.e., into meaning-differentiating features. In the following sections, our survey will be concerned only with this conception of structural semantics, which we consider the real analytical semantics. Only on the solid basis of such a paradigmatic semantics can a well-founded combinatorial semantics be built up.

3.0 Before beginning our discussion of purely content-oriented structural semantics as it has been briefly characterized in 2.3, we should like to refer to a long and quite varied series of tentative approaches which from a historical viewpoint can be termed precursors of this proper form of structural semantics.

3.10 Attempts approaching an analytical semantics as we define it can be found to some extent in lexicography.

3.1.1 Among the definitions in the larger dictionaries (the bilingual as well as the monolingual ones) from good lexicographical tradition, one can discern attempts to make use of meaning-distinguishing features, although this is not done consistently. Of course such features were not discovered on the basis of any method, but rather found out intuitively. Sometimes there is also an attempt to determine and delimit a base-meaning for a given lexical unit, but in such cases it is often apparent that this determining of meaning is etymologically colored. Occasionally, too, restrictions concerning the ability of certain words (e.g., adjectives) to combine with other words (e.g., nouns) are formulated almost in terms of classenformationally-determined selection restrictions.

3.1.2 Not to be overlooked are the contributions of the dictionaries of synonyms, dictionaries of antonyms, and other dictionaries which contain information on synonyms and antonyms, for these two content-relations hold a solid place in content-oriented structural semantics (cf. for example the work of J. Lyons).

3.2.0 Older approaches, which one can term 'structuralistic' avant la lettre at least as concerns certain aspects of them, are to be found in linguistic tradition.

3.2.1 One may here refer first and foremost to K.W.L. Heyse (1855), who had already had 'die Intuition eines strukturierten Wortfeldes'. In his work 'System der Sprachwissenschaft' (1856: 31-2) Heyse gives an analysis of the lexical field 'Schall' which amounts to a nearly perfect structural content-analysis, even though it was not so intended. He formulates differences of content in terms of distinctive features via intuitive application of the method of commutation; he discovers the hierarchical organization within his field (i.e., the relation between archi-unit and unit, in more modern terminology) and already establishes the existence of contentcorrelations in the vocabulary. This analysis is thus valuable above all from the point of view of method.

3.2.2 The question of precursors and pre-stages of the lexical field is to be treated only briefly here. First of all reference can be made to the tradition of lexicography, specifically to onomastics, i.e., to the arrangement of vocabulary according to meaning-groups and/or object-groups. Outside of this tradition, E. Coseriu has already referred to 'die Intuition eines strukturierten Wortfeldes' in K.W.L. Heyse (before 1855) (cf. 3.2.1). The concept of the field is said to have been formed as early as in the work of E. Tegnér (1874) and C. Abel (1885). R. M. Meyer's 'Bedeutungssysteme' (1910) already parallel the Trier fields quite closely. The paradigmatic character of the lexical field has been intuitively discovered in the work of F. de Saussure (1916) (cf. 3.3.1). A. Stöhr (1910) and R. Werner (1919) were also forerunners.

The first explicit formulation of the field-concept prior to Trier is by G. Ipsen in the year 1924. We wish to quote it primarily because of its undisputed influence on the terminology of subsequent research on the field:

Ferner, die Eigenwörter stehn in einer Sprache nie allein, sondern sind eingebunden in Bedeutungsgruppen; damit ist nicht eine etymologische Gruppe gemeint, am wenigsten um chiasmatische 'Wurzeln' aufgeführte Wörter, sondern solche, deren gegenständlicher Sinneinhalt mit anderen Sinneinhalten verknüpft ist. Diese Verknüpfung aber ist nicht als Aneinanderreihung an einem Assoziationsfaden gemeint, sondern so, dass die ganze Gruppe ein Bedeutungsfeld absteckt, das in sich gegliedert ist; wie in einem Mosaik fügt sich hier Wort an Wort, jedes anders umrissen, doch so, dass die Konturen aneinandergangen und alle zusammen in einer Sinneinheit höherer Ordnung auf, nicht in einer faulen Abstraktion untergehen (1924: 225).

And in fact, Trier does not exclude the possibility that his field theory was

E. Coseriu discovered this ante-litteram contribution to structural semantics. He has discussed and interpreted it in his contribution to the new Festschrift for R. Jakobson (1967b).
influenced by these formulations of Ipnens (Trier 1931:11, fn. 1). Ipnen returned (1932) to his definition of the "Bedeutungsfeld" in the Streiflberg-Festschrift; however, he there modified his ideas in a direction which departs from a purely content-oriented study of language, namely in the direction of semantic and formal affinity among the members of the field. Ipnen's new concept of the field has achieved hardly any practical significance in linguistics; it merely represents a special case within content-oriented field theory.

3.2.3 L. Hjelmslev (1958:646) has drawn attention to another approach, this time from the area of comparative linguistics: A. F. Pott (1861), following the comparative method, studied the different lexical structuring of a section of the system of kinship relations in various languages, determining the relevant features by means of which the different lexemes are marked off with respect to one another.

3.2.4 Most probably many other approaches in this direction could be discovered in the history of linguistics. We shall allow the above mentioned examples to suffice. Still, it would be a worthwhile undertaking to explore linguistic tradition for such forerunners of a structural semantics.

3.2.5 In this context mention can also be made of an attempt to arrive at a more differentiated conception of word-meaning: around 1900 K.O. Emdemann distinguished the following three components in lexical meaning:

1. den begrifflichen Inhalt von grösserer oder geringerer Bestimmtheit, ...
2. den Nebenbegriffen,

This classification was taken over by a number of scholars, either in precisely this form, as for example by H. Sperber, E. Gamillscheg, K. Ammer, W. Schmidt, or in a slightly modified version, as by H. Kronasser, F. Kainz, A. Sieberer; or in a considerably changed form, as by H. Güntert, E. Otto, A. Scherer.

3.3.0 In the following section we are already dealing with approaches to problems which belong, or almost belong to the proper domain of structural semantics; these efforts were, however, generally not consistently followed through.

3.3.1 F. de Saussure's Cours de linguistique générale (which first appeared in 1916) does not provide a completed treatment of semantics; in fact, this discipline is touched upon only occasionally. In addition to his treatment of the 'rapports associatifs' (cf. 2.1.1), among which only one type ("la seule analogie des signifiés, enseignement, instruction, apprentissage, éducation, etc...") 1964 : 174) belongs to purely content-oriented semantics, Saussure formulates, especially in his statements on 'la valeur linguistique considérée dans son aspect conceptuel', certain ideas which can be regarded as belonging to the fundamentals of a structurally understood field theory:

Puisque la langue est un système dont tous les termes sont solides et où la valeur de l'un ne résulte que de la présence simultanée des autres... (1964 : 159).

Even more clearly — because examples are supplied as illustrations (Fr. mouton — Eng. sheep/mutton and cf. below) — does the following quotation from Saussure point in the direction of the modern concept of the field, for here the paradigmatic character of the lexical field has been intuitively anticipated:

Dans l'intérieur d'une même langue, tous les mots qui expriment des idées voisines se limitent réciproquement; des synonymes comme redouter, craindre, avoir peur n'ont de valeur propre que par leur opposition; si redouter n'existait pas, tout son contenu irait à ses concurrents (1964:160 — cf. 161-2).

3.3.2.0 A large number of semanticists agree that field theory represents a significant stage in the history of modern semantics. For example, S. Ullmann expresses the following estimation of the effect of Trier's field theory: The whole perspective has changed; a "Copernican revolution" has taken place in semantics (1963:160).

3.3.2.1 In the following section the essential features of field theory, as developed by J. Trier (especially in 1931, 1932 and b, 1934 a and b, 1938) and taken over and to some extent continued by L. Weisgerber (primarily in 1942, 1954, 1957, 1962 a and b, 1964) will be discussed briefly.

Trier's conception of the field is based primarily on ideas from W. von Humboldt and F. de Saussure. From W. von Humboldt he took the principle of articulation (Gliederung) in language. This is probably the fundamental link between J. Trier and L. Weisgerber. From F. de Saussure he took the conception of language as a system. He was the first to consistently apply this principle of Saussure's to the study of vocabulary. Thus, he speaks of the 'Ideen der Ganzheit, der Gliederung und des Gefüges' as the 'Leistene' of his work (1931:25). Trier conceives of the vocabulary of a synchronous stage of a language as a whole arranged according to principles of content; that is, organized in 'Wortfelder' which can stand side by side, or in a hierarchical relationship to one another. The 'Wortfeld' or 'sprachliches Zeichenfeld' itself represents in turn 'ein gegliedertes Ganzes, ein Gefüge'. The global meaning of the field is articulated and distributed, leaving no gaps, by means of the lexical units functioning in this field. The content of the different units is determined by mutual delimitation with respect to their neighbors in the
field ('die Einzelworte bestimmen sich durch Zahl und Lagerung im Gesamtfeld gegenetig ihre Bedeutungen' (Trier 1931: 7)).

To illustrate, let us quote some of the most important passages for Trier's conception of the lexical field:

In der Sprache ist alles Gliederung. Wie die Worte sich aus dem Feld ergießen und damit ihr Wesen haben, so sind die Felder auch nur in der Gliederung übergeordneter Größen und so stufenweise aufwärts bis zum Ganzen der Sprache (1934: 188).

Trier's definition of the field concept:

Felder sind die zwischen den Einzelworten und dem Wortschatzganzen lebenden Wirklichkeitsteile, die als Teilganze mit dem Wort das Merkmal gemeinsam haben, dass sie sich ergießen, mit dem Wortschatz hingegen, dass sie sich ausgliedern. Die Ordnungsbühne ist dabei gleichmäßig (1934b: 430).


Die Worte im Feld stehen in gegenseitiger Abhängigkeit voneinander. Vom Gefüge des Ganzen her empfängt das Einzelwort seine inhaltliche begriffliche Bestimmtheit (1931: 2).

Die Bedeutung des Einzelwortes ist abhängig von der Bedeutung seiner begrifflichen Nachbarn. Alle schliessen sich zu der Aufgabe zusammen, in den Block ungleichförmiger Bewusstseinshäut gewissermaßen Grenzen einzuziehen, ihn zu klären, ihn begrifflich fassbar zu machen (1931: 3).

After J. Trier had ceased publishing on field theory, L. Weisgerber continued these ideas in the spirit of their founder, so that nowadays we can quickly correctly speak of the Trier-Weisgerber field theory as of one single conception. Weisgerber then incorporated the field theory into a comprehensive theoretical framework erected on Humboldtian principles. He distinguishes a 'static' and an 'energetic' study of languages, whereby he characterizes the former as grammatical procedure ('grammatisches Verfahren') and the latter as a fully linguistic procedure ('voll sprachwissenschaftliches Verfahren'). Static language study includes the 'form-oriented' (gestaltbezogen) and the 'content-oriented' (inhaltbezogen) approach; energetic language study includes the 'efficiency-oriented' (leistungsbefugte) and the 'effect-oriented' (wirkungsbefugte) approach (Weisgerber 1963: 11:18). Accor-
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The comparison of the internal organization in a lexical field with a mosaic, which Trier probably took over from G. Ipn en, has been rejected in the critical literature by opponents and supporters of field theory alike. Especially noteworthy is the criticism of this kind of illustration of linguistic relations in the lexical field on the part of content-research (Sprachinhaltforschung) (e.g. by H. Gipper, H. Schwarze; more cautiously in L. Weisgerber).

What J. Trier here designates as 'Begriffsblock' seems to correspond to 'content purport' in Heintzler's terminology (Prolegomena to a theory of language, 1963).

Saussure's definition of the concept 'value' would seem to underlie this and the following determinations.

Cf. footnote 50.

'single-stratum fields':

Arrangement in a series (Reihengliederung): e.g. the numerical series or the grades used in evaluating achievements of pupils (example from Trier): e.g. sehr gut/gut/befriedigend/ausreichend/ mangelhaft/ungenügend.

Surface arrangement (Flächenlösung): e.g. in the field of kinship terms in modern German: dominance of a single classificatory viewpoint.

Arrangement in depth (Tiefenlösung): e.g. the color cone in German: a two-level organization. Basically, this already goes beyond the type of the single-stratum field.

'Fields of more than one stratum': e.g. the linguistic articulation of dying in German. Weisgerber speaks of the
fact that 'die deutsche Sprache einen dreifachen Ring um das sterben legt' (1962a:184). Here, in the innermost circle, human dying (sterben) is contrasted with that of animals (verenden) and of plants (eingehen); in a second circle the 'cessation of life' is organized by means of objective points of view, e.g. ertrieren, verhängen; in the third and outermost circle by means of subjective points of view: e.g. hinscheiden, heimgehen, verröcheln, abkraten, verrecken, etc.44

In criticism of Weisgerber's view of the lexical field 'cessation of life', it must be noted that he includes the entire 'historical language' (esp. 'diastatic' and 'diafaphase' differences come clearly to the fore here), instead of analysing a 'functional language' (on these distinctions introduced by E. Coseriu, cf. 4.2.2.2.).

Weisgerber also made reference to three different kinds of lexical fields as they can be distinguished on the basis of the particular domains which they organize: lexical fields from the domain of 'natural phenomena', lexical fields from the domain of 'material culture', and lexical fields from the domain of the 'intellect' (des Geistigen) (1964:72, 1942:30-3).

Here, the lexical fields from the domain of the intellect assume an important specific role, for this part of vocabulary has 'viel mehr den Charakter des Vorstosses in die "geistige Zwischenwelt", teils in solchem Masse, dass tatsächlich die Begründung dieser "geistigen Gegenstände" nur von der Sprache aus verständlich wird' (1964:72). The transition from 'Wortfeld' to 'Sinnebezirk' ('semantic area') (in Weisgerber's sense) means, simultaneously, the changeover from a 'content-oriented' to an 'efficiency-oriented' perspective; from the static to the 'energetic' point of view. Weisgerber wishes to propose the concept of the 'Sinnebezirk' as basic for efficiency-oriented word-study, paralleling the concept of the 'Wortfeld' which is primary in content-oriented word-study. In view of the fact that Trier's usage of this term was not consistent, Weisgerber wants to redefine it in a twofold way:

Einmal als übergreifenden Begriff, innerhalb dessen die Betrachtung nach Feldern, aber auch die anderen Formen des Aufzeigens der Bestimmtheit von Wortinhalten zu ihrem Recht kommen. Sodann kann man ihn eher der leistungsberechteten Forschung zuweisen (1963:104).

As early as 1956, the group of linguists named 'Sprache und Gemeinschaft' defined the concept of the 'Sinnebezirk', with the concurrence of J. Trier, as follows:

Unter Sinnebezirk verstehen wir einen relativ selbständigen erscheinenden Ausschnitt aus dem sprachlichen Weltausb, wobei ausser und innersprachliche Bedingungen bei der Umgrenzung zusammenwirken. Es ist damit zu rechnen, dass wir in jedem Sinnebezirk Ausprägungen aller genannten Formen sprachlichen Zugriffs, grammatisch gesprochen also inhaltlicher Bestimmtheit, antreffen (1956:57-70).

44 Concerning the field 'Aufhören des Lebens', only briefly outlined by Weisgerber in 1962a: 184-5, K. Baumgärtner (1967: esp. 190-2) has made a proposal for systematization and for a real content-analysis.
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The decisively important 'Formen sprachlichen Zugriffs' respectively 'inhaltlicher Bestimmtheit' are represented by the 'Wortfeld' and the 'Wortstand' (cf. 3.3.3). In conclusion let us cite a statement by Weisgerber on the relationship of Wortfeld/ Sinnebezirk:


Weisgerber's long-term goal is a synthesis of the four stages of language study (ganztzeitliche Sprachbetrachtung) 3.3.2.2. The number of publications having to do with field theory in a more or less relevant way is so extensive as to be almost impossible to survey. The scale of reactions ranges from the direct adoption and application of Trier's field theory to related areas (this particularly by Trier's own students) through criticism of certain features of the concept of the field and criticism of the application and material results of field-research, up to a total rejection of field considerations as a theory. We have tried to give a detailed discussion of these objections elsewhere (Geckel 1971a: ch III. 3). Among the critics of field theory will be here mentioned only: F. Dornseif (1938), F. Schulzeviller (1942), W. Betz (1954) and E. Oksaar (1958), whose approach is based on practical suggestions by W. Betz and theoretical affinity with E. Leisi (1953); finally, from the side of onomasiology: U. Ricken (1961 a and b) and W. Bahner (1962).

A positive stance toward field theory, although with criticism of specific points, has been taken by W. von Wartburg (1937, 1962), S. Ohman (1951, 1953) and also S. Ullmann.

To the advocates of field theory belong, among others, those scholars concerned with the investigation of language content ('Sprachinhaltsforschung', e.g. H. Gipper, H. Schwarz (1962)) and also those interested in structural semantics (explicitly in E. Coseriu and J. Lyons).

Peculiarly, criticism with regard to field theory is almost always directed against Trier alone, and only rarely against Weisgerber, although the latter is precisely the one who should be regarded as the protagonist of the wordfield idea ever since the fifties, at least. Thus, criticism lags behind the development of the field concept to some extent, for example in that it still dwells on the mosaic simile as originally applied to the organization within the lexical field. Weisgerber himself admits that

46 The most comprehensive enumeration of such 'Formen inhaltlicher Bestimmtheit' (6) is found in Weisgerber 1962b: 206ff.
47 The following articles give information about some aspects of the 'Sprachinhaltsforschung', which in Anglo-American tradition is occasionally characterized as 'Neohumboldtian' linguistics: H. Basilius 1952 and L. Seiffert 1968b.
48 On behalf of the onomasiologists, on the other hand, B. Quadr (1952:153-4) makes a very positive assessment of the value of Trier's field theory.
Linguistics and Semantics

The text discusses the relationship between field theory in linguistics and semantic theories, emphasizing the importance of considering the context and usage of linguistic elements. The author references several works, including those of Porzign and R. M. Meyer, and provides a detailed analysis of the development of field theory.

Key points include:
- The distinction between different types of fields (e.g., paradigmatic vs. syntactic)
- The role of context in understanding linguistic phenomena
- The importance of diachronic and synchronic analysis in semantic studies

The text is structured as follows:
- Introduction to the concept of field theory in linguistics
- Analysis of Porzign's work
- Discussion of the relationship between field theory and semantic theories
- Summary and conclusion

In conclusion, the author suggests that a comprehensive understanding of field theory requires consideration of both diachronic and synchronic aspects, highlighting the importance of historical and contextual influences on linguistic development.
Its complexity is made clearly apparent in the schema which precedes (1960: 20).

As far as a purely content-oriented study of the lexical field is concerned, Duchâéché's 'champs linguistiques d'idées', which in turn include 'champs conceptuels' and 'champs sémantiques', are all that is relevant. These are distinguished in the following manner:

Les champs sémantiques diffèrent des champs conceptuels par un degré plus petit d'homogénéité, par une plus grande complexité et une plus grande étendue, unissant les mots qui concernent par exemple les travaux agricoles ou l'administration ou l'âge humain ou les degrés de parenté, etc. (1959: 300).

We have tried to give a somewhat more detailed discussion, as well as an attempt at criticism, of Duchâéché's field concept elsewhere (Geckezer 1971a: ch. III. 4).

3.3.2.4 Finally, let us refer to the danger of misinterpretations of the field concept. E. A. Nida apparently assumes that the various possibilities of the use of a word and the tree diagram of signifiants (as e.g. bachelor) customarily used in the semantics of TG represent a lexical field (1964: 39-40):

Such a schematic structuring can be said to define the semantic field, including the relationships between the various dictionary entries for a particular term. The semantic field of any lexical item is always much greater than the meaning which occurs within a specific context.

Furthermore, a field of the type developed by Matoré, contrary to the opinion of its author, has little more than the name in common with the Trier-Weisgerber type.

3.3.3 Approaches to structural semantics also come from such representatives of the theory of word-formation who see the principles of this linguistic subdiscipline not first and foremost as morphologically determined, but rather, as content-determined. If one overlooks such forerunners as Christian Wolff (1730) and O. Jespersen (1924), then the decisive points of view do appear first in studies by W. Porzig, and then, more explicitly, in the work of J. Kuryłowicz, who refers expressly to Porzig. On the one hand, Porzig (1930-31, 1967: 104-5, 128-35) finds that abstracts summarize a sentence by focusing the predicate, e.g. die Rose ist rot → die Rote der Rose; on the other hand, he recognizes that the two expressions are synonymous with respect to designation (Bezeichnung), but not with respect to signification (Bedeutung) (cf. the rigorous distinction between Bedeutung and Bezeichnung by E. Coseriu in 4.2.2.). J. Kuryłowicz44 broadened Porzig's outline into a theory. Among the important results of his investigations should be mentioned in this context: 1) not only abstracts, but also other derivations com-

43 Cf. also Matoré's scarcely credible claim: 'N'ayant pas su s'imposer, elle [la linguistique allemande des champs] est restée inconnue des linguistes français qui ont dû la réinventer en partant du concret linguistique' (1953: 64).

44 In a fine article (1936) the Polish linguist advocates a somewhat different conception from that in his contribution to the 6th International Congress of Linguists (1940a) and in 1949b: 54-6.

prise a syntactic function; 2) certain derivations do not contain any sentence function: e.g. château → châtelet; 3) the various phases of the underlying transformations are contained in the end product, e.g. arc (1) → (se servir) d'arc (2) → (se servir) d'arc (3) → (individu se servant) d'arc (4) → archer (5). The difference between primary and secondary lexicographic structures (cf. 4.2.2.) has been clearly recognized here.

Kuryłowicz's distinction 'derivation syntaxique' / 'derivation lexicale' appears in Ch. Bally (1965 : 180) as 'transposition fonctionnelle' / 'transposition sémantique'. This distinction of Bally's has been taken over by other scholars, as for example by H. Marchand (1966, 1969).

The perspectives in word-formation opened up by Porzig and Kuryłowicz were later pursued by B. Pottier, to some extent, but are completely integrated only in the total conception of lexicematic structures by E. Coseriu (cf. his word-formation types of Modifikation, Entwicklung, Komposition in 4.2.2.).

In conclusion, let us here mention the content-structures of the 'semantische Nische' (number of derivations of a suffix forming a semantic group) and of the 'Nischenüberdachung' ('the coinciding of the same meaning-group of two suffixes'), which were introduced by K. Baldinger (1950: 279). The niche, then, constitutes a subgroup within a materially identical derivational type which is held together by common content. Corresponding to the 'bridging over of niches' is the concept 'Wortstand' developed by the 'Sprachinhaltsforschung' ('Wichtig ist, dass hier ein bedeutungsmäßig aufbauwerkzeug getroffen ist, und zwar der Aufbau grüSerer Sinneinheiten vornehmlich durch das Zusammenwirken verschiedener Ableitungsmittel' (Duden 1959: §§§32-3)) e.g. the various meanings, in word-formation, for the formation of words designating professions in German (whereby the formations in -er represent a semantic niche).

3.3.4 In connection with the more recent discussion of the problem of homonymy (and of polysemy), certain points of view became apparent which at the same time, are relevant to structural semantics and even implicitly presuppose the existence of such a semantics. It was the contribution of R. Gödel to have taken up the problem anew in an important article with the characteristic title "Homonymie et identité" (1948) and to have suggested a solution based on a formal, synchronic criterion. He underscores the fact that his mode of inquiry concerns the paradigmatic axis, and differentiates homonyms (better: homophones) on the basis of their belonging to different derivational series, e.g. French polli, - polir, dépolir, polissage . . . / polis - impoli, poliment, politesse, etc. French louver (louange, louangeur) is considered a homonym with louver (location, locataire, sous-louer), and, in the case of the latter unit louver, he assumes 'identity' (i.e. polysemy) for 'donner en location'/prendre en location'.

In summing up, Gödel defines the 'signes homonymes' in the following manner:

45 H. Frei (1961: 44-5), on the other hand, points out that louver (locare), too, is the source of two different derivational series.
ce sont des monèmes, phonologiquement semblables, mais distingués par leur place dans les rapports associatifs. C'est dans ces conditions qu'il y a lieu de discerner les cas d'homonymie et ceux d'identité et la confrontation des séries mémorielles fournit un critère moins subjectif que le sentiment linguistique des individus (1948: 14-15).

H. Frei (1961: 43) presents a procedure which permits a distinction between polysemy and homonymy, although, to be sure, only for the substantives. It has to do with a pronominal replacement test. In order to prove that French mouton represents only one single lexical unit with two variants ('exceptions'), Frei cites the following perfectly acceptable sentence: 'On n'élève pas seulement le mouton pour en manger.' To show that in French police, on the other hand, there are two separate lexemes and not merely two variants of a system-unit, the Geneva linguist adduces contexts in which the pronominal replacement cannot be interpreted with reference to the unit police appearing in the main clause: 'On informera la police [= 'police'] si vous ne la [= 'policy'] signez pas; II a des ennui avec la police [= 'police'] parce qu'il n'en [= 'policy'] a pas.'

In his discussion of homonymy in Fr. voleur, E. Benveniste (1954) goes beyond the beginning made by Godel in that he places the viewpoint of the signifié in the center of his considerations. On the ground that they belong to two different classes sémantiques, he distinguishes two separate lexemes voleur: voleur1 belongs to the semantic class of 'marcher, courir, nager, ramper, ...'; voleur2 to that of 'dérober, soustraire, ...'.

In principle, we here already have before us the dissolution of homonymy by means of the lexical field as it is expressly represented by W. Porzig ('Die Zugehörigkeit zu ganz verschiedenen Feldern müsste für die Scheidung genügen': 1959: 161) and L. Weisgerber (dissolving of the 'Bedeutungsklumpen' by means of assigning the different units to different lexical fields - 1962a: 209-10). Benveniste uses other criteria as well, however: the grammatical construction and the derivational series (as defined by R. Godel): voleur 'fly' is intransitive, but voleur 'steal' is transitive. The two derivational series have the following form:

central
(radical)

content

marginal
(derivatives)

constituents
(pleremes)

exponents
(morphemes)

extensive
(nominal morphemes)

intense
(verb morphemes)

For additional bibliography, the following articles should also be mentioned: O. Duchâble 1962, K. Heger 1963, and especially W. A. Koch 1963.

he should not rather be included under point 4 among the very representatives of modern structural semantics; various arguments, which we will cite in the following paragraph, speak for the classification finally adopted by us.

There can be no doubt that it was L. Hjelmslev who after all laid the foundation for the possibility of a structural semantics with his idea that the content-level of language can be analyzed in a way analogous to the level of expression. Hjelmslev's project, however, did not get beyond the initial stages, chiefly for two reasons: first of all, because he completely eliminates semantic substance; secondly, because the separation between the lexical and the grammatical sphere is not carried out. Thus pleremics of the glossematician J. Holt (1946, 1961, 1964) deals almost exclusively with grammatical content. (Cf. Alarcos Llorach 1969). Hjelmslev's plerematics (the counterpart to kenematics) is concerned with everything belonging to the content-level. By analogy to the level of expression, Hjelmslev (1959) finds the following differentiations for the content-level, which is precisely what is being investigated in plerematics:

What is especially important here is the separation of the derivational elements from the grammatical elements (morphemes). Let us now return to the structural content-analysis. Proceeding from the principle that there is solidarity between expression and content (which was interpreted as isomorphism), Hjelmslev in his chief work, Omkring sprogets grundsætninger, transferred the decisive idea of passing under the sign-threshold to the analysis of vocabulary as well. Considerations of linguistic economy in the creation of new signs led Hjelmslev to the insight that the unlimited number of linguistic signs is made up of a limited number of 'non-signs' called 'figures': Thus, a language is so ordered that with the help of a handful of figures and through ever new arrangements of them a legion of

47 On the form/substance problem in Hjelmslev's conception of language, see E. Coseriu 1954, especially chapter V.
48 As a critical introduction to glossematics, see Siersema (1965). A concise presentation of this direction of modern linguistics is offered by E. Fischer-Jørgensen (1955); (our schema was taken from this article).
49 We are using the English translation by P. J. Whitfield, revised edition, 1963.
signs can be constructed" (1963: 46). He regards 'the construction of the sign from a restricted number of figureae' as "an essential basic feature in the structure of any language" (47). Hjelmslev's now-famous statement: 'une description structurale ne pourra s'effectuer qu'à condition de pouvoir réduire les classes ouvertes à des classes fermées', contained in his report on structural semantics for the 8th International Congress of Linguists (1958: 653), is clearly anticipated already in the Prolegomena (e.g. 1963: 71). Here, the question is one of attempting to reduce the open lists of the vocabulary to closed lists according to the grammatical model; basically, he strives toward a grammaticalization of the vocabulary.

While he considers, on the level of expression, already the phonemes as figureae, his content figureae correspond at least in part to what we now call distinctive content features or semes. In the Prolegomena (1963: 70), Hjelmslev gives some examples to illustrate how he conceives of the first stage of the analysis. Unfortunately, the great Danish linguist, who died far too soon, neither suggested new examples nor continued his analysis in his later works. Hjelmslev cites the following examples:

1) 'ram' = 'he-sheep'
2) 'ewe' = 'she-sheep'
3) 'man' = 'he-human being'
4) 'woman' = 'she-human being'
5) 'boy' = 'he-child'
6) 'girl' = 'she-child'
7) 'stallion' = 'he-horse'
8) 'mare' = 'she-horse'

The content of eight units of vocabulary is thus determined by means of combinations of six elements (content figureae). If one considers, e.g. the examples 1) and 2) and 1) and 7), one can state that 'The exchange of one and only one element for another is in both cases sufficient to entail an exchange in the other plane of the language' (1963: 70). Hjelmslev called this procedure 'exchange test', which ultimately belongs to the commutation test. This he defines in the following manner:

"L'épreuve qui doit servir à montrer si le remplacement d'un élément par un autre dans le plan de l'expression de la langue peut entraîner une distinction dans le plan du contenu, ou si le remplacement d'un élément par un autre dans le plan du contenu peut entraîner une différence dans le plan de l'expression (1966: 173)"

The commutation test serves first of all to identify the functional units, the invariants, within a paradigm. However, this service is not necessary for content analysis, since the units are here given as already identified, if one disregards homophony and polysemy. On the other hand, however, the commutation test forms the instrument for the delimitation of the functional level and for the analysis of lexemes into distinctive features, and as such it can be used as a criterion for the distinction of the two most important directions within structural semantics (cf. 4.1 and 4.2).

L. J. Prieto (1956, 1957) has formulated proposals for a content analysis based on Hjelmslev. But Prieto's "nooslogie" (1964) remains a disappointment since it stops at the point where structural semantics begins.

There is also an important line of affiliation running from Hjelmslev to A.-J. Greimas, in whose semantics the content-substance is not eliminated, however; and finally also to E. Coseriu.

4.0 Various important developments have grown out of the structural approaches and assumptions discussed in Section 3. They can be differentiated on the basis of their differing methods (distribution/commutation).

4.1.0 Determination of content by means of distributional methods.

In the following paragraphs we will briefly discuss some important representative figures of this methodological approach. Yet here it must be stated, however, that this orientation of semantic research did not progress beyond the experimental stages.

4.1.1. M. Joos has attempted, in his article "SemoLOGY: A linguistic theory of meaning" (1958) with the help of a 'purely linguistic test', namely the process of 'collocation', to define differences in meaning as differences of distribution in various contexts. Joos illustrates his procedure by means of the English lexeme code, and arrives, via the 'congruence' operative in the collocations among the meanings of the combinations with code, at a 'continuous 14-place CODE ring', which he interprets as follows: 'CODE has just one 'sememe' with 14 'allosemes' (1958: 64). Via collocations such as rigid code, strict code, ethical code, military code, religious code, etc., in which certain allomases are congruent, others incongruent (and are therefore eliminated), Joos arrives at the following fourteen allomases of code: Formalism, Codification, Law, Rule (public), Custom (public), etc.

7 On these most recent developments, the aforementioned introductory handbooks on semantics do not yet give information. For orientation we refer the reader especially to the following studies: Tz. Todorov 1966; A. Rey 1969; L. Leroi 1967; and H. Geckeler 1971a. Individual authors and their approaches are treated briefly also in R. Barthes 1964 and Y. Kegami (1962, 1967).

79 'In lexicography, a collocation is a word-combination which throws light on the meanings of the words involved' (1958: 62); Joos' definition of 'collocation' reads: 'concurrency of morphemes which eliminates meanings (others then [sic] surviving)' (55).

81 'Congruence: matching of surviving meanings between morphemes within a collocation' (1958: 59), simplified graphic representation in the case of the collocation RIGID CODE.
Ethics, Morals, Ritual, Crypto-Secrecy, Clique-Language, Condensation (public), Recoding (public), Language, Lexicon (1958:55). His 'semology' is concerned with 'distributional meaning' or 'inside meaning' (Joos 1962:46).44

4.1.2 J. Dubois, based on Z. S. Harris' conception of distribution, undertook (1964) to distinguish 'synonyms' on the basis of distribution. His statements on the French examples aigu-pointu, route-chemin-voie, and briser-casser-rompre utilizing the 'environnements (de droite et de gauche) which represent the distribution, exhibit the danger of confusion between signification and designation' (cf. 4.2.2).

4.1.3 S.M. Lamb's 'sememic approach' (1963) which is placed within his 'stratification' (cf. 1966) method, is distributional, too. Lamb distinguishes the following 'strata' of language structure: phonemic, morphemic, lexicemic, sememic; and, in addition: 'two peripheral strata which relate to the structure but are outside it: the phonic and the semantic' (1963:4). The relationship of respectively two consecutive strata to one another is characterized by means of types of 'representational relations', whereby the principle is: 'emes are represented by their alls on the next lower stratum' (1963:3). With respect to the two strata which are particularly interesting to us in this connection Lamb states: 'the sememic stratum is above the lexicemic, and . . . it is on the lexicemic stratum that we find the allos of the sememes, that is, the allosemes' (17). 'Sememes have their representations, i.e. their allosemes, on the lexicemic stratum, not on the semantic' (ibid.), whereby the semantic stratum would correspond to Hjelmslev's 'content substance.' Lamb's example, which exhibits 'diversification' as a representational relation, concerns the sememe S/könken/which has, in English, on the lexicemic stratum the two allosemes can and be able to, cf. he can go/he will be able to go. In fact this is a matter of distribution of suppletive forms. But is it justifiable to assume a particular stratum for material suppletion? In his publications, Lamb works with a great profusion of terminology; the analyses, however, do not come up to expectation.

4.1.4 Excursus. At this point, we would like to insert an excursive discussion of the function of context and of contextual determination of meaning. Two things must not be confused here: for one, contextual meanings, i.e. discourse-meanings or discourse-variants (as such, not relevant to our discussion), and second, the determination of meanings on the basis of context as a method. Here, then, we are dealing with meaning which is determined and investigated in terms of context. The meaning of a word is here equated to the sum of the different contexts in which it occurs, i.e. to its linguistic distribution. Publications from the English, respectively London, school of linguistics were probably the first in which the connection of the situational with the contextual determination of meaning was made. J. R. Firth took over the term context of situation from B. Malinowski (1960:306), and has developed this concept further in a series of studies (since

---

44 A succinct resumé of Joos' semology is given e.g. in Y. Dagan: 1962:10-11.

45 Such a confusion is clearly present in J. Dubois 1960.
f) contexto cultural

IV. universo de discurso: (= ‘el sistema universal de significaciones al que pertenece un discurso (o un enunciado) y que determina su validez y su sentido’, 318).

T. Slama-Cazacu published a study (1961:207-23) of considerable length which has, among other things, the complex ‘context’ as theme. She distinguishes various aspects of context, which, however, are a disappointment in comparison to the rich systematic differentiation of ‘entornos’ in E. Cozertu.

4.2.0 Determination of content by means of the commutation method.

Here we find ourselves in the realm of true content-analysis, of paradigmatic lexemics.

4.2.1.0 In the following paragraphs, the decisive ideas of the most important representatives of this orientation will be discussed briefly, whereby mention will be made of the particular achievements as well as of the deficiencies of these investigations. It may be noted that the linguists discussed below developed their versions of structural semantics almost simultaneously and independently of one another (this is particularly the case for B. Pottier, A.-J. Greimas, and E. Cozertu).

4.2.1.1 In France, B. Pottier (primarily in 1963, 1964, 1965) worked out an adequate conceptual apparatus for the analysis of content into distinctive features. This was done for the most part in clear parallel to already existing differentiations in the domain of phonemic sciences. He introduces the following terms as relevant for lexemics: Corresponding to the phème, le sème appears in lexemics, defined as ‘le trait sémantique pertinent’ (1963:8); parallel to the phèmèrne is le sémème, defined as ‘l’ensemble des traits sémantiques pertinents (ou sèmes) entrant dans la définition de la substance d’un lexème’ (1963:8); corresponding to the phonème is le lexème which is understood as the lexical realization of a seme. As a further parallel to phonology, B. Pottier introduces, for the area of vocabulary, archi-units: thus l’archisémèrne and its lexical realization as archilexème, also called cover-word and inclusif (1967a:55).

The classème introduced by Pottier does not, however, go back to a model in the area of phonemic analysis: ‘Le classème est une caractérisation d’appartenance de sèmes à des classes générales sémantico-fonctionnelles: animation, continuité, transitivité’ (1964:125). While sèmes and classèmes constitute the denotative meaning of a lexeme or of a lexie (as Pottier designates a lexical unit), the element virtuème introduced by him belongs to the domain of connotative meaning:

Chaque lexie a ainsi un certain nombre de virtualités combinatoires, qu’on peut appeler ses virtuèmes. Ceux-ci peuvent être caractérisés par un indice, très approximatif, de probabilité (1964 : 130-1). 83

He even regards the virtueme as a kind of seme: ‘les sèmes variables forment le

83 Cf. also his definition (1967b : 190).
virtuisme, et sont connotatifs (. . .)' (1967a: 27). Thus, according to Pottier, a lexical unit is made up of the following four components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sémème (particulirant)</th>
<th>classèmes (généralisants)</th>
<th>virtuèmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constante</td>
<td>varianté</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Si l’on considère une lexic, on a les composantes sémème et classème, fondées sur un choix essentiellement paradigmaticque, et les composantes fonctème et virtuèmes, déterminées surtout par la situation systématique (contrastes diverses au moment du choix paradigmaticque) (1964: 133).

With respect to the linguistic evaluation of the virtuisme, we are of the opinion that it is not a question of a fact of language, but rather of a category which is based on the knowledge of extralinguistic reality, of things (cf. e.g. 'mouette' - 'blanc'). In summary and as a transition let us quote from Pottier's recent fundamentals of a theory of linguistics:

Le contenu sémique d’un lexème est son sémème. Le sémème est l'ensemble des sèmes. Le sème est le trait distinctif minimal de signification, et se révèle par opposition dans un ensemble lexical. - Ce n’est donc qu’en travaillant sur de petits ensembles lexicaux qu’on peut établir les sèmes d’un sémème (1967a: 26).

B. Pottier has actually demonstrated the analysis of such a ‘petit ensemble lexical’ (1963: 11-17), which corresponds approximately to the concept ‘lexical field’. His study concerns the field ‘siège’ (‘seat’) in modern French. He carries out his analysis on the following five lexical units: chaise, fauteuil, tabouret, canapé, pouf. Thus, for example, he analyses the ‘lexic’ chaise into the following sèmes: s1: 'avec dossier', s2: 'sur pied', s3: 'pour 1 personne', s4: 'pour s’asseoir'. The ‘lexic’ fauteuil presents the same sème (S) as chaise plus the sème s5: ‘avec bras’. The result of Pottier’s analysis is schematically represented as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{chaise} & + & + & + & + & + & = & S_1 \\
\text{fauteuil} & + & + & + & + & + & = & S_2 \\
\text{tabouret} & - & - & + & + & + & = & S_3 \\
\text{canapé} & + & + & - & + & + & = & S_4 \\
\text{pouf} & - & - & + & + & + & = & S_5 \\
\end{array}
\]

94 ‘Nous proposons d’appeler fonctème l’ensemble des traits grammaticaux fonctionnels d’une lexic’ (1964: 127) and ‘fonctème (‘parties du discours’ et leurs implications)’ (133).
95 However, a complete field is not investigated.
96 In his 1965 article, Pottier has undertaken some minor modifications in his analysis. Thus, he no longer includes the unit pouf in this field, so that the sème s5 becomes irrelevant.

The sèmes s2 and s4 are common to all the lexical units in question: they make up the archi-sememe of the field; their lexical realization as archi-lexeme is represented by the 'lexic' siège. We can now oppose the different lexemes in pairs so that in every case they are distinguished only by a single distinctive feature (the other senses being identical):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{pouf-tabouret} : & s_1 & & \\
\text{tabouret-chaise} : & s_1 & s_0 & s_6 & s_5 \text{ make up the common basis, the archi-sememe.} \\
\text{fauteuil-canapé} : & s_0 & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Pottier’s illustration of an analysis-97 raises the question as to whether or not this is really a matter of an analysis of linguistic content or, at least in a first phase of the analysis, rather of a description of a series of functionally related objects, which is to say, of a part of extralinguistic reality. This point has been subject to criticism (e.g. Coseriu 1968: 8–9). And in fact, Pottier starts from a description of the objects, cf. e.g. 'Furons une suite d'objets désignés par la lexic chaise, et décirons chacune de ces chaises de la façon la plus complète' (1963: 11). On the basis of his test, he is able to eliminate the features of the description which are not relevant and thus arrives at the inventory of the pertinent features, whose combinations we have seen above. Do these features really function as sèmes in the language? ‘Wo liegen die Grenzen zwischen sachlichen und sprachlichen Geischpunkten?’ (Gipper 1959: 276).

Certain restrictive comments on Pottier’s structural semantics98 notwithstanding, his important contribution remains his having introduced the idea of the classeme into modern semantics and having reconsidered the old problem of polysemy in the light of his semantics. Indeed, he prepared a linguistic apparatus which is most highly suitable for application to the content-analysis of lexical fields.

4.2.1.2 Likewise from France is A.-J. Greimas’ contribution (1966) to content-analysis, which was not available in published form until 1966, but had been worked out some years earlier in the form of lectures. From this work, which is

97 Pottier does not refer to H. Gipper’s article (1959), which would have been of particular interest by way of comparison for his analysis.
98 The introduction of the category of the virtuisme was no doubt conditioned by practical exigencies and aspect of machine translation.
somewhat unsurveyable in spite of its systematic external arrangement, we will discuss only a few points, since the fundamental ideas of this semantics (and to some extent the terminology, too) coincide with the ideas of Pottier and Cosenzi, who, moreover, state them in a clearer form. In his book, Greimas cites as an example for an analysis of his type 'le système sémiétique de la spatialité' (1966:32-6) within the domain of the adjective in modern French. This analysis, in which it is not apparent in just what way the author progresses immediately to the senses, looks like this:

```
spatialité
   +-------------------------------+
   | dimensionalité                |
   | +-----------------------------+  
   | horizontalité               |
   | (haut/bas)                  |
   | verticalité                 |
   | superficie                  |
   | volume                      |
   | (vaste/x)                   |
   | (épais/mince)               |
   +-------------------------------+
   | non-dimensionalité           |
   | +-----------------------------+  
   | perspectivité               |
   | (long/court)                |
   | latéralité                  |
   | (large/étroit)              |
```

or, in a different form of graphic representation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMES</th>
<th>spatialité</th>
<th>dimensionalité</th>
<th>verticálité</th>
<th>horizon-talité</th>
<th>perspectivité</th>
<th>latéralité</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>haut</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bas</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>court</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>étroit</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaste</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>épais</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the hierarchical arrangement of the semes (e.g. 'dimensionalité' is hierarchically higher than the senses 'horizontalité' and 'verticalité'), every next-higer sense represents, with respect to the next lower sense, an 'axe sémiétique', the notion which we

---

Elsewhere, Greimas speaks rather of an 'axe sémantique', which he defines in the following manner: 'ce dénominateur commun des deux termes, ce fond sur lequel se dégage l’articulation de la signification. On voit que l’axe sémantique a pour fonction de sousumer, de totaliser les articulations qui lui sont inhérentes' (1966:21).

have called 'dimension'. (Cf. Greimas 1971a:ch. VIII) The opposition between adjectives situated on the same semantic axis (e.g. long/court; haut/bas) rests on their polar relationship with respect to the category 'quantité relative', which is subdivided into the two senses 'grand quantité' and 'petite quantité'. It is Greimas' contribution to have attempted, in his structural semantics, to progress immediately to very abstract features. One must note as a restriction, however, that his conception does not concern the entire domain of semantics and that his semantics is situated somewhere between a semantics of the langue and a semantics of the text.

4.2.1.3 In the U.S., U. Weinreich (1962, 1963a) and his disciple E. H. Bentix (1966) may be regarded as the exponents of content-analysis closest to European structuralism. U. Weinreich, who died all too early, has in his publications addressed himself primarily to combinatory semantics. He has ultimately discussed and criticized in detail the so-called 'semantic theory' of Katz (and Fodor) (Weinreich 1966), which is first and foremost a sentence-semantics. We know of no study by Weinreich in which he explicitly treats the paradigmatic side of semantics, but over and over again one finds statements in his works which prove that he means by 'compositional structure' and by 'covert semantic components' (e.g., 'generation', 'sex', 'alive' vs. 'dead') the same linguistic phenomena as the representatives of European structural content-analysis mean by semantic or structural structure or by senses or distinctive features of content. Perhaps it is also legitimate to see, in the following quotation from E. H. Bentix, a reflection of the views of his teacher Weinreich. An approach unusual for North American linguistics is formulated in the introduction (Chapter 1) of Bentix's above-mentioned monograph:

Our approach is structural in the paradigmatic sense of the word. The meanings of the forms in a given language are presented as standing in opposition to one another within the system of the language and as being distinguished by discrete semantic components acting as the distinctive features (1966:1).

We will look upon a minimal definition of the meaning of a form as a statement of semantic components that are sufficient to distinguish the meaning paradigmatically from the meanings of all other forms in the language (p. 2).

4.2.1.4 Another important contribution to structural semantics in our sense comes from the English school of linguistics, from J. Lyons. After Lyons had

---

**60** Criticism of Greimas' method and practical analyses has been made by K. Togeby (1965:7) and M. Wandruszka (1968:620-3) although Greimas expressly declares that the examples chosen by him are to be taken as illustrations of his theory and make no claim to material precision of analysis. Setting out from different theoretical premises, M. Bierwisch investigates (1967) among other things the content-structure of German adjectives of space.

**61** A good survey of the state of semantics in Soviet linguistics is given by the same author (1963a).

**62** Weinreich distinguishes 'linking' and 'nesting' as types of the combining of sign-contents. 'Linking may be described as that effect of a grammatical conjunction of two signs which yields a product of their designata' (1963a:163), e.g. in yellow flower, (to) walk fast. 'Nesting is not really defined by Weinreich in this article; he merely shows that 'nesting' appears in 'asymmetrical two-place relations' as e.g. buy flowers, under water (pp. 164-5).
first presented his theory in a monograph form (1963), he modified and refined it for the discussion of semantics in his introduction to linguistics (1968: 443-70), which has since become well-known. In our presentation of Lyons' ideas about semantics we will keep for the most part to this more recent version. Lyons recognizes 'that the vocabulary of a language will contain a number of lexical systems the semantic structure of which can be described in terms of paradigmatic and syntagmatic sense-relations' (1968 : 443).45

The lexical systems are made up of 'lexical items' between which the 'sense-relations' obtain. Lyons determines the content of a lexical item in the following manner:

..., the sense of a lexical item may be defined to be, not only dependent upon, but identical with, the set of relations [i.e. paradigmatic sense-relations] which hold between the item in question and other items in the same lexical system (1968 : 443).46

Recently Lyons has distinguished the following 'sense-relations':

A) Synonymy, whereby he emphasizes, in opposition to S. Ullmann, that this sense-relation 'is not essential to the semantic structure of language' (p. 452).

B) Hyponymy (formed by analogy with synonymy, antonymy) is defined as 'unilateral implication' or as 'inclusion', e.g. scarlet-red, tulip-flower, whereby in each case the first lexical unit represents the 'hyponym', the second the 'superordinate term' (or 'hyperonym'). This relationship corresponds to that between unit and archi-unit in our terminology.

C) Incompatibility, defined 'on the basis of the relationship of contradictoriness between sentences' (p. 458). Thus, the color-terms represent 'a set of incompatible lexical items' (Ibid.). This sense-relation must be distinguished from mere 'difference of sense'. Thus, e.g. English crimson and soft are 'different in sense, but not incompatible', while crimson and scarlet are 'similar in sense (.), but incompatible' (p. 459).

D) 'Oppositeness' of meaning, with three subtypes:

a) Complementarity, e.g. single : married, male : female, corresponds to the logical principle of 'tertium non datur'.

b) Antonymy, e.g. big : small, good : bad, forms the sense-relation which obtains between the 'opposites' par excellence' (p. 463). These are characterized by the fact that they are 'regularly gradable' (Ibid.) (cf. Sapir's concept of 'grading').

c) Converseness, e.g. buy : sell, husband : wife. This sense-relation has not been

45 His 'lexical systems' correspond to our 'lexical fields'; his 'sense-relations' in the Introduction correspond to the 'meaning-relations' in Structural Semantics; Lyons does not treat the 'syntagmatic sense-relations'.

46 Cf. also: 'I consider that the theory of meaning will be more solidly based if the meaning of a given linguistic unit is defined to be the set of (paradigmatic) relations that the unit in question contracts with other units of the language (in the context or contexts in which it occurs), without any attempt being made to set up "contents" for these units. This I should mark as one of the principal theoretical points that is being made in the present work' (1963 : 59).

sufficiently defined by Lyons. 'Converseness' represents a content-relation in which the one member implies the other. In actual fact, however, this relation has to do with different content relationships: thus, a common basic content may be assumed for buy and sell, whereby the differentiation of the two lexemes is given only by means of the different (classemic) viewpoint of the verbal process; husband and wife on the other hand are relational polar concepts.

Lyons' semantics differs from the other forms of structural semantics presented in 4.2.1 in that it has a different object of investigation, namely the kinds of 'sense-relations' within the field- or class-structures (in this regard it represents probably the most extensive treatment). One of the major achievements of this interesting approach is that it has provided, with its sense-relation of 'incompatibility', which actually falls outside of the framework of the other sense-relations, a contribution to the problem of the delimiting of lexical fields. The fact that Lyons has not attacked the entire area of a structural semantics can be regarded as a failing, as can the fact that he does not arrive, within the domain he does treat, at a proper analysis of content into distinctive features on the basis of the explicit principle of functional oppositions. At this point the most extensive outline of a structural semantics to date ought to be presented, namely, E. Coseriu's semantics. We will discuss it rather exhaustively in 4.2.2.

4.2.1.6 After the discussion of the most important proponents of the structural analysis of lexical content, it must be emphasized that the analyses of the individual semanticists (thus esp. in the case of Pottier, Greimas, Coseriu, despite certain theoretical or methodological divergences, do parallel one another, and can also be traced back to one another). A failing that can be found in the work of almost all these linguists is that a delimitation of the object, i.e. of semantics, either is not proposed at all, or else is silently assumed to be already given.

4.2.2.1 E. Coseriu47 has proposed the most comprehensive conception of a semantics of lexematic structures to date. His structural semantics has a twofold goal: for one, he wishes, by precisely delimiting the object of his semantics, to avoid the inadequacies of the approaches of other linguists, cf. the seven preliminary distinctions in 4.2.2.1; secondly, he succeeds in tracing all the problems of a structural semantics back to a single system, at present only outlined. This system comprises the paradigmatic structures (i.e. the primary structures, such as lexical field and lexical class as well as the secondary structures, which correspond to the


46 Attempts in this direction are found also e.g. in Hattori 1956 (the idea of the classeme, cf. also 4.2.2), and F. Rodriguez Ariznabar 1967 (concept of 'polarización').

47 This has been pointed out by E. Coseriu (1967b: 492 f.).

48 Esp. in 1966: Romanische (insbesondere französisché) Semantik, course given at the University of Tübingen in the winter term 1965-66; 1967c; and 1968a.
three content-determined processes of word-formation) and also the syntagmatic structures (i.e. the 'lexical solidarities'), cf. 4.2.2.2 and 4.2.2.3.

As concerns general problems, it must be said that the study of vocabulary has remained very far behind in comparison to the millenary grammatical tradition. This statement is true to an even greater extent with respect to a structural approach to vocabulary. In general, it is claimed that the chief difficulty lies in the very high number of lexical items in comparison to the limited number of units to be dealt with in phonology and in grammar. In his contribution to the 8th International Congress of Linguists, L. Hjelmslev has indicated a theoretical possibility for overcoming the above-mentioned difficulty: ‘Une description structurale ne pourra s’effectuer qu’à condition de pouvoir réduire les classes ouvertes à des classes fermées’ (1958: 653).

E. Coseriu emphasizes that the vast proportions of vocabulary (and thus the great number of lexical items to be studied) present no difficulty of principle for research. Rather, he claims, it is a matter of practical difficulty. Like Hjelmslev, he also strives to reduce the complex material to be analyzed: but, with Coseriu, this reduction is achieved on the basis of a series of distinctions to be enumerated briefly below.

4.2.2.1 Necessary preliminary distinctions. Via a succession of seven distinctions, E. Coseriu arrives at the desired homogeneous object of investigation, which can only then be subjected to a structural semantic analysis.

4.2.2.1.1 Distinction between extralinguistic reality (objects) and language (words).

The chief difficulty consists in the proximity of lexical function to the reality designated by the lexemes, for vocabulary is the last linguistic stratum before the transition to reality itself; that is, it represents the linguistic stratum having an immediate connection with extralinguistic reality. Therefore, it is sometimes difficult, but always essential, to distinguish between that which belongs to linguistic meaning and that which belongs to a knowledge of the objects. (Cf. Coseriu 1970b.)

The matter of technical vocabulary, of terminology, belongs in this framework. Technical vocabulary is simply a nomenclature and as such not structured on the basis of language but rather on the basis of extralinguistic reality, on the basis of the objects of the discipline in question. Terminology thus presents an objective classification constructed on logical, i.e. exclusive distinctions: A [ Not-A; e.g. acid ] base in chemistry. Linguistic oppositions, on the other hand, are very often inclusive:

\[ A \text{ Not-A} \]

\[ \text{Night} \text{ Day} \]

E. Coseriu sees his basic assumption that at least a large part of vocabulary is structured confirmed by the well-functioning linguistic communication even in extensive linguistic communities (1966: 178-9).

Since, in technical usage the words are really the representatives of the 'objects', designation and signification (cf. 4.2.2.1.7) coincide in this case whereas in the domain of the 'natural' language they must necessarily be separated. Therein lies also the reason for the translatability, or better, the substitutability of terminologies in a 1 : 1 ratio within the language communities having approximately the same state of knowledge in corresponding sciences:

En réalité on connaît les 'signifiés' des terminologies dans la mesure où l'on connaît les sciences et les techniques auxquelles elles correspondent, et non pas dans la mesure où l'on connaît la langue: ... (Coseriu 1966: 183).

The examples often cited as particularly clear cases for the structuring of a word-field — the evaluative scale (J. Trier) or the designations of military rank (R. M. Meyer) — are not instances of linguistic — i.e. semantic — articulations, but rather of conventionally set up, artificial classifications.

Mais l'important est qu'on reconnaisse que, dans ce qu'on appelle le 'lexique' d'une langue, il y a de larges sections purement 'désignatives', et où la seule 'structuration' possible est l'enumération, et d'autres qui sont structurées, ... qu'il y a un 'lexique structuré', linguistique, et un 'lexique nomenclateur' et terminologique (ibid.: 184).

Thus, in a structural view of vocabulary, everything belonging to terminology and nomenclature is eliminated at the outset. By this means one simultaneously achieves, with regard to the analysis, a considerable reduction of the almost unlimited number of lexical items making up the total vocabulary.

In this context are also to be placed these associations which are believed to exist between certain lexical contents, but which in reality obtain on the basis of relations between the designated objects; on this point cf. certain relations in Ch. Bailly's 'champ associatif'.

The question of the relationship between linguistic structurings and the structures of extralinguistic reality turns out to be especially important. The fact that a certain air-temperature is judged as 'cool' by one person and as 'warm' by another, or the fact that there are, in extralinguistic reality, no clearly defined boundaries between what is expressed e.g. by the common linguistic contents 'young' - 'old' is often interpreted as a mark of the subjective and imprecise nature of linguistic content-structurings. Herein lies a fundamental error:

les valeurs linguistiques sont des valeurs conceptuelles qui se définissent par leurs oppositions et par leur fonctionnement, et non pas par des critères 'réels' et par les limites, précises ou imprécises, entre les phénomènes de la réalité (ibid.: 186-7).

a) Difficulties which present themselves in the separation of classes of real phenomena are not difficulties affecting the distinction between the corresponding concepts; quite the contrary: such difficulties show that the concepts are clearly separated. Thus e.g. the fact that in extralinguistic reality there are no clear boundaries between day and night does not mean that the concepts 'day' and 'night' are
unclear as concepts. Here, therefore, the precise delimitation of the concepts stands in opposition to an imprecise delimitation of the phenomena conditioned by the nature of the extralinguistic data.

b) Lack of agreement in the usage of lexical elements with respect to a specific state of affairs does not imply a lack of agreement of these elements with each other content-wise. Illustrations such as: Ce café est chaud. - Non, il est froid; Vous êtes riche. - Non, je suis pauvre; Vous êtes jeune. - Non, je suis vieux do not prove inconsistency in the content of these adjectives, but rather variance in the estimation or evaluation of the respective state of affairs. The lack of agreement in the use of these adjectives does not concern their meaning - the fact that one can argue about it proves after all that the same contents are meant -, it rather concerns the question of whether one is to designate a specific state of affairs with one adjective or another. Thus, for example, one person finds a temperature of +5°C to be 'cold', but another does not find it so until −15°C. In fact, such cases of lack of agreement do not affect linguistic contents, but rather presuppose them.

c) Language does not choose only distinctions which coincide with boundaries in extralinguistic reality. It establishes boundaries in areas which exist as a continuum (e.g. the color adjectives in the domain of the color-spectrum) and distinguishes relationships (e.g. big - little) and combinations of continua and relationships (e.g. young - old) which as such do not exist at all in extralinguistic reality. These distinctions cannot, therefore, be traced back to structures in extralinguistic reality; they must be conceived of as structurings which human interpretation imposes, via language, on reality. Therefore questions such as 'At how many degrees does a temperature begin to be 'hot'?' and 'With what number of years does (old) age begin?' (Fr. 'A quel âge commence la "vieillesse"?') are totally irrelevant for the content-analysis of 'hot' respectively (old) age ("vieillesse").

d) Language may, however, dispense with distinctions in cases where a distinction is clearly present in extralinguistic reality. Thus e.g. the objects 'ladder (Fr. échelle)' and 'stairway (escalier)' are clearly distinguished in reality. In the Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and Romanian languages, however, there exists only one sign (scala, escala, escada, scar) corresponding to both objects while in German, English and French the distinction is made linguistically. -The case is exactly reversed in the distinction made by the Rumanian verbs a zice - a spune (to say).

As a principle, it can be stated that linguistic distinctions may, but need not coincide with objective boundaries in reality.

Le langage classe la réalité, mais il le fait selon des intérêts et des attitudes humaines... Dans ce sens la 'subjectivité' est constitutive du langage et elle est un fait linguistique-ment objectif. Mais on ne doit pas le confondre avec l'appréciation subjective (individuelle ou traditionnelle) non 'lexématisée' (ou 'grammaticalisée') (Coseriu 1966: 188).

At some points within the functioning of the vocabulary, however, knowledge of extralinguistic reality or the opinions with respect to it play an important role.

Thus e.g. in the interpretation of certain compounds or derivations, whose designatory function may be polyvalent from the point of view of the language-system. We refer in this context to the well-known examples German Straßenhändler and French bananier, liseuse, etc. Here, too, belongs the systematic locating of probability of the occurrence of words in linguistic contexts. Since linguistic contexts may express real contexts, there exists a certain probability that one will come across, in a linguistic context, the designations for the things which occur together in a real context, as e.g. boue, labour, charme, juge, etc. in Ch. Bally's example. It is clear that this probability is conditioned not linguistically, but by the co-presence of the objects. B. Pottier's category of the virtuel must also be understood in this sense.

4.2.2.1.2 Distinction between language (primary language) and meta-language.

Le 'langage primaire' est le langage dont l'objet est la réalité non linguistique; le 'metalinguage' est un langage dont l'objet est à son tour un langage: les 'choses' désignées par le mélanguage sont des éléments du langage primaire (ou, en général, d'un langage) (Coseriu 1966: 190). Each element on the level of expression (signifiants) of the primary language can be used metalinguistically and is substantivized for this purpose. Metalinguistic usage constitutes an infinite possibility of discourse (parole). It does not include any semantic structuring, for we are here concerned with an unlimited nomenclature in which every element stands in contrast to every other element. The metalinguistic sphere is therefore to be eliminated from the viewpoint of structural semantics.

4.2.2.1.3 Distinction between synchrony and diachrony. The distinction introduced by F. de Saussure (probably under the influence of G. von der Gabellentz189) between synchrony (better: language description) and diachrony (better: language history) is generally known in linguistics and has been thoroughly discussed; cf. especially E. Coseriu (1958). This distinction is above all methodologically important: the two points of view of language study must not be confused. Since 'la lengua funciona sincrónicamente y se constituye diacrónicamente' (1958: 154), we must, when we wish to describe functional language-structures, conduct our investigation in synchrony. Within synchrony we must make still finer differentiations and distinguish the synchrony of structures from the synchrony of the language, for des structures fonctionnelles peuvent se maintenir plus ou moins longtemps dans le temps, ce qui signifie que leur synchronie interne dépasse leur simultanéité avec d'autres structures de la langue (Coseriu 1966: 192).

Therefore, while certain structures are maintained in time, others undergo a linguistic change: thus we see that it is not the entire language which changes as a
single system, but that linguistic change is always accomplished within partial systems (or microsystems). — The synchrony of the language must always be related to a specific language-stage (état de langue).

In addition, it must be noted that an 'état de langue' need not be absolutely synchronic. Diachronic facts are present up to a certain degree in synchrony and are also known to the speakers. This diachronic interference in synchrony can be noticed especially in languages with a significant cultural and literary tradition, for instance in the intentional use of archaisms. But also in linguistic communities with a minor tradition background, as in the case of dialects, one can observe a certain diachronic awareness on the part of the speakers. The speakers assign certain linguistic phenomena which deviate from their own usage to a specific generation (to a younger or an older). In order to be able to take this state of affairs into account, E. Coseriu recommends for the principles of analysis:

Chaque structure doit être établie dans sa 'synchronie' propre, c'est-à-dire, dans son fonctionnement, et non pas dans l'état de langue tout entier, parce que cela signifierait confondre ou identifier arbitrairement des structures différentes, des modalités fonctionnelles autonomes... En principe, la description de chaque structure sera donc strictement synchronique. Par contre, la description d'un état de langue ('synchronité des structures fonctionnelles') devra, dans ce cas, constater la pluralité des 'synchronies' qui y se déroulent, c'est-à-dire, les différences diachroniques connues et utilisées (ou utilisables) par les sujets parlants. Une description agencée et complète implique, à cet égard, qu'on décrive une 'synchronie' choisie comme fondamentale et qu'on consigne parallèlement les autres 'synchronies', c'est-à-dire, les différences diachroniques co-existant dans le même état de langue, pour tous les cas dans lesquels ces différences existent et fonctionnent (1966: 194).

4.2.2.1.4 Distinction between technique of discourse ('technique du discours') and repeated discourse ('discours répété'). Under this distinction, valid within synchronic, technique of discourse means the freely available elements and procedures of a language, whereas the term repeated discourse embraces everything that, in a linguistic tradition, appears only in fixed form: fixed expressions and locutions, idioms, proverbs, 'refrains', Wellerisms, quotations (even from other languages), etc. In repeated discourse we are dealing with a kind of collage of past discourse (du 'déjà parlé'); the elements of this 'discours répété' are not commutable. Therefore, no oppositions are possible between them. But as total entities with a global unified meaning these fixed expressions are commutable. One can distinguish three different kinds, according to the level on which each is commutable:

1) Commutation with entire sentences or texts on the level of the sentences or texts: textemes or phrasemes (e.g. the refranes in Spanish). They are not a part of lexicemics.

2) Commutation with syntagms, interpreted on the syntagmatic level: stereotyped syntagms (e.g. Fr. avoir maille à partir, etc.). They do not properly belong to the domain of lexicemics, either.

3) Commutation with simple words, interpreted on the lexical level: lexical periphrases (e.g. Fr. en un clin d’œil, par cœur, etc.).

According to E. Coseriu, these periphrases are a part of lexicemics, since they can function in a word-field in opposition to simple words. At any rate, a distinction is to be made between those syntagms which may function as simple units and those which always do. In principle, it must be said that it is at times difficult to distinguish lexical periphrases from stereotyped syntagms. The present state of semantics permits, for the time being, no further reliable statements about this problem.

The linguistic phenomena of the technique of discourse are synchronically analyzable and structurable. Therefore it is precisely this technique which forms the object of the further distinctions.

4.2.2.1.5 Distinction between architecture of language and structure of language or between historical language and functional language. The synchronic technique of discourse within a historical language (i.e. a language as for example German, French, etc.) is not of a homogeneous nature. It exhibits three types of internal differences which can be more or less far-reaching:

Differences in geographical space: diatopic differences (e.g. dialectal differences);

Differences conditioned by the socio-cultural classes of the linguistic community: diastatic differences (concerning language levels or 'niveaux');

Differences in the intention of expression: diaphasic differences (concerning language styles).

Dans ce sens, une langue historique n’est jamais un seul ‘système linguistique’, mais un ‘diastème’: un ensemble de ‘systèmes linguistiques’, entre lesquels il y a à chaque fois coexistence et interférence (Coseriu 1966: 199).

Influenced by L. Flydal’s terminology, E. Coseriu calls this diastematic architecture of language and characterizes it as l’ensemble de rapports que comporte la multiplicité des “techniques du discours” coexistantes d’une langue historique (200).

The ideal object for investigation, from a structural view of language, is, however, the so-called functional language, which presents a syntactic (i.e. without differences in space), syntactic (i.e. without differences in the socio-cultural layers) and syntactic (i.e. without differences in the intention of expression) technique of discourse. The structure of language can be determined only within a fully homogeneous technique of discourse, that is, in a functional language. Only within the structure of language can oppositions be set up; it is not the principle of opposition which is dominant in the architecture of language, but that of diversity. This by no means implies that different functional languages are not used side by side in speaking. Quite the contrary; the speakers have various functional languages simultaneously at their command and do use them side by side. For reasons of method, however, one must introduce these distinctions, for the decisive fact is that
every opposition is set up and described in the functional language, to which it actually belongs. In the practice of investigation, then, it will be a matter of selecting and analyzing a middle level as the functional language and of always stating deviations therefrom in relation to this base. E. Coseriu designates this kind of investigation as ‘description “à étages”’ (1966:203).

4.2.2.1.6 Distinction between type, system, norm and discourse. For the technique of discourse in a functional language, E. Coseriu has proposed, and given reasons for, the distinction of four levels of structuring: type, system, norm, and discourse (1962, 1968c, 1969). With regard to a structural lexiconology, we can abstract from type as the unity of the various procedures in a language. On the level of discourse (=concretely realized speaking) we find, in the domain of vocabulary, the discourse-meanings or lexical variants which may be of a contextual or situational nature. Usually these are enumerated in dictionaries as ‘exceptions des mots’ under the various entries. Discourse-meanings may be determined in a language with respect to another language as well as with respect to the same language (= internal variants). In the framework of his structural semantics, E. Coseriu assigns the other distinction greatest significance:

Mais la distinction qui nous parait essentielle pour la lexiconologie structurale est la distinction entre système et norme de la langue. La norme comprend tout ce qui, dans la technique du discours, n'est pas nécessairement fonctionnel (distinctif), mais qui est tout de même traditionnellement (sociolinguistiquement) fixé, qui est usage commun et courant de la communauté linguistique. Le système, par contre, comprend tout ce qui est objectivement fonctionnel (distinctif) (1966:205).

From this definition of the norm as the level of what is merely traditionally fixed and not necessarily functional, and the definition of the system as the functional (or distinctive) level of language, it is clear that structural semantics is only concerned with the level of the system (system understood as system of what is already realized in the language and as system of possible realizations), i.e. with the functional lexical oppositions. Beside the lexiconology of the system, however, the significance of a lexiconology of the norm must not be forgotten. In its domain of competence belong e.g. problems of the fixation of possibilities offered by the linguistic system, questions of frequency, and others.

4.2.2.1.7 Distinction between signification and designation. This distinction, in principle known already since the Stoics, yet over and over again disregarded in linguistics, is considered by E. Coseriu to be of fundamental importance for structural semantics and for a functional study of language altogether (1966:208-10, 1968a:3, 1970b:105-6); ‘nur die Bedeutung ist eigentlich sprachlich und kann somit sprachlich strukturiert sein und sprachwissenschaftlich strukturiert werden, nicht aber die Bezeichnung, die an sich mit dem Aussersprachlichen zusammenhängt’ (1970b:105).

The signification is determined by means of purely linguistic relations on the content-level, by the relationships of signifiés to one another (similar to Saussure’s valeur); the designation on the other hand is the relation of whole linguistic signs to ‘objects’ of extralinguistic reality.186 Schematic representation:

As illustration one can cite E. Husserl’s already classic example: der Sieger von Jena - der Bestie von Waterloo. Here, one and the same ‘object’ (Napoleon I) is designated by different, indeed, opposite meanings.

In summary:

En principe, seulement les rapports de signification sont structurables; les rapports de désignation ne le sont pas. La désignation concrète (d’un objet déterminé) est un fait de ‘discours’, tandis que la signification est un fait de ‘langue’ (technique du discours). Aussi les rapports de signification sont-ils constants (du point de vue synchronique), tandis que les rapports de désignation concrète sont inconstants (variables). En outre, la désignation peut être métaphorique, tandis que la signification ne l’est pas, du point de vue synchronique et distinctif (..) (1966:209).

Elsewhere, E. Coseriu, in the framework of his conception of philosophy of language, once again considers the relationship of signification and designation:

Daft ist auch die Bezeichnung durch die Sprache etwas Sekundäres und Bedingtes, eine Möglichkeit, die erst durch die Bedeutung eröffnet wird. .. Bedeutung und Bezeichnung sind also völlig verschiedene sprachliche Funktionen: die Bedeutung ist begrifflich, die Bezeichnung dagegen gegenständlich (1967a:14-15).

In conclusion, and at the same time in retrospect, the hierarchy of the seven distinctions will be outlined once again: the lexematic structures are concerned with the linguistic contents, not with extralinguistic reality; they are based on the primary language, not the meta-language; they have to do with synchrony, not diachrony; they are determined within the technique of discourse, not in repeated discourse; they are concerned in each case with a functional language and not, globally, with a historical language; they refer to the language system (langue), not to the norm of language; this is a matter of signification, not of designation (i.e. only indirectly). Schematic representation:

186 “Les rapports de signification sont des rapports entre des signifiés, tandis que les rapports de désignation sont des rapports entre des signes tout entiers et les réalités extralinguistiques désignées” (1968a:3).
only after careful application of these seven preliminary distinctions do we arrive finally at the lexematic structures. E. Coseriu conceives of the organization of these structures in the following manner (1968a: 7):

**Lexematic Structures**

Paradigmatic Structures (oppositional)  
Syntagmatic Structures (= Solidarities) (combinatorial)

Primary Structures  
- Lexical field  
- Lexical class

Secondary Structures  
- Modification  
- Development  
- Composition

- Affinity  
- Selection  
- Implication

4.2.2.2 The paradigmatic structures (oppositional).
4.2.2.2.1 The primary structures.
4.2.2.2.1.1 The lexical field. As the preceding schema illustrates, E. Coseriu defines the lexical field within the lexematic structures as a primary paradigmatic structure. **Paradigmatic** means that the lexemes which can be chosen at a specific point in the *chaîne parlée* make up a paradigm, i.e. a system of oppositions.

**Primary** means that the lexemes are a part of the 'primary vocabulary', i.e. they do not imply other words, but correspond to immediate experience — as opposed to the **secondary** structures, which constitute the further development of a primary element (domain of word-formation).

The lexical field is defined by E. Coseriu in the following manner:

Ein **Wortfeld** ist in struktureller Hinsicht ein lexikalisches Paradigma, das durch die Aufstellung eines lexikalischen Inhaltskontinuums unter verschiedene in der Sprache als Wörter gegebene Einheiten entsteht, die durch einfache inhaltsschneidende Züge in unmittelbaren Opposition zueinander stehen (1967c: 254).

This conception of the lexical field in no way contradicts the Trier-Weisgerber lexical field theory; rather, it means a further development in a structural direction of this theory which was based to a too large extent on intuition:

Nous croyons plutôt que la théorie des champs a besoin d'être approfondie et développée et qu'une des directions dans lesquelles elle pourrait l'être est précisément la direction structurale. Aussi croyons-nous que la théorie des champs conceptuels doit être combinée avec la doctrine fonctionnelle des oppositions linguistiques (qui, du reste, y est implicite) et que l'explication de la combinaison doit être appliquée également aux rapports lexicaux, non pas pour identifier les unités, qui y sont données, mais pour établir les traits distinctifs qui les caractérisent et, par là, les oppositions de contenu dans lesquelles les unités mêmes fonctionnent. Ce n'est pas que par l'existence des oppo-

* Cf. also 1966: 212: 'Un champ lexical est un ensemble de lexèmes unis par une valeur lexicale commune (valeur du champ), qu'ils subdivisent en des valeurs plus déterminées, en s'opposant entre eux par des différences de contenu lexical minimales (traits distinctifs lexicaires ou sémiotiques'.

* As far as we know, E. Coseriu (1964: 158-9) was the first to have enlarged and extended the concept of opposition for the lexical domain by carrying over into lexicemics various oppositional types which had been developed by the Prague school for phonology, as Trubetzkoy's *priveative, gradual, and equipollent* oppositions.
designated. Content-differentiating features may be of a sort that is not found as such in extralinguistic reality, e.g. in the case of 'beautiful' — 'ugly', 'comfortable' — 'uncomfortable.' On the other hand, the very non-existence of an objective feature may have linguistically a differentiating function, thus e.g. in B. Pottier's field 'siège', in which items are differentiated by means of the fact that the non-presence of the back on the designated object constitutes, with respect to content, a positive, i.e. pertinent feature (as in the case of ‘tabouret’ and ‘pouf’).

3) Lexical fields are not fields of associations. Associative fields are centrifugal; they spread out uncontrollably, whereas lexical fields have a centripetal character. A lexical field represents a lexicematic system whose structuring is established on the basis of the semantic differences of its members.

4) Lexical fields have nothing to do with a word's range of application; more precisely with that of a significant (as in the case of the semantic theory of Katz and Fodor). There is no field which embraces only one lexeme. In a lexical field the meanings of the individual units are mutually delimited.

5) Lexical fields are not identical with conceptual fields. Every lexical field is a conceptual field, but not every conceptual field is necessarily a lexical field, for a conceptual field may also be a terminological field. Every lexeme corresponds to one concept, but not every concept is necessarily rendered by one single lexeme. A concept can also be expressed by means of a combination which comprises several words: e.g. la guerre de Trente Ans is the expression for one specific concept.

The following is a schematic representation of the relation between lexical field (LF) and conceptual field (CF):

4.2.2.1.2. The lexical class. E. Coseriu defines the lexical class as follows:

Eine Klasse ist die Gesamtheit der Lexeme, die unabhängig von der Wortfeldstruktur durch einen gemeinsamen inhaltstheoriedenden Zug zusammenhängen. Klassen manifestieren sich durch ihre grammatische und lexikalische 'Distribution'; d.h. die Lexeme, die zu derselben Klasse gehören, verhalten sich grammatisch, bzw. lexikalisch analog; sie können grammatisch gleiche Funktionen übernehmen und erscheinen in grammatisch, bzw. lexikalisch analogen Kombinationen (1967c: 294-5).

As examples of classes in a determinant language, e.g. in French, one can cite for the substantives 'living being' and 'non-living being', 'person' and 'non-person'; for the verbs, 'transitive' (possibly with additional subcategories) and 'intransitive'.

In the early stages of lexical field research, in the work of J. Trier, Begriffsfeld and Wortfeld are not yet precisely differentiated as terms.
E. Coseriu characterizes the classeme\(^{119}\) as follows: 'Der Inhaltszug, durch den eine Klasse definiert wird, ist ein Klassem' (1967c: 295).\(^{118}\) Classemes are a specific kind of seme which are able to function also outside of lexical fields or throughout a series of lexical fields. Whether we are dealing with a seme or a classeme in an individual case can be determined only by a comparison of the analyses of various lexical fields. The classemes are general determinations in the vocabulary, so that one is inclined to regard this classification as a kind of grammar of the vocabulary. Class and classeme must not be confused. Thus, the lexical class together with the lexical field is reckoned among the primary paradigmatic structures of the vocabulary, while classeme and seme belong to the distinctive features of lexematic content.

E. Coseriu distinguishes two kinds of classes: determining and determined classes: Determining classes are classes characterized by means of classemes, as e.g. the classes 'personors', 'animals', etc. Determined classes are classes characterized by distinctive features such as 'refers to class X'; thus e.g. Rum. a se insera — a se mitera, It. ammogliarari — maritarari are respectively determined by the distinctive feature 'refers to the class "men" (males)' — 'refers to the class "women"'; cf. also German Mund — Maut, essen — fressen, trinken — saufen ("refers to the class "persons" — refers to the class "animals").

As concerns the relationship of classes and lexical fields, one can observe that lexical fields may exhibit three different kinds of relations to the classes:

a) an entire lexical field functions within a determinate class:

```
   Class A  Classeme  Class B
   LF1      Classeme   LF2
```

Thus e.g. the lexical field of kinship relations is located in its entirety within the class 'personors'.

b) A determinate classeme functions within a lexical field, i.e. it subdivides the field:

```
   Classeme
   L   F
```

\(^{119}\) The term classeme has been introduced into semantics by B. Pottier. An intuition of the classeme can be discerned already in Hattori (1956).

\(^{118}\) Cf. also: "un clasmé... c'est un trait distinctif fonctionnant dans toute une catégorie verbale (ou, du moins, dans toute une classe déjà déterminée par un autre classeme). d'une façon principalement indépendante des champs lexicaux" (1968: 11) and "Les valeurs d'ordre très général, fonctionnant dans des séries de champs (par exemple "animé", "inhumé", "personne", "animal"), peuvent être appelées classèmes" (1966: 212).

Thus e.g. the lexical field of adjectives of age in Modern French undergoes a division by the classeme 'for persons'.

c) A lexical field is crossed by a determinate classeme, but its relationship to the classeme is that of indifference. In each case the classification results only through the context, i.e. in discourse:

```
   Classeme
   L   F
```

Thus e.g. in the case of Fr. débarquer, it is only the context which determines whether it belongs to the class 'transitive' or 'intransitive'.

Are we then, in the case of lexical fields and lexical classes dealing with two different kinds of lexical organization? B. Pottier answers this question in the affirmative, for he sees lexical field analysis under the perspective 'de l'infiniment petit aux classes généralisantes' and classematic analysis from the point of view 'de l'infiniment grand aux classes particularisantes' (1963: 10-26).

Another question, namely whether all content-distinguishing features are at the same time classemes or not, can be answered only on the basis of the results of a large number of successfully carried out analyses. If this were the case, then the lexical field would be a structure of intersections of various classes. Despite the fact that this is theoretically possible, E. Coseriu considers it to be dubious; he too considers lexical field and lexical class to be two different kinds of lexematic structures, although his opinion is not based on precisely the same considerations as is B. Pottier's. In conclusion let us quote one more statement by E. Coseriu on the distinction between lexical field and lexical class:


4.2.2.2. The secondary structures (domain of word-formation).\(^{111}\)

According to the respective grammatical determination of the implicit primary lexical units, three types of secondary structures\(^{112}\) can be distinguished:

\(^{111}\) Cf. especially 1968a.

\(^{112}\) Du point de vue lexémistique, elles [les structures secondaires] se distinguent par le fait qu'elles impliquent toujours la transformation irréversible d'un terme primaire existant en tant que lexème de contenu et d'expression dans la langue. C'est-à-dire qu'un terme primaire reçoit
4.2.2.2.1 Modification. 'Modification' corresponds to an 'inactual' grammatical determination, i.e. to a determination which does not imply any sentence-function of the modified primary lexical unit. The word-class (pars orationis) undergoes no alteration. In general, in modification we are dealing with a quantifying of the primary vocabulary element, that is, with diminutive and collective formations, or with prefix formation in the case of verbs, e.g. Fr. maison – maisonnette, It. cavallo – cavallino, Lat. rufus – subrufus, Fr. crier – criailleur, pleurer – pleurnicher, rouge – rougédre, It. quercia – querceto, Fr. venir – revenir, voir – prévoir.

4.2.2.2.2 Development. 'Development' corresponds to a grammatical determination which does comprise a sentence-function of the primary lexical unit, whereby the word-class changes in each case. Thus e.g. Fr. beau + predicative function → beauté ('le fait d'être beau'); partir + predicative function → départ ('le fait de partir'); en barque → embarquer; de la barque → débarquer.

In certain languages there can also be whole series of developments, e.g. Fr. riche → enrichir → enrichissement; nation → national → nationaliser → nationalisation; and also combinations of modification and development, e.g. It. passeggiare → passeggiata (dev.) → passeggiatina (mod.); G. gehen → durchgehen (mod.) → Durchgang (dev.); Fr. voir → revoir (mod.) → révision (dev.).

In the framework of the procedure of development (cf. Sp. blanco → blancura – blanquear – blancamente) internal linguistic gaps in the vocabulary can be detected from the point of view of the language-system as effectively realized. Thus e.g. in French the substantive and the adverb which would correspond to the adjective neuf are lacking, as are the substantive and verb to the adjective récent, etc.

Development involves a kind of 'deconcentration' in the meaning of the lexical item developed, with regard to the meaning of the primary lexeme. Cf. It. giornata d’inverno (‘winter day’) – giornata invernale (‘winter day’ and ‘wintery day’); cf. also the two interpretations of Ch. Bally’s examples chaleur tropicale, héroïne cornélienne.

4.2.2.2.3 Composition. ‘Composition’ always implies the presence of two basic elements standing in a grammatical relation to one another. Two types of composition can be distinguished:

1° The generic or ‘pronominal’ composition, type: Fr. pomme ➔ pommi-er

2 Sp. Limón ➔ limonero

where one of the two combined elements (2) is not identifiable with a lexeme existing in the language in question.

Une détermination grammaticale et, avec cette détermination grammaticale implicite, il est rendu de nouveau au lexique (dans le sens qu’il peut recevoir les déterminations grammaticales explicites des termes primaires) (1968a : 13).
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2° The specific or ‘nominal’ composition, type: G. kaufen + Mann (Mann, der kauft) ➔ Kaufmann, where both combined elements represent lexemes.

Type 1° of this new classification is usually referred to as ‘derivation’ and type 2° as traditional ‘composition’. The two types may also appear combined; e.g. G. Kindergärtnerin (spec. comp. [Kindergarten] + gen. comp.), Schulmeister, Fr. coupé-papier, etc.

4.2.2.3 Syntagmatic Structures (combinatorial) (1968a, and esp. 1967c)

Les structures lexémiques syntagmatiques sont des solidarités entre des lexèmes motivées par leur valeur de langue. Dans une solidarité, il y a toujours un terme déterminant et un terme déterminé, ce dernier impliquant en tant que trait distinctif l’appplicabilité à la classe ou au champ du terme déterminant, ou bien à ce même terme déterminant en tant que tel (1968a: 15).153

Among these solidarities, which correspond to the ‘essential meaning-relations’ (wesenhafte Bedeutungsbeziehungen) or to the ‘elementary semantic fields’ (elementare Bedeutungsfelder) of W. Porzig (cf. 3.3.2.3.), three types can be distinguished: ‘affinity’, ‘selection’, ‘implication’.

4.2.2.3.1 In affinity, the class of the determining lexemes functions as a distinctive feature in the determined lexemes; that is e.g. the relationship between the class ‘women’ and Lat. nubor, between the class ‘persons’ and Lat. senex or between the class ‘animals’ and Fr. guèpe.

4.2.2.3.2 In selection, the archi-lexeme of the determining lexemes functions as a distinctive feature in the determined lexemes; thus in the case of German Schiff, Zug, Auto etc. with respect to fahren. That is, the archi-lexeme of Schiff, Zug, Auto, namely ‘vehicle’, functions as a distinctive feature in fahren (‘to propel oneself by means of a vehicle’).

4.2.2.3.3 In implication, an entire determining lexeme functions as a distinctive feature in the determined lexeme; thus e.g. in the case of Fr. ailexan, rouan, lt. bato, saucer; Rum. roi, which are used only for horses, or Dutch ieteren to ‘ride a bicycle’.

4.2.2.4 After the discussion of this to date most comprehensive and most coherent attempt towards a classification of lexematic structures, the limitations of this semantics must be indicated. These limitations are conditioned by the methodological reduction consisting in the application of the preliminary distinctions outlined in 4.2.2.1. The areas of vocabulary there eliminated have not, until now, been assigned their proper place in a total semantic system. Thus, a considerable number of problems from the lexical domain must remain open for the present. These questions must be tackled after the definitive constitutng of structural semantics, for example the problems of the metaphorical sphere, of lexical

153 Cf. also: ‘Eine lexikalische Solidarität kann nunmehr als inhaltliche Bestimmung eines Wortes durch eine Klasse, ein Archilexem oder ein Lexem definiert werden, und zwar in der Hinsicht, dass eine bestimmte Klasse, ein bestimmtes Archilexem oder ein bestimmtes Lexem im Inhalt des betreffenden Wortes als unterscheidender Zug funktioniert’ (1967c: 296).
periphrases, and others. However, it seems to us that at the moment priority must be given to content-oriented structural semantics.

5.0 The various developments of a structural semantics discussed in Section 4 are exclusively descriptive-synchronic. By comparison, scholars have done far less in the area of diachronic structural semantics.

5.1.0 Modern structural semantics is only now developing a method for the descriptive-synchronic study of vocabulary. Thus, it cannot be expected that there will be much more than isolated attempts towards a structural approach to diachronic semantics. Two such attempts will be mentioned here.

5.1.1 J. Traver, the real founder of lexical field theory, has from the very beginning opened up the diachronic perspective of word-field research to scholars (cf. the entire title of his monograph of 1931: Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes. Die Geschichte eines sprachlichen Feldes, Band 1: Von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn des 13. Jahrhunderts). He conceives of 'Feldgliederungswand' and of the 'Strukturgeschichte' of a field as a 'komparative Statik', d.h. als eine sprungrweise von Querschnitt zu Querschnitt fortgehende, stets und immer von neuem das "Gesamtfeld" ins Auge fassende zeitlich rückwärts und vorwärts vergleichende Beschreibung, whereby the 'Dichtung der angelegten Querschnitte' (i.e. of the field descriptions, each of them carried out in a determinate synchronic) determines the 'Grad der Annäherung an den tatsächlichen Fluss des Werdens' (1931: 13). Whether or not this 'komparative Statik' can really grasp the essence of historical dynamics is extremely dubious (cf. Coseriu 1958). Traver sees, in the field-history he proposed, a unification of the descriptive and the historical study of language (1932a: 426) and, with his idea of 'Umgliederung', took part (1934a: 184) in the famous dispute on ‘das Ineinandergreifen descriptiver und historischer Sprachwissenschaft’ (cf. W. von Wartburg).

Trier was already familiar with the distinction, which is of fundamental importance for a structural diachronic semantics, between two kinds of linguistic change: 1° material innovation with unchanged meaning; and 2° conceptual (or content-) redistribution (e.g. 1938: 92). In the light of this relevant differentiation he gives a new interpretation to Wartburg's well-known discussion of the southwest French homophonous clash in gas (1934a: 177ff.).

5.1.2 In a very substantial contribution (1964), E. Coseriu presented the theoretical foundation for a structural diachronie semantics. The most important condition for such a diachronie lexicematics is, for him, ‘de se placer au point de vue du contenu en tant que tel’—and de considerer l'expression justement comme "expression", c'est-à-dire uniquement comme manifestation, et garantie de l'existence, des distinctions sémantiques, ..." (1964: 148). The object of structural diachronic semantics is defined as follows:

c'est le développement historique des 'champs conceptuels' considérés comme structures lexicales de contenu. Et, puisque structure veut dire avant tout opposition distinctive, la sémantique structurale diachronique aura à établir, à étudier et, si possible, à expliquer (motiver) le maintien, l'apparition, la disparition et la modification, au cours de l'histoire d'une langue, des oppositions lexicales distinctive (159-60).

E. Coseriu also clarifies the position of structural diachronic semantics within the other lexico-grammatical disciplines and in particular its relationship to traditional semantics. The three following problems of fundamental importance are then treated:

a) The problem of the delimitation of lexical change: Here, the 'in principle' decisive distinction between non-functional and functional lexical change is applied and also terminologically firmly established: The former is termed 'remplacement' (changement sémasiologique ou onomasiologique); the latter 'modification' (changement sémantique proprement dit) (170). As an illustrative example from French language history is cited the replacement of the signifiant 'ive' first of all by the signifiant 'cavale', then by 'jument' (thus, double 'remplacement'). In each case the content 'female horse' remains the same. To illustrate 'modification' the following real lexical change is cited:

```
chef          chef
               -
```

b) The problem of the types of lexical change: By analogy to phonology and grammar, the following statement can be considered as valid for lexiconology, too: 'un changement de structure ou fonctionnel est en principe l'apparition ou la disparition d'un trait distinctif et, par là, l'apparition ou la disparition d'une opposition (en phonologie: "phonologisation" et "déphonologisation")' (1964: 173). As illustration (173, 175):

```
U       U1       U2
  
```

134 This case, Trier speaks of the simple 'Kammerichtenwechseln', and refers directly to the 'Antike Bedeutungsfelder' of A. Jolles, to whom this distinction was apparently already familiar, too (1934b: 447).

135 'C'est une distinction radicale entre deux ordres de faits entièrement différents: un "remplacement" ne concerne que le signifiant (ou le lien signifiant-signifié); une "modification" concerne au contraire le signifié en tant que tel. Dans le cas d'un "remplacement" rien ne se produit, en principe, dans les rapports des contenus lexicaux; dans le cas d'une "modification", ce sont précisément ces rapports qui changent' (1964: 170).
6.0 To conclude our survey of linguistic, especially functional semantics, we will present, in the following paragraphs, some suggestions and orientations for further necessary research work in the domain of structural semantics, and will also attempt a prospect of the possible unity of linguistics.

6.1.0 Below we list, in simple outline form, a selection of problems the study and eventual solution of which seems to us very important for the progress of structural semantics. The posing of these questions may also be regarded as a suggestion for the orientation of future research in the field of structural semantics.

6.1.1 The question of the delimitation of lexical fields needs to be studied more thoroughly; further criteria for delimitation must be found, in addition to those listed by J. Lyons and E. Coseriu. The questions of the hierarchy of lexical fields with respect to one another and possible neutralizations (Coseriu 1964: 158; Geckeler 1971a: ch.V.3) between them must be further investigated.

6.1.2 Another problem is the distinction of possible types of lexical fields. How, for example, can L. Weisgerber's attempts to differentiate various kinds of lexical fields be structurally interpreted (cf. 3.3.2.1)?

6.1.3 It would also be interesting to pursue a still unpublished idea of E. Coseriu's, according to which the vocabulary of a language is made up of Bedeu-
tungsfelder (i.e. our lexical fields) and Bezeichnungsfelder (designational fields, e.g. the field of the playing of musical instruments in French: jouer, sonner, toucher).

6.1.4 The problematics of lexical classes, which was discovered and first treated in broad outlines by B. Pottier and E. Coseriu, needs further differentiation. The distinction between determining and determined classes introduced by E. Coseriu represents a first effort in this direction. For example, can determining classes be established among adjectives?

6.1.5 Another extensive complex of problems is concerned with the further determination of the grammaticalization of vocabulary and of its types among the 'secondary' lexicem structures (cf. 4.2.2), i.e. this has to do with the domain of word-formation. Which types of sentence-semantic structures underlie the secondary lexical structures? The most recent research has gotten away from assuming simple, actualized sentences, so-called 'kernel sentences' as a basis; thus e.g. H. E. Brekle in a recent publication (1970: 57ff.) no longer proceeds from 'aktuelle Satzstrukturen', but from a 'Satzbegriff (propositional concept)', i.e. from the semantic kernel of an actualized declarative sentence, freed from a number of modal relations as e.g. assertion, quantification, negation, modes, tenses, but not, as it would seem, e.g. from 'Aktionsart'. Additional studies in this direction would be most welcome.

6.1.6 The structural method developed in phonology with its elaborate technique was transferred as a model to the study of vocabulary (cf. Coseriu 1964: 150-5), especially to the analysis of lexical fields. At first, in an attempt to justify this transfer, analogies between the phonematic and the lexicem structures were particularly emphasized. However, it remains the task of future research to study and to emphasize precisely what is specific in the structuring of the vocabulary as opposed to the structuring in the phonemic domain.

6.1.7 An additional problem which has likewise been too little studied is the degree of material regularity of the level of expression with respect to the content-level in vocabulary (cf. Coseriu 1964: 166-70); 'Il s'agit de la motivation analogique, par laquelle à des contenus semblables peuvent correspondre des expressions semblables' (167). This material regularity is characteristic for grammar, and by comparison very rare in vocabulary outside the domain of word-formation (cf. e.g. the fairly regular formation of designations for fruit trees in French: pomme → pomme, poire → poirier, etc.). In this connection, L. Weisgerber's content-oriented views of the phonie shape of words fit well.

6.1.8 The problematics of structural levels (Coseriu 1952, 1968c, 1969) of language in their application to structural semantics also needs further investigation. Structural semantics as we understand it is as such concerned exclusively with the

---

219 E. Coseriu has given a provisory catalogue of analogies and differences between the phonematic and the lexicem structures in his above-mentioned course: Romanische (insbesondere französisch) Semantis; a résumé of this catalogue can be found in Geckeler 1971a: Ch. IV.2.
220 "Semblables", naturellement, non aux contenus, mais à d'autres expressions correspondant à des contenus analogues' (Coseriu 1964: 167, fn. 40).
level of the system (level of functional oppositions). But how does the transition function from the level of the system on the one hand to those of norm and discourse, and on the other hand to the type? Typologically oriented questions as e.g. that of analogy and differences in the lexematic structuring of different languages have been neglected by linguists till now.  

6.1.9 At the end of our selection of still unsatisfactorily studied problems we would like to mention the question, which has already been raised by scholars, as to whether or not the content-differentiating features (be they items or classemes) possess the status of linguistic universals. If so, then there is a definite catalogue of such content-differentiating features (cf. Leibniz) for all languages, as is assumed for the distinctive features in phonology by R. Jakobson and M. Halle (1956)? The whole controversy about linguistic universals, however, suffers from a failure to distinguish with respect to the concept 'universal' (cf. Coseriu 1970: 119, fn.1) among: a) 'universal' as something essential and conceptually necessary; b) 'universal' as something universally possible; c) what is not actually 'universal', but merely empirically general.

6.2 As a prospect for future research in linguistics we are confronted with the possibility of the union of the analytic-structural and the transformational-generative points of view. Precisely with respect to structural semantics, P.M. Postal (1966: 179, fn.10) has emphasized the essential unity of the components from componential analysis, of the semantic markers of Katz and Fodor and the minimum units of content of Hjelmslev. It seems to us rather more exact to draw attention to the possibility of an identity between the semantic markers of TG and our classemes and between the distinguishers of TG and our classemes. In the field of word-formation theory, too, approaches such as those of R. B. Lees (1963) and E. Coseriu are potentially unifiable, since after all the same facts are being treated but from different angles. There is no lack of indications of a union of structural-functional and transformational-generative points of view, thus e.g. in H. E. Brekle (1970), in M. Gross (Paris) and his team, who are occupied with the classemes of the French verb, and in part also in the work of S. M. Lamb. Thus the goal of striving for a unified linguistics does not seem altogether unattainable to us.
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