# Linguistica Pragensia 1/92

# CONTENTS - INHALT - SOMMAIRE - ÍNDICE

## Articles - Studien - Articles - Artículos

## News - Berichte - Nouvelles - Noticias

## Reviews - Besprechungen - Comptes rendus - Reseñas

# LEXICALIZATION AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN

*Leonhard Lipka* (Munich)


## 1. Introduction

1.1. Only recently has the linguistic discipline of word-formation (WF) been concerned with the phenomenon commonly referred to under the name *lexicalization*. There is a simple reason for this state of affairs: traditional approaches to WF have focussed almost exclusively on lexicalized words, i.e. on words as registered by lexicographers in dictionaries or at least as recorded somewhere in print.

*Institutionalization* is an even younger concept and term. As far as I can see, it was first mentioned in print in BAUER (1983). It can clearly be related to the social aspects of language generally, which have been re-discovered under the term *sociolinguistics,* earlier called *sociology of language,* which SAUSSURE had already emphasized at the beginning of the century.

1.2. In what follows I shall try to sketch previous work on lexicalization and institutionalization and to unravel the forbidding and confusing terminology. I will then illustrate a variety of changes which may affect a word or its extralinguistic denotatum in the course of the process of lexicalization. In my view, this may lead to alterations of form and content, which can also be combined, and to the loss – to a greater or lesser degree – of its motivation as consisting of parts or being derived from other words or languages. The result of this basically historical or diachronic process is the increasing unity (or "wordiness") of the form and concept and its familiarity, as an item, to the members of a larger or smaller speech community. This can be best captured, I believe, by the concept of *norm* introduced into linguistics by COSERIU, as a third level of language, in between SAUSSURE's distinction between langue and parole.

Although I shall try, in the following, to adopt, refine, and elaborate the ideas found in research on the problems at hand, I shall also extend the current notion of lexicalization in three new directions to include:

1. non-morphemic and submorphemic constituents, and so-called reductive WF e.g. in clippings, blends, and sound symbolism
2. derivation by semantic transfer, esp. metaphor and metonymy
3. loan processes from other languages.

It has to be stressed again, that not only the results of productive syntagmatic and non-syntagmatic WF processes may be affected by various changes, but also the products of semantic shift and transfer, as well as loanwords. All three devices for the extension of the lexicon of a language (cf. LIPKA 1990) can of course be combined in individual items.

1.3. Examples for the illustration of specific points will be given mainly from English (E), German (Ger), and also French (Fr) and in addition occasionally from other languages. What do words like the following have in common?

cook, cooker, baker, blackboard, whiteboard, white elephant, bluebell, callboy, callgirl, chair, chairman, chairperson, bus, flu, chap, chapman, milkman, forecastle, forehead, waistcoat, turncoat, holiday, radar, laser, USA, YMCA, NOW, ERA, glasnost

Ger Tellerwäscher, Geschirrspüler, Fernseher, Zuseher, Glotze, Schuh-macher, Uhrmacher, Buchstabe, Brieftasche, Geldbeutel, Börse, Portemon-naie, Portefeuille, Lehrstuhl, Lehrkanzel, Lerner, Fuchs, Galgenvogel, Froschmann, Milchmann, Schneemann, Strohmann, Wassermann, Flach-mann, Ballermann, Ski-Sarg, Handtuch, Händehandtuch, Ostwestfalen, S--Kurve, Pkw, LKW, Flüster-LKW, Flüster-Asphalt, Flüster-Jet, Hosen-träger, Brillenträger, Perestroika.

And what about personal names like the following?

Turner, Constable, Shakespeare / Ger Wagner, Schreiner, Kaufmann, Schmied / Fr Dieudonné, Pottier, Marchand.

They are all – at least originally – motivated, complex words and were coined according to productive morphological or semantic processes, or have been adopted from other languages, and they all have been affected – to a greater or lesser degree – by lexicalization and institutionalization. We will have a closer look at such examples and will first consider what linguists have said about such cases in the past.

2. Previous Research in the Field
2.1. In the first edition of MARCHAND's classic handbook on English WF, the term lexicalization does not even occur in the general index. Reference is made, however, in the text itself (1960: 80f) to the phenomenon, but only in connection with "phrases" and "syntactic groups" like *man in the street* and *black market*, where "motivation is still obvious", and also with reference to verb-particle constructions (VPCs). MARCHAND (1960: 81) states that

The process of lexicalization is obvious in changes in the significant with those words also that are not characterized by unity stress.

– giving as examples *sons-in-law* vs. *good-for-nothings* – and that (1960: 83) with VPCs beside "fully motivated combinations such as *write down, come in, go out*" there exist

wholly unmotivated groups of pseudo-signs such as *get up, give up, carry out (a plan)*.

2

On the same page he adds

> Many motivated phrases are entirely degrammaticalized (lexicalized), i.e.
> any modification can only apply to the whole combination while the consti-
> tuents are no longer susceptible of characterization.

Obviously, the terminology is not very consistent and developed, and the
whole problem is yet of minor importance.
2.2. In the second edition of MARCHAND's work, there are already four refer-
ences to lexicalization in the general index. The first one (1969: 94) is to the
unifying function of a stress pattern with a single heavy stress (called 'fore-
stress' by him):

> Many combinations of the type *man-made* are, however, always heard with
> forestress (e.g. *frost-bitten, moth-eaten* ...). They have obviously become lexi-
> calized to a higher degree ...

The second, longer passage – again in connection with *man-in-the-street* and
*black market* – is obviously concerned with semantic phenomena, and I quote
MARCHAND (1969: 122) in greater extension, with some omissions:

> There are degrees of semantic difference from a casual syntactic group (*black
> pencil*) to a syntactic group with a special meaning (*black market:* grammat-
> ical relation receding before lexicalization) to broken sign groups like *get up*
> consisting of distributionally independent speech units... We have thought
> fit to treat in word-formation combinations like *black market* where motiva-
> tion is obvious, whereas we have not included syntactic lexicalized groups in
> which synchronic analysis cannot discover any trace of motivation. The
> degree of motivation or non-motivation, however, is not always easily esta-
> blished... *Mother-of-pearl* and *mother-of-thyme* are as motivated as *butterfly,*
> i.e. by poetic comparison.

The other two references concern again the plural -s with phrases and VPCs.
2.3. Unlike his teacher MARCHAND, KASTOVSKY (1982: 164f.), in his book
on WF and semantics, gives an explicit, wide definition of lexicalization, which
does not involve the frequency of usage of an item. He considers "Lexikalisie-
rung" as:

> die Eingliederung eines Wortbildungs- oder syntaktischen Syntagmas in das
> Lexikon mit semantischen und/oder formalen Eigenschaften, die nicht voll-
> ständig aus den Konstituenten oder dem Bildungsmuster ableitbar sind.

Thus for him both complex lexemes (or WF syntagmas) and syntactic groups
may become fixed parts of the vocabulary, with formal and/or semantic proper-
ties which are not completely derivable or predictable from their constituents
or the pattern of formation. Concomitant demotivation and idiomatization are

for him both subcategories and symptoms of the lexicalization process. The pragmatic disambiguation of WF syntagmas is a further subcategory. For example both *callboy* and *callgirl* may theoretically be interpreted as 'boy/girl who calls' and 'boy/girl who is called'. The typical semantic fixation as 'boy who calls (actors onto the stage)' and 'girl who is called (by men on the phone asking for paid sex)' is a matter of lexicalization. Generally speaking, lexicalization is identified for KASTOVSKY with the incorporation of a complex lexeme into the lexicon with specific properties.

However, he makes a further interesting distinction between idiosyncratic and systematic lexicalization. Slight semantic changes such as the addition of semantic features (SFs) like HABITUALLY and PROFESSIONALLY to agent nouns like *smoker, gambler, baker, driver,* or a feature PURPOSE in *drawbridge, chewing gum, cooking apple* represent instances of the latter. Thus, the regularity of WF and of certain types of lexicalization are emphasized.

2.4.1. The most comprehensive discussion of lexicalization and institutionalization in a book on WF is found in BAUER (1983: 42–61). It deviates from the preceding accounts in two crucial aspects: 1. The definition of lexicalization as the third stage in the development of a morphologically complex word, and 2. the link with the deviation from productive WF rules. Thus *warmth* is an instance of lexicalization, because the suffix -*th* has ceased to be a productive pattern in the English language. For BAUER *warmth* is analysable but lexicalized. The same holds for *involvement,* because -*ment* appears to be no longer productive.

The first stage in the possible development of a complex word is its use as a nonce formation. This is defined by BAUER (1983: 45) as:

> a new complex word coined by a speaker/writer on the spur of the moment to cover some immediate need.

Nonce formations are already mentioned in MARCHAND's handbook, but excluded from his treatment in WF and only cited occasionally as curiosities.

For BAUER (1983: 48), the second step is institutionalization, which involves the fact that potential ambiguity is ignored and only some, or only one, of the possible meanings of a form are used. He also makes reference to so-called item-familiarity:

> The next stage in the history of a lexeme is when the nonce formation starts to be accepted by other speakers as a known lexical item.

The particular lexeme is recognized, e.g. *telephone box* as synonymous with *telephone kiosk.* Institutionalized lexemes are transparent and BAUER explicitly includes "the extension of existing lexemes by metaphor", as in *fox* 'cunning person' under institutionalization, not only WF processes.

Lexicalization, finally, is defined in a rather specific sense as follows:

The final stage comes when, because of some change in the language system, the lexeme has, or takes on, a form which it could not have if it had arisen by the application of productive rules. At this stage the lexeme is lexicalized.

BAUER (1983: 50) makes it quite clear that:

Lexicalization ... is essentially a diachronic process, but the traces it leaves in the form of lexicalized lexemes have to be dealt with in a synchronic grammar.

He distinguishes five types, which we will consider in the following, namely: phonological, morphological, semantic, syntactic, and mixed lexicalization. They all have in common some kind of idiosyncrasy, e.g. irregularity and unpredictability.

2.4.2. As examples of phonological lexicalization, BAUER (1983: 51f.) mentions an irregular stress pattern ( *Arabic / chivalric* as opposed to regular *syn/chronic, phon/etic*), vowel reduction in *day in* the names of the weekdays as opposed to *payday,* and isolation due to phonetic change in the language system, as in *lammas, husband.* He mentions that such changes lead to "opacity" in WF, but that remotivation is possible through spelling pronunciation, e.g. of *waistcoat, housewife, forehead.*

For morphological lexicalization he gives linking elements as in Ger *Gerechtigkeit-s-liebe, Kind-er-liebe,* alternants like *eat-/edible, legal/loyal, two-/tuppence* and again *warmth* as an irregular affix.

Semantic lexicalization, which is explicitly characterized as "not a unified phenomenon", is treated in some detail (1983: 55–59), and illustrated partly with examples I have used in an article published in 1977 (*Schreibfeder, mincemeat, understand, playboy*). The various factors and changes noted there are criticized for not being an adequate "classification". In particular, BAUER notes that it is not clear what is included in the "addition of semantic information" in the lexicalization process. It is interesting that he observed some complex words (*boy-friend, girl-friend, town house*) may have a different meaning in Britain, America, and New Zealand and thus depend on varieties of English.

The most problematic type is syntactic lexicalization and accordingly BAUER's formulations are careful and tentative. He mentions exocentric compounds (*pickpocket, scarecrow, wagtail*) and different kinds of objects (sentential vs. prepositional) with prefixal derivatives like *disbelieve* vs *believe.* Idioms are also briefly mentioned in this context.

His final class is mixed lexicalization, where he states that a single example may exhibit several types of lexicalization simultaneously (as in *length, lammas*) and that this may eventually lead to "complete demotivation", as in *gospel* and *nice.*

2.4.3. I will skip the treatment of lexicalization in a recent introduction to linguistic morphology by BAUER (1988: 67) but would like to draw attention to the changed spelling of *institutionalised* and *lexicalised* (cf. BAUER 1988: 246 f.).

In this book, the distinction between *lexicalization* and *institutionalization* is based on the prior one between productive and unproductive rules, which is certainly not unproblematic. Phonological lexicalization, consequently, depends on phonological rules, while words are said to be "semantically lexicalized if their meaning is no longer the sum of the meanings of their parts". This is often the criterion adduced for idiomaticity by other linguists. At any rate BAUER's notion of lexicalization is rather global and it does not admit of degrees and systematic processes.

2.5. We will now turn to my own contribution to the field. In 1981, I published a paper on lexicalization in German and English in a reader on WF (LIPKA/ GÜNTHER 1981), in which I have drawn heavily on work done by the two German philologists Karl BRUGMANN and Hermann PAUL (LIPKA 1981: 122f.) in connection with the most important semantic changes, which contribute to that aspect of lexicalization (in my use of the term), often labelled idiomatization, resulting in various degrees of idiomaticity.

3. Terminology

3.1. Let us begin with the term and concept of motivation (cf. LIPKA 1990: 42, 93ff.). Ultimately, it goes back to SAUSSURE and his pupil BALLY, who claims that linguistic signs are not completely arbitrary, but may be motivated by the signifié, the signifiant, or both of them together. This is further developed in ULLMANN (1962: 81ff.), who introduces the following fourfold distinction:

1. phonetic motivation (onomatopoeia): e.g. *crack, cuckoo*

2. morphological motivation (WF): *preacher, penholder*

3. semantic motivation (metaphor and metonymy): *coat (of paint), the cloth, bluebell, redbreast*

4. mixed motivation:

He then goes on to discuss the loss of the various types of motivation, which results in a change from what he calls (metaphorically) transparent to opaque words. I will adopt this terminology and use demotivation for the loss (to a greater or lesser degree) of any type of motivation.

3.2. We have already seen that there is no consistency in the use of the term lexicalization by MARCHAND, KASTOVSKY, and BAUER. However, non-lexicalized complex words resulting from the process of WF are referred to as *nonce formations* (with or without a hyphen) by both MARCHAND and

BAUER. In recent research *ad hoc-formation* is often used as a synonym, while finer distinctions were introduced in 1977 by Pamela DOWNING and in 1979 by Eve and Herbert CLARK (cf. LIPKA 1990: 94f.). The latter called innovative verbs as in *to porch a newspaper* and *to Houdini out of a closet* contextuals, because they depend heavily on context and may be decoded in it. The former, who investigates non-lexicalized Noun + Noun compounds recognizes a category she terms deictic compounds, interpretable in a concrete situation, illustrated by the *applejuice seat,* meaning 'the seat in front of which a glass of applejuice had been placed'. The now famous *pumpkin bus,* institutionalized to some extent within the community of linguists (cf. LIPKA/GÜNTHER 1981: 243), is another case in point, where the context makes the novel compound perfectly understandable, although it clearly does not constitute a nameworthy new category (cf. DOWNING 1977).

A long time ago, LEECH (1974: 226), in the first edition of his book on semantics, spoke of the process by which "an institutionalized lexical meaning" diverges from the expected "theoretical" meaning, and proposed for it the metaphorical term *petrification,* hoping it would suggest both "the 'solidifying' in institutional form" and "the 'shrinkage' of denotation" which often accompanies the process. Others have used the equally metaphorical term *fossilization.*

3.2.1. In my article on lexicalization in German and English (LIPKA 1981: 120), I gave the following definition of the term:

> Unter Lexikalisierung verstehe ich die Erscheinung, daß einmal gebildete komplexe Lexeme bei häufigem Gebrauch dazu tendieren, eine einzige lexikalische Einheit mit spezifischem Inhalt zu werden. Durch die Lexikalisierung geht der Syntagmacharakter in mehr oder weniger starkem Maße verloren.

Thus, lexicalization is defined as the process by which complex lexemes tend to become a single unit, with a specific content, through frequent use. In this process, they lose their nature as a syntagma, or combination, to a greater or lesser extent. I continued to state that this is a gradual process, which can only be explained diachronically, and which results in degrees of "lexicalizedness", a synchronic state of lexemes. Demotivation and idiomatization were both regarded as aspects of lexicalization.

In LIPKA (1983: 927) lexicalization was defined in almost identical words as later in my *Outline of English Lexicology* (1990: 97). Here the phenomenon is characterized as:

> a gradual, historical process, involving phonological and semantic changes and the loss of motivation. These changes may be combined in a single word. Semantic changes, e.g. idiomatization, may be formalized as the addition or loss of semantic features. Synchronically, the result of this process, various

degrees of idiomaticity, form a continuous scale. The process of lexicalization in general, as well as its result, namely the irregularity of the lexicon, can only be explained historically.

The notion of institutionalization is also adopted in my book, whenever the sociolinguistic aspects of words are stressed, and defined as (1990: 95f.):

> the integration of a lexical item, with a particular form and meaning, into the existing stock of words as a generally acceptable and current lexeme.

3.2.2. Institutionalized and lexicalized complex lexemes clearly neither belong to the level of the langue (with its systematic word-formation types) nor to the level of parole (with specific, concrete, realizations of the underlying language system). Obviously, a level in between the two is needed. As early as 1951 (cf. LIPKA 1990: 96) Eugenio COSERIU proposed such an intermediate level and called it the *norm* of a language. This level is not restricted to the lexicon, but also responsible for the conventional, unsystematic realization of certain sounds and for irregular inflections like *oxen, brethren, sang,* and *took.* It is particularly useful, however, to apply the concept of norm, as the traditional, collective realization of the language system, to lexicology and WF.

3.3. It should be pointed out here that lexicalization, institutionalization, demotivation, and idiomatization are all technical terms, and that there is no single "correct" use of them. I claim that such words are notational terms, i.e. they can be defined differently in different theoretical frameworks. I here follow Nils Erik ENKVIST who set up, in 1973, a distinction between so-called substantive terms and notational terms such as *style.* It is perfectly legitimate to define the latter – within a certain range – according to the intention of a particular scholar. So, neither KASTOVSKY's, BAUER's, LIPKA's wider or narrower definitions of lexicalization are correct, but the definition has to be appropriate, useful, within established conventions, and consistently used.


4. Aspects of Lexicalization: Extending the Notion

4.1. Lexicalization and institutionalization are not of an all-or-none kind (cf. LIPKA 1972: 76), but of a more-or-less kind. Both processes result in degrees of ʿlexicalizedness' and ʿinstitutionalization' (as a state of lexical items) in synchrony. At one end of the scale, items only show small phonological and semantic changes, as in *postman, blackboard, writer, gambler, sleepwalker.* At the other end, the combination of several aspects may produce considerable graphemic, phonological, or semantic deviation (the latter is idiomaticity) as in *viz., i.e., foʿcʿsle, Wednesday, gospel* (cf. FAISS 1978), *wryneck, cupboard, prayer, holiday.*

Institutionalization in particular, but also lexicalization, depends on different regional, social, ʿstylistic' and other varieties of a language. It is a matter of smaller or larger speech communities within the National Standards of a

language such as British and American English, or Swiss, Austrian, and High German (cf. LIPKA 1988).

4.2. Two further general, methodological points have to be made, before we can illustrate with examples: the impossibility of a detailed description and the necessity of a so-called cross-classification. In a single short article or lecture, examples can only be mentioned, but not analysed in detail, as for instance the development of *cupboard* and *holiday* (cf. LIPKA 1985), or the instantaneous coining of *implicature* and the verb *implicate* by GRICE (cf. LIPKA 1980: 303). Also, any classification of lexicalized and institutionalized words is by necessity a so-called cross-classification, since the various aspects criss-cross and combine in individual words, and a neat hierarchic ordering is impossible to achieve. Keeping this in mind, we will separate the respective phenomena, and it should therefore not be surprising that the same examples may appear in several categories. We will distinguish between formal, semantic, and extralinguistic developments, and finally consider loan processes.

4.2.1. As MARCHAND (1969:94) and BAUER (1983:205f.) have noted, a change in stress pattern, which results in a tone group with a single main stress, or nucleus, may have a unifying effect, or, alternatively, may be an indicator of the feeling pervasive in a speech community that an expression is a single word. It may be made up, originally, of full words, smaller units but still full linguistic signs, or even smaller constituents, often called formatives, which may be letters or syllables.

Thus, a single, so-called forestress will distinguish a compound lexeme from a syntactic group, as in *bláckbird, fállòut* and recent *déep strùcture, fást-fòod,* and *sóftwàre.* A change in spelling, from distinct words, via a hyphened group, to a single graphemic unit is also indicative of lexicalization and institutionalization as in the recent spelling of *handout.*

4.2.2. Submorphemic constituents may be combined with each other, or also with morphemes. In *U-turn, S-Kurve* the first constituent is iconic, i.e. motivated due to the shape of the letter while in *U-Bahn, S-Bahn* it is the result of clipping, or reductive WF, from *U(ntergrund)-Bahn, S(chnell)-Bahn.* The type *Gestapo* and *Stasi* (from *Geheime Staatspolizei, Staatssicherheitsdienst*) combines initial syllables and seems not to exist in English. On the other hand acronyms like *YMCA, USA, BRD* are productive also in French, as in *O.N.U.* (pronounced as single letters or read as a word) and *H.L.M.* from 'habitation à loyer modéré', for high-rise council flats. With such acronyms reading them as a word is a further sign of unification and loss of motivation, as in *radar* (from *radio direction finding and ranging*) and *laser* (from *light amplification through stimulated emission of radiation*). In combinations like *laser printer, laser surgery, laser technology* the acronym has completely lost its motivation.

4.3. Demotivation and Idiomatization

Both processes can come about through linguistic and extralinguistic changes

or a combination of both. Examples for graphemic changes are *bousun, bo's'n* (both from *boatswain*), *fo'c'sle (forecastle), sou'wester, tuppence, hoover.* Phonological changes may be only slight, as the reduction of the final vowel in *Monday, postman,* or considerable as in *breakfast, prayer, Wednesday, cupboard, waistcoat, holiday, victuals.* A combination of phonological and morphological changes (loss of inflection) is found in *Hochzeit* 'wedding', while *Hochschule* `university' is only morphologically and semantically isolated from the parallel syntactic group *hohe Schule.*

4.3.1. Semantic changes may be described as the addition of general or idiosyncratic SFs. Features like HABITUAL, PROFESSIONAL can explain *sleepwalker, gambler, writer,* while *streetwalker, callboy, callgirl, highwayman, wheelchair, pushchair* involve rather specific semantic material. In English, German and French *potter, pottery, Töpfer, töpfern, potier, potterie* are all necessarily semantically specialized as to material (baked clay) and do not simply denote the producer of pots and his products. Thus, an idiosyncratic SF CERAMICS may be postulated for this change, which is missing, however, in the technical term *poterie d'étain.*

Loss of features can be seen in *ladykiller, saddler* (who makes other leather articles as well) and in G *Kolonialwaren,* an obsolete term for grocery products, which no longer come from the colonies.

Metaphor and metonymy are involved in *backseat driver, bluebell, redbreast, Jesus bug, dogfight* (in the military sense), *daisy wheel* (in typewriters, printers), *tick* (for an annoying person), *Galgenvogel, Wendehals, Mauerspecht,* and the academic *chair, Lehrstuhl* (Austrian *Lehrkanzel*). Demotivation and metonymy can also be seen in Fr *embrasser* (involving lips more than arms) and the slang verb *baiser,* defined in one dictionary as 'posséder (sexuellement)'. Metaphor, demotivation, and institutionalization are combined in *domino theory, domino effect,* which need specialized extralinguistic knowledge for their interpretation.

4.3.2. Extralinguistic changes in the denotatum have caused the demotivation of *blackboard* (often green today), and the introduction of *whiteboard* (for a white smooth surface, used in classrooms for writing and drawing on). A *cupboard* is today neither a board nor for cups only. DOWNING mentions the existence of *lipstick in a pot.* It is well known that *shoemakers, watchmakers* (as well as their German equivalents) do no longer denote makers of these things. We can also, today, *sail (by hovercraft)* and *ship (goods by air).*

4.4. Loan processes, which may be further subclassified, serve to extend the lexicon, but also show various degrees of demotivation and institutionalization. Few English people know that the adjective *nice* derives from the Latin verb *nescius* 'I do not know', while Germans and Austrians are rarely aware that *fesch* is a clipped loan from E *fashionable.* The demotivated *frankfurter, hamburger* could be English derivatives, while G *midlife crisis* is clearly marked

as a loan by its pronunciation, identical with the English one. Pronunciation is also relevant in BrE *stein,* for a special cup for beer, used in AmE as a synonym for BrE *tankard,* a metal drinking cup, which is a clipped loan from G *Steingut.* In French, an air display or flight show is called a *meeting de l'air. Gestapo, glasnost, perestrojka* (literally simply *reconstruction, G Umbau*) have become internationally lexicalized and institutionalized loanwords.

4.5. The combination of several changes on various levels of language and often in the extralinguistic world too, is demonstrated by *blackbird, breakfast, cupboard, holiday, huzzy* (from *housewife*), *gospel, Christmas, vinegar, vintner, furrier.*

5. Institutionalization

5.1. Institutionalized words belong to the norm of the language and are more or less familiar to the members of a certain speech community, which can be defined as a special social group. A minimal degree of item-familiarity is a necessary requirement for institutionalization. This is connected with the naming-function and with the need of a society for a name for what DOWNING called "nameworthy categories". Clearly, *snowman* is not a nameworthy category in African societies, just as non-Catholic Japanese or Chinese will not need a name for *Ash Wednesday.* With *teetotallers* (not related to tea, but derived from a reduplication of total), or in orthodox Arab societies, *beerglass, wine-glass* etc. would not be nameworthy. In the old days of tea-drinking Britain *prelactarian* was institutionalized in academic circles for persons who put milk first in the cup before pouring the tea.

   With modern equal opportunities, words like *feminist, male chauvinist, chairperson,* and forms of address like *Ms* have been institutionalized just as G *Kauffrau, Fachfrau, Frauenbeauftragte.* But there is still no *Schneefrau, Feuerwehrfrau, Strohfrau,* in spite of the existence of the respective male equivalents, as with *Strohmann* in the idiomatic sense 'someone used as a front or cover for improper financial dealings'.

5.2. New objects in a changing world not only require new words in the field of technology, such as the metaphorical *daisy wheel, golf ball* for typewriters (*G Typenrad, Kugelkopf*), or *IBM-compatibles, lap-top, laser printer* in the field of PCs and ATs. In German, there is *Hängegleiter, Gleitschirmfliegerschule, Skisarg* (literally *ski-coffin*) in sports, the last item referring metaphorically to a container for skis on the top of cars. *Flüster-Jets,* for relatively silent airplanes, *Flüster-Asphalt, Flüster-LKW* combine compounding with loans and acronyms. In British English, where pies are favorite dishes, I have seen *pie funnels,* sometimes called *pie vents,* and even *animal pie funnels,* which let the steam escape. So far these words have not become generally institutionalized words despite their nameworthiness.

5.3. As this excursion into the field of culinary skills shows, register, expertise, style, and the consideration of varieties in general are extremely relevant for institutionalization. For regional and temporal variation we have Austrian *(Hof)Zuckerbäcker(ei),* corresponding to G *Konditor. Umziehen* 'move house' its equivalent to *übersiedeln* and *zügeln* in Austrian and Swiss German. Further examples are *Umfahrung, Zuseher* (in Austria) for High German *Umgehung(s-straße), Zuschauer* (with TV).

Metaphorical compounds from the language of computers are: *soft/hardware, mouse, menu, joystick, windows.* Some German slang or colloquial expressions recently institutionalized are *Ballermann* 'gun', *Flachmann* 'flat bottle for spirits', *Bordsteinschwalbe* 'prostitute', *Glotze* (for a TV set, a derogatory term institutionalized only in the seventies).

5.4. With regard to proper names, which prototypically demonstrate the naming function of words, we may distinguish their use as a base for derivations such as *Marxism, Leninism, Thatcherism* and their demotivation, especially with names for famous people, like *Thatcher, Turner, Shakespeare, Onions, (Richard) Wagner, Bernstein* (a demotivated loanword), but also place names like *New York, New Orleans, Newcastle,* G *Ostwestfalen* (in northern Germany), *Schwarzwald.*

## 6. Conclusion

In closing, I would like to stress again that both lexicalization and institutionalization are global notational terms, which may be further subcategorized. They are basically both historical processes, especially favoured by the frequent use of originally complex lexical items, which may consist of morphemes but also of smaller elements. In particular words many of the processes distinguished here are combined. I hope to have shown, however, that both notions must be made more precise in analysis, and that lexicalization must be extended to include: non-syntagmatic and reductive WF processes, semantic transfer, loan processes and combinations of these. Once we realize this, we cannot help discovering lexicalization and institutionalization everywhere around us, in the languages we use to categorize extralinguistic reality.

References

Bauer, L., 1983, *English Word-Formation,* Cambridge.
– 1988, *Introducing Linguistic Morphology,* Edinburgh.
Clark, E. V. & H. H. Clark (1979), "When Nouns Surface as Verbs", *Language* 55, 767–811.
Downing, P., 1977, "On the Creation and Use of English Compound Nouns", *Language* 53, 810–842.
Enkvist, N. E., 1973, *Linguistic Stylistics,* The Hague-Paris.
Kastovsky, D., 1982, *Wortbildung und Semantik,* Düsseldorf.
Leech, G., 1974; 1981, *Semantics. The Study of Meaning,* 2nd ed., Harmondsworth.
Lipka, L., 1972, *Semantic Structure and Word-Formation. Verb-Particle Constructions in Contemporary English,* München.

- 1974, "Probleme der Analyse englischer Idioms aus struktureller und generativer Sicht", *Linguistik und Didaktik 20,* 274-285.
- 1977, "Lexikalisierung, Idiomatisierung und Hypostasierung als Probleme einer synchronischen Wortbildungslehre", in D. Kastovsky & H. E. Brekle, eds, *Perspektiven der Wortbildungsforschung,* Bonn, 155-164.
- 1981, "Zur Lexikalisierung im Deutschen und Englischen", in L. Lipka & H. Günther, eds, *Wortbildung,* Darmstadt, 119-132.
- 1983, "A Multi-Level Approach to Word-Formation: Complex Lexemes and Word Semantics", in S. Hattori & K. Inoue, eds, *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Linguists,* Tokyo, 926-928.
- 1990, *An Outline of English Lexicology. Lexical Structure, Word Semantics, and Word-Formation,* Tübingen.

Lipka, L. & H. Günther 1981, *Wortbildung,* Darmstadt.

Marchand, H., 1960; 1969, *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation. A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach,* 2nd ed., München.

Tournier, J., 1985, *Introduction descriptive à la lexico-génétique de l'anglais contemporain,* Paris-Génève.

Ullmann, S., 1962, *Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning,* Oxford.

*Leonhard Lipka:* LEXIKALIZACE A INSTITUCIONALIZACE V ANGLIČTINĚ A V NĚMČINĚ

Autor podává přehled dosavadního bádání i matoucí terminologie užívané k charakteristice obou pojmů. Dokládá rozličné změny, které při těchto procesech postihují slovo nebo jeho mimojazykový denotát. Probírá jednotlivé aspekty *lexikalizace,* zejména demotivaci a idiomatizaci, a rozšiřuje jejich tradiční pojetí tak, aby zahrnovala: 1. nesyntagmatické slovotvorné procesy (portmanteaux a akronymy), 2. sémantický přenos (metaforu a metonymii), 3. redukční slovotvoření (zkrácená slova a elipsu), 4. procesy přejímání slov (výpůjčky a výpůjčkové útvary) a 5. kombinace těchto procesů (Ullmannovu *smíšenou motivaci). Institucionalizaci* definuje jako takové zapojení lexikální položky (se specifickou formou a významem) do slovní zásoby určitého jazykového společenství, aby náležela k jazykové *normě* (ve smyslu Coseria). K ilustraci jednotlivých jevů je užito příkladů z angličtiny, francouzštiny a němčiny (též rakouské a švýcarské).