AN ETYMOLOGICAL AND USAGE SURVEY OF THE COMMON

ENGLISH NOUN AND ITS CONSIMILAR

AND COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES

By

ROBERT SCHLEIFER

Bachelor of Arts

State University of New York

Albany, New York

1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
December, 1985

AN ETYMOLOGICAL AND USAGE SURVEY OF THE COMMON

ENGLISH NOUN AND ITS CONSIMILAR

AND COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES

Thesis Approved:

Thomas L. Warren
Thesis Adviser

Bruce Southard

Sherry Southard

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

This work serves as a preliminary investigation into an area that has hitherto been only peripherally explored--the etymological and usage relationships between common nouns, consimilar adjectives, and collateral adjectives. Through this study, I attempt to answer--or at least bring attention to--such questions as, Why do some nouns have consimilar adjectives, others collateral adjectives, and still others both consimilar and collateral adjectives? What etymological, morphological, and phonological similarities and differences do common nouns, consimilar adjectives, and collateral adjectives manifest? How knowledgeable are native speakers of English about consimilar and collateral adjectives? And, given a choice, which types of adjectives would such speakers prefer to use?

While my answers to these questions are not always complete or satisfactory, by recording my methods, speculations, expectations, and mistakes, I hope that future researchers can succeed where I have failed.

This project grows out of my lifelong interest in words and etymology, and eleven years experience working in industry as a service engineer, service manager, and technical writer. Linguistically, the more I learned about common nouns, consimilar adjectives, and collateral adjectives, the more I discerned certain etymological and usage patterns in these categories of words; and, professionally, the more attentively I listened to co-workers' choices of nouns and adjectives, the more I perceived that those persons who had attained high professional or scholastic positions tended to use a relatively high percentage of collateral

iii

adjectives in comparison to consimilar adjectives while those persons who had not attained such high positions tended, proportionally, to use a higher percentage of consimilar adjectives. I wondered if these perceptions were correct and what, if any, were the etymological and usage correlations between common nouns, consimilar adjectives, and collateral adjectives.

In searching the literature for studies on this topic, I was unable to find one article or one chapter in any text bearing on these relationships. Specifically, I examined numerous composition and linguistic texts (see A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY), every issue of The Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America, Verbatim, and The Sesquipedalian; and I conducted two ERIC searches using such descriptors as "collateral adjectives," "adjectives," "nouns," "etymology," and "usage." While I observed that an increasing number of English grammars (see, for example, Stageberg, 1981) and a plethora of journal articles (see Smith, 1981; Drysdale, 1979) analyze the morphology, phonology, and etymology of nouns and adjectives, no article, grammar, etymologicon, word-frequency study, or dictionary that I consulted save Funk & Wagnalls' Standard College Dictionary (Funk & Wagnalls, 1963, pp. xx, 265, passim) and David Gold's "The Ordering of Lexemes in a Dictionary" (Gold, 1979) even mentions collateral adjectives. And I have yet to speak with any linguist or grammarian save Laurence Urdang (Urdang, 1981) who has been acquainted with collateral adjectives. In short, I am embarking on an expedition into what is essentially uncharted territory, and the ultimate value of my study, if indeed it has any, may very well lie not in the answers it furnishes but in the questions it raises.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AF	Anglo-French
F	French
Frank	Frankish
G	Classical Greek
Gael	Gaelic
Infl.	Influenced by
L	Latin
MDu	Middle Dutch
ME	Middle English
MF	Middle French
MoE	Modern English
OE	Old English
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
OF	Old French
OHG	Old High German
ON	Old Norse
Per	Persian
San	Sanskrit
<	Derived from
>	Yielding

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the English language, common nouns can be denoted by two classes
of adjectives--consimilar adjectives and collateral adjectives. A com-
mon noun is essentially, if tautologically, any well-known noun (e.g.,
alcohol, angel, star, and coast); a consimilar adjective is any adjec-
tive that expresses fundamentally the same meaning in substantially the
same form as a given noun (e.g., alcoholic, angelic, starry, and coastal,
respectively); and a collateral adjective is any adjective that expresses
fundamentally the same meaning but in a substantially different form as a
given noun (e.g., bibulous, cherubic, stellar, and littoral, respective-
ly). Thus, speakers of English, when choosing an adjective to denote a
noun, often have a choice whether to use a consimilar or collateral ad-
jective, and the etymology of that adjective may be a factor in which
choice they make.

The ultimate purpose of this study, therefore, is to compare the
etymology and usage of common nouns, consimilar adjectives, and collater-
al adjectives, and to establish which relationships exist in these cate-
gories of words. This work, thus, has both theoretical and practical im-
port: It explores new avenues in lexicological and lexicographical schol-
arship, and it describes ways in which select groups of persons choose
and use adjectives in their spoken and written English. For instance, if
a university lecturer is familiar with his different audiences' knowledge

1

of and inclination or disinclination toward using consimilar and collateral adjectives in their daily speech, he can consciously use those categories of adjectives in his lectures that these different audiences can best relate to. Moreover, if characteristic etymological patterns are present in consimilar and collateral adjectives, and if these patterns can be correlated with usage patterns, the same lecturer--if he is cognizant of these relationships--can further incorporate identical word-elements into his lectures that his audiences themselves might use if they were delivering the lecture. Specifically, college undergraduates --as I intend to demonstrate in this study--not only greatly prefer to use consimilar rather than collateral adjectives in their casual conversation but frequently "coin" consimilar adjectives by affixing native (Old English or Middle English) suffixes, such as -ISH, -LY, and -LIKE, to native, Latinate, and Classical Greek-based common nouns. Thus, if the lecturer is familiar with these usage patterns, he can use this knowledge not only to construct consimilar adjectives for this particular audience but to incorporate these word-elements into the other parts of speech he uses, particularly adverbs and abstract nouns.

The ultimate value of this study lies, therefore, I believe, in its practical application for speakers and writers. However, before one can intelligently suggest ways in which speakers and writers can modify their usage with respect to etymological patterns and audience analysis, one must first establish the usage norms of various audiences and the etymology of the words they generally use. Therefore, the major part of this study involves formulating an etymological and usage data base that can delineate these relationships; and only at the very end of this work do I tender suggestions that writers and speakers can follow to improve

their communicational skills. My procedure for developing this work thus consists of six steps:

1. develop and distribute three adjective-usage examinations to 100 Oklahoma State University students and faculty;

2. compile an etymological data base of 1,381 terms consisting of 330 common nouns that have collateral adjectives, 189 consimilar adjectives, and 826 collateral adjectives;

3. propose six etymological and usage hypotheses based on a cursory examination of the results of the adjective-usage tests and the patterns evidenced by the etymological data base;

4. analyze and tabulate all words in the etymological data base and the results of the adjective-usage tests;

5. substantiate, reject, or modify the six etymological and usage hypotheses; and

6. note correlations between usage, etymology, and audience, and tender suggestions that speakers and writers can follow to improve their communicational skills.

The six etymological and usage hypotheses that I propose are

1. the overwhelming majority of common nouns that have collateral adjectives are native words, derived ultimately from Middle English or Old English;

2. the overwhelming majority of collateral adjectives are borrowed words, derived ultimately from Latin or Classical Greek;

3. most common nouns that have collateral adjectives are short monosyllabic or disyllabic words, or if these words are longer and use suffixes, these suffixes are usually derived from native sources;

4. all collateral adjectives are compound adjectives;

5. most speakers of the English language are essentially unfamiliar with collateral adjectives and would be hard pressed as to which collateral adjectives to use in all but the simplest of instances; and

6. in casual conversation, in instances in which speakers seek an adjectival equivalent for a common noun and know both a consimilar and collateral adjective, most will generally choose the consimilar adjective. Indeed, if no consimilar adjective exists they will often construct on-the-spot, non-grammatical consimilar adjectives, or otherwise contrive some awkward compound, or

use some imprecise synonym rather than search their memory bank for the appropriate collateral adjective.[1]

My audience for this project is thus a dual one. Primarily, I am writing for linguists and lexicologists who can appreciate my scholarship, understand my technical data, and ultimately pursue and bring to fruition the work I have only just begun. Secondarily, I am writing for all classes of writers, speakers, teachers, students, and anyone else interested in learning more about the English language and, in the process, improving their communicational skills.

---

[1]Two additional hypotheses that I originally considered but which I did not have time to adequately investigate were: 1) virtually all common nouns that have collateral adjectives entered the English language at a much earlier date than their collateral adjectives; specifically, most of these common nouns entered pre-1500 and most collateral adjectives post-1500; and 2) a significant number of common nouns and their collateral adjectives are cognate through the hypothetical Indo-European mother tongue. While these two hypotheses have theoretical and historical value, they cannot be directly correlated with current usage and thus do not play an intrinsic part in this study.

CHAPTER II

GRAMMATICAL AND ETYMOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

A noun is traditionally defined as any word that names "a person,
place or thing" (Pixton, 1980, p. 1) though I would add to this that it
can also name an animal, plant, activity, condition, idea, etc. A common noun, as a specific type of noun "used with limiting modifiers" (Gove,
1961, p. 459), denotes any of a class of nouns (e.g., man, woman, alligator, camp, etc.) and is thereby distinguished from a proper noun, which
names the actual person, place, or thing (e.g., John, Rover, Stillwater).
In this work, I use the phrase "common noun" in both this grammatical as
well as colloquial sense with the meaning of well-known, ordinary, in
wide usage. Thus, I define the common noun both as a generic noun and
as a word that most adults probably know (i.e., anyone with some high
school education).

For the purposes of this study, I further classify common nouns into seven categories, based on their morphology and etymology:

1. simple nouns (i.e., nouns without suffixes and often without
   prefixes) derived from native (i.e., Old English or Middle
   English);

2. simple nouns derived from Latin;

3. simple nouns derived from Classical Greek;

4. compound nouns (i.e., nouns with suffixes) derived from native
   sources;

5. compound nouns derived from Latin;

6. compound nouns derived from Classical Greek; and

7. simple or compound nouns derived from "other" (i.e., nonnative and nonclassical sources).

Horse, for example, is a simple noun derived from Old English, meta-thetically altered from its original form hros; alien is a simple noun derived from the Latin alienus, of which the masculine second declension -us ending has been deleted; bishop is a simple noun derived from the Classical Greek episkopos, altered through its movement through Latin, Old English, and Middle English; walnut is a compound noun derived from the Old English walhhnutu (< OE wealh: foreign + hnutu: nut); benefactor is a compound noun derived from the Latin benefactor (< bene: well + fact-, base of factus, past participle of facere: to make, to do + -or: agentive noun-forming suffix); tautology is a compound noun derived from the Classical Greek tautologia (< to aut(o): the same + connecting -o- + log-, base of logos: word, reckoning, thought < legein: to choose, gather, say, speak, calculate, + -ia: abstract noun-forming suffix). And wampum is a compound noun derived from the Narragansett wampumpeage (< wap: white + umpe: string + -ag: plural suffix[1]).

An adjective is traditionally defined as any word that "modifies (narrows, restricts, qualifies) a noun" (Pixton, 1980, p. 3). Thus, in the sentence, "She wore a red dress," red is an adjective since it modifies dress. Similarly, in the sentence, "He owned a large car," large

[1]Various sources offer modifications on this etymology. For example, the Random House Unabridged Dictionary (Stein, 1983, p. 1607) cites wamp(an) + -anpi + -ag as the three elements of the etymon. Webster's Third International Dictionary (Gove, 1961, p. 2574) cites api as the second element, while the American Heritage Dictionary (Morris, 1981, p. 1443) cites wap + -apy- + aki as the three elements. The OED does not offer a detailed etymology for this term.

is an adjective because it modifies car. And in the sentence, "He has a fiendish personality," fiendish is an adjective because it modifies personality--as would artistic or synthetic if used in its stead.

Etymologically, what we should note here is that red is a simple adjective derived from the Old English redd; large is a simple adjective derived from the Latin largus; fiendish is a compound adjective derived from the Old English feond (< base of feogan: to hate) yielding fiend in Modern English plus the adjectival suffix -ISH (< OE -isc); artistic is a compound adjective derived from the Latin artista (< L. art-, base of artis, genitive of ars) + Modern English -IST (< L. ista < G. -istes < -is-: verb base of -izein + -tes: agentive suffix) + Modern English -IC (< L. -icus < G. -ikos); synthetic is a compound adjective derived from the Classical Greek synthetikos, itself derived from the Classical Greek noun synthesis, of which the abstract substantive ending -sis is replaced by the adjectival suffix -tikos, yielding Modern English -TIC. (Hence, syn-: with, together + the-, verb base of tithenai: to put, to place + -tikos: adjectival suffix meaning pertaining to, characterized by, having the nature of, like. Reconstructed, the etymological meaning is "characterized by put or placed together," i.e., artificial, not natural.) And alcoholic (when used as an adjective) is a compound adjective derived from the Arabic al kuhl: powder of antimony + Modern English -IC (< L. -icus < G. -ikos).

In the above examples, then, we have two instances of simple adjectives and four instances of compound adjectives, the latter constructed upon noun bases from Old English, Latin, Classical Greek, or Arabic, and suffixed with one or more adjective-forming endings. I thereby classify

adjectives in the English language into one of six etymological categories:

1. simple adjectives derived from native sources;

2. simple adjectives derived from Latin;

3. compound adjectives derived essentially from native sources;

4. compound adjectives derived essentially from Latin;

5. compound adjectives derived essentially from Classical Greek; and

6. simple or compound adjectives derived essentially from other sources.

This analysis of nouns and adjectives thus forms the foundation for my ensuing study of consimilar adjectives, collateral adjectives, and their corresponding common nouns.

CHAPTER III

CONSTRUCTION OF ADJECTIVES

Consimilar Adjectives

In spoken and written English, if one seeks an adjective to denote a noun in those instances in which no simple adjective exists, one can often construct a compound adjective to fill this need by affixing one or more adjective-forming suffixes to the given noun. In this manner, for example, one can turn book into bookish, accident into accidental, acid into acidic, cancer into cancerous, man into manly, butter into buttery, and access into accessible. Such adjectives I designate consimilar adjectives because these adjectives use the same base form as their nouns plus an additional suffix (i.e., the adjectives are consimilar rather than identical to their base nouns). TABLE I on the following page illustrates the most frequently used adjective-forming suffixes in our language, classified according to their source of origin.

Collateral Adjectives

A considerable number of adjectives, however, cannot be constructed along the above formula by affixing an adjectival suffix to a noun. For example, if one wants to use a technical or zoological adjective for cow one cannot appropriately use "cowish" or "cowlike." Similarly, if one wants an adjective for car one could not say "car-ish" or "car-al." Such nouns, then, present usage problems in that they do not have technical

9

TABLE I

THE MOST FREQUENTLY USED ADJECTIVE-FORMING
SUFFIXES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

DERIVED FROM LATIN	DERIVED FROM GREEK
-AL < -ālis]	-IC < -ikos]
-AR < -āris]	-AC < -akos, VAR of -ikos when base ends in -i-]
-AN, -ANE < -ānus]	
-INE, IN < -īnus]	-TIC < -tikos]
-ILE, IL < -īlis]	-OID
-IC < -icus or G. -ikos]	-ODE }< -o-+-eīdēs]
-TIC < -t-+-icus or G. -tikos]	
-ARY < -ārius, -a, -m]	
-BLE < -bilis]	
-ID < -idus]	
-UOUS < -uus + -ōsus]	**DERIVED FROM OLD ENGLISH**
-ULOUS < -ulus + -ōsus]	
-ACIOUS < -āx, -ācis, + -ōsus]	-ISH < -isc]
-ITIOUS < -īcius, + -ōsus]	-ING < -ende]
-IVE < īvus]	-ED < -ede, -ode, -ade, -de]
-ORY < -ōrius, -a, -m]	-Y < -ig]
-OUS, -OSE < -ōsus]	-LY < -lic]
-LENT < -lentus]	-EN < -en]
-ATE < -ātus]	-LIKE < -gelīc]
-ITE < -itus]	-FUL < -full]
-ANT < -āns, -antis]	-SOME < -sum]
-ENT < -ēns, -entis]	-LESS < -lēas]
-IENT < -iēns, -ientis]	-WARD < -weard]
-FIC < . . . facere]	

or scientific consimilar adjectives that denote the nouns without connotation. TABLE II below illustrates 30 common nouns without technical consimilar adjectives.

TABLE II

THIRTY COMMON NOUNS WITHOUT TECHNICAL
CONSIMILAR ADJECTIVES

AIR	BRICK	CLOCK
ALLIGATOR	BRIDGE	COAL
ANKLE	CAMP	COPPER
APPLE	CAVE	CORK
ARM	CHAIN	CORPSE
BARBER	CHANCE	COTTON
BEAR	CHANT	COUNTRY
BIRTH	CHART	CROSS
BLOOD	CHEEK	CUP
BOX	CLAW	CURVE

What, then, does one do to articulate a technical or scientific adjective for any of these nouns? One solution is to choose a synonym for the noun in question and then, if possible, add an adjectival suffix to that noun. Thus, for car one might select vehicle, and then—with a minor change in the base noun—affix the adjectival suffix -ar after the -l, forming the adjective vehicular. The result would be a compound adjective which, while different in form from the original noun, would be identical or similar in meaning. Such an adjective, therefore, can be

said to be <u>collateral</u> to the original noun in that it uses a different noun base but expresses the same meaning. <u>Vehicular</u>, consequently, is a collateral adjective for <u>car</u> and denotes <u>car</u> in conjunction with any other real or hypothetical consimilar adjectives for that noun. Thus, <u>vehicular</u> and <u>car-ish</u>, if it were a real word, would both serve as adjectives for <u>car</u>, the former collateral and the latter consimilar.

Such a solution, however, has one major drawback: many nouns do not have closely related synonyms. For example, which synonyms can one use for the common nouns <u>tooth</u> or <u>cow</u>, or the proper nouns <u>Jupiter</u> or <u>Descartes</u>? There are none, and the solution then becomes one of adopting a synonym from a different source--usually an extinct language--removing its declensional ending (if present) and affixing one or more adjective-forming suffixes to the exposed noun base in a similar manner as one did for the consimilar adjectives. For example, if one sought a collateral adjective for <u>sun</u>, one could not use <u>sunny</u> since this form, besides being a consimilar adjective, actually refers to <u>sunshine</u> or <u>sunlight</u> and not the sun as a heavenly body. But if one turned to the Latin language, one would discover that the Latin term for sun is <u>sol</u>. Since this particular word has no declensional ending, all one need do is add the appropriate adjectival suffix <u>-ar</u> to the end of the noun base <u>sol</u>, and the result would be the collateral adjective <u>solar</u>. Similarly, one could turn to the Classical Greek for a collateral adjective for sun. The Classical Greek term for sun is <u>helios</u>. This is a second declension term with the characteristic second declensional ending <u>-os</u>. Removing the <u>-os</u>, this lays bare the noun base <u>heli-</u>. Checking TABLE I, one observes that the appropriate adjective-forming suffix for <u>heli-</u> is <u>-ac</u> (note that when the noun base ends in <u>i</u>, an <u>-ac</u> rather than <u>-ic</u> is used); therefore, by

affixing this suffix to the end of the base, one can reconstruct the Greek-based collateral adjective <u>heliac</u>.[1]

Likewise, if one wanted to use a collateral adjective for <u>time</u> in the sense of duration, one could not use <u>timely</u> which, besides being a consimilar adjective, does not even express the thought being conveyed (i.e., the passage of time--<u>not</u> "well-timed, opportune, suitable for the occasion, etc."). Thus, one might choose <u>chronological</u> < G. <u>kron-</u>, base of <u>kronos</u>: time + connecting -0- + <u>log-</u>, base of <u>logos</u>: word, reckoning, thought < <u>legein</u>: to choose, gather, say, speak, calculate + <u>-ic</u>, Latin-ized base of Greek <u>-ikos</u>: adjectival suffix with general meaning of per-taining to, characterized by, having the nature of, like, etc.: + <u>-al</u>, base of L. <u>-alis</u>: adjectival suffix with the same general meaning as <u>-ikos</u>.

These examples, then, trace the very scholarly and highly structured word-building mechanism that was actually used in the past--particularly during the Renaissance--but which is still used today when scientists, linguists, and other scholars wish to coin collateral adjectives (see Brown, 1979). The above examples, then, should not be considered unique either in their phonology, morphology, or their process of construction. Tens of thousands of collateral adjectives exist in our language, and

---

[1]Frequently the additional suffix <u>-al</u> (< L. <u>-alis</u>) is added to this adjective, creating the additional collateral adjective <u>heliacal</u>. Thus, <u>heliac</u> and <u>heliacal</u> exist independently as two variant Greek-based col-lateral adjectives for <u>sun</u> in addition to the Latin-based <u>solar</u>. Still other endings and "combining forms" may be attached to the noun base <u>heli-</u>, forming such adjectives (or nouns) as <u>heliocentric</u>, <u>heliotropic</u>, and <u>heliolatrous</u>. One must not, however, confuse these forms with such words as <u>helicopter</u>, <u>helical</u>, and <u>helicoid</u>, which are from the base <u>helic-</u>, Latinized base of Greek <u>helikos</u>, genitive of <u>helix</u>: spiral < <u>helissein</u>: to turn round. Similarly, <u>sol</u> may be extended into <u>solarium</u>, <u>soliform</u>, <u>solarization</u>, <u>solaristics</u>, etc. There is almost no limit to this type of word building.

most of them have followed precisely this pattern of construction. TABLE
III below illustrates 30 common nouns and their collateral adjectives.

TABLE III

THIRTY COMMON NOUNS AND THEIR
COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES

DOG - CANINE	PIG - PORCINE
NIGHT - NOCTURNAL	DAY - DIURNAL
MOON - LUNAR	COW - BOVINE
BROTHER - FRATERNAL	BISHOP - EPISCOPAL
SPRING - VERNAL	ANIMAL - ZOOLOGICAL
FALL - AUTUMNAL	BRASS - BRAZEN
STAR - STELLAR	TOUCH - TACTILE
SISTER - SORORAL	TWILIGHT - CREPUSCULAR
WEDGE - CUNEAL	WEEK - HEBDOMADAL
WINTER - HIBERNAL	MARBLE - MARMOREAL
SUMMER - ESTIVAL	WEREWOLF - LYCANTHROPIC
JUPITER - JOVIAN	CARTILAGE - CHONDRAL
ISLAND - INSULAR	STEPMOTHER - NOVERCAL
NAME - NOMINAL	THRESHOLD - LIMINAL
DONKEY - ASININE	BREAKFAST - JENTACULAR

A cursory, etymological evaluation of TABLE III reveals some inter-
esting phenomena: Most of the common nouns are short, monosyllabic or di-
syllabic words clearly derived from native sources while most of the col-
lateral adjectives are multisyllabic terms clearly derived from Latin or
Classical Greek. If these examples, then, are etymologically representa-
tive of the English stock of common nouns and their collateral adjectives,

one might posit that the preponderance of common nouns entered the English language at a much earlier date than their collateral adjectives since the former are native and the latter borrowed. Moreover, all collateral adjectives cited are compound adjectives further suggesting a later and more deliberate construction. In regard to morphology, when one views each collateral adjective juxtaposed to its common noun one notes a structural similarity in many of these terms--a similarity too distant to suggest a common etymology yet too similar and repeated too frequently to be attributable to chance (e.g., night-nocturnal; pig-porcine; marble-marmoreal; star-stellar). If such pairs then indicate a linguistic affiliation, and if the respective source language of each pair are, respectively, native (Old English or Middle English),and classical (Latin or Greek), then such terms must be cognate through a common ancestral language--in this case the only plausible language being the hypothetical Indo-European. One final observation upon TABLE III: Most of the collateral adjectives appear to be more complex terms than their common nouns. If this is correct, then this would suggest that many speakers of the English language are probably relatively unaware of collateral adjectives, or if they do know about them, they probably do not use them as frequently as they use consimilar adjectives, which are based upon the simpler common nouns.

These observations, then, form the basis for my etymological and usage hypotheses outlined on pages 3 and 4. My methods for compiling my etymological data base are described in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

METHODS OF RESEARCH

I compiled a sample list of 330 common nouns that have collateral
adjectives and registered 189 consimilar adjectives and 826 collateral
adjectives for these nouns by adhering to the following step-by-step pro-
cedure.

I began by perusing the first three letters (A's, B's, and C's) of
Webster's New World Dictionary, Paperback Edition (Guralnik, 1983), from
which I selected one noun[1] per column--two nouns per page--for a total
of 619 common nouns, based on the following six categories:

1. simple miscellaneous terms, e.g., mother, father, sun, moon,
   rain, snow, fat, thin;

2. simple zoological terms, e.g., cat, dog, cow, deer, mouse, goat,
   sheep, bear;

3. simple botanical terms, e.g., tree, flower, apple, acorn, grass,
   lily, oak, maple;

4. simple anatomical terms, e.g., hand, foot, mouth, ear, head,
   eye, lips, cheek;

5. semilearned terms, e.g., adage, adrenal, amber, hypnosis, mol-
   lusk, Moscow, tallow, renegade; and

6. interesting and humorous terms, e.g., stepmother, barracuda,
   George Bernard Shaw, Liverpool, erection (two collateral adjec-
   tives), syphilis, orgy.

---

[1] I also included occasional proper nouns, both to illustrate that
collateral adjectives are not restricted to common nouns and because such
collateral adjectives are interesting and useful in spoken and written
English.

I chose a paperback dictionary to limit the _frequency_ of nouns in my list to those words most adults would most likely know (i.e., common nouns with a relatively high frequency of use). I was assuming that a paperback dictionary with approximately 60,000 entries, as _Webster's Paperback_ was, would contain the most common stock of words in the language as distinguished from, say, a collegiate dictionary with approximately 160,000 entries or an unabridged dictionary with upwards of 250,000 entries--a contention that has never, according to lexicographer Laurence Urdang, been satisfactorily demonstrated (Urdang, 1981). However, I could not use a standard frequency list, such as Longman's _A General Service List of English Words_ (Longman, 1977) or Dahl's _Word Frequencies of Spoken American English_ (Dahl, 1980) for three reasons: 1) my list of common nouns was to include specifically those common nouns that have collateral adjectives, and no frequency list includes exclusively such nouns; 2) I wanted a cross section of common nouns, some of which--as _barracuda_ or _mollusk_--while still "common" were not common enough to be included on standard frequency lists; and 3) I wanted to include occasional proper nouns, which are not even _considered_ in frequency lists. In any case, the specific frequencies of the common nouns in my sampling were not a critical issue but were rather only of peripheral interest insofar as I sought to select those common nouns that "most adults would most likely know." I therefore chose _Webster's New World Paperback_, not only because it provides a sound vocabulary but because it is the only up-to-date paperback dictionary that provides adequate etymological information, i.e., etymological dissection of base words into prefixes, bases, and multiple bases where applicable.[2]

---

[2]The only other current paperback dictionary that offers etymological

After I compiled my initial list of 619 common nouns from this dic-
tionary, my next task was to investigate each term for possible collater-
al and consimilar adjectives. My procedure was as follows: If I knew
two or three (or, in a very few instances, even one) collateral adjec-
tives for a given noun, I considered my initial research for that parti-
cular noun complete; if I did not know any collateral adjectives, my sec-
ond step was to look up each noun in Roget's 1909, 1936, and 1942 the-
sauri (Roget, 1909; Manson, 1937; Roget, 1942). These editions were par-
ticularly valuable because, unlike the newer editions, they contained a
wealth of scholarly adjectives deleted from post-1955 editions--presum-
ably to "modernize" these later works (see Chapman, 1984). After con-
sulting these thesauri, I then looked up the same nouns in Sisson's Word
and Expression Locator (Sisson, 1966), Hartrampf's Vocabularies (Hart-
rampf, 1936), and Lewis' Comprehensive Word Guide (Lewis, 1958). From
these six works, collectively, I hoped to discover at least two collater-
al adjectives for each common noun. If, however, I was still having dif-
ficulty locating collateral adjectives for certain nouns, I then looked
up these problem nouns in Cassell's New Latin Dictionary (Simpson, 1959)
to determine what their Latin synonyms were. My rationale for this step
was that since my experience indicated that most collateral adjectives
were derived from Latin bases, if I knew the Latin synonym of an English
noun I could look up this Latin base in an unabridged English dictionary
and see if any English words began with the same spelling. For example,

---

information is The American Heritage Dictionary (Davies, 1983); however,
this dictionary does not generally dissect base words into prefixes,
bases, and multiple bases. I therefore consider the New World Paperback
markedly superior to the American Heritage Paperback in this respect.

if I wanted to determine a collateral adjective for <u>dog</u> (and was unfamil-
iar with <u>canine</u>) I could look up <u>dog</u> in <u>Cassell's</u> English-to-Latin dic-
tionary and note the Latin synonym <u>canis</u>. Determining that the noun base
for <u>canis</u>, which is a third declension Latin noun, is either <u>cani-</u> or
<u>can-</u>, I could then look up these bases in an <u>English</u> dictionary and "dis-
cover" that a collateral adjective for dog is <u>canine</u>. It was precisely
in this manner that I discovered such colorful collateral adjectives as
<u>novercal</u> for <u>stepmother</u>, <u>papilionaceous</u> for <u>butterfly</u>, and <u>testudinal</u> for
<u>tortoise</u>.

Similarly, I occasionally consulted a Classical Greek dictionary
(Classic, 1962) to further determine whether any Greek-based collateral
adjectives existed in conjunction with Latin-based collateral adjectives
for the same noun. I did not, however, consult a German-English or
Russian-English dictionary, to name just two other languages, because my
experience during the past five years in recording collateral adjectives
from written and spoken English indicated that virtually no collateral
adjectives entered English from these sources. Granted, an exhaustive
search of these languages may have turned up an occasional German- or
Russian-based collateral adjective, but owing to the fact that I consult-
ed foreign language dictionaries only as one of approximately eight re-
search techniques and that the possibility of finding collateral adjec-
tives from these two languages in particular was highly unlikely, I deem-
ed the skewing of my data base from these omissions to be insignificant.

My following step, after I had accumulated a number of potential
collateral adjectives and Latin and Greek word bases, was first to look
up these adjectives in <u>Webster's</u> <u>Second</u> <u>International</u> <u>Dictionary</u> (Nelson,
1934) to determine their exact definitions and etymologies. I chose

Webster's Second because it contains the largest vocabulary ever compil-
ed in one dictionary for any language in the world, numbering over 600,000
entries.[3] At this point, then, I also recorded the definitions and ety-
mologies of these adjectives' corresponding nouns. However, I made the
serious error of noting only the originally attested form of these nouns
and not the various languages that they had passed through on their jour-
ney into modern English--an oversight that later compelled me to recheck
and record the full etymology of each noun in my sampling (see CHAPTER V,
ETYMOLOGICAL FINDINGS). In any case, after recording these definitions
and partial etymologies, I returned to my Latin and Greek bases and check-
ed these bases in Webster's Second to see if any additional collateral
adjectives began with these letters.

After I had accumulated a number of collateral adjectives for each
common noun, I then planned to carefully examine each adjective and re-
ject those that were not specifically collateral to the noun I was check-
ing (i.e., their meanings were either too narrow, too broad, or not clear-
ly related to the noun in question. For example, I would not at first
accept feline as a specific collateral adjective for lion since its de-
finition was at once too narrow and too broad, referring, as it does, to
both the domestic cat and the entire cat family. For lion, I wanted the

---

[3]Compare these 600,000 entries of Webster's Second International
(Nelson, 1934) with the 450,000 entries of Webster's Third International
(Gove, 1961) and the 415,000 entries of the Oxford English Dictionary
(Murry, 1933). However, dictionaries have more merit than just the size
of their lexicon, and I continually referred to Webster's Third (and
other dictionaries) for its more comprehensive and accurate etymologies;
and I referred to the Oxford English Dictionary for its unique histori-
cal dating of first recorded usages of terms. In certain instances in
which these three dictionaries contradicted each other, I consulted still
other dictionaries and various scholarly works in an attempt to come to
some kind of resolution (see A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY).

more specific leonine (< L. leon-, base of leonis, genitive of leo: lion

+ Modern English -INE < L. -in-, base of -inus + Anglicized silent -e).

However, I eventually relaxed these standards accepting, for example,

such terms as the generalized lepidopteral and papilionaceous, as well

as the more precise rhopaloceral, as collateral adjectives for butterfly.

Similarly, I included eusuchian and loricate as collateral adjectives

for alligator, though neither of these terms refers exclusively to alli-

gators.

In attempting to compile as many collateral adjectives as practi-

cable, after I substantiated my initial list of collateral adjectives

with Webster's Second International Dictionary, I then skimmed the en-

tire column of headwords surrounding each of these adjectives in Web-

ster's Second and noted morphological variations and variant spellings

for each of these words. I then proceeded to add these variants to my

stock list of collateral adjectives, which accounts for such closely re-

lated forms in my sampling as, for example, rostrate, rostellate, rostri-

ferous, rostriform--all collateral adjectives for beak.

Finally, after pursuing all these steps, if I had still not uncover-

ed at least one collateral adjective for any given noun, I concluded that

that particular noun did not have collateral adjectives and deleted that

noun from my initial list of common nouns. Thus, from my original samp-

ling of 619 common nouns, I ended up with 330 common nouns that have col-

lateral adjectives.[4]

---

[4]In about 50 instances, I further rechecked selected common nouns
and their collateral adjectives in Webster's New World Dictionary (Gural-
nik, 1974) and The American Heritage Dictionary (Morris, 1981), both of
which provide Indo-European roots, to determine if these common nouns
and their collateral adjectives are cognate through the reconstructed
Indo-European language as I had surmised many were. Then, after I had

My subsequent task, after I had compiled my data base of common nouns, consimilar adjectives, and collateral adjectives was to tabulate and evaluate my findings. The following chapter describes that process.

---

recorded these Indo-European roots in my sampling, I turned to the <u>Oxford English Dictionary</u> and noted the earliest recorded dates in which these nouns and adjectives (and their variant forms) were first cited in printed literature. I was curious if my hypothesis that most common nouns entered the English language pre-1500 and most collateral adjectives post-1500 was correct. For a tentative evaluation of these hypotheses, see APPENDIX A, pp. 74-75.

CHAPTER V

ETYMOLOGICAL FINDINGS

I shall present my findings in the six major areas in which I compil-
ed and analyzed etymological data: 1) common nouns that have collateral
adjectives, 2) the French influence upon common nouns, 3) common nouns
that have consimilar and collateral adjectives, 4) common nouns that have
only collateral adjectives, 5) collateral adjectives, and 6) syllabifica-
tion. For my stock of common nouns and consimilar adjectives, I examin-
ed the first three letters in Webster's New World Dictionary, Paperback
Edition (Guralnik, 1983) from which I selected 330 common nouns that have
collateral adjectives and their 189 consimilar adjectives. For my stock of
collateral adjectives, I followed the methods described in CHAPTER IV, METH-
ODS OF RESEARCH, from which I compiled 862 collateral ajdectives. My total
stock of nouns and adjectives for this study thus totaled 1,381 words.

Common Nouns That Have Collateral Adjectives

My first hypothesis stated, "The overwhelming majority of common
nouns that have collateral adjectives are native words, derived ultimate-
ly from Middle English or Old English" (p. 3). Upon careful research,
however, this assertion proved patently not to be the case. Of my 330
tabulated common nouns, only 105 or 31.8 percent were derived ultimately
from native sources or approximately 20 percent less than a simple major-
ity. Moreover, not only did the native sources prove not to be an "over-

whelming majority" as I had expected, but they did not even constitute

the largest single source for such words. Latin, instead, turned out to

be the largest contributor, yielding 156 common nouns or 47.3 percent of

the total--a startling find considering that very few of these nouns were

the learned, scholarly types so closely associated with Latinate termino-

logy. Moreover, when I tabulated the number of common nouns derived ul-

timately from Classical Greek, I noted that 41 or 12.4 percent were from

this source--an amount only slightly less than half of that for native

sources. Or put another way, for every five common nouns derived ulti-

mately from native sources, two were derived from Classical Greek. To-

gether, then, Latin and Greek accounted for the ultimate source of 197

or 59.7 percent of my 330 common nouns; and an additional 28 words or

8.5 percent were derived ultimately from "Other" (nonnative and nonclass-

ical) sources, including Russian, Persian, Hawaiian, Irish, Hebrew, Choc-

taw, and Old Icelandic. TABLE IV below summarizes these findings.

TABLE IV

ETYMOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF 330 COMMON NOUNS
THAT HAVE COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES

Source	Common Nouns	
	Number	Percent
Native*	105	31.8
Latin	156	47.3
Greek	41	12.4
Other	28	8.5
TOTAL	330	100.0

*Old English or Middle English.

These findings were surprising in that Old English and Middle English together were the sources for less than one-third of the common nouns that have collateral adjectives. Consequently, I decided it was imperative to determine just how many of the common nouns from Latin, Greek, and other sources had passed through Middle English or Old English on their journey to Modern English. If, in fact, a considerable number did enter Modern English via native sources, it might be argued that many of these words had become so "naturalized" before entering Modern English to have become structurally indistinguishable from those 105 nouns descended ultimately from native sources. Indeed, if scholarly etymological research had not progressed to the point it has, one might have had no way of detecting that these words were not truly native words.

To determine the validity of this hypothesis, I critically rechecked the etymological development of each of those 330 common nouns. My anticipations were substantially realized: Of the 156 Latin-derived nouns, 116 or 74.3 percent did, in fact, pass through Middle English on their journey to Modern English; 18 or 5.4 percent passed through "other" (i.e., nonnative and nonclassical) languages; and only 22 or 6.6 percent entered Modern English directly from Latin. Similarly, of the 41 Greek-derived nouns, 26 or 63.4 percent entered Modern English via Middle English; 10 or 24 percent entered via other languages; and only 5 or 1.2 percent entered Modern English directly from Classical Greek. And of the 28 nouns derived from other languages, 11 or 39 percent passed through native sources; 7 or 25 percent entered Modern English through still other languages; and only 10 or 36 percent passed into Modern English directly from that original tongue. Thus, of the 225 common nouns

ultimately derived from nonnative sources (Latin + Greek + Other), 153

or 68 percent of them did, in fact, enter Modern English via native

sources; and when combined with the 105 nouns derived ultimately from na-

tive sources, 258 or 78.2 percent of the original 330 common nouns turn-

ed out to be, in some manner, influenced by native sources. TABLE V be-

low tabulates the number and percentage of Native, Latin, Greek, and

Other nouns that were influenced by native sources in respect to the total

stock of 330 common nouns.

TABLE V

COMMON NOUNS INFLUENCED BY NATIVE SOURCES

| Source | Common Nouns | | |
	Number	Influenced by OE or ME	Percent of Total
Native	105	105	31.8
Latin	156	116	35.2
Greek	41	26	7.9
Other	28	11	3.3
TOTAL	330	258	78.2

*Old English or Middle English.

In retrospect, while I had initially believed none of the 156 Latin

nouns to be influenced by native sources (see TABLE IV, page 24), I now

found 116 Latin nouns or 35.2 percent of my total stock of nouns to have

been thus influenced. Similarly, while I had not expected any of the 41

Greek nouns to have been influenced by native sources I now found 26 of them or 7.9 percent of my total stock of nouns to be thus influenced; and while I had not expected any of the 28 "other" sources to have been at all affected by native sources, I now found 11 of them of 3.3 percent of my total stock of nouns to have been, to some degree, affected by Old English or Middle English. Thus, including the 105 nouns or 31.8 percent derived ultimately from native sources, 258 or 78.2 percent of my stock of 330 common nouns were either derived from or influenced by Old English or Middle English--a sum almost two-and-a-half times greater than my original figure of 105 or 31.8 percent.

The French Influence

In rechecking the etymological development of each common noun that has collateral adjectives, I discovered another revealing pattern: Modern French, Middle French, and particularly Old French played significant roles in the development of these nouns. Of the 156 common nouns that entered Modern English ultimately from Latin, 102 or 65.4 percent entered via Old French, and 10 or 6.5 percent entered via Middle French or Modern French. Thus, 112 or 71.8 percent of the common nouns derived ultimately from Latin entered Modern English through some form of French. Moreover, of those 105 nouns that entered Modern English from native sources, 76 or 72.4 percent of them passed directly from Old French into Middle English; hence, only 29 or 27.6 percent did not. (Of these 29, it is further significant that 11 or 37.9 percent entered Middle English directly from Latin.) Of the 41 common nouns derived ultimately from Classical Greek, 17 or 41.5 percent also passed through Old French; and of the 28 common nouns derived ultimately from other sources, 4 or 14.3

percent entered Modern English via some form of French. Thus, of my orig-
inal 330 common nouns, 209 or 63.3 percent were influenced to some ex-
tent by French. TABLE VI below tabulates the number and percentage of
Native, Latin, Greek, and Other nouns influenced by some form of French
in respect to my total stock of 330 common nouns.

TABLE VI

COMMON NOUNS INFLUENCED BY FRENCH

| | Common Nouns | | |
Source	Number	Influenced by French	Percent of Total
Native*	105	76	23.0
Latin	156	112	33.9
Greek	41	17	5.2
Other	28	4	1.2
TOTAL	330	209	63.3

*Old English or Middle English.

In evaluating the native and French influences upon common nouns
that have collateral adjectives, one notes in TABLE VI that 209 or 63.3
percent of the 330 common nouns were influenced by some form of French
while one notes in TABLE V (page 26) that 258 or 78.2 percent of the 330
common nouns were influenced by native sources. Thus, I thought it would
be illuminating to determine just how many of these 209 French-influenced
nouns are the same words as the 258 native-influenced nouns. As a

preliminary estimate, I would suggest the percentage of overlap to be upward of 70 percent since two etymological patterns that I observed repeatedly were:

(1)   MOE < ME < OF < L

(2)   MOE < ME < OF < L < G

Moreover, if one omits the 105 nouns derived directly from native sources (MOE < ME < or OE), I would then estimate the percentage of overlap to be upward of 95 percent since very few Old French or Middle French terms that ultimately entered Modern English did not first pass through Middle English. If these estimates are correct, then this would indicate an even closer relationship between French and English--a relationship I intend to explore in a subsequent study.

Common Nouns That Have Consimilar and Collateral Adjectives

In researching and compiling collateral adjectives for my sampling, I made another significant discovery. Of my stock of 330 common nouns, 189 or 57.3 percent of them had consimilar as well as collateral adjectives. In respect to usage, this revelation meant that speakers of English would have a choice whether to use consimilar or collateral adjectives for any of these 189 nouns. Moreover, this percentage of nouns that have consimilar adjectives was misleading in that I had selected common nouns with the specific objective of determining what, if any, were their collateral adjectives. In fact, as I have already explained, I deleted those nouns from my sampling for which I could not discover any collateral adjectives. In short, if I had included all common nouns in my sampling and not merely those that have collateral adjectives, the

percentage of common nouns with consimilar adjectives would have been
substantially higher.

Common Nouns That Have Only Collateral Adjectives

Of my total stock of 330 nouns, 141 or 42.7 percent had only collat-
eral adjectives and could not be used consimilarly. This finding was al-
so important in respect to usage as it made it incumbent upon those per-
sons who profess or desire to use the English language precisely to know
what these collateral adjectives were--a consideration which formed the
basis of ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST 3 in my ADJECTIVE USAGE QUESTIONNAIRE (see
APPENDIX B).

Etymologically, I thought it might also be illuminating to deter-
mine whether there were any significant differences between these 141
nouns and the 189 nouns that had both consimilar and collateral adjec-
tives.[1] I thus tabulated and summarized the etymological sources for
both of these categories of nouns in the same manner that I had done in
TABLE IV for my entire stock of 330 nouns. TABLES VII and VIII on the
following page summarize these data.

The significant differences between TABLE VII and TABLE VIII are
that TABLE VIII displays a lower percentage of nouns derived from Latin
and Greek and a higher percentage of nouns derived from native and other
sources; by contrast, TABLE VIII displays a lower percentage of nouns

---

[1] It would, of course, have even been more illuminating and, no
doubt, significant to compare the etymological development of those com-
mon nouns that had only collateral adjectives with those common nouns
that had only consimilar adjectives. But, owing to the nature of my pri-
mary study, I had not prepared the data base for the latter.

TABLE VII

ETYMOLOGICAL SOURCE OF 189 COMMON NOUNS THAT HAVE
CONSIMILAR AND COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES

Source	Common Nouns	
	Number	Percent
Native	45	23.8
Latin	101	53.4
Greek	31	16.4
Other	12	6.3
TOTAL	189	99.9

TABLE VIII

ETYMOLOGICAL SOURCE OF 141 COMMON NOUNS THAT
HAVE ONLY COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES

Source	Common Nouns	
	Number	Percent
Native	56	39.7
Latin	58	41.1
Greek	12	8.5
Other	15	10.6
TOTAL	141	99.9

derived from native and other sources and a higher percentage of nouns derived from Latin and Greek. I would thus suggest as a tentative explanation for these differences that because most adjectival suffixes are classical (see TABLE I, page 10), common nouns derived from Latin and Greek can easily produce consimilar adjectives by the affixations of classical suffixes to their bases, obviating the need for collateral adjectives in these instances. In contradistinction, however, many native and nonclassical languages--e.g., Irish, Choctaw, Eskimo, Tamil-- cannot readily affix a classical adjectival suffix to their bases (how, for example, does one construct an adjective from elbow, bayou, or kayak?); and, consequently, when such nouns turn up in Modern English if a corresponding adjective is needed, it will generally be collateral. Thus, I would postulate that when compound adjectives were (and are) coined, the form of the base noun primarily determined what form the corresponding adjective would take (i.e., whether it would be consimilar or collateral). Whether or not this assumption is correct only further scholarship can determine.

Collateral Adjectives

From my stock of 330 common nouns, I compiled a list of 862 collateral adjectives, averaging 2.6 collateral adjectives per common noun. This average, however, is somewhat misleading in that, with additional time, I could have raised this number to perhaps five or six. Moreover, frequently two or more collateral adjectives for a given noun are similar in morphology, phonology, and etymology, displaying only variant spellings or employing different or supplementary suffixes (e.g., zoologic, zoological, zooidal, zoic). For the purposes of this study,

therefore, I grouped together such similar terms (I disregarded the ety-mology of the suffixes) and counted them as one collateral adjective in my tabulations. My functional number of collateral adjectives thereby decreased from 862 to 603, and the majority of my ensuing calculations were based on this number.

Etymologically, of these 603 collateral adjectives, 17 or 2.8 per-cent were derived ultimately from native sources; 372 or 61.7 percent were derived from Latin; 201 or 33.3 percent were derived from Classical Greek; and 13 or 2.2 percent were derived from other sources (e.g., Arab-ic, Hebrew, Dutch, etc.). TABLE IX below summarizes these findings.

TABLE IX

ETYMOLOGICAL SOURCE OF 603 COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES

Source	Collateral Adjectives	
	Number	Percent
Native	17	2.8
Latin	372	61.7
Greek	201	33.3
Other	13	2.2
TOTAL	603	100.0

From this table one can calculate that 573 collateral adjectives or 95.0 percent of the total were derived from Latin and Greek--of which Latin contributed almost twice the number of adjectives as Greek (1.85 Latinate adjectives for each Greek). Or put another way, of every 100

collateral adjectives in my sampling, 95 were classical and the remain-

ing 5 either native or derived from "other" sources. Thus, the classi-

cal languages were overwhelmingly the greatest sources for collateral

adjectives.

Syllabification

Hypothesis three of my six etymological and usage hypotheses sug-

gested that

> most common nouns that have collateral adjectives are short
> monosyllabic or disyllabic words, or if these words are long-
> er and use suffixes, these suffixes are usually derived from
> native sources (page 3).

And hypothesis four suggested that

> all collateral adjectives are compound adjectives (page 3).

To determine the validity of these hypotheses, I counted the syllables

in each of my common nouns and collateral adjectives, paying particular

attention to their suffixes, if present, and the sources of their bases.

The results were, in many ways, unanticipated. Of my 330 common nouns,

only 54 or 16 percent were monosyllabic, 215 or 65 percent were disyl-

labic, and 61 or 18 percent were trisyllabic or polysyllabic. Together,

the monosyllabic and disyllabic nouns constituted 269 or 81 percent of

my total stock of common nouns. Moreover, of these 269 nouns, 249 or 93

percent were derived either directly or indirectly from Old English or

Middle English. Thus, better than nine out of ten of the monosyllabic

and disyllabic common nouns that have collateral adjectives were, in

some manner, influenced by native sources.

The trisyllabic and polysyllabic common nouns, however, portrayed

an entirely different story. Of these 61 nouns, only 9 or 14.8 percent

were derived from native bases or used native suffixes, the majority

being from Latin. For example, of the first ten trisyllabic and polysyl-

labic nouns in my sampling--<u>abdomen</u>, <u>accident</u>, <u>adrenal</u>, <u>alchemy</u>, <u>alcohol</u>,

<u>alligator</u>, <u>anaconda</u>, <u>anchovy</u>, <u>animal</u>, and <u>announcement</u>--six were derived

from and used Latin suffixes, two were from Arabic,[2] one was from Classi-

cal Greek, one was from Sinhalese, but none were from native sources.

Thus, my expectation that the longer common nouns would use native suf-

fixes was entirely in error.

In respect to my collateral adjectives, however, my expectations

were substantially realized. Of my 862 collateral adjectives, 858 or

99.5 percent were compound adjectives, most of which were classical in

origin and used classical suffixes. And of the four simple collateral

adjectives--<u>shy</u> (<u>bashfulness</u>), <u>first</u> (<u>beginning</u>), <u>near</u> (<u>closeness</u>), and

<u>clear</u> (<u>clarity</u>)--the first three were derived from native sources, and

the fourth, though derived ultimately from Latin, had been altered in

Old French and Middle English to the extent that it was now indistin-

guishable from a native word. Thus, both in regard to common nouns that

have collateral adjectives and the collateral adjectives themselves, the

simpler words tended to be native-derived or native-influenced while the

more complex words tended to be classical.

Etymological Summary

The etymological characteristics of common nouns that have collateral

---

[2]The two words from Arabic or 20 percent of this partial sampling
is a disproportionate representation since the <u>al-</u>prefix represents the
Arabic definite article and is found in an unusually large number of
Arabic loan words, e.g., <u>algebra</u>, <u>albacore</u>, <u>alcazar</u>, <u>alcove</u>, <u>alkali</u>,
<u>Allah</u>, <u>Aldebaran</u>, <u>Alioth</u>, and <u>Altair</u>.

adjectives (including their consimilar adjectives, which are constructed upon the same etymological base) and collateral adjectives are relatively distinct and unambiguous. If one compares, for example, TABLE IX (page 33) with TABLE IV (page 24), one notes that the classical sources in TABLE IX yield 573 or 95 percent of the collateral adjectives whereas in TABLE IV they yield 197 or 59.7 percent of the common nouns; and while the native sources in TABLE IX yield 17 or 2.8 percent of the collateral adjectives, in TABLE IV they yield 105 or 31.8 percent of the common nouns. Moreover, these differences become accentuated when one notes that of those 59.7 percent of classically-derived common nouns, one can calculate from TABLE V (see page 26) that 68.9 percent of them (the average of 116/156 + 26/41) passed through Middle English or Old English on their journey to Modern English and became more or less indistinguishable from native words. Thus, in regard to the 330 common nouns, one can calculate that 142 (116 + 26) or 43.0 percent of the classical nouns have developed a native morphology and phonology and 55 (197-142) or 16.6 percent of them retain their classical morphology. If one then compares the 95.0 percent of the collateral adjectives that are ultimately derived from Latin and Greek and still retain some or all of their classical morphology with the 16.6 percent of the common nouns that clearly evidence a classical morphology, one notes that the classical morphology of collateral adjectives is five times more prevalent than it is with the common nouns. Or put another way, whereas approximately 19 out of 20 collateral adjectives are derived from classical sources and still retain their classical morphology, only about one of six (3.3 of 20) common nouns has a distinctly classical morphology.

Moreover, when one compares those collateral adjectives ultimately derived from native sources with those common nouns ultimately derived from native sources, the differences in etymology become striking. Whereas 17 or only 2.8 percent of the collateral adjectives originated in Old English or Middle English, 105 or 31.8 percent of the common nouns originated in native sources. And when one adds to this 31.8 percent the 43.1 percent of those nouns ultimately derived from classical sources but which have passed through native sources and acquired a distinctly native morphology in conjunction with the 3.3 percent of "other" sources that have also acquired a native morphology, one winds up with a figure of 78.2 percent of our common nouns that are structurally, if not actually, of native form. TABLE X below summarizes this information.

TABLE X

SUMMARY OF NATIVE AND CLASSICAL MORPHOLOGY UPON
COMMON NOUNS AND COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES

Source	Common Noun		Collateral Adjective	
	Number (Total: 330)	Percent	Number (Total: 603)	Percent
Native	258	78.2	17	2.8
Classical	55	16.6	573	95.0

In reviewing these data, it becomes evident that the classical influences upon common nouns and collateral adjectives are, in many ways, opposite. Whereas the common nouns exhibit a 78.2 percent native

morphology and a 16.6 percent classical morphology, the collateral adjectives exhibit a 2.8 percent native morphology and a 95.0 percent classical morphology. However, while only 31.8 percent of the common nouns are derived ultimately from native sources and 59.7 percent from classical sources, delineating a disparity between the common nouns' morphology and origin, the collateral adjectives' morphology and origin are essentially synonymous. Thus, my first hypothesis that "the overwhelming majority of common nouns that have collateral adjectives are native words, derived ultimately from Middle English or Old English" (page 3), while not accurate as it stands, would become accurate if modified to read, "the overwhelming majority of common nouns that have collateral adjectives are words either derived ultimately from or significantly influenced by Middle English or Old English"; and my second hypothesis, that "the overwhelming majority of collateral adjectives are borrowed words, derived ultimately from Latin or Classical Greek" (page 3) is accurate as it stands. My third hypothesis, that "most common nouns that have collateral adjectives are short monosyllabic or disyllabic words, or if these words are longer and use suffixes, these suffixes are usually derived from native sources" (page 3) is only partially correct. Of my stock of 330 common nouns, 269 or 81 percent are, indeed, monosyllabic or disyllabic. But of the remaining 61 trisyllabic and polysyllabic nouns, only 9 or 14.8 percent are derived from native bases or use native suffixes—hardly justifying my term "usually." In fact, as we have seen (page 35), the majority of these longer words are derived from and use Latin suffixes. Thus, I would modify hypothesis three to read

> most common nouns that have collateral adjectives are short
> monosyllabic or disyllabic words, but if these words are

longer and use suffixes, both the word bases and their suf-
fixes are generally derived from Latin.

As for my fourth hypothesis, that "all collateral adjectives are compound adjectives," while this statement, according to my data, is 99.5 percent accurate, it would become 100 percent accurate if preceded by the word "virtually."

CHAPTER VI

ADJECTIVAL USAGE

Having established certain etymological patterns for common nouns,

consimilar adjectives, and collateral adjectives, my next task was to

survey people's usage of these classes of words to determine what pat-

terns, if any, they exhibited. Indeed, I had already proposed two broad

usage hypotheses, which I now intended to substantiate, refute, or quali-

fy. Specifically, hypothesis five of my etymological and usage hypothe-

ses stated:

> most speakers of the English language are essentially unfamil-
> iar with collateral adjectives and would be hard pressed as
> to which collateral adjectives to use in all but the simplest
> of instances (p. 3)

and hypothesis six stated:

> in casual conversation, in instances in which speakers seek an
> adjectival equivalent for a common noun and know both a consim-
> ilar and collateral adjective, most will generally choose the
> consimilar adjective. Indeed, if no consimilar adjective ex-
> ists they will frequently construct on-the-spot, nongrammati-
> cal consimilar adjectives, or otherwise contrive some awkward
> compound, or use some imprecise synonym rather than search
> their memory bank for the appropriate collateral adjective (pp.
> 3-4)

To determine the accuracy of these hypotheses, I developed three adjec-

tive-usage tests which I distributed to 100 undergraduate students, Eng-

lish graduate instructors, and English professors at Oklahoma State Uni-

versity in the form of a four-page questionnaire. Following is a detailed

description of that questionnaire along with my rationale for designing
it the way I did.

Page one of this questionnaire explains its general purpose and re-
quests demographic information about respondents: age, sex, race, na-
tionality, scholastic status, major field of study, etc. Page two com-
prises ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST I, a preliminary survey that seeks to estab-
lish whether respondents will choose consimilar adjectives, collateral
adjectives, or some combination of the two when presented with given
nouns in a simulated conversational situation. Specifically, as soon as
respondents read each noun on the page they are requested to jot down
the adjective (or adjectives) that comes to mind that has "the same or
nearly the same meaning" as the noun they have just read--even if they
are unsure whether or not it is a real word. Through this survey, then,
one can observe how persons choose adjectives for nouns--an observation
that will reveal not only something of their lexical knowledge and usage
patterns, but may further suggest how persons in medieval and Renaissance
England first coined consimilar and collateral adjectives.

In developing this test, I chose and organized my nouns with parti-
cular objectives in mind. I placed bible first for several reasons.
This was a word of which I was confident all respondents would instantly
jot down biblical--thus quickly and effortlessly involving them in this
questionnaire while demonstrating the celerity with which I wanted them
to record every adjective that they considered. But there was also a
linguistic reason why I chose bible. Biblical, the obvious adjectival
form, was clearly a consimilar adjective and would prepare respondents
to use consimilar adjectives. Yet at the same time it was a word of un-
mistakable classical morphology and phonology--particularly the multiple

adjective-forming suffixes -ic + -al--and, thus, would also prepare them to use the characteristically classical collateral adjectives.

As my second entry, I chose dog because it has both obvious consimilar adjectives--dogged, doggish, and doglike--and one very well-known collateral adjective--canine. (Cynic, as a medical term referring to a doglike spasm of the facial muscles, and cynoid, meaning dog-shaped--both terms derived from the classical Greek kyn-, base of kynos, genitive of kyon: dog--are not so well-known collateral adjectives for dog.) Thus, I sought to demonstrate to respondents near the onset of this test that they had real choices whether to use consimilar or collateral adjectives for each answer.

The selection of my other nouns provided, essentially, the same options for respondents with the exception of the six entries ear, nose, mouth, ape, arson, and ax, which do not have denotative consimilar adjectives. For these nouns, I wanted to observe how many, if any, of my respondents would "construct" idiosyncratic consimilar adjectives, a la ear-earish, nose-nosy (or nosel, nozel, which would be phonologically significant), mouth-mouthy, ape-apian, arson-arsonic, and ax-axial. These last three nouns--ape, arson, and ax--I selected for the subsequent reason that their "obvious" adjectival forms--apian, arsonic, and axial--were actually adjectives for, or, in the case of arsonic, a spurious adjective for, entirely different nouns. Apian, specifically, is a collateral adjective for bee (which is one of the two reasons I put bee on the list. The other reason was that I believed few would know apian and wondered what consimilar adjectives, if any, they would cite for bee in place of the rather inelegant beeish or beelike). Specifically, I wanted to see how many respondents would free associate apian with ape and

if any of those respondents who knew apian was a collateral adjective for

bee evidenced a disinclination to use it as a consimilar adjective for

ape. Moreover, if many respondents did free associate apian for ape,

this occurrence would further raise the question of why ape had never

yielded apian as its consimilar adjective. Is it possible, for instance,

that apian did arise as a consimilar adjective for ape but was never

properly acknowledged because it had already been accepted, if in fact it

had, as a collateral adjective for bee, and that those linguists, lexico-

graphers, or critics who had coined apian as a collateral adjective for

bee had successfully thwarted its acceptance as a consimilar adjective

for ape? These are intriguing questions, and I shall return to them in

CHAPTER VII, USAGE FINDINGS.

I was similarly interested in determining how many persons would

cite arsonic as a consimilar adjective for arson. (The collateral adjec-

tive for arson is incendiary, though most persons associate incendiary

with fire bombs and do not link it with the willful destruction of prop-

erty by fire--its most specific definition.) For those who did choose

arsonic, this would tentatively suggest at least two things to me: 1)

that they were probably not critically considering the meaning of arson

when they saw it but were more influenced by its morphology or phonology,

and 2) they were apparently not "blocked" from using arsonic by the ex-

istence of its near-homograph arsenic which, of course, refers to the

chemical element. (This associative yet nonblocking phenomenon of per-

sons conscious of arsenic who selected arsonic as a consimilar adjective

for arson might further be correlated with persons knowledgeable of api-

an as a collateral adjective for bee who selected apian as a consimilar

adjective for ape.) Moreover, for those who did cite the consimilar

adjective for arson, I was further curious to note how many would spell

it arsenic with an e (the chemical spelling) rather than arsonic with an

o (the imagined consimilar spelling), an occurrence that would perhaps

signify a subliminal or a conditioned association with arsenic--either

as a chemical or a word.

Similarly, I included ax on my questionnaire to determine how many

respondents would cite axial as a consimilar adjective for ax or other-

wise contrive some consimilar adjective, e.g., axe-like or axish, or just

leave the space blank. (Axial is, properly, the consimilar adjective

for axis, not ax; dolabrate and dolabriform, both from the Latin dolabr-,

base of dolabra-: mattock, pickax, are the collateral adjectives for ax.)

Page three of my questionnaire comprises ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST II--

five sentence completions in which respondents are instructed to choose

"whatever word seems to best fit into the sentence." This test is simi-

lar to ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST I in that it seeks to elicit from respondents.

either a consimilar or collateral adjective for each entry; however, it

does not pressure respondents into recording within four seconds each of

their answers and is, thus, a more leisurely examination than TEST I. In

TEST II, moreover, I was not only interested in which type of adjective

respondents would use but also how precise and discriminating they would

be in their specific selection. For example, in sentence three, I was

curious to know what percentage of respondents would cite divine as the

most appropriate collateral adjective to refer to that type of inspira-

tion that those who believe in the Gospels think they receive, what per-

centage would cite the less appropriate holy, and what percentage would

cite the rather awkward consimilar adjective godlike. Similarly, in sen-

tence four, I wanted to determine the varying percentages of respondents

who would record <u>lethal</u>, <u>fatal</u>, or <u>deadly</u> in reference to a drug over-
dose that killed five people.

For the five sentence completions, the various answers that I had
anticipated were:

Sentence One	:	<u>Martian</u> or <u>Mars</u>
Sentence Two	:	<u>illegitimate</u> or <u>bastard</u>
Sentence Three	:	<u>divine</u>, <u>holy</u>, or <u>godlike</u>
Sentence Four	:	<u>lethal</u>, <u>fatal</u>, or <u>deadly</u>
Sentence Five	:	<u>edible</u> or <u>eatable</u>.

Page four of my questionnaire comprises ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST III—a
vocabulary test of collateral adjectives. In this examination, I include
three groups of common nouns arranged in vertical rows with an answer
blank beside each noun. After respondents read each noun, they are re-
quested to write "one (or more) adjective that has the same or nearly
the same meaning as that noun but DOES NOT use a similar spelling." Thus,
<u>lunar</u>, they are informed, is an acceptable answer for <u>moon</u>, but <u>moonlike</u>
and <u>moonish</u> are not. Each group of nouns calls for increasingly more
sophisticated collateral adjectives. Group I cites nouns with rather
well-known collateral adjectives, e.g., <u>moon</u> (<u>lunar</u>); <u>war</u> (<u>martial</u>, <u>bel</u>-
<u>licose</u>, <u>belligerent</u>); <u>king</u> (<u>royal</u>, <u>regal</u>). Group II cites nouns with
substantially more learned collateral adjectives, e.g., <u>day</u> (<u>diurnal</u>);
<u>sister</u> (<u>sororal</u>); <u>island</u> (<u>insular</u>). And Group III cites nouns with rare
collateral adjectives, e.g., <u>threshold</u> (<u>liminal</u>); <u>werewolf</u> (<u>lycanthrop</u>-
<u>ic</u>); <u>twilight</u> (<u>crepuscular</u>). I included Groups II and III primarily to
examine how thoroughly English graduate instructors and English profes-
sors—presumably among the best educated and most verbally articulate
English speaking persons—had mastered this aspect of the English lexicon.

CHAPTER VII

ADJECTIVAL USAGE FINDINGS

Of the 100 questionnaires I distributed to undergraduate students,
English graduate instructors, and English professors at Oklahoma State
University, I received 57 completed questionnaires (a 57% response) in
the following distributions: 27 freshmen, 17 sophomores/juniors/seniors,
9 English graduate instructors, and 4 English professors. While these
numbers--particularly those of the English professors--were considerably
lower than I had anticipated, I could not redistribute my questionnaires
for fear of receiving duplicate questionnaires from some of the same re-
spondents. Consequently, I had to work with a sampling which, in many
ways, was less than optimum, and my findings should therefore be consid-
ered tentative and preliminary. With this understood, I now analyze the
results of each of the three adjective usage tests that comprised this
questionnaire.

Adjective Usage Test I

ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST I constituted my "simulated conversational situ-
ation" test in which respondents were requested to jot down the first ad-
jective (or adjectives) that came to mind that had the same or nearly the
same meaning as selected given nouns. For this test, I tabulated my re-
sults in the following manner: I added up all the responses in column
one for each respondent group, determined how many of their responses

were consimilar adjectives and how many were collateral adjectives, and
then calculated the percentage of each of these two categories of adjec-
tives in relation to the total number of responses. When I had complet-
ed these computations, I placed this information into a table. TABLE XI
below is that table.

TABLE XI

SIMULATED USAGE OF ADJECTIVES TEST RESULTS:
RESPONDENT SELECTION OF CONSIMILAR
VERSUS COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES

Respondents		Total Responses	Consimilar Adjectives		Collateral Adjectives	
Total Number	Academic Group		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
27	Freshmen	376	365	97	11	3
17	Sophomores Juniors Seniors	210	180	86	30	14
9	English Graduate Instructors	135	63	47	72	53
4	English Professors	60	9	15	51	85

The important columns to note in this table are the "Group" column
beneath the "Respondents" heading and the "Percent" columns beneath the
"Consimilar Adjectives" and "Collateral Adjectives" headings. Reading
vertically, one notes that as the status of respondents increases from
Freshman to English Professor, their usage of consimilar adjectives de-
creases from 97 percent to 15 percent while their usage of collateral

adjectives increases from 3 percent to 85 percent. Reading horizontally, one notes that the freshmen chose approximately 32 consimilar adjectives for each collateral adjective, the sophomores, juniors, and seniors about six consimilar adjectives for each collateral adjective, the English graduate instructors slightly more than one collateral adjective for each consimilar adjective, and the English professors about five collateral adjectives for each consimilar adjective. Thus, from this limited survey, two correlations appear to exist: 1) a direct correlation between one's scholastic status and the frequency of one's usage of collateral adjectives, and 2) an inverse correlation between one's scholastic status and the frequency of one's usage of consimilar adjectives. Whether these correlations can be extrapolated to other groups of students and faculty or to wider segments of the population, only further surveys can determine.

In regard to some of my more quixotic speculations upon usage and etymology in TEST I (see CHAPTER V, ADJECTIVAL USAGE, pp. 41-43), my hypotheses were generally either clearly substantiated or clearly unsubstantiated. For example, my expectation that a significant number of respondents would "coin" their own consimilar adjectives for nouns that do not have technical consimilar adjectives was definitely confirmed. For ear, nose, mouth, and cat, 38 of my 57 respondents constructed the adjectives earish, nosey, mouthy, and cattish, respectively, by affixing an adjectival suffix to the common noun. Of the remaining 19 respondents, 14 cited the correct collateral adjective, and 5 left these answer spaces blank. However, for arson, no one recorded arsonic or arsenic as I had expected. Instead, 29 of the respondents left this answer space blank, and the remaining 18 respondents cited such adjectives as firey, blazing,

smoky, and destructive. Similarly, none of the respondents unwittingly
coined apian as a consimilar adjective for ape though 49 of them cited
either apish or apelike as a consimilar adjective, and the remaining
eight respondents either left the answer space blank or conjured up some
distantly-related adjective as monkey-like or gorillaish.[1] And for ax,
none of the respondents noted axial as I had anticipated though 39 of
them cited either axelike (variously spelled axlike or axe-like), axed,
axish, or axy, and the remaining 19 respondents either left the answer
spaces blank or recorded some related term as hatchet-jobed or mattocked.

These findings thus suggested two things to me: 1) when consider-
ing which adjective to use for a given noun, the respondents appeared to
choose their adjectives based more on the meaning of the noun than its
morphology or phonology, and 2) the respondents' primary selection of
the adjective-forming suffixes -ish, -ed, -y, and -like as opposed to
-ic, -an, -al, and the other adjective-forming suffixes from which they
could have chosen (see TABLE I, page 10) indicated their propensity to-
ward affixing native, not classical, suffixes onto common nouns when con-
structing compound adjectives. Whether this was because they were more
exposed to the native suffixes in their childhood, native suffixes are
more frequently used in casual conversation, or native suffixes are in-
herently easier for English-speaking persons to affix to native nouns

---

[1] In regard to my speculation that perhaps apian never emerged as a
consimilar adjective for ape because it had already axisted as a collat-
eral adjective for bee, a quick check with the Oxford English Dictionary
easily dispelled this notion. Ape was first quoted in Middle English be-
tween 1150-1450 with apish as its adjective emerging in 1532. But apian
as a collateral adjective for bee did not appear for another 300 years--
until 1862.

only additional research can determine--research that could potentially
contribute valuable information about language acquisition and usage.

Adjective Usage Test II

ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST II comprised the "sentence completion" test.
For this test, however, I did not systematically tabulate my findings as
I did for TEST I. Nevertheless, certain patterns do emerge, some of
which are illuminating to contrast with TEST I.

Most surprisingly, none of the respondents on TEST II coined awk-
ward consimilar adjectives as they did on TEST I. Presumedly this was
because they had ample time in which to reflect upon their answers and
did not feel pressured to write some word down the instant they read each
question. Consequently, the overall results on TEST II were consider-
ably more sophisticated than they were on TEST I. Nonetheless, marked
differences in the precision of word choice between the English profes-
sors, graduate instructors, and undergraduates were evident. For exam-
ple, in sentence one the best adjective to denote the planet Mars was
the collateral adjective Martian. Accordingly, 100 percent of the Eng-
lish professors and 89 percent of the graduate instructors chose Martian
(the one deviating respondent citing exotic); but only 31 percent of the
undergraduates chose Martian (often spelling it without the capital M),
44 percent of them erroneously cited Mars (or mars) as an adjective, and
the remaining 25 percent marked down planetary, foreign, red, cold, or
some other term. Similarly, in sentence three 100 percent of the Eng-
lish professors and 77 percent of the graduate instructors chose divine
as the most appropriate adjective to refer to that type of inspiration
that persons associate with their gods (the two deviating respondents

writing <u>holy</u>); but only 27 percent of the undergraduates chose <u>divine</u> (often spelling it <u>devine</u> when they did), 49 percent chose <u>holy</u>, 16 percent cited <u>Godlike</u> or <u>God's</u> (a word I had not anticipated),and the remaining eight percent wrote <u>wonderful</u>, <u>great</u>, or some other term. The comparative results from the other three sentences were, in essence, the same. Consequently, the two correlations that I observed for ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST I (see page 48) seemed also to be applicable here, namely, the higher one's scholastic status the more apt was one to use collateral adjectives, and the lower one's scholastic status the more apt was one to use consimilar adjectives. Moreover, as the respondents' scholastic status rose so too did the precision of their adjectival choices, whether these be consimilar or collateral. For example, in sentences three and four, the English professors' and graduate students' overwhelming choices of <u>divine</u> and <u>lethal</u>, respectively, in contrast to the undergraduates' predominant choices of <u>holy</u> and <u>fatal</u>, respectively, demonstrated these differences in word choice.[2]

Adjective Usage Test III

ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST III comprised the collateral adjective vocabulary test. For this test, I tabulated my results in the following manner: I checked every questionnaire within each respondent group and

---

[2]Of all the answers on my three usage tests, however, the most amusing one came from one of the English professors, who, in response to sentence two which sought either <u>illegitimate</u> or <u>bastard</u> to refer to a child who had been born before his parents were married, wrote "second" in the answer blank. He then gratuitously commented upon his answer below in the sentence. "The idea here is so illogical, I cannot conceive of a rational person having this kind of thought. Whether his parents were married or not he'd still be their first child."

noted the number of correct answers for Word Group I, Word Group II, and Word Group III of the vocabulary test. I then averaged the number of correct answers and resulting percentages for each word group in each respondent group and placed this information into a table. TABLE XII below is that table.

TABLE XII

COLLATERAL ADJECTIVE VOCABULARY TEST RESULTS

Respondents		Average Correct Answers					
		Word Group I		Word Group II		Word Group III	
Total No.	Academic Group	No. (N = 12)	Per-cent	No. (N = 12)	Per-cent	No. (N = 13)	Per-cent
27	Freshmen	2.0	17	0.6	5	0.0	0
17	Sophomores Juniors Seniors	3.5	29	1.3	11	0.2	2
9	English Graduate Instructors	9.0	75	3.5	29	0.8	6
4	English Professors	10.5	88	7.0	58	2.5	19

This table clearly illustrates the differences in collateral adjective proficiency by the four respondent groups. For each word group, the freshmen knew the least number of collateral adjectives and the English professors the most--with the other two respondent groups falling proportionally in between. However, when one focuses upon Word Group II and especially Word Group III, one notes something quite unexpected:

even the best respondent group, the English professors, could not answer more than 58 percent of the questions in Group II and 19 percent of the questions in Group III; and the second best respondent group, the English graduate instructors, could not answer more than 29 percent of the questions in Group II and 6 percent in Group III. Thus, all respondent groups were, to varying degrees, deficient in their knowledge of collateral adjectives.

Usage Conclusions

Hypothesis five of my six etymological and usage hypotheses stated:

> most speakers of the English language are essentially unfamiliar with collateral adjectives and would have difficulty choosing an appropriate collateral adjective for a given noun in all but the simplest of instances (p. 3)

Is this hypothesis correct? According to data presented in TABLE XII (p. 52) and, to a lesser extent, TABLE XI (p. 47), it would appear that for a limited sampling of students and faculty at one university--Oklahoma State University--it is correct. However, whether these findings can be extrapolated to include other universities and other segments of the population is not at all certain. Indeed, the scant four faculty respondents would appear to invalidate the professor respondent group even at that university in which they taught. In short, hypothesis five must be revised, and I would revise it by first removing the professor group from the data base, and then replacing "most speakers of the English language" with "most college undergraduate and graduate students. . . ." Hypothesis five would thus read:

> most college undergraduate and graduate students are essentially unfamiliar with collateral adjectives and would have difficulty choosing an appropriate collateral adjective in all but the simplest of instances

Hypothesis six begins:

> in casual conversation, in instances in which speakers seek an
> adjectival equivalent for a common noun and know <u>both</u> a con-
> similar and collateral adjective, most will generally choose
> the consimilar adjective. . . . (p. 3)

Is this hypothesis correct? Unlike hypothesis five, the findings here

are somewhat contradictory, and this hypothesis is more difficult to

prove or disprove, even in such a limited sampling. For example, in AD-

JECTIVE USAGE TEST I, one might argue that many of the undergraduates

who chose the consimilar adjectives <u>motherly</u>, <u>fatherly</u>, <u>toothlike</u>, and

<u>nosey</u> for <u>mother</u>, <u>father</u>, <u>tooth</u>, and <u>nose</u>, respectively, also knew the

collateral adjectives <u>maternal</u>, <u>paternal</u>, <u>dental</u>, and <u>nasal</u> and that, conse-

quently, this first statement of hypothesis six is correct. But one can-

not make such an assumption about the undergraduates' knowledge without

further testing. Moreover, another observer might argue even more co-

gently that most (if not all) of the English professors and graduate stu-

dents who chose the collateral adjectives also knew the consimilar adjec-

tives, which are simpler words. Thus, one notes a seeming paradox in

these views. The resolution, however, may be found in an analysis of the

second statement of hypothesis six, which states in part, "if no con-

similar adjective exists [most speakers] will often construct on-the-

spot, non-grammatical consimilar adjectives, or otherwise contrive some

awkward compound . . . rather than search their memory bank for the appro-

priate collateral adjective." Certainly, this phenomenon has been amply

demonstrated in ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST I in which undergraduates regularly

constructed such consimilar adjectives as <u>earish</u>, <u>cattish</u>, and <u>axy</u> from

<u>ear</u>, <u>cat</u>, and <u>ax</u>, respectively, or otherwise affixed a -<u>like</u>, -<u>ed</u>, -<u>ing</u>,

or other adjective-forming suffix onto a simple noun. However, few of

the English graduate instructors and none of the English professors

constructed such adjectives. Thus, the answer lies not in proposing what "most speakers" probably say but in summarizing what different respondent groups actually use. With this perspective, then, I would revise hypothesis six to read:

> In casual conversation, in instances in which college under-graduates seek an adjectival equivalent for a common noun and know <u>both</u> a consimilar and a collateral adjective, most will generally choose the consimilar adjective. Indeed, if no con-similar adjectives exist they will often construct on-the-spot, non-grammatical consimilar adjectives, or otherwise contrive some awkward compound, or use some imprecise synonym rather than search their memory bank for the appropriate collateral adjective. However, English graduate instructors and those with even more advanced English training when familiar with both the consimilar adjective and collateral adjective will often choose the collateral adjective.

It is important to emphasize, however, that this conclusion is based large-ly on the data in ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST I, which attempts to simulate daily conversation in a milieu in which speakers are little concerned with the precision or sophistication of their diction. In other con-texts, the findings may vary substantially.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Having established certain etymological and usage patterns in regard to common nouns, consimilar adjectives, and collateral adjectives, the final task remains of integrating these findings, noting correlations between them, and suggesting ways in which speakers and writers can improve their communicational skills with respect to selected reading and listening audiences. In this endeavor, it is therefore expedient to first review the six etymological and usage hypotheses that formed the basis for this study, revised and corrected in concurrence with the facts. The first four statements pertain to etymology:

1. the overwhelming majority of common nouns that have collateral adjectives are words either derived ultimately from or significantly influenced by Middle English or Old English;

2. the overwhelming majority of collateral adjectives are borrowed words, derived ultimately from Latin or Greek;

3. most common nouns that have collateral adjectives are short monosyllabic or disyllabic words, but if these words are longer and use suffixes, both the word bases and their suffixes are generally derived from Latin; and

4. virtually all collateral adjectives are compound adjectives.

The final two statements pertain to usage:

5. most college undergraduate and graduate students are essentially unfamiliar with collateral adjectives and would have difficulty choosing an appropriate collateral adjective for a given noun in all but the simplest of instances; and

6. in casual conversation, in instances in which college undergraduates seek an adjectival equivalent for a common noun and know both a consimilar and a collateral adjective, most

will generally choose the consimilar adjective. Indeed,
if no consimilar adjective exists they will often con-
struct on-the-spot, non-grammatical consimilar adjectives,
or otherwise contrive some awkward compound, or use some
imprecise synonym rather than search their memory bank for
the appropriate collateral adjective. However, English
graduate instructors and those with more advanced English
training when familiar with both the consimilar and col-
lateral adjective will often choose the collateral adjec-
tive.

Moreover, in addition to these six etymological and usage observa-

tions, I discovered some more specific findings and extrapolated other ap-

parent trends both from these findings and from my original, modified hy-

potheses. Specifically,

1. a direct correlation appears to exist between one's scholas-
   tic status and the frequency of one's usage of collateral
   adjectives;

2. an inverse correlation appears to exist between one's scho-
   lastic status and the frequency of one's usage of consimi-
   lar adjectives;

3. when constructing consimilar adjectives from nouns, under-
   graduates tend to be more influenced by the meaning of the
   noun than its form;

4. when constructing consimilar adjectives from common nouns,
   undergraduates much prefer to use the adjective-forming
   suffixes -ish, -y, -like, -ed, and -ing rather than -al,
   -ic, -an, -ive, and the other suffixes available to them;
   and

5. as one's scholastic status rises, so too does the sophisti-
   cation and precision of one's adjectival choices, whether
   these be collateral or consimilar.

From these eleven observations, then, one can derive certain signi-

ficant relationships between etymology and usage and offer prudent sug-

gestions to speakers and writers.

Specifically, from the usage data it is evident that college under-

graduates are much more familiar with consimilar adjectives than collat-

eral adjectives and much prefer to use them in casual conversation; and

from the etymological data, it is evident that most consimilar adjectives

(which are little more than common nouns with adjective-forming suffixes) are predominantly either native words or classical words altered by native sources to the extent that many of them are now indistinguishable from native words. Moreover, while the usage data clearly indicate that undergraduate students specifically prefer to use the adjective-forming suffixes -ish, -y, -like, -ed, and -ing, the etymological data show that these suffixes are ultimately derived from Old English; and while the usage data illustrate that when constructing adjectives the undergraduates primarily concentrate on the meaning rather than the form of their adjectives, the etymological data note that the collateral adjectives are virtually all classically-derived, and, somewhat surprisingly, that the majority of longer (i.e., trisyllabic or polysyllabic) common nouns and their suffixes are too. Thus, from these relationships, one can tender three principles that speakers and writers should observe when addressing undergraduate audiences:

1. generally use consimilar rather than collateral adjectives;

2. whenever possible, construct consimilar adjectives from short simple nouns--native in origin or form--that have clear, almost visual, meaning for the audience; and

3. strive to use the same native adjective-forming suffixes that the audience, themselves, normally use, e.g., -ish, -y, -like, -ed, and -ing.

These suggestions, however, must be tempered by the realization that they are directed toward a rather specific audience in a rather specific milieu--that in which the writer or speaker is addressing a college audience and is concerned only that they understand what he is saying, not that they learn from or are impressed by his diction. Accordingly, then, if one is speaking to a less educated audience (for example, high school students or various classes of blue-collar workers) or an equally educated

audience but in a more casual relationship (for example, during a social get-together), one should strive even more diligently to adhere to these suggestions. In such situations, moreover--particularly when involving less educated persons--speakers and writers should be particularly careful not to use learned collateral adjectives or even learned classical consimilar adjectives in their discourse, even if they expect that their audience knows or can figure out what they mean. To do so will, in all likelihood, sound calculated and pretensious calling attention away from what they are saying to how they are saying it; and this will interfere with the effectiveness of their communication and may detract from their credibility. For instance, a college counselor advising a small group of incoming freshmen how to best conduct their social affairs should avoid using the Latin-based collateral adjectives _fatuous_ or _puerile_ but should instead use the native-based consimilar adjective _childish_. Similarly, the owner of a small air conditioning company advising his new mechanics how to speak with customers should not use the Greek-based consimilar adjective _polysyllabic_ but should instead use the simple native-based adjective _long_.

However, when addressing better educated audiences or not-so-well-educated audiences but in more formal settings, speakers and writers should strive to use a proportionally higher percentage of collateral adjectives and an increasingly sophisticated selection of consimilar and collateral adjectives (note Finding Number Five, page 57, that "as one's scholastic status rises, so too does the sophistication and precision of one's adjectival choices, whether these be collateral or consimilar"). However, even for the most erudite audiences, one should eschew recondite collateral adjectives since the evidence suggests that no general

audience, regardless of education, is proficient with such terms. Therefore, unless one is writing or speaking to a highly specialized audience --say a group of entomologists--one should never use highly technical collateral adjectives such as <u>coleopterous</u>, <u>isopterous</u>, <u>dipteral</u>, or <u>orthopteral</u>, but should instead use their corresponding consimilar adjectives; or, if such consimilar adjectives do not exist or cannot be mellifluously constructed, then one must recast the sentences to be able to use the corresponding common nouns <u>beetle</u>, <u>termite</u>, <u>fly</u>, and <u>roach</u>, respectively.

One may, in short, regard college undergraduate students interacting within a communicational milieu in which clear and easy understanding is the prime object of discourse as a median target audience for their writing or speaking. Using the etymological findings (see CHAPTER V) and the results and implications of the three adjective usage tests (see CHAPTER VII) as a focal point, speakers and writers can vary their usage of consimilar and collateral adjectives and the native and classical composition of the former based upon whether their actual audience isis more or less sophisticated than college undergraduates and whether the milieu is more or less formal.[1]

---

[1]While many persons might argue that these principals and suggestions are self-evident and in no need of independent substantiation, the fact they are based on a corpus of etymological and usage data and that this corpus establishes word choices, word-roots, and patterns of usage exhibited by given segments of the population adds a legitimacy, specificity, and a credibility to these suggestions that they might not otherwise have.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dictionaries

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Second College
    Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982.

Burchfield, Robert, Ed. Supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary.
    Vol. I, A-G, 1972; Vol. II, H-N, 1976; Vol. III, O-Scz, 1982.
    London: Oxford University Press.

The Classic Greek Dictionary. Chicago: Follett Pub. Co., 1962.

Funk & Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary. New York: Funk & Wagnalls,
    1963.

Davies, Peter, Ed. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Lan-
    guage, Paperback Ed. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1979.

Fowler, H. W. A Dictionary of Modern English Usage. Revised by Ernest
    Gowers. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Gove, Phillip, Ed. Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Spring-
    field, Mass.: Merriam-Webster, 1961.

Guralnik, David, Ed. Webster's New World Dictionary, Pocket-Size Ed.
    New York: World Publishing Company, 1977.

Guralnik, David, Ed. Webster's New World Dictionary, Second College Ed.
    New York: Simon and Schuster, 1977.

Hill, Robert. A Dictionary of Difficult Words. New York: Signet Clas-
    sic, 1975.

Johnson, Samuel. A Dictionary of the English Language. London, 1755.

Morris, William, Ed. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English
    Language. First Ed. New York: American Heritage Publishing Co.,
    1982.

Murray, James A. H., Ed. Oxford English Dictionary. 12 vols. London:
    Oxford University Press, 1933.

Nelson, William B. Webster's Second International Dictionary of the
    English Language. Cambridge, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam, 1934.

Onions, C. T., Ed. The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Simpson, D. P., Ed. Cassell's New Latin Dictionary. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1977.

Smith, Robert. Dictionary of English Word-Roots. Totowa, N.J.: Little-field, Adams & Co., 1977.

Stedman's Medical Dictionary. 22nd Ed. Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Co., 1981.

Stein, Jess. The Random House College Dictionary. New York: Random House, 1983.

Thomas, Clayton, Ed. Taber's Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Company, 1981.

Urdang, Laurence, Ed. The Random House College Dictionary. New York: Random House, 1975.

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam, 1983.

Wolfe, Henry Bosley. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. 9th Ed. Cambridge, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam, 1977.

Books, Articles, Conferences, and Letters

Brown, Rolland W. Composition of Science Words. New York: Darby Bros., 1979.

Chapman, Robert L., Ed. Roget's International Thesaurus. 4th Ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1984.

Dahl, Hartvig. Word Frequencies of Spoken American English. Essex, Conn.: Verbatim, 1980.

Drysdale, Patrick. "Dictionary Etymologies: What? Why? And for Whom?" Papers of the Dictionary Society of North America. Ontario, Canada: University of Western Ontario, 1979.

Gold, David L. "The Ordering of Lexemes in a Dictionary." Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America (1979), pp. 51-80.

Guralnik, David B. Letter to Robert Schleifer, November 24, 1981.

Hartrampf, Gustavus A. Hartrampf's Vocabularies. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1936.

Laird, Charlton. Webster's New World Thesaurus. New York: World Pub-
lishing Co., 1982.

Lewis, Norman. The Comprehensive Word Guide. Garden City, N.Y.: Double-
day & Company, Inc., 1958.

Mauson, C. O. Sylvester. Roget's Thesaurus of the English Language in
Dictionary Form. Garden City, N.Y.: Garden City Publishing Com-
pany, 1937.

Nybakken, Oscar. Greek and Latin in Scientific Terminology. Ames, Iowa:
Iowa State University Press, 1959.

Pixton, William H. Some Conventions of Standard Written English. 2nd
Ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co., 1980.

Roget, John Lewis. Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases.
New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1909.

Roget, Samuel Romilly. Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases.
Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1942.

Sisson, A. F. Sisson's Word and Expression Locator. New York: Parker
Publishing Co., 1966.

Smith, Raoul N. "On Defining Adjectives--Part III." Journal of the Dic-
tionary Society of North America, No. 3 (1980-81), pp. 28-38.

Stageberg, Norman. An Introductory English Grammar. 4th Ed. New York:
Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981.

Urdang, Laurence. Personal conference with Robert Schleifer, October 30,
1981, 10:30 A.M. to 12:30 P.M.

West, Michael, Ed. A General Service List of English Words. London:
Longman Group, 1977.

Journals

Aman, Reinhold, Ed. Benedicta. 331 S. Greenfield Ave., Waukisha, Wis.
53186 (published semi-annually).

Dictionary Society of North America. Indiana State University, Terre
Haute, Ind. 47809 (published semi-annually).

Hughlings J. Himwich, Ed. The Sesquipedalian. 706 N.E. 18th, Oklahoma
City, Okla. 73105 (published monthly).

Journal of the Society for Technical Communication. 815 15th St., N.W.,
Washington, D.C. (published quarterly).

Russell, Willis et al., Eds. American Speech: A Quarterly of Linguistic Usage. University of Alabama, Box 2877, Tuscaloosa, Ala. 35486 (published quarterly).

Urdang, Laurence, Ed. Verbatim: The Language Quarterly. Essex, Conn. 06426 (published quarterly).

APPENDIX A

PROCEDURE FOR RESEARCHING COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES:

CASE STUDY OF THE COMMON NOUN HEART

Following the methods outlined in CHAPTER IV, METHODS OF RESEARCH,
I investigated and discovered six collateral adjectives for heart. Be-
low is a step-by-step description of that investigation.

I encountered heart quite fortuitously while scanning the h's in
Webster's New World Dictionary, Paperback Edition (Guralnik, 1983) for
common nouns for my sampling. Heart seemed like a good choice to inves-
tigate: it is an exemplary common noun, one that virtually everyone
knows and uses; it has both literal and figurative meanings, the latter
quite numerous and often very colorful; and it has no precise consimilar
adjectives--making it a good prospect for having collateral adjectives.

I began my investigation by noting heart's etymology in Webster's
Paperback dictionary. It specified, without further comment, that heart
was derived from "OE heorte" (Guralnik, 1983, p. 280). This was interest-
ing but of no particular consequence in helping me to discover collater-
al adjectives. for heart. I then contemplated whether I knew any collat-
eral adjectives for heart, and almost immediately cardiac (< cardi-,
Latinized spelling of Greek kardi-, base of kardia: heart + -ac, Latin-
ized spelling of Greek -ak-, base of -akos: pertaining to, characterized
by) occurred to me. I had thus "discovered" one collateral adjective
for heart. But was this the only one? In pursuit of this prospect, I
turned to Roget's Thesaurus (Roget, 1942) and looked up heart, in which
I was deluged with over 68 pages of entries pertaining to this term. How-
ever, most of these entries were words and phrases reflecting upon figur-
ative meanings of heart (e.g., love, romance, courage, spirit, essen-
tials, etc.) and, therefore, did not help me in my search. Surmising,
however, that earlier editions of Roget's Thesauri might provide a more
literal synonymy for heart, I then consulted the 1909 and 1937 editions

(Roget, 1909; Mauson, 1937), but these volumes, likewise, did not cite any relevant collateral adjectives.

I subsequently turned to Sisson's Word and Expression Locator (Sisson, 1966), in which I noted such terms as pectoral, cardiac, cardiological, tachycardia, cardiophobia, and bradycardia. This volume was of some help, and I jotted down pectoral and cardiological as two potential collateral adjectives in addition to cardiac, though I felt strongly that I would later discard pectoral since it was clearly a collateral adjective for chest or breast (the latter in the sense of the upper part of the human torso). I then turned to Norman Lewis' Comprehensive Word Guide (Lewis, 1958) from which I recorded such terms as endocardial, intracardial, and myocardial. But these terms were clearly too narrow in meaning (note the prefixes: endo- < G. endon: within; intra- < L. intra: within, inside; and myo- < G. my-, base of myon, genitive of mys: muscle, + characteristic G. combining vowel -o-), and I ignored them.

I then turned to Hartrampf's Vocabularies (Hartrampf, 1936), but when I looked up heart, all I found was a list of various bodily organs and parts (e.g., bowels, breast, nostrils, sinews, etc.). This volume, as I was later to learn, would be of virtually no aid in my quest for collateral adjectives.

Having thus examined my six basic references on the subject and having discovered only two or possibly three collateral adjectives for heart, I then decided I had better consult Cassell's New Latin Dictionary (Simpson, 1977). I looked up heart in the English-to-Latin section of this dictionary and recorded cor, cordis and pectus, pectoris. I had previously read pectoral in Sisson's Word and Expression Locator and had tentatively rejected it as not specifically referring to heart (I believed

it to be a collateral adjective for chest or breast), and, thus, I was particularly surprised to see this form turn up again. However, I learned from Cassell's that in the Latin language pectus had referred to the breast, both literally and figuratively, as "the seat of the affections," and that this "seat" was also considered to be the heart (Simpson, 1977, p. 429)--hence the link between pectoral and heart. As for cor, cordis, this immediately brought to mind cordial, a drink which, etymologically, stimulates the heart, and which, in later times, was broadened to mean "warm and friendly; hearty" (Guralnik, 1977, p. 315). And cordial, in turn, led me to think of discord, concord, record, accord, courage--all terms etymologically derived from the Latin cor, cordis. I would file away this information for subsequent use.

I now turned to Webster's Second International Dictionary (Nelson, 1934) and looked up cardiac and cardiological. These proved to be bona fide collateral adjectives for heart, and I proceeded to skim the columns in which these words appeared and discovered two other variants of them: cardiacal and cardial (note that the three terms from Lewis--endocardial, intracardial, and myocardial--all had ended in cardial). Webster's Second had thus confirmed my first two collateral adjectives (cardiac and cardiological) and furnished me with two additional ones (cardiacal and cardial).

I subsequently looked up pectoral in Webster's Second. I was especially curious to see if this word could be used as a collateral adjective for heart as well as for chest and breast. According to Webster's Second International Dictionary (Nelson, 1934, p. 1801), Webster's Third International Dictionary (Gove, 1961, p. 1663), Webster's New World Dictionary (Guralnik, 1977, p. 1046), and Taber's Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary

(Thomas, 1981, p. P-35), it could not. However, all of these sources, save Taber, agreed that it could be used--figuratively at least--to mean the heart of the emotions. Thus, I was observing in Modern English a figurative usage of a term that had flourished in ancient Rome over 2000 earlier.

I then looked up cord- (the base of cordis, genitive of cor, as extrapolated from Cassell's cor, cordis) in Webster's Second to determine if any collateral adjectives begin with these four letters. Checking the columns, I observed--seven entries below cord--the term cordate. Webster's second definition of this term stated: "Heart-shaped; as a cordate shell" (Nelson, 1934, p. 591). Cordate was clearly a collateral adjective for heart. Moreover, Webster's third definition stated,"Bot. [botanical] Having a rounded base with a notch at its attachement to the petiole; said esp. of leaves." Cordate, I then recalled, was a common botanical term, and this immediately brought to mind obcordate, a heart-shaped leaf joined to the stem at its apex (< ob-, a Latin prefix meaning, in this regard, inversely, oppositely + CORDATE), sagittate, an arrow-head-shaped leaf (< L. sagitt-, base of sagitta: arrow + -ATE < -at-, base of -atus, first conjugation past participial ending + -e, Anglicized silent e. cf. sagittal, Sagittarius) cuneate, a wedge-shaped leaf (< L. cune-, base of cuneus: a wedge + -ATE, as above. cf. cuneal, cuneiform), and a miscellany of other adjectival descriptions of leaf shapes.

I continued skimming the columns of Webster's Second and subsequently encountered cordial. I immediately became curious as to whether this term had any literal meanings in addition to the two figurative meanings expressed earlier, i.e., a liqueur and "warm and friendly; sincere" (Guralnik, 1977, p. 315). Webster's first definition stated, "Of belonging to,

or proceeding from, the heart; vital Obs. [obsolete]'' (Nelson, 1934, p. 591). Hence, cordial had once been a collateral adjective for heart but no longer retained this sense. To verify this, I consulted Webster's Third International Dictionary. It restated, in precisely the same words, the first definition given in Webster's Second, but with one significant difference: it deleted ''Obs.'' (Gove, 1961, p. 505). Was this possible? Could the literal meaning of cordial which had already become obsolete before 1934 (the publication date of Webster's Second) have been resurrected by 1961 (the publication date of Webster's Third)? It could, but I believed that it had not, and that because of Webster's Third's policy to drastically reduce the number of usage labels in this edition, it had arbitrarily deleted ''obs.'' from this definition and had consequently made this definition inaccurate. As one means of testing this hypothesis, I looked up cordial in Webster's New World Dictionary, The Random House Dictionary, The American Heritage Dictionary, and, just for the fun of it, Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary--the college edition of Webster's Third International. Neither Webster's New World Dictionary nor The American Heritage Dictionary made any allusion to cordial as a collateral adjective of heart, either to point out that it remains in current usage or that it has become obsolete. But the Random House Dictionary and, most incredulously, Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary both specifically noted that this meaning of cordial had indeed become obsolete, the latter stating in its first definition, ''obs. of or relating to the heart: vital'' (Wolf, 1977, p. 252). Thus, according to Merriam-Webster's three dictionaries, cordial as a collateral adjective for heart had been obsolete prior to 1934, had been resurrected in time for publication of the Third International in 1961, and had again become

obsolete by 1977. This was sheer nonsense. Webster's Third Internation-
al Dictionary was clearly derelict in its scholarship. I therefore con-
cluded that cordial could not be used as a collateral adjective for heart
though it could be used, in a more figurative manner, as a collateral ad-
jective meaning "stimulating the heart; envigorating, reviving" (Gural-
nik, 1974, p. 315).

I now returned to Webster's Second International Dictionary, for I
had not yet finished searching the columns beginning with cord- for other
potential collateral adjectives. Four entries below cordial I observed
cordiform. The definition stated "heart shaped" (Nelson, 1934, p. 591)
or the same definition that I had read for cordate (the -FORM combining
form < L. -form-, base of formis < forma: a shape, figure, image--preced-
ed by a characteristically Latin connecting -i-, resulting in -iform, an
ending roughly equivalent to the -ATE ending in cordate, meaning, in this
regard, possessing, having, characterized by). Realizing, however, that
in the English language there is virtually no such thing as exact syno-
nyms--particularly when the two terms are derived from the same base lan-
guage as cordate and cordiform are--I then consulted Webster's New World
Dictionary and Webster's Third International Dictionary to see if I could
determine any discriminating differences between these two terms. Web-
ster's New World cited none, but Webster's Third clearly indicated, as I
then realized that Webster's Second had also indicated, that while both
terms meant "heart-shaped," only cordate was specifically associated
with leaf shapes.

I then continued skimming the columns of cord- words, but I noted
no additional terms relating to heart. With a total, then, of six col-
lateral adjectives for heart--cardiac, cardiological, cardial, cardiacal,

cordate, and cordiform--I considered this segment of my work finished
and proceeded to enter these adjectives onto my list of collateral adjec-
tives alongside my common noun heart.

I now sought to determine if any of these collateral adjectives
were cognate with heart through the hypothetical, reconstructed Indo-
European parent language. I looked up heart in Webster's New World Dic-
tionary, which provides Indo-European roots. It cited the hypotheti-
cal Indo-European base "kerd-, krd-, heart" (Guralnik, 1977, p. 645);
The American Heritage Dictionary concurred (Morris, 1982, p. 607). I
then reflected upon my collateral adjectives. It was clear that four of
them--cardiac, cardiological, cardial, and cardiacal--were clearly from
the Greek base kardi- and two of them--cordate and cordiform--were clear-
ly from the Latin base cord-. I thus chose to look up one word from each
group (cardiac from group one and cordate from group two) and identify
their Indo-European roots. I checked cardiac in Webster's New World Dic-
tionary, which referred me to heart, suggesting a common Indo-European
base. But when I looked up cordate (as well as the other forms with ini-
tial cord-) in Webster's New World, it made no such cross reference. I
therefore decided to check these terms in The American Heritage Diction-
ary--which clearly stated that the Indo-European base for cardiac and
cordate is kerd- (Morris, 1982, pp. 203, 295) and referred me to the Ap-
pendix for further information. In the Appendix (Morris, 1982, p. 1522),
I read the basic form kerd, the suffixed form kerd-en- (which is the spe-
cific Indo-European base for the Old English heorte > heart), the suffix-
ed form krd-yd- (which is the specific Indo-European base for the Classi-
cal Greek base kardi- > cardiac, cardial, cardiacal, and cardiological),
and the "zero-grade" form krd- (the same form described in Webster's New

World Dictionary for heart which is, more accurately, the specific Indo-

European base for the Latin base cord- > cordate and cordiform, etc.).

I therefore concluded that the common noun heart and its six collateral

adjectives are all cognate through the Indo-European mother tongue.[1]

---

[1]If one is familiar with Grimm's law and conventional orthographi-
cal changes in the Latinization and, hence, Anglicization of Classical
Greek words, one can almost predict upon sight of common nouns and their
collateral adjectives when they will be cognate through the Indo-European
mother tongue and when they will not. Grimm's law posits that in prehis-
toric times, some time after the "Common Germanic" subfamily of the Indo-
European family of languages branched off from its parent Indo-European
language, the "stop consonants" in the Common Germanic language under-
went a systematic sound shift that did not occur in non-Germanic Indo-
European languages, e.g., Latin, Greek, Celtic, Baltic-Slavic, Indo-
Iranian, etc. Hence, Germanic words (represented for our purposes by
English words) and their cognates in non-Germanic Indo-European languages
(represented for our purposes in Latin and Greek) demonstrate certain
consonant correspondence which, when understood in this historical con-
text, can help one identify these terms as being derived from the same
Indo-European bases. For example, the Indo-European voiceless velar stop
/k/ became the voiceless glottal /h/ in Common Germanic, and is now re-
presented in English by the letter h. Similarly, the voiced alveolar
stop /d/ became the voiceless alveolar stop /t/ in Common Germanic, and
is now represented by the English t. Thus, if one applies these corre-
spondences to the non-Germanic Classical Greek base kardi-, one can con-
struct a hypothetical English equivalent "harti"--the h corresponding to
the k, and the t corresponding to the d. Or viewed ex post facto, given
the English heart and the Classical Greek kardia, by understanding that
the English h and t could be consonant correspondences to the Greek k
and d, one can strongly suspect that these words are either cognates
through the Indo-European or, much less likely, that heart derived from
kardia--but necessarily at a time prior to this consonant shift in pre-
historic Common Germanic, or the English word would retain its Greek k
and d.
    Moreover, for one knowledgeable about Latinization and Angliciza-
tion of Classical Greek spelling, it is evident that a Greek k character-
istically became a Latin c, and that this Latinized c passed on to Eng-
lish. Indeed, this Latinization of Greek spelling became so prevalent
in the English language (English never actually borrowed any words di-
rectly from Greek until the English Renaissance of the sixteenth century;
before this time the preponderance of Greek words entered English via
Latin) that even when words began to be borrowed wholesale from Greek,
they were first Latinized in spelling or what one might now more appro-
priately call "Anglicized." With this knowledge, then--along with the pre-
ceding illustrations of consonantal shifts described by Grimm's law--one
can easily understand how the c in the collateral adjective cardiac is
actually a Latinization of the Classical Greek k from the word kardia

Having established the cognation of heart and its collateral adjectives, my final task was to date heart and these adjectives to determine if heart, indeed, had entered the languge pre-1500 and its collateral adjectives post-1500--as I originally hypothesized they had. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, heart in the form of heorte, as a term referring "to the bodily organ," was first recorded in the English language circa 1100 (Murray, 1933, p. H-159). However, in other senses, e.g., "the vital part of principle," "mind . . . including the functions of feeling, volition, and intellect," "intent, will, purpose, inclination, desire," and "courage," heorte was recorded as early as 825 in the Vespasian psalter. These earlier occurrences were quite surprising in that the figurative senses of the word appeared to precede the literal sense--or perhaps earlier citations for the literal sense were merely lacking. In any case, heart was clearly of Old English derivation.

As for its collateral adjectives, the Oxford English Dictionary cited the earliest printing of the Greek-based cardiac occurring in 1601, though it was used as a noun meaning "a disease of affliction of the heart" in 1450 (Murray, 1933, p. C-113). Cardiacal, however, as a collateral adjective for heart, was used even earlier in 1447, cardial for not another 400 years until 1868, and cardiology (there is no mention of the adjective cardiological) not until 1847. In regard to the Latin-based collateral adjectives, the Oxford English Dictionary noted the earliest printed use of cordate with the meaning "heart-shaped" having occurred in

_____

and how, further, if this word had been adopted into the Common Germanic subfamily of the Indo-European language before the great consonant shift in prehistoric times, today a cardiac patient may very well be called a "hartiac" patient.

1769, though it was used 99 years earlier, in 1670, with the meaning of "hearty, cordial" and 19 years prior to that, in 1651, with the meaning of "wise, prudent, sagacious" (Murray, 1933, p. 357). Cordiform, however, was not recorded until 1828, and cordial, as a collateral adjective for heart, was not used until 1646, though it was printed almost two-and-one-half centuries earlier, in 1400, with the sense of "cordial spirits" (Murray, 1933, p. C-987).

In recapitulating, the common noun heart was first cited in the English language in 825 and was clearly an Old English word; but the earliest recorded collateral adjective for heart, cardiacal, was not cited in the language for another 800 years, until 1447, and the latest recorded collateral adjective for heart, cardial, was not cited until over 1000 years after heart, in 1868. While my initial hypothesis that common nouns entered the language pre-1500 and collateral adjectives post-1500 was, therefore, not entirely substantiated in this instance, in essence --at least in regard to heart--it was correct.

APPENDIX B

ADJECTIVE USAGE QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Student, Faculty Member, Graduate Instructor:

I am conducting an investigation into the way persons use and choose adjectives in their written and oral communication. As part of this project, I would appreciate it if you would fill out the following questionnaire and place it in my mailbox (or send it to me) no later than May 2. Most persons find this questionnaire interesting and fun to answer.

Thank you for your cooperation. If you are interested in the nature of my research or the results of this questionnaire, drop a note in my mailbox or write your name at the end of this form.

Robert Schleifer
Department of English
Oklahoma State University
Morrill Hall
Stillwater, OK 74074
(Mailbox: Room 205)

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name Not Required

Age ___   Sex __   Race _____   Nationality _____

Circle the most appropriate: Student   Graduate Assistant   Instructor
Ph.D.   Other (name) _____

Dept. (or Major Field of Study) _____   Minor _____

State where you spent most of your adult life _____

Years in Oklahoma ___   Class (circle one): Frsh Soph Jr Sr Grad

Do you know Latin? ____   Classical Greek ____

Is there anything else you think I should know? (For example, is English your second language?) _____

_____

_____

ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST 1

DIRECTIONS: Below is a list of nouns. The <u>instant</u> you read each noun, write the first adjective (or adjectives) that comes to mind that has the same or nearly the same meaning as that noun. For example, for the word "moon" the first adjectives you might think of are <u>moonlike</u> and <u>moonish</u>. If so, write them down. Then again, you might only think of <u>lunar</u>. In any case, write down the adjectives that immediately come to your mind--even if you are not sure if they are real words. But DO NOT SPEND MORE THAN FOUR SECONDS ON EACH NOUN. If you cannot think of any adjectives within four seconds, leave the answer space blank. There are no right or wrong answers on this test.

Example:

Participant "A" MOON _____ _____ _____

Participant "B" MOON _____ _____ _____

Participant "C" MOON _____ _____ _____

_____

BIBLE _____ _____ _____

DOG _____ _____ _____

STAR _____ _____ _____

NIGHT _____ _____ _____

MOTHER _____ _____ _____

CAT _____ _____ _____

EAR _____ _____ _____

TOOTH _____ _____ _____

MOUTH _____ _____ _____

APE _____ _____ _____

ARSON _____ _____ _____

BEE _____ _____ _____

FATHER _____ _____ _____

NOSE _____ _____ _____

AXE _____ _____ _____

ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST II

SENTENCE COMPLETION: Fill in the blank with <u>whatever word</u> seems to best fit into the sentence.

1. As the spaceship approached the "red planet" (that next closest plan-

    et to Earth), the astronauts wondered what the _____

    landscape would look like.

2. Because his parents were not married until after he was born, he was

    considered the _____ child of his family.

3. At the age of 35, the degenerate criminal felt "saved" and began

    quoting the bible and preaching the gospel. Evangelists claimed

    that at this age he had received _____ inspiration.

4. An overdose of the drug had killed five people, but the doctors were

    still unsure as to how much of the drug constituted a _____

    dose.

5. The starving man picked a wild mushroom. As he looked at it, he won-

    dered if it was _____ or poisonous.

ADJECTIVE USAGE TEST III

DIRECTIONS: Below are three groups of nouns. After each noun write one (or more) adjective that has the same or nearly the same meaning as that noun but DOES NOT use a similar spelling. For example, an acceptable adjective for the word "MOON" would be lunar. You could not use moonlike or moonish since these adjectives use the same basic spelling as moon. Spend as much time as you wish on this section, but DO NOT use a dictionary.

NOTE: Most persons will not be able to answer more than a few of these.

GROUP I		GROUP II		GROUP III	
MOON	_____	PIG	_____	BUTTERFLY	_____
WAR	_____	FLOOD	_____	THRESHOLD	_____
ANIMAL	_____	DAY	_____	UNDERWORLD	_____
BIRD	_____	ISLAND	_____	MARBLE	_____
SPRING	_____	JUPITER	_____	ASPARAGUS	_____
FALL (Season)	_____	WINTER	_____	CARTILAGE	_____
TOUCH	_____	SUMMER	_____	WEREWOLF	_____
BRASS	_____	SISTER	_____	TWILIGHT	_____
WALKING	_____	COW	_____	ALLIGATOR	_____
CHEST	_____	WEDGE	_____	CANNIBAL	_____
KING	_____	GEORGE BERNARD SHAW	_____	STEPMOTHER	_____
LAND	_____			WEEK	_____
		DESCARTE	_____	BALDNESS	_____

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE RESEARCH DATA

COMMON NOUNS WITH THEIR CONSIMILAR

AND COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES

Following is a sampling of the 330 common nouns, 826 collateral adjectives, and 189 consimilar adjectives that formed the basis for my etymological research. The common nouns are on the left side of each column; the consimilar adjectives, when existent, are in parentheses below the nouns; and the collateral adjectives are on the right side of each column. An asterisk preceding a noun signifies that it does not have a technical consimilar adjective for at least one of its definitions, and the abbreviation in brackets following each noun and collateral adjective is a reference to the source language of that word (see LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS, p. viii). Those collateral adjectives that are not followed by an abbreviation are from the same source language and etymon as the previous bracketed adjective. For the sake of clarity, I have deleted all other etymological information from this sampling.

COMMON NOUN	COLLATERAL ADJ	COMMON NOUN	COLLATERAL ADJ
basis [G] (basic)	fundamental [L] substantive [L]	beard [OE] (bearded)	barbate [L] aristulate [L]
*bath [OE] (bathing)	balneal [L] balneological balneatory	beast [L] (beastly)	bestial [L] theroid [G]
battle [L] (battling)	belligerent [L] belliferous warring [Frank]	beauty [L] (beautiful)	aesthetic [G] cosmetic [G] Junoesque [L] bonny [L] pulchritudinous [L]
beak [L] (beaked)	rostrate [L] rostellate rostriferous rostriform nebbed [OE] rhynchopherous [G]	*bee [OE]	apian [L] apiarian apiological allotropous [G] melittological [G]
*bean [ME]	fabaceous [L] fabriform leguminiform [L] leguminose leguminous	*beetle [OE]	coleopteran [G] coleopteral adephagous [G]
		beginning [OE]	primal [L] primordial
bear [OE] (bearish)	ursine [L] ursiform arctoid [G]		exordial [L] inchoate [L] inceptive [L] tyronic [L] first [OL]

COMMON NOUN	COLLATERAL ADJ	COMMON NOUN	COLLATERAL ADJ
*being [OE]	ontological [G]	blind [OE] (blinded)	ableptical [G] cecitical [L] typhlotic [G]
*belch [OE] (belching)	eructative [L]	*blood [OE] .	hemal [G] hematal hematic hematological sanguinary [L] sanguineous sanguinous
*bell [OE]	campanulate [L] campanular campaniliform tintinabulary [L]		
*belly [OE]	ventral [L] abdominous stomachic [G]	blue [Frank] (bluish)	lazuline [Per] azure
*berry [OE]	baccate [L] baccaceous bacciferous bacciform cocciferous [L]		cerulean [L] chalybeous [G] cyaneous [G] cyanean sapphire [San] sapphirine
*bird [OE]	ornithic [G] ornithological avian [L]	*blueberry [ME]	vacciniaceous [L]
birth [OE] (birthing)	natal [L] obstetric [G] parturient [L] puerperal [L]	blush [OE] (blushing)	erubescent [L]
		*boat [OE]	cymbate [G] cymbiform navicular [L] scaphoid [G]
*bishop [G]	episcopal [G]		
bladder [OE] (bladdery)	vesical [L] vesicular urocystic [G]	*body [OE]	corporal [L] corporeal somatic [G] somatologic somatoligical
blame [G] (blameful)	culpable [L] inculpatory incriminatory [L] condemnatory [L] censorious [L] censorial censorian	bog [Gael] (boggy)	quaggy [?]
		*boil [OE]	furuncular [L] furunculus furunculoid
blessing [OE] (blessed)	beatific [L] benedictory [L]		

COMMON NOUN	COLLATERAL ADJ	COMMON NOUN	COLLATERAL ADJ
bone [OE] (bony)	osseous [L] ossific ossicular ossiculate osteological [G] ostean	*bow [OE]	obeisant [L]
		box [G] (boxed)	locular [L]
book (bookish)	NOTE: I have not been able to discover one simple collateral adjective for book. However, numerous adjectives with initial biblio-exist in English to denote specific relationships between books and persons, e.g.,	*brain [OE] (brainy)	cerebral [L] cerebroid cerebriform cerebrational encephalic [G] encephaloid
	bibliognostic [G] bibliographic bibliolatrous bibliological bibliopegic bibliomaniacal bibliophagic bibliophilistic bibliopolical bibliopolistic bibliotaphic bibliothecal bibliothecarial bibliothetic	branch [L] (branched)	ramous [L] ramose ramiform ramulose
		brass [OE] (brassy)	brazen [OE]
		breakfast [OE]	jentacular [L]
		*breast (breasted)	mammary [L] mammate subareolar [L]
		*brew (brewing)	poculent [L]
		*brick [OE]	coctile [L]
		*bridge [OE]	pontific [L] pontal
*border [OHG] (bordered)	limbic [L]	bright [OE]	fulgent [L] radiant [L] nitid [L] nitidous splendent [L] splendiferous vivid [L]
boredom [OE] (bored)	tedious [L]		
bosom [OE] (bosomy)	gremial [L] mammary [L] (see breast)		
*boundary [L]	cadastral [G]		

COMMON NOUN	COLLATERAL ADJ	COMMON NOUN	COLLATERAL ADJ
brine [OE] (briny)	brackish [MDu] salty [OE] halinous [G] saline [L]	*burglary [L] burial [OE]	kleptistic [G] kleptomaniacal funeral [L] funerary
*bull [OE] (bullish)	bovine [L] taurine [G]		sepulchral [L] cemetarial [G] charnel [L]
burden [L] (burdensome)	onerous [L] grievous [L]	butcher [Frank] (butchering)	mortuary [L] carnificial [L]

VITA

Robert Schleifer

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: AN ETYMOLOGICAL AND USAGE SURVEY OF THE COMMON ENGLISH NOUN AND ITS CONSIMILAR AND COLLATERAL ADJECTIVES

Biographical:

Education: Bachelor of Arts degree, State University of New York at Albany, May, 1971. Courses in commercial and industrial air conditioning at Hudson Valley Community College, New York (1971), York Corporation (1974), and Carrier Corporation (1975). Seminars in the teaching of vocabulary improvement at New York University (1982) and Hunter College (1982). Program in medical terminology at Indian Meridian Vocational College (1984). Graduate studies in technical writing at Oklahoma State University (1982-85). GPA: 4.0. Comprehensive examinations in Technical Writing Theory, Commercial and Industrial Air Conditioning Systems, and Rhetoric and Development of Style in Technical and Scientific Literature. Completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1985.

Professional Experience: Service Engineer, Manager, and Technical Writer for Pol-Air Conditioning Corporation, 1971-1982. Experience on 5-40 ton industrial air conditioning systems. Contributing Editor, Contracting Business: The Magazine of Mechanical Systems Contracting and Energy Management, 1982-84. Editor, English Graduate Student Association Newsletter, Oklahoma State University, 1983-85.

Courses Taught: English 2333, "Introductory Technical Writing," OSU, five sections, 1982-1984. English 3323, "Intermediate Technical Writing and Professional Report Writing," OSU, Fall 1983, Spring 1984. English 615, "Vocabulary Development," Seminar Central Adult Education School, February-March, 1982. "Advanced Vocabulary Development," Ethical Culture Society, May, 1982. Short courses in "Electrical Circuitry in Commercial Air Conditioning Systems" and "Mechanical Problems in Commercial Air Conditioning Systems," Pol-Air Conditioning Corporation, 1978-82.