

Lexicalization & Institutionalization*

The State of the Art in 2004

Leonhard Lipka, Susanne Handl, and Wolfgang Falkner

Although lexicalization & institutionalization (L & I) are central and pervasive phenomena in the lexicon of all languages, these processes were neglected for a long time in accounts of word-formation (WF). They must necessarily be considered from an onomasiological perspective. Here, previous relevant research and terminology are reviewed. A number of definitions are compared and both notions are extended and refined. The results of L & I are gradual phenomena. They depend on regional, social and other varieties (registers) of a language. Formal, semantic and extralinguistic developments are distinguished.

1. Introduction

The concepts of **lexicalization** and **institutionalization**, as integral part of word-formation, are important in the context of words that have not existed in a language for a very long time and are not yet fully established and accepted by the language community. Questions related to such words, then, are: What happens to a new or complex word once it has been formed, coined, or borrowed from another language, and is used by a larger number of speakers? What changes does such a word undergo? How does it find its way into the dictionary of a language? This is what the terms lexicalization and institutionalization are all about. Obviously, the processes involved cannot only be observed in very recent additions to the lexicon, but also – and even better, since these have been subject to a longer development already – in words that originate way back in the history of English and have already gone through various stages of change. This article will take a look at many examples and illustrate a number of different aspects involved in this process.

1.1 *Some remarks on terminology*

Before that, however, it needs to be made clear that the two complex lexemes lexicalization and institutionalization are, of course, **notational terms** (cf Enkvist 1973) of the linguistic metalanguage. This means that, as opposed to **substantive terms**, like *robin*, *cottage*, or *chair*, they may be defined in different ways by different people, and there is no single correct and reliable definition. As with many other notational terms in linguistics (and other disciplines), this accounts for a certain amount of confusion in the literature. In this article we shall try to sketch previous work on lexicalization and institutionalization and to unravel the forbidding and confusing terminology.

A useful cover term for all types of linguistic expressions, originally proposed by Mathesius (1975) and adopted by Štekauer (2000: 337 f, 352), is **naming unit** (NU), a conventional sign for the denotation of an extralinguistic object. Following both linguists, three types of naming units can be distinguished:

- a) *simple and complex lexemes: bug, debug, bus-driver, sundowner, tomahawk, cruise missile,*
- b) *expressions (noun phrases, collocations, definite descriptions): friendly fire, the President (of the USA), Gulf War II,*
- c) *proper names (person names, place names, eponyms): George W. Bush, Camp David, Alzheimer, Poinsettia, Bakelite.*

This morphologically diverse variety of naming units may all serve for performing the speech act of **reference**. Depending on which perspective we adopt, when we use language as an instrument of communication, we can distinguish between *encoding* (with the focus on the content of thought or the referent) and *decoding* (with the written or spoken utterance as starting point), as in the dynamic, functional model of communication by Mathesius (1975, originally postulated in 1961), adopted by Štekauer (2000). This corresponds to the fundamental distinction between **onomasiology** and **semasiology/semantics** (cf Lipka 2002a, 2002b) and is the basis for Štekauer's (1998) *An onomasiological theory of English word-formation*.

There is a variety of changes which may affect a NU or its extralinguistic denotatum in the process of lexicalization. These may lead to alterations of form and content, which can also be combined, and to the loss – to a greater or lesser degree – of its transparency or motivation as consisting of parts or being derived from other words or languages. The result of this basically historical or diachronic process is the increasing unity (or 'wordiness') of the form and concept and its familiarity, as an item, to the members of a larger or smaller speech community. This can best be captured by the concept of **norm** introduced to linguistics in 1951 by Coseriu (1967: 11), as a third level of language, in between Saussure's levels of **langue** and **parole**. This level is not restricted to the lexicon, but is also responsible eg for the conventional, unsystematic realization of certain sounds. It is particularly useful, however, to apply the concept of norm, as the traditional, collective realization of the language system, to lexicology and WF. The norm accounts for the choice between alternative word-formation types (*to nationalize, to clean*, but not **to nationalify, *to national*), for lexical gaps, and for the habitual disambiguation eg of *sleeping tablet* (FOR sleeping) and *headache tablet* (AGAINST headaches).

The concept of **motivation**, as employed here, goes back to Saussure and his pupil Bally, who claim that linguistic signs are not completely arbitrary, but may be motivated by the signifié, the signifiant, or both of them together. This is further developed by Ullmann (1972: 81 ff), who introduces a fourfold distinction:

1. phonetic motivation (onomatopoeia): eg *crack, cuckoo*
2. morphological motivation (WF): *preacher, penholder*
3. semantic motivation (metaphor and metonymy): *coat* (of paint), the *cloth*
4. mixed motivation: *bluebell, redbreast*

Ullmann then goes on to discuss the loss of various types of motivation which results in a change from what he (metaphorically) calls **transparent** to **opaque** words. My use of **demotivation** is based on Ullmann's concept and refers to the loss (to a greater or lesser degree) of any type of motivation.

1.2 Approaching lexicalization and institutionalization

Now, what do examples like the following have in common?

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

And what about personal names like the following?

- (2) *Turner, Constable, Shakespeare*

They are all – at least originally – motivated, complex words and were coined according to productive morphological or semantic processes, or have been adopted from other languages, and they have all been affected – to a greater or lesser degree – by formal and/or semantic changes subsumed under the concepts of **lexicalization** and **institutionalization**. We shall take a closer look at such examples. First, we will give an overview of what has been said about such cases in the past.

2. Previous research in the field

In the first edition of Marchand's classic handbook on English word-formation (WF), the term 'lexicalization' does not even occur in the general index. Reference is made, however, in the text itself (1960: 80 f) to the phenomenon, but only in connection with 'phrases' and 'syntactic groups' like *man in the street* and *black market*, where "motivation is still obvious", and also with reference to verb-particle constructions (VPCs). Marchand (1960: 81) states that "[t]he process of lexicalization is obvious in changes in the significant with those words also that are not characterized by unity stress", giving as examples *sons-in-law* vs. *good-for-nothings* – and that with VPCs beside "fully motivated combinations such as *write down, come in, go out*" (1960: 83) there exist wholly unmotivated groups of pseudo-signs such as *get up, give up, carry out* (a plan). On the same page he adds: "Many motivated phrases are entirely degrammaticalized (lexicalized), ie any modification can only apply to the whole combination while the constituents are no longer susceptible of characterization."

Obviously, the terminology is not very consistent and developed, and the whole problem is assigned minor importance.

In the second edition of Marchand's book, there are already four references to lexicalization in the general index. The first one (1969: 94) is to the unifying function of a stress pattern with a single heavy stress (called 'forestress' by him): "Many combinations of the type *man-made* are, however, always heard with forestress (eg *frost-bitten, moth-eaten* ...). They have obviously become lexicalized to a higher degree ..."

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

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

Unlike his teacher Marchand, Kastovsky (1982a: 164ff), in his book on word-formation and semantics, gives an explicit, wide definition of lexicalization which does not involve the frequency of usage of an item. He defines 'Lexikalisierung' as "die Eingliederung eines Wortbildungs- oder syntaktischen Syntagmas in das Lexikon mit semantischen und/oder formalen Eigenschaften, die nicht vollständig aus den Konstituenten oder dem Bildungsmuster ableitbar sind."

Thus for him both complex lexemes (or WF syntagmas) and syntactic groups may become fixed parts of the vocabulary, with formal and/or semantic properties which are not completely derivable or predictable from their constituents or the pattern of formation. Concomitant **demotivation** and **idiomatization** are for him both subcategories and symptoms of the lexicalization process. The pragmatic disambiguation of WF syntagmas is a further subcategory. For example, both *callboy* and *callgirl* may theoretically be interpreted as 'boy/girl who calls' and 'boy/girl who is called'. The typical semantic fixation as 'boy who calls (actors onto the stage)' and 'girl who is called (by men on the phone asking for paid sex)' is a matter of lexicalization and again points to the norm of a language. Generally speaking, lexicalization is identified by Kastovsky with the incorporation of a complex lexeme into the lexicon with specific properties.

However, he makes a further interesting distinction between **idiosyncratic** and **systematic lexicalization**. Slight semantic changes such as the addition of semantic features (SFs) like HABITUALLY and PROFESSIONALLY to agent nouns like *smoker*, *gambler*, *baker*, *driver*, or a feature PURPOSE in *drawbridge*, *chewing gum*, *cooking apple*, represent instances of the latter. Thus, the regularity of WF and of certain types of lexicalization is emphasized. Idiosyncratic lexicalization, on the other hand, often is the origin of idioms, when the semantic changes are so extreme that the meaning of the whole lexeme can no longer be derived from its parts (cf Lipka 1972: 75ff; 1974).

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

According to Bauer, the first stage in the possible development of a complex word is its use as a nonce formation. This is defined (Bauer 1983: 45) as "a new complex

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

Nonce formations are already mentioned in Marchand’s handbook (1969), but excluded from his treatment of WF and only cited occasionally as curiosities. In later research, beginning perhaps with an article on English compound nouns by Pamela Downing (1977), non-established complex lexemes, their function, and the actual process of coining came into focus. Since such ‘innovations’ may depend heavily on context, Eve and Herbert Clark (1979) called them **contextuals** in their study on innovative verbs such as *to porch a newspaper*, *to Houdini out of a closet*.

For Bauer (1983: 48), the second step is **institutionalization**, which involves the fact that potential ambiguity is ignored and only some, or only one, of the possible meanings of a form are used. He also makes reference to so-called *item-familiarity*: “The next stage in the history of a lexeme is when the nonce formation starts to be accepted by other speakers as a known lexical item.”

A similar view is adopted by Quirk et al (1985: 1522 ff) who consider institutionalization as the integration of a lexical item, with a particular form and meaning, into the existing stock of words as a generally acceptable and current lexeme.

The particular lexeme is recognized, eg *telephone box* as synonymous with *telephone kiosk*. Institutionalized lexemes are transparent, and Bauer (1983: 48) explicitly includes not only WF processes, but also “the extension of existing lexemes by metaphor”, as in *fox* ‘cunning person’, under institutionalization and thus takes a step in the direction of **dynamic lexicology**.

Lexicalization, finally, is defined in a rather specific sense as follows: “The final stage comes when, because of some change in the language system, the lexeme has, or takes on, a form which it could not have if it had arisen by the application of productive rules. At this stage the lexeme is *lexicalized*.”

Bauer (1983: 50) makes it quite clear that “lexicalization ... is essentially a diachronic process, but the traces it leaves in the form of lexicalized lexemes have to be dealt with in a synchronic grammar.”

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

As examples of **phonological lexicalization**, Bauer (1983: 51ff) mentions an irregular stress pattern (*Árabic*, *chivalric* as opposed to regular *synchronic*, *phonetic*), vowel reduction in *day* in the names of the weekdays as opposed to *payday*, and isolation due to phonetic change in the language system, as in *lammas*, *husband*. He mentions that such changes lead to ‘opacity’ in WF, but that remotivation is possible through *spelling pronunciation*, eg of *waistcoat*, *housewife*, *forehead*.

For **morphological lexicalization** he gives alternants like *eat/edible*, *legal/loyal*, *two/tuppence* and again *warmth* as a (synchronically) irregular affix.

Semantic lexicalization, which is explicitly characterized by Bauer as “not a unified phenomenon”, is treated in some detail (1983: 55-59), and illustrated partly with examples from Lipka (1977) such as *mincemeat*, *understand*, *playboy*. Some complex words, as he observes, may have a different meaning in Britain, America, and New Zealand, such as *boy-friend*, *girl-friend*, *town house*, and thus depend on varieties of English.

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

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

In his introduction to linguistic morphology Bauer (1988: 67) identifies the **institutionalization** of words as "their coming into general use in the society and so being listed in dictionaries." The terminological appendix C of the same book (1988: 246 f) gives the definition: "A word is said to be institutionalised if it is created by a productive morphological process and is in general use in the speech community", whereas for **lexicalization** we read: "A word is lexicalized if it could no longer be produced according to productive rules."

Thus, the definitions are mainly based on the distinction between productive and unproductive rules, which is certainly not unproblematic.

Phonological lexicalization, consequently, depends on phonological rules, while words are said to be 'semantically lexicalized if their meaning is no longer the sum of the meanings of their parts'. This is often the criterion adduced for **idiomaticity** by other linguists. At any rate, Bauer's notion of lexicalization is rather global, and it does not admit for degrees and systematic processes.

3. Definitions

As demonstrated, there is no consistency in the use of the term 'lexicalization' in the writings of Marchand, Kastovsky, and Bauer. A long time ago, Leech (1974: 226), in the first edition of his book on semantics, used yet another term for the process by which 'an institutionalized lexical meaning' diverges from the expected 'theoretical' meaning: He proposed the metaphorical term **petrification**, hoping it would suggest both "the 'solidifying' in institutional form" and "the 'shrinkage' of denotation" which often accompanies the process. Others have used the equally metaphorical term **fossilization**.

Putting all these different approaches together in a terminological nutshell, **lexicalization**, in my own view, can be defined as (Lipka 1992: 107) "the process by which complex lexemes tend to become a single unit with a specific content, through frequent use. In this process, they lose their nature as a syntagma, or combination [of smaller units], to a greater or lesser extent."

Lexicalization can thus be regarded as (Lipka 2002a: 113) "a gradual, historical process, involving phonological and semantic changes and the loss of motivation. These changes may be combined in a single word ... The process of lexicalization in general, as well as its result, namely the irregularity of the lexicon, can only be explained historically."

Idiomatization concerns the semantic changes involved in the process of lexicalization. It can manifest itself (Lipka 2002a: 113) "as the addition or loss of

semantic features. Synchronically, the result of this process, various degrees of idiomaticity, form a continuous scale.”

The notion of **institutionalization**, finally, refers to the sociolinguistic aspect of this process and can be defined as (Lipka 2002a: 112) “the integration of a lexical item, with a particular form and meaning, into the existing stock of words as a generally acceptable and current lexeme.”

It has to be stressed again that not only the results of productive syntagmatic and non-syntagmatic WF processes may be affected by various changes, but also the products of semantic shift and transfer (metaphor and metonymy), as well as loanwords. All three devices, which play an important part in dynamic lexicology for the extension of the lexicon of a language (cf Lipka 2002a: 138f), can of course also be combined in individual items.

Institutionalized and lexicalized complex lexemes clearly neither belong to the level of the *langue* (with its systematic WF types) nor to the level of *parole* (with specific, concrete realizations of the underlying language system). Instead they are part of the level in between, the norm of a language.

4. Aspects of lexicalization: extending the notion

4.1 Methodological remarks

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

4.2 Lexicalization and institutionalization as gradual phenomena

Lexicalization and institutionalization are not of an all-or-none kind (cf Lipka 1972: 76), but of a more-or-less kind. Both processes result in degrees of ‘lexicalizedness’ and ‘institutionalization’ (as a state of lexical items) in synchrony. At one end of the scale, items only show small phonological and semantic changes, as in *postman*, *blackboard*, *writer*, *gambler*, *sleepwalker*. At the other end, the combination of several aspects may produce considerable graphemic, phonological, or semantic deviation (the latter is idiomaticity) as in *viz*, *ie*, *fo’c’sle*, *Wednesday*, *gospel* (cf Faiss 1978), *wryneck*, *cupboard*, *prayer*, *holiday*. Institutionalization in particular, but also lexicalization, depends on different regional, social, ‘stylistic’ and other varieties of a language. It is a matter of smaller or larger speech communities within the national standards of a

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

4.3 *Stress patterns*

As Marchand (1969: 94) and Bauer (1983: 205ff) have noted, a change in stress pattern, which results in a tone group with a single main stress, or nucleus, may have a unifying effect, or, alternatively, may be an indicator of the feeling pervasive in a speech community that an expression is a single word. It may be made up, originally, of full words, smaller units but still full linguistic signs, or even smaller constituents, often called formatives, which may be letters or syllables. Thus a single, so-called forestress will distinguish a compound lexeme from a syntactic group, as in *bláckbird*, *fállòut* and recent *déep strùcture*, *fást-fòod*, and *sóftwàre*. A change in spelling, from distinct words, via a hyphenated group, to a single graphemic unit is also indicative of lexicalization and institutionalization as in recent *handout*.

4.4 *Submorphemic constituents*

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

4.5 *Demotivation and idiomatization*

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

Semantic changes may be described as the addition of general or idiosyncratic SFs. Features like HABITUAL, PROFESSIONAL can explain *sleepwalker*, *gambler*, *writer*, while *streetwalker*, *callboy*, *callgirl*, *highwayman*, *wheelchair*, *pushchair* involve rather specific semantic material. In English, German and French *potter*, *pottery*, *Töpfer*, *töpfern*, *potier*, *poterie* are all necessarily semantically specialized as to material (baked

clay) and do not simply denote the producer of pots and his products. Thus, an idiosyncratic SF CERAMICS may be postulated for this change, which is missing, however, in the technical term *poterie d'étain*. Loss of features can be seen in *ladykiller* and in *saddler* (who makes other leather articles as well, cf F *maroquinerie*).

Metaphor and metonymy are involved in *bluebell*, *redbreast*, *Jesus bug*, *dogfight* (in the military sense), *daisy wheel* (in typewriters, printers) and *tick* (for an annoying person). Metaphor, demotivation, and institutionalization are combined in *domino theory*, *domino effect* which require specialized extralinguistic knowledge for their interpretation.

Extralinguistic changes in the denotatum have caused the demotivation of *blackboard* (often green today) and the introduction of *whiteboard* (for a white smooth surface, used in classrooms for writing and drawing on). A *cupboard* today is neither a board nor for cups only. It is well known that *shoemakers* and *watchmakers* no longer denote makers of these things (but cf *winemaker*). We can also, today, *sail* (by Hovercraft) and *ship* (goods by air).

Loan processes, which may be further subclassified, serve to extend the lexicon, but also show various degrees of demotivation and institutionalization. Few English people know that the adjective *nice* derives from the Latin verb *nescius* 'not knowing, incapable'. The demotivated *frankfurter*, *hamburger* could be English derivatives, while German *midlife crisis* is clearly marked as a loan by its pronunciation, identical with the English one.

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

5. Institutionalization

5.1 Institutionalized words belong to the norm of the language and are more or less familiar to the members of a certain speech community. A minimal degree of item-familiarity is a necessary requirement for institutionalization. This is connected with the naming function and with the need of a society for a name for what Downing (1977) called **nameworthy categories**. Clearly, *snowman* is not a nameworthy category in African societies, just as non-Catholic Japanese or Chinese will not need a name for *Ash Wednesday*. With *teetotallers* (not related to *tea*, but derived from a reduplication of *total*) or in orthodox Arab societies, *beer-glass*, *wine-glass* etc. would not be nameworthy. In the old days of tea-drinking Britain *prelactarian* was institutionalized in academic circles for persons who put milk in the cup first before pouring the tea, cf *tif* (tea in first) and in colloquial General E.

With modern equal opportunities, words like *feminist*, *male chauvinist*, *chairperson*, and forms of address like *Ms* have been institutionalized.

New objects in a changing world require new words not only in the field of technology, such as the metaphorical *daisy wheel*, *golf ball* for typewriters, or *IBM-compatibles*, *lap-top*, *laser printer* or the acronym *URL* in the field of *PCs*. In British English, where pies are favourite dishes, we have seen *pie funnels*, and even *animal pie*

funnels, which let the steam escape. So far these words have not become generally institutionalized words despite their nameworthiness.

As this excursion into the field of culinary skills shows, register, expertise, style, and the consideration of varieties in general are extremely relevant for institutionalization. Examples for metaphorical compounds and semantic transfer from the language of computers are: *soft/hardware*, *mouse*, *menu*, *joystick*, *windows*, *thumbnail*.

With regard to proper names, which prototypically demonstrate the naming function of words, we may distinguish their use as a base for derivations such as *Marxism*, *Leninism*, *Thatcherism*, and their demotivation, especially with names for famous people, like *Thatcher*, *Turner*, *Shakespeare*, *Onions*, *(Richard) Wagner*, *Bernstein* (a demotivated loanword), but also place names like *New York*, *New Orleans*, *Newcastle*, German *Ostwestfalen* (in northern Germany), *Schwarzwald*, where the language users are no longer aware of the original literal meaning of the NU.

5.2 The technical term *institutionalization* was introduced into the lexicon of linguists in Bauer (1983: 48), apparently derived by productive word-formation (WF) processes with the suffixes *-ation* and originally *-ize* (BrE *-ise*) from the verb *institutionalize* ‘put in an institution’, item-familiar to many speakers of BrE. It is lexicalized semantically and therefore cannot be the source of the technical linguistic term. It also is a neologism, not a nonce-formation, which may be interpreted from co-text and context. We agree with Štekauer (2002) that the two notational terms must not be equated but clearly distinguished (cf. Lipka 1999).

Of course, institutionalization is not a one-way phenomenon. The process by which a NU becomes familiar to (at least certain members of) a speech community can also be reversed when a category loses its nameworthiness, eg because an extralinguistic denotatum disappears or becomes unimportant. Before and shortly after the beginning of the new millennium, the media were full of references to *Y2K* and of concerned reports about the *millennium bug*. Nowadays there is hardly a need to use such NUs any more; they have undergone a process of **de-institutionalization**. We would now like to postulate this (rather clumsy) metalinguistic neologism, viz *de-institutionalization* derived by productive WF processes (ie the prefix *de-* as in *de-motivation* and the suffix *-ation*). This naming unit (NU cf Mathesius 1975, Štekauer 2002) denotes the reverse of *institutionalization*, defined as the adoption of an item-familiar word in the lexicon of a specific speech community (regional, technical, political or cultural phenomena), technical processes (invention of new referents). These may make a NU superfluous like the advent of electronic communication and new vehicles.

We disagree with Kastovsky (1982a: 146ff, see above) who defines **Lexikalisierung** as “die Eingliederung in ... das Lexikon” and also with Bauer (1983: 48) who defines **institutionalization** as the second “or “final stage in the history of a lexeme”, ie of the lexicalization of a word. My use of the term is different. We believe that both processes are basically independent of each other. We define **institutionalization** as the process of being accepted in the lexicon of a specific speech community (Americans, doctors and medical people, computer freaks, linguists etc). Kastovsky’s definition of lexicalization refers to this very process, adopting the word in a lexicon. Clearly, both are **notational terms**. We believe that WF produces new **lexemes**, but metaphor and metonymy (M&M) produce new **lexical units** (cf Lipka’s

English Lexicology) like *bluebell*, *redbreast* – combining WF and M&M, called **mixed motivation** by Stephen Ullmann. Together with loans, all these are processes of **dynamic lexicology** for extending the lexicon (cf Lipka 2002a: IX, 136-138). Like *(film) star* – lexicalized metaphorically, or semantically, all of the new simple or complex words (whether produced by irregular or by productive WF processes) may be institutionalized, like *elevator* or *lift* in AmE or BrE (cf G *Fahrrstuhl* (not a *Stuhl* or chair) and *Aufzug*, but not the regular Instrument- nominalization *lift/er*. This is the motivation for the trademark *Lift/a*, for a movable chair, G *Treppenlift*, for the *handicapped* (no longer politically correct, now replaced by *disabled*) to reach upstairs at home.; cf *wheelchairbound* (Jessica Lynch). Both *cook* and *cooker* (morphologically and semantically lexicalised) are institutionalised in ‘general English’. This distinction, which played a great role in the Prague School of Linguistics, may clearly be related to my topic. Thus, with regard to the lexicon, in traditional lexicology and lexicography of English, it was captured originally by a well-known diagram in the SOED, where the **centre** of the English vocabulary, ‘the common core’ was represented as **common English** (cf Lipka 2002a: 17). From this, various varieties and fields (cf 7.3 a) - d)) radiate, which can be equated with the Pragueian notion of **periphery**. Obviously, words may move from this to the centre, ie become lexicalized and institutionalized (like *keyhole surgery*), but basically also in the opposite direction.

6. Conclusions

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

6.2 Lexicalization and institutionalization must necessarily be investigated from an onomasiological perspective. New referents and the disappearance of old ones, together with de-institutionalization, must be considered from the perspective of words functioning as more or less item-familiar NUs. Both lexicalization and institutionalization and de-institutionalization are basically historical (or **diachronic**, in the metalanguage of linguists) processes which cannot be adequately captured within the framework of a purely language-immanent structural linguistics. Both lexicalized and institutionalized words, ie item-familiar ones, are registered and listed in good dictionaries. As mentioned above, they belong to the **norm**, as a level of language, introduced into linguistics in Coseriu (1967).

7. Postscriptum (by Leonhard Lipka, 2004)

7.1 Acknowledgement

I would like to acknowledge warmly and gratefully the help of Susanne Handl (SH) and Wolfgang Falkner (WF) and comments by P. Štekauer, R. Janney, G. Stein, D. Kastovsky and Uta. The addition of references to more recent publications, which stress the important role of **onomasiology** (cf Štekauer 2002) in connection with both lexicalization and institutionalization and other changes, esp further examples, are mine.

7.2 New referents

New things (ie extralinguistic referents) need a new name (a new naming unit or NU) in either a specific speech community (regional, social or technical (**register**), ie experts eg linguists), or in the whole world (ie instances of **globalization** or **internationalisms**, like *SARS* (severe acute respiratory syndrome), in French *SRAS* (syndrome respiratoire aigue sévère) and other new diseases like *AIDS* (also *Aids*), *Alzheimer*, *Parkinson*, *anorexia nervosa*. In the UK we have eg, *Belisha beacon*, (named after a former British Minister of Transport, a ball on one of two posts with a flashing light on top for protecting pedestrians on *zebra crossings*). We also have *pelican crossing*, a pedestrian crossing with traffic lights operated by pedestrians (from *pedestrian light controlled* altered to conform with the bird's name). Further new referents are *satellite dish aerial* (shortened to *satellite dish* or *dish aerial*, G *Satelitenschüssel*), *post-it*, *tortilla*, *spaghetti*, *ciabatta*. Old referents have disappeared like *telex*, *walkman*, *to hang up* (end a telephone conversation).

7.3 Case histories

We may distinguish several areas, fields or cases for lexicalization and institutionalization called **case histories** in Lipka (2002a: 218-223) and Lipka (2003: 211-217):

The following 7.3 a) –d) parallel 7.4 a) – d)!

- a) Relatively new diseases eg *BSE*, *SARS*, *AIDS* (French *le sida*), *athlete's foot* (see 7.4 a).
- b) Political, social and cultural phenomena and the environment eg *political correctness*, *feminism*, *perestroika*, the *Euro* (€) (in German non-serious *Teuro*), G *Mark*, *Pfennig*. *Feminism*, *Ms*, *sexist*, *macho*, *to marginalize*. But also *African American*, *Native American*, *Inuit* (for earlier *Eskimo*). *Environmental concerns: Green issues* (see 7.4 b).
- c) Computer technology and electronic communication have produced a host of new NUs, such as *computer*, *desktop*, *laptop*, *mouse*, *menu*, *email*, *CD* (compact disk), *CD-player*, *DVD* (digital versatile disk), *snail mail*, *fax machine* (from *facsimile*), *millennium bug*, *answerphone*, inventions and further new gadgets, such as *in-line skates*, *rollerblade* (originally a trademark), *answering machine*, G *Anrufbeantworter* (see 7.4 c).

- d) Regional variation: (BrE, AmE, SAE) *centre/center, lift/elevator, petrol/gas, holidays/vacation, 9/11 (nine eleven – the American emergency phone number), apartheid, robot* (see 7.4.d).
- e) Medical language (or General E) has *pneumonia, tonsillitis, haemorrhage, apoplexy, MRI (magnetic resonance imaging), G Computertomographie (CT), Kernspintomographie*, item-familiar in G medical language like *EKG, EEG*, but also *(doctor-)assisted suicide, G Sterbehilfe* (all concerning ethical and legal problems), *Hemiparese, day clinic, outpatient. Alzheimer, Parkinson, CJD, anorexia nervosa, bulimia, minimally invasive surgery (keyhole surgery)*.

New referents of all sorts come into existence such as *automobile, aquarium* (from *aquatic* and *vivarium*), but may also disappear eg *mountain bike, velocipede, laser printer/surgery* and new NUs or neologisms consequently are coined and old words become rare, old-fashioned, or die out completely (see 5.2 for **de-institutionalization**), cf G *Mark, Pfennig*. All this is about onomasiology, lexicalization and institutionalization, and the coining and loss of NUs.

7.4 Fields, areas and cases of lexicalization and institutionalization, de-institutionalization and neologisms

The following recent cases of neologisms and established, item-familiar words or NUs may serve as examples: The economical WF process of **acronyming** is very productive in many languages, eg in French *HLM (habitation à loyer modéré)* called *council houses* in the UK, G *Sozialwohnungen*. English examples are *ATV* ('all-terrain vehicle'), *ATB* (all-terrain bike) and *ATM* (AmE, automatic teller machine, where you get cash from your own account), *cash dispenser* and *cashpoint* in BrE, (for regional variation see d) above and below). *ATM* is not derived from the regular agent-nominalization *teller* (a person who tells sth.) but from the institutionalized and semantically lexicalized meaning of *teller* ('a person who deals with customers' transactions in a bank'), *CD* (compact disk), *CD-ROM, CD player, DVD* ('digital versatile disk'), *PC* ('political correctness', 'personal computer' or, older 'police constable').

- a) Diseases: *BSE* or *mad cow disease* and its human variant *CJD* ('Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease'), *AIDS* (see 7.3a).
- b) Political, social and other phenomena: *whistleblower*, inf ('a person who informs on so. engaged in an illicit activity'). On the cover of TIME 12/30/2002 – 1/6/2003 three female *persons of the year*, viz C. Cooper, Sh. Watkins, C. Rowley, were pictured under the heading *whistleblowers*. In Britain, in connection with the alleged suicide of Dr Kelly and the scandal about the non-existent *WMDs* ('weapons of mass destruction') in Iraq, *whistleblower* was used as an attention seeking device (ASD) on the front page of the GUARDIAN. German *Tschechien* was accepted as the official NU by the Czech government in 2004 (see 7.3b).
- c) Computer technology etc.: *computer, desktop, laptop, mouse, menu, spell-checker, email* – from earlier *E(lectronic)-mail, virus, to surf the net, Internet, mobile, cellphone, cell(ular) phone, (Handy, a pseudo-loan in German Denglish, a mixture of German and English, cf. F. Franglais), (Italian cellulare, telefonino), camera phone, (G. Foto-Handy), smart phones*. The cover of TIME 1/3/1983 salutes the computer as the Machine of the Year (see 7.3c).

- d) Regional variation: The different norms of British English and American English (BrE, AmE) are well-known (*industrialise/-ize, petrol/gas, sidewalk/pavement* *homely, nightcap, sundowner etc.*), but South African English (SAE) peculiarities are less item-familiar, eg *apartheid, township, robot* (traffic lights), *bioscope* ('cinema'). BrE has *velocipede, penny farthing* (an old type of bicycle or high wheel, with a very large front wheel and a very small rear wheel, metaphorical from its shape, G *Hochrad*), *farthing, penny, shilling* are no longer part of the British currency system, after *decimalisation*. BrE has *perambulator*, old fashioned and *pram*, AmE *stroller*, Denglish *buggy. Pushchair* is for infants, while *wheelchair* is for invalids. Both are semantically lexicalized and also institutionalized (see 7.3d).
- e) Medical language: *CT, MRI, G EEG; EKG, Aids, SARS* (see 7.3e).

7.5 New referents come into existence or disappear and consequently new NUs or neologisms are coined like *spaceship, astronaut* but old ones become rare, old-fashioned or die out completely, like *USSR, iron curtain, glasnost, penny farthing*.

The preceding examples are mainly the result of *observational linguistics*, cf Lipka (2003), another not yet institutionalized metalinguistic NU.

Leonhard Lipka, Susanne Handl and Wolfgang Falkner
Institut für englische Philologie
LMU Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität
Schellingstrasse 3/RG
D-80799 München
Deutschland

Leonhard.Lipka@anglistik.uni-muenchen.de
susanne.handl@web.de
falkner@lmu.de

Notes

* This article was originally written by Susanne Handl and Wolfgang Falkner, who – during a serious illness – stepped in for me and produced the rudiments of this article on the basis of earlier relevant work of mine on the topic of lexicalization and institutionalization originally intended as chapter 5 of the *reader* (lexicalized !) Štekauer and Lieber (to appear) *A Handbook of Word-Formation* (see PS). Some further examples and relevant publications have been added by me in June 2004.

References

- Bauer, Laurie. 1983. *English word-formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, Laurie. 1988. *Introducing linguistic morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Clark, Eve V. and Clark, Herbert H. 1979. "When nouns surface as verbs." *Language* 55, 767-811.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1967. *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general. Cinco estudios*, 2nd ed., Madrid: Gredos.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane and Ritt, Nikolaus (eds.). 2000. *Words: Structure, meaning, function. A Festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky*. Berlin-New York: Mouton-de Gruyter.
- Downing, Pamela. 1977. "On the creation and use of English compound nouns." *Language* 53, 810-842.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1973. *Linguistic stylistics*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Falkner, Wolfgang. 1999. "Pampers, Sunkist, Whiskas, Swirl: Semantic motivation in English trade names used in Germany." In: W. Falkner and H.-J. Schmid (eds.), *Words, lexemes, concepts – approaches to the lexicon*. Studies in honour of Leonhard Lipka. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 319-330.
- Faiss, Klaus. 1978. *Verdunkelte compounds im Englischen. Ein Beitrag zu Theorie und Praxis der Wortbildung*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Kastovsky, Dieter. 1982a. *Wortbildung und Semantik*. Tübingen/Düsseldorf: Francke/Bagel.
- Kastovsky, Dieter. 1982b. "Word-formation: A functional view." *Folia Linguistica* 16, 181-198.
- Kastovsky, Dieter. 1986. "The problem of productivity in word-formation." *Linguistics* 24, 585-600.
- Knowles, Elizabeth and Elliot, Julia. 1991; 1997. *The Oxford Dictionary of New Words*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1981. *Semantics. The study of meaning*, 2nd, revised and updated ed. (1st ed. 1974), Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1972. *Semantic structure and word-formation. Verb-particle constructions in contemporary English*. München: Fink.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1974. "Probleme der Analyse englischer Idioms aus struktureller und generativer Sicht." In: W. Bauer et al. (eds.), *Studien zur generativen Grammatik*. Vorträge vor dem Frankfurter Kreis junger Linguisten. Frankfurt/M.: Athenäum, 222-238. [also in: *Linguistik und Didaktik* 20 (1974), 274-285]
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1977. "Lexikalisierung, Idiomatisierung und Hypostasierung als Probleme einer synchronischen Wortbildungslehre." In: H. E. Brekle and D. Kastovsky (eds.), *Perspektiven der Wortbildungsforschung*. Beiträge zum Wuppertaler Wortbildungskolloquium vom 9.-10. Juli 1976 anlässlich des 70. Geburtstags von Hans Marchand am 1. Oktober 1977. Bonn: Bouvier Verlag Herbert Grundmann, 155-164.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1980. "Die Analyse englischer Texte aus linguistischer und pragmatischer Sicht." *Anglia* 98, 293-318.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1981. "Zur Lexikalisierung im Deutschen und Englischen." In: L. Lipka and H. Günther (eds.), *Wortbildung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 119-132.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1985. "Inferential features in historical semantics." In: J. Fisiak (ed.), *Historical semantics. Historical word-formation*, Berlin/New York: Mouton, 339-354.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1988. "Variety is the spice of life: language variation and sociolinguistics." In: J. Albrecht, J. Lüdtke, and H. Thun (eds.), *Energie und Ergon. Sprachliche Variation – Sprachgeschichte – Sprachtypologie*. Studia in honorem Eugenio Coseriu (= Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 300), vol. II, Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 317-325.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1992a. "Lexicalization and Institutionalization in English and German." *Linguistica Pragensia* 1, 1-13.

- Lipka, Leonhard. 1992b. "Lexicalization and institutionalization in English and German. Or: *Piefke, Wendehals, smog, perestroika, AIDS* etc." *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 40, 101-111.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1994. "Lexicalization and institutionalization." In: R. E. Asher (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, Vol. 4, 2164-2167.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1999. "*Blairites, Teletubbies, Spice Girls, and Wheelie Bins* – Neologisms, the Word of the Year, and the Nomination Function of 'Words'." In: U. Carls (ed.), *Form, Function, and Variation in English*. Studies in Honour of Klaus Hansen. New York/Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 41-48.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 2000a. "Word-formation and (proper) names: A neglected field." In: Ch. Dalton-Puffer and N. Ritt, (eds). 2000. *Words: Structure, Meaning, Function*. A Festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 130. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 187-203.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 2000b. "English and (general) word-formation – The state of the art in 1999." In: B. Reitz and S. Rieuwerts (eds.), *Anglistentag 1999 Mainz*. Proceedings. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 5-20.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 2001. "*Handy, Friseur, парикмахер, und Rascacielos* – Lehnwörter, Scheinentlehnungen und Lehnübersetzungen in europäischen Sprachen sowie im Japanischen." In: M. C. Davies, J. L. Flood, and D. N. Yeandle (eds.), *Proper words in proper places*. Studies in lexicology and lexicography in honour of W. J. Jones. Stuttgart: Heinz, 301-319.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 2002a. *English lexicology. Lexical structure, word semantics and word-formation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 2002b. "Names, onomasiology and semantics: Functional & semiotic lexicology." In: S. Scholz, M. Klages, E. Hantson, and U. Römer (eds.), *Language: Context and Cognition*. Papers in Honour of Wolf-Dietrich Bald's 60th Birthday. München: Langenscheidt-Longman, 217-225.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 2003. "Observational Linguistics and Semiotics." In: J. Hladký (ed.), *Language and function. To the memory of Jan Firbas*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 211-222.
- Marchand, Hans. 1960. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Marchand, Hans. 1969. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation*. 2nd revised edition. München: C. H. Beck.
- Mathesius, Vilém. 1975. *A functional analysis of present day English on a general linguistic basis* (edited by Josef Vachek). The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Quirk, Randolph; Greenbaum, Sidney; Leech, Geoffrey; and Svartvik, Jan. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*, London etc.: Longman.
- Stein, Gabriele. 2000. "The function of word-formation and the case of English *-cum-*." In: Ch. Dalton-Puffer and N. Ritt (eds.), A Festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky, 277-288.
- Štekauer, Pavol. 1998. *An onomasiological theory of English word-formation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Štekauer, Pavol. 2000. *English word-formation. A history of research (1960-1995)*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Štekauer, Pavol. 2002. "On the theory of neologisms and nonce-formations." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 22, 97-112.
- Štekauer, Pavol. 2004. "Review of Lipka (2002a) *English Lexicology*." *Linguistica Pragensia* 14, 49 – 52.
- Štekauer, Pavol and Lieber, Rochelle (eds.) (to appear). *Handbook of Word-formation*. Springer.
- Summers, Della. 1992; 1998. *Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture*. Harlow: Longman

Ullmann, Stephen. 1972. *Semantics. An introduction to the science of meaning*, 2nd ed. (1st ed. 1962), Oxford: Blackwell.