Z. Saloni

REMARKS ON LEXICAL FUNCTIONS

(IN THE MARGINS OF JURI APRESJAN'S PAPER)[1]

In the paper given at the Fourth MTT conference [Apresjan 2009] Juri Apresjan convincingly showed that «the degree of interlinguistic idiomaticity of Lexical Functions in the standard theory has been somewhat exaggerated». He included very interesting examples of Russian and English collocations treated as implementations of lexical functions. Some examples in both languages are fully parallel. It would be worthwhile to observe the equivalents of these examples in a third language. It will be my native Polish.

1. ADV_1 and ADV_2

These functions serve to transform their arguments X in adverbial phrases. Their value L is quite often a preposition. Apresjan claims that «the combinations of the form $L + X$ are less idiomatic than has been believed hitherto, not only interlinguistically but intralinguistically as well.»

He gives a number of examples where the lexical functions for semantically defined groups of English words have exact equivalents in Russian and keep some part of their own meaning. Let us consider also Polish equivalents to these groups:

1. «ADV_1 from the names of emotional states is uniformly expressed by the preposition *in* + the argument lexeme: *in admiration, in agitation, in amazement, in anger, in anxiety, in bewilderment, in confusion, in delight, in despair, in doubt, in embarrassment, in fury, in horror, in indignation, in panic, in rapture, in sorrow, in surprise, in suspense*, etc. They also allow literal translations into Russian: *в беспокойстве, в гневе, в изумлении, в ярости, в отчаянии, в панике, в печали, в смятении, в сомнении, в тревоге, в удивлении, в ужасе, в восторге, в восхищении, в замешательстве,* etc.»
The Polish translation is the same: *w zachwycie, we wzburzeniu, w zdumieniu, w złości, w obawie, w oszołomieniu, w zamieszaniu, w zażenowaniu, w strachu, w oburzeniu, w popłochu, w uniesieniu, w zaskoczeniu.*

2. ADV_1MANIF «can be roughly defined as 'displaying X while doing something'. This function is expressed in English by the preposition *with (with horror, with admira-*

---

[1] I am indebted to Professor Igor Mel'čuk and Dr. Karen Rondestvedt for their substantial comments and linguistic improvements.

tion, with anger, with anxiety, with envy, with fury, with incredulity, with indignation, with joy, with pride, with shame, with surprise), in Russian by the preposition *c* governing the instrumental case (*с беспокойством, с гордостью, с изумлением, с яростью, с недоверием, с радостью, со стыдом, с удивлением, с ужасом, с восторгом, с возмущением, с завистью*). In Polish this function also has a uniform value: the preposition *z* with the instrumental case (*z przerażeniem, z zachwytem, ze złością, z obawą, z konsternacją, z zawiścią, z furią, z niedowierzaniem, z oburzeniem, z radością, ze wstydem, z zaskoczeniem, ze zdziwieniem*).

3. Almost all examples given in the section devoted to ADV_1 and ADV_2 can be literally translated into Polish. Thus Polish data also verify Apresjan's theses. The most interesting is the case of the group of nouns denoting meals. The value of ADV_1 for these nouns in English is *at*, e. g.: «*at breakfast, at dinner, at lunch, at meals* (*The whole family meets at meals*), *at supper, at table* (= 'while eating'), *at tea.* Their Russian counterparts are uniformly expressed by the combination of the preposition *за* + the argument lexeme: *за завтраком, за обедом, за ланчем, за едой, за ужином, за столом, за чаем*. There is also a uniformly expressed ADV_2REAL_1 for such arguments: *for breakfast, for dinner, for supper etc.*; their Russian analogues are *на завтрак, на обед, на ужин,* etc.» Both of these lexical functions have clear-cut translations into Polish: *podczas* (*podczas śniadania, podczas obiadu, podczas kolacji*) and *na* (*na śniadanie, na obiad, na kolację*). Moreover, the first is not only semantically specified, but also morphologically transparent: *pod* + *czas* 'at the time', lit. *pod* 'under' + *czas* 'time'.

2. MAGN

Let us consider the next example: the value of the lexical function **MAGN** for the noun *control*: *strict*. In this case there is exact equivalence between English and Russian (cf. *конроль* and *строгий*). In Polish the situation is more complicated. The first candidate for the value of **MAGN** for Polish *kontrola* (this is the natural equivalent of the English and Russian noun of the same origin) is *ścisły*; the second is its synonym (in this «meaning») *surowy* — both are phraseologically bound collocations. There is also the third candidate for this slot: *dokładny* 'exact' — the collocation *exact control* in English is not usual, but it can be found on the Internet. All three collocations *ścisła kontrola*, *surowa kontrola*, and *dokładna kontrola* occur in Polish, although *surowa kontrola* has a lower frequency rank than the other two.

The situation with the whole class of nouns whose parallels in English were discussed by Apresjan is still more complicated. That class comprises (among others) the following nouns: *audit, censorship, examination, inspection, monitoring, oversight, superintendence, supervision, surveillance*. Let us compose, by choosing the most natural Polish translations of the English words, the analogous class in Polish and discuss the values of **MAGN** for all its elements. The corresponding class of Polish nouns contains these words: *kontrola, inspekcja, rewizja, cenzura, oględziny, analiza, obserwacja, nadzór; kierownictwo, inwigilacja*.

Let us check appropriate collocations in the Polish IPI PAN (Instytute Podstaw Informatyki PAN, Institute of Computer Science PAS) corpus (250 000 000 words):

	ścisły	*surowy*	*dokładny*	Internet
kontrola (over 1000)	242	18	80	*ścisła*
inspekcja (731)	0	1	2	*ścisła*
rewizja (176)	4	0	5	*ścisła*
cenzura (337)	3	5	0	*ścisła*
oględziny (304)	0	0	45	*dokładne*
analiza (over 1000)	3	0	463	*dokładna*
obserwacja (378)	4	0	18	*ścisła*
nadzór (over 1000)	74	3	3	*ścisły*
inwigilacja (64)	1	0	0	*ścisła*

I excluded from examination the word *kierownictwo* (over 1000), because of its other meaning (or, rather, the existence of a homonym) 'management, board of managers' — the number of occurrences of the appropriate collocations would be misleading.

In the first column the words checked are listed with the number of occurrences in the IPI PAN Polish corpus given in brackets; in the three following columns are the number of occurrences of the given collocations (in all cases) in the same corpus; the fifth column contains the adjective prevailing with the given noun on the Internet.

Thus, the rules of expressing the lexical function **MAGN** for this group of words in Polish are less strict than in English and Russian, although it is evident that *ścisły* tends to prevail. It seems to me that the cause is different syntactic and semantic treatments of the adjectives under consideration in various languages. In English the first meaning of *strict* in bilingual and monolingual dictionaries is a certain **property** of a person, e. g. *a strict teacher, The Stuarts are very strict with their children* (LDOCE). Another evidently different meaning of **MAGN** is 'exact and correct', e. g. *strict sense, strict rules*. In both these collocations *strict* can be replaced by *exact*; the resulting sense is not figurative and expresses the meaning directly. Moreover, the expression *exact sense* is three times more frequent than *strict sense* and *exact rules* is over ten times more frequent than *strict rules*. Let us notice than in the set of Polish synonyms of *kontrola* (which I introduced based on Polish equivalents of the nouns in the English synonym series) there is the noun *analiza*. Its natural translation into English is, of course, *analysis*. And in English *exact analysis* is almost three times more frequent than *strict analysis*. In the process of translation we added to the expression new lexical and phraseological properties. Maybe we have changed the semantic properties of the words under consideration?

On the other hand, a *strict teacher* in Polish is *surowy nauczyciel*, never *ścisły*! And *dokładny nauczyciel* 'thorough (?exact) teacher' is something different from a *strict teacher*. *Strict control* is certainly a stable collocation, close to an idiomatic expression. However, it probably has some trace of the meaning present in *strict teacher* and *strict rule*.

3. OPER1

The most complicated point of my comparison is given by Apresjan's discussion of the pair of phrases with the Russian noun *влияние* and its English equivalent *influence*:

(1) a. *оказывать влияние на военных* 'to exert influence on the military'
   b. *иметь влияние среди военных* 'to have influence among the military'

At first glance the meaning of the noun in both sentences is the same: the argument for such an interpretation is also its intralinguistic correspondence; the only difference is its lexical co-occurrence. And in the standard theory of lexical functions both verbs *оказывать* 'to exert' and *иметь* 'to have' express the same function of $\mathbf{OPER_1}$ and, according to the standard theory of LFs [Mel'čuk 1974; cf. Mel'čuk 1996; Mel'čuk 2007], in the above sentences have no meaning of their own, i. e., they are semantically void. This factor, together with deep analysis of the grammatical, derivational, government, and combinatorial features of the noun *влияние* in both phrases [Apresjan 2009] suggests to us that there are two lexemes *влияние*: «*влияние1* in (1a) denotes a kind of pressure, that is an **action**; *влияние2* in (1b) denotes the ability to affect somebody's actions and decisions without using force or orders, that is, a certain **property** of a person.

The parallelism between Russian and English is striking: «the English lexemes *influence1* and *influence2* display almost the same kind of semantic, grammatical, derivational, syntactic, and combinatorial distinctions as their Russian counterparts *vlijanie1* and *vlijanie2*» (p. 7). However in dictionaries, both Russian and English, these potentially homonymous lexemes are not distinguished, being described in the same entry as the same «sense». In English pedagogical dictionaries we can find a clue for the division of the two units: *influence* is «uncountable and countable» (LDOCE). So, maybe this is the case of natural polysemy: an action and the ability to take this action?

The comparison with Polish is really interesting. Russian *влияние* and English *influence* have a standard Polish equivalent *wpływ*. It is etymologically similar to them, as it contains the stem *pływ-* (occurring, first of all, in verbs, especially *pływać* 'swim, float'). It is given in all bilingual dictionaries with Polish as an output language. However, when we translate (1a) and (1b) into Polish, we will see that *vlijanie* or *influence* should be translated differently:

(2) a. *оказывать влияние на военных* — wywierać wpływ na wojskowych
   b. *иметь влияние среди военных* — mieć wpływy wśród wojskowych

Polish *wpływy* is formally the plural of *wpływ*, which in its basic meaning (corresponding to *vlijanie1*) is inflected for number, e. g.: *rozmaite wpływy, którym ulegał podczas studiów na Harvardzie* 'various influences he was subject to during his studies at Harvard'. Both lexemes are strictly interrelated; the *plurale tantum* noun *wpływy* should be treated as derived from the bi-numeral noun *wpływ*.

In many Polish dictionaries the unit *wpływy* is a separate entry or, at least, a subentry. Such a decision is additionally grounded in its additional «financial» meaning 'receipts, takings' (formerly, also *wpływ* was used in that sense). We will limit ourselves

to *wpływu* referring to a property of a person. This lexeme has a synonym series similar like *влияние2* (*influence2*): *autorytet* 'authority', *znaczenie* 'meaning' (in the figurative sense), while *wpływ* denoting an action is synonymous to such nouns as *presja* 'pressure' and *oddziaływanie* 'action' (like *влияние1* and *influence1*).

The differences in government patterns is obvious and parallel to Russian and English ones: *wpływ* is *na kogoś/coś* 'on somebody/something'; *wpływy* are *wśród kogoś* 'among somebody' or *w czymś* 'somewhere, lit. in something'.

The combinatorial differences, as far as active valency is concerned, are also visible. Only *wpływ* has the following values of LFs BON and ANTIBON: *dobry* (*pozytywny, zbawienny, korzystny, dobroczynny*) 'good (positive, salutary, profitable, beneficial), *zły* (*negatywny, szkodliwy, zgubny*) 'bad (negative, harmful, baneful). There are visible distinction in MAGN: *wpływ* can be *duży* (*wielki, potężny, ogromny*) 'big (large, powerful)' and also *głęboki* 'deep' or *trwały* 'long-lasting', but neither *szeroki* 'wide'; *wpływy* can be *duże* (*wielkie, potężne, ogromne*) and *szerokie*, but neither *głębokie* nor *trwałe*.

Observations concerning the (passive) valency of both lexemes are still more interesting. The phenomena of Polish have correspondence in Russian and English examples, beginning with (1). The difference in the values of **OPER**$_1$ for Apresjan was the basis for distinguishing two different lexemes *влияние*. For *влияние1* **OPER**$_1$ is *оказывать*, for *влияние2* — *иметь*. Active valency of the first is very limited — it is used only in fixed collocations, and this property was the basis for the initial MTT conclusion that *оказывать* is the semantically void occurrence of the lexical function **OPER**$_1$. However, in the context *оказывать влияние* the verb is interchangeable with the verb *производить*, whose co-occurrence is much broader and which has also its own lexical meaning close to 'produce'. Therefore Apresjan postulates similar, rather general, meaning for *оказывать*. Moreover, *оказывать* can be used with nouns denoting mental and emotional attitudes towards someone or something, as *внимание* 'attention', *доверие* 'confidence', etc. and «should be interpreted in terms of LFs as the value of **MANIF**. It is noteworthy that *оказывать* in this case is interchangeable with a more or less standard expression of **MANIF** by means of the verb *проявлять* 'to display, to show'» (p. 6). I would like to add an observation to this analysis.

For an advanced user of Russian the verb *оказывать*, having or not having its own meaning, is morphologically transparent: it contains the prefix *о-* and a verbal basis *каз(ывать)*, occurring in about a dozen verbs — some of them have meanings connected with visual sensations: *показывать* 'show', *указывать* 'indicate', *выказывать* 'reveal'. There are, of course, also perfective counterparts of these verbs: *оказать*, *показать*, *указать*, *выказать*. The verb without a prefix, *казать*, is also used in some idioms but also occurs as such with the reflexive suffix *-ся*: *казаться* 'seem', first of all used for visual sensations. It seems to me that the association with displaying something is felt also for *оказывать*. The obsolete (occurring in the 19th century) meaning of *оказывать* 'to show', mentioned by Apresjan in a footnote, may be preserved not only in some dialects, but also in the (sub)consciousness of an average educated Russian. If someone exerts influence on someone else, this impact can be seen or observed.

Let us consider the Polish counterpart of Russian *оказывать* in its **OPER₁** role: *wywierać*. It is not related to the Russian verb but it has very similar collocational and semantic features. We can quote the definitions of the entry *wywrzeć — wywierać* (the aspectual pair of the verb) from the experimental *Inny słownik języka polskiego PWN* (Alternative Dictionary of Polish PWN), in which words are defined in their most typical context:

1 Jeśli jakaś osoba lub sytuacja **wywarła** wpływ na inną osobę lub sytuację, to zmieniła ją w określony sposób. 'If some person or situation X exerted influence on some other person or situation Y, then X changed Y in a particular way.'

2 Jeśli ktoś **wywiera** presję lub nacisk na kogoś, to używa swoich sił lub stanowiska, aby go nakłonić lub zmusić do czegoś. […] 'If somebody exerts pressure on another person, then he uses his forces or position to make that person do something.'

3 Jeśli coś **wywiera** nacisk na coś innego, to działa na to z określoną siłą lub w określony sposób. […] 'If something exerts pressure on another object, then it acts on that object with a particular strength or in a particular way.'

4 Jeśli jakaś osoba, rzecz lub sytuacja **wywarła** na kimś jakieś wrażenie, to wywołała w nim takie myśli lub uczucia. […] 'If some person, thing or situation X make an impression on some person B, then X caused in Y such things or feelings.'

5 Jeśli coś **wywarło** jakiś skutek, to spowodowało go. 'If something achieved some result then it caused that result.'

6 Jeśli jakaś osoba **wywarła** zemstę, to zemściła się. 'If some person took revenge, then he has avenged himself.'

It is clear that all these occurrences of the aspectual pair are used in the role of **OPER₁**. Both members of the pair are not used in other roles. The collocation *wywierać wpływ* is synonymous to the verb *wpływać* etc. Moreover, the verbal root *-wierać/-wrzeć* is not used without a prefix. Verbs containing this root with a prefix as a rule have the meaning of a change made by a motion: *otwierać* (etymologically *odwierać*) 'open', *rozwierać* 'open out', *zwierać* 'converge', *zawierać* 'contain', *przywierać* 'adhere', *uwierać* 'pinch'. So we can also postulate for *wywierać* the meaning 'do, produce', similar to Russian *okazyvat'*.

Let us now consider the example (2b) and the value of the function **OPER₁** for *wpływy*. It is fully parallel to *влияние2* and *influence2 — mieć*. However let us consider the following examples from the same entry of the same *Alternative Dictionary of Polish*:

(3)   a. *Prosiliśmy go o pomoc, wiedząc, że ma rozległe wpływy w mieście.*
    'We asked him for help, because we knew that he had wide influence in the town.'
    b. *Jak myślisz, jaki to będzie miało wpływ na nasze życie?*
    'What do you think, what influence will this have on our life?'

The noun *wpływy* in the first example refers to a property, but this is not the case for the second example: *wpływ* here is an action. The verb form *miało* (from *mieć* 'to have') is interchangeable with the form *wywierało* (from *wywierać*), considered above as a value of **OPER₁** for *wpływ*: *Jaki to będzie wywierało wpływ na nasze życie?*

It seems that this interchangeability occurs also in English:

(4)   a. *The Council had influence over many government decisions.* (LDOCE)
       b. *If you have influence over me, I may try to predict what signals you would like to see or hear, and consciously send them to you.* (BNC)

Of course, it is not quite clear which *influence* we have in these sentences: action or property.

The same doubt arises concerning the following Polish example:

(5)   *Miał duży wpływ na wnuka.* 'He had great influence on his grandson.'

The noun *wpływ* can be treated as an equivalent both of *influence1* (action — in this case *miał* can be replaced by *wywierał*) and *influence2*. In the second case its use in the singular is not quite typical, but such interpretation still seems possible.

It seems to me that it is possible to use a regular equivalent of Polish *mieć* 'have' as the value of **OPER₁** for *влияние1* also in Russian. For example the Russian translation of the last Polish example:

(5')   *Он имел большое влияние на внука.*

is accepted by many native speakers of Russian. We can also find such sentences on the Internet:

(6)   a. *«Люди с маузерами» имели влияние на прошлые выборы.*
              '«The people with Mausers» had influence on previous elections'.
       b. *Кадетская школа имеет очень позитивное влияние на стиль жизни мальчиков.*
              'Cadet school has a very positive influence on the pupils' life style'.

In the last sentence in the role of the lexical function **BON** we find the adjective *позитивное*, characteristic, as it seems, for *влияние1*. I would say that this is an obvious occurrence of *влияние1*, but it is used with **OPER₁** *иметь*, typical of *влияние2*.

Similar discrepancies in expressing lexical functions can be found in other examples from the Internet:

(7)   a. *Россия теряет влияние на Армению.* 'Russia is losing influence on Armenia.'
       b. *Россия теряет влияние на выборы в Украине.*
              'Russia is losing influence on the results of election in Ukraine.'
       c. *Организаторы опросов в последние десятилетия приобрели колоссальное влияние на политику.*
              'Organizers of opinion polls acquired in last decades colossal influence on the policy.'
       d. *[Митрополит Паисий Лигарид] Приобрёл влияние на царя благодаря своей учёности.* (Russian Wikipedia) 'X acquired influence on the czar thanks to his erudition.'

Apresjan claims: «On the other hand, *влияние2* has such verbal LFs as **INCEPOPER1** *приобретать (влияние)* 'to acquire influence' and **FINOPER1** *терять (влияние)* 'to lose influence'. Neither is possible for *влияние1*» [Apresjan 2009: 5]. Which lexeme

влияние occur in each of four last sentences? If it is *влияние2*, then this lexeme joins with the preposition *на*, typical of *влияние1*. If it is *влияние1*, it is used with the values of lexical functions theoretically impossible for it.

4. Conclusion

The parallels in a third language, Polish, led us to difficult examples.

Let us quote the conclusion of Apresjan's article: «LFs collocations form a continuous space with two poles: (a) highly idiomatic collocations, like MAGN *wolfish appetite*, *raging thirst*, *wide awake*, *inveterate liar*, etc., with LF values which are possible only for a very limited number of argument lexemes and are therefore semantically hazy or downright unaccountable; (b) collocations like BON *bad behavior* (*improper* is more idiomatic), *bad deal* (*raw* is more idiomatic), *bad effect* (*harmful* is more specific), *hear badly* (*indistinctly* is more specific), *bad influence* (*baneful* is more idiomatic) etc., with LF values which are possible for a very wide range of argument lexemes and are therefore semantically clear and to a large extent predictable. The former border on pure idioms, and the latter border on free word combinations (though they are not quite free)». [Apresjan, 2009: 13]

The comparison of Apresjan's data with Polish ones has shown that the description of lexical functions is a very subtle task. On both poles of the continuum there are phenomena that stand in sharp contrast. But in between we find phenomena that are unclear and not precisely distinguishable from each other. Moreover, we should not neglect additional connotations connected with lexical means (including lexical functions) and associations of these means with other, also homonymous ones.

Z. Saloni

Warsaw University, Institute of Applied Linguistics, Warsawa, Poland

zasaloni@uw.edu.pl

REFERENCES:

Apresjan 2009 — *Apresjan Ju. D.* The Theory of Lexical Functions: An Update // Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Meaning⇔Text Theory (MTT '09) held from June 16 to 18, 2009, at the Université de Montréal / Ed. by D. Beck, K. Gerdes, J. Milićević, A. Polguère. 2009. P. 1—14.

Mel'čuk 1974 — *Mel'čuk I. A.* Opyt teorii linguističeskix modelej «Smysl⇔Tekst». M.: Nauka, 1974.

Mel'čuk 1996 — *Mel'čuk I. A.* Lexical Functions: A Tool for the Description of Lexical Relations in the Lexicon // Lexical Functions in Lexicography and Natural Language Processing / Ed. by L. Wanner. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1996. P. 37—102.

Mel'čuk 2007 — *Mel'čuk I. A.* Lexical Functions // Phraseology. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research / Eds. H. Burger, D. Dobrovol'skij, P. Kühn, N. Norrick. Berlin; NY: W. de Gruyter, 2007. P. 119—131.