

## Verbs of opening: a cross-linguistic study

Egor Kashkin<sup>1</sup>, Maria Sidorova<sup>2</sup> & Daria Zhornik<sup>3</sup>

(V. V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute RAS<sup>1</sup>; Lomonosov Moscow State University<sup>2, 3</sup> & Institute of Linguistics RAS<sup>2, 3</sup>)

Keywords: semantics, lexical typology, verbs of opening, metaphor, constructional profile

The research has been supported by RFBR, grant № 17-06-00184.

This paper deals with the lexical typology of verbs which describe opening, i. e. creating access to an object by removing a barrier ('to open', 'to unlock', 'to uncover' etc.). This domain has not received much attention yet. In (Bowerman, Choi 2001; Bowerman 2005) there are some data only on English and Korean. Vinogradova et al. (2017) touch upon its properties in several languages, but mostly concentrate on the antonymic domain of closing. We will analyze the cross-linguistic patterns adopted by verbs of opening in their literal and metaphoric uses, and also discuss some theoretical implications provided by this study.

Our sample currently includes 11 languages, from which we have reliable first-hand data: Germanic (English, German, Swedish), Romance (French), Slavic (Russian, Polish), Uralic (Hill Mari, Komi, Moksha, Western Khanty), Altaic (Yakut). They form a convenience sample, following the approach laid out in (Bakker 2010: 4; Song 2018: 87–88). We rely on the frame-based approach to lexical typology (Rakhilina, Reznikova 2013, 2016; Koptjevskaja-Tamm et al. 2015), which involves collocational analysis as the key procedure for highlighting typologically relevant semantic oppositions. Our data come from elicitation, dictionaries and corpora.

Verbs of opening distinguish between different types of objects, such as parts of a building (door, window), containers (bottle, suitcase), body parts (eyes, mouth), mechanisms (tap), folding objects (newspaper, umbrella), e.g. Polish *odkorkować* specific for some containers and Swedish *låsa upp* or *regla upp* 'to unlock' related to various locking devices. A special lexeme can collocate with the names of living entities or basically intact objects (envelope, food can), e.g. Russian *vsкрыt* 'to dissect (e.g. a dead animal); to open (e.g. a food can)'. Another separate frame is removing an obstacle for visual perception (Polish *odstłonić*, Moksha *štaftəms*). It can also be relevant how wide an object is open and how intense the physical action is.

The metaphoric extensions of the domain under consideration will be provided in the talk as well. They include, among others, expressions of creating access to some non-physical entity (Russian *raskryt sekret* 'to reveal (lit.: to open wide) a secret'), discovery (Russian *otkryt Ameriku* 'to discover America'), starting an event (English *to open the meeting*), switching on a mechanism (French *ouvrir la radio* 'to switch on (lit.: to open) the radio').

We will elaborate on the two directions in which our study can contribute to semantic typology. The first one deals with different word-formation patterns followed by verbs of opening. Thus, they can be derived from verbs of closing (English *lock – unlock, cover – uncover, bar – unbar*), in this case playing a secondary role to their antonymic domain. Semantic oppositions between the frames of opening can be expressed by prefixes (e. g. Russian *raz- / ras-* which encodes the distributive meaning and is used in some verbs of opening wide like *ras-paxnut* 'to open wide', *raskryt* 'to open wide, to unfold'. cf. the neutral *ot-kryt* 'to open'). Denominal verbs are attested in this domain as well, e. g. Western Khanty *xūltəmtti* 'to open slightly' derived from the noun *xūl* 'a chink,

a slit'. These data contribute to the studies of derivational patterns in lexical typology, which still remains an underdescribed issue, see (Koptjevskaja-Tamm et al. 2007: 168; Koch 2014; Marzo, Umbreit 2016) for some background.

The second issue is the co-occurrence of different verbs and frame elements. According to FrameNet, verbs of opening should be linked to the frame of Closure, which has, among others, a core slot of a locking device (a fastener in the terminology of FrameNet) and a non-core slot of manner. Thus, Russian *otperet'* 'can collocate with names of locking devices (e.g. *otperet' zamok* 'to open the lock'), but not with degree adverbials like *nastež* 'wide open'. On the contrary, Russian *raskryt'* 'to open wide' can co-occur with such adverbials (*raskryt' dver' nastež* 'to push the door wide open'), whereas names of locking devices are impossible in constructions with this lexeme. In our talk we will provide more examples of this kind and evaluate them relying on the notion of a constructional profile (Janda, Solovyev 2009; Kuznetsova 2015; Lyashevskaya 2016: 338–381).

### References:

- Bakker, D. . 2010. Language sampling, In *The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology*, J. Song (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Electronic version.
- Bowerman, M. . 2005. Why can't you "open" a nut or "break" a cooked noodle? Learning covert object categories in action word meanings. In *Building object categories in developmental time*, Gershkoff-Stowe L. & Rakison D. Mahwah (eds.). NJ: Erlbaum. 209–243.
- Bowerman, M. & Choi, S. . 2001. Shaping meanings for language: universal and language-specific in the acquisition of semantic categories. In *Language acquisition and conceptual development*, Bowerman M. & Levinson S. (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 475–511.
- FrameNet – online database, <https://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/fndrupal/> (accessed on 27.01.2019).
- Janda, L & Solovyev, V. . 2009. What constructional profiles reveal about synonymy: a case study of Russian words for SADNESS and HAPPINESS. *Cognitive linguistics*, 2. 367–393.
- Koch, P. . 2014. Between word formation and meaning change. In *Morphology and meaning. Selected papers from the 15<sup>th</sup> International morphology meeting* (Vienna, February 2012), Rainer F et al. (eds.). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 71–96.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M., Vanhove, M. & Koch, P. . 2007. Typological approaches to lexical semantics. *Linguistic typology*. Vol. 11. 159–185.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M., Rakhilina, E. & Vanhove, M. . 2015. The semantics of lexical typology. In *The Routledge handbook of semantics*, N. Riemer (ed.). Routledge. 434–454.
- Kuznetsova 2015 – *Kuznetsova J. Linguistic profiles*. Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter, 2015.
- Lyashevskaya, O. . 2016. *Korpusnyje elementy v grammaticheskikh issledovanijakh russkogo jazyka* [Corpus instruments for Russian grammar studies]. Moscow: LRC Publishing House.
- Marzo, D. & Umbreit, B. . 2016. Investigating lexical motivation in French and Italian. In *The lexical typology of semantic shifts*, Juvonen, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.). Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter. 423–455.
- Rakhilina, E. & Reznikova, T. . 2013. Frejmovyj podhod k leksicheskoj tipologii [A frame-based approach to lexical typology]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 2. 3–31
- Rakhilina, E. & Reznikova, T. . 2016. A frame-based methodology for lexical typology. In *The lexical typology of semantic shifts*, P. Juvonen, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.). Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter. 95–129.

Song, J. J. . 2018. *Linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vinogradova, O., Kashkin, E., Sidorova M. & Zhornik D. . 2017. *Verbs of closing and opening: towards a lexical typology*, 50<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea (10–13 September 2017, University of Zurich, Switzerland). Book of abstracts. Zurich: University of Zurich, 2017. P. 250–252.