

Lexical Layers of Identity

Focusing on Slavic languages, Danko Šipka provides a systematic approach to lexical indicators of cultural identity. In contrast to existing research, which focuses heavily on syntactic and phonological approaches, Šipka's approach is novel, more systematic and encompassing, and postulates three lexical layers of cultural identity: deep, exchange, and surface. The deep layer pertains to culture-specific words, divisions, and features that are generally not subject to change and intervention. The exchange layer includes lexical markers of cultural influences resulting from lexical borrowing, which situates the speakers into various cultural circles. This layer is subject to gradual changes and some limited level of intervention from linguistic elites is possible. Finally, the surface layer encompasses the processes and consequences of lexical planning. It is subject to abrupt changes, and it is shaped in constant negotiation between linguistic elites and the general body of speakers.

DANKO ŠIPKA is Professor of Slavic Languages and Applied Linguistics at Arizona State University. His research interests include lexicography, lexicology, morphology, and computational linguistics. His publications encompass over 150 papers and reviews as well as thirty books including *Lexical Conflict* (Cambridge, 2015).

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-49271-3 — Lexical Layers of Identity
Danko Šipka
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

Lexical Layers of Identity

*Words, Meaning, and Culture in the Slavic
Languages*

Danko Šipka



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-49271-3 — Lexical Layers of Identity
Danko Šipka
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108492713

DOI: 10.1017/9781108685795

© Danko Šipka 2019

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2019

Printed and bound in Great Britain by Clays Ltd, Elcograf S.p.A.

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Šipka, Danko, author.

Title: Lexical layers of identity : words, meaning, and culture in the Slavic languages / Danko Šipka.

Description: New York, NY : Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018048005 | ISBN 9781108492713 (hardback)

Subjects: LCSH: Slavic languages – Lexicology. | Slavic languages – Foreign words and phrases. | Slavic languages – Word formation. | Language and culture – Europe, Eastern.

Classification: LCC PG319.5 .S54 2019 | DDC 491.8/042–dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2018048005>

ISBN 978-1-108-49271-3 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> vii
<i>List of Tables</i>	viii
<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xvi
Part I Introduction	1
1 A Conceptual Map	3
2 Relevant Research Traditions	17
2.1 The Research Traditions of the Deep Layer	17
2.2 The Research Traditions of the Exchange Layer	31
2.3 The Research Traditions of the Surface Layer	35
2.4 Confrontation of Slavic Languages	39
3 Research Methodology	48
Part II The Deep Layer	63
4 Lexeme-level Culture-bound Words, Divisions, and Features	65
5 Lexicon-based Culture-bound Field Density	82
6 Stability and Change	104
6.1 Semantic Divergence Tracking	104
6.2 Lexical Divergence Tracking	120
Part III The Exchange Layer	129
7 Cultural Influences	131
7.1 Synchronic Contrasting	132
7.2 The Dynamics of the Exchange Layer	140

vi	Contents	
8	Geographical Contact	147
8.1	Synchronic Study of Contact Borrowing	147
8.2	The Dynamics of Contact Borrowing	150
9	Inbound and Outbound Exchange	154
	Part IV The Surface Layer	161
10	Lexical Planning	163
11	Lexicographic Traditions	172
11.1	The Nexus of Maneuvers	172
11.2	The Micro Maneuvers	180
11.3	The Dynamics of Maneuvering	193
12	Attitudes	198
	Part V Synthesis	209
13	Interaction between the Layers	211
14	Main Findings	217
15	An Outlook	224
	<i>References</i>	230
	<i>Index</i>	257

Figures

2.1	Sources of Slavic standard languages	<i>page 45</i>
3.1	A taxonomy of subject-matter fields in semantic divergence tracking	53
3.2	An example of macrolanguage hierarchy	56
6.1	A taxonomy of subject-matter fields in the Slavic inherited lexicon	107
7.1	Initial and recoded variables	134
11.1	Sociolinguistic aspects of lexicography	173
13.1	Interaction between the three lexical layers of identity	213

Tables

3.1	The characteristics of the three lexical layers of cultural identity	<i>page</i> 49
4.1	The distribution of source languages	68
4.2	Subject-matter fields of borrowings	69
4.3	Examples of equivalence categories	74
4.4	The frequency of equivalence types	76
4.5	The distribution of multiple equivalence types	77
4.6	Differentiation and transfer in inherited and borrowed words	78
4.7	The equivalence between Russian and Serbian	80
5.1	Monochronic and polychronic cultures	84
5.2	Serbo-Croatian categories with multiple English equivalents	85
5.3	The field of social interaction	86
5.4	Institutions	86
5.5	Measures	87
5.6	Logical operators	87
5.7	Body parts	87
5.8	English to Serbo-Croatian categories	87
5.9	Rural world concepts	88
5.10	Features	89
5.11	Movement	90
5.12	Serbo-Croatian to English parts of speech	90
5.13	English to Serbo-Croatian parts of speech	90
5.14	General taxonomy fields in Hidekel' and Kaul' (2006)	92
5.15	Non-technical categories in Hidekel' and Kaul' (2006)	93
5.16	Subject-matter fields in top-ranked words in Russian and Serbian idioms	95
5.17	Negative and positive characterization of a person in Ćosić (2008)	97
5.18	Word-formation networks of basic body parts in Serbian and Russian	98
5.19	The frequency of word-formation nests in Russian and Serbian	99

List of Tables	ix
5.20 Associative networks of Russian and Serbian basic body parts	100
5.21 Visual descriptives in Russian and Serbian associative networks of body parts	102
5.22 A bilingual word sketch for <i>house/maison</i> from Kilgariff (2013:3)	102
6.1 Illustrated terminal nodes in a taxonomy of the subject-matter fields in the Slavic inherited lexicon	108
6.2 The general parameters of semantic development in Slavic languages	111
6.3 Semantic developments in East, West, and South Slavic	111
6.4 The processes of semantic development in the three branches of Slavic languages	114
6.5 The processes of semantic development in East Slavic languages	115
6.6 The processes of semantic development in West Slavic languages	116
6.7 The processes of semantic development in South Slavic languages	117
6.8 Pan-Slavic semantic development per part of speech	118
6.9 East Slavic semantic development per part of speech	119
6.10 West Slavic semantic development per part of speech	120
6.11 South Slavic semantic development per part of speech	121
6.12 East Slavic processes versus West and South Slavic	122
6.13 West Slavic processes versus East and South Slavic	123
6.14 South Slavic processes versus East and West Slavic	124
6.15 The types of semantic changes in three groups of Slavic languages	124
6.16 Lexical diversion of semantic words from Swadesh (2017)	125
6.17 Russian-to-Polish lexical development in Swadesh (2017)	125
6.18 Russian-to-Serbo-Croatian lexical development in Swadesh (2017)	126
6.19 Polish-to-Russian lexical development in Swadesh (2017)	126
6.20 Polish-to-Serbo-Croatian lexical development in Swadesh (2017)	127
6.21 Serbo-Croatian-to-Russian lexical development in Swadesh (2017)	127
6.22 Serbo-Croatian-to-Polish lexical development in Swadesh (2017)	128
7.1 Language generality indices	136
7.2 Macrolanguage presence indices	137
7.3 Macrofield presence indices	138
7.4 Macrofield profiling indices	139

x	List of Tables	
7.5	Fragmentation and concentration indices for Serbian and Russian macrolanguages and macrofields	141
7.6	The current standard language status of a sample of Near Eastern loanwords from Škaljić (1966)	144
8.1	Types of borrowing in Egorova (2014) and Klajn and Šipka (2006)	148
8.2	Contact borrowing languages in Egorova (2014)	149
8.3	Contact borrowing languages in Klajn and Šipka (2006)	149
8.4	Serbo-Croatian diachronic contact languages	151
9.1	Field prominence index in Serbian–Albanian lexical exchange	156
11.1	Types of usage labels (Svensén, 2009:316)	183
11.2	Users' judgments about acceptability of labels in the standard language	185
11.3	Users' judgments about acceptability of labeled words in the standard language	186
11.4	Exclusion and non-exclusion labels in Ožegov and Švedova (1992)	188
11.5	Exclusion labels in Żmigródzki et al. (2012)	189
11.6	Exclusion labels in Vujanić et al. (2011)	191
11.7	Exclusion labels in Bajec et al. (2000)	192
12.1	Ethnically marked items in the 1990s database for Šipka (2002)	203
12.2	Pilot study data for new Bosnian words	204
12.3	General Bosniak Corpus versus the Islamic Bosniak Corpus data	205
12.4	The number and percentage of Bosnian word forms	206
14.1	The characteristics of the three lexical layers of cultural identity	220

Preface

It is a truism in cross-cultural linguistic studies that the lexicon of any language or group of related languages represents a repository of cultural identity markers. The same holds true for the policies and the attitudes about these identity markers (e.g., inherited, i.e., “domestic” versus borrowed, i.e., “foreign” words). While there exists a rich literature about specific words and concepts from a linguistic anthropology viewpoint, borrowing and other contact-driven changes from a contact linguistic perspective, as well as a body of works on policies and attitudes toward lexical markers of cultural identity from a sociolinguistic point of view, these works remain enclosed in their particular fields and a big picture about lexical layers of cultural identity remains elusive.

The principal goal of this book is to bring the three fields together and provide a synthesis of the states and processes relating to the lexical markers of cultural identity. The aforementioned fields (lexical structure, lexical borrowing, and lexical planning) are relevant in answering the questions about what lexical elements culturally define speakers of various languages. Speakers of any language are culturally defined by how their lexicon carves out their field of thinking (e.g., if they have a separate word for *foot* and *leg*, *older brother* and *younger brother*, and so on). They are furthermore defined by belonging to a cultural circle and geographical or historical setting of some kind, the lexical expression of which are borrowings from various culturally, geographically, or historically relevant languages or their absence. Examples of this include Greco-Latin borrowings in various European languages and their absence in many other languages, borrowings from English in Japanese and their absence in Mandarin Chinese, where new words are coined for new concepts, Norman lexicon in English, etc. Finally, in standard languages, they are defined by the constant negotiation of lexical choices between linguistic elites and the general body of speakers (e.g., efforts to declare a word “incorrect,” to replace one word with the other, to introduce a word for a new concept) and the attitudes of the body of speakers toward these activities of lexical planning.

It could not be emphasized enough that the present monograph represents a first step toward a systematic exploration of lexical markers of cultural identity. As such, it does not offer definite answers to any questions but rather

points to the need for a comprehensive construal of these markers and proposes techniques for their exploration. In light of this, the material from Slavic languages is used primarily to illustrate the approach rather than to conduct its comprehensive analysis.

The present monograph uses materials from three major Slavic languages: Russian, Polish, and Serbo-Croatian¹ (with numerous references to other Slavic languages) to identify three lexical layers of cultural identity and explore relationships between them. These three languages are most widely spoken in their respective branches, and they represent various anthropological-linguistic, contact-linguistic, and sociolinguistic environments. The lexicons of these Slavic languages are explored in the following three layers rooted in the aforementioned phenomena that culturally define speakers and the three separate research traditions devoted to them. The following three layers concurrently represent the three main parts of the book, divided further into chapters.

- a. The first component is the deep cultural layer, comprising culture-bound concepts, different carving of various conceptual spheres, etc. – the first previously mentioned lexical expression of cultural identity, studied in anthropological linguistics.
- b. The second element of the present model encompasses the exchange layer, which pertains to the inbound lexical transfer from other languages in Slavic and the way the lexicons of Slavic languages are incorporated and perceived in other languages that culturally defines speakers, and is studied in the literature on linguistic contacts.
- c. The final component is the surface layer, encompassing planned intervention in the lexicon and speakers' attitudes toward the lexicon and the interventions, i.e., the third lexical sphere that culturally defines the speakers, studied in lexicological sociolinguistics.

The analysis strives to provide the tools and initiate research that would eventually be a basis for answering the following questions. First: which cultural identity markers can be found in each of the three proposed layers? Second: what is the best way of exploring lexical markers of cultural identity in these layers? Third: which segments of the layers are stable, and which ones exhibit a higher susceptibility toward changes? Finally: how do the

¹ This language is also known as Bosnian/Croatian/Montenegrin/Serbian, i.e., under the names of its ethnic standards. The term Serbo-Croatian versus Bosnian/Croatian/Montenegrin/Serbian is hotly debated just like the issue of whether it is one polycentric standard language or whether each of its varieties represents a separate language (for more about these debates, see Kordić, 2010). These politicized debates are generally not of interest here. Changing the name or the approach to the language(s) is not going to change the findings of this research. The intricate sociolinguistic status of this language will be discussed further in Chapters 10–12. Some examples in this text will pertain to Serbo-Croatian in its entirety, and some to one of its ethnic variants, which will be clearly noted.

three layers interact? My goal here is to initiate the process of answering these questions, not to provide answers to them.

A key idea behind this project is that there is a kind of cultural identity that profiles each speaker of any standard language as a member of the group that shares that standard language. In other words, rather than assuming that standard languages (and in many cultures and increasingly so, the standard language is the principal linguistic form for most of the population) only encapsulate national or any other identity, I will make a claim that they create an identity on their own. The speakers are then culturally defined as users of their respective standard language, one of its ethnic or geographical variants, and of a group of related languages. Clearly, the cultural identity of speakers profiled by the language and language group is connected to all other identities and to many other intersecting cultures, but one can also legitimately talk about linguistic cultural identity. As noted, there are areas of stability and change in linguistic cultural identity and there are areas of cross-speaker, cross-region, cross-generational, cross-gender variation, but all speakers are profiled by the markers of this linguistic identity, if with nothing else, then by the potential to use or not use any of the relevant markers. It is of utmost importance to realize at the very outset that the phenomena discussed here represent only a part of the markers of cultural identity. Not only do they interact internally and exhibit interpersonal and intergroup variance, but they also engage in exchange with various other markers of cultural identity, which moderate them in the final outcome.

The lexicon of a language is the primary repository of the aforementioned linguistic markers of cultural identity. Standard languages have a broader repertoire of those markers than other forms that a speaker may use (e.g., rural or urban dialects) given that the surface layer remains by and large their exclusive preserve. Other linguistic forms typically evolve without linguistics elites having any prominent role, as they may be present only marginally rather than systematically. Hence the decision to explore lexical layers of cultural identity in standard languages in the present monograph.

Focusing on the lexicon does not mean that no other markers of cultural identity exist. For example, any student of Slavic languages will be familiar with morphosyntactic frames such as Russian *мне не хочется* and Polish *nie chce mi się* 'I do not feel like, I do not want' (literally: It does not want itself to me), Serbo-Croatian *hladno mi je, dosadno mi je* 'I am cold, I am bored' (literally: cold to me it is, boring to me it is), and many others. One might argue that they may be related to some widespread beliefs, but it would be extraordinarily difficult to find consistent proof for such claims. Not only is the lexicon the principal repository of the markers of cultural identity, it also lends itself to consistent qualitative and quantitative analyses much better than other linguistic elements. And last but not least, large dictionary datasets of lexical elements are readily available, which is not the case with morphosyntactic structures.

The book addresses general linguistic states and processes in the lexicon using material from Slavic languages, which could be of interest to researchers and students at Slavic and linguistic departments. Sections devoted to the three explored layers should additionally attract the attention of students and professionals in the field of anthropology, psychology, history, sociology, and political science. Cultural anthropologists and intercultural psychologists will be interested in the analysis of the deep layer, as it discusses how the categories of cross-cultural anthropology (e.g., polychronism versus monochronism) find their expression in the lexicon. Historians may be attracted to the sections about the exchange layer, as these markers of cultural identity are a clear consequence of historical contact and interaction. Sociologists and political scientists may find the analysis of the surface layer interesting as it discusses the mechanisms of establishing authority in society and the reactions to these attempts. As is the case with any broadly conceived monographs in social and behavioral sciences, not all parts will be of interest to all readers. Each such project maintains a fine balance between accessibility and scholarly rigor. My goal was to make the introduction and the conclusion accessible to all potential readership constituencies and to make other segments of the text that had to maintain some level of technicality to keep them rigorous enough accessible to those who may take interest in them.

One should note that the nexus of language and culture features an extremely high level of complexity. The task at hand here is not to provide a definitive account of all factors at play but rather to establish the mechanisms that elucidate some relevant issues and provide a systematic account of this field in a broader context. To use a metaphor, the task here is to come up with basic ingredients for a GPS to facilitate moving through the lexical jungle of cultural linguistics rather than to catalog everything that dwells in that jungle.² To add a simile to a metaphor, the work here is akin to that of an astrobiologist – I am looking for the places where something that has not yet been proven may be sought and for the ways of proving it.

The book is organized into five parts, each with three chapters. Nesting between the introductory and concluding parts are the parts covering the three lexical layers of identity, the deep layer, the exchange layer, and the surface layer, that reflect the triad model proposed in the book. The segmentation into the five parts reflects the triad model proposed in the book. The parts about the deep, the exchange, and the surface layers are thus nested between an introduction and conclusion.

The first part of the present monograph comprises three chapters: “The Conceptual Map,” “Relevant Research Traditions,” and “Research

² I am grateful to Wayles Browne for pointing this out to me using a fine reference to Prutkov’s (1854) aphorism: “Никто не обнимет необъятного” (Nobody can encompass the non-encompassable) (repeated as aphorism 3, 44, 67, and as a part of aphorism 160).

Methodology.” Chapter 1 introduces three key concepts: *culture*, *identity*, and the *lexeme*. It also introduces the derived idea of Slavic cultural identity, which is an additional important concept given that the analysis is conducted using the example of Slavic languages. Additionally, important concepts of authority and ethnicity are discussed. With these concepts in mind, an introductory definition and an exemplification of the deep, exchange, and surface lexical layers of cultural identity are proposed. Chapter 2 discusses relevant intercultural research traditions, most notably Russian “linguoculturology,” the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) theory, and cultural linguistics. Given the broader scope of the model proposed in this book, work from the fields of contact linguistics and sociolinguistic lexicology is also discussed. Chapter 3 proposes a methodological framework for the study of lexical markers of cultural identity based on the epistemological construct of the three layers. The framework is proposed with an eye to partially resolving the challenges of the research discussed in the previous chapter.

The second part discusses the deep layer. Chapter 4, “Lexeme-level Culture-bound Words, Divisions,” explores how language-specific words and their features reflect the cultural identity of their speakers. Chapter 5, “Features, Lexicon-level Culture-bound Field Density,” looks into how the depth and breadth of lexical fields express cultural characteristics. Finally, the last chapter in this part, Chapter 6, “Stability and Change,” tells the story of stability and change in the lexical markers of cultural identity.

The third part of the book is devoted to the exchange layer. Chapter 7, “Cultural Influences,” looks into the major sources that have shaped the cultural markers in the exchange lexical layer. Chapter 8, “Geographical Contact,” explores the words from surrounding and substrate languages. Finally, Chapter 9, “Inbound and Outbound Exchange,” addresses the different statuses of Slavic languages as a source or recipient of lexical transfer.

The fourth part of this monograph discusses the surface layer. Chapter 10, “Lexical Planning,” offers a general overview of various paths of linguistic interventions. The next chapter, “Lexicographic Traditions,” looks into the practice of enforcing lexical solutions in lexicography, the most direct manner of lexical engineering. Finally, Chapter 12, “Attitudes,” analyzes the dynamic of accepting or rejecting lexical solutions by the speakers of Slavic languages.

The final part of this book first discusses, in Chapter 13, the interaction between the three layers before proceeding, in Chapter 14, to summing up the books main findings and providing, in Chapter 15, an account of the prospects for further research in this field.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to the Slavic-Eurasian Research Center of Hokkaido University for a trimestral fellowship that enabled a part of my research on this present monograph. Most notably, I am deeply indebted to the Center Professor Motoki Nomachi for his most generous support at all junctures of my stay in Sapporo, from providing most insightful and valuable comments on earlier versions of this manuscript, to helping with bibliographic references, to organizing my guest lectures in Tokyo and Sapporo. My profound gratitude is also due to Wayles Browne for his comments on the earlier drafts of the manuscript that led to its significant improvement. Similarly, I am most indebted to L'upčo Spasovski for his punctilious interventions in an earlier draft of this manuscript, which have improved the text enormously. I am furthermore grateful to Ilija Čašule for his most valuable comments on an earlier draft.

I am grateful to Olja Šipka for proofreading the manuscript.

I am most grateful to Helen Barton for her generous editorial support. I am also indebted to the two publisher's reviewers whose valuable comments have led to further improvements to previous versions of this text. I am also grateful to Jacqueline French for her excellent copy-editing and to Stephanie Taylor and Bethany Johnson for their help in the production process.

Robert Lew also helped by bringing some minor omissions to my attention.

I am grateful to the following colleagues, who responded to my survey about cross-linguistic anisomorphism between Japanese and Slavic languages: Tadashi Nakamura, Shinichi Yamazaki, Susumu Nonaka, Go Koshino, Yoko Kumanoya, Ikuo Onisi, Alma Okajima, and one informant who wished to remain anonymous.

The generous help that I received from these esteemed colleagues does not mean that they share my political or linguistic views. Furthermore, any shortcomings of the book are to be ascribed to me and to me only.

Parts of Chapter 4 have appeared as "Slavic Lexical Borrowings in English: Patterns of Lexical and Cultural Transfer," *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 49/3–4 (2004), pp. 353–364. Parts of Chapter 6 have appeared as "Semantic Change in the Slavic Inherited Lexicon: An Initial Analysis," *Wiener Slawistischer*

Almanach 79 (2017), pp. 1–24. Parts of Chapter 7 have appeared as “The Challenges of Contrasting Interactional Lexical Layers of Slavic Cultural Identities,” *Mundo Eslavo* 16 (2017), pp. 441–452. Parts of Chapter 11 have appeared as “Sociolinguistic Factors in South Slavic Lexicographic Traditions,” in Domínguez-Rodríguez, M^a Victoria et al. (eds.), *Words across History: Advances in Historical Lexicography and Lexicology*, Grand Canaria University Press, 2016, pp. 413–424, and “Exclusion Labels in Slavic Monolingual Dictionaries: Lexicographic Construal of Non-Standardness,” *Colloquium* 1/1 (2016), pp. 1–17.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-49271-3 — Lexical Layers of Identity
Danko Šipka
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)
