

UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

MASTER'S THESIS

**MECHANISMS OF CHANGE IN ENGLISH AND LATIN LEXICON – A  
COMPARISON**

Mentors:

Dr.sc. Mateusz-Milan Stanojević

Dr.sc. Vladimir Rezar

Student: Judita Mustapić

Zagreb, 2018

*To my beloved Dad*

## **Abstract**

The aim of my work is to show the mechanisms of semantic change and the way they affected some of the words when they were borrowed from Latin into the English lexicon in the sixteenth century. The analysis of the words is based on the cognitive theories about prototypical categories and mechanisms of metaphor and metonymy which act as forces expanding categories and creating new meanings and senses of words. The analyzed words were chosen from *The Proheme of The Boke named the Governour* by Sir Thomas Elyot. The research shows the importance of historical, political, and social circumstances and their impact on language.

## Table of contents:

1. Introduction .....	6
2. Historical overview .....	8
2.1. History of the Latin language .....	8
2.2. History of the English language .....	15
2.2.1. Early Modern English .....	18
3. <i>The Boke named the Gouvernour</i> by Sir Thomas Elyot .....	23
3.1. Sir Thomas Elyot .....	23
3.2. <i>The Boke named the Gouvernour</i> .....	24
3.3. <i>The Proheme of The Boke named the Gouvernour</i> .....	25
4. The mechanisms of change .....	28
4.1. Code-switching .....	29
4.2. Innovation, diffusion and result .....	30
4.3. Categorization .....	32
4.4. Cognitive mechanisms .....	34
4.5. Metaphor .....	35
4.6. Metonymy .....	37
5. The diachrony of semantic change in English and Latin vocabulary on the example of EmodE Latin loanwords in <i>The Proheme</i> .....	39
5.1. Violently .....	40
5.2. Devulgate .....	45
5.3. Describe .....	48
5.4. Education .....	53
5.5. Dedicate .....	58
5.6. Animate .....	64

5.7. Contend .....	71
5.8. Equal .....	76
6. Conclusion .....	83
7. List of sources cited in the text .....	85

# 1. Introduction

The subject of my thesis is the semantic change which affected some words in English and Latin lexicon. The main focus of the work will be placed on the mechanisms responsible for the semantic change which will be followed from the ancient Latin meanings of the words to contemporary English ones. The analyzed words are chosen from Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Proheme* from *The Boke named the Governour*, as Elyot is a perfect example of a scholar who was a great expert in both languages and cultures. Since he lived in the 16th century, a time of increased borrowing from Latin, his works are abundant in Latin loanwords. At the same time, he was a great defender of English, and was largely responsible for the status and the refinement of English vocabulary. I will start with short histories of both languages to show the significance of cultural, social, and historical events which determine the course of a language's development and status. Furthermore, this part of the work will show the historical relationship between the two languages, and explain why Latin had such a great impact on English. The sixteenth century and the Early Modern English (EmodE) will be described in more detail, as the period of Elyot's work and important linguistic changes, followed by a short overview of Elyot's life and work, and *The Boke named the Governour*.

The next part of my work will deal with the theory of borrowing and the mechanisms of change, namely metaphor and metonymy, considered by many scholars to be the main mechanisms of semantic change and human thought in general. Different theoretical courses will be mentioned in the short theoretical overview, but the majority of my research will be based on cognitive theories and scholars.

The practical part of the work will be focused on the diachrony of semantic change in English and Latin vocabulary on the example of EmodE Latin loanwords in *The Proheme* of Sir Elyot's *The Boke named the Governour*. The loanwords were chosen based on the period of their borrowing (EmodE period), which means that all Latin loanwords borrowed in previous periods, and already existing as a part of English lexicon in Elyot's time, were ruled out unless they went through a considerable change of meaning in EmodE period. The other

important criterion was that a word had to be directly borrowed from Latin into English, without French acting as an intermediary. However, this criterion might not always be followed since, in some cases, it is hard to determine if an etymon of an English word was Latin, French, or both. In many situations, it was both.

The analysis of the eight chosen words (*violently, devulgate, describe, education, dedicate, animate, contend, equal*) will start with the mentions of their contemporary meanings, followed by the diachrony of the change since their first recorded meanings, and end with the diachrony of the change of the etymons. At the end, a general conclusion will be given.

## 2. Historical overview

### 2.1. History of the Latin language

Latin belongs to the Italic branch of the Indo-European language family. The Italic branch is further divided into smaller subgroups, one of which is Latino-Faliscan with Latin and Faliscan. Some features of Latin vocabulary and grammar, such as the verbal and case systems, and word order, have their roots already in the Proto-Indo-European.

It was originally spoken by a small group of people called Latins who lived by the Tiber River in Latium. They are believed to originate in central Europe from which they entered Italy towards the end of the second millennium BC. The rest of Italy was populated by many other groups speaking different languages. There were important Etruscan cities Veii and Caere very close to the city of Rome, Greek and Punic merchant communities were situated at the ports, Faliscan was spoken in the towns of Falerii and Capena, east of the Tiber were Umbrian communities, Sabellian was spoken north and east of the Rome, etc. The number and the vicinity of different linguistic groups was remarkable. There is evidence of bilingualism and language shifts from this period, but, unlike in Greece, there was never a koiné, at least not in a linguistic sense.

However, there is evidence that some kind of cultural koiné existed which influenced Latin vocabulary, mainly through two important lexical fields: the onomastic system and religious vocabulary. All the languages in Italy “share the same system of family names combined with a restricted set of praenomina” (Clackson and Horrocks 2007, 42). This is believed to be an Etruscan invention. In the words of Palmer: “On the Roman side the IE system of a single compound name (e.g. *Hipparchus*) was replaced by the Etruscan custom of using *praenomen*, *nomen (gentile)*, and *cognomen*, many of the names themselves being of Etruscan origin” (Clackson and Horrocks 2007, 47).

When it comes to religious vocabulary, Greek had a considerable influence since Roman religion is based on the Greek model of the pantheon. Another important adoption from



Greek colonists was writing and alphabet, with which Romans accepted their “shared ways of constructing texts: ‘speaking inscriptions’ of the type ‘I belong to X’ or ‘Y made me’ are found in the archaic period in most of the languages spoken in Italy” (Clackson and Horrocks 2007, 44) .

Many loanwords from this period show the adoption of words which designated cultural items or parts of life in which other cultures were dominant. E.g., there are many words for material artefacts from Greek, and the Etruscan art of stage performance is responsible for loanwords such as *persona* (mask) and *subulo* (flautist). Sabellian languages are responsible for colour terms in Latin: *heluus* (yellow), *rufus* (red), *rauus* (grey), which can be connected to “the language of traders in animal hides and furs” (Clackson and Horrocks 2007, 47). Latin and Sabellian also share a number of similarities in the language of prayer and rituals, while Etruscans are considered to be the civilizing force which brought Greek culture and alphabet to the Romans.

With the exception of Latin and Greek, none of the languages spoken in Italy survived. All of them disappeared in the early years of the Roman Empire when Latin became dominant. But before that, Latin was just one of many languages, with Etruscan or South Picene better attested than Latin in the earliest periods. In the words of (Clackson and Horrocks 2007, 38):

If we take a cut-off point of 100 BC and look at the inscriptions that survive before that date (...) there are over 9,000 Etruscan texts surviving before this date but only around 3,000 in Latin. If we go further back in time the importance of Latin diminishes further. There are only four or five Latin inscriptions datable to before 600 BC and over 150 Etruscan ones in the same period. (...) South Picene, one of a group of IE languages known as 'Sabellian', is recorded in over 20 inscriptions from a wide area in east central Italy before 300 BC, 19 of them in stone. In the same period there are fewer Latin texts of more than a single word in length, and only six inscriptions on stone.

This epigraphic record shows the situation on the linguistic map of Italy with languages which were more dominant than Latin before the Roman expansion. As in every other period in history, it was the political supremacy that dictated the prestige of a language, and the

slow rise in the number of Latin texts mirrors the steady rise of the importance of Roman people.

*Fibula Praenestina* was, for a long time, considered to be the oldest inscription in Latin. It is a small golden brooch dated to the early seventh century BC and the short text of only four words reads a standard dedication commonly used in the archaic world:

*Manios:med:vhe:vhaked:numasioi*

*(Manius me fecit Numerio<sup>1</sup>).*

The archaic forms, such as the reduplication of perfect (*fhefhaked*), nominative singular ending *-os* (as opposed to classical *-us*), dative ending *-oi*, and other linguistic features were recognised by linguists as the forms characteristic for Early Latin, but not everybody agrees on the subject. There were, and still are, many who question the authenticity of the artefact, and their suspicions are, ironically, also based on the language of the inscription, which is judged too convenient to be true. In the words of Giacomo Lignana: "...it looks, in a certain way, like combination of the most recent finds within the study of the historical grammar of Latin" (Tikkanen 2012, 23). However the 'too-good-to-be-true' explanation is not the only reason for the theory that *Fibula Praenestina* is a forgery. Expert teams found several problems with the fibula itself, Tikkanen (2012, 25) says:

...the fibula was unique when it came to its shape, and its gold was not as fragile and as brittle as one would expect of a gold item more than 2,500 years old. An analysis of the microstructure of the artefact revealed that the gold granules did not fit with the structure of an ancient artefact, and when examined through a microscope, the artefact's surface proved not to be worn in the way that an object that has been buried in the ground and then dug out, tends to be worn.

However, the debate on the authenticity of the fibula is still ongoing, and there are scholars who still believe it to be the oldest known Latin inscription.

If the *Fibula Praenestina* really is just a forgery, then the title of the first known Latin text belongs to the *Duenos* inscription, named after the phrase:

---

<sup>1</sup> Manius made me for Numerius

### *Duenos med fecit*

meaning “Duenos made me”. The text of 125 characters without inter-word spacing is engraved on a vase and dated to the late sixth or early fifth century BC. The meaning of this ritual inscription has been unclear to scholars since the 1880 when it was found. It incorporates several of the Early Latin aspects of language, such as the accusative *med* or the nominative singular ending *-os*. Some scholars interpret *Duenos* to mean *bonus* (good).

Two ceremonial hymns which were very important for the Roman state and religion for centuries, *Carmen Arvale* and *Carmen Saliare*, although recorded much later in 218 AD, originated at a very remote (but unknown) period of antiquity and display linguistic features of Old Latin and Greek influence. They were since then handed down through generations of priests. Although they must have undergone some modernization and corruption through the centuries, the antiquity of the hymns is best visible in the fact that “they had become mere gibberish to those who pronounced it” (Tikkanen 2012, 63).

Similar to the abovementioned *Carmina, Leges XII tabularum*, or the Twelve Tables, also has no other evidence but second-hand quotations and paraphrases by authors who wrote centuries after the composition of the document. Roughly dated to the fifth century BC, the text was, according to Roman beliefs, written on the bronze tablets which were destroyed in the Gallic sack of Rome in 390 BC. Another similarity with the *Carmina* is the Greek influence. The Romans believed that patricians, when forced by plebeians into writing a law, sent an embassy to Athens to study Solon's legislation. That such a crucial document for the Roman state is based on Greek models shows the affinity to the Greek culture which was at the heart of the Roman state.

Another important document dated to 186 BC is *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*, an official proclamation with instructions and orders concerning Bacchanalian houses in Italy. The importance of this document is best described by Tikkanen (2012, 148):

The rigid format of these documents is eloquent testimony to an already lengthy tradition of such official writing, and indeed to the rigorous training of the senatorial draftsmen who prepared them. Two obvious indicators of the existence of established conventions are the archaizing orthography and the rather tortuous

syntax and phraseology so characteristic of legal-official documents in most cultures throughout the ages.

The language used in the *Senatus consultum* is the official Latin of the period in which it was written. However, there were still some uncertainties about spelling and syntax because there were not any significant conventions established yet, according to Tikkanen.

The most important historical set of events which influenced the status of the Latin language is the gradual expansion of Rome. Latin would have never achieved its unique global status if it were not for the Roman Empire and its power. The expansion started with the geographically closest cities, and by the end of the second century BC, there were Roman *coloniae* throughout Italy. The citizens of the *coloniae* were not forced into adopting Latin, but they rather recognised the advantages that the use of Latin might bring to them. Those who knew and used Latin were closer to the institutions and could acquire functions more easily. Latin also appeared in official proclamations, it was used as a *lingua franca* in trade across Italy, and was the only language used in the Roman army, in which men from the whole Italy served. This process of Romanization caused by the Roman expansion had a significant impact on the many societies of Italy – the emergence of the sense of unity. The diversity of Italian peninsula was thus united under the Roman *signa*; and common purpose and common identity called for a common language.

It is no wonder then that the first known authors of Latin poetry were not Romans, but Italians with Roman patronage. Naevius and Lucilius were from Campania, Ennius and Pacuvius from Calabria, Plautus and Accius from Umbria, and Caecilius from Cisalpine Gaul.

According to Clackson and Horrocks, it was not until the end of the first century that the peoples of Italy united under a single identity influenced by Hellenistic models and Roman realpolitik. Latin was now the official language of the Roman state, and the common language of trade, law, literature, and government. Just like any other official language, it needed to be standardized. The need for an efficient language used in both administration and 'higher written forms' had already led to some conventions being established before the first century BC (as seen from *Senatus consultum*). But the most important phase in which Latin was intensively regularized and conventionalized is the period of the late Republic and the early Empire. Once standardized forms changed very little for the rest of the antiquity.

The driving force behind the final formation of literary and standard Latin is commonly believed to be the aristocracy of the late Republic. But one of them was more important than the others – Marcus Tullius Cicero. Clackson and Horrocks regard his compositional practice to be the essence of correct syntax and ‘good’ style. In other words, Cicero set the standards for what was correct and what was wrong in language based on the traditional Roman variety of Latin combined with *consuetudo*, i.e. contemporary usage of the educated elite. Archaisms were welcomed, but only if they were Roman, because the most important feature of the standard Latin was its *urbanitas*, as opposed to the rustic way of speaking brought to Rome by a great number of rural poor newcomers at the beginning of the first century BC. That Cicero believed that the Roman variety of Latin was without fault and therefore best suited as the basis for standard Latin is best visible from his words:

Consequently, since there is a distinct way of speaking peculiar to the race and city of Rome, in which nothing can be found fault with, nothing can displease, nothing can be censured, nothing sound or smell of foreign parts, let us follow this, and learn to avoid not only rustic roughness but also outlandish foreign ways (Cicero, *de Oratore* 3.44-5)

Cicero's contribution to Latin also included a great number of technical and philosophical neologisms, syntactic innovations regulating subordinate clauses and connective particles and relatives, and the establishment of Greek standards in matters of stylistic elegance.

Since Greek was the first true standard language (with normative principles of ‘good’ usage), it was inevitable that its rules of consistency and clarity, in addition to its being “the cultural language for the Roman elite” (Clackson and Horrocks 2007, 190), would have had the greatest impact on the formation of the Latin standard language. Some of Greek many contributions to Classical Latin are aspirated plosives (“Cicero confirms that this change was still taking place during his lifetime” (Clackson and Horrocks 2007, 190)), the letters Z and Y, the development of participial syntax, and the most pervasive and most lasting change – lexical borrowing and calquing. Calquing is seen as “the principle means by which a native vocabulary was created in the fields of philosophy, rhetoric and grammar among others” (Clackson and Horrocks 2007, 197-8).

Standard Latin devised by the Roman educated elites of the late Republic and early Empire was the language of the written word. Even those who belonged to the Roman elite had a different colloquial speaking style than the one they used in their writings. As any modern standard language, it was artificial and spoken by nobody. Different varieties of the so-called Sub-Elite Latin were used in everyday situations in both Rome and other areas of the Empire.

Many linguists believe that the lower classes in the Roman Empire spoke a form of Classical Latin called Vulgar Latin which would later become Romance languages. This Vulgar Latin would, according to them, be an incorrect form of Classical Latin and it was uniform throughout the Empire. But Clackson and Horrocks believe the situation must have been much more complicated than that. According to him, it would be over-simplistic to think of the vast Roman Empire as linguistically unified, because spoken varieties must have been very different in e.g. Roman Britain and North Africa.

Just like at the beginning of the rise of Latin in Italy, the situation is once again marked by great diversity. There was not a single common rural variety opposed to the Classical Latin of written texts, but many variations of spoken Latin differing from one geographical area to the other. And while written Latin remained fixed in its classical form for centuries, spoken variations, as any other natural language, changed through time and moved further apart from the written norm. At one point, the differences became so apparent that the spoken varieties were no longer considered to belong to the same language as the classical variety of Latin. In this way, Romance languages were born.

Although the Roman Empire ceased to exist in 476 AD with the separation of the Western Empire from the Eastern, it was not the end of Latin. Latin was still used in many administrative structures inherited from the Empire, such as the Senate, Roman law (which remained the dominant legal code in the Mediterranean), land tax, accounts, letters, spells, etc. But the most important role in the continuation of Latin belongs to the Church, which used Latin in services and as the language of both written and oral communication, including sermons, prayers, Bible readings, songs, etc. In this way, as the language of the Church, Latin expanded beyond the boundaries of the Western Roman Empire to the areas which were never under Roman rule, and influenced languages other than Romance, such as English, Irish, Old German, Dutch, etc.

For the European nobility and educated elites, Latin was the language of literacy, philosophy, religion, and science well into the nineteenth century. Even today, Latin enriches the scientific registers of almost all known languages. However, the Latin of today cannot be regarded as spoken language, since it is learned only from historical written sources. It is purely prescriptive, uniform, and fixed, functioning more as a cultural sign than a conventional language.

## **2.2. History of the English language**

The earliest form of English is Old English (OE) believed to emerge in the fifth century when Germanic tribes of Anglo-Saxons settled in Britain. Their languages were the basis for the emergence of OE, and this is the reason why English belongs to the Low West Germanic branch of Indo-European languages. Before Anglo-Saxon tribes came to England, the island was populated by many different tribes with many different languages none of which is attested. Some of these native inhabitants were the Britons (or the Celts), the Picts in the north of the country, and the Scots who came from Ireland.

The Romans invaded Britain for the first time in 55 BC under Julius Caesar, but it was not a great success due to the unexpectedly strong resistance of the natives. A year later, Caesar returned with his army and this time he succeeded in establishing a settlement in the southeast. But the real occupation of Britain happened almost a hundred years later, in 43 AD under Emperor Claudius.

The invasions brought Romanization to the native tribes, and with it came Latin and all the vernaculars spoken by different classes of Roman officers. The influence of the Roman way of life was visible in road building, bath houses, theaters, temples, etc. The Latin was established as the language of official documents and proclamations, but it was not the only reason for its success with the native people: "It is likely that Latin had a prestige value and was spoken not just by those for whom it was a first language but also by the upper-class native inhabitants of cities and towns" (McIntyre 2009, 4). Probable bilingualism and language shifts must have influenced the language of the native speakers.

However, Roman occupation was not welcomed by the Britons. In 61 AD, a widow of a Briton leader, Boudica, led a revolt against the Roman forces which resulted in 70,000 dead Roman soldiers. However, the presence of Roman forces was useful during the occasional attacks from the Picts and Scots, and when Roman soldiers were withdrawn from Britain in 410 AD, the Britons were unable to defend themselves.

After several declined appeals to Rome, Vortigern, one of the native leaders, entered into an agreement with the Angles, the Saxons, and the Jutes – Germanic tribes of north-west Germany and Denmark collectively known as Anglo-Saxons. The Anglo-Saxons succeeded in repelling the Picts and the Scots, and decided to settle in Britain. By the seventh century, they established seven kingdoms or the “Anglo-Saxon heptarchy”: Northumbria, Mercia, East Anglia, Essex, Kent, Sussex, and Wessex. Their way of life gradually destroyed the remnants of the Roman civilisation, and the fusion of their dialects caused the decline of the Latin influence on the native language, because “political power has always had an influence on the prestige of particular dialects” (McIntyre 2009, 5).

Some of the characteristics of the Germanic languages visible in OE are ‘weak’ and ‘strong’ declension of adjectives, weak and regular verbs, stress accent on the first or the root syllable of most words, gemination of consonants, etc. Also, unlike Present Day English, OE was inflected.

The settlement of the Anglo-Saxons did not signify the end of the Latin influence on OE. In spite of the long period of Roman occupation, Latin most significantly influenced OE through Christianity. In 597 AD Pope Gregory I sent a missionary, Augustine, to England. He baptized Ethelbert, the King of Kent, and four years later became the first Archbishop of Canterbury. England quickly became a Christian country, in only a hundred years. Latin, now as the language of the Church, once again entered England. Since schools were at the time mostly established in monasteries, Latin was also the language of learning, knowledge, and culture. In this period, Latin influence on OE was mostly through vocabulary, the majority of English words having to do with the church, services, and ministers, were borrowed from Latin in this period.

Unfortunately, the period of cultural flourishing did not last long. It was interrupted by a series of the raids led by Scandinavian invaders commonly known as the Vikings or the



Danes. After a number of attacks, in 886 the Danes settled in the east of the island and established Danelaw. In 1014, King Ethelred was defeated and exiled to Normandy by Svein Forkbeard, the King of Denmark, who crowned himself as the King of England. The Danes were in power in England until 1042, and in this period, Scandinavian languages, including Old Norse, were a significant source of loanwords. Some of these are now common: *take*, *birth*, *window*, *wrong*, *egg*, *law*, *leg*, *kid*, *cow*, etc. The –s inflection on third-person present simple singular form is also of Scandinavian origin.

The end of the Danish reign happened in 1042 with the death of Harthacnut who had no son, so the crown passed to his maternal half-brother Edward the Confessor, a descendant of the line of the Saxon kings exiled to Normandy. Having lived his whole life in Normandy, on the accession to the throne, Edward brought his French advisors with him and filled the court with French-speaking advisors. “A strong French atmosphere pervaded the English court during the twenty-four years of his reign” (Baugh and Cable 1978, 108). It was the beginning of the French influence on English.

This influence became stronger after the events of 1066, when Edward the Confessor died childless and the accession to the throne was disputed between Harold Godwinson and Edward's cousin William of Normandy. This led to the Battle of Hastings in which Harold was killed and William crowned the King of England. With William's victory, French had truly arrived in England and its prestige connected to the power of the royal court gradually changed English.

The consequence of the French influence was not restricted only to the considerable enrichment of the vocabulary, but the changes were so extensive in every aspect of the language that English now entered the next stage of its development – Middle English (1100-1500). Unlike highly inflected Old English, Middle English was almost completely analytic - there was a general reduction of inflections in all word classes. Spelling and pronunciation changed considerably to resemble French. And in addition to these grammatical changes, there was also the loss of a large part of Old English words and the addition of a great number of French and Latin words.

At this period, there were three languages which coexisted in England. French was the spoken language of the ruling class because of the majority of French advisors around

William the Conqueror. Latin, already established as the language of the Church and culture, began to be used as the language of administration (William was raised in Normandy where Latin was used in all official documents, so he favored it in his new royal court). English was thus downgraded to a sub-elite vulgar tongue used by the less-educated rural masses. However, even if its prestige vanished, English was still spoken by the majority of people in the country. All of the three languages were mixed in code-switching caused by inter-marriage, trade, etc., which “increased the hybrid nature of English” (McIntyre 2009, 13).

But the status of English would rise again to overpower the prestige of French. This process began with the loss of Normandy in 1204 and increased during the Hundred Years War between England and France. French was now the language of the enemy and it disappeared from universal use in the fifteenth century. The patriotic sense of national identity among the English nobility resulted in a new importance and prestige given to English.

### **2.2.1. Early Modern English**

Between 1400 and 1500, a gradual modification of the way in which certain vowels were pronounced took place. This is known as the Great Vowel Shift. The pronunciation of long vowels altered because the position of the tongue gradually moved closer to the roof of the mouth making them sound more raised. This change had an impact on both the pronunciation of certain words and their spelling. The causes of the Great Vowel Shift have never been completely understood, but some linguists suggest that it might have been motivated by social factors and merchant classes consciously or subconsciously emulating the varieties of English they considered particularly prestigious. Whatever the reason for this significant change was, the Great Vowel Shift is one of the events that caused the language to develop into its next phase – Early Modern English.

Early Modern English (EmodE) is considered to begin around 1500 and last until 1800. Unlike Old English, and even Middle English, EmodE is completely understandable to the speakers of Present Day English. The reason for this is the fact that after the Great Vowel Shift, no larger changes in grammar, spelling, or pronunciation took place in English. Some notable

events which happened during this period were mostly concerned with the position, standardization, and enrichment of the language.

The sixteenth century brought some changes which directly or indirectly influenced the language. These changes include the spread of popular education and literacy, the increased means of communication, commerce, and transportation, and the emergence of social consciousness.

In 1476, William Caxton set up the first printing press in England. He was not the inventor of the printing press, but a printer who had worked in Bruges and decided to introduce this novelty in Britain. The majority of the texts printed by Caxton were in Latin (it was still the language of learning), but he decided to also print books in English. The effect of this decision was that the knowledge was now within the reach of everybody: firstly, because English was the language spoken by the majority of people, and secondly because the books were not as expensive anymore as they used to be before the printing press.

Another result of Caxton's printing press was the beginning of the process of standardization. Although it was not his primary concern and intention, Caxton was a decisive factor in the selection of the dialect which would be established as the standard. Since his press was set up in Westminster, he used London English with another incorporated variety – Chancery English, a form of the East Midland dialect which was used among the educated classes and in government documents. This dialect and its prestige associated with powerful people would later become the basis for Standard Present Day English. Because of mass-production and low cost, books and pamphlets spread across the country and with them the London Standard variety used by Caxton.

The process of standardization that happened during the sixteenth century applied only to the written language. The real problem was the question of orthography which varied not only from one geographical area to another, but from writer to writer. Spelling was chaotic and inconsistent (however, every writer had a great deal of consistency within his own works). There was no generally accepted system that everyone could use, according to Baugh and Cable.

There were attempts to represent the pronunciation of the word, but the habits formed under the influence of French interfered. In some cases, letters were inserted in words which were not pronounced to correspond to Latin spelling (*debt – debitum*). In addition to this, the pronunciation of some words changed under the influence of the Great Vowel Shift while its spelling remained the same. This is responsible for the fact that English vowel symbols even today do not correspond to the sounds they represent in the majority of other modern languages.

This problem was recognized by many scholars who attempted to draw up systems and rules of the language. By 1550 there was “a nucleus of common practice” (Baugh and Cable 1978, 208). Some authors undertook the task of reforming the language phonetically, among which were Thomas Smith in 1568 with his work *Dialogue concerning the Correct and Emended Writing of the English Language*, John Hart and his *An Ortographie*, and William Bullokar in his *Booke at Large, for the Amendment of Ortographie for English Speech*. The most extensive and most important work on the spelling in the sixteenth century is believed to be *Elementarie* by Richard Mulcaster who based his reform on the custom or usage seeing that it was inevitable that the same letter must sometimes be used for different sounds, rejecting phonetic spelling as inconvenient. The final fixation of English spelling would be achieved in the following century by Dr. Johnson.

As the language was being ‘fixed’ in the EmodE period, there was an increased need for the instructions on its use. Never before were there any kinds of grammars, guides, or monolingual dictionaries of the English language. The earliest dictionaries were bilingual, usually Latin or French. The first monolingual dictionary of English was a dictionary of ‘hard words’ by Robert Cawdrey called *The Table Alphabeticall of Hard Words* in 1604. It was followed by the dictionaries (also of ‘hard words’) by John Bullokar, Henry Cockeram, Edward Philipps and others. The first dictionary in which the author tried to list all the words of the English language was published in 1721 by Nathaniel Bailey – *Universal Etymological English Dictionary*. Bailey's dictionary was the most significant until the publication of the most impressive dictionary of the period – Samuel Johnson's *A Dictionary of the English Language* (1755). What distinguished Johnson's *Dictionary* from the previous attempts is the fact that it offered fixed spelling of words which could be accepted as standard.

The sixteenth century saw all the modern languages of Europe, including English, face the problem of the recognition in the fields of knowledge in which Latin had been the unquestioned authority for centuries. As the vernaculars of *vulgus* struggled to take the place of the language reserved only for the educated elite, the tradition of Latin was being even more strengthened by the Renaissance and the revival of Ciceronianism. Latin was still considered the language of poetry, oratory, philosophy, and knowledge. In comparison to Latin, modern languages seemed unpolished, limited, too vulgar, and lacking the words and ways to express scientific, technical or artistic ideas.

But because of the spread of popular education and reduced cost of printed texts, books were in demand more than ever. Since the majority of the country spoke English, and not Latin, the translations of Thucydides, Aristotle, Caesar, Livy, Sallust, Tacitus, Cicero, Seneca, etc. “literally poured from the press in the course of the sixteenth century” (Baugh and Cable 1978, 204). These translations were not an easy task for their translators due to the lack of a great number of words needed to express classical thought. The translators had to borrow from other languages, and because Latin was almost a second mother tongue for all educated men, it was only natural that they filled the voids with Latin words. In other words, the translators tried to enrich the vocabulary by translating Latin words by Latin borrowings because they simply lacked an adequate English word, and for them Latin was the only source of polished and refined terms.

In many European countries, the sixteenth century saw a great number of authors who decided to rebel against the utmost authority of Latin and defend their vernaculars. In England, these defenders of the language were very influential people: Elyot, Ascham, Wilson, Puttenham, and Mulcaster. Their belief was that English was in no way inferior to Latin, and that every thought expressed in Latin words can also be expressed in English. But they were also aware of the fact that English vocabulary was undeveloped in certain areas due to the historical importance of Latin.

In order to refine their mother tongue so it could be used in scientific, philosophical, and literary texts, these defenders of English undertook the conscious (unlike the translators) task of enlarging the vocabulary, mostly by, according to Baugh and Cable, borrowing from Latin, but also Greek (again through Latin), French (mostly originally Latin words), and Italian

(another Romance language) which were at the time considered to be the languages of intellectual thought. Ironically, the superiority of Latin over English was battled by adding more Latin words to English vocabulary.

Although there was a general agreement on the fact that English vocabulary was limited and often inadequate and needed to be enriched, there were many who disliked the way the enrichment was done by Elyot, Ascham, and others. Edward Phillips, Sir John Cheke, and Thomas Wilson criticized the loanwords because of their strangeness and obscurity naming them 'Inkhorn Terms' to ridicule them. However, their opposition to Latin loanwords was not strong enough and it did not end the borrowing, and a great number of words which are now in common use were acquired in this period. Some of these words are *disability, expectation, abject, external, benefit, exist, erupt, atmosphere, conspicuous, expensive, adapt, harass, meditate, insane, appropriate*, etc.

One of the authors who worked on the conscious enrichment of English was Sir Thomas Elyot, an important political and cultural figure of the sixteenth century. I have decided to choose *The Proheme* from his work *The Boke named the Governour* as an example of a text in which Latin loanwords are abundant and naturalized in English in order to express the humanistic and classical thought of the author. Sir Thomas Elyot was not only a great defender of English who made considerable efforts to make English a language of intellectual thought and literal endeavors, but he was also a person who introduced the classical Latin and Greek culture to England. With a great admiration for both English and Latin, Elyot decided to write in his mother tongue, but to adopt Latin words where English lacked the right terms. For this reason, Elyot's *The Governour* is the best indicator of the voids existing at the time in English vocabulary, and the ways they were filled with Latin words.

### **3. *The Boke named the Governour* by Sir Thomas Elyot**

#### **3.1. Sir Thomas Elyot**

Sir Thomas Elyot was an English author, scholar, and a statesman of the royal court of Henry VIII. He occupied a major role in public affairs of the period: he was an ambassador to the court of the Emperor Charles V, a member of Parliament, and he performed a number of legal duties in the Government, but above all he was a humanist who introduced classical culture to England and enriched English vocabulary by conscious efforts to polish and refine it. He also translated numerous Latin and Greek works. His exact place and date of birth are not known, but his lifetime is roughly placed between c. 1490 and 1546. Very little is known about his education, but it is known that in the later stages of his education he was a pupil of Sir Thomas More and probably of Thomas Linacre (he wrote a book on medical remedies probably under his influence). Good connections with the important people of the state include friendships with Thomas Wolsey and Thomas Cromwell.

His humanistic work was in no way disconnected from his duties performed for the state because, as Stein (2014) points out, he believed that the literary gift and ability had to be used to serve the public good and counsel those in authorities, and not for private gain. A strong sense of patriotism can be seen in his wish to use his literary ability and talent to counsel the King and other officials of the court. All his works are, at least in one part, concerned with the state of the monarchy and the duties of public officials.

It was a part of Elyot's patriotic duty to liberate English from the stigma of inadequacy and vulgarity. But in order to do so, the language first needed to be enriched and enlarged by a number of words found in great intellectual and philosophical works. For this reason, Elyot's works are abundant in Latin loanwords, which were for him (and the majority of his

contemporaries) the only logical choice for borrowing, since Latin was almost a second mother tongue to every well-educated man of the sixteenth century.

Elyot is the author of the first English dictionary of Classical Latin called *The Dictionary of syr Thomas Elyot knyght*. His dictionary was not the first work of its kind in England (*Medulla grammaticæ* appeared in 1480), but it was, as Stein (2014) says, the first book with 'dictionary' in its title. It was not only a language dictionary, but also an encyclopaedia in the modern sense, because, in addition to words, it also explained objects, historic events, personalities, and so on. This combination of a dictionary and a modern encyclopaedia shows the great innovating spirit of Sir Thomas Elyot responsible for bringing Latin words and classical terms closer to ordinary English people by explaining them in the vernacular.

His other works include *The Boke named the Gouvernour*, *The Castel of Helth*, *Of the Knowledge whiche maketh a wise man and Pasquil the Playne*, *The Doctrinal of Princes Made by the Noble Oratour Isocrates*, *The Image of Gouvernance*, etc.

### **3.2. *The Boke named the Gouvernour***

*The Boke named Gouvernour* was first published in 1531, printed by the king's printer Thomas Berthelet, and dedicated to Henry VIII. *The Gouvernour* is the Elyot's mostly widely recognised work. Considered to be the first book on education printed in English, since the subject of the book was the training of future statesmen, it is "an early example of the attempt to improve the English language" (Baugh and Cable 1978, 214). A great number of words found in *The Gouvernour* were either used for the first time or recorded only a several years before and not yet in general use.

The upbringing of future statemen proposed by Elyot in the book was very much in the spirit of the sixteenth century and the spread of popular education which for the first time included wider popularity other than the social elite. Hogrefe claims that he believed that the training and the positions in the state should be distributed according to one's capacity and desire, and not their rank.




*The Governour* is divided into *The Proheme, Book I, Book II, and Book III*. *The Proheme* (as every other introduction to his works) is filled with a strong sense of praise of Henry VIII whom he refers to as “the most noble and victorious prince kinge Henry the eyght (...) bothe in wysedome and very nobilitie equall to the most excellent princes...” (Elyot 1531, 1-2). Henry VIII is also compared to “Artaxerxes, the noble kynge of Persia” and to “kynge Alexander” (Elyot 1531, 2), along with the mentions of Plato, Salomon, and Aristotle. These names were not mentioned in his work just to please the King by comparing him to the great rulers of ancient times, but they also show that Elyot based his work on classical authors, which he admits himself in *The Proheme*: “...whiche mater I haue gathered as well moste noble autours (grekes and latynes) as by myne owne experience...” (Elyot 1531, 1).

### **3.3. *The Proheme of The Boke named the Governour***

*The Boke named the Governour* begins with the introduction called *The Proheme* in which Elyot greets and praises Henry VIII, and shortly mentions the main subject of the book – education. Since it would be too long to analyze all the Latin loanwords in the book, I have chosen to concentrate only on *The Proheme* which, as the rest of the book, is rich in Latin loanwords, some of which Elyot uses for the first time as his invention, and some newly introduced by his contemporaries only a few years before his book. The borrowing of these loanwords and the mechanisms of semantic change which took place not only at the period of borrowing, but through the entire history of the word (both Latin and English), will be analyzed in this part of the work. Although there are many words of Latin origin in the text, only the words borrowed in EmodE period will be analyzed. Some of the words were borrowed in previous periods, but were used by Elyot, or his contemporaries, in different sense. These new meanings will also be analyzed. This is the entire text of *The Proheme* by Sir Thomas Elyot with the words chosen for the analysis bold:

**The Proheme of Thomas Elyot, knyghte, unto the most noble and victorious prince kinge Henry the eyght, kyng of Englande and Fraunce, defender, of the true faythe, and lorde of Irelande.**



LATE consideringe (moste excellent prince and myne onely redoughted soueraigne lorde) my duetie that I owe to my naturall contray with my faythe also of aliegeaunce and othe, wherewith I am double bounden unto your maiestie, more ouer thaccompt that I haue to rendre for that one litle talent deliuered to me to employe (as I suppose) to the increase of vertue, I am (as god iuge me) **violently** stered to **deuulgate** or sette fourth some part of my studie, trustyng therby tacquite me of my duties to god, your hyghnesse, and this my contray. Wherfore takinge comfort and boldenesse, partly of your graces moste beneuolent inclination towarde the uniuersall weale of your subiectes, partly inflamed with zele, I haue nowe enterprised to **describe** in our vulgare tunge the fourme of a iuste publike weale: whiche mater I haue gathered as well moste noble autours (grekes and latynes) as by myne owne experience, I beinge continually trayned in some dayly affaires of the publike weale of this your moste noble realme all mooste from my chyldhode. Whiche attemptate is nat of presumption to teache any persone, I my selfe hauinge moste nede of teachinge: but only to the intent that men which which will be studious about the weale publike may fynde the thinge therto expedient compendiously writen. And for as moch as this present boke treateth of the **education** of them that hereafter may be demed worthy to be gouernours of the publike weale under your hyghnesse (whiche Plato affirmeth to be the firste and chiefe parte of a publyke weale; Salomon sayenge also where gouernours be nat the people shall falle in to ruyne), I therefore haue named it The Gouernour, and do nowe **dedicate** it unto your hyghnesse as the fyrste frutes of my studye, verely trustyng that your moste excellent wysedome wyll therein esteme my loyall harte and diligent endeouour by the example of Artaxerxes, the noble kyng of Persia, who rejected nat the pore husbondman whiche offred to hym his homely handes full of clene water, but mooste graciously receyued it with

thankes, estemyng the present nat after the value but rather to the wyll of the gyuer. Semblably kynge Alexander retayned with hym the poete Cherilus honorably for writing his historie, all though that the poete was but of a small estimation. Whiche that prynce dyd not for lacke of jugement, he beyng of excellent lernynge as disciple to Aristotell, but to thentent that his liberalite employed on Cherilus shulde **animate** or gyue courage to others moche better terned to **contende** with hym in a semblable enterpryse.

And if, moste vertuous prince, I may perceyue your hyghnes to be herewith pleased, I shall sone after (god giuing me quietenes) present your grace with the residue of my studie and labours, wherein your hyghnes shal well perceiue that I nothing esteme so moche in this worlde as youre royall astate, (my most dere soueraigne lorde), and the publike weale of my contray. Protestinge unto your excellent maiestie that where I commende herin any one vertue or dispraise any one vice I meane the generall description of thone and thother without any other particuler meanyng to the reproche of any one persone. To the whiche protestation I am nowe dryuen throughe the malignite of this present tyme all disposed to malicious detraction. Wherfore I mooste humbly beseche your hyghnes to dayne to be patrone and defendour of this little warke agayne the assaultes of maligne interpretours whiche fayle nat to rente and deface the renoume of wryters, they them selves beinge in nothinge to the publike weale profitable. Whiche is by no man sooner perceyued than by your highnes, beinge bothe in wysedome and very nobilitie **equall** to the most excellent princes, whome, I beseche god, ye may surmount in longe life and perfect felicitie Amen.

## 4. The mechanisms of change

Taking all historical situations in consideration, the periods of contact between Latin and English were numerous, long-lasting, and powerful. Although it is true that every aspect of English language, including phonology, morphology, syntax, etc., was to some extent affected by Latin, the lexicon is the part of the language where this impact is most intensive. The question is why the lexicon (not just in this case, but in almost every other case of contact between languages) is the aspect of language most susceptible to change. The answer is given by Sarah Grey Thomason (2005, 693-4):

Features that are deeply embedded in elaborate interlocking structures are in general less likely to be borrowed, because they are less likely to fit into the recipient language's structures; that is why the lexicon, which for all its structure is less highly organized than other grammatical subsystems, is borrowed first, and it is why inflectional morphology tends to be borrowed last.

The organization of structures plays an important role in the process of borrowing, and for this reason the lexicon, not a very organized system, is the first to be borrowed because there is less chance that the change would be disruptive to the recipient language itself. In addition, lexemes are easier to learn and adopt than, say, syntactic changes. There is also a certain hierarchy to lexical borrowing, since “in borrowing, interference always begins with non-basic vocabulary” (Grey Thomason 2005, 692). Non-basic words, especially if their content is new to the recipient language, will be the first to enter the language usually in order to fill a void. Basic words, used in everyday speech, are less likely to be affected by borrowing. If the loanwords borrowed from Latin by Elyot in *The Proheme* are considered, it is clear that all of them are words belonging to the non-basic vocabulary (e.g. *devulgate*, *dedicate*, *animate*).

## 4.1. Code-switching

The mechanism of interference by which Elyot and his contemporaries introduced new words into English is *code-switching*, or switching between two languages in different social situations. Since, as already mentioned above, every educated and noble person of the sixteenth century used Latin as a second mother tongue in all matters connected to religion, intellectual work, or literature; their linguistic behaviour must have included code-switching on a daily basis. According to Thomason (2005, 695-6):

Code-switching is a (perhaps the) major route by which loanwords enter a language. (...) In fact, I believe that is impossible in principle and in practice to draw an absolute boundary between code-switching and borrowing. They are indeed two separate phenomena, but they are linked by a continuum: as in so many other areas of historical linguistics, the dividing line between them is fuzzy, not sharp.

By this constant switching between languages, words enter a recipient language at one point as the innovation of an individual and, accepted by others, become a part of the lexicon of the recipient language. In a specific situation of borrowing, just as in the general situation of contact between two languages, the prestige and power play the most important role. In other words, as the authority of one language over another is determined by the social and political factors, so is the author of a linguistic innovation usually distinguished by his social status. This was especially the case in the EmodE period when education and knowledge were generally connected to the elites who spoke Latin: “For linguistic phenomena, innovations initiated by the elite tend to be limited to borrowings from external prestige groups; members of higher social classes do not introduce changes from within the language” (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 2005, 715).

## 4.2. Innovation, diffusion and result

Following the tripartite model proposed by Helmut Lüdtke (1999, 50): “INNOVATION > DIFFUSION > RESULT” where *innovation* is “a single act performed by one speaker”, *diffusion* “imitation and repetition” and *result* “the outcome, difference in state” in the recipient language, it is obvious that the innovation itself, no matter how influential its author is, must be accepted by other speakers in order to create any kind of difference in the recipient language. This is, according to Lüdtke (1999, 50), “applicable especially to performance phenomena that require full consciousness on the part of both speaker and hearer, such as lexical borrowing and coinage of new words or locutions”.

The *diffusion* always starts by the so-called *early adopters* who also need to be highly esteemed in the society and their acceptance of the change will further be accepted by other speakers. Walt Wolfram and Natalie Schilling-Estes (2005, 729) characterize the *early adopters* as:

...people who are central figures in tightly knit groups but who are risky enough to adopt changes anyway, perhaps for reasons of prestige (whether overt or covert). Because these early adopters are well regarded in their social groups, the changes they adopt are likely to be picked up by other members of these groups, thereby diffusing through a large segment of a population.

As will be seen later, Sir Thomas Elyot was both an innovator and an early adopter, and his prestige and social connections made him the right person for the task of enriching the English language. The use of loanwords newly introduced by his contemporaries was a common occurrence in his texts, but very frequently Elyot would add a feature or more to change the sense of a word, which would make him an *innovating adopter*.

The innovations need to be practical and convincing to be accepted, or, in the words of Andreas Blank (1999, 62) they need to have “the adequacy or persuasive character” or

“good cognitive performance”. When speakers (or readers) decide to accept an innovation, their main motivation is its pragmatic and communicative purpose.

But the question is what is the innovator's, or in this case Elyot's, purpose? It is already mentioned that he wished to refine and 'fix' the language. His borrowings are not restricted only to necessary words which did not exist in English before, but in many situations, he uses a Latin word in the place of an existing and adequate English one.

“Two fundamental factors”, according to Dirk Geeraerts (1999, 105), “shaping lexical changes” are “expressivity and efficiency”. Efficiency is a hearer-oriented strategy employed to communicate a piece of information as successfully as possible and to reduce the linguistic effort on both sides. On the other hand, expressivity is a speaker-oriented strategy “that speakers can adopt for optimizing their communicative success when they want to impress their interlocutors, treat him or her gently, manifest emotions, show things under a different light etc.; in short, when they want to come out on top” (Blank 1999, 65).

For Blank, as for Geeraerts, expressivity is an important contributor to lexical changes, because speakers tend to innovate when trying to impress their interlocutors. Considering that Elyot uses *The Proheme* mostly for political purposes, the expressivity employed here (which aims at the benevolence of Henry VIII) is the force behind the semantic change, i.e. borrowing. To impress the King (and other readers) and to manifest loyalty and affection, Elyot knew he had to borrow from a language with prestige, even though in many cases it was not onomasiologically necessary since English words with the same or similar meaning already existed. These cases, in which loanwords double or replace already existing word in the recipient language are instances of *luxury borrowing* which Thomas Krefeld (1999, 265) considers to be “a mere result of social prestige”.

Borrowing new words for whatever reason, adding features to them, or replacing old features by new ones, create a number of senses of a word which are adjusted to a situation and the context. Language is not just a set of rules and words with their encyclopaedic meaning which operate on the principle – one form, one meaning. Language is, in the words of Eugenio Coseriu: “rather than a product (*ergon*), a process (*energeia*) that exists virtually

in the speaker's mind as a mere potentiality (*dynamis*) and finds reality only in concrete utterances. While communicating, we reify what is in our mind and thereby reinvent language every time we speak” (Blank 1999, 61).

The reinventing of language which happens every time we want to express something that exist in our minds adds to the variety of uses and senses attributed to a single lexeme. In this way, the language changes semantically as “a mere side-effect of the speaker's pragmatic goals” (Blank 1999, 63).

Generally, it is “the normal, expected state of affairs in lexical semantics that a word (especially a word in frequent use) will be polysemous, i.e. will have a range of established senses” (Taylor 1999, 32). These senses do not suddenly appear at the same time, but emerge gradually through uses in different contexts and situations. Polysemy refers to a period of coexistence of two or more meanings of the same lexeme.

### **4.3. Categorization**

Words take on new meanings by cognitive mechanisms which make it possible for us to memorize new meanings connected to already existing lexemes. In order to remember the connections created by innovating and retrieve the information when needed, the human mind needs to categorize. Jespersen said that “man is a classifying animal” (Warren 1999, 217), and it is believed by a great number of scientists and scholars that it is our fundamental innate principle (not just in language) to form categories based on perceived common characteristics. Human mind needs categories in order to interpret new facts through old knowledge. For this reason, all languages in the world have common names for the members of sets, or, as Eleanor Rosch refers to them – class labels. These common characteristics that make something become a member of a category are in language features of meaning. Features make meaning componential.

The abovementioned categorization of units happens in polysemy, too. According to Taylor, a concept is a principle of categorization by which the human mind categorizes entities as



examples of concepts. He explains concept as our private, mental entities which cannot be accessed by others except through the medium of language. This means that categorization is necessarily subjective since concepts as mental entities are shaped privately in every person's mind.

The way our minds use concepts to categorize involves “the profiling (or designation) of an entity, against background assumptions. (These latter are referred to variously as domains, frames, idealized cognitive models, etc.)” (Taylor 1999, 38). When an entity is profiled against various background assumptions or domains, concepts emerge slightly different every time the background assumption changes. The act of conceptualization thus shows that concepts are not fixed, but depend on selectively activated domains, while the profiled entity remains the same.

The categories that exist in our minds are organized prototypically, according to Dirk Geeraerts. The units which belong to a certain category are organized around the prototype which exhibits the highest degree of typicality, i.e. has the majority or all of the features which describe a certain category. Rosch postulates that there is one and only one prototype per category. Other members of the category exhibit less degrees of typicality and take the form of a radial set clustered around the prototype. “Not every member is equally representative for a category ... prototypical categories exhibit a family resemblance structure” (Geeraerts 1999, 92).

The changes which happen to a specific word meaning Geeraerts (1999, 93) describes as modulations on the central or core cases:

If a particular meaning starts off as a name for referents exhibiting the features ABCDE, the subsequent expansion of the category will consist of variations on that type of referent. The further the expansion extends the fewer features the peripheral cases will have in common with the prototypical centre. A first layer of extensions, for instance, might consist of referents exhibiting features ABCD, BCDE, or ACDE. A further growth of the peripheral area could then involve feature sets ABC, BCD, CDE, or ACD (to name just a few).

Adding new meanings to a word thus happens by the expansion of its category, and the members are radially positioned around the prototype according to the number of common features they exhibit. To be able to acquire new members and stay stable, the prototypical categories have two important traits which are also necessary for interpreting new facts through old knowledge: structural stability and flexible adaptability.

Structural stability is the fundamental property of prototypical categories because the system can function efficiently only if the overall structure is stable and not threatened by changing conditions. This includes the principles according to which the extendibility of a category is restricted. On the other hand, the categories also need to be flexible and adaptable to the change which happens in the outside world and reflect itself in the language. "Prototypically organized categories maintain themselves by adapting themselves to changing circumstances" (Taylor 1999, 98).

#### **4.4. Cognitive mechanisms**

The expansion of prototypical categories is, as already said, the change of meaning. Since categories show structural stability which keeps the expansion restricted, then there also must be a restricted number of ways in which that expansion can happen. These ways of expanding are mechanisms of semantic change. Geeraerts (1999, 98) believes that the traditional mechanisms of semantic change, metaphor and metonymy, can be incorporated into the prototype theory:

The flexibility that is inherent in prototypically organized concepts cannot work at random; there have to be a number of principles that restrict the flexible extendibility of concepts, or, to put it another way, that specify the principles according to which concepts can be used flexibly. These principles define what an acceptable extension of a particular concept is. The traditional associationist mechanisms of semantic change (such as metaphor and metonymy) have precisely that function; they restrict the set of acceptable conceptual extensions to those changes that are brought about by regular associationist mechanisms such as metaphor and metonymy. In this sense, then, the traditional classificatory categories

of historical semantics can in fact be incorporated into a functional classification of the causes of semantic change.

Mechanisms of semantic change are our innate mental processes which create new senses of the already known words. Closs Traugott (2017) considers them to be hypotheses that lead to an observed change. They explain the 'how' of semantic change – what happens during the transformation of one sense of a word to another. In cognitive view, these processes are seen as forces which expand categories.

Metaphor and metonymy are, according to Geeraerts, mechanisms which act as forces expanding prototypical categories. Words acquire new senses and meanings when these two mechanisms create new members of a category, each in its own specific way.

Raimo Anttila (2005, 431) also considers metaphor and metonymy to be the two mechanisms of cognition and language: "The two crucial factors in any relevant conception of cognition, namely similarity and contiguity, come out in (cognitive or otherwise) linguistics as metaphor and metonymy". The reducing of all mechanisms of change to metaphor and metonymy started with Roman Jakobson in 1956 and his idea that "metaphor and metonymy are modes of thought that leave their traces in all kinds of signs and sign system" (Steen 2005, 2).

Based on these views that semantic change is restricted to metaphor and metonymy as basic cognitive and linguistic mechanisms, the semantic changes discussed in this work will be limited only to these two mechanisms.

## **4.5. Metaphor**

Traditionally, metaphor has been regarded as a purely literary phenomenon reserved for poetry. Existing as a trope since ancient times, it was for centuries perceived as the linguistic expression opposite to literal and direct utterances. However, metaphor theory changed

significantly during the twentieth century and the distinction between literal and metaphorical as non-literal has been refuted. Also, it has been stated by a number of linguists that metaphor is in no way restricted only to literary work, but it is present in all kinds of texts and everyday situations.

In cognitive linguistics, metaphor is seen as a cognitive mechanism of change which operates on the principle of, according to Lakoff and Johnson, mapping across mental spaces or domains. This process includes source domain, target domain, and the mapping of the source on the target domain. The target domain holds a quality or a trait described by a source domain.

Domains are also known in cognitive semantics as the background assumptions (or knowledge) against which, according to Taylor, an entity needs to be profiled to create categories by conceptualisation. Since metaphor works on the principle of mapping across domains, and categories are created by profiling against multiple background assumptions, metaphor is the fundamental mechanism by which categories acquire new members, or words acquire new meanings.

In order for a successful mapping from a source to a target domain, or metaphORIZATION, Closs Traugott says that there must be the perception of similarity between the domains. Similar properties and relations of resemblance take part in the creation of novel senses which will (at least for some period of time) coexist with conventional meaning of the word. Metaphor as a mechanism is necessary and responsible for remembering novel meanings by placing them as new facts inside the categories of old knowledge.

Transfers from one domain to another usually happen in one direction, from more to less concrete. The concrete domains of human experience include domains belonging to the physical world (objects, motions), and more abstract domain are those of spatial, temporal, textual, etc. It is a fundamental trait of human cognition to conceptualize the epistemic and indefinable experiences based on those which are closer, physical, and concrete.

An example of the process of metaphORIZATION given by Koch (2012) is the change that happened to the word *belly* derived from the OE word *bælg* denoting 'bag, purse'. Since the

contemporary meaning of *belly* (body-part) belongs to a different domain than 'bag', the mechanism of change is metaphor.

## 4.6. Metonymy

While metaphor is, both traditionally and in cognitive semantics, described as a relation of similarity, metonymy is based on relations of nearness and contiguity. In the first century BC *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, formerly attributed to Cicero, describes metonymy as: "the figure which draws from an object closely akin or associated an expression suggesting the object meant, but not called by its own name (Bk.IV, 32)" (Bredin 1984, 52).

The description of metonymy has not much changed through history. The theory about metonymy given in *A General Rhetoric* by Group  $\mu$  states that metonymy is "the substitution of one verbal expression for another, whenever the expressions are related to one another within a web of connotative associations" (Bredin 1984, 49). Lakoff and Johnson added the systematic character to the definition of metonymy, stating that "metonymical connections are not random, but are specific types of connection" (Bredin 1984, 52). Beatrice Warren described metonymy as an abbreviation device, since, in her opinion, metonymy operates on the principle of close connections between what is said and what is left out in a pragmatically abbreviated utterance.

In cognitive semantics, metonymy is seen as "a cornerstone of human cognition and ordinary language use" (Nerlich and Clarke 1999, 197). While historically seen as second to metaphor, today the view shared by many scholars is that it is, in fact, more common than metaphor. Our world knowledge and the understanding of cause and effect, part and whole, time and space is based on the mechanism of metonymy.

Unlike metaphor which creates change by mapping across the domains, metonymy is seen, by Lakoff and Johnson, as mapping within a domain. It is a transfer or exchange between two members of the same category when a word is used in a sense that is different from its

usual one. This sense is then (if understood and accepted) added to a word and the category acquires a new member. The frequent situation is the exchange between the name of a category and the name of its prototype: either the prototype is used to refer to the whole category, or vice versa.

Koch (2012) shows metonymical change on the example of the word *bar* meaning 'public house' derived from the *bar* meaning 'counter in a public house', saying that the change is metonymical since it happened within the same domain and conceptual frame.

Cognitive linguistics did not abolish the view that metonymy is based on nearness and contiguity: "Many aspects of our experience may be associated with each other on the basis of physical or causal connections. These are forms of contiguity and may hence give rise to metonymy" (Steen 2005, 4). Metonymies are deeply rooted in relations which exist in the outside world and the culture an individual belongs to. The nearness or contiguity between two concepts can be different from culture to culture. As an example of this, Benjamin W. Fortson IV gives the example of the adjective *blue-collar* which was created metonymically to describe a worker who performs manual labor. This metonymy was created in the US culture, and without explanation might not be understood in other parts of the world.

The conventionality of metonymy and its manner of expressing values and prejudices inherited by a culture is best visible in the subjectification as an inevitable part of everyday utterances since in the majority of communicative situations speakers' beliefs and attitudes become a part of his or her words. Subjectification usually results in the pejoration of melioration. Elizabeth Closs Traugott claims that subjectification, together with pragmatic strengthening, develops new meanings in a process called *invited inferencing* which belongs to metonymy. New meanings are created by conventionalizing conversational implicatures which eventually become semanticized and new polysemies develop: "It is a term that highlights the interactive nature of language use: speakers/writers can invite addressees/readers to let implicatures go through" (Closs Traugott 2005, 634).

## **5. The Diachrony of semantic change in English and Latin vocabulary on the example of EmodE Latin loanwords in *The Proheme***

Having identified metaphor and metonymy as the mechanisms responsible for semantic change, it is important to state that it is generally accepted that “in the majority of cases semantic change is fuzzy, self-contradictory, and difficult to predict” (Fortson IV 2005, 660). In many cases, linguists disagree on the causes and mechanisms of semantic change. In the words of Gerard Steen (2005, 5):

The preference for one option or the other partly depends on the choice of perspective by the analyst who may be looking for metonymy or for metaphor for a specific reason. Concomitantly, in language use, the experience of a linguistic expression as (predominantly) metonymic or metaphorical may depend on the perspective of language users, depending on their communicative interest in either contiguity or similarity relations.

In this section, the main part of my research will be shown: the analysis of the Latin loanwords from the text of Sir Elyot's *The Proheme* borrowed in EmodE period. The analysis of every word will start with its contemporary meaning, continue with the changes that happened in English since documented in OED for the first time, and end with the analysis of the semantic changes that happened to the Latin etymon.

## 5.1. Violently

In the *Proheme*, Sir Thomas Elyot says that he is “**violently** stered to deuulgate or sette fourth some part of (his) studie” (Elyot 1531, 3). In this sentence, *violently* can be easily replaced by synonyms such as *strongly*, *passionately*, *vehemently*, *ardently* etc. In no way does the use of the word evoke anything physically or emotionally hurtful or dangerous as could be assumed from the entry in the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, i.e. from its contemporary use. The only sense that can be read from his sentence and the use of the word is his strong and passionate emotion to do something good, not to hurt anybody or anything in any way. In the text below, I will try to show the reasons and the mechanisms responsible for this change.

*The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* lists *violently* as: “**violently** adv: *kick/struggle/react violently, be violently ill/sick. He fell violently in love with her.*” (Hornby 1995, 1329)

Adverb derived from the adjective *violent*. In the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* the contemporary meaning of *violent* is described as:

**1(a)** using, showing or caused by physical force that is intended to hurt or kill sb: *violent crime, a violent attack/assault/struggle, meet with/die a violent death* (eg be murdered), *watch a violent film* (ie one in which many people are hurt or killed). *Students were involved in violent clashes with the police. He has a tendency to become/turn violent.*

**(b)** using, showing or caused by very strong emotion: *fly into a violent rage, use violent language, take a violent dislike to sb.*

**2 very** bad or strong: *violent winds/storms/earthquakes, violent toothache, a violent contrast/change*

(Hornby 1995, 1328-9)

Every example found in the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* gives a negative connotation to the meaning of *violent*, e.g. *violent* can be used with words such as *attack*,



*assault, death, rage, earthquake, toothache* etc. Even the example *violently falling in love with someone* can be seen as a negatively marked one, because it is the case of the domain shift and conceptual metaphor LOVE IS WAR.

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the first use of the adjective *violent* occurred in the Bible in 1382. This sense is described as: “Of action, behaviour, etc.: characterized by the doing of deliberate harm or damage; carried out or accomplished using physical violence; (Law) involving an unlawful exercise or exhibition of force” (OED Online 2000). This is the first and the most prominent sense of the meaning, the prototype: the sense related to physical force and violence. Also, the one closest to the contemporary meaning.

Five years later, in 1387, the first occurrence of the adverb *violently* is documented in a translation of *Polychronicon* by Higden (translated by John of Trevisa). The OED explains its meaning as “By means of physical strength or violence; by undue or unlawful force; in a manner intended to cause harm or damage”. Like the adjective, the adverb's most representative sense of meaning is marked by physical strength, force and harm.

The next documented sense of the word is from 1425: “*Brut* (Corpus Cambr.) 328 Grete..hetes, & þerewiþal a grete pestilens..destroyed & slow, violently & strongly, both men & wymmen without noumbre” (OED Online 2000). According to the OED, it means “with great intensity or severity” and is still generally connected to words with negative notions, such as *burn'd, beat, sick* etc. Blank (1999) says that when we use a word in a slightly different sense than its usual one, our interlocutors are able to understand what we mean because of the context and because of the close connection between the existing concept and the concept we used in that concrete act of speech. These close links make the name transfers between two concepts within the same frame possible, and, if efficient, the word becomes polysemous. “A strong and habitual relation between two concepts within a frame makes speakers express them by using only one word: the frame relation is 'highlighted'.” (Blank 1999, 74). He considers this type of change metonymy because of the change which happens within a single frame or domain. This would explain a slight shift in the meaning which happened in 1425 without adding much change to the concept of *doing something violently*. Since the change happened within the same domain, and the

connection of the concepts was so close that speakers expressed them by only using one word, this change is metonymic.

All of the abovementioned senses still indicate great intensity of wrong and harmful force or strength which is mostly physical. For the first time in 1518, *violently* is used detached from its negative connotations to express a strong feeling of passion. According to the OED, this sense can be described as “with deep feeling or emotion; ardently, passionately, vehemently” and it is documented for the first time in *Select Cases Star Chamber* by I.S. Leadam. Since Elyot's *Gouernour* was written in 1531, the word *violently* was not a novelty at the time, since it had been used in English for two centuries, but this different sense used for the first time less than two decades before. Especially if we consider the fact that Elyot had a variety of synonyms already existing in English to choose from (e.g. *passionately*, *ardently*, *vehemently*), but opted for another Latinate borrowing with a twist to its prototypical meaning, not yet well known to a wider readership. Comparing this semantic shift to the one that happened before, it can be seen that the leap from one sense of meaning to the other is greater in this case. It is much easier to associate violence with severity and intensity, than to a strong feeling of passion. This is because the change of domains happened: from the physical to the emotional domain. According to Lakoff and Johnson, this is the case of metaphor, since metaphor involves mapping across domains. According to Bernd Heine (2005, 578): “To this end, one salient human strategy consists in using linguistic forms for meanings that are concrete, easily accessible, and/or clearly delineated to also express less concrete, less easily accessible, and less clearly delineated meaning contents”. This is why this concrete and easily accessible concept of physically marked violence and intensity was easily understood when transferred to a less concrete world of emotions.

In later years, the word acquired some further features or new senses, e.g. since 1771 it has been used to describe “in a flashy or showy manner; in a vivid colour or colours; ‘loudly’” (OED Online 2000) through another metaphorical extension.

*Violently* was formed within English from adj. *violent* and suffix *-ly*. *Violent* is partly a borrowing from Latin, partly a borrowing from French. Latin etymon is *violentus* and the

adverb can be compared to the Latin adverb *violenter*. According to Lewis and Short, *violentus* can be translated as “forcible, violent, vehement, impetuous, boisterous (class.)” (Lewis and Short 1879). The OED describes the etymon as: “acting with (unreasonable) force, aggressive, (of actions) marked or accompanied by violence or aggression, (of natural agencies) operating or moving with destructive force, (of a statement) strong, extreme, in post-classical Latin also (of a smell) strong, overpowering (6th cent.)”.

This description can be broken into three senses of *violentus* according to three kinds of contexts in which it can be used:

The first one is ACTION: aggressive actions marked or accompanied by violence. The examples of this kind can be found in Livy: “*tyrannus saevissimus et violentissimus*” (very atrocious and violent tyrant), Cicero: “*homo vehemens et violentus*” (vehement and violent man), Horace: “*Lucania bellum incuteret violenta*” (violent Lucania inflicted war) (Lewis and Short 1879).

The second one is NATURAL AGENCIES, such as *ventus* (wind), *turbo* (vortex), *tempestas* (storm), and *ignis* (fire) (Lewis and Short 1879).

The third applies to *verba* (words), e.g. in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: “*iam verba minus violenta loquentem*” (now saying less violent words) (Lewis and Short 1879).

What differs in the last case when compared to the others is the change of domain, the shift from physical world to epistemic: words can be violent and harmful, but only metaphorically, not physically like war, tyrant, storm, or fire. It is interesting to note that Ovid wrote considerably after the other authors mentioned above, his *Metamorphoses* were first published in 8 BC. Obviously, a metaphorical change happened and another meaning was added to the word while still in Latin.

It is interesting to notice that the metaphorical change of almost the same kind happened twice in the word's history, but the Latin metaphorical change did not enter English. The word, when first borrowed, implied only the prototypical sense of Latin *violenter*: the physical force and harm. Only later did English *violently* make its own mapping across the domains.

In post-classical Latin, the word undergoes two changes, in form and meaning. Not *violentus* anymore, but *violens*, and to imply that it is still considered the same word, DuCange stresses that “*violens pro violentus...eadem notione utitur Horatius*<sup>2</sup>” (DuCange 1887). But as any other word, *violentus* also changed its semantical properties in post-classical Latin, and its meaning was, at the time, extended to the domain of smell, denoting a “strong, overpowering smell” (OED Online 2000). This simple metaphorical extension makes sense since it is easy to imagine a smell which is almost as physically abusive as violence implied in the prototypical sense of the meaning of the word *violently*. Also, a connection could have been created based on a similar-sounding word *vinolentus* (full of wine, intoxicated) which is a compound made of *vinum* (wine) and the verb *olere* (to smell). But this part of the word's history is not relevant to the English one, since Elyot and his contemporaries borrowed from classical sources disregarding post-classical Latin as corrupt.

In conclusion, the Latin word *violenter* changed its meaning from exclusively physical notion of aggression and force to a metaphorically extended sense used to describe words or smells. This domain shift happened before the word entered English, so the speakers of English were presented with both meanings. The first meaning that was used in English was the Latin prototypical one – the physical notion of aggression, which was then metonymically expanded to denote intensity or severity, still in connection with negative notions of violence. It was not, according to the OED, until the 16th century that the word was metaphorically changed in English. Since then, it changed only metaphorically.

---

<sup>2</sup> *violens for violentus...the same sense as used by Horace*

## 5.2. Devulgate

*To devulgate* or *to divulgate* is one of the innovative borrowings that did not stand the test of time. Today it is obsolete and *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* does not even mention it, while Merriam-Webster redirects it to its synonym *divulge* which also has the same etymon. In the following text, I will research the word's development and the reasons for its failure to become a part of the English lexicon.

According to the OED Online, *to divulgate* means "to make commonly known; to publish abroad". It is first documented in 1530 in J. Palsgrave's *Lesclarcissement*: "I dyvulgate a mater, I blowe it abrode...I thought full lytell he wolde have dyvulgate this mater" (OED Online 2000). This is just a year before Elyot's *Gouernor*. In 1531, Elyot wants "to **deuulgate** or sette fourth some part of (his) studie". Apart from these two examples, the OED cites only three other mentions of *divulgate*: one in the seventeenth and two in the nineteenth century, after which it became obsolete. It also underwent no change in meaning.

The reason for such a fruitless adoption of *devulgate* in English might be attributed to its earlier borrowed counterpart *divulge*. *Divulge* was first mentioned in 1464 and, according to the OED Online, with exactly the same meaning as *devulgate*. While its first documented meaning is identical as that of *devulgate* (OED Online), in later centuries it underwent the expansion of its semantic field to denote either metonymically close senses or metaphorically changed ones. E.g. in 1566 it took on a sense "to publish (a book or treatise)" and in 1602 "To declare or tell openly (something private or secret); to disclose, reveal". Milton used it in 1667 in his *Paradise Lost* to signify "To make common, impart generally".

To tell openly someone's secret or to make something common (as in the examples from 1602 and 1667) certainly differs from publishing a written text, at least in the sense of social circumstances, including "the ethic and aesthetic judgement" (Rastier 1999, 127). Rastier (1999, 117) says that languages articulate evaluations rather than descriptions, and Traugott (1999, 189) claims that speakers or writers tend to encode their point of view towards something whenever they say or write something. These examples show the strong forces of

social evaluation and subjectification which decreased the ethic value of the word in question. Since the meaning became more negative, according to typical typology of semantic change, this is the case of purely subjective pejoration, and to Benjamin W. Fortson IV (2005, 661), “melioration and pejoration are subsumable under metonymic change”, so these changes are, in fact, metonymic.

*Divulge* is still used today to denote “to make sth known, esp a secret: divulge a confidential report/sb's identity/one's age. *I cannot divulge how much it costs*” (Hornby 1995, 340). Its survival can be attributed to its stronger phonetical form and a higher token frequency. But the higher token frequency did not only help the word to survive, but also had much to do with the semantic changes which happened to it. Joan Bybee makes a case for regarding the frequency and repetition as the most important processes which trigger many changes in grammaticalization. If the repetition and high token frequency can bleach or generalize a gram in grammaticalization making it susceptible to take on new meanings, the same could be true for any other kind of semantic change. A word frequently used happens to be found in different contexts which in turn affect its meaning adding new senses to it. Fortson (2005, 658) seems to agree with this view saying that “the frequency of a linguistic form has often been viewed as a factor influencing language change”. This is the reason why *divulge*, and not *divulgate*, created a set of different meanings and did not become obsolete.

But why did Elyot need to reach for a new Latinate borrowing if there was already a word with not only the same meaning, but also the same Latin etymon? For Geeraerts (1999, 105), expressivity is the basic motivation behind any kind of lexical change, while Blank (1999, 65) says that it is a hearer-oriented strategy that speakers adopt when they want to optimize their communicative success and impress their interlocutors. To assure that a hearer, or in this case a reader, would be impressed, Elyot had to risk with a newly introduced innovation borrowed from Latin – the ultimate language of scientific authority. Since, at the time Elyot was writing his *Gouverneur*, already existed synonyms of *divulgate* which could have taken its place (*publish, spread, give out, publy... also divulge*), expressivity was an important force in this borrowing, used not out of necessity but as a luxury.

When a word is borrowed and integrated without any onomasiological necessity, it is considered (Krefeld 1999, 265) to be a result of social prestige. Since the prestige of a

language is connected to the culture it represents, loanwords tend to appear connected to the domains in which these cultures are accepted as exemplary. These loanwords, then, double or even replace already existing words without bringing new senses, and Krefeld calls them *luxury borrowings*.

As a sign of his social and intellectual prestige, Elyot copied a Latin word into his English text without adding a new sense to it, as will be seen from the meaning of the Latin word. Although, in the case of *divulgate*, Elyot cannot be regarded as an innovator since the word was documented a year before his book, but an early adopter. In order for an innovation to spread, it needs to be picked-up by so called 'early adopters' who are well regarded in their social groups. After them, the changes are likely to be adopted by other members of the social group and by that diffused through larger segments of a population. Elyot was aware of the fact that *divulgate* might not be understood by all his readers and so he decided to pair it with a phrase with very similar meaning – *to sette fourth*.

*Devulgate* is derived from Latin verb *divulgare* which in classical Latin means "to spread among the people, to make common, publish, divulge" (Lewis and Short 1879). It was formed in Latin from the inseparable particle *dis-*, which in most cases answers to English *asunder, in pieces, apart, in two, in different directions*, and the verb *vulgare* meaning "to make common, publish" (Lewis and Short 1879). Even though *vulgare* itself indicates making something common or publishing it, the particle *dis-* acts as an intensifier emphasizing the uncontrolled directionality of the action. It also adds to the expressivity of the word.

In the examples given by Lewis and Short, it refers to nouns such as *librum* (book), *chirographa* (handwriting, autograph), *versiculos* (little verses), *rem sermonibus* (speeches), *opinionem* (opinion). Most of these nouns are implying written texts which, when *devulgated*, become accessible to wider groups of people, mainly by publishing or verbally (like speech and opinion). This primary meaning is neutral and does not imply any positive or negative evaluations.

Lewis and Short also lists a secondary sense: "to make common, lowered or degraded to". The connection between something made common to a greater number of people and its

lowering in status is not surprising. When something is no longer restricted to only a small number of people belonging to the elite, it loses its value and becomes degraded. Here, just as with its English counterpart, pejoration initiated by subjectification happened, which, as mentioned before, makes it a metonymical change.

The Latin word *divulgare* was created as an intensified form of *vulgare*, with the meaning remaining the same. However, the meaning, neutral at first, underwent a metonymic change which resulted in the word implicating degradation. The first, prototypical, meaning was taken into English when the word was borrowed and naturalized as *devulgate* or *divulge*. The history of the word *devulgate* was largely influenced by the earlier adopted form *divulge*. It is an example of the importance that frequency has in semantic change. While *divulge* went through both metonymic and metaphoric changes due to its more frequent use, *devulgate* appears to have stayed semantically unchanged. Elyot chose *devulgate* instead of *divulge*, in my opinion, as a luxury borrowing and he was motivated by a hearer-oriented strategy of expressivity – to show his intellectual prestige and to impress the readers. However, the adoption was not successful, and very soon *devulgate* became obsolete.

### 5.3. Describe

*Describe* was already a part of the English lexicon when Elyot wrote his *The Governour*. First, it was, according to the OED, only used in English translations of Latin texts during the fifteenth century, but in the sixteenth century, shortly before *The Governour*, it was documented in originally English texts. In these first examples and in *The Proheme*, the word is used as it would be used in Latin, but I will try to show the changes in meaning that the word underwent before and after Elyot.



The contemporary meaning of *describe* is:

**1** to say what sb/sth is like: *Words cannot describe the beauty of the scene. She described her attacker to the police. Can you briefly describe how you spend a typical day? She describes the experience as the most painful of her life.*

**2** to say that sb/sth is sth; to call sb sth: *She describes herself as an inventor. He is described by his colleagues as thoughtful and sensitive.*

**3** to make a movement which has a particular shape: *describe a perfect circle on the ice.*

(Hornby 1995, 313-14)

In contemporary English, it is easy to delineate the meaning of *describe*, as seen above from the example in the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* - it is a frequent word typically used when specifying what something or somebody is like. This is its first and prototypical meaning. The second entry is not much different from the first one, it is in fact so similar to it that can be regarded as a slight shift of the meaning triggered by the use in different contexts, while the third entry differs from the previous ones in more than one instance of meaning: it indicates movement and does not define characteristics of something.

Although the word derived from the same etymon was known in English through French in different forms since the fourteenth century, *describe* (borrowed directly from Latin, according to the OED) was for the first time used in a translation of Boccaccio's *De Claris Mulieribus* in 1450, and it implied the sense:

to portray by words or by visual representation. (...) To use words to convey a mental image or impression of (a person, thing, scene, situation, event etc.) by referring to characteristics or significant qualities, features, or details; to give an account of or statement about in speech or writing; to portray in words. (OED Online 2000).

This sense, as used with the word for the first time, is still used today, it did not become obsolete. On the contrary, it is still the most frequent one. The next two mentions of *describe* in the OED Online are from translated works: Higden's *Polychronicon* and Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliotheca Historica*.

What these three texts where *describe* is mentioned in the beginning of its use all have in common is the fact that they are all translations of originally Latin texts. This can be seen as only adapting Latin *describere* to an English text in hope, or maybe already knowing, that the readers are familiar enough with Latin and will be able to decipher the meaning of the word. If we consider Latin as something of a L2 to 16th century learned readership, it is very likely that this carryover could be seen as a way of filling gaps in the English translation of a Latin text.

For the first time in 1513, *describe* (in the same sense as used in the abovementioned translated texts) was recorded in an original text (and not an English translation of a Latin text) in Henry Bradshaw's *The Life of Saint Werburge of Chester*. In the same year and by the same author, a sense of *describe* denoting “to write down (a word, piece of text, etc.); to put in writing; to transcribe, copy out” (OED Online 2000) was used in his work *The Life of Saint Radegunde*. This means that already at the beginning, the word was used in more than one context. As will be seen later, this sense is the closest to the original Latin sense of *describere*.

In 1526, *describe* took on another sense: “to represent in a painting, drawing, sculpture, etc.; to make a likeness of; (of a picture etc.) to depict, portray. Also: to make (a representational picture, image, etc.)” (OED Online 2000). This sense is now somewhat rare, almost obsolete. Since meaning consists of various features which, according to Taylor (1999) activate upon word's use in a context, this sense could be seen as arising from a feature described above in the first sense of the word - “to give an account of or statement about in speech or writing; to portray in words” (OED Online 2000). To portray something in an act of writing and to portray it in an act of drawing, painting or chiseling are close concepts, differing only in the kind of art employed by the context. In other words, the concept of describing something emerges in the act of conceptualising it, no matter what medium of representation is used, as long as the characteristics of that same thing are portrayed – the activity remains the same. It is only the background assumptions that are changed. Since the activity remains in the same conceptual area (domains are not changed), this is a case of metonymy.

In his book in 1531, Elyot's medium of *describing* is language: “...to **describe** in our vulgare tongue the fourme of a iuste publike weale...” (Elyot 1531, 3), which means that he uses

*describe* in its first sense: to use words to represent characteristics of something. Here again, Elyot is not exactly the innovator, he is only one of the early adopters, but his wish to enrich his “vulgare tongue” is visible in this adoption of a Latin word which could have easily been replaced by already existing synonyms, such as: *say, devise, express, represent, picture...*

From 1535 on, a new set of close-knit senses is documented by the OED Online, representing all kinds of tracing, marking, delineating or taking a shape of something. These senses, as will be shown later, are much more similar to some senses of Latin meaning of *describere* than the sense used by Elyot and others before him. Contexts in which these senses appear are mostly of geometrical and geographical kind. There is no certain way of knowing if these senses are taken directly from their Latin counterparts or were they invented in English emerging from different contexts of their use. A case could be made for metonymic expansions of meaning via conceptual closeness of e.g. representing and taking shape of something, or drawing and delineating. However, these are only assumptions.

Latin *describere* is a compound made of the preposition *de* meaning: “from, away from, down from, out of” and the verb *scribere* meaning: “to scratch, grave, engrave, draw” (Lewis and Short 1879). The development of *scribere* itself from ‘scratching or engraving something’ to ‘drawing’ is a case of profiling an activity against background assumptions.

The development of Latin *scribere* from ‘make marks on a surface’ to ‘write’ is not just a matter of ‘restriction’ or ‘specialisation’ of meaning (nor of addition, or subtraction, of semantic features). The profiled activity remains much the same. What has changed are the background assumptions (the ‘theories’) against which this activity is profiled

(Taylor 1999, 40).

This example of profiling ‘marks scratched on a surface’ to ‘writing’ shows the importance of the background knowledge and of the human ability to associate new concepts to those already existing in their minds in order to fill lexical gaps.

According to Lewis and Short (1879), the first sense of *describere* is “to copy off, transcribe anything from an original; to write down, write out”. Cicero and Vergil used it with nouns *librum* (book), *carmina* (poems), *legem* (law), *epistolam* (letter) – to copy or transcribe a book or a poem. According to Forcellini (1828), “in a strict sense, it means writing, copying, transcribing from one paper to the other”<sup>3</sup>.

In its second sense, *describere* means “to sketch off, to describe in painting, writing, etc.” in its most literal sense, but can also be used metonymically to mean “to represent, delineate, describe” (Lewis and Short 1879). Forcellini indicates these uses as *latiori sensu* and says that they apply to painters or transcribers of books who represent something with a brush or a pen<sup>4</sup>. This case of change is almost the same as the one that would later happen in English. The activity of representing characteristics of something stays the same, while different contexts, or in this case, ways of representing, are changed. As for the change in the sense “to represent, delineate, describe”, the connection, or the closeness of the activities in question, points to metonymy. The connection between the literal and metonymic sense – the activity, remained the same, while context changed.

*Describere* can also be found in texts meaning “to mark off, define, divide, distribute into part” or “to ascribe, apportion, appoint, assign to any one” (Lewis and Short 1879). For example “*describere annum in duodecim menses*”<sup>5</sup> as Livy used it, or to appoint somebody to a position (*officia*). In the case of appointing someone to *officia*, a possible metonymic relation could be seen between the prototypical meaning which includes a feature of something being written down and appointing somebody to a position. Obviously, such a decision had to be written down in a legal document to be considered valid. And according to Warren, metonymy is basically an abbreviation device. So, the whole process of writing somebody's name in a legal document as an employee with the official position is abbreviated to a construction in which that same person is ‘described’ as the employee.

In post-classical Latin, *describere* (sometimes *discribere*) had a changed meaning, but again connected to its feature of writing something down. It meant “to write down in register, to

---

<sup>3</sup> *stricto sensu est de una in aliam chartam scribere, exscribere, transcribere*

<sup>4</sup> *latiori sensu est verbum proprium tum pictorum, tum librariorum, qui penicillo aut stilo aliquid repraesentant*

<sup>5</sup> *to divide a year into twelve months*

enrol" (OED Online 2000), or according to DuCange: "censum per capita imponere, eumque exaequatum in libros censuales referre"<sup>6</sup>. Here again, the concept of abbreviation by metonymy can be applied since registering someone or something also includes the act of writing it down. Although post-classical meanings of Latin words were not very appealing to English authors because of the vulgarity they assigned to post-classical Latin, this meaning survived into the 17th century. The Oxford English Dictionary indicates that the sense "to write (a person's name) on a list or register; to register, esp. in a census; to enrol" appeared in English for the first time around 1475 in J. Fortescue's *The Governance of England* and was this way used a few more times afterwards, with the last mention in the OED in 1667.

Unlike *violently* and *devulgate*, *describe* was not borrowed into English in its prototypical Latin meaning. The word already underwent metonymic change to create the sense used by English writers of the fifteenth and sixteenth century – 'to portray by words'. In addition, there were other metonymic changes in both classical and post-classical periods of Latin. The metonymy continued to be the sole mechanism of the change of *describe* in English, too. However, since the later senses correspond to those found in Latin, it is possible that they were not invented in English, but taken directly from Latin sources.

## 5.4. Education

The word *education* is very important in this work because, in addition to the first appearance of the word, the education as a concept was still being shaped in the sixteenth century England. Moreover, *The Governour* is the first book written in England that deals with the subject of education, so Elyot's choice of the loanword must have been more thought through than the other loanwords encountered in the book. As for the Latin etymon

---

<sup>6</sup> to establish a census for each person and register it equally proportioned

*educatio*, it is interesting to note that there are two possible roots of the word – *educare* and *educere*. I will try to explain the effect that both verbs had on the word *educatio(n)*.

The *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* lists *education* as:

**1** a process of training and instruction, esp of children and young people in schools, colleges, etc., which is designed to give knowledge and develop skills: *students in full-time education; the state education system; a good all-round education; nursery/primary/secondary education; adult education classes; health/religious education*

**2** the field of study dealing with how to teach: *a college of education; a lecturer in education*

**3** the process of teaching sb about sth or how to do sth: *an AIDS education programme; User education is vital if the new computer system is to gain acceptance.*

(Hornby 1995, 369)

Nowadays, *education* is a well-known and frequent word used to denote the abovementioned senses: the processes of the development of knowledge and skills performed in schools, colleges and other similar institutions.

According to the OED Online, the first documented mention of the word *education* in English was in 1527: "*Inventory Goods Henry Fitzroy* 44 in Camden Misc. (1855) III By example of good education, as well in noryture as good lernyng." (OED Online 2000). This is only four years before Sir Elyot's *Gouernour* which deals with the proper upbringing and the training of future statesmen. Of course, for this kind of topic Elyot needed a word that would best encompass every process necessary to create a knowledgeable, skilled, and well-trained person. And where better to look for such a word than in Latin?

Latin *educatio*, *-onis*, as well as Middle French *education* (which is also a borrowing from Latin) are etymons of the English word (OED Online 2000). *Educatio* in Latin means "a breeding, rearing, training, bringing up, education" of men, but can also be applied to

animals and plants (Lewis and Short 1879). Since animals, and especially plants, cannot be imparted knowledge the way people can, the word is in these cases changed semantically. What connects bringing up and rearing children to breeding and taking care of animals or plants is the closeness of the two processes. The agents and actions can be substituted to create a new sense, but the activity remains the same. Since the profiled activity remains in the same domain, this change is a case of metonymy.

*Educatio* is a noun borrowed from Latin to fill a gap in English lexicon, but what Latin verb is really responsible for the notion of *education* as we know it and use it today? There are two possible roots which are very similar in form: *educare* and *educere*. Their similarity is most visible in the first person singular present active indicative form where both of them are *educō*. While *educare* is etymologically the more probable choice, *educere* is not to be ruled out yet, at least as an influence, if not the real etymon of *education*.

According to Lewis and Short, *educare* in Latin had a meaning “to bring up a child physically or mentally, to rear, to educate” which is indeed very similar, but not quite the same as the English meaning of *education*. Especially considering the quotation from Lewis and Short which says that “*educit obstetrix, educat nutrix, instituit paedagogus, docet magister*<sup>7</sup>” meaning that *educere* is a process performed by a midwife (*obstetrix*) who draws or brings out a baby, *educare* is the domain of a wet-nurse (*nutrix*), while a pedagogue (in that time, a slave) is there to guide and attend children, mostly walk them to school and back. The last one is the teacher (*magister*) who, contrary to what may be expected, has nothing to do with *educatio* since the notion was not connected to knowledge or teaching skills, but with upbringing. The teacher was the one to *docere* which would in English be translated as *educate*, i.e. “to teach, instruct, inform, show, tell, etc.” (Lewis and Short 1879). *Educare* gives the notion of attention to one's well-being and personal growth and development to the concept of education:

*Educare* intimates rearing, supporting, raising, and cultivating. (...) Education, in the sense of *educare*, intimates a process of cultivation and growth, an uncovering of our most radical possibilities for being. To educate, then, in this more ontological sense suggested by *educare*, is to help uncover and nurture a more meaningful way of being, that is, well-being.

---

<sup>7</sup> midwife brings out, wet-nurse rears, slave *paedagogus* attends, and teacher educates

(Dewar 2016, 57)

Education, in the sense of *educare*, helps a person to achieve the best way of being by nurturing him or her; it gives the support in the process of growth, and helps to uncover person's possibilities. Here we can see why this verb, which was for old Romans connected to wet-nurses and their care of children, helped to create the notion of education in the sense of the process of one's personal growth.

*Educere*, on the other hand, at first sight does not seem to have much to do with the whole concept of education, since its first meaning is “to lead forth, draw out, bring away” (Lewis and Short 1879). The etymology of the word is reflected in its meaning: it is derived from the preposition *ex* (out of, from within) and the verb *ducere* (to lead, conduct, draw, bring forward, in all senses). It was also used in military terms to denote “to lead forth, march out troops” (Lewis and Short 1879). However, this feature of drawing something out or leading someone forth can be connected to the metaphorical drawing of someone's possibilities and qualities out of their minds and bodies, or leading them on their way to achieving something. This sense is noted in Lewis and Short (1879): “To bring up, rear, a child, to educate” with a remark that it is “usually with reference to bodily nurture and support; while 2. *educere*<sup>8</sup> refers usually to the mind; but the distinction is not strictly observed”. This remark means that in Latin these two verbs were perceived as being similar (both in form and some aspects of their meaning) and probably many times mistaken one for another.

This similarity of the phonological shape of *educere* to *educare* might be another reason why this verb with no apparent connection to the upbringing of children was after all connected to education. Fortson considers it a special sort of reanalysis, similar to folk etymology, when a word's meaning is analyzed on the basis of a similar-sounding word.

*Educere* could be seen as an influence which implies a sense of uniformity and predetermined movement to education as an institutional process, according to Dewar. He believes that *educere*, understood as leading forth, parallels *currere* (running), the Latin root

---

<sup>8</sup> refers to *educare*



of *curriculum*, and that both verbs lead to an understanding of education as an institutionalized process determined by its beginning and ending points, which culminates in a diploma that bears the stamp of institutional and social approval.

In other words, *educere* helps to create the notion of *education* which applies to the institutionality and the predetermined course of events which needs to be satisfied in order for a person to be educated. It does not concern itself with personal well-being and growth of a student (as *educare* is), but with the externally set starting and ending points.

What can be seen from all this is that *educare* and *educere* are intertwined in the creation of *education* in its modern sense of the word, because both physical upbringing and mental development of knowledge and skills, just as individual growth and institutionally predetermined sets of events, are essential to the concept of *education*.

In post-classical Latin, according to DuCange (1887), *educatus* is someone who is *nutritus* (nourished) and *institutus* (governed), which corresponds to the combined notions of *educare* and *educere* as mentioned above. This concept of education consisting of nourishing and governing is the same as the one encountered in English, but it must be remembered that Elyot and his contemporaries borrowed only from classical sources.

The idea of *education* as a process of imparting knowledge and skills (with both notions of personal nourishment and institutionally predetermined set of events) has remained nearly the same through centuries, its semantic field has not yet been significantly broadened. But, since no word can stay unchanged for a long time, especially the one as frequent as *education*, different historical and social changes influenced its way of use. So today we may speak of all kinds of educations: primary education, secondary education, adult education, religious education, moral education etc. New ways of learning and new kinds of schools and other educational institutions came into existence throughout past centuries. This could be regarded as changes of our conception of the world and the transformation of already existing conceptual systems, which happen, according to Blank, by shifting concepts, the loss of already existing ones, or by introducing new ones.

As an example of this sociocultural transformation of an already existing conceptual system, there is the case of *adult education* or *further education*, as it is also called. Defined as

“formal education, but not at a university, provided for people who are older than school age” (Hornby 1995, 481), it refers to different courses and ways of learning skills intended for the adults who want to upgrade their knowledge. Adult and children education cannot be viewed as the same kind of process from many points of view, particularly methodologically, which makes them different phenomena. In other words, some features are the same, some are lost, and some are added; but we still consider both of these processes as education.

The word *education* is understood today almost the same way as it was understood in the ancient Roman times. It denotes the processes responsible for the creation of a person's skills and knowledge. Metonymically, this idea was, through history, extended to mean the breeding or rearing animals, but its first and most frequent sense remained the same. However, since the society has always changed, so have the institutions dealing with education. For that reason, *education* now refers to different concepts than it did in the sixteenth century or the ancient Roman Empire. Still, the profiled activity remains the same.

## 5.5. Dedicate

The word *dedicate* was a recent invention in 1531 when Elyot wrote his book. He may not be the first to use it, but his contribution to the development of the word might have been the first expansion of its semantic field. It will be argued in the following text that Elyot was the first to start the process of pejoration which will continue to degrade the meaning of the word until the nineteenth century. In addition to Elyot's contribution, the processes of semantic change of the word *dedicate* both before and after Elyot's book will be explained in this section.

Today we use *dedicate* to denote:

**1 oneself/sth to sth/doing sth** to give or devote oneself, time, effort, etc to a good cause or purpose: *dedicate oneself to one's work. She dedicated her life to helping the poor.*

**2 sth to sb** to address sth one has written, eg a book or a piece of music to sb as a way of showing respect: *She dedicated her first book to her teacher* (eg by putting his name at the front). *That song was dedicated to Lynette from her husband Peter.*

**3 sth (to sb/sth)** to devote a church, etc with solemn ceremonies to a sacred purpose, to the memory of sb/sth, etc: *The chapel was dedicated in 1880. A memorial stone was dedicated to those who lost their lives.*

(Hornby 1995, 303)

The first documented mention of *dedicate* is, according to the OED Online, in 1530, only a year before Sir Elyot's *Gouernour*. It appeared for the first time in English in *L'esclaircissement de la langue francoyse* by John Palsgrave, the first grammar of the French language. Although it was a French grammar with a title in French, it was a work written in English to help Englishmen who wanted to learn French. The sentence where *dedicate* was encountered for the first time is "I dedycate a church" and the meaning of the verb here is "to devote (to the Deity or to a sacred person or purpose) with solemn rites; to surrender, set apart, and consecrate to sacred uses" (OED Online 2000). This first sense of the word includes a set of features dealing with sanctity, special purposes and rites, and all other senses which will later arise from this one are more or less coloured by it, according to the OED Online.

Although its prototypical meaning is generally connected to all kinds of sacred and religious places of worship and prayer, such as churches, chapels, etc., very early in its history, *dedicate* was used for other purposes too. Since the OED gives no indication that the word was used in any other way than the one mentioned above before 1542, it is safe to assume that Elyot was the first to make this change in 1531. His *Gouernour* is dedicated to the King Henry VIII with the words: "I therefore haue named it The Gouernour, and do nowe **dedicate** it unto your hygnesse as the fyrste frutes of my studye..." (Elyot 1531, 4).

This dedication has nothing in common with the solemn rites or the sacred devoting of a place to a deity, but it is an act of addressing a piece of work to a patron. Considering the time and the political circumstances, Elyot's dedication to the King might not be that far from prototypically sacred ways of the use of the word. His dedication was aimed at acknowledging the King as a figure larger and more important than others, almost a deity. However, the King (however important) is still less than a deity, but in order to compare the King to a deity, Elyot employed the invited inferencing which in turn caused the pejoration. By inviting his readers to "let implicatures go through" (Closs Traugott 2005, 634), Elyot associated the King to a higher form of being by the use of the word *dedicate* which was until that point used exclusively in connection to religion. By doing this, he also invited his readers to think of the King as almost a deified person, which was justifiable considering the circumstances of the time and situation. Since the action of dedication is unchanged, but the receiver and the received are different, and since Closs Traugott considers invited referencing as a kind of conceptual metonymy, this change is a case of metonymy.

According to the OED, this sense "to inscribe or address (a book, engraving, piece of music, etc.) to a patron or friend, as a compliment, mark of honour, regard or affection" is documented for the first time in 1542. This use is the closest to Elyot's: it is an act of inscribing or addressing person's work to another person as a compliment or mark of honour, regard or affection. What is interesting here is that the OED cites this sense as used only since 1542, but clearly Elyot used it the same way already in 1531, more than a decade earlier. This shows the importance of Elyot as an innovator who not only borrowed words from Latin, but also expanded their semantic fields by using them in new ways and different contexts.

In later years, the word acquired some further senses. Its semantic field widened by adding different kinds of recipients to whom something can be dedicated. E.g., in 1553, a new sense "to give up earnestly, seriously, or wholly, to a particular person or specific purpose; to assign or appropriate" (OED Online 2000) appeared. This new widening of semantic field indicates further pejoration of its meaning because now almost anything (mind, thoughts, time, summer, etc.) can be dedicated to almost anyone. The notion of the sanctity of the process and its purpose is decreased, if not completely lost.

In 19th century, two new similar senses emerged denoting “to devote or throw open to the use of the public (a highway or other open space)” which is documented for the first time in 1843 and the other “to open formally to the public, to inaugurate, make public” documented for the first time in *Times* in 1892 (OED Online 2000). The addition of features of secularity can be seen here (while at the same time, the features of sanctity and solemnity are lost) and a larger number of possible receivers of the dedicated offering, as opposed to only deities, kings, or other special figures it used to be applied to). Certainly, this broadening of the number of eligible recipients of a dedication adds to the degradation of the notion of its purpose: now anything can be dedicated to anyone, there is no any sacred or honourable meaning to it anymore, the only feature that remained is that of affection and compliment.

The etymon of English *dedicate* is Latin verb *dedicare*. The verb is derived from the preposition *de* meaning “from, away from, down from, out of” and the verb *dicare* which general meaning is “to proclaim, make known”, but was also used in religious contexts to denote the sense “to dedicate, consecrate, devote any thing to a deity or to a deified person” (Lewis and Short 1879). The verb *dicare* was originally the same word as *dicere* (“to say, tell, mention, relate, affirm, declare, state; to mean, intend”), but later its meaning changed. *Dedicare* in Latin means “to give out tidings, a notice, etc.; hence, to affirm, declare, announce any thing”, but also has a religious sense “to dedicate, consecrate, set apart a thing to a deity or deified person” (Lewis and Short 1879). This religious notion of the verb *dedicare* is the one which was borrowed into English. If compared to the meaning of *dedicate* first encountered in English (which is also prototypical), we can see that almost no semantic shift happened.

What really distinguishes the Latin sense of *dedicare* from all the English ways of use of the word is the feature of “set form of words” (OED Online). The Latin way of dedicating something to somebody (exclusively a deity or deified person) included the set form of words which were very significant and solemn (they were also formulas), whose very significance and solemnity were the power which carried out the process: the words themselves *dedicated*, not the person saying or writing them. This use of words is

*performative*, or in the words of Austin (1975, 6): “...a performative sentence or a performative utterance, or, for short, a performative... it indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action”. That is why the verb *dicere* (to say, declare, state) is, in a way, the root of *dedicare* – to dedicate or set apart something to a deity is to say or declare that something is dedicated or set apart for a deity.

Romans also expanded the meaning of *dedicare* to mean something less sacred and solemn than the prototypically used sense. In the post-Augustean period, the transferred sense “to dedicate, inscribe a composition to any one” was in use. This sense was used the same way as phrases “mittere ad aliquem”, or “mittere alicui”<sup>9</sup> (Lewis and Short 1879). In other words, for Romans to dedicate something to somebody also could have the meaning of sending something to somebody (a letter, a book, etc.) This could also be seen as the expansion based on the features of meaning connected with the root *dicere*. To say something to somebody via a letter or even a book could have been understood as setting apart that written document to somebody (a common person, not a deity). Here, in this sense of the word, the root of English meaning Elyot used in his book is visible – a written work sent or *dedicated* to somebody.

Other transferred senses include “to destine, dispose, prepare, set up a thing for any purpose; to dedicate, consecrate it to any object” and “to dedicate, consecrate, devote a thing to its future use” (Lewis and Short 1879). Things dedicated this way were *urbem* (city), *testamentum* (testament), *domum* (home), *theatrum* (theatre), *thermas* (baths), *gymnasium*, etc. These two senses are similar in their nature and in their way of use, and both of them are products of pejoration. Just as in English, the Latin verb was found in different contexts no longer associated with religious practices and deities, but in a number of situations with more secular character. This transition from religious to everyday use is a clear case of pejoration, which is a part of metonymy, according to Fortson (2005, 661).

Lewis and Short also indicate another, seemingly unrelated, sense of the word used in connection with law. Although it is indicated that it was used rarely, it is worth to mention that *dedicare* also could mean “to specify one's property in the census” (Lewis and Short 1879). Maybe this sense can be connected with the feature of “setting up a thing for any

---

<sup>9</sup> to send to somebody

purpose” or “devoting a thing to its future use” in order to achieve the sense of dedicating a piece of property to its future use by somebody. The mechanism of change employed here would in that case have to be metonymy, since the abovementioned features of meaning remained the same, but the context changed. Also, there is a visible closeness of the concepts in question.

In post-classical Latin, *dedicare* was, in addition to the classical meaning, used as a synonym of *celebrare*<sup>10</sup> (DuCange 1887) in connection with the Christian tradition of celebrating days dedicated to certain saints. If a day is dedicated to a saint, it means that it is also a day of celebration, which means that these two words were intertwined to create a notion of a holiday dedicated to a saint. This process of using a well-known word (in this case *dedicare*) but with the meaning of another word (*celebrare*) can be compared to the process of semantic encroachment in which a sort of cross-over happens between two words: a meaning becomes detached from one form in order to cross over to another form, according to Lüdtke. The nearness of the concept of celebration to the concept of dedication must in this case be seen through their connection in Christianity – the day of celebration dedicated to a saint. This nearness of notions is the reason why semantic encroachment was able to occur. Since there is a visible nearness and semantic encroachment is qualified as a special kind of metonymy, this would also be a case of metonymy.

But, how did *dedicate* acquire its contemporary meaning? How did a word used to denote only sacred and religious processes of devoting to deities become a word used for everyday situations? Today, people are *dedicating* their time or effort to other people, projects, or special causes. This use can only be described as a logical part of the chain of the process of pejoration that has been happening to the word since it was used for the first time. First the receiver of something dedicated was only a deity or a deified person, after some time a King or some other monarch was perceived as being worthy of a dedication, and now anyone or anything can be that receiver including common people, pets, work projects, hobbies etc. But not only did the receiving end of this process expanded, the objects which are dedicated also went through the same: from temples, churches, and statues which were originally

---

<sup>10</sup> to celebrate

dedicated, they came to denote almost anything. The process remains the same throughout the time: it is a proclamation of giving somebody or something to somebody or something, but the reasons and the people or concepts involved in the process change from higher valued to the lower ones. The constant pejoration, subsumable under metonymic change, started with Elyot's invited inferencing to commend the King, and, one step at a time, in the end, the idea of *dedication* degraded from deities to the openings of highways.

## 5.6. Animate

*Animate* is yet another word used for the first time only a few years before the Elyot's work, and Elyot here acts as an early adopter. His explanation of the new loanword is "gyue courage" which corresponds to the first recorded meaning of the English word. Later, this word will acquire many different metaphorical and metonymical meanings, which I will try to enumerate in the following text.

The contemporary meaning of *animate* is listed in *The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* as:

**1** to give life to sth/sb; to make sth/sb more lively: *A smile suddenly animated her face.*

**2** to make people and animals in pictures appear to move, by making pictures of them in different positions and using the sequence of pictures in a cinema film.

(Hornby 1995, 40)

This Latin borrowing was for the first time mentioned (according to the OED Online) in 1487 in J. Skelton's translation of *Bibliotheca Historica* (written in Latin). The first originally English work where this word is documented is H. Bradshaw's *Life of St. Radegunde* in 1513. Both uses are explained in the OED Online to denote "to give spirit, inspiration, or impulse. To fill



with boldness, courage, spirit; to encourage". This sense is described by Lewis and Short as "now rare", it became obsolete.

Elyot used this word in 1531, a short time after it appeared in English for the first time and it was not yet generally accepted. Synonyms which already existed at the time Elyot was writing *The Governour* were *to stir, to commove, to eager, to provoke* etc., and were used to denote the same notion as *animate*. Elyot says: "Whiche that prynce dyd not for lacke of judgement, he beyng of excellent lernynge as discipule to Aristotell, but to thentent that his liberalite employed on Cherilus shulde **animate** or gyue courage to others moche better terned to contende with hym in a semblable enterpryse." (Elyot 1531, 4)

"That prynce" is Alexander the Great, and what he did was to keep by his side the poet Cherilus after he had written a history for him, in order to *animate* the others to try and do the same, maybe even to surpass Cherilus and his history. What makes it clear that *animate* is a newly borrowed word not yet well known among Elyot's readership is the fact that he paired it with the description "or to gyue courage". Obviously he needed to, in a way, translate the word for his readers so it could be understood.

In 1533, only two years after *The Governour*, a new sense appeared: "to breathe life into, to endow with life, give life to or sustain in life; to quicken, vivify" (OED Online 2000). Strangely though, this sense was acquired later than the previous one, even though it is much closer to the original meaning of Latin *animare*. If the process was reversed and the sense "to give spirit, inspiration, or impulse" was derived from the sense "to breathe life into" it would be a clear case of metaphor. But since the word and both of these meanings were taken from Latin, there is no direct act of change between them nor any mechanism of change took place in English. But the semantic change happened in Latin already, and the first sense taken into English when the word was borrowed was not the prototypical sense of the Latin word.

In 1586, a new specialized use of the word is documented for the first time with the sense "to bring into active or legal operation" (OED Online 2000). This sense is obsolete today. This way of use connected with the law did not stand the test of time, its last documented use in the OED Online was in the 18th century. But how did this bringing of something into active or legal operation become connected to the notion of giving spirit, inspiration, or courage? A

sentence from 1714 might help to answer this question: “Royal Majesty, who undoubtedly by Virtue of Her Prerogative, might refuse the Royal Assent to that, as well as any other Bill, whose Fiat only, animated a Bill, and gives it Life and Spirit” (OED Online 2000).

It is implied in this sentence that the Queen is the one and only who has the power to decide the future of bills: whether they will be accepted or declined. What is interesting in this sentence is the end where it is explained that the Queen's *fiat* has the power to give life and spirit to a bill, or in other words to *animate* it. Since *animating* is understood as the giving of life and spirit to something from the beginning of the word's use in English (and even before in Latin), a parallel can be made in this case between the creation of life and the Queen's approval of a bill. Human life is in charge of God and bills are in charge of Her Majesty, which makes the Queen almost as important to God (in the domain of law). The way God *animates* our bodies with life, the Queen *animates* a bill with Her Royal Assent. The mechanism employed in this change of meaning is metaphor since there was a change of domains, but the activity itself is paralleled.

In 1605, a new sense “to impart an active quality or a particular power to (a substance)” (OED Online 2000) appeared and was used in the language of science to denote chemical reactions in which one substance reacts with another. This could also be understood as a metaphorical change since the reaction might be seen as bringing a metal to life. So, to animate a metal is to give it movement – similar to the process of bringing life which *animating* prototypically means, since life is generally connected with the notion of movement, opposing death which is still.

In 1612, the sense “to represent as alive, give the appearance of life to” is documented for the first time in the OED Online, and in 1630, a similar sense “to convert into living creatures. Formerly also: to infest with insects or vermin” appeared, while in 1646 a sense “to cause to move or to act; to give motion or action to” occurred for the first time. All these senses are based on the same principle of endowing something with life, or breathing life into it. The only use that could be considered slightly different is the one where *to animate* is used to denote infesting with insects or vermin.

While this might seem as a considerable change of meaning in relation to these other senses, it is not the case. This might be best explained with the example found in the OED

Online related to this sense of meaning. The example is from Sir T. Browne's *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*: "The corrupt and excrementous humour in man are animated into lyce" (OED Online). In other words, man's humour which is not living thing is infested with lice which are living beings – the humour is given life in some way, and by that is *animated*. This use is also metaphorical, and it was triggered by the fact that human excrement and other fluids are emotionally marked conceptual domain and a tabooed topic. In a sentence like this one, almost every word in a sentence tends to be replaced by euphemisms in order to avoid the 'loss of face'. The same happened to the verb in this case – *animate* is here a euphemism. According to Blank, "...a good semantic euphemism has to be veiling and explicit at the same time, if we want it to be communicatively efficient" (Blank 1999, 81). *Animate* meets both of these conditions: it is veiling enough to avoid a 'face-threatening act', but it is also explicit enough not to be misunderstood.

In the 20th century, with the arrival of new technologies, another sense of the word was created: "to give (an image, character, film, etc.) the appearance of movement using animation techniques; to make an animated film of" (OED Online 2000). This way of use of the word is for the first time documented in the OED in 1916 and is still used today very frequently. This semantic change was caused by the invention of motion picture which emerged at the end of the 19th century. "Motion picture, also called film or movie, series of still photographs on film, projected in rapid succession onto a screen by means of light. Because of the optical phenomenon known as persistence of vision, this gives the illusion of actual, smooth, and continuous movement." (Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., n.d.)

The description of motion picture as a series of still photographs projected in rapid succession in order to give the illusion of movement is important for its connection with the verb *animate*. The photographs are still and without life until the process of animation starts. After they are animated, the continuous movement commences and they appear to be alive – they are given "life and spirit", vivified, they live in their own way. The process of the creation of a motion picture fits perfectly to already existing process of *animating* in people's minds, since it is, according to Blank, a basic trait of human cognition to interpret new facts through old knowledge. New facts which occurred with the invention of sequencing pictures in order to create a movement are interpreted through the old

knowledge that *to animate* means *to give life or to vivify*. This new sense of the meaning was construed metaphorically with the change of the domains.

In Latin, *animare* originally had the meaning “to fill with breath or air, to blow upon” (Lewis and Short 1879). It meant to use one's mouth to blow into something in order to create sound or other similar effects, to use one's own breath and the air from the lungs. Lewis and Short give the example: “*duas tibias uno spiritu animare*”<sup>11</sup> which shows that it was usually paired with musical instruments. They also cite “*bucinas*”<sup>12</sup> as one of the objects used with the verb *animare*.

The second sense listed in *A Latin Dictionary* of Lewis and Short is explained as “to quicken, animate”. This sense was used in contexts similar to the example from the dictionary: “*stellae divinis animatae mentibus*”<sup>13</sup>. There is an obvious metaphorical change of meaning in this case since it is easy to recognize reminiscent properties needed in order to achieve metaphorical connection between two notions. That connection is here created between the concept of blowing air and the image of the divine creatures that dwell up in the sky and move the stars around with their imaginary breath. Not only is there the parallel between the two processes, but it is also easy to recognize the similarity of the notions, and metaphor is based on similarity.

These two senses were created in association with the noun *anima* which means “air, a current of air, breeze, breath, wind” (Lewis and Short 1879). There is also another noun – *animus*, translated as “rational soul” (Lewis and Short 1879) or usually only “*soul*”. Both nouns took part in the process of the creation of the verb *animare*.

The next sense is somewhat more influenced by *animus* than *anima*, it has more to do with the soul than with the flow of air. It is explained as “to endow with, to give, a particular temperament or disposition of mind” (Lewis and Short 1879). But how is this sense connected to previous ones if they come from different nouns? Is this word polysemous or

---

<sup>11</sup> to blow into two pipes in one breath

<sup>12</sup> a trumpet, horn

<sup>13</sup> the stars animated by divine minds

are they only homonyms? The answer should be found in the relationship between the nouns *anima* and *animus*.

The problem of their original meanings is one of great difficulty, owing to the nature of the terms themselves, two words obviously cognate, differing in fact only in declension and gender and both connoting entities or substances of the nature of wind or breath, intangible, invisible, and easily confused.

(Onians 1951, 168)

As Onians says above, both words are connected to wind or breath, and they have the same Greek stem 'anemo-' meaning *wind*. However, their distinction is a great difficulty, even today, and they are easily confused. Onians (1951, 169) continues to say that: "...word 'anima' was generic. It was in fact applied to anything of the nature of vapour, air, or wind, to breezes, exhalations, etc., and so could be applied both to the physical breath coming from the chest and to the life-soul conceived as vaporous...".

In other words, *anima* was used to denote different kinds of air movement, and through metonymy and closeness of concepts it started to denote the physical breath coming from the chest, but also a less physical concept – life-soul. This semantic shift could be seen as metaphor and metonymy working together. Metonymy because of the physical closeness of lungs which are the organs we use for breathing, and the soul which was in Roman times believed to reside in our chest, together with all of our feelings and consciousness. On the other hand, there is obviously a shift from a physical to a non-physical domain, which means that metaphor was also involved.

About *animus*, Onians (1951, 170) says that:

It is not generic. It cannot like 'anima' be applied to any and every thing of the nature of air or breath but means something specific of that nature. (...) 'Animus' was originally some 'breath' in the chest; also 'animus' was the stuff of consciousness, and the consciousness was in the chest; therefore 'animus' was breath that was consciousness in the chest. What breath was there in the chest? The ordinary breath of respiration, the breath in the form of which pride, spirit, etc., i.e. 'animus', appears, and in the form of which – words – consciousness issues forth, thoughts are uttered.

Here again, it is clear that the position of human chest and lungs, together with the belief that our consciousness is also placed in the chest, plays a great role in the semantic shift which happened to *animus*. As Onians said, it was originally some breath in the chest, but there was already a generic term for all kinds of breath and it was *anima*; so the meaning of *animus* had to be specialized for a special, non-generic, kind of breath: the one reserved for pride, spirit, etc. Another metonymy happened here, since again physical closeness of concepts in question played a role (consciousness being located in the chest). Thoughts, pride, spirit – all of these notions belonged to the consciousness – to what is now considered to be a part of the mind and placed in the head, rather than the chest which is today connected to feelings.

Even though *anima* and *animus* are two distinct words with meanings which would later be seen as different, they are still conceptually very close and were in the past influenced one by the other. As they are semantically very close and borrowed from the same Greek etymon, both of these nouns influenced the verb *animare* adding different features to it.

*Animare* was used by Ovid to denote “to transform a lifeless object to a living being, to change into by giving life (aliquid in aliquid animare)”<sup>14</sup> (Lewis and Short 1879) which can be understood as associated with the notions found in the noun *anima*. In other words, a lifeless object is endowed with the air or breath of life. In this context, it is not necessarily a conscious form of life, and because of that, the notion of the consciousness implied by the noun *animus* is not involved in the creation of this sense.

According to Lewis and Short, the semantic field of *animare* was later expanded to refer to colours and fire: to enliven something with bright colours and to light or kindle fire. These shifts are metaphorical in their nature, since the change of domains happened. The process of brightening something with a more vivid colour can be understood as giving it a new life and soul, transforming it into something almost alive from its lifeless and drab existence. Fire can be likened to a living being: it has the beginning, period of growth, and the end. In this case, metaphor is easily grasped: to light a fire is to give life - *anima* - to it, since without *anima* there is no life. Also, fire needs the air – *anima* - to burn, and if *anima* in this sense is taken away from it, it will die.

---

<sup>14</sup> to transform something (not-alive) into something (alive)

Another metonymic expansion of semantic field is visible in the uses of the verb to denote that someone or something is “brought or put into a particular frame of mind, disposed, inclined, minded, in some way” or “endowed with courage, courageous, stouthearted” (Lewis and Short 2000). These senses are more influenced by the noun *animus* and its features associated with the mind (as we understand them today). Courage and inclination are some of the ideas connected to the conscious part of human existence, and to be *animated* in that context means to “breathe in the form of which pride, spirit, etc., i.e. 'animus', appears” (Onians 1951, 170) and in which words are uttered. In this case, meaning is changed according to the contiguity of notions and the closeness of concepts, which makes it a metonymic change. This sense is the one that was taken into English when the word was first borrowed in 16th century.

The meaning of the Latin word *animare* was created based on two conceptually closed terms: *anima* (air, breath, wind) and *animus* (soul). Through semantic mechanisms of metaphor and metonymy, they generated different senses of *animare*. In English, too, the mechanisms created numerous senses of the word *animate*. In contrast to previous examples, the change was mostly metaphorical. From the beginnings and the two Latin nouns that participated in the creation of the verb *animare*, the word is connected to breath, life, and the energy of life. Since this concept is very wide and relatable to a number of ideas, it is no wonder that so many metaphorical meanings were created.

## 5.7. Contend

In order to express an idea of opposition and struggle, Elyot used another novelty loanword, first time used in the sixteenth century. In this section, I will try to show the expansion of semantic field which happened to the word *contend* by the continuous addition of new features.

Today, we use *contend* as listed in *The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*:

**1 ~with/against sb/sth; ~ for sth** to struggle in order to overcome a rival, competitor or difficulty: *Several teams are contending for (ie trying to win) the prize. She's had a lot of problems to contend with. A struggle between contending (ie rival) groups.*

**2** to give sth as one's opinion; to assert: *I would contend that unemployment is our most serious social evil.*

(Hornby 1995, 249)

The first documented use of *contend* in English was, according to the OED, in 1518 in *Fyfte Eglog* by Alexander Barclay. The meaning of the word is described as “to strive earnestly; to make vigorous efforts; to endeavour, to struggle” (OED Online 2000). This way of use is now obsolete, the last citation of this sense in the OED is from 1820.

In 1529, some features were added to the original meaning of the word and a new sense was created. The added features are those of opposition and the existence of an object which is contended about: “to strive in opposition; to engage in conflict or strife; to fight. Const. ‘with’, ‘against’ (an opponent), ‘for’, ‘about’ (an object)” (OED Online 2000). Since Rastier (1999, 116) claims that metonymy is, in fact, the extension of the most priced part or associated unit of the whole or set which then extends its name to the whole concept, it can be said that the most priced part or associated unit of the concept of fight against someone else is the endeavour or vigorous efforts put into it which are found in the previous sense of the word.

The difference between these two senses is that in the first one, a person struggles with himself/herself, they strive and make vigorous efforts to achieve something valuable. This is seen from the examples: “I have contended to bring in honest men and..they have not proved as I expected” and “Contending to excel themselves and their Fellows” (OED Online 2000). The other sense is less the achievement of something valuable, and more a fight against someone else, strife to win over somebody. The examples of these cases are sentences: “No army..could be able to contend alone with the English forces” and “A cause for which they are ready to contend to their life's end” (OED Online 2000).



These two senses already existed in 1531, when Elyot wrote his *Gouernour*. The sentence he used the word in was: “Whiche that prynce dyd not for lacke of iugement, he beyng of excellent lernynge as disciple to Aristotell, but to thentent that his liberalite employed on Cherilus shulde animate or gyue courage to others moche better terned to **contende** with hym in a semblable enterpryse.” (Elyot 1531, 4). The sense chosen by Elyot was the one which includes a fight and strife in opposition to someone else, which is obvious from the preposition *with* used after the verb.

Another sense appeared in 1539, with some difference in the features already existing in the meaning of the verb. In this semantic change, the features of fight and opposition are narrowed down to those involved only in verbal disputes. In the OED this sense is described to denote: “to strive in argument or debate; to dispute keenly; to argue. Const ‘with’, ‘against’ (a person), ‘for’, ‘against’, ‘about’ (a matter)”. The reason why this change happened is most probably the closeness of the concept of an argument or debate to the concept of a struggle involved in a fight against someone, and since metonymy is based on the principle of closeness, this is also a case of metonymic change. The features of struggle, endeavour and opposition are obviously the most valued parts of the meaning of *contend*. They are prominent in yet another sense, used for the first time in 1589, according to the OED. The sense denotes “to strive in rivalry with another, for an object; to compete, vie” (OED Online 2000). The difference between this sense and the previous ones is the added feature of an object which is the prize earned by the winner of a competition. The added feature extended the meaning of the word, i.e. added to the semantic field of the word. The Rastier's claim that metonymy is in fact the extension is applicable to this change as well. This sense is the one found in contemporary dictionaries as the prototypical meaning of the word *contend*.

Only two entries in the OED, in 1609 and 1615, are mentioned as examples of a sense denoting “to urge one's course, proceed with effort”. The first example, from 1609, is from Shakespeare's *Sonnets*: “Like as the waues make towards the pibled shore..Our minuites..In sequent toile all forwards do contend” (OED Online 2000). The other example is from the Chapman's translation of Homer's *Odysseys*: “I answer'd; That a necessary end To this infernal state made me contend” (OED Online 2000).

The fact that there are only two examples, and both from the 17th century, probably means that this sense was not widely accepted. The context in which this sense can be found is that of troublesome journeys or enterprises. The prominent feature, in this case, is the one of struggle. The opponent here is not human, as in previous senses, but natural forces or unfortunate circumstances. The domain is changed from physical fight or verbal dispute to that of the competition against something that cannot be grasped, which makes this change metaphorical. In addition to this, it is no wonder that this metaphorical change occurred in the examples mentioned above, since, when it comes to different mechanisms of semantic change, there is a “prevalent use of metaphors in poetic texts. (...) That is to say, metaphors deviate from ordinary language by jumping or crossing conceptual boundaries” (Nerlich and Clarke 1999, 207).

The literal meaning of *contendere*, Latin etymon of *contend*, was “to stretch, stretch out vigorously, to draw tight, strain” (Lewis and Short 1879). The word is a compound made of prefix *con-* (from preposition *cum*<sup>15</sup>) and *tendere* meaning “to stretch, make tense, stretch out, spread out, distend, extend” (Lewis and Short 1879). The verbs *tendere* and *contendere* are similar in meaning, both of them denoting “to stretch (out)”, but the prefix *con-* indicates a notion of “bringing together” which made the other part of the meaning possible – “to draw tight, strain”. This literal way of use of the word was not long-lasting, soon the word acquired additional senses, and this one became rare and mostly used poetically, according to Lewis and Short.

Metonymical extension of meaning based on the closeness of concepts created two additional senses of the word. The first one is “of weapons, to shoot, hurl, dart, throw” and the other is “of places, neutr., to stretch, reach, extend” (Lewis and Short 1879). Both of these meanings are part of the same domain, there is no crossing of conceptual boundaries, which rules out the metaphorical change. The links between the literal and the new senses are concrete and objective, happening in the 'real world'. Shooting or throwing something does indeed include physical stretching of the person doing it. And so does reaching a place

---

<sup>15</sup> with

or extending. In these cases, it was our world-knowledge of cause and effect that influenced the semantic change, hence metonymy happened.

It was another, this time metaphorical change that created the sense of the word which was taken into English when the word was borrowed for the first time. Frequent in prose and poetry (as most metaphors are), this sense is understood as: “to strain eagerly, to stretch, exert, to direct one's mental powers to something, to pursue or strive for earnestly; or neutr., to exert one's self, to strive zealously for something, etc.” (Lewis and Short 1879). This time, the conceptual boundaries of the domains are crossed, the connection between the two senses is not in the ‘real world’ anymore, it is the similarity between the processes that is recognised and paralleled. We need to ‘stretch’ our mental powers or our energy to achieve something, the struggle which is happening inside of a person who strives zealously for something is compared to the physical strain and tension.

The reason why this sense entered English rather than the literal and original meaning of *contendere* might be the source of borrowing, i.e. the classical texts. Elyot was a writer who was very familiar with Latin, even bilingual, as was the case with the majority of authors of his time. His Latin was learned from written sources, not via contact with the people who actually spoke it, since Latin was not a spoken language anymore at that period of time. Latin works read by authors who lived in the 16th century, were, in most cases, either poetry or *belles lettres* prose. As it was already mentioned above, metaphor is the mechanism mostly employed in poetic register. It is my assumption that the reason for the metaphorical sense of the borrowed word might be found in its frequency encountered in Latin texts Elyot read.

The Latin literal meaning of *contendere* 'to stretch' was not long-lasting, but it was a good basis for many metonymies which were created based on the concrete and physical closeness. In this case, it was not the prototypical Latin meaning that entered English first, nor its many metonymic meanings, but a metaphorical one. Since 1518, when the word first entered English, it underwent the addition of features (opponent, prize) which changed its meaning. The change was, in most cases, metonymical, with only one case of crossing domains – the struggle with the weather.

## 5.8. Equal

*Equal* was first recorded in English in a Chaucer's work, but there are not any mentions of it in the OED until 1526. In addition to the problem of its first appearance in English, this section will deal with the word's semantic development and the problem of the two Latin etymons the English word was derived from. I will try to explain how these etymons developed in Latin and how they affected the English loanword.

*Equal* is listed in *The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* as:

**1 ~ (to sb/sth)** the same in size, quantity, quality, extent, level, status, etc: *They are of equal height. Equal amounts of flour and sugar should be added to the mixture. An area of forest equal to the size of Wales has been destroyed. In intelligence, the children are about equal (to each other). He speaks Arabic and English with equal fluency. Women are demanding equal pay for equal work (ie equal to that of men). Equal rights/treatment; an equal opportunities programme (ie giving the same opportunity for employment to any person, regardless of sex, race, etc.)*

**2 ~to sth** having the strength, courage, ability, etc for sth: *She doesn't feel equal to the task. He proved equal to (ie able to deal with) the occasion.*

(Hornby 1995, 388)

The adjective *equal* is first documented in English in Chaucer's *A Treatise on the Astrolabe* which is dated around 1400. He used it in the following sentence: "To turn the howres inequales in howres equales [L. Ad conuertendum horas inequales in horas equales]" (OED Online 2000). The form of the word Chaucer used is Latin, he did not adapt it to English. Since this word does not convey a notion unknown to English people before, this is a case of luxury borrowing because the already existing words denoting the same (*same, even*) are replaced by a borrowing without bringing new senses. The meaning in the sense used by Chaucer is explained in the OED to denote: "Of magnitude or numbers: Identical in amount; neither less nor greater than the object of comparison. Of things: Having the same measure;

identical in magnitude, number, value, intensity, etc.” (OED Online 2000). This use of the adjective is restricted to the amounts and measurements found in the real world, it is basically a comparison of two things expressed in numbers or terms related to measurements.

It is important to say that the next example cited in the OED, after Chaucer's sentences from around 1400, is from 1526, more than a century later, in a work by W. Bonde. This probably means that the occurrence of the word in Chaucer's work is an earlier one and was not generally accepted by wider English audience. “An earlier occurrence of any word is always possible”, say Baugh and Cable (1978, 214). The reason for that might be found in the fact that Chaucer used Latin form of the word and it was because of that seen as a foreign word for a long time. If he had anglicized it, the borrowing could have been accepted much earlier.

The next sense which occurred in English was used to denote: “possessing a like degree of a (specified or implied) quality or attribute; on the same level in rank, dignity, power, ability, achievement, or excellence; having the same rights or privileges” (OED Online 2000). This sense is documented for the first time in 1526 in W. Bonde's *Pylgrimage of Perfection*. Elyot's use of the word points to this sense, since he compares his patron, King Henry VIII, to other most excellent rulers: “Whiche is by no man sooner perceyued than by your highnes, beinge bothe in wysedome and very nobilitie **equall** to the most excellent princes, whome, I beseche god, ye may surmount in longe life and perfect felicitie Amen.” (Elyot 1531, 4)

In Elyot's opinion, his patron is comparable in his ability and excellence to the best of them, whatever quality they had and whatever they may have achieved, Henry VII is not minor to them. There are no exact measurements as in the previous sense of the word, but an imagined scale on which the King is on the same level as “the most excellent princes”. This leap of meaning from physical and real-world equality of numbers and magnitudes to perceived equality of rank or status could be attributed to both semantic change which happened inside English or to another act of borrowing from Latin, since Latin already had this metaphorical sense of the word.

Both cases are possible, and even though Chaucer's borrowing was not yet widely accepted into English, he was a famous author. If the semantic shift did take place in English, the mechanism employed here had to be metaphor. The similarity and resemblance of physical

equality of two numbers or amounts is paralleled by the similarity of rank, dignity, power, ability, etc., even though this similarity cannot in any way be as exact as the one expressed in numbers. Also, there is no exact measurement of e.g. one's ability or excellence.

A number of new senses of the word appeared in the 17th century, only to become obsolete or rarely used later. Majority of them described the notion of being on the same level or equality of the manner and degree. E.g. in 1626, a sense is documented which is described as “of movements, pressure, heat, light, etc.: Even, free from fluctuation in rate or intensity”. In 1661, another sense: “of distribution, mixture, etc.:Evenly proportioned” is documented, which was also used: “of rules, laws, conditions, processes, or actions (hence of agents): Affecting all objects in the same manner and degree; uniform in effect or operation”. And another sense in 1663: “uniform throughout in appearance, dimensions, or properties” (OED Online 2000).

What appears to be a slightly different use of the adjective, but still comparable to other senses found in 17th century, is the sense denoting: “of the mind, temper, demeanour, tone of voice: Even, tranquil, undisturbed, unruffled” (OED Online 2000). The feature of tranquility is further removed from the original notion of *equal* than the others. The similarity between tranquility and equality (as a product of comparing) is not easily perceived, they may not be related at all. The tranquility is probably connected to it through the feature of evenness and uniformity of manner.

All these senses can be understood as the same concept set against different backgrounds or contexts, either movement, pressure, heat, light; surfaces; distribution and mixtures; or rules, law, processes or actions. The domains are changed, but the principle, on which the notion of *equal* is based, remained the same. Concepts are not fixed entities, but they emerge in the act of conceptualization when characterized against multiple domains which are selectively activated.

There are two Latin adjectives which influenced English *equal*: *aequus* and *aequalis*. The situation is further complicated by the fact that *aequalis* is a derivative of *aequus*: “As the form of the Latin ‘aequus’ does not permit it to be directly anglicized without the addition of a suffix, the English ‘equal’ represents the senses of that word as well as those of its derivative ‘aequalis’” (OED Online 2000). *Aequus* was originally used for describing a place,

especially in the works of historians when describing strategic positions, and the meaning was: “that extends or lies in a horizontal direction, plain, even, level, flat” (Lewis and Short 1879). It was used this way by Caesar, Sallust, Cicero, Livy, and Tacitus among others. This sense was limited to the spatial domain to express horizontality and flatness.

A sentence from Cicero's *De Oratoribus* in which he used *aequus* in its original meaning to illustrate the spatial relations of people listening and speaking, could give the answer to the question of the invention of the other, metaphorical, sense of the word. The sentence is: “*sive loquitur ex inferiore loco sive aequo sive ex superiore*<sup>16</sup>” (Lewis and Short 1879) and, according to Lewis and Short, this can be translated as: “i. e. before the judges, sitting on raised seats, or in the Senate, or in the assembly of the people from the rostra”. When a person is summoned to the court to answer in front of the judges, his or her physical position of standing is lower than that of the judges since they are sitting on raised chairs, and at the same time his or her position on the hierarchical scale is inferior to them. When speaking from the *Rostra*<sup>17</sup>, a speaker is superior to the assembly of the people listening to him because they are quietly listening to his words spoken with a certain authority (not everyone could speak from the Rostra), and at the same time he is physically standing on a higher place than they are.

The height of one's place of standing (or sitting) is in these and other examples seen as connected to one's social position in a certain situation. This connection is metaphorical, the similarity of notions create the possibility of the transfer of a word to another domain. The metaphorical change is visible in Cicero's sentence where he refers to speaking in front of the Senate as speaking on the same level. Since it is a fact that senators were not all seated on the same level (lines of seats were somewhat raised above to the ones in front of them), this equality that Cicero speaks about is a metaphorical one. This metaphorical change created a sense which is in Lewis and Short described to denote: “That is equal to another in any quality, equal, like”. The same level in the terms of spatial relations thus gave rise to the equality in any way. Another part of this sense refers to “things divided into two equal parts: a half”. Equality in this case implies the equality of amount – two halves of one thing must be equal.

---

<sup>16</sup> if he is speaking from inferior, equal, or superior position

<sup>17</sup> a stage or platform for speakers in the Forum (Lewis and Short 1879)

*Aequus* was also used with the sense “favorable, convenient, advantageous” (Lewis and Short 1879) when referring to a place, time, or in general of persons and things. *Aequus* at first denoted horizontal, flat, and even place, especially in the context of military strategies, and for that reason it is no wonder that these two notions became connected, since these qualities of a place were advantageous in battles: “as a level place is more favorable for military operations than an uneven one” (Lewis and Short 1879). In this way, a metonymy was created between two close notions which became intertwined in people's minds. It was later extended to refer to time, persons or things in general.

When talking about people, the abovementioned semantic shift based on the closeness of concepts created a sense related to moral characteristics of a person: “fair, equitable, impartial in conduct toward others” (Lewis and Short 1879). This sense directly influenced the meaning of English borrowing *equal*, and according to the OED, the word was used since 1535 “in sense of Latin 'aequus': Fair, equitable, just, impartial” (OED Online), but this way of use is obsolete now.

Another sense used the same way in Latin and English concerns the state of mind, temper, or demeanour. This sense is in English *equal* explained to indicate “of the mind, temper, demeanour, tone of voice: even, tranquil, undisturbed, unruffled” (OED Online 2000). The same sense is in Latin *aequus* described as “even, unruffled, calm, composed, tranquil, patient, enduring” (Lewis and Short 1879). Since the way of use and contexts in which these senses can be used are the same, the only explanation is that this sense is taken directly from Latin written texts into English, without any semantic change taking place.

The adjective *aequalis* is the direct etymon of English *equal*: “Etymology: < Latin *aequalis* < *aequus* level, even, just” (OED Online 2000). It is derived from the adjective *aequus* by adding the suffix *-alis*. The prototypical meaning attributed to *aequalis* is “that can be put on an equality with; conseq., equal, like” (Lewis and Short 1879). This meaning can be compared to the metaphorical sense of the adjective *aequus*: “that is equal to another in any quality, equal, like” which means that, in this case, only the form of the word is new, but the meaning is taken from the already existent adjective. “There seems to be a general rule allowing the substitution of unmarked, or less marked forms for marked, or more marked



ones" (Lüdtke 1999, 53). *Aequalis*, being a more marked form than *aequus*, won over the meaning previously attributed to *aequus* following the process of semantic encroachment: "the more frequent 'signifié' wins the (in a pseudo-Darwinian sense) fitter 'signifiant' over to its side" (Lüdtke 1999, 55). In other words, a new and marked form of the word is better suited for the already well-known meaning.

The majority of the senses of the word *equal* which have been used in English from the first borrowing of the word in the 16th century to the present time are influenced mostly by this sense of Latin *aequalis*. It is the concept of comparison of two subjects which is the basis of the most senses of the words *aequalis* and *equal*. That comparison (which needs to have the same level or amount as the final product) is crucial to the meaning of Latin *aequalis*, the same way as it was crucial to the sense of the newly borrowed word when it entered English for the first time.

Later, this concept of comparison expanded to denote many things, in both Latin and English. E.g., in Latin, it was frequently used to denote "that can be compared in respect to age, of the same age, equally old (...) contemporary, coeval (...) coeval, coexistent" (Lewis and Short 1879). How did this change from *equality* to the same age or coexistence happen? Since metonymy is regarded as an abbreviation device by Warren, she claims that what is mentioned and what is left out are so closely connected that the unuttered concepts are easily retrieved. Basically, the parts of sentences containing the terms expressing the age were left out because they were so closely connected with what was mentioned in the sentence that it was unnecessary to utter them.

*Aequalis* was also used metaphorically, especially by poets, to create similes. E.g. "florentes aequali corpore Nymphae<sup>18</sup>. Verg. Cir. 435" (Lewis and Short 1879). This comparison is not rooted in the real state of affairs, but it is an imagined similarity exaggerated to the point it approximated equality.

A somewhat different use of the adjective can be found in the sense "Uniform, equable, unvarying" (Lewis and Short 1879). Uniformity implied here can be understood to denote that something is done in an equal and unvarying manner or degree, which means that here

---

<sup>18</sup> The bodies of Nymphs equal to flower

again the abbreviation triggered by close connection of mentioned and unmentioned happened, i.e. metonymy as an abbreviation device.

*Aequus* and *aequalis* are the two Latin etymons of English *equal*. However, *aequalis* is considered to be the direct etymon of *equal*, while it is, at the same time, derived from *aequus*. Both adjectives underwent semantic change in Latin acquiring many different metaphorical and metonymical meanings. *Aequalis* was more subjected to metonymical change, while the changes that affected *aequus* were mostly metaphorical in nature. The concept of similarity and the comparison expressed through measurements were the first senses connected to the English word *equal*. Later, through metaphor, this sense was paralleled to denote the similarity of rank, dignity, power, ability, etc. The same concept was, then, set against different backgrounds and contexts to create a number of senses connected to movement, pressure, heat, light, rules, law, actions, etc.

## 6. Conclusion

The effect Latin had on every modern language of Europe is enormous. English is not exception to that. Although a part of the Germanic branch of Indo-European languages, the influence of Latin and one of its successors, French, made English, according to Baugh and Cable, almost a Romance language, at least when vocabulary is in question. Through many years of Roman occupation and the arrival of Christianity to England, Latin established its authority over plain and vulgar English. It was not until the sixteenth century that the scholars started to think of English as a language suitable for literal, philosophical, and scientific work. However, it needed refinement and enrichment because it lacked words to express such fine thought. Sir Thomas Elyot, together with other great scholars of the period, undertook the task of the enrichment. Since he was a great admirer of classical thought and culture, and since Latin was to him (and to his educated contemporaries) almost a second mother tongue, the voids of the English vocabulary were filled with numerous Latin loanwords.

His most important work, *The Booke named the Governour*, is a great example of this effort. The subject of the book is the education of future statesmen, and on many occasions, he refers to ancient and classical sources of his thoughts and beliefs. His great patriotic decision to write in English was not discouraged by the inadequacy of the English vocabulary, for this was corrected by the corresponding Latin terms. Moreover, in some cases, even if there was an English word for the notion he wanted to express, Elyot opted for a luxury borrowing – the more Latin words imported, the more refined English becomes!

The introductory chapter of his book – *The Proheme*, counts eight Latin borrowings which were either introduced in the English during the sixteenth century, or their meanings were changed in the same period. All of these words, naturally, underwent a considerable number of semantic changes and acquired a great number of new senses since their first appearance in Latin and afterwards in English. When words are frequently used, they appear in more than one context, and these new contexts change their semantic fields by adding or replacing some of the features. If we think of a semantic field of a word as a prototypically organized category with only one prototype per category and other members radially

clustered around it, the changes that happen to the word can be seen as the expansions of these prototypical categories. The processes which act as forces expanding them are semantic mechanisms. According to a number of linguists, the semantic mechanisms can be reduced to metaphor and metonymy, with all other ways of semantic expansion subsumable under them. These mechanisms are, according to some scientists, not only involved in the change of semantic fields, but are also cognitive forces shaping our thoughts in general.

The difference between metaphor and metonymy is the way in which they profile activities against background assumptions. Metaphor creates change by mapping across the conceptual domains, while metonymy involves mapping within the domains. Even though metaphor was for a long time considered the most important mechanism of change, metonymy is today seen as the cornerstone of human cognition and language use.

My research demonstrates the abovementioned facts that metaphor and metonymy are the two basic cognitive and linguistic processes, and that metonymy is more common than metaphor. The analysis of the semantic changes of the eight words chosen from *The Proheme* shows that from 51 changes that happened in the history of these words, 31 changes were created by metonymy, while only 20 were created by metaphor. The words *describe* and *dedicate* underwent no metaphorical change at all, and *education* and *devulgate* have only one metaphorically created sense. The exceptions are two words: *violently* (four metaphors, one metonymy) and *animate* (seven metaphors, three metonymies), which have more metaphorically than metonymically created senses. All other words were changed mostly by metonymy, with a small number of metaphors.

The language is a part of human thought and culture, and it behaves like our other cognitive functions. Metonymy, as the cornerstone mechanism of human thought, is believed to be deeply rooted in the relations which exist in the outside world and culture. Knowing that, as mentioned in the beginning, the success of a language depends on the culture it belongs to, it is obvious that we cannot escape the cultural and social influence on the language – they determine where we borrow from and how we do it.

## 7. List of sources cited in the text

Anttila, Raimo. 2005. "Analogy: The Warp and Woof of Cognition." In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, edited by Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda, 425-441. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Austin, John L. 1975. *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Baugh, Albert C., and Thomas Cable. 1978. *A History of the English Language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Blank, Andreas. 1999. "Why do new meanings occur?" In *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, edited by Andreas Blank and Peter Koch, 61-89. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bredin, Hugh. 1984. "Metonymy." *Poetics Today*, Vol. 5, No. 1: 45-58. JSTOR. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1772425>

Bybee, Joan. 2005. "Mechanisms of Change in Grammaticalization: The Role of Frequency." In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, edited by Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda, 602-623. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. 55 BC. *De Oratore*. Translated by E.W. Sutton. London: William Heinemann Ltd.

Clackson, James, and Geoffrey Horrocks. 2007. *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Closs Traugott, Elizabeth. 2005. "Constructions in Grammaticalization." In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, edited by Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda, 624-647. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Closs Traugott, Elizabeth. 2017. *Semantic Change*. Oxford Research Encyclopedias. Accessed May, 2018.

<http://linguistics.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-323>

Dewar, Matthew D. 2016. *Education and Well-Being. An Ontological Inquiry*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

DuCange, Charles du Fresne et al. 1887. *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*. Accessed May, 2018. <http://ducange.enc.sorbonne.fr/>

Elyot, Sir Thomas. 1531. *The Booke named the Governour*. London: J. M. Dent & Co.

*Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*. Accessed December, 2017. <https://www.britannica.com/>

Forcellini, Egidio et al. 1828. *Totius Latinitatis lexicon*. Toronto: Londini, Baldwin et Cradock.

Fortson IV, Benjamin W. 2005. "An Approach to Semantic Change." In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, edited by Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda, 648-667. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Geeraerts, Dirk. 1999. "Diachronic prototype semantics. A digest." In *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, edited by Andreas Blank and Peter Koch, 91-107. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Grey Thomason, Sarah. 2005. "Contact as a Source of Language Change." In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, edited by Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda, 687-712. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Heine, Bernd. 2005. "Grammaticalization." In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, edited by Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda, 575-601. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Hogrefe, Pearl. 1963. "Sir Thomas Elyot's Intention in the Opening Chapters of the *Governour*." *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 60, No. 2, Part 1: 133-140. JSTOR. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4173411>

Hornby, A. S. 1995. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Fifth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krefeld, Thomas. 1999. "Cognitive ease and lexical borrowing: the recategorization of body parts in Romance." In *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, edited by Andreas Blank and Peter Koch, 259-277. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lewis, Charlton T., and Charles Short. 1879. *A Latin Dictionary*. Perseus Digital Library. Accessed May, 2018. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>

Lüdtke, Helmut. 1999. "Diachronic semantics: towards a unified theory of language change?" In *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, edited by Andreas Blank and Peter Koch, 49-59. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

McIntyre, Dan. 2009. *History of English Language. A resource book for students*. Abingdon: Routledge.

*Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online*. Accessed May, 2018. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>

Nerlich, Brigitte, and David D. Clarke. 1999. "Synecdoche as a cognitive and communicative strategy." In *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, edited by Andreas Blank and Peter Koch, 197-213. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

*Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Accessed December, 2017. <http://www.oed.com/>

Onians, R. B. 1951. *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rastier, François. 1999. "Cognitive semantics and diachronic semantics: the values and evolution of classes." In *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, edited by Andreas Blank and Peter Koch, 109-143. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Steen, Gerard. 2005. "Metonymy Goes Cognitive-Linguistic". *Style*, Vol.39, No. 1 , Metonymy (Spring): 1-11. JSTOR. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/style.39.1.1>

Stein, Gabriele. 2014. *Sir Thomas Elyot as Lexicographer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, John R. 1999. "Cognitive Semantics and Structural Semantics." In *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, edited by Andreas Blank and Peter Koch, 17-48. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Warren, Beatrice. 1999. "Laws of thought, knowledge and lexical change." In *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, edited by Andreas Blank and Peter Koch, 215-234. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Westin Tikkanen, Karin. 2012. "The Consequences of Truth." In *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology*, Vol.22, No. 1: 19-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.2214>

Wolfram, Walt, and Natalie Schilling-Estes. 2005. "Dialectology and Linguistic Diffusion." In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, edited by Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda, 713-735. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.



## **Abstract**