One Lexicological Theory, two Lexicographical Models and the Pragmatemes

Lena Papadopoulou
Hellenic Open University
papadopoulou.lena@gmail.com

Abstract

Generally little attention has been paid to pragmatics in most dictionaries. The present paper focuses on the concept of pragmatemes and their lexicographical treatment within the frame of Explanatory Combinatorial Lexicology. First, necessary preliminary notions closely related with pragmatemes are considered, by briefly reviewing the melčukian global model of human linguistic behaviour, linguistic sign and phrasemes typology. Second, the definition of pragmatemes, that is of phrasemes used in given extralinguistic situations, and the central acting part of the conceptual representation of the communicative situation are presented. Following, the structure of Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary (ECD) and PragmatLex are outlined and an illustration of the Greek pragmatemes Συγχαρητήρια ‘Congratulations’ and Συλλυπητήρια ‘Condolences’ is provided within the simplified versions of ECD - Dictionary of Collocations and Lexique actif du français- and the lexicographical model for pragmatemes PragmatLex. Finally, we conclude our paper with a brief discussion on which lexicographical approach is preferable.

Keywords: Meaning Text Theory; phraseology; pragmatemes

1 Introduction

Pragmatics generally is an area of great importance. However, it is relatively poorly treated in the majority of dictionaries, so there is scope for work on this subject. The concept of pragmatemes, that is expressions that are used in specific extralinguistic situations, and the developed models for their lexicographical treatment represent a significant step towards addressing that challenge. This paper aims to present two lexicographical models in which pragmatemes can be processed; the ECD and the PragmatLex. To do so, first our theoretical framework (Meaning⇔Text Theory) will be set, then the definition of pragmatemes will be provided and, following, the dictionaries’ structure will be described and illustrated by processing the Greek pragmateme Συγχαρητήρια ‘Congratulations’ and its antonym Συλλυπητήρια ‘Condolences’. Finally, criteria for model selection will be proposed.
2 Preliminary notions

Our work is framed within Meaning⇔Text Theory (MTT), the main aim of which is to build models of natural languages (among others, Mel’čuk 1988a; Mel’čuk 1997; Mel’čuk 2001b; Polguère 1998; Milićević 2001; Milićević 2006; Kahane 2001). Concept-Sound Model (CSM) is the global model of human linguistic behavior which is developed within MTT:

\[
\text{[WORLD]} \leftrightarrow \{\text{SemR}\} \leftrightarrow \{\text{SPhonR}\} \leftrightarrow \{\text{LINGUISTIC SOUNDS}\}
\]

Figure 1: Concept-Sound Model (Mel’čuk 2012: 170-181).

Conceptics, Meaning-Text Model (MTM) and Phonetics/Graphics are the three major models of CSM which represent the production of an utterance. First, Conceptics model captures the construction of a semantic representation (SemR) based on the conceptual representation (ConceptR) of the given extralinguistic situation (SIT). Second, MTM describes the construction of the Phonological Representation (PhonR) of the given SemR. The third model - Phonetics/Graphics- represents the construction of the corresponding sound/letter string for the given PhonR.

A typology of linguistic signs has been established within MTT based on the transitions between these three models and the applied restrictions. A simple linguistic sign within MTT corresponds to the triplet of \(X = <'X'; /X/; \Sigma X>\), where ‘\(X\)’ is the signified, /\(X\)/ the signifier and \(\Sigma X\) the combinatorial properties of the linguistic sign \(X\). Simple linguistic signs are combined into complex linguistic signs. The notions of unrestrictedness and regularity are implied by such combination, that is freedom in the selection of meanings and lexical units and the compositionality, respectively.

Free phrases are complex linguistic signs whose signified and signifier are constructed both unrestrictedly and regularly, while on the contrary phrasemes, or non free phrases, are not. Phrasemes are classified into semantic phrasemes and pragmatic phrasemes, or pragmetemes, (Mel’čuk 1995; Mel’čuk 1998). On the one hand, pragmetemes are restrictedly constructed by the ConceptR(SIT). On the other hand, the signified ‘\(X\)’ of a semantic phraseme is unrestrictedly constructed by the ConceptR(SIT) but its signifier /\(X\)/ is constrained by the selected SemR. Semantic phrasemes are non compositional and they are categorized into three types on the basis of their semantic opacity: (i) full idioms, (ii) semi-idioms, or collocations, and (iii) quasi-idioms.

3 Pragmatemes

Pragmatemes are compositional phrasemes whose signified is restrictedly constructed by the Conceptual Representation of the given extralinguistic situation (Mel’čuk 1998). Blanco (to appear) points out that this definition concerns the prototypical pragmatemes. On the one hand, a pragmateme can
be both constrained by the ConceptR and the SemR, i.e. the idiom/pragmateme break a leg [to wish good luck to actors and musicians before they go on stage to perform]. On the other hand, a lexeme whose signified is bound by the Concept(SIT) is considered as a pragmateme, i.e. Congratulations. The ConceptR(SIT) plays the lead role in pragmatemes definition Although, Mel’čuk recognizes the inherent difficulties in defining the extralinguistic reality, he proposes that ConceptR is based on three main models (2001a, p. 90): (i) the speaker’s model, (ii) the speaker’s model of the addressee and (iii) the situation’s model. The ConceptR(SIT) of the pragmateme break a leg will be based on that ‘I am addressing to an actor which is going on stage to perform. I wish (s)he will have a successful presentation. If I were (s)he I would like to be encouraged. I will wish him/her good luck, as I should do.’ (speaker’s model), ‘(S)he is thinking that (s)he is going on stage to perform, that (s)he is stressed, that (s)he expects to be encouraged’ (speaker’s model of the addressee) and on that ‘the speaker wants to encourage a performer before going on the stage by wishing him good luck ’ (situation’s model).

4 Lexicological processing of pragmatemes

Once the pragmatemes have been defined and before moving to the presentation of the two lexicological models for pragmatemes, which are both framed within Explanatory Combinatorial Lexicology, some preliminary remarks upon pragmatemes have to been made. Although pragmatemes are linguistic signs, they are not considered to be LUs, because they dispose of an internal argumental structure, so as they are ordered within the keyword(s) that phraseologically bind(s) them, that is within the LU(s) that can define the SIT of the pragmateme. It has to been also pointed out that pragmatemes and specifically their SIT is described by non standard lexical functions (LFs) (Mel’čuk, 1995); (Blanco, 2010).

4.1 Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionaries

Explanatory Combinatorial Lexicology is developed within the MTT (among others, Mel’čuk & Zholkovsky 1984; Mel’čuk 1988b; Mel’čuk 1995; Mel’čuk, Clas, & Polguère 1995; Mel’čuk 2006b; Mel’čuk & Polguère 2007) and Explanatory Combinatorial dictionaries (ECD) are compiled within it. ECDs are highly formal theoretical lexicons, whose entries are exhaustively described on the basis of explicitness and consistency. The macrostructure of an ECD is structured by super-entries, entries and sub-entries. Vocables constitute the super-entries, which are sets of lexical units (LUs) that share the same signifier and they are linked by a semantic bridge, LUs are the entries, which can correspond to lexemes, idioms or quasi-idioms, and collocations and pragmatemes are considered to be sub-entries. As far is microstructure is concerned, it is structured in four zones: (i) the semantic, (ii) the phonological/graphematic zone, the (iii) syntactics zone and (iv) illustrative zone.
Due to the theoretical basis of ECD and its subsequent high lengthiness, the Dictionary of Collocations (DiCo) and Lexique actif du français (LAF) have been developed as simplified versions. DiCo (Dictionary of Collocations) is the formalized version of the purely “theoretical” ECD. DiCo is sort of a “simplified” and more formalized ECD and in which the lexical units are structured as a series of eight main fields: (i) Name of the unit, (ii) grammatical properties, (iii) semantic formula, (iv) government pattern, (v) synonyms, (vi) semantic derivations and collocations, (vii) examples and (viii) full idioms that include the LU (Polguère 2000: 519) and LAF is the “popularized” version of the ECD which attempt to bridge the gap between “theoretical” and “commercial” lexicography with regard to explanatory combinatorial lexicology in order to be as much as possible accessible to a public of non-specialists (Polguère 2000: 522-3).

Following an illustrative example of processing the Greek pragmateme Συλλυπητήρια ‘Condolences’ (Figure 2 and 3) (Papadopoulou to appear) within the keyword-LU, respectively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a ΠΕΝΘΟΣ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom, neutr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentiment négatif : ~ του ατόμου X για το γεγονός Z του ατόμου Y με W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIΙΥΙΙΙ1, XIΙΙΥΙΙ2Z1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{QSyn}Θλίψη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{A0} expression of sympathy for Y on Z συλλυπητήριος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{A0}πένθιμος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{A0Locin a nation}εθνικό ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{AntiVer.A1} βαρυπενθών (ironic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{CausMagnFact0}βαθιά ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{expression of sympathy for Y on Z}συλλυπητήρια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{FinV0}βγάζω τα μαύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Mgn expression of sympathy for Y on Z}βαθιά, θερμά&lt;ολόθερμα συλλυπητήρια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Magn.A1}βοηθημένος στο ~, βαρυπενθών (literary)&lt; βοηθημένος στο μαύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Magn}βαρό ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{MagnLocin Greek nation}πανελλήνιο ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{MagnV0}βαρυπενθώ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Oper expression of sympathy for Y on Z}εκφράζω, απευθύνω, δίνω, στέλνω, λέω συλλυπητήρια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{to support X through ~}συμπαραστέκομαι στο ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{to sympathize with X in ~}συμμετέχω στο ~, συλλυπούμαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Ver expression of sympathy for Y on Z}ειλικρινή&lt;εγκάρδια&lt;ολόψυχα συλλυπητήρια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{X=’Y’s husband}χήρος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{X=’Y’s wife who AntiV0}εύθυμη ~ (ironic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{X=’Y’s wife}χήρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Z= death}θάνατος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Όλο το έθνος πενθεί (για) το θάνατο του ηγέτη.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 LU a ΠΕΝΘΟΣ in DiCo (Papadopoulou to appear).
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4.2 PragmatLex

Please note that there must always be at least two level 2 and level 3 headings if you need to use these in your paper (e.g. at least 4.1 and 4.2 Blanco (2010; to appear a; to appear b) obviously based on MTT and recognizing the lack of dictionaries of ECD type in the majority of languages proposed the PragmatLex, which is designated as a lexicographical model for the processing of pragmatemes. PragmatLex is highly formal and it provides an exhaustive description for each pragmateme, which is structured in thirteen fields. It is worth pointing out that PragmatLex is written in XML in order to be applicable to NLP systems.

PragmatLex is a dictionary of monolingual coordinated dictionary type (Blanco 2001), considering that the translation equivalence of each pragmateme is provided linearly according to the overall microstructure information, so as the description of pragmatemes is entailed within the language indication: ⟨<ARTICLE language="">description of pragmatemes</ARTICLE language ="">”. First, the canonical form of the pragmateme is indicated Lemma>canonical form of the pragmateme</Lemma>. Second, the morphosyntax of the pragmateme is annotated based on the six deep-syntactic parts of speech (Mel’čuk 2006a). Third, the translation equivalence is provided in the target language.
according to the corresponding structure of the L2 PragμatLex. Following, the LU-keyword(s), the definition of the SIT, the performing Speech act, the semantic structure and the lexical functions of the pragmateme are indicated. Afterwards, the coda, that is pragmatemes extensions which with no semantic addition complement the pragmatemes, the synonyms and the antonyms of the pragmateme and, finally, the decomposition of the local grammar that may the lemma disposes.

In the following figures the pragmatemes Συλλυπητήρια-Condolencias ‘Condolences’ (Papadopoulou to appear) and Συγχαρητήρια-Felicidades ‘Congratulations’ are shown within PragμatLex in Greek and Spanish language:

![Figure 4: Συλλυπητήρια in PragμatLex (Papadopoulou to appear).](image-url)

```xml
<ARTICLE language="el">
  <Lemma>Συλλυπητήρια</Lemma>
  <Morphosyntax>N</Morphosyntax>
  <TRANSLATION language="es">condolencias</TRANSLATION>
  <Keyword>πένθος, κηδεία</Keyword>
  <SIT>expresión escrita u oral de compasión hacia alguien en duelo</SIT>
  <SPEECH ACT>compadecerse</SPEECH ACT>
  <SS>~ Χ[of X, Aposs, Adj (p.ej. προεδρικά συλλυπητήρια] a Υ por Ζ</SS>
  <LF>
    <Magn>βαθιά, θερμά<ολόθερμα</Magn>
    <Ver>ειλικρινή<εγκάρδια<ολόψυχα</Ver>
    <Oper>εκφράζω, απευθύνω, δίνω, στέλνω, λέω</Oper>
    <V0>συλλυπούμαι</V0>
    <A0>συλλυπητήριος</A0>
  </LF>
  <CODA>
    <01>Γεροί να είστε να τον θυμάστε</01>
    <02>Να ζήσετε να τον θυμάστε</02>
    <03>Ζωή σ’ εσάς</03>
    <04>Ζωή σε λόγου σας</04>
  </CODA>
  <SYNONYM>-</SYNONYM>
  <ANTONYM>συγχαρητήρια</ANTONYM>
  <PARADIGM>-</PARADIGM>
</ARTICLE>
```
Figure 5: *Condolencias* in PragμatLex (Papadopoulou to appear).

Figure 6: *Συγχαρητήρια* in PragμatLex.
5 ECD or PragμatLex?

ECD, or PragμatLex, that is NOT the question, as two different types of dictionaries are concerned, which are based on the same lexicological theory, yet; ECD is a dictionary of lexical units and PragμatLex is a dictionary of pragmatemes. However, we could answer the question in three different rounds from three different points of view.

First, the ideal lexicographical treatment of pragmatemes is within ECD, given that ECD’s structure provides a global description of pragmatemes within their semantic frame (lexical units’ links). However, there are no available complete ECD dictionaries for all languages. Second, PragμatLex’ structure is proper for pragmatemes processing, as it focuses only on pragmatemes. Third, we propose a parallel processing of ECD and PragμatLex, that is the lexicographer elaborates pragmatemes which are associated with a keyword within PragμatLex and (s)he incorporates these data into the structure of ECD, i.e. the information of pragmateme condolences can be introduced as subentries into the structure of the lexical unit MOURNING (Papadopoulou, to appear) or congratulations into WEDDING.
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