

# The Croatian Suffix *-stv(o)*: A Study of Meaning and Polysemy in Word Formation

Gabrijela Buljan

*Abstract:* This paper reports the results of an exploratory semantic analysis of Croatian suffixations in *-stv(o)*. The suffix builds nouns which denote qualities, professions, states, collectivities, etc., and most suffixations take different interpretations in different contexts. Our aim is to identify the suffix's most type-frequent and productive meanings as well as typical patterns of polysemy in *-stv(o)* derivatives and their main motivating mechanisms. Assuming a usage-based Cognitive Grammar stance and Barcelona's (2011) gradient view of metonymy, we examine an extensive corpus of suffixations and propose low-level generalizations, i.e., symbolic schemas that are shown to be variably frequent and productive. Although no single superschema can capture the extreme semantic variability of *-stv(o)* derivatives, we identify various local patterns of polysemy, which are predominantly motivated by metonymy.

## 1. Introduction

This paper reports the results of an exploratory synchronic semantic analysis of Croatian suffixations in *-stv(o)*.<sup>1</sup> The suffix *-stvo* is a Pan-Slavic and Old Slavic suffix attaching mainly to noun and adjective bases to build nouns denoting states (*pijanstvo* 'drunkenness'), roles (*banstvo* 'governorship'), occupations, dominions (*kapetanstvo* 'captainship', *kraljevstvo* 'kingdom'), collectivities (*susjedstvo* 'neighborhood'), etc. (Skok 1971: 354–55). It is a functional counterpart of the English nominalizers *-dom*, *-hood*, *-ship*, *-ness*, *-ity*; German *-schaft*, *-heit*, *-keit*, *-ität*; French *-ance*, *-age*, *-erie*, *-ité*, *-itude*, *-isme*, to name but a few.<sup>2</sup> Our task is challenging: not only does the suffix build nouns of an impressive semantic range, but most suffixations are semantically versatile as well.

---

<sup>1</sup> The suffix *-stv-* and its allomorph *-št-* will be cited with their inflectional morpheme *-o* as *-stvo/-štvo*.

<sup>2</sup> Croatian has several nominalizing suffixes too, e.g., *-ost*, *-in(a)*, *-il(o)*, *-oč(a)*, as do Slavic languages more generally, but the discussion of their distribution and of cross-linguistic similarities and differences is beyond the scope of this paper.

Croatian sources focus mainly on morphophonemic complexities like shortening and expansion of derivational bases. Semantic descriptions amount to lists of semantic groups that are insufficiently motivated (as in Babić 2002) or not motivated at all (as in Silić and Pranjković 2007, or Barić et al. 1997). Babić (2002: 303–10) establishes two discrete meaning hierarchies, one abstract, the other concrete. A suffixation is argued to be polysemous only if its meanings remain within one schematic category. Thus in the abstract group, *govorništvo* ‘rhetoric’ is seen as polysemous between “skill” and “field of study”, but concrete *članstvo* ‘membership’ in “collectivity of members” and abstract *članstvo* in “status as a member” would be two homonyms. Each schematic group has more specific subgroups. For example, under “location” Babić proposes ‘territory under N’s authority’, and ‘room, building where Ns work’. Whereas under “feature typical of N” we find “act”, “behavior”, “state”, “life”, “lifestyle”, “tendency”, “ability”. Babić observes that the subgroups are close but does not elucidate the nature or extent of this closeness, calling for more research in the area. The analysis undertaken here is our response to Babić’s call.

## 2. Theoretical Background and Objective

This study is informed by usage-based Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987, 1991, 1999, 2000, 2008, 2009; Radden and Dirven 2007) and Barcelona’s (2011) prototype- and schema-based definition of metonymy (on metonymy, see Section 3.3). With usage-based cognitive linguistics we share the idea that meaning arises from use. On any occasion of their use, linguistic units serve as points of access to “richly detailed conceptualization that constitutes our full understanding of the expression in context and includes all relevant aspects of the conceived situation” (Langacker 1987: 157). Contextual meaning gives rise to conventional meaning by schematization and entrenchment through repetition (Langacker 2005: 147–55).

Our goal is to examine a corpus of naturalistic data and to propose generalizations about the meanings of the suffixations. We rely on frequency, as one possible operationalization of prototypicality (Geeraerts 1988; Gries 2006: 76; Glynn 2014: 14), to identify *-stov*’s quantitative prototypes, viz. its most type-frequent meanings. Since particular meanings may arise by semantic extension of existing suffixations, we will seek to identify those meanings (i.e., semantic categories) that could figure as parts of more or less productive symbolic word formation (WF) constructions for assembling new suffixations. We also survey major patterns of polysemy in the suffixations and their motivating mechanisms.

Our goals are driven by the following tenets of usage-based models: a user’s language consists of a dynamic network of symbolic constructions (form-meaning pairings) of different levels of complexity, entrenchment, and

schematicity. Frequency of exposure to linguistic units is vital to the building of such networks via entrenchment and pattern extraction. Repetition of fully specific constructions, like words and expressions (token frequency), leads to the entrenchment of their memory representations. Repetition of (partly) schematic symbolic constructions,<sup>3</sup> e.g., a suffixal construction (type frequency), leads to pattern recognition and its entrenchment as a schema that may become available for sanctioning novel specific constructions,<sup>4</sup> like suffixations. (See Bybee 2007, 2008, 2010 and for views from the learner (L2) perspective see Ellis 2012 and Goldberg 2016.) How does this translate to our concerns?

**Schema entrenchment: type frequency and productivity.** Since frequency is one possible manifestation of prototypicality, by identifying the type-dominant meanings we will uncover those portions of *-stvo*'s semantic space that arguably represent users' entrenched knowledge of the suffix. Type-frequent meanings may have spawned low-level schemas like [[PERSON/...]-[[QUALITY/*stvo*]], which is schematic for *pokvarenjaštvo* 'scoundrelness' (< *pokvarenjak* 'scoundrel'), *čudaštvo* 'weirdness' (< *čudak* 'weirdo') and can sanction novel nouns like *zvekanstvo* 'daftness' (< *zvekan* 'daft person').<sup>5</sup>

**Entrenchment of specific forms: token frequency and independent storage.** Highly token-frequent *-stvo* nouns may have been stored as lexically specific symbolic constructions, e.g., *biskupstvo* 'bishopdom' [[BISHOP/*biskup*]-[COLLECTIVITY/*stvo*]] or *pijanstvo* 'drunkenness' [[DRUNK/*pijan*]-[STATE/*stvo*]]. Any polysemous *-stvo* noun may in fact be stored as a network of such constructions if sufficiently token-frequent, each pairing the word's phonological form with one of its meanings, e.g., [[BISHOP/*biskup*]-[ROLE/*stvo*]] and [[BISHOP/*biskup*]-[COLLECTIVITY/*stvo*]]. These constructions vary in entrenchment due to their different token-frequencies, e.g., the "role" construction of *biskupstvo* is

<sup>3</sup> The term "(partly) schematic symbolic construction" refers to (partly) schematic form-meaning pairs ("schemas" for short) whose semantic poles include semantic categories like quality, collectivity, profession, role, etc. Thus, when referring to the type frequency or productivity of semantic categories or meanings, we shall mean the type frequency or productivity of such schematic symbolic constructions.

<sup>4</sup> "Sanction" is a term in Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987: 66–71, 492) that captures the essentially categorizing relationship between conventional units in a language (e.g., entrenched WF constructions) as sanctioning units and novel structures assembled in accordance with the specifications of those sanctioning units.

<sup>5</sup> Admittedly, the existence of many types, especially high-frequency ones, does not guarantee schema productivity (Baayen and Lieber 1991; Bybee 1995: 434). High-frequency items have strong memory representations and can be accessed independently of the schema they instantiate (cf. the autonomy effect of token frequency, Bybee and Moder 1983), and thus fail to contribute to the schema's productivity. We believe this is not the case with *-stvo*. It does occur in very frequent nouns (*iskustvo* 'experience' N = 329 081), but also in many with fewer than 10 tokens (N > 200 or 28%), making schemas plausible.

more entrenched than the “collective” one. We will identify token-dominant uses of each noun in our database since they are likely to be the synchronically conventional meanings. It could be argued, from a synchronic point of view at least, that they are the likely sources of semantic extension to the other, less frequent, uses. However, it will be seen that semantic extension can also operate from less well-established concepts, referred to by Langacker as “local prototypes”, to novel target interpretations (Langacker 1987: 380–81, 383).

Several theoretical and methodological challenges are addressed in Section 3. In Section 4 we explain our methodology. Section 5 presents our results and a detailed discussion of the three most robust semantic categories. A general discussion of the findings, conclusions, and limitations of the study are given in Section 6. The paper ends with the Appendix, which reports in brief on the semantic categories that could not be addressed in detail within the confines of this paper.

### 3. Some Challenges in WF Semantics

Any study in WF semantics faces at least the following challenges:

- i. Semantic category: what counts as a category of meaning in (abstract) nominalizations?
- ii. Lexical semantic variation: are variant uses of suffixations cases of polysemy or monosemy?
- iii. Motivation for lexical semantic variation: metonymy or facetization (Paradis 2004)?
- iv. WF schemas: are particular corpus examples products of derivation or lexical semantics?
- v. WF schema polysemy: can we speak of suffixal polysemy over and beyond the polysemy of suffixations? Is the suffix polysemous or accidentally multifunctional? In either case, how has the polysemy/multifunctionality developed?

We focus on questions i–iii. Our exploratory corpus methodology does allow some hypotheses about WF schemas (question iv, section 3.4), but proving the existence/psychological reality of WF schemas and of polysemy links between them (question v) is beyond the scope of this study.<sup>6</sup> Still, some critical com-

<sup>6</sup> Diachronic (corpus) research should establish whether affixal multifunctionality is (a) semantically motivated (affixal polysemy) or (b) a historical accident (cf. Luschützky and Rainer 2013). If (a), how has the polysemy developed: bottom up, by reading into the affix postderivational semantic changes in derivatives or abruptly, by allowing

ments are given on the likelihood of a strong form of polysemy (a single overarching superschema) in Section 3.4.

### 3.1. Semantic Categories

While “quality”, “state”, “condition”, “rank”, “action”, etc. have been used as semantic categories for describing similar suffixes in other languages (Marchand 1969; Lehrer 2003; Plag 2003; Lieber 2004; Trips 2009; OED), there is little consistency in their use. For instance, it is often unclear whether “state” and “condition”, or even “quality” and “status” are used as labels for distinct categories or synonyms. For Marchand (1969) *bachelordom* means “a state or condition”. In the OED entry for the English free form *hood*, *cild-hād* is glossed as ‘child-condition’. Trips (2009: 51) speaks of OE *cildhād* ‘childhood’ as a “state”. Haspelmath and Sims (2010: 87) showcase *childhood* as a “status” noun. Merriam Webster’s simple definition of *state* is “the overall physical condition of something [...]”. The entry for *condition* includes, among others “the state in which something exists: the physical state of something” or “the physical or mental state of a person or animal”. *State* and *condition* can also mean “social status”, “high rank”, which are also found as meanings of nominalizing suffixes. Several factors cause this inconsistency. First, the abstract nature of most suffixations makes them elusive to rigorous characterization.<sup>7</sup> Secondly, word formation categories are prototype-structured (Szymanek 1988: 62–66; Štekauer, Valera, and Körtvélyessy 2012: 6). Their cores may stand out in some relief, but each category has suffixations at its periphery lying close to neighboring categories (e.g., *piratstvo* ‘piracy’ “profession/occupation” lying close to “behavior/quality”, cf. fn. 28). Thirdly, an example may fit several semantic categories simultaneously (on multiple motivation see Peirsman and Geeraerts 2006: 286; Umbreit 2011), e.g., *veleposlanstvo* ‘embassy’ is a “concrete institution” and a “location”. The final issue is the optimal level of analytical granularity. What is gained or lost by assuming general categories like “collectivity” as opposed to “collectivity of people” vs. “collectivity of objects” vs. “abstract collectivity”; or even “collectivity of people” as opposed to “collectivity of people defined by geographical identity” vs. “collectivity of people in a status”, etc? In Sections 3.4 and 4 we explain how we proceeded on issues of granularity and multiple motivation. In Sections 5.1 to 5.3 we define

---

metaphor and metonymy to add functions to the affix in the very act of derivation (cf. reinterpretation vs. approximation, Rainer 2005). Psycholinguistic experiments could complement this with a cognitive storage/processing perspective. Mental connections that language users make/store between cognitive representations like WF schemas need not match their diachronic development (Rainer 2014: 349).

<sup>7</sup> Concrete categories are no exception, e.g., “location” and “instrument” (Luschützky and Rainer 2013: 1302–05).

the three semantic categories taken up for detailed analysis. The remainder is explained in the Appendix. One-off and rare meanings, like the “meeting” interpretation of *predsjedništvo* ‘presidency’ (*predsjedništvo je trajalo satima*, lit. presidency AUX lasted for-hours, ‘the presidency meeting lasted hours’), are left out of discussion.

### 3.2. Lexical Semantic Variation: Polysemy or Monosemy

Virtually all suffixations allow multiple interpretations. Whether these are distinct related senses or contextual variants of a single meaning is part of the persistent problem of distinguishing polysemy from monosemy. We cannot discuss the rich history of this research. The question has been debated in linguistics, lexicography, and psycholinguistics, often with conflicting results (see Falkum and Vicente 2015). Linguistic tests for distinguishing polysemy from monosemy, e.g., identity test by conjunction reduction (Zwicky and Saddock 1975) or anaphoric reference test (Cruse 2004) may fail in the face of contextualized language data (Geeraerts 1993; Norrick 1981: 115).<sup>8</sup> In contrast, Zlatev (2003) treats lexical meaning as use-potential. The dichotomy between polysemy and generality is argued to be false. Typical cases of polysemy occupy various places on the cline between full homonymy and full monosemy; their actual position on this cline depends on the context. The problem is also not acute in usage-based cognitive semantics. Conventional meaning arises through schematization and entrenchment of contextual meaning through repeated occurrence but may still involve swathes of knowledge of encyclopedic proportions. This continuous view of meaning is hard to reconcile with the idea of discrete word senses (Geeraerts 1993: 259–60; Glynn 2014: 16) or with the terms “sense”, “meaning”, and “polysemy”. Polysemy is now understood more widely as any systematic variation in use (Glynn 2014: 8)<sup>9</sup> or as “entrenched functional-conceptual variation of a schematic or non-schematic form” (p. 14).<sup>10</sup> An important agenda for corpus-driven polysemy studies is to apply statistical techniques to detect, confirm, and predict structure, i.e.,

<sup>8</sup> Polysemous items should fail on the tests: e.g., *expire* is seen as polysemous since ‘die’ and ‘cease to be valid’ are antagonistic in zeugma:

(i) John and his driving licence expired last Thursday (Cruse 1986: 61).

Norrick (1981: 115) shows that a slight change of context yields the opposite result:

(ii) ?Judy’s dissertation is thought provoking though yellowed with age.

vs.

(iii) Judy’s dissertation is still thought-provoking though yellowed with age.

<sup>9</sup> Zlatev defines polysemy as clusters of contextual interpretations (2003: 458).

<sup>10</sup> We will use the terms “meaning” and “use” interchangeably for simplicity.

meanings as statistical tendencies (p. 27). They use extensive naturalistic corpus data manually annotated for various usage-features (formal, semantic, sociolinguistic), but mainly work with a larger number of tokens of only a smaller number of types (cf. Gries 2006; Glynn 2014). Since *-stvo* expresses a sizeable number of concepts and virtually every derivative is semantically variable itself, we decided to explore as many nouns as possible in as many usage contexts as feasible (see below), leaving their statistical verification for the future. By no means do we claim that all of these meanings represent discrete senses, much less stable representations in semantic memory. But we do not summarily treat them as contextual modulations of a single underspecified meaning either.

In our analysis we treated as more or less distinct any newly attested use for which it could be claimed (a) that it represents a (sub)domain relatively distinguishable from other (sub)domains with which the noun is associated (as evidenced by contextual cues: e.g., *članstvo* “membership as status” can be *granted, revoked, confirmed*, etc., while the “human collectivity” sense is evidenced by verbs like *showed up, argued*, etc.)<sup>11</sup> and (b) that it occurs with some regularity (token and type frequency). The more conceptually distinguishable and frequent a use, the stronger the case for it being a distinct meaning. To illustrate, the “status” reading of *majčinstvo* ‘motherhood’ may be justified alongside its more frequent meaning “role” (N = 47/100) since (a) it construes motherhood from an external vantage point, as a matter of legal status that can be contested or awarded, rather than a biological fact; (b.i) it occurs with some, albeit small, token frequency (N = 1/100), (b.ii) there are other nouns featuring the same ambiguity, e.g., *očinstvo* ‘fatherhood’, *roditeljstvo* ‘parenthood’, and (b.iii) there are nouns where “status” occurs without “role” or as the sole meaning (*držaoljanstvo* ‘citizenship’).<sup>12</sup> Both our conceptual and quantitative criteria allow gradient outcomes, but they are hypotheses pending future psycholinguistic and statistical verification.

<sup>11</sup> This criterion is supported by recent psycholinguistic studies, which suggest that polysemes with different degrees of sense similarity are accessed differently: less strongly related meanings behave like homonyms, showing competition rather than priming, closely related meanings prime each other (Foraker and Murphy 2012). There is no agreement on whether this translates into their having separate vs. shared/single mental representations.

<sup>12</sup> The case for e.g., “status” as a semantic category of WF would be even stronger if another affix built “status” nouns exclusively or as a matter of strong statistical preference.

### 3.3. Metonymy or Facetization?

Metonymy has been recognized as the main engine of lexical semantic change (Blank 1997: 344) and of lexical semantic change leading to affix change through reinterpretation (Rainer 2005: 423). Suffixations in *-stvo* are no exception since most cases of polysemy in our data are more or less easily motivated by metonymy (see Section 5 and Appendix).

Despite growing interest in metonymy among cognitive linguists (see Benczes, Barcelona, and Ruiz de Mendoza 2011), there is no consensus yet on its definition or delimitation. There have been attempts to distinguish metonymy from phenomena like facetization.<sup>13</sup> For Paradis (2004), metonymy (e.g., RED SHIRT FOR PLAYER in *The red shirts have won*) is a directional mapping between two concepts. Using world knowledge we focus on a target concept (PLAYER) not conventionally associated with the source linguistic item (*red shirt*), which is why metonymy creates novel senses (*red shirt* comes to mean ‘player’). In facetization there is no concept-to-concept mapping but one richly specified lexical meaning. Contexts highlights a facet of this encoded meaning in search of contextual relevance. Words like *book* have two facets: concrete (TOME) and abstract (TEXT). Words like *court* and *Ministry* have four: ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT, BUILDING, INTERIOR OUTFIT, and STAFF (Paradis 2004: 251).

While attempts to constrain metonymy are welcome, Paradis relies on the controversial zeugma test to distinguish facetization (allows zeugma) from metonymization (blocks zeugma). But facetization has been shown to behave nonuniformly with respect to zeugma, cf. *Linguistics is the biggest and most sympathetic department of the faculty.* vs. *\*The whole department was made redundant and then torn down* (Geeraerts and Peirsman 2011: 97). In contrast, zeugma is allowed in some indisputable metonymies: *That author is pretty young, but impossible to read* (Barcelona 2011: 33). Based on this evidence, among others, Geeraerts and Peirsman (2011: 97) conclude that facetization is a subtype of metonymy rather than a distinct phenomenon.

We embrace Barcelona’s (2011) prototype- and schema-based notion of metonymy, which allows us to treat as metonymic most instances of polysemy in our data. For Barcelona (2011), the (proto)typicality of metonymies depends on the perceived distinctness of the target vis-à-vis the source. Typical metonymies involve targets clearly distinct from the source, either because they are relatively secondary (Langacker 1987: 158–65) subdomains of the source (WHOLE FOR PART metonymies) or are not included in the source (PART FOR WHOLE, PART FOR PART metonymies). In purely schematic metonymies (usually WHOLE

<sup>13</sup> Paradis treats metonymy, facetization, and zone activation as different “construals of salience based on a part-whole configuration”, where salience is defined “as a construal of focus of attention” (Paradis 2004: 246). We focus on metonymy vs. facetization.



FOR PART metonymies) targets are less distinguishable from sources, e.g., the physical object domain, being more intrinsic, is less clearly distinguishable from the overall book domain in *This book is very large*. For Barcelona, the secondary status of (sub)domains is not a criterion for metonymy, but for degrees of metonymicity. What makes them all metonymies is the overarching schema described as follows: “[A]n asymmetric mapping of a conceptual domain, the source, onto another domain, the target. Source and target are in the same functional domain and are linked by a pragmatic function, so that the target is mentally activated” (Barcelona 2011: 52).<sup>14</sup> To illustrate, the noun *majčinstvo* ‘motherhood’ may be construed as a “role” (to play), a “status” (to be denied/granted), an “abstract institution” (to protect by law), etc. If seen as targets in WHOLE FOR PART metonymies, the three can be ordered by their increasing degree of secondariness vis-à-vis the whole as follows: “role”, “status”, “institution”. The metonymic status of “role” is the most precarious, but it qualifies as a purely schematic metonymy. Alternatively, one could assume that in creating the suffixation one of these concepts was intended as its conventional meaning. Any subsequent uses could then be viewed as its PART FOR PART metonymic extensions. The central concern would then be establishing historical precedence, if that can be established at all.<sup>15</sup>

A word on metaphor. In most cases, metaphors in our data were immaterial to the classification of examples into semantic categories. For instance, fitting *bludništvo* ‘debauchery’ under “quality” does not depend on its metaphorical construal as FIRE in a corpus reference to the debauchery of the Internet **burning out** the retinas of innocent believers. The metaphor may be absent, *bludništvo* would still mean “quality”. Sometimes metaphors are relevant to categorization. For example, the HUMANS ARE ANIMALS metaphor contributes to the figurative reading of *životinja* ‘animal’ as ‘a person who is brutal’, and thus allows *životinjstvo* to be interpreted as a human “quality”, specifically, ‘brutality’ (see Section 5.2).

### 3.4. WF Schemas

The semantic categories emerging from our analysis need not be well-established categories of WF. For instance, honorific readings of status nouns *barunstvo* ‘baronship’, *grofovstvo* ‘countship’ in address forms *Vaše Barunstvo* ‘Your Baronship’, *Vaše Grofovstvo* ‘Your Countship’ result from post-deriva-

<sup>14</sup> “Functional domain” is a equivalent to Langacker’s “abstract domain” (1987: 150), later renamed “nonbasic” domain (2008: 45), and to Lakoff’s ICMs (1987).

<sup>15</sup> Some insight could be gained from dictionaries of Old Church Slavonic, Old Slavic, and from literature on *-stvo* cognates in Slavic languages. Still, we believe that large electronic diachronic corpora of Croatian, currently nonexistent, would better capture the subtle semantic shifts in these abstract and often overlapping domains.

tional semantic extension. When and how semantic categories become WF schemas capable of producing novel complex lexemes is a difficult question. Empirically, the strength of semantic categories as independent categories of WF can only be assessed by a systematic analysis of the full set of functionally overlapping suffixes. Methodologically, the statistical validity, psychological reality, and historical origin of such categories should be verified. To avoid commitment at this exploratory stage as to whether a semantic category is a bona fide WF category, we will speak of semantic categories in a general way. We do commit to the usage-based view that type-frequent items may spawn a WF schema by abstraction, that items of higher type frequency have stronger schemas, and that ultimately these schemas may sanction novel types. But since semantic extension can occur post-derivationally in multiple lexical items, we shall consider hapaxes (potential neologisms) stronger linguistic evidence of WF schemas. There is the risk that our corpus-novel nouns are hapaxes, not innovations, but this risk is inherent to any corpus analysis (see Section 5).

Finally, we submit that the extensive semantic variability of our data makes a unitary superschema of *-stvo* highly unlikely (see Luschützky 2015: 1290). Research has demonstrated the primacy of low-level constructions in early language acquisition (Tomasello 2003) and adult language comprehension (McRae, Ferretti, and Amyote 1997). Low-level constructions allow a statement of restrictions on constructional productivity and polysemy (Croft 2012: 91, 374–83; Langacker 1991: 46–48). In our case, the fact that one easily stumbles upon innovations like *govnarstvo* ‘piece-of-shitness’ but far less easily novel nouns denoting human collectivities suggests there exist lower-level schemas of unequal productivity. Also, no polysemy generalizations are possible at the most schematic level, since no single suffixation takes the full range of meanings that such an all-encompassing schema would license. It would be impossible to articulate anything of substance at its semantic pole to embrace its myriad lower- and lowest-level elaborations (Croft 2004, Brdar and Brdar-Szabó 2014). While not fully predictable, polysemy is found at lower levels of *-stvo*’s constructional network, e.g., between “collectivity of people”, “quality”, “time”, and “status”. This level may still be too coarse, since different kinds of human collectivities extend in different directions. “Human collectivity defined by membership in a concrete institution” extends to “duration of membership in a concrete institution” and “status as a member of a concrete institution”, e.g., in *članstvo* ‘membership’, ‘duration of membership’, and ‘status as a member’. “Human collectivity defined by geographical identity” tends to extend to “quality of human collectivity defined by geographical identity”, e.g., *balkanstvo* ‘all peoples from the Balkans’ extends to ‘quality of peoples from the Balkans’. At this level of granularity much depends on base semantics, i.e., its associated domain. *Balkan* denotes a geographical area, the collective sense picks out the plurality of peoples from the area, and meton-

my extends this to the quality/behavior typical of these peoples. This is why base semantics figured as an important element in our analysis.

#### 4. Methodology

**Corpus and data.** Our data was extracted from *hrWaC*, a corpus of texts from the Croatian Internet (news portals, comments, discussion boards, etc.) (Ljubešić and Erjavec 2011). The corpus affords a balance between conventionality and innovation and provides a fair picture of the use of our suffixations. “A fair picture” also implies that native speakers might find particular uses outlandish, even anomalous,<sup>16</sup> but these were all taken in the bargain. After all, the oddity of such uses is offset by their low frequency counts. Since our search syntax (\**stvo*, \**štvo*) returned randomly scattered noun tokens (N = 4 363 241), not frequency-ordered noun types, we had to manually search through the data to identify target nouns. To that end, we inspected 10 000 concordance lines from this initial pool of automatically retrieved 4 363 241 corpus examples. This search resulted in 725 noun types. For each of the 725 nouns that occurred more than 100 times in the corpus, we extracted a random sample of 100 examples for the analysis. With nouns occurring ≤ 100 times in the corpus, we extracted all their tokens. The sum of all these tokens represents the size of our final database, which numbers 37 173 corpus examples. Each example in the database was annotated for the meaning of suffixation and the semantics of the derivational base. Due to the volume of analyzed data, we can afford to discuss only the three most robust categories (Sections 5.1 to 5.3). Figures in Table 1 and summary descriptions in the appendix must suffice for the other 18 categories. Some of them figure in the discussion of the three main categories, being involved in the polysemy of their nouns. The downside of this big-picture approach is loss of fine detail about particular cases and exceptions. We also trimmed down many examples and incorporated them into running text.

**Interpretation.** Derivational bases could not always be determined unambiguously. Some examples may involve suffix replacement: *škot-ska* ‘Scotland’ > *škot-stvo* ‘Scotlandhood’ or suffixation *Škot* ‘a Scot’ > *škot-stvo*. In others base reduction is likely *dalmatinstvo* ‘Dalmatianhood’ > *Dalmatin-ac* ‘a person from Dalmatia’. We followed the dominant pattern in ambiguous cases; that is, if most nouns in a set are based on country names, rather than names of inhabitants, we grouped the ambiguous case with the majority pattern. We were also conservative with examples allowing multiple motivation. We did not depart from interpretations consistent with base semantics and/or the dominant pattern unless context suggested otherwise. For instance, *veleposlanstvo*

<sup>16</sup> Orthographic errors were a common occurrence but we did not correct them in our syntactic examples.

‘embassy’ is both a “concrete institution” and a “location”, but we counted as “location” only examples which highlighted some aspect of the physical object, as in a reference to a car bomb **blowing up** the French embassy in Libya.

## 5. Results

Table 1 on page 200 gives various frequency data for each semantic category in our database (represented as rows in Table 1). Column 2 gives the total number of tokens (TokF)—in the hrWaC corpus—of all those nouns which exhibited a “target meaning” (TM)<sup>17</sup> as one of their meanings (TokF Ns).<sup>18</sup> All

<sup>17</sup> “Target meaning” (TM) is used for the semantic category under analysis. “Non-target meaning” (non-TMs) is used for any other meanings found in (the group of) nouns concerned.

<sup>18</sup> Let us clarify several figures in Table 1. Since all these figures represent various measures that only concern tokens of the 725 nouns selected for analysis (see Section 4), it would seem paradoxical that the column 2 total (N = 5 757 698) should exceed the 4 363 241 examples automatically retrieved from the whole hrWaC corpus (corpus total). However, the paradox is only apparent, since the two figures represent different counts done for different purposes. Whereas the initial automatic search of hrWaC counted all examples (=tokens) of all *-stvo/-štvo* nouns in the corpus regardless of their meanings, column 2 features, for each semantic category shown in rows of Table 1, the total number of tokens in hrWaC of all the nouns which exhibited the target meaning as one of their meanings. The inflation of the column total to 5 757 698 tokens was due to polysemous nouns, since all tokens of an n-way polysemous noun were counted n times, once in each category of meaning in which the noun was found to participate. As most nouns are polysemous, it is hardly surprising that the column 2 total overshot the corpus total. Multiple counts also explain the relatively high sum total of column 3 (N = 123 420), only this time, we counted all tokens of polysemous nouns in the analyzed samples more than once. The need for these measures, specifically the measure in column 3, will become obvious in Sections 5 and 6. Further, note that the sum total of column 5 (N = 37 073) does not correspond to the total number of examples in the database (N = 37 173). The two figures should ideally match, because each example token in the database was assigned to a single meaning, and column 5 reports the number of examples in each of the meaning categories shown in table rows (and their sum total). The slight discrepancy is due to one noun, viz. *sredstvo* (Smpl TokF= 100), which can be glossed generally as ‘any type of instrument or means by which a result is achieved’ (‘instrument’ for short) and is found in references to medicine, treatments, remedies, cleaning agents, financial resources (the latter especially in the plural), etc. None of the tokens of *sredstvo* matched any of the semantic categories in Table 1. Note that it is not the rarity of the meaning “instrument” per se that disqualified this noun from quantification, but its **exclusive** association (in the sample and probably in the whole corpus) with this rare meaning, which is not represented as a separate category (row) in Table 1. The noun *knjigovodstvo* ‘bookkeeping’, for instance, also invited the “instrument” interpretation in some of its tokens, but it also participated in the major semantic category “profession”. Therefore, when the subject of quantification was the

other columns report sample-based data. Column 3 reports the total number of tokens (TokF)—in the analyzed samples—of all those nouns which exhibited a TM as one of their meanings (Smpl TokF Ns). Column 4 lists the type frequency of each TM, viz., the number of nouns featuring a TM (TypF:TM). Column 5 gives the total TokF of each TM across all nouns (TokF:TM). Column 6 gives the type-token ratio of each TM, viz., an averaged measure of dispersion of TM tokens across noun types (TypF/TokF TM). The theoretical range is 0 to 1. Values closer to 0 suggest that a small number of types account for TM tokens, values closer to 1 suggest greater lexical variety, viz., many more noun types host TM tokens. In a usage-based framework, this implies that the same number of tokens of a meaning may or may not be conducive to schema productivity. Tokens concentrated in a small number of nouns are likely to lead to the entrenchment (item-familiarity) of specific nouns without contributing to schema productivity (see fn. 5). Experiencing the same number of tokens in many noun types leads to better familiarity with construction semantics and to schema productivity. Column 7 gives the number of hapax legomena and neologisms. The status of these hapaxes as neologisms rather than accidental corpus-rarities was checked in comprehensive dictionaries of Croatian: the Academy dictionary (Daničić et al. 1880–1976), Anić (2004), and Skok (1971). Since most words are polysemous, column 8 gives, for each TM, the TypF of the TM occurring as the only or dominant meaning (TypF:TM dom); column 9 reports the TypF of the TM occurring as a subordinate meaning (TypF:TM sub). Any cutoff point is arbitrary but we considered a meaning dominant in a noun's polysemy structure if it accounted for at least 50% of all analyzed tokens. Column 10 reports the TokF of all non-TMs (TokF:non-TM). Column 11 gives the proportion of each TM in its total sample token frequency (TM/Smpl TokF). This may be seen as an informal indication of TM predictability, viz., the odds that on a given occasion of its use a word would be interpreted as having the TM concerned. Categories taken up for closer inspection (shaded in Table 1), have been selected mainly because of their highest TypF in the database, but some of them also do well on other measures, as reported in detail below.

### 5.1. Unbounded Event

One of our most interesting quantitative findings concerns the category “unbounded event” (Table 1).<sup>19</sup> The meaning is virtually always subordinate, oc-

---

category “profession”, the “instrument” tokens of *knjigovodstvo* were counted among its non-TMs.

<sup>19</sup> Here *unbounded* means **temporally** unbounded. Simplifying somewhat, reified events unbounded in time are viewed as having duration (their beginning and end are out of focus); events bounded in time are seen in their entirety; beginning, pro-

curring in nouns which predominantly denote abstract entities like various “professions”, “ideologies”, “qualities”, etc. (see below).<sup>20</sup> For instance, *mesarstvo* ‘butcher’s trade’ is a type of profession qualitatively distinct from *ribnjačarstvo* ‘fish farming’. However, these nouns allow more dynamic reconstructions, since they make more or less inherent reference, via their base words, to events involved in pursuing the professions, to ideologies, to behavioral displays of qualities, etc. The events may be designated by the base words, e.g., *progonstvo* ‘exile’ (< *progoniti* ‘to exile’).<sup>21</sup> They may be embedded in the bases of the base words themselves, as in *prevoditeljstvo* ‘translation as a profession’ (< *prevoditelj* ‘translator’ < *prevoditi* ‘to translate’). The event may even be implicit but figures in the domains accessed via the base-designated participant, e.g., *porotništvo* (lit. juror-stvo) ‘jury duty’, derived from < *porotnik* ‘juror’ (event: ‘that which jurors do’). Be that as it may, the TM “unbounded event” arises by a higher-order conceptual reification of multiple episodes of such events as they are instantiated in time. Cf. (1):

- (1) Nemam ni trunku tolerancije za takvo političko **mesarstvo** nad ljudima na bilo kojem dijelu svijeta.

I have zero tolerance for such political **butchery** (lit. butcher-stvo) over people in any part of the world.

Although these episodes are temporally scattered, at this level of conceptual reification they are seen as interconnected and effectively homogeneous since they represent repetitions of the same event type. This repetition renders the designated situation temporally unbounded and the nouns uncountable. Put simply, each time the subject performed the “job” counts as an episode of the event. In (1), *mesarstvo* is (metaphorically) understood as ‘committing political butchery (violence) over people’. In (2), *mesarstvo* is described abstractly as a type of profession (‘butcher’s trade’) different from other profession types like *ribarstvo* ‘fishing’.

---

gression, and end included. For more detail on bounding in the context of count vs. mass noun distinction and perfective vs. imperfective verbs see Langacker (1987: 189–97, 258–62), Radden and Dirven (2007: 64–81, 175–97), Belaj and Tanacković Faletar (2014: 63–71, especially fn. 60).

<sup>20</sup> “Entity” is a general “cover term for anything we might conceive of or refer to for analytical purposes: things, relations, locations, points on a scale, sensations, interconnections, values, etc.” (Langacker 1987: 198).

<sup>21</sup> This is assuming that the base verb is truncated before suffixation. Otherwise, the base could be the noun *progon*, derived by nominalizing the verb *progoniti*. For Babić, the latter nominalization is tautologous since *progon* and *progonstvo* are seen as synonymous (2002: 307). On problems of morphological constituency see Section 4.

- (2) Uz **mesarstvo**, Mato Gavrilović bavi se različitim drugim poslovima i trgovinom.

In addition to **butchery**, Mato Gavrilović is also into commerce and various other activities.

“Unbounded event” is a most versatile category. It is found with nouns whose bases denote professional agents (1), followers of ideologies (3), people defined by qualities (4), relationships (5), roles (6), states (7), statuses (8), etc. The dominant meanings of these nouns most often directly match the meanings of their bases (we refer to these meanings as “base-driven meanings”). Thus nouns with bases denoting (non-)professional agents predominantly mean “profession” (see Section 5.3; for others see the Appendix). Their extension to the TM is motivated by the general metonymy ENTITY & EVENT.<sup>22</sup> ENTITY is schematic for profession types, ideology types, quality types, etc. EVENT is schematic for events which figure in the domains accessed via ENTITIES. Elaborations of the general metonymy are suggested with the examples below. Notice the supporting morphosyntax: e.g., the manner specification *žestok* ‘fierce’ in (3), the time reference *u radno vrijeme* ‘during working hours’ in (4), the phasal verb *nastaviti* ‘to continue’ in (5).

- (3) Ta se mala, no živahna stranka često isticala **žestokim starčevićanstvom**.

This small, but vigorous party stood out for its fierce **Starčevićanism** (lit. Starčevićite-stvo).

(IDEOLOGY & PURSUING AN IDEOLOGY)(On “ideology” see Appendix pt. 6)

- (4) Nerijetke su naslovnice koje upućuju na ozbiljne društveno-ekonomske probleme poput ... **neradništva** u radno vrijeme.

Many headlines warn against serious socio-economic issues like ... **lazing about** (lit. nonworker-stvo) during working hours.

(QUALITY & MANIFESTING A QUALITY)

- (5) Fracuska marka će nastaviti svoje **rivalstvo** s Audijem u novoj globalnoj seriji.

The French make is going to continue its **rivalry** (lit. rival-stvo) with Audi in the new global series.

(RELATIONSHIP & EXERCISING A RELATIONSHIP) (On “relationship” see Appendix pt. 15)

<sup>22</sup> Peirsman and Geeraerts (2006: 311) propose ENTITY 1 & ENTITY 2 as the formula for metonymy when the direction of meaning shift is irrelevant. We will generally use the & formula since we do not commit to particular directions in this exploratory stage.

Table 1. Overview of quantitative results per semantic category of *-stoo* nouns

Semantic category (1)	TokF Ns (2)	Smpl TokF Ns (3)	TypF TM (4)	TokF TM (5)	TypF/ TokF TM (6)	Hap./ Neol. (7)	TypF TM dom (8)	TypF TM sub (9)	TokF: non-TM (10)	TM/ Smpl TokF (11)
1 Unbounded event	489 720	20 641	289	2 299	0.126	1/1	10	279	18 342	0.111
2 Quality	287 008	13 573	284	5 197	0.055	28/12	160	124	8 376	0.383
3 Profession	420 364	13 590	229	8 484	0.027	19/11	178	51	5 106	0.624
4 Collectivity: people	877 904	10 430	144	3 311	0.043	4/3	41	103	7 119	0.317
5 Bounded event	239 465	8 807	135	1 856	0.073	1/1	17	118	6 951	0.211
6 Ideology	27 074	4 655	91	2 253	0.040	3/2	54	37	2 402	0.484
7 Realm/domain	711 917	7 694	87	1 778	0.049		12	75	5 916	0.231
8 Concrete institution	597 225	7 170	85	1 742	0.049	1/0	21	64	5 428	0.243
9 Status	157 877	5 031	75	868	0.086	2/2	18	57	4 163	0.173
10 State	234 015	5 119	74	2 188	0.034	3/1	32	42	2 931	0.427
11 Field of study	132 568	4 012	52	467	0.111		7	45	3 545	0.116



12	Collectivity: concrete institutions	345 342	3 880	43	332	0.130		3	40	3 548	0.086
13	Location	592 927	3 657	41	843	0.049	2/1	9	32	2 814	0.231
14	Role	112 888	2 771	40	687	0.058	2/1	7	33	2 084	0.248
15	Relationship	136 049	2 504	34	1 468	0.023	1/1	23	11	1 036	0.586
16	Time	124 390	2 551	34	471	0.072		6	28	2 080	0.185
17	Collectivity: objects	130 011	2 427	32	688	0.047	1/1	10	22	1 739	0.283
18	Abstract institution	72 732	1 895	29	464	0.063	1/1	6	23	1 431	0.245
19	Geographical identity	12 507	1 271	27	415	0.065	2/2	9	18	856	0.327
20	Religion	38 994	1 327	21	1 084	0.019		20	1	243	0.817
21	Honorific	16 721	415	6	178	0.034	1/0	4	2	237	0.429
	Total	5 757 698	123 420	1 852	37 073	0.050	72/40	647	1 205	86 347	0.300

- (6) Ako se zna da je sat **porotništva** vrijedan 25 kuna, dade se lako izračunati da ovim putem stranke agilnijem članstvu osiguraju 600 do 1000 kuna.

If an hour of **jury duty** (lit. juror-stvo) is worth 25 kunas, it is easy to figure out that in this way parties may secure 600 to 1000 kunas for their more active members.

(ROLE & PERFORMING A ROLE) (On “role” see Appendix pt. 14)

- (7) Prihvati li se ovakav Prijedlog zakona o sigurnosnim službama, značit će to nastavak **rastrojstva** ... hrvatskog sigurnosnog sustava.

Passing this Draft of the Act on the Security and Intelligence System will mean a continued **unravelling** (lit. unravel-stvo) of the Croatian security and intelligence system.

(STATE & EVENT LEADING TO A STATE)<sup>23</sup> (On “state” see Appendix pt. 10)

- (8) S težom o dolasku stranih radnika ne slažu se ... predstavnici sindikata koji su upozorili da se stranim radnicima ne isplati **‘gastarbajterstvo’** u Hrvatskoj zbog visokih troškova.

Union representatives disagree with the claim about the influx of foreign labor; they warn that **‘guestworkership’** (lit. guestworker-stvo) in Croatia doesn’t pay due to the high cost of living.

(STATUS & PERFORMING EVENTS IMPLIED BY STATUS) (On “status” see Appendix pt. 9)

The TM “unbounded event” stands out as a category with the overall highest type frequency, which is not matched by a particularly high TokF (especially when compared to the TypF and TokF of “quality” and “profession”). Table 2 on the next page shows the different frequency data for the TM “unbounded event”, broken down by base semantics (B-clusters). According to the data in column 9 of Table 2, only ten nouns (3%) crossed the 50% dominance threshold. Five of these nouns are very rare (N < 8), most others denote criminal activities like *svodništvo* (lit. pimp-stvo) ‘solicitation for prostitution’ and are used in references to being wanted for/accused of **perpetration** of the crimes. One was a hapax and a neologism, viz., *krvopilstvo* ‘bloodsucking’ in an ironic reference to a **continuity** of professional bloodsucking and slander. Since the TM is mostly subordinate, it is plausibly regarded as the result of semantic extension from the various entity types to “unbounded events” rather than

<sup>23</sup> This specific metonymy fits our general metonymic pattern ENTITY & EVENT but could also be considered a version of another metonymic pattern, slightly less general than the former, viz. EFFECT & CAUSE, where STATE (as a type of ENTITY) is seen as the EFFECT of the CAUSE (a type of EVENT).

vice versa. As for the dispersion of TM tokens across noun types (column 7 of Table 2; cf. column 6 of Table 1), the total value of 0.126 makes “unbounded event” the second best-performing category overall, although it is still close to the lower end of the theoretical range. At the same time, the TM’s predictability value of only 11% (column 12 of Table 2; cf. column 11 of Table 1) makes it the second-worst performer of all. Putting the last two measures together, we could conclude in a convenient metaphor that the TM “unbounded event” is spread wide, but thin.

Table 3 on page 206 allows us to appraise various polysemy configurations involving the TM “unbounded event”. It shows the type and token frequencies of all non-TMs found with nouns in different B-clusters. The prevailing meanings in each B-cluster (bolded) are mostly base-driven meanings, viz., nouns featuring professional agents in their bases mostly mean “profession” (1), etc.<sup>24</sup> Rarely, other meanings are prevalent. For instance, “quality” is dominant in the singleton category *životinjstvo* (lit. animal-stvo) ‘animality’ (< *životinja* ‘animal’); the base noun, categorized as “animal” (row 14 of Table 3), is understood metaphonymically (see Goosens 1990) as denoting man’s animal-like qualities. With two patient-denoting base nouns (row 13 of Table 3), *novinstvo* (lit. news-stvo) ‘journalism’ and *porodiljstvo* (lit. woman in/after childbirth-stvo) ‘obstetrics’, the dominant meaning is “profession”. Two observations must be made regarding polysemy in these B-clusters. First, most non-TMs can be linked directly to the cluster’s prevalent meaning, rather than the TM “unbounded event”. For instance, “school subject”, “book”, and “exam” form a “bundle” of potential metonymic extensions from the non-TM “profession” (and/or even from each other as in SCHOOL SUBJECT & EXAM; see Section 5.3). In (9), *neradništvo* (lit. nonworker-stvo) is used in an (ironic) reference to ‘the collectivity of idle people’ via the metonymy QUALITY & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE WITH A QUALITY. It needs no reference to the TM “unbounded event” exemplified in (4).

- (9) Vi ste pokazali da se ... može prokazati društveni ološ poput nas, nataloženi mulj **neradništva** u napaćenju i siromašnoj Hrvatskoj ... .  
 You have shown that one can discredit societal scum like us, the thick sludge of **do-nothings** (lit. nonworker-stvo) in poor, anguished Croatia ... .

Still, multiple motivation cannot be excluded. A non-TM can be motivated by both another (usually the dominant) non-TM and the TM “unbounded event” at the same time. For instance, nouns predominantly meaning “ideology” ex-

<sup>24</sup> Prevalence means having the highest TypF and the highest TokF. These values mostly converge on the same meaning. If not, we treated as prevalent the highest-scoring meanings on each frequency type.

Table 2. Quantitative results for semantic category “unbounded event”, broken down by base semantics (B-clusters)

Base semantics (1)	Example (2)	TokF		Smpl		TypF/		Hap./		TypF		TokF:		TM/ Smpl TokF (12)
		Ns (3)	(4)	TokF Ns (4)	(5)	TM (5)	TokF TM (6)	TM (7)	neol. (8)	dom. (9)	TM sub. (10)	non-TM (11)		
1	Person_profession	255 429	9 828	125	902	0.139	1/1	3	122	8 926	0.092			
2	Person_quality	15 976	2 891	53	353	0.150		53	53	2 538	0.122			
3	Person_role	63 007	2 690	40	542	0.074		5	35	2 148	0.201			
4	Person_ideology	3 530	1 060	18	85	0.212		1	17	975	0.080			
5	Person_relation- ship	4 044	717	10	54	0.185		1	9	663	0.075			
6	Person_member of concrete institution	4 973	731	9	53	0.170		9	9	678	0.073			
7	Person_status	15 126	506	8	56	0.143		8	8	450	0.111			
8	Event	15 443	648	7	128	0.055		7	7	520	0.198			
9	Person_state	733	422	6	36	0.167		6	6	386	0.085			
10	Person_religion	35 298	381	4	33	0.121		4	4	348	0.087			
11	Person_geography	73 476	400	4	32	0.125		4	4	368	0.080			
12	Person_field of study	832	150	2	12	0.167		2	2	138	0.080			
13	Patient	1 827	191	2	12	0.167		2	2	179	0.080			
14	Animal	26	26	1	1	1.000		1	1	25	0.038			
Total		489 720	20 641	289	2 299	0.126	1/1	10	279	18 342	0.111			

tend to “collectivity of people” (see Appendix pt. 4), but this collectivity can be understood both as a ‘collectivity of ideologists, i.e., adherents to ideology’ (motivated by non-TM “ideology”) and a ‘collectivity of people **pursuing** the ideology’ (motivated by TM “unbounded event”).

Meanings within a B-cluster may be related only indirectly. For instance, the “field of study” (see Appendix pt. 11), i.e., the ‘zoology’ reading of *životinjstvo* links up seamlessly with “collectivity of animals”.<sup>25</sup> It is hardly necessary to force direct links between ‘zoology’ and “quality”, or between ‘zoology’ and “unbounded event” if “unbounded event” means ‘displaying brutality’. Similarly with *barbarstvo* (lit. barbarian-stvo) ‘barbarianism’, which combines the meaning “realm/domain” (see Appendix pt. 7), i.e., part of the world dominated by barbarians, which taps into the original meanings of the base noun *barbar* (‘foreigner, one from abroad, one who speaks in a foreign tongue’), with “quality” (‘barbarousness, uncivilized, and uncultured quality’) and its dynamic reconstrual as ‘displaying barbarousness’, which are rooted in the interpretation of the base noun *barbar* as ‘an uncivilized, uncultured man’.

## 5.2. Quality

The second most type-frequent and apparently the most productive semantic category is “quality”. “Quality” is defined as ‘a name for a significant property of an entity’.<sup>26</sup> Prototypical examples include *bogatstvo* ‘richness’ (< *bogat* ‘rich’), *lakomstvo* ‘greediness’ (< *lakom* ‘greedy’), *lukavstvo* ‘cunningness’ (< *lukav* ‘cunning’), but the category is heterogeneous and has unclear boundaries.

First, it is commonly claimed that “quality” nouns are deadjectival, which should set them off from denominal “status” nouns like e.g., *kinghood* (see Luschutzky 2015: 1270). However, the distinction between “status” and “quality” cannot lie in base morphosyntax. Some “quality” nouns have nominal bases whose nominal entities allow access to the salient quality via ENTITY & DEFINING QUALITY metonymy; e.g., denominal *majmunstvo* (lit. monkey-stvo) ‘apishness, foolishness’ is virtually synonymous with deadjectival *glupost* ‘foolishness’. The latter codes the pertinent quality directly in the adjective; the same quality has to be metonymically inferred from the noun *majmun* ‘monkey’ in the former. Other nouns have evaluative nominal bases directly naming individuals by their salient, usually negative, property, like *idiotstvo* ‘idiocy, defining property of idiots’ (< *idiot* ‘idiot’), *beskičmenjaštvo* ‘spinelessness, defining property of spineless people’ (< *beskičmenjak* ‘spineless person’). Any

<sup>25</sup> We did not propose a separate category “collectivity of animals” since the meaning is sparse. It was counted under “collectivity of people” although a more general label “collectivity of animate entities” would be more appropriate.

<sup>26</sup> The qualities are mostly, but not only human, hence the general term “entity” (Langacker 1987: 489).

Table 3. Non-TMs of nouns featuring the TM “unbounded event”, broken down by base semantics (B-clusters)

Base semantics Total TokF non-TMs	Non-target meanings (TypE/TokF)
1 Person_profession (8926)	<b>profession</b> (124/6597), realm/domain (57/746), concrete institution (37/232), coll. of concrete institutions (35/227), field of study (34/187), coll. of objects (18/215), style/manner (15/60), bounded event (14/159), quality (13/127), school subject (12/38), coll. of people (11/204), metaref. (8/18), location (5/15), result (4/23), skill (4/12), list/record (2/48), status (2/3), inchoative (2/2), exam (2/2), instrument (1/8), time (1/1), quantity (1/1), book (1/1)
2 Person_quality (2538)	<b>quality</b> (53/1960), bounded event (42/371), coll. of people (8/15), state (4/16), status (3/15), metaref. (3/7), ideology (2/85), profession (2/42), result (2/5), person/object (1/14), religion (1/8)
3 Person_role (2148)	<b>role</b> (26/521), coll. of people (14/286), status (13/182), abstract institution (11/145), quality (10/161), concrete institution (8/238), time (8/22), profession (7/209), realm/domain (7/153), inchoative (5/29), bounded event (4/19), metaref. (4/4), relation (3/90), location (3/24), style/manner (2/8), state (2/2), skill (1/34), ideology (1/19), field of study (1/1), patient (1/1)
4 Person_ideology (975)	<b>ideology</b> (18/744), quality (15/113), bounded event (7/34), coll. of people (5/55), state (2/12), status (1/7), coll. of concrete institutions (1/4), time (1/2), style/manner (1/2), metaref. (1/1), profession (1/1)
5 Person_relationship (663)	<b>relationship</b> (8/444), concrete institution (4/79), status (4/19), quality (3/88), coll. of people (2/10), state (2/2), abstract institution (1/11), bounded event (1/6), location (1/3), metaref. (1/1)

6	Person_member of concrete institution (678)	<b>concrete institution</b> (7/331), quality (6/101), profession (4/102), ideology (4/95), coll. of people (2/39), bounded event (2/4), state (1/3), metaref. (1/2), inchoative (1/1)
7	Person_status (450)	<b>abstract institution</b> (5/133), <b>status</b> (5/95), relation (4/83), profession (3/59), quality (3/35), location (2/26), realm/domain (1/14), coll. of concrete institutions (1/3), coll. of people (1/1), time (1/1)
8	Event (520)	<b>bounded event</b> (6/219), location (3/58), time (3/13), quality (2/41), status (2/4), coll. of objects (1/94), concrete institution (1/56), state (1/31), coll. of people (1/2), fact of action (1/2)
9	Person_state (386)	<b>state</b> (6/254), abstract institution (2/66), status (2/8), bounded event (2/4), location (1/40), time (1/6), quality (1/6), metaref. (1/2)
10	Person_religion (348)	<b>religion</b> (4/327), quality (3/12), coll. of people (2/4), style/manner (1/3), realm/domain (1/1), state (1/1)
11	Person_geography (368)	<b>quality</b> (3/83), coll. of people (3/11), ideology (2/95), geographical identity (2/40), bounded event (2/15), <b>location</b> (1/96), state (1/16), realm/domain (1/11), coll. of concrete organizations (1/1)
12	Person_field of study (138)	<b>field of study</b> (2/115), skill (1/16), school subject (1/2), style/manner (1/2), bounded event (1/1), realm/domain (1/1), coll. of people (1/1)
13	Patient (179)	<b>profession</b> (2/106), school subject (2/2), coll. of concrete institutions (1/57), realm/domain (1/8), coll. of objects (1/4), time (1/1), state (1/1)
14	Animal (25)	<b>quality</b> (1/17), field of study (1/3), coll. of people/animate entities (1/3), metaref. (1/2)

difference between “quality” and “status” is a semantic one, since “status” involves additional semantic restrictions (on “status” see Appendix pt. 9).

Secondly, quality nouns are close to state nouns like *pijanstvo*. Both denote qualities, but differ in the permanent vs. episodic nature of the qualities (on “state” see Appendix pt. 10).

Thirdly, there is the question of what counts as a quality. Social identities are complex social constructs which primarily include references to qualities narrowly defined, such as moral character (*beskičmenjaštvo*), sociocognitive properties (*lukavstvo*), emotional dispositions and temperament (*mekuštv*o ‘soft-heartedness’).

- (10) Teško da se branitelji ubijaju radi **beskičmenjaštva** i podaničkog mentaliteta vlade.

War veterans are hardly taking their own lives because of Government’s **spinelessness** and servility.

However, people are also defined by geographical background (11–12), ideological stances (13), professions (14), etc. Many suffixations later discussed under “profession”, or falling under the here unreported categories “geographical identity”, “ideology”, “religion” tap into nonbasic domains which may figure as domains relative to which a person’s/an entity’s quality is characterized.

- (11) Iz njih u svakom retku izbija čisto narodni mentalitet, nepatvoreno **bošnjaštvo** koje je bilo jedno od najglavnijih obilježja Crkve Bosanske.

Emanating from them, in every single line, is a folk mentality, a genuine **Bosniakness** (lit. Bosniak-stvo) that used to be one of the major features of the Church of Bosnia.

(GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY & QUALITY (OF BEING) ASSOCIATED WITH GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY)

- (12) Vesna Pusić je bila toliko prštala od nakupljenoga **europeljstva** da su čistačice u EU središnjici stalno morale čistiti za njom kud god je hodala.

Vesna Pusić was bursting at her seams with accumulated **Europeanness** (lit. European-stvo) so much so that the cleaning ladies in EU headquarters had to clean up after her wherever she went.

(GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY & QUALITY (OF BEING) ASSOCIATED WITH GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY). (On “geographical identity” see Appendix pt. 19).



- (13) Colbert je meni najbolji dok je miran i tih ... I meni je trebalo malo da na to oguglam; bahatost, narcisoidnost, **republikanstvo**.  
I find Colbert best when he's composed and soft-spoken. I took a while too to grow used to it: the arrogance, narcissism, **republicanism** (lit. Republican-stvo).  
(IDEOLOGY & QUALITY (OF BEING) ASSOCIATED WITH AN IDEOLOGY)
- (14) Iz tekstova je izviralo **istraživačko novinarstvo** ... procijenjivalo se ... mnoge sfere društvenih odnosa u RH i regiji.  
**Investigative journalism** (lit. journalist-stvo) was emerging from the texts ... many areas of social relations in Croatia and the region were assessed ... .  
(PROFESSION & QUALITY (OF BEING) ASSOCIATED WITH PROFESSION)

While each example above codes a distinctive quality of entities (texts, people), it is clear that the domains evoked (those of ideologies, professions, etc.) are less natural as cognitive backgrounds for conceptualizing qualities than the domains of, e.g., moral character or temperament. They are, in Langacker's terms, less central to the specification of the nouns (1987: 158–61). Centrality depends on four parameters of which the degree characteristicness is the most relevant here.<sup>27</sup> A domain is characteristic for the designation of the linguistic unit if it is unique to the class of designated entities and thus sufficient to identify a class member. A specification in the domain of qualities is sufficient to identify *grubijanstvo* 'roughness' (< *grubijan* 'ruffian') as a member of the class of human qualities, i.e., the quality domain is sufficient to identify *grubijanstvo* as a type of quality. A specification in the domain of ideologies, in turn, does not uniquely invite the construal of *republikanstvo* as a member of the class of quality nouns. This domain is characteristically used for designation of various ideology types, which makes it a non-characteristic domain to recruit for quality specifications. Compare (15–18), which showcase more typical and quantitatively dominant uses of the same suffixations, where they denote a type of geographical identity, ideology, and profession, respectively. Each is specified relative to what is now their characteristic "host" domain of geographical identity, ideology, and profession, and are easily perceived as members of their respective classes.

<sup>27</sup> The other three parameters include the degree to which the knowledge is **intrinsic**, viz., makes no essential reference to external entities; **generic**, viz., not restricted to specific exemplars but typical of whole classes and **conventional**, viz., shared within a wider community of speakers (Langacker 1987: 158–61).

- (15) Šta je **bošnjaštvo** da li je to etnička, nacionalna ili politička kategorija, ili sve to skupa?

What is **Bosniakhood** is it an ethnic, national, or political category or all of that rolled into one?

- (16) Moderno **europaštvo** bez samosvojnih europskih narodnosti isto je što i tijelo bez kosti.

A modern **Europeanhood** without particular European ethnicities is like a boneless body.

- (17) Pad Bastille i dalje funkcionira kao inicijalni simbol nastanka evropskog **republikanstva**.

The fall of the Bastille still stands as the first symbol of the birth of European **Republicanism**.

- (18) Profesor Branko Hebrang ... rekao je da se **novinarstvo** treba definirati kao profesija ... .

Professor Branko Hebrang ... said **journalism** needs to be defined as a profession ... .

The fourth issue is the potential need to distinguish qualities from behaviors. Qualities like *bogatstvo* 'richness' can be conceptualized independently of behavior. But most qualities derive from an entity's regular display of certain behaviors. *Tračerstvo* 'gossipiness' implies a type of behavior and is more dynamic than *bogatstvo*; i.e., if a person regularly engages in gossip sessions, 'gossipiness' becomes their defining quality. Due to this tight connection between behaviors and qualities, we treat them as a single category labelled "quality".<sup>28</sup>

Related to this is the final question, viz., whether to distinguish between the abstract conception of a quality type (e.g., what makes *pozerstvo* 'show-off-ness' as a quality type different from *tračerstvo* as another quality type) and construals of quality types as instantiated in individual entities (*njezino tračerstvo* 'her gossipiness' vs. *njegovo tračerstvo* 'his gossipiness'). This type vs. instantiation distinction seems to be of little consequence in interpreting suffixations based on quality nouns/adjectives. The interpretation of *tračerstvo*

<sup>28</sup> Note that nouns denoting behaviors, like *tračerstvo*, are close to nouns denoting types of regular leisure activities (see Section 5.3) like e.g., *kajakaštvo* 'kayaking', *planinarstvo* 'mountaineering'. The latter denote activity types pursued regularly for pleasure/other reward, but involve social sanction, formal training/qualification, and/or careful planning, and lack evaluative overtones commonly found with quality/behavior nouns.

*stvo* as a quality type is not much different overall from the interpretation of *tračerstvo* as a quality instantiated in an individual. Nevertheless, the type vs. instantiation distinction should not be dismissed out of hand since it is not unique to the prototypical quality nouns. A parallel contrast exists in suffixations *bošnjaštvo*, *europsjstvo*, *republikanstvo*, *novinarstvo*, whose interpretations as types of “geographical identity”, a type of “ideology” and a type of “profession” (15–18) coexist with their instantiated “quality” interpretations illustrated in (11–14).

Space prevents a thorough discussion. Suffice it to say that despite the above argument for differentiating type construals of prototypical quality nouns and their construals as qualities instantiated in individuals, for practical reasons we counted both under “quality”. The conceptual leap between two construals of *grubijanstvo* is negligent compared to the conceptual leap between (11) and (15), (12) and (16), (13) and (17), and (14) and (18), which makes it far easier to perceive the latter pairs of examples as distinct senses (see Sections 3.2 and 3.3).

According to Table 1, “quality” is the second most type-frequent meaning in our database and is one with the highest number of hapaxes (N = 28). The hapaxes unattested in the dictionaries consulted (potential neologisms) (N = 12) are marked with a superscript letter n.

- (19) *autokratstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘autocracy’, *čepičarstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘kiss-ass-ness’,<sup>29</sup> *člankoliztvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘bootlickerness’, *čovjekoljupstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘philantropy’, *govnarstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘piece-of-shitness’, *hegelijanstvo* ‘being a follower of Hegelianism’, *kanadstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘Canadianness’, *koljaštvo* ‘cutthroatness’, *kumirstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘idolatry’, *muktaštvo* ‘cheapskateness’, *muškoložništvo*,<sup>30</sup> *nehajstvo* ‘negligence’, *neobarbarstvo*<sup>(n)</sup> ‘neobarbarousness’,<sup>31</sup> *nepostojanstvo* ‘inconsistency, inconstancy’, *neumičstvo* ‘inability/inaptness’, *polugospodstvo*<sup>(n)</sup> ‘semigentility’,<sup>32</sup> *pokorničstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘servility’, *prirepaštvo* ‘bootlickerness’, *provincijalstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘provincialism’, *puzavaštvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘servility, crawlerhood’, *razborstvo* ‘reasonableness’, *režonerstvo* ‘argumentativeness’, *škotstvo*<sup>n</sup>

<sup>29</sup> The noun was found as one in a series of synonyms of derogatory terms for people who fawn on others, but its semantic composition is uncertain. The probable base noun is *čepić*, one of whose meanings is ‘suppository’.

<sup>30</sup> The noun was not found in the dictionaries but is a reference to male homosexuality from the New Testament of the Bible where it is rendered as “them who defile themselves with mankind” (1 Timothy, 1).

<sup>31</sup> Since *barbarstvo* has been recorded in dictionaries, this is best analyzed as a case of prefixation. The noun is not counted as a neologism licenced by the “quality” schema of *-stvo*.

<sup>32</sup> Since *gospodstvo* is a well-attested noun, this is best analyzed as a case of prefixation. The noun is not counted as a neologism licenced by the “quality” schema of *-stvo*.

'Scottishness', *tračerstvo* 'gossipness', *uljudstvo* 'politeness, civility', *umještvo* 'skillfulness, agility', *vezaštvo* 'corruptive behavior that involves exploiting political and other connections for personal gain', *zvekanstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'daftness'.

This lengthy list suggests that "quality" is probably the most productive schema. Interestingly, the neologisms include nouns synonymous with already existing suffixations; *čovjekoljupstvo* has synonyms in *čovjekoljublje*, *čovjekoljubivost*; *nehajstvo* in *nehajnost*; *nepostojanstvo* in *nepostojanost*. The fact that the derivation of the new suffixations with *-stvo* has not been blocked may indicate the deep cognitive entrenchment of the "quality" schema for *-stvo*.

Table 1 (columns 8 and 9) also shows that "quality" is one of five categories where the meaning is more often dominant (N = 160) than subordinate (N = 124); i.e., it is dominant in 160 out of 284 nouns (56%). Recall that with "unbounded events" this figure was only 3%. The predictability value of "quality" (column 11), viz., the chance that on hearing a noun from this sample, it would be interpreted as "quality" is 38%. Finally, the T/T value (column 6) is fairly low (0.055). The TM has the second largest number of noun types (N = 284), and in theory allows for a wide dispersion of tokens, but the tokens are too overwhelming (N = 5197) to produce a favorable T/T score. The TM "unbounded events" did well here as the types were not so heavily outnumbered by tokens.

Table 4 on the next page shows that the most type-frequent B-cluster of TM "quality" are nouns with nominal bases denoting people defined by quality or adjectival bases denoting the quality (row 1), with 147 out of the total of 284 noun types (52%) featuring this meaning. Examples include references to qualities as a matter of genetics (*izdajništvo u genetici moje obitelji* 'treachery (lit. traitor-stvo) in my family's genetics'), as being displayed (*ispoljavanje dioljaštva* 'acting out one's savagery') or list the quality in sets of other characteristics (*osobine kao hostilitet, potreba za dominacijom i kritizerstvo* 'character traits like hostility, need for domination, and criticalness'). According to the data in columns 8, 9, and 10, the B-cluster also has the most hapaxes (23/28 or 82%) and neologisms (8/12 or 67%), and accounts for the largest proportion in the total set of quality-dominant nouns in the sample (124/160 or 78%). It does best on predictability (column 12), which is 67%, but the T/T score (column 7) remains low (0.039).

Table 5 on page 214 gives frequencies of non-TMs participating in various polysemy configurations involving the TM "quality". As with "unbounded events", the prevailing meanings in each B-cluster (bolded) are mainly the base-driven meanings. In the first B-cluster (row 1), the two most robust extensions are to dynamic reconstructions of qualities as countable instances of their manifestation (20) or their mass instantiation (21).

**Table 4.** Quantitative results for semantic category “quality”, broken down by base semantics (B-clusters)

Base semantics (1)	Example (2)	TokF		Smpl TokF		TypF TM		TypF/ TokF TM		Hap./ Neol. (8)		TypF TM dom. sub. (9) (10)		TokF: non-TM (11)		TM/ Smpl TokF (12)				
		Ns (3)		Ns (4)		TM (5)		TM (6)		TM (7)		TM (8)	TM (9)	sub. (10)	TM (11)		TM (12)			
1	Person_quality	137 718		5 618		147		3 756		0.039		23/8		124		23		1 862		0.669
2	Person_geography	13 243		1 306		34		376		0.090		3/3		14		20		930		0.288
3	Person_ideology	7 618		1 735		30		197		0.152		1/0		5		25		1 538		0.114
4	Person_profession	43 124		1 027		15		143		0.105				2		13		884		0.139
5	Person_role	34 787		968		14		173		0.081				3		11		795		0.179
6	Person_religion	39 618		995		12		78		0.154				12		12		917		0.078
7	Person_member of concrete institution	3 194		537		8		127		0.063				3		5		410		0.236
8	Person_status	480		337		6		141		0.043				3		3		196		0.418
9	Person_relationship	625		330		6		96		0.063				3		3		234		0.291
10	Animal	1 277		145		4		28		0.143				2		2		117		0.193
11	Person_event	316		248		3		55		0.055				3		3		193		0.222
12	State	526		126		2		8		0.250				2		2		118		0.063
13	Person_quantity	407		100		1		17		0.059				1		1		83		0.170
14	Person	4 074		100		1		1		1.000				1		1		99		0.010
15	Patient	1		1		1		1		1.000		1/1		1		1		1.000		1.000
Total		287 008		13 573		284		5 197		0.055		28/12		160		124		8 376		0.383

**Table 5.** Non-TMs of nouns featuring the TM “quality”, broken down by base word semantics (B-cluster 15, with no non-TMs, has been omitted)

<b>Base semantics Total TokF non-TM</b>	<b>Non-target meanings (Type/TokF)</b>
1 Person_quality (1862)	<b>bounded event (69/568)</b> , unbounded event (52/352), coll. of people (16/55), ideology (13/200), metaref. (13/22), state (12/116), status (9/94), person/object (6/146), honorific (3/74), result (3/7), location (2/95), profession (2/42), coll. of objects (1/78), religion (1/8), time (1/2), realm/domain (1/2), quantity (1/1)
2 Person_geography (930)	<b>geographical identity (24/401)</b> , coll. of people (18/161), ideology (16/268), metaref. (6/15), status (3/24), bounded event (3/16), unbounded event (3/14), location (2/4), state (1/16), realm/domain (1/11)
3 Person_ideology (1538)	<b>ideology (29/1329)</b> , unbounded event (14/77), bounded event (10/41), coll. of people (5/55), state (3/14), style/manner (2/6), status (1/7), coll. of concrete institutions (1/4), time (1/2), realm/domain (1/1), metaref. (1/1), profession (1/1)
4 Person_profession (884)	<b>profession (15/515)</b> , unbounded event (13/172), bounded event (6/52), coll. of people (6/26), coll. of objects (2/56), field of study (2/30), realm/domain (2/26), style/manner (2/3), concrete institution (2/2), metaref. (1/2)
5 Person_role (795)	<b>role (11/221)</b> , unbounded event (11/166), coll. of people (5/150), status (5/22), realm/domain (4/77), abstract institution (3/47), inchoative (3/24), bounded event (3/8), metaref. (3/3), time (2/10), relationship (2/9), style/manner (2/8), state (2/2), concrete institution (1/29), location (1/19)

6	Person_religion (917)	<b>religion</b> (12/847), coll. of people (5/24), unbounded event (3/16), style/manner (2/5), state (2/2), geographical identity (1/14), bounded event (1/6), concrete institution (1/2), realm/domain (1/1)
7	Person_member of concrete institution (410)	<b>unbounded event</b> (6/17), <b>concrete institution</b> (5/217), coll. of people (5/37), ideology (4/98), profession (2/31), bounded event (2/4), state (1/3), metaph. (1/2), inchoative (1/1)
8	Person_status (196)	<b>status</b> (5/47), unbounded event (3/40), coll. of people (2/11), abstract institution (2/3), profession (1/46), school subject (1/15), realm/domain (1/14), coll. of objects (1/7), bounded event (1/4), coll. of concrete institutions (1/3), relationship (1/3), time (1/1), state (1/1), metaph. (1/1)
9	Person_relationship (234)	<b>relationship</b> (4/188), unbounded event (3/23), status (1/10), bounded event (1/6), coll. of people (1/4), role (1/1), concrete institution (1/1), state (1/1)
10	Animal (117)	<b>person/object</b> (2/4), <b>bounded event</b> (1/97), honorific (1/7), field of study (1/3), coll. of people (1/3), metaph. (1/2), unbounded event (1/1)
11	Person_event (193)	<b>bounded event</b> (3/127), unbounded event (2/49), location (1/13), status (1/2), coll. of people (1/2)
12	State (118)	<b>state</b> (2/60), status (2/45), quantity (1/2), unbounded event (1/5), single instance of action (1/3), time (1/2), metaph. (1/1)
13	Person_quantity (83)	<b>coll. of abstract ideas</b> (1/34), state (1/24), coll. of people (1/22), coll. of objects (1/3)
14	Person (99)	<b>coll. of people</b> (1/99)

- (20) Slažem se, ubojstvo POW je totalni idiotizam i **kukavištvo**.  
I agree; the murder of a POW is total idiocy and **cowardice** (lit. coward-stvo).
- (21) Da me MIKA ne bi stalno optuživao za **podrepaštvo** Crkvi, ni ja nisam pobornik ovakve uistinu nemoralne Europske Unije.  
Just so MIKA doesn't keep accusing me of **ass-kissing** (lit. undertailer-stvo) the Church, I am also against this deeply amoral European Union.

While *kukavištvo* may be used in abstract references to a behavior/quality type qualitatively distinct from other quality/behavior types, like *podrepaštvo* 'asskissery' or *tračerstvo* 'gossipiness', all of these nouns also imply events, viz., behaviors of base-denoted participants *kukavica* 'a coward', *podrepaš* (lit. undertailer) 'bootlicker', and *tračer* 'a gossip'. When construed dynamically, as in (20) and (21), evolution in time, which is a component of any event (behavior), becomes prominent. In (21) *podrepaštvo* means repeated instances of the behavior in time and we are looking at the mass noun construal of ass-kissing. The metonymy responsible for this shift is QUALITY & MANIFESTING A QUALITY. Example (20) reconstrues the behavior type as a single complete episode of the event, including the beginning and the end, viz., as a "bounded event".<sup>33</sup> The metonymy behind this shift is QUALITY & INSTANCE OF MANIFESTING A QUALITY.

Shifts between "quality" and other non-TMs are less frequent, but are easily motivated. A few examples must suffice. The metonymy QUALITY & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE WITH A QUALITY is featured in an example where heresy is flagged as the reason why one needs 'to shut the mouths of **the godless**' (*zatvoriti usta bezbožništvu*). Similarly, a "quality" can be reified into a singular, countable 'person/object' via ENTITY & DEFINING QUALITY metonymy, as in a reference to Zeus as 'a genuine **divinity**' (*stvarno božanstvo*). The same metonymy allows the reconstrual of "quality" as a "location characterized by the quality", e.g., in a reference to Croatian wooden ships making their way 'to **far away spaces**' (*u daleka prostranstva*, lit. spacious-stvo<sub>PL</sub>). "Quality" is reconstrued as a matter of "status" via the metonymy QUALITY & STATUS DERIVING FROM A QUALITY in a corpus reference to a lowly serf 'clambering his way up to **gentility**' (*popeti se do gospodstva*). Also, a more or less permanent "quality" may be reconstrued as a temporary "state", e.g., in a metaphorical reference to 'curing oneself of **lesbianhood**' (*izliječiti od lezbijstva*).

In almost all other B-clusters (rows 2–14 in Table 4, excluding the singleton cluster "patient" in row 15), "quality" is subordinate or equal in TypF to other,

<sup>33</sup> Cf. "episodic nominalization" in Langacker (1991: 24) and "episodic events" Raden and Dirven (2007: 82).



typically base-driven, meanings (cf. Table 5). To illustrate, the metonymy **RELATIONSHIP & QUALITY OF ENTITIES IN A RELATIONSHIP** arguably motivates the use of *suradništvo* (lit. co-worker-stvo ‘cooperativeness’) as one in a list of positive qualities in young students, alongside responsibility and compassion. However, the noun predominantly means a relationship between people based on mutual cooperation, as exemplified by a corpus example where people are said to ‘confuse acquaintanceship, **cooperation**, and friendship’ (*miješaju poznanstvo, suradništvo i prijateljstvo*). Disregarding the last B-cluster in Table 4, which only has one hapax noun, the TM predictability values are low (column 12). In most cases they fall between 10% and 30%, in one cluster reaching 42% (person\_status).<sup>34</sup> The T/T ratio (column 7 of Table 4) is also low, mostly well below 0.2.<sup>35</sup> Still, three B-clusters, viz. bases denoting persons defined by geographical identity and ideology (rows 2 and 3 of Table 4), and a patient noun base (row 15 of Table 4), accounted for the remaining five hapaxes, of which four are neologisms (column 8): *kanadstvo*<sup>n</sup>, *škotstvo*<sup>n</sup>, *provincijalstvo*<sup>n</sup>, *hegelijanstvo*, *kumirstvo*<sup>n</sup>. To the extent that these are indeed neologisms, it is tempting to propose that the quality schema is not only robust and productive with bases denoting (people characterized by) qualities but may have become generalized to operate on other bases, like those denoting people defined by geographical identities. Be that as it may, quality is here best understood as the target of semantic extension, typically from the base-driven meanings bolded in Table 5. Of course, each B-cluster features additional non-TMs, many unrelated to “quality”. For instance, the style/manner reading of “ideology” in a reference to ‘Radić-esque **republicanism**’<sup>36</sup> (*radićevsko republikanstvo*) needs no reference to “quality”; neither does the “field of study” reading of nouns with professional agent bases *primalja* ‘midwife’ > *primaljstvo* ‘midwifery’ in a reference to ‘bachelors of **midwifery**’ (*prvostupnici primaljstva*).

### 5.3. Professions, Occupations, Trades, and Other Regular Activities (“Profession”)

Our third most type-frequent category are activities which (a) involve socially sanctioned rules of procedure for successful outcomes, (b) require formal qualification, training or skill, (c) involve reward (financial, health, sat-

<sup>34</sup> With hapaxes, we cannot speak of the proportion of TM in the total set of analyzed meanings in a B-cluster, i.e., of its predictability **relative to** other, competing meanings. Hapaxes have no competition.

<sup>35</sup> The last two B-clusters, with their TypF of 1 and TokF of 1, score a perfect 1, but this is completely uninterpretable. To state the obvious, a single token cannot be dispersed across a single noun.

<sup>36</sup> Stjepan Radić (1871–1928) was a Croatian politician, the founder of the Croatian People’s Peasant Party.

isfaction, etc.), and (d) take place regularly. This mostly involves professions, trades, and occupations (*zubarstvo* 'dentistry', *mesarstvo* 'butchery', *stolarstvo* 'carpentry'), but also various leisure activities (*kajakaštvo* 'kayaking', *planinarstvo* 'mountaineering').<sup>37</sup> Closer to category fringes we find activities like *piratstvo* 'piracy', which fail on the criteria of formal qualification and social sanction, but still qualify as regular, income-producing 'pseudo-professional' pursuits requiring skill, planning, and reward (cf. fn. 28).

Table 1 shows that the TM is not only type-frequent (N = 229, cf. column 4) but with the exception of its third lowest T/T ratio overall (0.027, cf. column 6), does very well on other measures. It is the second most predictable meaning overall (62%, cf. column 11) and has the biggest favorable discrepancy between the number of nouns where the meaning is dominant versus subordinate (178 : 51; cf. columns 8 and 9). Importantly, the category yields the second largest batch of hapaxes of which all are neologisms (column 7). Since its good performance is largely due to two B-clusters, we turn to them first.

According to Table 6 on the next page, two B-clusters account for most types and tokens of TM "profession", viz., nouns with bases denoting professional agents (row 1), and nouns with bases denoting nonprofessional agents pursuing various leisure activities (row 2). These also contribute most to the prevalence of TM-dominant nouns in the whole category (170 of 178 TM-dominant nouns come from these two clusters, see column 9). Exceptions should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis. We offer two illustrative examples. The dominant meaning of *pjesništvo* 'poetry' (< *pjesnik* 'poet') is "collectivity of objects" (see Appendix pt. 17), i.e., 'all poetry by an author or period'. The prominent meaning of *ribnjačarstvo* 'fish farming' is "concrete institution" (see Appendix pt. 8), i.e., a legal entity registered to pursue fish farming. The two B-clusters are also the most predictable (column 12 of Table 6), having the largest proportion of TM tokens in their respective samples (66% and 71%). Their T/T ratios (column 7), however, are low (0.026 and 0.025). Although each B-cluster is represented by many noun types (suggesting the likelihood of schema productivity), many nouns occur in many tokens. This leads to item-familiarity, which detracts from schema entrenchment and productivity. Still, "profession" is safely considered a productive category of WF, especially with nonprofessional agent bases. The two account for 18 of the 19 hapaxes, all listed in (22) on page 219. The 11 possible neologisms are marked with the superscript letter n in (22).

<sup>37</sup> For simplicity, we use the term 'profession' for both types of activity. We also counted them together in the analysis of other semantic categories.

- (22) *bič-barstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'beach-bar business', *čarobništvo* 'wizardry', *eko-vrtlarstvo*<sup>(n)</sup> 'eco-gardening',<sup>38</sup> *gravnerijanstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'Gravner-style wine production', *gumbarstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'button making', *juvelirstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'jeweler's trade', (*filmsko*) *kritičarstvo*<sup>n</sup> '(film) criticism', *krmadarstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'pig farming', *lančarstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'chain making', *limarstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'tinner's trade', *marvogojstvo* 'livestock farming', *opekarstvo* 'brickmaking', *ormararstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'closetmaking', *paziteljstvo*<sup>n</sup> '(land) keeping', *slikotvorstvo* 'imaging', *suknarstvo* 'draper's trade', *ton majstorstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'sound engineering', *tkalstvo* 'weaving', *štamparstvo* 'printing'.

We allow that some of these superscripted nouns might be accidental dictionary gaps, since after all they denote close-to-obsolete trades. This would also explain their low frequency in hrWaC.

Some nouns from clusters with bases other than nonprofessional agents (rows 3–11) also featured "profession" as the only or dominant meaning; viz., in *bič-barstvo* 'beach bar business', based on the location noun *bič bar* (phonological adaptation of *beach bar*), in *porodiljstvo* 'obstetrics', based on a patient noun *porodilja* 'woman in/after childbirth', and *slobodnjaštvo* 'freelancing', based on the status noun *slobodnjak* 'freelancer'. The existence of *bič-barstvo* suggests that language users may also be sensitive to slightly more schematic levels of construction semantics than the level that specifies the semantic category of the base when producing novel "profession" nouns (for a similar proposal regarding "quality" see p. 217 above). However, generally, in most B-clusters shown in rows 3–7 and 9–10 of Table 7, "profession" is subordinate to base-driven meanings. For instance, "quality" is the basic meaning of *-stvo* (row 7 of Table 6) as exemplified in (23), but it features an idiosyncratic extension to "profession" shown in (24):

- (23) Rat je jedna ekstremna situacija gdje **herojstvo** lakše dolazi do izražaja.

War is an extreme kind of situation where **heroism** (lit. hero-stvo) finds easier expression.

- (24) **Herojstvo** je usamljeno i nezahvalno zanimanje. Jadni Spider-Man, Batman i Harry Potter.

**Heroism** is a lonely and unrewarding profession. Poor Spiderman, Batman and Harry Potter.

(QUALITY & PROFESSION INVOLVING THE USE OF QUALITY)

<sup>38</sup> Since *vrtlarstvo* 'gardening' is a well-established suffixation, this noun may have arisen by compounding (with clipping of the first member *ekološko*<sub>ADJ</sub> 'ecological' > *eko*). The noun was not counted as a neologism licenced by the 'profession' schema of *-stvo*.

**Table 6.** Quantitative results for semantic category “profession”, broken down by base semantics (B-clusters)

Base semantics (1)	Example (2)	TokF		Smpl		TypF		TypF/		Hap./		TypF		TokF:		TM/ Smpl TokF (12)
		Ns (3)	(4)	Ns (5)	TM (6)	TokF TM (7)	Hap./ Neol. (8)	TypF TM dom. (9)	TypF TM sub. (10)	TokF: non-TM (11)						
1	Person_profession	281 755	8 800	150	5 830	0.026	16/10	130	20	2 970	0.663					
2	Person_other regular activities	54 478	2 911	51	2 076	0.025	2/0	40	11	835	0.713					
3	Person_member of concrete institution	6 192	508	8	115	0.070		1	7	393	0.226					
4	Person_role	1 978	544	7	177	0.040		1	6	367	0.325					
5	Person_status	4 085	259	5	75	0.067		2	3	184	0.290					
6	Patient	1 827	191	2	106	0.019		1	1	85	0.555					
7	Person_quality	1 671	200	2	42	0.048		2	2	158	0.210					
8	Abstract	68 301	100	1	59	0.017		1		41	0.590					
9	Person_relationship	2	2	1	2	0.500		1			1.000					
10	Person_ideology	74	74	1	1	1.000		1	1	73	0.014					
11	Location	1	1	1	1	1.000	1/1	1			1.000					
	Total	420 364	13 590	229	8 484	0.027	19/11	178	51	5 106	0.624					

Table 7 on page 223 indicates that the overall most frequent non-TM is “unbounded event”, especially in the two major B-clusters. The extension of “profession” to “unbounded event” was already explained and exemplified with *mesarstvo* in (1). Its extension to “bounded event” is illustrated in (25), which reconstrues “profession” as a single instance of the event type in a metonymy PROFESSION & INSTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY.

- (25) Sad u nedjelju ga je Kruno morao smirivat da stavi kočnice zadnjih 15 minuta zbog eventualne ozlijede (nakon onog **mesarstva** Pranjića).

This Sunday Kruno had to get him to slow down for the final 15 minutes to avoid injury (after the **butchery** of Pranjić).

A nonmetaphorical example is given in (26).

- (26) Akteri nabrojanih tuča, **svodništava** i krađa nose imena poput Ivan Radonja Gladni, Maruša Skurca (očito, prostitutka) ili Miljak zvani Nesreća.

Protagonists of the mentioned brawls, **solicitations for prostitution** (lit. pimp-stvo<sub>PL</sub>), and thefts bear names like Ivan Radonja Gladni, Maruša Skurca (clearly a prostitute), or Miljak Nesreća.

A major group of other non-TMs are motivated by the general metonymy PROFESSION & PARTICIPANT. The participants are typically various types of agents like: (a) “concrete institution” in a reference to a ‘leading inland waterways **shipping company** HRB Dunavski Lloyd Sisak Ltd.’ (*vodeće riječno brodarstvo HRB Dunavski Lloyd Sisak d.o.o.*, lit. shipper-stvo), (b) “collectivities of people” in a reference to folk music being favored by ‘war **profiteerdom**, i.e., a new caste of Balkan businessmen’ (*ratno profiterstvo, nova kasta balkanskih poduzetnika*, lit. war profiteer-stvo), and (c) “collectivities of concrete institutions” (see Appendix pt. 12) in a reference to total exports of ‘Croatian **fishing**’ (*hrvatsko ribarstvo*, lit. fisher-stvo).

Metonymy allows us to zoom out from “concrete institution” through “collectivity of concrete institutions” to the whole sector where the economic activity takes place, including economic players, their relationships, regulatory mechanisms, etc. The latter, incidentally a very robust non-TM especially in the first B-cluster (see Table 7), can be interpreted as the “realm” dominated by the economic activity and fits our figurative interpretation of the semantic category “realm/domain” (see Appendix pt. 7). “Collectivity of concrete institutions” can be illustrated with a corpus example where **cattle raising** (*govedarstvo*) is referenced as having been halved (“collectivity of concrete institutions”). The meaning “realm/domain” is found in an example discuss-

ing guidelines for restructuring (the realm/domain of) Croatian **farming** (*poljodjelstvo*) to meet EU standards.

Another common metonymic extension is from “profession” to “field of study”, e.g., in reference to ‘a graduate of **gravestone masonry**’ (lit. mason-stvo) (*apsolvent nadgrobnog klesarstva*).

As earlier, we find that not all non-TMs are directly motivated by “profession”. Other non-TMs occasionally figure as local prototypes. Take for instance the noun *računovodstvo* ‘accounting’. In most cases it means ‘accounting’ as a profession type. However, the “exam” interpretation of *računovodstvo* in *polagati računovodstvo u rujnu* ‘to take **accounting** in September’ is due to metonymy operating first and foremost on the concept “school subject” (SCHOOL SUBJECT & EXAM), rather than “profession” directly. The example reads as ‘taking the **exam** in the **school subject** *Accounting* in September’. Also interesting is the “time” reading of *porodiljstvo*, which is not an extension of the dominant meaning “profession”, i.e., ‘obstetrics’, in which case it would mean the time during which someone was pursuing this career. In the corpus example, a woman compared the bliss of the early postpartal period (*porodiljstvo*) to the extremely difficult pregnancy, suggesting that the noun was used to indicate the period during which a woman was in postpartal “state”.

## 6. General Discussion and Conclusions

The goals of this study have been to analyze an extensive database of *-stvo* suffixations to identify the suffix’s most type-frequent and most productive meanings, and to explore typical mechanisms motivating the semantic variability of *-stvo* suffixations. We have used several quantitative measures that bring us a step closer to achieving the first goal.

As seen in Table 1, the **type frequency** (column 4) of our semantic categories ranged from 289 (“unbounded event”) to 6 (“honorific”). The range is wide, but all these categories were found to be dominant in at least a handful of nouns, even if only as a matter of lexical idiosyncrasy. The five categories with type-frequencies over 100 nouns include “quality”, “profession”, “collectivity of people”, “unbounded event”, and “bounded event”. Their highest TypF scores compared to others mean that these five semantic categories are experienced in the largest number of nouns, which increases users’ experience with the patterns/schemas, i.e., their confidence in matching *-stvo* with the five meanings. Two of the five categories, viz. “quality” and “profession”, also have a (much) higher number of nouns where the meanings are dominant as opposed to subordinate in various polysemy configurations (columns 8 and 9), which increases users’ experience with those *-stvo* nouns as “quality” and “profession” nouns, i.e., their confidence in matching them with the two meanings. This, in conjunction with other measures on which the two categories do very well (see Sections 5.2 and 5.3 and further below), suggests

**Table 7.** Non-TMs of nouns featuring the TM “profession”, broken down by base semantics (B-clusters 8 and 11, with no non-TMs have been omitted)

	Base semantics	Non-target meanings (Type/TokF)
	<b>Total TokF non-TM</b>	<b>unbounded event (90/578), realm/domain (61/765), concrete institution (43/352), field of study (41/297), coll. of concrete institutions (34/229), style/manner (14/58), coll. of objects (13/213), school subject (12/40), coll. of persons (10/211), bounded event (9/47), metaref. (6/16), quality (5/33), skill (4/12), location (3/11), list/record (2/48), result (2/2), inchoative (2/2), exam (2/2), role (1/26), ideology (1/15), instrument (1/8), status (1/2), time (1/1), state (1/1), book (1/1)</b>
1	Person_profession (2970)	
2	Person_other regular activities (835)	<b>unbounded event (35/312), quality (10/108), bounded event (9/118), coll. of objects (8/177), coll. of persons (6/19), metaref. (4/24), result (3/21), field of study (3/20), concrete institution (3/10), school subject (3/6), realm/domain (2/7), location (2/4), style/manner (2/3), coll. of concrete institutions (2/2), status (1/1), role (1/1), quantity (1/1), skill (1/1)</b>
3	Person_member of concrete institution (393)	<b>collectivity of persons (6/156), concrete institution (4/184), unbounded event (4/34), quality (3/6), location (1/5), status (1/2), bounded event (1/2), metaref. (1/2), role (1/1), inchoative (1/1)</b>
4	Person_role (367)	<b>unbounded event (6/57), realm/domain (3/76), role (3/15), coll. of persons (2/100), concrete institution (2/66), skill (1/34), status (1/9), bounded event (1/4), abstract institution (1/3), metaref. (1/2), field of study (1/1)</b>
5	Person_status (184)	<b>status (4/89), unbounded event (3/35), quality (2/28), coll. of concrete institutions (2/4), realm/domain (1/14), relationship (1/6), result (1/4), abstract institution (1/3), metaref. (1/1)</b>
6	Patient (85)	<b>unbounded event (2/12), coll. of concrete institutions (1/57), school subject (2/2), realm/domain (1/8), coll. of objects (1/4), time (1/1), state (1/1)</b>
7	Person_quality (158)	<b>quality (2/110), bounded event (2/31), unbounded event (2/14), status (1/3)</b>
9	Abstract (41)	<b>realm/domain (1/41)</b>
10	Person_ideology (73)	<b>ideology (1/44), quality (1/18), bounded event (1/6), unbounded event (1/5)</b>

strongly that they are well-established WF schemas of *-stvo*. Interestingly, “collectivity (of people)”, though prioritized in some theoretical discussions of abstract nominalizing suffixes (see Lieber 2004), does not fare that well. Although the category has the fourth-highest TypF (N = 144), it does not appear to be particularly open to new members, with only four hapaxes in the database, of which three are neologisms (see Appendix pt. 4). This finding is consistent with Nagórko (2009: 788) and Mihatsch (2015: 1187), who claim that “collectivity” is an old, widespread, no longer particularly productive meaning in Slavic abstract noun suffixes. “Collectivity of people” is also much more often a subordinate than the dominant meaning in its “host” nouns (103 vs. 41 nouns). Granted, it is semantically versatile, in the sense of being found in a variety of nouns and polysemy configurations (see Appendix pt. 4); however, its largely subordinate status in polysemous nouns suggests (according to our quantitative criterion anyway) that the meaning may not be the actual point of departure for all those semantic extensions, rather its destination. The two “dynamic” categories, viz. “unbounded event” and “bounded event”, rank high in terms of their TypF (N = 289 and N = 135). However, this is not matched by high TokFs (N = 2299 and N = 1856). The two categories score lowest of the five categories on the latter measure. They also have the least favorable dominant vs. subordinate ratio (10 : 279 and 17 : 118, respectively). Many cases where the meanings are dominant seem like lexical idiosyncrasies, although “bounded event” is basic in a series of homicide nouns like *ženomorstvo* ‘uxoricide’ and nouns whose bases perhaps tautologously code the meaning, e.g., *bjegstvo* ‘escape’ (< *bijeg* ‘escape’). Beyond the five top-ranked categories, several others are in good standing on the criterion of meaning dominance vs. subordinateness, viz., “ideology”, “relationship”, and “religion”, which correlates nicely, and expectedly so, with their relatively high predictability scores (column 11 of Table 1; see also below).

Type frequency should also be assessed from the point of view of how the tokens are distributed across the types (T/T ratio) for the theoretical implications this may have for schema entrenchment. Given the theoretical range of 0 to 1, the generally low T/T ratios (column 6 of Table 1) seem unfavorable to the interpretation of any of the semantic categories as entrenched constructional schemas. This is so even with the five categories having the most noun types. Although the existence of many types creates conditions for a good dispersion of tokens, tokens are often too many to maintain a good T/T balance. This is especially so with the category “profession”, which performs best or second best on other measures. Still, when interpreted relatively, the best T/T ratio among nouns with a healthy number of types and tokens is found with “unbounded events”, a category for which there is little other evidence of its having a schema (only one hapax, which is also a neologism, and few nouns with meaning dominance). As for predictability, viz., the proportion of tokens of the meaning in the sample, the most predictable meanings proved to



be “religion” (82%), “profession” (62%), and “relationship” (59%). This means that nouns like *katoličanstvo* ‘catholicity’, *stolarstvo* ‘carpentry’, or *suparništvo* ‘competition’ are most frequently used and experienced with the meanings “religion”, “profession” and “relationship”, respectively, i.e., that the particular form-to-meaning matches are fairly consistent. The next highest ranked category on this criterion is “ideology” (48%). However, it does sit below 50%, which means that it slightly more frequently means something other than “ideology” (e.g., “quality” or “geographical identity”; see Section 5.2 and Appendix pt. 19).

**Productivity.** We relied on neologisms as linguistic evidence of schema productivity so as to avoid crediting putative WF schemas with corpus uses that may have occurred by semantic extension. Two categories, viz., “quality” and “profession”, together account for over half of all hapaxes (47/72 or 65%) and neologisms (23/40 or 58%) in our database (column 7 of Table 1), and thus qualify as productive WF schemas. The remaining categories account for anywhere between zero and four hapaxes, of which zero to three are neologisms, and their productivity, as well as status as WF schemas, is uncertain. They should be verified by other methods or using other corpora. Beyond the numbers, we consider as a strong indicator of productivity the existence of neologisms that should have been token-blocked by already existing, virtually synonymous suffixations, e.g., *čovjekoljupstvo* vs. *čovjekoljubivost*/*čovjekoljublje*. This was typically the case with “quality” nouns.

**Semantic extension mechanisms.** Unfortunately, we were unable to discuss the motivation behind all instances of lexical variability in our extensive database. A web-based corpus is the breeding ground for many interesting examples such as a reference to cigarette and coffee as the ‘Holy Duality’ *sвето dvojstvo* (a minimal “collectivity of objects”), which was most likely assembled in analogy to the model of ‘Holy Trinity’, rather than created by semantic extension from the “quality” interpretation of the noun *dvojstvo* as found in *dvojstvo* (*književnog djela*) ‘**dual nature** of a literary work’. Future studies must also address in detail the conceptual links between meanings within and across B-clusters of particular semantic categories, between/across semantic categories, and perhaps even higher up in the conceptual hierarchy of schemas if warranted by data. Let us briefly illustrate a case of conceptual intersection between two semantic categories, viz., “ideology” and “geographical identity”. We remain in principle suspicious about the usefulness or cognitive reality of a schema that would generalize over them (how could we describe the semantic pole of their taxonomically superordinate schema?). We treated “ideology” and “geographical identity” as separate categories (cf. Appendix pts. 6 and 19); however, a set of “geographical identity” nouns (actually a little over 50% of all such nouns in the database, i.e., 14 of 27) bridge this gap, by allowing metonymy to reconstrue geographical identities as objects of political ideologies in a version of CONTAINER & CONTENT metonymy. *Jugoslavenstvo*

(lit. Yugoslavian-stvo) ‘Yugoslavianism’ is thus found referenced as an ethnic category in a register of baptisms, but also as the political idea behind the unification of various ethnicities in former Yugoslavia (that is advocated, defended, etc.). Both “ideology” and “geographical identity” also link metonymically with the meanings “quality” and “collectivity of people”, but elaborate them in different ways. Specifically, *njegovo jugoslavenstvo* ‘his Yugoslavianhood/Yugoslavianism’ can mean either the individual’s quality of being of Yugoslavian identity or his quality of being the advocate of the Yugoslavian idea without necessarily being a Yugoslavian himself, or even both. Similarly, there are quality-consistent, and ideology-consistent interpretations of “collectivity of people”. These two and other elaborations of “quality” or “collectivity of people” might be subsumed under their common higher-order schemas “quality” and “collectivity of people”, respectively, where the grouping principle is some kind of family resemblance. “Geographical identity” and “ideology” also have some unshared uses, e.g., only “ideology” was found with “collectivity of concrete institutions” (see Appendix pt. 12) and “style/manner” (see Section 5.2 and Table 5); only “geographical identity” was found with “realm/domain” in a reference to the cultural boundaries of **Europeanhood** (*kulturne granice Europejstva*).

As for metaphor, we ignored instances where metaphor optionally joined metonymy in motivating particular examples. Sometimes, however, metaphor did important cognitive prep-work. We showed some examples where metaphor produced alternative readings of base nouns and in doing so allowed the suffixations to extend in new directions. However, we also proposed a metaphorical extension of a whole semantic category, viz., “realm/domain” to accommodate data consistent with its metaphorical construal (see Appendix pt. 7).

In our analysis we were able to establish some major metonymic patterns, which motivate more or less systematically the bulk of nouns’ semantic variability. A general metonymic pattern ENTITY (PROFESSION, IDEOLOGY, RELIGION, GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY, QUALITY, ROLE, RELATIONSHIP, STATUS, STATE) & (BOUNDED OR UNBOUNDED) EVENT triggers all extensions to the two dynamic construals of the various entity types listed above. Examples of metonymies delivering the TM “unbounded event” are given in Section 5.1, while metonymies responsible for “bounded event” reconstruals are exemplified in Appendix (pt. 5). Metonymy also allows the reconstrual of the entity types above as “qualities” (Section 5.2). Also robust are extensions from the various entity types to “collectivities of people”, as amply illustrated in Appendix, pt. 4. Some fairly specific and/or idiosyncratic metonymic patterns (e.g., SCHOOL SUBJECT & EXAM) were occasionally commented on in text in making general points. By necessity short references to additional metonymies found with other semantic categories are given in the Appendix; future studies must address them in more detail.

A few words on the limitations of the study and prospects for future research. A significant challenge for this meaning-driven study was the well-known fact of prototype-based categorization and multiple motivation. The two conspire to make clean semantic/WF categories a utopian goal. Due to methodological limitations, we left for future studies: (a) the statistical verification of semantic categories, i.e., whether the categories proposed represent statistically valid “structure”, (b) questions of psycholinguistic representation and access (discrete or single/shared representations of the various patterns of polysemy as well as whether polysemy is involved at all), and (c) diachronic development of the semantic categories. For the same reason, we left for future studies the assessment of (d) whether our semantic categories represent bona fide categories of WF (e.g., “status”) since the final verdict must await extensive corpus studies of the whole functional domain of abstract nominalizations (also addressing affixal rivalry) and (e) whether polysemy links between nouns translate into WF polysemy, i.e., whether *-stvo* is polysemous, or only multifunctional, with lexical semantics being behind all contextual variability. We certainly hope our study takes us a step closer to answering these questions.

## References

- Anić, Vladimir. (2004) *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Novi liber.
- Baayen, Harald and Rochelle Lieber. (1991) “Productivity and English derivation: A corpus based study”. *Linguistics* 29: 801–43.
- Babić, Stjepan. (2002) *Tvorba riječi u hrvatskome književnome jeziku*. 3rd ed. Zagreb: HAZU, Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Barcelona, Antonio. (2011) “Reviewing the properties and prototype structure of metonymy”. Réka Benczes, Antonio Barcelona, and Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, eds. *Defining metonymy in cognitive linguistics. Towards a consensus view*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 7–57.
- Barić, Eugenija, Mijo Lončarić, Dragica Malić, Slavko Pavešić, Mirko Peti, Vesna Zečević, and Marija Znika. (1997) *Hrvatska gramatika*. 2nd ed. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Belaj, Branimir and Goran Tanacković Faletar. (2014) *Kognitivna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Knjiga prva: *Imenska sintagma i sintaksa padeža*. Zagreb: Disput.
- Benczes, Réka, Antonio Barcelona, and Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, eds. (2011) *Defining metonymy in cognitive linguistics. Towards a consensus view*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Blank, Andreas. (1997) *Prinzipien des lexikalischen Bedeutungswandels am Beispiel der romanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Brdar, Mario and Rita Brdar-Szabó. (2014) “Croatian place suffixations in *-ište*: Polysemy and metonymy”. Frank Polzenhagen, Zoltán Kövecses, Stefanie

- Voglebacher, and Sonja Kleinke, eds. *Cognitive explorations into metaphor and metonymy*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 293–322.
- Bybee, Joan. (1995) "Regular morphology and the lexicon". *Language and cognitive processes* 10: 424–55.
- . (2007) *Frequency of use and the organization of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . (2008) "Usage-based grammar and second language acquisition". Peter Robinson and Nick Ellis, eds. *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge, 216–36.
- . (2010) *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, Joan and Carol Lynn Moder. (1983) "Morphological classes as natural categories". *Language* 59: 251–70.
- Croft, William. (2004) "Logical and typological arguments for Radical Construction Grammar". Mirjam Freid and Jan-Ola Östman, eds. *Construction grammar(s): Cognitive and cross-language dimensions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 273–314. [*Constructional approaches to language*, 3.]
- . (2012) *Verbs. Aspect and causal structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruse, D. Alan. (1986) *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . (2004) *Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Daničić, Đuro, Matija Valjavec, Pero Budmani, Tomo Maretić, Stjepan Muslimin, and Slavko Pavešić. (1880–1976) *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Zagreb: JAZU.
- Ellis, Nick. (2012) "What can we count in language, and what counts in language acquisition, cognition, and use?" Stephan Th. Gries and Dagmar S. Divjak, eds. *Frequency effects in language learning and processing*. Vol. 1. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 7–35. [*Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs*, 244.1.]
- Falkum, Ingrid Lossius and Agustin Vicente. (2015) "Polysemy: Current perspectives and approaches". *Lingua* 157: 1–16.
- Foraker, Stephani and Gregory L. Murphy. (2012) "Polysemy in sentence comprehension: Effects of meaning dominance". *Journal of memory and language* 67(4): 407–25.
- Fought, Carmen. (2006) *Language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. (1988) "Where does prototypicality come from?" Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn, ed. *Topics in cognitive linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 207–231. [*Current issues in linguistic theory*, 50.]
- . (1993) "Vagueness's puzzles, polysemy's vagaries". *Cognitive linguistics* 4: 223–72.

- Geeraerts, Dirk and Yves Peirsman. (2011) "Zones, facets, and prototype-based metonymy". Réka Benczes, Antonio Barcelona, and Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, eds. *Defining metonymy in cognitive linguistics. Towards a consensus view*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 89–102.
- Glynn, Dylan. (2014) "Polysemy and synonymy: Corpus methods and cognitive theory". Dylan Glynn and Justyna A. Robinson, eds. *Corpus methods for semantics. Quantitative studies in polysemy and synonymy*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 7–38.
- Goldberg, Adele. (2016) "Partial productivity of linguistic constructions: Dynamic categorization and statistical preemption". *Language and cognition* 8(3): 369–90.
- Goossens, Louis. (1990) "Metaphonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions of linguistic action". *Cognitive linguistics* 1(3): 323–340.
- Gries, Stephan Th. (2006) "Corpus-based methods and cognitive semantics: The many meanings of to run". Stefan Th. Gries and Anatol Stefanowitsch, eds. *Corpora in cognitive linguistics: Corpus-based approaches to syntax and lexis*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 57–99.
- Haselow, Alexander. (2011) *Typological changes in the lexicon: Analytic tendencies in English noun formation*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. [Topics in English linguistics, 72.]
- Haspelmath, Martin and Andrea D. Sims. (2010) *Understanding morphology*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder Education.
- Lakoff, George. (1987) *Women, fire, and dangerous things. What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1987) *Foundations of cognitive grammar*. Vol. 1: *Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . (1991) *Foundations of cognitive grammar*. Vol. 2: *Descriptive applications*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . (1999) *Grammar and conceptualization*. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter. [Cognitive linguistics research, 14.]
- . (2000) "A dynamic usage-based model". Michael Barlow and Suzanne Kemmer, eds. *Usage-based models of language*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1–63.
- . (2005) "Construction grammars: Cognitive, radical, and less so". Francisco J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez and M. Sandra Peña Cervel, eds. *Cognitive linguistics: Internal dynamics and interdisciplinary interaction*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 101–159. [Cognitive linguistics research, 32.]
- . (2008) *Cognitive grammar. A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . (2009) *Investigations in cognitive grammar*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. [Cognitive linguistics research, 42.]

- Lehrer, Adrienne. (2003) "Polysemy in derivational affixes". Brigitte Nerlich, Zazie Todd, Vimala Herman, and David D. Clarke, eds. *Polysemy: Flexible patterns of meaning in mind and language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 217–33.
- Lieber, Rochelle. (2004) *Morphology and lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ljubešić, Nikola and Tomaž Erjavec. (2011) "hrWaC and slWaC: Compiling web corpora for Croatian and Slovene". Ivan Habernal and Vaclav Matousek, eds. *Text, speech, and dialogue, lecture notes in computer science*. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer, 395–402.
- Luschützky, Hans Christian. (2015) "Status nouns". Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen, and Franz Rainer, eds. *Word formation. An international handbook of the languages of Europe*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1285–304. [*Handbücher zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung*, 40.1.]
- Luschützky, Hans Christian and Franz Rainer. (2013) "Instrument and place nouns: A typological and diachronic perspective". *Linguistics* 51(6): 1301–59.
- Marchand, Hans. (1969) *The categories and types of present-day English word-formation*. München: Oscar Beck.
- McRae, Ken, Todd R. Ferretti, and Lianne Amyote. (1997) "Thematic roles as verb-specific concepts". *Language and cognitive processes* 12(2/3): 137–76.
- Mihatsch, Wiltrud. (2015) "Collectives". Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen, and Franz Rainer, eds. *Word formation. An international handbook of the languages of Europe*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1183–95. [*Handbücher zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung*, 40.1.]
- Nagórko, Alicja. (2009) "Diminutiva/Augmentative und Kollektiva". Tilman Berger, Karl Gutschmidt, Sebastian Kempgen, and Peter Kosta, eds. *Die slavischen Sprachen. The Slavic languages. Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Geschichte, ihrer Struktur und ihrer Erforschung. An international handbook of their history, their structure, and their investigation*, Band 1/Vol. 1. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 782–92. [*Handbooks of linguistics and communication science/Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 32.1.]
- Norrick, Neal R. (1981) *Semiotic principles in semantic theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [*Current issues in linguistic theory*, 20.]
- Paradis, Carita. (2004) "Where does metonymy stop? Senses, facets, and active zones". *Metaphor and symbol* 19(4): 245–64.
- Peirsman, Yves and Dirk Geeraerts. (2006) "Metonymy as a prototypical category". *Cognitive linguistics* 17(3): 269–316.
- Plag, Ingo. (2003) *Word formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Radden, Günter and René Dirven. (2007) *Cognitive English grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rainer, Franz. (2005) "Semantic change in word formation". *Linguistics* 43(2): 415–41.

- Rainer, Franz. (2014) "Polysemy in derivation". Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Štekauer, eds. *The Oxford handbook of derivational morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 338–53.
- Silić, Josip and Ivo Pranjković. (2007) *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Skok, Petar. (1971) *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Zagreb: JAZU.
- Szymanek, Bogdan. (1988) *Categories and categorization in morphology*. Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubeski.
- Štekauer, Pavol, Salvador Valera, and Livia Körtvélyessy, eds. (2012) *Word-formation in the world's languages: A typological survey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomasello, Michael. (2003) *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Trips, Carola. (2009) *Lexical semantics and diachronic morphology. The development of -hood, -dom, and -ship in the history of English*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Trost, Klaus. (1976) "Zur Definition der Abstrakta (am Beispiel von Russisch und Deutsch)". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 81: 221–39.
- Umbreit, Birgit. (2011) "Motivational networks: An empirically supported cognitive phenomenon". Klaus-Uwe Panther and Günter Radden, eds. *Motivation in grammar and the lexicon*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 269–87.
- Zlatev, Jordan. (2003) "Polysemy or generality? Mu". Herbert Cuykens, René Dirven, and John R. Taylor, eds. *Cognitive approaches to lexical semantics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 447–94.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. and Jerrold M. Saddock. (1975) "Ambiguity tests and how to fail them". John P. Kimball, ed. *Syntax and semantics*. Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press, 1–36.

## Secondary sources

- Croatian Web-Based Corpus. Available at: <http://nlp.ffzg.hr/resources/corpora/hrwac/>
- The Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), s.vv. "hood", "status".
- Merriam Webster On-line Dictionary. Available at: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>

Filozofski fakultet Osijek  
 Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku  
 L. Jägera 9, 31000 Osijek  
 Croatia  
 gbuljan@ffos.hr

## Appendix: Remaining Semantic Categories in Brief

Semantic categories are ordered by frequency rank in Table 1. We only illustrate typical polysemy, i.e., metonymic, patterns in which the semantic category participates directly. One of the meanings is usually dominant, but their order below is not meant to indicate the presumed direction of semantic extension. Snippets of authentic contexts (adapted for coherence) are given to justify interpretations. The superscript letter 'n' on hapaxes marks possible neologisms.

### 4. Collectivity of People

Description: a plurality of humans sharing a common property which is coded in the base and involves entities' profession, religion, geographical identity, ideology, role, membership in an institution, relationship, quality, status, state, etc.

Dominance: More often subordinate than dominant. Dominant in some of the nouns whose bases refer to people of a status, e.g., *plebejstvo* 'plebeians', profession *učiteljstvo* 'teachers collectively', role, e.g., *činovništvo* 'clerkdom', to people generically, e.g., *čovječanstvo* 'humanity', *ljudstvo* 'manpower' (< *ljudi* 'people'), to a singleton noun whose base denotes an administrative unit, e.g., *općinstvo* 'people of a municipality' (< *općina* 'municipality'). Elsewhere, dominant meanings tend to be the base-driven meanings ("profession", "religion" etc.).

Polysemy: QUALITY & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE WITH A QUALITY (*pokvarenjaštvo im je u krvi* '**deviousness** is running through their veins' vs. *pokvarenjaštvo i dalje dobro živi* '**the devious** still have it good'); PROFESSION & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE OF A PROFESSION (*zabraniti bavljenje liječništvom* 'to prohibit pursuing **the medical profession**' vs. *zbunjujući jezik liječništva* 'the confusing jargon of **medical professionals**'); RELIGION & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE OF A RELIGION (*osnivač kršćanstva* 'the founder of **Christianity**' vs. *pozornost kršćanstva* 'the attention of **Christiandom**'); IDEOLOGY & COLLECTIVITY OF ADHERENTS TO AN IDEOLOGY (*gajiti simpatije za ljevičarstvo* 'being fond of **left-wing ideology**' vs. *lažima zavedeno ljevičarstvo* '**adherents of left-wing ideology** misled by lies'); STATUS & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE IN STATUS (*osloboditi optužbe zbog maloljetništva* 'drop charges due to **status as a minor**' vs. *festival maloljetništva u klubu* 'a festive crowd of **minors** in the club'); STATE & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE IN A STATE (*patništvo umjetnika* 'artists' **distress**' vs. *svjetsko patništvo je pogrebnik Boga* '**the distressed** of the world are God's undertakers'); ROLE & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE IN A ROLE (*prihvatiti liderstvo* 'to accept **leadership**' vs. *korumpirano liderstvo* 'corrupted **leadership**'); RELATIONSHIP & COLLECTIV-



ITY OF PEOPLE IN A RELATIONSHIP (*ulazak u suradništvo* 'entry into **cooperation**' vs. *rastuće suradništvo* 'growing **cooperant-base**'); GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE OF GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY (*neuniformnost hrvatstva kao etničkog identiteta* 'non-uniformity of **Croatianhood** as an ethnic identity' vs. *svjetsko Hrvatstvo pozdravilo odluku* '**Croatians** of the world welcomed the decision'); CONCRETE INSTITUTION & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE AS MEMBERS OF A CONCRETE INSTITUTION (*formiranje masonstva u Hrvatskoj* 'establishment of **freemasonry** in Croatia' vs. *hrvatsko masonstvo kao fanovi Amerike* 'Croatian **freemasons** as American fans').

Hapaxes: *makedonstvo* 'Macedonians', *galantarstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'collectivity of sellers of small decorative goods', *boljarstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'collectivity of feudal landowners in Russia and parts of Romania', *dvoranstvo*<sup>n</sup> 'the court, i.e., courtly ladies and gentlemen'.

## 5. Bounded Event

Description: reified conception of a single complete episode of the event named or implied by the derivational base.

Dominance: more often subordinate than dominant. Dominant with nouns whose bases refer to (persons defined by) the perpetration of singular events: a cluster of homicide nouns *ubojstvo* 'homicide', *bratoubojstvo* 'fratricide', *čedomorstvo* 'infanticide/neonaticide', *ocoubojstvo* 'patricide', etc., and nouns *bjegstvo* 'an escape', *zločinstvo* 'a criminal act', *zvjerstvo* (lit. *beast-stvo*) 'an act of brutality'. Subordinate in nouns typically denoting "professions", "ideologies", "qualities", "roles", "states", etc.

Polysemy: PROFESSION & INSTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY (Section 5.3); IDEOLOGY & INSTANCE OF PURSUING AN IDEOLOGY (*podupirati protuhrvatstvo* 'to support **anti-Croatian ideology**' vs. *zvati knjigu smećem je protuhrvatstvo* 'to trash a book is **an act of anti-Croatianism**'); RELIGION & INSTANCE OF MANIFESTING A RELIGION (*preobratiti koga s mnogoboštva* 'to convert someone from **polytheism**' vs. *izjednačavati čovjeka s bogom je mnogoboštvo* 'to equate man with God is **an act of polytheism**'); QUALITY & INSTANCE OF MANIFESTING A QUALITY (*lukavstvo je ženina najveća vrlina* '**cunning** is woman's greatest virtue' vs. *predsjednikova brojna lukavstva* 'the president's many **displays of cunning**'); ROLE & INSTANCE OF PERFORMING A ROLE (*istinitost tvrdnji o njegovom doušništvu* 'authenticity of claims about his **role as a snitch**' vs. *prijava ubojstva nije doušništvo* 'to report a homicide is not **an act of snitching**'); RELATIONSHIP & INSTANCE OF EXERCISING A RELATIONSHIP (*biti u rivalstvu* 'to be in **rivalry**' vs. *beskonačna rivalstva* 'endless **rivalries**'); STATE & EVENT LEADING TO STATE (*znaci mentalnog rastrojstva*

‘signs of mental **disorder**’ vs. *nastavak rastrojstva sustava* ‘continued **unraveling** of the system’).

Hapax: *ženomorstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘uxoricide’.

## 6. Ideology

Description: a coherent system of ideas, doctrines, normative beliefs that guide the motivations and behavior of social groups, often constituting a sociopolitical program (*ljevičarstvo* ‘left-wing ideology’). Includes movements (*ilirstvo* ‘the Illyrian movement’, *puritanstvo* ‘Puritanism’) as organized activities to promote or attain ideological ends, and less institutionalized lifestyle practices (*vegetarijanstvo* ‘vegetarianism’, *boemstvo* ‘bohemianism’).

Dominance: mostly dominant due to prevalence of bases denoting followers of ideologies (*ljevičarstvo*); elsewhere, subordinate to “geographical identity”, “quality”, etc.

Polysemy: IDEOLOGY & PURSUING IDEOLOGY (Section 5.1); IDEOLOGY & INSTANCE OF PURSUING AN IDEOLOGY (pt. 5); IDEOLOGY & QUALITY (OF BEING) ASSOCIATED WITH AN IDEOLOGY (Section 5.2); IDEOLOGY & COLLECTIVITY OF ADHERENTS TO IDEOLOGY (pt. 4); IDEOLOGY & CONCRETE INSTITUTION PURSUING AN IDEOLOGY (*njegovati neokaljano benediktinstvo* ‘to practice untarnished **Benedictineship**’ vs. učiti u *benediktinstvo* ‘enter the **Benedictine order**’); IDEOLOGY & GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY AS A TYPE OF CONTAINER & CONTENT metonymy (*nositelji europejstva* ‘bearers of **Europeanism** (as a political idea)’ vs. *europejstvo bez samostojnih europskih narodnosti* ‘**Europeanism** without particular European ethnicities’).

Hapaxes: *antihadezeovstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘anti-Croatian-Democratic-Union-ideology’, *don-grubišićstvo*<sup>n</sup> (‘the Don Grubišić ideology’),<sup>39</sup> *klerikalstvo* ‘clericalism’.

## 7. Realm/Domain

Description: a politically defined territory controlled by a ruler, government, or other authority, sometimes described simply as ‘realm or rule of N’ (Trips 2009: 119). Prototypical examples are *kraljevstvo* ‘kingdom’, *carstvo* ‘empire, tzaardom’, *kneževstvo* ‘dukedom, principality’. Less prototypically, any area dominated by any entity (a people, religion), e.g., in a reference to *barbarstvo* as ‘the part of world dominated by barbarians’ or *katoličanstvo* as ‘the part of world dominated by the Catholic religion’. We adopted Marchand’s interpre-

<sup>39</sup> Don Grubišić: a Roman Catholic priest and politician, who served in the Croatian Parliament (2011–2015).

tation of the suffix *-dom* (1969: 262) and allowed metaphorical interpretations of (a) physical realm/domain as social realm/domain and (b) human entity dominating the physical realm as social activity dominating the social realm. This fed the category with many nouns predominantly meaning “profession” if the pertinent sector/realm of economic activity was contextually foregrounded. Like *kingdom*, *graditeljstvo* ‘civil engineering’, *poljodjelstvo* ‘farming’, etc. can be referenced as realms/domains that are strong/weak, well managed or mismanaged, subject to evolution or fragmentation, etc.

Dominance: more often subordinate than dominant due to many “profession” nouns. Dominant in prototypical examples above.

Polysemy: REALM/DOMAIN & LOCATION OVER WHICH A REALM/DOMAIN EXTENDS (*Rimsko carstvo* ‘the Roman **Empire**’ vs. *širenje carstva* ‘expansion of the **empire**’); PROFESSION & REALM/DOMAIN DOMINATED BY PROFESSION (Section 5.3); RELIGION & REALM/DOMAIN DOMINATED BY RELIGION (*prijeći na katoličanstvo* ‘convert to **Catholicism**’ vs.  *smanjenje katoličanstva* ‘reducing the realm of **Catholicism**’).

Hapax: -

## 8. Concrete Institution

Description: any establishment, organization created to pursue an endeavor. Most bases denote (non-)professional agents, where “concrete institutions” are companies, sports clubs, and similar legal entities. Also found with bases denoting people with unique roles, pursuing ideologies, rarely religious followers, etc.

Dominance: more often subordinate than dominant due to prevalence of “profession” nouns.

Polysemy: PROFESSION & CONCRETE INSTITUTION PURSUING THE PROFESSION (Section 5.3); ROLE & CONCRETE INSTITUTION FULFILLING A ROLE (*preuzeti predstavništvo* ‘to assume the **role of representative**’ vs. *otvoriti predstavništvo* ‘to open a **representative office**’); IDEOLOGY & CONCRETE INSTITUTION PURSUING THE IDEOLOGY (pt. 6); RELIGION & CONCRETE INSTITUTION PURSUING A RELIGION (*odreći se katolištva* ‘to abjure **Catholicism**’ vs. *preustrojiti katolištvo* ‘to reorganize the **Catholic Church**’); CONCRETE INSTITUTION & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE AS MEMBERS OF A CONCRETE INSTITUTION (pt. 4); RELATIONSHIP & CONCRETE INSTITUTION BASED ON A RELATIONSHIP (*pobratimstvo naroda* ‘**brotherhood** of nations’ vs. *Pobratimstvo “Pohodjenje”, molitvena zajednica* ‘**Brotherhood** “Pohodjenje”, a prayer group’); CONCRETE INSTITUTION & QUALITY ASSOCIATED WITH A CONCRETE

INSTITUTION (*uključivanje u sektaštvo* ‘joining a sect’ vs. *sektaštvo liberalizma* ‘sectarian quality of liberalism’); CONCRETE INSTITUTION & LOCATION WHERE A CONCRETE INSTITUTION OPERATES (*Ministarstvo zdravlja* ‘Ministry of Health’ vs. *računala u Ministarstvu* ‘computers in the ministry building’); CONCRETE INSTITUTION & STATUS AS A MEMBER OF A CONCRETE INSTITUTION (*formiranje masonstva u Hrvatskoj* ‘the establishment of freemasonry in Croatia’ vs. *kandidat za masonstvo* ‘candidate for the status of a freemason’), etc.

Hapax: *poklisarstvo*, archaic for ‘embassy’.

## 9. Status

Description: not firmly established as an independent category in WF. Similar to “state” (pt. 10) and “quality” (Section 5.2). Prototypical with bases referring to “a convention or construct, not to something natural” (Luschützky 2015: 1290), such as *državljanstvo* ‘citizenship’. Status involves or implies a position in some kind of hierarchy or classification, “the legal standing or position of a person as determined by his membership of some class of persons legally enjoying certain rights or subject to certain limitations ...” (OED).

Dominance: more often subordinate than dominant. Dominant in nouns like *punoljetstvo* ‘legal age’, *prvorodstvo* ‘first-bornship’, *gastarbajterstvo* ‘immigrant workership’, *apatridstvo* ‘statelessness’, *barunstvo* ‘baronship’, *grofovstvo* ‘countship’. Subordinate with nouns primarily denoting natural “roles”, “qualities”, “states” etc. Found with verbs of attainment, attestation, revocation etc. or implicit/explicit references to formal hierarchies, e.g., *očinstvo* ‘paternity’ (rather than ‘fatherhood’) in contexts of legal custody/paternity disputes; *herojstvo* ‘heroism’ a quality construed as a top rank in a hierarchy of social worthiness (rising up to heroism by committing ritualistic suicide).

Polysemy: STATUS & PERFORMING EVENT IMPLIED BY STATUS (Section 5.1); QUALITY & STATUS DERIVING FROM QUALITY (*božanstvo je skriveno ispod čovječnosti* ‘divinity is hidden beneath humanness’ vs. *branitelji božanstva Duha svetoga* ‘defenders of the divine status of the Holy Ghost’); STATUS & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE IN A STATUS (pt. 4); STATUS & ABSTRACT INSTITUTION (*dodijeliti skrbništvo* ‘to award custody, status of a custodian’ vs. *definirati načela sustava zaštite djece s posebnim osvrtnom na skrbništvo* ‘to define principles of child protection systems with a special emphasis on custodianship’); STATUS & TIME IN STATUS (*steći članstvo* ‘to achieve status as a member’ vs. *produljiti članstvo* ‘to prolong the period in status as a member’); STATE & STATUS BASED ON A STATE (*kliconoštvo se ne liječi* (lit. germ-carrier-stvo) ‘carrier state is not treated’ vs. *utvrditi kliconoštvo kod klinički zdravih ljudi* ‘to determine carrier status in asymptomatic people’); RELATIONSHIP & STATUS OF BEING IN A RELATIONSHIP (*njegovati pobratimstvo* ‘to nur-

ture **brotherhood** vs. *dobrim odnosima država pridonosi i pobratimstvo njihovih dvaju gradova* ‘**twin town status** between their two cities contributes to the good relationship between the countries’); ROLE & STATUS DERIVING FROM ROLE (*emocionalni zahtjevi očinstva* ‘emotional demands of **fatherhood**’ vs. *DNA test očinstva* ‘DNA test of **paternity**’); STATUS & LOCATION WHERE EVENTS IMPLIED BY STATUS TAKE PLACE (*potvrdili su njegovo austrijsko gastarbajtestvo kao laž* ‘they confirmed his **status as an Austrian guestworker** to be a lie’ vs. *otići u gastarbajterstvo* ‘to go to the **place where one will work as a guestworker**’).

Hapax: *patricijstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘patricianship’, *našinstvo*<sup>n</sup> (lit. ours-stvo) ‘status of being ours’.

## 10. State

Description: temporary states, like *spokojstvo* ‘peacefulness, serenity’, *pijanstvo* ‘drunkenness’ etc. For some, temporariness distinguishes “states” from “qualities” (permanent) (Trost 1976: 225, in Luschützky 2015: 1271). Conceptually basic with nouns based on adjectives denoting states (*nezadovoljstvo* ‘state of discontent’, from < *nezadovoljan* ‘discontent’) or nouns denoting people undergoing a state or living in circumstances that affect them emotionally, socially, physically (*stradalništvo* ‘state of being a casualty’, from < *stradalnik* from ‘a casualty’ < *stradati* ‘to become a casualty’; *beskućništvo* ‘homelessness’, from < *beskućnik* ‘a homeless person’).

Dominance: slightly more frequent as subordinate than dominant; subordinate to a variety of meanings, none particularly type-frequent in combination with “state”.

Polysemy: STATE & LOCATION WHERE A STATE OBTAINS (*podnositi izgnanstvo* ‘suffer the **state of exile**’ vs. *umrijeti u izgnanstvu* ‘die in **exile**’); RELIGION & STATE OF BEING TEMPORARILY AFFECTED BY RELIGION (*iskorijeniti mnogoboštvo* ‘to uproot **polytheism**’ vs. *toniti u mnogoboštvo* ‘sinking into the **state (metaphorically construed as a location) of polytheism**’). Idiosyncratically, even with a “profession” noun; *dimnjačarstvo* ‘chimney sweeping’ is interpreted as ‘a state of obsession with a profession’ in *dimjačarstvo ga je popustilo krajem osnovne škole* ‘(his **obsession with**) **chimney sweeping** finally loosened up in him at the end of elementary school’. The sole meaning of *rajstvo* (lit. paradise-stvo), a noun with a locative noun basis *raj* ‘paradise’, found in a corpus reference to ‘experiencing the sweetest **heavenly state**’ (*doživljavati najslađe rajstvo*).

Hapaxes: *rajstvo*<sup>n</sup>, *budalaštvo*, *paćeništvo*.

## 11. Field of Study

Description: a branch of knowledge that is taught and researched, usually as part of higher education, e.g., *zvjezdoznanstvo* (arch. 'astronomy'). Also found with nouns usually denoting "professions" (*zubarstvo* 'dentistry'), "roles" (*državništvo* 'diplomacy').

Dominance: The lack of hapaxes and the dominance of this meaning in only a handful of obsolete nouns (with the exception of *govorništvo* 'oratory', which is still in use) suggest that this schema, if it existed, has decayed.

Polysemy: PROFESSION & FIELD OF STUDY as a subtype of CONTAINER & CONTENT metonymy (*baviti se zubarstvom* 'to do **dentistry**' vs. *postdiplomski studij zubarstva* 'postgraduate studies in **dentistry**'); FIELD OF STUDY & PURSUING A FIELD OF STUDY (*zanima me zvjezdoznanstvo* 'I'm interested in **astronomy**' vs. *kvalitetno amatersko zvjezdoznanstvo* 'studying **astronomy** at a high-quality amateur level').

Hapax: -

## 12. Collectivity of Concrete Institutions

Description: mainly found with "profession", where it designates collectivities of legal entities pursuing a profession. Also "ideology" (in a reference to 'unification of **all political parties sharing the ideology of Croatian national and ethnic rights**'—*ujedinjenje pravaštva*).

Dominance: generally subordinate to the meanings above. Dominant in *zanatstvo* 'collectivity of crafts and trades' and *novinstvo* 'the press, news media, and agencies' (alternatively used as 'journalism'), where its dominance is due to many references to 'press conferences' (*konferencije za novinstvo*).

Polysemy: PROFESSION & COLLECTIVITY OF CONCRETE INSTITUTIONS PURSUING A PROFESSION (*ljubitelj gljivarstva* 'fan of **mushroom farming**' vs. *kreditiranje gljivarstva* 'crediting **mushroom farming companies**'); IDEOLOGY & COLLECTIVITY OF CONCRETE INSTITUTIONS PURSUING AN IDEOLOGY (see *pravaštvo* above).

Hapax: -

### 13. Location

Description: any “place in space related to a particular activity and/or enclosed space surrounding individuals in particular situations” (Haselow 2011: 66). Most frequent in references to locations/offices where “professions” and “roles” (dominant meanings) are pursued (*knjigovodstvo* ‘bookkeeping’, *pravobraniteljstvo* ‘the office of the ombudsman’), but also to physical territories under the jurisdiction of a political entity (*carstvo* ‘empire, tzardom’), or to places where one undergoes a state (*biti u izgnanstvu* ‘be in exile’; *izgnanstvo*, lit. exiled-stvo), where a relationship (*susjedstvo* ‘neighborhood’) or a status (*gastarbajterstvo* ‘guestworkership’) are exercised.

Dominance: most often subordinate, dominant in a handful of nouns, notably *susjedstvo* ‘neighborhood’.

Polysemy: REALM/DOMAIN & TERRITORY OVER WHICH REALM/DOMAIN EXTENDS (pt. 7); PROFESSION & CONCRETE INSTITUTION & LOCATION (*računovodstvo* ‘**bookkeeping as a profession**’ vs. *računovodstvo je dio svake kompanije* ‘a **bookkeeping department** is part of any company’ (departments can be understood as small-scale concrete institutions) vs. *dostaviti poštu u računovodstvo* ‘deliver mail to **bookkeeping**’); STATE & LOCATION WHERE STATE OBTAINS (pt. 10); RELATIONSHIP & LOCATION WHERE A RELATIONSHIP IS EXERCISED (*razvijanje dugotrajnog sustanarstva* ‘developing long-term **co-tenancy**’ vs. *prijateljsko raspoloženje u novom sustanarstvu* ‘friendly atmosphere in the new **place of co-tenancy**’); COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE IN A RELATIONSHIP & LOCATION WHERE A COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE IN A RELATIONSHIP LIVE (*zabrinuto susjedstvo* ‘concerned **neighborhood**’ vs. *mirno susjedstvo* ‘quiet **neighborhood**’); STATUS & LOCATION WHERE EVENTS IMPLIED BY STATUS TAKE PLACE (pt. 9).

Hapax: *babinstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘land with property owned by the grandmother’, *nadbiškustvo* ‘archbishopric’.

### 14. Role

Description: the position or purpose that someone/something has in an organization (*direktorstvo* ‘chairmanship’) or in a relationship (*majčinstvo* ‘motherhood’). Implies a set of activities, i.e., duties and responsibilities to be fulfilled. Homogeneous in base semantics, i.e., bases denote people in certain roles. Usually used with verbs like *preuzeti* ‘take over’, *obavljati*, *izvršavati* ‘to fulfill’, *težiti k* ‘to aspire to’, *odreći se* ‘to give up’, etc.

Dominance: rarely dominant, it takes a back seat to diverse meanings like “concrete institution” via metonymy ROLE & CONCRETE INSTITUTION FULFILLING A ROLE (pt. 8); “collectivity of people” via ROLE & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE IN A ROLE metonymy (pt. 4); “unbounded event” via ROLE & PERFORMING A ROLE metonymy (Section 5.1); “bounded event” via ROLE & INSTANCE OF PERFORMING A ROLE metonymy (pt. 5); “quality” via ROLE & QUALITY ASSOCIATED WITH A ROLE metonymy (*nitko ne bira sluganstvo* ‘nobody chooses **the role of a servant**’ vs. *sluganstvo je poželjna osobina* ‘**servility** is a desirable character trait’); “status” via ROLE & STATUS DERIVING FROM ROLE (pt. 9).

Hapax: *kumordinarstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘role of a valet’, *županstvo* ‘role as head of the county’.

## 15. Relationship

Description: the way in which two or more people are related/connected, normally implying equivalent mutual rights, responsibilities, dispositions, and stances. Schematized as  $A \rightarrow B = B \rightarrow A$ , and found in *prijateljstvo* ‘friendship’, *suradništvo* ‘co-workship’, *sustanarstvo* ‘co-tenancy’ etc. Fairly homogeneous in base semantics; bases denote people in a relationship. Frequent collocates include verbs like *njegovati* ‘to nurture’, *uspostaviti* ‘to establish’, *produljiti* ‘prolong’, *ostati u* ‘remain in’, etc. Close to nouns denoting “roles” or “statuses”, but the latter are not symmetrical in the above sense ( $A \rightarrow B$ ) but  $*B \rightarrow A$ , and they construe the entities from the vantage point of the base-designated entity only. For instance, the “status” noun *podložništvo* ‘subservience’ (< *podložnik* ‘a subservient person’) is the status of the person who is in a subordinate position. This position makes schematic reference to the superordinate entity and the relationship between the two, but they are not in profile. When reconstrued as a “relationship” both entities and their relationship are profiled, i.e., co-conceived with equal prominence. Thus, *podložništvo* is featured in one corpus example which discusses the relationship between two main characters in a book; their relationship is said to shift between duty and trust, subservience and friendship.

Dominance: more often dominant than subordinate.

Polysemy: RELATIONSHIP & EXERCISING RELATIONSHIP (Section 5.1); RELATIONSHIP & INSTANCE OF EXERCISING A RELATIONSHIP (pt. 5); RELATIONSHIP & LOCATION WHERE A RELATIONSHIP IS EXERCISED (pt. 14); RELATIONSHIP & ABSTRACT INSTITUTION (*živjeti u sustanarstvu* ‘to live in **co-tenancy**’ vs. *sustanarstvo izmišljeno u socijalizmu* ‘**co-tenancy**, a socialist invention’); RELATIONSHIP & CONCRETE INSTITUTION BASED ON A RELATIONSHIP (pt. 8); RELATIONSHIP & QUALITY OF ENTITIES IN A RELATIONSHIP (Section 5.2); RELATIONSHIP & STATUS (pt. 9); RELATIONSHIP & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE IN A RELATIONSHIP (pt. 4).



Hapax: *dušmanstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘foehood, enmity’.

## 16. Time

Description: a period during which a “state” or a “status” obtains, a “role” is fulfilled, a “profession” is pursued, an “abstract institution” is in place, etc.

Dominance: typically subordinate to the meanings above.

Polysemy: STATE & TIME DURING WHICH A STATE OBTAINS (*liječiti kliconoštvo* ‘to cure **carrier state**’ vs. *okončati kliconoštvo* ‘to end **the period of being in carrier state**’); STATUS & TIME IN STATUS (*osloboditi optužbi zbog maloljetništva* ‘to drop charges due to **status as minor**’ vs. *kraj maloljetništva* ‘end of **period in the status of a minor**’); ROLE & TIME DURING WHICH A ROLE IS PERFORMED (*preuzeti banstvo* ‘take over **governorship**’ vs. *tijekom banstva* ‘during his **mandate/period of governorship**’); PROFESSION & TIME DURING WHICH A PROFESSION IS PURSUED (*kaskaderstvo je opasno* ‘**stuntmanship** is dangerous’ vs. *kraj kaskaderstva* ‘end of **period of (pursuing) a stuntmanship career**’); ABSTRACT INSTITUTION & TIME DURING WHICH AN ABSTRACT INSTITUTION EXISTS (*ukinuti robovlasništvo* ‘to abolish **slavery**’ vs. *tijekom robovlasništva* ‘during **the time of slavery**’), etc.

Hapax: -

## 17. Collectivity of Objects

Description: collectivities of objects that come into being as a result of (professional) activities or that figure as participants in other events. Different from singular results of activities like the use of *stihoklepstvo* ‘versemaking’ in a reference to a song as one’s first (**result of**) **versemaking** (... *svoje prvo stihoklepstvo*). Most are subordinate meanings of profession nouns (crafts and trades), whose bases denote (non-)professional agents, e.g., *lončarstvo* ‘pottery as a trade’ vs. ‘pottery as the collectivity of pottery products’ (< *lončar* ‘potter’); *stihotvorstvo* ‘versemaking’ vs. ‘collective products of verse-making’ (< *stihotvorac* ‘versemaker’); *kiparstvo* ‘sculpture as craft/art’ vs. ‘collectivity of sculptures’ (< *kipar* ‘sculptor’), or the result patient itself, e.g., *knjištvo* (lit. book-stvo) ‘literary activity’ vs. ‘books as products of literary activity’ (< *knjiga* ‘book’). Other nouns denote “collectivities of objects” as patients in other kinds of events, like *nasljedstvo* ‘inheritance, the collectivity of items inherited’ (< *naslijediti* ‘to inherit’), or “collectivities of objects” as objects of possession *posjedništvo* ‘collectivity of things possessed’ (< *posjednik* ‘possessor’). One noun de-

notes the collectivity of objects in a base-named location *pokućstvo* ‘furniture’ (lit. around-house-stvo).

Dominance: more often subordinate than dominant.

Polysemy: in a version of CAUSE & EFFECT metonymy, QUALITY & COLLECTIVITY OF OBJECTS CAUSING A QUALITY (*osobine kao uspjeh i bogatstvo* ‘traits like success and richness’ vs. *čuvati svoje bogatstvo* ‘the safekeep one’s riches’); BOUNDED EVENT & COLLECTIVITY OF OBJECTS RESULTING FROM BOUNDED EVENT (*to je posljedica nasljedstva* ‘this is the result of (the act of) inheriting’ vs. *vrijednost nasljedstva* ‘the value of inheritance’); PROFESSION & COLLECTIVITY OF OBJECTS RESULTING FROM PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY (*zlatarstvo* ‘goldsmithery’ vs. *kolekcija zlatarstva* ‘a collection/exhibit of goldsmithery’).

Hapax: *B-trojstvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘B-trinity’, a critical reference to the practice of reducing the celebration of Christmas to the three ‘Bs’: *bakalar* (‘cod’), *bor* (‘Christmas tree’), and *blagdan* (‘holiday—a day off from work’).

## 18. Abstract Institution

Description: a significant and long-standing custom, practice, tradition, or law in a society/culture that is accepted as an important part of a society. Bases denote people in roles, statuses, relationships, and states. Prototypically, role-based nouns like *kumstvo* (lit. best man-stvo), approximately rendered as ‘godparenthood at baptism’, ‘sponsorship at confirmation’, or ‘best man-hood at weddings’, when used in references to the religious/societal institution/practice of awarding children/young adults/newly-weds their sponsors at baptism/confirmation/wedding. Also prototypical in *beženstvo* (lit. without-woman-stvo) ‘the institution of celibacy’, *robovlasništvo* ‘slavery, slaveholding’. Less prototypical in references to *majčinstvo* as an institution in need of government protection, *papinstvo* ‘papacy’ as an institution (not) to be questioned, etc.

Dominance: more often subordinate than dominant.

Polysemy: STATUS & ABSTRACT INSTITUTION (pt. 9); ABSTRACT INSTITUTION & IMPLEMENTING AN ABSTRACT INSTITUTION (*ukinuti robovlasništvo* ‘abolish slavery’ vs. *teretiti koga za robovlasništvo* ‘charge someone with slaveholding’); ROLE & ABSTRACT INSTITUTION (*preuzeti očevo kumstvo* ‘take over father’s sponsorship’ vs. *kumstvo je nastalo u prvim stoljećima crkve* ‘sponsorship was created in the first centuries of the Church’); RELATIONSHIP & ABSTRACT INSTITUTION (pt. 15); STATE & ABSTRACT INSTITUTION (*neženstvo zbog lošeg socijalnog stanja* ‘(being in) unmarried state due to poor social status’ vs. *ukinuti neženstvo među svećenicima* ‘to abolish celibacy among priests’).

Hapax: *Crobovlasništvo*<sup>n</sup> ‘slaveholding, with Croatia as the slave’, an opportunistic blend of *Cro(atia)* and *robovlasništvo* exploiting the obvious phonetic overlap.

## 19. Geographical Identity

Description: identities rooted in shared ethnicity, attachment to a country, region, city or village. Admittedly more of a social construct than a geographical category as it tends to be defined as an aggregate of features like culture, customs, dress, religion, cuisine, etc. (in Fought 2006). Homogeneous in base semantics: geographical concepts in all but one case, viz. *muslimanstvo* ‘Muslimhood’, which testifies to the vagaries of folk understanding of complex constructs like ethnicity, nation, religion.

Dominance: twice as frequent as a subordinate meaning as the dominant meaning.

Polysemy: since geographical identity is a complex social construct, this creates conveniently muddled water for ideological power-play, esp. in the Balkans, hence frequent extensions to “ideology”. “Ideology” and “quality” (Section 5.2) contribute abundantly to its lack of quantitative dominance. IDEOLOGY & GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY (pt. 6); GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY & COLLECTIVITY OF PEOPLE OF A GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY (pt. 4.)

Hapax: *kninjanstvo*<sup>n</sup>, *drništvo*<sup>n</sup>, based on Croatian city names *Knin*, *Drniš*.

## 20. Religion

Description: a system of belief in and worship of (a) higher powers (*katoličanstvo* ‘Catholicism’, *neopoganstvo* ‘neopaganism’), etc. Very homogeneous base semantics; bases denote followers of a religion. *Islamstvo* is tautologous as it is based on *islam* ‘Islam, the Muslim religion’ (*Islamist* is not the (truncated) base noun of *islamstvo* as it denotes a person pursuing a scientific study of Islam—*islamistika*). *Farizejstvo* ‘Phariseeism’ is another marginal member. The noun is used figuratively for a particular “quality”, viz. hypocrisy, as is its base noun *farizej* ‘a hypocrite’. *Phariseeism* was found with the meaning “religion” in a corpus example claiming the adulteration of the original creed and its distortion into the **pharisaical religion**, later consolidated into **Phareeism** (*farizejstvo*) in the Talamud.

Dominance: dominant in virtually all nouns, not the target of semantic extension.

Polysemy: extends to “quality” via RELIGION & QUALITY OF BEING A RELIGIOUS FOLLOWER metonymy (*prijeći na muslimanstvo* ‘convert to **the Muslim religion**’ vs. (*isticati svoje muslimanstvo* ‘emphasize one’s **Muslimhood**’); “unbounded events” via metonymy RELIGION & PURSUING A RELIGION (*povratak vješticiarstva* ‘the return of **witchcraft (as a pagan religion)**’ vs. *progoniti koga zbog vješticiarstva* ‘persecute someone for **practicing witchcraft**’); “collectivities of people” (pt. 4), “bounded event” (pt. 5), “state” (pt. 10), “concrete institution” (pt. 8), “realm/domain” (pt. 7), and “style/manner” in a version of HYPERONYM & HYPONYM metonymy (but see Peirsman and Geeraerts on the questionable status of the hyperonym vs. hyponym relations as metonymy 2006: 306–8), viz. RELIGION & SUBTYPE OF RELIGION (*prijeći na katoličanstvo* ‘convert to **Catholicism**’ vs. *nepostojanje hrvatskog katoličanstva* ‘non-existence of a **Croatian Catholicism**’).

Hapax: -

## 21. Honorific

Description: special address forms conveying respect. Very rare, thus questionable as a category of WF.

Dominance: dominant in (*Vaše*) *Visočanstvo* and (*Vaše*) *Veličanstvo*, both translating as ‘(Your) Highness’. Exceptionally also dominant in an otherwise small number of mock uses of the noun *svinjstvo* in *Njegovo Svinjstvo* ‘His Pigness’ (all from a single source). Ultimately parasitic upon the meaning “quality” which is either coded in base adjectives, e.g., *visočanstvo* (< *visok*<sub>ADJ</sub> ‘tall’), *veličanstvo* (< *velik*<sub>ADJ</sub> ‘big, large’) (both adjectives with base expansion *-an*), and *savršenstvo* ‘perfection’ (< *savršen*<sub>ADJ</sub> ‘perfect’), or metonymically (ENTITY & DEFINING QUALITY) accessed in base nouns, e.g., *svinja* ‘pig’ (> *svinjstvo* ‘pigness’) and *gospodin* ‘gentleman’ (> *gospodstvo* ‘gentility’). The latter qualities are, stereotypically, ‘dirtiness or low moral character’ and ‘good manners’, respectively. A series of metonymies could be proposed to link the meanings “quality”, “person/object” and “honorific”, viz. QUALITY (*veličanstvo mora* ‘the **magnificence** of the sea’) & ENTITY DEFINED BY QUALITY (*Bog je čovjeku najdragocjenije biće, veličanstvo kojem se može diviti* ‘God is to man the most precious creature, a **majesty** that he can admire’) & ADDRESS FORM FOR ENTITY DEFINED BY QUALITY (*Vaše Veličanstvo* ‘**Your Highness**’).

Hapax: *Njeno Blagorodstvo* ‘Her Nobility’.