

- Bradley, D., Lexical Representation of Derivational Relations, [w:] Juncture, red. M. Aronoff i M.-L. Kean, Anna Libri, Saratoga, 1980, s. 37-56.
- Cutler, A., Deegree of Transparency in Word Formation, "Canadian Journal of Linguistics", nr 26, 1981, s. 73-77.
- Górecka, E., A Way of Testing the Productivity of Word Formation Rules / WRA/7, "Studia Anglica Posnaniensia", nr 14, 1982, s. 169-174.
- Leskowski, R., Derwacja słowotwórcza, [w:] Pojęcie derwacji w lingwistyce, red. nauk. J. Bartmiński, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin, 1981, s. 107-126.
- Nagórko-Kuraj, A., O eksperymentach w badaniach słowotwórczych, "BRUJ", nr 35, 1977, s. 141-151.
- Strachalska, B., Zaburzenia formacji słowotwórczych języka polskiego w etymologii akusacyjno-mnesticznej i ruchowej, w: Badania lingwistyczne nad etymologią, Ossolineum, Wrocław, 1978, s. 203-208.
- Wheeler, C.J., Schumsky, D.A., The Morpheme Boundaries of Some English Derivational Suffixes, "Glossa", nr 14, 1980, s. 3-34.

Summary

The article presents a critical review of recent experimental studies in Polish and English word formation. Attention is focused throughout on the types of issues in the theory of derivational morphology that are particularly suitable for experimental investigation. These include the lexical and derivational status of a given form /determined by means of the Lexical Decision Task Technique/, the problem of motivation, morphological build-up of a derivative /including identification of formative boundaries/, choice of co-functional affixes, productivity of word-formation rules, and the structure of the lexicon. In conclusion, several flaws and shortcomings of experimental methods in word-formation studies are pointed out.

Josy Warakowski

A typology of graffiti

/Part 1/

Grffiti - unlicensed writing in public places - is not a uniform phenomenon. Generally it is identified with lots of meaningless scribbles, such as people's initials, names or declarations of their feelings - perhaps also dates and simple messages testifying to someone's presence at a given place. These traditional forms of graffiti are frowned upon by most decent folk and indeed it is little wonder. The number and variety of surfaces covered with inscriptions is great enough to talk about a social, and to some extent maybe even an environmental, problem.

Not all graffiti, however, is primitive and devoid of content. In many parts of the world, for example in England, much more sophisticated specimens can often be found. Although perhaps defacing property just as well, they are at least worth reading, being usually very witty and amusing. The humour of graffiti has largely to do with the structure of particular inscriptions and this seems an interesting object of study. In this article we want to show some of the patterns on which contemporary English graffiti is built. Thus, it is hoped, something like a typology of the phenomenon in question will arise.

Let us begin with the already classical example to the effect: KILROY WAS HERE. It can be found in many parts of the world and yet the man referred to was no great traveller. He was an inspector in one of the American shipyards during World War II and he used to write these words on the equipment he had checked. Later, however, other shipyard workers started scribbling them just for fun wherever they chose and soon the inscription could be found in places where it was obvious that Mr Kilroy could not have been. The idea spread very much beyond the area where it was first

popular and now the stranger the location in which these words can be sighted, the better the joke.

With so wide a circulation of the phrase, a phenomenon only to be expected would be its variation. And indeed, the assumption is borne out by at least a few examples. Some of them show that the game can become even more exciting when it turns into a competition. To see the words KILROY WAS HERE FIRST must be a severe blow to every hunter of the undiscovered corners of the world. It is therefore not surprising that someone who managed to outsmart the ubiquitous Kilroy also gave vent to his feelings in graffiti, in the form of this little rhyme found on a wall: GIAP YOUR HANDS AND JUMP FOR JOY, I WAS HERE BEFORE KILROY. But its author would be wrong to think they might let him go with the last word - before long someone else scribbled underneath: NO, YOU WEREN'T - KILROY BUILT THIS WALL.

As soon as Mr Kilroy's original message became a standard, people would vary it by all sorts of additions. Since it was no longer as interesting to see the hackneyed KILROY WAS HERE, right below it you could find a note: I SURE WAS - KILROY. It is the more funny that it seems to be made by the man himself, although again, by all likelihood, it could not have been. Another example of this sort, referring already to another person, reads: LORD LUCAN WAS HERE. Written under it is a protest: NO, I WASN'T. A beautiful paradox, when you think of it, but we shall have more of those later on.

Without intending to do so, Mr Kilroy started a mania which seems to have offered a lot of fun to graffiti writers. Even among themselves, however, there was someone ready to "spoil" it with inscriptions like: KILROY'S DEAD - KILJOY or PLEASE DO NOT DEFACE THESE WALLS - KILJOY IS HERE. Of course, these dire announcements, and particularly the name of their author, only point back to the original protagonist.

Talking about variation, there is one graffiti with an especially numerous offspring. In England it can hardly be overlooked. In Roger Kilroy's book /Kilroy 1979 : 76/ we read that "it began as a simple soccer fan's battle-cry, ARSENAL RULES OK?" and then "evolved into a national cult, as much a craze as the yoyo, the hula-hoop and the skateboard." Suddenly, everybody and everything started to rule. As would be expected, the simple pattern soon

became a stereotype to be replaced by new, more elaborate structures. A very typical one is that which we shall call internal correspondence. It is not exclusively characteristic of the "rules OK" graffiti, and there will be other examples of it further on, but it accounts for most of the variations concerned here. The principle consists in the fact that the ending of a phrase corresponds in some way or other to its beginning. This relation can be either positive, analogical, when both ends of the inscription are in keeping with each other, or negative, paradoxical, when they are in contradiction. For the time being we shall only deal with the first type. Here are a number of examples in which the correspondence in question is achieved by altering the very final tag OK:

QUEEN ELIZABETH RULES UK

DYSLEXIA RULES, KO? /or a more advanced stage of the illness: LYSLEXIA LURRS, KO?/

BOXING RULES, KO?

SCHIZOPHRENIA RULES, OK? OK?

JAMES BOND RULES, OOK? /his cryptonym, as you know, was 007/

ANAGRAMS - OR LURK?

MAILET RULES, CHOQUET?

FLOWER POWER RULES, BOUQUET?

SPANISH PUNK RULES... OUI!

SCOTS RULE, OCH AYE!

FRENCH DOCKERS RULE AU QUAI.

HORSE POWER RULES NEIGH NEIGH /Beverley race course/

Then there are many cases in which the basic structure is expanded by various appropriate additions:

ETNSWIN RULES RELATIVELY, OK?

THE LAW OF THE EXCLUDED MIDDLE EITHER RULES OR DOES NOT RULE, OK?

SCRYPTICS MAY OR MAY NOT RULE, OK?

PRESSIMISTS RULE - NOT OK!

SCHIZOPHRENIA DIVIDES AND RULES, OK?

PROCRUSTINATION WILL RULE ONE DAY, OK?

CONSIDERATION RULES, IF THAT'S OK.

COWARDICE RULES, IF THAT'S OK WITH YOU.

SYCOPHANCY RULES - IF IT'S OK BY YOU.
 PEDANTS RULE, OK - OR, MORE ACCURATELY, EXHIBIT
 CERTAIN OF THE TRAPPINGS OF TRADITIONAL LEADERSHIP.
 ROBERT'S THESAURUS RULES - OK, ALL RIGHT, VERY WELL,
 YOU BET, CERTAINLY.

Other changes include puns:

SAUSAGE ROLLS, OK?
 SALTVA DROIDS, OK?
 AMARCHY, NO RULES, OK?
 PHONOLOGY RULES, OK?

And finally we come across even freer variations:

THE WEBER SHALL INHERIT THE EARTH - IF THAT'S ALL RIGHT
 WITH YOU.
 APATHY RULES - SO WHAT? /and a deeper stage: APATHY
 RU...!
 HYPOHONDRIACS AREN'T OK.
 ROONER SPOOLS, OK?
 ENOUGH IS ENOUGH - OK?

And now some internal correspondences from outside the range
 of these variations. They are still examples of a simple, non-
 -contradictory relationship obtaining within the sentence.

MURDER IS A DYING PROFESSION.
 REINCARNATION IS MAKING A COMEBACK.
 DISMEMBERING TAKES SOME GUNS.
 RACIAL PREJUDICE IS A PIGMENT OF THE IMAGINATION,
 CELIBACY IS NOT AN INHERITED CHARACTERISTIC.
 PREDESTINATION WAS DOOMED TO FAILURE FROM THE START.
 YOU'RE NEVER ALONE WITH A SCHIZOPHRENIC.
 GIVE ME PATIENCE, I WANT IT NOW.
 BAD SPIRITS OF THE WORLD, UNTIE!

Some of them are clearly ambiguous - inscription two because
 the present participle and the gerund look exactly alike, inscrip-
 tion three because it makes sense both when it is interpreted
 as an idiom and when we understand it literally. However, no mat-
 ter how you look upon these graffiti, the connection between
 the two halves in each of them is always there. It is precisely
 due to this connection that the endings of the last two examples

above actually add to the expression of the whole inscriptions.
 A large amount of graffiti is based on paradox. Internal cor-
 respondence seems an especially useful structural device in its
 service. In the following examples we shall see how one half of
 each inscription actually contradicts the other.

I USED TO BE APATHETIC BUT NOW I DON'T CARE.
 I USED TO BE CONCEITED BUT NOW I'M ABSOLUTELY PERFECT.
 I USED TO BE A VERBOSIST BUT I'M ALL RIGHT NOWWWWWH!
 I NEVER USED TO BE ABLE TO FINISH ANYTHING BUT NOW I
 I USED TO BE INDECISIVE BUT NOW I'M NOT SO SURE...
 OK, SO I'M CURED OF SCHIZOPHRENIA BUT WHERE AM I NOW
 WHEN I NEED ME?
 I CAN'T REMEMBER IF I USED TO BE FORGETFUL OR NOT.
 I WOULDNT BE PARANOID IF PEOPLE DIDNT PICK ON ME.

Let us have a closer look at these statements. The first seven
 of them are similar because each of them is divided into two
 parts by the word "but". Now their paradoxical nature lies
 in the fact that this conjunction is not, as it would be in lo-
 gically correct sentences, followed by anything opposite to what
 precedes it. On the contrary - the second half of each of these
 inscriptions is a repetition of the first one, only in other
 words. So while the sentence pattern "I used to... but now I...",
 entailing a temporal sequence, makes us expect a change that
 occurred in time, there is actually none. The element of surprise
 thus created will very likely find release in laughter - practi-
 cally the main reason for which messages of this sort appear
 in public places.

Specifically, when someone who used to be apathetic no longer
 cares, we might want to ask if he cared when he was still apathe-
 tic. The thing is he could not have because apathy by definition
 is not caring. Or, in like manner, when someone who used to be
 conceited declares he is already absolutely perfect, is he any
 more modest than before? Not at all.

The last inscription above is a conditional. Normally in sen-
 tences of this sort we would expect that one thing conditions
 another, which relationship is expressed by the conjunction "if".
 What we get, however, is another tautology, apparent as soon as
 we realize what being paranoid really means. Of course, the man

would not be paranoid if people did not pick on him, or rather if only he could stop imagining that they do so. Although, as another graffiti says, JUST BECAUSE YOU'RE PARANOID, IT DOESN'T MEAN THEY'RE NOT OUT TO GET YOU.

Other inscriptions, although different in structure, are just as paradoxical:

I WAS WRONG ONCE - I THOUGHT I MADE A MISTAKE.

DO YOU HAVE TROUBLE IN MAKING UP YOUR MIND - WELL, YES AND NO...

I COULDN'T CARE LESS ABOUT APATHY.

MY PSYCHIATRIST TOLD ME I WAS CURED OF INDECISION -

- AT LEAST I THINK THAT'S WHAT HE SAID.

HYPOCHONDRIA IS THE ONLY DISEASE I HAVEN'T GOT.

MY INFERIORITY COMPLEXES AREN'T AS GOOD AS YOURS.

NEOSTALGIA ISN'T WHAT IT USED TO BE.

I BET YOU I COULD STOP GAMBLING.

Thus, for example, it is impossible to have all diseases except hypochondria. Come to think of it, it is impossible to have all diseases at all, you can only think you have them. But that is exactly what hypochondria is all about. In the same way, when you are worrying about the fact that your inferiority complexes are not as good as somebody else's, you are actually worrying about their inferiority. So what is there to worry about? Or, for that matter, when you say that nostalgia is not what it used to be, i.e. that it is inferior to what it once was, you are actually being nostalgic about it. And what could be more nostalgic than being nostalgic about nostalgia?

Finally, we get someone who bets he could stop gambling, i.e. nothing else but betting. It seems he might just as well swear not to take oaths or promise never to promise again. A vicious circle. On second thoughts, however, such declarations can perhaps make sense if all these things are done for the last time. Then they only serve to stress the person's determination to avoid them in the future and it is quite accidental that form gets mixed up with content here. There seems to be no physical impossibility or logical contradiction in such statements.

Either of these two, however, whether real or apparent, are present throughout the following graffiti:

I LOVE MARKING - IT'S PEOPLE I CAN'T STAND.

A FATE WORSE THAN DEATH IS BETTER THAN DYING.

WE BUY JUNK AND SELL ANTIQUES. /written in dust on old van/
I'D GIVE MY RIGHT TO BE AMBIGUOUS.

IF THE HUMAN BRAIN WAS SIMPLE ENOUGH FOR US TO UNDERSTAND, WE'D BE SO SIMPLE WE COULDN'T.

THOSE WHO THINK THEY KNOW IT ALL UPSET THOSE OF US WHO DO.

YOUR LIBERAL - OR WE'LL SHOOT YOUR DOG.

ONLY THE MEDIOCRE ARE ALWAYS AT THEIR BEST.

MICKEY MOUSE WAS A RAT.

ALEX HALEY WAS ADOPTED.

Logically speaking, graffiti one is a paradox, but practice does not seem to confirm it. In fact, the inscription illustrates a very widespread attitude of man towards his fellow creatures.

The second example stops being paradoxical if we consider life to be the greatest value of all and if we can preserve it even when a fate otherwise worse than death befalls us.

The introductory idiom and the following part of inscription four coincide in such a way as to make the whole statement absurd. It will be noticed that the literal interpretation of the idiom suggests itself in this case even against our will.

Appropos of the fifth graffiti, why do we not understand the human brain now that we are not so simple as not to be able to understand it?

As for example six, do we not, when saying this, actually think we know it all and thus upset someone else who really does? But then, does that someone not... oh no, there is no end to it.

Then, how can the mediocre always be at their best? Well, in fact they never are, but then they are never at their worst either, so in the long run they usually come off better than all the rest.

In the end, if the slander about Alex Haley be true, there is no way he could possibly write about his long pedigree except as fiction, and that is what his book Roots apparently is not.

To finish off our selection of paradoxical internal correspondences, here are a few more examples:

LET'S KEEP INTEREST IN THE FAMILY.

EVERYBODY DIES, TRAFFIC'S LIFE,
ANARCHY IS AGAINST THE LAW,
EXTREMS ARE ON THE WAY OUT,
PROCRASSTINATE NOW!

Now the suggestion about incest is absurd, unless keeping it in the family means not making it public, instead of doing it within the family which it already is by definition. Inscription two is also ambiguous the way the first one can be. The phrase "that's life" means "such is life" that everybody dies, and not that death is life. Moving down the list, since anarchy is against the law in the first place, there is no need to make it any more illegal, which Graffiti to three appears to be doing. According to example four, exts are on the way out. This is undoubtedly true, only somehow it does not seem to be telling us very much, does it? And lastly, can you possibly procrastinate now if the moment you start doing so you actually put an end to it? Perhaps you could be successful if you went about the job really slow.

As would be expected, not every paradox to be seen on the wall is built on the pattern of internal correspondence. There are many instances of what we might call external paradox, since they primarily depend on the place in which they appear. Some of these inscriptions are the following:

EVERYONE WRITES ON WALLS EXCEPT ME.
GRAFFITI SHOULD BE BANNED.
NO WRITING IS ALLOWED ON THIS WALL.

DO NOT WRITE
IN THIS PLACE

The first three graffiti, if only found on a wall, are actually self-contradictory because they all oppose writing on walls. The fourth one, apart from being like its predecessors, does not even leave any space for a potential graffiti-writer and thus is even more absurd. It seems advisable, talking about this group of scribbles, to quote Jon Neer, one of the photographers who documented Norman Mailer's book on graffiti. On seeing the sign: DON'T POLLUTE - KEEP THE CITY CLEAN, he said: "They don't see that sign is a form of pollution itself." /Kuriansky, Mailer and Neer 1974 : 8/.

From these inscriptions it is probably only a short way

to the purely nonsensical ones, such as:

IF YOU NOTICE THIS NOTICE
YOU WILL NOTICE IT'S NOT WORTH NOTICING.
IGNORE THIS SIGN.
THE WAGES OF SIN IS DEATH
- IF YOU HATE ALREADY PAID, IGNORE THIS NOTICE.

While the previous group at least pretended to preserve the sense of purpose, we can hardly say so of these notices. Except, of course, that they were written for fun, which objective they seem to achieve extremely well.

At this point we end the first part of our presentation of graffiti. As the numerous variations of this phenomenon have not yet been exhausted, we intend to continue the task in part two, due to appear before long. It is also there that one will be able to find some possible conclusions.

References

Birch, T. /1980/ Therese Birch's Jellybone Graffiti Book, Arrow Books Ltd, London.
Frowkin, V. and Rodman, R. /1978/ An Introduction to Language, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York. /p.p. 375 - 376/
Kilroy, R. /1979/ Graffiti: The Scrawl of the Wild, Transworld Publishers Ltd, London.
Kuriansky, M., Mailer, N. and Neer, J. /1974/ The Faith of Graffiti, Praeger Publishers Inc., N.Y.
Rees, N. /1980/ Graffiti 2, The Anchor Press Ltd, Tiptree, Essex.
Workman, G. /1982/ Graffiti rules OK?, in Modern English International, No. 4, April 1982, Adlinox Ltd, Grimby. /p.p. 10 - 11/

Streszczenie

Artykuł stanowi pierwszą część opracowania będącego próbą klasyfikacji angielskich napisów na murach - zjawiska znanego w Wielkiej Brytanii jako graffiti. Zastępuje ono na uwagę po-

nieważ jego zakres i różnorodność są tam nieporównywalnie większe niż u nas. Choćby napisy w miejscach publicznych analizowane są przeważnie z socjologicznego punktu widzenia, nas interesuje przede wszystkim ich strona językowa. W związku z tym pomijamy najbardziej prymitywne formy graffiti i rozważamy jedynie te przykłady, które stanowią już pewne kompletne wypowiedzi, typowe pod względem formy. Ich budowa, w połączeniu z takimi czynnikami jak częstotliwość występowania, jest zwykle źródłem humoru. W tej części artykułu badane są wariancje na temat danego napisu, zależności zachodzące wewnątrz wybranych przykładów, czy to proste /analogiczne/, czy sprzeczne /paradoksalne/, a wreszcie napisy z pogranicza czystego nonsensu. Ponadto artykuł niniejszy nie wyzerpuje wszystkich rodzajów omawianego zjawiska, przewiduje się kontynuację analizy oraz jej podsumowanie w kolejnej publikacji.

Anna Żurawska-Swieca

Die Ebenen der Valenz

In den letzten Jahren sind semantische Fragestellungen mit Recht in das Gesichtsfeld der linguistischen Forschung getreten. Diese Tatsache gilt auch für die Valenz, da die Festlegung der syntaktischen Umgebungen eines Verbs allein nicht ausreichend ist.¹⁾ Nach dem gegenwärtigen Stand der Forschung muss man drei Ebenen der Valenzbestimmungen unterscheiden: eine syntaktische Valenz, eine semantische Valenz und eine lexische Valenz.²⁾ Um die Rolle der Valenz auf den verschiedenen Ebenen des Sprachsystems und ihr Verhältnis zur Kommunikation deutlich zu machen, geht man von der Auffassung aus, dass es sich beim Sprachsystem um eine komplizierte und mehrstufige, um eine vermittelte Zuordnung handelt, um eine Einheit von verschiedenen Komponenten, die in sich relative Teilgestalten darstellen, zueinander nicht in 1:1 Entsprechung stehen und nicht parallel strukturiert sind, die jedoch in engem Zusammenhang und dialektischer Wechselwirkung zueinander stehen.³⁾ Dieser allgemeine Zusammenhang lässt deutlich werden in welcher Weise die Valenz auf den verschiedenen Ebenen des Sprachsystems lokalisiert ist und warum von diesen verschiedenen Ebenen der Valenz die Rede ist.

Die syntaktische Valenz meint die obligatorische oder fakultative Besetzung von Leerstellen in einer bestimmten, vom Verb geforderten Zahl und Art, differenziert nach den Einzelsprachen.⁴⁾ Helbig schreibt dazu folgendes: "In jeder Fassung der syntaktischen Theorie der Valenz ist unverzichtbar die Unterscheidung zwischen Valenzgebundenen (Valenzdeterminanten)