

COGNITIVE APPROACH TO LEXICAL VARIATION IN OVERSEAS ENGLISHES

Tetyana KozlovaDSc, Zaporizhzhia National University,
e-mail: ethstlab@yahoo.com, orcid.org/0000-0001-5879-6054, Ukraine**Leszek Bednarczuk**Professor, PhD, Polonia University in Czestochowa,
email: l.bednarczuk@live.ap.edu.pl, orcid.org/0000-0002-9722-6916, Poland

Abstract. Modern English includes a range of standard and nonstandard varieties that are spoken around the world and differ at all levels of language structure. The purpose of this article is to overview international variation of English lexis, discover similarities intersecting this diversity, find out about productive patterns of lexical change and interpret them from a cognitive perspective. The paper demonstrates the importance of internal and external sources of borrowing, considers the ways of coining new vocabulary, gives attention to efficient strategies employed to name colonial settings and to distinguish newly forming identities from British and other English-speaking communities. Varying experience of adjustment to overseas environments stimulated a high degree of lexical change and heteronymy. Although in different regions English emerged from unique colonial contexts, speakers' precolonial experience, knowledge and intuitions about the world played a significant role in the processes of categorization and conceptualization, and hence naming. It is argued that it is possible to discern common cognitive ground for such diversity in lexis.

Keywords: borrowing, coinage, semantic derivation, heteronymy, category extension.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23856/2915>

Introduction

The transformation of English from national into international means of communication, the process of its geographical dissemination and its linguistic consequences have long been studied in detail in descriptive (Hay, 2008; Hickey, 2012; Ramson, 1963; 1970), comparative (Boberg, 2010; Siemund, 2013; Peters 2009), sociolinguistic (Cheshire, 1991), and cultural (Bailey, 2012; Damousi, 2009; Laugsen, 2002) perspectives. When colonies were established overseas, the first settlers had to give names for new geographical features, animals and plants, local inhabitants and their cultural attributes. Not only does the examination of naming strategies provide an insight into a changing cultural identity of speakers, their attitudes with local inhabitants, degree of cultural loyalty, it also reveals how previous experience, established values and cultural practices were exploited to adapt to new environments, how new knowledge was gained and categorized.

This paper examines colonial naming practices in the main overseas varieties of English spoken in North America, Australia, and New Zealand. Other international forms are not considered here for they exhibit different patterns of language contact and settlement. The sociocultural and linguistic consequences of the English language adaptation in America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand are complex and unique. However, they share some features that should not be neglected: strong cultural ties with the metropole of the British empire; restricted availability of autochthonous cultural and linguistic element over the

displacement of pre-colonial population; numerous lexico-semantic lacunae; excessive variability of new names; heteronymy within particular varieties and on cross-variety level.

It is hypothesized that multiple names were not by chance but stemmed from cognitive difficulties and search for the adequacy in filling the existing categories with new members.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the naming processes occurring at the early stages of the English language adaptation to overseas contexts.

As to materials, national dictionaries of English compiled on historical principles (*Avis et al.*, 1967; *Craigie & Hubert*, 1968; *Hughes*, 1992; *Orsman*, 1997) were used to select multiple names. The selection of words and expressions allowed systematization of sources, ways and means of regional vocabulary development, identification of their efficiency. Cognitive analysis was employed to the primary meanings of the selected words to make judgements about how lexical representations were constructed.

This study follows several theoretical approaches developed by cognitive psychologists to principles and levels of categorization, and building taxonomies (*Rosch*, 1999); linguistic application of categorization and prototype principles to lexical semantics (*Taylor*, 2003), including polysemy, metaphoric and metonymic extensions (*Díaz-Vera*, 2015; *Dirven*, *Pörings*, 2002; *Geeraerts* 1997).

Sources and ways of vocabulary development in overseas varieties of English

The size and content of the lexicon in English vary in accordance with geographical, historical, and sociolinguistic setting. Having spread from the British Isles to other regions, English evolved into a multicultural system. Forms of English spoken in the contemporary world involved a wide range of sources and ways of vocabulary development, hence increased its heterogeneity. Lexico-semantic boundaries arose due to the necessity of lexical lacunae filling and category extension. Changes in social life, experiences with new items of geographical and cultural environment motivated the inclusion of new members into existing categories. The processes of categorization led to the formation of new concepts verbalized by external and internal means.

Autochthonous and European migrant languages were used as valuable external sources of innovations: *moccasin* “a soft-soled shoe of a type worn originally by American Indians” < Algonquian (*Craigie & Hubert*, 1968: 1534), *koala* “the arboreal, mainly nocturnal marsupial of e. Australia” < Dharuk (*Hughes*, 1992: 295), *Maori* “Polynesian inhabitant of New Zealand” < Maori (*Orsman* 1997: 469), *atigi* “an inner shirt of summer skins” < Eskimo (*Avis et al.*, 1967: 18), *ravage* “browsing area where a group of moose or deer in winter tread the snow” < Canadian French (*ibid.*: 617, 874).

Many autochthonous words were indirectly borrowed via other colonial languages: *canoe* “type of West Indian light boat” < Spanish *canoas* < Arawakan (Haiti) (*Craigie & Hubert*, 1968: 411), *kayak* “a light boat” < Danish *kajak* < Greenland Eskimo (*Avis et al.*, 1967: 400).

In more complicated cases, borrowings were combined with native stems and produced etymological hybrids (*muspike* “kind of game fish” < Algonquian *muskellunge* + *pike* (*Avis et al.*, 1967:502)), translation calques (*dreamtime* “in Aboriginal belief: a collection of events that shaped the world” < Aranda *alcheringa* (*Hughes*, 1992: 177), *Land of the long white cloud* < Maori *Aotearoa* (*Orsman*, 1997: 437), *rappé pie* “rich nourishing dish” < Acadian

French *tarte râpée* “(lit.) grated pie” (*Avis et al.*, 1967: 615)) in order to reflect distinctive features and local colouring of denotata.

Numerous words have enjoyed worldwide spread through borrowing from one variety to another. For instance, at the beginning of the seventeenth century the word *tomahawk* “a club or hatchetlike weapon or tool used by the Algonquian Indians” was borrowed from Algonquian into American English (*Craigie & Hubert*, 1968: 2331), and in the mid-eighteenth century entered Canadian English (“originally, a light Indian war-club” (*Avis et al.*, 1967: 790). In the nineteenth century, the word extended its meaning in Australian and New Zealand varieties: “a hatchet; the stone hatchet of the Aborigines” (*Hughes*, 1992: 585) and “a hatchet or small ax, used as trade, and a useful tool of the settler, occas. also a Maori stone implement” (*Orsman*, 1997: 846).

British dialects and other regional and/or social varieties of English around the world became important internal sources of regional vocabulary enrichment. For instance, *gammon* “guile, deceit” < British criminal cant *gammon* “jest, farce with someone” (*Hughes*, 1992:222), *gills* “a jocular designation for a (semi-important) person” < British slang *gill* “chap, cove” (*ibid.*: 227), *in(to) holts* “in conflict, at grips” < variation of British dial. *in holds* “grips” (*ibid.*: 258), *improve* “bring land into agricultural use” < U.S. *improve* “to bring land under cultivation” (*ibid.*: 269).

A substantial number of coinages were produced by the recycling of existing common English words to name unique referents (*barren(s)* “an elevated track of exposed land that nourishes only scrubby trees, shrubs, berries, etc. and resembles a moor” (*Avis et al.*, 1967: 33), *combine* “a farm machine which cuts and threshes grain in one operation” (*ibid.*: 161), *morning glory* “a wave induced by the flow of air over the Australian land mass” (*Hughes*, 1992: 343)) and general notions (*guts* “information, the facts” (*ibid.*: 248), *guyver* “empty or ingratiating talk, persiflage” (*ibid.*: 249)). Some of such words were used in their original forms and meanings (*lounge* > *lounge (room)* “the sitting room of a private house” (*ibid.*: 316)). A great number of them underwent semantic widening (*lolly* “a sweetmeat” > “a sweet of any kind, esp. boiled” (*ibid.*: 315)) or specialization (to *lock* “to shut off from” > “to shut land off from small settlers; to prevent the release of land” (*ibid.*: 314). Metaphoric and metonymic transfers turned less productive and involved mainly native stems (*Union Jack* “a cicada” (*ibid.*: 605), *St. Andrew’s Cross* “the orb-weaving spider” (*ibid.*: 475-476)).

New lexical units were also created by means of analogy. Analogical creation involves acting of one form as a model for another. The pattern, employed to name items of local significance that resemble those found in Britain, consists of two elements. The first one is an adjective or an attributive noun, such as *native*, *wild*, *American*, *Canada/Canadian*, *Australian*, or *New Zealand*, used as a distinguishing epithet in the meaning of ‘local, indigenous, typical of, or originating in the place’: “Godman *Nat. Hist.* I 179 The American badger has been ... established as a species distinct from the badger of Europe” (*Craigie & Hubert*, 1960: 42), “1889 *Cent.* 417/3 The American badger ...resembles the foregoing [=European species], but differs in the dental formula” (*ibid.*), “1881 *Amer. Naturalist* XV. 96 The green lizard ... of the Southern United States is sometimes called the American Chameleon, but it is not related to the chameleon of the Old World” (*ibid.*). The qualifier within the structure limits the meaning of the second element which is usually a British English common name in collocations or compounds referring to:

a. plants (*American ash*, ~ *aspen*, ~ *chestnut* (*Craigie & Hubert*, 1960: 42-43), *wild barley*, ~ *bean* (*ibid.*: 2486), ~ *grape* (*ibid.*: 2489); *Canada/Canadian rye*, ~ *thistle* (*Avis et al.*, 1967:119-120), *wild potato*, ~ *rose* (*ibid.*: 857-858); *Australian violet* (*Hughes*, 1992: 16),

native apple, ~ *apricot*, ~ *cherry*, ~ *oak*, ~ *parsley* (*ibid.*: 360-361), *wild carrot*, ~ *parsley*, ~ *turnip* (*ibid.*: 635); *New Zealand beech*, ~ *birch*, ~ *daisy*, ~ *willow* (*Orsman*, 1997: 531), *native honeysuckle*, ~ *ivy* (*ibid.*: 525), *wild onion*, ~ *radish*, ~ *turnip* (*ibid.*: 913));

b. animals (*American crow*, ~ *eagle*, ~ *elk* (*Craigie & Hubert*, 1960: 43), *wild canary* (*ibid.*: 2486), ~ *hog* (*ibid.*: 2489), *Canada hedgehog*, ~ *lynx* (*Avis et al.*, 1967: 112), *Canadian horse* (*ibid.*: 117), ~ *partridge* (*ibid.*: 119), *wild cat* (*ibid.*: 856); *Australian dotterel*, ~ *terrier* (*Hughes*, 1992: 16), *native cat*, ~ *dog*, ~ *magpie*, ~ *salmon* (*ibid.*: 363), *wild goose*, ~ *turkey* (*ibid.*: 635); *New Zealand cod*, ~ *robin*, ~ *sole* (*Orsman*, 1997: 531), *native bee*, ~ *quail*, ~ *rat* (*ibid.*: 525), *wild duck*, ~ *pig*, ~ *pigeon* (*ibid.*: 913));

c. people existing in a country since the earliest time (*American Indian* (*Craigie & Hubert*, 1960: 40), *native American* (*ibid.*: 1583-1584), *wild Indian* (*ibid.*: 2489); *native (Canadian) Indian* (*Avis et al.*, 1967: 505); *Australian Aboriginal*, ~ *black*, ~ *savage* (*Hughes*, 1992: 16), *native doctor*, ~ *chief*, ~ *king*, ~ *inhabitant*, ~ *shepherd* (*ibid.*: 359-360), *wild man*, ~ *native*, ~ *tribe* (*ibid.*: 636); *New Zealand troops*, ~ *ladies*, ~ *man* (*Orsman*, 1997: 530), *native Maori* (*ibid.*: 524));

d. early settlers (*American native*, ~ *prince*, ~ *patriot*, ~ *bishop*, ~ *settlers* (*Craigie & Hubert*, 1960: 41), *Canadian population* (*Avis et al.*, 1967: 115); *native colonist*, ~ *lad*, ~ *settler*, ~ *white* (*Hughes*, 1992: 359), *wild colonial boy* “a bushranger; a larrikin” (*ibid.*: 637); *New Zealand child*, ~ *poet*, ~ *boy* (*Orsman*, 1996: 530));

e. people born in the region as opposed to ‘immigrant’ or ‘naturalized’ (*native-born American citizen* (*Craigie & Hubert*, 1960: 1584), *native American democrat* (*Mathews*, 1956: 1113); *native colonial* (*Hughes*, 1992: 363-364); *New Zealand natives*, *native women* (*Orsman*, 1996: 524));

f. things typical of, or belonging to the country and its people (*American shore*, ~ *race* (*Craigie & Hubert* 1960: 41); *Canadian football*, ~ *gray (cloth)* (*Avis et al.*, 1967: 117), ~ *train* (*ibid.*: 120); *Australian adjective* “the epithet bloody”, ~ *blue* “light blue”, ~ *game* “football”, ~ *metropolis* “Sydney”, ~ *slanguage* “a distinctively Australian expression, esp. of the more colourful variety; colloquial Australian speech” (*Hughes*, 1992: 16), *native hut*, ~ *grave*, ~ *path*, ~ *tongue*, ~ *weir* ~ *well* (*ibid.*: 359), *wild land*, ~ *pasture*, ~ *territory* “unalienated, unimproved; waste” (*ibid.*: 636-637); *New Zealand war* “Maori inter-tribal conflict” (*Orsman*, 1996: 532), *native chapel*, ~ *mat*, ~ *oven* “hangi”, ~ *settlement*, ~ *school*, ~ *village*, ~ *wine* “a liquor made from the juice of the tutu berry”, ~ *war* “New Zealand war” (*ibid.*: 525)).

As is clear from the above-mentioned examples, naming processes involved internal and external sources. Innovations entered English through semantic change, word-formation, and borrowing. From these many sources and in these many ways, the overseas varieties of English drew their lexico-semantic resources when it was time to compare the Old World and the New World environment, fill the gaps between previous and new experience of the world. Are there any common cognitive grounds for such a high degree of lexical variation?

Naming processes and category development

In what follows, I will try to answer how information was systematized in the New World context and why it was verbalized in a certain way in different varieties of English. The starting point is that heterogeneity of the English vocabulary should be recognized together with its underpinning unity.

It is necessary to point out that most striking trend in vocabulary is toward heteronymy. The term ‘heteronymy’ was employed (Görlach, 1990) to a well-known situation when the same thing is given several references. There are two types of heteronymy to take into account: firstly, multiple references in different varieties of English (Bauer, 2002: 42), such as *lorry* in Britain and *truck* in the USA (*ibid.*), and, secondly, heteronymy within a particular variety as with *ice-house*, *snow house*, *snow hut*, *snow igloo* (Avis et al., 1967: 366, 724-725).

Multiple names for the same thing in different Englishes are stimulated by speakers’ cultural practices and communicative preferences leading to differences in feature salience. Returning to the example given in (Bauer, 2002: 42), both *lorry* and *truck* refer to a large motor vehicle for the transportation of goods on roads. At first, the word *lorry* was the British railroad word derived from *lurry* “pull, tug” (OED, 2004) and then it extended its meaning to “a road vehicle”. The word *truck*, a shortening of *motor truck*, was derived from “a wheeled cart carrying heavy loads”, an extension of earlier “a wheeled cart carrying guns” (*ibid.*). Even though both the lorry and the truck are cognized as ‘the mover’, American English gives more salience to the agentive feature ‘a movement controller’ whereas British English favours ‘a facilitator of motion’. From a diachronic perspective, such difference in feature salience leads to the expansion of the category because new members are included on the horizontal level: lorries are vehicles carrying goods on railroads and those carrying goods on roads; trucks are machines with wheels used to transport heavy loads and vehicles with engines used to transport goods and people. As the number of referents gradually widens and the level of abstraction increases, the lexical meanings of the words *lorry* and *truck* undergo widening. From a synchronic perspective, the category of vehicles does not branch into ‘those with controlled movement’ (*trucks*) and ‘those with facilitated movement’ (*lorries*) as both lorries and trucks are motor vehicles, and the words *lorry* and *truck* may be treated as cross-variety lexical equivalents.

The second type of multiple naming occurs in one particular variety due to:

a. regional differences, even in such dialectally homogeneous community as Australia (“1889 E. Giles *Aust. twice Traversed* I. 153 We saw a native pheasant’s nest... This bird is known by different names in different parts of Australia. On the eastern part of the continent it is usually called the Lowan, while in Western Australia it is known as the Gnow” (Hughes, 1992: 363));

b. a competition between loans and innovations derived from native stems (*rimu* from Maori (earliest recorded in 1820) and *red pine* (first recorded in 1879) “a valued coniferous timbered tree common in New Zealand (Orsman, 1996: 604, 671) in New Zealand English);

c. a low degree of early settlers’ cultural competence and use of a misnomer, like the noun *ice house* “igloo” in Canadian English (Avis et al., 1967: 366, 724-725), as igloos are made of blocks of snow rather than ice;

d. transnomination, i.e. renaming when new lexical units are created alongside the existing names to denote the same objects, typified by Australian English *koala*, 1798 – *koala wombat*, 1808 – *sloth*, 1811 – (native) *bear*, 1827 – *monkey bear*, 1839 – *native sloth*, 1852 – *tree-bear*, 1889 – *koala bear*, 1937 (Hughes, 1992: 35, 295, 341, 363, 516, 594).

Examples in (a.) illustrate borrowings from different languages of Australia spoken in its eastern and western parts: Nyungar *now* > *gnow* (*ibid.*: 229), Wemba-wemba *lawan* > *lowan* (*ibid.*: 317). The words were borrowed into Australian English almost simultaneously in the mid-nineteenth century and produced heteronymy by mere chance as the names, or “allonym(s)” (Allsopp, 1996), are equivalent designations of the same item. In line with cross-

variant exact equivalents, allonyms in Australian English and other varieties are used in different territories and do not result from the category extension.

In group (b.), competition between loans and English alternatives results in near equivalency. Although *rimu* and red *pine* vary dialectally, for some speakers of New Zealand English *rimu* denotes “the tree” and *red pine* “the timber”, expanding membership in the categories of ‘trees’ and ‘materials’ respectively: “1877 *TrNZI* IX. 163 ...if professional men and timber merchants would only encourage its use, it [*rimu*] would soon supersede the vague conventional term of ‘red pine’ ” (*Orsman, 1996: 671*).

Transnominations (d.), even if stimulated by competence gaps (c.), are motivated by the selectivity of sign-makers and strive to encode important characteristics of the referents. The names that appear inadequate come out of active usage. For instance, the Australian English word *sloth* had been used to refer to the koala for about 70 years when it became obsolete (*Hughes, 1992: 516*). Obviously the structural and behavioral parallels of koalas with sloths were thought less prominent than characteristics (‘having a pouch’ or some other) which distinguish the koala from the sloth. The name considered the most relevant to meet the communicative needs gains general usage.

Transnominations illustrate the “the principle of cultural elaboration” in vocabulary (*Wierzbicka, 1997: 10-11*), inventiveness of speakers, their being particular about details and category development. The fundamental idea expressed by Sapir that “language is a guide to ‘social reality’ ... [and that it] has become the medium of expression for... society” (*Sapir, 2008: 209*) is well applicable to multiple naming. Being a way to socio-cultural reality, heteronymy enables holographic projections of concepts in language reflecting what and how people think about the world, what particular information is gathered, stored, and later retrieved if necessary. Heteronymy, like synonymy, is actually affected by culture, that is, the choice of a salient feature encoded in a name is the matter of cognitive and cultural preference.

This allows to discuss, for example, the Canadian English names referring to “a circular house built by the Inuit people”. The words *snowhouse* and *ice-house* (*Avis et al., 1967: 366, 724*) highlight the type of building material. The equivalents *snowhouse*, *snow hut* and *snow igloo* (*ibid.: 724-725*) accentuate on the construction type (in the quotes that follow, bold type added for emphasis): ‘home, for living’ (“1771 *Cartwright Journal* I 96: ...I **visited** my Indian **friends** in their **snowhouse**” (*ibid.: 724*)); ‘small and simple, just raised and fixed’ (“1823 *Literary Gaz.* 25 Oct. 673/3: ...Esquimaux ... were **erecting** their **snowhuts**, and **taking up** their residence **at a short distance from the vessels**” (*ibid.: 725*)); ‘relating to a particular ethnic group’ (“1921 *Haworth Trailmakers* 235: ... in summer **they lived** in skin tents and in winter in snow **igloos**, in the building of which **they were very expert**” (*ibid.*)). In Inuit culture, the word *igloo* implies ‘any type of home which cannot be moved’ (*ibid.: 370*). Outside Inuit culture, *igloo* expands the subcategory of ‘shelters’ on the horizontal level of the category of ‘houses’.

In the same fashion, the word *wigwam* provides evidence for the elaboration of the category of shelters, makeshifts in the global context: “an Aboriginal’s dwelling or shelter; roughly constructed dwelling occupied by a white person, a traveler; other type of primitive building for occupational, communal, etc. purposes” – *teepee*, *wigwam* (*Craigie & Hubert, 1960: 2485*) in American English; *Esquimaux wigwam*, *teepee*, *lodge*, *skin tent*, *tupek*, *wickup*, *wigwam* (*Avis et al., 1967: 705, 855*) in Canadian English; *breakwind*, *gunyah*, *humpy*, *mia-mia*, *wiltja*, *wigwam*, *wurley*, *yu* (*Hughes, 1992: 248, 266, 334, 635, 638, 650, 660*) in Australian English; *wigwam*, *whare* (*Orsman, 1996: 604, 671*) in New Zealand

English. The fact that *wigwam* moves to the upper level of the category and becomes its more central member may be supported by similarities its semantic structure bears to that of the common English *shelter*. Both words develop implications of ‘affording protection from attack, something unwanted, unpleasant etc.’, cf.: *sheltered life*, ~ *childhood*, ~ *accommodation*, etc. (Summers, 2007: 1513) and *a wigwam for goose’s bridle* “a reply to a stickybeak, or an unwanted question” (Hughes, 1992: 635), probably based on the alteration of the British dialect phrase *a whim-wham for a goose’s bridle* (Orsman, 1996: 913).

The above-discussed and other cases of heteronymy (*canoe*, *dugout*, *kayak*; *hatchet*, *tomahawk*; (*spiny*) *anteater*, *echidna*, (*native*) *hedgehog*, (*native*) *porcupine*, to name but a few) provide evidence that new names reflect the addition of new members and expand the horizontal levels of existing categories, sometimes branching these categories and moving to the upper levels of categorization.

Semantic shifts prove different results of categorization. Moving away from different types of metaphoric and/or metonymic extensions, I just point out that they are less frequent than widening and specialization of meanings. It may be explained by the fact that metonymies are based on associative transfers within one and the same cognitive domain while metaphors rely upon analogical shifts from one cognitive sphere to another. It is possible that the experience of the introduced colonial environment was then insufficient for the interlocutors to establish shared knowledge and make analogical connections between the source and the target domains. With metonymies, it was difficult, although not impossible, to identify the salient feature/s by which and object could be identified: ‘symptom of illness → victim’ (*lumpy* “an animal afflicted with a lumpy jaw” (Hughes, 1992: 318)), ‘part → whole’ (*urupa* Maori ‘fence around a grave, a burying place’ > “a cemetery” (Orsman, 1996: 877)). With metaphors, it was required to find adequate properties conventionally associated with the metaphorical source and appropriate for the non-conventional representation in the metaphorical target: ‘occupation → natural phenomenon’ (*barber* “a vapor or mist made up of tiny particles of ice” called so for its cutting qualities (Avis et al., 1967: 31), *doctor* “a cool, refreshing sea breeze, with a considerable inland penetration” from the association of ‘bringing relief’ (Hughes, 1992: 168)). Over such cognitive difficulties metaphors and metonymies appeared more efficient at the younger stages of lexis development in overseas Englishes.

Concluding remarks

With its spread beyond the British Isles, English established as the language of various communities. It is hardly possible to draw generalizations about the colonization processes which took place in different regions with their unique social, cultural and linguistic consequences. As colonies started and developed, lexis was the most flexible layer to react to the environmental changes. The creation of new names for new things was conditioned by the sociolinguistic circumstances and cultural contacts. A great variety of sources and means of vocabulary development in overseas Englishes arose from availability of new experience and links with previous cognitive and cultural practices. That was why new forms of English with distinct vocabulary evolved in different parts of the world particularly in North America, Australia and New Zealand.

The common features of lexis change may be summarized as follows. Both external and internal sources were efficient for innovations. New names were created by means of borrowing, semantic derivation and various types of word-formation. Loans and native stems

became actively exploited in naming processes resulting in heteronymy. Multiple names for the same items were motivated by the cognitive difficulties in organizing the information about the new world, search for adequate features of the referents, and establishing cognitive distances between the source and target domains. The competition among terms provides evidence for category modifications. New members were added at the lower (subordinate) levels of the existing groupings, expanding them and increasing their complexity by making their central members more general and abstract.

This study has taken a step in the direction of establishing relationship between categorization processes and lexical variation in one and the same language. Further research should employ a linguistic ecology perspective and extrapolate from the cognitive approach outlined here in order to discover cognitive trends towards lexical diversity in the forms of English that followed other colonial and post-colonial patterns.

References

- Allsopp, R. (Ed.). (1996). *Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [in English].
- Avis, W. S. (Ed.-in-chief). (1967). *A Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles*. Victoria: University of Victoria (BC), Gage Publishing. [in English].
- Bailey, R.W. (2012). *Speaking American: A History of English in the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [in English].
- Bauer, L. (2002). *Introduction to International Varieties of English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. [in English].
- Boberg, Ch. (2010). *The English Language in Canada: Status, History and Comparative Analyses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [in English].
- Cheshire, J. (Ed.). (1991). *English Around the World: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [in English].
- Craigie, W. & Hulbert, J. R. (Eds.). (1960). *A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles*. 4 volumes. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. in English].
- Damousi, J. (2009). *Colonial Voices: A Cultural History of English in Australia, 1840-1940*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [in English].
- Díaz-Vera, J. E. (Ed.). (2015). *Metaphor and Metonymy across Time and Cultures: Perspectives on the Sociohistorical Linguistics of Figurative Language*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG. in English].
- Dirven, R., Pörings, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. [in English].
- Geeraerts, D. (1997). *Diachronic Prototype Semantics. A Contribution to Historical Lexicology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [in English].
- Görlach, M. (1990). Heteronymy in international English. *English World-Wide*. Vol. 11, Issue 2, 239-274. [in English].
- Hay, J. (2008). *New Zealand English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. [in English].
- Hickey, R. (Ed.). (2012). *Standards of English: Codified Varieties around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [in English].
- Hughes, J. (1992). *The Concise Australian National Dictionary*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press. [in English].
- Laugsen, A. (2002). *Convict Words. Language in Early Colonial Australia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [in English].

- Mathews, Mitford M. (Ed.). (1956). *A Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles*, 2 volumes. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press. [in English].
- Orsman, H. W. (Ed.). (1997). *Dictionary of New Zealand English: A Dictionary of New Zealandisms on Historical Principles*. Auckland: Oxford University Press. [in English].
- Peters, P., Collins, P., Smith, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Comparative Studies in Australian and New Zealand English: Grammar and Beyond*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. [in English].
- Ramson, W. S. (1963). *Australian English*. Canberra: Australian National University Press. [in English].
- Ramson, W. S. (1970). *English Transported: Essays on Australasian English*. Canberra: Australian National University Press. [in English].
- Rosch, E. (1999). *Principles of categorization. Concepts: Core Readings*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: A Bradford Book, The MIT Press, 189-206. [in English].
- Sapir, E. (2008). *Language as a Form of Human Behavior. The Collected Works of Edward Sapir. I. General linguistics*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 204-216. [in English].
- Siemund, P. (2013). *Varieties of English: A Typological Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [in English].
- Summers, D. (Ed.). (2007). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited. [in English].
- Taylor, G. R. (2003). *Linguistic categorization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [in English].
- The Oxford English Dictionary*. (2004). *OED*. [Electronic resource]. CD-ROM, version 3.1., 2nd ed. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press. [in English].
- Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding Cultures Through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press. [in English].