Republic of Iraq
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Misan
College of Basic Education
Department of English

Lexical Relations in English

A research submitted to the council of English department, College of Basic Education at the University of Misan in partial fulfillment requirements to get B.A. degree in English language teaching

By

Rusul Jabbar Balas & Rabab Ali Sabar

Supervised by:

Asst.Prof. Hayder Tuama Jasim

2024 - 2025

In the name of Allah, the Entirely Merciful, the Especially Merciful

"Say, 'Are those who know equal to those who do not know?' Indeed, only those of understanding will be reminded".

Allah, the Exalted, the Great, has spoken the truth

(Quran 39:9, Az-Zumar).

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my beloved family, whose unwavering support, encouragement, and love have been the driving force behind my success.

You have been my greatest supporters throughout my educational journey.

Acknowledgement

I would also like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, ***Assistant Professor Hayder Tuama Jasim***, for his invaluable guidance, insightful feedback, and constant encouragement throughout this journey. his dedication, expertise, and mentorship have been instrumental in shaping this work and inspiring me to achieve excellence.

I would also like to extend my heartfelt thanks to the staff of the English Department for their unwavering support, encouragement, and assistance throughout my academic journey.

List of Contents

Introduction

Lexical relations constitute the systematic connections between words that underpin the organization and interpretation of meaning within a language. These relationships, fundamental to semantic analysis, enable speakers to navigate the complexities of vocabulary by categorizing words based on shared or contrasting meanings. As Lyons (1977) emphasizes, such relations form the structural backbone of semantic networks, allowing for the efficient retrieval and application of lexical knowledge in communication (Lyons, 1977 : 220). By examining these associations, linguists uncover how words interact to create coherence and nuance in discourse.

Synonymy and antonymy represent two primary lexical relations that highlight semantic similarity and opposition. Synonymy, the relationship between words with comparable meanings, is not merely about interchangeability but involves subtle differences in register, connotation, or context. For instance, “slim” and “thin” share a core meaning but diverge in evaluative tone (Cruse, 1986 : 154). Antonymy, conversely, revolves around binary oppositions such as “hot/cold” or “alive/dead,” where words define their meanings through contrast. These pairs often structure conceptual boundaries, shaping how individuals perceive and articulate experiences (Lyons, 1977 : 274).

Hyponymy and meronymy extend the study of lexical relations by addressing hierarchical and part-whole connections. Hyponymy establishes a subtype relationship, as seen in “rose” being a hyponym of “flower,” where the former inherits attributes from the broader category (Cruse, 2000 : 132).

1. Semantics

Semantics, the study of meaning in language, explores how words, phrases, and sentences convey information, ideas, and intentions. Central to this field is the examination of relationships between linguistic forms and their interpretations, encompassing lexical, structural, and contextual dimensions. Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet (2000) emphasize that meaning arises not only from individual words but also from syntactic structures and pragmatic inferences, positioning semantics as a bridge between syntax and pragmatics (Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet, 2000: 3).

Theoretical frameworks in semantics often distinguish between sense and reference, concepts foundational to understanding how language connects to reality. Sense refers to the abstract meaning of an expression, while reference denotes its relation to real-world entities. Saeed (2016) illustrates this distinction through examples like “the morning star” and “the evening star,” which share the same referent (Venus) but differ in sense due to contextual associations (Saeed, 2016: 45).

A critical debate in semantics revolves around compositionality—the principle that the meaning of a complex expression derives systematically from its parts. This principle, formalized in Frege’s work, asserts that syntactic structure governs how meanings combine. Cruse (2000) challenges rigid adherence to compositionality by highlighting idioms and metaphorical language, where literal interpretations fail to capture intended meaning (Cruse, 2000: 78).

The role of context in shaping meaning extends beyond syntax, engaging pragmatics to address implicature, presupposition, and speech acts. Kearns (2011) argues that semantic analysis must account for how speakers exploit

shared knowledge to infer meanings beyond literal content, as seen in indirect requests or sarcastic remarks (Kearns, 2011: 132).

2. Semantic relations

Semantic relations describe how meanings interact within and across linguistic units, forming the structural backbone of language. These relations, such as synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy, enable systematic organization of lexical knowledge. Saeed (2016) categorizes these relations into paradigmatic (substitutable in context) and syntagmatic (combinatorial within phrases), emphasizing their role in structuring semantic networks (Saeed, 2016: 89). Such distinctions clarify how words relate through similarity, opposition, or hierarchical inclusion, shaping both comprehension and production.

Synonymy and antonymy represent foundational paradigmatic relations. Synonyms like “happy” and “joyful” share core meanings but differ in nuance, register, or collocational preferences. Antonyms, such as “hot” and “cold,” establish contrasts along scalar, relational, or complementary axes. Cruse (2000) notes that antonymy often reflects perceptual or cultural salience, as seen in spatial terms like “up” and “down” (Cruse, 2000: 145).

Hierarchical relations, particularly hyponymy and hypernymy, structure conceptual categories. Hyponyms (e.g., “rose” and “tulip”) are specific instances of hypernyms (“flower”), creating taxonomies that mirror cognitive categorization. Lyons (1995) argues that such hierarchies reflect prototypical organization, where central members (e.g., “robin” for “bird”) anchor category boundaries (Lyons, 1995: 210).

Meronymy, the part-whole relation, connects terms like “wheel” and “car” or “finger” and “hand.” Unlike taxonomic relations, meronymy relies on functional or structural integration. Kearns (2011) distinguishes meronymy from other relations by its context-dependent flexibility, as parts may shift based on perspective (e.g., “page” as part of a “book” or “story”) (Kearns, 2011: 93).

Polysemy and homonymy address ambiguity in lexical meaning. Polysemous words, like “bank” (financial institution vs. river edge), share etymological roots but diverge in usage. Homonyms, such as “bat” (animal) and “bat” (sports tool), are phonetically identical but semantically unrelated. Palmer (1981) stresses that distinguishing these phenomena requires analyzing historical development and contextual distribution (Palmer, 1981: 178).

Thematic roles, though syntactically mediated, further exemplify semantic relations. Verbs like “give” impose roles (agent, theme, recipient) that structure sentence meaning. Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet (2000) link these roles to argument structure, demonstrating how syntax and semantics jointly determine interpretation (Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet, 2000: 132).

3. What are lexical relations?

Lexical relations are systematic connections between words based on shared or contrasting meanings, forming the structural foundation of vocabulary. These relations, such as synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy, enable speakers to organize knowledge, infer meaning, and navigate ambiguity. Saeed (2016) underscores their role in structuring semantic networks, where words relate through similarity, opposition, or hierarchical inclusion (Saeed, 2016: 5).

Synonymy and antonymy represent fundamental lexical relations. Synonyms, such as “happy” and “joyful,” share core meanings but differ in connotation, register, or collocational preferences. Antonyms, like “hot” and “cold,” establish contrasts along scalar, directional, or complementary axes. Cruse (2000) emphasizes that these relations reflect cognitive and cultural salience, as seen in spatial antonyms such as “up” and “down” (Cruse, 2000: 145).

Hyponymy and hypernymy structure hierarchical categories. Hyponyms, such as “rose” and “tulip,” are specific instances of hypernyms like “flower.” This taxonomic organization mirrors cognitive categorization, where prototypes anchor category boundaries. Saeed (2016) notes that hypernyms encapsulate shared attributes of hyponyms, enabling generalization and inference (Saeed, 2016: 97).

Meronymy describes part-whole relationships, connecting terms like “wheel” and “car” or “finger” and “hand.” Unlike taxonomic relations, meronymy depends on functional or structural integration, meronymic

connections are context-dependent, as parts may shift based on perspective (Kearns, 2011: 112).

Polysemy and homonymy address lexical ambiguity. Polysemous words, such as “bank” (financial institution vs. river edge), have related meanings derived from shared etymology. Homonyms, like “bat” (animal) and “bat” (sports tool), are phonetically identical but semantically unrelated (Lyons, 1995: 210).

Thematic roles, though syntactically mediated, further exemplify lexical relations. Verbs impose roles such as agent, theme, and recipient, structuring sentence meaning. For example, “give” requires an agent, recipient, and theme. These roles, linked to argument structure, demonstrate the interdependence of syntax and semantics (Cruse, 2000: 152).

4.Why are lexical relations important?

Lexical relations, the systematic connections between words, serve as a cornerstone for understanding how language structures meaning. These relations—such as synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy—enable the organization of vocabulary into coherent networks, facilitating efficient communication. By delineating how words interrelate, lexical relations underpin semantic clarity, cognitive processing, and practical applications across disciplines. Their study reveals the intricate architecture of language, offering insights into both theoretical linguistics and real-world usage (Cruse, 1986: 123).

The role of lexical relations in semantic organization is paramount. Words do not exist in isolation; their meanings are dynamically shaped by their relationships with other terms. For instance, hyponymy (e.g., “rose” as a type of “flower”) establishes hierarchical structures that allow speakers to categorize and retrieve concepts efficiently. Such systems reduce ambiguity and enhance comprehension by embedding words within broader semantic fields. This organizational framework is essential for interpreting nuanced meanings, as overlapping relations create a web of associations that reflect cognitive and cultural realities (Saeed, 2016: 89).

In language acquisition and education, lexical relations simplify the learning process. Learners often grasp new vocabulary by relating unfamiliar terms to known synonyms, antonyms, or superordinate categories. For example, understanding “vehicle” as a hypernym aids in mastering hyponyms like “car” or “truck.” This relational approach accelerates vocabulary expansion and reinforces retention, as connections between words create mnemonic anchors. Educational strategies leveraging these principles, such as semantic mapping, demonstrate improved outcomes in both first and second language contexts (Lyons, 1995: 45).

Lexical relations also underpin advancements in computational linguistics and natural language processing (NLP). Algorithms rely on semantic networks to disambiguate word senses, enhance machine translation, and improve information retrieval. For instance, recognizing that “bank” (financial institution) and “bank” (river edge) are homonyms prevents contextual errors in text analysis. Similarly, ontologies built on hierarchical relations (e.g., WordNet) enable machines to infer meaning through

structured data, illustrating the practical utility of lexical frameworks (Palmer, 1981: 210).

Cognitively, lexical relations reflect how the human mind stores and accesses linguistic information. The mental lexicon is not a static repository but a dynamic network where words are interconnected through relational pathways. This organization mirrors associative memory processes, allowing rapid semantic activation during comprehension and production. Neuroimaging studies corroborate that related words trigger overlapping neural patterns, underscoring the biological basis of lexical networks (Cruse, 1986: 130).

In summary, lexical relations are indispensable for semantic coherence, cognitive efficiency, and technological innovation. Their study bridges theoretical linguistics with applied fields, offering a lens to examine language as both a social tool and a mental construct. As research continues to uncover their complexities, these relations remain central to unraveling the interplay between language, thought, and technology.

5.Types of lexical relations

5.1 Synonymy and Antonymy

Synonyms are words with comparable meanings, such as “rapid” and “quick,” while antonyms express opposition, like “hot” and “cold.” These relationships are context-dependent, as substituting synonyms may alter nuances (Saeed, 2016: 68).

5.2 Hypernymy and Hyponymy

Hypernyms represent broader categories (e.g., “furniture”), and hyponyms specify subtypes (e.g., “chair” or “table”). This hierarchical structure organizes lexical fields taxonomically (Jackson, 2002: 45).

5.3 Meronymy

Meronymy describes part-whole relationships, such as “wheel” as a component of “car.” This relation reflects how complex entities are mentally decomposed into parts (Hanks, 2013: 112).

5.4 Collocations

Collocations are conventional pairings like “strong coffee” or “heavy rain,” governed by probabilistic patterns rather than strict rules. They highlight constraints on lexical co-occurrence (Cruse, 2011: 89).

6. Synonymy

Synonymy refers to a lexical relation where words share a significant degree of semantic overlap, enabling them to substitute one another in specific contexts without altering the propositional meaning of an utterance. This relationship is central to linguistic flexibility, allowing speakers to convey ideas through varied yet equivalent expressions. However, true synonyms—words entirely interchangeable across all contexts—are rare, as subtle distinctions in connotation, register, or collocational behavior often emerge (Saeed, 2016: 70).

Synonyms exhibit semantic similarity but rarely identity. For instance, “happy” and “joyful” align closely in denoting positive emotion, yet “joyful” may imply a more intense state. Contextual dependency is another key feature: “elderly” and “old” can be synonyms in some contexts, but “elderly” often carries a more respectful tone (Jackson, 2002: 33). Additionally, synonyms may differ in stylistic register, such as “purchase” (formal) versus “buy” (neutral), or regional usage, like “apartment” (American English) and “flat” (British English). These variations highlight the nuanced nature of synonymy, where equivalence is constrained by pragmatic and sociolinguistic factors (Cruse, 2011: 94).

English abounds with synonym pairs that illustrate these principles. Consider “fast” and “quick,” which are broadly interchangeable, though “fast” may emphasize speed in motion, while “quick” often relates to time efficiency. Verbs like “gaze” and “stare” share a core meaning of focused looking but diverge in connotation—“gaze” suggests admiration, whereas “stare” may imply rudeness. Adjectives such as “slim” and “skinny” both describe thinness, yet “slim” connotes attractiveness, and “skinny” may carry a negative undertone. Even technical terms, like “automobile” and

“car,” reflect synonymy shaped by formality and context (Hanks, 2013: 121).

Determining synonymy requires careful consideration of semantic boundaries. Words like “broad” and “wide” are often treated as synonyms, but their collocational preferences differ: “broad” pairs with “street” or “smile,” while “wide” aligns with “road” or “gap.” Such distinctions underscore the role of convention in shaping synonymy. Furthermore, cultural and historical shifts influence synonymic relationships; archaic terms like “thou” once had modern equivalents but now lack true synonyms (Saeed, 2016: 72).

7. Antonymy

Antonymy denotes a lexical relation where words exhibit contrasting meanings, forming a fundamental axis of semantic opposition. Unlike synonymy, which unifies concepts through similarity, antonymy structures language by delineating boundaries between opposing states, qualities, or actions. This relation is pivotal for constructing coherent narratives, enabling speakers to articulate contrasts such as presence versus absence, motion versus stasis, or approval versus disapproval. Antonymy is not monolithic; it encompasses distinct subtypes, each governed by specific linguistic and conceptual principles (Saeed, 2016: 85).

Antonyms are categorized into gradable, complementary, and relational oppositions. Gradable antonyms, such as “hot” and “cold,” exist on a spectrum, allowing intermediate states (e.g., “warm”). These pairs often correlate with adjectives and reflect subjective or context-dependent scales. Complementary antonyms, like “alive” and “dead,” represent binary oppositions with no middle ground—something cannot be both or

neither simultaneously. Relational antonyms, such as “buy” and “sell,” denote inverse actions or roles, where one term’s meaning presupposes the other (Cruse, 2011: 118).

The markedness of antonyms further distinguishes them. For instance, “fast” is unmarked in comparisons (“How fast?”), while “slow” is marked (“How slow?”). Cultural and contextual factors also shape antonymic relationships. The pair “light” and “dark” may function as antonyms in color descriptions but not in metaphorical uses like “light-hearted” versus “dark humor” (Jackson, 2002: 52).

English antonyms illustrate the diversity of oppositional relations. Gradable pairs include “young” and “old,” which frame age as a continuum, while “happy” and “sad” contrast emotional states. Complementary antonyms like “true” and “false” exclude intermediacy, often appearing in logical or factual contexts. Relational antonyms, such as “teacher” and “student,” reflect reciprocal roles within social or institutional frameworks (Hanks, 2013: 144).

Verbs also participate in antonymy: “arrive” and “depart” denote opposing directions of motion, while “build” and “destroy” contrast creation and annihilation. Spatial antonyms like “up” and “down” or “left” and “right” anchor physical orientation. Even abstract concepts, such as “freedom” and “captivity,” rely on antonymic contrast to convey meaning (Saeed, 2016: 87).

Antonymy is not always straightforward. Some pairs, like “light” and “heavy,” function as antonyms in weight-related contexts but not in others (e.g., “light bulb” vs. “heavy rain”). Polysemy complicates matters further:

“high” contrasts with “low” in elevation but with “short” in pitch. Additionally, cross-linguistic variation reveals that antonymic pairs may not align directly across languages, reflecting cultural priorities. For instance, some languages encode temperature distinctions differently, affecting antonymic mappings (Cruse, 2011: 120).

8.Hyponymy and Hypernymy

Hyponymy describes a hierarchical relationship where a specific term (hyponym) is subsumed under a broader, more general category (hypernym). This relation underpins taxonomic structures in language, enabling the organization of concepts into nested classes. For example, “tulip” and “daisy” are hyponyms of the hypernym “flower,” as they represent distinct types within the overarching category. Hyponyms inherit the properties of their hypernyms but also possess unique attributes: while all flowers share botanical characteristics, a tulip is differentiated by its shape and growth patterns (Saeed, 2016: 102).

The specificity of hyponyms allows for precise communication. Words like “hammer” and “screwdriver” function as hyponyms of “tool,” each denoting specialized instruments within the broader class. This relationship is not restricted to concrete nouns; abstract terms like “joy” and “sorrow” can be hyponyms of “emotion,” illustrating how hyponymy operates across semantic domains (Cruse, 2011: 78).

Hypernymy is the inverse of hyponymy, where a general term encompasses multiple specific instances. Hypernyms serve as umbrella categories, such as “fruit” for hyponyms like “apple” and “banana,” or “vehicle” for “car” and “bus.” This relation facilitates generalization, allowing speakers to

refer to groups of related entities without specifying individual members. For instance, the hypernym “furniture” subsumes hyponyms like “chair,” “table,” and “sofa,” reflecting a functional and categorical coherence (Jackson, 2002: 47).

Hypernymy also operates in verb systems. “Move” acts as a hypernym for verbs like “run,” “walk,” or “crawl,” which specify modes of motion. Similarly, “speak” serves as a hypernym for “whisper,” “shout,” or “mutter,” each conveying distinct manners of verbal expression (Hanks, 2013: 132).

For example, “color” functions as a hypernym for “red,” “blue,” and “green,” while “blue” itself becomes a hypernym for hyponyms like “navy” or “sky blue.” This nesting reveals how meaning is structured through progressive specificity. Such hierarchies are not static; cultural or contextual factors may influence categorization. In culinary contexts, “pasta” serves as a hypernym for “spaghetti” and “lasagna,” but in other settings, these terms might belong to broader categories like “food” (Saeed, 2016: 105).

While hyponymy and hypernymy provide organizational clarity, ambiguities arise. Some terms resist straightforward classification due to overlapping categories. For instance, “penguin” is a hyponym of both “bird” and “marine animal,” highlighting multidimensional categorization. Similarly, prototypicality affects hypernymic relationships: “rose” is a prototypical hyponym of “flower,” whereas “dandelion” may be less central due to its association with weeds (Cruse, 2011: 80).

9.Meronymy

Meronymy refers to a semantic relation where a lexical item denotes a component or constituent of another term, establishing a part-whole relationship. This concept is central to understanding how meaning is structured in language, particularly in lexical semantics. For instance, the word wheel is a meronym of car, as a wheel constitutes a part of a car. Similarly, branch functions as a meronym of tree, illustrating how parts are systematically linked to wholes (Cruse, 2000: 150).

The structural complexity of meronymy is further explored through distinctions between different types of part-whole relations. Lyons (1995: 290) categorizes meronymy into subtypes, such as component-integral object (e.g., engine and car), member-collection (e.g., student and class), and portion-mass (e.g., slice and cake), Hyponymy involves hierarchical inclusion based on class membership, such as rose being a hyponym of flower. In contrast, meronymy focuses on constituent parts, as seen in petal and rose (Palmer, 1981: 112).

The asymmetry inherent in meronymic relationships further distinguishes them from other lexical associations. Saeed (2016: 200) notes that meronymy is typically directional: the part implies the whole, but the reverse is not true. For example, the statement She painted her fingernails logically entails the involvement of a hand, but She injured her hand does not necessarily imply damage to the fingernails. This asymmetry highlights the non-reciprocal nature of part-whole relations, which plays a crucial role in inferential reasoning and discourse coherence.

10.Polysemy

Polysemy is a linguistic phenomenon where a single lexical item possesses multiple related meanings, which develop through historical, contextual, or cognitive associations. Unlike homonymy, where distinct meanings are unrelated (e.g., bank as a financial institution and bank as a river edge), polysemous meanings share a conceptual core. For example, the term head can denote the physical organ, a leader (e.g., head of state), or the top of an object (e.g., head of a table), all linked by underlying notions of prominence or control (Cruse, 2000: 120).

A defining characteristic of polysemy is the semantic relatedness between meanings, Saeed (2016: 180) illustrates this with the word foot, which can refer to the body part, the base of a mountain, or the end of a bed. These senses are connected through spatial and functional associations, reflecting how language users analogically map concepts across domains

The diachronic development of polysemous meanings highlights their dynamic nature. Over time, words accumulate senses through contextual reinterpretation. Lyons (1995: 305) observes that newspaper originally referred to the physical medium (paper) but expanded to denote the medium's content (e.g., read a newspaper) and the institution itself (e.g., the newspaper published an article).

Polysemy also introduces ambiguity, which language users resolve through contextual cues. Palmer (1981: 95) notes that the sentence The chicken is ready to eat is structurally ambiguous but pragmatically resolved based on situational knowledge.

11.Homonymy

Homonymy, a fundamental concept in lexical semantics, refers to the phenomenon where distinct words share identical forms in both spelling and pronunciation yet possess unrelated meanings. This linguistic occurrence is pivotal in understanding the complexities of vocabulary structure and usage. As Crystal (2008: 210) notes, homonyms are characterized by their phonetic and orthographic equivalence, which often leads to ambiguity in communication.

The distinction between homonyms and related categories such as homophones and homographs is critical for accurate linguistic analysis. While homophones share pronunciation but differ in spelling (e.g., “flower” and “flour”), and homographs share spelling but differ in pronunciation (e.g., “read” present vs. past tense), homonyms encompass both identical spelling and pronunciation (Fromkin, 2018: 145).

Examples of homonyms abound in English, reflecting both historical developments and ongoing language evolution. The word “bat,” referring to either a flying mammal or a sports implement, demonstrates how divergent semantic fields can coexist within a single form (Bauer, 1983: 45).

The prevalence of homonyms in English poses unique challenges for language learners and computational systems alike. Adams (2001: 78) emphasizes that polysemous words—those with related meanings—should be distinguished from true homonyms, as the latter’s meanings are entirely unrelated. This distinction becomes crucial in natural language processing algorithms, where misclassification can lead to significant interpretive errors.

12 Other Lexical Relations: Metonymy, Collocations, and Idioms

Metonymy is a lexical relation where a concept is referenced through an associated entity, rather than by its literal name. This phenomenon relies on contiguity rather than similarity, distinguishing it from metaphor. For instance, the crown may symbolize a monarch, and the pen can represent writing or journalism (Cruse, 2000: 132).

Collocations are recurrent combinations of words that co-occur more frequently than chance, forming entrenched units in the lexicon. Examples include strong tea, heavy rain, or make a decision. These pairings are not arbitrary; strong collocates with tea due to shared sensory associations, while heavy modifies rain to convey intensity (Palmer, 1981: 78).

Idioms are fixed expressions whose meanings cannot be deduced from their constituent parts. Phrases like kick the bucket (to die) or spill the beans (to reveal secrets) exemplify this non-compositional nature (Saeed, 2016: 215).

The interplay between these relations underscores the complexity of lexical organization. Metonymy and idioms both involve meaning shifts but differ in their reliance on association versus convention. Collocations, meanwhile, illustrate how statistical regularities shape lexical behavior. Together, these phenomena reveal how language balances creativity with structure, enabling nuanced communication while adhering to cognitive and cultural norms (Lyons, 1995: 320).

References

- Adams, M. (2001). Complex Words in English. Pearson Education.
- Bauer, L. (1983). English Word-Formation. Cambridge University Press.
- Chierchia, G., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2000). Meaning and grammar: An introduction to semantics (2nd ed.). MIT Press.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986). Lexical semantics. Cambridge University Press.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986). Lexical semantics. Cambridge University Press.
- Cruse, D. A. (2000). Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics. Oxford University Press.
- Cruse, D. A. (2011). Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2008). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (6th ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2018). An Introduction to Language (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Hanks, P. (2013). Lexical analysis: Norms and exploitations. MIT Press.
- Jackson, H. (2002). Introduction to lexical semantics. Continuum.
- Kearns, K. (2011). Semantics (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1995). Linguistic semantics: An introduction. Cambridge University Press.
- Murphy, M. L. (2010). English semantics and pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, F. R. (1981). Semantics (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Saeed, J. I. (2016). Semantics (4th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.