Chapter Two

From Conceptpoor to Experience-Rich

In chapter one, I discussed the idea of viewpoint pluralism, and talk about seeing the world from different points of view. Later on, in chapters six and seven, I discuss what the mind is, and explain the idea that our minds form representations of events and objects in the world. This is a very important idea for several reasons. First, it provides some understanding of the relation between mind and body. Secondly, it provides a basis for saying how our language could be broadened. If our minds form representations of physical events and objects, and these representations are extremely varied, then our language needs to be correspondingly varied if we are to be able to describe our experiences. We need a language that is adequate to describing our experiences when we see the world from multiple points of view. This chapter discusses some ways in which our language can be broadened to enable us to more adequately describe our experiences.

Mental Events are Representations of Physical Events and Objects

Mental events are representations of physical events and objects. Our minds construct representations of events and objects in the world and in our bodies based on input received through the senses. For example, your mind constructs the sound of a ringing bell when the clapper strikes the side of the bell. This disturbance is encoded in sound waves that strike your ears. Your ears convert these sound waves into neural patterns that encode the original physical event in different form. Your mind constructs the sound you hear from this neural pattern, locating it at the point of the original disturbance.

We may be Conceptpoor in Some Areas

One consequence of the view that mental events are representations of physical events is that it's possible to see that we may be "concept poor" in some areas. To be concept poor

(or "conceptpoor") is to lack adequate concepts to describe experience, or to fail to use available concepts to describe experience. To be conceptpoor with respect to experiences of a certain type is to lack adequate concepts to describe experiences of that type. So someone is conceptpoor with respect to colors if they lack adequate concepts to describe color experiences, or if they fail to use concepts that are available to them.

Shades of Color

The representations your mind forms are extremely complex and varied. Think of color words, for example. Think of all the different shades of color that have the same name: "green". We do distinguish shades of green by referring to them as "light green" or "dark green", but there is no generally accepted set of words to describe the many shades of green. We are conceptpoor in our color language in that we often use only one widely accepted word, 'green', to describe a wide range of color experiences.

I thought of the idea of being more discriminating about shades of color one day in 1986 while driving to philosophy class in the springtime. Alongside the road were many trees,

Points of view: 1 Shades of green behind a lighthouse in Lake Superior, Michigan

Points of view 2 Shades of green next to Haggetts Pond in Andover, Massachusetts

each with different shades of green. In looking at these many shades of green, I realized that I simply thought of them all as "green," and that if I remembered this experience, I would remember seeing many green trees. Yet many of these trees were different shades of green. At this point, I realized that if I had a way to pick out all these different shades of green, I would better be able to remember my experience. Yet at the time, I could only think of one or two different terms used to describe shades of green. I decided that a more systematic approach is required if we are to be able to distinguish and remember the many different shades in our color experience.

One result of not having a systematic method for distinguishing shades of color is that we tend not to notice differences in shades of colors. Because we call these colors all green, we see them as the same color, not noticing the tremendous variety in shades. The same argument applies to other colors such as red and blue. The Eskimos have nine different words for different colors (shades) of snow; we should try to be this discriminating in our own language with respect to some of our more commonly viewed colors.

Our language does contain color words to pick out color shades; for example, 'sky blue', 'pea green', 'maroon', 'ivory', 'lemon yellow', 'crimson', 'copper', 'livid pink', 'scarlet', 'rose', and 'apple green'. But these shade words do not form a complete or systematic set. Nevertheless, becoming aware of existing shade words is a good way to improve color awareness.

Points of view 3 Shades of red and shades of blue

Emotion and Feeling

The idea that we are conceptpoor with respect to some color experiences can be generalized to other areas of experience as well. We have one word, 'love', to describe a whole range of emotional experiences. Yet there are many types of love and the experience varies greatly from one type to another. There's a big difference, for example, between love for one's parents and romantic love. Likewise, there are many types of fear

and anger. Our emotions represent another area in which we may be conceptpoor, and our language blurs important distinctions in experience.

Not only are there many types of love, the feeling of love varies greatly in intensity from one person to another. With some love, there may be very little feeling at all. With other love, the feeling may be almost indescribably intense. And of course, there are many examples of love that fall somewhere in between these two extremes. Besides different kinds of love, it would be helpful if our language were more flexible in describing where on a continuum a certain experience falls. Of course, we can say "I love him very much" or "I hardly love her at all." But apart from these types of statements, it is not easy to specify where on a continuum a certain experience of love lies.

In the area of feeling, we use the word 'friend' to describe many different people we have different feelings for. There are work friends, play friends, girlfriends, boyfriends, hobby friends, animal friends, best friends, worst friends, casual friends, distant friends, college friends, computer friends, racquetball friends, dinner friends, phone friends, political friends, etc. Yet we may describe them all as "friends," sometimes without noticing differences in friend types, and without noticing the shades of differences in our feelings for different friends.

Taste

Taste is another area in which we may be conceptpoor. We have a few basic words such as 'salty', 'sweet', 'cold', and 'hot'. Yet there are many differences in how foods taste. Because we have the idea of sweetness in our minds, we may just think of something as tasting "sweet" without noticing differences in sweet tastes. Experience here forms a continuum, just as in the case of color. Taste, then, is another area in which we may be conceptpoor.

Taste is an interesting example, because so much of our taste language is dominated by talk of what things taste like. If we are trying a new fruit, we might say "It tastes a little like an apple, but more like a pear." Or an unknown white fish may "taste a lot like

whiting." Foods taste so different that it is often difficult to describe them in any other way. For example, how can we describe the taste of oysters without mentioning oysters? Of course, there are fried oysters, baked oysters, and oysters on the half shell. Some foods stand out because they are extreme in one way or another. For example, who can doubt that anchovies taste salty, that chocolate tastes sweet, or that lemons taste sour? Because we share many taste experiences in common, these well-known experiences can be used as a common frame of reference for describing food tastes.

There is a physiological reason why we use the terms 'sweet,' 'salty,' 'cold,' and 'hot' so frequently when describing the tastes of food. This is because we have taste buds that detect sweet and sour flavors, and our tongue is also very sensitive to hot and cold foods. These physiological facts may place a limit on how much our language of taste can be developed. But we can still become more concept-rich in taste by noticing differences in how the same kind of food tastes on different occasions, and also in developing our ability to describe where along the continuum of sweet, sour, hot, and cold different foods lie.

If We are Conceptpoor, We May be Experience-Poor

In those areas in which we are conceptpoor, we may also be "experience-poor". One way to be experience-poor is to fail to notice the details of experience. It is easy not to notice the details of experience for which there's no name or ready description. And the details of experience are harder to remember if we don't remember their name or description. If you remember that someone was wearing a red shirt, this could be true of a wide variety of shades and you are less likely to remember the shade unless you think of its name. On the other hand, if you remember that someone was wearing a maroon shirt, this calls a specific shade to mind, and you can more easily remember the shade the person was wearing.

This philosophical insight has a practical application. Ask yourself:

Do I fail to notice the details of some of my experiences because I lack adequate concepts to describe them?

Are there any areas in which I am experience-poor because I am conceptpoor?

Seek out New Experiences and Become Experience-Rich

One way to become experience-rich is to be aware of the details of your experiences. You can become experience-rich by becoming more discriminating in areas of experience in which our language doesn't provide tools to discriminate. Start being aware of the difference shades of green, red, blue, and other colors. Start noticing different variations in sweet and sour tastes, and in hot and cold foods. Reflect on the variety in your emotional experience, and on the differences in your feelings for different friends.

You can also enrich your life by seeking out new experiences. Your mind forms representations of bodily and physical events based on its input, so different input yields different representations. Try stimulating your tastebuds with new inputs: try foods you've never tried before just to see what they taste like. Try to meet new people and do things you've never even thought of doing before!

Of course, the fact that an experience is a new experience may not be sufficient reason to justify having it if there are stronger reasons not to have the experience. Some new

experiences are unpleasant or even painful. But seeking out new experiences makes you more discriminating within particular areas of experience, and within a broader range of experience.

By having new experiences you acquire new points of view of the world and thereby increase your knowledge and understanding of yourself and of the world around you. For example, try taking a different route to work or school. Or, try a new restaurant, try food you've never had, or start a conversation with someone you say "Hello" to but never converse with.

By taking new points of view you become aware of details and aspects of the world you didn't notice before, or you see the same thing in a new way. Seeking out new experiences also gives you a wider range in types of experience, making you more experience-rich in this sense as well.

One basic principle of experience is:

- You can't know what an experience is like unless you've had the experience.

The reason for this is that there's no reliable method for inferring from our physiology or our brain state to the nature of our subjective experience. So you won't know what squid or mussels taste like until you try them, and you won't know what it's like to fall in love until you do.

If you follow these suggestions, you will have a richer and a more interesting and varied life. And you may wish to add this principle to your philosophy of life:

- Seek out new experiences for their own sake, unless there is a stronger reason not to have a particular new experience.

Create New Words to Describe Your Experiences

Once you become more aware of the details of your experiences, you may want a method for remembering these details and for describing them to others. In some cases you may not be able to find the words to express yourself. In these cases, you might try creating new words to describe your experiences. For example, you might describe something that's hot (spicy) and sweet as "hotsweet". An example of a hotsweet taste is the taste of hot mustard with honey.

We use words to express points of view. The points of view we can express are limited by the words available to us. And if there is no way to express a point of view, we tend not to notice that it's a possible point of view. Hence, our language limits our experience.

Our language grows out of our experience. A word becomes part of a language when it is used by enough people to become accepted as a word by speakers of the language. But we need not wait for words to evolve; we can also propose new words that represent new points of view. These words will become part of the language if the points of view they are used to express are sufficiently significant that enough speakers of the language choose to express themselves using these words.

Three Rules of Language

The next three sections present three rules that are intended to enhance the power of our language to describe our experiences and express our points of view. These rules are:

- The Twice as Much Rule
- The Duonym Rule
- The Rule of Degree

The Twice as Much Rule and the Rule of Degree address the fact that our experience is continuous while our language is discrete. Both rules provide greater flexibility in expressing points of view that require saying where on a continuum a quality or property lies.

The Duonym Rule is a rule for generating new words by combining existing words into a new word. Many aspects of experience are more complex than any single word reflects and the Duonym Rule addresses this fact. The "Dictionary of Duonyms" that follows gives words with definitions created in accordance with the Duonym Rule.

The Twice as Much Rule

We are conceptpoor due partly to the following fact:
Experience is continuous; language is discrete.

The word 'green' refers not to a set of discrete shades of green but rather to a continuous range of colors that shade into one another. But when we say "That's a green car", we say that it falls somewhere on the spectrum of green; we don't say where it falls. So language is and concepts are discrete in the sense that something is either green or it's not. Our experience is continuous and our language often does not easily tell us where on the continuum an experience occurs.

In some cases we do have the ability to be precise. For example, we can say "It's 101 degrees out". But in the area of color, we don't even have words to pick out many of the different shades. Color charts that printers use to select different shades of ink and that designate shades by number reflect this fact. Our concepts are inadequate to describe and express our experiences and points of view.

If we are indeed conceptpoor and experience-poor, is there anything we can do to improve our language? I propose the following rule which helps provide a way to express where a quality or property falls on a continuum:

1. To express the idea that something is "twice as much", or has a very high degree of some quality, repeat the word.

For example, instead of saying

"It's a hot day"

say

"It's a hot hot day"

A hot hot day is one that's twice as hot as you expected, twice as hot as usual, or just extremely hot.

Here's another example:

That's a red red car.

A red red car is one that's twice as red as you expected, twice as red as the normal shade for red cars, or extremely red.

Here are some other examples:

She's a sweet sweet girl.

He's a fat fat cat.

This is white white paper.

This is the final final version.

It was a dark dark night.

Think of the extension of a term (the class of things that fall under it) as follows:

```
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
least                                          most
```

The Twice as Much Rule enables us to select another point on the spectrum - one that's higher in degree. So here are the relative values of hot, hot hot, and hot hot hot days:

```
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
        hot     hot hot              hot hot hot
```

The Twice as Much Rule is one that is already used on an ad hoc basis in ordinary language. People sometimes repeat a word for emphasis, or they underline it. Alternatively, they say "It's a very hot day". But "very hot" is less precise because it just points to the upper range of the spectrum. So 'very hot' and 'extremely hot' suffer from the same defect as 'hot': they pick out a range, though it's a smaller range, on the spectrum of hot things. The Twice as Much Rule picks out a point that's twice what you'd expect, or substantially more than. Of course, it doesn't pick out an exact number, and the speaker or listener has to figure out where it falls on the range.

A recent discussion on a sports radio talk show in Boston, Massachusetts concerned whether there should be several different categories for baseball players entering the Hall of Fame. The question discussed was whether there should simply be a single category for all players entering the Hall of Fame, as there is now, or whether there should be special categories for especially talented players. The discussion centered on whether, besides the existing group of stars and superstars, there is also a group of super-superstars, or even super-super-superstars. Presumably, the super-super-superstars would be in a class to themselves, and players like Babe Ruth, Joe DiMaggio, and Ted Williams would fit into this category. This is a good example of applying the twice as much rule to pick out different points on a spectrum when the single words 'star' or even 'superstar' are not adequate to do the job.

I propose that we make the Twice as Much Rule into a general rule of language that can be used in a range of contexts.

The Duonym Rule

Many aspects of experience are too complex to express with a single word. Of course, many words do represent a complex of qualities. The words 'aristocrat', 'supercilious', and 'bungalow' are examples of such words. But often in our experience we encounter a complex of qualities that we would like to describe and for which no word already exists.

One solution to this problem is simply to describe the complex of qualities by listing

them together. However, if this complex of qualities is one we often encounter, it is easier to refer to if a word exists to denote it. It is also easier to point out this complex of qualities to another person if you can do so using a word they understand.

Terms such as 'couchpotato' and 'yuppie' come into vogue precisely because they capture a complex of qualities (e.g., young urban professional) commonly encountered by a large number of people. Terms of this type are often coined by someone taking a particular point of view and expressing it. For example, a columnist for the Boston Globe coined the term 'yuppie', while a New York Times reporter coined the term 'brain trust' at a press conference held by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. George Orwell coined the word 'doublethink'.

Yet there are many common aspects of experience not easily describable in a single word. For example, what is a word for the margin of time you allow yourself when calculating when to leave for an appointment in case you encounter an unexpected delay (buffertime?)? What is a word for the experience of looking at a word and thinking it's not spelled correctly even though it is (wordperceptionitis?)? What's a word for someone who seems to spend all their time on the phone (phonehead?)?

The Duonym Rule proposes a way to form new words out of existing words by combining existing words into a single world made of the existing words. By using this rule, you can create new words that express your own point of view. If enough people share your point of view, your word may become an accepted part of the language.

The term 'duonym' or "dual word", refers to the idea of a single word made from two words. Like 'synonym', 'antonym', and 'homonym', it refers to a fundamental word category.

I propose the following Duonym Rule for generating new concepts:

2. To form a duonym, find two aspects of experience that go together. Find two words that individually describe these two different aspects of experience. Take these two words and join them together to form a single word. This resulting word, which consists of two existing words joined together into a single word, is a duonym.

Obviously, not just any two words, when put together, can form a duonym. If two words describe aspects of experience that do not go together, the result of putting them together is not a duonym. For example, it is difficult to imagine how "candlepants" could be a duonym, since candles and pants don't go together in any obvious way. This is why the rule specifies to find two aspects of experience that go together. The term "aspects of experience" is deliberately broad, since the relevant aspects might be qualities (like yellow), things (like books), or people (like lovers). Of course, part of the challenge of duonyms is finding new ways to combine aspects of experience together. Even so, some aspects of experience simply do not go together, and putting these words together does not create duonyms.

For a word to be a duonym, it must be composed of words that are words on their own. This rules out certain duonym-like combinations of words that may, in fact, combine two concepts together into a single concept. Nonetheless, if the components of a word themselves are not words, then the word is not a duonym. For example, 'synfuel' is not a duonym because 'syn' is not a word by itself, even though it is an abbreviation for the word 'synthetic.' Other examples of "compound words" that are not duonyms are 'pavement,' 'hologram,' and 'semiconductor.'

Duonyms that refer to more than the sum of their parts stand a better chance of being accepted as duonyms than ones that simply consist in joining the two words together. For example, duonyms like 'egghead' and 'bookworm' are popular because they describe a familiar aspect of experience in a unique and interesting way. On the other hand, a

prospective duonym like 'yellowcup' that simply combines the quality of yellowness with the quality of being a cup stands less chance of being adopted into the language. If 'yellow' had a different meaning, for example if it meant "yellow" as in "afraid," then a duonym using 'yellow' as a component would have a better chance of adoption.

Once you create a duonym, there is, of course, no guarantee that enough people will adopt your word to make it become a part of the language. In reality, it is very difficult to single-handedly add a world to an existing language. In many cases, adopting a new word takes many years, and is often the result of events beyond the control of the person who originates the word. The presence of television, newspapers, and magazines has a lot to do with the popularity of certain words that seem to spring up into use almost overnight. On the other hand, if you do create a new duonym and your friends like it well enough to use it, then you have the potential of a word that could eventually be adopted by speakers of your language.

The Duonym rule has already been used to create a number of words. For example, the words 'girlfriend' and 'boyfriend' are two very popular duonyms that have been created by putting together two words that described two aspects of experience that go together. And notice that the word 'girlfriend' is more than the sum of its parts: a girlfriend is not just a friend who's a girl; she's a friend who's a girl with whom one has a romantic relationship.

Once a word is created, it acquires its own special connotations and emotive meanings. For example, the word 'redhead' has a use partly because redheads have a reputation for having a certain personality type ("Redheads are hotheads"). Whether this stereotype is true or not, the fact remains that we as speakers of English have found it useful (so far) to have a special word for redheads, and not for blackheads, brownheads, and blondheads. Maybe we should also think of people as blackheads, brownheads, or blondheads. Since "blondes have more fun," perhaps we could think of fun-loving people as "blondheads."

Here are some duonyms that are already widely used in the English language:

- baseball
- catnap
- coffeecup
- dinnerplate
- fruitcake
- hotcake
- pancake
- teaspoon
- watercolor
- milkshake

The Dictionary of Duonyms, which is chapter three of this book, contains other words that were created using the Duonyms rule.

You can also generate new words by stringing together words that fall at different places on the same spectrum. In some cases, it is necessary to hyphenate these words so it is clear where the divisions in the words fall. Here are some examples:

- darling-dearest
- honey-pie-sweet-darling-face
- superspectacular
- sweet-angelcake
- mega-wickedawesome

Try making up your own new words!

The Rule of Degree

I have already discussed in previous sections the fact that in some cases it is difficult to express degrees of a continuous quality or property. We can say "It's very hot", "That car is very red", or "This tea is not very sweet". But words such as 'very' and 'little' just pick out a subset of the continuum, like this:

```
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
little  not very              very
```

It is very difficult to be more precise with the traditional rules of language.

The Rule of Degree is intended to remedy this defect by providing a way to indicate where on the continuum from least to most a particular instance of an object or phenomenon falls. This rule is as follows:

3. To indicate where on a continuum a quality or property falls, place a number in parentheses after the word, giving it a percentage or decimal ranking from 0 to 1. Here '0' means it has none of the quality, where '1' means it has the maximum amount of the quality.

For example, if ice cream is fairly good, though not as good as possible, write:
This ice cream is good (.7).

To say a car is as red as it can be, write:
That car is red (.1).

To say that you're just a little hungry, write:
I'm hungry (.2).

To say that you're "about average" hungry, write:
I'm hungry (.5).

To say that you're extremely hungry, write:
I'm hungry (.9)
or even
I'm hungry (.99)

Sometimes we say "On a scale of 1 to 10, that's a 7". The Rule of Degree provides a ready way to provide a scale for any appropriate word. To be appropriate, a word must admit of degree. There is no reason why we cannot use two or even three digits in the rule of degree, so that something can be sweet (.99) or even sweet (.994).

When I originally wrote Duonyms, I proposed drawing a line over the word and marking an "x" at the point where you feel the quality exists on the continuum. This line is supposed to correspond to the continuum marked out by this word, from very little to very much. There are several problems with this proposal:

- While it can readily be done when writing by hand, it is very difficult and often impossible to duplicate on a word-processor.
- This proposal cannot readily be adapted to conversation (though see below).

Some of my students at the University of Massachusetts Lowell suggested the idea of using numbers in parentheses after a word to indicate degree. While I agree that this is a good solution, I don't know how readily people will adapt to phrases such as "I love you (.9)"

While I concede that the idea of introducing a numerical scale into our language when talking about qualities that have degrees may not appeal to some, I still maintain that there should he a better way to indicate degrees than we have yet discovered. And I believe that, in fact, this numerical addition to our language could add descriptive value in certain contexts.

Using the Rule of Degree in Conversation

The Rule of Degree can be used in conversation. Think of the distance between your thumb and forefinger (the finger next to your thumb) as equal to a scale from 1 to 10. You can show degrees of a word or quality in conversation by holding your thumb and forefinger an appropriate distance apart while saying the word. Here holding them as far

apart as possible indicates the maximum amount or degree, while holding them close together indicates a small amount or degree.

Another method of applying the Rule of Degree is to hold both hands in front of you. Here the distance between your hands is equal to the line you draw above a word. Holding your hands far apart indicates a high amount or degree, while holding them close together indicates a small amount or degree. When Johnny Carson used to respond with another joke to the question "How hot was it?" or "How (blank) was it? he was trying to do verbally what this rule does visually.

Still another method to apply the Rule of Degree in conversation is to say the number after the word. So if you're maximally hungry, say "I'm hungry one." Or, if you're "about average" tired, say "I'm tired point five." If a movie was absolutely terrible, you can say "That movie was terrible one," or "That movie was terrible point 99," or "That movie was good zero." If your audience is unfamiliar with the Rule of Degree, you can say "On a goodness scale from zero to one, that movie was an absolute zero."

A Word about Hyphens

How do hyphens fit into the picture? Can a duonym contain a hyphen? How do we know when to hyphenate a word and when not to hyphenate it?

When I first wrote Duonyms, I had the benefit of an extended online discussion with some very interesting and talented members of the Delphi computer network, based in the Boston, Massachusetts area. For months we discussed the merits of duonyms, and in particular the role of hyphens in duonyms. At the time, I was pretty much opposed to the

use of hyphens when creating duonyms, while many of the members of Delphi were very adamant in defending the role of hyphens.

Over time, I have come to appreciate more the value of hyphens. I believe now we primarily use hyphens to indicate where a word should be broken up when not using a hyphen might create confusion. This often is a matter of how the end of one word and the beginning of another world happen to look together, and also how long the words are. For example, the word "experiencerich" and "bluejeansonlyperson" are sufficiently long that hyphens are helpful in showing what components these words are made up of. Thus, we can write "experience-rich" and "bluejeans-only-person." A similar example is "continuous-experience," which is more easily grasped with a hyphen. Sometimes it is not the length of the words, but the way they go together, that seems to require a hyphen. For example, "fire engine" would be a good candidate for a duonym, but putting the two words together yields fireengine,' which might be confusing because of the double e's. Another approach is to write 'fire-engine.' Similarly, "hot hot" could be written as a duonym, but this yields 'hothot," which looks like 'ho-thot.' As a result, if 'hot hot' is written together, the best solution is to write 'hot-hot.' Of course, these words can also be written as two separate words.

The best type of duonym is created from two short words that can be put together in a way that it is easy to tell at a glance what the components are. Words such as 'egghead,' 'catnap,' and 'suntan' fit this category. We might call these "paradigm examples" of duonyms, meaning that they most clearly exemplify the requirements for a word to be a duonym. Words that require hyphenation do not fit the criteria for a word's being a duonym as well, but they can still be considered duonyms. The reason is that the hyphens are used is to make the word easier to understand when its components are written together. The two words are still being used together to form a single concept. So 'experience-rich' can still be considered a duonym even though it contains a hyphen. On the other hand, sometimes two words are normally written separately and they are hyphenated only because they occur before a noun. An example is "much-repeated" in the sentence "'Go with the flow' is a much-repeated slogan." In this case, "much-

repeated" should not be considered a duonym, since this phrase is normally written as two words.

In some cases, a duonym starts out as two words, then becomes hyphenated, and eventually becomes a single word. For example, the words 'free-lance' and 'on-line' are often written as 'freelance' and 'online.' A term is a good candidate to become a duonym when it describes a unique aspect of experience that there is reason to refer to periodically or frequently. Obviously, the term 'online' is used more and more today as more people buy computers and sign up for the Internet. On the other hand, if the components of a word are sufficiently long, or the two words don't go together well, then the word may remain as two words or it may always be written with hyphens.

Duonyms and the Internet

The advent of the Internet has suddenly made duonyms a lot more common. This is because Internet addresses cannot contain blank spaces. Many companies create their Internet address by creating a duonym out of their company name. For example, the company I work for is called Flow Research, and our Internet address is http://www.flowresearch.com/. Of course, a proper name that is in the form of a duonym may not actually be a duonym if is not a descriptive word but a proper name. Nonetheless, the popularity of the Internet has made the idea of putting words together to form a single word more popular, especially as people search for domain names that have not yet been taken.

It is likely that the Internet will also become as effective a vehicle for popularizing new words as television has been over the past 30 years. One advantage of the Internet is that it is truly international in scope, while television is normally either national or local, depending on the show. Widespread use of the Internet will make it easier to spread ideas, and will also facilitate discussion of ideas. New ideas may get a more sympathetic hearing on the Internet than on television, since the number of television shows is much more limited than the number of Internet websites. The presence of the Internet is

beginning to create something of a "global village," since it is now feasible to communicate with a large number of people in other countries at the click of a mouse.

The following chapter consists of a dictionary of English duonyms. Some of these words are proposed new words, while others are already an accepted part of our language. Students in my philosophy or logic classes submitted some words. Each word has a definition, along with an example of the use of the word. It is my hope that these words will facilitate self-expression, and will encourage you to take new points of view!