

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ФІНАНСІВ УКРАЇНИ  
ДЕРЖАВНИЙ ПОДАТКОВИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ  
Факультет соціально-гуманітарних технологій та менеджменту  
Кафедра мовної підготовки та соціальних комунікацій

Затверджено  
Вченою радою факультету соціально-  
гуманітарних технологій та  
менеджменту  
протокол від 09.03.2023 № 8  
Голова Вченої ради факультету  
Наталія ЗИКУН

**Конспект лекцій**

з навчальної дисципліни

«Зіставна лексикологія основної іноземної та української мов»

для підготовки здобувачів вищої освіти першого (бакалаврського) рівня

(денної та заочної форми навчання)

галузь знань: 03 «Гуманітарні науки»

спеціальність: 035 «Філологія»

освітня програма: «Германські мови та літератури (переклад включно)»

Статус дисципліни: обов'язкова

Ірпінь – 2023

Конспект лекцій з навчальної дисципліни «Зіставна лексикологія основної іноземної та української мов» складений на основі робочої програми навчальної дисципліни, затвердженої Науково-методичною радою Університету 16.02.2023 протокол № 2.


Укладач:



---

А.І. Чорна, ст.викладач, кафедри мовної підготовки

Розглянуто та схвалено кафедрою мовної підготовки та соціальних комунікацій, протокол від 08.03.2023 № 7

Завідувач кафедри  Т.С. Гиріна, д.н. з соц. комунікацій, професор

2023/04/03 12:34

### ЗМІСТ

Тема 1. Contrastive lexicology of English and Ukrainian: Fundamentals	4
Тема 2. Contrastive analysis of the formal structure of English and Ukrainian words	6
Тема 3. Contrastive analysis of the categories and types of present-day English and Ukrainian word-formation	10
Тема 4. Contrastive analysis of compounding in English and Ukrainian	13
Тема 5. Contrastive studies of semantics of English and Ukrainian words: methodological issues	15
Тема 6. Contrastive analysis of semantics of English and Ukrainian words: feature approach	19
Тема 7. Contrastive analysis of semantics of English and Ukrainian words: field approach	23
Тема 8. Contrastive analysis of semantics of English and Ukrainian words: concept approach	26

## LECTURE 1. CONTRASTIVE LEXICOLOGY OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN: FUNDAMENTALS

1. Tasks of contrastive lexicology. Its theoretical and practical value.
2. Comparative versus contrastive linguistics.

**1. Tasks of contrastive lexicology. Its theoretical and practical value.** Contrastive lexicology is intimately related to culture viewed as the socially inherited customs of a society that are shared and accepted by people. Speech experience of the people is their cultural experience, i.e. those structures, spheres and means of activity into which speakers are included and which influence the understanding and the use of words. **Edward Sapir** (1884–1939) states that being a collective art of expression each language possesses “aesthetic factors – phonetic, rhythmic, symbolic, morphological – which it does not completely share with any other language” [Sapir]. Our task is to discover how “the colour and texture of its matrix” can be “carried over without loss of modification” as without that “a work of literary art can never be translated” [Sapir].

There are many differences among English and Ukrainian as even a superficial examination of their vocabularies reveals. But this does not mean that there are no limits on the type of lexical systems that human beings can acquire and use. Quite to the contrary, current research suggests that there are important **lexical principles and tendencies shared by all human languages**. Studying these principles contributes to the development of the general linguistic theory and is the main concern of contrastive lexicology.

**Theoretical value of contrastive lexicology** becomes obvious if we realize that it forms the study of one of the three main aspects of language, i.e. its vocabulary, the other two being its grammar and sound system. Just as the small set of Arabic numerals can be combined to express in writing any natural numbers, so the small set of sounds and letters can be combined to express in speech and writing respectively an indefinitely large number of words.

**Practical value of contrastive lexicology** is very substantial. It came into being to meet the needs of many different branches of applied linguistics: translation, lexicography, standardization of terminology, information processing, foreign language teaching, literary criticism and others.

Contrastive lexicology **stimulates a systematic approach to the facts of the vocabulary and plays a prominent part in the general training of every linguist**.

The treatment of words in lexicology cannot be divorced from the study of all the other elements in the language system to which words belong. In the process of communication, **all these elements are interdependent** and stand in definite relations to one another. We separate them for the convenience of study but afterwards we should put them back together to achieve a synthesis. The lexical level of the language system provides the most evident information on regularities of the evolutionary processes in contrasted languages, and therefore should be examined first of all and may be regarded as **a clear model for contrastive research of other language levels**.

There are three aspects that can be differentiated in contrastive lexicological research: formal, semantic and functional. Formal aspect is represented through the research of similarities and differences of different formal means used to create lexical units, for example, affixation in English and in Ukrainian. Contrastive analysis of the semantic structures of separate words and semantic groups of words represent the semantic aspect of contrastive lexicological studies, for example, the contrastive analysis of groups of synonyms with the dominant word *laugh* and

*сміятися*. Contrastive analysis of different stylistic classes of words belongs to functional contrastive research, for example, neologisms in English and in Ukrainian.

**2. Comparative versus contrastive linguistics.** Language is many things – a system of communication, a medium for thought, a vehicle for literary expression, a social institution, a catalyst for nation building. All human beings normally speak at least one language and it is hard to imagine significant social, intellectual or artistic activity taking place in its absence.

The scope and diversity of human thought and experience place great demand on language. One of the most fundamental claims of modern linguistic analysis is that all languages have some common features. This can be verified by considering a few simple facts. Since all the languages are spoken, they must have phonetic and phonological systems; since they all have words and sentences, they must have a lexical and a grammatical system; and since these words and sentences have systematic meanings, there obviously must be semantic principles as well. The number of existing languages is amazing. The most extensive catalog of the world's languages is that of Ethnologue (published by Summer Institute of Linguistics International; *URL: <https://www.ethnologue.com/>*), whose detailed classified list includes 7,111 known living languages and this figure changes all the time (date of access for the figure indicated: April, 16, 2019). Languages are not at all uniformly distributed around the world. Just as some places are more diverse than others in terms of plant and animal species, the same goes for the distribution of languages. Only 288 are spoken in Europe, while 2,303 are spoken in Asia (date of access for the figures indicated: April, 16, 2019). And all languages have means that enable their speakers to express any proposition that the human mind can produce. In terms of this criterion all languages are absolutely equal as instruments of communication and thought.

#### **Перелік питань до самоконтролю**

1. What does it mean to compare and contrast two objects? Study the meaning of “contrast” and “similarity”.
2. Explain the term “comparative linguistics”.
3. Comment on the position of contrastive linguistics within comparative linguistics.
4. Typological versus contrastive linguistics.
5. The object of contrastive lexicological studies.
6. Essential components of contrastive lexicology agenda.
7. Definition of contrastive Lexicology.
8. Main ideas of Edward Sapir and their reference to Contrastive Lexicology.
9. Theoretical value of contrastive lexicology.
10. Practical value of contrastive lexicology.
11. Aspects of the contrastive analysis of lexis.

#### **Список рекомендованої літератури**

1. Aristotle. Categories. *URL: <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/categories.html>*
2. Chesterman A. Contrastive functional analysis. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company, 1998. 230 p.
3. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Longman, 1999. 1779 p.
4. Sampson G. Schools of Linguistics. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1980. 283 p.
5. Sapir E. Language. An Introduction to the Study of Speech. Echo Library, 2006. 148 p.

6. Saussure Ferdinand de. Course in General Linguistics / ed. by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, in collaboration with Albert Riedlinger; transl. By Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. 240 p.

## LECTURE 2. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FORMAL STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN WORDS

1. The word as a fundamental unit of the language.
2. Morphemes: free and bound forms.

**1. The word as a fundamental unit of the language.** Of all the units of linguistic analysis, **the word** is the most familiar. Literate speakers of any language rarely have difficulties segmenting a stream of speech sounds into words or deciding where to leave spaces when writing a sentence. **What, though, is a word?** The real essence of a word is not an easy question to answer. The problem associated with the definition of the term “word” is one of the most complicated in the analysis of linguistic entities. In typologically different groups of languages the criteria employed in establishing those entities are of different types and each group constitutes a separate system with its own patterns of formation and own types of linguistic units.

First of all, we should define what units can be considered linguistic ones (units of the language). Any unit can be considered unit of the language on condition it:

- a) possesses external (sound or graphical) form and semantic content,
- b) is not created in the process of speech but used as something already existing and only reproduced in speech.

Thus, separate sounds cannot be considered units of the language, as a separate sound does not possess meaning: [д] in *день* is meaningless. Only the external form of *день* can be divided into sounds, but the word itself cannot. Therefore, sounds are only structural units for making up units of the language. An account of the lexicon which does not incorporate lexical semantic information is inadequate. Our fundamental assumption implies that each linguistic unit has a constant and specific meaning. Actually, if we agree with Leonard Bloomfield<sup>1</sup> that a phonetic form which has a meaning is a linguistic form then the word is a linguistic form. Ideally, linguistics would consist of two main investigations: **phonetics** in which we would study the speech event without reference to its meaning and semantics, in which we would deal with the relation of the event to the features of meaning. Most recent work on lexical semantics has been concerned with accounting for the flexibility of word meaning taking into account pragmatic reasoning. This extends the formalism and this extension is desirable for alternative interpretations of words in a discourse context.

We will follow the Saussurian idea that the connection between the linguistic forms and their meanings is wholly **arbitrary**. Each combination of signs is arbitrarily assigned to some features of the practical world. Linguistic study usually starts from the form not from the meaning. But each linguistic form has a constant and definite meaning, different from the meaning of any other linguistic form in the same language. If the forms are different their meanings are also different.

Trying to give a definition of the word it is important to remember that the definition should indicate the most essential characteristic features of the notion expressed by the term,

including the features by which this notion is distinguished from other similar notions. For instance, in defining the word one must distinguish it from other linguistic units, such as the phoneme, the morpheme, or the word-combination.

The word has a good many aspects. Some scientists denied the possibility of giving a satisfactory definition of the word because in different languages it presents itself in different ways and that is why the notion of the “word in general” does not exist. In **Ferdinand de Saussure’s** opinion the notion of the word is not compatible with our idea of a concrete language unit. **Charles Balli** also considered this notion one of the most ambiguous in linguistics.

The word is a language reality and makes the principal functional-structural unit of the language. The leading position of the word among other units is explained by the importance of the functions it performs. And though in different languages words can be singled out of the stream of speech differently, it may be difficult to suggest the definition common for all languages, but still it is not impossible. As Oleksandr Smirnitskiy remarked that the versatility of peculiarities of different languages cannot prevent us from defining the word as the linguistic unit in general because “from this versatility we can single out features that stand out as the most substantial features of the word despite all possible deviations from typical cases”.

The term “word” has been reinterpreted in a lot of ways and undisputable criteria have not been produced yet. We can apply:

- orthographical criterion: words are separated by spacing;
- phonological criterion: the word has one primary stress, potential pause between words but not in the middle of words;
- semantic criterion: the word expresses coherent semantic concept;
- syntactic criterion: the word is the smallest part of the sentence.

With different modifications different criteria have been applied by a lot of scientists. When grammatical aspects prevailed, they defined the word as “an ultimate or indecomposable sentence” (Henry Sweet) or as “minimum free form” (Leonard Bloomfield). When semantic aspects were of primary importance the word was considered to be the sign of a separate notion or the linguistic equivalent of a separate concept. When semantic criterion was combined with phonological the word was defined as “an articulate sound-symbol in its aspect of denoting something which is spoken about”.

**2. Morphemes: free and bound forms.** The ideas below were suggested by Leonard Bloomfield and developed by other structuralists. He stated that a linguistic form which is never spoken alone is a **bound** form, all others are **free** forms. Some linguistic forms bear partial phonetic-semantic resemblances to other forms: e.g. *John ran, John fell, Bill ran, Bill fell; Johnny, Billy; playing, dancing; blackberry, cranberry, strawberry*. A linguistic form which bears a partial phonetic-semantic resemblance to some other linguistic form, is a **complex** form. In any complex form, each constituent is said to accompany other constituents. The constituent forms in our example above: *John, ran, Bill, fell, play, dance, black, berry, straw, cran-* (unique constituent in *cranberry*), *-y* (bound-form constituent in *Johnny, Billy*), *-ing* (bound-form constituent in *playing, dancing*).

A linguistic form which bears no partial phonetic-semantic resemblance to any other form is a simple form or a **morpheme**. Thus, *play, dance, cran-, -y, -ing* are morphemes. The term



morpheme is derived from Greek *morphe* – form and *-eme*. The Greek suffix *-eme* has been adopted by linguists to denote the smallest unit or the minimum distinctive feature.

A morpheme can be described phonetically, since it consists of one or more phonemes. e.g. the morpheme *pin* bears a phonetic resemblance to other morphemes, such as *pig*, *pen*, *tin*, *ten*. On the basis of these resemblances it can be analyzed and described in terms of three phonemes, but, since these resemblances are not connected with resemblances of meaning, we cannot attribute any meaning to the phonemes. It is the morpheme that is the smallest meaningful unit of form. The meaning of a morpheme is a **sememe**. Linguists assume that each sememe is a constant and definite unit of meaning, different from all other meanings in the language.

Since every complex form is made up entirely of morphemes, a complete list of morphemes would account for all the phonetic forms of a language. The total stock of morphemes in a language is its **lexicon**. However, if we knew the lexicon of a language, and had a reasonably accurate knowledge of each sememe, we might still fail to understand the forms of this language. Every utterance contains some significant features that are not accounted for by the lexicon.

The description of the types of morphemes in any given language is relatively simple in comparison with the description of the meaningful constructions in which those morphemes occur. Each language has a different system for the combining of morphemes. In syntax there may be alternative orders:

*John ran away – Away ran John – Away John ran*

But in morphology the order is fixed. The morpheme boundaries are determined on the basis of comparison with other utterances. We seek utterances which differ from our original in only one stated portion. We try to make the selection of a basic alternant so as to get, in the long run, the simplest description of facts. L. Bloomfield suggests that this principle of immediate constituents leads us to distinguishing certain classes of words:

**A. Secondary words**, containing free forms:

1. **Compound words**, containing more than one free form: *door-knob*, *wild animal-tamer*. The included free forms are the members of the compound word: in our examples, the members are the words *door*, *knob*, *tamer*, and the phrase *wild animal*.
2. **Derived secondary words**, containing one free form: *boyish*, *oldmaidish*. The included free form is called the underlying form; in our examples the underlying forms are the word *boy* and the phrase *old maid*.

**B. Primary words**, not containing a free form:

1. **Derived primary words**, containing more than one bound form: *re-ceive*, *de-ceive*, *con-ceive*, *re-tain*, *de-tain*, *con-tain*.
2. **Morpheme-words**, consisting of a single (free) morpheme: *man*, *boy*, *cut*, *run*, *red*, *big*.

A sample analysis which has become almost classical, being repeated many times by many authors, is Bloomfield's analysis of the word *ungentlemanly*. Comparing the word with other utterances the listener recognizes the morpheme *un-* as a negative prefix because he/she has often come across words built on the pattern *un-* plus adjective stem: *uncertain*, *unconscious*, *uneasy*, *unfortunate*, *unmistakable*, *unnatural*. One can also come across the adjective *gentlemanly*. Thus at the first cut we obtain the following immediate constituents: *un – gentlemanly*. If we continue our analysis we see that although *gent* occurs as a free form in low colloquial usage, no such words as *lemanly* may be found either as a free or as a bound



constituent, so this time we have to separate the final morpheme. We are justified in so doing as there are many adjectives following the pattern noun stem + *-ly*, such as *womanly*, *masterly*, *scholarly*, *soldierly* with the same semantic relationship of “having the quality of the person denoted by the stem”; we also have come across the noun *gentleman* in other utterances.

The two first stages of the analysis resulted in separating a free and a bound form: 1) *un-* + *gentlemanly*, 2) *gentleman* + *-ly*. The third cut has its peculiarities. The division into *gent-* + *leman* is obviously impossible as no such pattern exists in English, so the cut is *gentle* + *man*. A similar pattern: *adjective stem* + *-man* is observed in *nobleman*. The word *gentle* is open to discussion. If we compare it with such adjectives as *brittle*, *fertile*, *juvenile*, *little*, *noble*, *subtle* and some more containing the suffix *-le/-ile* added to a bound stem, they form a pattern for our case.

To sum up: as we break the word we obtain at any level only two immediate constituents. All the time the analysis is based on the patterns characteristic of the English vocabulary. As a pattern showing the combination of all the constituents segregated at various stages we obtain the following formula:

$$un- + \{[(gent- + -le) + -man] + -ly\}$$

What concerns morphological types of words, Ukrainian lexicological tradition is a bit different. According to M.P. Ivchenko the following types of words with reference to the morphological structure can be distinguished in Ukrainian:

#### **I. Non-derived words:**

1. Non-derived words consisting of the root: *тепер, тут, там, дуже, мало, завжди, скрізь, можна, у, при, від, над, до, і, але*.

2. Non-derived words consisting of the root and the ending: *мов-а, вод-а, вез-у, весел-ий*. Here belong also words with zero affix: *вік, віз, ніс*.

#### **II. Derived words made up of roots, prefixes and suffixes:**

1. Words consisting of the root and the suffix: *скрип-к-а, істор-ичн-ий*. Several suffixes can be used.

2. Words consisting of the root and the prefix: *до-пис, пере-клад*.

3. Combination of the root with prefixes and suffixes: *пере-стрибну-ти, про-світ-и-ти, за-нев-ни-ти*.

**III. Compound words created by combining two stems with or without infix:**  
*лісостеп, скороход*.

#### **Перелік питань до самоконтролю**

1. Comment on the notion of the word and approaches to its definition.
2. Comment on the notion of morpheme and its grammatical and lexical meaning.
3. Types of morphemes. Free/bound morphemes.
4. Types of Affixes. Its classification.
5. The classification of prefixes.

6. Suffixation. English and Ukrainian suffixes.

7. Watch the video on Morphology. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=syjbhT45bJ14> – and be ready to discuss it.

#### **Список рекомендованої літератури**

1. Горпинич В.О. Будова слова і словотвір. К.: Рад. школа, 1977. 116 с.
2. Івченко М.П. Сучасна українська літературна мова. К.: Видавництво Київського університету, 1962. 591 с.
3. Ковалик І.І. Діалектичний характер морфологічної будови слова. Сучасна українська літературна мова. Морфологія / за заг. Редакцією І.К. Білодіда. К.: Наукова думка, 1969. 584 с.
4. Смирницкий А.И. Лексикология английского языка. М.; Изд-во лит-ры на иностр. языках, 1956. 260 с.
5. Смирницкий А.И. К вопросу о слове (Проблема “отдельности слова”). М.: Изд-во Акад. Наук. СССР, 1952. С. 182–203.
6. Arnold I.V. The English Word. М.: «Высшая школа», 1973. 303 р.
7. Gardiner A.H. The Definition of the Word and the Sentence. The British Journal of Psychology, XII, 1922, P. 352–361. URL: [https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item\\_2325796\\_3/component/file\\_2325795/content](https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_2325796_3/component/file_2325795/content)
8. Korunets I.V. Contrastive Typology of the English and Ukrainian Languages. Вінниця: «Нова книга», 2004. P. 179–192

### **LECTURE 3. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CATEGORIES AND TYPES OF PRESENT-DAY ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN WORD-FORMATION**

1. Definition of the field of word-formation.
2. Principal types of word-formation.
3. Word-formation rules.

**1. Definition of the field of word-formation.** Word-formation is generally defined as the branch of the science of language which studies the patterns on which a language forms new lexical units, i.e. words. Thus word-formation is said to treat of composites which are analyzable both formally and semantically.

The distinction between the formation of new lexical units and inflection has long been regarded as controversial. It is generally acknowledged now that while inflection produces all the word-forms of that lexeme from the stem (or stems) of a given language, derivation results in the formation of what is traditionally considered to be a different word.

To most common derivational process utilized throughout many languages of the world belong **affixation and prefixation, compounding, back-derivation, clipping, blending and some others.**

Great importance is attached nowadays to the study of various processes of word-formation for the ability to make and understand new words is admittedly as much of our linguistic competence as the ability to make and understand new sentences.

The problems of the intersection between word-formation and syntax (syntactic and lexical derivation, transposition and derivation, nominalization etc.) which have an immediate bearing on the problem of nomination and transposition of linguistic sign in word-making, seem to be of special linguistic interest.

Studies of the processes occurring in separate words can help to describe the word-formation system of a language in general and to determine means and ways of forming new words.

**2. Principal types of word-formation.** All types of word-formation may be studied in two respects: word-creation as a historical process and the relation of new words to other words in the language. As it has been emphasized earlier, contrastive lexicology is a particular linguistic enterprise within the field of descriptive **synchronic** comparative linguistics aimed at producing description of one language vocabulary from the perspective of another at **the present state of their development**. Thus our chief purpose is to analyze those types of word-formation which characterize modern English and Ukrainian lexical systems.

There are two principles of classification of the types of word-formation:

- I. **Based upon the morphemic structure of the initial word or words.**  
Proceeding from this principle we may distinguish: **A. Derivation** – the type where the word has only one semantic centre, other morphemes being affixes, e.g. *brotherhood*. **B. Compounding** – the type where the word has at least two semantic centres, e.g. *red-hot, navy-blue, walking-stick, newspaper, to whitewash*.
- II. **Based on the relationship of components to the new word.** According to this principle we can single out the following types: **A. Morphological word-building** – creating new words using morphemes and changing the structure of the existing words after certain linguistic patterns. This type of word-building comprises: derivation – suffixation, prefixation and zero-derivation; compounding – joining of two or more stems to form a new unit; shortening – abbreviation or curtailing of the word; sound-interchange- the change of a unit in a morpheme resulting in a new lexical meaning (*life – live*); back – formation (*editor – to edit*); reduplication (*to murmur*). **B. Morphological-syntactic word-building** – new words appear through transference from one part of speech into another which implies both a change in morphological and syntactic peculiarities of a word, e.g. substantiation of adjectives: *the unemployed, the poor, молода тополя і молода запрошувала гостей на весілля*; other types of conversion (*to drink – a drink*). **C. Lexico-syntactic word-building** i.e. the formation of new units through the process of isolation from free word-combinations, e.g. *forget-me-not, marry-go-round, stay-at-home, happy-go-lucky, kill-me-quick (a hat), for-eyesonly (a film-star), pie-in-the-sky (promise), добраніч, нісенітниця*.

Some scholars (M. Zhovtobriuh, B. Kulyk, M. Pliushch) are inclined to include into this classification lexical-semantic word-building, i.e. any change in the meaning of a word that comes out as the result of the historical development of the language, e.g. *to run – to move and to manage; машина – механізм and автомобіль*. But if a word acquires a new meaning just its semantic system that is broadened. It becomes polysemantic but no new word appears. A new word appears when the limit of semantic variation is reached and a homonym is created. Homonyms retain no semantic connection with the initial word.

4. **Word-formation rules.** A rule of word-formation usually differs from a syntactic rule in one important respect: it is of limited productivity, in the sense that not all words which result from the application of the rule are acceptable. They are freely acceptable only when they have gained an institutional currency in the language. Thus there is a line to be drawn between “**actual words**” (*sandstone, unwise*), and “**potential words**” (*\*lemonstone, \*unexcellent*) both of these being distinct from “non-English words” like *\*selfishless*, which, because it shows the suffix *-less* added to an adjective and not to a noun, does not obey the rules of word-formation.

Rules of word-formation are therefore at the intersection of the historical and synchronic study of the language, providing a constant set of “models” from which new words, ephemeral or permanent, are created from day to day. Yet, on a larger scale, the rules themselves (like grammatical rules) undergo change: affixes and compounding processes can become productive or lose their productivity; can increase or decrease their range of meaning or grammatical applicability. We will concentrate on productive or on marginally productive rules of word-formation, leaving aside “dead” processes, even though they may have a fossilized existence in a number of words in the language. For example, the Old English suffix *-th*, no longer used to form new words, survives in such nouns as *warmth, length, depth, width, breadth*. A corollary of this approach is that the historical study of a word is irrelevant to its status as an illustration of present-day rules: the fact that the word *unripe* has existed in the English language since Anglo-Saxon times does not prevent us from using it as an example of a regular process of word-formation still available in the language.

New formations, invented casually for a particular occasion (as in *She needs guidance, and the poor child is as guidanceless as she is parentless* are normally comprehensible, but are used at a certain cost to acceptability. They are often referred to as **nonce formations** and are liable to be criticized if too many are used.

History provides quite a number of examples where a derived form has preceded the word from which (formally speaking) it is derived. Thus *editor* entered the language before *edit*, *laze* before *lazy*, and *television* before *televise*. The process by which the shorter word is created by the deletion of a supposed affix is known as **back-formation**, since it reverses the normal trend of word-formation, which is to add rather than to subtract constituents. Back-formation is a purely historical concept, however of little relevance to the contemporary study of word-formation. To the present-day speaker of English, the relationship between *laze* and *lazy* need be no different from that between *sleep* and *sleepy*. Still new formations of this kind continue to be made. The process is particularly fruitful in creating denominal verbs. It should be noted that new formations tend to be used with some hesitation, especially in respect of the full range of verbal inflections. We had the agential *baby-sitter* before the verb *baby-sit* and the form “Will you *baby-sit* for me?” before inflected forms “He *baby-sat* for them”. Other back-formations continue to display their lack of established acceptability: *\*They sight-saw, \*She housekept*.

#### **Перелік питань до самоконтролю**

1. How is word-formation defined?
2. What are the principles of classification of the types of word-formation?
3. What are the principal types of word-formation?
4. Comment on the difference between morphological, morphological-syntactic and lexical-syntactic word-building.
5. How does a rule of word-formation differ from a syntactic rule?
6. What types of word-formation are most productive in English and in Ukrainian?

7. Specify differences in English and Ukrainian suffixes by means of which we form abstract nouns of status or activity given in the last part of the lecture. Try to add more suffixes to the list.

#### Список рекомендованої літератури

1. Горпинич В.О. Будова слова і словотвір. К.: Рад. школа, 1977. 116 с.
2. Івченко М.П. Сучасна українська літературна мова. К.: Видавництво Київського університету, 1962. 591 с.
3. Ковалик І.І. Діалектичний характер морфологічної будови слова. Сучасна українська літературна мова. Морфологія / за заг. Редакцією І.К. Білодіда. К.: Наукова думка, 1969. 584 с.
4. Смирницкий А.И. Лексикология английского языка. М.; Изд-во лит-ры на иностр. языках, 1956. 260 с.
5. Смирницкий А.И. К вопросу о слове (Проблема “отдельности слова”). М.: Изд-во Акад. Наук. СССР, 1952. С. 182–203.
6. Arnold I.V. The English Word. М.: «Высшая школа», 1973. 303 р.
7. Gardiner A.H. The Definition of the Word and the Sentence. The British Journal of Psychology, XII, 1922, P. 352–361. URL: [https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item\\_2325796\\_3/component/file\\_2325795/content](https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_2325796_3/component/file_2325795/content)
8. Korunets I.V. Contrastive Typology of the English and Ukrainian Languages. Вінниця: «Нова книга», 2004. P. 179–192

### LECTURE 4. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF COMPOUNDING IN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

1. Compounding as the type of word-formation.
2. “Bahuvrihi” compounds.
3. Reduplicatives

**1. Compounding as the type of word-formation.** 1.1. Characteristic features of compounds and the treatment of compounds in linguistics. **Compounding** is one of the productive means of word-formation both in English and in Ukrainian. It is characterized by the ease with which compound words are formed when need arises without becoming permanent units of the vocabulary. Compounding should be studied both diachronically and synchronically. Our task is to make a synchronic review and this implies the solving of the following questions:

1. The principal features of compounds which distinguish them from other linguistic units.
2. The semantic structure of compound words.
3. The principles of classification.

**A compound** is a lexical unit consisting of more than one stem and functioning both grammatically and semantically as a single word. I. V. Arnold states that these stems occur in English as free forms [Arnold 1973, p. 60]. In Ukrainian lexicological tradition compounding is subdivided into:

1. Stem-combining with the help of interfixes *о, е, є* (*добррозчливий, працездатний, життєрадісний*) or without them (*триповерховий, всюдихід*);

2. Word-combining or juxtaposition (*Lat. juxta – near, positio – place*) – combining several words or word-forms in one complex word (*хаталабораторія, салон-перукарня*) [Плющ 1994, с. 158].

In principle any number of stems may be involved, but in English, except for a relatively minor class of items (normally abbreviated), compounds usually comprise two stems only, however internally complex each may be. Compounding can take place within any of the word classes, but with very few exceptions, the resulting compound word in English is a noun, a verb or an adjective. In Ukrainian this list includes nouns, adjectives and adverbs. The structural cohesion and integrity of a compound may depend upon unity of stress, solid or hyphenated spelling, semantic unity, unity of morphological and syntactic functioning or, more often, upon the combined effect of several of these factors.

The integrity of a compound is manifested in its indivisibility, i.e. the impossibility of inserting another word or word-group between its elements. e.g., a *sunbeam* – we can insert *bright* or *unexpected* between the article and the noun: *a bright sunbeam, a bright and unexpected sunbeam*, but no such insertion is possible between *sun* and *beam*.

2. “**Bahuvrihi**” compounds. The term *bahuvrihi* was introduced by the Sanskrit grammarian Panini in his famous Grammar, in which he classifies compounds into four types: *avyayībhava*, *tatpuruṣa*, *bahuvrihi*, and *dvandva*. According to Panini, *bahuvrihis* are those compounds which denote a new thing not connoted by the constituent members individually. The Sanskrit compound *bahuvrihi* exemplifies this type of compounding since its literal meaning is ‘much rice’ and is used to denote something which is not connoted by the compound members, that is, ‘having much rice, i.e. a rich man’. Given that the meaning of most *bahuvrihis* is ‘having X’, these formations are also attested as possessive compounds in the relevant literature. Leonard Bloomfield attracted attention to the fact that the large class of English compounds that is exemplified by *whitecap, longnose, swallow-tail, blue-coat, blue-stocking, red-head, shorthorn* has noun function and a noun as head member, and yet is to be classed as exocentric, because the construction implies precisely that the object does not belong to the same species as the head member: these compounds mean ‘object possessing such-and-such an object (second member) of such-and-such a quality (first member)’ [Bloomfield 1933, p. 236].

We will accept the approach that the term *bahuvrihi* refers not to the pattern of formation but to the relation that such compounds have with their referents. Neither constituent refers to the entity named but, the whole refers to a separate entity (usually a person) that is claimed to be characterized by the compound, in its literal or figurative meaning. Thus, a *highbrow* means ‘an intellectual’, on the basis of the facetious claim that people of intellectual interest and cultivated tastes are likely to have a lofty expanse of forehead. Many *bahuvrihis* are somewhat disparaging in tone and are used chiefly in informal style. They are formed on one or other of the patterns already described. e.g: *birdbrain, egghead, hardback, loudmouth, blockhead, butterfingers, featherweight*. Ukrainian: *твердолобий, криворукий*.

4. **Reduplicatives**. Some compounds have two or more constituents which are either identical or only slightly different, e.g. *goody-goody* (a self-consciously virtuous person, informal). The difference between the two constituents may be in the initial consonants, as in *walkie-talkie*, or in the medial vowels, e.g. *criss-cross*. Most of the reduplicatives are highly informal or familiar, and many belong to the sphere of child-parent talk, e.g. *din-din* (dinner). The most common uses of **reduplicatives** (sometimes called ‘jingles’) are:

- to imitate sounds, e.g. *rat-a-tat* [knocking on door], *tick-tock* [of clock], *ha-ha* [of laughter], *bow-wow* [of dog].
- to suggest alternating movements, e.g. *seesaw, flip-flop, ping-pong*.
- to disparage by suggesting instability, nonsense, insincerity, vacillation (вагання) etc.: *higgledy-piggledy, hocus-pocus, wishy-washy, dillydally, shilly-shally*.

- to intensify, e.g. *teeny-weeny, tip-top*.

In connection with reduplication (Uk.: *тихо-тихо, ледь-ледь, думав-думав*) Ukrainian linguists single out such compounds as:

- synonymic unities, e.g. *пане-брате, стежки-доріжки, часто-густо*;
- semantic unities, e.g. *батько-мати, руки-ноги, хліб-сіль, дідипрадіді*;
- appositional unities, e.g. *машина-амфібія, дівчина-смуглянка*.

#### **Перелік питань для самоконтролю**

1. The notion of compound.
2. Compounds versus syntagmatic word combinations.
3. Structural types of compounds.
4. Semantic types of compounds.
5. Form of compounds: spelling peculiarities.
6. Endocentric versus exocentric compounds.
7. Relation of components. Bahuvrihi compounds.
8. Reduplicatives.
9. Approaches to contrastive analysis of noun-compounds.

#### **Список рекомендованої літератури**

1. Горпинич В.О. Будова слова і словотвір. К.: Рад. школа, 1977. 116 с.
2. Івченко М.П. Сучасна українська літературна мова. К.: Видавництво Київського університету, 1962. 591 с.
3. Ковалик І.І. Діалектичний характер морфологічної будови слова. Сучасна українська літературна мова. Морфологія / за заг. Редакцією І.К. Білодіда. К.: Наукова думка, 1969. 584 с.
4. Смирницкий А.И. Лексикология английского языка. М.; Изд-во лит-ры на иностр. языках, 1956. 260 с.
5. Смирницкий А.И. К вопросу о слове (Проблема “отдельности слова”). М.: Изд-во Акад. Наук. СССР, 1952. С. 182–203.
6. Arnold I.V. The English Word. М.: «Высшая школа», 1973. 303 р.
7. Gardiner A.H. The Definition of the Word and the Sentence. The British Journal of Psychology, XII, 1922, P. 352–361. URL: [https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item\\_2325796\\_3/component/file\\_2325795/content](https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_2325796_3/component/file_2325795/content)
8. Korunets I.V. Contrastive Typology of the English and Ukrainian Languages. Вінниця: «Нова книга», 2004. P. 179–192

### **LECTURE 5. CONTRASTIVE STUDIES OF SEMANTICS OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN WORDS: METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES**

1. The study of meaning: semasiology and semantics.



2. Comparability criterion: possible approaches to establishing *tertia comparationis* in contrastive lexicology.

1. **The study of meaning: semasiology and semantics.** Long before linguistics existed as a discipline, thinkers had been speculating about the nature of meaning. For thousands of years, this question has been considered central to philosophy. Contributions to the studies of meaning have come from a diverse group of scholars, ranging from Plato and Aristotle in antiquity to Ludwig Wittgenstein in the twentieth century. In linguistics the branch of the study concerned with the meaning of words is called **semasiology** or **semantics**. The terms semasiology and semantics are often used indiscriminately as if synonymous. In case of semantics, however, there are several more meanings, e.g. the *term pure semantics* refers to a branch of symbolic or mathematical logic originated by R. Carnap.

For a very long period of time the study of meaning constituted part of philosophy, logic, psychology, literary criticism and history of the language. Semasiology came into its own in the 1830's when a German scholar Christian Karl Reisig (1812–1829), lecturing in classical philology, suggested that the studies of meaning should be regarded as an independent branch of knowledge. Reisig's lectures were published by his pupil F. Heerdeggen in 1839 some years after Reisig's death.

It was Michel Breal, a Frenchman, who played a decisive part in the creation and development of the new science. His book "Essai de sémantique" (published in Paris in 1897) became widely known and was followed by a considerable number of investigations and monographs on meaning not only in France, but in other countries as well. He proposed to investigate how it happens that words, once created and endowed with a certain meaning, extend that meaning or contract it, transfer it from one group of notions on to another, raise its value or lower it. He believed that studying such changes constitutes semantics, i.e. science of meaning. According to professor J. R. Firth the English word for the historical study of the change of meaning was semasiology, until in 1900 Breal's book (Essai de s`emantique) was published in English under the title of "Semantics". Nowadays the term semantics prevails and is used to denote **the branch of linguistics which specializes in the study of meaning of linguistic units on all levels of language and language use**. This term is widely accepted by a lot of linguists and we consider it possible to use it for:

- the branch of linguistics which specializes in the study of meaning;
- the expressive aspect of language in general;
- the meaning of one particular word in all its varied aspects and nuances.

The definition of lexical meaning has been attempted more than once in accordance with the main principles of different linguistic schools. However, at present there is no universally accepted definition reflecting all the basic characteristic features of meaning and being at the same time operational. Thus, meaning is considered to be one of the most ambiguous and controversial terms in the linguistic theory. This complex phenomenon has been studied by many outstanding linguists.

2. **Comparability criterion: possible approaches to establishing *tertia comparationis* in contrastive lexicology.** **Tertium comparationis** has to be established prior to any analysis and assumes defining the relations of equivalence, similarity and difference in the observed languages. **It is an overall platform of reference which enables the comparison to be performed.** Tertium comparationis presents the actual realization of

that universal feature (an essential or indispensable element, condition, or ingredient) in the two languages which the contrastivist is interested in. Tertium comparationis, which enables the comparison to be performed, is a background of sameness, and the *sine qua non* for any justifiable, systematic study of contrasts. Tertia comparationis in contrastive lexicological studies depend on the approach selected.

As it has been stated previously, tertium comparationis assumes defining the **relations of equivalence, similarity and difference** in the lexical units of the observed languages on three levels: code dimension, informational dimension and cultural dimension.

In this lecture course we accept the semiotic approach to meaning and identify it with semiosis – the action of signs, that is inseparable unity of representamen, object and interpretant. **The informational dimension of semiosis** presupposes that the meaning of the word is studied through the prism of the relation between the interpretant and the object established by the interpreter via representamen. The analysis of different possible contexts in which the representamen is encountered, makes it possible to bring to light all the nuances of the relations between the object and the interpretant and to discover what is traditionally called the notional nucleus of meaning (“objective”, “nominative”, “representative”, “factual”, components of meaning) abstracted from stylistic, pragmatic, modal, emotional, subjective, communicative and other shades. The emotional content of the word i.e. its capacity to evoke or directly express emotions is rendered by connotative component of meaning (also called emotive charge or intentional connotations). This content is studied at the cultural level of semiosis (cultural interpretant).

When linguists contrast the meaning of words in a language, they can be interested in characterizing the **notional interpretant, cultural interpretant or both of verbal signs**. Notional interpretant covers those basic, essential components of meaning which are conveyed by the literal use of a word. Some of the basic components of a word like *needle* in English might include “thin, sharp, steel, instrument”. These components would be part of the denotative meaning of *needle*. However, you may have “associations”, or “connotations”, attached to a word like *needle* which lead you to think of “*painful*” whenever you encounter the word. This “association” is not treated as part of the denotative meaning of *needle*. In a similar way you may associate the expression *low-calorie*, when used to describe a product, with “good for you”, but we would not want to include this association within the basic denotative meaning of the expression. Poets and advertisers are of course, very interested in using terms in such a way that their associative meanings are evoked, and some linguists do investigate this aspect of language use. In contrastive lexicology we may be interested in characterizing what constitutes the denotative meaning of words in both languages (informational dimension of semiosis) as well as any components which add to the denotative meaning (cultural dimension).

Applying **feature approach** presupposes that semantic components are revealed and organized in the process of componental analysis which is used for a detailed comparison of meaning in two languages. The results of the analysis based on this approach can provide a more adequate basis for translational equivalences as it explains semantic transpositions of words, figurative extension in particular and facilitates judging of the semantic compatibility as an important feature of style.

**“Feature approach” to contrastive analysis** can be accepted for all the three dimensions of semiosis. When we research the code dimension “the feature” that serves as

Tertium comparationis refers to the formal structure of words, in case of informational dimension – the semantic component of the semantic structure of words and for the cultural dimension – the conceptual component of mental models underlying processes of creating lingual objects in different languages. For example:

- Code dimension: means of expressing gender. Tertium comparationis: derivational suffixes.

- Informational dimension: verbs rendering speech activity. In this case Tertium comparationis for comparing systems of verbs in English and in Ukrainian is their common feature – the projection on the invariant denotatum and microdenotata, e.g. **in Ukrainian:** *казати, промовляти, проказувати, вимовляти, балакати, мовити, (заст.) повідати, прорікати, (вультг.) гавкати, тягти, тягнути (повільно, протяжно), (розм.) цідити, рубати, виціджувати, карбувати, чеканити, гарчати (сердито, невдоволено), видушувати, витискати (із себе, через силу), хрипіти, хлипати, сичати, шипити* and others; **in English:** *to say, to tell, to communicate, to inform, to blab out, to proclaim, to announce, to dispute, to negotiate, to report, to declare, to comment, to slander, to brag, to nark, to retell, to interpret, to broadcast, to repeat, to explain, to sort, to joke, to whisper* and others. Each of the verbs in both languages renders the action performed by different objects (persons) and each of these lexemes, naming the corresponding denotata (microdenotata) has certain shades of meaning. Compare Ukr.: *промовляти* and *виціджувати* (промовляти неохоче, недбало); Eng.: *to pronounce* and *to whisper* (to inform someone secretly).

- Cultural dimension: means of expressing evaluative attitude. Possible tertium comparationis: the lexical choice of news reporting accidents in Ukrainian and English papers. By analyzing the difference of the word choice, the contrastivist can reveal the hidden ideologies in the news discourse covertly implied and discover differences in the representation of the same event in vastly different ways through the particular uses of lexicon that reflect different cultural standpoints.

So, how would a semantic approach help us to understand something about the nature of contrasted languages? In this lecture course it is claimed that **the main objects of contrastive semantic studies in lexicology are the following:**

- to compare and contrast semantic structures of separate words and their development including causes and classification of the latter (feature approach);

- to compare and contrast semantic grouping and relationships in vocabulary systems i.e. synonyms, antonyms, terminological systems etc. (field approach);

- to compare and contrast mental models underlying processes of interpreting words (concept approach).

#### **Перелік питань для самоконтролю**

1. Semasiology versus semantics: terminological difference.
2. Peirce's semiotic ideas.
3. Comment on the notion of interpretant and dimensions of semiosis.
4. The notion of tertium comparationis.
5. Approaches to establishing tertium comparationis in contrastive lexicology.

### Список рекомендованої літератури

1. Іваницька Н.Б. Двобічний зіставний аналіз української та англійської дієслівних систем: методика проведення. Наукові праці. Філологія. Мовознавство. 2013. Випуск 204. Т. 216. С. 40–43.
2. Bibliography of linguistics papers dealing with lexical semantics. URL: <https://dingo.sbs.arizona.edu/~hharley/courses/522/522Spring1999/LexSemBiblio.html>
3. The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words /ed. by M. Bergman & S. Paavola. URL: <http://www.commens.org/dictionary>
4. Morris Ch. Foundations of the Theory of Signs. International Encyclopedia of Unified Science. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938. Volume 1, Number 2. P. 1–59.
5. Morris Ch. Writings on the General Theory of Signs. The Hague & Paris: Mouton, 1971. 486 p.

## LECTURE 6. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF SEMANTICS OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN WORDS: FEATURE APPROACH

1. The nature of semantic change.
2. Types of semantic change.

**1. The nature of semantic change.** As it has been mentioned previously, lexical semantics is a subdivision of lexicological studies which is concerned with the systematic study of word meanings. Descriptively speaking, the main topics studied within lexical semantics involve either the internal semantic structure of words, or the semantic relations that occur within the vocabulary, or issues of cognitive semantics. In contrastive lexicology this differentiation brought to life three methodological approaches to contrastive research: feature, field and concept approaches. The concern of this lecture is to discuss the first topic and to demonstrate how feature approach can be applied to contrastive studies of the semantic change in English and Ukrainian words. This presupposes that we will try to find answers to two most fundamental questions addressed by lexical semanticists:

(a) how to describe the meanings of words, and

(b) how to account for the variability of changes in meaning. These two are necessarily connected, since an adequate description of meaning must be able to support our account of variation and our ability to interpret it. The study of semantic variation leads in two directions: on the one hand, to the processes of selection from a range of permanently available possibilities; and on the other hand, to the creation of new senses from old, by such means as, for example, metaphor and metonymy, in response to contextual pressure. An understanding of synchronic variation of meaning (variation observable at any one time in a language) is essential to an understanding of diachronic change (change over time). The latter observations are the seeds of **etymology**, the study of the history of words. Over longer stretches of time, such changes become very obvious. Words seem to shift around: some narrow in meaning such as English *queen* which earlier meant *woman*, *wife* but now means *wife of a king*. Others become more general, while still others shift to take on new sense or disappear altogether. Words are borrowed from language to language. The study of such processes is now part of **historical semantics**.

Another motivation for the study of word meaning comes from dictionary writers as they try to establish meaning correspondences between words in different languages, or in monolingual dictionaries, seek to provide definitions for all the words of a language in terms of a simple core vocabulary. In lexicology, similarities and differences in word meaning are a central concern. In contrastive lexicology one of the tasks of contrastivists is to find out similarities and differences in the processes of changes which occur in word semantics. To solve this task, the researches apply the “**feature approach**”, i.e. start with selecting features of the semantic structure of words as Tertium comparationis.

The alteration of meaning (understood as the set of semantic features) occurs because words are constantly used in different senses and these senses are not exactly the same each time. When new senses are shared by speech community and become established in usage a semantic change has occurred.

In his book “On language change. The invisible hand in language” [Rudi Keller, 1994] Rudi Keller writes that when our primary interest in regard to semantic change is the meaning of words, we may say that the meaning of a word is its conventional use, or the rule of its use. Thus to trace changes in a word’s meaning, we have to find out how and why the rules of use for the word changed. Changes in meaning are as common as changes in form. Like the latter they can be internally or externally motivated. Semantic changes are externally motivated when:

a) changes in social life of a community result in the necessity to find nominations for new objects or phenomena, for example, *computer, spaceship, гривня, Рада (Верховна рада)* and others. Quite commonly new nominations are borrowed, for example, comparatively new borrowings from the English language in present-day Ukrainian are *менеджмент, маркетинг, бартер, імпичмент, інтернет, кліп, сканер, серфінг, валеологія, грант, офшорний, провайдер, траст, набліситі, тренінг, фрістайл, боді шейпінг, пауерліфтинг, фітнес, кикбоксинг, плеймейкер, топ-шоу, памперси, блюз, рекет, офіс/офісний, ретро, сервіс, аудит, стільниковий зв'язок, мобільний телефон, і-мейл, гамбургер, чізбургер;*

b) the existing objects or phenomena are modified thus the meaning of existing nominations is changed to correspond to modifications, for example, the word *car* from Latin ‘*carrus*’ which meant ‘a four-wheeled wagon’, but now it denotes ‘a motor-car’, ‘a railway carriage’. Other examples: *зелені (амер. долари), шкура (шкіряна куртка), Бушові стегенця (стегенця американських бройлерів), кравчучка (вертикальний/легенький двоколісний візок), кучмовоз (більший і міцніший двоколісний вертикальний візок типу тачки), попса (американські чи інші естрадні пісні низької якості), стречі (вузькі дівчачі штани), капрі (дівочі штани-кльош із розрізом унизу), фритюр (смаження), мондіаль (світовий чемпіонат), візаж (косметичний і художній догляд за обличчям). New senses are created by speech communities and therefore the number of semantic features (semes) which make the basis of senses may change.*

New senses may be added or dropped out or the senses may be rearranged in the semantic structure. For example, in English: Old English *fæger* – ‘*fit, suitable*’, Modern English *fair* came to mean ‘*pleasant, enjoyable*’ then ‘*beautiful and pleasant in conduct*’ from which the second modern sense ‘*just, impartial*’ derives. The first meaning continued to develop in the sense of ‘*light complexion*’ and a third one arose from ‘*pleasant*’ in a somewhat pejorative sense, meaning ‘*average, mediocre*’, e.g. *He only got a fair result in his exam.*

In Ukrainian: the word *поле* used to mean ‘*безліса рівнина, порожній великий простір*’, now it is also used in the sense ‘*ділянка землі, відведена під що-небудь*’, ‘*простір, у межах якого відбувається якась дія*’, ‘*сфера діяльності*’, ‘*смужка вздовж краю аркуша паперу*’, ‘*відігнуті краї капелюха*’ and some others.

In this course of lectures semantic change will be understood as the emergence of new senses of the lexeme caused by different reasons and based on different semantic processes.

**2. Types of semantic change.** The most neutral way of referring to semantic change is simply to speak of semantic shift without stating what type it is. For instance, the Latin verb *arrivare* derives ultimately from *ad ripam* – ‘at the shore’ but has long lost this meaning. A closer look at all changes in meaning shows that alterations in meaning can be classified according to type. There are several basic types of semantic change which on the one hand refer to the range of a word’s meaning and on the other, to the way the meaning is evaluated by speakers:

**1) semantic expansion.** Here a word increases its range of meaning over time. For instance, in Middle English *bride* was a term for ‘small bird’, later the term *bird* came to be used in a general sense and the word *fowl*, formally the more general word was restricted to the sense of ‘farmyard birds bred especially for consumption’. Another case is *horn* – ‘bone-like protrusion on the heads of certain animals’, then ‘musical instrument’, then ‘drinking vessel’ of similar shape. The instance of *arrivare* just quoted belongs to this category. In Ukrainian: *буксувати* in its sense ‘стояти на місці, не рухатися внаслідок того, що колеса, обертаючись, ковзаються на місці (about the car)’ was widened to ‘знаходитися в скрутному становищі; не виконувати якісно і своєчасно (about work)’. тановищі; не виконувати якісно і своєчасно (about work).

**2) semantic restriction.** This change is the opposite to expansion. Can be seen with such words as *meat* which derives from Middle English *mete* with the general meaning of ‘food’ and now restricted to ‘processed animal flesh’. In turn the word *flesh* was narrowed in its range to ‘human flesh’. Borrowing from another language may be involved here. For instance, Old English *snipan* (German *schneiden*) was replaced by Old Norse *cut* as the general term and the second Old English word *ceorfan* was restricted in meaning to ‘carve’. The word *wit* meaning ‘the faculty of thinking, good or great mental capacity’ was reflected by borrowed word *reason* and now means ‘the utterance of brilliant or sparkling things in an amusing way’. In Ukrainian: *бігати* besides denoting ‘the action of moving quickly on foot’ got the sense ‘тривожитися, піклуватися, турбуватися за когось, щось’; the old Slavonic word *билина* denoted the name of the plant. In modern Ukrainian it means only ‘стеблина трави, травинка’.

**3) semantic deterioration.** “A disapproval” in the meaning of a word. The term *knave* meant originally (Old English) ‘male servant’ from ‘boy’ (cf. German *Knabe*) but deteriorated to the meaning of ‘base or coarse person’, having more or less died out and been replaced by boy. *Villain* developed from ‘inhabitant of a village’ to ‘scoundrel’. The word *peasant* is used now for someone who shows bad behaviour as the word *farmer* has become the normal term. In official contexts, however, the term ‘peasant’ is found for small and/or poor farmers. In Ukrainian semantic deterioration can be illustrated by the semantic development of the word *бурса*. Primarily the word denoted ‘нижче духовне училище’, then the meaning was expanded and *бурса* started to be used in reference to any male clerical school. In modern Ukrainian youth environment, it denotes any educational establishment (school, professional training school, university) but the sense has ironic connotation.

**4) semantic amelioration.** This type of semantic change concerns cases when the meaning is “improved”. Words arise from humble beginnings to position of greater importance. For example, the term *nice* derives from Latin *nescius* ‘ignorant’ and came, at the time of its borrowing from Old French, to mean ‘silly, simple’ then ‘foolish, stupid’, later developing a more positive meaning as ‘pleasing, agreeable’. Many words have been elevated in meaning through the association with the ruling class, e.g., *knight* meant ‘a young servant’, now – ‘a man who fought for his feudal’; *minister* meant ‘a servant’, now –

‘an important public official’. In Ukrainian such words as *офіс, менеджмент, кур’єр* are more prestige than *контора, управління or посильний*.

Amelioration is the opposite case of the previously discussed semantic deterioration. In some sources it is called **pejoration** and is considered even more usual than amelioration, i.e. there are more instances of words developing a negative meaning than the opposite case. **Pejoration**, or degradation of meaning is a process that commonly involves a lowering in social scale, the acquisition by the word of some derogatory emotive charge. The **pejorated** meanings are also proper to the words that mean the names of diseases, bad habits, social evils, injustice etc. For more details and examples of pejoration see [Borkowska, Kleparski, 2007].

Semantic changes can bring about the shift in markedness. The scholars who research the shift in markedness prefer to use the terms **the specialization or the generalization of meaning**. The stylistically marked lexical unit becomes unmarked and vice versa. If the word with the new meaning is used in the specialized vocabulary of some professional group we speak of **the specialization of meaning**, e.g., to *glide* meant ‘to move gently smoothly’, now – ‘to fly with no engine’. Originally a jet was a special type of airplane (a marked item in the stylistic sense), now it is stylistically neutral and a propeller machine is regarded as the special kind. If the word with the extended meaning passes from the specialized vocabulary into common use, we describe the result of the semantic change as **the generalization of meaning**, e.g., *barn* meant ‘a place for storing barley’, now – ‘a covered building for storing grain’; *pioneer* – ‘soldier’, now – ‘one who goes before’; the meaning of the word *vehicle* that meant ‘a trolley’ spread on all the means of transport. The word *столяр* first meant only ‘the man who made tables’ and then started to mean ‘a specialist in processing wood and manufacturing things from it’.

In some cases, semantic change is inseparable from processes referring to the structural level of analysis:

**1) reanalysis.** The Latin morpheme *min* ‘little’ is seen in *minor* and *minus* but the words *minimum* and *miniature* led to the analysis of *mini-* as the morpheme meaning ‘small’ which has become general in English (and German) as a borrowed morpheme, cf. *minibar, minicomputer, miniskirt*.

**2) truncation.** An element is deleted without substitution. Developments in word formation often show this with some elements understood but not expressed: *mini* in the sense of *miniskirt*. Other cases may involve compound phrases, e.g. *documentary film* and *feature film* have both been reduced by truncation of the head noun *film* to the qualifiers *documentary* and *feature* which are used on their own. Truncation may also involve an expansion in meaning. For instance, in American English the term *Cologne*, from *Eau de Cologne*, is often used in the broader sense of ‘perfume for men’.

**3) meaning loss through homophony.** Old English had two verbs *lætan* ‘allow’ and *lettan* ‘obstruct, hinder’. These became homophonous and only the meaning ‘allow’ survived. However, in the expression *without let* or *hindrance* the original meaning survives.

**4) meaning change in discourse.** Words may become indicators of the structure of discourse. Two illustrations of this are *but* and *while*. The former once meant ‘outside of’ and the latter ‘a period’ (still to be seen in *She rested for a while*). Now these words mean ‘however’ and ‘during’. *She took a rest while the others were in the restaurant*.

**5) semantic effect of grammatical changes.** There are also grammatical changes taking place in English which bring about semantic changes. For instance, the verb *talk* is assumed to take the preposition *about* when the object is inanimate as in *She was talking about the weather*. But there is an increasing use without a preposition to add force and immediacy to what one is saying: *Okay, so we’re talking big money now*.

Present-day English and Ukrainian show quite a number of semantic changes which consist of expansions, restrictions, ameliorations and deteriorations. To start with, one can quote an unusual semantic development with the word *sanction* which has come to have two



opposite meanings. It can mean ‘to allow something’ as in *They sanctioned the proposal* or ‘to forbid something’ especially in the nominalized form as in *Britain imposed sanctions on the country*.

*Decimate* originally meant to reduce something by one tenth but now simply means to reduce drastically. *The staff was decimated by the restructuring of the firm*. Up until recently the sole meaning of the word *joy* was ‘pleasurable, euphoric state’ but has come to be used in the sense of success as in *They got no joy out of the insurance company*. *Philosophy* is originally a science concerned with the use of reasoning and argument in the pursuit of truth and greater understanding of reality and the metaphysical. Now it has come to mean little more than ‘policy’ in a sentence like *The company’s philosophy is to be aggressively competitive*. *Culture* is a collective term referring to the arts and human intellectual achievement in general. However, it has come to be used in the sense of general set of attitudes and behavioural types, usually in a public context as in *The culture of violence in our inner cities*.

*Students* used to be an exclusive term for those studying at universities and other institutions of higher education. But more and more the term is also being used for *pupils* perhaps to attribute more adult status to those still at school.

It should be noted that it is obvious from even the briefest of surveys of semantic change that if any one word in a group of semantically related words shifts, then the others are immediately effected and may well react by filling the semantic ‘space’ vacated by the item which made the move. Semantic change does not occur with words in isolation. But the issue of contrastive analysis of lexical fields applying field approach will be discussed in the next lecture.

#### **Перелік питань для самоконтролю**

1. How do the the main topics studied within lexical semantics correlate with three methodological approaches to contrastive research of lexis?
2. What are the possible causes of changes in a word’s meaning?
3. Do you agree with the statement of Rudi Keller that “to trace changes in a word’s meaning, we have to find out how and why the rules of use for the word changed”? Give your reasons.
4. What are the four principle types of semantic change? Supply examples of each type in English and Ukrainian.
5. Explain how semantic change can be connected with processes referring to the structural level of analysis.
6. What processes of establishing new relationship between the existing and new sense of the word are semantic changes based on?

#### **Список рекомендованої літератури**

1. Іваницька Н.Б. Двобічний зіставний аналіз української та англійської дієслівних систем: методика проведення. Наукові праці. Філологія. Мовознавство. 2013. Випуск 204. Т. 216. С. 40–43.
2. Bibliography of linguistics papers dealing with lexical semantics. URL: <https://dingo.sbs.arizona.edu/~hharley/courses/522/522Spring1999/LexSemBiblio.html>
3. The Commens Dictionary: Peirce’s Terms in His Own Words /ed. by M. Bergman & S. Paavola. URL: <http://www.commens.org/dictionary>
4. Morris Ch. Foundations of the Theory of Signs. International Encyclopedia of Unified Science. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938. Volume 1, Number 2. P. 1–59.
5. Morris Ch. Writings on the General Theory of Signs. The Hague & Paris: Mouton, 1971. 486 p.

## LECTURE 7. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF SEMANTICS OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN WORDS: FIELD APPROACH

1. Factors facilitating the contrastive study of lexicon.
2. Lexical fields.

**1. Factors facilitating the contrastive study of lexicon.** The lexical level of any language is naturally represented by some characteristic constants. I. Korunets [Korunets, p. 118–119] states that these constants are the following:

- 1) words, their semantic classes and word-forming means as well as their structural models and stylistic peculiarities of use;
- 2) lexicosemantic groups (LSGs) of words;
- 3) stable and idiomatic expressions which are also of universal nature, though they always have some national peculiarities in every single language.

Trying to compare lexicons of the two languages we proceed from such fundamental ideas:

- the idea that the basic lexicalization assumption should be explained within the framework of even more fundamental ideas of semiosis – the action of language signs which possesses code, informational and cultural dimension;
- despite seemingly chaotic mass of different words in both languages they are, like units of other language levels, systemically arranged.

I. Korunets also emphasizes that regular lexemes and lexical units can be divided into two typologically relevant groups: **universal lexicon and nationally specific lexicon** [Korunets, p. 118–119]. The systemic organization of **universal lexicon** is conditioned in all languages by lingual and extralingual factors which are of universal nature. Extralingual factors, predetermining the systemic organization of lexicon are **the physical and mental factors, the environmental factors, the social factors**. The physical needs of human beings are rendered in a great number of common notions of actions designated by such verbs as *live, eat, drink, sleep, wake, run, jump, love, die* etc. The common mental activity of man is rendered by the notions designated by such words as: *speak, think, ask, answer, decide, realize, imagine, understand* and many others. What concerns natural environment of human beings, all languages have acquired a large number of common notions designated by words which reflect the multitudes of objects and phenomena surrounding every human being on the globe, such as *the sun, the moon, the stars, the wind, the sky, thunder, lightning, rain* as well as various species of flora and fauna, colours etc. Social factor involves social phenomena as well as relationships and activities of man, e.g. at the family level: *mother, father, child, sister, brother, aunt, uncle, grandmother, grandfather* etc. [Korunets, p. 118–119].

It should be noted that the fact that some words in English and in Ukrainian belong to universal lexicon does not mean that these words have completely identical semantic structures. There are certain anomalies in the structure of the vocabulary which disturb the pretty patterns of structural analysis. Such ‘holes’ in the vocabulary have been called lexical gaps, especially when viewed in the light of another language’s lexis. For example, such a universal emotion as *ГНІВ* is verbalized in English as *anger* and *wrath* and in Ukrainian as *гнів, лють, роздратування*.

Besides universal lexicon each language possesses nationally specific lexicon designating national customs, traditions, folk rites and feasts, administrative or political systems, etc. I. Korunets indicates [Корунець, 2017] that they may also designate peculiar geographical, geological or environmental conditions of a speech community life. No less peculiar may also be the cultural or religious traditions of a nation often expressed through

certain proper names or names of saints, e.g. Ukrainian *Івана Купала, Маковія*, or Ireland's *St. Patrick, Scottish tartan, American Uncle Sam* or *the British John Bull, the British Lion*.

Culturally biased, i.e., nationally specific are often elements in a governmental or election systems of a country (e.g., *the administration, secretaries and undersecretaries or primary elections in the U.S.A.*). The monetary systems in most countries contain some nationally peculiar units as well, e.g., *shilling, penny, dollar, гривня*. Culturally biased are mostly the titles of address and the ways of conduct, and, at last but not at least, some articles of clothing / footwear, e.g., the Scottish *kilt, tartan*, the Ukrainian *вишиванка, кептар* or the American *Indians' moccasins*.

Most peculiar are always national meals, beverages and even partaking of food, established as a result of a nation's agricultural traditions and consumption of peculiar products. The nationally biased notions as non-equivalent units of lexicon are also observed in some national systems of weights and measures, e.g., English *mile, ounce*, Ukrainian *верста, пуд*. All in all, these notions are found both in English and in Ukrainian, for example, in English: *county, borough, butterscotch, custard, muffin, toffee, bushel, chain, furlong, inch, mile, pint, penny, shilling, pound, lady, mister, sir; lobby, speaker, teller* (Parliament), *Lord Chancellor, Number 10 Downing Street, Whitehall*, etc. Ukrainian: *кобзар, веснянка, коломийка, козак, запорожець, кептар, копа (яєць), пуд, січ, свитка, хата, лежанка, весільний батько, троїсті музики, вечорниці, борщ, вареники, галушки, кутя, медок, ряжанка, опришок, плахта, гривня* [Корунець, 2017].

Both universal and nationally biased lexical units are systemically arranged and make up **thematic and lexico-semantic groups** of words which can become the object of contrastive analysis. A **thematic group** is a subsystem of the vocabulary for which the basis of grouping is not only lingual but also extralingual: the words are associated because the things they name occur together and are closely connected in reality, e.g.: terms of kinship: *father, cousin, mother-in-law, uncle*; names for parts of the human body: *head, neck, arm, foot, thumb*; colour terms: *blue, green, yellow, red / scarlet, crimson, coral*; military terms: *lieutenant, captain, major, colonel, general*.

In this lecture attention will be paid to the contrastive analysis of lexical fields that are most commonly called **lexicosemantic groups** (LSGs). The latter is defined as the semantic class of words which meets the following criteria: the lexemes are of the same part of speech and their meanings have at least one semantic feature in common. Most commonly the words belonging to one LSG contain words put together by the semantic relationship of synonymy, e.g., *to think, to conclude, to consider, to reflect, to mediate, to reminisce, to contemplate*.

**2. Lexical fields.** A great amount of studies in the field of contrastive lexicology are connected with what has come to be known as the lexical or semantic field theory. This theory has its history (see [Кучер, 2014]).

Lexical field is defined as the extensive organization of related words and expressions into a system which shows their relations to one another. The members of the lexical groups are joined together by some common semantic component known as the common denominator of meaning.

An example of a simple lexical field are verbs denoting speech acts: *to speak, to talk, to chat, to natter, to mumble, to ramble, to stammer, to converse*.

Several terms are alternatively used for 'lexical field': 'lexical set', 'semantic field', 'semantic domain', 'lexico-semantic group'. Semantic field is defined as "a set of lexemes which cover a certain conceptual domain and which bear certain specifiable relations to one another" (A. Lehrer) or as a "named area of meaning in which lexemes interrelate and define each other in specific ways" (D. Crystal) [cit from Potiatyuk, p. 108–109]. Uliana Poyiatyuk puts it in simpler terms and defines a lexical field as a group of words whose members are related by meaning, reference or use [Potiatyuk, p. 109]. She also indicates that the vocabulary of the language is essentially a dynamic and well-integrated system of lexemes structured by relationships of meaning. Mainly these relationships are synonymy and

antonymy, hierarchical, general-particular and part-whole relationships, and also relationships of sequences and cycles.

Different types of semantic relationships bring to life lexicosemantic and thematic groups. The latter contain words belonging to different parts of speech. They have been mostly studied diachronically (see [Бойко; Войтів; П'яст] and others). Proceeding from the conviction that the meaning of words can be understood only when we study it in connection with synonymic words [Покровский, с. 82], we will proceed with discussing the synonymic relations in the vocabulary of the contrasted languages.

#### **Перелік питань для самоконтролю**

1. Universal versus nationally biased lexicon.
2. Systemic organization of lexicon: lexical fields.
3. Types of semantic relationships within the vocabulary system.
4. Approaches to the research of synonyms in contrastive lexicology.
5. Comment on the essence of the interpretational test suggested by Bendix.

#### **Список рекомендованої літератури**

1. Bendix E.H. Componential Analysis of General Vocabulary: The Semantic Structure of a Set of Verbs in English, Hindi, and Japanese. *Foundations of Language*. 1972. 8 (3). P. 421–435.
2. Korunets I.V. Contrastive typology of the English and Ukrainian languages. Вінниця: “Нова книга”, 2004. 464 с.
3. Palmer F.R. *Semantics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981. 221 p.
4. Попіатунук У. All about Words: An Introduction to Modern English Lexicology 1: навч.-метод. посібник. Львів ПАІС, 2014. 362 с.
5. Lyons J. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968. 519 p.
6. Ullmann S. *Semantics: An introduction to the science of meaning*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962. 278 p.
7. Бойко Л.П. Торговельна лексика запорозького козацького вжитку: автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.01. Дніпропетровськ, 1997. 18 с.
8. Войтів Г.В. Назви одягу в пам'ятках української мови XIV – XVIII ст.: дис...канд. філол. наук: 10.02.01 / НАН України, Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича. Львів, 1995. 209 с.
9. Жлуктенко Ю.О. Контрастивний аналіз як прийом мовного дослідження. Нариси з контрастивної лінгвістики : зб. наук. праць. К. : Наук. думка, 1979. С. 5–11.

### **LECTURE 8. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF SEMANTICS OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN WORDS: CONCEPT APPROACH**

1. Defining cognitive linguistics and cognitive semantics.
2. Defining concept in modern cognitive science.

**1. Defining cognitive linguistics and cognitive semantics.** The cognitive approach to language encompasses a wide variety of theoretical proposals with a common denominator: the idea that language is an integral part of cognition and therefore it should be understood in the context of conceptualization and mental processing. **Cognitive linguistics** is defined as a study of language in connection with different human facilities which include perception, categorization, memory, thinking etc. [Potapenko, 2013]. In this view lexical units are of special importance because they serve as primary means to verbalize the interaction of cultural, psychological and communicative aspects involved in the process of cognition.

Serhiy Potapenko believes that the existing cognitive theories can be classified into those related to different human faculties: perception-based, categorization-based, memory-based, reasoning-based, socially-based and discourse related [Potapenko, 2013, p. 10] and methods applied in cognitive linguistics are usage- and corpus-based analysis, quantitative methods and empirical methods.

It is also emphasized in S.Potapenko's textbook [Potapenko, 2013, p. 19–21] that the main empirical method is that of associative experiment which allows to confirm the psychological relevance of the theoretical assumptions made by the investigator, i.e. that the associative network is not arbitrary but to a large extent motivated as a reflection of hierarchical conceptual structures in a speaker's consciousness. As a lexical sign is included into the associative network, after a word-stimulus is perceived, an appropriate fragment of the complex conceptual structure with its specific features and associated emotions and evaluations becomes fully or partially activated. Hence, responses evoked by a stimulus can be viewed as a reflection of corresponding conceptual structures. Besides the associative experiment allows us not only to reveal pertinent cognitive domains but also rank them according to their relative salience for the speakers. The prominent Ukrainian scholars applying the associative experiment methodology are Andrei Levitsky (the concept CHERNOBYL) [Левицкий, 2018] and Svitlana Martynuk (binary oppositions of RIGHT and LEFT in Slavic languages) [Martinek, 2007].

The area of study known as **cognitive semantics** is concerned with the investigation of the relationship between the experience, the conceptual system, and the semantic structure encoded by language. Semantic structures are characterized relative to knowledge systems whose scope is essentially open-ended. Scholars investigate knowledge representation (conceptual structure), and meaning construction (conceptualization). Cognitive semanticists have employed language as the lens through which these cognitive phenomena can be investigated. Consequently, research in cognitive semantics tends to be interested in modelling the human mind as much as it is concerned with the analysis of linguistic semantics. Cognitive scientists are aware of the range of linguistic diversity. Moreover, the crucial fact for understanding the place of language in human cognition is its diversity. For example, languages may have less than a dozen distinctive sounds, or they may have 12 dozen, and sign languages do not use sounds at all. Languages may or may not have derivational morphology (to make words from other words, e.g., *run* – *runner*), or inflectional morphology for an obligatory set of syntactically consequential choices (e.g., plural *the girls* are vs. singular *the girl is*). But what is of utmost importance is that culturally meaningful reference of lingual signs which is obtained from all means of denotative-connotative presentation of cultural senses also differs.

Technique of the contrastive lexicological study based on concept approach is expected to provide the explication of cognitive procedures applied by the subject when interpreting those culturally meaningful references of lingual signs. Two factors should be taken into consideration: a) cognitive contrastive lexicological analysis is productive only for concepts which have partial interlingual equivalence; b) when intending to conduct contrastive analysis of concepts one has to apply a complex of analytical devices, operations and procedures which are used to analyze the interconnection of language and culture.

**2. Defining concept in modern cognitive science.** **Concept** is an umbrella term used in several scientific fields: first of all, in cognitive psychology and cognitive linguistics, dealing with thinking and cognition, storing and transforming information, as well as in cultural linguistics, which is still defining and refining the boundaries of the theory formed by its postulates and basic categories. **The concept in cognitive science** is the basic axiomatic category; the hyperonym of the *notion, ideas, frame, script, gestalt* etc. It is a discrete unit of the collective consciousness, which is stored in the national memory of native speakers in verbally determinate form. S. Potapenko believes that concepts refer to structures meant for the storage of verbalized knowledge and thus should be included into memory-based language models together with concept-structuring schemas and worldview as a repository of various concepts [Potapenko, p. 55].

As a **cognitive unit of meaning**, a concept is an abstract idea or a mental model sometimes defined as a “unit of knowledge” or as a “unit of culture” which **is associated with the corresponding representation in a language**. In some linguistic definitions concept is even treated as an entity that substitutes meaning though most researchers consider it a mistake to confuse a concept with the meaning of a word. Generally, the nature of concepts – the kind of things concepts are – and the constraints that govern a theory of concepts have been the subject of much debate. Philosophers suggest three main options to identify concepts: with mental representations, with abilities, and with Fregean senses (see [Margolis, Laurence]).

The first of these options (*Concepts as mental representations*) maintains that **concepts are psychological entities**, taking as its starting point the representational theory of the mind (RTM). According to RTM, thinking occurs in an internal system of representation. Beliefs and desires and other propositional attitudes enter into mental processes as internal symbols. RTM is usually presented as taking beliefs and other propositional attitudes to be relations between an agent and a mental representation.

The second option (**Concepts as abilities**) maintains that concepts are neither mental images nor word-like entities in a language of thought. Rather, concepts are abilities that are peculiar to cognitive agents. The concept CAT, for example, might amount to the ability to discriminate cats from non-cats and to draw certain inferences about cats. While the abilities view is maintained by a diverse group of philosophers, the most prominent reason for adopting the view is a deep skepticism about the existence and utility of mental representations, skepticism that traces back Ludwig Wittgenstein. One of the most influential arguments along these lines claims that mental representations are explanatorily idle because they reintroduce the very sorts of problems they are supposed to explain. For example, Michael Dummett cautions against trying to explain knowledge of a first language on the model of knowledge of a second language. In the case of a second language, it is reasonable to suppose that understanding the language involves translating its words and sentences into words and sentences of one’s first language. But according to Dummett, one can’t go on to

translate words and sentences of one's first language into a prior mental language. "There is really no sense to speaking of a concept's coming into someone's mind. All we can think of is some image coming to mind which we take as in some way representing the concept, and this gets us no further forward, since we still have to ask in what his associating that concept with that image consists" (cit. from [Margolis, Laurence]).

The third view (**concepts are Fregean senses**) identifies concepts with *abstract* objects, as opposed to mental objects and mental states. Concepts are said to be the constituents of propositions. For proponents of this view, concepts mediate between thought and language, on the one hand, and referents, on the other. An expression without a referent ("Pegasus") needn't lack a meaning, since it still has a sense. Similarly, the same referent can be associated with different expressions (e.g., "Eric Blair" and "George Orwell") because they convey different senses. Senses are more discriminating than referents. Each sense has a unique perspective on its referent – a unique mode of presentation. Differences in cognitive content trace back to differences in modes of presentation. Philosophers who take concepts to be senses particularly emphasize this feature of senses. Christopher Peacocke, for example, locates the subject matter of a theory of concepts as follows: "Concepts C and D are distinct if and only if there are two complete propositional contents that differ at most in that one contains C substituted in one or more places for D, and one of which is potentially informative while the other is not" (cit. from [Margolis, Laurence]). In other words, C and D embody differing modes of presentation. To avoid terminological confusion, we should note that Frege himself did not use the term "concept" for senses, but rather for the referents of predicates. Similarly, it is worth noting that Frege uses the term "thought" to stand for propositions, so for Frege thoughts are not psychological states at all [Margolis, Laurence].

### **Перелік питань для самоконтролю**

1. How can existing cognitive theories be classified?
2. Read the article by A. Levitstkyi on the concept ЧОРНОБИЛЬ (see the library) and get ready to discuss the suggested methodology of analysis.
3. Discuss approaches to defining concepts in modern cognitive science.
4. What is the main task of contrastive lexicological studies?
5. Explain the difference between "cultural" and "informational" approaches to understanding the concept in cognitive linguistics.
6. What is a Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) according to Anna Wierzbicka and what is its potential for the contrastive study of languages?
7. What is the definition of concept in the semiotic framework?
8. Comment on the potential of interpretant in contrastive studies based on "concept approach".

### **Список рекомендованої літератури**

1. Andreichuk Nadiia I. Contrastive lexicology of English and Ukrainian languages: theory and practice: textbook. — Kherson: Helvetica, 2019. — 234 p.
1. Iliencko O. L., Kamienieva I. A., Moshtagh Ye. S. English lexicology — Kharkiv : O. M. Beketov NUUE, 2020. — 217 p.



2. Бортничук Е. Н. и др. Словотворення в сучасній англійській мові. К. : Вища шк., 2018. — 261 с.
3. Глуховцева К. Д. Складні питання сучасної української літературної мови. Вступ. Фонетика. Фонологія. Морфологія. Орфоепія. Графіка. Орфографія. Лексикологія. Фразеологія. Лексикографія: навч. посіб. для здобувачів освіт. ступенів "бакалавр", "магістр" освіт. програми "Українська мова і література"— Старобільськ : Держ. закл. "Луган. нац. ун-т ім. Тараса Шевченка", 2021. — 265 с.
2. Гурко О.В. Лексикологія основної іноземної та української мов: плани практ. занять і завдання для самост. роботи. — Дніпро: Ліра, 2019. - 63 с.
3. Деменчук О.В. Порівняльна лексикологія англійської та української мов: навч. посіб. для студ. вищ. навч. закл. — Рівне : Перспектива, 2020. — 165 с.
4. Дудко І. В. Мова – найважливіший національний ідентифікатор. — Київ: Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. Літературознавство, мовознавство, фольклористика. - 2021. - Вип. 2. - С. 65.
5. Король А. А. Лексикологія німецької мови як другої іноземної : навч. посіб. "— Чернівці : ЧНУ ім. Юрія Федьковича : Рута, 2021. - 79 с.
4. Купіна Я. В. Лексикологія англійської мови, навч.-метод. рек. з курсу "Лексикологія" : [в 2 ч.], частина 1, 2019. — Харків. нац. пед. ун-т ім. Г. С. Сковороди. - Харків: ХНПУ ім. Г. С. Сковороди, 2019 — 69 с.
5. Купіна Я. В. Лексикологія англійської мови, навч.-метод. рек. з курсу "Лексикологія" : [в 2 ч.], частина 2, 2019. — Харків. нац. пед. ун-т ім. Г. С. Сковороди. - Харків: ХНПУ ім. Г. С. Сковороди, 2019 — 52 с.