

**MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION OF
THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN
THE UZBEK STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY
THE ENGLISH LEXICOLOGY DEPARTMENT**

YARMUKHAMEDOVA M

English faculty - 3 group 302

**LEXICAL AND STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE SEMANTIC FIELD OF
“RELIGION”**

COURSE PAPER

**THE COURSE PAPER
IS ADMITTED TO DEFENSE**

The head of the English

Department _____Matyakubov.J

2016 “_____” _____

SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR:

_____ G.Tursunova

2016 “_____” _____

TASHKENT-2016

Contents

Introduction.....

Chapter I. Historical background of semantic structure of the English word.

1.1. Different points of view to the problem of semantic components
and various classification of semantic structure.....

1.2. Semantic field: definition and its usage.....

Chapter II Lexical and Stylistic Analysis of the Semantic Field of “Religion”

2.1. Diachronic-Semantics-Analysis-of-the-word “GOD

Conclusion

The list of used literature.....

Introduction

Integration of Uzbekistan in the world and international community, speed of development of international economical, political and cultural relations suppose global transition in study and teaching foreign languages. Deep knowledge of foreign languages means not only practically mastering a language, but also study of its theoretical basis. In this plan the science is considered to be one of the main factors on successful mastering a language, development of education and qualification of personnel depend.

The President of the Republic of Uzbekistan I.A. Karimov stresses “The task of a science is establishment of our future, directions of future, natural law which will be in reality. The science must become the means strength driving development of society forward¹”.

The present Qualification paper deals with the study of polysemantic words in the English language, which present a certain interest both theoretical investigation and for practical language use.

So far we have been discussing the concepts of meaning, different types of word meanings and the changes they undergo in the course of the historical development of the English language. When analyzing the word meaning we observe, however, that words as a rule are not units of a single meaning. The bulk of English words are polysemantic, that is to say possess more than one meaning.

The actuality of the course paper is defined by concrete results of the investigation. The actual meanings of religion words and their arrangement in the semantic structure of correlated words in different languages may be altogether different. The actual number of meanings of the commonly used words ranges from five to about a hundred.

In fact, the commoner the word the more meanings it has

¹Каримов И.А. Тарихийхотирасизкелажак йўқ. Тошкент “Ўзбекистон”1999 й. 149-150 б.

The aim of this course paper is to define religion words in the English language and investigate their lexical analysis.

To get the desired result the work puts the following **tasks** to solve before itself:

- to study historical background of semantic structure of the English word;
- to analyze different points of view to the problem of semantic components and various classification of semantic structure;
- to analyze peculiar features of religion words;
- to study synchronic and diachronic approaches of the word “God”;
- to analyze the word meaning;

The object of course paper is to study the peculiarities of religion words in the English language

The subject matter of the course paper is very actual as it is based on diachronic approach to the problem of religion words in the English language.

The novelty of the course paper is that we have tried to investigate religion words in the English language. The meanings of religion words and their arrangement in the semantic structure of correlated words in different languages may be altogether different. The number of meanings of the commonly used words ranges from five to about a hundred

The practical value of the course paper is that the analyzed examples can be used in seminars and lectures on lexicology. The history of language and as a manual for students and teachers.

The theoretical value of the research is detailed and comprehensive analysis of religion words in the English language which form a big layer of the English vocabulary.

The structure of the work.

The given course paper consists of introduction, two chapters and conclusion which are followed by the list of literature used in the course of research.

Introduction deals with the description of the structure of a qualification paper.

The first chapter deals with the historical background of semantic structure of the English word.

The second chapter deals with the study of lexical and stylistic analysis of the semantic field of “religion”.

Conclusion presents the results of the investigation the Polysemantic words in the English language.

Bibliography gives the list of literature used in the course of the investigation.

Chapter I. Historical background of semantic structure of the English word

1.1. Different points of view to the problem of semantic components and various classification of semantic structure

From the discussion of the diachronic and synchronic approach to polysemy it follows that the interrelation, monosemantic words is easily perceived. For instance the word *movie* is recognizably American and *burnie* is Scottish. Polysemantic words as a rule can not be given any such restrictive labels. To do it we must state the meaning in which they are used.

There is nothing colloquial or slangy or American about the word *yellow* denoting cowardice, *jerk* in the meaning “a sudden movement or stopping of concerned”: But when *yellow* is used in the meaning of sentimental or when *jerk* is used in the meaning of “an odd person”. It is both slang and American.

Stylistically neutral meanings are naturally more frequent. The polysemantic words *worker* and *hand* e.g. may both denote “a man who does manual work” to hire factory hands is one of its marginal meanings characterized by colloquial stylistic reference. Broadly speaking and the interdependence of, individual meaning two different angles. These two approaches are not mutually exclusive but are viewed here as supplementing each other in the linguistic analysis of a polysemantic word.

It should be noted, however, that as the semantic structure is never static, the relationship between the diachronic and synchronic evaluation of individual meanings may be different and different periods, of the historical development of language.

This is the perhaps best illustrated by the semantic analysis of the word *revolution*. Originally, when this word first appeared in middle English it denoted “the revolving motion of celestial bodies and also” “the return or recurrence of a point or a period of time” later on the word acquired other meaning and among

them that of “a complete overthrow of the established government or regime” and also “a complete change, a great reversal of conditions”.

In 1600 when these meanings were first registered in dictionaries the meaning “revolving motion” was both primary and central (synchronically).

In Modern English, however, while we can still diachronically describe this meaning as primary it is no longer synchronically central as the arrangement of meanings in the semantic structure of the word revolution has considerably changed and its central as the most frequent meaning is “a complete overthrow of the established government or the regime” it follows that the primary meaning of the word may become synchronically one of its minor meanings and diachronically a secondary meaning may function as the central meaning of the word.

The actual arrangement of meanings in the semantic structure of any word, in the historical period is the result of the semantic development of this word within the system of the given language.

There is one more point to be discussed in connection with the problem of the synchronic approach to polysemy. It will be recalled that in analyzing the semantic structure of the word table observed that some meanings are representative of the word in isolation. E.g. they invariably occur to us when we hear the word or see it written on paper meanings come to the fore only when the word is used in certain contexts²³. This is true of all polysematic words. The objective yellow e.g. When used in isolation is understood to denote a certain colour whereas other meanings of this word e.g. “envious” “suspicious” or “suspicious”, “corrupt” are perceived only in certain contexts.

2

Antrushina “English lexicology”. 1985. Moscow. “Visshayashkola”. P.165

3 Kunin A. “English Lexicology”. “Visshayashkola”. Moscow, 1972. P.112

The semantic structure of the word has an objective existence as a dialectical ontology which embodies dialectical permanency and variability.

The context individualizes the meaning; it is determined by context.

Stylistically neutral meanings are naturally more frequent. The polysemantic words *worker* and *hand* e.g. may both denote “a man who does manual work” but whereas, this is the most frequent and stylistically neutral meaning of the word *worker*, it is observed only in 28% of all occurrences of the word *hand*, in the semantic structure of which the meaning “a man who does manual work” is one of its marginal meanings characterized by colloquial stylistic reference.

Wiktionary, the free dictionary. A polysemy is a word or phrase with multiple, related meanings. A word is judged to be polysemous if it has two senses of the word whose meanings are related. Since the vague concept of relatedness is the test for polysemy, judgments of polysemy can be very difficult to make. Because applying pre-existing is helpful in determining polysemy but not the may no longer be so.

Some apparently unrelated words share a common historical origin, however, so etymology is not an infallible test for polysemy and dictionary writers also often defer to speakers' intuitions to judge polysemy in cases where it contradicts etymology. English has many words which are polysemous. For example, the verb “to get” can mean “take” (I'll get the drinks) “become” (she got scarred), “have” (I've got three dollars), “understand” (I get in) etc.

There are several tests for polysemy, but one of them is zeugma when applied in different contexts, it is likely that the contexts bring out different polysemes of the same bring. If the two poly senses of the same word do not seem to hit, yet seem related, then it is likely that they are polysemous.

The leading semantic component in the semantic structure of a word is usually termed *denotative component* (also, the term *referential component* may be used). The denotative component expresses the conceptual content of a word.

The following list presents denotative components of some English adjectives and verbs:

Denotative components

<i>Lonely</i> , adj.	----->>	[alone]
<i>Notorious</i> , adj.	----->>	[widely]
<i>Celebrated</i> , adj.	----->>	[widely]
<i>To glare</i> , v.	----->>	[to look]
<i>To glance</i> , v.	----->>	[to look]
<i>To shiver</i> , v.	----->>	[to tremble]
<i>To shudder</i> , v.	----->>	[to tremble]

It is quite obvious that the definitions given in the right column only partially and incompletely describe the meanings of their corresponding words. To give a more or less full picture of the meaning of a word, it is necessary to include in the scheme of analysis additional semantic components which are termed *connotations* or *connotative components*.⁴

Let us complete the semantic structures of the words given above introducing connotative components into the schemes of their semantic structures.

Denotative	Connotative		
Components	Component		
<i>Lonely</i> , adj.	----->	Alone,	Melancholy,
without	+	sad	Emotive
company		Connotation	

⁴Griberg S.I. "Exercises in Modern English". Moscow 1980

Notorious, adj. ----->

The above examples show how by singling out denotative and connotative components one can get a sufficiently clear picture of what the word really means. The schemes presenting the semantic structures of *glare*, *shiver*, *shudder* also show that a meaning can have two or more connotative components.

The given examples do not exhaust all the types of connotations but present only a few: emotive, evaluative connotations, and also connotations of duration and of cause. (For a more detailed classification of connotative components of meaning).

The words of different languages which are similar or identical in lexical meaning, especially in the denotational meaning are termed correlated words. The wording of the habitual question of English learners, e.g. “What is the English for стол?”, and the answer “The English for стол is ‘table’” also shows that we take the words table стол to be correlated. Semantic correlation, however, is not to be interpreted as semantic identity. From what was said about the arbitrariness of the sound-form of words and complexity of their semantic structure, it can be inferred that one-to-one correspondence between the semantic structure of correlated polysemantic words in different languages is scarcely possible.⁵

Arbitrariness of linguistic signs implies that one cannot deduce from the sound-form of a word the meaning or meanings it possesses. Languages differ not only in the sound-form of words; their systems of meanings are also different. It follows that the semantic structures of correlated words of two different languages cannot be coextensive, i.e. can never “cover each other”. A careful analysis

⁵See ‘Semasiology’, §1, p.13.

invariably shows that semantic relationship between correlated words, especially polysemantic words is very complex.

The actual meanings of polysemantic words and their arrangement in the semantic structure of correlated words in different languages may be altogether different. This may be seen by comparing the semantic structure of correlated polysemantic words in English and in Russian. As a rule it is only the central meaning that is to a great extent identical, all other meanings or the majority of meanings usually differ. If we compare, e.g., the nine meanings of the English word *table* and the meanings of the Russian word *стол*, we shall easily observe not only the difference in the arrangement and the number of meanings making up their respective semantic structures, but also the difference in the individual meanings that may, at first sight, appear similar.

Table	стол
1. a piece of furniture	1. предмет обстановки (сидеть за столом)
2. the person seated at a table	2. Ср. арх. застолица
3. the food put on a table, meals; cooking	3. пища (подаваемая на стол), еда
Note: This meaning is rare in Modern English. Usually the word <i>board</i> (or <i>cooking</i>) is used.	Note: Commonly used, stylistically neutral.
(Cf. <i>board and lodging</i> , plain cooking)	(стол и квартира, простой, сытный, вегетарианский стол).
4. a flat slab of stone or board.	4. Ср. плита

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 5. slabs of stone (with words written on them or cut into them) | 5. Ср. скрижали |
| 6. Bibl. Words cut into slabs of stone (the ten tables) | 6. Ср. заповедь |
| 7. an orderly arrangement of facts, figures, etc. | 7. Ср. таблица |
| 8. part of a machine-tool | 8. Ср. планшайба |
| 9. a level area, plateau | 9. Ср. плато |

As can be seen from the above, only of the meanings and namely the central meaning 'a piece of furniture' may be described as identical. The denotational meaning 'the food put on the table' although existing in the word of both languages has different connotational components in each of them. The whole of the semantic structure of these words is altogether different. The difference is still more pronounced if we consider all the meanings of the Russian word *стол*, e.g. 'department, section, bureau' (cf. *адресный стол*, *стол заказов*) not to be found in the semantic structure of the word table.

Words identical in sound-form but different in meanings are traditionally termed homonyms.

Modern English is exceptionally rich in homonymous words and word-forms. It is held that languages where short words abound have more homonyms than those where longer words are prevalent. Therefore it is sometimes suggested that abundance of homonyms in Modern English is to be accounted for by the monosyllabic structure of the commonly used English words.⁶

⁶Not only words but other linguistic units may be homonymous. Here, however, we are concerned with the homonymy of words and word-forms only, so we shall not touch upon the problem of homonymous affixes or homonymous phrases.

When analyzing different cases of and homonymy we find that some words are homonymous in all their forms, i.e. we observe full homonymy of the paradigms of two or more different words, e.g., in **seal**₁ – ‘a sea animal’ and **seal**₂ – ‘a design printed on paper by means of a stamp’. The paradigm “seal, seal’s, seals, seals” is identical for both of them and gives no indication of whether it is **seal**₁ or **seal**₂ that we are analyzing. In other cases, e.g. **seal**₁ – ‘a sea animal’ and (to) seal, - ‘to close tightly’, we see that although some individual word-forms are homonymous, the whole of the paradigm is not identical. Compare, for instance, the paradigms: **seal**₁(to) **seal**₃

Seal	seal
Seal’s	seals
Seals	sealed
Seals’	sealing, etc.

It is easily observed that only some of the word-forms (e.g. seal, seals, etc.) are homonymous, whereas others (e.g. sealed, sealing) are not. In such cases we cannot speak of homonymous words but only of homonymy of individual word-forms or partial homonymy. This is true of number of other cases, e.g. compare find [faɪnd], found [faʊnd], found [faʊnd], and founded [ˈfaʊndɪd], founded [ˈfaʊndɪd]; know [nou], knows [nouz], knew [nju:], and on [nou]; nose [nouz], noses [ˈnouzɪs]; new [nju:] in which partial homonymy is observed.

Most of lexical items in English are polysematic. Michael Breat: “Polysemy is a semantic universal”.

“The alternative to it is quite unthinkable: it would mean that we would have to store in our brains a tremendous stock of words with separate names for any possible subject we might wish to talk about. It would also mean that there would be no metaphor & that language would be robbed of much of its expressiveness & flexibility.”

Urban: “The double reference of verbal signs is precisely what makes language an instrument of knowing”.

Ex.:

- - **family** – She lost both of her parents.
- - **parent** – Envy is the parent of all evils.
- My family comes from Scotland.

Ex.:

- a lorry
- a loudspeaker

In case of polysemy, we deal with modification of the content plane. Different meanings of one & the same word are closely interrelated. From what has been said above about polysemantic words, it should become clear that the semantic structure of a polysemantic word presents a system within which all its constituent meanings are held together by logical associations. In most cases, the function of the arrangement and the unity is determined by one of the meanings.

Fire, n:

1. Flame
2. An instance of destructive burning: a forest fire
3. Burning material in a stove, fireplace: There is a fire in the next room.
A camp fire.
4. The shooting of guns: to open (cease) fire.
5. Strong feeling, passion, and enthusiasm: a speech lacking fire.

If this meaning happens to disappear from word's semantic structure, associations between the rests of the meanings may be severed; the semantic structure loses its unity and falls into two or more parts which then become accepted as independent lexical units.

Let us consider the history of three homonyms:

board, n- a long and thin piece of timber

board, ⁷n- daily meals, esp. as provided for pay, e.g. *room and board*

board, n- an official group of persons who direct or supervise some activity, e.g. *a board of directors*.

It is clear that the meanings of these three words are in no way associated with one another. Yet, most larger dictionaries still enter a meaning of *board* that once held together all these other meanings ‘a table’. It developed from the meaning ‘a piece of timber’ by transference based on contiguity (association of an object and the material from which it is made). The meanings ‘meals’ and ‘an official group of persons’ developed from the meaning ‘table’, also by transference based on contiguity: meals are easily associated with a table on which they are served; an official group of people in authority are also liked to discuss their business round a table.

Nowadays, however, the item of the furniture, on which meals are served and round which boards of directors meet, is no longer denoted by the word *board* but by the French Norman borrowing *table*, and *board* in this meaning, though still registered by some dictionaries, can very well be marked as archaic as it is no longer used in common speech. That is why, with the intrusion of the borrowed *table*, the word *board* actually lost its corresponding meaning. But it was just that meaning which served as a link to hold together the rest of the constituent parts of the word’s semantic structure. With its diminished role as an element of communication, its role in the semantic structure was also weakened. The speakers almost forgot that *board* had ever been associated with any item of furniture, nor could they associate the notions of meals or of a responsible committee with a long thin piece of timber (which is the oldest meaning of *board*). Consequently, the semantic structure of *board* was split into three units.

⁷Arbekova T.I. “Lexicology of English language”. Moscow 1977

Historically all three nouns originate from the same verb with the meaning of 'to jump, to leap' (O.E. *springan*), so that the meaning of the first homonym is the oldest. The meanings of the second and third homonyms were originally based on metaphor. At the head of a stream the water sometimes leaps up out of the earth, so that metaphorically such a place could well be described as a leap. On the other hand, the season of the year following winter could be poetically defined as a leap from the darkness and cold into sunlight and life. Such metaphors are typical enough of Old English and Middle English semantic transferences but not so characteristic of modern mental and linguistic processes. The poetic associations that lay in the basis of the semantic shifts described above have long since been forgotten, and an attempt to reestablish the lost links may well seem far-fetched. It is just the near-impossibility of establishing such links that seems to support the claim for homonymy and not for polysemy with these three words.

It should be stressed, however, that split of the polysemy as a source of homonyms is not accepted by all scholars. It is really difficult sometimes to decide whether a certain word has or has not been subject to the split of the semantic structure and whether we are dealing with different meanings of the same word or with homonyms, for the criteria are subjective and imprecise. The imprecision is recorded in the data of different dictionaries, which often contradict each other on this very issue, so that *board* is represented as two homonyms in Professor V.K.Muller's dictionary, as three homonyms in Professor V.D.Arakin's and as one and the same word in Hornby's dictionary.

Spring also receives different treatment. V.K.Muller's and Hornby's dictionaries acknowledge but two homonyms:

- I. a season of the year;
- II. a) the act of springing, a leap,
b) a place where a stream of water comes up out of the earth;

and some other meanings, whereas V.D.Arakin's dictionary presents the three homonyms as given above.

Polysemy viewed diachronically is a historical change in the semantic structure of the word resulting in disappearance of some meanings (or) and in new meanings being added to the ones already existing and also in the rearrangement of these meanings in its semantic structure. Polysemy viewed synchronically is understood as coexistence of the various meanings of the same word at a certain historical period and the arrangement of these meanings in the semantic structure of the word.

The concepts of central (basic) and marginal (minor) meanings may be interpreted in terms of their relative frequency in speech. The meaning having the highest frequency is usually the one representative of the semantic structure of the word, i.e. synchronically its central (basic) meaning.

As the semantic structure is never static the relationship between the diachronic and synchronic evaluation of the individual meanings of the same word may be different in different periods of the historical development of language.

The semantic structure of polysemantic words is not homogenous as far as the status of individual meanings is concerned. Some meaning (or meanings) is representative of the word in isolation, others are perceived only in certain contexts.

The whole of the semantic structure of correlated polysemantic words of different languages can never be identical. Words are felt as correlated if their basic (central) meanings coincide.

1.2. Semantic field: definition and its usage

In linguistics, a **semantic field** is a set of words grouped semantically (that is, by meaning), referring to a specific subject. The term is also used in

other academic disciplines, such as anthropology, computational semiotics, and technical exegesis.

Brinton defines "semantic field" or "semantic domain" and relates the linguistic concept to hyponymy:

"Related to the concept of hyponymy, but more loosely defined, is the notion of a semantic field or domain. A semantic field denotes a segment of reality symbolized by a set of related words. The words in a semantic field share a common semantic property."

A general and intuitive description is that words in a semantic field are not necessarily synonymous, but are all used to talk about the same general phenomenon. Synonymy requires the sharing of a sememe or seme, but the semantic field is a larger area surrounding those. A meaning of a word is dependent partly on its relation to other words in the same conceptual area. The kinds of semantic fields vary from culture to culture and anthropologists use them to study belief systems and reasoning across cultural groups.

Andersen identifies the traditional usage of "semantic field" theory as:

"Traditionally, semantic fields have been used for comparing the lexical structure of different languages and different states of the same language."

The origin of the field theory of semantics is the lexical field theory introduced by Jost Trier in the 1930s, although according to John Lyons it has historical roots in the ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt and Johann Gottfried Herder. In the 1960s Stephen Ullmann saw semantic fields as crystallising and perpetuating the values of society. For John Lyons in the 1970s words related in any sense belonged to the same semantic field, and the semantic field was simply a lexical category, which he described as a **lexical field**. Lyons emphasised the distinction between semantic fields and semantic networks.^[10] In the 1980s Eva Kittay developed a semantic field theory of metaphor. This approach is based on the idea that the items in a semantic field have specific relations to other items in

the same field, and that a metaphor works by re-ordering the relations of a field by mapping them on to the existing relations of another field. Sue Atkins and Charles J. Fillmore in the 1990s proposed frame semantics as an alternative to semantic field theory.

The semantic field of a given word shifts over time. For example, the English word "man" used to mean "human being" exclusively, while today it predominantly means "adult male," but its semantic field still extends in some uses to the generic "human".

Overlapping semantic fields are problematic, especially in translation. Words that have multiple meanings (called polysemous words) are often untranslatable, especially with all their connotations. Such words are frequently loaned instead of translated. Examples include "chivalry" (literally "horsemanship," related to "cavalry"), "dharma" (literally, "support"), and "taboo."

Semantic field theory has informed the discourse of Anthropology as Ingold relates:

"Semiology is not, of course, the same as semantics. Semiology is based on the idea that signs have meaning in relation to each other, such that a whole society is made up of relationally held meanings. But semantic fields do not stand in relations of opposition to each other, nor do they derive their distinctiveness in this way, nor indeed are they securely bounded at all. Rather, semantic fields are constantly flowing into each other. I may define a field of religion, but it soon becomes that of ethnic identity and then of politics and selfhood, and so on. In the very act of specifying semantic fields, people engage in an act of closure whereby they become conscious of what they have excluded and what they must therefore include."

The arrangement of words (or lexemes) into groups (or *fields*) on the basis of an element of shared meaning. Also called *lexical field analysis*.

"There is no set of agreed criteria for establishing **semantic fields**," say Howard Jackson and Etienne⁸ZéAmvela, "though a 'common component' of meaning might be one".

Although the terms *lexical field* and *semantic field* are usually used interchangeably, Siegfried Wyler makes this distinction: a lexical field is "a structure formed by lexemes" while a semantic field is "the underlying meaning which finds expression in lexemes".

Examples and Observations:

- "A lexical field is a set of lexemes that are used to talk about a defined area of experience; Lehrer, for example, has an extensive discussion of the field of 'cooking' terms. A **lexical field analysis** will attempt to establish the lexemes that are available in the vocabulary for talking about the area under investigation and then propose how they differ from each other in meaning and use. Such an analysis begins to show how the vocabulary as a whole is structured, and more so when individual lexical fields are brought into relationship with each other. There is no prescribed or agreed method for determining what constitutes a lexical field; each scholar must draw their own boundaries and establish their own criteria. Much work still needs to be undertaken in researching this approach to vocabulary. Lexical field analysis is reflected in dictionaries that take a 'topical' or 'thematic' approach to presenting and describing words."⁹

- **Semantic Taggers**

"The semantic tagger assigns words to the broad semantic field in which they occur in a given example. This process entails assigning a unique semantic field code to a polysemous word to reflect its meaning in the context in which it occurs. Hence, to use a hackneyed example, in the utterance 'I robbed the bank' one would want *bank* to be placed in the semantic field of *financial institution* rather

⁸ZéAmvela, *Words, Meaning and Vocabulary*, 2000.

⁹Howard Jackson, *Lexicography: An Introduction*. Routledge, 2002

than *location* in this example. If the utterance were 'I sat on the river bank and fed the ducks,' we would want the reverse decision."¹⁰

Conceptual Domains and Semantic Field

"When analyzing a set of lexical items, linguist Anna Wierzbicka does not just examine semantic information She also pays attention to the syntactic patterns displayed by the linguistic items, and furthermore orders the semantic information in more encompassing scripts or frames, which may in turn be linked to more general cultural scripts which have to do with norms of behavior. She therefore offers an explicit and systematic version of the qualitative method of analysis for finding a close equivalent of conceptual domains.

"This type of analysis may be compared with **semantic field analysis** by scholars such as Kittay, who proposes a distinction between lexical fields and content domains. As Kittay writes: 'A content domain is identifiable but not exhausted by a lexical field'. In other words, lexical fields can provide an initial point of entry into content domains (or conceptual domains). Yet their analysis does not provide a full view of conceptual domains, and this is not what is claimed by Wierzbicka and her associates either. As is aptly pointed out by Kittay, 'A content domain may be identified and not yet articulated by a lexical field, GS,' which is precisely what may happen by means of novel metaphor."¹¹

¹⁰Tony McEnery, *Swearing in English: Bad Language, Purity and Power from 1586 to the Present*. Routledge, 2006

¹¹Gerard Steen, *Finding Metaphor in Grammar and Usage: A Methodological Analysis of Theory and Research*. John Benjamins, 2007

Chapter II Lexical and Stylistic Analysis of the Semantic Field of “Religion”

2.1. Diachronic Semantics Analysis of the word “GOD”

Linguistics as the key to study and redefine our perspective about language has important role in the study of meaning which is called linguistic semantics (Lyons, 1932:12). Semantics is one aspect that is needed for the people who wants to be a good researcher, Leech (1977: ix) states that semantics as the study of meaning is the central of study about communication.

Moreover, meaning is needed for teaching and learning process of linguistics. As the linguist, the researcher admits that meanings bring crucial impact on his study, the study or research will go successfully at the time the researcher understand the meaning well. The important the study in the field of meaning prevent the fake data included on this research, especially related with language use in our daily activity.

The researcher found the problem that appears in newspaper in *JawaPoson* January 16, 2010. The problem appears when the kingdom of Malaysia had assumed that the word “GOD” in Christian religion is the same with the name of God of Islamic religion. The perspective Kingdom of Malaysia firstly appears based on the conflict of Lawrence Andrew Jr. in *Herald Magazine* since 1992 in the past, the magazine called the word “GOD” as the same as God in Islamic religion. Even the word God is the same, but some translations of the main source of *Helard magazine* which is known as Bible mentioned different word of God. An abnormal phenomenon above needs the solution to reveal the real in reality. In this case, the researcher takes lexical meaning, lexical relation and diachronic field to reveal the real meaning and its history about word of God.

The researcher takes a point of historical study to study and detect about the beginning of the word and the development of meaning to reveal the problems that appears on both religions. Related with the word of “GOD”, the researcher uses the diachronic study to detect the history word of God. This research helps anyone

who wants to know the history of God. To know the truth meaning and the relation of the meaning that appears in the kingdom of Malaysia the researcher try to do the best to solve the problem.

Through my perspective that I learn in the book of W. Terrence Gordon, historical study means the method that Saussure gives to answer the problem that appears in the historical field. Saussure assumed that the problem of historical study has nearly forgotten by the linguist in Saussure period. This problem is proved when the linguist of Saussure period cannot answer the truth meaning of linguistic itself. They forget that every single thing of science included language walked through the time. It was important and to be the reasons not to forget about the History (Gordon, 1996:16).

After the data had been obtained from the data sources, they are analyzed in the following steps:

First of all, the researcher classifies the data into two categories in accordance with the number of the duration of the data sources, namely Old Testament and New Testament in the term of the word God. The data of each category are presented, analyzed, and concluded. For the next, the researcher tries to comprehend the data found (in related with the word God) with the related literature that appears in the first Holly Bible written in IBRANIAN language and the Holy Qur'an.

Comprehending the data of Holy Bible and Holy Qur'an means the meaning of related text in the word God is compared with the fact used in Holy Qur'an. The cross meaning of both Holy Books is relevant because, both religion is the same in term of the root religion that comes from Prophet Ibrahim, and the Unitarian systems (the narration of the story in the past, education, and perception are nearly the same). After the whole categories have already been presented, analyzed, and concluded, the researcher makes tentative conclusions. After consulting into the informants, the researcher makes truth conclusions

The data of this research were taken from Old Testament and New Testament. The data are classified into two categories. The first category is the data of Old Testament and for the second category is the data of New Testament.

The Data Analysis from the First Category

The first data were taken from the text of the translation of Old Testament which was written in the holy book and software version (Alkitab Electronic). For the next, the data of Old Testament will be compared with the text of New Testament to know the differences between the Old Testament and New Testament in terms of the word "GOD".

There are two thousand eight hundred seventy nine verses found related to the word "GOD". The researcher uses three examples to represent the data found. This example is taken from the first verse in Old Testament. For the next, the researcher chooses the word that has the related meaning with the word God. For the last example, the researcher uses the improvement of the word God in Old Testament. Actually, the researcher has chosen those three examples because the improvement of the word God happened in Old Testament.

Verse one in Old Testament:

Genesis, 1:1

*"In the beginning **God** created the heaven and the earth", (Genesis, 1:1)"*

The verse above tells about God created the heaven and the earth. It should be the highest thing who has a power creates the heaven and the world. The thing that created the heaven and the earth was God. The type of lexical relation of the word God in this verse is classified into Denotative meaning of God. It is proved when the script of Genesis 1:1 that written in Old Greek language mention the word Elohim as the creatures of the heaven and the earth.

*"BERE"SYIT BARA" „**ELOHIM** „ET HASYAMAYIM VE"ET HA"ARETS (Genesis, 1:1)"*

The word "Elohim" is the form of God before being translated into the English Language. In other Holly Bible, the word God use "Yahweh". The history of the word Yahweh and Elohim is explained by Karen Armstrong in her book The History of God. She said about the beginning of the word God appeared around eight century BC. There are two early writers of Biblical English that mention the word God with the word "Yahweh" and "Elohim". The word "Yahweh" was written

by the writers in initial “J”, another writer in initial “E” mentioned the word God as “*Elohim*”. The name of God as “*Yahweh*” and “*Elohim*” based on the strength of the territory of Israel Kingdom. Israel in Abraham age called *Cana’an*. *Cana’an* around eight century BC separated into two big kingdoms. “J” wrote the bible in south kingdom and “E” wrote in north kingdom. Both names of God are possibly the God of Abraham called “El” as the greatest lord in *Cana’an*. In other place “El” called “*El Eliyon*” the highest Lord of the Lord in *Cana’an*(Amstrong, 1993:39).

The researcher assumed about the difference word of Yahweh and Elohim is caused by the different geographical aspect. Geographical aspect builds a reasons about the word Yahweh and Elohim creates. The reason means the connection that reveal the fact of the difference of the word Yahweh and Elohim.

This phenomenon is studied in the field of synchronic study. Synchronic study has important point in the study of the word God. The importance of synchronic study is to be data that has interaction of logic and Psychology which has connection in relations of terms in one system. This synchronic study is to be data for Diachronic study to complete the data of the history of language (Gordon, 1996: 36).

Because the researcher did not have enough data used in synchronic study, the researcher focuses on the field of Diachronic study. Diachronic study of the word God has begun with the word Elohim and Yahweh as the first word used in Bible.

The word *Elohim* is the same with the word “*El*”, “*El- Eliyon*” and “*El-Shaddai*”. The word El is used by Ibrahim to call his God. El is known as the highest God in Canaan. Ibrahim also used El-Sadai and El-Eliyon (the greatest God) as the other names of God used in Ibranian language (Amstrong, 41). The word “*El Eliyon*” is the same as the Arabic word “*Al-Alyyu*” (the highest). The meaning of the Highest is the same as Abraham’s God. The lord in Abraham language as “El” is currently attached to the name of the servant of God as Israel (means the servant of God), Isma-El, Samu-El, Isra-El, and many others(Amstrong, 41). The word Al-alyyu also appear on the holy book namely Holly Qur’an as one of the name of God which known as “*Asm’ulHusna*”.

The Unitarian between Holy Bible and Holy Qur'an is proved when the God of Islamic religion called ALLOH. The word Alloh is come from "*Ilah*" which means God. The word "*Ilah*" has definition God in general. General means another name of God, the example in another word is the word "human". The word human is the general word of the word Ahmad as a part of human itself. The grammatical meaning of general in Arabic language called "*Nakiroh*" (General). After that, to make the word "*Ilah*" is different from the others, because the characteristics of God are not the same as others, so the word "*Al*" is to specify the word "*Ilah*". The position of the character of the word "*Al*" in Arabic language has specific meaning (*Ma'rifat*).

The character of God in Old Testament has the same meaning as God in Islamic religion. In Islam the first verse that relegated to the last prophet gives the definition of the God:

Read: in the name of the Lord who created (Al-A'laq (Embryo):1)

The researcher assumed that the similar definition of God is because the same source of Abraham religion as the father of both Islamic and Christian religion. That is the reason why the religion in the world categorized as two concentrations: Reveal and Non-Reveal Religion. Islamic and Christian are included into Reveal religion because both Islamic and Christian religion has revelation from the God as The Holy Bible for Christian religion and The Holy Qur'an for Islamic religion.

The archeologist Harnack and Brunner agree that Islamic and Christian religions are Unitarian (a branch of Christian religion who does not behave TRINITY). There are many similarities about the story in Islamic and Christian perspective; it means the similarities between Koran and Bible are not found in the whole verse.

Dr.MauriceBucaille in his book *La Bible, Le Coran et la Science* (1976), said that Holy Bible and Holy Qur'an has the same history about the beginning of Jesus. The genesis of Jesus which comes from the process of *parthenogenesis*, it is kind of the outgrown of baby inside of uterus beyond the logic of humanity. The ovum doesn't need spermatozoa to create an embryo that will be a baby. The creature of Jesus (Isa) is the same as Adam creature which is born with *parthenogenesis*. Old

Testament explains about Adam creatures that is created with the explanation that the creation of first human is not coming from the holly thing as God, but with Adam or Adamah (Ground). This explanation is nearly the same in the explanation in Holly Qur'an. In the verse 3: 59, Holly Qur'an assumed that the creation of Adam is come from ground. In addition, in Holly Qur'an mention the prophet Isa or know as Yesus has the same creation with Adam.

If we conclude kinds of word God in the beginning sub disciplinary of this chapter, the word "God" comes from the word "*El*", "*El Eliyon*", and "*Elohim*". Those changes are not disciplinary influence the meaning of every single word that contains the sound change. The meanings are the same, but the sound and the time of each word are not the same. There is no specification of the way the word "*El*", "*El Eliyon*", and "*Elohim*" improves. Saussure gives an explanation of this phenomenon. He said that there is no way to define in certain rule about a language. Factors of physiologist and psychologist make an interaction to decide the improvement of the word God.

Verse two in Old Testament:

Genesis 2:

2.1 Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.

2.2 And on the seventh day **God** ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made.

2.3 And **God** blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which **God** created and made.

2.4 These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens,

2.5 And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the LORD God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground.

2.6 But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.

2.7 And the **LORD God** formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

The key of the verses above focuses on the verse of Genesis, 2:4,

*“These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that **the Lord God** made the earth and the heavens”,* (Genesis, 2:4).

The Word God in Genesis 2:4 have an addition word “Lord”. The word “Lord God” is having the same meaning as the God. The function of the word “Lord” is to strengthen the characteristic of God who is able to create the heaven and the earth. The word “Lord God” means nothing in entire world is the same with God.

The use of word Lord begins with that verse (Genesis, 2:4). The beginning of Bible the word God actually uses the word God itself, but in the following verse after the verse of Genesis, 2:4, the use of the word God improves into the word “Lord”. It means the word Lord is the replacement of the word God. This phenomenon will be described into the verse below;

Verse Three

Genesis 4

4:1 And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the **LORD**.

4:2 And she again bare his brother Abel. And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground.

4:3 And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the **LORD**.

4:4 And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the **LORD** had respect unto Abel and to his offering:

4:5 But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respected. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell.

4:6 And the **LORD** said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen?

4:7 If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.

4:8 And Cain talked with Abel his brother: and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him.

4:9 And the **LORD** said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not: Am I my brother's keeper?

4:10 And he said, What hast thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground.

4:11 And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand;

4:12 When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.

4:13 And Cain said unto the **LORD**, My punishment is greater than I can bear.

4:14 Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth; and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me.

4:15 And the **LORD** said unto him, therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And the **LORD** set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him.

4:16 And Cain went out from the presence of the **LORD**, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden.

4:17 And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch.

4:18 And unto Enoch was born Irad: and Irad begat Mehujael: and Mehujael begat Methusael: and Methusael begat Lamech.

4:19 And Lamech took unto him two wives: the name of the one was Adah, and the name of the other Zillah.

4:20 And Adah bare Jabal: he was the father of such as dwell in tents, and of such as have cattle.

4:21 And his brother's name was Jubal: he was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ.

4:22 And Zillah, she also bare Tubalcain, an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron: and the sister of Tubalcain was Naamah.

4:23 And Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, Hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech: for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt.

4:24 If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold.

4:25 And Adam knew his wife again; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew.

4:26 And to Seth, to him also there was born a son; and he called his name Enos: then began men to call upon the name of the **LORD**.

In this verse, the context tells about the story about the first human created by the God, but the difference with the previous verse is the diction of the word God with the word “Lord”. The word Lord replaces the word God. It is proved when the meaning of the word Lord occupies the word God in the verse above. It means, the word Lord has different form, but having the same meaning or nearly the same. This phenomenon is called Synonym.

This phenomenon is proved when the root of the word Lord is not the same with the word God. The word Lord comes from the word *loaf* and *keeper*. This word appears in halweared. The complexity of the internal word disappears as the phonetics change. The Phonetic change in diachronic study scraped the word into the new component that is able to identify.

The data analysis from the second category

There are one hundred two thousand forty verse found related with the word “GOD” in New Testament. But, the researcher uses two examples to represent the data found.

Verse One in New Testament:

*“And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called **theSon of God**”* (Mathew, 1:35).

Mathew becomes the first verse of New Testament, because Mathew is the continuation of the Old Testament. In the verse above, the word God appears with the word “The Son of”. The word “The Son of God” means Isa. The word Isa comes from Aram language. Christian religion usually called Isa as Jesus. In Arabic language the word Isa was known as *Yasu' al-Masih*.

In the New Testament, the word God appears in few words(one hundred two thousand forty word) than the word God that appears in Old Testament (two thousand eight hundred seventy nine word). It means that the word God is replaced with the other word that has similar meaning with the word God. The concreteness of the word God is replace into the abstract one as Saussure said in the previous study on this research. To prove this theory, the researcher uses the verse in New Testament at the verse of Mathew, 1:35. The researchers choose this verse because the word God is having new related word that known as “Son of God”. The meaning word “Son of God” is known as “Jesus”.

Verse two in New Testament:

20:1 The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulcher, and see the stone taken away from the sepulcher.

20:2 Then she rennet, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and said unto them, They have taken away the **LORD** out of the sepulcher, and we know not where they have laid him.

20:3 Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulcher.

20:4 So they ran both together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulcher.

20:5 And he stooping down, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in.

20:6 Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulcher, and see the linen clothes lie,

20:7 And the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself.

20:8 Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulcher, and he saw, and believed.

20:9 For as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead.

20:10 Then the disciples went away again unto their own home.

20:11 But Mary stood without at the sepulcher weeping: and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulcher,

20:12 And seethe two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain.

20:13 And they say unto her, Woman, why weepiest thou? She said unto them, because they have taken away my **LORD**, and I know not where they have laid him.

20:14 And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus.

20:15 Jesus said unto her, Woman, why weepiest thou? Whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, said unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.

20:16 Jesus said unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and said unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master.

20:17 Jesus said unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my **Father**, and your **Father**; and to **my God, and your God**.

20:18 Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the **LORD**, and that he had spoken these things unto her.

20:19 Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and said unto them, Peace be unto you.

20:20 And when he had so said, he showed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the **LORD**.

20:21 Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my **Father** hath sent me, even so send I you.

20:22 And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost:

20:23 Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.

20:24 But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came.

20:25 The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the **LORD**. But he said unto them, except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.

20:26 And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came **Jesus**, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you.

20:27 Then said he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.

20:28 And Thomas answered and said unto him, **My LORD and my God**.

20:29 Jesus said unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.

20:30 And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book:

20:31 But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.

In those verses, the word God is having new transformation of word again. Because of the previous verse tells about the word “Son of God” so in this verse the Word God transforms into the word “Father” as the father of the “Son of God”. This assumption is approved when the word “Father” followed by the word “My God, and Your God”.

*“Jesus said unto her, touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my **Father**, and your **Father**; and to **my God, and your God**”(Johannes, 20:17).*

In here the word God, Father, and Lord belong to the God, but in the verse of Johannes 20: 28; there are inconsistent term of using the word “**My LORD and my God**”. The use of the word God and Lord firstly appear in the form of Great thing that created the entire world. The use of word God that belongs to Jesus appears in 3th Century, when the group of the strongest politic win the vote of Jesus is God. The strongest politician at that time called Anastasia and the opponent is Arian (the cluster who does not agree about the Jesus as a God). After the new God appears, the vote that called Console 325 born Binaritarian; Father and Son, and followed with the trinity (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit). (A. Marconi, 2008:Marconi@yahoo.com).

The researcher assumed that trinity of Christian was not the first appears in the world. There are similar religion appears before the Trinity of Christian. For example, the perception of ancient Egypt: Isis-Osiris-Horus. Another example of the trinity of Christian is the Persian Mithraism; is about the God who goes down to the earth. The god saves the people, but the God turned into the ox and the God was tortured until die to redeem the sin of human.

An inconsistent of trinity was not a secret anymore. It was proofed when the root of Christian Religion as Ibrahim Religion does not use three God for his entire live. The other resources from Holy Qur'an as

*“And Thomas answered and said unto him, **My LORD and my God**”, (Johannes, 20:28)*

This verse appears in the middle of the verse of Johannes. As we know this verse tells about the death of the “Jesus”. Thomas as the friends of Jesus said into Jesus with the word **My LORD and my God**. It means that the word “**My LORD and my God**” belongs to Jesus as the God. To prove of this analysis, the previous verse uses the word “Father” as the Lord God that appears in the previous verse.

The researcher did not the truth of the differences between the God which appears in Old Testament and The God which mention in this verse. The ambiguity of meaning and lexical relation indicate the arbitrariness of sign and the abstractness of the sign itself trough the time. The Ambiguity of the word my Lord and my God because this word was not belong to the God who create the entire world, but it's belongs to the Son of God namely Jesus. The word my Lord and my God indicate that there are two different meaning of the word God and Lord. The first God belongs to the God that used in Old Testament and The God that belongs to the New Testament. The abstract meaning of the word God is categories homonym as the part of Ambiguity. Homonym is the word that has more than one meaning. In this case, the word Lord and God has two meaning as the discussion above.

Discussion

After presenting and analyzing the data from the Bible, the researcher discusses the whole data to answer the research problems stated in the previous chapter. The researcher finds out the improvement of the meaning in the word God between Old Testament and New Testament. The researcher discuss about what lexical meanings and lexical relation are developed for the word of "GOD" in the Old Testament and New Testament, and how the meaning of "GOD" is developed in the Bible.

As Saussure said about the meaning in language is defined into two categories; system and speech. The system in language as analyzed with diachronic and synchronic study. The synchronic study is not discuss in this research deeply, because the focus of this research is the study about diachronic. The surface explanation about synchronic is because the relation of diachronic and synchronic study is difficult to differentiate and related each other. It is about the root of the word God that is begun with the word "*El*", "*Eliyon*", *Elohim*, and "*Yahweh*". The word "*El*" until the word "*Elohim*" has the same root, but the word "*Yahweh*" has different root. This phenomenon is in term of synchronic study, it is because the word "*Elohim*" and "*Yahweh*" produced in the same time but in different place.

The study about time is in the term of diachronic study that appears in the word “*El*”, “*Eliyon*”, *Elohim*, *ilahun*, *Al-ilah*, and *Alloh*. Saussure gives an opinion about this phenomenon. A linear system of internal word *El* to *El-liyon-lohim* is not able to stand alone. So, it is not only a word that is added into the word *El* which can be defined as the word that has meaning God. It has a rule that interact between association of word and linear system of internal word. The other linear systems are a linear system of meaning. The example is the word sweater, slipper, stapler, etc. is having the same linear system but the meaning is not the same as the word “*El*”, “*Eliyon*”, and *Elohim*”. A linear system and association of meaning creates a system limit the arbitrariness of the sign in language. As Saussure said about the limit arbitrariness creates sign that signified. The more arbitrary of the word is more difficult to understand.

An entity of the concrete becomes an abstract. But, there are no abstractions of the word without any concrete element that has function as foundation of that abstraction. The example of this word is the word God, Lord God, Lord, Son of God, My Lord, My God. The concreteness of the word God is still used in entire change of the word God but, the problem had been found in the last two word (My lord, My God) this word belongs to the Son of God that known as Jesus. This phenomenon makes a new meaning of the word God that mention in the first verse in Old Testament.

The researcher has gotten many lessons during the research on lexical meaning in the word of God. For the researcher, there is not any arbitrariness of the language in this word. There are complex systems in accordance with the speakers of the language. For example, the word bird-cage, because of the cage created for the bird. But, for the word bird itself, it is difficult to be analyzed. The deep understanding about the history of words need more research to know the real meaning of the word and a logic system of the meaning of the word that reflects in social term.

1 Lexical meaning for the word God

After conducting this research, there are two main points concerning to this research question. The first point, answering the first question, the researcher describe the development of lexical meaning in the word God is defined into two categorize, the first categorize is the use of the word God in general meaning as the word Lord. For other categorize is the use of word God into the particular meaning as the word Lord God, Son of God and etc.

The development of meaning in New Testament has begun with the use of the word “Lord”. The word Lord means the other word of mentioning the word God. After that, the word Lord followed by the word “Lord God”. The word Lord God has the same meaning of God, but the problem is the next word which has mentioning the word “God” with the word “Son”. The word Son of God has different meaning with the word God. The word of Son of God caused ambiguity of mentioning the word God and Son of God. It proved when the use of the word Son of God has the same word with the word God in Old Testament (Lord and God: Johannes 20:28).

2 The kind of lexical relations used in the word of God

The word God in Old Testament use Denotative meaning. For the other word as Lord and Lord God include on synonym. For about the word Lord and God that belongs to Son of God in New Testament (Johannes 20:28) was categorized as Homonym.

3 The way the meaning of the word God has developed

The way of the word God improve is the concrete of the word God becomes the abstract one. The concrete means there is nothing word that reflect the word god. It proved in the beginning of the verse genesis, 1; 1. Abstract means the word god can be described into another word, for example the word Lord, Lord God, and Son of God etc.

The researcher hopes this research would give some advantages for the further researchers who concern in studying in the same field. For the second, hopefully the researcher give some contribution about the history of god, especially in term of religion, and for the hidden massage that the researcher use to conclude the

anomaly phenomenon depends on the reader. For the last, hopefully there are many researchers that interact about this research and continue the research deeply.

Conclusion

An important issue that needs to be discussed is the generalizability of the results from written to spoken language. Although we cannot offer definitive arguments on this point, we can cite some reasons why the result might underestimate the difference between same and different class of words in speech. Having analyzed the theoretical and practical material used for fulfilling the tasks of my course paper, we have come to the conclusions that there are several problematic questions in the field of semasiology which are continuously in the focus of attention of language scholars.

Studying these problems, we have analyzed religion words as universal linguistic phenomena, reviewing the existing definitions of the religion words and their specific peculiarities.

An exact definition of any basic term is an easy task altogether. In the case of lexical meaning it becomes especially difficult due to the complexity of the process by which language and human conscience serve to reflect outward reality and to adapt it to human needs.

The definitions of lexical meaning have been attempted more than once in accordance with the main principles of different linguistic schools. The disciples of F. de Saussure consider meaning to be the relation between the object or notion named, and the name itself. Descriptive linguistics of the Bloomfieldian term defines the meaning as the situation in which the word is uttered. Both ways of approach afford no possibility of a further investigation of semantic problems in strictly linguistic terms, and therefore if taken as a bases of for general linguistic theory, give no insight onto the mechanism of meaning. Some of Bloomfields successors went so far as to exclude semaseology from linguistics on the ground that meaning could not be studied objectively and was not part of language but an aspect of the use to which language is put. This point of view was never generally accepted. The more general opinion is well revealed in R. Jakobson's pun. He said:

«Linguistics without meaning is meaningless.» In our country definitions given by the majority of authors, however different in detail, agree in one basic principle: They all point out that lexical meaning is the realization of the notion by means of definite language system. It has also been repeatedly stated that the plane of content in speech reflects the whole of human consciousness which comprises not only mental activity but emotions as well.

The notional content of a word is expressed by the denotative meaning (also referential or extensional meaning) which, as we shall see later, may be of two types, according to whether the word's function is significative or identifying (demonstrative). To denote, that is to serve as linguistic expression for a notion or an actually existing object referred to by a word. The term denotatum (PL. denotata) or referent means either a notion or an actually existing individual thing to which reference is made. The emotional content of the word is its capacity to evoke or directly express emotion. It is rendered by the emotional or expressive counterpart of meaning, also called emotive charge, intentional or affective connotations of words.

It is well known that the main and major component of the semantic structure of the word is its lexical meaning. But it is as well clear, that the content of the word consists not only of the aggregate of lexical meanings. The majority of the linguists admit that in the content of the word exists some additional meaning to add to its lexical meaning. Different linguists name this additional meaning in different terms: "emotive meaning", (I. V. Galperin), "connotative meaning" (E. S. Aznaurova) etc. this additional meaning also materializes a concept in the word but unlike lexical meaning, it does not have reference (соотносится с) to the feelings and emotions of the speaker towards these things or his emotions through a kind of evaluation. Some linguists (N. G. Comlev) think, that the stylistic content of the word shows itself only in the individual sphere of communication, expressing the subjective feelings and emotions of the speaker, and so consider the stylistic content an extra linguistic phenomena some linguists suppose, that the stylistic

meanings doesn't correlate with any objective notion or subject and so they consider the stylistic content of the word a subjective moment of the communication (V. A. Zveghintsev).

A large number of linguists refer the stylistic meaning to the objective linguistic essence (E. s. Aznaurov, A. A. Ufimtseva, M. D. Stepanov). They do it on the basis that, in any language there is a large group of words, in the semantic structure of which there are stylistic meanings, common to all bearers of the language. These meanings are fixed in most of the dictionaries and are the components of the semantic structure of the word as well as the lexical meanings of these words. They can be discovered by way of componential analysis in the form of semes. Semes are the smallest constituents, of the definition of a meaning fixed in the dictionaries. For example if we take the word gentleman, and study its semantic structure by means of componential analysis, we can discover the semes fine; "perfect; excellent of highest quality, best; So we can make conclusion that the word gentleman has in its semantic structure a positive evaluative meaning. If we take the adjective blatant and look at its definition we can find there the dominative semes "unpleasant", "repulsive", "offensive". Then we can see that this adjective has a negative emotional evaluative meaning. Both the emotional and the evaluative components of the meaning of the word are the properties of the semantic structure of the word and make the stylistic meaning of the word.

After conducting this research, there are two main points concerning to this research question. The first point, answering the first question, the researcher describe the development of lexical meaning in the word God is defined into two categorize, the first categorize is the use of the word God in general meaning as the word Lord. For other categorize is the use of word God into the particular meaning as the word Lord God, Son of God and etc.

The development of meaning in New Testament has begun with the use of the word "Lord". The word Lord means the other word of mentioning the word God. After that, the word Lord followed by the word "Lord God". The word Lord God

has the same meaning of God, but the problem is the next word which has mentioning the word “God” with the word “Son”. The word Son of God has different meaning with the word God. The word of Son of God caused ambiguity of mentioning the word God and Son of God. It proved when the use of the word Son of God has the same word with the word God in Old Testament (Lord and God: Johannes 20:28).

The word God in Old Testament use Denotative meaning. For the other word as Lord and Lord God include on synonym. For about the word Lord and God that belongs to Son of God in New Testament (Johannes 20:28) was categorized as Homonym.

The way of the word God improve is the concrete of the word God becomes the abstract one. The concrete means there is nothing word that reflect the word god. It proved in the beginning of the verse genesis, 1; 1. Abstract means the word god can be described into another word, for example the word Lord, Lord God, and Son of God etc.

The researcher hopes this research would give some advantages for the further researchers who concern in studying in the same field. For the second, hopefully the researcher give some contribution about the history of god, especially in term of religion, and for the hidden message that the researcher use to conclude the anomaly phenomenon depends on the reader. For the last, hopefully there are many researchers that interact about this research and continue the research deeply.

The list of used literature

1. Каримов И.А. Тарихий хотирасиз келажак йўқ. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон, 1999. – 149-150 б.
2. Гинзбург Р.С., Хидеккель С.С., Князева Г.Ю., Санкин А.А. – Лексикология современного английского языка (на англ. яз.) Наука, М: 1968. – 167 с.
3. Ильиш Б.А. История английского языка. Наука, М: 1968. – 124 с.
4. Карашук П.М. Аффиксальное словообразование в английском языке. – “Наука”, М: 1965. – 121 с.
5. Плоткин В.Я. “Динамика английской фонологической системы”. – Наука, Новосибирск, 1967. – 154 с.
6. Смирницкий А.И. История английского языка (средний и новый периоды). – М: МГУ, 1965. – 37 с.
7. Соссюр Ф. де. Труды по языкознанию. / Пер. с фр. – Наука, М: 1977. – 177 с.
8. Чейф У.Л. «Значение и структура языка» / Пер. с англ. – Наука, М: 1975. – 76 с.
9. Швейцер А.Д. Очерк современного английского языка в США. – Наука, М: 1963. – 69 с.
1. Adams V. Introduction into English word-formation. – High school, Moscow: 1983. – 108 p.
2. Albert C. Baugh and Thomas Cable - The history of English language: High school, М: 2002. – 212 p.
12. Antrushina .English lexicology. – High school, М: 1985. – 233 p.

13. Arbekova T.I. Lexicology of English language-. Moscow 1977
14. Arnold I.V. "The English word".- "High school",M:1986.-133p.
15. Brunney K. History of English language.- High school, M:1956.-90p.
16. Cruise "Lexical semantic".- "Cambridge University press", L: 1995.-78p.
17. Crystal D. "The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English language"
- "Cambridge University press", L:1996.-199p.
- 18.Ginzburg R. "A course in Modern English".- "High school", M: 1979.-232p.
- 19.Griberg S.I. "Exercises in Modern English".- "High school", M: 1980.-198p.
20. Jonathan Galperin "History of English".- "High school", M:1999.-58p.
- 21.Kunin A. "English Lexicology". -"High school", M: 1972.-237p.
- 22.Mednikova E.M. "Seminars in English Lexicology".- "High school",
Moscow: 1978.-92p.
- 23.Potter S. "Modern Linguistics".- "High school", M:1957.-122p.
24. Martin S. "The Encarta World English Dictionary".- L:1999-80p
- 25.Oxford dictionary
- 26.Ginzburg R. "A course in Modern English".- "High school", Moscow: 1979.-
87p.
- 27.Griberg S.I. "Exercises in Modern English". -"High school", Moscow: 1980.-
209p
- 28.JonathanGalperin "History of English". Kunin A. "English Lexicology".-
Moscow: 1999.-237p.
29. Adams V. "Introduction into English word-formation". "High school",
Moscow: 1983.-176p.

30. Albert C. Baugh and Thomas Cable "The history of English language" 2002
31. Antrushina "English lexicology". 1985
32. Oxford dictionary

Internet Sources

33. www.5ballov.ru
34. www.freeenglish.com
35. www.4students.ru

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmadin, Dimjati. 2008. Dissertation: *Semantic and Language Style Analyses of Juz „Amma of the Holy Qur”am English Translation by A. Yusuf Ali, T.B Irving N.J Dawood*. The Degree of Doctor Program, State University of Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
- Amstrong, Karen. 1993, *A History of God: The 4,000-Year Quest of Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. New York. Ballantine Books.
- Bogdan, Robert, C; Biklen, Sari Knop. 1998. *Qualitative Research for Education*. Boston: Allyn Bacon.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Crystal, David. 1991. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwel Ltd.
- Denzim, Norman K; Lincoln, Ivonna S. 1994. *Hand Book of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publication.
- Echols, John M. and Hassan Shadily. 1988. *Kamus Indonesia-Inggris*. Jakarta. Gramedia.

Echols, John M. and Hassan Shadily. 1988. *Kamus Inggris-Indonesia*. Jakarta. Gramedia.

Eastman, Carol M. (1984). Language, Ethnic Identity and Change. In Edwards, John (ed.)