

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

OLIMOVA NILUFAR

English faculty - 3 group 302

**LEXICAL AND STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE WORDS DENOTING
“NEGATIVE FEELINGS”**

COURSE PAPER

SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR:

_____ G.Tursunova

2016 “ _____ ” _____

TASHKENT-2016

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....

CHAPTER I METHODS OF LEXICOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

- 1.1. Contrastive Analysis.....**
- 1.2. Statistical Methods of Analysis.....**
- 1.3. Immediate Constituents Analysis.....**
- 1.4. Distributional Analysis and Co-occurrence.....**
- 1.5. Transformational Analysis.....**
- 1.6. Componential Analysis.....**
- 1.7. Method of Semantic Differential.....**
- 1.8. Contextual Analysis.....**

CHAPTER II LEXICAL AND STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE WORDS DENOTING “NEGATIVE FEELINGS”

- 2.1. Linguistic study of semantic fields.....**
- 2.2. Lexico-Semantic Field “Annoyance” and its analysis.....**

CONCLUSION.....

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURES.....

INTRODUCTION

Thanks to the independence gained by our republic lots of positive changes have taken place in our life. With the political, economic and social development and foreign relation of the country, the demand for foreign languages and translation has risen rapidly for the last decade. The language universities, once not very popular, have become one of linguistics have been trained in the country and the same time many works about Uzbekistan, culture of Uzbek people and other different materials have been translated into different languages of the world

As the English language is considered an international language, great attention is paid to learn it in all parts of the world, in particular Uzbekistanis performing significant attempts on the improvement of English as a second language at universities. To be more precise, the Presidential Decree #1875 “Measures on improvement of learning foreign languages” makes essential progress on the teaching the English language in all educational directions of Uzbekistan.

This course paper is devoted to the study of the lexical and stylistic analysis of the words denoting “negative feelings.

The actuality of the Course Paper is that the words with the meaning of negative feeling in the linguistic field as it’s the most interesting part of lexicology according to its semantic structure.

The aim of this course paper is to reveal the lexical and stylistic analysis of the words denoting “negative feelings. According to this general aim the following particular **tasks** were put forward:

1. to distinguish methods of lexicological analysis
2. to reveal the semantic peculiarities of words denoting negative feeling
3. to study linguistic field of semantics

4. to analyze lexical units of the English language that nominate the emotional state of annoyance;
5. to determine the affiliation of the researched items to certain layers of lexico-semantic field.

The object of the Course paper is the words denoting negative feeling

The subject of this Course Paper is to study the lexical and stylistic analysis of the words denoting “negative feelings”.

The novelty of this Course paper is determined by concrete results of investigation which is a new phenomenon “negative feeling words especially – “annoyance” for the learners of the English language.

The theoretical importance of the work is in the fact it will present some theoretical basis for working out concrete practical recommendation in studying English. People who are involved in learning English Lexicology can use the results of this qualification paper.

The practical value of this paper is that it can be used as an aid for the theoretical courses of English Lexicology and semasiology, as well as, in the process of teaching English. And it also can be used as a topic for discussion for the students of the Language Universities and Institutions of the work and achieved gains can be used in lectures and seminars on English Lexicology, the History of English language, General linguistics and Practical English classes.

The structure of given Course paper consists of Introduction, two chapters, conclusion and bibliography.

Introduction is about the actuality and the aim of investigation, about its subject matter and object matter, methods used in the course of it explaining, its actual methods, novelty and scientific and practical values.

Chapter I deals with the theoretical foundation of the problems of methods of lexicological analysis.

Chapter II is dedicated to the the lexical and stylistic analysis of the words denoting “negative feelings”

In Conclusion we have the practical results of the investigation.

In the list of used literature we have given references used in carrying out this investigation.

CHAPTER I. METHODS OF LEXICOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

I.1. Contrastive Analysis

In fact contrastive analysis grew as the result of the practical demands of language teaching methodology where it was empirically shown that the errors which are made recurrently by foreign language students can be often traced back to the differences in structure between the target language and the language of the learner. This naturally implies the necessity of a detailed comparison of the structure of a native and a target language which has been named contrastive analysis.

It should be borne in mind that though objective reality exists outside human beings and irrespective of the language they speak every language classifies reality in its own way by means of vocabulary units. In English the word “foot” is used to denote the extremity of the leg. In Uzbek there is no exact equivalent for foot. The word denotes the whole leg including the foot.

Classification of the real world around us provided by the vocabulary units of our mother tongue is learned and assimilated together with our first language. Because we are used to the way in which our own language structures experience we are often inclined to think of this as the only natural way of handling things whereas in fact it is highly-arbitrary.

One example is provided by the words watch and clock. It would seem natural for Uzbek speakers to have a single word to refer to all devices that tell us what time it is; yet in English they are divided into two semantic classes depending on whether or not they are customarily portable. We also find it natural that kinship terms should reflect the difference between male and female: brother or sister father or mother uncle or aunt yet in English we fail to make this distinction in the case of cousin.

Contrastive analysis also brings to light what can be labeled problem pairs the words that denote two entities in one language and correspond to two different words in another language.

Contrastive analysis on the level of the grammatical meaning reveals that correlated words in different languages may differ in the grammatical component of their meaning.

Contrastive analysis brings to light the essence of what is usually described as idiomatic English idiomatic Uzbek the peculiar way in which every language combines and structures in lexical units various concepts to denote extra-linguistic reality.

In English we can also use structurally similar word-groups and say he smokes a lot he learns slowly (fast). The structure of idiomatic English word-groups however is different. The formula of this word-group can be represented as an adjective + deverbial noun he is a heavy smoker a poor learner "The Englishman is a slow starter but there is no stronger finisher" (Galsworthy). Another English word-group used in similar cases has the structure verb to be + adjective + the infinitive (He) is quick to realize (He) is slow-to cool down which is practically non-existent in the Uzbek language. Last but not least contrastive analysis deals with the meaning and use of situational verbal units words word-groups sentences which are commonly used by native speakers in certain situations.

For instance when we answer a telephone call and hear somebody asking for a person whose name we have never heard the usual answer for the Uzbek speaker would be adashdingiz (nomerda). The Englishman in identical situation is likely to say Wrong number .

To sum up contrastive analysis cannot be overestimated as an indispensable stage in preparation of teaching material in selecting lexical items to be extensively practiced and in predicting typical errors. It is also of great value for an efficient teacher who knows that to have a native like command of a foreign language to be able to speak what we call idiomatic English words word-groups and whole

sentences must be learned within the lexical grammatical and situational restrictions of the English language.

I.2. Statistical Methods of Analysis

An important and promising trend in modern linguistics which has been making progress during the last few decades is the quantitative study of language phenomena and the application of statistical methods in linguistic analysis.

The first requirement for a successful statistical study is the representativeness of the objects counted for the problem in question its relevance from the linguistic point of view. Statistical approach proved essential in the selection of vocabulary items of a foreign language for teaching purposes.

It is common knowledge that very few people know more than 10% of the words of their mother tongue. It follows that if we do not wish to waste time on committing to memory vocabulary items which are never likely to be useful to the learner we have to select only lexical units that are commonly used by native speakers.

It goes without saying that to be useful in teaching statistics should deal with meanings as well as sound-forms as not all word-meanings are equally frequent.

Besides the number of meanings exceeds by far the number of words. The total number of different meanings recorded and illustrated in Oxford English Dictionary for the first 500 words of the Thorndike Word List is 14 070 for the first thousand it is nearly 25 000. Naturally not all the meanings should be included in the list of the first two thousand most commonly used words. Statistical analysis of meaning frequencies resulted in the compilation of A General Service List of English Words with Semantic Frequencies. The semantic count is a count of the frequency of the occurrence of the various senses of 2 000 most frequent words as found in a study of five million running words. The semantic count is based on the differentiation of the meanings in the OED and the frequencies are expressed as

percentage so that the teacher and textbook writer may find it easier to understand and use the list. An example will make the procedure clear.

room ('space') takes less room, not enough room to turn round (in) make room for (figurative) room for improvement – 12%	
come to my room, bedroom, sitting room; drawing room, bathroom – 83%	
(plural = suite, lodgings) my room in college to let rooms – 2%	

It can be easily observed from the semantic count above that the meaning 'part of a house' (sitting room drawing room) makes up 83% of all occurrences of the word room and should be included in the list of meanings to be learned by the beginners whereas the meaning 'suite lodgings' is not essential and makes up only 2% of all occurrences of this word.

One more specific feature must however be stressed here. All modern methods aim at being impersonal and objective in the sense that they must lead to generalizations verifiable by all competent persons. In this effort to find verifiable relationships concerning typical contrastive shapes and arrangements of linguistic elements functioning in a system the study of vocabulary has turned away from chance observation and made considerable scientific progress.

Thus statistical analysis is applied in different branches of linguistics including lexicology as a means of verification and as a reliable criterion for the selection of the language data provided qualitative description of lexical items is available.

I.3. Immediate Constituents Analysis

The theory of Immediate Constituents (IC) was originally elaborated as an attempt to determine the ways in which lexical units are relevantly related to one another. It was discovered that combinations of such units are usually structured into hierarchically arranged sets of binary constructions. For example in the word-group a black dress in severe style we do not relate a to black black to dress dress to in. but set up a structure which may be represented as a black dress / in severe style. Thus the fundamental aim of IC analysis is to segment a set of lexical units into two maximally independent sequences or ICs thus revealing the hierarchical structure of this set. Successive segmentation results in Ultimate Constituents (UC) two-facet units that cannot be segmented into smaller units having both sound-form and meaning. The Ultimate Constituents of the word-group analysed above are: a | black | dress | in | severe | style.

It is mainly to discover the derivational structure of words that IC analysis is used in lexicological investigations. For example the verb denationalise has both a prefix de- and a suffix -ise (-ize). To decide whether this word is a prefixal or a suffixal derivative we must apply IC analysis. The binary segmentation of the string of morphemes making up the word shows that *denation or *denational cannot be considered independent sequences as there is no direct link between the prefix de- and nation or national. In fact no such sound-forms function as independent units in modern English. The only possible binary segmentation is de | nationalise therefore we may conclude that the word is a prefixal derivative. There are also numerous cases when identical morphemic structure of different words is insufficient proof of the identical pattern of their derivative structure which can be revealed only by IC analysis. Thus comparing snow-covered and blue-eyed we observe that both words contain two root-morphemes and one derivational morpheme. IC analysis however shows that whereas snow-covered may be treated as a compound consisting of two stems snow + covered blue-eyed is a suffixal

derivative as the underlying structure as shown by IC analysis is different (blue+eye)+-ed. In Uzbek: be/or/lik ,

It may be inferred from the examples discussed above that ICs represent the word-formation structure while the UCs show the morphemic structure of polymorphic words.

I.4. Distributional Analysis and Co-occurrence

Distributional analysis in its various forms is commonly used nowadays by lexicologists of different schools of thought. By the term distribution we understand the occurrence of a lexical unit relative to other lexical units of the same level (words relative to words / morphemes relative to morphemes). In other words by this term we understand the position which lexical units occupy or may occupy in the text or in the flow of speech. It is readily observed that a certain component of the word-meaning is described when the word is identified distributionally.

For example in the sentence The boy — home the missing word is easily identified as a verb — The boy went came ran home. Thus we see that the component of meaning that is distributionally identified is actually the part-of-speech meaning but not the individual lexical meaning of the word under analysis. It is assumed that sameness / difference in distribution is indicative of sameness / difference in part-of-speech meaning.

According to Z. Harris "The distribution of an element is the total of all environments in which it occurs the sum of all the (different) positions (or occurrences) of an element relative to the occurrence of other elements". In Soviet linguistics this definition has been improved applied on different levels and found fruitful in semasiology. The "total" mentioned by Z. Harris is replaced by configurations combining generalized formulas of occurrence with valency. Defining word classes for distributional analysis depends on the structural use of the word in the sentence.

Observation is facilitated by coding. In this words are replaced by conventional word-class symbols. Each analyst suggests some variant suitable to his particular purpose. A possible version of notation is N for nouns and words that can occupy in the sentence the same position such as personal pronouns. To indicate the class to which nouns belong subscripts are used; so that N_p means a personal noun N_m — a material noun N_{coll} — a collective noun etc. V stands for verbs. A — for adjectives and their equivalents D — for adverbs and their equivalents. Prepositions and conjunctions are not coded.

Observation is further facilitated by simplifying the examples so that only words in direct syntactic connection with the head-word remain.

Thus when studying the verb make for example: The old man made Henry laugh aloud may be reduced to The man made Henry laugh.

Until recently the standard context was taken to be the sentence now it is often reduced to a phrase so that this last example may be rewritten as to make somebody laugh.

When everything but the head-word of the phrase is coded we obtain the distributional formula: make+ N_p + V

The examples collected are arranged according to their distributional formulas and the analyst receives a complete idea of the environments the language shows for the word in question. The list of structures characteristic of the word's distribution is accompanied by examples:

Make + a + N - make a coat a machine a decision

Make + (the) + N + V - make the machine go make somebody work

Make + A - make sure

Make + a + A+N - make a good wife.

In each of these examples the meaning of make is different. Some of these patterns however may be used for several meanings of the word make so that the differentiation of meanings is not complete. Compare for instance the following sentences where the pattern make + N remains unchanged although our intuition tells us that the meaning of make is not the same:

60 minutes make an hour.

60 people make a decision.

A phrase all elements of which including the head-word are coded is called a distributional pattern for instance to make somebody laugh to V1 Np V2

Another example:

Get + N (receive) – get letter

Get + Adj (become) – get angry

Get + Vinf (start) – get to think

To conclude distribution defined as the occurrence of a lexical unit relative to other lexical units can be interpreted as co-occurrence of lexical items and the two terms can be viewed as synonyms.

It follows that by the term distribution we understand the aptness of a word in one of its meanings to collocate or to co-occur with a certain group or certain groups of words having some common semantic component.

I.5. Transformational Analysis

Transformational analysis in lexicological investigations may be defined as re-patterning of various distributional structures in order to discover difference or sameness of meaning of practically identical distributional patterns.

Word-groups of identical distributional structure when re-patterned also show that the semantic relationship between words and consequently the meaning of word-groups may be different. For example in the word-groups consisting of a possessive pronoun followed by a noun his car his failure his arrest his goodness etc. the relationship between his and the following nouns is in each instant different which can be demonstrated by means of transformational procedures.

· his car (pen table) may be re-patterned into he has a car (a pen a table) or in a more generalised form may be represented as A possesses B.

· his failure (mistake attempt) may be represented as he failed (was mistaken attempted) or A performs B which is impossible in the case of his car (pen table).

- his arrest (imprisonment embarrassment) may be re-patterned into he was arrested (imprisoned and embarrassed) or A is the goal of the action B.
- his goodness (kindness modesty) may be represented as he is good (kind modest) or B is the quality of A.

Types of transformation differ according to purposes for which transformations are used.

There are:

- permutation
- replacement
- addition (or expansion)
- deletion

Transformational procedures are also used as will be shown below in componential analysis of lexical units.

I.6. Componential Analysis

Componential analysis is thus an attempt to describe the meaning of words in terms of a universal inventory of semantic components and their possible combinations.

Componential approach to meaning has a long history in linguistics.

L. Hjelmslev's commutation deals with similar relationships and may be illustrated by proportions from which the distinctive features d1 d2 d3 are obtained by means of the following procedure:

d1 = 'boy' = 'man' = 'bull'

'girl' 'woman' 'cow'

hence

d2 = 'boy' = 'girl'

'man' 'woman'

d3 = 'boy' = 'girl'

'bull' 'cow'

As the first relationship is that of male to female the second of young to adult and the third human to animal the meaning 'boy' may be characterized with respect to the distinctive features d1 d2 d3 as containing the semantic elements 'male' 'young' and 'human'. The existence of correlated oppositions proves that these elements are recognized by the vocabulary.

In criticizing this approach the English linguist Prof. W. Haas argues that the commutation test looks very plausible if one has carefully selected examples from words entering into clear-cut semantic groups such as terms of kinship or words denoting colours. It is less satisfactory in other cases as there is no linguistic framework by which the semantic contrasts can be limited. The commutation test borrows its restrictions from philosophy.

A very close resemblance to componential analysis is the method of logical definition by dividing a genus into species and species into subspecies indispensable to dictionary definitions. It is therefore but natural that lexicographic definitions lend themselves as suitable material for the analysis of lexical groups in terms of a finite set of semantic components. Consider the following definitions given in Hornby's

dictionary:

Cow— a full grown female of any animal of the ox family.

Calf — the young of the cow.

The first definition contains all the elements we have previously obtained from proportional oppositions. The second is incomplete but we can substitute the missing elements from the previous definition. It is possible to describe parts of the vocabulary by formalising these definitions and reducing them to some standard form according to a set of rules.

Componential analysis may be also arrived at through transformational procedures. It is assumed that sameness / difference of transforms is indicative of sameness / difference in the componential structure of the lexical unit. The example commonly analysed is the difference in the transforms of the structurally identical lexical units puppydog bulldog lapdog. The difference in the semantic relationship between the

stems of the compounds and hence the difference in the component of the word-meaning is demonstrated by the impossibility of the same type of transforms for all these words. Thus a puppydog may be transformed into ‘a dog (which) is a puppy’ bull-dog however is not ‘a dog which is a bull’ neither is a lapdog ‘a dog which is a lap’. A bulldog may be transformed into ‘a bulllike dog’ or ‘a dog which looks like a bull’ but a lapdog is not ‘a dog like a lap’.

I.7. Method of Semantic Differential

All the methods of semantic analysis discussed above are aimed mainly or exclusively at the investigation of the denotational component of the lexical meaning.

The analysis of the differences of the connotational meaning is very hard since the nuances are often slight difficult to grasp and do not yield themselves to objective investigation and verification.

An attempt to establish and display these differences was developed by a group of American psycholinguists. They set up a technique known as the semantic differential by means of which as they claim meaning can be measured. It is perfectly clear however that what semantic differential measures is not word-meaning in any of accepted senses of the term but the connotational component of meaning or to be more exact the emotive charge.

Their technique requires the subjects to judge a series of concepts with respect to a set of bipolar (antonymic) adjective scales. For example a concept like horse is to be rated as to the degree to which it is good or bad fast or slow strong or weak etc.

Horse

+

good.....bad

—

fast.....slow

strong.....weak

+

hard.....soft

+

happy.....sad

The meaning of the seven divisions is taking as an example the first of the scales represented above from left to right: extremely good quite good slightly good neither good nor bad (or equally good and bad) slightly bad quite bad extremely bad.

In the diagram above horse is described as neither good nor bad extremely fast quite strong slightly hard equally happy and sad. The responses of the subjects produce a semantic profile representing the emotive charge of the word.

I.8. Contextual Analysis

Contextual analysis concentrates its attention on determining the minimal stretch of speech and the conditions necessary to reveal in which of its individual meanings the word in question is used. In studying this interaction of the polysemantic word with the syntactic configuration and lexical environment contextual analysis is more concerned with specific features of every particular language than with language universals.

Roughly context may be subdivided into lexical syntactical and mixed. Lexical context for instance determines the meaning of the word black in the following examples. Black denotes colour when used with a key-word naming some material or thing black velvet black gloves. When used with keywords denoting feeling or thought it means 'sad' 'dismal': black thoughts black despair. With nouns denoting time the meaning is 'unhappy' 'full of hardships': black days black period.

If on the other hand the indicative power belongs to the syntactic pattern and not to the words which make it up the context is called syntactic. Make means 'to cause' when followed by a complex object: I couldn't make him understand a word I said.

A purely syntactic context is rare. As a rule the indication comes from syntactic lexical and sometimes morphological factors combined. Thus late when used predicatively means 'after the right expected or-fixed time' as to be late for school.

When used attributively with words denoting periods of time it means 'towards the end of the period' in late summer. Used attributively with proper personal nouns and preceded with a definite article late means 'recently dead'.

To sum up the study of details may be more exact with the contextual method.

Acquaintance with the currently used procedures of linguistic investigation shows that contrastive analysis and statistical analysis are widely used in the preparation of teaching material and are of primary importance for teachers of English.

The special interest of contemporary science in methods of linguistics research extends over a period of about twenty five years.

The present status of principles and techniques in lexicology although still far from satisfactory shows considerable progress. The structural synchronic approach may be said to have grown into a whole system of procedures which can be used either successively or alternately.

The main procedures belonging to this system are the analysis into immediate constituents; distributional analysis with substitution test as part of it; transformational analysis; componential analysis and statistical analysis.

Each of these techniques viewed separately has its limitations but taken together they complete one another so that each successive procedure may prove helpful where the previous one has failed. We have considered these devices time and again in discussing separate aspects of the vocabulary system. All these are formalized methods in the sense that they replace the original words in the linguistic material sampled for analysis by symbols that can be discussed without reference to the particular elements they stand for and then state precise rules for the combination and transformation of formulas thus obtained.

CHAPTER II LEXICAL AND STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE WORDS DENOTING “NEGATIVE FEELINGS”

2.1.Linguistic Study of Semantic Fields

An expression is meaningful ('has meaning') on account of its use in various acts of speech. Every one of these acts determines a Field of Attention. Such a field has a familiar structure: it radiates from a focal region of prominence, continuously decreasing in intensity but without excluding anything.

Different uses of the same word do not simply accumulate. A word's recurrence in different contexts has operational significance: it produces a continual amalgamation of the various fields of attention of which the word has been a recurrent part and results in a composite field. The recurrent word is a memento, a keep-sake, of its past uses; its recurrence ensures the fusion of them in that individual and continually evolving composition that we call its 'Semantic Field'.¹

Empirical evidence of the focal structure of a word's Semantic Field is found in a simple intuition, which is shared by the speakers of a language: there is, on the whole, agreement amongst them on the comparative normality of a word's uses. Occurrence in its most normal contexts represents the focal region of its meaning; ever less normal contexts are grouped around it in a continuous gradation. Of special importance amongst the focal occurrences of many words are, of course, those 'referential' occurrences, the contexts of which include specific extralingual situations. It is only to the extent that we agree on the comparative normality of a word's uses that we can communicate with one another. Shared knowledge of a word's individual meaning is like the knowledge we share of an individual person: nothing needs to be excluded, but we need to agree that some things about that person's conduct and some situations or happenings in which he or she may appear, are fairly normal for that person, while others would be more or less 'out of character'.

Every new use of a word in a given context is characterised by a certain tension between the word's Semantic Field and the new context: the tension

is minimal when occurrence in the given context resembles what is focal to the word's Semantic Field, but is considerable when resemblance can only be found in the Field's margins. It is more normal to speak of potatoes being baked 'in the oven' than baked 'in a bonfire' or 'in the sun' or 'in hell'.²

Distinction of a word's meaning from the meanings of other words determines every one of its uses. The distinction is latent but easy to elicit; we are aware of it when choosing a word for a given context; the word is chosen (or capable of being chosen) from a recurrent range of substitutibles ('exchangeables'). That range, again, is no mere collection or class. Every context of a word's use imposes its own gradation of normality upon the word's contrasts. (BAKE which, in the focal region of its contexts, combines with *dough / fish / potatoes / apples* etc., contracts an equi-normal contrast to CATCH when it combines with *fish*, and to GROW or HARVEST when it combines with *potatoes* or *apples*.) The ranges of focal contrasts that a word contracts in its different focal contexts are different; but there are various overlaps amongst them. Some focal alternatives (like those of BAKE to BOIL / ROAST / EAT / BUY etc.) present themselves to our choice in many of a word's focal contexts, while others (like BAKE / HARVEST) are less normal in most of them. The resultant grading of a word's recurrent contrasts is as characteristic of its Semantic Field as is the focal organisation of its contexts.

The two ways of characterising a word's Semantic Field correspond to two conditions of its effective use: on the one hand, some affinity between the word's given context and its contextual potential and, on the other hand, a distinctive appropriateness of the word's selection within a certain range of choice. It is these two aspects of a word's meaning that Porzig meant to account for, when he described "word-contents" as "established in two ways: by the syntactic and by the paratactic fields (1950: 126)."

The connection between the two aspects of a Semantic Field appears clearly in the connection between the two analytic operations that bring them into view. One of them keeps the word constant, in order to survey the variant contexts in which its

occurrence makes sense; the other keeps any particular context of the word's occurrence constant, in order to survey the variant contrastive substitutions for it that make sense. The first operation yields the region of the word's uses; the second yields the range of choice on a particular occasion of its use. The meaningful utterances that are obtained by substitution within either range group themselves, by their comparative normality, around a focal centre; and there is a recurrence of focal contrasts in various focal instances of a word's use.

The individual value of a word's meaning is its perspective, the focal structure it imposes on its contexts and contrasts. This graded distribution of prominence is what we are referring to when we identify the meaning of a word and distinguish it from others. This, clearly, is to abandon a common assumption about the meanings of words—an assumption which is generally shared even by those who would accept that "the meaning of a word is its use". They would define that meaning, a word's 'literal meaning', by determining its boundaries, by stating specific conditions of the word's 'appropriate' use. Porzig thought he could provide such a definition in terms of a word's implicit 'syntactic field'; others would define appropriate use in terms of 'truth-conditions' or of 'presuppositions' (true-or-false conditions). Any such demarcation, however, of the region of a word's uses turns out to impose inappropriate restrictions on ordinary language and fails to account for obvious differences of meaning.

No one will deny that certain restrictions of ordinary usage are useful, even imperative, in certain kinds of discourse; but if we applied them universally, we should seriously impair the power of a natural language. There is a need for the open texture of Semantic Fields in the normal 'literal' uses of words as much as in exceptional 'stylistic' adventures. To refer, once more, to the practice of a Court of Law: the Law provides definitions of offences, but none of these definitions is expected to state sufficient conditions for identifying a particular offence and for distinguishing it from innocence. The conditions for the appropriate use of the

defined words, or of many of the words defining them, have to be stated very largely in the ordinary open-textured language of Semantic Fields. There can be no formal rules, then, no boundaries, not even 'fuzzy' ones, for the appropriate application of the defined or the defining words. When a judge has found an action or omission to be a case of 'malice aforethought' or of 'false pretences' or of 'negligence' ('without due care'), he has had no list of sufficient conditions to refer to; what has determined his decision is degrees of overall affinity with precedents (degrees of tension) in the application of Semantic Fields.

The appropriateness of a value judgment is incapable of being pinned down to specific features and conditions. This is why value-words are generally excluded from technical vocabularies and why, in a 'logical language', they cannot be allowed to make any independent contribution to the senses of the sentences in which they occur. The words of Trier's model-field are all eminently evaluative.

It is true, of course, that we may be able to state necessary conditions of a word's appropriateness in literal usage—e.g. 'having been killed' as implicit in, or presupposed by, 'having been murdered', or 'not married' as implicit in 'bachelor' (when we are not referring to academic qualification). But even then, we shall only have drawn a boundary to divide a word's 'literal' uses from paradoxes (like 'married bachelor'), which is not nearly enough to determine its individual value. Although implicit features and necessary conditions of a word's literal use are generally amongst the most prominent parts of a word's Semantic Field, their presence tells us very little about the word's distinctive use. This is sometimes admitted. C.J. Fillmore, for instance, finds that *commend* and *praise* have "essentially the same analysis" (1975: 288). But he would, I think, agree that to say of a soldier that he was commended to his general for bravery would be more normal than to say that he was praised; while for a soldier to commend his general would be less normal than to praise him. The context, however, that determines the appropriateness of a word's occurrence extends beyond the boundaries of a

sentence. The wider context of the soldier's utterance may have sufficient affinity with the focal contexts of 'commend' for its occurrence to be normal: a soldier addressing a victorious Revolutionary Committee might commend his general to that Committee.

In order to demonstrate that two words differ in meaning, we only need to show that there are some contexts in which one is more normal than the other. Generally, we speak with minimal tension, choosing what is most normal in a given context. But occasionally, we make an unusual choice, and words may be required to make a non-literal contribution to what we have to say.

'Literal' and 'Non-literal'. A word is generally allowed to have 'non-literal' uses, besides the 'literal'. In contexts (syntactic and situational) that are not foreseen by the definition of its literal meaning, it would then be said to be capable of making 'metaphorical' or 'figurative' contributions to the sense of the utterance in which it occurs. And though demarcations of 'appropriate' or 'literal' meaning can tell us nothing more about a word's non-literal uses than that they are out of bounds, we are to learn more about them by examining 'metaphorical' or other 'figurative' modifications of literal meanings and by appreciating their 'stylistic' or 'rhetorical' motivation: a non-literal expression is then characterised as one or another of conventionally recognized rhetorical devices (metaphor, metonymy, hyperbole, euphemism, irony, oxymoron, etc.)

The notions of an expression's Semantic Field and of its interaction with any given context enable us to explain how any use of it, whether 'literal' or 'non-literal', is understood by certain operations with the established meanings of words.

When a word occurs in what is a highly abnormal context for it, then there is considerable tension between, on the one hand, its established Semantic Field and, on the other, our immediate perception of the given context. In making sense of such a displacement of a Semantic Field, we shall either modify it, i.e. view its

occurrence as a conventional 'figure of speech', or we shall revise our first perception of the given context.

When we are told that *the Crown opens parliament*, we understand it, because 'the Crown' responds to an obvious metonymic interpretation. But when we understand the biblical statement (Joshua 10) that *the sun stood still all day*, the words of the sentence are, all of them, kept within the boundaries of their literal meanings. In making sense of their abnormal co-occurrence, we have to enrich their normal contexts by God's miraculous answer to Joshua's prayers. And when, many centuries later, we were told that *the sun stands still always*, the more normal contexts of 'the sun' - of the sun rising or setting and of its observer standing still - had to be enriched by including the rotation of the earth. The licence that Copernicus was required to obtain for his transgression of normal usage, and which his church was reluctant to grant, was not a stylistic one, not a licence for using a figure of speech.

Fields of Semantic Fields

Expressions of words (the 'signs') and their uses are all in the same world: the world of anyone's experience, in which the present is continually amalgamated to the past. The 'real' or 'natural' world of 'objects', to which expressions and their uses belong, is that part of our several worlds of experience that we are not free to choose and that we may therefore assume to be imposed on all of us as 'given'. It is in that part of our several worlds of experience that the expressions of words acquire and communicate their meanings.

Association in a Word-Field. Trier would probably concede that the extensive documentation he provided for establishing the Field of *wosheit*, *kunst* and *list* contains evidence of that overlap of syntactic

constructions which, for Porzig, is the foundation of their association in a (paratactic) field. Scanning the presented texts, we shall find (or are able to extrapolate) that the three words are exchangeable in connection with words such as *lkren*, *gelernen*, *pflegen*, *maister* (teach, learn, practice, master) etc. But Trier would not accept this as a definition and demarcation of his Word-Field; such a definition he would regard as an intolerable impoverishment of his argument for the affiliation (*Feld-Zusammengehörigkeit*) of those three words. He had found them to 'belong together' in contexts that covered theology and law and architecture, music and painting and poetry, astronomy and medicine and magic, the arts of war and of courtly etiquette. In order to discover the interrelations of those three words, he had to survey the distinctive use of each in the world of medieval chivalry, in 'courtly discourse' amongst those who lived in the castles and manor-houses of the time. It was, after all, only when that cultural context had disintegrated that the meanings of those words and the organisation of their Field were found to have changed. Porzig's theory of word-meanings fails to cover that field. The whole scenery of it, however, with its intrinsic capacity for continual change, is present in the Semantic Fields of the words. It was because Trier accepted Porzig's restrictive notion of 'the meanings of single words' that he was forced to search for 'nourishment' of his Word-Field somewhere 'beyond' and 'above' the meanings of words, in a disembodied 'order of contents' (1934: 160).

Discrimination within a Word-Field. Trier found, too, that the subtle differences between the uses of field-sharing words could not be adequately described as differences of coverage or of syntactic potential. "A description," he said (1931: 323), "cannot adequately represent the actual state of usage (*Wortbrauch*), unless the meanings and manners of use (*Verwendungsweisen*) are distinguished by *relative prominence* (*Stärke*), by more or less exclusivity...." The words, then, that share a Field, differ from one another not so much in each having exclusive coverage of a certain part of the Field as, rather, in having their 'core-regions' (*Kerngebiete*) in different places. (For *wosheit*, for instance, it was "the region of

an ideal representation of man, where morality, religion and intellect are inseparably connected"; here, its dominance was "as good as unrivalled".) This is, in fact, the way in which we distinguish Semantic Fields.

Alternatives and Directives. In his last contributions (1968: 195f, 1972: 202) Trier reproaches himself for having failed to make clear, how his notion of Field differed from Ipsen's, from whom he had derived the field-metaphor. "The image [i.e. Ipsen's image] of sharp boundaries between adjoining words was to be replaced by a togetherness of starlike radiating cores, which are so situated that each is entered, or can be entered, by the extreme beam-ends of neighbouring cores." (1968: 203). Weisgerber (1954: 332-4) similarly described the meeting of word-meanings in a Field as an 'interplay of search-lights' as they meet to illuminate a scenery. This elaboration of the word-field metaphor comes very close to portraying the association and discrimination of those radiating fields-of-attention that I called 'Semantic Fields'. And the proximity of views turns out to be even closer if in the end we would, as Trier confidently expects, just observe "what is really done under the 'field'-banner".

The unlimited but individually structured spread of a word 's Semantic Field provides whatever evidence there may be for its ('paratactic') association with others and for their mutual discrimination in a Field of Words. (I shall be using capital initials to indicate reference to Trier's sense of the term.) Trier's doubts about the sufficiency of the evidence of 'single words' were all based on the assumption that the meaning of a word is confined within 'neat boundaries' (*sduberliche Umgrenzung*, 1934: 160), such as those of Porzig's syntactic field. These doubts do not apply to Semantic Fields. Every Semantic Field is, as Trier requires, an "articulation of the whole" (*Gliederung des Ganzen*, ib. 150). It extends beyond mere syntactic constructions to actual sentences and, in its radiating gradation, to any wider context and situation.

The natural spread of a Semantic Field does not depend on messages from a world of 'autonomous contents'. The if the meanings of words are viewed as Semantic Fields, then they provide the evidence for everything Trier is 'really doing' in establishing a Field of Words. This, however, is not to say that his selection of a particular Field for study and analysis can be shown to be uniquely imposed by the available evidence. Trier thought that, in order to justify his selection, we should have to observe not only *what* he was doing, but also *what for* (1934: 144, 158).

In those last contributions to the discussion, Trier would recall (1968: 191f) that his Word-Field studies (1931) did not originate in general linguistic considerations (such as attempts to emulate the success of structural phonology); nor did the original impulse come from the philosophy of language. The purpose of establishing a particular Field was to supply a need in the study of historical semantics. And even afterwards (1934: 144, 158), when he was trying to find a general linguistic justification for such work, he suggested that we should also ask 'a second question'-a question that can be answered more easily, more instructively and more profitably. We should ask, "what we intend to do with the Field in our pursuit of linguistic inquiries". What kind of insight do we expect of it? Success or failure in realizing our expectations would either justify or discredit the selection of a particular Word-Field. It is not clear, however, whether Trier would have been happy then to admit that reliance on such pragmatic criteria would justify different Fields for different purposes and would allow one and the same word to 'belong' to different Fields. But this is implicit in his notion of Word-Field. Multiple field-membership of an individual word does not imply a homonymic split of meaning, any more than the various associations of an individual person imply a split personality.

When a word is characterised as belonging to a particular Word-Field (and not merely to its own Semantic Field), then certain contrasts to it in a subregion of its more prominent contexts are selected as being of particular interest. Different

interests will select different contrasts, i.e. different ranges of choice in different regions of contexts. Consider, for example, the uses of 'red': if we are interested in comparing English with other languages, we would examine any context in which 'red' contrasts with other words of the referentially defined colour-spectrum: 'red/yellow/green/blue/...', that whole group being contrasted with 'black/grey/white'; for the purpose of certain sociological inquiries, we might confine ourselves to occasions for the occurrence of 'red' in contrast to other 'racial colours': 'red / black / white / fair / coloured / ...'; referring to facial complexion, we would contrast 'red / flushed / pale / white / sallow / ...'; for the purpose of distinguishing kinds of wine, prominent contrasts of 'red' are restricted to 'red / white / rosy':- four different word-fields for 'red' to belong to.

What makes a particular Field of contrasting words interesting is not so much their sub-ordination under some comprehensive term like 'colour' or 'complexion' as the differences between the uses of those words - differences of comparative normality in certain contexts. Many of these differences are not imposed by 'the nature of things'. How would one explain that some languages are content with as few as two or three 'colour-words'? Why should, for some people, wine be 'white' more normally than 'red' in the context of fish? Why should warning-signals be 'red' rather than any other colour? What is the reason, in some communities, for ousting 'black' from normal references to racial colours? It is on account of such differences between the uses of contrasting words that we find it interesting to assemble them in a Field. These differences reflect the tendencies and traditions, the predispositions and expectations that prevail in the life of a speech-community. -No further information of that kind is to be expected from any further sub-ordination of the selected Word-Fields as, themselves, members of ever more comprehensive fields of fields.

What we are supposed to gain from establishing a hierarchy of Word-Fields is a

conceptual order that would ultimately comprise the whole vocabulary of a language: the *Weltbild* (world-view) which it imposes on its speakers. But that conceptual hierarchy of ever more comprehensive headings and fields is established by similarities amongst member-fields, and similarities point in many different directions; they are not, by themselves sufficient for determining a particular conceptual order: any proposed taxonomy has many rivals. In this respect there is a decisive difference between lexical and biological 'hierarchies'. A taxonomy of the vocabulary has nothing to parallel the evolutionary implications of biological taxonomies. Darwin referred to these implications as "included in our classification", as a bond "deeper ... than mere resemblance". Similarities are picked out as relevant, if they are supported by "community of descent" (*The Origin of Species*, Ch. XIV): the conceptual 'trees' of genus, species and varieties are family-trees of ancestral relations. This is true of the taxonomies of animals and plants, and also of the philological classification of languages. But there is nothing that would bestow the privileged validity of a 'natural order' upon the categories and sub-categories of a 'conceptual dictionary'. Not every conceptual dictionary makes metaphysical claims. Roget's pioneering and long-lived *Thesaurus* (1852) is content with accepting the directives of a practical purpose (Trier's 'second question'). "In constructing the following system of classification...", he says in his Introduction, "my chief aim has been to obtain the greatest amount of utility"-utility, that is, for the writer or orator or translator, as a guide to " all the resources ... of his language" (Everyman's Library, 1949: 3ff).

All that is not to deny that there are suggestions in the vocabulary of a natural language of various kinds of significant order as well as suggestions for more coherent metaphysical adventures. But even if, in some limited section of the vocabulary, a certain order appears to be all but imperative, it is bound to be changeable, and we are always free to inaugurate a change. The Semantic Fields of individual words provide empirical evidence for a variety of Word-Fields, and

Word-Fields allow of a variety of more comprehensive conceptual orders. We are free to choose.

The lexical meaning of words

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.⁶

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.

The denotative meaning may be of two types according to whether the word function is significative and evokes a general idea, or demonstrative, i.e. identifying.

To find words in their significative meaning it is best to turn to aphorisms and other sayings expressing general ideas. Thus A good laugh is sunshine in the house or A man cannot be too careful in the choice of his enemies contain words in their significative meaning. The second type (demonstrative meaning) is revealed when it is the individual elements of reality that the word serves to name. Some large blue china jars and parrot-tulips were ranged on the mantelshelf, and through the small leaded panes of the window streamed the apricot coloured light of a summer day in London.

The expressive counterpart of meaning is optional, and even when it is present, its proportion with respect to the logical counterpart may vary within wide limits. The meaning of many words is subject to complex associations originating in habitual contexts, verbal or situational, of which the speaker and the listener are aware, and which form the connotational component of meaning. In some words the realization of meaning is accompanied by additional stylistic characteristics revealing the speaker's attitude to the situation, the subject matter, and to his interlocutor.

Within the affective connotations of a word we distinguish its capacity to evoke or directly express: a) emotion, e.g. daddy as compared to father, b) evaluation, e.g. clique as compared to group, c) insensitive e.g. adore, is compared to love d) stylistic colouring e.g. slay as compared to kill.

The complexity of the word meaning is manifold. Apart from the lexical meaning including denotative and connotative meaning it is always combined with the grammatical meaning.

It will be useful to remind the reader that the grammatical meaning is defined as an expression in speech of relationship between words based on contrastive features of arrangements in which they occur. This being a book on lexicology and not on grammar, it is permissible to take this definition ready-made without explaining or analysing it, and concentrate our attention upon lexico-grammatical meaning.

More than that, every denotational meaning is itself a combination of several more elementary components. The meaning of kill, for instance, can be described as follows: {cause become not alive}. One further point should be made: cause become, not and alive in this analysis are not words of English or any other language; they are elements of meaning, which can be combined in various ways with other such elements in the meaning of different words. In what follows they will be called semantic components. To illustrate this idea of componential analysis we shall consider the word adored in the following epigram by Oscar Wilde: «Men can be analysed, women-merely adored.» Adored has lexical meaning and a grammatical meaning. The grammatical meaning is that of a participle II of a transitive verb. The denotational counterpart of the lexical meaning realises the corresponding notion, and consists of several components, namely - feeling attachment, intensity, respect. The connotational component is

that of intensity and loftiness. The definition of adore is to feel a great attachment and respect, to worship

One and the same word may have several meanings. A word that has more than one meaning is called polysemantic.

Polysemy is inherent in the very nature of words and notions, as they always contain a generalisation of several traits of the object. Some of these traits are common with other objects. Hence the possibility of identical names for objects possessing common features.

Thus polysemy is characteristic of most words in many languages, however different they may be. But it is more characteristic of the English vocabulary as compared with Russian, due to the monosyllabic character of English and the predominant of root words. The greater the relative frequency of the word, the greater the number of elements that constitute its semantic structure, i.e. the more polysemantic it is. This is regularity of cause statistical not a rigid one.

Words counts show that the total number of meanings separately registered in NED for the first thousand of the most frequent English words is almost 25,000 i.e. the average number of meaning for each of these most frequent words is 25.

Consider some of the variants of a very frequent, and consequently polysemantic word run. We define the main variant as to go by moving the legs quickly as in Tired as I was; I began to run frantically home. The lexical meaning does not change in the forms ran or running. The basic meaning may be extended to inanimate things: I caught the bus that runs between C and B; or the word run may be used figuratively: It makes the blood run cold. Both the components on foot and quickly are suppressed in This self- service shop is run by the Co- op and The car runs on petrol. The idea of motion remains but it is reduced to operate or function. The difference of meanings is reflected in the difference of syntactic valency. It is

impossible to use this variant about humans and say We humans run on foot. It is possible to use the active- passive transformation when the meaning implies management; The Co-op runs this self- service shop but not I was run by home. There other variants of run where there is no implication of speed or «on foot» or motion but the implication of direction is retained: On the other side of the stream the bank ran up steeply. The bank ran without the indication of direction is meaningless. The verb run has also several other variants, they all have something in common with some of the others. Thus, though there is no single semantic component common to all variants, every variant has something in common with at least one of the others.

It is only recently that linguists have made any serious attempt to give a systematic, account of grammar and semantics, semantics and context. Every meaning in language and every difference in meaning is signalled either by the form of the word itself or by context. Cf. ship -sheep, brothers - brethren, smoke - screen star.

In analysing the polysemy of a word we have to take into consideration that the meaning is the content of a two-facet linguistic sign existing in unity with the sound form of the sign and its distribution, i.e. its syntagmatic relations descending on the position in the spoken chain. We have therefore to search for cases of unity for both facets of the linguistic sign- its form and its content. This unity is present in so- called lexico-grammatical variants of words.

No universally accepted criteria for differentiating these variants within one polysemantic word can so far be offered, although the problem has lately attracted a great deal of attention. The main points can be summed up as follows: lexico-grammatical variants of a word are its variants characterised by a paradigmatic or morphological peculiarities, different valency, different syntactic functions, very often they belong to different lexico-grammatical groups of the same part of speech thus run is intransitive in I ran home, but transitive in I ran this office.

All the lexical and lexico-grammatical variants of a word taken together form its semantic structure. Thus, in the semantic structure of the word youth three lexico-grammatical variants may be distinguished: the first is an abstract uncountable noun, as in the friends of one's youth, the second is a countable personal noun a young man that can be substituted by the pronoun he in the singular and they in the plural; the third is a collective noun 'young man and women' having only one form, that of the singular, substituted by the pronoun they. Within the first lexico-grammatical variant two shades of meaning can be distinguished with two different referents, one denoting the state of being young, and the other the time of being young. These shades of meaning are recognized due to lexical peculiarities of distribution and sometimes are blended together as in to feet one's youth has gone, where both the time and the state can be meant. These variant form a structured set because they are expressed by the same sound complex and are interrelated in meaning as they all contain the semantic component young and can be explained by means of one another.

The difference in syntactic context and distribution is best seen in verbs. Among the many variants of the verb carry one can distinguish a lexico-grammatical variant with the meaning 'to support the weight of a thing and to move it from one place to another'. In this variant there is always an object, as in the following formulas: N1+carry+N2 (Railways and ships carry goods) or N1+ carry+N2+ prep+N3 (She was carrying the baby in her arms).

In both cases carry is a transitive verb. There is also an intransitive variant in which carry is followed by a predicative or adverbial of distance, time, etc. and means 'to have the power to reach':N1+carry+prep+N2 (His voice carried across the room).

Nonce usage takes place in cases of occasional figurative meanings. Nonce usage

is also sometimes called application and defined as the extensional meaning of a word or term. The following example serves to illustrate nonce usage as application: Tom possessed a formidable capacity for psychological bustling. In any easy agreeable way he bustling other people into doing things they did not want to do.

Here the word bustle does not show any of its dictionary meanings. This is nonce usage which is clearly motivated and readily understood.

To sum up this discussion of the semantic structure of a word we return to its definition as a structured set of interrelated lexical variants with different meanings. These variants belong to the same set because they are expressed by the same combination of morphemes, although in different conditions of distribution. The elements are interrelated due to some common semantic component. In other words, the word's semantic structure is an organized whole comprised by recurrent meanings and shades of meaning a particular sound complex can assume in different contexts, together with emotional or stylistic colouring and other connotations, if any.

Polysemy and semantic structure exist only in language, not in speech. The sum total of many contexts in which the word may occur permits us to observe and record cases of identical meaning and cases that differ in meaning. They are registered and classified by lexicographers and found in dictionaries.

Stylistic meaning.

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 .

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. Thus, the stylistic meaning can be defined as "a component of the semantic structure of the word expressing the emotional and evaluative attitude of the speaker towards

the thing or event denoted by the word by the pattern “pleasant – unpleasant” and by the pattern “good – bad”. Both of these meanings are the components of the stylistic meaning and most often they appear in the word together and sometimes separately, They are fixed in the semantic structure of the word in the form of semes “pleasant”, “unpleasant”, “good – bad”, or another semes which may expose these semes under further steps of the componential analysis.

2.2. Lexico-Semantic Field “Annoyance” and its analysis

Language is the key in understanding human emotions because it nominates, expresses, describes, imitates, categorizes, classifies and structures them. Language provides assistance in understanding emotions of the representatives of different cultures

In linguistics, lexico-semantic field have mainly been researched in terms of expression and meaning¹. When using the first approach, certain groups of words, which have similar meaning and identical distribution, are selected. In terms of expression, the main object of research is a lexeme. In terms of meaning, the main objects of research are semantic categories, basic units of meaning and their combinations. Common basic units of meaning of certain groups of words unite them into one semantic field.

In the modern English language the notion *annoyance* and *irritation* are almost identical: *annoyance* – “a feeling of slight anger, irritation”²; *irritation* – “the feeling of being annoyed about something”³ (underlined by us).

¹ . Васильев Л. М. Теория семантических полей / Л. М. Васильев // Л. М. Васильев Вопросы языкознания. – 1971. – № 5. – С. 105–113.

² Longman dictionary of contemporary English / [director Della Summers]. – New ed. – Essex, 2003. – 1950 p.51

³ Longman dictionary of contemporary English / [director Della Summers]. – New ed. – Essex, 2003. – 1950 p.861

Using the synthesizing approach, the analysis of emotional state of annoyance definitions means that the general meaning of lexical unit will be determined according to the analysis of the definitions from dictionaries. Therefore, the following features of the nucleus of “annoyance” have been singled out: *annoyance/ irritation is a feeling or an emotional state of being slightly angry, especially about actions that happen repeatedly or for a long time.* The lexemes, that have been analysed, have a generic seme emotional state or feeling. Lexeme meanings clarify the following semes: “intensity” (*slight*), “reason” (*actions that happen repeatedly or for a long time*). It should be mentioned that seme “intensity” demonstrates that annoyance is not characterised by the high level of intensity and is weaker than anger. Therefore, it may be concluded that annoyance is the emotional state that is different from anger. Nevertheless, both anger and annoyance belong to emotions, which are frustrations.⁴

Semantic analysis of the lexemes that denote emotional state of annoyance demonstrates that for most of the elements of semantic field “annoyance” common features can be found in the archiseme *slightly angry*. This archiseme possesses the notion which is present in the majority of definitions in the lexico-semantic field. That is why this archiseme may be considered a field dominant.

Semantic analysis of nominants of emotional state of annoyance singles out the following layers of lexico-semantic field “annoyance”: nucleus, nuclear periphery, close periphery, remote periphery and marginal layer. The analysis has showed that the number of differentiating features, which clarify the generic seme *slightly angry*, influences the position of lexeme – the bigger number of distinguishing features in a semantic structure of a lexeme causes the bigger distance from the field nucleus. The boundaries between the layers of lexico-semantic field are vague and indistinct.

⁴ Ильин Е. П. Эмоции и чувства / Е. П. Ильин. – СПб. [и др.]: Питер, 2002. - 752 с., ил. – (Серия “Мастера психологии”).

Each layer of a semantic field contains lexical units that belong to different parts of speech. One field is formed by the overlapping of layers, which comprise different parts of speech⁵. The basis of nominative space of annoyance are nouns that nominate this emotional state.

In a substantive lexico-semantic field the units are grouped around the nucleus. Lexemes *annoyance/ irritation* are the nucleus. Nuclear periphery consists of synonyms of *annoyance/ irritation: exasperation, aggravation*. Some *annoyed* is present in the definitions of these lexemes, hence, common semantic feature of these nouns is the feeling of annoyance.

Let us look at those nouns of emotional state of annoyance, which belong to nucleus and nuclear periphery zones of the lexico-semantic field under investigation: *annoyance, irritation, exasperation, aggravation*. **Annoyance** – the feeling of being annoyed⁶: *Alan found the constant noise of the traffic an annoyance*; **irritation** – the feeling of being annoyed about something, especially something that happens repeatedly or for a long time: *The heavy traffic is a constant source of irritation*; **exasperation** – when you feel annoyed because someone continues to do something that is upsetting you: *Carol sighed in exasperation*⁷; **aggravation** – the state of being annoyed and irritated: *I don't need all this aggravation at work*⁸.

Definition of *irritation* demonstrates that annoyance is the emotional state that is caused by certain actions. It is a result of actions and a reaction on it, especially when it continues for a long time or permanently.

Close periphery zone of lexico-semantic field consists of those lexical units, the meaning of which is slightly different from the nucleus meaning: **vexation** – when

⁵ . Расточинская О. В. Сопоставительная характеристика семантических полей слов со значением СТРАХ во французском и русском языках: дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.05 / Расточинская Ольга Васильевна. – Смоленск, 1973. – 256 с.

⁶ Oxford Wordpower Dictionary. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2006. – 888 p 26

⁷ Longman dictionary of contemporary English / [director Della Summers]. – New ed. – Essex, 2003. – 1950 p.

you feel worried or annoyed by something: *Erika stamped her foot in vexation*⁹; **chafe** – a state of vexation and irritation: *Some hunters are chafing under new restrictions*; **stir** – a feeling of excitement or annoyance: *Plans for the motorway caused quite a stir among locals*¹⁰.

Nominative units that lose some of their basic features, yet leaving one as their generic feature, and acquiring other semantic components, belong to the remote periphery of the lexico-semantic field. For example: **impatience** – annoyance at having to accept delays and other people's weaknesses: *His impatience with the slowness of bureaucratic procedures*; **pique** – a feeling of being annoyed or upset, especially because someone has ignored you or insulted you: *He stormed out in a fit of pique*; **frustration** – the feeling of being annoyed, upset or impatient because you cannot control or change a situation or achieve something: *People often feel a sense of frustration that they are not being promoted quickly enough*; **chagrin** – annoyance and disappointment because something has not happened the way you hoped: *Much to her chagrin, I got the job*; **displeasure** – the feeling of being annoyed or not satisfied with someone or something: *Their displeasure at being kept waiting was clear*¹¹.

The remote periphery of the lexico-semantic field also consists of the following idioms: **a thorn in somebody's side** – someone or something that annoys you or causes problems for a long period of time: *He's been a thorn in the side of the party leadership for years*; **a pain (in the neck)** – to be very annoying: *It's a pain, having to go upstairs to make coffee every time; There were times when Joe could be a real pain in the neck*; **a headache** – a problem that is difficult or annoying to deal with: *Security is a big headache for airline operators*.

⁹ Longman dictionary of contemporary English / [director Della Summers]. – New ed. – Essex, 2003. – 1950 p.

¹⁰ Longman dictionary of contemporary English / [director Della Summers]. – New ed. – Essex, 2003. – 1950 p. 1631

¹¹ Longman dictionary of contemporary English / [director Della Summers]. – New ed. – Essex, 2003. – 1950 p.

The marginal layer overlaps peripheries of other lexico-semantic fields that is why there are inter-field connections in the language. Generic and distinguishing feature of the field of these units move to the structure periphery of their meaning and characterise a new denotation. Old-fashioned language units belong here, too. The following units belong to this layer: **trouble** – disturbance of mind or feelings, worry, vexation: *Their troublesprang from poor articulation* ; **inquietude** (literary) – feeling of anxiety;¹² **botheration** (old-fashioned) – when you are slightly annoyed: *Botheration. I forgot my glasses* ; **irksomeness** (old-fashioned) – annoyance¹³.

Lexical units of adjectival lexico-semantic field “annoyance” qualify objects and express properties and qualities of objects and phenomena. An adjective *annoyed* is a nucleus of adjectival lexico-semantic field of annoyance. Nucleus periphery contains the following lexical units: *irritated, peeved, frustrated, upset, miffed, exasperated, nettled*. Definition analysis of the given lexemes distinguishes the following groups according to their semantic features:

1) semantic feature “in a state of annoyance and impatience” – *irritated, peeved, frustrated*: **irritated** – feeling annoyed and impatient about something: *John was getting irritated by all her questions* ; **peeved**(informal) – annoyed: *Peeved at his silence, she left* ; **frustrated** – feeling annoyed, upset, and impatient, because you cannot control or change a situation, or achieve something: *He gets frustrated when people don't understand what he's trying to say*;

2) semantic feature “in a state of annoyance and discontent” — *upset, displeased*. **Upset** with someone – unhappy, angry and annoyed: *You're not still upset with me, are you?*; **displeased** – annoyed or not satisfied: *He looked extremely displeased* ; **nettled** (informal) – to be annoyed by what someone says or

¹² Longman dictionary of contemporary English / [director Della Summers]. – New ed. – Essex, 2003. – 1950 p.

¹³ Shorter Oxford English Dictionary. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2007. – [электронный ресурс] –

Режимдоступу : <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/page/askoxfordredirect>

1) semantic feature “in a state of lasting annoyance” – *fed up, sick (and tired)*: **fed up** (informal) – annoyed or bored, and wanting something to change: *I'm really fed up with this constant rain; Anna got fed up with waiting* [580]; **sick/ sick and tired** (spoken) – to be angry or bored with something that has been happening for a long time: *I'm sick and tired of your excuses; I'm sick of working for other people* 1529];

2) semantic feature “petulance” – *touchy, peevish, huffy, irritable, crabby, bad-tempered, moody, grumpy*: **touchy** – easily becoming offended or annoyed: *She is very touchy about her past* [1756]; **peevish** – easily annoyed by small and unimportant things: *The kids were peevish after so long in a car* [1214]; **huffy** – quick to take offence, touchy [10]: *Some customers get huffy when you ask them for their ID* [794]; **irritable** – getting annoyed quickly or easily: *Jo was tired, irritable and depressed* [861]; **crabby** – easily annoyed by unimportant things: *You're a bit crabby this morning* [7, 364]; **bad-tempered** – someone who is bad-tempered becomes easily annoyed and talks in an angry way to people: *Her husband was a disagreeable, bad-tempered man* [96]; **moody** – often becoming annoyed or unhappy, especially when there seems to be no good reason: *Myra can be a bit moody sometimes* [7, 1065]; **grumpy** – easily annoyed and often complaining about things: *There's no need to be so grumpy!* [718].

The following idiomatic formation also belongs to the remote periphery: **cheesed off** – bored and annoyed with something: *You sound really cheesed off* [254].

Marginal layer of lexico-semantic field contain the units that are characterised by a low frequency and a limited sphere of use: **uneasy** (obsolete, old-fashioned) – troublesome, annoying, unaccommodating: *They are profoundly uneasy about actively assisting a suicide* ; **vexatious** (old-fashioned) – making you feel annoyed or worried [1836]; **vexed** (old-fashioned) – annoyed or worried [1836] ¹⁶ .

¹⁶ Longman dictionary of contemporary English / [director Della Summers]. – New ed. – Essex, 2003. – 1950 p.

Verbal lexico-semantic field “annoyance” comprises the verbal units which convey an action, an occurrence or a state of being. This field has got the causative verbs meaning “cause the feeling of annoyance”: **annoy** – to make someone feel slightly angry and unhappy about something: *What annoyed him most was that he had received no apology* [51]; **irritate** – to make someone feel annoyed or impatient, especially by doing something many times or for a long period of time: *It really irritates me when he doesn't help around the house* [861]; **frustrate** – if something frustrates you, it makes you feel annoyed or angry because you are unable to do what you want: *The fact that he's working with amateurs really frustrates him* [651]; **bother** – to annoy someone, especially by interrupting them when they are trying to do something: *Danny, don't bother Ellen while she's reading* [166]; **aggravate** – to make somebody angry or annoyed: *What really aggravates me is the way she won't listen* [21]; **exasperate** – to make someone very annoyed by continuing to do something that upsets them: *It exasperates me to hear comments like that* [539]; **irk** – if something irks you, it makes you feel annoyed [859]; **displease** – to annoy somebody or to make somebody angry or upset [213]; **peeve** – irritate, annoy, vex: *She is rather peeved that David doesn't cut more ice*; **provoke** – incite to anger, enrage, vex, irritate, exasperate; cause anger, resentment or irritation: *Whatever he said wouldn't provoke me* [10]; **pester** – to annoy someone, especially by asking them many times to do something: *She'd been pestered by reporters for days* [1227]; **worry** – to annoy someone: *The heat didn't seem to worry him* [1907]; **vex** (old-fashioned) – to make someone feel annoyed or worried [1836]; **get** – used to say that something really annoys you: *It really gets me the way he leaves wet towels on the bathroom floor* [675]. **chafe** – to feel impatient or annoyed: *Some hunters are chafing under the new restrictions* [240]; **fray** – if someone's temper or nerves fray, or if something frays them, they become annoyed: *Tempers soon began to fray* [640]¹⁷; **huff and puff** (informal) – to show clearly that you strongly disagree with or are annoyed

¹⁷ Longman dictionary of contemporary English / [director Della Summers]. – New ed. – Essex, 2003. – 1950 p.

about something: *After a lot of huffing and puffing, he eventually gave in to our request* [793]; **huff** – to say something in a way that shows you are annoyed, often because someone has offended you: *“I haven't got time for that now,” huffed Sam irritably* [794]; **rankle** – if something rankles, you still remember it angrily because it upset you or annoyed you a lot: *His comments still rankled* [1356]; **irk** – feel vexed, annoyed or disgusted.

Verbal nominants of the emotional state of annoyance are also the following idioms: **drive somebody crazy/ mad/ insane** (spoken), to drive somebody nuts (spoken informal) – to make someone feel very annoyed: *The continuous noise was driving me crazy* [480]; **drive somebody up the wall/ round the bend/ out of their mind** (spoken informal) – make someone feel very annoyed: *That voice of hers drives me up the wall* [480]; **drive somebody to distraction** – make someone feel very upset or annoyed: *She was being driven to distraction by her husband's bad habits* [480]; **get in somebody's hair** – to annoy someone, especially by always being near them [727]; **keep you hair on** (spoken) – used to tell someone to keep calm and not get annoyed: *All right, all right, keep your hair on! I'm sorry* [727]; **get under somebody's skin** (informal) – if someone gets under your skin, they annoy you, especially by the way they behave: *What really gets under my skin is people who push straight to the front of the line* [7, 1548]; **bug** (informal) – to annoy someone: *It just bugs me that I have to work so many extra hours for no extra money* [192]; **get on someone's nerves** – to annoy: *She got on his nerves with her stupid questions* [1101]; **get/ put somebody's back up** (informal) – to annoy someone: *Simone was the kind of person who was always putting people's backs up* [91]; **get somebody off one's back** (spoken) – to stop annoying someone with a lot of questions, criticism etc, or to make someone stop annoying you in this way: *Maybe the only way to get him off my back is to tell him the truth* [91]; **to plague someone** – to annoy someone, especially by asking

for something many times or asking them many questions: *The kids have been plaguing me with questions* [1246]¹⁸.

All the researched verbs denote either the emotional state of annoyance itself or the influence on a person's mood with an intention to cause this emotional state. Because of verbal lexemes, annoyance may be seen as a process. Semantic analysis of lexemes of the modern English language, which denote the emotional state of annoyance, has demonstrated that archiseme "slightly angry" is common for all the elements of the lexico-semantic field "annoyance". This archiseme is a field dominant and identifies it. Its notion is more or less presented in the definitions of all field units. Lexico-semantic field "annoyance" is built by layering the fields of different parts of speech. A certain unit belongs to a particular zone according to the number of features in its semantic structure.

¹⁸Longman dictionary of contemporary English / [director Della Summers]. – New ed. – Essex, 2003. – 1950 p.

Conclusion

Acquaintance with the currently used procedures of linguistic investigation shows that contrastive analysis and statistical analysis are widely used in the preparation of teaching material and are of primary importance for teachers of English.

The special interest of contemporary science in methods of linguistics research extends over a period of about twenty five years.

The present status of principles and techniques in lexicology although still far from satisfactory shows considerable progress. The structural synchronic approach may be said to have grown into a whole system of procedures which can be used either successively or alternately.

The main procedures belonging to this system are the analysis into immediate constituents; distributional analysis with substitution test as part of it; transformational analysis; componential analysis and statistical analysis.

Each of these techniques viewed separately has its limitations but taken together they complete one another so that each successive procedure may prove helpful where the previous one has failed. We have considered these devices time and again in discussing separate aspects of the vocabulary system. All these are formalized methods in the sense that they replace the original words in the linguistic material sampled for analysis by symbols that can be discussed without reference to the particular elements they stand for and then state precise rules for the combination and transformation of formulas thus obtained.

What makes a particular field of contrasting words interesting is not so much their sub-ordination under some comprehensive term like 'colour' or 'complexion' as the differences between the uses of those words - differences of comparative normality in certain contexts. Many of these differences are not imposed by 'the nature of things'. How would one explain that some languages are content with as few as two or three 'colour-words'? Why should, for some people, wine be 'white' more normally than 'red' in the context of fish? Why should warning-signals be 'red' rather than any other colour? What is the reason, in some communities, for

ousting 'black' from normal references to racial colours? It is on account of such differences between the uses of contrasting words that we find it interesting to assemble them in a Field. These differences reflect the tendencies and traditions, the predispositions and expectations that prevail in the life of a speech-community. -No further information of that kind is to be expected from any further subordination of the selected Word-Fields as, themselves, members of ever more comprehensive fields of fields.

All that is not to deny that there are suggestions in the vocabulary of a natural language of various kinds of significant order as well as suggestions for more coherent metaphysical adventures. But even if, in some limited section of the vocabulary, a certain order appears to be all but imperative, it is bound to be changeable, and we are always free to inaugurate a change. The Semantic Fields of individual words provide empirical evidence for a variety of Word-Fields, and Word-Fields allow of a variety of more comprehensive conceptual orders. We are free to choose.

All the researched verbs denote either the emotional state of annoyance itself or the influence on a person's mood with an intention to cause this emotional state. Because of verbal lexemes, annoyance may be seen as a process. Semantic analysis of lexemes of the modern English language, which denote the emotional state of annoyance, has demonstrated that archiseme "slightly angry" is common for all the elements of the lexico-semantic field "annoyance". This archiseme is a field dominant and identifies it. Its notion is more or less presented in the definitions of all field units. Lexico-semantic field "annoyance" is built by layering the fields of different parts of speech.

The list of used literatures

1. Арнольд И.В. Лексикология современного английского языка. -3-е изд. перераб. и доп.- М.: Высшая школа 1986.-295
2. Ахматова О.С. Глушко М.М. Основы компонентного анализа.- М. 1969.-150 с.
3. Бродська В. Лексико-стилістичний аналіз тексту методом статистичної лексикографії. - Чернівці: Рута 2003. — 199 с.
4. Верба Л.Г. Порівняльна лексикологія англійської та української мов. -Вінниця: Нова книга 2003.-160 с.
5. . Васильев Л. М. Теория семантических полей / Л. М. Васильев // Л. М. Васильев Вопросы языкознания. – 1971. – № 5. – С. 105–113.
6. Гальперин И.Р. Стилистика английского языка.- 2-е изд. испр. и доп.- М.: Высшая школа 1977.- 332 с.
7. Головин Б.И. Из курса лексики по лингвистической статистике.- Горький 1966.-285 с.
8. Зеленько А.С.Основы лексикології (під кутом зору теорії лінгвістичного детермінізму) : Моногр. дослідж. - Луганськ: Альма-матер 2003. -178 с.
9. Лексикология английского языка: Р.З. Гинзбург С.С. Хидекель Г.Ю. Князева.- 2-е изд. испр. и доп.- М.: Высшая школа 1979.- 269 с.
10. Нижегородцева-Кириченко Л. А. Лексико-семантическое поле «Интеллектуальная деятельность» : опыт концептуального анализа (на материале существительных современного английского языка) : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.04 / Нижегородцева-Кириченко Лариса Алексеевна. – К., 2000. – 357 с.
11. Никитин М. В. Курс лингвистической семантики / М. В. Никитин. – СПб.: Науч. центр проблем диалога, 1996. – 700 с.

12. Ильин Е. П. Эмоции и чувства / Е. П. Ильин. – СПб. [и др.]: Питер, 2002. - 752 с., ил. – (Серия “Мастера психологии).
13. Фрумина Р.М. Статистические методы изучения лексики. -М. 1992.- 206 с.
14. Расточинская О. В. Сопоставительная характеристика семантических полей слов со значением СТРАХ во французском и русском языках: дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.05 / Расточинская Ольга Васильевна. – Смоленск, 1973. – 256 с.
15. Шаховский В. И. Эмотивный компонент значения и методы его описания: Учеб. Пособие спецкурсу / В. И. Шаховский. – Волгоград: ВГПИ, 1983. – 94 с.
16. Longman dictionary of contemporary English / [director Della Summers]. – New ed. – Essex, 2003. – 1950 p.
17. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2010. – 1840 p.
18. Oxford Wordpower Dictionary. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2006. – 888 p.
19. Shorter Oxford English Dictionary. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2007. – [электронный ресурс] – Режим доступа : <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/page/askoxfordredirect>