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

AZIZOVA HULKAR

English faculty - 3 group 302

SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF THE LEXICAL FIELD DENOTING "ACTION" IN MODERN ENGLISH

COURSE PAPER

THE COURSE PAPER
IS ADMITTED TO DEFENSE
The head of the English
Department _____Matyakubov.J
2016 "____" _____

SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR:
_____ G.Tursunova
2016 "____"_____

TASHKENT-2016

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION......3

Chapter I General theory and meaning in linguistics

1.1. Types of lexical meanings.....4

1.2. The theory of meaning in linguistics.....7

1.3. Semantic analyses of meanings.....11

CHAPTER II SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF THE LEXICAL FIELD DENOTING "ACTION" IN MODERN ENGLISH

2.1. The study of the fields of semantic fields…….

2.2. Polysemy in the semantic field of action and movement in the English language…….

Conclusion……..

The list of used literatures…….

Introduction

The president of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islom Abduganievich Karimov speaking about the future of Uzbekistan underlines: "Harmonious generation is the future guarantee of prosperity"[1]

It is our task to prepare taught, professionally competent and energetic personnel, real patriots to see them in the world depository of science and culture. In this plan the national program about training personal was worked out au the formation of new generation of specialist "With the thigh common aid and professional culture creative and social activate, with the ability to orientate in the social and political life independently, capable to raise and solve the problem to the perspective"

The subject of the given course paper deals with one of the most actual problems of lexicology that is the use of action words in the English language and their lexical analysis.

The object of the course paper is to show the peculiarities of action words by lexical and semantic features.

The novelty of this course paper is that we have tried to point out the necessity of studying o the problem of semantic analysis of the lexical field denoting "action" in modern English

Actually of the theme of the present course paper is seen in the fact that the English language is becoming richer in action words by way of acquiring more and more element of the vocabulary, and thee linguist, translators and language teachers should be in familiar with these change in the lexical structure of the language, therefore our graduation paper is very actual.

The aim of the present course paper is to give a detailed description of the semantic analysis of the lexical field denoting "action" in modern English.

In accordance with the aim of the paper we have worked out concrete facts. They are:

1. To analyze two stages of analyzes. The remaining two stages of analyzes, semantics and programmatic, concerned with getting at the meaning of a sentence.

In the first stage a partial representation of the meaning is obtained based on the possible syntactic structure of the sentence, and on the meaning of the word in that sentence.

In the second stage, the meaning is elaborated based on contextual and work knowledge.

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 the given course paper is as follow: Introduction, two chapters Conclusion and Bibliography.

The main part includes two chapters in itself.

The first chapter has two paragraphs, in which were discussed general theory and meaning in linguistics.

The second chapter has three paragraphs, in which were discussed semantic analysis of the lexical field denoting “action” in modern English .

Conclusion is about the summary thoughts about the theoretical and practical position of the theme.

Bibliography directs us to the list of all literatures that have been used in the process of carrying out the given theme.

All chapters and their paragraphs have been illustrated examples collected from the books and Internet sites listed in bibliography.

Chapter I General theory and meaning in linguistics.

1.1. Types of lexical meanings

An exact definition on any basic term is no 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 adopt it to human need.

The definition of the lexical meaning has been attempted more than once in accordance with the main principles of different linguistic school. According to F.De Saussure consider meaning to be the relation between the object or notion named, and the name itself, Descriptive linguistics of the Bloomfield an trend defines the meaning as the situation in which the word is altered both ways approach afford no possibility of a further investigation of semantic problems in strictly linguistic theory, give no insight into the mechanism of meaning. Some of Bloomfield's successors went so far as to exclude semasiology from linguistics on the ground that meaning could not been 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 I well revealed in R.Jakdoson'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 a definite language system. It has also been repeatedly stated that the plane of content in speech reflects the whole of human consciousness, which comprises not only mental activity but emotions as well.

The notion 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 , then , is to serve as linguistic expression for a notion or as a name for an actually existing object referred to buy a word. The term denotatum (P. I.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 it 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 (or expressive counterpart) and evokes a general ideas. Thus a good laugh is sunshine in the house (THACKERAY) or a man cannot be too careful in the choice of his enemies (WILDE) contain words in their significative meanings. The second type (demonstrative meaning) is revealed when it is the individual elements of reality that 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 colored light of a summer day in London (Wilde).

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 conno-tational component of meaning. In some words the realization of meaning is accompanied by additional stylistic characteristics revealing the speakers 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) intensity, e.g. adore as compared to love; d) stylistic coloring, e.g. lay 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 definite as an expression in speech of relationship between words based on contrastive features of arrangements in which they occur. The being a book on lexicology and not on grammar, it is permissible to take this definition ready-made without explaining or analyzing it and concentrate. Our attentions open lexico-grammatical meaning.

More than that, every denotational meaning is itself a combination of several more elementary components. The mining of kill, for instance, can be described a follows: {cause[become (not+alive)]}. One further point should be made cause, become, not and alive in this analysis are not words of English of 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 hall consider the word “adored” in the following epigram by Oscar Wilde. “Men can be analyzed, women-merely adored”. Adored has a lexical meaning and a grammatical meaning.[1]

The grammatical meaning is that of a Participle 2 of a transitive verb. The denotational counter part of the lexical meaning realize the corresponding notion, and consists of several components, namely-feeling, attachment, intensity, respect. The connotation 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 way have several meanings. A great that has more than one meaning is called polysemantic.

Polysemy is in horrent in the very nature of words and notions, as they always contain a generalization of several traits of the object some of these traits are common with other objects possessing common features.

Thus polysemy is characteristic of most words in many languages, however different they may be. But it I more characteristic of the English vocabulary as compared with Russian, due to the monosyllabic character of English and the predominance 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 regularity is of course a statistical, not a rigid one.

Word counts how that the total number of meanings separately registered in NED for the forts thousand of the most frequent English wordsis 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 leg quickly as in Tired as I was, I began to run frantically home. The lexical meaning doesn't change in the forms ran or running. The basic meaning may be extended to in animate things/ caught the but that runs between C and B; or the word "run" may be used figuratively// makes the blood run cold. Both the components of foot and quickly* are sup reed in Thisself-service shop is run by the. Co-op and "the car runs on petrol".[2]The idea of motion remains but it is reduced to operate of function. The difference of meaning I reflected in the difference of syntactic valiancy. It is impossible to use this variant about humans and say:"We humans run on foot". It is possible to use active-passive transformation when the meaning implies management. The Co-op runs this self-service shop but not/was run by home. There are other variants of run where there I no implication of speed or "on foot", or motion but the implication of 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 sing/semantic componentcommon 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 signaled either by the form of the word itself or by context. CF. ship: sheep, brothers: brethren, smoke screen: screen star.

In analyzing the polyseme 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 depending 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 the so-called lexico-grammatical variants of word.

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 variant of a word are it variants characterized by paradigmatic or morphological peculiarities, different syntactic functions, very often they belong to different lexico-grammatical groups of the same part o speech thus run intransitive in/ ran home, but transitive in/ run this office.

All the lexical and lexico-grammatical variant 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 “a young man” (plural youths) that can be substituted by the pronoun “he” in the singular and “they” in the plural; the third I a collective noun “young man and woman” 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 feel that one’s youth has gone”, where bath the time and the state can be meant. These variants form a structured set because they are interrelated in meaning as they all contain the semantic component “young” and can be explained by means of another one.

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 after the verb which may be followed by an adverbial or a prepositional object as in the following formulas: Na+carry+N^ (Railways and ships carry goods) or N,+ca/pry-(-N,-/-prep+N (She was carrying the baby in her arm).

In both cases clarify is a transitive verb. There is also intransitive variant in which carry is followed by a predicative or adverbial of distance, time, etc. and means “to have the power to reach”: N+corr (/+prep+H-Nj (His voice carried across the room).

Nonce usage takes place in cases occasional figurative meanings. Nonce usage I 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 an easy agreeable way he bustled other people into doing thing they didn’t want to do, (W.COOPER). Here the word bustle does not show any of its dictionary meanings. This is nonce usage which I clearly motivated any 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’ semantic structure I 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 adoring and other connotations.

Polysemy and semantic structure exist only in language not in speech. The sum total of many contexts in which the word may occur permit u to observe and record case of identical meaning and case that differ in meaning. They are registered and classified by lexicographersand found in dictionaries, for example, we read the bother has two variants as a verb: (1) ”to worry or to cause trouble” and (2) “to take the trouble”[3].

It is very important to distinguish between the lexical meaning of a word in speech and its semantic structure in language. The meaning in speech is contextual. If one examines, for example, the word “bother’ in the following: Any woman will love any man who bathers her enough (H.PHILLIPHS) one sees it in a definite context that particularizes it and makes possible only one meaning: “to cause trouble”. This notion receives the emotional coloring of irony revealing the protagonist’sview of love as cynical and pessimistic. This coloring in the word “bother” is combined with a colloquial stylistic tone. Actually used it has only one meaning, it I monosemantic but it may render a complicated notion or emotion with many features.

Polysemy does not interfere with the communicative function of the language because in every particular case the situation and context, i.e. the environment of the word, cancel all unnecessary meaning and make speech unambiguous

1.2. Semantic analysis of the meaning.

No general or complete scheme of types of lexical meaning has so far been accepted by linguists. Linguistic literature abounds in various terms reflecting various points of view. The following terms may be found with different authors

the meaning is direct or nominative when it nominates the object without the help of context, in isolation, i.e. in one-word sentences. A typical case is the titles: “Rain” (a short story by W.S.Maugham), “The Egoist” (a novel by Meredith), etc. The meaning is figurative when the object is named and at the same time characterized through its similarity with another object. Note the word “characterized” it I meant to point out that when used figuratively a word while naming the object simultaneously describes is.

Other oppositions are abstract::concrete, main or primary::secondary, readily see that in each of these the basis of classification is different, although there is one point they have in common. In each case the comparison takes place within the semantic structure of one word.

Take, for example, the noun “screen. We find it in its direct meaning when it names a moveable piece of furniture used to hide something or protect somebody, as in the case of “fire screen” placed in front of a fireplace. The meaning is figurative when the word is applied to anything which protects by hiding, as in “smoke screen”. We define the meaning as figurative comparing it to the first that we called direct. Again, when by “screen” the speaker means a silver-colored sheet on which pictures are shown, this meaning in comparison with the first will be secondary. When the same word is used attributively in such combinations as “screen actor”, “screen star”, “screen version”, etc., it come to mean “Pertaining to the cinema” and I abstract in comparison with the first meaning which is concrete. The main meaning is that which possesses the highest frequency at the present stage of development. All these terms reflect relationships existing between different meanings of a word at the same period, so the classification may be called synchronic and paradigmatic, although the terms are borrowed from historical lexicology and stylistics.

If the variants are classified not only by comparing them inside the semantic structure of a word but according to the style the sphere of language in which they may occur the clarification is stylistically. All the words are classified into stylistically neutral and bookish colloquial bookish styles in their turn may be (a)

general, (b)poetical, (c) scientific or learned, while colloquial styles are; subdivided into (a) literary colloquial, (b) familiar colloquial, (c) slang.

If we primarily interested in the historical perspective, the meanings will be classified according to their genetic characteristic and their growing or diminishing role in the language. In this way the following terms are used etymological, i.e. the earliest known meaning archaic, i.e. the meaning superseded at present by a newer one but till remaining in certain collocations; present-day meaning, which is the one most frequent in the present-day language; and the original meaning serving as basis for the derived ones. It is very important to pay attention to the fact that one and the same meaning can at features of meaning may therefore serve as distinctive features describing each meaning in its relationship to the others.

Diachronic and synchronic ties are thus closely interconnected as the new meanings are understood thanks to their motivation by the older meaning.

Hornsby's dictionary, for instance, distinguishes in the word "witness" tour different meanings which may be described as follows:

Witness, "evidence, testimony"-a direct, abstract, primary meaning.

Witness, "a person who has first-hand knowledge of an event and is able to describe it"-a metonymical, concrete secondary meaning.

Witness "a person who gives evidence under catch in a law court"-a metonymical, concrete, secondary meaning specialized from "witness"

Witness "a person who puts his signature to a document by the side of that of the chief person who signs it"-a metonymical, concrete, secondary meaning specialized from "witness".

Lexicographers abstract the meaning of words from examples of usage.

Every meaning is thus characterized with reference to what it denotes in the extra-linguistic reality and with respect to other meanings with wide it is contrasted. The hierarchy of lexico-gpammatical and lexical variants, shades of meaning and nonce usage characterizes the semantic distance between them a signaled by distribution. It is of great importance for applied linguistics, for

lexicography in particular, as mistakes in this respect distort the lexicographical description of words and hinder the usefulness of dictionaries.

Semantics.

1. Semantic is a subfield of linguistics that is traditionally defined as the study of meaning. One of the study is the meaning of compounds, another is the study of relations between different linguistic expressions (Homonymy, synonymy, antonymy, polysemy, hypernymy, hyponymy).

Semantics includes the study of thematic roles. Semantics deals with sense and reference, truth conditions and discourse analysis. Pragmatics is often considered a part of semantics.

Why Semantic Structures

What the heck is a semantic structure?

Semantic structure is a fancy term for an organization that represents meaning for example, an English sentence is a semantic structure. Consider the following sentence structure:

Subject-verb-object.

Now, before you object, saying "The words have meaning not the structure!" consider two examples at the period structure:

Dog bites man.

Man bites dog.

Now, obviously the words have meaning. But, two sentences containing the same words in the same structure can have very different meanings-depending on "where" in the structure the words appear. So in the first case it's the dog who bites the man, and in the second case the man who bites the dog. Changing the position of the words (or "terms") within the structure changes the meaning of the structure.

So, you ask, how do I know which position meanswhat? To grossly oversimplify, in the case of our three-word sentences above, English grammar tell us that the word before the verb is the subject, and the verb after the verb is the object. The subject is the "deer", the verb is the "done", and the object is the

“done-unto”. Systems that use other semantic structures also need to supply a grammar, or way of interpreting meaning based on structure, in order to be useful.

Semantics I the aspect of the language function that relates to understanding the meanings of word and sentences.

This issometime appear from their unusualresponses when they are told to do something and sometimes it is revealed by the questions they ask, and the things they say about words. There is an example here of 12 year old Nerada’ interpretation of the word “acquire”. In the example, she was unable to direct room the context that she was being asked what “acquire”, rather than “a choir” meant.

People with semantic processing difficulties have particular trouble with abstract words like “vague” or “curious”, words that relate to feelings and emotions such a “embarrassed” and “anxious”, and words that refer to status (for instance “expert” or “authority”) or degree (for example, “essential” or “approximate”)

They have difficulty with idiom as, saying and slang expressions, often taking them literally or interpreting them oddly. For example, when asked I he enjoyedspending time with his friend, a 14 year old with semantic proceeding problem replied, “I don’t see have you can spend time and I certainly don’t see how you could enjoy it pending time is not something you can do. You can only actually spend money”.

Another difficulty child with semantic problems experience is that they may not be able to identify the key point or topic in a sentence and because of this may suddenly change the subject, very obscurely, apparently thinking they are on the same subject. Here is another real example from a girl aged eleven.

Question: “Could you get the book off the shelf and give it to me?” Reply:”The Galt Stream warms the coast-line”.

CHAPTER II SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF THE LEXICAL FIELD DENOTING “ACTION” IN MODERN ENGLISH

2.1. The study of the fields of semantic fields

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 *lкren*, *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-Zusammengehцrigkeit*) 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* (*Stȯrke*), 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' (*sȯuberliche 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 outselves 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

thedifferences 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 to types, according to whether the word's function is significative or identifying (demonstrative).To denote , than 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 servers 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. A part 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 and 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 mire 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 constitutive 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: Nl+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':Nl+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 bustled 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 linguistic 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 wordgentleman, 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. Polysemy in the semantic field of action and movement in the English language

One of the long-established misconceptions about the lexicon is that it is neatly and rigidly divided into semantically related sets of words. In contrast, we claim that word meanings do not have clear boundaries.1 In this paper we will give proof of the fuzziness of meaning through an analysis of the semantic field of action in the English language. We will show that many action verbs belong not only to several subdomains within the field of action, but also to various semantic domains through metaphorical extension.

Before dealing with the double or even triple membership of action verbs, let us first present the model on which our description of the lexicon is based, the Functional-Lexematic Model

1. The Functional-Lexematic Model

The FLM integrates Coseriu's *Lexematics* (1977), Dik's *Functional Grammar* (1997a) and some fundamental principles of cognitive linguistics. Following Faber and Mairal (1998: 4-5), the two main objectives of this model are, on the one hand, the construction of the linguistic architecture of the lexicon of a language, and on the other hand, the representation of knowledge based on the linguistic coding of dictionary entries.

The FLM establishes three axes of analysis: the paradigmatic, syntagmatic and cognitive axes. The elaboration of the paradigmatic axis entails the structuring of the lexicon in semantic domains --each corresponding to a basic area of meaning,2 and the organization of lexical domains into hierarchically constructed subdomains elaborated on the basis of shared meaning components A subdomain is "a subdivision of semantic space derived from the factorisation of the meaning definition of its members"3 (Faber and Mairal 1998: 6). Word definitions are built according to Dik's method of *Stepwise Lexical Decomposition*. This means that the definition structure of each lexeme consists of the nuclear word --the archilexeme-- and a series of semantic features which mark its distance from the preceding members of the subdomain.

Following Faber and Mairal (1999), the domain of MOVEMENT is organised into four subdomains. The first subdomain describes generic movement, while the other subdomains subsume lexemes which denote movement in a number of contexts: liquid, atmosphere and land. Cutting across this major configuration of the domain, the parameters of manner and direction introduce further divisions within each subdomain.4 For instance, these parameters traverse the following subdomains within the subdomain lexicalizing generic movement:

1. Direction:

To move towards a place/person/thing

To move back

To move up

To move down

2. Manner:

To move quickly

To move slowly

To move smoothly

To move in a circular manner

As an example of a subdomain structured paradigmatically, we have selected the subdomain *To move down*:

fall: to move down from a high position/the sky/a tree.

plunge: to fall suddenly a long way from a high position.

plummet: to fall very quickly from a high position.

come down: to fall (rain/snow) heavily.

descend: to move down a slope/stairs (fml).

The verbs indented to the right (*plunge, plummet, come down*) are defined in terms of the verb immediate above them (*fall*), which thus becomes their definiens. They are basically differentiated from one another in terms of manner. The other archilexeme of this subdomain is *descend*.

The construction of the syntagmatic axis implies the analysis of the complementation patterns of each lexeme using predicate frames as integrated formulae.

The following types of information are captured in predicate frames:

(i) the form of the predicate

(ii) the syntactic category to which it belongs

(iii) its quantitative valency, i.e. the number of arguments that the predicate requires

(iv) its qualitative valency, i.e. the semantic functions of the arguments and the pertinent selection restrictions

(v) the meaning definition

Predicate frames describe a state of affairs and specify the relationship between the predicate arguments (represented by the variable *x*). Each argument is characterized by a selection restriction --described in terms of binary semantic features-- and fulfills a semantic function (Agent, Experiencer, Goal, Recipient, etc.).

Consider the predicate frame of the verb *bow*:

[(x1: prototyp. human)Ag (x2: prototyp. part of the body)Go]Action

DEF = to bend your head and upper body as a greeting or as a sign of respect.

This frame describes an Action and specifies the relationship between a human argument, performing the function of Agent, and an argument fulfilling the function of Goal and semantically marked as part of the body (head).

The elaboration of the cognitive axis entails the formulation of the predicate conceptual schemata, which are cognitive constructs encoding semantic, syntactic and pragmatic information and representing our knowledge about the lexical unit in question. Conceptual schemata are codified at three levels: lexeme, subdomain and domain.

2. Polysemy of MOVEMENT verbs

Many MOVEMENT verbs fall within several subdomains. This double/multiple membership may be accounted for on the following grounds:

a) The meaning component focalised

b) The genus of the lexeme

c) The metaphorical extension of the verb

Let us examine each of these factors.

2.1. Focalization of a meaning component

We have used Dik's (1997a) pragmatic functions of *Focus* and *Topic* to account for some instances of polysemy in the semantic field of MOVEMENT. These functions specify the information status of the constituents of the predicate within the communicative setting in which they occur, and they are assigned to the constituents after the assigning of semantic and syntactic functions. The *Topic* is the entity about which the predication predicates something in the setting in question, whereas the *Focus* refers to the most relevant information in the setting:

(1) As for Mary (Focus), I don't care for her (Topic).

The application of such functions to the paradigmatic description of the lexicon is based on the organization of the lexicon at three levels: domain, subdomain and lexeme. In consonance with this idea, we may formulate various levels of focalization:

Level of focalization 1: Domain

Level of focalization 2: Subdomain

Levels of focalization 3, 4, ... : Lexeme

A domain stands for the level of focalization number 1. It performs the function of Focus in that it represents one of the basic areas of meaning.

A subdomain represents the level of focalization number 2 in that it focuses on an area of meaning within a domain.

The following levels of focalization are formulated at lexeme-level. This means that the lexemes of a subdomain represent different levels of focalization based on the meaning hierarchies within the subdomain.

What is most relevant is that what is Focus on a level becomes Topic on the level below. Then a domain, which performs the function of Focus on the level of focalization number 1, becomes topic at subdomain-level in that it presents the given information, since all the subdomains of MOVEMENT lexicalize the concept of movement. Therefore, the archilexeme of the lexical field, *move*, which performs the function of Focus at domain-level in that it codifies the nuclear meaning of the domain, becomes Topic at subdomain-level, since it is the definiens of the archilexeme of each subdomain.

Similarly, a subdomain, which acts as Focus on the level of focalization number 2, becomes Topic at lexeme-level, since all the lexemes in the subdomain share the nuclear information formalised by the subdomain. Then, as we move down in the semantic hierarchy which characterizes the internal structure of each subdomain, what is Focus in the meaning definition of the archilexeme (level of focalization

number 3) becomes Topic in the meaning definition of its hyponyms (level of focalization number 4). For example, if we take the subdomain analysed above, *To move down*, the definiens "to move down" acts as Focus in the definition of*fall* (the archilexeme), and as Topic in the definition of *plunge, plummet* and *come down*, the function of Focus being performed by the semantic parameters of manner and place in that they individuate the members of the subdomain.

Let us now consider the functions of Topic and Focus in the case of lexemes belonging to several subdomains. Here the function of Focus applies to a particular meaning component, which thus becomes especially relevant. The verbs *whizz* and *zoom* involve quick movement, thus belonging to the subdomain *To move quickly*. But they can also denote movement through the air:

(2) The bullets whizzed past.

Then, these verbs belong to the subdomain *To move quickly* or *To move through the air* depending on which parameter is highlighted, whether manner or medium.

Similarly, the verbs *circle* and *whirl* refer to circular movement in the air. If the manner component is focalized, then the verbs fall in the subdomain *To move in a circular manner*. If the focus is on the medium, then the verbs belong to the subdomain *To move through the air*.

2. Genus of the lexeme

Many verbs describe generic movement. Verb membership is then determined by the semantic parameter of medium or direction, or by the parameter specifying the nature of the subject/object.

The table below presents the verbs whose membership is influenced by the medium parameter.

The verb *dart* describes sudden movement in air and on land:

(3) He darted across the room.

(4) Bees were darting from one flower to another.

The verbs *dive, plunge* and *sink* designate downward movement in air and water:

(5) She plunged into the swimming-pool.

(6) The falcon plunged towards its prey.

Sink, as the general term, denotes movement in a wider variety of contexts:

(7) Helen sank into water/mud/an armchair.

However, we postulate that the verbs *dart, dive* and *sink* prototypically describe movement in a given medium: *dart* is prototypically associated with *air*, and *dive* and *sink* with water. Our claim is supported by the fact that the medium parameter need not be syntactically present:

(8) She dived from the bridge and rescued the drowning child.

(9) The aircraft-carrier, hit by a torpedo, sank at once.

Further, as we will show below, *sink* has a metaphorical projection onto FEELING, which codifies the metaphor Emotion = Liquid (Goatly 1997):

(10) When he crashed, his heart sank at the thought that he might die.

Finally, *glide* refers to quiet/smooth movement in a wide range of contexts (water, air, land):

(11) The cruiser glided across the sea.

(12) An owl glided over the fields.

(13) The snake glided towards its prey.

As mentioned above, the domain of MOVEMENT is marked by the semantic parameter of direction, which can determine verb membership. The lexemes *jump, vault, leap, hop* and *spring* are subsumed under various subdomains depending on whether they denote forward or upward/downward movement over an obstacle:

(14) Robert jumped one metre/over the fence/out of the shadow.

(15) Carol sprang at him/to her feet.

Finally, as shown below, verb membership can also be determined by the parameter describing the nature of the subject or object.

ARGUMENT	SEMANTIC SCOPE	VERB	DIMENSION	MEANING
	Human/ Object	*shake* *tremble* *quiver*	*To move from side to side/back and forth/up and down repeatedly*	To move quickly from side to side/ up and down To shake un-controllably/ slightly To shake slightly
	Part of the body	*shake* *tremble* *quiver*	*To move one's body*	To move one's body quickly from side to side/up and down To shake un-controllably/slightly To shake slightly
Subject	Human Boat	*sail*	*To move towards a place* *To move over liquid*	To travel to a place by ship To move (boat) over the sea
	Object	*rise*	*To move upwards* *To move*	To move upwards through air

		fall	*downwards*	To move down from a high position/the sky/a tree
	Vehicle/ aircraft	*plunge* *plummet*	*To move in/downwards below the surface of a liquid* *To move downwards through air*	To move (vehicle) below the surface of water To move down through air very quickly
	Human	*rise* *fall* *plunge* *plummet*	*To move one's body by raising it* *To move to the ground*	To stand up (fml) To move to the ground from force of weight / loss of balance To fall suddenly a long way from a high position To fall very quickly from a high position
Object	Object	*swing* *lift* *raise* *bend*	*To move from side to side/back and forth/up and down repeatedly* *To cause stb/sth to move up*	To move regularly from side to side/back and forth To cause sb/sth to move up To lift sth

			To move in a different direction	To turn in a curve/angle
	Part of the body	*swing* *lift* *raise* *bend*	*To move a part of one's body*	To move regularly from side to side/back and forth To move a part of one's body upwards (esp. head/arm/leg/foot) To move a part of one's body upwards To move a part of one's body downwards

The verbs *shake, tremble* and *quiver* may be found with a subject argument semantically characterized as human or as concrete. But they can also take an object denoting a part of the body via the metaphor Body part = Human (Goatly 1997):

(16) Mark was so nervous that his knees were shaking.

Sail typically occurs with a subject semantically characterized as boat. Its use with a human agent results from a metonymical process (content for receptacle):

(17) They sailed the Mediterranean.

Rise designates upward movement of both human and concrete entities, but the prototypical argument is human, as shown in the restricted use of *rise* with human subjects when it describes body movement:

(18) She rose to greet me.

Fall, *plunge* and *plummet*, which denote downward movement, may also occur with human and concrete entities:

(19) He fell off the horse.

(20) The vase fell from her hand.

Lastly, the verbs *swing, lift, raise* and *bend* take an object semantically marked as object or part of the body:

(21) She lifted her head when I came in.

(22) The suitcase is too heavy for him to lift.

2.3. Metaphorical extension of the lexemes

The verbs *creep* and *escape* fall within various subdomains because of their metaphorical extension.

VERB	SUBDOMAIN	MEANING
Creep	To move in a particular way	To move quietly and slowly in order to get to a place without being noticed
	To move slowly	To move (light/shadow/mist) very slowly, so that you hardly notice it (lit.)
Escape	To move off/away from a place/thing/person	To leave a place after doing sth illegal
	To move out of a place	To move (gas/liquid) out of an object/a container

Creep typically describes a person's slow movement towards a place and thus falls primarily within the subdomain *To move in a particular way*, which refers to movement on land. Yet it also belongs to the subdomain *To move slowly* through a process of personification (Object/Substance=Human), whereby a concrete entity

semantically marked as “light/ shadow/ mist” is seen as a human entity. The meaning components speed --“*slowly*”-- and secrecy --“*without/hardly being noticed*”-- are basic to the definition of both verbs.

On the other hand, *escape* falls in the subdomains *To move off/away from a place/ thing/ person* and *To move out of a place*. This double membership obtains from the metaphorization of liquid as a human entity:

(23) Gas is escaping from this hole.

3. Interfield membership of MOVEMENT verbs

We have so far analysed the intrafield membership of a set of MOVEMENT verbs, i.e. their grouping under several subdomains within the semantic domain of MOVEMENT. We will now focus on the verbs' interfield membership, i.e. their projection onto other semantic fields.

The relations of a semantic domain with others codify metaphorical processes, thus showing that lexical structure is governed by conceptual structure., or, in Sweetser's words (1990:25), “much of meaning is grounded in speakers' understanding of the world”. Indeed, each language is equivalent to a particular conceptual system by means of which we interpret our environment, and this conceptual organization is reflected in the lexicon. This means that metaphor is not only a cognitive but also a linguistic phenomenon. Metaphorical processes are encoded in the lexicon and must thus be integrated in a lexical model.

Therefore, the codification of metaphorical processes in the lexicon not only tells us a great deal about how we understand and construct reality but also reflects the internal organization of the lexicon.

Below we sketch the metaphors codified in the domain of MOVEMENT, which establish connections with the semantic fields of COGNITION, SPEECH, CHANGE, FEELING and ACTION.

MET. PROCESS	TYPE METAPHOR	METAPHOR	LEX. EXPRESSION	TARGET DOMAIN
Reification	Concretization	Idea = Object	*swing, revolve, stuff* *cram, shove*	COGNITION
		Words = Object	*raise, drop, pass*	SPEECH
		Ideas/Words = Cloth	*spin, weave*	SPEECH
	Place/Space	Activity = Place	*rush, leave, quit abandon*	ACTION
	Orientational	Health = Up	*fall, sink*	CHANGE
		Pitch = Up	*rise, raise, sink, lower drop*	CHANGE
		More = Up	*jump, rise, raise, fall sink, plunge, plummet come down, lower drop, sink*	CHANGE
		Importance/Status = Up	*rise, climb, come down*	CHANGE
		Happy = Up	*fall, sink, lift*	FEELING
		Activity/Process = Movement	*push, prod*	ACTION

		forward		
Personification		Emotion = Sense expression	*shake, tremble, shiver shudder, quiver*	FEELING
		Idea = Human	*slip, escape*	COGNITION
		Body part = Human	*fall, sink*	FEELING

Following Goatly (1997), the metaphorization of abstract entities can obtain through a process of reification or personification. Reifying metaphors fall into three categories:

(i) Concretizing metaphors, which codify the representation of abstract entities as objects or cloth/clothes (first row).

(ii) Orientational metaphors, i.e. equations linked to the notion of place/space (second row).

(iii) Metaphors related to the notion of orientation. Abstract concepts such as health, pitch, happiness, amount and rank are seen as entities on a vertical axis (up/down)5.

The last set of equations codify the personification of abstract entities.

Note that some verbs codify several metaphors, e.g. *rise, fall, sink, lower*. In this regard, we may affirm that the intrafield membership correlates with the interfield double membership.

MOVEMENT AND CHANGE

The projection of MOVEMENT onto CHANGE touches upon verbs denoting an increase or decrease in amount or degree, thus linking MOVEMENT to CHANGE, since the semantic parameters of amount and degree traverse the domain of

CHANGE. The connection between both semantic fields obtains from a set of orientational metaphors (cf. above):

(24) He has risen to the position of manager.

(25) Share prices have plunged.

MOVEMENT AND FEELING

MOVEMENT verbs also extend to FEELING. This extension results from the codification of several metaphorical processes:

- the metaphorical representation of a feeling (happiness) on an up/down scale:

(26) Whenever I feel down, Martha lifts my spirits.

(27) Peter's face fell when I broke the news to him.

- the personification of body parts. This metaphor interacts with the previous one (cf. example above).

- the metaphorical structuring of emotions as sense expressions. The verbs *shake, tremble,shiver, shudder* and *quiver* describe body movement as expression of an internal emotional state (anxiety, fear, disgust). This metaphorical process can be explained by the fact that emotions have corresponding physical effects on the experiencer, and these effects have come to represent the emotion that caused them:

(28) He trembled like a leaf at the sight of the tiger.

MOVEMENT AND COGNITION

The metaphorical projection of MOVEMENT into COGNITION results from a process of reification or personification of abstract entities. On the one hand, ideas can be metaphorized as objects moving in/into (*revolve, penetrate*) or out of somebody's mind (*slip, escape*):6

(29) The importance of her decision did not penetrate at first.

(30) His surname has slipped my mind.

(31) There is a major point which seems to have escaped you.

To use Halliday's terminology (1994:117), the last examples are instances of the *please-type* metaphorical structuring of mental processes. Mental processes can be represented either as *like-types* or *please-types*. This means that *I like X* is equivalent to *X pleases me*. Then, *It has slipped my mind/It has escaped me* has the same meaning as *I have forgotten it*.

Ideas can also be seen as objects which are pushed into someone's mind:

(32) He stuffed my head full of strange ideas.

Following Reddy (1993), the verbs *stuff, cram* and *shove* lexicalize an aspect of the *conduit metaphor*, which explains the conceptualization of communication as the transfer of thoughts bodily from one person to another.

MOVEMENT AND SPEECH

The verbs *raise*, *drop*, *pass, spin* and *weave* show the extension of MOVEMENT to SPEECH. Ideas can be communicated like objects being moved: *raise* (a subject, an *objection*), *drop*7 (a *hint, remark*), *pass* (a *sentence, remark*):

(33) You shouldn't drop hints about promotion to your boss.

Words can also be metaphorically seen as strands of thread that the speaker puts together to produce a coherent message:

(34) The old sea captain sat by the fire spinning yawns.

MOVEMENT AND ACTION

The connection of MOVEMENT with ACTION is established though the metaphorization of activities as places. Activities can be described as if they were linear motion. It is then possible to move into (*rush*) or away from an activity (*leave, quit, abandon*):

(35) They abandoned the game because of the rain.

On the other hand, causing an activity is causing movement forward:

(36) She pushed me into taking the job.

The semantic analysis of the field of MOVEMENT has shown that words are embedded in a set of rich semantic relations. The focalization of a meaning component and the genus of the lexeme account for the extension of a few MOVEMENT verbs to other subdomains within the domain (intrafield extensions). On the other hand, the metaphorical processes encoded in the semantic domain of MOVEMENT account for the projection of many verbs onto other semantic fields (interfield extensions), thus giving proof of the linguistic significance of metaphor.

Conclusion

The definition of the lexical meaning has been attempted more than once in accordance with the main principles of different linguistic school. According to F.De Saussure consider meaning to be the relation between the object or notion named, and the name itself, Descriptive linguistics of the Bloomfield an trend defines the meaning as the situation in which the word is altered both ways approach afford no possibility of a further investigation of semantic problems in strictly linguistic theory, give no insight into the mechanism of meaning. Some of Bloomfield's successors went so far as to exclude semasiology from linguistics on the ground that meaning could not been 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 I well revealed in R.Jakdoson'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 a definite language system. It has also been repeatedly stated that the plane of content in speech reflects the whole of human consciousness, which comprises not only mental activity but emotions as well.

The notion 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 , then , is to serve as linguistic expression for a notion or as a name for an actually existing object referred to buy a word. The term denotatum or referent means either a notion or an actually existing individual thing to which reference is made. The emotional content of the word is it 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 (or expressive counterpart) and evokes a 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 meanings. The second type (demonstrative meaning) is revealed when it is the individual elements of reality that 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 colored light of a summer day in London.

The semantic analysis of the field of MOVEMENT has shown that words are embedded in a set of rich semantic relations. The focalization of a meaning component and the genus of the lexeme account for the extension of a few MOVEMENT verbs to other subdomains within the domain (intrafield extensions). On the other hand, the metaphorical processes encoded in the semantic domain of MOVEMENT account for the projection of many verbs onto other semantic fields (interfield extensions), thus giving proof of the linguistic significance of metaphor.

The list of used literatures

1. Арнольд И.В. Лексикологя 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.Основи 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. Coseriu, Eugenio. 1977. *Principios de Semбntica Estructural*. Madrid: Gredos.
12. Dik, Simon C. 1997. *Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
13. Faber, Pamela and Ricardo Mairal. 1997. “The Paradigmatic and the Syntagmatic Structure of the Semantic Field of EXISTENCE in the

Elaboration of a Semantic Macronet". In *Studies in Language* 21 (1) (Amsterdam: John Benjamins): 119-154.
14. "Towards a Semantic Syntax". *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*: 1998. 37-64.
15. . *Constructing an English Lexicon for Verbs*. Berlin: Mouton.
16. Geckeler, Horst. 1971. *Strukturelle Semantik und Wortfeldtheorie*. Munich: Fink. 1999
17. Goatly, Andrew. 1997. *The Language of Metaphors*. London: Routledge.
18. Halliday, Mark. A. K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
19. Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
20. Martнn Mingorance, Leocadio. 1984. "Lexical Fields and Stepwise Lexical Decomposition in a Contrastive English-Spanish Verb Valency Dictionary". In Hartman, R. R. K. (ed.). *LEXeter '83 Proceedings.Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter*. Tьbingen: Max Niemeyer: 226-236.
21. "La semбntica sintagmбtica del adjetivo.Parбmetros para la organizaciyn de un lexicyn inglйs/ espacol de valencias 1985a adjetivales". *Actas del II Congreso Nacional de la Asociaciyn Espacola de Lingьнstica Aplicada*. Madrid: Sociedad General Espacola de Librerна: 329-340.
22. "Bases metodolygicas para un estudio contrastivo del lйxico derivado". *Revista Espacola de Lingьнstica Aplicada*. 1985b 1: 37-54.
23. Romelhart, David E. 1993. "Some Problems with the Notion of Literal Meanings". In Ortony, A. (ed.).
24. Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.