# FORMATION OF A SUBSTANTIVE CORE OF THE POLYSEMOUS VERB OF RELATIONS

*Professor Svetlana Kisselyova, Doctor of Philology*
*Professor Nelly Trofimova, Doctor of Philology*
*High School of Economics, St. Petersburg*

This investigation is implemented within the cognitive approach and is dedicated to the formation of a substantive core of the polysemantic verb, particularly of the verb of relations in the modern English. The cognitive approach is suspected image mainstay as well as third meaning mainstay; it means the meaning of the speech act, which is realized by the speaker in the proper communicative situation or inside of the fitting context on the basis of the nominative and primitive terms, included in the words. The substantive core of the polysemantic word is appealed to integrate all its lexical-semantic variants (LSV) and not to allow falling into homonyms.

Now it`s anecdotal evidence, according to which the lexical entry (definition) of a word should include all elements of plan of contents of a linguistic unit. And with this opinion there are hold the researches in the sphere of «semantic compactness», as the result of hypothesis appearance under finding out of the substantive core in the single meaning level as well as in polysemous word.

In terms of the first line, the word`s definition has referential information about lexical item, connotative, communicative and pragmatic semes. Actually, plan of content of words includes much more meanings as it is written in lexical entries. For instance, sufficiently complete description of the denotative meanings of some words for their differentiation is written in the treatise of A. Vezhbitskaya [15, 33-37]. While I. Arkhipov considers, that such huge definitions were combined while finding out of real information units of issue about words in memory, but these definitions do not suit to the substantive core role. With all evident superfluity of such definitions of lexical entries there can be the forcible position «any designation onto any lost sign» [2, 15-19].

It is very important for the article the restriction of the semantic values of meanings of verbs a treatment, particularly, with the meaning «combination of parts into the whole» till min necessary ones to identify partial semes. The substantive core on the level of a separate meaning of a verb of the partial semantics should intend narrowing of semantic components till the minimum necessary до минимально необходимых (stable, central). Moreover, the value "part and the whole" should be recognizable.

Among famous linguists implementing the investigations in this sphere, it is necessary to notice some linguists (S. Katsnelson, V. Serebrennikov), developing the concept of A. Potebnya about the nearest and the furthest meanings. A. Potebnya considers that the word`s meaning includes «two different issues», one of them is called «the nearest meaning», belonged to the study of language, the other one - «the furthest meaning», a subject of other studies. But only the nearest meaning has the real content of thought while its pronouncing [10, 19-20]. While pronunciation of the word the person`s consciousness does not focus on complex of all word`s characteristics, because it needs time and definite intellectual operation. It`s the author`s opinion that a word out of the context extends not

the full content, but only one material sign. He calls it the nearest meaning, which is together with the flight of imagination makes the understanding between a speaker and a hearer intelligible. The nearest (or objective) meaning is called by A. Potebnya «public», because he considers that people of one linguistic community have similar thoughts. The further meaning is considered to be subjective. «The top thought`s objectivity appears from the private understanding, the scientific one, only by public understanding, it means language and tools, creation of which is driven by language existence» [11, 120-124].

Thus, the nearest meaning is a form, where the content is performed to our conscious. At that the inner form of the word implies the relations of thought`s content and conscious. It gives an opportunity to see «unborrowed idea is arised to person». According to opinion of A. Potebnya, this issue can explain why the language may have many words to define one and the same thing and vise versa, one word may define different things. Moreover, he thinks that sometimes it is absolutely impossible to mark in some definition the most single and quintessential characteristic. Therefore, the meaning`s base includes not one but minimum possible amount of signs. The author considers that the word semantics, fixed in dictionary as the nearest meaning of the word is a secondary and derivative in relation to knowledge about the world, which is the further meaning [11, 124].

State about «nation» of the meaning is alive in nowadays as well. So, S. Apresyan makes distinctions of the formal and comprehensive meanings. The formal ones are defined by him as minimum general and at the same time more discriminatory criteria necessary to define and distinguish a thing [1]. From S. Katsnelson point of view, «The formal concept sums up the most important what we should know about the issue, that is why any new step in learning of issue is out of such meaning» [7, 20]. The comprehensive meaning comprises new sides of issue, its features and connection with other things. All people may have different concepts because of the individual experience, education level, talent, etc [7, 20]. Other ways of saying, the comprehensive meaning of the author agrees with the further meaning of A. Potebnya.

From Yu. Karaulov point of view, firstly there is a change of the furthest meaning of the word, then the components of this enriched meaning spread onto the level semantics and partially reflects in changes of the nearest meaning. «The information registered by the linguistic semantics reflects narrow part about world knowledge and in some cases can reflects them perversely» [6, 168-170].

There is still an open question about number abridgement of semantic components composed of meanings. Some linguists are trying to number of components by reduction of meanings. Other researchers consider, that this number cannot be limited, it intends that the meaning cannot be described by exhaustive set of semantic components while the semantic components itself is kernel, capable for further articulation of meanings elements [12]. Thus, many linguists point to the baffling complexity of such operations inside of the lexical-semantic variants (LSV).

V. Gak singles out core of word`s meaning as semanteme, semantic category, semantic component or character (seme) (as reflection of distinctive feature). Semanteme corresponds with lexeme in plane of expression. He discerns archisemes, differential semes and potential semes in the semantic structure of the meaning. For example, archiseme «means of transport» calls characters, peculiar to the class of objects: bus, train, airplane, etc. Archiseme may become a differential seme regarding the semes of the higher level (for instance, «to go» and «to talk» has «to act» archiseme. The core of word`s meaning corresponds to the differential semes essentially distinguishing semanteme of one word from the other one. Potential semes reflects minor, sometimes irrelevant signs of subject, different associations, with which the given subject is really associated in the speakers` minds. While usually usage of the word they are got in back, their functioning is connected with transferred meaning of the word [5, 13-14].

M. Nikitin singles out the intension concept pushed closer to minimum necessary substantial core.

Intension is regarded to be a substantial core of the lexical meaning, «structured part of semantic features, constituted the denotation class. Intension is the same content concept about class in logic. It is an intension that is the base of thinking and speaking operations on classifications and denotations naming» [9, 109]. For instance, all mothers are women-mothers; these two characters (parent and female) make the intension of the word "mother" in its direct meaning.

From M. Nikitin point of view, the semantic features in intension divide into two parts, connected by sexuated-specific (hyper-hyponimic) relations. The sexuated part of the intension is called hyperseme (archiseme), the specific part - hyposeme (differential features). Thus, he makes an example, connected with a girl, the intension of which is a female child, a hyperseme is a child concept, hyposeme – concept about female.

The varied relations and dependencies exist among characters. Thereby «some characters make to think about others with greater or lesser necessity» [9, 110]. The author considers, that relative to the intension, that is meaning core, the combination of such implied features forms the implication of a lexical meaning (LM), i.e. periphery of its information material. The information about denotation, which is brought by the word in the text, consists of two things: indispensible intensional features and some part of implicated features, brought up by the context.

From the point of view of M. Nikitin, implication of features can be strict (mandatory, necessary), highly probable, faint (free) and negative. In the first two cases the intension of the meaning implies features with probability, equal or close to 1. The package of such features forms a strong meaning implication. Its variety is a strict implication that forms the features package of the especially strong implication with probability equal to 1. Features of a strong implication are close to the intensional core, what is the integral part of LM, therefore rather often they are put into meanings interpretation in defining dictionaries. It is really true regarding the strict implication. Nevertheless they are beyond the intension limits because «theoretically possible absence of such feature in denotation does not exclude denotation from the class where he is supposed to be by the man» [9, 110]. For instance, the word`s intensional of winter is a season from December till February (in the Northern hemisphere). The strong implication meaning include such features as the coldest season, it is snowing, water is frozen, the sun is shining lightly, people wear warm clothes, etc. This example shows us the difference between intensional and implication features: if winter is warmer than the other season, nevertheless it is still winter, because the determining feature is a time duration.

From the other hand, M. Nikitin says that implication of some features relative to intensional is seemed to be impossible or remote (features are incompatible), «besides strict or negative implication there is extensive area of features, their joint occurrence is in the rough: their presence and lack are equal possible and problematic, they can be or cannot be» [9, 111]. This features area against intensional of some meaning forms its weak or free implication.

Summing up it can be said that M. Nikitin presents lexical meanings like complex formations, which are directly in weaved into cognitive systems of consciousness. The structure of the lexical meaning is formed first of all by objective and lexical connections, extended by the intensional core and included in periphery of the content of some implication features. The intensional structure is formed by the logical dependences of its semantic features and first of all by sexuated-specific (hyper-hyponimic) relations. The implication features are also structurally ordered by its probabilistic characteristics and objective-lexical dependences [9, 115]. M. Nikitin considers intensional is in the nearest view (or equal) comprehensive core of meaning.

According to A. Vezhbitskaya opinion, to put together dictionary definitions it is necessary to use «reductive analysis» method, which supposes that all concepts should be defined by set of most indefinite semantic features [3]. The author quotes H. Leibniz that great number of concepts can be combined of several elements «because the nature tends to achieve the maximum effect with help of

the minimum number of elements, i.e. to act primary way» tran [4, 296].

From the point of view of A. Vezhbitskaya, the main issue is in positing of close set of semantic primitives, their contours are given by explanations of all lexical and grammatical meanings of natural language. «If there is some number of conceptual primitives, straightly understood (not through other concepts), so these primitives can be a very good base for all other concepts; infinite number of new concepts can be received from few number of semantic primitives» [4, 296-297]. The semantic primitives were developed and researched by the author in the area of body parts words.

It is worth of mentioning, that some linguists doubts in these or those semantic units as «arche», because according to the general language theory at the level of the base meaning units there appears a competition for the right of this or that unit to pretend to be a part of the meta language as an element [14; 7]. Therefore, the interpretation examples by A. Vezhbitskaya cause difficulties in perception, because there are no well defined syntax rules of forming of Meta language phrases. Although the author believes that every meaning of any word can be defined with maximum precision, the lexicographical value of the «multipurpose meta language» in great doubts.

From our point of view, the usage of semantic primitives by A. Vezhbitskaya undoubtedly brings scientists closer to the minimum comprehensive meanings, which explain the sense of functioning of lexical items. The explanation of first word meaning in dictionaries are not always available to consciousness of a just person, that is why A Vezhbitskaya offers stocktaking of suggested definitions without usage of a specific meta language.

Yu. Apresyan defines in his works some definitions as meta language and semantic primitives the way so that the meta language vocabulary reduces several times to two words types: 1) semantic primitives (undefined words, not accepted further semantic reduction), and 2) semantically more complex words, which can achieve primitives in one or two steps. The author states that «the words of the natural language which are chosen to be primitives, - these are the words of the «first plan», more implanted in language and culture. They service the more number of pragmatic situations». At that the real primitives – really existing senses, never materialized in words of the natural languages: physical perception (eyesight, hearing, etc.), defining «to percept», physical states (hunger, thirst, etc), meaning «to feel», physical acts and actions (to work, to relax, etc), meaning "to do", etc [1, 486-481].

Thus, there are some definitions of the substantive core of the word meaning: «intensional» (M. Nikitin), «differential seme» (V. Gak), «semantic primitive» (A Vezhbitskaya, Yu.D. Apresyan) and others. A. Potebnya in his works notices that the substantive core («the nearest meaning») must be typical to «nationality» and «singleness» what is a part of a semantic core of the indication. «The formal concept» of S. Katsnelson should be well-known to all language team. All these authors are united by the way of understanding of the word meaning like singleness, its complex character presents specified cognitive reflection of reality. Well, the overall picture reflects the basic linguists` opinion regarding the notional alliance inside of the meaning that is its substantive core.

From our point of view, this survey helps to sum up that the substantive of the word`s meaning has the following features: narrowing of the semantic elements till min necessary, stable components, where the meaning should be max recognizable; the opinion subjectivity is admissible from the point of view of the cognitive linguistics.

Thus, in view of the above it is possible to define the main cognitive mechanisms, which is the base of verb meaning «compose», and to define an invariant as the substantive core, connecting lexical-semantic variants of this verb. The purpose is either to proof the functioning of the verb`s lexeme representative, expressing the relations between the part and the whole on the level of the language system and updating of transferred meanings at the speech level. Whereas on the basis of a nominative-primitive meaning is realized the cognition of all transferred meanings, it is formed

firstly. The primary meaning is produced of the dictionaries definitions with usage of components` analysis on the basis of the severalty principle. So, the nominative-primitive meaning of «compose» on the basis of the data of 28 defining dictionaries has the following look: «compose» (1) «to form things or people together as a whole». According to our opinion this definition includes the necessary and full components so that to recognize this word at the level of everyday awareness.

From our point of view the primary introduce of the verb "compose" was associated with the image of planks/logs, put/knocked together to create some building similar to house, wall, raft, etc. Eventually, when the life of people became more difficult and came into the world of artefacts, when more complex issues and things appeared, the relation between them, which also form and create more complex issues and things.

In the capacity of LSV of the researched verb, motivated by the nominative-primitive meaning, it is reasonable to make an example of any secondary meaning of this verb. Its analysis is realized on the basis of comparison as the traditional way of interpretation. It is believed an actual thing to find out the items are the basis while the formation and decoding of the metaphorical statements. At that, the analysis is based on the principles of the cognitive approach, supported of cognition and nomination for the appropriate images of perception. It is in prospect to proof whether the cognitive images which are in the basis of the nominative-primitive meaning are kept while understanding of the metaphorical statement.

The cognitive approach supposes the image support as well as the third meaning. Thus, the basis of the metaphor "She composed satirical poems for the New Statesman; It can't be too difficult to compose a nice negative reply (if you compose a short piece of writing such as a poem or a speech, you write it; used especially when this requires skill or effort)" [CCELD, 285] is associated similarity on formation of parts into the whole. There is the reflection of the comparison with the partial relation between the specified subjects in the metaphorical meaning. According to planks, which are the parts of some building, this LSV on the basis of the primary meaning can be explained as the composition of the satirical meaning or the negative answer, implied creation of parts into the whole. This lexeme is based on the semantic elements «to write», «to create», «piece of writing», «ability», «to form words». Therefore, the semantics of «compose» supposes the existence of these semes. It is obvious, that the nominative-primitive issue is here like a seme "to form words", where the component "words" represents the seme «part», other semes are eliminated. Therefore it is possible to say that in the given specific meaning a part of the primitive whole of the verb "to compose" is lost, because the verb acquires the creative features: She composed satirical poems for the New Statesman; It can't be too difficult to compose a nice negative reply as if/so as compose (1) (to form things or people together as a whole) or to acquire integrity.

The next metaphor "Look at the way Hoyland composes his picture" [CCELD, 285] hypothetically is motivated by the comparison, connected with the specific style of painting, with creation of masterpieces, with the integrity formation. This image is associated with deviation from the conventional usage of the verb "to compose". In this metaphor the meaning «to compose» is rethought incompletely, its semantics includes not only additional but the core components of the nominative-primitive meaning: "if you compose a painting, a garden, or a piece of architecture, you arrange its different parts in a deliberate and usually attractive or artistic way", not given in the definition of the primary meaning.

It should be noted that the lexeme "compose" keeps the meaning of establishment of the partial relations between «the whole» and its «parts»: «the whole» and «parts» are represented explicitly. So, the nominative-primitive meaning is seen through the substantive core of this verb. In this metaphor there is an adaptation of the verb meaning "to compose", implied of the direct meaning, but kept the idea to «combine the parts into the whole». At such abstract level the conceptual integration happens.

The content of this metaphor has the abstract character either: "In the second case, I will give you some tea to compose your spirits, and do all a woman can to hold my tongue" [Collins, 60]. As it was noticed, the word "compose" represents the image of combination of wood parts into the whole (construction), and the researched verb means only this. When such image (frame) is over the other image in this context with the specific lexical filling, so it does not keep its systematic meaning. A person understands that "to compose one's spirits" – is to get up the nerve, to cool, to bring to senses. Here is a mechanism of searching more appropriate sense. The components which are in the basis of this meaning (to make an effort not being angry, to be calm, to pull yourself together, to be concentrated) cover all concepts of formation of the whole from the parts. The presence of the meaning of the common meaning attests that the semiosis is processed according to updating of the abstract concepts and the following introduces of this lexeme. The components of the nominative-primitive meaning are eliminated and the verb "to compose" is categorized into the class with meaning «to get up the nerve».

It should be noticed that this meaning is appeared in case that the memory of a person keeps the memories about the cases of realization of the actual transferred senses in the sense structures of the statements. It is to be supposed that this information proofs that the real people have a real image of relation between abstract things and between real people/things as the metaphoric understating with usage of the lexeme "like" and the construction "as if". Therefore it is supposed to put the meaning into the meaning of the substantive core which has the following cover: nominative-primitive meaning "compose 1 (to form things or people together as a whole) or as if/like compose 1 (to acquire integrity)".

In summary, the analysis results allow to form the following core of the lexeme "compose" as "to acquire integrity". This invariant as the substantive core is an item of the lexical language system and all meaning are updated against the communicative set of participants of communication.

Thus, it should be noticed that the abstract meaning "to acquire integrity" is a strong reason of real existing of the substantive core connecting all verbs of one class but not showing the different features of separately taken verb. Every verb has its own substantive core, contained some specific components. The substantive core is perception of all common things that characterize all LSV of the polysemantic word. The nature of such meanings is so extensive настолько широка, that grows out of relations between real things.

**LIST OF REFERENCES**

1. Апресян Ю. Избранные труды. Т. 1. Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка. - М.: Школа «Языки рус. культуры», 1995. - 436 с.

2. Архипов И.К. Проблема языка и речи в свете прототипической семантики // Studia Linguistica N 6. Проблемы лингвистики и методики преподавания иностранных языков СПб., 1998 - С 5-22.

3. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. - М.: Рус. словари., 1996. - 411 с.

4. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание.- М.: Прогресс, 1997.- 215с.

5. Гак В.Г. О семантическом инварианте и синонимии предложения // Сб. научн. тр. МГПИИЯ им. М. Тореза. - Вып. 112. - М.: Изд-во МГПИИЯ, 1977. - С. 42-50.

6. Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. - М.: Наука, 1987. - 261 с.

7. Кацнельсон С.Д. Общее и типологическое языкознание. - Л.: Наука, 1986. - 315 с.

8. Кондаков Н.И. Логический словарь-справочник. - М.: Наука, 1975. - 680 с.

9. Никитин М.В. Курс лингвистической семантики. - СПб, 1996. - 756с.

10. Потебня А.А. Из записок по русской грамматике. Т. 1-2. - М.: Наука, 1959. - 276 с.

11. Потебня А.А. Полное собрание трудов: Мысль и язык. Подготовка текста Ю.С. Рассказова

и О.А. Сычева. Комментарии Ю.С. Рассказова. - Издательство ?Лабиринт?, М., 1999. - 268 с.

12. Стернин И.А. Лексическое значение слова в речи. - Воронеж: ВГУ, 1985. - 170 с.

13. Фрумкина Р.М. «Куда ж нам плыть?» // Московский лингвистический альманах. Вып. 1. - М.: Школа «Языки рус. культуры», 1996. - С. 67-82.

14. Шатуновский И.Б. Семантика предложения и нереферентные слова. - М., 1996. - 293 с.

15. Wierzbicka A. Lexicography and Conceptual Analysis. - Ann Arbor: Karoma, 1985. - 327 p.

## SOURCES AND AUTHORISED ABBRIVATION

CCELD - Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary. Collins London and Glasgow, 1990. - 1703 с.

Collins - W. Collins. The Woman in White. - England: Penguin Books, 1985. - 648 p.

Davis - B. Davis. Midnight Partner. - New York, Toronto, London, Sydney, Auckland: Bantam Books, 1997. - 353 с.