

LEXICAL MEANING OF A WORD AS AN OBJECTIFICATION OF INFORMATION ABOUT REALITY

Ivanova Karyna

Graduate Student,

Izmail State University of Humanities

The meanings of language units are understood as reflection of objects, phenomena, and the realities of the surrounding world in the human mind. According to A. N. Smyrnytskyi, a word meaning is the connection of sound with the reflection of an object or phenomenon [11, p. 81–82]. In terms of content, the meaning of a word is a reflection of an object and a designation of the notion of this object. In structural and functional terms, it is a stable connection between a sign and its notional content. We share the point of view of a number of researchers (D. N. Shmelev, D. Bolinger, V. G. Gak, O. S. Akhmanova, I. A. Sternin, R. M. Gaisina, M. P. Kochergan, E. V. Kuznetsova, T. P. Lomtev) that the meaning of the word is multicomponent in its structure.

In the study, we assume that the structure of the word meaning consists of semes – micro-components, elementary units of language that reflect different types of information about the reality indicated by the word. The meaning of the word reflects objects, signs, and other realities. The seme displays some information about objects, attributes, and other realities.

Despite the fact that most scientists recognize the component composition of lexical meaning, there are different approaches to the question of which components make up the lexical meaning of a word and how they are organized. So, for example, according to the concept of atomic composition of lexical meaning, presented in the works of V. G. Gak [3], T. P. Lomtev [6] D. Bolinger [2], the meaning is divided into atomic semes, the combination of which determines the structure of each meaning. Some authors (I. V. Arnold [1], I. A. Sternin [12], V. M. Telia [13]) distinguish macrocomponents in the structure of meaning, which are combinations of semes united by the commonality of the presented information: denotative, connotative, grammatical, etc. N. G. Komlev [4], B. A. Plotnikov [9] consider meaning as a set of different aspects, such as significative, grammatical, etc. I. A. Sternin [12] presents the concept of field organization of lexical meaning and cumulative function of a word in speech. Therefore, we consider a meaning as a system of components (semes) forming a structure. The meaning highlights the core and periphery. The core is formed by essential and permanent semantic components, while the periphery is formed by additional semantic components determining the semantic development of the word, as well as its

communicative variation. The periphery is represented by near and far ones, and the border between the core and the periphery is blurred, which allows for a smooth transition from the core through the near periphery to the far (and vice versa). Individual semantic components (semes) can be grouped into macrocomponents. Like the whole meaning, macrocomponents also have a field structure. Semes inside one meaning can further be repeated in other meanings, moreover, this can also happen with castling of the core and periphery.

It should be noted that not all scientists share the point of view about semes existence, and therefore do not consider component analysis an acceptable method for analyzing the content side of significant language units. Thus, according to M. M. Makovskyi, the recently very popular component analysis does not reflect the linguistic features of meaning and is based entirely on logical grounds and a researcher's intuition. Moreover, it is impossible to draw any conclusions about the history and semantic connections of the word on the basis of "component analysis" or similar methods" [7, p. 10]. However, we believe that A. M. Kuznietsov [5] provides quite well-reasoned theoretical and experimental justifications for the existence of minimal units of component analysis and, consequently, the legal capacity of the method.

Despite the fact that many linguists (E. M. Vereshchahin and V. H. Kostomarov, M. V. Nikitin, I. A. Sternin, V. M. Teliia) recognize the macrocomponent structure of a word meaning, they disagree on various issues related, in particular, to the components of the structure (the number of selected macrocomponents, their composition). Thus, D. N. Shmelov insists on the need to include grammatical design in the meaning of the word [15], since each reflection of a "piece of reality", becoming an element of the word, is formed in accordance with those grammatical categories of words that exist in the language. The opinions of scientists also differ on the status of the functional and stylistic characteristics of a word. I. A. Sternin [12] and V. M. Teliia [13] speak about the expediency of including this type of information in the meaning structure.

There are also disagreements about the compatibility of lexical units and the inclusion of this characteristic as a component of the structure of lexical meaning. There is no single approach to the question of the structure and status of a component that represents information about the logical-subject correlation of meanings. A. A. Ufimtseva [14] points out that the differentiation of significative and denotative components is a necessary condition for distinguishing the reflection of an object, on the one hand, its properties and characteristics, on the other hand. The significative and denotative components in the sign meaning of words, that is, the abstract and concrete in the meaning of the latter ones are not opposed, on the contrary, they must be considered not as mutually exclusive, but as interrelated [14, p. 94].

We consider it is necessary to include a denotative-significative macrocomponent, connotative, grammatical, and sociolinguistic components in the word meaning structure. The obvious fact is that the semanticspecifics of a lexical unit determine the features of lexical and syntactic compatibility, but compatibility itself is not a component of the meaning structure. This understanding of the macro-component composition of the word meaning is presented in the work of L. M. Pelepeichenko [8].

According to this theory, the meaning of the word includes [8, p. 19–20]: 1. Macrocomponents representing extralinguistic information (1.1. Denotative-significative macrocomponent (blocks of class-semes, generic semes, species semes, and substantive semes); 1.2. Connotative macrocomponent. It includes semes or blocks of semes: emotional (joy, contempt, ridicule); emotionally-evaluative (approval – disapproval, positive or negative assessment); rationally-evaluative (positive or negative assessment); associative-figurative; socio-cultural, etc.); 2. Macrocomponent representing linguistic information (2.1. Grammatical macrocomponent including blocks of semes that represent information about categorical and grammatical features of a word); 3. Macrocomponent providing information about the relationship between linguistic and extra-linguistic factors (3.1. Sociolinguistic macrocomponent including blocks of semes that represent information about the style of usage, scope of distribution, word-origin, its relation to the lexical composition).

Denotative and significative components can be combined into one macrocomponent, since, according to A. A. Ufimtseva, they are interdependent and interconnected in a single dialectical whole levels of mastering the subject sphere, therefore, the term "denotative-significative" indicates the integrity of the denotative and significative components of the meaning, as well as the need to distinguish them, since the denotative semes reflect substantive properties in the sign sense, and significative – relationships [14, p. 109].

The connotative component of meaning combines information about the speaker's attitude (assessment and feelings), associations (including figurative ones). It is represented by emotive, emotionally-evaluative, rationally-evaluative semes [10, p. 16]. In this sense, the idea of A. I. Prykhodko seems to be important for us. The scientist notes that the evaluative component of the word meaning correlates with the sphere of rationally-evaluative perception, while the emotional component correlates with the sphere of emotionally-sensory perception. On this basis, it is concluded that emotionality is determined by the psychological state of the speaker, and the assessment is determined by the intention of one of the communicants to achieve a certain pragmatic goal: to somehow influence the spiritual or physical state of the addressee [10, p. 29]. Emotivity as a component of connotation is information fixed in the meaning about the emotional attitude to the designated object or phenomenon. A. I. Prykhodko also emphasizes the

anthropocentric nature of evaluation, since in order to evaluate an object, a person needs to try it on in relation to oneself: "what a person needs is evaluated" [10, p. 14].

In modern linguistics, the semantic structure of a word also has a pragmatic meaning that reflects the external conditions of communication, a specific communicative situation. However, in our opinion, an information of this kind can be represented by semes of connotative and sociolinguistic macrocomponents, so we don't think it's appropriate to separate this meaning into a separate component.

The function of a meaning is determined by the ratio of macrocomponents in the meaning structure. Thus, meanings in which the denotative-significative component is the main one performing a nominative function, and meanings, in which the connotative component is predominant, perform a connotative function (expressive, emotional, or figurative). It is known that the main function of a word is nominative. It provides an identification of the object based on the features that are actually inherent in denotation. These features are reflected in the denotative-significative component. The meanings with an enhanced denotative-significative component are considered as units of the nuclear zone of the corresponding semantic micro-fields and fields, while meanings with an enhanced connotative macrocomponent are treated as units of the peripheral zone of the corresponding micro-fields and fields.

The system significance of a word is also determined by its reference (reference ability). In this regard, it is necessary to find out the type of reference and the meanings of the word group under study. It is known that the system relationships of a word are detected in the process of analyzing the class of units to which it belongs.

The prospect of research is to analyze existing approaches to the study of adjective lexicon denoting a person's individual qualities on the material of English fiction texts.

References:

1. Arnold Y. V. Semanticheskaia struktura slova v sovremennom anhlyiskom yazyke y metodyka ee yssledovaniya: Kyiv: Kyiv. un-t, 1966. 33 p.
2. Bolyndzher D. Atomyzatsiia znacheniia. *Novoe v zarubezhnoi lynchvystyke: Lynchvysticheskaia semantyka*. M., 1988. Vyp. 10. P. 200–234.
3. Hak V. H. K probleme semanticheskoi syntahmatyky. *Problemy strukturnoi lynchvystyky*. Kharkov: Yzd-vo KhHPU, 1996. P. 367–395.
4. Komlev N. H. Komponenty sodержatelnoi struktury slova. Kharkov: Yzd-vo KhHPU, 2000. 192 p.
5. Kuznetsov A. M. Ot komponentnoho analiza – k komponentnomu syntezu. Kharkov: Yzd-vo KhHPU, 2007. 125 p.
6. Lomtev T. P. Prynysypy vydeleniia dyfferentsyalnykh semanticheskyykh elementov. Kyiv: Kyev.un-t, 2004. P. 272–289.

7. Makovskyi M. M. Ystoryko-ɛtymolohycheskyi slovar anhlyiskoho yazyka. Kharkov: Yzd-vo KhHPU, 1999. 416 p.
8. Pelepeichenko L. N. Perekhodnye typy znachenyi slov. Kharkov: Yzd-vo KhHPU, 2006. 121p.
9. Plotnykov B. A. Osnovy semasyolohyy. Don: DNU. 2014. 222 p.
10. Prykhodko H. I. Sposoby vyrazhennia otsinky v suchasni anhliskii movi. Zaporizhzhia : Vyd-vo ZDU, 2001. 362 p.
11. Smyrnytskyi A. Y. Znachenye slova. *Vopr. yazykoznavania*. 1990. № 2. P. 79–90.
12. Sternyn Y. A. Leksycheskoe znachenye slova v rechy. Voronezh: Yzd-vo Voronezh. un-ta, 1985. 171 p.
13. Telyia V. N. Konnotatyvnyi aspekt semantyky nomynatyvnykh edynyts. Kyiv: Kyev.un-t, 2000. 143 p.
14. Ufymtseva A. A. Leksycheskoe znachenye: Pryntsypy semasyoloh. opysanyia. Moskva: Nauka, 1986. 239 p.
15. Shmelev D. N. Problemy semanticheskoho analiza leksyky. Moskva: Nauka, 1987. 280 p.