Mykhaylenko V. V.,
Doctor of Philology,
Professor, Dept. of Translation and Philology
Ivano-Frankivsk King Danylo Galytskiy University of Law

THE CORPUS-BASED MEANING DIFFERENTIATION OF THE ADJECTIVE *PUBLIC*

Summary. In this paper we will present elements of corpus-based cognitive-semantic analysis of the adjectival lexeme *public* in English. The primary goal of this paper is to detail the conditions of actualizing components of the lexical meaning of the referred adjective as a polysemantic unit. It is proved that all the revealed components are rooted in the structure of the lexical meaning of the adjective *public*. The results of the exploration stress that their actualization depends primarily on the lexeme combinability with the noun as the head word of the NP, second, on the major Lexical-Semantic Field of the discourse, third, on the register type of discourse, and on the discourse authors intention, i.e. his/her attitude to the subject or object of utterance.

Key words: lexeme, meaning, phrase, sentence, discourse register, context, componential structure of meaning, lexical semantics, cognitive semantics.

Introduction. The denotative meaning of a great number of words can be identified at the level of wordcombination, sentence or discourse only. These words constitute a considerable part of the present-day English lexicon and are referred to as polysemantic words. Polysemy is the ability of a word to possess a complex semantic structure revealing several components or lexical-semantic variants [15, p. 16]. Probably, the most widely accepted definition of polysemy is as the form of ambiguity where 2+ related senses (components or lexical-semantic variants) are associated with the same word; consider the meanings of the lexeme *public,* as a noun, adjective, predicative, a part of an adverbial, for instance:

1) The British public never believe you are one of us until you will live here.

In the noun phrase the head word *public* denotes a group of people like a society

2) *Its like living in a public park!* BNC.

In the noun phrase the adjunct *public* denotes a property belonging to the community.

3) Public spending is set to be slashed in a desperate Government bid to save the pound. BNC.

In example (3) the adjunct *public* denotes finance or budget managed by Government.

4) Sir *Colin indicated that it could be another two years before the truth is made.*

The lexeme *public* inthe function of predicativedenotes known to other people.

5) *Shes now confusing the show business quality of performing well in publi*c. BNC.

The lexeme *public* incombination with the preposition *in* denotes to be seen by other people.

The noun phrase with the lexeme *public* as an adjunct is the most frequent case in Modern English differentiating its meaning, therefore, it is in the focus of investigation to reveal the factors preconditioning the realization of a component of the lexical meaning.

The lexical meaning is the meaning of a word which is specifiable independently of other words – ultimately with reference to the non-linguistic world – and which is independent of the grammar of the language [2, p. 375].

According to our hypothesis the lexical meaning of adjective presents a componential structure, which in the dictionary entry has a dominant component and periphery ones, when the lexeme is used in the context the position of components can shift.

In the componential Classical Theory of Meaning [11, p. 170−210], (i) meanings of words were defined on the basis of necessary and sufficient conditions (or features/markers) without reference to contexts, (ii) therefore, a particular entity was either a full member of the category defined by a word or not, and (iii) the similarity of meanings of different words, or senses of the same word, could be quantified by counting the number of features/markers shared by meanings / senses / components / lexical-semantic variants / semes/readings.

State of the art. The nature of lexical semantics has changed markedly in the twenty-to-thirty years since classic texts like John Lyons [12] and D. Cruse [4] were published. M. Lynne Murphyconsiders that theories of grammar have become much more lexically-oriented, paying more attentionto issues of lexical meaning, though the issues were narrowed to polysemy/homonymy and the nym relations (synonym, antonym, meronyms, etc.) [13, p. 8–9]. Lexical semantics could be defined as the study of word meaning, but in practice it often more specifically explore the study of lexical (i.e. content) word meaning, as opposed to the meanings of grammatical (or function) words. This means that lexical semanticists are involved in investigating open or notional parts of speech – noun, verb, adjective and their combinability with adverb and preposition classes.

The lexical meaning of adjectives, for instance consists in the particular systematization of facts of experience by the language [3, p. 103–171]. In this sense the lexical meaning of adjectives belongs to the system of the language. But at the same time the language has historically established the uses of the meaning of lexemes [2, p. 304].The logical distinction between semantics and pragmatics reflects this pattern of thinking: first the "clean" relation to the world of denotable objects, then the step into the messy world of users and interpreters[9, p. 80]. The interactive trend understood itself as modern being antimentalist; the anthropological perspective n language as a "mode of action" suggested by B. Malinovsky (1930) and the contextual theory of meaning (the study of meaning and context should be central)suggested byJ.R. Firth (1935); later on "meaning in use" by L. Wittgenstein (1933); "How to Do Things With Words" byJ.L. Austin (1962); "Speech Acts" by Jonh R. Searle (1969);"On declarative sentences" by J.R. Ross, 1970]. Paul H. Grices contribution to the study of meaning – the theory of implicature [8, p. 43–46] is the notion devised to capture those aspects of what

is communicated by an utterance, which is clearly part of what is going on, cannot be analysed as constituting part of what one would call the meaning of the words [9, p. 87]. Cognitive linguistics (CL), or cognitive semantics, drew on research in philosophy, anthropology, and cognitive psychology and adopted a perspective in which polysemy became an omnipresent propertyassociated with lexical items but also morphemes,grammatical constructions, and whole grammatical classes [5, p. 274].

We are going to put forward ourprerequisitesfor the following investigation:

1) when we speak, we do not use the dictionary entry of the words selected;

2) we choose one of the components/sense/seme/reading of the lexical meaning of the words to convey the necessary meaning;

3) our interlocutor comprehends the very component as the meaning of the word;

4) otherwise the communication will not be felicitous.

Investigation. The analysis of 100 ml words constituting the volume of the British National Corpus reveals the use of 38032 cases of the lexeme public. They are grouped according to the discourse register or genre: 1787 units in colloquial (spoken), 1399 in fiction, 2041 in magazine, 5193 in newspaper, 8561 in non-academic, 8977 in academic and 1074 in miscellaneous. Lets take 100 text fragments for the part of speech analysis of *public*. There are the following parts of speech categories of the lexeme public are defined: an adjectival adjunct, like *public spending* (58 units), a substantivized adjective, like *the public* (18 units), *British public* (5 units), a part of an adverbial, like *in public* (5 units) and a predicative, like *become public* (5 units) [BNC]. Corpus-linguistics work on polysemy within Cognitive Linguistics comes in three trends:

First, there are studies where the corpus-linguistic component consists merely of using a corpus as a source of examples – ideally, examples are not just cherry-picked to support a particular point but also considered if they constitute counterexamples; given the limited role that corpus methods other than mere retrieval play in such work, this will not be discussed here.

Second, there are analyses which involve the retrieval of many examples of the element to be analyzed, which are then annotated for various characteristics, which are then analyzed statistically.

Third, there are studies straddling the boundary between corpus linguistics and computational (psycho)linguistics, which differ from the previous kind of analyses in that many do not (i) involve (semi-)manual annotation and (ii) aim at uncovering something about human language per se but rather test/evaluate computational models of linguistic data (with no pretense of cognitive realism) [5, p. 275; 1, p. 29–51].

The object of our investigation is the adjectival lexeme public used in the NP (noun phrase) as adjunct.

Now we shall start with the constituents of the definition of the lexeme *public* based on the historical principles [OED].

1. Public is a principle of the law which holds that no subject can lawfully do that which has a tendency to be injurious to the public, or against the public good.

2. In various phrases (mostly obsolete) rendering or suggested by Latin *res* publica, for instance, *public state*, *public thing* (also *thing public*), the *commonwealth or state; public good, public wealth* (also *good public* or *wealth public*), *public wealth*, *the common or national good* or *well-being; the commonwealth* or *state*; also *common public = common good*.

3. A collective group regarded as sharing some cultural, social, or political interest but who as individuals do not necessarily have any contact with one another.

4. Public, for instance, *public opinion* is the opinion of the mass of the community.

5. That is open to, may be used by, or may or must be shared by, all members of the community; not restricted to the private use of any person or persons; generally accessible or available; generally levied (as a rate or tax). Also (in a narrower sense) that may be used, enjoyed, shared, or competed for, by all persons legally or properly qualified. Sometimes involving the sense, provided or supported at the public expense, and under public control: as in public elementary school, and often in public baths, public library, public park, and the like; public convenience: see convenience A thing may also be public at once in senses 4 and 5, as public worship, or in 1, 3, 4 and 5, as public meeting. See also public school, in various senses.

Note: In British English a private school that prepares students for college or for public service; in American English a school that gets money from and is controlled by a local government. The fifth component denotes some possession of the community.

The definitional analysis of the OED entrybased on the historical principles helps to reveal five major components in the lexical meaning of the adjective *public*:

1) republican justice;

2) state wealth;

3) a group of individuals(united by some cultural, social, or political interest);

4) mass of the community;

5) possession of the community.

The component republican justice or pertaining to law was dominant according to the diachronic semantics [see also dynamic semantics: 14, p. 89–91].

Then we shall consider the Webster s entry of the lexeme *public* based on the synchronic principles [Websters]:

1) (a) exposed to general view, open; (b)well-known, prominent; (c) perceptible, material;

2) (a) of, relating to, or affecting all the people or the whole area of a nation or state <public law>; (b):of or relating to a government; (c) of, relating to, or being in the service of the community or nation;

3) (a) relating to people in general, universal; (b)general, popular;

4) relating to business or community interests as opposed to private affairs : social;

5) devoted to the general or national welfare: humanitarian;

6) (a) accessible to or shared by all members of the community; (b) capitalized in shares that can be freely traded on the open market – often used with go;

7) supported by public funds and private contributions rather than by income from commercials <public radio><public television> [Websters].

The results of the definitional analysis of the Websters entry of the lexeme *public* based on the synchronic principles helps to reveal the components of its meaning:

1) exposed to people;

2) related to state, government or community;

3) related to people;

4) related to business or community interests;

5) pertaining to general welfare;

6) accessible to all members of community;

7) supported by community or private funds.

The componential analysis is a very important method of linguistic investigation and has attracted a great deal of attention. It is usually illustrated by some simple example such as the wordsman, woman, boy, girl, all belonging to the semantic field "the human race" and differing in the characteristics of age and sex. The meaning of adjectives can be analyzed into its constituents Further on we can define the features making up their structure of meaning. In the meaning of a lexeme different types of features or components, or semes can be distinguished:

a) those belonging only to the structure of meaning of the adjectives, specific semes [17, p. 24];

b) those making up a lexical field, generic semes [17, p. 24];

c) those present in more than one lexical field determining a particular lexical field or a lexeme, but not defining the lexical field.

At present the component exposed to people is the dominant one in the lexical meaning of the adjective *public* registered in the dictionary.

Castillo del Jesus Gerardo Martínez writes that adjective is a word class which generally qualifies a noun. Regularly adjectives are found either before (in SVO languages) or after (in VSO languages) the noun they refer to. Adjectives in this position are termed attributive, e.g.:

*Even as the clamour grows for Mansell to reverse his decision to quit, thepublic hero has decided to give it a go in America.*BNC.

Adjectives placed after a copula are called predicative, e.g.:

The affair has become public. BNC.

Adjectives can themselves be qualified by adverbs), e.g.:

Mary steals a baby from a supermarket whilst her husband is having a very public nervous breakdown in the school where he teaches. BNC.

Adjectives can also post-modify a noun. They are gradable depending on whether a comparison is made with one other thing or many other things, e.g.:

*Andrei Kanchelskis, warns that the men from Moscow will be on a mission most public – to sell themselves to the big-money clubs of Western Europe.*BNC.

Adjectives are lexical words used to modify nouns and refer to physical and concrete properties as well as abstract properties denoted by nouns [2, p. 80–80]. Adjectives give meaning in two directions as lexemes manifesting the systematization of the facts of experience made by the language and as elements forming the category, the adjectival category, as the answer of the language to the needs of expression of speakers [3, p. 103–171]. At the same time they are predicates, the expression of a particular state of affairs, provided by the means to mean, combine and get into relation with other words. In any case they are elements capable of individual free use by speakers [12]. This functional approach is attempted in contextual analysis, semantic syntax and some other branches of linguistics.The definitions of meaning given by various authors, though different in detail, agree in the basic principle: they all point out that lexical meaning is the realization of concept or emotion by means of a definite language system.In most present-day methods of lexicological analysis words are studied by placing them, or rather considering them in larger units of context; a word is defined by its functioning within a phrase or a sentence.

Euginio Coseriu and Horst Geckeler believe that every aspect of meaning of a word is reflected in a characteristic pattern of normality (and abnormality) in grammatically appropriate context. The meaning of a word is constituted by its contextual relations and the very component of the lexical meaning of a word is actualized by its contextual relations or distribution [3, p. 15–16]. Castillo del Jesús Gerardo Martínez [2, p. 80–80] underlines that adjectives in English can play a double function: they are elements of a language, forming part of the language structure ruled by the norm and the system of the language, and they are words of free use by the speakers [2, p. 80–80]. In any case they can be considered under two points of view: as elements bearing the lexical function [3, p. 103–171] – elements bearing meaning and as elements of relation and combination, the expression of a particular state of affairs with a number of terms functioning as actants of that state of affairs, predicates, see [19, p. 25]

Here comes the question of the factors which can help the reader/hearer to determine a component actualized by the lexeme.Traditionally, context was defined as "objective" social variables (such as gender or class of speakers). Teun A. Van Dijk in his monograph explores a multidisciplinary theory of context, where he argues that it is not the social situation itself that influences the structures of text and talk, but rather the definition of the relevant properties of the communicative situation by the discourse participants. The new theoretical notion developed to account for these subjective mental constructs is that of context models, which play a crucial role in interaction and in the production and comprehension of discourse. He stresses that if contexts were objective social conditions or constraints, all people in the same social situation would speak in the same way. They dynamically control how language use and discourse are adapted to their situational environment, and hence define under what conditions they are appropriate [19, p. I-VII].

According to Dylan Glynn "Cognitive Semantics has slowly been moving towards empirical methods and some in the field have long held that meanings cannot be understood as reified objects" [6, p. 4], here we would add as units described and classified into LSF from the point of Lexical Semantics.

We shall try to reveal the conditions of actualizing the components of the lexical meaning of the adjective *public* in examples 10–18:

Even as the clamour grows for Mansell to reverse his decision to quit, the public hero has decided to give it a go in America. BNC.

The adjective *public* due to its combinability with the noun *hero* actualizes the component *popular* or *well-known.*

This week has diminished prospects of further interest rate cuts. Ministers expect the current public spending round to be the toughest for many years as the Government seeks to maintain. BNC.

The adjective *public* in the combination with V-ing*spending-*finance [see Websters: spending money] actualizes the component state and units *public spending, minister,* and *government* can form the Lexical-Semantic Field of Governance.

Government is that the years of Thatcherite prosperity have been matched by a deterioration in public services and the environment. BNC.

The adjective *public* in the combination with the noun *services* actualizes the component social = services for people / country.

When he says, in your welcome new Architecture page, that the British public needs... to be shown what a city street such as Hammersmith Road could become. BNC.

The combination *British public* realizes the component *people / society* general or *community* people living on some territory.

It accused Roy of using his very public fight to beat lung cancer as a way of furthering his career. BNC.

The adjective *public* in the combination with the noun *fight* realizes the component social (=society). And the previous clause *whose husband recently died from the disease* points out the necessity of the action. See the following sentence:

Judge Gabriel Hutton cited the families grief and the general public outrage when he passed sentence. He said Goochs car became a lethal factor. BNC.

In the NP *general public outrage* the adjective *public* actualizes the component all the members of the society.

The radioactivity is within acceptable levels. The contaminated mud was scooped off public beaches by members of local pressure group CORE – Cumbrians Opposed to a Radioactive Environment. BNC.

In the NP *public beaches* the adjective *public* actualizes the component all the society members

Each year, APT distributes thousands of hours of entertaining, educational and empowering programming to Americas 360+ public television stations. BNC.

Help us protect funding for your public television and radio stations award-winning services. BNC.

In the NP *public television stations and radio stations* the adjective *public* realizes the component supported by public funds that makes both stations independent from the state or oligarch.

James Pustejovsky analyzes the "disambiguation" of polysemy of the lexeme *bank* in context as a phenomenon of coercion The basic meaning of *bank* is coerced into the financial institution, and into the building reading. That is, there is only one interpretation of *bank* (in this sense), but it can be shifted by the context in which it occurs. The author assumes that polysemy should be treated in a similar way: We have a basic meaning, and general rules to derive specialized meanings. He distinguishes between the following four levels of representation:

a) Argument structure – specifies the number and type of semantic arguments, and how they are related syntactically.

b) Event structure – specifies the sort of an event, e.g. whether it is a state, a process, or a transition.

c) Qualia structure – specifies certain aspects in which the entity can interact with other entities. For subtypes:

i) constitutive: the relation between an object and its constituents, like material, weight, or parts and component elements;

ii) formal: that which distinguishes the object within a larger domain, like orientation, magnitude, shape, dimensionality, color, position;

iii) telic: the purpose and function of the object, in particular the purpose that an agent has in performing an act, the built-in function or aim which specifies certain activities;

iv) agentive roles: factors involved in the origin or bringing about of an object referring to the creator of an artefact or a cause;

d) Lexical inheritance structure – specifies the way how a lexical structure is related to other structures, by way of a type inheritance system [17, p. 73–96].

The principled polysemy approach [6, p. 33–75] targeted the first of the two problem areas. First, the proponents proposed criteria to determine when two usages constitute different senses by doing more justice to the role of context and distinguishing polysemy from vagueness; second, they proposed criteria to identify the proto-type, or sanctioning sense, of a polysemous category.

The basic meaning of the adjectival *lexeme* public presumably is related to republican justice, for instance, *public law, public nuisance, public offences,* public charge (a). But we can apply *public* to the state property, for instance, *public enterprise Public Record Office* and also to the governance, for instance, *public policy, public body, public administration, public spending, public expenditure, public money, public purse, public debts, public services,* etc. There are of course many other uses of *public*, for instance, *public menace, public good public health, publicutility, public political purposes,* etc. with the common component pertaining to society The specific interpretations of *public* with the component pertaining to community, for instance, *public rejoicing, public interest, public engagement, public mind,* etc. Sometimes the component provided or supported at the public expense, and under public control is realized by the adjective public, for instance: *public elementary school, public baths, public library, public park, public conveniences, public beaches,* etc. All these components are rooted in the structure of the lexical meaning of the adjective *public* but their actualization depends primarily on the lexeme combinability with the noun as the head word of the NP, second, on the major Lexical-Semantic Field of the discourse, third, on the register type of discourse, and on the discourse authors intention, i.e. his/her attitude to the subject or object of utterance.

Conclusions and perspectives. In this paper we have demonstrated, that the functional approach to the semantic structure of the adjectival lexeme *public* is supported and enriched by additional analyses – etymological, definitional, componential, parts of speech and parts of a sentence, corpus and contextual types.

The treatment of polysemy in Cognitive Linguistics involves (a) viewing meaning/sense/component/reading as categorization, (b) recognizing the importance of context for meaning/sense/component/reading and (c) underlining that linguistic and encyclopedic knowledge must not be separated.

This is a little-known field of research as well as the trail blazing one that presumably will be stimulated by the existence of large language corpora as research tools. We believe that Cognitive Semantics has slowly been moving towards empirical methods and some in the field have long held that meanings cannot be understood as reified objects.

Further on there must be the analysis of data from a different and much larger corpora than has been used for this paper to reveal all possible contexts (in various discourse registers) of the adjectival lexeme *public* actualizing its functional semantic components. It will attract different trends of research to be explored in the framework of cognitive semantics.

References:

1. Benom C. English through and the gradience of force dynamics / C. Benom // International Journal of Cognitive Linguistics. – 2014. – Vol 5. – № 1. – Pp. 29–51.

2. Castillo del Jesús Gerardo Martínez. The predicative Function of Adjectives / Jesús Gerardo Martínez del Castillo // EPOS. – 1997. – Vol. XIII. – Pp. 303–331.

3. Coseriu Euginio, Geckeler Horst. Linguistics and Semantics / Euginio Coseriu, Horst Geckeler // Thomas Sebeok (ed.). Current Trends in Linguistics. Vol.12. – The Hague: Mouton, 1974. – Pp.103–171.

4. Cruse D. Alan. Lexical Semantics / D.A. Cruse. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1986. – 310 p.

5. Divjak Dagmar S., Gries Stefan Th. Corpus-based Cognitive Semantics: A Contrastive Study of Phrasal Verbs in English and Russian / Dagmar S. Divjak, Th. Stefan Gries // K. Dziwirek and B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.). Studies in Cognitive Corpus Linguistics. – Frankfurt a. M. : Peter Lang, 2009. – Pp. 273–296.

6. Evans Vyvyan. The Meaning of Time: Polysemy, the Lexicon and Conceptual Structure / Vyvyan Evans // Journal of Linguistics. – 2005. – Vol. 41. – № 1. – Pp. 33–75.

7. Glynn Dylan. The Many Uses of Run: Corpus Methods and socio-cognitive semantics / Dylan Glynn // D. Glynn, J. Robinson (eds.). Corpus Methods for Semantics: Quantitative Studies in Polysemy and Synonymy. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2014. – Pp. 117–144.

8. Grice Paul H. Logic and Conversation/ H Paul Grice // P. Cole, and J.L. Morgan (eds.). Speech Acts. – New York: Academic Press, 1975. – Pp. 183–98.

9. Harder Peter. Functional Semantics: A Theory of Meaning, Structure and Tense in English / Peter Harder // Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996. – 586 p.

10. Katz Jerrold J., Fodor Jerry A. The Structure of a Semantic Theory / Jerrold J. Katz, Jerry A. Fodor // Language. – 1963. – Vol. 39. – № 2. – Pp. 170−210.

11. Krifka Manfred. Lexikalische Semantik / Manfred Krifka – Berlin : Humboldt-Universitätzu Berlin, 2001. – S. 3.

12. Lyons John. Semantics. 2 Vols. / John Lyons. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1977. – Vol. 1. – 897p.; V.2. – xiv + 526 p.

13. Murphy M. Lynne. Semantic Relations and the Lexicon: Antonymy, Synonymy and other Paradigms / M. Lynne Murphy. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 304 p.

14. Mykhaylenko V. On Dynamics of the Components in the Lexeme "Land" / V. Mykhaylenko // Проблеми загального, германського та слов'янського мовознавства. До 70-річчя професора В.В. Левицького: Збірник наукових праць. – Чернівці : Книги – XXI, 2008. – С. 8–91.

15. Mykhaylenko V. A Glossary of Linguistics and Translation Studies / V. Mykhaylenko. – Ivano-Frankivsk : King DanyloGalytskiy University of Law, 2015. – 528 p.

16. Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 20 vols. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2009 (1989).

17. Pottier Bernard Louis. Linguistique générale: Théorie et description / Bernard Louis Potier. – Paris : 1976. – 224 p.

18. Pustejovsky James. Type Coercion and Lexical Selection / James Pustejovsky // James Pustejovsky (ed.). Semantics and the Lexicon. – Dordrecht : Kluwer, 1993. – Pp. 73–96.

19. Van Dijk Teun, Discourse and Context / Teun Van Dijk. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1981. – 283 p.

20. Websters Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged. – Springfield, MA : Merriam-Webster, 1993.

Михайленко В. В. Корпусний аналіз і диференціація значення прикметника *public*

Анотація. У представленій статті наведено елементи когнітивно-семантичного аналізу прикметника *public* в англійській мові на основі його корпусного аналізу. Основна мета даної праці є детальне вивчення умов актуалізації компонентів лексичного значення прикметника *public* як багатозначної одиниці. Доведено, що всі встановлені компоненти присутні в структурі лексичного значення прикметника. Результати проведеного дослідження вказують на те, що їх актуалізація залежить, по-перше, від сполучуваності лексеми з іменником як головним словом фрази, по-друге, від основного лексико-семантичного поля дискурсу, по-третє, від жанру дискурсу і, по-четверте, від наміру автора дискурсу – його/її ставлення до суб'єкта або об'єкта висловлювання.

Ключові слова: лексема, значення, компонентна структура, фраза, речення, жанр дискурсу, контекст, лексична семантика, когнитивна семантика, корпусний аналіз.

Михайленко В. В. Корпусный анализ и дифференциация значения прилагательного *public*

Аннотация. В данной статье освещены элементы когнитивно-семантического анализа прилагательного *public* в английском языке на основе корпусного анализа. Основная цель этой работы – детальное изучение условий актуализации компонентов лексического значения указанного прилагательного как многозначной единицы. Доказано, что все установленные компоненты присутствуют в структуре лексического значения прилагательного *public*. Результаты проведённого исследования указывают на то, что их актуализация зависит, во-первых, от сочетаемости лексемы с существительным в качестве главного слова фразы, во-вторых, от основного лексико-семантического поля дискурса, в-третьих, от типа жанра дискурса и, в-четвертых, от намерения автора дискурса – его/её отношения к субъекту или объекту высказывания.

Ключевые слова: лексема, значение, компонентная структура, фраза, предложение, жанр дискурса, контекст, лексическая семантика, когнитивная семантика, корпусный анализ.