

спасіння, символізує перемогу добра над злом. Як фізичне світло перемагає темряву, так і духовне просвітління (оновлення) перемагає гріх. Отже, особливість функціонування архетипних матриць у біблійній картині світу полягає в тому, що вони творять розгорнуті символіко-алегоричні картини, лексико-асоціативні ряди, супроводжувані ускладненою художньо-образною структурою різнорівневих понять і явищ.

Перспективу подальших наукових розвідок порушеної проблеми вбачаємо у виокремленні лексико-асоціативних полів наскрізних біблійних архетипів і в поглибленому витлумаченні символів, що модифікують такі архетипи.

Література

1. Біблія або Книги Святого Письма Старого й Нового Заповіту [переклад проф. Івана Огієнка]. – К. : Українське Біблійне Товариство, 2002. – 1375 с.
2. Лановик З. Б. Біблійна герменевтика : становлення, методологія (символіко-алегоричний аспект літературознавчого дискурсу): дис. ... доктора філол. наук: спец. 10.01.06 / Лановик Зоряна Богданівна. – Тернопіль, 2006. – 409 с.
3. Лосев А. Ф. Очерки античного символизма и мифология / А. Ф. Лосев. – М. : Мысль, 1993. – 959с.
4. Набитович І. Й. Категорія *sacrum* у художній прозі ХХ–ХХІ століть : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня докт. філол. наук: спец. 10.01.06 «Теорія літератури» / І. Й. Набитович. – К., 2009. – 40 с.
5. Процик І. В. Архетипи в художньому моделюванні І. Драча і М. Ореста : дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.01 / Процик Ірина Володимирівна. – Запоріжжя, 2012. – 198 с.
6. Сендерович С. Ревизия юнговой теории архетипа / С. Седерович // Логос. – 1995. – № 6. – С. 144–164.
7. Сковорода Г. Диалог. Имя ему – потоп зміин / Г. Сковорода // Історія української філософії : хрестоматія. – К. : Либідь, 1983. – С. 336–372.
8. Швидка Н. В. Архетипно-символьна опозиція *світло / темрява* в біблійному дискурсі / Н. В. Швидка // Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету : збірник наукових праць. – Чернівці : Видавничий Дім «Родовід», 2016. – Вип. 769. Романо-слов'янський дискурс. – С. 71–75.
9. Шелестюк Е. В. Символ versus троп: сравнительный анализ семантики / Е. В. Шелестюк // Филологические науки. – 2001. – № 6. – С. 50–58.
10. Уилрайт Ф. Метафора и реальность / Ф. Уилрайт // Теория метафоры. – М. : Прогресс, 1990. – С. 82–110.
11. Франкл В. Человек в поисках смысла: [сборник] / В. Франкл; [пер. с англ. и нем. Д. А. Леонтьева, М. П. Папуша и Е. В. Эйдмана]. – М. : Прогресс, 1990. – 363 с.

Soroka T.

– Candidate of Science (Linguistics), Associate Professor, English Language and Translation Department, Izmail State University of Humanities

УДК 81'22 (811.161.2+811.111)

STAGES OF EMPIRICAL STUDYING LEXICO-SEMANTIC PECULIARITIES OF THE UKRAINIAN AND ENGLISH AXIOMENS

The article is dedicated to the description of the procedure of empirical studying lexico-semantic peculiarities of words denoting philosophical, world outlook, scientific, social, political, moral, religious, legal, aesthetic values in Modern Ukrainian and English. The subject of this study is structurally defined organization of axionomens which are qualified as determined linguistic units taken from the lexicographical interpretative sources. Matrix presentation of non-material values is to expose the functional character of semes forming definite structures within the framework of analyzed words.

Key words: axionomen, formalized analysis, matrix, generalized seme.

Сорока Т.

– кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри англійської мови та перекладу Ізмаїльського державного гуманітарного університету

ЕТАПИ ЕМПІРИЧНОГО ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧНИХ ОСОБЛИВОСТЕЙ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ТА АНГЛІЙСЬКИХ АКсіОНОМЕНІВ

Статтю присвячено опису процедури емпіричного дослідження лексико-семантичних особливостей українських та англійських слів на позначення філософсько-світоглядних, наукових, громадсько-політичних, соціальних, моральних, релігійних, правових і естетичних цінностей. Предмет дослідження – системно-структурна організація аксіономенів, що кваліфікуються як ціннісно-зумовлені реєстрові одиниці лексикографічних джерел тлумачного характеру. Ступінчаста ідентифікації як засіб виявлення вербальних маніфестаторів семантичних компонентів значень полягала в послідовному зведенні слів на позначення цінностей через типові ідентифікатори до аксіономенів з максимально узагальненим характером. Обґрунтовано застосування матричного методу представлення семантичних відношень між аксіономенами. Розглянуто етапи збору лексикографічного матеріалу і виділення семного складу аксіоіменників.

Ключові слова: аксіономен, лексичне значення, матриця, генералізована сема.

Сорока Т.

– кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры английского языка и перевода Измаильского государственного гуманитарного университета

ЭТАПЫ ЭМПИРИЧЕСКОГО ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИХ ОСОБЕННОСТЕЙ УКРАИНСКИХ И АНГЛИЙСКИХ АКСИОНОМЕНОВ

Статья посвящена описанию процедуры эмпирического исследования лексико-семантических особенностей украинских и английских слов, обозначающих философско-мировоззренческие, научные, общественно-политические, социальные, моральные, религиозные, правовые и эстетические ценности. Предмет исследования – системно-структурная

организация аксиономенов, которые квалифицируются как ценностно-обусловленные реестровые единицы лексикографических источников толкования слов. Обосновано применение матричного метода представления семантических отношений между аксиономенами. Рассмотрены этапы процедуры сбора лексикографического материала и выделения семного состава слов.

Ключевые слова: аксиономен, лексическое значение, матрица, генерализированная сема.

1. Problem statement

Lexical semantics of nowadays is regarded as the most productive basis for detailed studying linguistic content without which the definite language system can't be adequately presented in general. Thus, re-orientation of linguistic investigations toward the semantic foundation is logical and scientifically-determined. It is explained by an irrefutable fact concerning a statement about primacy of linguistic content and lexical property in a word over its form and the possibility of using semantic approach to study all language levels as well. Polysemy is characteristic of most words in many languages, however different they may be. But it is more characteristic of the English vocabulary as compared with Ukrainian, 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 variants that constitute its semantic structure, i.e. the more polysemantic it is.

2. Critical overview

The semantic structure of a word is considered as a structured set of interrelated lexical variants with different denotational and sometimes also connotational meanings. These variants belong to the same set because they are expressed by the same combination of morphemes, although in different contextual conditions. The elements are interrelated due to the existence of some common semantic component. In other words, the word's semantic structure is an organized whole comprised by recurrent meanings and shades of meaning that a particular sound complex can assume in different contexts, together with emotional, stylistic and other connotations, if any. Every meaning is thus characterized according to the function, significative or pragmatic effect that it has to fulfill as denotative and connotative meaning referring the word to the extra-linguistic reality and to the speaker, and also with respect to other meanings with which it is contrasted.

The representatives of American structuralism Eugene Nida [5] and Floyd Lounsbury [4] were influenced by the view of Leonard Bloomfield who claimed that the meaning of a linguistic form is something in extralinguistic reality. They were interested in the relation between the language and the culture of the community and distinguished between

“linguisesemes” (features of meaning based on the linguistic context) and “ethnosemes” (features based on the ethnological and cultural context). The semantic components which they obtained by the method of componential analysis (CA) represented the closest analogy with the phonological distinctive features of N. S. Trubetskoy.

A form of componential analysis describing semantic components in terms of categories represented as a hierarchical structure so that each subsequent category is a sub-category of the previous one is described by R. S. Ginzburg. She follows the theory of the American linguists Jerrold Katz and Jerry Fodor involving the analysis of dictionary meanings into semantic *markers* and *distinguishers* but redefines it in a clear-cut way. The markers refer to features which the word has in common with other lexical items, whereas a distinguisher, as the term implies, differentiates it from all other words.

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

Cow – “*a full grown female of any animal of the ox family*”.

Calf – “*the young of the cow*. The first definition contains all the elements we have previously obtained from proportional oppositions. The second is incomplete but we can substitute the missing elements from the previous definition. We can, consequently, agree with J. N. Karaulov and regard as semantic components (or semes).

Dictionary definition is an informal CA, in which each part of the definition is component. Each meaning of a lexical unit in a dictionary has a definition expressed by a set of semantic components. Weinreich U. argues that the words used in definitions of terms are no different in principle from the words defined. According to him the circularity of the dictionary is unavoidable but a semantic analysis should reduce the circularity as far as possible.

Matrix is a two-dimensional structure which replaces oversimplified notation systems used in CA so far. Matrix enables a researcher to study all the interconnections between the related meanings of different lexical units as well as between different meanings of a specific lexical unit [3]. As the contemporary CA to semantic structure requires open multidimensional structures, the problem with two-dimensionality will be overcome by a computer-readable database and a multidimensional matrix in near future.

3. Purpose of investigation

The purpose of the article is to characterize the procedure of empirical studying lexico-semantic peculiarities of words denoting philosophical, world outlook, scientific, social, political, moral, religious, legal, aesthetic values in Modern Ukrainian and English.

4. Research course

The vocabulary of the Ukrainian and English languages is examined as a system, i.e. an integral organization with interconnected and interdependent sectors which, in their turn, have specific qualities. However, these sectors are the subject to laws existence of the whole entirety. Both the structure and the system of the Ukrainian and English languages are naturally and volumetrically submitted by explanatory dictionaries, where phonology, morphology and word formation are fixed in the complex form of expressing the content of lexical units. Lexicographical practice of compiling explanatory dictionaries was aiming researchers at studying semantic structure of a word not as an isolated but an integrally-linked element of a language system. Thus, explanatory dictionaries with complete databanks allow realizing the analysis of linguistic means of word-stock manifestations in the terms of semantic components. Any dictionary entry is considered to be a group of strictly-organized formal indications. The quantity of them depends upon the degree of a word polysemy, i.e. the rich polysemy the more reasons for diversifying an entry formal indications. Since a dictionary entry comes out the instrument of word's lexical meaning interpretation, its intersection with others but distinctive indications affords opportunity to describe the correlation of lexical meanings in a language system by means of formalized analysis procedure.

For the first time the formalized principles of semantic classification of the Ukrainian vocabulary were formulated and based by scientific employees of the department of structurally-mathematic linguistics of O.O. Potebnia Institute of Linguistics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Just from this institution various up-to-date investigations in theoretical and applied linguistics on the material of lexicographical sources have been spread. The Ukrainian eminent scholar M. Peschak was the author of this methodology. She could with her followers throw light on the problem of differentiating language and speech and also achieve a clear presentation of lexical meanings as linguistic facts [2]. The research material of the present article includes the arrangements of Ukrainian and English axionomens qualified as determined linguistic units denoting spiritual values taken from the lexicographical interpretative sources [6; 7]. Each of the axionomens is characterized as a dialectical unity of form and content.

For choosing material of investigating systematically-structural peculiarities of axionomens lexical semantics of the modern Ukrainian and

English languages we put formal but exclusively linguistic criterion into operation, i.e. referring the analyzed words only to nouns. This approach gives an opportunity to define and to describe semantics of words with the help of such steps: a) matrix analysis of axionomens seme structure on the first stage of research material classification; b) description and complex analysis of axionomens correlations, their connections and peculiarities; c) typological comparison of axionomens semantics in Ukrainian and other foreign lexical systems. Matrix method of presenting semantic relations between Ukrainian and English axionouns serves as metalanguage for description of analyzed objects in our investigation, whereas matrix on the one hand occurs as a model of system of semantic connections, on the other hand it occurs as semantic structure of axiolexis. This model fixes semantic connections between the words denoting Ukrainian and English spiritual values in the form of columns and lines of equal length, inside of which the axionomens correlation (a lexical stock) and their meanings ration (i.e. a seme stock) are marked by the symbol +.

The places of axionomens in matrix are strongly-fixed: words of the highest and average degrees of polysemy are located in deeply-filled parts but monosemantic ones can be met rarely. At the same time all matrix cells have functional loading, likewise distances between words and directions of their location. In comparison with explanatory dictionaries matrix is formally simple for demonstrating lexical semantics of the Ukrainian and English languages. Its topographical way of placing filled cells practically substitutes verbal expression of interpretative parts of words.

All the meanings of lexical units are formed by a hierarchical structure of semantic constituents – theoretical constructs or conceptual building blocks – which semantically characterize the vocabulary of any language. Terms like *semantic feature* (A. Ufimtseva), *semantic component* (L. Vasilyev, A. Zholkovskiy) and *semantic marker* (J. Katz, J. Fodor) are often used interchangeably in the present linguistics; they are of various level of abstraction and determine the semantically-syntactic environment of the word. In our investigation we introduce the term a *generalized seme* (GS), which is understood as a semantically-derived feature having briefly-generalized content which is logically removed from the initial sememe and used in modeling the horizontal axis of matrix.

Structuring modern Ukrainian and English axiovocabularies provide the separation of their word-stock and inner organization. As a result of this structuring the division of analyzed vocabulary into lexico-semantic groups and establishing connections between them take place.

The procedure of empirical studying lexico-semantic peculiarities of the Ukrainian and English axionomens is subdivided into the following consecutive stages:

1. Axionomens having in their lexical meanings both explicit and implicit indications on forms and means of expressing axiological knowledge are taken out from the up-to-date Ukrainian and English explanatory dictionaries by means of sampling data method. In consequence of it the card-file of linguistic material is made up. One should point out that firstly preliminary lists of lexemes considered as fundamental *conventional values* of the Ukrainian (**життя, честь, гідність, держава, суверенітет, мова, людина, здоров'я, недоторканність, безпека, свобода, мир, праця, освіта, культура, релігійність, право, порядок, закон**) and the English (**life, liberty, right, security, law, sovereignty, equality, privacy, honour, freedom, worship, personality, dignity, health, well-being, education, respect, religiosity, culture, order, peace**) national communities are formed. *Conventional value* is a term introduced in the scientific usage by the author of the article for the first time and denotes a constitutionally-guaranteed and defined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights social phenomenon.

Afterwards *the step-identification method* (in the terms of E. Kuznetsova) is applied for the above-proposed lists of words. This method helps to determine lexico-semantic groups in both languages as sets of units interpreted through the same word identifiers. The step-identification method as a means of finding verbal manifestations of semantic components consists in consecutive reducing words through typical identifiers till those ones of maximum generalized character. This procedure will be carried out until the situation of cross-identification arises in contrasted interpretations. Thus, the ultimate identifiers are accepted as lexico-semantic units denoting philosophical, world outlook, scientific, social, political, moral, religious, legal, aesthetic values containing stable complexes of semantic components existing in other axionomens of the analyzed language.

2. The completed card-file of Ukrainian (**життя, порядок, воля, природа, честь, дух, право, час, розум, слава, мова, щастя, мир, любов, культура, закон, добро, доля, свобода, праця, правда, істина, душа, пам'ять, мрія, простір, логіка, віра, свідомість, історія, врода, блаженство, наука, ініціатива, гордість, повага, освіта, стиль, мудрість, справедливість, аскетизм, талант, благоговіння, співчуття, достоїнство, мужність, держава, краса, гармонія, совість, творчість, Бог, людина, мораль, побратимство, довершеність, чуйність, благородство, злагода, успіх, Батьківщина, толерантність, здоров'я, доброчесність, майстерність, соборність, гуманізм, раціоналізм, рівність, знання, надія, дипломатія, дружба, симпатія, авторитет, уважність, доброта, благодать, благо,**

мистецтво, удача, грація, благочестя, правосуддя, щирість, чесність, сміливість, вихованість, святість, гостинність, милосердя, пристойність, благополуччя, користь, терпіння, суверенітет, солідарність, вітальність, прогрес, оптимізм, відповідальність, опікування, безпека, порядність, дисциплінованість, турботливість, компетентність, ретельність, старанність, працьовитість, плюралізм, професіоналізм, незалежність, людяність, надійність, недоторканість, статус, обов'язок, ментальність, гідність, демократія, самовладання, легітимність, альтруїзм, вдячність, конституція, патріотизм, ввічливість, вірність, ґречність, інтелігентність, лагідність, підприємливість, поміркованість, смиренність, стриманість, цивілізованість, щедрість, довіра, акуратність, духовність, лояльність, наполегливість, неупередженість, об'єктивність, родинність, унітарність, консенсус, державність, цілеспрямованість, естетичність, православність, релігійність, самовідданість, трудолюбство, громадянськість, колективізм) and English axionomens (*life, time, order, nature, right, grace, spirit, law, love, style, soul, mind, art, space, power, culture, wisdom, dream, will, honour, pride, liberty, trust, authority, freedom, perfection, dignity, truth, sympathy, memory, comfort, morality, sovereignty, discipline, knowledge, constitution, care, justice, logic, education, language, mercy, faith, glory, piety, spirituality, civilization, democracy, beauty, good, virtue, hope, diligence, charity, blessing, persistence, tolerance, humility, consciousness, mastery, respect, felicity, science, God, fortune, patience, worship, labour, duty, competence, efficiency, harmony, independence, integrity, chastity, vitality, optimism, peace, security, mentality, benevolence, goodness, prudence, conscience, humanism, intelligence, diplomacy, accuracy, objectivity, sanctity, legality, friendship, fame, personality, honesty, generosity, progress, experience, success, talent, confidence, kindness, decency, self-possession, rectitude, happiness, health, respectability, loyalty, courage, modesty, moderation, pragmatism, aestheticism, rationalism, initiative, career, devotion, informality, proficiency, punctuality, excellence, responsibility, privacy, status, reliability, sincerity, pluralism, luck, holiness, elegance, religiosity, traditionalism, professionalism, beatitude, fortitude, temperance, prestige, equality, prosperity, well-being, thrift, innovation, patriotism, solidarity, impartiality, purposefulness, politeness, gratitude, consensus*) gives an opportunity to analyze their quantitative stock, qualitative peculiarities and semantic properties as well.

3. On the basis of studying lexicographic definitions a special matrix is modeled where a list of axionomens (a lexical stock) is arranged on the vertical axis and the horizontal one indicates a seme stock (GSs) of the collected language material. At the same time inside a matrix cell only one word is disposed. The presence of a common lexical meaning is marked by the symbol+.

4. Lists of words and their GSs in matrices are grouped in a descending line depending on a quantitative stock. It is conducted to maximum concentration of axionomens in one matrix angle and contrasting it to an alternate angle placed diagonally as the least completed one.

5. The vocabulary fragment under study is subdivided into lexico-semantic groups due to the total amount of lexical meanings (i.e from axionomens of the highest and average degrees of polysemy till monosemantic ones) and its seme-stock is divided into sets according to the frequency of GSs usage distinguished in lexical meanings of words with the different degree of polysemy.

6. Degree of axionomens polysemy and the character of their interconnections are presented enough completely in accordance with the matrix method. The obtained lexico-semantic groups of axionomens are studied as independent systematically-structural unities of words.

The presented stages of empirical studying lexico-semantic peculiarities of the Ukrainian and English axionomens are combined with the selection of such methods and procedures of lexicological analysis as: the step-identification, descriptive, statistic methods and a componental analysis as well.

5. Concluding remarks

The application of matrix method in practice proves that the structural organization of axio-vocabulary considerably becomes complicated; internal mechanisms and dynamics of semantic cooperations of axionomens are revealed under the influence of extra-linguistic factors. Matrix presentation of non-material values gives an opportunity to describe in detail the structure of axionouns lexical meanings which are not in chaotic order, but clearly organized; to distinguish the degree of their related semantics, to expose the functional character of semes forming definite structures within the framework of the analyzed words.

6. Further research

The practical value of the research is to use the results for fundamental studies of all lexico-semantic sub-systems of value paradigms of the Ukrainian, English and French language societies.

References

1. Кузнецова Э. В. Ступенчатая идентификация как средство описания семантических связей слов / Э. В. Кузнецова // Вопросы металингвистики. – Л. : Ленинградский гос. ун-т им. А. А. Жданова, 1973. – С. 84–95.
2. Клименко Н. Ф. Формалізовані основи семантичної класифікації лексики / Н. Ф. Клименко, М. М. Пещак, І. Ф. Савченко. – К. : Наукова думка, 1982. – 251 с.
3. Фабіан М. П. Етикетна лексика в українській, англійській та угорській мовах : [монографія] / Мирослава Петрівна Фабіан. – Ужгород : Інформаційно-видавниче агентство «ІВА», 1998. – 256 с.
4. Lounsbury F. A. Semantic analysis of the Pawnee kinship usage / Floyd Floyd G. A Lounsbury // Language, 32, 1956. 1. – P. 158–194.
5. Nida E. A. Componential Analysis of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantic Structures (Approaches to Semiotics) / Nida, Eugene A. – Belgium : Mouton, 1975. – 360 p.
6. Словник української мови : у 11-ти т. / [І. К. Білодід та ін.]. – К. : Наукова думка, 1970–1980. – Т. 1–11.
7. Oxford English Dictionary / Being a corrected re-issue with an introduction, supplement and bibliography of a new English dictionary on historical principles / Ed. by : J. A. H. Murray : Vol. 1–12. – Oxford : the Clarendon Press, 1970.