ФОНЕТИЧНА, ЛЕКСИЧНА ТА ГРАМАТИЧНА СИСТЕМИ МОВИ ТА МЕТОДИ ЇХ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ

Nataliia Yermakova,
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Docent,
Khortytsia National Academy

TYPOLOGY OF SUBSTANTIVE EURYSEMY

The article is aimed to consider the classifications of lexemes with wide meaning (eurysemes) based on substantive units of different languages. Linguists note the heterogeneous character of the respective lingual signs and appropriately they represent the types of substantive eurysemy. The article also reveals that most eurysemantic lexemes can denominate either generic meaning (having a low level of lexical abstraction) or categorical meaning (having the highest level of abstraction).

Foreign scholars associate the words of concrete semantics with hypero-hyponymy rather than with eurysemy. Eurysemic substantives of generalized generic type are traditionally considered as hyperonyms or umbrellaterms relative to hyponyms.

Preference for lexemes of generalized categorical type in studying nouns of wide meaning caused the existing classifications of eurysemic substantives to cover either abstract or concrete ones, and rarely both.

Thereafter we offer our own classification of English nouns of wide semantics based on singling out the types of referents that eurysemic unit can signify. Under the referent we mean a concrete subject, to be corresponded with the linguistic unit in the process of its contextual use. On this basis the eurysemes have different degrees of referential correlation (high, average, low) which are distinguished on the basis of referential types. Notably words of wide meaning can acquire the traits of multi-, poly- and monoreference.

Keywords: *classification, correlation, eurysemy, invariant, substantive.*

Єрмакова Наталія Миколаївна,
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
Хортицька національна академія

ТИПОЛОГІЯ СУБСТАНТИВНОЇ ЕВРИСЕМІЇ

Метою статті є розглянути класифікації лексем із широким значенням (еврисем) на основі субстантивних одиниць різних мов. Лінгвісти відзначають неоднорідний характер відповідних мовних знаків і, згідно якого, пропонують класифікації субстантивної еврисемії. Відмічено також, що більшість широкозначних одиниць можуть виражати, певним чином, узагальнено-родове (з низьким ступенем лексичної абстракції) або узагальнено-категоріальне значення (з максимальним ступенем абстракції).

Зарубіжні лінгвісти дослідження слів конкретної семантики традиційно пов'язують не з еврисемією, а з гіперо-гіпонімією. Широкозначні іменники узагальнено-родового типу традиційно розглядають як гіпероніми відносно гіпонімів.

Віддання переваги лексемам узагальнено-категоріального типу в дослідженні широкозначних іменників призвело до того, що існуючі класифікації еврисемічних імен об'єднують або тільки абстрактні іменники, або, поряд з абстрактними, містять деякі конкретні назви.

Відповідно цього, запропоновано власну класифікацію широкозначних іменників англійської мови, що базується на виокремленні типів референтів, які може позначати еврисемічна лексема. Під референтом нами розуміється конкретний об'єкт реальної дійсності, названий певним словом у конкретному висловлюванні. На цій підставі ми виокремлюємо три ступені референтної віднесеності еврисемічних одиниць – високий, середній, низький. Виходячи з цього, досліджувані одиниці можуть мати ознаки мульти-, полі- та монореферентності.

Ключові слова: *класифікація, кореляція, еврисемія, інваріант, субстантив.*

The term *euryseme* was introduced to denote a language unit of wide meaning being, by analogy, derived from the existing term for wide semantics – *eurysemy*. It is defined as a word with wide semantic volume for signifying a great number of things and natural phenomena, with the most general seme in its structure (invariant) being concretized in speech by narrowing the identified notion. Consequently, an euryseme is recognized to have one wide meaning, polyreference, interrelation with a notion of wide volume, contextual dependence, lack of semantic derivation.

The category of eurysemy has been and remains the subject of attention of linguists since the middle of the last century. In linguistics of the late XXth – early XXIst centuries the problem of wide semantics in the English language was dealt with by a number of scientists [Баланюк 2009; Василюк, 1990; Єрмакова, 2017; Кримець, 2012; Луговий, 2012; Скорофатова, 2012; Терещенко, 2008].

In modern linguistics, there are discussions to consider eurysemy as a separate autonomous lexical-semantic category [Василюк, 1990; Єрмакова, 2017; Терещенко, 2008]; to consider it as one of the lexico-semantic variants of the polysemant [Луговий, 2012; Скорофатова, 2012], or to characterize it as a kind of monosemy with a wide volume of denotate [Квеселевич 2001; 77].

Despite the difference of views, researchers determined the typology and specificity of the phenomenon of wide semantics in linguistics, revealed the criteria of distinguishing eurysemy from polysemy, defined that lexemes of different parts of speech (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns and even conjunctions and prepositions) can be referred to eurysemic units, as well as analyzed the features of their functioning in different languages.

In turn, we found out that eurysemes have a rather wide range of referents and are characterized by different degrees of reference which had not been researched before and which we have analyzed in our previous publications [Єрмакова 2015; Єрмакова 2016; Єрмакова 2017].

Therefore, the *relevance* of the presented article is due to the problematic approaches to the linguistic phenomenon of a wide meaning, the lack of fundamental research on the problem of classification of eurysemic units in the English language, the feasibility of analyzing the combinatorial capabilities of words with a wide semantics, in particular, the ability of eurysemes to perform various semantic and grammatical functions in context, while maintaining, at the same time, their wide range of reference.

The article *aims* to consider classifications of lexemes with a wide meaning (eurysemes) focused on substantive units of different languages.

According to the goal, the following *tasks* are to be solved:
– to describe the criteria laid down in the classification of substantive eurysemes;
– to consider classifications of lingual signs with wide semantics;
– to provide our own classification of substantive eurysemes of the English language.

Studies have shown that eurysemy is peculiar to different parts of speech and it is characterized by heterogeneity. The heterogeneity of substantive lexemes of wide meaning is reflected, first of all, in that eurysemic units can be both concrete and abstract nouns in different languages: *fact, thing, affair, matter, business, type, concern* [Василюк, 1990]; *річ, діло, робота, справа, почуття, рух* [Терещенко, 2008]; *thing, body, person, matter, affair, man* [Скорофатова, 2012]; *thing, place, kind, matter, way* [Єрмакова, 2017]; *chose, fait, personne, homme, femme, gens* [Луговий, 2012]; апарат, механізм, машина, прилад, пристрій, деталь, корпус [Кримець, 2012].

According to some linguists, the English lexemes like *kind, type* may not be considered the nouns of wide semantics because they don't signify a class of objects. These words are called *hedges*. Hedges, in the broad sense of the term, are lexico-semantic units used for modifying a sentence [Brown, 1988; Heng, 2002; Hübler, 1983; Hyland, 2000; Vass, 2004].

Furthermore, similar substantives are characterized by different level of eurysemy, e.g. the English nouns *plant, animal, person* have wider semantics than the words *tree, bear, woman*. These lexemes represent different levels of categorization: the first words, being the names of human beings, faunonyms, floronyms, refer to a superordinate level of categorization, the other ones, signifying the representatives of these categories, relate to the lower level.

It should be noted that the scholars often put both abstract and concrete lexemes of wide meaning on the same line that reliably depends on the goals of the research. Analysis of the phenomenon of desemantization by V. S. Lugovyi, for instance, is based on the French eurysemes *chose, fait, personne, homme, femme* [Луговий, 2012]. In other cases, the authors restrict their studies to eurysemic substantives expressed by concrete lingual signs (e.g. the research by I. M. Vasyliuk is made on the English nouns of wide meaning signifying the category *human being* [Василюк, 1990], or on the eurysemic substantives represented by abstract lexemes, particularly, by the nouns or phrases with a general meaning of eventfulness studied by A. O. Skorofatova [Скорофатова, 2012]).

The heterogeneity of substantive eurysemes with a different degree of generalization and abstraction, signifying objects of physical world or notions of the highest degree of abstraction, resulted in singling out two types of wide meaning: *generalized categorical* or *categorical wide* (having the highest level of abstraction) and *generalized generic* (having a low level of lexical abstraction) types of wide meaning [Луговий, 2012; Василюк, 1990; Кримець, 2012].

The lexemes of categorical wide type, as a rule, are the substantives with a notional component *notion-category*. Categorical meaning of objectivity is considered as a border of semantic widening of lexemes [Скорофатова, 2012]. The content of these lexemes involve the most general properties peculiar to many phenomena of the real world. These lingual signs are traditionally called abstract substantives, e.g. *thing, matter, fact, way, event, idea, problem*.

The eurysemes of generalized generic type (as usual they are concrete lexemes like *plant, tree, animal, person, man, woman*) include a generic notion of a class of objects which, according to logical-philosophic explanations of generic and superordinate concepts, is more general than superordinate notion, and it is the basis of substantives signifying a particular representative of a class of objects.

This classification is correlative with two categories of wide meaning proposed by the Ukrainian scholar S. S. Tereshchenko in the Ukrainian language: *categorical wide* and *relatively wide* meaning. The categorical wide meaning pertains to the eurysemes with the highest degree of abstraction expressing the notions of *objectivity* for nouns (e.g. *річ (thing)*), *non-processual feature of an object* for adjectives, *action (робити (to do))* or *state (бути (to be))* for verbs and so on. The structure of this meaning, according to the linguist, has only one integral seme. A relatively wide meaning has a generic notion [Терещенко 2006].

The basis of a relatively wide meaning is represented by a generic notion, and the structure is composed by not only an integral, but differential semes, e.g. the noun *human being, person, event, animal* and other like them. The level of abstraction of this type of meaning is greatly lower than the previous one [Єрмакова, 2017].

Foreign scholars associate the words of concrete semantics with hypero-hyponymy rather than with eurysemy. Eurysemic substantives of generalized generic type are traditionally considered as hyperonyms or umbrellaterms relative to hyponyms (lexemes

of narrow meaning signifying the same category). Particularly, French linguists study the peculiarities of semantic structure of words referring to the thematic groups *seating furniture*, *city transport,* consider applying a componential analysis for researching a structural organization of word groups signifying *residential buildings* [Mounin, 1975; Pottier, 1963].

It may really be noted that the difference also becomes evident in there being hypero-hyponymy relations between the language units of the first and the second type, e.g. *person, animal* or *bush*, *tree* (generalized generic type) are hyponyms, and the words *being* and *plant* (generalized categorical type) are hyperonyms relative to them. Besides, the ability of eurysemes to pass from one type to another with different transitional forms is not eliminated. The very words having an inconstant semantic volume can over time take or lose semantic traits which precisely define their meaning and semantic development towards growing abstraction.

The opposition of eurysemes based on a generalized generic and generalized categorical meaning is no one criterion for classifying words with wide semantics. M. I. Mostovyy singles out the types of wide meaning nomination depending on the denoted object. Under this approach highlighted are *elemental* and *eventive* types of wide meaning nomination. Elemental type of nomination is used in reference to the eurysemes signifying the elements of reality: thing, process, reference, any real or unreal object. Eventive type refers to a situation as a nominee (microsituation / macrosituation), i.e. the event, fact connecting a number of elements. Lexis of wide semantics replaces propositive nomination with eventive nomination [Мостовий 1993].

A. I. Gurska distinguishes two types of eurysemy as to the parts of speech: a verb is required to have a grammatical meaning, a noun – wide lexical one [Гурська, 1974: 10]. Thus the scholar admits both lexical and grammatical semantic potential of a word to be indications of a level of wide meaning. In other words, eurysemy is not limited by grammatical sector only, in the case of verbs at least, and it involves a lexical potential. Similarly, grammatical meaning is inherent to eurysemic substantives, and it was mentioned by S. S. Balaniuk on the example of the word *way* correlative in his wide meaning *manner of any kind of action* with grammatical categorical meaning of a class of qualitative adverbs [Баланюк 2009].

The level of *concentration* of lexical abstraction is the basis for differentiating two groups of language units with wide meaning for D. I. Kveselevych. The first group involves the words with lexical abstraction *reaching peak apogee* and it is identical with grammatical abstraction (they are proper words of wide semantics like *thing*), the second group includes the words in which lexical abstraction does not reach the highest level and it is below grammatical abstraction (*simple words of wide semantics* like *matter, affair*) [Квеселевич 2001].

Significant is the study by V. S. Lugovyi in this direction which was made on French eurysemes specified by a general word of wide notional basis *récipient* [Луговий 2012]. The scholar considers deep semantic processes, which are prerequisite for development of a wide meaning, and comes to conclusion that a wide meaning is inherent to non-motivated lexical units characterized by special meaning structure of generic type. At the same time revealed is the correlation of hierarchic structure of meaning with hypero-hyponymic structural organization of words inside the group. It leads to homogenization of some features and lets the word nominate different things being within general characteristics.

Actually there is no unified generally accepted classification of eurysemic units or hyponymic relations, and consequently scholars have all the reasons to classify them differently basing on their heterogeneity. Notably M. I. Mostovyy differentiates properly taxonomic notion (*flower* in reference to *rose, carnation*), generalizing functional notion (*transport* in reference to *car, bicycle*), nominations of traits involving heterogeneous combinations of hyponyms (*furniture* in reference to *bed, chair*), pseudo-countable substantives (*fruit* in reference to *apple, orange*) among hyperonyms [Мостовий 1993].

Particular attention has been given to the widest lingual unit *thing* in English, *chose* in French, *річ* in Ukrainian considered as a substitute for both concrete and abstract nouns. This lexeme was studied in English, French and Ukrainian in comparative analysis because of its wide semantics [Василюк 1990; Луговий 2012; Терещенко 2008].

As it was mentioned the lexical unit *thing* has the highest level of wide semantics among the substantives signifying almost everything one may see, think of, imagine, perceive. Having the meaning of just objectivity, the lexeme *thing* may involve the reference to any other nouns in its notional content. By its widest semantics the lingual sign *thing* is a universally used unit and the group of its referents is not limited. Besides, the eurysemic substantive *thing* can replace not only any noun, but other units of a text whether nominative or predicative [Єрмакова 2017].

Preference for lexemes of generalized categorical type in studying nouns of wide meaning caused the existing classifications of eurysemic substantives to cover either abstract or concrete ones, and rarely both. D. I. Kveselevych, for instance, offers the classification where the eurysemic substantives are divided as follows:

– substantives reflecting processes of mental activity like *idea, decision*;
– substantives having modal connotation like *supposition, intention, hesitation*;
– substantives expressing emotive state like *regret, desire*;
– substantives having temporal meaning like *period, instant* [Квеселевич 2001].

H.-J. Schmid calls abstract nouns *shell-nouns* and subdivide them in his classification into:

– *factual* (*fact, thing, point, problem, reason, difference, upshot*);
– *linguistic* (*news, message, rumor, report, order, proposal, question*);
– *mental* (*idea, notion, belief, assumption, aim, plan, decision*);
– *modal* (*possibility, truth, permission, obligation, need, ability*);
– *eventive* (*act, move, measure, reaction, attempt, tradition, trick*);
– *circumstantial* (*situation, context, place, area, time, way, approach*) [Schmid, 2000].

The term *shell-nouns* highlights the peculiarity of this group of abstract nouns to be featured as *capsules* or *empties* referring to an information content relevant to sentence fragments or texts of different size. Besides, inside this category, they single out a prototype (nouns regularly functioning as shells in the text), and a periphery (nouns being used likewise on rare occasions and only in some syntactic constructions) [Schmid, 2000].

The classification of nouns with wide meaning by M. A. K. Halliday and R. Hasan has a heterogeneous character. It includes both concrete and abstract general nouns:

– *people, person, man, woman, child, boy, girl* (signifying human beings);

– *creature* (signifying any being);

– *thing, object* (signifying inanimate objects, concrete, countable items);

– *business, affair, matter* (signifying inanimate abstract concepts), and:

– *move* [*action*];

– *place* [*place*];

– *question, idea* [*fact*] [Halliday, 1976].

M. A. K. Halliday and R. Hasan consider these nouns superordinate among substantive eurysemes.

On the whole, it can be stated that the attempts to classify lingual units of wide meaning are evidence of the heterogeneity of their semantic volume, the level of abstraction and the width of meaning which are clearly recognized by different scholars and it follows that there is a perspective for research. Correspondently we offer our own classification of English nouns of wide semantics based on singling out the types of referents that a eurysemic unit can signify. As to the referencial features of a language unit, under the latter we mean a concrete subject, to be corresponded with the linguistic unit in the process of its contextual use. Such unit is to be taken in all complexity of its lingual and speech features. On this basis the eurysemes have different degrees of referential correlation (*high, average, low*) which are distinguished on the basis of referential types. Notably words of wide meaning can acquire the traits of *mono-*, *poly-* and *multireference*.

The perspective for our further research is the eurysemic units of other parts of speech, namely, verbs.

References:

1. Баланюк С.С. Прикметники зі значенням „особливий" в англійській мові : парадигматика, синтагматика, епідигматика : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 «Германські мови». Чернівці, 2009. 15 с.

2. Баланюк С.С. Широкозначність як основа явища невизначеності на прикладі англійських прикметників лексико-семантичної групи «особливий». *Вісник Житомирського державного університету*. 2010. Вип. 54. Серія : Філологічні науки. С. 182–186.

3. Василюк І. М. Дифузія як семантична структура (на матеріалі англійської мови). *Мовознавство*. 1990. № 6. С. 53–55.

4. Гурська А. І. Полісемія чи широка семантика? : (на матеріалі деяких англійських дієслів руху. *Особливості розвитку сучасних германських і романських мов.* 1974. С. 9–12.

5. Єрмакова Н. М. Референтна віднесеність широкозначної лексеми "thing" в англійській мові. *Філологічні трактати : [наук. журнал]*. Суми : Сумський державний університет, 2015. Т. 7 (2). С. 77–82. URL : https://tractatus.sumdu.edu.ua/Arhiv/2015-2/12.pdf

6. Єрмакова Н. М. Референтна складова семантики широкозначних лексем в англійській мові (на прикладі похідних слів із базовою евврисемою thing). *Наукові записки : Серія : Філологічні науки (мовознавство)*. Кіровоград : РВВ КДПУ імені В. Винниченка, 2016. Вип. 146. С. 285–289. URL : http://elar.tsatu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/15625/1/Maksymets.pdf

7. Єрмакова Н.М. Семасіологічні параметри субстантивної еврисемії англійської мови : дис. … кандидата філол. наук : 10.02.04. Запоріжжя, 2017. 196 с. URL : chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/http://phd.znu.edu.ua/page/dis/02_2017/Ermakova_dis.pdf

8. Квеселевич Д. І., Сасіна В. П. Практикум з лексикології сучасної англійської мови: навч. посібник. Вінниця: Видавництво «Нова Книга», 2001. 126 с.

9. Кримець О. Лексико-семантична категорія широкозначності та її вияв в українській технічній термінології. *Вісник Нац. ун-ту «Львівська політехніка». Серія «Проблеми української термінології»*. 2012. № 733. С. 115–119. URL : https://science.lpnu.ua/terminology/all-volumes-and-issues/visnik-no-733-2012/leksiko-semantichna-kategoriya

Луговий В. С. Широкозначність фразеологізмів з онімним компонентом як об'єкт лексикографії. *Вісник 178 Дніпропетровського ун-ту : Сер. «Мовознавство».* 2012. Т. 20, вип. 18. С. 126–130. URL : http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/vdumo_2012_20_18_23

10. Мостовий М. І. Лексикологія англійської мови: [Підруч. для інтів і фак. інозем. мов]. Х. : Основа, 1993. 256 с.

11. Скорофатова А. О. Широкозначність та множинність інтерпретації у діалектному дискурсі. *Лінгвістика*. 2012. Ч. І., № 3 (27). С. 101–107.

12. Терещенко С. С. Лексико-семантична парадигма широкозначних слів української мови : дис. … кандидата філол. наук : 10.02.01. Дніпропетровськ, 2008. 194 с.

13. Терещенко С. С. Широкозначначність та багатозначність в українській мові. *Культура народов Причерноморья.* 2006. № 82. С. 177–179.

14. Brown P., Levinson S. C. Politeness : Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1988. 310 p.

15. Halliday M. A. K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. London–New York : Longman, 1976. P. 374.

16. Heng Ch. S., Tan H. Maybe, Perhaps, I Believe, You Could [Electronic resource]. *Making Claims and the Use of Hedges.* 2002. URL : http://www.melta.org.my/ET/2002/wp09.htm

17. Hübler A. Understatements and Hedges in English. John Benjamins Publishing, 1983. 192 p.

18. Hyland K. Hedges, Boosters and Lexical Invisibility : *Noticing Modifiers in Academic Texts, Language Awareness.* 2000. Vol. 9. P. 179–197.

19. Mounin G. La langue française. P. : Seghers, 1975. 196 p.

20. Pottier B. Recherches sur l'analyse sémantique en linguistique et en traduction mécanique. Nancy : Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de l'Université, 1963. 74 p.

21. Schmid H.-J. English abstract nouns as conceptual shells: from corpus to cognition. Berlin–New-York : Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. 457 p.

22. Vass H. Socio-cognitive Aspects of Hedging in Two Legal Discourse Genres. Madrid : Iberica, 2004. .P. 125–141.