

**LATIP 2021****I International Conference on Language and Technology in the Interdisciplinary Paradigm****CORRELATION OF SEMANTIC COMPONENTS IN THE  
STRUCTURE OF WORD SEMANTICS**

Elena Maklakova (a)\*, Liudmila Litvinova (b)

\*Corresponding author

(a) Voronezh State Forestry University named after G.F. Morozov, 8, Timiryazev st., Voronezh, Russia,  
elena.maklakova5@mail.ru

(b) Voronezh State Forestry University named after G.F. Morozov, 8, Timiryazev st., Voronezh, Russia,  
creativity1972@mail.ru

**Abstract**

The article deals with the problem of seme description of a word semantics by the example of lexical and phraseological units "Names of persons" in the Russian language and in their English equivalents. The terms of seme semasiology help us to structure the semantics of lexical units using micro- and macro meaning components. To compare the word meanings from different languages, the semantic material must be prepared, basing on the seme semasiology principles. They include aspect-and-structural description of word semantics, using a universal meta-language for descriptions and the screen models to describe semantic features of different words in a specific order. The aspect approach to the study of a word semantics includes its description according to the macro-components of the meaning: denotative, connotative, and functional-and-stylistic ones. The seme interpreting of a word meaning is based on a generalized lexicographic description taken from explanatory, translated, and encyclopedic dictionaries. The article provides the examples of meta-language notation for the three macro components in a word meaning. Semantic features have unequal weight in the structure of a word meaning. The article gives a number of patterns characteristic of the semes correlation. The description of a word meaning is methodically justified and made with the help of the proposed terminology. The description will allow you to do the inter-language comparison as good as it is possible

2357-1330 © 2021 Published by European Publisher.

*Keywords:* Core, dominance, determination, hierarchy, periphery, seme



## 1. Introduction

The content plan of a language is "a continuum in which semantic features of different levels of abstraction are distinguished and also have a different specific weight in a word semantics" (Karasik, 2010, p. 34). The allocation of the identified types signs, their generalized description as the specific mutual ratio in a structure of "semes, representing individual cognitive signs in the speech" (Popova & Sternin, 2007, p. 45) are the subject of this article. The article is devoted to the linguistic information of the Russian and English personal names that are the same lexico-phraseological field in the language system for further analysis of their semantics with the help of contrastive methods.

## 2. Problem Statement

The semantic specificity of a lexeme towards its equivalent can be identified and described at the levels of macro- and micro-components of direct and figurative types of both meanings, which makes it possible to record its different signs.

The aspect description of the semantics of phraseological and lexical units is important; it is a step-by-step description of its macro-components in the fixed order:

- a) the denotative macro component of a meaning according to the scheme: archi-seme, gender-distinguishing seme, integral seme of belonging to a thematic group, differential semes of a concretizing nature;
- b) the connotative macro component of the meaning: evaluative and emotional signs;
- c) the functional component of the meaning: stylistic, social, temporal, territorial and frequency features, as well as probability features of political correctness and communication tone.

There is reason to believe that describing words for further contrastive comparison of their semantics is important to identify denotative, connotative and functional macro components, as well as the types of their semantic micro-components, their component status in the structure of each of the compared sememes.

## 3. Research Questions

Special semantic features of the analyzed lexical and phraseological units are predetermined by the fact that they are the products of the speaking process, the result of semasiological process. This is directly determined by the communicative sphere of language activity. And it allows considering these semantic features not only from the standpoint of the internal structure of the meaning, but together with their functioning processes. The seme analysis of the Russian lexical and phraseological units and their English equivalents helps us to conclude that there is a certain structural isomorphism of denotative macro-components of the meaning in the personal names. A universal approach to the denotative component description of the personal names was presented above.

Based on the axiological approach to the connotation problem as one of the macro-components of the meaning to study nominative units, we believe that connotative semantics is the semantics of an anthropomorphic attitude to reality. It determines its rather subjective nature. So, it identifies the nature of

the study: the personal names are analyzed from the emotional point of view - what emotivity the speaker gives into them, what intentions he/she wants to get with its help. Evaluation is a way of expressing the value of an object or a phenomenon. Emotion is the expression of psychological states of a person, reflecting the positive or negative feelings of the speaker in the form of direct experiences. Positive and negative ratings can be considered as opposite, assuming a certain average, neutral rating, which acts as a reference point for the object qualification. A zero score indicates that the subject is indifferent to the named object. The description of the connotative macro component in the meaning of the sememe is made by listing the connotative semes as follows: evaluative seme (*non-evaluative, approving, disapproving*); emotional seme (*non-emotional, positive-emotional, negative-emotional*). The connotation of the personal names is a special architectonic macro-component of the semantics of an emotional-evaluative nature. Based on the systematic nature of the vocabulary and the relationship of emotional-evaluative relations, it should be concluded that the identification of connotative meanings in the semantic structure of a word "is extremely important to understand this structure" (Apresyan, 2001, p. 5).

The extralinguistic factors in the language are reflected in the language semantics of the units to be studied at the functional macro component of the meaning level. According to Sternin, functional specificity "reflects the differences between the units of the two languages associated with the historical place of units in language systems. The historical place of a word is the features of the word as a unit of the national language system, regardless of the reality, consciousness, and the emotional-evaluative mechanism of the thinking process" (Sternin, 2008, p. 23). Considering personal names in the light of their extralinguistic determinism involves, first of all, considering the main factors of extra-linguistic influence, which include the social, temporal, territorial conditions of the functioning of these language units. The above-mentioned factors confirm the existence of "a close relationship between society and the vocabulary of the language it speaks" (Vezhbitskaya, 2001, p. 32). And also these factors leave a rather significant trace in their family structure and, thus, they determine the national and cultural specific features in their use. Despite the fact that functional semes are a part of the seme structure of any lexical or phraseological unit, they are usually considered to be additional or peripheral (Vezhbitskaya, 2002). However, in our study many examples of approximate equivalents were revealed during the contrastive analysis right of this particular type of seme. The fact indicates the important role the functional macro component of the meaning plays in describing the national features of the semantics of personal names.

#### **4. Purpose of the Study**

It should be noted that the identification and establishment of inner-family relations of semes is an important point to prepare the comparing of contrastive linguistic units in two languages. It helps us to determine the interaction and interdependence of semes within one sememe and to make a better component analysis of its meaning altogether.

#### **5. Research Methods**

The seme description of personal names is one of the most important aspects in the study of lexical and phraseological field in the language system. As you know, using the "semantic component" concept,

a word meaning can be represented as an object formed by a certain number of discrete elements. In our work, a seme is understood as a semantic micro-component that reflects the specific features of the phenomenon designated by a word. The idea that "semantic features do not exist separately, but are connected by diverse connections and dependencies" (Nikitin, 2003, p. 38) is to be stressed. The set of semantic signs of a word, acting at the level of lexical semantics, is an integral formation stored in the memory of people. In any phenomenon, "a human thought notes repeated elements and signs, fixes them, giving them codifying designations" (Gasparov, 1996, p. 56).

This study uses an aspect approach to the functional description of personal names. The aspect-structural description of a word semantics consists of:

a) unification of the metalanguage in the seme description within the semantic class or lexical-and-semantic field;

b) sequential identification and description of denotative, connotative and functional aspects in each sememe semantics;

c) strict application of the complete structural and functional seme typology of a particular semantic class to each meaning description– in tracing the presence of all possible seme types within each aspect in each sememe, including both their presence and absence;

d) seme enumeration within each semantic aspect in a certain fixed order.

The unpredictability of many nominative decisions in the researched field provides a broad word-forming combinability and practical inexhaustibility of lexical and phraseological personal names in the Russian and English languages. However, their functional structure can be described with a universal metalanguage using a screen model.

The semantic tools to describe lexical and phraseological units include definition analysis, which is an analysis of dictionary articles from different types of dictionaries. This process is to fix the component composition of the Russian units, as well as to identify their semantic similarities and differences with their English equivalents in the comparing process.

## 6. Findings

Definitions from different dictionaries are not always good enough for analysis requirements for a word component so the facts and information presented in them are to be carefully studied for further processing following the research direction. So, it is possible to supplement and expand the generalized lexicographic interpretations of the lexical units on the basis of contexts analysis and their use.

As we know, "the lexical meaning of every lexical-and-semantic variant of a word represents a complex unity" (Arnold, 1981, p. 181), where the scientists find the core – the centre, the nearest part, the far part and the furthest part or periphery of the meaning, basing on the field approach. Differentiation of the core and the periphery is applied at the sememe level and the core-periphery relations form lexical and structural-and-linguistic mega-components of the meaning. Among the macro-components in the lexical meaning, the denotative one is understood as nuclear, because "through a concept that ... reflects our reality, the denotative meaning corresponds to the non-linguistic reality" (Arnold, 1981, p. 78).

The archi-seme in the sememe structure is very special because with its help the naming object belongs to a certain class – a person, a military, a relative, a woman. The archi-seme is the sememe

autonomous center, while other semes define or concretize it in a direct or indirect way. One of the great problems in semantic description of the personal names according to lexicographic data is the formulating the archi-seme using the meta-language. That is why it is rather difficult to run further research with the contrastive analysis without the above-mentioned meta-language. In our study, it is a person or a group of persons.

At the micro-components level this type of seme also includes the brightest semes, and they indicate usual and persistent features of the named object. The nuclear components of the meaning are reflected in explanatory dictionaries and can be found out with the help of a seme analysis of dictionary definitions. The core of the meaning or the nearest part/periphery can also include very bright connotative semes - emotions and appreciations, as well as some functional semes that are actualized in speech and are relevant to the language consciousness of native speakers. As for peripheral semes, it is the norm to believe that they denote less significant, more often non-permanent/usual or probable features of a subject. However, as the research practice shows, they are very important for describing the meaning. They are not only often actualized in speech, but create imagery and expressiveness of word usage, and play the basis to form figurative meanings, expand the nominative possibilities of a word and very often turn out to be national-specific.

Having an unequal specific weight in the structure of a sememe, semes have various types of relations with each other. As for our research results, these are hierarchical, determinant, and dominant relationships.

Our research proves the existence of a consistent subordination in the sememe structure of semantic components of different abstraction levels, i.e., the principle of the semes hierarchy in a sememe. The archi-seme has the highest abstraction level compared to other semes in the sememe structure. The principle is true for the aspect semantic description of the personal names.

The determination relations are observed between the macro-components and between the micro-components of a sememe and very often the presence of any semantic component in its structure implies the presence of another component or group of components. In particular, the archi-seme "a person" assumes the presence of the seme "gender", it specifies whether a given language unit can be associated with a male or a female, and possibly with persons of both sexes: male or female. At the same time, in the comparison between the Russian and English languages, the tendency to construct feminisms or lexical units denoting women is characteristic to a large extent of the conversational communication sphere. Such words, formed from stylistically neutral language units with an inter-style seme in their structure, are characterized by functional semes *speak* or *low-style*. These facts must be taken into account when selecting their English equivalents and in the identifying process of the national specific features in their semantics.

The problem of seme determinant relations in the sememe structure includes the concepts of in/sequential connotation, when the emotional-and-evaluative micro-components of a word semantics either have the same sign, or their signs do not coincide. The opposite connotative evaluations cannot be logically combined. For example, such semes as *disapproving* and *positive-emotional*, *approving* and *negative-emotional*, etc. are incompatible in one connotative macro component.

The seme interdependence relationship in the structure of the macro component is fixed in many examples: if the word meaning has the seme *old, obsolete, geographically limited*, then there are *rare or infrequent* semes. If there's the seme *public* (i.e., not using limitations in any social group), as a rule, there is *territorial seme total; nationwide, modern*. Generally, the presence of the seme *high-potential or total*; incompatible functional semes include the following seme pairs: *modern and non-general, book and very common, national and geographically limited*, etc. Taking into account a number of natural phenomena in the determinant relations sphere of semes helps us to anticipate the possibility to identify differences in national specific features in the name semantics.

The brightness and weakness of some meaning components create the basis to develop the relations between the semes and they are a structural part of one sememe. The relations are individual; most significant semes are in a dominant position, so they suppress the other less important and weaker ones. The dominant semantic component can be, for example, the archi-seme *person*, or the differential seme that determines whether a lexical unit belongs to a thematic group of personal names. A clear example of the dominant components in the meaning structure is the group of invective personal names: *angel, reptile, devil, eagle*, etc. The evaluativeness in these examples of personal names is represented in the "good – bad" dichotomy. The nominee's choice of a particular position depends on the value of a person orientation in our world, and it is also reflected in the semantics structure of language units. Signaling the value of the speaker attitude to the name object, such language units are used as an emotional and evaluative characteristic of the personal names, which shows not only the connotation essence as a semantic macro component, but also its dominant role in the meaning structure. When forming the lexical-and-phraseological semantic sign evolving from a differential in the category integrated within specific thematic groups, then we have the amplification or damping of the semantic components. So, we have new seme-dominant, in which these structures are distinguished. Thus, the dominant relations of the seme are relative and are related to their differentiability and integrality.

## 7. Conclusion

The study of the semantic components correlation in the word semantics structure on the aspect-structural basis approach to its description provides a potential opportunity to identify and summarize the seme set information that makes up a certain semantic language area – its seme space. This approach makes a word semantics interpretation or a phrase semantics interpretation more informative as well to differentiate the close meanings, helps to establish and describe the paradigmatic relations between words. And it is also very important for the more accurate and reliable contrastive analysis of lexical and phraseological units semantics in different languages. The results of the word meaning structure describing at the seme level provide a strong scientific evidence for the national division specificity of the same world fragments in different languages and the "systematic vocabulary development with the socio-cultural potential" (Influence 2002), thus, forming the foundations for a successful dialogue between the certain cultures representatives.

## References

- Apresyan, Yu. D. (2001). The meaning and use. *The Questions of linguistics*, 4, 3-23.
- Arnold, I. V. (1981). Stylistics of the modern English language. *Stylistics of decoding*. Prosveshchenie.
- Gasparov, B. M. (1996). Language, memory, image. *Linguistics of linguistic existence*. New Literary Review.
- Karasik, V. I. (2010). Linguistic crystallization of meaning. *Paradigm*.
- Nikitin, M. V. (2003). *Fundamentals of cognitive semantics*. Publishing House of the Herzen State Pedagogical University.
- Popova, Z. D., & Sternin, I. A. (2007). *Lexical system of the language*. Istoki.
- Sternin, I. A. (2008). Selected works. *Theoretical and applied aspects of linguistics*. Istoki.
- Vezhbitskaya, A. (2001). Understanding cultures through keywords. *Languages of Slovenian culture*.
- Vezhbitskaya, A. (2002). Russian cultural scripts and their reflection in the language. *Russian language in scientific coverage*, 2(4), 6-34.