

European Journal of Literature and Linguistics

Nº 4 2016



«East West» Association for Advanced Studies and Higher Education GmbH

**Vienna
2016**

European Journal of Literature and Linguistics

Scientific journal

Nº 4 2016

ISSN 2310-5720

Editor-in-chief

Erika Maier, Germany Doctor of Philology

International editorial board

Akhmedova Raziyat Abdullayevna, Russia, Doctor of Philology
Belous Viktor, Ukraine, Ph. D. of Philology
Halipaeva Imperiyat Arslanbekovna, Russia, Doctor of Philology
Jasna Potočnik Topler, Slovenia, PhD of Literature
Khoutyz Irina, Russia, Doctor of Philology
Marszałek Paulina, Poland, Doctor of Philology
Montoya Julia, Spain, Doctor of Philology
Petrov Vasily Borisovich, Russia, Doctor of Philology
Tsersvadze Mzia Giglaevna, Georgia, Doctor of Philology
Vorobyova Olga Ivanovna, Russia, Doctor of Philology
Zholshayeva Maira Satibaldiebna, Kazakhstan, Doctor of Philology
Zhaplova Tatiana Mikhaylovna, Russia, Doctor of Philology

Proofreading

Kristin Theissen

Cover design

Andreas Vogel

Additional design

Stephan Friedman

Editorial office

European Science Review
“East West” Association for Advanced Studies
and Higher Education GmbH, Am Gestade 1
1010 Vienna, Austria

Email:

info@ew-a.org

Homepage:

www.ew-a.org

European Journal of Literature and Linguistics is an international, German/English/Russian language, peer-reviewed journal. It is published bimonthly with circulation of 1000 copies.

The decisive criterion for accepting a manuscript for publication is scientific quality. All research articles published in this journal have undergone a rigorous peer review. Based on initial screening by the editors, each paper is anonymized and reviewed by at least two anonymous referees. Recommending the articles for publishing, the reviewers confirm that in their opinion the submitted article contains important or new scientific results.

Instructions for authors

Full instructions for manuscript preparation and submission can be found through the “East West” Association GmbH home page at: <http://www.ew-a.org>.

Material disclaimer

The opinions expressed in the conference proceedings do not necessarily reflect those of the «East West» Association for Advanced Studies and Higher Education GmbH, the editor, the editorial board, or the organization to which the authors are affiliated.

East West Association GmbH is not responsible for the stylistic content of the article. The responsibility for the stylistic content lies on an author of an article.

© «East West» Association for Advanced Studies and Higher Education GmbH

All rights reserved; no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Publisher.

Typeset in Berling by Ziegler Buchdruckerei, Linz, Austria.

Printed by «East West» Association for Advanced Studies and Higher Education GmbH, Vienna, Austria on acid-free paper.

Yermakova Nataliia,
Zaporizhzhia National University
postgraduate student, the Faculty of Foreign Philology
E-mail: yermakova.natasha@gmail.com

Eurysemy vs Polysemy

Abstract: The article is devoted to define the criteria of differentiation of two disputable linguistic phenomena: eurysemy and polysemy. Some scholars consider eurysemy to be an individual lexico-semantic category, others though admit its difference from polysemy, but actually look at these phenomena as at the same one.

Keywords: eurysemy, wide meaning, invariant, contextual dependence, polysemy.

First of all it should be stated that the problem of relations between eurysemy and polysemy exist. Moreover whereas some scholars consider those two phenomena to be quite different lexical ones, others though see these oppositions but actually look at them as at the same phenomenon. Such situation proves that the status of eurysemy is no clearly defined.

As a rule, some researches think that eurysemy and polysemy coexist in the semantic structure of the words, namely substantives. Interrelations between those phenomena are as “part and whole”, “quantity and quality”, at the same time it is stressed that eurysemy differs from polysemy in the respect that the latter is characterized by more than one lexico-semantic variants (hereinafter referred to as LSV) whereas eurysemy is the internal characteristics of any LSV. Such “cohabitation” of those two phenomena within the framework of one lingual unit gives grounds to state that eurysemy as a rule accompanies so to say polysemy and even crosses with the latter. E. g., the structure of the polysemantic English substantive *way* is made up by eight LSV but only two of those meanings can be called eurysemic [1, 11].

On the other hand if we take into consideration the coexistence of eurysemy and polysemy we can say that these phenomena are to be appraised as correlations between wide notional (conceptual) basis with specialized meanings which originated on this basis. As an example of such correspondence the scholars provide us with such specialized meanings as “the body of a ship”, “the body of a vehicle” which were created on the basis of the main meaning of the English word *body* [2].

That fact that the euryseme (the word of wide semantics) possesses one significative meaning which expresses very wide concept allows some researches to connect wide meaning phenomenon with single meaning. The idea is that the wide meaning of a word is basic, main and very often the only one, and thus the words of

wide meaning are to be associated with single-meaning ones [3, 27; 4].

In some cases eurysemy and polysemy are not differentiated at all, since in both cases i. e. in the words with several meanings connected in a whole (in polysemy), as well as in the words with one meaning which actually unites a number of semantic variants, i. e. in a eurysemic word one can see not such phenomena as polysemy and eurysemy but only two basic types of polysemy.

The latter (which can be called the “polysemants”) can be singled out if we take into consideration the differentiation between the parts of speech researched:

- substantives with indefinite polysemy i. e. with very cognate meanings (this kind of polysemy is a characteristic feature for abstract nouns);
- substantives with clear-cut, contrasting meanings (this kind of polysemy is a characteristic feature of concrete nouns) [5, 9].

In spite of the general accepted idea that the phenomenon of polysemy and eurysemy are principally different ones, in some cases we can observe the attempts to define the common features, to be characteristic of both: the words with wide semantics (eurysemic) and of polysemic words. One of such common features to be peculiar to eurysemic and polysemantic words some scholars call *polydenotation* i. e. the capability of the lexical unit to denote a wide range of the phenomena and objects of surrounding world. Thus eurysemic unit *thing* has “limitless number of objects” (it is reflected in general notion about an object), and eurysemic word *eye* nominates different objects of the surrounding world, namely 1) the organ of sight; 2) sight hole; 3) needle eye; 4) eyelet etc. [6].

Quite different perspective is expressed in the idea that *polydenotation* is peculiar to polysemic words only, since the correlation with more than one denotates indicates different meanings of the lingual units. The advo-

cates of this point of view stress that one object denoted refers actually to more than one objects. Such objects represent in fact a variety of orderly-arranged elementary senses. Since the object denoted correlates with the corresponding notions, the reference to other notions means that the lingual unit has a different meaning [7, 85].

Our opinion is that *polydenotation* is really characteristic feature of both eurysemic and polysemantic substantives. But both nouns demonstrate different ways of conceptual reflection of reality. If we take a polysemantic word, we can see that it is able to conceptualize different reference in more than one way and each referent is conceptualized separately. Which is why every special meaning of a polysemantic word is realized in its context and, correspondingly, through its referential relations.

In this respect we deem it to be quite logical, when scholars advocate such an idea that “any LSV of a polysemantic lingual unit represents a rather independent really existing lingual sign with an autonomous significative and denotative meaning” [8, 12]. At the same time a eurysemic unit correlates with a number of different referents, with the latter being conceptualized as a whole, to be characterized through very wide features.

More feasible arguments are given when eurysemy and polysemy are opposed. The differential features are represented by different combinations and from time to time are supplemented by new traits. At the same time, it is quite possible to single out some basic characteristics to differentiate those two phenomena. Among them we can note the followings:

- a euryseme possesses one wide general even abstract meaning which can be called *invariant* [9; 10; 11]. Such meaning is correlated, as it is stressed by the researchers, with the notion of *wide volume* [12; 13; 14; 15]. Whereas the meaning of a polysemantic word renders different notions through its LSV. At the same time we can say about “presence/absence” of archi- and differential semes in the meaning of eurysemic words [16];

- the *integrated semantic structure*, unique meaning, i. e. “one notion” reflection, the absence in its semantic structure a stable basis for specialization of meaning of a eurysemic sign whilst the semantic structure of a polysemantic word could be considered to be a fragmental one [17; 16];

- *contextual dependence*: the lingual use of a polysemantic word excludes all its meanings but one, realized in a given context, while any context or situation tend only to

concretize but not to change the wide meaning of a unit, let alone eliminating it. A wide meaning of euryseme is to be a basis for any specialized one, considering that in any speech situation only direct and not transferred meaning is realized [18, 176–188];

- the absence of semantic derivation in eurysemic meanings vs derivational hierarchy in a polysemantic word: polysemy originates, majorly, at the result of metaphoric and metonymic mechanisms, whilst eurysemic signs enrich the semantic structure due to raising the level of abstraction as far as the meaning is concerned, which actually means the denotative limitation [17; 6; 4];

- the transference phenomenon which originates polysemy, since, firstly such mechanism is connected with the “concept wideness”, is an obstacle to create an indefinite object correlation which is the basic of a transference of meaning; secondly, the transference of meaning is supposed to “envisage” the so called “figurative concreteness” of thinking whilst in the case when we deal with eurysemic units the level of lexical abstraction reaches its highest points [19; 3];

- the existence of *hypero-hyponimic relations* between eurysemes and other words of one lexico-semantic group [20; 19–21]. It explains that polysemantic unit has not and eurysemic one has the reference function or the function of substitution that in its turn is related with the polyfunctionality of the latter: on the one hand, it means the direct and indirect nomination and, on the other hand, the ability to fulfill lexical and grammatical functions;

- *high potential of combinative power* (lexical, syntactical) due to which eurysemes can combine with an almost limitless number of categorically different lexemes; having, at the same time, one invariant meaning [22, 183].

Such variety of viewpoints on the correlation of eurysemy and polysemy indicates that though scholars recognize the interrelation of them as well as the presence of their general parameters (e. g. such as polydenotation), they interpret that correlation in different ways: from the complete opposition to the integration of these phenomena to one of them, notably to polysemy or eurysemy.

It should be noted that some researchers single out their own criteria of differentiation of polysemy and eurysemy, as to the approaches to the latter. As concerns our study, we should mention that in general eurysemy and polysemy are considered to be correlated but not identical phenomena.

References:

1. Димова С. Н. О полифункциональности слова с широким значением (на материале английского существительного way): автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – М., – 1972. – 22 с.

2. Уфимцева А. А. Типы словесных знаков. – Изд. 3-е. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, – 2011. – 208 с.
3. Горшкова К. А. Имя существительное широкой семантики thing в современном английском языке: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Одесса, – 1973. – 115 с.
4. Гросул А. Я. Широкозначные глаголы динамического состояния в английском языке: дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.04: защищена в Институте языкознания АН СССР. – Кишинёв, – 1977. – 137 с.
5. Гарипова Н. Д. Наблюдения над смысловой структурой многозначных слов разных частей речи//Исследования по семантике. – Уфа, БГУ, – 1977. – С. 90–97.
6. Колобаев В. К. О некоторых смежных явлениях в области лексики (к вопросу о соотношении полисемии и широкозначности слова). – Ин.яз. в школе – 1983. – № 1 – С. 11–13.
7. Гришанова В. Н. К вопросу о критериях разграничения значений полисемантических фразеологических единиц//Русский язык в школе. – № 6. – 1979. – С. 84–88.
8. Воронина А. З. Глагольные фраземы в аспекте номинации (на материале фразеологических единиц типа «глагол–существительное» в современном английском языке): дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – М., – 1979. – 184 с.
9. Halliday M. A. K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London–New York: Longman, – 1976. – P. 374.
10. Ullmann S. Précis de sémantique française. – Berne: Francke Verlag, – 1975. – 352 p.
11. Schmid H.-J. English abstract nouns as conceptual shells: from corpus to cognition. – Berlin–New-York: Mouton de Gruyter, – 2000. – 457 p.
12. Bolinger D. Pronouns and repeated nouns. – Indian: Indiana University Linguistics Club, – 1977. – 63 p.
13. Ivanič R. Nouns in search of a context. A study of nouns with both open- and closed-system characteristics//International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching 2, – 1991. – P. 93–114.
14. Francis G. A corpus-driven approach to grammar//Baker M., Francis G., Tognini-Bonelli E. Text and technology: In honor of John Sinclair. – Philadelphia – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, – 1993 – P. 137–156.
15. Vendler Z. Adjectives and nominalizations. – The Hague: Mouton, – 1968. – 134 p.
16. Терещенко С. С. Широкозначність та багатозначність в українській мові//Наукова електронна бібліотека періодичних видань НАН України, – 2007. – С. 177–179. – URL://http://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/21756/74-Tereshchenko.pdf?sequence=1
17. Плоткин В. Я. Широкозначность как особый тип семантики слова//Номинация и контекст: Сб. науч. тр. – Кемерово: КГУ, 1985. – С. 85–96.
18. Ullmann S. Semantic Universals/S. Ullmann//Universals of Language. Ed. By J. H. Greenberg. – Cambridge, Massachusetts, The M. I. T. Press, – 1963. – P. 172–207.
19. Амосова Н. Н. Основы английской фразеологии//Предисл. О. И. Бродович. Изд. 2-е, дополненное. – М.: Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», – 2010. – 216 с.
20. Авдеев А. А. Проблемы широкозначности и её соотношение с полисемией и дейксисом (На материале имен существительных английского, русского и французского языков): дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.19: защищена в Воронеж. гос. ун-те, 27.12.2002. – Воронеж, – 2002. – 172 с.
21. Баланюк С. С. Широкозначність як основа явища невизначеності на прикладі англ.прикм-ків лексико-семант. групи «особливий». – Вісник Житомирського держ. ун-ту. Філологічні науки – 2010. – № 54 – С. 182–186.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20534/EJLL-16-4-12-15>

*Kolev Dimitar,
Institute for Bulgarian Language — BAS,
PhD student
E-mail: dimitar_kolev87@abv.bg*

New lexis in the area of sports in Bulgarian and Czech language

Abstract: The article concerns the titles of new sport disciplines in Bulgarian and Czech language, which come from English, or, in some cases, from Eastern languages (Chinese, Japanese, etc.). The purpose of the

Contents

Section 1. Linguistics	3
<i>Vasilishina Elena Nikolaevna</i> Atypical stylistic devices in journalistic texts	3
<i>Gasimova Naila, Huseynova Farida</i> How to learn trust and confidence when we write letters, reports, email messages or other business documents.....	6
<i>Yermakova Nataliia</i> Eurysemy vs Polysemy.....	10
<i>Kolev Dimitar</i> New lexis in the area of sports in Bulgarian and Czech language.....	12
<i>Manssour Habbash</i> Online Sources in EFL/ESP Classes at Saudi Arabian Universities for Creating LASS.....	15
<i>Mehmeti Flutura</i> Analysis of the nominal signs in the text of “Martesa e Halilit” song and in the translated version in German by M. Lambertz.....	24
<i>Mirzakhanyan Nelli</i> Interpretation of the world through folklore (based on Chukotka and Alaska Eskimos data).....	28
<i>Nevreva Maria Nikolaevna, Lebedeva Elena Victorovna, Gvozd Olga Viktorovna</i> Statistics of noun morphological derivation in the scientific functional style text corpora.....	31
<i>Savić Aleksandra</i> The current linguistic situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.....	34
<i>Khoshimkhujaeva Mokhirukh Muzaffarovna</i> Anthroponyms in English, Russian and Uzbek phytonyms	36
Section 2. Literature	40
<i>Abdurahmonov Abilzhon Abdusamatovich</i> The tradition and innovation color Naming in poetry	40
<i>Bovkunova Oksana Volodymyrivna</i> From Mannerism to Baroque: poetics peculiarities of “arcadia” genre by PH. Sidney	42
<i>Vlasova Natalya Petrovna</i> Extralinguistic factor of literary text (By the example of the novel by M. Drabble “The Garrick Year”	45
<i>Vorobyeva Alexandra Nikolaevna</i> The motive of confusion of a man in modern literature.....	47
<i>Zahra Sonia Barghani, Anushiravani Alireza</i> Biblical tale turned blockbuster thriller: the adaptation of Noah (2014).....	50
<i>Kobzar Iuliia</i> Literarische Repräsentation der Grenze in Jura Soyfers „Lied von der Grenze“	57
Section 3. Philology	60
<i>Ilchuk Olha Andriivna</i> Das konzeptuelle metonymische Modell der abgeleiteten Substantive des modernen Deutsch mit den heimischen Suffixen	60
<i>Korovina Nadezhda</i> Types of storytellers Komi people.....	62
<i>Maherramova Malahat Abdurrahman kizi</i> Theoretische und methodologische Grundlage der Forschung des funktionalen Modells der Wortbildung.....	65

Markovskaja Elena Vladimirovna

On the experience of creating genre classification of folkloric materials for electronic catalog of folkloric archival depository of ILLH, KarRC, RAS68

Trendevska Sandra

English borrowed interjections and their semantics, role and expressive function in colloquial Russian and Macedonian languages73