

Mykhaylenko V. V.,  
D.Sc.

Professor, Dept. of Translation and Philology  
Ivano-Frankivsk King Danylo Galytskyi University of Law

## COGNITIVE-SEMANTICS OF THE «CUSTOMS» LSF CONSTITUENTS IN THE PROFESSIONAL DISCOURSE

**Summary.** The present paper is aimed to develop the lexical-semantic field into the semantic domain at the factor of context introduction. The lexical-semantic field mirrors a subsystem in the lexicon of language system. On the contrary, the cognitive-semantic domain is a dynamic unity based on the functional continuum of discourse. An algorithm of «reading» the components of the meaning of the lexeme «customs» is suggested due to applying componential, distributional, and corpus types of analysis.

**Key words:** field, domain, lexical semantics, cognitive semantics, intended meaning, concept, context.

**Introduction.** The end of the 20th century is characterized both by a dissatisfaction with existing formal semantic theories and by a wish to preserve insights from other semantic traditions. Cognitive semantics, the latest of the major trends which dominated that period, attempted to focus on meaning as a cognitive phenomenon. In Leonard Talmy's opinion, its approach is concerned with the patterns by which conceptual content is organized in language addressing the linguistic structuring of such basic conceptual categories as space and time, scenes and events, entities and processes, motion and location, and force and causation [25, p. 3–5, see also: 18, p. 102–103].

Cognitively speaking, semantics is a relation between language and cognitive structure, and the appropriate *framework* for the cognitive structure is a conceptual space. On this assumption, Peter Gärdenfors suggests that formulating semantics for a specific language can reveal two major steps: (1) to specify the mapping between the lexicon of the language and the appropriate conceptual spaces, (2) to describe the operations on the image schemas defined with the aid of the conceptual space that correspond to different syntactic formation rules [6, p. 19–36].

The analysis of semantic structures has been a priority on the cognitive linguistic agenda. Dagmar Divjak and Stefan Th. Gries add, that early studies, which shaped the field for many a year investigated the degree to which, for example, metaphor could be used to account for meaning extension. Radial categories allowed for new insights into the linguistic organization – if not also mental representation – of polysemy, and to a lesser extent near-synonymy [5, p. 273].

We are planning to model the LSF «customs» in the language system and then transfer it into the cognitive semantic domain revealing the ways of such transposition by applying componential, distributional, and corpus types of analysis.

### State of the Art

Within cognitive semantics, corpus-based approaches that use non-elicited data are few and far between. One early cognitive-semantic corpus-based approach that is relevant for the present paper is Raymond W. Gibbs Jr., Teenie Matlock (2001) on *make* [7, p. 213–39]. Their study relies on collocate analysis (the first

word to the right of the head word) as well as colligation analysis (the syntactic structure of the word combination) and correlate different senses with collocations and colligations. They came to «suggest the need to incorporate information about lexical-grammatical constructions in drawing links between different senses of a polysemous word» [7, p. 234]. Other more recent work included the papers published by Stefan Th. Gries and Anatol Stefanowitsch [11, p. 57–99] in particular D. Schönefeld (2006), who investigated the translational equivalents of the basic posture verbs *sit*, *stand*, and *lie* in English, German, and Russian with regard to how those languages had conventionalized the same physiologically determined perceptual experiences [22, p. 297–344]. Her investigation is based on approximately 8,000 collocations of the relevant posture verbs, and her work's crosslinguistic orientation has been a source of inspiration for the present study. [see: 5, p. 275].

Understanding meaning as communicative function has significant implications for the relationship between semantics (as the discipline that covers linguistic meaning) and pragmatics (as the discipline that covers linguistic interaction). Consequently, Peter Harder comes to conclusion that semantics seemed to develop transparently a discipline of pragmatics – «frozen pragmatics» [12, p. 127]

### Investigation

Let's start with the lexical meaning of the object of our investigation. In English, *customhouse / customs* understood as «an office in the port or on the border to collect duties», see the dictionary definition: *government agency entrusted with enforcement of laws and regulations to collect and protect import-revenues, and to regulate and document the flow of goods in and out of the country* [Business Dictionary]; *the agency, establishment, or procedure for collecting such customs* [Merriam Webster]; *the government department responsible for the collection of these duties; the part of a port, airport, frontier station, etc. where baggage and freight are examined for dutiable goods* [Collins Dictionary].

As one can see, polysemy requires the researcher to determine whether two usage events are identical or sufficiently similar to be considered a single sense, what degree of similarity is between different senses, where to connect a sense to others in the network, and which sense(s) to recognize as prototypical one(s), for instance, the lexeme *customs* – (pl.) «traditions, duties or taxes imposed on imported and, less commonly, exported goods, money collected under a tariff, (used with a *sing. verb*), the governmental agency authorized to collect these duties, (used with a *sing. verb*) the procedure for inspecting goods and baggage entering a country: go through customs (The Free Dictionary). Dagmar Divjak and Stefan Th. Gries point out that linguists interested in (near) synonymy in addition they have to decide what the differences are between the near-synonyms as well as what the relation is between semantically similar words in a domain [5, p. 273–4].

The focus of most scientists who study component analysis, are semantic fields. First, the substitutability of certain components is not always absolute; actually semantic components cannot be completely discrete, although their canonical formula provides discrete (shared property). In the study of the specific meaning of lexemes or vocabulary, whose members are easily identified with «intuitive» analysis, we consider it advisable to employ a componential method.

We made a differentiation of the concepts actualized by the field. Here we consider the LSF as a macrosystem. All the referred dictionary definitions have common components of *customs* «the governmental agency authorized to collect these duties». Thus on this basis we can distinguish the following microfields: identifying people to question on the basis of prior offences/likely risk, etc; searching baggage and individuals for smuggled items; making arrests of people suspected of smuggling; seizing smuggled goods; checking documentation relating to imported goods; undertaking physical examinations of freight; detecting and prosecuting drug smugglers; collecting and supplying trade statistics; writing reports; fighting the increasing problem of alcohol and tobacco smuggling; helping to combat the worldwide illegal trade in endangered species of animals and birds; dealing with revenue due on imported goods; checking customs documents; questioning people who have been found with illegal items or goods over the allowance; preparing reports and witness statements; taking on specialist roles such as dog handling or undercover and surveillance work.

Gliozzo and C. Strapparava believe that the concept of Semantic Domain extends the concept of Semantic Field from a lexical level, in which it identifies a set of domain related lexical concepts, to a textual level, in which it identifies a class of similar documents. The founding idea is the lexical coherence assumption, that has to be presupposed to guarantee the existence of Semantic Domains in corpora [8, p. 13].

Corpus linguistics is the study of language based on large collections of «real life» language use stored in *corpora* (or *corpus*) – computerized databases created for linguistic research, also known as corpus-based studies. Corpus linguistics is viewed by some linguists as a research tool or methodology, and by others as a discipline or theory in its own right. Sandra Kuebler and Heike Zinsmeister conclude that «the answer to the question whether corpus linguistics is a theory or a tool is simply that it can be both. It depends on how corpus linguistics is applied» [15, p. 4–5]. As it has been shown to have the potential to yield highly interesting, fundamental, and often surprising new insights about language, according to Nadja Nesselhauf's opinion, it has become one of the most wide-spread methods of linguistic investigation in recent years [19, p. 44–47]. Corpus linguistics is, however, not the same as mainly obtaining language data through the use of computers. The main task of the corpus linguist is not to find the data but to analyse it.

Dictionary entries may distinguish the major subsystems: customs (institution, building, organization, agency, etc), customs operator (*officer, agent, employee, operator*, etc.), and duty (*fee, tariff, tax, due, liability, levy, toll, charge, commission, excise, custom, revenue, payment*) which verbalize the conceptual domain of «customs» in the English worldview. L. Weisgerber considers that the system of lexemes is not fixed – not only can lexemes disappear and new ones appear, but what also changes are the meaning relations between neighbouring lexemes. According to L. Weisgerber, the drawback of traditional, diachronic semantics is an atomic description of the history of change in meaning of individual language

instead of investigation of meaning which hangs in the whole vocabulary structure [29, p. 318–335], «there are few if any words which are semantically isolated» [18, p. 424].

In the process of the language fact analysis the LSF can be transformed into the Semantic Domain (SD), cf.: Gliozzo and Strapparava's term *semantic domain* and Bondarko's *functional-semantic field*, for instance:

1. *About 100 people, including a senior French Customs officer, were arrested after the Japanese failed to claim back VAT on high-fashion handbags.*

2. *The Commission calculates, moreover, that the job of cross-checking between the customs departments of each member state into the validity of traders' declarations would mean.*

3. *On Tuesday union leaders claimed that every French customs post along the Spanish border was closing to all traffic except private cars.*

4. *These are likely to include increased customs controls and measures to stop other' illegal transactions.*

5. *Chris Luby by day is a customs and excise inspector, by night a Human Aeroplane.*

6. *He disparaged the customs service testing programme as mere display.*

7. *He drove to a Customs depot where it was sealed by Spanish Customs officers.*

8. *US Customs Commissioner Carol Hallett said: We have dropped a cluster bomb on Carlos Cardoen.*

See the lexeme *customs* realizes such components: as (A) an institution or area: *department* (2), *depot* (7), *post* (3); as (B) activities: *calculating* (2), *checking/cross-checking* (2), *service* (6), *control* (4); and as (C) *officer* (10), *inspector* (5), *commissioner* (8). Accordingly there are three major microfields in the LSF of «Customs» based on the corpus analysis.

Now comes the notion of *valency* or *valence* originally restricted to the syntax verbs: «nombred'actants», as Lucien Tesnière defined them in the glossary to his «Elements...» It was linked by the same definition to dependency [26, p. 67–90]. But Peter Matthews included and other parts of speech into that definition: «a verb or other lexical unit» [16, p. 394].

This is the second step of «reading» the actualized component is the analysis of lexical and grammatical combinability of the noun *customs*. We shall start with the nominal phrase structure including the lexeme *customs*:

Here are basic distributional models of the nominal phrase: 'NP → [Det] + N (CUSTOMS) and NP → [Det] + N=Adj (CUSTOMS) + N which can differentiate their variants in discourse, the expansion of adjuncts depends on the semantic cohesion of the constituents' actualized components (see: sentences 1-8):

1. NP → [Det] + Adj3. + Adj2. + N=Adj1. (CUSTOMS) + N

2. NP → [Det] + N=Adj (CUSTOMS) + N

3. NP → I + Adj2. + N=Adj1. (CUSTOMS) + N

4. NP → Adj2. + N=Adj1. (CUSTOMS) + N

5. NP → [Det] + N=Adj2. (CUSTOMS) + Conj + N=Adj1. + N

6. NP → [Det] + N=Adj3. (CUSTOMS) + N=Adj2 + Adj1. + N

7. NP → [Det] + N=Adj (CUSTOMS) + N

8. NP → [Det] + N=Adj (CUSTOMS) + N

We must admit that the nominal constituents in the NP with the lexeme *customs* in its structure develop an implicative component of *customs*, for instance: (A) *house, post, agency, department, depot, office*; (B) *officer, inspector, commissioner, agent, officials*, and (C) *controlling, checking, inspecting, approving*, etc.

The corpus analysis is our third step of «reading the component «customs» – overt or covert in discourse lexicon. It is an essential tool of modern linguistic analysis of a large amount of factual material. We use the British National Corpus of modern English with its computerized search, genre classification and distributional analysis to investigate the constituents of the LSF «customs» registered in texts. One frequently overlooked aspect of language use which is difficult to keep track of without corpus analysis is register. Register consists of varieties of language which are used for different situations [cf.: 18, p. 402]. Language can be divided into many registers, which range from the general to the highly specific, depending upon the degree of specificity that is sought. A general register could include fiction, academic prose, newspapers, or casual conversation, whereas a specific register would be sub-registers within academic prose, such as scientific texts, literary criticism, and linguistics studies, each with their own field specific characteristics. Daniel Krieger underlines that the corpus analysis reveals that language often behaves differently according to the register, each with some unique patterns and rules [14]. The total number of instances with the noun lexeme is 2185, cf. their distribution in various registers: spoken –

44, fiction – 204, magazine – 104, newspaper – 274, non-academic – 492, academic – 364, MSC – 720. Our choice is the newspaper register, where we could find professional surveys of the customs.

9. *And this afternoon, as Patron of Museums Year 1989, opens the Customs and Excise Museum and Exhibition at Custom House, Greenock, Glasgow.*

10. *Twice on the trot packages have been opened for inspection by HM Customs.*

11. *It attracted a large Customs and Excise office and the Access credit card headquarters, but tourists were not encouraged.*

12. *At Seoul in Korea, where his father, a commissioner of the Imperial Chinese Customs, was on a tour of duty.*

13. *Most of the former Soviet republics have started to erect customs posts on their borders; and after more than 50 years of peaceful co-existence.*

14. *Cocaine seizures by Customs have risen by 50 per cent this year.*

15. *FOUR top Russian athletes were ordered to return to Moscow yesterday after Swedish customs officials found illegal substances in the team coach's luggage.*

There is a discrepancy between the dictionary definition of *customs* as an adjunct to the head word «*house, post, agency, department, depot, office, museum*», etc. (7, 9, 11, 13) and in the professional register presented in BNC, where in most examples the lexeme is used as one-word term capitalized – *Customs* used without the definite article (10, 12, 14). Besides, as a headword it attracts adjunct expressed either by noun or noun phrase (10) or adjectives denoting, nationality and country name (1, 3, 7, 8, 12, 15.)

New methods are introduced which looked at language from a usage-based perspective [24, p. 1–13]. A contextual semantic domain corresponds to what cognitive linguistics describes as a cognitive frame or cognitive context. Whereas lexical semantic fields deal with the paradigmatic relations between a lexical item and other members of the same category, contextual semantic domains focus on the syntagmatic relationships between a lexical item and other lexical items that are used in the same context or cognitive frame. Words are used in context – substantial part of the meaning of a particular word is derived from the context in which it is used. Whenever I mention the word «to hide» to an English speaker s/he will be able to form a mental image of somebody hiding oneself or something else. That picture, however, is not complete. At this level there is still a lack of information that prevents the hearer from being able to get the full scope on the meaning of this word. As soon as the hearer hears this word used in context, however, the mental image is completed.

At the beginning of the 1970s, Eleanor Rosch put forth a new theory of the mental representation of categories. Concepts such as *furniture* or *bird*, she claimed, are not represented just as sets of criterial features with clear-cut boundaries, so that an item can be conceived as falling or not falling under the concept based on whether or not it meets some relevant criteria. Rather, items within categories can be considered differentially representative of the meaning of category-terms [21, p. 192–233; cf.: 20, p. 1–20]. Several experiments seemed to show that the application of concepts was no simple yes-or-no business: some items (the «good examples») are more easily identified as falling under a concept than others (the «poor examples») [Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy].

The total number of 2185 text fragments registered in the BNC either with the lexeme *customs* or other lexemes with the covert component *customs*. Compare: C.V.: W. Porzig tried to identify

Table 1  
Frequency of usage of the Semantic Domain 'customs' constituents in both registers

FICTION REGISTER	FREQUENCY OF USAGE	NEWSPAPER REGISTER (PROFESSIONALLY MARKED REGISTER)
excise (9)	excise (253)	excise (57)
officers (5)	officers (51)	officers (23)
–	VAT (55)	VAT (7)
–	commissioners (31)	commissioners (2)
revenue (19)	revenue (21)	revenue (5)
police (4)	police (18)	police (6)
–	department (15)	department (3)
–	officials (13)	officials (10)
–	brokers (12)	brokers (7)
–	seized (12)	seized (7)
–	duties (12)	duties (1)
immigration (7)	immigration (10)	–
–	spokesman (9)	spokesman (9)
–	board (9)	board (3)
–	investigator (5)	investigator (3)
–	warehouse (5)	–
–	payment (5)	–
–	issues (5)	–
–	regulation (5)	regulation (1)
–	drugs (5)	drugs (3)
–	law (5)	law (3)
–	seizure (4)	–
–	insure (4)	–
–	facility (4)	–
–	registration (4)	–
–	refused (4)	refused (3)
–	cooperation (4)	cooperation (1)
–	control (4)	–
–	documents (4)	–
–	declare (4)	declare (1)
–	guard (4)	–
–	confirmed (4)	confirmed (2)
–	charged (4)	charged (2)
–	probe (3)	probe (3)
–	tribunal (3)	tribunal (1)
–	checking (3)	checking (2)
–	inquiry (3)	–
–	fraud (3)	–
arrested (3)	collected (3)	–
–	arrested (3)	arrested (3)
–	approved (3)	–
–	examination (3)	–
–	investigation (3)	–

links that inherent in most senses of words (such as «kiss» due to «lips», «grab» due to the «hand») [20, p. 1–20]. Here are some examples: The total number of 2185 text fragments registered in the BNC either with the lexeme *customs* or other lexemes with the covert component *customs*. Compare: C.V.: W. Porzig tried to identify links that inherent in most senses of words (such as “kiss” due to “lips”, “grab” due to the “hand”) [20, p.1-20]. Here are some examples:

The referred Semantic Domain is based mainly on the text fragments of actual speech registered in the BNC. It can be stated that, by and large, semantic studies have traditionally been based on decontextualized data, collected and analyzed by means of introspection. Though, the findings may be empirically problematic: not all fine-grained sense distinctions are necessarily supported by the data [5, p. 276].

Different methods can be employed in studying and describing the functioning of language units taking part in expressing the meaning of utterance. One must also consider the possibility of using such concepts and terms that could be applied in analyzing of semantic functions on the level of utterance, taking into account all formal means in interaction. In accordance with the principle of *categorical situation* suggested by A.V. Bondarko serves this aim – a particular aspect corresponding to a given functional-semantic field is singled out of the general situation expressed by the utterance [4, p. 5–6].

The semantic domain/functional semantic field is based on a grammatical category as a center (nucleus) around which all other (peripheral) language means revolve [4, p. 95; see also V.V. Vinogradov's model of analysis of a grammatical category: 28].

Grice's theory of conversation and implicatures was interpreted by many (including Grice himself) as a convincing way of accounting for the variety of contextually specific communicative contents while preserving the uniqueness of a sentence's «literal» meaning, which was identified with truth conditions and regarded as determined by syntax and the conventional meanings of the occurring words, as in formal semantics [10, p. 41–58]. The only semantic role context was allowed to play was in determining the content of indexical words (such as «I», «now», «here», etc.) and the effect of context-sensitive structures (such as tense) on a sentence's truth conditions. However, in about the same years Charles Travis and John Searle pointed out that the semantic relevance of context might be much more pervasive, if not universal: intuitively, the same sentence type could have very different truth conditions in different contexts, though no indexical expression or structure appeared to be involved [26, p. 39–49; 22, p. 18]. In speaking, John R. Searle specifies, the Speaker attempts to communicate certain things to his Hearer by getting him to recognize the Speaker's intention to achieve and it is in general achieved: «the hearer understands what I am saying, what he utters as soon as he recognizes my intention in uttering what I utter as an intention to say that thing» [23, p. 43].

#### Conclusion and perspectives

The lexical-semantic field mirrors a subsystem in the lexicon of language system. On the contrary, the cognitive-semantic domain is a dynamic unity based on the functional continuum of discourse.

An algorithm of «reading» the components of the meaning of the lexeme «*customs*» is suggested due to applying componential to reveal the semantic structure of the dominant lexeme, distributional to point out semantic relationship of the phrase constituents, and corpus to suggest the author's interpretations of the quantitative data provided by the BNC, types of analysis.

The concept of Semantic Domain extends the concept of Lexical-Semantic Field from a lexical level, in which it identifies a set of domain related lexical concepts, to a text or discourse level, in which it identifies a class of similar documents. The founding idea is the lexical coherence assumption, which has to be presupposed to guarantee the existence of Semantic Domains in corpora. Frequency of use of the referred data based on the corpus analysis reveals the difference between the fiction discourse – polysemous lexemes and professional (customs) discourse – lexemes with actualized professional components.

Further on the LSF «*customs*» can be a constituent of a more general the LSF «*taxation*» or «*budget*» as a representative of the «*budget*» concept that needs a bigger volume of corpora to reveal semantic relationship of the constituents. A suggested study is of great necessity for the translators and learners of professional (Finance, Economy, Taxation) English.

#### References:

- Allwood Jens, Gärdenfors Peter (eds.). *Cognitive Semantics. Meaning and Cognition* / Jens Allwood and Peter Gärdenfors. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999. – x + 201pp.
- Bach K. *Conversational Implicature* / K. Bach. // *Mind and Language*. – 1994. – Vol. 9. – Pp.124–162.
- Biber Douglas. *Corpus-Based and Corpus-driven Analyses of Language Variation and Use* / Douglas Biber, Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. – Pp.1-34.
- Bondarko A.V. *Functional Grammar: A Field Approach* / A.V. Bondarko. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1991 (1984). – 207 p.
- Divjak Dagmar, Gries Th. Gries. *Corpus-based Cognitive Semantics. A Contrastive Study of Phasal Verbs in English and Russian* / Dagmar Divjak and Stefan Th. Gries // Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Katarzyna Dziwirek (eds.). *Studies in Cognitive Corpus Linguistics*. – Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, 2009. – Pp.273-296.
- Gärdenfors Peter. *Some Tenets of Cognitive Semantics* / Peter Gärdenfors // Jens Allwood and Peter Gärdenfors. – Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999. – Pp. 19–36.
- Gibbs Raymond W. Jr., Matlock Teenie. *Psycholinguistic Perspectives on Polysemy* / Raymond W. Gibbs Jr., Teenie Matlock // Cuyckens, H. & B. Zawada (eds.). *Polysemy in Cognitive Linguistics*. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001. – Pp. 213–39.
- Gliozzo Alfio, Strapparava Carlo. *Semantic Domains in Computational Linguistics* / A. Gliozzo, C. Strapparava. – Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Verlag, 2009. – ix + 131pp.
- Gotz-Votteler Katrin. *Describing Semantic Valency* / Katrin Götz-Votteler // Thomas Herbst, Katrin Götz-Votteler (eds). *Valency: Theoretical, Descriptive and Cognitive Issues*. – Berlin. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007. – Pp.37-50.
- Grice H.P. *Logic and Conversation* / H.P. Grice // P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. – New York, NY: Academic Press, 1975. – Pp.41–58.
- Gries S. Th. *Corpus-based Methods and Cognitive Semantics: The Many Meanings of to Run* / S. Th. Gries // S. Th. Gries and A. Stefanowitsch (eds.). *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics: Corpus-Based Approaches to Syntax and Lexis*. – Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006. – Pp.57–99.
- Harder Peter. *Functional Semantics. A Theory of Meaning, Structure and Tense in English* / Peter Harder. – Berlin. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2010 (1996). – 585p.
- Kobozeva I.M. *Lingvisticheskaya Semantika [Linguistic Semantics]* / I.M. Kobozeva. – Moscow: Editorial-URSS, 2000. —352p.
- Krieger Daniel. *Corpus Linguistics: What It Is and How It Can Be Applied to Teaching* / Daniel Krieger // *The Internet TESL Journal*. – Vol. IX. – No.3.

15. Kuebler Sandra, Zinsmeister Heike. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistically Annotated Corpora* / Sandra Kuebler, Heike Zinsmeister. – London. Oxford: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014. – 320 p.
16. Matthews Peter. The Scope of Valency in Grammar / Peter Matthews // Thomas Herbst Katrin Götz-Votteler (eds). *Valency: Theoretical, Descriptive and Cognitive Issues*. – Berlin. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007. – Pp.3-14.
17. Meyer Charles F. *English Corpus Linguistics. An Introduction* / Charles F. Meyer. – Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2002. – ix + 165pp.
18. Mykhaylenko Valery V. *A Glossary of Linguistics and Translation Studies* / Valery V. Mykhaylenko. – Ivano-Frankivsk: King Danylo Galytshyn University of Law, 2015. – 528 p.
19. Nesselhauf Nadja. *Collocations in a Learner Corpus [Studies in Corpus Linguistics, 14]* / Nadja Nesselhauf. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005. – xii + 332 pp.
20. Porzig W. *Sprachform und Bedeutung. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit A. Martys Sprachphilosophie* / W.Porzig // *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch*. – 1928. – xii + 20 pp.
21. Rosch E. *Cognitive Representation of Semantic Categories* / Eleanor Rosch // *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. – 1975. – Vol. 104. – Pp.192–233.
22. Schönefeld D. *From conceptualization to linguistic expression: where languages diversify* / D. Schönefeld // Gries, S. Th. & A. Stefanowitsch (eds). *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics: Corpus-Based Approaches to Syntax and Lexis*. – Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006. – Pp. 297–344.
23. Searle John R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* / John R. Searle. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p.
24. Storzjohann Petra. *Lexical-semantic Relations: Theoretical and Practical Perspectives* / Petra Storzjohann // Petra Storzjohann (ed.). *Lexical-semantic Relations: Theoretical and Practical Perspectives*. – Amsterdam. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2010. – 188 p.
25. Talmy Leonard. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. – Vol.1 / Leonard Talmy // The MIT Press Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2000. –viii + 565 pp.
26. Tesnière Lucien. *Elements of Structural Syntax*. Translated by Timothy Osborne and Sylvain Kohane. – Amsterdam. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2015 (1959). – lxxxii + 698.
27. Travis Charles. *Insensitive Semantics* / Charles Travis // *Mind and Language*. – 2006. – Vol.2. –No 1.– Pp.39–49.
28. Vinogradov V.V. *Russkiy yazik [Russian language]* / V.V. Vinogradov. – Moscow: Vysshaya shkola. – 2012 (1972). – 720 p.
29. Weisgerber L. *Sprachliche Gestaltung der Welt* / L.Weisgerber. – Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1962. – S.318-335.

**Михайленко В. В. Когнітивна семантика складових лексико-семантичного поля в професійному дискурсі**

**Анотація.** Мета даної статті – вирізнити шляхи транспозиції лексико-семантичного поля «customs» у когнітивно-семантичний простір, який репрезентує відповідний концепт у картині світу. ЛСП – підсистема в лексиконі мовної системи, тоді як когнітивно-семантичний простір виступає динамічною єдністю, що віддзеркалює функціональний континуум дискурсу. Запропоновано алгоритм «прочитання» компонентів значення лексеми «customs» завдяки використанню компонентного, дистрибутивного та корпусного типів лінгвістичного аналізу.

**Ключові слова:** лексичне поле, семантичне поле, лексична семантика, когнітивна семантика, адресантне значення, концепт, контекст.

**Михайленко В. В. Когнитивная семантика конститuentов лексико-семантического поля в профессиональном дискурсе**

**Аннотация.** Настоящая статья посвящена определению путей транспозиции ЛСП «customs» в когнитивно-семантическое пространство, которое актуализирует соответствующий концепт в картине мира. ЛСП является подсистемой в лексиконе языковой системы, тогда как когнитивно-семантическое пространство выступает динамическим единством функционального континуума дискурса. Предложен алгоритм «прочтения» компонентов значения лексемы «customs» благодаря использованию компонентного, дистрибутивного и корпусного типов лингвистического анализа.

**Ключевые слова:** лексическое поле, семантическое поле, лексическая семантика, когнитивная семантика, адресантное значение, концепт, контекст.