

5. Wang N. (2011). *Eco-literature and eco-translatology : deconstruction and reconstruction*. Chinese translators journal. № 2. P. 10–15.

Maria Onyshchuk
PhD in Philology, Associate Professor
Department of Applied Language Studies,
Comparative Linguistics, and Translation,
National Pedagogical Dragomanov University

LEXICOGRAPHIC APPROACH TO THE CONTRASTIVE CORPUS-BASED STUDIES

Currently, corpus-based investigations as a methodology of linguistic research occupy a specific niche in modern linguistics and SLA instruction, being abundantly represented by the subject-related elaborations of Sinclair (1991), Stubbs (2001), Kennedy (1998); McEnery, Wilson (2001); Meyer (2002), Demska (2005), Baranov (2001), Maksymiv (2008).

In the paper, we are launching a debate over the applicability of lexicographic approach to corpus studies. Although technical terms for corpora employed in linguistic comparison appear partly confusing, corpus linguistic remains utterly comparative in nature. Parallel corpus serves for comparing language samples on the basis of source texts and their translations; comparative corpora provides basis for intra-lingual comparison together with comparing varieties of the same language (McEnery and Xiao, 2011).

With regards to lexicography, corpus linguistics has not only introduced new methods of language research, but considerably expanded its scope. The valuable property of available corpora (*BNC*, *COBUILD*) lies in its encoding with textual and sociolinguistic metadata (*gender*, *age*, *domain*) which allows for a more accurate lexicographic description. Applying corpus annotations, namely, POS tagging, facilitate more rational word assemblies into polysemous and homographic ones (McEnery and Gabrielatos, 2006). Besides, tracking subtle changes in the lexical

item's meaning and use allows for keeping corpus constantly updated, supplying with additional information about distribution and co-occurrence range.

Moreover, corpus evidence complement the lexicographers' research so that the dictionary entries obtain accuracy. Interestingly, Hunston (2002) suggests grounded commentaries about changes implemented by corpora with regard to dictionaries and other references, defining them within the framework of five cornerstones with focus on frequency, collocation and phraseology, variation, lexis in grammar, and authenticity (Hunston, 2002: 96). The researcher points out that an output of corpus-based investigation is widely employed by people without recognizing the operating corpus itself.

The lexicographic approach to contrastive language study can be applied across multilingual corpora of various kinds; yet, the comparable type can be designed to conduct a cross-linguistic contrast, for all corpora have always been pre-eminently suited for comparative studies (Aarts, 1998: i).

In a search of improving grammatical descriptions (McEnery and Xiao (2005), grammar provides its thorough elaboration illustrated with relevant corpus use examples, 'giving equal attention to the way speakers and writers actually use these linguistic resources' (Biber et al, 1999) as well as considers register variations, demonstrating the mismatches between written and spoken grammars.

When considering an interlink between pattern and meaning, which appears very handy in language learning, pattern grammars question the distinctive properties between grammar and lexis; the former's ability to constitute word-building processes where a lexeme is analysed as non-isolated, a phrase constituent remains essential (Hunston, 2002). In addition to the lexical focus, corpus-based teaching materials demonstrate how the target language is actually used in different contexts, as exemplified in Biber et al's (2002) *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, which pays special attention to various spoken and written registers. With regards to research implications of the lexical approach to the corpus-based contrastive studies, apart from the well-grounded value of corpora as an essential prerequisite of language research, we have got to consider the property of

collocations' quantitative measurement and provision of structurally handling a considerable amount of authentic data in the light of the *KWIC* (*key word in centre*) principle.

The corpus linguistics methodology retains its intrinsically comparative property that can be illustrated by extracting collocations through applying statistic measures, thus comparing the probabilities co-occurring words within a specified window span of the node word; keywords are identified by comparing the target corpus with the reference corpus. Importantly, *Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis* (*CIA*) applies comparison (Granger, 1998) regardless of the languages involved, i.e. comparing interlanguage with target native, or, comparing different languages.

To sum up, the entire corpus research enterprise is based on comparison, for example, by comparing the same linguistic feature in different corpora, comparing different linguistic features in the same corpus, and comparing what is observed and what is expected. The corpus-based contrastive study yields a number of interesting findings; the relevance of authenticity and frequency of corpora in language education as well as the future of corpus-based language pedagogy, for these findings can inform the SLA research.

References

1. Aarts, J. (1998). 'Introduction'. In S. Johansson and S. Oksefjell (eds.) *Corpora and Cross-linguistic Research*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. ix-xiv.
2. Biber, D., Conrad, S., Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Biber, D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S., Finegan, E. (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
4. Granger, S. (1998). The computer learner corpus: a versatile new source of data for SLA research. In S. Granger (ed.) *Learner English on Computer*. London: Longman (p. 3–8).
5. Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (p. 96).

6. McEnery T., Gabrielatos C. (2006) *English Corpus Linguistics*. The Handbook of English Linguistics: McMahon-Blackwell Publishing (pp. 33–72).

7. McEnery, A., Xiao, R. (2005). Help or help to: What do corpora have to say? *English Studies* 86 (2) (pp. 161–187).

8. McEnery, A., Xiao, R. (2011). How can corpora help in language pedagogy? *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Routledge (p. 17).

Ю. В. Орлова,
кандидат філологічних наук
доцент кафедри прикладної лінгвістики,
порівняльного мовознавства та перекладу
НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова

ЗМІСТ КОНЦЕПТУ *ВІК ЛЮДИНИ* **У МЕНТАЛЬНОМУ ЛЕКСИКОНІ НОСІЇВ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВИ**

(за даними вільного асоціативного експерименту)

Зміст концепту у ментальному лексиконі найліпше виявляється за допомогою експериментально-психологічних методів, зокрема методу вільного асоціативного експерименту. Це обумовлене тим, що асоціативне мислення є стійким нейрофізіологічним механізмом пізнання дійсності, а асоціації (асоціати за суміжністю, схожістю, контрастом; причинно-наслідкові), як результат такої інтелектуальної операції, постають цінним джерелом перекодованої (вербалізованої) інформації про об'єктивно наявні в психіці носіїв мови семантичних зв'язків (синтагматичних, парадигматичних; центральних (ядерних), периферійних) (Є. Біла, Н. Галунова, Н. Горбатюк, О. Залевська, І. Кант, О. Карпенко, П. Козлаковський, О. Леонтьєв, В. Маслова, І. Талабко, Д. Терехова, Р. Фрумкіна, В. Щадріков та ін.). Вивчення семантики для встановлення прихованих процесів, що відсвітлюють свідоме і підсвідоме, понині характеризується незгасаючою **актуальністю**, зосібна, в питанні визначення архетипно-стереотипної основи смислових домінант ціннісно-