

UDC 81'373

DOI: 10.31558/1815-3070.2023.45.2

LEXICAL SEMANTIC DERIVATION MODELS REVISITED

У статті робиться спроба ревізії моделей семантичної деривації лексики та способів їхньої експлікації у віддалено споріднених мовах (українській та англійській). Представлено концепції, які обстоюють ідею динамічної концептуалізації світу дискурсу (певної ситуації або її фрагмента). Основну увагу приділено вивченню стратегій семантичної деривації лексики, встановленню зв'язків між вихідним та цільовим значеннями, з'ясуванню особливостей динаміки розвитку семантичної парадигми лексики в зіставно-типологічному аспекті.

***Ключові слова:** семантична деривація, семантичний зсув, модель ситуації, учасник ситуації, tertium comparationis, міжмовний.*

1. Introduction. The present-day linguistic semantics advocates the priority of a dynamic approach towards the study of linguistic items' semantics (Dekker 2012; Коптєвська-Тамм 2016). Focusing on a dynamic conceptualisation of the discourse world (a particular situation or its fragment), the approach declares a new conception of linguistic items' semantics modelling. The content of a linguistic item is presumably arranged through a sampling of the polycentric model (Taylor 1995: 99), structured as a set of alternative, hierarchically established semantic dimensions. The approach accords with the assumption on a multidimensional nature of cognition modelling (Multidimensional Models of Perception and Cognition, 1992), as well as with the theoretical premises on how multidimensional situations are modelled (Therriault, Rinck 2007).

Semantics modelling is thought to reveal not only the conceptual entities which underlie the content of a linguistic item or a class of linguistic items but also those areas of the language cognition which represent the national worldview, features of ethnic mentality, characteristics of cognitive abilities of those, belonging to different linguistic communities. From this perspective, semantics modelling acquires significance for cross-linguistic (either contrastive or typological) studies, as it offers methods to reveal the peculiar manners, in which the semantics of a linguistic item encodes and distributes information on a particular state of affairs in related and non-related languages (Cross-Linguistic Semantics, 2008; Narrog 2012).

Semantic derivation is one of the aspects which reveals the dynamic nature of a linguistic item. As a dynamic phenomenon, semantic derivation is considered in terms of semantic shift models which are thought to represent the strategies of a linguistic item's semantic development in both diachronic and synchronic aspects. Lexical semantic derivation modelling stems from a very long tradition, which underwent developments from historical (Lewandowka-Tomaszczyk 1985; Sweetser 1990; Traugott, Dasher 2005) to compositional (Pustejovsky 1996; Sweetser 1999), constructional (Goldberg 1995), cognitive (Barcelona 2012), contrastive and

typological (From Polysemy to Semantic Change, 2008; Juvonen, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2016) semantics studies.

The issue of combining methodologically adjacent approaches, dealing with semantics modelling, within a group of languages or within an individual human natural language is of paramount importance at present. The relevance of such approaches is determined by the universal and integral nature of semantic derivation: a) regular semantic shifts are found in many (if not in all) languages of the world, irrespective of their phylogenic and cultural differences (Wierzbicka 1992); b) semantic shifts are the same at any linguistic level (lexical, word-building, grammatical), taking into account the fact that at those levels the common semantic mechanisms are used (see From polysemy to semantic change 2008).

According to the original hypothesis, the modelling of a lexical item's semantics is fulfilled through sampling a set of alternative hierarchically established semantic dimensions. On that ground, the models of semantic derivation are interpreted as theoretical constructs which represent various ways of a certain situation conceptualisation or its fragment. Within cross-linguistic studies, the models of semantic derivation are intended to reveal the ways the information on the worldview changes is encoded and distributed in lexical semantics of related and non-related languages.

The purpose of the paper is to elaborate on the types of lexical semantic derivation models (see Demenchuk 2018; 2019; 2020) and to establish the ways they are explicated in distantly related languages – Slavic (Ukrainian) and Germanic (English).

The purpose is fourfold:

- to represent methodological backgrounds of the semantic derivation analysis within interlingual studies;
- to ascertain the characteristics of lexical semantic derivation strategies;
- to characterise lexical semantic derivation models and to establish the ways they are substantiated in the languages contrasted;
- to outline the prospects of lexical semantics modelling studies.

2. Methodological Background. The modern theory of Linguistic Semantics advocates the necessity and expediency to model the contents of linguistic items through sampling a multidimensional situation concept. The concept is thought to represent the dynamics of a particular situation or its fragment, which is the result of different worldview strategies conceptualisation. From this viewpoint, a linguistic item's semantics is interpreted as a multidimensional phenomenon which represents the conceptualisation of the discourse world from different cognitive (gnoseological) angles – those of different linguistic communities. Such an approach is relevant in reductionist and non-reductionist theories. The reductionist theory grounds on the smallest units and defines the larger or more complex units in terms of combinations of atomic primitive units. A non-reductionist theory grounds on the largest units and defines the smaller ones in terms of their relation to the larger units (Croft 2001: 47). From this perspective, the content of a linguistic item may be modelled in terms of either primitives or complex constructs. It is evident that the contraposition of the

approaches is not relevant and within a dynamic approach towards semantic derivation modelling provides for the use of both.

The study of lexical semantic derivation focuses on a number of methodological prerequisites: a) lexical semantics encodes information in the format of a situation concept; b) a situation concept is a lexical representation of a certain a situation or its fragment; c) a situation concept is multidimensional as it represents different interpretations of a situation or its fragment; d) multidimensionality of a situation concept provides for various ways of its lexical representation; e) a situation concept reveals the features of internal (within the boundaries of a concept) and external (beyond the boundaries of the concept) extensitons; f) there are similarities and differences in the ways various languages construe a situation or its fragment. Within those prerequisites, cross-linguistic investigations of lexical semantic derivation provide for establishing correspondences (similarities and differences) in mechanisms and strategies of how a situation concept develops.

The representativeness of lexical semantics in the format of a situation concept determines the choice of basis for comparison (*tertium comparationis*) – a MODEL OF SITUATION. As a metalanguage construct, the model of situation reveals the features of a propositional function, in which the arguments encode information about the reality objects, and the predicate – information about the way a person interprets these objects. In this regard, the model of situation represents the content of a linguistic item in the perspective of characteristics and relations, attributed to the situation participants. We find it relevant to use this type of model, reasoning from the hypothesis that language semantics is determined by the universal (presumably inborn) cognitive abilities and strategies a person uses in conceptualising a situation or its fragment. From this viewpoint, the model of situation is considered to be a standard which represents the content of a linguistic item through sampling a multidimensional concept which encodes information on how a situation is construed by a designator. It is worth noting that what is meant here is by no means a real-world situation: It is a state of affairs strictly as it is portrayed by the language L and as it is reflected in the possible uses of L. It is a linguistic situation, not a psychologically, logically or pragmatically defined one. It is a complex fact – a set of facts and entities linked by semantic dependency relations into a unified structure that is denoted by the predicate ‘L’ (Mel’čuk 2015: 12).

3. Strategies of lexical semantic derivation. Within a dynamic approach, lexical semantic derivation is considered to represent ‘variation of meaning of a given word, be it synchronic or diachronic, i.e., the relation between two different meanings of a polysemous word or the relation between two meanings of a word in the course of semantic evolution’ (Zalizniak 2008: 217). The variation entails the reconfiguration of the word semantic components, which presumably provides for numerous combinations of the word meanings. The degree of associations between the meanings may be either in its minimum (a derived meaning may select a conspicuous, culturally prominent feature from an associative zone of the derivational meaning, cf. the etymons of the equivalents: *лебідь* < IE **albho-* “white” vs. *swan* < Sanskrit *svánati* “(it) sounds”), or in its maximum (both meanings may represent the same situation,

with the derived meaning containing the same components, actants and roles as the derivational one; the only difference is supposed to be observed in the configuration ('inner syntax') of the components and their communicative perspective, cf. Ukr. *Відчуваю тугу у серці* 'I feel sorrow in my heart' vs. Ukr. *Відчуваю серцем тугу* 'I feel sorrow with my heart'. The medium degree indicates a transition type, in which the derived meaning obtains an essential part of the derivational one, though the actant's type or its reference scope may change. Semantic derivation of the transition type reveals two strategies: a) the transfer occurs based on a category shift – a certain physical feature or situation of the source meaning is used as a model for an abstract property or situation and is applied to a referent with essentially other properties, cf.: Ukr. *м'який вирок* '(soft) mild sentence', Eng. *soft science*, etc.; b) the transfer occurs on the basis of the denotative identity – the derived meaning has other set of actants (and roles) and corresponds to other situation, however, it derives (inherits) some essential components from the source meaning, cf.: Eng. *The sun heats water* vs. *The boiler heats water* – the source and target meanings have a common assertive part 'to raise the temperature of', the denotative quality of the participants is preserved (both exert a physical influence), the only change occurs in a 'causer' taxonomic class: NATURAL PHENOMENON → DEVICE.

One may note that semantic derivation is not just reduced to obvious polysemy (ambiguity which provides for a static combination of the source and target meanings (cf. the idea of 'semantic bridges' (Mel'čuk 1988)), as beside the semantic components it also takes into account various types of actantial alternations, such as deagentivation, focus of attention shift, categorical shift, etc. A selected derivational strategy represents a certain type (model) of a lexical item's semantic development. We single out four types of lexical semantic derivation models: componential-combinatorial, integral-situational, topological-schematic and complex-constructive.

4. Models of lexical semantic derivation.

4.1. Componential-combinatorial model. The componential approach focuses on the idea of a feature-based and combinatorial representation of lexical meaning. It is posited that a lexical item's semantic structure consists of a cluster of semantic features that serve as elementary "building blocks", primitives that are demonstrations of basic, innate concepts (Wierzbicka 1996). In the aspect of cross-linguistic studies, such an approach agrees with the idea of segmentation of a physical continuum 'within which languages may draw either the same or a different number of boundaries and within which they may draw the boundaries at the same or different places' (Lyons 1968: 58), cf.: Ukr. *білий* 'який має колір крейди, молока, снігу; протилежне чорний [having the colour of chalk, milk, snow; opposite to black]' (SUM); Eng. *white* 'the color of pure snow, of the margins of this page, etc.; reflecting nearly all the rays of sunlight or a similar light' (RHWUD). In total, the lexicographic view on the white colour phenomenon is described within an arbitrary scale, which reconstructs the features of componential (combinatorial) strategies: from popular ('of a colour like that of chalk'), through associative ('opposite to black'), towards academic ('reflecting nearly all the rays of sunlight').

Providing for the stable associations on the phenomenon denoted by a word, the componential strategies reveal the relations, occurring between semantic components and their configurations. The following relations are usually singled out: a) semantic components and their configurations coincide almost completely in the source and target lexemes; b) semantic components and their configurations do not coincide as a matter of fact, however, there are some intermediate words-meaning' which at a certain stage of semantic reduction may reveal some common configurations. From this viewpoint, the componential strategy becomes similar to the procedure of constructing 'semantic bridges'. By definition, a semantic bridge is a configuration of semantemes shared by the lexicographical definitions of the source and target lexemes such that it simultaneously satisfies the following two conditions: (1) configuration is sufficiently important for the definition; (2) configuration occupies a sufficiently central position in the definitions (Mel'čuk 2006: 285); c) lexemes contain neither common semantic configurations nor intermediate word-meanings, however, they usually have systemic (core) components which regularly occur in the structures of two different lexemes of the same word.

Within cross-linguistic studies, the componential-combinatorial model of lexical semantic derivation represents the correspondences (similarities and differences) in the ways the semantic components and their configurations develop (extend) in the contrasted languages. For example, the similarities are observed in the extensions of the concept of 'heaviness', represented by the terms Urk. *важкий* vs. Eng. *heavy*. The primary ('parametric') meaning 'of great weight' (Ukr. *важкий пором* 'heavy ferry' vs. Eng. *heavy log*) may extend to the boundaries of: (a) experiential, cf.: Ukr. *важка їжа* 'heavy meal' vs. Eng. *heavy meal*; (b) emotional, cf.: Ukr. *важке прощання* 'heavy parting' vs. Eng. *heavy heart*; (c) cognitive (difficult to understand), cf.: Ukr. *важкий стиль* 'heavy style' vs. Eng. *heavy style*; (d) identificational, cf.: Ukr. *важкі бомбардувальники* 'heavy bombers' vs. Eng. *heavy bombers*; (e) associative, cf.: Ukr. *важкий туніт* 'heavy tramp' vs. Eng. *heavy tramp*, semantics. In addition to that, the contrastive analysis reveals specific extension strategies. In Ukrainian, the concept of 'heaviness' may extend to the boundaries of evaluative semantics (meanings: 'of a nasty temper; of a disagreeable disposition'), cf.: Ukr. *важкий характер* 'lit. heavy temper'. In English, the situation is construed by a different term, cf.: Eng. *Servants sometimes suffer from the ill-temper of their employers*. English, in its turn, reveals the extension in reference to the evaluation of a person (meanings: 'stupid, naïve, easy-going'), cf.: Eng. *If there is anything worse it is a heavy man when he fancies he is being facetious*.

4.2. Integral-situational model. Within the situational approach, semantic description focuses on diathesis alternations which provide for the transformations in the predicate structure configuration due to the changes observed in the participants and their relations (Levin 2015). The approach upholds the idea of semantic (the demand to make all necessary distinctions relevant to meaning) and syntactic (the demand to make syntactically relevant distinctions which permit the expression of significant generalisations) correlations, underlying the actantial derivation strategies (Van Valin, LaPolla 1997: 91). The strategies occur when a lexeme of a polysemous

word reveals neither common semantic configurations nor regular recurrent opposition of the components, though sharing the same actantial structure, ‘scenario’, set by the predicate. Three types of actantial derivation strategies are singled out: (a) ‘valency-increasing’ (the increase of obligatory actants); (b) ‘valency-reducing’ (the reduction of obligatory actants); (c) ‘alternative’ (the number of core actants is retained but their semantic roles alter), (see Dixon, Aikhevald 2000: 6).

The ‘valency-increasing’ actantial derivation is characteristic of lexical items with a potentially high degree of semantic attraction. The phenomenon is observed in the Ukrainian term *потемніти* ‘become dark’ within a ‘derivative – idiom’ couple. The lexical items mutually attract based on the semantic features ‘result of change’ vs. ‘symptom of change’, cf.: Ukr. *потемніти* ‘стати темним [‘to become dark’]’ vs. *в очах потемніло у кого* ‘комусь стає погано, млясно від болю, втоми, слабості [‘somebody is feeling bad, giddy because of pain, fag, illness’]’ (SUM). The attraction is also observed at the level of the participants’ semantic roles. The Ukrainian language may actualise the semantic role of the Patient, indicating a modified quality of the object, cf.: *Небо потемніло, заіскрилось зорями* ‘The sky went dark and sparkled with stars’. With the phraseological equivalent one may observe the increase in the semantic role of Experiencer in the *dativus subiecti* position, cf.: Ukr. *У Пилипка потемніло в очах, голова кругом заходила* ‘Everything went dark before Pylypko’s eyes, he felt giddy’. The concept of situation is also enriched with the semantic components ‘temporary interruption of proper vision functioning’ and ‘short-term visual impairment’. The increase of actants is also observed in the English equivalent (*everything went dark before smb. ’s eyes*), though within a quantifier term (*everything* = ‘everything I saw’).

The ‘valency-reducing’ actantial derivation is characteristic of the so-called decausative terms which represent the transition of agentive situation to a non-causative one. For example, the colour term Eng. *redden* ‘to make red, to impart a red colour to (a substance or thing)’: *The south wind began to blow and the June sunset reddened the sky to the zenith* (OED) represents the situation in which the Causer (*sunset*) changes the *sky*-participant’s state by imparting the red colour to it. A similar situation is observed in Ukrainian, cf.: *червонити* ‘кидати червоний відсвіт на щось [to cast a red light on smth.]’: *Сонце червонить своїм світлом спечений степ* ‘The sun reddens a scorched steppe with its light’ (SUM). When decausativisation occurs, the situation is reinterpreted as a process, in which the state of the Patient is characterised as an arbitrary change of its perceptual properties, cf.: *redden* ‘to turn red or reddish in color’: *Off in the west, as the sun sinks behind a toothy ridge of mountains, the sky reddens and cools* (OED).

It should be pointed out that arbitrariness is a relative characteristic of the changes which the Patient may undergo, as of paramount importance for the perceptual situation are background participants and their relations, cf.: Eng. *And ride the rough channels as the sky reddens at sunset*. In this case, we claim the redistribution of semantic components within the so-called shadow actants (Pustejovsky 1996: 63): the Causer gets syntactically ‘shadowed’, and the focus shifts to the Cause-participant – the semantic role, which concurrently takes charge of the Causer. In Ukrainian, the

situation is represented by the reflexive, cf.: *червонитися* ‘ставати червоним від чого-небудь [to become red of smth.]’: *Вікна червонились рубіновими блискавками* ‘The windows reddened with ruby lightnings’ (SUM).

The ‘alternative’ actantial derivation is based on the changes, occurring in the participant’s type or referential characteristics. The change of the referential characteristics may be instantiated by the case of reflexive-reciprocal coreference, cf. Ukr. *бачитися* ‘здаватися [to seem]’: *Мені так бачиться, що він може допомогти* ‘He seems to be able to help’ (SUM). In English, the meaning may be rendered by the verb *seem* with a complement phrase, cf.: *The house seems to be deserted*. There might be traced a correlation between *seem* and *see*, as the English term *see* reveals the features of the reciprocal coreference, cf.: *see* ‘to meet one another’: *How have you done since last we saw in France?* (OED) The same is found in Ukrainian, cf.: *бачитися* ‘зустрічатися, бувати разом де-небудь [to meet, to spend time together]’: *Я дуже близько зійшовся з Павлом, бачимось мало не щодня* ‘I am close to Pavlo, we see each other almost every day’ (SUM).

4.3. Topological-schematic model. The topological approach towards the meaning represents the idea of the ‘holistic’ arrangement of a lexical item’s content. The semantic description within the topological approach applies to certain patterns, among those are image-schemas: ‘the recurring patterns of our sensory-motor experience by means of which we can make sense of that experience and reason about it, and that can also be recruited to structure abstract concepts and to carry out inferences about abstract domains of the thought’ (Johnson 2005: 18).

The topological strategies of semantic derivation are substantiated in the aspect of basic image-schemas transformations. One may observe such transformations between the discrete collection (image-schema MULTIPLEX) and indiscrete quantity (image-schema MASS) – ‘as one moves further away, a group of individuals at a certain point begins to be seen as a mass’ (Lakoff 1987: 442), cf.: Ukr. *За річкою синіють ліси, жовтіють поля* ‘The forests loom blue, the fields show up yellow beyond the river’; Eng. *We saw the land looming*.

Within interlingual studies, the topological strategies of semantic derivation reveal similarities and differences in the extension of image-schematic concepts. For example, the extension within the situations ‘state of physical concentration’ → ‘state of mental concentration’ may be substantiated on the basis of two semantic shift strategies: a) Eng. *cluster*: arrangement of objects close to one another is interpreted as conglomeration of objects – image-schema ADJACENCY; b) Eng. *concentric*: arrangement of objects is interpreted as accumulation of objects at a certain point – image-schema FOCUSING. In Ukrainian, the extension may apply to any of the strategies, cf.: *скупчений 1a* ‘який розташувався близько один від одного [allocated close together]’: *Уся долина була заставлена юртами, вони стояли не рядами, а скупчені навколо інших юрт* ‘The valley was filled with yurts, they didn’t stand in rows, but were crowded around other yurts’; *скупчений 1b* ‘який згромадився в одному місці [concentrated in one place]’: *скупчена крига* ‘concentrated ice’ → *скупчений 2a* ‘у стані зібраності [composed]’: *Знов був скупчений, готовий до дії* ‘He was composed and ready to act’; *скупчений 2b* ‘зосереджений [focused on

smth.]’: *скупчена увага* ‘focused attention’ (SUM). In English, it is rather a concentric strategy to be counted for, cf.: *concentrated 1* ‘brought to or towards a common centre or focus’: *The concentrated beams of the sun made the aurum fulminans go off* → *concentrated 2* ‘having the faculties collected and directed to one object’: *Then calm, concentrated, and still, and slow, he lay coil’d like the boa in the wood* (OED).

4.4. Complex-constructional model. The constructional approach focuses on the idea of a ‘mixed’ representation of a lexical item’s semantics, which is associated with the elaboration of the knowledge representation inner structure, e.g.: a frame with deep cases (Ch. Fillmore), a construction with argument structures (Ch. Fillmore, P. Kay, G. Lakoff, A. Goldberg, W. Croft), a conceptual category with functional and argument structures (R. Jackendoff), a complex primitive with a set of propositions (C. Vandeloise), etc.

Within the constructional approach, a lexical item’s semantics is reduced to the meaning of a construction – a complex arranged in the form of a proposition. The samples of constructions are argument structures sort of *X causes Y to receive Z*. They represent a certain event fragment (a dynamic scene), e.g., smb. causing smth. to move, smb. experiencing smth., smb. changing smth., etc., in which argument roles are interpreted as functions derived from the event, cf.: ‘Constructions are associated directly with semantic structures which reflect scenes basic to human experience’ (Goldberg 1995: 5).

For interlinguistic studies, language-specific constructions are of paramount importance. The typology of such constructions is determined by their ranging over ‘regions of SYNTACTIC SPACE, the space of possible syntactic types’ (Croft 2001: 363). That provides for singling out a conceptual space area, within which an argument structure becomes a language-specific construction. For example, the English term *spy on* (*She spied on the neighbours through a key-hole*) and its Ukrainian equivalent *підглядати* use common argument structures: (a) *X sees Y* (perception); (b) *X turns his eyes to Y* (perception kinesics); (c) *X sees Y in a non-canonical way* (interaction). The Ukrainian equivalent, in its turn, may realise the semantic role of the Content (Information) in the argument structure (e) *X tries to find out about Z* (interaction), cf.: *підглядати* ‘крадькома дивитися, намагаючись простежити за ким-небудь, довідатися про щось [to watch smb. in a stealthy manner to find out smth.]’ (SUM).

The constructional approach towards semantic derivation proceeds from the assumption that ‘it is natural for constructions to be associated with a central sense, and with extensions from that sense’ (Goldberg 1995: 203). From this perspective, the situation of spying reveals both similar and specific extensions in the contrasted languages: similar – a semantic shift towards the argument structure (c’) *X sees Y in a canonical way* (interaction), cf.: *Приїхала до матері, а повіялася підглядала парубків незнайомих* ‘She came to her mother, but instead went to spy on strangers’ vs. *I think I’ve just spied Andrew in the crowd*; specific – a semantic shift towards the argument structures (a’) *X identifies Y* (interaction), cf.: *He can spy out the faults in the structure of a boat*.

5. Conclusions. The investigation performed appeals to the conceptions which uphold the idea of the dynamic world conceptualisation of discourse (of a particular

situation or its fragment). The dynamic approach towards a lexical item's semantics reveals and elaborates upon the system of lexical semantic derivation models – theoretical constructs which represent the dynamic potential of a lexical item, claiming various types of semantic associations which underlie the development of a lexical item's semantic paradigm.

Four types of lexical semantic derivation models have been singled out: componential-combinatorial (represents the semantic shift correspondences in semantic components and their configurations), integral-situational (provides for the semantic shift correspondences in situation participants and their relations), topological-schematic (reveals the semantic shift correspondences in image-schematic concepts) and complex-constructive (characterises the semantic shift correspondences in complex constructions).

The models revealed the ways the information on the worldview changes is encoded and distributed in lexical semantics of the Slavic (Ukrainian) and Germanic (English) languages. The analysis establishes the fact that the contrasted languages may apply to any of the models. The differences are observed in the ways the models are explicated in the languages: (a) semantic derivation may be 'compensated' (redistributed) in the semantics of a different term, phrase or construction; (b) semantic derivation may apply to a different number of shift strategies; (c) semantic derivation may use different types (configurations) of shift strategies; (d) semantic derivation may reveal the features of language-specific shift strategies.

It is expedient to carry out further research into semantic derivation modelling within the typological aspect. The choice of the aspect is determined by the tendency of modern semantic studies to a profound analysis of semantic shifts in related and non-related languages.

References

1. Barcelona, A. *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective*. Berlin. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2012. 368 p.
2. Croft, W. *Radical construction grammar: Syntactic theory in typological perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. 416 p.
3. *Cross-linguistic semantics: Explications, metalanguage, grammar*. Ed. by C. Goddard. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publ., 2008. 356 p.
4. Dekker, P. *Dynamic semantics*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2012. 127 p.
5. Demenchuk, O. «Lexical semantic modelling in cross-linguistic perspective». *Naukovyi chasopys natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni M.P. Drahomanova. Seriya 9. Suchasni tendentsii rozvytku mov* 17, 2018: 32–42.
[Demenchuk, O. «Lexical semantic modelling in cross-linguistic perspective». *Науковий часопис національного педагогічного університету імені М.П. Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов* 17, 2018: 32–42.]
6. Demenchuk, O. «Modelling semantic derivation: Semantic shift strategies of irrational vocabulary in English». *Advanced Education* 12, 2019: 120–126.
7. Demenchuk, O. «Towards a typology of lexical semantic derivation models: Linguistic and psycholinguistic aspects». *PSYCHOLINGUISTICS* 28(2), 2020: 8–23.
8. From polysemy to semantic change. *Towards a typology of lexical semantic association*. Ed. by M. Vanhove. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publ., Co., 2008. 404 p.

9. Goldberg, A. E. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995, 265 p.
10. Johnson, M. «The philosophical significance of image schemas». *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics*. Ed. by B. Hampe. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2005, 15–34.
11. Juvonen, J. «Making do with minimal lexica. Light verb constructions with *make/do* in pidgin lexica». *The lexical typology of semantic shifts*. Ed. by P. Juvonen, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm. Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2016, 223–248.
12. Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. «The lexical typology of semantic shifts: An introduction». *The lexical typology of semantic shifts*. Ed. by P. Juvonen, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm. Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2016, 1–20.
13. Lakoff, G. *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987. 632 p.
14. Levin, B. «Semantics and pragmatics of argument alternations». *Annual Review of Linguistics* 1, 2015: 63–83.
15. Lewandowka-Tomaszczyk, B. «On semantic change in a dynamic model of language». *Historical Semantics: Historical Word-Formation*. Ed. by J. Fisiak. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1985, 297–323.
16. Lyons, J. *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968. 519 p.
17. Mel'čuk, I. «Semantic description of lexical units in an Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary: Basic principles and heuristic criteria». *International Journal of Lexicography* 1.(3). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988: 165–188.
18. Mel'čuk, I. «Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary». *Open Problems in Linguistics and Lexicography*. Ed. by G. Sico. Monza: Polimetrica, 2006, 225–355.
19. Mel'čuk, I. *Semantics. From meaning to text*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publ., 2015. Vol. 3, 546.
20. *Multidimensional models of perception and cognition*. Ed. by F.G. Ashby. New York; London: Taylor & Francis Group & Psychology Press, 1992. 544 p.
21. Narrog, H. *Modality, subjectivity, and semantic change. A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. 333 p.
22. *OED: Oxford English Dictionary: Second Edition on CD-ROM*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Vers. 4.0.
23. Pustejovsky, J. *The generative lexicon*. Cambridge, MA; London: The MIT Press, 1996, 298 p.
24. Radden, G., Kövecses, Z. «Towards a theory of metonymy». *Metonymy in language and thought*. Ed. by K-U. Panther, G. Radden. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publ., 1999, 17–60.
25. *RHWUD: Random House Webster's Unabridged Dictionary*. Electronic dictionary of American English. Seattle, WA: Random House, Inc.; Multimedia 2000, Inc. Vers. 3.0.
26. *SUM: Slovník ukrajskoi movy: v 11 t. Redkolehiiia*: I. K. Bilodid (holova), L. S. Palamarchuk (zast. holovy), A. A. Buriachok ta in. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1970-1980. T. 1–11.
[Словник української мови: в 11 т. Редколегія: І. К. Білодід (голова), Л. С. Паламарчук (заст. голови), А. А. Бурячок та ін. Київ: Наукова думка, 1970-1980. Т. 1–11.]
27. Sweetser, E. E. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 188 p.
28. Sweetser, E. E. «Compositionality and blending: Semantic composition in a cognitively realistic framework». *Cognitive Linguistics: Foundations, Scope, and Methodology*. Ed. by T. Janssen, G. Redeker. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1999, 129–162.
29. Taylor, J. *Linguistic categorization. Prototypes in linguistic theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. 312 p.
30. Theriault, D., Rinck, M. «Multidimensional situation models». *Higher level language processes in the brain: Inference and comprehension processes*. Ed. by F. Schmalhofer, C. Perfetti. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2007, 311–328.

31. Traugott, E. C., Dasher, R. B. Regularity in semantic change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 341 p.
32. Van Valin, R. D., Jr., LaPolla, R. J. Syntax: Structure, meaning and function. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 744 p.
33. Wierzbicka, A. Semantics, culture, and cognition: Universal human concepts in culture-specific configurations. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1992, 496 p.
34. Wierzbicka, A. Semantics: Primes and universals. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, 512.
35. Zaluzniak, Anna A. «A catalogue of semantic shifts. Towards a typology of semantic derivation». *From polysemy to semantic change. Towards a typology of lexical semantic association*. Ed. by M. Vanhove. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publ., 2008, 217–232.

LEXICAL SEMANTIC DERIVATION MODELS REVISITED

Oleh Demenchuk

The Department of Romance and Germanic Philology, Rivne State University of Humanities, Rivne, Ukraine.

Abstract

Background: Semantic derivation is one of the aspects that reveals the dynamic potential of lexical items, the mechanisms and strategies of lexical items' extensions, the semantic associations that underlie the development of lexical items' semantic paradigms. As a dynamic phenomenon, semantic derivation is interpreted in relation to the notion of semantic shift, which refers to a pair of senses linked by some genetic relations, either diachronically or synchronically. Such an approach correlates with the idea of semantic derivation consistency, which provides for establishing the characteristics of a lexical item's semantic potential in its dynamic developing.

Purpose: The study aims at elaborating on the types of lexical semantic derivation models and the ways they are explicated in distantly related languages – Slavic (Ukrainian) and Germanic (English).

Results: The analysis provided in the paper proceeds from the assumption that the development of a linguistic item's semantic paradigm is simultaneously realised with the changes in a situation. The changes determine the type (model) of a derivational strategy that underlies the development of a lexical item's semantic paradigm. From this viewpoint, a lexical item's semantics is interpreted as a multidimensional phenomenon that represents the conceptualisation of the world of discourse from different cognitive (gnoseological) positions – positions of different linguistic communities. On that ground, the models of lexical semantic derivation are considered as theoretical constructs that reveal the ways the information on the changes is encoded and distributed in lexical semantics of the contrasted languages.

Discussion: There are four types of lexical semantic derivation models: componential-combinatorial (semantic shifts in semantic components and their configurations), integral-situational (semantic shifts in situation participants and their relations), topological-schematic (semantic shifts in image-schematic concepts) and complex-constructional (semantic shifts in complex constructions). The paper concludes that the contrasted languages may apply to any of the models. The differences are observed in the ways the models are explicated in the contrasted languages.

Keywords: semantic derivation, semantic shifts, model of situation, situation participant, tertium comparationis, cross-linguistic.

Vitae

Oleh Demenchuk is Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Romance and Germanic Philology at Rivne State University of Humanities. His areas of research interests include contrastive and typological linguistics, cognitive linguistics, functional linguistics, and linguistic semantics.

Correspondence: oleh.demenchuk@gmail.com

Надійшла до редакції 13 січня 2023 року
Рекомендована до друку 28 січня 2023 року