

доступу: <https://zbruc.eu/node/114247> (дата звернення: 8.01.2023).

3. Марасюк С. Дослідження взаємозв'язку категорій «етнос», «нація», «держава» в контексті процесів державотворення. *Актуальні проблеми державного управління*, 1 (31), 2008. С. 45–51.

4. Масенко Л. Т. Мова і суспільство. Постколоніальний вимір. Київ: КМ Академія, 2004.

5. Панасенко Г. С. Розвиток мовних конфліктів у сучасній Україні. *Сучасне суспільство : політичні науки, соціологічні науки, культурологічні науки*: зб. наук. праць / Харківський національний педагогічний університет імені Г. С. Сковороди. Харків, 2017. Вип. 2 (14). С. 157-174.

UDC 81'37

Oleh DEMENCHUK

Doctor of Philology

Head of the Department of Romance and Germanic Philology

Rivne State University of Humanities

LEXICAL SEMANTIC DERIVATION MODELS REVISITED

The modern theory of Linguistic Semantics advocates the necessity and expediency to model the contents of linguistic items through a sampling of a multidimensional situation concept. The concept is thought to represent the dynamics of a certain situation or its fragment, which is the result of conceptualisation of different worldview strategies.

Semantic derivation is one of the aspects that reveals the dynamic nature of a linguistic item. As a dynamic phenomenon, semantic derivation is considered in terms of semantic shift models that 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 (B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk; E. Sweetser; E. Traugott & R. Dasher) to compositional (J. Pustejovsky), constructional (A. Goldberg), cognitive (A. Barcelona), contrastive and typological (M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm) approaches.

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) situation concept is a lexical representation of a situation or its fragment; c) 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) situation concept reveals the features of internal (realised within the boundaries of a concept) and external (directed to other concepts) extensions; f) there are similarities and differences in the ways various languages construe a situation or its fragment. Within those prerequisites, cross-linguistic studies 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*) of semantic derivation – it is a MODEL OF SITUATION. As a metalanguage construct, the model is supposed to reveal 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 as a standard that represents the content of a linguistic item through a sampling of a multidimensional concept that 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’ ” [1, p. 12].

Semantic derivation is not just reduced to obvious polysemy (ambiguity that provides for a static combination of the source and target senses, 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.

The performed investigation appeals to the conceptions that uphold the idea of a dynamic conceptualisation of the world of discourse (of a certain situation or its fragment). The dynamic approach towards a lexical item’s semantics elaborates upon the system of lexical semantic derivation models – theoretical constructs that represent the dynamic potential of a lexical item, claiming various types of semantic associations that underlie the development of a lexical item’s semantic paradigm.

As to a cross-linguistic study, four types of lexical semantic derivation models are relevant to be considered: componential-combinatorial (semantic shift correspondences in the aspect of semantic components and their configurations), integral-situational (semantic shift correspondences in the aspect of situation participants and their relations), topological-schematic (semantic shift correspondences in the aspect of image-schematic concepts) and complex-constructional (semantic shift correspondences in the aspect of complex constructions).

The models reveal the ways the information on the worldview changes is encoded and distributed in lexical semantics of the contrasted languages. We posit

that the contrasted languages may apply to any of the models. The differences may be observed in the ways the models are explicated in the contrasted 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 necessary to carry out further research into semantic derivation modelling within the lexico-typological aspect. The choice of the aspect is determined by the tendency of modern lexical semantic studies to a profound analysis of semantic shifts in related and non-related languages.

REFERENCES

1. Mel'čuk I. Semantics. From meaning to text. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2015. 546 p.

UDC 81'373.6:811.111

Iryna MASLO

Assistant Lecturer of the Department of Foreign Languages

Sofiia BASALKA

2nd-year student of Geodesy and Land Management

*National University of Water and
Environmental Engineering, Rivne*

THE ORIGIN OF THE WORD «EARTH»

Almost every language has its own name for our planet ‘EARTH’. It is called ‘Aarde’ in Dutch, ‘Dünya’ in Turkish, ‘Erde’ in German, ‘Terra’ in Italian and Portuguese, ‘Terre’ in French, ‘Tierra’ in Spanish, ‘Земля’ in Ukrainian, ‘Země’ in Czech, ‘Ziemia’ in Polish. The common or basic idea in all languages is that, they were all derived from the same meaning in origin, which is ‘ground’ or ‘soil’ [2].

The modern English word and name of our planet ‘Earth’ appeared 1,000 years ago. The English language is descended from the Anglo-Saxons (Germanic inhabitants of England) with the migration of some Germanic tribes from the continent to Britain in the fifth century AD. The word ‘earth’ came from the Anglo-Saxon word ‘erda’ and its German equivalent ‘erde’, meaning ‘ground’ or ‘soil’. In Old English this word became ‘eor(th)e’ or ‘ertha’ [3].

There is also speculation that the origins of this word may be from the Indo-European language base ‘er’. This basis gave more modern adaptations of the word used in languages today. However, it is certain that Earth is the only one planet that did not come from Greco-Roman mythology. All other planets in our solar system were named after Greek and Roman gods and goddesses.

Other modern popular terms for ‘earth’ came from the Latin language. ‘Terra’ means ‘land’, the land you stand on, farm or otherwise interact with. This is where we get the modern English words ‘terrestrial’, ‘subterranean’, ‘extraterrestrial’ and