

2. Воробьев, В.В. (1997). *Лингвокультурология: теория и методы: учебник* (с. 331). Москва.
3. Давидченко, І. Д. (2018). *Формування лінгвокультурологічної компетентності майбутніх вихователів дошкільних навчальних закладів*. Дис. канд. пед. наук. ДВНЗ “Донбаський державний педагогічний університет”. Слов’янськ.
4. Зиновьева, Е. И., Юрков, Е. Е. (2009). *Лингвокультурология: теория и практика*. (с. 292). Санкт-Петербург: ООО “Издательский дом “МИРС””.
5. Маслова, В. А. (2001). *Лингвокультурология: Учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений* (с. 204). Москва: Академия.
6. Мельник, Т. В. (2002). *Розвивальні завдання з розвитку образного мовлення (5–9 кл.): метод. рекомендації* (с. 46). Севастополь: Ребест.
7. Селіванова, О. О. (2008). *Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми: підручник* (с. 717). Київ: Довкілля.

O. V. Demenchuk,
Professor of the Department of Romance and Germanic Philology
Rivne State University of Humanities

LEXICAL SEMANTIC DERIVATION MODELS IN A TYPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

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.

According to the original hypothesis, the modelling of a lexical item's semantics is realized through a sampling of alternative, hierarchically established semantic dimensions. On that ground, the models of semantic derivation are interpreted as theoretical constructs that represent the ways a certain situation or its fragment is conceptualized.

The ***purpose*** of the paper is to characterize the types of lexical semantic derivation models and to establish the ways they are explicated in related and non-related languages.

The study of lexical semantic derivation focuses on a number of methodological prerequisites: a) lexical semantics encodes information in a format of situation concept; b) situation concept is a lexical representation of a certain situation or its fragment; c) situation concept is multidimensional as it represents different interpretations of a situation or its fragment; d) multidimensionality of situation concept provides for various ways of its lexical representation; e) situation concept reveals the features of internal (realized within the boundaries of a certain 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.

We single out four types of lexical semantic derivation models: componential-combinatorial, integral-situational, topological-schematic and complex-constructional.

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. 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" (Lyon, 1968).

Within a situational approach, semantic description focuses on diathesis alternations that provide for the transformations in a predicate structure configuration due to the changes observed in the participants and their relations. 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 that permit the expression of significant generalisations) correlations (Van Valin & LaPolla, 1997), underlying the actantial derivation strategies. 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.

The topological approach towards meaning represents the idea of a “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 thought” (Johnson, 2005). The topological strategies of semantic derivation are realized in the aspect of basic image-schema transformations.

The constructional approach focuses on the idea of a “mixed” representation of lexical item’s semantics, which is associated with the elaboration of a knowledge representation inner structure. 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).

Conclusions. The performed investigation appeals to the conceptions that uphold the idea of a dynamic conceptualization of the world of discourse (of a certain 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 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.

We single out four types of lexical semantic derivation models. The models reveal the ways the information on the worldview changes is encoded and distributed in lexical semantics of related and non-related languages. The study concludes that languages may apply to any of the models. The differences are 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 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. Goldberg, A. (1995). *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure* (p. 203). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
2. Johnson, M. (2005). The philosophical significance of image schemas. In: B. Hampe (ed.), *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 15-34). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter. (p. 18).
3. Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics* (p. 58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Van Valin, R., & LaPolla, R. (1997). *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function* (p. 91). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

О. В. Дзикович,
доцентка кафедри теорії, практики та перекладу німецької мови
КПІ ім. Ігоря Сікорського

СТРАТЕГІЇ ЧИТАННЯ У НАУКОВИХ РОЗВІДКАХ

Основним інструментом пізнання під час дослідницьких робіт та наукових пошуків є інформування з інших сторонніх джерел, аналіз цієї інформації, синтез, інтерпретація, обробка та екстраполяція на поставлену мету дослідження. Таке зібрання інформації відбувається головним чином завдяки читанню. Проблематика ‘ефективного читання’ в освіті та науці неодноразово