Some tendences for the development of Slavic lexicons from the standpoint of cognitive diachronic onomasiology

Natalia Ivashyna and Alena Rudenka

The article represents the ideas of cognitive diachronic onomasiology. A comprehensive onomasiological approach to the names of the day has been adopted here. A link between a source concept and a target concept, as well as means of creation of new naming units were found. Also, the means of conceptualization of Slavic words with the meanings 'explain' and 'teach' and the frequency of such means are analyzed.

Keywords: *cognitive diachronic onomasiology, model of conceptualization, competition of conceptual models, naming, Slavic languages.*

1. Introduction

A new branch of the linguistic research – cognitive diachronic onomasiology – has been chosen as a theoretical methodological platform in the article. Cognitive onomasiology is based on the assumption that investigating the processes of nomination, its stages, pecularities and regularities helps to understand the mechanisms of verbal thinking. Diachronic cognitive onomasiology establishes a correspondence between the stages of nomination and time sequence of facts recorded in the history of language.

There exist a number of linguistic observations, diachronic in particular, which possess a high potential for generalization. On the other hand, modern explanatory theories are often criticized for being wordy as they lack empirical evidence which show how the theory 'works'.

Though a lot of language phenomena have already been given attention to by linguists, today these phenomena are "rediscovered" to be reinterpreted (or interpreted for the first time) in a wide scientific context. On the other hand, a number of modern concepts, for example, logical-semantic or cognitive-semantic ones were created without observing any particular language phenomena (which is reasonable as all the phenomena of similar nature cannot serve as empirical evidence for theory foundation; on the contrary, a theory should explain a maximal number of similar phenomena which did not initially comprise its basis).

Historical onomasiology provides abundant empirical evidence for study within the frame of modern theoretical research. According to Andreas Blank and Peter Koch (Blank and Koch 1999: 11), who rank among the founders of cognitive diachronic onomasiology,

> combining diachronic lexicology with onomasiology and applying it to more than only one or a few languages can enable us to show empirically which conceptualizations are proper to a single or very few speech communities and which can be found universally and thus may match with a biological predisposition of man in perceiving the world. Cognitive onomasiology then can procure us deeper insight into the way our mind works.

According to Kubriakova, it is important to bear in mind that "prior to the act of naming a mental structure should be formed which is looking for its formal representation" (Kubriakova 1997: 43). That is why, while investigating the content of naming units, the

representatives of cognitive diachronic onomasiology work within the conceptual rather than semantic framework.

In the present article the authors applied a model of complex cognitive onomasiological research proposed by Blank.

2. Slavic names of the day: onomasiological approach

2.1 Cognitive diachronic onomasiology as a research tool

The relations between a target concept (the meaning of a nominative unit formed as a result of act of naming), a source concept (the meaning of the initial naming unit) and words expressing the target and source concepts may be understood and described in the best way if we combine semantic typology of new naming units, based on the semantic relations between target and source concepts, with onomatological typology which proposes means and ways of creating the form of a new naming unit.

Blank writes that "these types of lexical innovation … rely semantically on a small set of associative relations between source and target concepts" (Blank, Koch 1999: 12-13). All associative relations can be reduced to the three main principles of remembering: similarity, contrast and contiguity. The essence and novelty of Blank and Koch's idea is that not only conceptual relations between source and target concepts but also ways of concept naming (morphological derivation including different types of compounding, semantic derivation, conversion, idiom formation, borrowing, etc.) can be found, which allows to conduct comprehensive onomasiological research.

The article deals with the names of the day[1] in the Slavic languages. The formation of these naming units, their development from the Common Slavic Unity up to the present day, and formation of the lexemes belonging to the concept 'twenty-four hours' are analyzed.

2.2 *дьнь и *ноктъ in Slavic languages

The semantic group comprising the names of parts of the day has a structure similar to that of the seasons' names: a four-member paradigm (*дьнь – *ноктъ – *jutro – *večerъ) was preceded by a two-member paradigm with the opposition *дьнь – *ноктъ, where *ноктъ was a marked member of the opposition.

It is known that Slav. *дьнь and *ноктъ follow Indo-European naming units denoting light and dark parts of the day (*dei-en- and *nek̥ʰ-(t), *nok̥ʰ-t-s). They are closed and semantically stable. Stability is a characteristic of Indo-European words denoting night: almost all the languages have the same meaning, variations are few.

The Slavs counted calendar days in accordance with the day-time or, in other words, by the light part of the day. The night, which was a border between days, was in the position of neutralization. The usage of the lexeme *дьнь as a measuring unit led to the formation of the notion of continuousness between two days, since the neutralization of the opposition 'day-time – night-time' allowed later on to present 'day' and 'night' as parts of one whole.

The day of the Slavs started in the morning, not at night, as it was among other Indo-Europeans (the Greeks counted calendar days from evening to evening, the Romans – from midnight to midnight). If necessary, the night was considered to be a part of the previous day (Stepanov 1915, 2: 18). Later on Christianity brought the Biblical notion of the day: и бысть

вечер и бысть утро, день един (Gen. 1, 5) which remained alien to the Slavs for a long time.

Interestingly, the Slavs used the word **дьнь* to count twenty-four hour days while ancient Indo-Europeans used nights for this purpose. In fact, not only Indo-Europeans counted days in terms of night. This way is known to the majority of peoples of the world. Choosing night as a means of counting calendar days is explained by the fact that the Moon was a chronometer of the primitive calendar (Schrader 1917-1923, 1929: 504-505). As a result, in the calendar of the ancient Slavs the Sun played a more important role than the Moon. However, M. Nilsson argues that Indians and Australians do not use night to count days, but they use the word *dream* which has no relation to the Moon. In his opinion, night is used for counting calendar days as it is the time of rest, a whole, and is thought of as the moment on the time axis (the same is true for counting years by winters) (Nilsson 1920: 17). Apparently, it is more likely that the way of time counting depended on the role that a certain season and time of the day played in life and way of thinking of a people. The Indo-European way of time counting by winters and nights dates back to a very ancient epoch of the primitive communal system. Of course, for primitive people the most difficult periods were winter and night. This time bore danger. Thus, it has special importance for the primitive man whose life was a struggle for survival.

Changes of people's way and view of life inevitably lead to the transformation into the system of concepts and their manifestation in language. For the Slavs, who were farmers, unlike their predecessors - Indo-Europeans, day-time and summer were the most important and difficult times as these periods were related to physical work. As a result they chose day-time and summer to count calendar days and years.

There is another interesting regularity connected with Indo-European way of time counting by nights. When day and night are mentioned together, night is always in pre-position (similarly, everywhere the enumeration of seasons starts with winter). This pecularity O. Schrader extends over Old Slavic *noštedьnije* (Schrader 1917-1923, 1929: 505). However, the situation was different with the Slavs. Together with the forms *noštedьnь*, *noštedьnьstvo* there also existed forms with the reverse order – *dьnonoštije*. In collocation **дьнь i noktь *noktь* was in post-position. Therefore, this tendency does not only contradict the Slavic way of time counting but supports it. In addition, in the most ancient texts the collocation **дьнь i noktь* was often used in the meaning 'always', 'constantly', 'permanently'. This expression exists in modern Slavic languages as well. Psycholinguistic experiments also show that these lexemes are semantically close. One of the most frequent responses to the stimulus *day* is *night* and vice versa.

In the Common Slavic language these words formed a polar conceptual field. Subordination relations did not exist because the generic term 'day' in comparison with 'day' and 'night' as its parts had not been formed yet.

2.3 *'A day'* → *'a twenty-four hours day'* in Slavic languages

In dictionaries of the Old Slavic languages 'twenty-four hour day' is presented as one of the meanings of the word **дьнь*. Is it really so? Apparently, the concept of a twenty-four hour day had not been formed by the appearance of written language. However, the most ancient texts observed the tendency towards the appearance of the meaning 'twenty-four hour day' on the basis of the lexeme **дьнь*. At that time the difference between the function of an interval and that of a unit of measurement began to appear. The usage of the word in the

function of a measurement unit demonstrated the tendency that determined a further semantic development of Slav. *dьnь. *Dьnь was initially an ordinal, not a cardinal measurement unit. The sequence of days reflected the process itself, to be more precise, the result of counting: *третий д%нь сумьреть* (Kotkov 1965: 195 back, 7). At the same time *dьnь did not lose its qualitative nature and continued to be perceived as qualitative and specific.

Scientific literature on twenty-four hour day parts emphasizes the idea that a twenty-four hour day was alien to the Common Slavic epoch. *Dьnь and *noktь are viewed as different elements which could not comprise a single unit (Koperzhinskii 1909: 31; Stepanov 1909: 4). However, this assumption is not quite correct: not the idea of a twenty-four hour day itself but the opposition 'day' – 'a twenty-four hour day' was alien to the ancient Slavs.

Probably, the very question concerning the differentiation of the meanings 'day' and 'twenty-four hour day' in the Old Slavic texts is not put correctly. It would be more correct to distinguish between the two functions of the Slav. *dьnь: the function of an interval and the function of a measurement unit. *Dьnь was an unmarked member of the paradigm. Thus, it is more homogeneous, with some semantic diffuseness and a possibility to perform different functions. Owning to the fact that *dьnь is an unmarked member, it had several functions and in the context it had various functional loads. This can also explain the fact why Sreznevskij mentions eight meanings of the word *dьнь*: 1. 'day as opposed to night', 2. 'twenty-four hours', 3. 'time of journey', 4. 'daylight work, work in general, activity, 5. 'time, season', 6. 'life', 7. 'weather', 8. 'holiday'. According to SJS, there are seven meanings of this word, three of them are the main meanings: 1. 'day as opposed to night', 2. 'twenty-four hours', 3. 'certain, fixed time'. All these meanings should be defined as functional or contextual ones because they are based on the functions in which the lexeme *dьnь could be used. Moreover, these meanings are of Greek origin and reveal semantic variations of the Greek word ἡμέρα.

Polysemy caused by the polyfunctionality like this was sometimes eliminated in language by means of formal differentiation. For instance, in the Slavic written records *dьnь was used to denote distance. The concept 'a day's run' is very ancient; it indicates the syncretism of space and time concepts. This way of measuring distance is common for image-bearing thinking (Nilsson 1920: 12).

In the Old Russian language the form *dьnище* 'a day's run' (together with *dьнь*) appeared to distinguish temporal and metrological meanings.

*Dьnь has the same semantic development as *lěto 'summer' → 'year'. The analogy is evident: the cyclic sequence as the basis for the name transfer, polyfuctionality, the stage when the meanings co-existed, and one meaning is formed on the basis of another, and finally, the tendency towards the differentiation of meanings.

However, the process of semantic transformation 'summer' → 'year' was much faster. A new sememe had been formed by the time when the Common Slavic Unity drifted apart, and thus, the tendency to meaning differentiation of Slav. *lěto appeared.

The tendency to differentiate the meanings of the lexeme *dьnь was not fully realized as some Slavic languages did not have a word for the concept 'twenty-four hours'. Thus, the process of semantic changes of Slav. *dьnь cannot be considered as completed. There exist potential possibilities for further lexical-semantic transformations.

A slow pace of the semantic development of Slav. *dьnь can be objectively explained. A day and night are short and thus they are obvious time markers. There is no need to unite them while counting, it is enough to count days (or nights, as the majority of ancient Indo-Europeans did).

A year is quite long. So, counting by seasons is not convenient because the concept of season is rather subtle. A year is perceived as a whole and chosen as a unit of measurement.

Thus, the Slavic languages depict two ways of semantic transformation 'day' → 'twenty-four hour day'. Not being precise while describing the mathematical notion of partially ordered set, it is possible to view lexemes *день, ночь* and *сутки* as a set comprising three elements which can be marked as follows: D – 'day', N – 'night', C – 'twenty-four hours'. D is a part of a cycle and an unmarked unit. N is marked as compared to D, C is the combination of D and N.

Analyzing the relations between the three elements and ignoring their contents, we can have the equalities $D = \rho_{min}$ (D, N); $C = \rho_{max}$ (D, N) that are similar to the smallest and largest elements in a partially ordered set of three elements used in the structure theory (Birkhoff 1952: 16-18). However, in this case the symbols are understood not quantitatively but as a chronological sequence of changes and possibilities of realization of a certain type of semantic development.

ρ_{min} (D, N) is the initial and only possible way of semantic transformations at the first stage. This possibility was realized in all Indo-European languages. Moreover, the relation $D = \rho_{min}$ (D, N) is probably universal for the semantic shift 'day' → 'twenty-four hours'.

ρ_{max} (D, N) is a later and semantically secondary way of development. It means using a different word for the concept 'twenty-four hour day'.

Thus, the following lexico-semantic universals may be presumably formulated:

1. If a language has a word denoting the night-time, it also has a word denoting the day-time.

2. If a language has a word denoting the twenty-four hour day, it also has a word denoting the day-time.

2.4 *Slavic names of the day within the framework of cognitive diachronic onomasiology*

In order to define the relations between the concepts 'day' and 'twenty-four hour day' in the modern Slavic languages three groups of words can be distinguished:

1. (D, N) → D (Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Czech, Slovak, Upper Sorbian, Lower Sorbian, Kashubian, Polabian);
2. (D, N) → D + N (Bulgarian, Macedonian);
3. (D, N) → C (Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian, Polish).

The fact that the first group of words (with the presence or absence of the second and third types) was to a different extent preserved in many languages may be considered as the peculiarity of all Slavic as well as other Indo-European languages (a typological law). The use of the lexeme **дьнь* in the function of a measurement unit, which gave an impulse to the realization of (D, N) → D type in the modern Slavic languages, caused the preservation of words of this sort. **дьнь* is atill an unmarked member of the parAdigm, consequently, this element can bear the feature of meaning combination.

According to A. Blank's cognitive onomasiological typology, the way of semantic development of Common Slavic **дьнь* 'daylight' → 'twenty-four hour day' is a typical conceptual contiguity (source and target concepts are metonymically related) realized through semantic derivation.

Strictly speaking, the second and third groups depict one and the same tendency of semantic development, in other words, two stages of this development. The second type depicts a transition stage when the concept is verbalized descriptively via the enumeration of its constituent components. The synthetic method of expressing the idea of a twenty-four hour day displays critical thinking. Designations of this sort can be found in the Old Slavic written records: *и с̧кошася два дни и дв̧ нощи* (Shakhmatov 1962: 6851). Nowadays the descriptive equivalent of a twenty-four hour day exists in the languages which have no word to denote this concept.

The final stage of the second type of word development occured in the form of A combination of constituent components into a single lexical unit. This stage is presented by Old Russ. *нощедьнь, нощвдьньство, нощедьница, дьноноштид*, Bulg. *денонощие* and Maced. *деноноќие*. See also: Lett. *diennakts*, Tadjik. *шабо-наруз*, etc.

In this case the contiguity between source and target concepts takes place. Moreover, this is not only conceptual, but also syntagmatic contiguity. In the Old Russian and Old Slavic languages this metonymic relation is verbalized with the help of an idiom, in the modern Bulgarian and Macedonian languages through compounding.

The third group of naming units means using a different word to denote the concept 'twenty-four hour day'. For example, Russ. *сутки*, Blr. *сутк*, Ukr. *доба* and Pol. *doba*. This way of semantic development is realized in few languages, however, it does not mean that the type (D, N) → C is lexically redundant. On the contrary, the fact that the Russ. *сутки* was borrowed by the neighbouring peoples (Ossetic *суткæ*, Kirghiz *сутка*, Moldov. *sutkə*, etc.) indicates the necessity to fix and verbalize the concept.

Let us view the history of East. Slav. *сутки* in detail, since this word is a good illustration of a new sememe formation process.

Сутки in the meaning 'a period of time that equals twenty-four hours' exists in the Russian and Belorusian languages. It is difficult to state the precise time of the appearence of this naming unit in the Eastern Slavic languages. For the first time it was mentioned in the Russian Cellarius in the year 1771. However, for A. S. Pushkin, whose language formed in the 1810s, it was a well-known word: in the vocabulary of Pushkin's language it is mentioned as many as 29 times (Vinogradov 1961, 3). It is obvious that half a century is not enough for a word to become widely used in a language. Probably, the word *сутки* in its temporal meaning appeared in the Eastern Slavic languages not later than in the 17th century.

In the Old Russian language of the 16th century *сутокъ, сутъкъ* had the meaning 'union; borderline' (Sreznevskii 1903, 3). In the Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian dialects space meanings of this word and its variants remained: 'angle', 'front angle', 'narrow path', 'mouth of a river', 'confluence', etc. (see Tseitlin for further information on the meanings of East. Slav. *сутки* (Tseitlin 1959: 233-235)). *Сутки* has a temporal meaning 'twilight' only in the dialects within Nizhni Novgorod region. V. Dal gives examples with the same sememe 'twilight': *сутемёнки, сутéмки, су́темъ, су́теменъ, су́тиски, су́тычки* (Dal 1981, 4). Compare also Blr. reg. *сутонне, сутонак* 'twilight', *сутонець, сутуняцца, сутэняці* 'to get dark' (Krapiva 1962; Sciashkovich 1972). The meaning 'twilight' is especially important as it gives the possibility to reconstruct the transformation of the space meaning of 'сутки' into a temporal one. Buslaev is the first to give a correct estimate of the relations between the meanings of the word *сутки*, classifying it as "the most prominent example of space-time transformation" (Buslaev 1959: 297).

The development of East. Slav. *сутки* can be presented as follows: 'something adjoining (about objects in space)' → 'the time between day and night' (metaphor) → 'combination of day and night' (conceptual contiguity – synecdoche).

As far as word-formation is concerned, the analogy with the lexeme *сумерки* is obvious: *су-тьк-и / су-мерк-и*, pluralia tantum nouns formed with the prefix *sǫ-*. At the last stages of development directly connected with temporal semantics only semantic derivation occured.

In all Modern and Old Slavic languages derivatives of the stem *dob-* are found, which allows to reconstruct a wide net of meanings for the Common Slavic **doba*: 'benefit', 'method, manner', 'fit', 'resemblance, similarity of face or character', 'degree', 'suitable time', 'good opportunity, circumstance, situation', 'period of time', 'season', 'period, term', 'age (epoch)', 'age (of a person)', 'twenty-four hours', 'hour', 'weather'.

The most ancient examples of the usage of the lexeme **doba* in its temporal meaning are found in the Old Czech written records. For example, the following expressions with the lexeme in its temporal meaning: *v tu dobu, v jednu dobu, v takú dobu, v kú dobu*, etc.

The sememe 'period of time' is widely presented in the Slavic language area, however, the extension of meaning differs from language to language. For example, in Bulgarian and Macedonian the semantics of the lexeme is characterized by such additional differenciative features as 'time, usually night-time' (Romanski 1954, 1). The Zagreb dictionary gives a wide meaning of the Serb.-Croat. *doba* – 'time when something is happening' (Danichich 1880, I).

Com. Slav. **doba* < IE **dhabh-* 'join in a proper way, match' (Pokorny 1949-1959) and semantic development of the meaning 'twenty-four hour day', apparently took place as follows: 'good opportunity, circumstance, situation', 'suitable time' → 'period of time' → 'period of time equal to day and night'. Here, as well as in the previous examples, metonymy verbalized through semantic derivation plays the leading role.

Metonymy prevails in the nomination of a twenty-four hour day in the Slavic languages, moreover, all three models are presented. One of them, the most ancient and widespread, is based on 'part–whole' relations with the day-time. Another model is based on the conceptual and syntagmatic contiguity of light and dark periods which form a twenty-four hour day. The third model is built on synecdoche: contiguity with the concepts 'border of day and night' or 'period of time'. At the same time, the second and third models are not used in all Slavic languages. According to Blank and Koch (1999: 11), "universally recurrent conceptualization" is not found in any language of the world. First, there are always some speech communities that, for some reason or another, prefer a cognitively unprivileged way of conceptualization of a certain concept. Second, several cognitively salient ways of conceptualization may coexist and compete with each other.

Research in the field of diachronic onomasiology is valuable, since it allows comparing the productivity of different conceptual models. It is known that human cognition is based on several basic mental operations. They are the key ones in the naming process. Conducting historical and semantic research on the basis of a wide range of languages it is possible to define universal and culturally-specific models of conceptualization.

3. Slavic words with the meaning 'to explain' and 'to teach': onomasiological approach

3.1 *Competition of conceptual models as a research tool*

Let us consider the phenomenon of the competition of conceptual models. This idea was formulated not only within the framework of cognitive diachronic onomasiology (in the form it is stated above), but also within the framework of conceptual (cognitive, basic) metaphor.

Conceptual metaphor is a popular area of linguistic and lingua-cultural research nowadays. By conceptual metaphor we understand the establishment of a relation between two different frames on the basis of similarity of some of their features.

It is typical of conceptual metaphors to exist for a long time as models of the development of metaphor frame, i.e. they serve as the basis for the establishment of new particular conceptual structures and relations based on a certain model of metaphorization. In language all this is revealed through: a) similarity of the syntagmatic environment of lexemes which name the concepts of the compared frames; b) a possibility to generate an endless number of utterances, built on the basis of the given model of metaphorization, which describe the metaphorized area of knowledge.

There is no need to explain this notion in detail – we may refer to numerous works in this area (Jäkel 1997; Lakoff 1999: 51-71, etc.).

Lakoff, a remarkable scientist in the area of conceptual metaphor and a founder of this research programme, argues that one and the same conceptual target domain may be linked by different and not connected with each other (sometimes even contradictory) metaphors (Lakoff 1999: 51-71). Following him, Jäkel writes that metaphors offer only partial description and explanation of the conceptual target domain, moreover, some aspects are revealed and some are shaded. It is in focusing that the difference between alternative metaphors linking one and the same target domain lies (Jäkel 1997: 2-3), in other words, the competition of different basic metaphors takes place when one and the same conceptual target domain is being presented (= explained).

The comparison of the two ideas mentioned above shows that in this case the generation, organization and interrelation of conceptual spheres (= frames = conceptual domains) within the framework of a conceptual system transforms into the sphere of onomasiology which pays a great attention to the earlier stages of the naming process.

Comparison – transfer – metaphor as the mechanism of generation of new concepts and their names is relevant both for the individual and collective consciousness. The competition of different conceptual metaphors, as well as the competition of naming units based on different ways of conceptualization, is the consequence of the fact that the universal cognitive comparison operation may be carried out on different grounds.

How does this competition in the processes of naming become apparent?

1) in synchrony of one language – due to the presence of names of one and the same concept, the names based on different ways of conceptualization;

2) in diachrony of one language – due to the presence of different names of one and the same concept at the successive stages of language development;

3) in synchrony of different languages – due to the presence of names of one and the same concept, names based on different ways of conceptualization in kindred languages.

3.2 *'To explain' and 'to research' in Slavic languages*

The competing ways of naming mentioned above may be demonstrated in the Slavic languages.

Let us consider causative verbs of understanding and knowledge that belong to different stages of development of the Belarusian language, in particular the lexemes with the meaning 'to explain' and 'to teach'.

3.2.1 *Models of conceptualization of the meaning 'to explain' at different stages of the development of the Belarusian language*

The lexical-semantic group of understanding both in the Modern and Old Belarusian (XIV-XVIII cc.) languages is rich in causatives. The meaning 'to explain' in modern language is represented by the lexemes *агаварыц//ца(-ь), асвятліць, асвяціць, арыентаваць, выкладаць, дэталізаваць, каменціраваць, канкрэтызаваць, матываваць, папулярызаваць, паясніць, прапагандаваць, праясніць, разжаваць, талкаваць, тлумачыць, трактаваць, убіць* (colloq.), *удзяўбці* (colloq.). The majority of the lexemes given here and below are polysemantic, and 'to explain' is one of their meanings.

In the Old Belarusian language the words of this kind are fewer: *выказати, выкладати, объяснити, тлумачити, толковати, толмачити, трактовати* – mainly because of the existence of the newest borrowings in the language of the XX century (*арыентаваць, дэталізаваць, каменціраваць, канкрэтызаваць, матываваць, папулярызаваць, прапагандаваць*), and the development of the semantic transfer 'to make it light, well seen' → 'to explain' (*асвятліць, асвяціць, праясніць*, etc. when the lexeme *объяснити* disappeared from the language), and the new way of motivation 'to hammer in, to 'drum' into (smb.'s head)' → 'to explain' (*убіць, удзяўбці*). In Old Belarusian *выкладати, тлумачити, трактовати* were borrowings. The other verbs *выказати, толковати, толмачити,* except the dominant of the row *объяснити,* are inseparably linked with the semantics of speaking: either by a motivating lexical-semantic variant (*выказати*) or because of the meaning of other lexical-semantic variants and their own meanings at the previous stages of development, or due to the intergrity of the naming and speaking processes (*толмачити* 'to explain' ← 'to interpret' < *толмачъ* 'an interpreter' < com. Slav. **тълмачь* < Turkic **тълмачь* (Vasmer 1987, IV: 72); *толковати* < *толкъ* < com. Slav. **тълкъ*, kin. Ir. *ad-tluch* 'to thank', 'to ask for smth', Lat. *loquor, locūtus sum, loquī* 'to speak, to name, to say', etc.) (Vasmer 1987, IV: 71).

Interestingly, the verb *расширити* is used not only in the meaning 'to make known to everybody' that is similar to Mod. Blr. *пашырыць*, but also in the meaning 'to expound, to explain': *Златооустъ написалъ и расширил в рёчох истинноую правду* (Чэцця, 157).[2]

Thus, three semantic transfers participate in the naming process of the notion 'to explain' in the Modern and Old Belarusian languages. They present three conceptual schemes 'to speak' → 'to explain', 'to make it bright, well seen' → 'to explain', 'to make a physical action, changing spatial parameters of smth.' → 'to explain'.

Much is written about the common tendency of the naive language consciousness to describe the processes of acquiring information in terms of movement in space. It should be noted though that spatial parameters do not actively participate in the formation of the concept 'to explain' at different stages of the Belarusian language development (see O. Blr. *расширити*, Mod. Blr. *убіць, удзяўбці*). The transfer on the basis of speaking prevails in Old

Belarusian, while in Modern Belarusian the one on the basis of the semantics of light is predominant.

In general the semantics of light plays a rather remarkable role in the formation of causatives of explanation and teaching. If the meaning 'make bright, well seen' motivates 'to explain', then 'to make dark, badly seen' motivates 'to confuse, to make unintelligible' (see O. Blr. *баламутити, мутити*; Mod. Blr. *марочыць, муціць, туманіць, цямніць*). Besides, in this case (and also to a lesser degree) we deal with a competing conceptualization by means of spatial notions (e.g., Mod. Blr. *блытаць*).

3.2.2. *Models of conceptualization of the meaning 'to teach' at different stages of the development of the Belarusian language*
In Modern Belarusian the lexical-semantic group with the general meaning 'to teach' besides prefixal derivatives *вучыць* includes the verbs *выкладаць, убіць* (colloq.), *удзяўбці* (colloq.), *наставіць* 'to teach' + 'to pass experience', *адукаваць* 'to teach' + 'to introduce to a culture'; *выхаваць, развіць, цывілізаваць* 'to develop the spiritual world, to introduce to a culture'; *арыентаваць, інструктаваць, практыкаваць, спецыялізаваць, трэніраваць, спецыялізаваць, трэніраваць*. These verbs denote the transmission of special knowledge and skills and form the periphery of the group of the verbs of teaching.

The verb *учити* bears the general meaning in the lexical-semantic group of Old Belarusian causatives of teaching. The group includes prefixal formations, as well as the verbs *выдавати, выкладати*; the same semantics with the element of passing experience the verbs *вразумити, напомнити, наставити, напомянути* have. The words *будовати, воспитати, выховати, осветити, цвичити* had the meaning 'to bring up, to educate, to enlighten' was denoted by, thus, this meaning was more active in Old Belarusian, but the lexemes meaning 'to pass special knowledge' did not exist in the language.

We excluded from the analysis of motivation of the verbs of teaching borrowings and calques (Mod. Blr. *адукаваць, развіць* (Fr. calque *developper*), *цывілізаваць, арыентаваць, інструктаваць, практыкаваць, спецыялізаваць, трэніраваць, выхаваць* (< O. Blr. *выховати*), *выкладаць* (< O. Blr. *выкладати*), O. Blr. *цвичити*; the meaning 'to teach, to bring up', 'to motivate' of O. Blr. *будовати* developed on the Belarusian ground, though in its first meaning 'to built' (the verb was borrowed from Polish) as well as words with the first intellectual meaning (Mod. Blr. *вучыць* < O. Blr. *учити*, O. Blr. *напомнити, напомянути*). Among other verbs of teaching there are both conceptualized on the basis of spatial notions (Mod. Blr. *наставіць* < O. Blr. *наставити* and already mentioned *убіць, удзяўбці*) and on the basis of designations of light (O. Blr. *осветити*).

Other conceptual metaphors as the mechanism of transfer and other conceptual spheres as the source of transfer can also participate in the process of naming concepts of explanation and teaching. The source concept O. Blr. *выдавати* – transfer of property; O. Blr. *будовати* – building (the transfer 'to form, to improve a building' → 'to form, to improve a person'), O. Blr. *воспитати* 'to provide with food' → 'to provide with spiritual food', *вразумити* < *разумъ* < *умъ* < O. Rus. *умъ* < Proslav. **итъ* < I. E. **ou-mos* > Hitt. *au-, auš-* 'to see' (Trubachiov 1959: 154-157), i.e. these verbs are motivated by the semantics of perception.

The relations between the conceptual spheres of perception and thinking are worth mentioning. Neisser argues that perception is a process of matching a prototype in the long-term memory and the incoming stimulus, matching the outer and inner worlds. 'To perceive' is a frequent and natural source concept to denote thinking processes, imagination, etc. Very

often perception and thinking are syncretic, indivisible in the semantics of words, see, for example, Proslav. *videti* connected by the vowel alternation with *vĕdati* (Vasmer 1986, I: 137). In addition, lexemes with the meaning 'to see' are used in the meaning 'to understand' in many languages of the world. These relations may be observed within the studied lexical-semantic groups, in particular, Mod. Blr. *разжаваць* (colloq.) 'to explain in detail' ← 'to make it simpler for comprehension (intellectual perception), learning' ← 'to make it simpler for physiological perception, learning'. The semantics of light is systematically used as the source conceptual sphere for intellectual naming units due to some cognitive reasons: light is a condition for a better perception and, consequently, for a better intellectual activity.

In Indo-European languages the mentioned semantic transfer is mainly realized under the influence of Greek and Latin texts: the religious world outlook influenced the possibility for the intellectual lexicon to be enriched by the words with the meaning of light. The use of such Old Belarusian verbs as *осветити, просветити* with the meaning 'to teach, to educate' goes back to the earlier period. 'The verb просв̧тити (просв̧щати) (O. Rus. – A. R.), which had the first meaning 'to begin to produce light, to burn', acquired new meanings 'to pass knowledge', 'to christen', 'to glorify', 'to improve', 'to adorn'. This happened because the verb started to be used not only with the names of the sources of light (св̧ча, лучина) but with names of people... and such nouns as лице, очи, душа, манастырь, миръ. Such compatibility, that was not originally typical of the verb, is borrowed from the Greek verbs φωτίζειν, φωταγωγεῖν that, as well as O. Rus. просв̧тити, derived from the root with the meaning 'light'' (Kopylenko 1969: 96-103). Thus, the metaphoric use of these verbs that was brought by translations of religious literature (in Old Belarusian from Greek through Old Slavic, as well as through Polish or directly from Latin) originally had a relegious coloring, but later on these words began to be used in science, art, education and culture. The ideas of Enlightenment spread in Belarus earlier than in Russia. The notions 'to enlighten', 'Enlightenment', 'education' were realized with the help of the Latin root *адук-(едук-)*. That is why the semantic element of enlightenment is weakened in Modern Belarusian verbs with the meaning of light.

In Old Slavic просв̧тити apart from its first meaning 'to light, to illuminate' is used figuratively: да ты ми просв̧тиши оумъ Евх 79а 21-22. By the way, one of the meanings of O. Slav. просв̧тити is 'to return eye sight' (Staroslavianskii slovar' 1994: 525-526), i.e. 'to improve the possibility to perceive'.

3.2.3. *Models of conceptualization of the meanings 'to explain' and 'to teach' in the Old Slavic language*
The Old Slavic verbs that have the meaning 'to explain' are motivated either by the semantics of speaking – съказати (съказааше jма отъ вьсѣхъ кънигъ сже бёахэ о немь Мар. Лк. 24, 27) or inseparably connected with it – протлъковати < тлъкъ 'an interpreter' (а не зёло вьзиштэ вьходоу образа / повёдаk таибьнэ / не протлъкоуk не протлъкованааго Супр. 501, 24) (Blagova, Tseitlin, Gerodes 1994: 530, 696).

Among Old Slavic verbs of explanation there are verbs motivated by the semantics of light – оуашнати (показание оудьное на много приваждаемо потрёбьнё намъ оуашнати прёдълеж\штее Зогр-лл 1б 6) (Blagova, Tseitlin, Gerodes 1994: 781).

The meaning 'to teach' in the Old Slavic language is denoted by the verb оучити and its derivatives наоучати, поучати, прооучати; въразоумити, казати 'to point out' → 'to teach, to instruct, to induce' (дгда никогоже б̧ кажýшта / тъгда… пр̧м̧ни cg – Супр 415, 4; не б̧ нікътоже оуч\ его – Клоц 5б 26) (Blagova, Tseitlin, Gerodes 1994: 280) and its

derivatives, see наказати; огласити 'to instruct (before christening or professing)', пооустити, правити 'to spread a true teaching', ставлати (наставлати кого въ чьто (3) ὀδηγεῖν 'to show (the way), to bring in, to bring to; fig. to teach': ограждена т\ обр‚тас / кр‚пъкок рýкок и в‚рок / къ наставл‚ктюмоу т\ Евх 91б 9-10. – Евх 26б 4-5) (Blagova, Tseitlin, Gerodes 1994: 354), оувѣштати, оутѣшати.

The lexemes наказати, огласити, оувѣштати, оутѣшати are connected with the semantics of speaking; казати, вразумити are related to perception; правити, ставлати (наставлати) are connected with spatial notions.

The group under consideration, as well as many other lexical-semantic groups of the Old Slavic corpus, shows a rather close relation to the idea of divine teaching: възиде и(соу)с(ъ) въ цръкъве ј оучааше Мар. Ин. 7, 14; г(оспод)и / наоучи ны молити с\ Мар. Лк. 11, 1; томи ли тg наказа оучитель Супр. 411, 3. It is true even if the teacher is not God: кодратъ... пооучааше какштg\ Супр. 109, 10; онъ же ако отьць доуховьнъ / став(ь)аше а Супр. 203, 14-15 (Blagova, Tseitlin, Gerodes 1994: 348, 491, 622, 756).

Obviously, persuasion is the main means of teaching in this case. In some contexts namely it is brought to the forefront: на мнозѣ кажg / молg припада\ / клана\ cg / оувѣштати dгo не вьзможе Супр. 527, 14-15 (Blagova, Tseitlin, Gerodes 1994: 725). Thus, the ideas of teaching and persuasion in Old Slavic corpus are in correspondence with each other, see пооустити 'to encourage, to induce'; 'to teach, to instruct'.

The first direct meaning 'to point' of the verb казати is fixed in Old Slavic texts while the meaning 'to speak' is fixed only for some prefixal derivatives such as сказати. In the dictionary of the Old Russian language the verb *казати* has the meaning 'to show' (*отъкрыите ларё и покажёте а чlвкоу ономоу чьто dмоу хран\ть свѣтъ... Изб 1076, 272 об.-273*), 'to speak' (*и нача казати* [Пр XIV (2), 125б – *сказати] моукоу мижа своdго Пр 1383, 131б*), and 'to instruct' (*не подобаdт ни неч(с)тива. ни грѣшника ненавидѣти. нъ молити за н\. и съ кротостию казати ПНЧ 1296, 93*) are fixed (Avanesov 1988, I: 186).

O.Blr. *казати* has the meanings 1) 'to speak', 2) 'to order', 3) 'to witness' (Zhuraŭski 1996, 14: 224), in other words in Old Belarusian the meanings 'to show', 'to point out' are expressed by prefixal derivatives only.

Both the semantics 'to show' and 'to speak' are recorded for Proslav. *kazati (sę)*. According to Etimologicheskii slovar' slavianskikh iazykov "the primary meaning is 'to show, to give a sign' (hence the derived meaning – 'to speak')" (Trubachiov 1983, 9: 169). Thus, the seme of causation of perception 'to make bright, better perceived' is relevant for both meanings that are syncretically bound in the semantics of the Proslavic verb. The competition of 'to show, to make it better seen' and 'to speak' of the derivatives of this root and of the derivatives of different roots appeared later.

3.2.4 *Models of conceptualization of the meanings 'to explain' and 'to teach' in Russin and Bulgarian*
In the Russian language the same conceptual models are used to denote the meaning 'to explain': on the basis of 'to speak' (*растолковать* and other prefixal formations), 'to make clear, light' (*объяснить* and other prefixal formations), 'to hammer in' ≈ 'to move, put inside with an effort' (*вдолбить*), 'to chew over' ≈ 'to make it better perceived' (*разжевать* (colloq.)). In the Bulgarian language the verbs *обясня, поясня, разтълкувам* are used. Their semantic development is similar to that considered above for the lexemes with the same meaning in other languages.

The meaning 'to teach' in Russian is represented by the borrowings *муштровать, дрессировать* in their secondary meaning 'to teach (excessively strict)', the verb *учить* with the primary meaning of teaching and its affixal derivatives as well as by the verbs, the meanings of which are based on the semantic transfers considered above: *вразумлять* (the initial semantics is 'perception', see above); *наставлять, направлять* (obs.), *напутствовать* (before starting smth. to do, before leaving) with the common primary meaning 'to show the way, to help sb orientate themselves in space', *преподавать* with the primary meaning of property transfer (comp. O. Blr. *выдавати* 'to teach', Fr. *apprendre* 'to study', 'to teach' < *prendre* 'to take', 'to be spread' and similar names formed on the basis of this model).Thus, among figurative names both in Modern Russian and Modern Belarusian prevail those that are motivated by spatial notions, while in Old Belarusian source conceptual spheres are more varied ('space', 'light', 'physical activity'). In the Old Slavic language the verbs denoting speech dominate while forming verbs with the semantics of teaching. In Modern Bulgarian the lexemes *уча* (and prefixal derivatives), *преподавам, упътвам* are used; in both Modern Russian and Modern Bulgarian the verbs Rus. *просветить*, Bulg. *просветя* are used. The table below shows the number of lexemes (affixal derivatives were excluded) which naming was realized through one of the three conceptual models considered above on the basis of the meanings 'to make it better perceived' including 'to make it better seen' and 'to make it better lit' within the framework of the latter. Also, the meanings 'to speak'; 'to make a physical action changing spatial parameters of sth.' are presented below. Such a presentation allows us to make the described hypothesis and conclusions made on the basis of language material vivid and clear.

Source conceptual sphere		Language	Mod. Blr.	O. Blr.	Mod. Rus.	O. Slav.	Mod. Bulg.
to make it per-ceived better	to make it seen better	to make it lighter	3	1	1	1	1
			1		1		
to speak			2	3	1	2	1
to change space			2	1	1		

Table 1 *The ways of motivation of lexemes with the semantics 'to explain'.*

Source conceptual sphere		Language	Mod. Blr.	O. Blr.	Mod. Rus.	O. Slav.	Mod. Bulg.
to make it per-ceived better	to make it seen better	to make it lighter		2	1	1	1
				1	1	2	
to speak						4	
to change space			3	1	3	2	1

Table 2 *The ways of motivation of lexemes with the semantics 'to teach'.*

The tables demonstrate the competition of different ways of conceptualization while naming the concepts 'to explain', 'to teach' in Slavic languages.

4. Conclusion

The results of the onomasiological research into the two layers of Slavic lexicon – names of the day and those with the meanings 'to explain' and 'to teach' – are presented in the article. Cognitive diachronic onomasiology research tools were adopted by the authors. On the one hand, the process of determination of the type of link between a source concept and a target concept was used alongside the onomasiological typology of means and ways of creation of a new naming unit. On the other hand, the frequency of occurrence of competitive conceptual models used in the process of naming of the above concepts was determined.

Thus, cognitive diachronic onomasiology instruments are highly productive for the study of the facts of development of Slavic languages. These tools allow not only to describe, but also explain such facts. It is of great importance, since the explanatory function is a predominant characteristic of cognitive linguistics and contemporary linguistic semantics.

Notes

[1]In the English language the word *day* has two main meanings 'the period of time when it is light outside' and 'one of the periods of time that a week is divided into, equal to 24 hours' (Macmillan English dictionary for Advanced Learners, Macmillan Publishers Ltd., 2002). The former meaning refers to the Russian word *день,* while the latter refers to the word *сутки* (in this meaning the word is used in the title). So far as the difference is essential here and to avoid misunderstanding, further on the word *day* will be used in the first meaning and for the second meaning we will use descriptive constructions *twenty-four hour day* or, simply, *twenty-four hours*.

[2] The card file of Ġistarychny sloŭnik belaruskai movy, ed. Arkadz' I. Zhuraŭski, Minsk, 1982-, 1-. The principles of writing Old Belarusian texts and abbreviations of written records correspond to that accepted in this dictionary. The letters underlined in the examples are superlinear.

References

AVANESOV, Ruben. (ed.). 1988-. *Slovar' drevnerusskogo iazyka* (XI-XIV vv.), vol. I-. Moscow: Russkii iazyk.

BIRKHOFF, Garret. 1952. *Teoriia struktur*. Moscow: IL.

BLAGOVA, Emilia, TSEITLIN, Ralia M., GERODES, Stanislav (ed.). 1994. *Staroslavianskii slovar'* (po rukopisiam X-XI vv). Moscow: Russkii iazyk.

BLANK, Andreas and KOCH, Peter. 1999. *Historical Semantics and Cognition.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

BUSLAEV, Fiodor I. *Istoricheskaia grammatika russkogo iazyka*. 1959. Moscow: GUPIMP RSFSR.

DAL, Vladimir I. 1978-1980. *Tolkovyi slovar' velikorusskogo iazyka*, vol. 1-4. Moscow: Russkii iazyk.

DANICHICH, Duro (ed.). 1880-1976. *Rechnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga iezika*, vol. I-XXVI. Zagreb: JAZiU.

JÄKEL, Olaf. 1997. *How can mortal man understand the road he travels? Prospects and Problems of the Cognitive Approach to Religious Metaphor*. In: *L.A.U.D.* 418 (A).

KOPERZHINSKII, Kost'. 1928. *Do sistemi poniattiv chasu u slov'ian*. Kiev.

KOPYLENKO, Moisei M. 1969. O grecheskom vliianii na iazyk drevnerusskoi pis'mennosti. In: *Russkaia rech'* 5: pp. 96-103.

KOTKOV, Sergei I. (ed.). 1965. *Izbornik 1076*. Moscow: Nauka.

KRAPIVA, Kondrat (ed.). 1962. *Belorussko-russkii slovar'*. Moscow: GIIiNS.

KUBRIAKOVA, Elena S. 1997. *Chasti rechi s kognitivnoj tochki zreniia*. Moscow: RAN.

LAKOFF, George. 1999. The System of Metaphors for Mind and the Conceptual System of Analityc Philosophy: A Study of the Metaphorical Constrains on Philosophical Discource. In: FOX, Barbara, JURAFSKY, Dan, MICHAELIS, Laura A. (ed.). *Cognition and Function in Language*. Stanford: CSLI: pp. 51-71.

NILSSON, Martin P. 1920. *Primitive Time-Reckoning*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.

POKORNY, Julius. 1949-1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke Verlag.

ROMANSKI, Stefan (ed.). 1955-1959. *Rechnik na s"vremenniia b"lgarski knizhoven ezik*, vol. 1-3. Sophia: BAN.

SCIASHKOVICH, Tacciana F. 1972. *Materyialy dlia sloǔnika Ġrodzenskai voblasci*. Minsk: Navuka i tekhnika.

SHAKHMATOV, Aleksei A. (ed.). 1962. Ipat'evskaia letopis'. In: *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* 2. Moscow: AN SSSR.

SCHRADER, Otto. 1917-1923, 1929. *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, vol. I-II. Berlin, Leipzig: W. de Gruyter.

SREZNEVSKII, Izmail I. 1893-1903. *Materialy dlia slovaria drevnerusskogo iazyka,* vol. 1-3. St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia Akademiia nauk.

STEPANOV, Nikolai V. 1909. Edinicy schiota vremeni (do XIII v.) po Lavrent'evskoi i pervoi Novgorodskoi letopisiam. In: *Chteniia obshchestva liubitelei istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* 4: pp. 3-56.

STEPANOV, Nikolai V. 1915. Kalendarno-khronologicheskie faktory Ipat'evskoi letopisi. In: *Izvestiia ORIAS* XX, 2: pp. 17-34.

TRUBACHIOV, Oleg N. (ed.). 1974-. *Etimologicheskii slovar' slavianskikh iazykov*, vol. 1-. Moscow: Nauka.

TRUBACHIOV, Oleg N. 1959. *Istoriia slavianskikh terminov rodstva i drevneishikh terminov obshchestvennogo stroia*. Moscow: AN SSSR.

TSEITLIN, Ralia M. 1959. Materialy dlia izucheniia znachenii priimennoi pristavki *sǫ-*. In: *Uchionye zapiski Instituta Slavianovedeniia AN SSSR* XVII: pp. 229-241.

VASMER, Max. 1987-1988. *Etimologicheskii slovar' russkogo iazyka,* vol. I-IV. Moscow: Progress.

VINOGRADOV, Viktor V. (ed.). 1956-1961. *Slovar' iazyka Pushkina*, vol. 1-4. Moscow: GIIiNS.

ZHURAǓSKI, Arkadz' I. (ed.). 1982-. *Ġistarychny sloǔnik belaruskai movy*, vol. 1-. Minsk: Navuka i technika.

Natalia Ivashina
Belarusian State University
Department of Theoretical and Slavonic Linguistics
ul. Janki Kupaly, 4-17
220030 Minsk Belarus
Natasha.Ivashina@seznam.cz

Alena Rudenka
Belarusian State University
Department of Theoretical and Slavonic Linguistics
per. Kazarmennyj, 5a-49
220030 Minsk Belarus
alena@rudenka.net