

(псл. \*vъšь, рос. вошь, лит. utėlė, ді. uī-ka) дослідники намагалися звести до єдиної праформи l'u.

Назва клопа також містить компонент «воша». Слово утворилося шляхом спрощення: н. Wanze «клоп», свн. wanze (< двн. want-lūs «настінна воша»).

Походження назви гусені не вияснено (н. Raure, свн. gūre, снн. gure, нл. gaups < герм. \*gūrō). Дослідники пов'язують цю назву з гот. gaupjan, н. gurpen та реконструюють вихідне значення як «щетиnistий» [4, с. 425].

Отже, назви комах у германських мовах виникали шляхом звуконаслідування, спрощення, а також табування. При табуванні звучання слова відхилялося від регулярного фонетичного розвитку.

### **Список використаних джерел:**

1. Гримм Я. Германская мифология: в 3 т. Т.2. URL: [www.studfile.net](http://www.studfile.net)
2. Жлуктенко Ю. О., Яворська Т. А. Вступ до германського мовознавства. Київ : Вища школа, 1986. 232 с.
3. Левицький В. В. Основи германістики. Вінниця : Нова книга, 2008. 528 с.
4. Левицький В. В. Этимологический словарь германских языков : в 2 т. Винница : Нова книга, 2010. Т. 1. 616 с.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.36059/978-966-397-263-3/18>

**Chystiak D. O.,**

*Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,  
Professor at the Department of Romanic Philology  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv*

### **NOTION OF CONCEPT IN FRENCH SCHOOL OF INTERPRETATIVE SEMANTICS: PROBLEMS AND PERSPECTIVES**

The study of literary conceptualization goes together with the research of images of the world of the most diverse writers is becoming more and more present in the contemporary linguistic landscape, and not only in the sciences of language but also in the human sciences in general. It could be noted that this actualization of the notion of the concept is based on the post-structuralist anthropocentric paradigm which is characterized by

a transdisciplinary integration approach. Cognitive analysis in the sciences of language pays attention to the phenomena of the construction of links between language and culture in the constitution of dynamic signification in the literary text. These problems were analyzed by the representatives of the Moscow-Tartu school of cultural semiotics as well as the researchers of the post-structuralist paradigm (J. Kristeva, R. Barthes, F. Rastier).

Ukrainian researchers also produced some background studies on the delimitation of the notion of the concept, its structure, and even the methods of analysis of this phenomenon of language and culture (research by A. Prykhodko and O. Selivanova). There are a number of works devoted to literary conceptualization (studies by I. Bekhta, L. Belehova, T. Vilchynska, V. Ivashchenko, O. Kaganovska, V. Nikonova) that we could characterize by a plurality of analyzes. The aim of this research would therefore be to model the main particularities in linguistic-cognitive analysis in interpretative semantics. The practical results of the work can be applied during the courses “Problems of textual linguistics” and “Stylistics” in higher education.

Interpretative semantics draws up a classification of the notions that are delimited by the term “concept” by proposing a replacement of this term according to the objectives of the method of analysis of the literary text by François Rastier. The first definition of the concept is as follows: “it is a mental, general and abstract representation of an object. This concept, philosophical and logical, is posed without any relation to languages or other sign systems” [9, p. 125]. The second definition of the concept is close to the “primitive” notions by A. Wierzbicka [14], Y. Wilks [15] and R. Schank [13] or the “noem” by R. Martin [5] and B. Pottier [6; 7]. It is “a universal of representation which belongs to language, but is not dependent on any determined language” [9, p. 125]. It should be noted that the primitives are located in the linguistic metalanguage or in the cognitive apparatus; as purely conceptual units, they are categories, in the philosophical sense of the term. A distinction must be made between micro-semantics in the strict sense of the theory of primitives, which is called “fundamental semiotics” by A. J. Greimas [2].

The third definition of the concept in F. Rastier is “the hypothetical psychic correlate” [9, p. 125] of the primitive concept because it should be noted that it is necessary to distinguish the noemic level from the conceptual level. F. Rastier insists on this distinction since he considers as unargued the hypothesis that metalinguistic universals are universals of thought.

The fourth definition of the concept encompasses the signified of a morpheme of a language (what is called in differential semantics “sememe” by B. Pottier [7] and R. Martin [5], “formula” by Y. Wilks [15] or frame by E. Charniak [1]). The fifth definition derives from the concept delimited by F. De Saussure and becomes a correlate of the concept-frame taking the name of “the multimodal simulacrum”. To formulate this notion, interpretative semantics observes several reductions: the reduction of the conceptual level to the linguistic level which is an extreme consequence of the hypothesis of linguistic determinism; reduction of the linguistic to the conceptual (either “by means of grammars or universal semantics” or by the notion of universals [9, p. 126]).

After the formulation of the notions of the concept, emitted in the contemporary linguistic paradigm, F. Rastier proposes his own definition of the concept which is “a constructed sememe, which definition is stabilized by the norms of a discipline, in such a way that its occurrences are identical to its type” and “the conventional validity of these disciplinary norms allows the translation of concepts which therefore escape the variety of languages as well as the diversity of contexts” [9, p. 126]. In this definition, we see that the interferences between extensional semantics are set aside (in particular psychological semantics à la Jackendoff and even the structuralism of A. J. Greimas where we see that the very notion of the seme is considered as a quality of the referent). For interpretative semantics, on the other hand, the semes are constitutive of the linguistic meaning, determine the parts of the concept (a multimodal simulacrum which is also a referential impression), constitutive of the eidetic (or conceptual) meaning without link with the referent.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the multimodal simulacrum is not necessarily independent of language, which can involve several modes (visual, auditory) but is not linked to any particular mode. The problem of extra-semiotic reference varies with the levels of complexity (morpheme, word, statement, text) and the types of isotopy and/or seme involved (specific, micro-, meso-, macro-generic [10, p. 60]). The minimal unit at the origin of a referential path reaching at least as far as the simulacrum therefore seems to be the signifier of a word (lexia) contained in the context [11, p. 272]. It should be noted that at the level of textual reference F. Rastier attests that “in case of mythical texts (literary and / or religious in particular), the production of referential impressions can be complex again, no longer by an absence of determinations (as at the level of the isolated word) but by the plurality of determinations” [11, p. 273].

Interpretative semantics offers several openings in contemporary linguistics to the study of literary conceptualization. If the signified is analyzed into parts (semes) and the word is analyzed by lexies (contextual functional unit of several words), the statement is studied in its inherent relationships with the textual content (thus the text is not an addition of statements according to the principle of absolute non-compositionality). The meaning results from the interaction of the denotative and connotative contents (inherent and afferent) determines the reference (the semes are no longer the replicas of the parts of the referent) in a vast linguistic and extralinguistic cultural context. Moreover, a detailed analysis of the notion of the referent and its avatars in interpretative semantics highlights the definition of the concept as a multimodal simulacrum that offers a progressive vision of this notion in the literary context as a dynamic component of semiosis at the borders of meaning, imagery and referencing. It should be added that these considerations attest that the study of the literary concept should continue with an in-depth study of the four semantic constituents delimited by the interpretative semantics: the thematic, the dialectic (the states and processes represented), the dialogic (the units in their modality) and the tactic (the linear layout of the units).

#### **Bibliography:**

1. Charniak E. Organization and inference in a frame-like system of common sense knowledge. *TINLAP '75*. Stroudsburg : Association for Computational Linguistics, 1975. P. 42–51.
2. Greimas A.J. *Sémantique structurale*. Paris : P.U.F., 1986. 262 p.
3. Hébert L. *Introduction à la sémantique des textes*. Paris : Honoré Champion, 2001. 232 p.
4. Heger K. Noèmes métalinguistiques-réflexifs et la distinction entre syntaxe et sémantique. *Annexes des Cahiers de linguistique hispanique médiévale*. 1988. Vol. 7 No. 1. P. 351–359.
5. Martin R. *Pour une logique du sens*. Paris : P.U.F., 1983. 268 p.
6. Pottier B. *Linguistique générale: Théorie et description*. Paris : Klincksieck, 1985. 339 p.
7. Pottier B. *Théorie et analyse en linguistique*. Paris : Hachette, 1992. 240 p.
8. Rastier F. Problématiques du signe et du texte. *Intellectica*. 1996. No. 23. Vol. 2. P. 11–52.
9. Rastier F. *Sémantique et recherches cognitives*. Paris : P.U.F., 1991. 262 p.
10. Rastier F., Cavazza M., Abeillé A. *Sémantique pour l'analyse*. Paris : Masson, 1994. 240 p.

11. Rastier F. Sens et textualité. Paris : Hachette, 1989. 287 p.
12. Saussure F. de. Cours de linguistique générale. Paris : Payot, 1986. 520 p.
13. Schank R. J., Abelson R. P. Scripts, plans, goals and understanding: an inquiry into human knowledge structures. Hillsdale : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977. 256 p.
14. Wierzbicka A. La quête des primitifs sémantiques. *Langue française*. 1993. Vol. 98. No. 1. P. 9–23.
15. Wilks Y. Primitives and words. *TINLAP '75*. Stroudsburg : Association for Computational Linguistics, 1975. P. 38–41.