

ALEXANDER I. ILIADI

The State Institution “South Ukrainian National
Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushinsky”
ORCID id: orcid.org/0000-0001-5078-8316

Fields of research: etymology, comparative-historical
linguistics, general and typological linguistics.

ILONA M. DERIK

The State Institution “South Ukrainian National
Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushinsky”
ORCID id: orcid.org/0000-0002-8979-4745

Fields of research: general and typological linguistics,
translation studies, corpus linguistics.

DOI: doi.org/10.35321/all90-07

UNIVERSALITY IN SEMANTIC DYNAMICS: FROM ‘BODY’ TO ‘PERSON’, ‘SELF’, ‘SOUL’

Semantinės dinamikos universalumas:
nuo ‘kūno’ iki ‘asmens’, ‘savasties’, ‘sielos’

ANNOTATION

The research is aimed at describing a relevant regularity in semantics development tending to be universal due to the evidence in many languages. In the focus of the research, there is an identical sequence of stages of semantic evolution ‘body’, ‘corpus’ → ‘person’, ‘self’, ‘soul’ and its outcome revealed in the languages under analysis. The reviewed semantic shift is presented in genetically related and unrelated languages in different periods of their history, which makes it possible to define it as a phenomenon diachronically reproduced at each chronological cross-section. The postulate of the universality of the semantic correlation between ‘body’, ‘body parts’ & ‘soul’, ‘spirit’, ‘person’, and ‘self’ is based on the reliably established regular sequence of “steps” from the etymological ‘body’ to other meanings in the languages of eleven genetic families. This correlation of sememes can be defined as a cluster of chains of semantic changes. Despite some differences, these chains

still fit into the framework of the same semantic model, which was implemented in different conditions, from which these differences originate. That is, all variants of semantic shifts took place under certain conditions and were included in the “operational field” of one model.

KEYWORDS: semantic universality, correlation of meanings, linguistic typology, model, pronoun, compound word, reflex.

ANOTACIJA

Tyrimo tikslas – aprašyti atitinkamą semantikos raidos dėsningumą, kuris dėl įrodymų daugelyje kalbų yra universalus. Tyrimo objektas – identiška semantinės raidos etapų seka ‘kūnas’, ‘korporas’ → ‘asmuo’, ‘asmenybė’, ‘siela’ ir jos rezultatai atskleisti analizuojamose kalbose. Apžvelgiamas semantinis poslinkis pateikiamas genetiškai giminiškose ir nesusijusiose kalbose skirtingais jų istorijos laikotarpiais, o tai leidžia jį apibrėžti kaip reiškinį, diachroniškai atsikartojantį kiekviename chronologiniame pjūvyje. Semantinės koreliacijos tarp ‘kūno’, ‘kūno dalių’ ir ‘sielos’, ‘dvasios’, ‘asmens’, ‘savasties’ universalumo postulatą yra pagrįstas patikimai nustatyta dėsninga „žingsnių“ seka nuo etimologinės ‘kūno’ iki kitų reikšmių vienuolikos genetinių šeimų kalbose. Šią sememų koreliaciją galima apibrėžti kaip semantinių pokyčių grandinių klasterį. Nepaisant kai kurių skirtumų, šios grandinės vis tiek telpa į vieno ir to paties semantinio modelio, realizuojamo skirtingomis aplinkybėmis, rėmus, iš kurių ir kyla šie skirtumai. Tai reiškia, kad visi semantinių poslinkių variantai vyko tam tikromis sąlygomis ir buvo įtraukti į vieno modelio „operacinį lauką“.

ESMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: semantinis universalumas, reikšmių koreliacija, lingvistinė tipologija, modelis, įvardis, sudėtinis žodis, refleksas.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. There has been established a special tradition of studying the problem of typicality and even universality of semantic changes. However, it hasn't been generally accepted so far, existing as a sum of ideas in the works of representatives of different linguistic schools. Originally narrowly defined by Michail M. Pokrovskij as a phenomenon of the regularity of interruptions of meaning in the languages of Europe (according to him, ‘identical, rather original, meanings in several languages independently of each other are worked out in the same way’; Pokrovskij 1895: 13), it (or an idea close to it) was later embodied in a purely practical application by Carl Darling Buck namely in his work *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages* (Buck 1949). For a long time, the aspect of the search for *universals* in the semantic dynamics of words remained the prerogative of etymological studies,

where the persuasiveness of the interpretation of the reconstructed meaning and its evolution depends on the reliability of typologically similar examples from other languages. In particular, the focus on typological analogies in semantics distinguishes such fundamental works on etymology as the *Historical and Etymological Dictionary of the Ossetian Language* (1958–1995) by Vasilij I. Abaev, as well as the *Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages* (1974–2021) published in Moscow and the recent *Etymological Dictionary of Germanic Languages* (2010) by Victor V. Levitsky. However, etymological studies, by their wide range of tasks, are not limited to the recalculation of typological analogies in the development of meaning and do not establish the areal of their distribution; they only collect facts for their own needs, which can become the basis for future theoretical research in the relevant field of universology.

1.2. The findings of etymological and semasiological research works on lexical meaning in synchrony and diachrony require a theoretical basis for numerous examples of the typicality and regularity of semantic dynamics in time and space. There is a need in the theory which might elaborate methodological principles for describing and verifying models of semantic change common to a large number of related and unrelated languages. The corresponding set of theoretical and methodological issues has been partially analyzed in the recent (1) studies by Anna A. Zalizniak, who was the first to analyse the universals in polysemy and proceeded to elaborate a catalogue of semantic transitions (Zalizniak 2013: 397–409; 2018); (2) studies by Elena G. Mikina (Mikina 2009; 2012; 2020; 2022) on the semantic evolution of Latin and Romanic verbs of speech. E. G. Mikina's works illustrate organic synthesis of comparative-historical linguistics and linguistic typology since the chains of stages of the dynamics of meaning are established against a broad Indo-European background. Close ideas are set out in: (Nerlich 1992; Geeraerts 1997: 28 and next).

1.3. There is the search for answers to two of the fundamental questions which are relevant to the current state of this issue. *The first* one is about the balanced relationship between the synchronous state of semantics and its historical dynamics in the scientific apparatus of research. It is known that 'semantic evolution and synchronic polysemy are two sides of the same phenomenon' (Zalizniak 2013: 413), but it is not known (resp. not obvious) whether this is a particular case of semantic derivation in the language(s) of a particular epoch or whether we are dealing with an ancient correlation of sememes, reproduced in a late chronological slice. Both of these phenomena need to be distinguished. For example, Indo-European verbs with a reliably established **primary** meaning 'to find' regularly have the **secondary** sememe 'to give birth' (: Ossetian *aryn* (Southern *waryn*), *erun* 'to find' **and** 'to beget', Pamir Ormuri *vār-* 'to find' **and** 'to give birth' ~ PIE **uer-* 'to find' (Abaev 1958: 73–74); Russian dial. *ребяенок*

найде́тся ‘a child will be born’, Ukrainian dial. *знайти дитину* ‘to give birth to a baby’, Serbian dial. *нашло се дете* and other ~ **na-jbti* (ESSJ XXII 113–114, 116; Tolstaja 1997: 290–291)) with the relevantly ancient age. By the way, among the Slavs, it arose within the framework of the language of the ritual (still pagan!) action of deceiving fate: a newborn was allegedly brought by a guest who found a child on the road. Thus, there may be presumed the reproduction of long-established semantic relations in the late period of the history of the languages of the two groups. But in the case of Turkic *tap-* ‘to find’, ‘to give birth’ (Abaev 1958: 74) there is no such clarity as used to be in Proto-Turkic (Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak, eds., 2003: 1436: **tāp-*; Tenišev et al. 2006: 208, 288) or even ancient Turkic language condition (VII–XIII cc.) as only the first meaning was attested (DTS 533), however, there is no data on the meaning of ‘to give birth’ for **tāp-* in the antiquity, so it can be seen as a local late semantic derivation in one of the languages. Well, the **cultural conditions of this derivation** among the Indo-Europeans (Iranians, Slavs) and the Turks do not coincide either.

The second one is that each example of the presumably universal type of semantic development should be considered “under a magnifying glass” and verified by a sufficient number of arguments. The collection of evidence for each case, its verification, classification of the collected material and its explanation is time-consuming and very laborious work, but almost always such research leads to very interesting results. The works on linguistic comprehension of many of these phenomena of semantics are yet to come, especially since the importance of studying universals in the dynamics of lexical meaning has not yet been fully realised.

2. OBJECTIVE AND TASKS

An interesting example of the correlation between the ‘body’ & ‘person’, ‘self’, and ‘soul’ sememes which are studied here, with some reservations, can be regarded as an illustration of the thesis about the universality of some models of semantic development. This correlation has been ignored in the specialized literature, and meanwhile, there have been scientific prerequisites for this for a long time. For example, in the electronic catalogue “The Catalogue of Semantic Shifts” (Zalizniak et al.: <https://datsemshift.ru/shift4380>), the transition of ‘body’ → ‘self’ in several *non-Indo-European* languages is noted. Although “The Catalogue” simply records the synchronic correlation of these sememes, the data collected prompts the search for manifestations of a similar correlation in the *Indo-European* languages and the study of the conditions of its appearance.

Accordingly, *the objective* of the research is to describe the model of semantic development ‘**body/part of the body**’, ‘**corpus**’ → ‘**person**’, ‘**self**’, ‘**soul**’ (**or its variants**) and to prove its universal nature, i.e. its implementation in the lexical and semantic systems of languages of different genetic families in synchrony and diachrony.

The achievement of this objective involves the fulfilment of several *tasks*, namely: 1) to summarize all known evidence of the correlation of the sememes ‘body’, ‘corpus’ & ‘person’, ‘self’, ‘soul’; 2) to prove the direct nature of *semantic derivation* in all (if possible) cases, excluding the possibility of mediating (intermediate) stages; 3) substantiate the reproducibility of the model under consideration on different chronological slices in the history of the languages involved in the analysis; 4) to find out the reasons for this semantic shift.

3. MATERIAL AND METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH

3.1. The study involves the lexical material of eleven genetic families of languages, in which we see the implementation of this model of semantic development. As far as we know, these data have not yet been the object of a special (within the framework of the outlined problem) linguistic research and, accordingly, the typological similarity of different words, demonstrating the commonality of their semantic development, is not noted and explained.

Since the *primacy* of the meaning of ‘body’ concerning sememes ‘self’, ‘person’, ‘soul’ etc. **is essential** to the proposed study, the first step in the procedure of proving the originality of the somatic meaning is to refer to the findings of etymology and reconstruction. These data are presented in etymological dictionaries and paragraphs of comparative grammars. The numerous facts in these sources often need to be generalized against a broad typological background. If we are dealing with languages whose vocabulary has not yet received etymological elucidation, the material is extracted from the available grammatical descriptions of these languages, their vocabulary and texts. This applies to a greater extent to the Algonquian and Austronesian languages. Since this article is not a corpus study but aims to substantiate the universality of one model of semantic derivation, it seems to us sufficient simply to indicate its manifestations in several languages of *each* of the considered language families.

3.2. When analyzing the material, we relied on the general theoretical principles of working with the dynamics of the semantic structure of the word, outlined in the works of our predecessors, namely: (Budagov 1963; Stern 1964;

Trubačiov 1964; Schuster-Šewc 1975; Nerlich 1992; Geeraerts 1997: 23–122; Traugott 1999; Traugott, Dasher 2002; Geeraerts 2010: 25–41; Mikina 2012).

The tasks of the study determined the choice of its *methods*. In particular, some techniques of the following methods are used here: (1) comparative-historical (to clarify the relative chronology of the states of semantics of the objects (words) under consideration in different periods of their history and to determine the genetic relationship of the compared lexemes); (2) typological (to describe heterogeneous units with similar semantic evolution); (3) the method of commenting on dictionary entries (to clarify the logic of development and direction of semantic connections between the sememes of a certain lexeme). They are implemented within the framework of the analysis *procedure*, the essence of which is described through:

- the sum of the criteria for selecting the material for the study;
- interpretation of the material under study;
- a scheme of representation of facts (see section 4).

Criteria

1. The lexemes employed in the study have two poles of the semantic spectrum: 'body/part of body', 'corpus' VS 'person', 'self', and 'soul'.

2. There must be derivative relations between both groups of meanings, namely: the sememes 'person', 'self', and 'soul' are derived from 'body' or 'part of the body'.

3. Within a cluster of the sememes 'person', 'self', and 'soul', derivation relations are also allowed in some cases.

4. It is taken into account that sememe '(my)self' in the *body* may develop under the three following conditions: a) due to the morphological modification of the *body* (by affixation); b) as a part of composite words; c) syntactically, i. e. in the function of the reflexive pronoun ('self' as 'my/its/his body'). The last condition is true *only* for several languages of the same branch of the Indo-European family and sporadically *several* languages inside the Indo-European lingual areal.

5. Lexemes in which intermediate sememes are marked between both clusters of meanings, excluding the direct semantic derivation of 'body' → 'person', etc., are excluded from consideration as they do not correspond to the model of semantic derivation. However, this criterion cannot always be met due to the lack of written monuments in some languages or the low level of their etymological development.

6. Lexemes with *the same type* of semantic correlation that arose in *different* cultural-semiotic (mythological, religious, apotropaic) conditions (cf. above the example of the correlation 'to find' : 'to give birth') are also not taken into account.

Interpretation (general grounds)

1. The nature of the correlation of the meanings of one word or group of cognates is described by employing modelling, but any model must be verified through typological parallels corresponding to the sum of the parameters specified by the model. This means that the direction and result of semantic development (primarily in cases requiring semantic reconstruction) have been proved on the condition that the same vector of evolution of meaning, its initial, intermediate and final stages can be traced in different words from different languages. What is crucial for analysis is *only* the fact of the relevant chronology of the semantic states of the word evidence and the verification of the preservation of the sememes' correlation as primary and secondary in different languages in different periods of their history.

2. The wider the geography of the model's implementation (it is marked in many languages), the higher the probability that we deal with a universal type of semantic evolution.

3. If the material reveals the relevance (urgency) of the mentioned type of semantic derivation on several chronological slices or even over the course of an entire historical period, one should speak not of an innovation in the semantic structure of words that arose at some point in the history of the language, but of old relations of semantic derivation reproduced in diachrony.

4. PROCEDURE

So, here are some facts *pro domo sua* of the universality of the transformation of lexical meanings with this vector. The study involves the following order of presentation of facts and their analysis.

4.1. Evidence of Indo-European languages

4.1.1. Iranian lexicon

Proto-Iranian **grīuā*- 'neck, nape of the neck', whose reflexes display the following meanings (with the extension of semantics to 'body in general'):

Khwarezmian *γryw* 'body' & 'soul' and further there are indicated meanings 'self, herself, himself, yourself', secondary to 'soul' (Èdel'man 2008: 57), cf. combination of words *y' γryw* 'by myself; himself'; further cf. Sogdian *'γryw*, man. *γryw* 'body' & 'person', 'soul', 'self' (Livšic 1962: 128, 192; Rastorgueva, Èdel'man 2007: 291–292; Gharib 1995: 130, 167), Middle Persian *grīw* [*glyw*]

‘neck’, ‘throat’, *grīw* [*glyw*], *gryw*] ‘self’, ‘soul’ (MacKenzie 1986: 37; here both words are given in different dictionary entries), *gryw*, *gryyw* [*grīw*] ‘neck’, ‘form’ & ‘self’, ‘soul’, cf. *Gryw hsyng* ‘Primal Man’ VS *gryw zyndg*, *gryw jywndg* ‘Living Soul’ (Durkin-Meisterernst 2004: 164).

Such examples are interpreted as a *semantic branch* (Rastorgueva, Èdel’man 2007: 292) or *semantic development* (Èdel’man 2008: 57), but the reasons and conditions of this semantic specialization are not explained.

Here are examples of the use of Sogdian *γryw* as the equivalent of a reflexive pronoun in the following phrases: ‘XRZY ZNH *γryw*h nwsšk(w?) myn’m – ‘Then I consider *myself* immortal’ VS ‘XRZY ZNH *γryw*h ‘mrtch myn’m, lit. ‘then I consider *myself* dead’ (Livšic 1962: 128, 192).

For the semantic development ‘body limbs’, ‘body parts’ → ‘body in general’ in the Iranian examples cf. the recent study of Velizar Sadovski (Sadovski 2017: 567–599; in particular see p. 577 and 579).

Proto-Iranian *tanū- ‘body’: Avestan *tanū-* ‘body’ & ‘person’, ‘itself’ (one was used also as a reflexive pronoun) (Bartholomae 1904: 633; Abaev 1979: 261), cf. ‘[...] *hiiat mā vohū pairī.jasaṭ manāḡhā / pərəsaṭcā mā ciš ahī kahiiā ahī / kaθā aiiarē.daxšārā fərasaiiāi dīšā / aibī θβāhū gaēθāhū *tanušuca*’ – ‘[...] when he **surrounds me with good thought / and asks me* ‘Who are you? Whose are you?’ / How would you **submit your day(ly)-*mark-earnings for questioning / *regarding your herds and persons*’ (Skjærvø 2018: 121).

Further cf. Old Persian *tanūš* (*tn^uuš*) ‘body’, ‘trunk’ & ‘person’, ‘self’ (Hinz 1973: 152; Abaev 1979: 261: ‘is also used as a reflexive pronoun’), Khwarezmian *tn* ‘body’, ‘trunk’ & ‘self’, cf. *y’ tn’h* ‘his body’ and ‘himself’ (Benzing 1983: 612), Middle Persian *tan* [*tn*] ‘body’ & ‘person’, ‘self’, cf. *xwēš tan* ‘one’s self’ (MacKenzie 1986: 81; Durkin-Meisterernst 2004: 324), Persian *tan*, *tana*, Pahlavi *tan* ‘body’ & ‘person’ (Abaev 1979: 261), Zaza *tan* ‘human, person’ < **tanu-* ‘body’ (Cabolov 2010: 373), Persian *tān* ‘body, flesh’ & ‘person’, ‘(hu) man’ (Rubinčik 1970: 398).

As we can see, in Iranian **tanū-* is often used as a reflexive pronoun. Aryan **tanū-* also performs the same function in the Dardic and Indo-Aryan languages (see below). In general, the semantic spectrum of Proto-Iranian **tanū-* is identical to the set of basic meanings of its Indo-Aryan etymological counterpart (see below). It is permissible to speak of two probable conditions in which this lexeme developed the meaning ‘myself’, and ‘self’.

1. In the word combination Avestan *tanū-* with *x^aa-* ‘its, his’, ‘self’, ‘itself’, ‘himself’, cf. *auuaēnatā sūcā manāḡhā / āuuarənā vīciθahiiā narēm.narēm x^aaxiiāi tanuiiē* – ‘Observe through (this) flame by (your) thought / the **preferences of discrimination (= judgement) (made) man-by-man for his own body*’ (Skjærvø 2018: 34, 82), cf. above Middle Persian *xwēš tan*. The same is likely to be

assumed for the Old Indian *tanū-* ‘self’, cf. *sváyā tanvā* (an example is adduced from: Mayrhofer 1992: 621). Thus, ‘**one’s/own body**’ → ‘**myself**’, ‘**self**’, ‘**person**’.

2. In the word combinations and composites, formed based on the word combinations with the reflexes **tanū-*, cf. Young Avestan *tanu.kərəta-* adj. ‘made by oneself, self-created’ (Bartholomae 1904: 636), *tanūm (ā)guz* ~ Old Indian *tanvām gūh* ‘to hide’ (Mayrhofer 1992: 622) = ‘hide yourself’.

The development of the semantics ‘**body**’ → ‘**personality, person (= one, the only)**’ is also observed in morphological derivation, cf. Pahlavi *tanīhā* ‘alone’ (MacKenzie 1986: 82), Persian *tanha* ‘alone’, ‘singular’, ‘only’, derived from *tan* ‘body’ employing the adverbial suffix *-ihā* (Cabolov 2010: 373–374).

Proto-Iranian **sarah-* ‘head’:

Sogdian *sr-* /*sar*/ ‘head’ (→ ‘self’) is used as the equivalent of a reflexive pronoun in the following phrases: ZKw *srw* nwš’kw myn’m – ‘I consider **myself** happy’ (lit. *immortal*), prw *srw* pcyrb’n – ‘(the order) I will surely carry out’, lit. ‘I will take it on [my] **head** (= on **myself**)’ (Livšic 1962: 128);

Ossetian *sær* ‘head’ → ‘person’, there is also a usage functionally close to ‘self’, ‘myself’, cf.: (a) ‘*nal mæ xæssys dæ særmæ*’ – ‘you have become squeamish **about me**’; (b) (Kosta) ‘*adæmy farnæj k_oy skænin mæxīcæn kad æmæ sær!*’ – ‘If only I could create for **myself** honour and dignity with the farn of the people!’, ‘*dæ særyl mæ ’rxæssaj*’ – ‘may you sacrifice me for **yourself** (‘your **head**)’ (Abaev 1979: 73, 74).

Oppositio

Here it is advisable to point to the reverse order of the semantic development, which is also attested in the Iranian vocabulary. It is about the reflexes of Old Iranian **vi-āna-* ‘breathing’ (Bailey 1943: 106–107), **vyāna-* (Nyberg 1974: 106), cf. its cultural semantics in: Middle Persian *jān* [y’n] ‘the animal spirit of man’ (ibid.: 106), Persian *jān* ‘soul’, ‘spirit’, ‘life’ & ‘live body’ and ‘essence’, ‘child, kid, baby’ (Rubinčik 1970: 425; Avdoev 2017: 18). Here the group of sememes ‘soul’, ‘spirit’, ‘life’ is primary, motivated with the primordial meaning ‘breathing’ (cf. Proto-Slavonic **duxъ* ‘spirit’, **duša* ‘soul’ (poetic ‘life’: Russian *душа моя* ‘my life’) : **dyšati*, **(vbz)dъxnōti* ‘to breathe’), meanwhile sememes ‘live (= breathing) body’, ‘essence’ (→ ‘child, kid, baby’) are secondary.

It should be pointed out, that semantic derivation ‘**breathing**’ → ‘**soul**’ → ‘**(breathing) body**’ → ‘**essence**’ → ‘**child**’ is an example of relatively late chronology because the Middle Persian texts do not contain pieces of evidence of antiquity ‘body’, ‘child’.

Like somatic vocabulary, words with the meaning ‘breathing’ (→ ‘spirit’, ‘soul’) can be isofunctional reflexive pronouns, as they also develop the sememe ‘self’, cf.:

Avestan (Gathas) *vyānā-* (in *aṭ ē vaočaṭ ahurō mazdā ... vyānaya* – ‘then he **himself** spoke Ahura Mazda with wisdom’) (Bartholomae 1904: 1478: *vī + *yānā-*) = **vyāna-* ‘breathing’. In (ibid.): ‘meaning and etymology are uncertain’, but according to Harold Walter Bailey, ‘may be understood of the ‘self’, but can hardly be explained of the intelligent soul’ (Bailey 1943: 107). So, a probable semantic chain is **‘breathing’** → ***‘breathing body’** → **‘self’**;

Khotanese *uysana* ‘breath’ (**uz-ana-*) and *uysānā* ‘self’ (**uz-ānakā-*) in *uysānā diṣṭai ttiṇa dāṇa* – ‘thou (as a hare) didst cast **thysself** into the fire’ (ibid.);

Ancient Greek ψυχή ‘aspiration’, ‘breath’, **‘soul’** (of the deceased), **‘spirit’** (Beekes 2010: 1671) and **‘themselves’** in Homer’s “Iliad”, cf.: πολλὰς δ’ ἰφθίμους **ψυχὰς** Ἀϊδὶ προΐαψεν / ἠρώων, **αὐτοὺς** δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν... (Homeri 1920: Book I, lines 3 and 4) – ‘[The wrath of Achilles] sent forth to Hades many valiant **souls** of heroes, and made them **themselves** spoil for dogs...’. Here the pronoun *themselves* refers to the dead bodies (= souls) of the heroes (this example was courteously adduced by the reviewer of this article, and the authors of the paper express their deep gratitude for this fact).

The type of semantic development **‘breathing’** → **‘soul’**, **‘spirit’** → **‘self’**, **‘person’** also tends to be universal, since it is noted not only in Indo-European but also in Semitic languages, cf.:

Slavonic **duša* ‘spirit’, ‘soul’ (related to **dъxnъti*, **dyšati* ‘to breathe’, ‘to sigh’) → ‘person’, ‘human’, cf. Russian *ни души* ‘not one person’, ‘nobody’, *пять душ* = *пять человек* ‘five people’;

Semitic: Arabic *nafas* ‘breathing’, *nafs* (*nefs*) ‘soul’, ‘vitality’, ‘vital force’, ‘essence’ & ‘person’, Aramaic *nafšī* ‘my soul’ & ‘my identity’, ‘my “ego”’, ‘my self’ (Abaev 1973: 196) ~ **naf-* ‘breath’ (Orel, Stolbova 1994: 395–396).

4.1.2. Indo-Aryan lexicon

Above, we have considered the correlation of sememes in the reflexes of Proto-Iranian **tanū-*. The same situation is represented in Sanskrit, where *tanūh* ‘body’ & ‘person’, ‘self’ are attested (Monier-Williams 2002: 435). The meaning ‘person’ in *tanū-* also appears in the composition of compound words *tanū-kṛt* ‘forming the person’, *tanū-pāna* ‘protection of the person’ etc. Monier Monier-Williams (ibid.), which are often collapsed phrases. It was from these composites that *tanū-* was abstracted with innovative semantics.

This word is often used like a reflexive pronoun in Sanskrit, where *tānū-nāpāt* ‘son of himself; self-generated’ (ibid.), *tanvā tānāca* ‘with oneself and **one’s**

descendants', *tanū-kṛt*– '**self**-created', *tanvām gūh* 'to hide' (= 'hide **yourself**') (Mayrhofer 1992: 622) are attested. Similarly in NW-Prākṛiti *tanuvaka*– (Mayrhofer 1956: 475). The same state of semantics is attested in the Dardic languages (see below).

4.1.3. Dardic lexicon

Proto-Aryan **tanū*– 'body' in the Dardic languages has changed its grammatical status, having turned into pronouns, cf.: Kashmiri *pān* 'himself, myself', as well as 'body', *panun* 'one's', Shina *tomū* 'one's', (reflexive) Khowar, Kalasha *tan*, Pashai *tānuk*, Gawar-Bati, Tirahi *tanū* and others, as well as Phalura *tēṇi* 'one's' < **tān(u)wa*– (Kogan 2005: 182–183), cf. also Torwālī *tanu* 'one's own' (Mayrhofer 1956: 475) and Khowar *tān* 'self', 'own' (Mayrhofer 1992: 621).

Cf. Pashai *tānek* = *šēr-a eke jāy-a ma b-e-č-e* – '*May **you** never gather together in one place*' (Lehr 2014: 195: 'the categorial status of *tānek* is unclear'), where *tānek* may be equal 'yourself' = 'your own bodies'.

Pashai *tānek* as a reflexive possessive form reveals the mechanism of sememe 'self' development: it is constructed from the word *tān* 'body' + nominalizing suffix *-ek* (ibid.: refers to Georg Morgenstierne).

4.1.4. Ancient Greek lexicon

σῶμα 'living body' & 'human' as 'himself', cf. καὶ ἑαυτῶν σώματα = (their) property and themselves (Dvoreckij 1958: 1596). The correlation of sememes that developed in the ancient Greek period was preserved (reproduced) in Medieval Greek, cf. here σῶμα as 'body', 'body of Christ, the sacramental bread' & 'slave' (Sophocles 1900: 1065). The sememe 'slave' = 'a nameless person'.

There is presupposed for σῶμα a pre-form **tuoH-mṇ* with a basic meaning 'compactness, swelling' (?) or **(s)tjoH-mṇ* 'what has stiffened' (Beekes 2010: 1439–1440).

4.1.5. Latin lexicon

corpus, *-oris* 'body, flesh', 'corpus' & 'person', 'human', cf. *liberum corpus* = free person, *nostra corpora* = *nos* 'we' (Forcellini, Gesner, Bailey 1828: 498; Dvoreckij 1976: 264). The second set of meanings is an innovation of Latin, since for the Proto-Indo-European prototype of Latin *corpus* only the sememe 'body' is reconstructed (PIE **k̑ȓp-os-* 'body', cf. Mlr. *crí* 'body'; Vaan 2008: 137);

The possibility of semantic development was discussed above, namely **'body part' → 'person'** etc. This evolution may be exemplified by the Latin *pectus*, *-oris* 'bosom', 'heart', which is used as 'person', 'human' in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, cf. 'Aut ultor vestrae, fidissima *pectora*, mortis, / Aut comes, inquit, ero' (Ovidius 1984: Book III, line 58 sq.), where *fidissima pectora* = the most loyal/reliable people. Typologically this transfer was supported with Russ. poetic *верные сердца* = *loyal people*, where *сердца* – Nom. plur. to *сердце* 'heart'.

4.1.6. Hittite lexicon

tuekk-/tukk-, *tuekka-* 'body' (pl. 'body parts', 'limbs') & 'person', 'self' (< PIE **tuék* ~ Sanskrit *tvác-* 'skin'). The meaning 'self' < **one's body* appears in the singular (Kloekhorst 2008: 885). Semantic innovation of the Hittite period.

4.1.7. Germanic lexicon

Middle English *bodie*, *bodi* 'body' & 'person', cf. permutability of *body* and *self* in *my ioly body* and *my jolly self* (Mayhew, Skeat 1888: 31).

It is difficult to figure out the nature of the relationship between sememes 'body' and 'person', 'human' in the modern English word *body*, if not to attract typologically similar lexical units. However, the inner logic of the semantic derivation in this word is clarified when including it in a wide typological backdrop.

German *Leib* 'body' in the early period of New High German was used also as 'person' alongside with later 'corpus' (Kluge 2002: 566).

4.1.8. Slavonic lexicon

Russian *тело* 'body' has recently acquired the meanings 'person', and 'human' in the modern colloquial speech, cf.: *со мной разговаривало тело в должности директора* – *I was talking to the body in the position of the director*; *открывается дверь и выходит тело* – *the door opens and the body comes out*. However, the phraseology of the XIX century somewhat increases the age of this semantic development in the Russian language, cf. *Не мятое тело попало в дело* (Dal' 1989: 263) – about an unexperienced **person** in a difficult situation.

4.1.9. Baltic lexicon

Latvian *augums* 'height' and 'stature', 'human's figure', which in the poetic text gets a new meaning '(my)self' as 'my body' (*manu augumiņu*), cf. in "Kur tu jāsi, bāleliņi": *Šķir, Dieviņi, manu ceļu / Sargā manu augumiņu / Lai godam*

es varētu / Ienaidnieku uzvarēt. (Lyrics Translate 2024) – ‘Choose [for me], dear Dievs [supreme deity of the Baltic pantheon or Christian God], my pathway / [And] protect **me** (= my body/**stature**) / So that I could, in glory, / Prevail over [my] enemies’ (this example was foregrounded by Professor Grasilda Blažienė, and in this connection we express our deep gratitude to her).

4.2. Evidence of the languages, belonging to other genetic families

4.2.1. Finno-Ugric lexicon

In the Finno-Ugric lexicon, our attention is attracted to a Hungarian personal pronoun of a courteous appeal, cf. *Maga* ‘you’ (one person), *Maguk* ‘you’ (many people), which contain *maga*, going back to *mag* ‘body’. Furthermore, in Hungarian reflexive-amplifying pronouns denoting ‘self’ were formed from *mag* ‘body’ + appropriate personal-possessive suffixes, cf. *mag-am* ‘myself’, *mag-ad* ‘yourself’, *mag-a* ‘himself’, *mag-unk* ‘we ourselves’, *mag-atok* ‘yourself’, *mag-uk* ‘themselves’ (Majtinskaja 1976: 392, 394).

4.2.2. Turkic lexicon

Proto-Turkic

Turkic (Osman) *beden* ‘body’ & ‘myself’ (Vladimircov 1989: 261), Uyghur dial. *boj* ‘body’ & Altai *poj* ‘myself’ (used with possessive affixes), ‘self’ & ‘somebody’ etc. (Sevortian 1978: 177), ‘persons’, ‘people’. Cf. Old Turkish *‘kalın bod kara baş’* – ‘a dense mob, common **people**’, 1622 (Clauson 1972: 296–297: **bo:d** ‘stature’ and ‘self’).

Both sememes are assumed for the Proto-Turkic period: **bod* (1) ‘body’, ‘stature’, (2) ‘self’ (as a result of **bod* pronominal usage) etc., but for the older (Proto-Altaic) chronological slice, only the sememe ‘body’ (‘intestines’, ‘belly’) is reconstructed (Tenišev 2001: 266; Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak, eds., 2003: 365). See also (Sevortian 1978: 177): ‘body’ is the oldest meaning while the sememe ‘myself’ arose later.

Thus, here we have an example of the reproduction of ancient (still proto-linguistic) semantic relations in the later periods of the history of the Turkic languages.

4.2.3. Mongolian lexicon

Mongolian *budin*, *büdün* ‘body’ & *büdüm* ‘his’, ‘own’, *beje* ‘body’, ‘selfhood’, ‘essence’, ‘alone’, Mongolian *Bīje* ‘body’, ‘trunk’, ‘plant stem’ & ‘person’ (Sevortian 1978: 178), cf. especially Mongolian *бiйepa* ‘personally’, literally – ‘by a body’ as a noun with the marker of an instrumental case *-pa*; also cf. *бiйepenā* ‘on yourself’, literally – ‘on its body’, which is the form of the locative with the marker *-pe* & the marker of reflexus possessivum *-nā* (Sanžeev 1953: 172, 173), Mongolian (written form) *beye* ‘body’ & ‘person’, ‘myself’ (Vladimircov 1989: 261). Cf. in the written monuments, where *beye*, *bei* is attested as ‘person’ and ‘myself’:

‘sayi **beye** yuyen saki’at ger iyen tegusgen cidaju’ as ‘person’ (Haenisch 1952: 22);

‘Bii **bei** ~ ee uji-sen’ – ‘I saw **myself**’ (Martin 1961: 121).

4.2.4. Tungus-Manchu lexicon

Manchu бэjэ ‘human’, ‘man’, ‘male’, ‘person’, ‘generation’, ‘age’ & ‘body’, Evenki бэjэ (боje) ~ бэi ‘human’, ‘self’, бэj (бөj, бөj) ‘human’, ‘man’ & ‘body’, бэjэ ‘body’ & ‘self’, ‘body, flesh, corpus’, ‘life, being’, ‘person’, ‘self’, ‘own’ (Manchurian) (Sevortian 1978: 178; Vladimircov 1989: 261);

Udihe бэйэ (in the function of the noun) ‘myself’ (*Бэйэниэ, бэйэниэ* [...] йэу йэгдиг’эни бүйниэ?!’ – ‘[Laughs at me], and **he himself**, and **he himself** ... what kind of егдйга?!’) & ‘(the human) body’ (‘Нуани бэйэни дондор суһалини!’ – (about the shaman) *His body started shivering as if in fever*) (Simonov, Kialundziuga 1998: 217–218).

The correlation of the sememes ‘body’ : ‘person’, ‘human’ : ‘myself’ in the words with this etymon is present in all languages of this genetic family (Cincius, ed., 1975: 122–123). However, without historical data, it is difficult to talk about the primacy or secondarity of meanings. In “The Catalogue” (for Evenki бэе there are *only two* meanings ‘body’ – ‘person’; Zalizniak et al.: <https://datsemshift.ru/shift3666>) the direction of the semantic derivation is not defined (ibid.: <https://datsemshift.ru/shift4380>), which is correct in the absence of etymology.

4.2.5. Chukotko-Kamchatkan lexicon

Koryak увук ‘body’ and ‘myself’ (Žukova 1990: 82). Cf. *Mei, Ka’li-ñā’ut, u’wik mīnā’yatn!* – ‘Halloo, Painted-Woman! I will drop down **myself**!’ (lit. **my own body**) (Bogoras 1917: 32).

Koryak lexeme reproduces a very ancient state of semantics since both meanings are reconstructed for the Proto-Chukchi epoch, cf. the semanticisation of the Proto-Chukchi prototype **uwiki* ‘body’, ‘myself’ (Mudrak 2000: 146). But the reconstruction of its Proto-Chukchi–Kamchatkan antecedent **uγwiki* verifies *only* the sememe ‘body, carcass’ (ibid.: 146), which proves the innovativeness of ‘myself’ for Proto-Chukchi. Thus, the relative chronology of Proto-Chukchi–Kamchatkan ‘body, carcass’ > Proto-Chukchi ‘body’, ‘myself’ shows the semantic derivation of ‘myself’ from ‘body’, as in other cases.

4.2.6. Dravidian lexicon

The semantic shift, which is postulated in our study, is also attested within two Dravidian word families (etymological clusters), cf.:

Tamil *piṇam*, *piṇan* ‘body’, ‘corpse’, ‘carcass’ & ‘disembodied soul’, ‘devil’, ‘spirit’, Maṇḍa *piṇam* ‘corpse’, ‘dead body of animals’ etc., Tulu *puṇa* ‘corpse’, ‘dead body’ etc. (Burrow, Emeneau 1984: 368). Cognates from different languages show the same set of meanings ‘body’, ‘corpse’, ‘carcass’, and ‘dead body’, while ‘soul’ and ‘spirit’ are distinguished only in Tamil, which results in presupposing local semantic innovation here **‘body’, ‘dead body’ → ‘disembodied soul’, ‘soul’**. This way of semantic development (‘body’ → ‘soul’) is supported by the pattern of the archaic tenseless negative, cf. *yaareyum kaanoom* – ‘I don’t see a **soul**’ (lit. *everybody* not-seen). Adduced according to Schiffman 1999: 149.

Tamil *mey* ‘truth’, ‘reality’, ‘consciousness’, ‘soul’ & ‘body’ (used euphemistically), *meym-mai* ‘truth’, ‘existence’, Maṇḍa *mey*, *mai* ‘body’ & ‘person’, Toda *moy* ‘body’, Kannaḍa *may(i)*, *mey(i)*, *mai* ‘body’, ‘side’, ‘part’, Tulu *mai* ‘body’ & ‘person’ (Burrow, Emeneau 1984: 458).

The specificity of the correlation between ‘body’ : ‘soul’ : ‘person’, presented in the Dravidian examples, is somewhat different from the other viewed cases. Particularly we have *archaic* meanings ‘body’ and ‘corpse’ (they are used euphemistically and also in songs, that is in archaic speech forms, which indicates their ancient) and *innovative* ‘soul’ = ‘disembodied soul’ (cf. above Tamil *piṇam*) → ‘person’. The main argument in favour of the primacy of the sememe ‘body’ in Tamil *mey*, Maṇḍa *mey*, *mai* etc. and the secondarity of the rest of the meanings is a reference to Tamil *mēni* ‘body’, ‘shape’, Maṇḍa *mēni* ‘body’, ‘shape’ etc., made by the authors of *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary* (Burrow, Emeneau 1984: 458, 461). Cf. also the prototype **may-(mt)-* > **mē-nd-* for *mey* as ‘a body-part’ in: (Krishnamurti 2003: 483). Thus, the sequence of stages may be presented as **‘body’ → ‘(disembodied) soul’ → ‘person’**.

A different picture emerges in other examples, where **‘body’ → ‘live (breathing) body’ → ‘soul’, ‘spirit’ / ‘person’, ‘self’** (in Iranian; see above)

or ‘**body** (= **main part of being**)’ → ‘**self** (= **own body**)’, ‘**person**’, ‘**soul**’
(in other cases).

4.2.7. Vainakh languages

Chechen *doz* ‘heart’ & ‘soul’ (cf. *daɣax* ‘at heart’, ‘in soul’) (Karasaev, Maciev 1978: 147, 555), *ɖoɖ* ‘heart’, Ingush *ɖoɖ* ‘heart’, Batsbi *ɖokI* ‘heart’ (Dešeriev 1963: 527) ~ Chechen *deɖI* ‘body’ (*deɖI*ан меженаш ‘body parts’) (Karasaev, Maciev 1978: 615), cf. *Дозмайра Асланбек / Ша юккѳе уккхича, / Болатчу шен герзех / Кадетта и вавлча [...]* – ‘Aslanbek is brave **in spirit**, / Bursting into the middle of the enemies, / Became a steel weapon / To cut down the enemy [...] (B. Saidov) (Index 2011: 67). Apparently, the sememe ‘soul’ is an innovation of the Chechen word, since only the meaning of ‘heart’ is noted for its genetic “counterparts” in other languages.

In all these cases we can see existing apart forms which continue an etymologically common prototype. In Vainakh languages this one was divided as the result of the primary alternation of vowels in the root (see for example: Dešeriev 1963: 527).

4.2.8. Afroasiatic lexicon

Semitic

Ge’ez *ʾakāl* ‘body’, ‘limb’, ‘substance’, ‘hypostasis’ & ‘person’, ‘volume’, Tigrigna *ʾakal* ‘body’, Amharic *akal* ‘person’ ~ Arabian *ʾukl-* ‘corps’ (Belova 2012: 53). The antiquity of the correlation ‘body’ : ‘person’ derives from its representation already in the ancient Ethiopian language (Ge’ez), now extinct. As we can see, modern languages have retained this correlation.

Ge’ez *ʾabāl* ‘body’, ‘flesh, piece of flesh’, ‘member of body’ & ‘(my)self’, ‘person’ etc. (Majzel’ 1983: 197; Leslau 1987: 3). Cf. *ʾEmma ʾayneka ʾenta yamān tāseḥḥetaka, melexā wa-ʾ awḏeʾā ʾem-lā ʾlēka, ʾesma yexēyyesaka kama [...]* *ʾemenna ʾabāleka ʾem-kʷellu [...]* as ‘person’, ‘self’ (Lambdin 1978: 307).

Aramaic *gūp-* ‘body’ & ‘personality’, ‘myself’, Hebrew *gūp-ā* ‘corpse’, (Post-Biblical) *gūp* ‘body’ and *gap* ‘myself’, ‘self’ (Majzel’ 1983: 197), *bʿ-gappō* ‘with own body = alone’, Tigre *gof* ‘body’, ‘heart’ & ‘soul’ (Cohen 1970: 108).

Arabic *ḡutt-at-* ‘body’, ‘corps’, Soqotri *gitteh* ‘corpse’, ‘body’ (ibid.: 199) < **gtt* ~ Egyptian *ds* [< **gs*] ‘person’, ‘-self’ (Takács 1999: 255).

South Arabian *gitt-eh* ‘body’, ‘corpse’ ~ Egyptian (Pyr) *ḡs* ‘myself’ < Afrasian **gVč-*. See: (Majzel’ 1983: 197).

Epigraphic South Arabian *grb* ‘body’, ‘(bodily) life’ & ‘person’, Sabaic *grb* ‘body’ & ‘person’, Tigre *gärob* ‘body’ & ‘person’ (Cohen 1970: 178) and

Mehri *garābēt* ‘mass’, ‘group of people’ etc. < *gVrVb- (Blažek 2020: 56: with literature). It is an example of a relatively ancient chronology of ‘body’: ‘person’ correlation since both sememes are attested in the Old Arabic vocabulary.

Cushitic

Beja *gari* ‘body’, ‘trunk’ & ‘self’, acc. *garob* (Rp) = *garoot* ‘body’ & ‘self’ ~ Se *gVrVb- (Blažek 2020: 56). Regarding other Semitic cognates see previous item. Regarding the examples from Beja, the employment of the somatism *body* in the function of a reflexive pronoun is achieved by employing a technique similar to the one presented in Hungarian (see above). Here Beja *gari* ‘body’ is turned into ‘self’ due to the addition of the possessive suffix, cf. *ugarooyu* ‘myself’. In the same way the sememe ‘self’ is found in *nifis* ‘soul’ > *unifsu* ‘myself’ (BPG 2005: 225).

4.2.9. Algonquian lexicon

Mohegan-Pequot *-ahak* ‘body’ and ‘myself’ used as the reflexive pronoun, cf.: *‘Tapi ni nukucusumô nahak’* – ‘I can wash **myself**’; *‘Mus numic wici kahak wiwâhcumunsh’* – ‘I will eat corn with **you**’ (Fielding 2006: 56). An illustrative example of a change in the grammatical status of a word, accompanied by the appearance of pronominal semantics. The antiquity of the grammatical-semantic transformation is unclear.

Menominee (as a part of a one-word sentence) *vail taskūqcikew* – has a short **body** VS *dni nēyaw* – **myself** (= *my body*). See: (MD 20–21, 151).

Arapaho (as a part of a one-word sentence) *honoo3i3insinenoo* – I am lying on my **back** VS *ceniiiko'ooteihinoo* – I am **selfish** (Cowell, Moss et al. 2012: 22, 177; DoReCo: doreco.huma-num.fr/languages/arap1274).

Natick or Wôpanâak (Wampanoag) /hogk/ ‘a living body or personality’ & ‘creature’, ‘person’, ‘soul, spirit’, /-hogk(a)/ ‘body’, ‘self’, cf.:

‘[...], n noh **keteahogkou** pish tummuswau wutch ummissinninnutu, [...]’ – ‘[...], that **soul** shall be cut off from his people; [...]’;

‘[...]. kah noh **keteahogkou** kesohkóadtog’ – ‘[...], and that **person** be guilty’ (AT 2011: 225, 226).

Cheyenne *-vétove* ‘body’ in the possessive usage develops the semantics ‘myself’ (Leman 2011: 12; ChD: <https://www.cheyennelanguage.org/dictionary/lexicon.php?letter=13#e21037>).

4.2.10. Austronesian lexicon

Malayo-Polynesian: **Cham** *tràj* ~ *jàj* 'body' and 'myself', 'our' (Alieva, Buj Kchan' Tche 1999: 134). The direction and age of semantic derivation is questionable.

Indonesian *badan* 'body', 'torso' & 'myself', 'in person' (Korigodskij 1990: 69). According to Robert Blust and Stephen Trussel (Blust, Trussel 2013: https://www.trussel2.com/ACD/acd-lo_b.htm?zoom_highlight=badan), this word, borrowed 'from Arabic through Malay', in all Austronesian languages means 'body'. Thus, sememes 'myself', 'in person' result from semantic derivation in Indonesian.

West Futuna-Aniwa *hkano* 'body', 'flesh', 'essence' (traditionally the most important aspect of the self) & 'soul', 'spirit', 'conscious self', cf.: '[...] *kaie uri tano hkano*' – '[...] *but black is his body*' VS '[...] *tiona nohkano*' – '*his spirit, mind (conscious self)*'. However, the sememe 'soul/spirit' 'resulting from switch by missionaries in significance of *ata* and *hkano*' (Dougherty 1983: 263).

Malagasy *tèna* 'body' is used for *self*, as there is no reflexive pronoun in Malagasy, cf. *namòno tèna izy* – *he killed himself* (Parker 1883: 40).

The material accessible for observation in some modern languages from other families only confirms the correlation between 'body' & 'human', and 'person' (Zalizniak et al.: <https://datsemshift.ru/shift3666>), however, the lack of data on their history and etymology makes it impossible to determine the vector and degree of antiquity of semantic evolution. This concerns the following languages: *Cavineña* (Tacanan family), *Yuwana* or *Hodi* (genetically unclassified language), *Otomi* (the Oto-Manguean language family), *Inanwatan* (*Suabo*) and *Warembori* (the Trans–New Guinea family of languages), *Mikir* (the Sino-Tibetan language family), *She* (the Hmong–Mien (or Miao–Yao) family of languages), *Yaminahua* (the Panoan family of languages).

5. RESULTS (SYNTHESIS AND COMMENTARIES)

5.1. The reviewed material allows us to distinguish three notable features. These include in particular:

A) Lexemes with etymological meanings 'body (generally)' and 'corpus (generally)' are the regular base for the development of sememes 'soul', 'self', 'person' and less frequent cases when these secondary sememes arise in the

words, denoting ‘neck’, ‘throat’, ‘head’ or ‘heart’. A possible reason (mythological background) for the semantic derivation of ‘heart’ → ‘soul’ was the archaic idea about the heart as the seat of the soul or feelings, cf. Latin *pectus* ‘bosom’, ‘heart’ & ‘soul’ and above Vainakh, Afroasiatic (Tigre) examples and closest analogy in Manda *sondomme* ‘heart as the seat of feelings’, ‘courage’ (Vydrin 1997: 234).

B) None of the presented examples has a full paradigm of meanings; they demonstrate the lacunas in the semantic structure. The described picture is presented in the table in the most general form.

Language	Original semantics	Secondary semantics			
Indo-European	‘body’, ‘head’	‘soul’, ‘spirit’	‘self’	‘person’, ‘human’	‘one’s own’
Iranian	‘body’	+	+	+	
Indo-Aryan	‘body’		+	+	
Dardic	‘body’		+		+
Ancient Greek	‘(living) body’		+	+	
Latin	‘body’	+		+	
Hittite	‘body’		+	+	
Germanic	‘body’			+	
Slavonic	‘body’			+	
Finno-Ugric	‘body’		+		
Turkic	‘body’		+	+	
Mongolian	‘body’		+	+	+
Tungus-Manchu	‘body’		+	+	+
Chukotko-Kamchatkan	‘body’		+		
Dravidian	‘body’	+		+	
Vainakh	‘body’, ‘heart’	+			
Afroasiatic	‘body’, [‘heart’]	+	+	+	
Algonquian	‘body’	+	+	+	
Austronesian					
Cham	‘body’		+		+
Indonesian	‘body’		+	+	
Malagasy	‘body’		+		
West Futuna-Aniwa	‘body’		+		
Other	‘body’			+	

However, we can confidently speak about the universality of such types of semantic development as (1) ‘body’ → ‘self’, ‘person’ or ‘body’ → ‘self’ → ‘person’; (2) ‘body’ → ‘self’, [‘person’], ‘one’s own’; (3) ‘body’ → ‘soul’, ‘person’ (models 2 and 3 are represented in languages of three language families); (4) ‘body’ & ‘person’. All of them turn out to be *variant implementations*

of a single pattern of semantic derivation (cf. Geeraerts 1997: 23–24), the difference between which is due to the grammatical (morphological-syntactic) and cultural (worldview) conditions for the functioning of lexemes with the specified set of meanings. About the local manifestations of this pattern ([‘body’, ‘dead body’ → ‘disembodied soul’, ‘soul’]; [‘body’ → ‘(disembodied) soul’ → ‘person’]; [‘body’ → ‘live (breathing) body’ → ‘soul’, ‘spirit’/ ‘person’, ‘self’]; [‘body (= main part of being)’ → ‘self (= own body)’, ‘person’, ‘soul’] etc.) see above.

As for the low frequency of examples of semantic derivation ‘body’ → ‘soul’, ‘spirit’ (which does not negate the fact that it is represented in languages of several families), then this state in part may be explained as the consequence of the realisation of the meaning ‘soul’ in special sacral terms, therefore it was not necessary to extrapolate ‘soul’ on other words. But this conclusion needs to be verified with the data of the written monuments.

C) The missing meaning of ‘self’ in the semantic range of some of the analyzed words can be explained with the restrictions which are laid within the very system of the language. In particular pronoun ‘self’ could be derived and exist further only within a special grammatical class of words with their morphology, therefore no other lexeme from another grammatical paradigm (substantive, numeral) with other formal features could not produce appropriate *pronominal* semantics. For example, such a picture is attested in Vainakh languages, where the *self* can emerge only in pronoun paradigm and never among nouns, cf. here: pronoun ‘**self**’ *cō* (1 person, singular), *xvō* (2 person), *uā* (3 person), *вай-ваьу* (1 person, plural), *шайна* (2 person), *чара шавьу* (3 person) & noun ‘soul’, ‘spirit’ *дог*, *са*, ‘**body**’ *дегI* (Karasaev, Maciev, 1978: 146, 147, 552, 615). Thus, the sememe ‘self’ can emerge in a noun only on the condition that there is no direct dependence of pronominal meaning on the form, which ties semantics with the certain grammatical class of words. The language system at least allows for two conditions under which the words, denoting the body or its parts, develop the sememes ‘self’ and ‘myself’: 1) in a certain context; 2) as a part of compound words (see below).

5.2. Comments regarding the specific relationship between ‘body’ & ‘person’, ‘soul’, and ‘self’. As illustrated above the reviewed semantic correlation is attested in many languages. Leaving aside the meanings ‘brunch’, ‘plant stem’ as secondary (from primary ‘body’, ‘corpus’), a researcher should give special attention to other meanings. First and foremost we can conclude *secondary* ‘self’, ‘own’, ‘person’, ‘soul’ to ‘body’, ‘corpus’, and ‘trunk’, and appeal to the data of vocabulary entries, texts, etymology, reconstruction (see above) indicates it. So, it is possible to state a semantic universal shift but what is its mechanism?

A) Semantic side. Its semantic base (for some cases) probably was the perception of the body as the main part of a human being, therefore ‘body’ or ‘head’ → ‘person’, ‘self’; ‘body’ → ‘self’ → ‘person’. Variant development for ‘soul’: ‘living (body)’ and further – ‘spiritualized’ → ‘soul’.

If the lexemes are represented by ‘self’ and ‘person’ in the set of meanings, then in most cases ‘person’ is secondary to ‘self’, since ‘self’ appeared in the *body* when it is used as ‘one’s body’ = ‘(my)self’ (cf. also ‘body’ → ‘one’s own’, ‘own’ = ‘own body’), and then ‘person’, ‘human’ arose as a result of “alienation” (abstraction) from the “pronominal” context.

The direct shift of ‘body’ → ‘person’, ‘human’ is based on synecdoche, as in the case of the Russian *телo* ‘body’ and secondary as ‘person’, ‘human’.

B) Morphological factor. In some languages, the shift ‘body’ → ‘self’ took place in certain grammatical forms of the substantive *body*, where the very conditions (grammatical semantics) have caused that. Thus, the semantic mechanism ‘self’ ← ‘body’ is based on the morphological modification of words with the meaning ‘body’. Examples of that may be illustrated with the data of the: (1) Pashai *tānek* as a reflexive possessive form to *tān* ‘body’; (2) Hungarian language, where reflexive-amplifying pronoun *self* was formed from the substantive *mag* ‘body’ + appropriate personal-possessive suffixes; (3) Beja *gari* ‘body’, which is turned into ‘self’ due to the addition of the possessive suffix; (4) Mongolian languages, where *бијера* ‘personally’ = ‘by a body’, that is a noun with the marker of an instrumental case *-pa*; *бијеренā* ‘on yourself’ = ‘on its body’ – the form of the locative with the marker *-pe* & the marker of reflexus possessivum *-nā*. So, here semantics ‘self’, ‘myself’ developed in case forms, meaning ‘by a body’ (→ ‘personally’ → ‘myself’, ‘self’), ‘on its body’ (→ ‘on yourself’, ‘self’), and in the noun *body*, extended with personal-possessive suffixes (‘body’ → ‘my, his body’ → ‘myself’ etc.).

C) Factor of stem composition. In some examples, the lexeme *body* acquired sememes ‘self’, ‘myself’ within the frames of the phrases, which later were turned into compound words. That is, word combinations with the *body* were collapsed into a lexical composite, where the meaning ‘body’ was neutralized just as ‘(my)self’, cf. Avestan *tanu.kərətā-* adj. ‘made by oneself’: Old Indian *tanū-kṛt-* ‘self-created’. A similar situation is represented in Hungarian (see above), where ‘body’ was neutralized in pronominal derivatives.

Under the same conditions, semantics ‘person’ appears in the *body*: in particular, in Old Indian *tanū-* it also appears in the composition of compound words *tanū-kṛt* ‘forming the person’, *tanū-pāna* ‘protection of the person’.

D) Syntactic conditions. The meanings of ‘self’, ‘myself’, ‘(one’s) own’ in the *body* appear as a result of its use in the sentence as a reflexive pronoun or as a word functionally close to reflexive and possessive pronouns. The pronominal

use of *body* itself was originally based on such phrases as Avestan *x^vaxiiāi tanuiiē* ‘his own body’, Old Indian *sváyā tanvā* ‘one’s own body’ etc. Other examples are presented sporadically in Middle Iranian, modern Iranian (Ossetian) languages and in Turkic, Mongolian, Tungus-Manchu, Chukotko-Kamchatkan etc. Cf. Mohegan-Pequot *-ahak* ‘body’ changed its grammatical status, being integrated into the composition of the polysynthetic construction etc. Then, the *body* in the pronominal function replaced similar constructions.

Conditions of emergence of ‘self’ in *body*

Conditions Languages	Morphological variation	Within compound words	Syntactic conditions
Indo-European	+	+	+
Finno-Ugric	+		
Turkic			+
Mongolian	+		+
Tungus-Manchu			+
Chukotko-Kamchatkan			+
Dravidian			
Vainakh			
Afroasiatic	+		+
Algonquian			+
Austronesian			+

E) The “zero semantic correlation” factor. However, there are languages, where the above-described semantic shift is impossible. Particularly our attention is attracted to such lexemes in the languages of Africa as Rwanda *umu-biri* ‘body’, Kinga *emi-hano* ‘bodies’ (Toporova 2000: 28, 29), Pulaar-Fulfuldé (Fula) *ter-gal* ‘body’, *ter-de* ‘body parts’ (Koval’ 2000: 223), *bandu* ‘body’, Seereer *fo baal ol* ‘body’, Wolof *yar W* ‘body’ ~ Seereer *njer/cer* ‘body’ (Pozdniakov 1993: 40, 101), Pulaar-Fulfuldé *fitan-du* ‘soul’, *pital-i* ‘souls’ (Koval’ 2000: 162: with the reference to Edward Sapir). Words to denote ‘body’ and ‘soul’ here belong to *different semantic classes*: “active class” (class of active objects, active names) VS “passive class” (class of passive objects, passive names) etc. The laws of these classes do not allow the meaning of one class to be produced in the frames of other classes. In other words, semantic derivation here is pretty strictly regulated and distinct from other observed languages where the emergence of new meaning is possible due to a broader spectrum of culture (religious, poetic

and other) associations with a more free-flowing, flexible nature of relations between meanings.

6. CONCLUSIONS

1. The vocabulary analyzed in this study provides sufficient illustrations of the universality of the semantic derivation model implemented in different languages of the widest geography (examples from 11 language families!). The semantic and grammatical laws of these languages created the conditions for the sum of similar semantic shifts, defined as multiple manifestations of this model. Multiplicity presupposes the presence of a cluster of chains of semantic shifts (see above), based on which semantic derivation is modelled.

2. In reality we have reasons for assertion about the direction of the semantic derivation ‘body’ → ‘self’, ‘person’, ‘soul’, because ‘body’ and ‘corpus’ are original, which is confirmed with the etymological data.

3. The reproducibility of the considered model in diachrony is proved by its representation in the lexical semantics of languages in different periods of their history. Late semantic derivation in languages where it was not previously recorded testifies to the typicality of some semantic structures of linguistic thinking.

4. We deal with one of the universal semantic shifts, however in the frame of this semantic pattern its “technical aspect” (conditions and mechanism) of meaning emergence of ‘soul’, ‘person’, ‘human’, and ‘self’ might be different. In particular, the reasons for the generation of these sememes are determined by the peculiarities of the world picture, the cultural background, the peculiarities of the morphological variation of words, their function in the sentence and the compositions that arose based on the corresponding word combinations.

REFERENCES

- Abaev Vasilij I. 1958: Абаев, Василий И. *Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка* [Istoriko-ètimologičeskij slovar’ osetinskogo jazyka] 1, Москва, Ленинград: Издательство АН СССР [Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatel’stvo AN SSSR].
- Abaev Vasilij I. 1973: Абаев, Василий И. *Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка* [Istoriko-ètimologičeskij slovar’ osetinskogo jazyka] 2, Москва, Ленинград: Наука [Moskva, Leningrad: Nauka].

Abaev Vasilij I. 1979: Абаев, Василий И. *Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка* [Istoriko-ëtimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka] 3, Москва, Ленинград: Наука [Moskva, Leningrad: Nauka].

Alieva Natal'ja F., Bui Kchan' Tche 1999: Алиева, Наталья Ф., Буй, Кхань Тхе. *Язык чам. Устные говоры восточного диалекта* [Jazyk čam. Ustnye govory vostočnogo dialekta], Санкт-Петербург: Петербургское востоковедение [Sankt-Peterburg: Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie].

AT – *The State of the Material: algonquian texts*, available online, 2011. Available at: <https://web.archive.org/web/20120606165553/http://people.umass.edu/aef6000/Texts/AlAlgonqui/Massachusetts/Alia/Trmbll.pdf> [retrieved 02.05.2024].

Avdoev Teimuraz V. 2017: Авдоев, Теймураз В. *Езидско-русский словарь* [Ezidsko-russkij slovar'] (*Ferhengoke Êzdîkî-Rûsî*), ч. 1: *Лексический словарь* [č. 1: Leksičeskij slovar'], Калининград: Апокриф [Kaliningrad: Apokrif].

Bailey Harold W. 1943: *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bartholomae Christian 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.

Beekes Robert S. P. 2010: *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, with the assist. of L. van Beek, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Belova Anna G. 2012: Белова, Анна Г. *Этимологический словарь древнеарабской лексики (на материале избранных текстов доисламской поэзии)* [Ëtimologičeskij slovar' drevnearabskoj leksiki (na materiale izbrannyh tekstov doislamskoj poëzii)], вып. 1 [vyp. 1], Москва: Институт востоковедения РАН [Moskva: Institut vostokovedenija RAN].

Benzing Johannes 1983: *Chwaresmischer Wortindex*, mit einer Einleitung von H. Humbach, hrsg. von Z. Taraf, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Blažek Václav 2020: An Excerpt from the Comparative and Etymological Dictionary of Beja: Anatomical Lexicon. – *Folia Orientalia* 57, 25–125.

Blust Robert, Trussel Stephen 2013: *The Austronesian Comparative Dictionary*, web edition. Available at: <https://www.trussel2.com/ACD/> [retrieved 03.05.2024].

Bogoras Waldemar 1917: *Publications of the American Ethnological Society* 5: *Koryak Texts*, ed. by F. Boas, Leyden: Brill.

BPG – Wedekind Klaus, Wedekind Charlotte, Abuzeinab Musa. *Beja Pedagogical Grammar*, Aswan 2004 – Asmara 2005.

Buck Carl D. 1949: *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages: A Contribution to the History of Ideas*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Budagov Ruben A. 1963: Будагов, Рубен А. *Сравнительно-семасиологические исследования (романские языки)* [Sravnitel'no-semasiologičeskie issledovanija (romanskije jazyki)], Москва: МГУ [Moskva: MGU].

Burrow Thomas, Emeneau Murray B. 1984: *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*, 2nd edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Caboloov Ruslan L. 2010: Цаболов, Руслан Л. *Этимологический словарь курдского языка* [Ėtimologičeskij slovar' kurdskogo jazyka] 2 (N–Z), ред. Д. Н. Ушаков [red. D. N. Ušakov], Москва: Восточная литература [Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura].

ChD – *Cheyenne Dictionary*, available online. Available at: <https://www.cheyennelanguage.org/dictionary/index.html> [retrieved 28.05.2024].

Cincius Vera I., ed., 1975: Цинциус, Вера И., ред. *Сравнительный словарь тунгусо-маньчжурских языков: материалы к этимологическому словарю* [Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-man'čžurskich jazykov: materialy k ėtimologičeskomu slovar'ju] 1 (A–H), составители В. А. Горцевская, В. Д. Колесникова, О. А. Константинова, К. А. Новикова, Т. И. Петрова, В. И. Цинциус, Т. Г. Бугаева [sostaviteli V. A. Gorcevskaaja, V. D. Kolesnikova, O. A. Konstantinova, K. A. Novikova, T. I. Petrova, V. I. Cincius], Ленинград: Наука [Leningrad: Nauka].

Clauson Gerard 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cohen David 1970: *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques*, comprenant un fichier comparative de J. Cantineau, Paris, La Haye: Mouton & Co.

Cowell Andrew, Moss Alonzo Sr. et al. 2012: *Dictionary of the Arapaho Language*, 4th edition, Wyoming: University Press of Colorado.

Dal' Vladimir I. 1989: Даль, Владимир И. *Пословицы русского народа* [Poslovicey russkogo naroda] 1, Москва: Художественная литература [Moskva: Chudožestvennaja literatura].

Dešeriev Junus D. 1963: Дешериев, Юнус Д. *Сравнительно-историческая грамматика нахских языков и проблемы происхождения и исторического развития горских кавказских народов* [Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika nachskich jazykov i problemy proischoždenija i istoričeskogo razvitija gorskich kavkazskich narodov], Грозный: Чечено-ингушское книжное издательство [Groznyj: Čečeno-ingušskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo].

DoReCo – *Language Documentation Reference Corpus. Language: Arapaho*. Available at: <https://doreco.huma-num.fr/languages/arap1274> [retrieved 28.05.2024].

Dougherty Janet W. D. 1983: *West Futuna-Aniwa: An Introduction to a Polynesian Outlier Language*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press Publications in Linguistics 102.

DTS – *Древнетюркский словарь* [Drevnetiurkskij slovar'], редакторы В. М. Наделяев, Д. М. Насилов, Э. Р. Тенишев, А. М. Щербак [redaktory V. M. Nadeliaev, D. M. Nasilov, È. R. Tenišev, A. M. Ščerbak], Ленинград: Наука Ленинградское отделение [Leningrad: Nauka Leningradskoe отделение], 1969.

Durkin-Meisterernst Desmond 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum Subsidia: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts 3: Texts from Central Asia and China*, Part 1, Turnhout: Brepols.

Dvoreckij Josif Ch., comp., 1958: *Дворецкий, Иосиф Х., сост. Древнегреческо-русский словарь* [Drevnegrečesko-russkij slovar'] 2, ред. С. И. Соболевский [red. S. I. Sobolevskij], с прил. грамматики, сост. С. И. Соболевским [s pril. grammatiki, sost. S. I. Sobolevskim], Москва: ГИС [Moskva: GIS].

Dvoreckij Josif Ch. 1976: *Дворецкий, Иосиф Х. Латинско-русский словарь* [Latinsko-russkij slovar'], ред. К. Н. Яблонская, Г. А. Барышева [red. K. N. Jablonskaja, G. A. Baryševa], издание 2-е, переработ. и доп. [izdanie 2-е, pererabot. i dop.], Москва: Русский язык [Moskva: Russkij jazyk].

Èdel'man Džoj I. 2008: *Эдельман, Джой И. Хорезмийский язык* [Chorezmijskij jazyk]. – *Основы иранского языкознания: среднеиранские и новоиранские языки* [Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija: sredneiranskie i novoiranskie jazyki], отв. ред. В. А. Ефимов [otv. red. V. A. Efimov], редколлегия М. Н. Боголюбов, В. А. Ефимов, Д. И. Эдельман [redkollegija M. N. Bogol'jubov, V. A. Efimov, D. I. Èdel'man], Москва: Издательская фирма «Восточная литература» РАН [Moskva: Izdatel'skaja firma "Vostočnaja literatura" RAN], 6–60.

ESSJ XXII – *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavianskich jazykov. Praslavianskij leksičeskij fond] 22 (*nadělitī – *narodъ), ред. О. Н. Трубачёв [red. O. N. Trubačiov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 1995.

Fielding Stephanie 2006: *A Modern Mohegan Dictionary. For the Council of Elders*, reviewed by the Cultural and Community Programs Department. Available at: <https://ia902904.us.archive.org/16/items/mohegan-dictionary/MoheganDictionary.pdf>.

Forcellini Egidio, Gesner Johan, Bailey James 1828: *Totius latinitatis lexicon* 1, red. J. Bailey, Londini: sumbtibus Baldwin et Cradock.

Geeraerts Dirk 1997: *Diachronic Prototype Semantics: A Contribution to Historical Lexicology*, Ser. *Oxford Studies in Lexicography and Lexicology*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Geeraerts Dirk 2010: *Theories of Lexical Semantics*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Gharib Badrozaman 1995: *Sogdian Dictionary: Sogdian-Persian-English*, Tehran: Farhang Publications.

Haenisch Erich 1952: *Sino-Mongolische Dokumente vom Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Ser. *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst Jahrg.* 1953, 3; 1954, 2. *Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst. Abhandlungen*; 1953, 3, etc. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Hinz Walther 1973: *Neue Wege im Altpersischen*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Homeri 1920: *Opera*, Tomus 1, *Iliadis Libros I–XII Continens*, eds. D. B. Munro, T. W. Allen, Ser. *Scriptorum classicorum bibliotheca Oxoniensis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Index 2011: *Index of /pdf/Books/Linguistics/Mega linguistics pack/Caucasian/*. Available at: <https://theswissbay.ch/pdf/Books/Linguistics/Mega%20linguistics%20pack/Caucasian/> [retrieved 01.05.2024].

Karasaev Aisaš T., Maciev Achmet G. 1978: Карасаев, Айсаш Т., Мациев, Ахмет Г. *Русско-чеченский словарь* [Russko-čečenskij slovar’], отв. ред. И. Ю. Алироев [otv. red. I. J. Aliroev], ред. А. Т. Карасаев, А. Д. Тимаев, Я. У. Эсхаджиев [red. A. T. Karasaev, A. D. Timaev, J. U. Èschadžiev], эл. версия [èl. versija], Москва: Русский язык [Moskva: Russkij jazyk].

Kloekhorst Alwin 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Ser. *Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary*, 5, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Kluge Friedrich 2002: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, bearb. von E. Seebold, 24., durchges. und erw. Aufl., Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Kogan Anton I. 2005: Коган, Антон И. *Дардские языки. Генетическая характеристика* [Dardskie jazyki. Genetičeskaja charakteristika], Москва: Издательская фирма «Восточная литература» РАН [Moskva: Izdatel’skaja firma “Vostočnaja literatura” RAN].

Korigodskij Robert N. 1990: Коригодский, Роберт Н. *Большой индонезийско-русский словарь* [Bol’šoj indonezijsko-russkij slovar’] 1 (A–L), Москва: Русский язык [Moskva: Russkij jazyk].

Koval' Antonina I. 2000: Коваль, Антонина И. Морфемика пулар-фульфульде [Morfemika pular-ful'ful'de]. – *Основы африканского языкознания: морфемика, морфонология* [Osny afrikanskogo jazykoznanija: morfemika, morfonologija], отв. ред. В. А. Виноградов [otv. red. V. A. Vinogradov], Москва: Восточная литература [Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura], 103–290.

Krishnamurti Bhadriraju 2003: *The Dravidian languages*, Ser. *Cambridge Language Surveys*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lambdin Thomas O. 1978: *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Ge'ez)*, Ser. *Harvard Semitic series*, 24, Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.

Lehr Rachel 2014: *A Descriptive Grammar of Pashai: The Language and Speech Community of Darrai Nur*: A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the division of the humanities in candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Chicago, Illinois.

Leman Wayne 2011: *A Reference Grammar of the Cheyenne Language*, 4th edition, Raleigh: Lulu Press.

Leslau Wolf 1987: *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic) – Ge'ez-English, English-Ge'ez, with an Index of the Semitic Roots*, reprinted, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag.

Lyrics Translate 2024: *Kur tu jāsi, bāleliṇi*. Available at: <https://lyricstranslate.com/en/kur-tu-j%C4%81si-b%C4%81leli%C5%86i-where-will-you-ride-brother.html>.

Livšic Vladimir A. 1962: Лившиц, Владимир А. *Согдийские документы с горы Муг. Чтение, перевод, комментарий* [Sogdijskie dokumenty s gory Mug. Čtenie, perevod, komentarij], вып. 2: *Юридические документы и письма* [vyp. 2: Juridičeskie dokumenty i pis'ma], Москва: Издательство восточной литературы [Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury].

MacKenzie David N. 1986: *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*, reprinted (with corrections), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Majtinskaja Klara E. 1976: Майтинская, Клара Е. Венгерский язык [Vengerskij jazyk]. – *Основы финно-угорского языкознания. Марийский, пермские и угорские языки* [Osny finno-ugorskogo jazykoznanija. Marijskij, permskie i ugarskie jazyki], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 342–414.

Majzel' Solomon S. 1983: Майзель, Соломон С. *Пути развития корневого фонда семитских языков* [Puti razvitija kornevogo fonda semitskich jazykov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka].

Martin Samuel E. 1961: *Dagur Mongolian Grammar, Texts, and Lexicon*, Based on the Speech of Peter Onon, *Indiana University Publications, Ser. Uralic and Altaic Series*, 4, Bloomington: Indiana University; The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Mayhew Anthony L., Skeat Walter W. 1888: *A Concise Dictionary of Middle English from A.D. 1150 to 1580*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mayrhofer Manfred 1956: *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen 1 (A–TH)*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Mayrhofer Manfred 1992: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen 1*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

MD – *Menominee Dictionary: English–Menominee*, available online. Available at: <https://web.archive.org/web/20200712174150/https://static1.squarespace.com/static/53129cd4e4b06c7ef09b071b/t/53271601e4b055350d944f15/1395070465326/Menominee+Dictionary+English-Menominee.pdf>.

Mikina Olena H. 2009: Мікіна, Олена Г. Про унікальність та закономірність у семантичній еволюції [Pro unikal'nist' ta zakonornirnist' u semantyčnij èvoliuciji]. – *Вісник донецького національного університету* [Visnyk donec'koho nacional'noho universitetu], сер. Б: Гуманітарні науки [ser. B: Gumanitarni nauky] 1, 59–63.

Mikina Olena G. 2012: Мікіна, Олена Г. Історико-семасіологічне дослідження латинських і романських дієслів мовлення на індоєвропейському фоні [Istoryko-semasiolohične doslidžennia latyns'kych i romans'kych dièsliv movlennia na indoèvrops'komu fonì], Донецьк: Юго-Восток [Donec'k: Yugo-Vostok].

Mikina Olena H. 2020: Мікіна, Олена Г. Еволюція від 'рахувати' до 'розповідати' як семантична універсалія [Evoliucija vid 'rachuvaty' do 'rozpovidaty' jak semantyčna universalija]. – *Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського* [Včeni zapysky TNU imeni V. I. Vernads'koho], сер. Філологія. Соціальні комунікації [ser. Filolohija. Social'ni komunikaciji] 31(70), 1/3, 115–119.

Mikina Olena H. 2022: Мікіна, Олена Г. Історія латинського дієслова *inquam*, *inquit* як підтвердження семантичної універсалії [Istorija latyns'koho dièslova *inquam*, *inquit* jak pidtverdžennia semantyčnoji universalii]. – *Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського* [Včeni zapysky TNU imeni V. I. Vernads'koho], [Včeni zapysky TNU imeni V. I. Vernads'koho], сер. Філологія. Журналістика [ser. Filolohija. Žurnalistyka] 33(72), 4/2, 19–24.

Monier-Williams Monier 2002: *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*, ed. E. Leumann, 2nd edition, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Mudrak Oleg A. 2000: Мудрак, Олег А. *Этимологический словарь чукотско-камчатских языков* [Ėtimologičeskij slovar' čukotsko-kamčatskich jazykov], Москва: Языки русской культуры [Moskva: Jazyki ruskoj kul'tury].

Nerlich Brigitte 1992: *Semantic Theories in Europe 1830–1930. From Etymology to Contextuality*, Ser. *Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Studies in the history of the language sciences*, 59, Amsterdam Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Co.

Nyberg Henrik S. 1974: *A Manual of Pahlavi, Part 2: Ideograms, Glossary, Abbreviations, Index, Grammatical Survey, Corrigenda to Part 1*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Orel Vladimir E., Stolbova Olga V. 1994: *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary: Materials for a Reconstruction*, Ser. *Handbook of Oriental Studies*, Sec. 1: *The Near and Middle East*, 18, Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.

Ovidius 1984: *Metamorphoses*: in Two Volumes, translated by F. J. Miller, revised by G. P. Goold, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Parker G. W. 1883: *A Concise Grammar of the Malagasy Language* 4, ed. R. Rost, *Trübner's collection of simplified grammars*, London: Trübner & Co., 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill.

Pokrovskij Michail M. 1895: *Покровский, Михаил М. Семасиологические исследования в области древних языков* [Semasiologičeskie issledovanija v oblasti drevnich jazykov], Москва: Университетская типография [Moskva: Universitetskaja tipografija].

Pozdniakov Konstantin I. 1993: Поздняков, Константин И. *Сравнительная грамматика атлантических языков. Именные классы и фоно-морфология* [Srvnitel'naja grammatika atlantičeskich jazykov. Imennye klassy i fono-morfologija], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka].

Rastorgueva Vera S., Ėdel'man Džoj I. 2007: Расторгуева, Вера С., Эдельман, Джой И. *Этимологический словарь иранских языков* [Ėtimologičeskij slovar' iranskich jazykov] 3 (F–H), Москва: Восточная литература [Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura].

Rubinčik Jurij A. 1970: Рубинчик, Юрий А. *Персидско-русский словарь* [Persidsko-russkij slovar'] 1, Москва: Русский язык [Moskva: Russkij jazyk].

Sadovski Velizar 2017: The lexicon of Iranian. – *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*. HSK 41.1, ed. by J. Klein, B. Joseph, M. Fritz, in cooperation with M. Wenthe, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 566–598.

Sanžeev Garma D. 1953: Санжеев, Гарма Д. *Сравнительная грамматика монгольских языков* [Srvnitel'naja grammatika mongol'skich jazykov] 1, Москва: АН СССР [Moskva: AN SSSR].

Schiffman Harold F. 1999: *A Reference Grammar of Spoken Tamil*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schuster-Šewc Heinz 1975: Modellierung semantischer Prozesse und Etymologie. – *Slawische Wortstudien*, Sammelband des internationalen Symposiums zur etymologischen und historischen Erforschung des slawischen Wortschatzes (Leipzig, 11–13.10.1972), Bautzen: Domowina-Verlag, 12–19.

Sevortian Èrvand V. 1978: Севортян, Эрванд В. *Этимологический словарь тюркских языков. Общетюркские и межтюркские основы на букву «Б»* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' tiurkskich jazykov. Obščetiurkskie i mežtiurkskie osnovy na bukvu "B"] 2, Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka].

Simonov Michail D., Kialundziuga Valentina T. 1998: Симонов Михаил Д., Кялундзюга Валентина Т. *Словарь удэгейского языка (хорский диалект)* [Slovar' udègejskogo jazyka (chorskij dialekt)] 1, Стеншев: Издание А. Маевича [Stenšev: Izdanie A. Maeviča].

Skjærvø Prods O. 2018: *An Introduction to Old Avestan*, 3rd version, unpublished, available online. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/72414767/Old_Avestan_Primer [retrieved 03.05.2024].

Sophocles Evangelinos A. 1900: *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (From BC 146 to A–D 1100)*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Starostin Sergei A., Dybo Anna V., Mudrak Oleg A., eds., 2003: *Etymological Dictionary of the Altaic Languages*, Leiden: Brill.

Stern Gustaf 1964: *Meaning and Change of Meaning. With Special Reference to the English Language*, 2nd edition, reprinted, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Takács Gábor 1999: *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian 1: A Phonological Introduction*, Ser. *Handbook of Oriental studies*, Sec. 1: *The Near and Middle East*, 48, Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.

Tenišev Èdgem R. et al. 2001: Тенишев, Эдгем Р. и др. *Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков. Лексика* [Srvnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tiurkskich jazykov. Leksika], 2-е изд., доп. [2-е izd., dop.], ред. коллегия А. В. Дыбо, И. В. Кормушин, Л. С. Левитская и др. [red. kolegija A. V. Dybo, I. V. Kormušin, L. S. Levitskaja i dr.], ред. тома Е. А. Поцелуевский [red. toma E. A. Poceluevskij], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka].

Tenišev Èdgem R. et al. 2006: Тенишев, Эдгем Р. и др. *Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков. Пратюркский язык-основа. Картина мира пратюркского этноса по данным языка* [Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tiurkskich jazykov. Pratiurkskij jazyk-osnova. Kartina mira pratiurkskogo ètnosa po dannym jazyka], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka].

Tolstaja Svetlana M. 1997: Толстая, Светлана М. Из полесской обрядовой лексики: *нашлось дитя* [Iz polesskoj obriadovoj leksiki: *našlos' ditia*]. – *Український діалектологічний збірник* [Ukrajinskij dialektolohičnyj zbirnyk] 3, Київ: Довіра [Kyjiv: Dovira], 287–292.

Торогова Irina N. 2000: Топорова, Ирина Н. Морфемика и морфология имени существительного в языках банту [Morfemika i morfonologija imeni suščestvitel'nogo v jazykach bantu]. – *Основы африканского языкознания: морфемика, морфология* [Osnovy afrikanskogo jazykoznanija: morfemika, morfonologija], ред. В. А. Виноградов [red. V. A. Vinogradov], Москва: Восточная литература [Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura], 9–45.

Traugott Elizabeth C. 1999: The Role of Pragmatics in a Theory of Semantic Change. – *Pragmatics in 1998. Selected Papers from the 6th International Pragmatics Conference 2*, ed. J. Verschueren, Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association, 93–102.

Traugott Elizabeth C., Dasher Richard B. 2002: *Regularity In Semantic Change*, Ser. *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics*, 97, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trubačiov Oleg N. 1964: Трубачёв, Олег Н. «Молчать» и «таять». О необходимости семасиологического словаря нового типа [“Molčat” i “tajat”]. О neobchodimosti semasiologičeskogo slovaria novogo tipa]. – *Проблемы индоевропейского языкознания. Этюды по сравнительно-исторической грамматике индоевропейских языков* [Problemy indoevropskogo jazykoznanija. Ètiudy po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj grammatike indoevropskich jazykov], отв. ред. В. Н. Топоров [otv. red. V. N. Toporov], Москва: АН СССР [Moskva: AN SSSR], 100–105.

de Vaan Michiel 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Vladimircov Boris J. 1989: Владимирцов, Борис Я. *Сравнительная грамматика монгольского письменного языка и халхаского наречия. Введение и фонетика* [Sravnitel'naja grammatika mongol'skogo pis'mennogo jazyka i chalchaskogo narečija. Vvedenie i fonetika], 2-е изд. [2-е izd.], Москва: Главная редакция восточной литературы изд. «Наука» [Moskva: Glavnaja redakcija vostočnoj literatury izd. “Nauka”].

Vydrin Valentin F. 1997: Выдрин, Валентин Ф. Следы именной классификации в языках манде [Sledy imennoj klassifikacii v jazykach mande]. – *Основы африканского языкознания. Именные категории* [Osnovy afrikanskogo jazykoznanija. Imennye kategorii], ред. В. А. Виноградов [red. V. A. Vinogradov], Москва: Аспект Пресс [Moskva: Aspekt Press].

Zalizniak Anna A. 2009: Зализняк, Анна А. О понятии семантического перехода [O poniatii semantičeskogo perechoda]. – *Компьютерная лингвистика и интеллектуальные технологии: по материалам ежегодной Международной конференции «Диалог 2009»* [Kompiuternaja lingvistika i intelektual'nye tehnologii: po materialam ežegodnoj Meždunarodnoj konferencii "Dialog 2009"] 8(15), 107–111.

Zalizniak Anna A. 2013: Зализняк, Анна А. *Русская семантика в типологической перспективе* [Russkaja semantika v tipologičeskoj perspektive], сер. [ser.] *Studia philologica*, Москва: Языки славянской культуры [Moskva: Jazyki slavianskoj kul'tury].

Zalizniak Anna A. 2018: The Catalogue of Semantic Shifts: 20 Years Later. – *Russian Journal of Linguistics* 22(4), 770–787.

Zalizniak Anna A. et al.: *The Catalogue of Semantic Shifts*. Available at: <https://datsemshift.ru/shifts> [retrieved 04.05.2024].

Žukova Alevtina N. 1990: Жукова, Алевтина Н. *Словарь корякско-русский и русско-корякский – около 4000 слов* [Slovar' koriaksko-russkij i russko-koriakskij – okolo 4000 slov]: пособие для учащихся начальной школы [posobie dlja učaščichsia načal'noj školy], 2-е изд. дораб. [2-e izd. dorab.], Ленинград: Просвещение, Ленингр. отд-ние [Leningrad: Prosveščenie, Leningr. otd-nie].

Semantinės dinamikos universalumas: nuo 'kūno' iki 'asmens', 'savasties', 'sielos'

SANTRAUKA

Somatinių žodžių, reiškiančių 'kūnas' arba 'kūno dalis', stebėjimas vienuolikoje genetiškai skirtingų šeimų kalbose atskleidžia įdomią tokių žodžių sememų koreliaciją. Visų pirma, kontekstai, kuriuose somatizmai pateikiami, be kita ko, *būtinai* parodo, kad jie vartojami kaip 'asmuo, žmogus', 'aš, savastis' ir 'siela, dvasia'. Toks sememų santykio dėsningumas vargu ar yra atsitiktinis, o semantinė-tipologinė analizė, atlikta atsižvelgiant į etimologijos ir lingvistinio modeliavimo duomenis, suteikia rimtą priežastį manyti, kad tokie gausūs

atvejai atskleidžia universalios semantinės kalbinio mąstymo struktūros apraiškas. Šią struktūrą galima apibūdinti kaip semantinio darinio tipą, perteikiamą semantinių poslinkių grandinėmis: ['kūnas' → 'siela'], ['kūnas' → 'asmenybė', 'žmogus'], ['kūnas' → 'savastis' → 'aš pats'], ['kūnas' → 'savastis' → 'asmenybė' → 'žmogus']. Kartu jie sudaro daugiamatį semantikos kūrimo modelį su vienu vektoriumi. Galima daryti prielaidą, kad modelis neapsiriboja tam tikru kalbos istorijos laikotarpiu, bet yra atkuriamas diachroniškai dėl jo vaizdavimo skirtinguose sinchroniniuose pjūviuose.

Šio tipo semantinio darinio realizavimo niuansai visiškai priklauso nuo sąlygų (veiksnių) visumos – semantinio, morfologinio, kamieno komponavimo ir sintaksinio veiksnio.

Nagrinėjamas semantinės darybos tipas būdingas ne tik afrikiečių kalboms dėl specifinės jų semantinių santykių sistemos organizacijos pagal žodžių, priklausančių skirtingoms klasėms 'aktyvus' ir 'pasyvus', principą, todėl 'aktyviajai' klasei būdinga semema 'siela' negali būti *įkūnyta* leksemoje iš 'pasyviosios' klasės.

Įteikta 2024 m. gegužės 5 d.

ALEXANDER I. ILIADI

ILONA M. DERIK

*The State Institution "South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University
named after K. D. Ushinsky"*

65020, Ukraine, Odessa

34, Staroportofrankivska Str.

alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com

ilonaderik@gmail.com