

MEANINGS 'BODY' AND 'PERSON', 'SELF', 'SOUL': ONE SEMANTICAL UNIVERSAL

У статті запропоновано опис і часткове пояснення причин семантичного зрушення 'тіло', 'тулуб' → 'особа', 'сам, себе', 'дух, душа'. Зазначена семантична зміна засвідчена в різних мовах (індосвропейських і неіндосвропейських) у різні періоди їхньої історії, що дає підстави констатувати у подібному смислового співвідношенні один із прикладів так званих семантичних універсалій.

Ключові слова: *лексика, семантична універсалія, мова, займенник, композита.*

The paper deals description and partial explanation of the causes of semantical shift 'body', 'corpus' → 'person', 'self', 'soul'. Mentioned semantical shift is attested in different languages (affined and unallied) in different periods of their history and this fact enables us to state one of examples of co-called semantical universals in such semantical relations.

Key words: *vocabulary, semantical universal, language, pronoun, compound word.*

Four years ago at the conference «Languages and the world» in The Kirovohrad Volodymyr Vynnychenko State Pedagogical University, talking with Alexander Dmitriyevich, I asked him what he thought about so-called «semantical universals». The fact is that not so long ago the book by E. G. Mikina¹ on this topical theme had been published, therefore I was very interested in his opinion as the linguist with a phenomenal erudition regarding this problem. He answered me, that future of semasiology will largely depend on investigations of this problem but the difficulty is that each example of semantical universals should be examined «under microscope» and well-founded with enough arguments. Remembering that our conversation, I would like to devote this semasiological etude to the memory of professor A. D. OGuy – indefatigable researcher of languages.

In particular the following lexemes indicate the regular semantical shift 'body', 'corpus' → 'person', 'self', 'soul', which is attested in different languages (affined and unallied) in different periods of their history. To the best of my knowledge, this lexical material thus far has been not the object of special linguistic research (it is astoundingly!) and accordingly typological affinity of the words, demonstrating common feature in their semantic development, is not noted and explained. Taking into account this fact, I think my task is to show forth summarily of all the facts known to me and try to find out causes of mentioned semantical shift.

1. Evidence of Indo-European languages

¹ Мікіна О. Г. Історико-семасіологічне дослідження латинських і романських дієслів мовлення на індосвропейському фоні. – Донецьк : Юго-Восток, 2012.

1.1. Iranian lexicon

Proto-Iranian **grīyā-* ‘neck, nape of the neck; nape’ > Khorezm *γryw* ‘body, soul’ > *γryw* ‘self, herself, himself, yourself’ [4, c. 57], comp. combination of words *y’ γryw* ‘by myself; himself’, Sogdian man. *γryw* ‘body, person, soul’, ‘self’ [6, c. 291–292; 11, c. 130, 167], Middle Persian *grīw* [*glyw*]¹ ‘neck’, ‘throat’, *grīw* [*glyw*], *gryw* ‘myself, self’, ‘soul’ [15, c. 37], which are interpreted as a «semantic branch» [6, c. 292] but reasons and conditions of such semantic specialization are not explained.

Proto-Iranian **tamu-* ‘body’: Avestan *tanū-* ‘body’, ‘person’ ‘self’ (one was being used also as a reflexive pronoun) [10, c. 633; 1, c. 261], Old Persian *tanūš* ‘body, self, trunk’ [12, c. 152], Middle Persian *tan* [*tn*]¹ ‘body’, ‘person’ [15, c. 81], Persian *tan*, *tana*, Pahlavi *tan* ‘body’, ‘person’ [1, c. 261]. Exactly the same situation is represented in Sanskrit, where attested *tanūḥ* ‘body, corpus’ and ‘self’, ‘person’; this word in late language was being used in reflexive meaning. Comp. also NW-Prākṛ. *tanuvaka-*, Torwālī *tanu* ‘one’s own’ [17, c. 475].

1.2. Ancient Greek lexicon: σῶμα ‘living body’ and ‘human’ as ‘himself’, comp. καὶ χρήματα καὶ τὰ ἑαυτῶν σῶματα = (their) property and themselves [3, c. 1596].

1.3. Latin lexicon: *corpus*, *oris* ‘body, flesh’, ‘corpus’ and ‘person’, ‘human’, ‘figure’, ‘living being’, cp. *liberum corpus* = free person, *nostra corpora* = *nos* ‘we’ [2, c. 264].

1.4. Hittite lexicon: *ištanzan-* ‘soul, spirit, mind’, pl. also as ‘living beings, persons’ [13, c. 414–415].

1.5. Middle English lexicon: *bodie*, *bodi* ‘body’, ‘person’, comp. permutability *body* and *self* in *my ioly body* and *my jolly self* [16, c. 31], German *Leib* ‘body’ in the early period of New High German was being used also as ‘person’ alongside with later ‘corpus’ [14, c. 566].

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

2.1. Finno-Ugric lexicon

In Finno-Ugric lexicon our attention is attracted with a Hungarian personal pronoun of courteous appeal, comp. *Maga* ‘you’ (one person), *Maguk* ‘you’ (many persons), which contains *maga*, going back to *mag* ‘body’. Furthermore, in Hungarian reflexive-amplifying pronouns denoting ‘self’ were formed from *mag* ‘body’ + appropriate personal-possessive suffixes, comp. *mag-am* ‘myself’, *mag-ad* ‘yourself’, *mag-a* ‘himself’, *mag-unk* ‘we ourselves’, *mag-atok* ‘yourselves’, *mag-uk* ‘themselves’ [5, c. 392, 394].

2.2. Turkic lexicon: Proto-Turkic **noδ* (A. M. Shcherbak), **bōδ* (M. Resenen) ‘body’ (in according to E. V. Sevortian it is the oldest of the mentioned meanings) and ‘self’ (is used with possessive affixes) [7, c. 177]. Comp. also [8, c. 266], where ‘body’ is considered to be primary meaning, but its pronominal use (*self*, numerable word) is related far back to the Proto-Turkic epoch.

2.3. Mongolian lexicon: Mong. *būdin*, *būdin* ‘body’, *būdiim* ‘his, own’, *beje* ‘body’, ‘selfhood’, ‘essence’, ‘alone’, Mongor. *Bīje* ‘body’, ‘trunk’, ‘plant stem’, ‘person’ [7, c. 178].

2.4. Tungus-Manchu lexicon: *ḃəjə* ‘human’, ‘man’, ‘male’, ‘person’, ‘body’, ‘generation’, ‘age’, Evenki *ḃəjə* (*ḃoje*) ~ *ḃəi* ‘human’, ‘self’, *ḃəj* (*ḃəj*, *ḃəj*) ‘human’, ‘man’, ‘body’, *ḃəjə* ‘body’, ‘self’, ‘body, flesh, corpus’, ‘life, being’, ‘person’, ‘self’, ‘own’ (Manchurian) [7, c. 178].

Leaving aside meanings ‘brunch’, ‘plant stem’ as secondary, a researcher should give special attention to other meanings. The first and foremost I can make the conclusion about secondary ‘self’, ‘own’, ‘person’, ‘soul’ to ‘body’, ‘corpus’, ‘trunk’ and content (etymology) of vocabulary entries (see above) indicates it. So, it is possible to state a semantical universal shift but what is its mechanism? Its semantic base probably was the perception of the body as a (main?) part of being, therefore ‘body’ = ‘living’ and further – ‘spiritualized’ → ‘soul’. This is supported with the following fact: in some cases the semantical paradigm of the word *body* contains meanings ‘dwell, reside’, ‘presence’, ‘being’, ‘existence’, comp. Turkish *vücut* ‘body, corpus’ and ‘dwell, reside’, ‘presence’, ‘being’, ‘existence’, ‘the main part’ (of something) [9, c. 901–902]. But I can not rule out another explanation: ‘body’ = ‘trunk’, ‘plant stem’, where ‘body’ is secondary meaning, although in this case ‘body’ is primary to ‘self’, ‘soul’, ‘person’: ‘trunk’, ‘plant stem’ → ‘body’ → ‘self’. Certainly it took place in specific contexts (in different periods of language history), which needs to be reconstructed with attraction of written monuments in each case.

So, ‘body (= main part of being)’ → ‘self’, ‘myself’, ‘person’, ‘soul’. Syntactically it was expressed with use of the word *body* as reflexive pronoun but the first step was use of *body* as second part of compound words (composita), where meaning ‘body’ was neutralized just as ‘self’, comp. Avestan *tanu.kərəta-* ‘selbsterzeugt’: Sanskrit (Veda) *tanū-kṛt-* ‘selbst erzeugend’ (examples are extracted from: [17, c. 475]) and cases when Avestan *tanu* is used as a reflexive pronoun. The similar situation is represented in Hungarian (see above) where ‘body’ was neutralized in pronominal derivatives.

I suppose further researches in a perspective largely should be focused on special study of the contexts, where mentioned words got their new meaning 'self'. For reaching of this purpose is needed to appeal to written monuments.

References

1. Абаев В. И. Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка [Текст] / В. И. Абаев. – М. ; Л. : Наука, 1979. – Т. III. – 358 с.
2. Дворецкий И. Х. Латинско-русский словарь : Изд. 2-е, перераб. и доп. [Текст] / И. Х. Дворецкий. – М. : Русский язык, 1976. – 1096 с.
3. Древнегреческо-русский словарь [Текст] / [сост. И. Х. Дворецкий / под ред. чл.-кор. АН СССР проф. С. И. Соболевского]. – М. : Госуд. изд-во иностр. и нац. словарей, 1958. – Т. II. – 1905 с.
4. Эдельман Д. И. Хорезмийский язык / Д. И. Эдельман // Основы иранского языкознания: Среднеиранские и новоиранские языки. – М. : Наука, 2008. – С. 6–60.
5. Майтинская К. Е. Венгерский язык [Текст] / К. Е. Майтинская // Основы финно-угорского языкознания. Марийский, пермские и угорские языки. – М. : Наука, 1976. – С. 342–414.
6. Расторгуева В. С. Этимологический словарь иранских языков [Текст] / В. С. Расторгуева, Д. И. Эдельман. – М. : Вост. литература, 2007. – Т. 3. – 493 с.
7. Севортян Э. В. Этимологический словарь тюркских языков. Общетюркские и межтюркские основы на букву «Б» [Текст] / Э. В. Севортян. – М. : Наука, 1978. – 349 с.
8. Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков. Лексика : 2-е изд., доп. [Текст]. – М. : Наука, 2001. – 822 с.
9. Турецко-русский словарь [Текст]. – М. : Русский язык, 1977. – 966 с.
10. Bartholomae Chr. Altiranisches Wörterbuch / Chr. Bartholomae. – Strassburg : Verlag von Karl J. Trübner, 1904. – 2000 S.
11. Gharib B. Sogdian Dictionary (Sogdian-Persian-English) [Text] / B. Gharib. – Tehran : Farhang Publications, 1995. – 517 p.
12. Hinz W. Neue Wege im Altpersischen / W. Hinz. – Wiesbaden : Otto Harrassowitz, 1973. – 174 S.
13. Kloekhorst A. Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon [Text] / A. Kloekhorst. – Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2008. – 1162 p.
14. Kluge F. Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache / [bearb. von Elmar Seebold]. – Berlin ; New York : Walter de Gruyter, 2002. – 1023 S.
15. MacKenzie D. N. A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary / D. N. MacKenzie. – London ; New York ; Toronto : Oxford University Press, 1986. – 236 p.
16. Mayhew A. L. A Concise Dictionary of Middle English from A.D. 1150 to 1580 [Text] / A. L. Mayhew, Walter W. Skeat. – Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1888. – 272 p.
17. Mayrhofer M. Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen / M. Mayrhofer. – Heidelberg : Carl Winter, 1956. – Bd I: A–TH. – 570 S.