

Editorial Board:

Natalia Bigunova, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Foreign Languages of Humanities Faculties, Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University;*Viktor Britsyn*, Doctor of Philology, Professor, O. O. Potebnia Institute of Linguistics of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine);*Olga Valigura*, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of Eastern Philology Department, Kyiv National Linguistic University (Kyiv, Ukraine);*Mariya Veresh*, Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Translation Theory and Practice, Uzhhorod National University (Uzhhorod, Ukraine);*Volodymyr Glushchenko*, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of the General, Germanic and Slavic Linguistics, Slovyansk State Pedagogical University (Slovyansk, Ukraine);*Andrea Grominova*, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor at the Department of Russian Studies, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius (Trnava, Republic of Slovakia);*Jan Grzesiak*, Doctor of Humanities, Professor, Adam Mickiewicz University (Poznan, Poland);*Ivan Zimomrya*, Doctor of Philology, Professor at the Department of Translation, Theory and Practice, Uzhhorod National University (Uzhhorod, Ukraine);*Mykola Zymomria*, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of Higher School of Ukraine, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of the Germanic Languages and Translation Studies, Drohobych State Pedagogical University of Ivan Franko (Drohobych, Ukraine);*Olexander Iliadi*, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Methods of Preschool and Primary Education, Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State Pedagogical University (Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine);*Olena Kon*, Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor, Dean of the Philological Faculty, State Institution “South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky” (Odesa, Ukraine);*Serhii Mykhyda*, Doctor of Philology, Professor at the Department of Ukrainian and Foreign Literature, Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State Pedagogical University (Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine);*Nadiia Spodarets*, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of General and Slavonic Literary Studies, State Institution “South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky” (Odesa, Ukraine);*Ryshard Stefaniak*, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Vice-President of Częstochowa, Poland;*Inna Stupak*, Doctor of Philology, Professor at the Department of Translation and Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, State Institution “South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky” (Odesa, Ukraine);*Volodymyr Sulim*, Candidate of Philology, Professor at the Department of Intercultural Communication and Translation, Lviv National University named after Ivan Franco (Lviv, Ukraine);*Oleh Tyshchenko*, Doctor of Philology, Professor at the Department of Technical Translation, Lviv State University of Life Safety (Lviv, Ukraine);*Myroslava Fabian*, Doctor of Philology, Professor at the Department of English Philology, Uzhhorod National University (Uzhhorod, Ukraine);*Ahneszka Chaikowska*, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Dean at the Faculty of Philology at Jan Długosz University in Częstochowa (Częstochowa, Poland);*Natalia Chendey*, Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of English Philology, Uzhhorod National University (Uzhhorod, Ukraine);*Anastasiia Yumrukuz*, Candidate of Pedagogy, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of the Western and Oriental languages and Methods of their Teaching, State Institution “South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky” (Odesa, Ukraine)Deputy editor-in-chief: *Natalya Zhmayeva*, Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Translation and Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, State Institution “South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky” (Odesa, Ukraine)

MEANINGS ‘BOWL’ AND ‘SKULL’ IN THE MIRROR OF COMPARATIVE SEMANTICS: THE PROBLEM OF HISTORICAL PRAGMATICS AND ARCHAIZING TRANSLATION

Alexander I. Iliadi

Doctor of philological sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Translation, Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, State Institution “South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky”, Odessa, Ukraine

e-mail: alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5078-8316>**SUMMARY**

The article is devoted to the consideration of the semantic relations between Indo-European words for designation of the cup and the head, skull, which hypothetically could form a cultural sign complex, that draws to universality. The results of the study allow to make some conclusions. 1. Semantic pattern ‘bowl, cup’ → ‘skull, head’ reveals signs of universality, being inherent in lexico-semantic systems of many languages. This is due to typological common processes into vocabulary of analyzed languages. Everywhere this semantic development proceeds at about the same scheme, including allusions, ideophonia and reliance on cultural background. 2. Semantic shift ‘skull’ → ‘bowl, cup’ really is not attested in known us data. Available for study examples in fact show a play on words, used by the authors of texts, or ritually determined rethinking of semantic relations in the opposite direction. 3. Linguistic data is different from conclusions of archeologists, whose investigations confirm wide usage of bowls made of human skulls. Therefore further researches in the field of etymology can give researchers linguistic evidences of skulls usage as bowls in antiquity.

Key words: *lexeme, meaning, etymology, semantics, text.*

Introduction. In 1965, V. M. Toporov in Warsaw presented a report on universal sign complexes that construct societies, among which he called, for example, the World Tree (Arbor mundi), the World Egg and the Holy Time. Special attention was paid to such landmark complexes as natural

phenomena and social beginnings, namely: *fire* — *water*, *house* — *forest*, *sky* — *earth*, etc. (Toporov, 2010: 8, 16). Furthermore, there seems to be validity the assumption about stable correlation of cultural concepts that with high degree of probability may be defined exactly as one more sign complex too. We mean an opposition «*bowl* VS *skull*», represented in different historical and cultural (first and foremost in mythopoetic) traditions as well as lingual system. Our conviction is based on the evidences of different languages lexical semantics: here the correlation ‘bowl, cup’ VS ‘skull, head’ is well attested. Needless to say, that proof of universal of this correlation and therefore its status as a universal sign complex depends on confirmation of existence of such kind semantic relations in as many languages as possible. As it seems to us, potential probability of a proof of mentioned opposition universality determines the **topicality** of any research on the subject.

The main **practical task** of our investigation is to determine the nature of mentioned semantic correlation as the ground of supposed sign complex. We think it is important to outline the circle of historical realities (in a broad sense) involved in the process of becoming our sign complex to understand its pragmatic «basis» in the aspect of the problem of «Wörter und Sachen». In its turn, cultural background enables us to explain or reconstruct ancient relations between detached meanings of one word or a group cognate lexemes. In etymology this procedure with regard to explanation of unclear meanings of ancient words is actually equaling the archaizing translation.

Methods of research. The specifics of the scientific search requires to apply the following *methods*: 1) the etymological method; 2) descriptive method; 2) the method of dictionary definition analysis.

The **material of the study** is represented with lexemes, chosen from lexicographical sources, monuments of writing and epic texts.

In view of practical specifics of suggested study all necessary for analysis **literature** further is used as necessary.

Material analysis and results. So back to our concepts and their lexical and semantic objectivation. Seemingly suffice it to appeal to some examples for illustration a potential of mentioned opposition. But this is at first glance, because the key problem lies in dual nature of ‘bowl’ and ‘skull’ relation: here are two opposite semantic shifts ‘bowl, cup’ → ‘skull’ VS ‘skull’ → ‘bowl, cup’. They both do not just show various semantic transitions but reflect some peculiarities of associative system working and embody the forms of poetic thinking within which corresponding images emerged. Next

step is the differential description of both directions (vectors) of semantic changes through the analysis of engaged lexemes, containing signs of such kind semantic shifts.

I

‘Bowl, cup’ → ‘skull’

The opinion about such semantic development is contained in studies of many linguists. W. P. Lehmann rightly notes «Shift of meaning from ‘vessel’ to ‘skull, head’ quite common» (Lehmann, 1986: 197). Similarly see: (Levitski, 2000: 221): «Semantic development ‘cup’, ‘vessel’, ‘pot’ → ‘head’, ‘skull’ takes place on a regular basis». But here are represented a few examples, «migrating» from one author to another. The vocabulary of Indo-European languages can give more examples, that are usually unnoticed in generalizing works on etymology.

1.1. Slavic languages

1.1.1. Proto-Slavic **čaša* ‘bowl’, ‘cup’, ‘goblet’ (: Old Slavonic *чаша* ‘bowl’, Serbo-Croatian *чаша* ‘bowl’, ‘goblet’, Old Russian *чаша* ‘round (as a hemisphere) vessel for the liquid’, Russian *чаша* ‘antique vessel for drinking in the shape of a hemisphere’) VS ‘braincase’, ‘skull’ (: Russ. dial *чаша* ‘braincase’, ‘skull’). Similarly in some derivatives, cf. Polish *czaszka* ‘bowl’ > *czaszka* ‘skull’ (Trubachev, 1977, 4: 30; 1990, 16: 227). Accordingly to R. O. Jakobson etymology, **čaša* < **česati* ‘scratch’, ‘split off, divide’, that is ‘shell, crust, bark’ → ‘bowl’ → ‘skull’ (Trubachev, 1990, 16: 227).

1.1.2. Proto-Slavic **luban’a* ‘skull’ (: Serbian, Croatian *lubaña* ‘skull’, Slovenian *lubanja* ‘skull’, ‘hill’) — a derivative from **lubō* (Trubachev, 1990, 16: 154), cf. Pol. dial. *lub-* ‘crust’ and ‘vessel in the shape of a deep vat for washing’ (Schuster-Šewc, 1967: 76).

1.1.3. Proto-Slavic **lbbō* ‘skull’ (: Bulgarian *лббō* ‘skull’, Czech *leb* ‘skull’, ‘helmet’) etymologically related to **lubō* ‘crust, bast’, ‘box’ (Trubachev, 1990, 16: 225–227) VS Pol. dial. *lub-* ‘crust’ and ‘vessel in the shape of a deep vat for washing’ (see above).

1.1.4. Proto-Slavic **čerpō*, whose reflexes have such spectrum of meanings: 1) ‘(clay) *pot*’ and ‘potsherd, shard’ (Macedonian *упен*, Serb., Croat. dial. *črep* in both meanings); 2) ‘skull’ (Bulg. *чепен*, Maced. *чепен*, Russ. *чепен* etc.). See: (Trubachev, 1977, 4: 72–73), where the conclusion about original semantics ‘clay vessel’ or ‘clay potsherd’ for **kerp-* > **čerpō* is made. By the way as regard semantic correlation ‘potsherd’ VS ‘skull’ cf. Russ. *чепенок* ‘potsherd’ ~ *чепен* ‘skull’ (see: Trubachev, 1977, 4: 72–73).

However, we should note that semantic evolution in some mentioned cases is not as clear cut. We would not exclude the possibility of parallel, independent development of ‘bowl’, ‘cup’, ‘vessel’ on the one hand and ‘skull’, ‘head’ on the other hand from common for both series of meanings semantic basis ‘shell’, ‘crust’. Semantic shift ‘shell’ → ‘skull’ as «shell, box for brain» is just as likely as well as change ‘shell’, ‘crust’ → ‘vessel’, originally understood as the ‘vessel made of bark, crust’. Cf. meanings of Celtic, Latin and Indo-Arian words:

Irish *ballog* ‘skull’ and ‘shell’;

Irish *blaosc*, *blaosg* ‘skull’ and ‘husk, scale’, ‘shell’ (O’Reilly, O’Donovan, 1864: 50, 66);

Gaelic *cogan* ‘loose husk’, ‘covering’ and ‘small vessel’ (MacBain, 1911: 93);

Latin *testa* ‘any hard shell’ and ‘braincase’, ‘skull’ (Benvenist, 1974: 337–338);

Old Indian *karāṅka* ‘skull’, ‘head’ and ‘cocoa-nut hollowed to form a cup or vessel’ (Monier-Williams, 1988: 254), where the very wording of the semantics ‘cocoa-nut hollowed to form a cup or vessel’ directly points to the specifics of meaning derivation on the basis of an association *a vessel, cup and skull with (shell of) hollowed nut, empty nut*.

This statement in equal measure is applied to Baltic lexemes, having the same set of meanings (see next). The mental side of semantic phenomena is a very complex set of multidirectional processes in those semantic structures of the language and also deep associations are involved to ensure the links between:

a) inner form, underlying the nomination (onomasiological level, level of initial nomination: ‘shell’, ‘crust’, ‘empty nut’);

b) closest meanings (semantic level: ‘shell’ → ‘bowl’ or ‘skull’; ‘hollowed, empty nut’ → ‘vessel made of hollow nut’);

c) secondary visual images (level of cultural experience: ‘skull’ like ‘cup, bowl’).

Sometimes the determining psycho-physiological factor of words and their meanings generation is ideophonia, that is ability of some sounds or sound complexes to embody some ideas about objects and phenomena, namely, render their appearance — volume, form, and movement. In other words, accordingly to V. I. Abayev, this or that image directly generates «corresponding sound image». For example there is relationship between

sound complex «Velar consonant + Vowel + Labial consonant» and semantics ‘vessel’, ‘clump, clod’, ‘head’, ‘heap’, ‘fat man’ etc. This phonetic cluster is associated with something round or plump and data of many languages confirm such state of things because words with meaning ‘subject of convex shape’ here frequently show mentioned phonetic feature — sequence «V + O + L», cf.: Turkic *kub, kup* ‘jug’, Engl. *cob* ‘fat man’, ‘clump’, ‘heap’, Ossetian *gopp* ‘top’ (as ‘bulge’), Germ. *Kumm* ‘cup’, Italian *ceppo* ‘stump’, ‘chump’ etc. But in the framework of considered problem especially interesting for us are the following examples: Ital. *coppa* ‘cup, bowl’, ‘goblet’, *coppo* ‘jug, pitcher’ VS *coppa* ‘back of the head, nape’ (Abayev, 1995: 579) as one more evidence of close relationship between the meanings ‘cup, bowl’ and ‘skull’, ‘head’.

1.2. Baltic languages

Lithuanian *kiáušas*, *kiaūšas* ‘cup’ VS ‘skull’ (*kiaušas galvos* = «cup of head») along with such meaning *kiáušas* as ‘eggshell’, ‘nutshell’ (Smoczyński, 2019: 650). Semantic hierarchy may be represented as ‘shell’ → ‘cup’, ‘vessel’ → ‘skull’. This means we have one more ancient case of metaphoric usage of a word with the meaning ‘shell’, ‘crust’. Terminological primacy of meaning ‘vessel’ is confirmed with Lith *káušas* ‘wooden vessel’, ‘cup’, ‘ladle, scoop’ (and ‘nutshell’, ‘conch’), that is genetically identical to form *kiáušas* (Smoczyński, 2019: 618).

1.3. Indo-Arian languages

1.3.1. Old Indian *kapāla* a ‘cup’, ‘jar’, ‘dish’ (used especially for the Puroḍāśa offering) VS the ‘skull’, ‘cranium’ (Monier-Williams, 1988: 250) and Proto-Iranian **kapāla*- ‘a big round vessel’ VS ‘skull’. In according to M. Mayrhofer and D. I. Edelman, these words, denoting different kind vessels, scoops, ladles to rake in, draw, go back to IE **kap-* ‘catch’ (Mayrhofer, 1988: 300; Edelman, 2011: 245).

1.3.2. Old Indian *karpara* ‘cup’, ‘pot’, ‘bowl’ VS ‘the skull, cranium’ and also ‘shell of a tortoise’, ‘potsherd’ (Monier-Williams, 1988: 258).

1.4. Germanic languages

1.4.1. Old English *hafola* ‘head’ (*hafela, hafala, heafela, heafola*; Bosworth, 1921: 503), whose exact structural and etymological equivalent is Old Indian *kapāla-m* ‘skull’ (Holthausen, 1963: 147) that, as we know, originally meant ‘cup’, ‘jar’ (see above OInd *kapāla*).

1.4.2. Gothic *hvairnei* ‘skull’. Hypothetically, Gothic word had more ancient meanings ‘vessel’, ‘bowl’. Etymologically identical Indo-Eu-

ropean words evidence on it (Lehmann, 1986: 197: «Shift of meaning from ‘vessel’ to ‘skull, head’ quite common»). Cf. first and foremost ON *hverna* ‘pot’, ‘pan’, ‘basin’ (Vries, 1977: 271: connected with Goth *hvaírnei* ‘skull’; Orel, 2003: 200: to IE **k^uernā*), MlR *cern* ‘bowl’ < IE **k^uernā* (Orel, 2003: 200), Sanskrit *carúṣ* ‘vessel’, ‘pot’, Proto-Slavic **čara* ‘glass’, ‘cup’, OIr *coire*, Wel *pair* ‘kettle’ < IE **k^uer-* ‘pan’ (Lehmann, 1986: 197).

1.4.3. Proto-German **hauþiða-/*habuða-* ‘vessel’, ‘head’. See: (Levitski, 2000: 221).

1.5. Celtic languages

Irish *clagan* ‘flagon’, ‘lid’ VS ‘skull’ (O’Reilly, O’Donovan, 1864: 121), perhaps, borrowed from English, cf. *flagon*, Middle English *flakon* ect., about which see (Klein, 1966: 596, 597). English loan word in Irish developed meaning toward ‘vessel (bottle, flagon)’ → ‘skull’ on well-known pattern.

II

‘Skull’ → ‘bowl, cup’

2.1. Mentioned semantic shift seems to be problematic because, to best of our knowledge, any convincing evidence of word usage *skull* as ‘vessel’ has not been yet attested. Actually all that we have is not linguistic data (no cases, when names of *skull*, *head* would be used as designation of a *vessel*) but historical writings, authors of which narrate the cruel customs of ancient peoples to cut heads of vanquished foes and make of them bowls. In literature of Herodotus’ time, Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages stories that kind are well known, cf.:

1) story of Herodotus about military custom of Scythians to do bowls of skulls of their angriest enemies and relatives, turned enemies (the technique of making is described in detail);

2) narrative of Titus Livius about murdering of Roman consul Lucius Postumius Albinus by Gauls (his skull was set in gold for using as a bowl during sacred ceremonies);

3) told by Paulus Diaconus story about killing of the last Gepyds’ king Kunimund by Langobards and turning Kunimund’s skull into a cup to drink;

4) death of emperor Baldwin of Flanders (according to version of George Acropolites) at the hands of Bulgarians: their king John ordered to make the vessel of Baldwin’s cut head;

5) story of Theophanes the Confessor about Bulgarian ruler Khan Krum, which made the precious bowl of skull of Byzantine emperor Nicephorus, which led a military campaign against the Bulgarians;

6) story about a military campaign of Zena-Petros — Christian ruler of Ethiopia against pagans of Damot land (in «Life of Jared Melodist»). He lost the battle to his pagan opponent and skull of defeated Zena-Petros was turned into measuring vessel for grain;

7) famous old-Russian annalistic story from «Tale of Bygone Years» about killing of Prince Svyatoslav by Pecheneges on the Dnieper rapids also contains «canonical» scenario of what as head of killed ruler was turned into a cup;

8) some mythological plots from «Edda» also reference to similar cases of murdering heroes and subsequent making cups from their skulls (see below).

Detail historic and philological analysis of these plots is made in special investigation by A. F. Litvina and F. B. Uspenski (Litvina, Uspenski, 2018: 72–125). They come to the conclusion about obvious literary source underlying of Middle Ages narratives about bowl made of head of a defeated army leader. However, it is not excluded that in Middle Ages authors literary narrative, literature scheme could be combined with the mytho-poetic traditions of barbaric, pagan ethnoses, some of which used brass or iron ritual vessels shaped of face or skull.

There is one case, that, at first glance, is worthy of attention. This case also belongs to mentioned category of Middle Ages stories about sad fate of king, but unlike of them the text of this one contains linguistic (lexical) data. Let’s consider one in detail.

2.2. Langobardian word *scala* ‘bowl’ is mentioned by Paul the Deacon (Paulus Diaconus) in his «Historia Langobardorum» in the passage about extermination of Gepids by Langobards and murder of Gepids’ king Kunimund by king of Langobards Alboin: «*In eo proelio Alboin Cunimundum occidit, caputque illius sublatum, ad bibendum ex eo poculum fecit. Quod genus poculi apud eos ‘scala’ dicitur, lingua vero Latina patera vocitatur*» (Pauli Historia, 1878: 80) = «In that battle Alboin killed Kunimund and, having taken his *head*, made of it a *bowl to drink*. Such kind of bowl they call *scala* and in Latin — *patera*». Lat. *patera* denotes ‘bowl’, ‘sacrificial vessel’, directly (semantically) corresponding to Lang. *scala*, but this one with taking into account literally concordances in Old Germanic vocabulary meant ‘skull’

as «shell for brain» from older 'schell', 'crust', cf.: OHG *scala* 'shell, hull', OE *scealu* 'shell, husk' < **skalō* > **skal-jō* > ON *skel* 'shell', OE *scill* id., MLG *schelle* 'shell, scale' (Orel, 2003: 332, 333). Thus, there was a figuratively usage of a somatic term *skull* as designation of *bowl*. The entire chain of semantic changes can be surely reconstructed as 'shell, husk' → 'shell for brain' → 'skull' as a whole. We mean really attested ancient compound-words with metaphorical meaning 'shell for brain': their semantics further evolved in 'skull' through compactification within *metaphoric phrase* → *compound-word* (with semantics 'shell for brain' or 'bowl for brain') → *single-base word* (meaning 'skull', 'head'), cf. such examples as ON *hjarn-skál* 'skull' = *hjarni* 'brain' & *skál* 'bowl' (Orel, 2003: 170, 339), OHG *hirni-scala* = *hirni* 'brain' & *scála* 'shell' (Graff, 1838, 4: 1035; 1842, 6: 474).

It should be pointed out, that second link in postulated chain 'skull' → 'bowl, cup' is clear illustrated with epic material, cf. for example a periphrasis «*skálar*, er und skǫrom vóro», used for denoting skulls of Nidud's childs, one literally means «bowls under the hair» (see below). So, cf.:

1) in «Vǫlundarkviða» episode of murder Nidud's sons by blacksmith Völund: «Sneið af *haufuð* / húna peira, / ok und fen fiǫturs / fœtr um lagði. / En þær *skálar*, / er und skǫrom vóro, / sveip hann útan silfri, / seldi Níðaði» (Edda, 1914: 116–117) = «Головы прочь / отрезал обоим / и под меха / ноги их сунул; / из черепов / чаши он сделал, / вковал в серебро, / послал их Нидуду» (Starshaá Edda, 1963: 71). Here is a periphrasis «*skálar*, er und skǫrom vóro», used for denoting skulls of Nidud's childs, one literally means «bowls under the hair»;

2) in «Greenland speeches of Atli» Gudrun (Atli's wife) kills her sons and creates cups of their skulls: «Maga hefir þú þinna / mist, sem þú sízt skyldir: / *hausa* veitst þú þeira / hafða at *ǫlskálom*» (Edda, 1914: 253) = «Сынов ты лишился / своих любимых, — / из их черепов / я сделала чаши» (Starshaá Edda, 1963: 149).

At first glance, seemingly we have sufficient reasons to state metaphorical usage words, denoting *head*, *skull*, as names of *vessels*. But one detail seems to be able to shake our confidence. The point is that known us data (Germanic words) show only the possibility of *two independent* patterns of semantic development: 'shell' → 'skull' and 'shell' → 'bowl, cup' like in examples viewed above. Etymology of Germ. **skalō*, **skaljō* confirm this assumption (see above). And a similar case seems to be represented with ON *skál* 'bowl' and Engl. *scale* 'cup, bowl', 'dish', presciently united by

E. G. Graff within one definition with ON *skél* 'conch', 'shell', OHG *scála* 'shell', Goth. *schale* 'tile' and Engl. *scala* 'peel' (Graff, 1842, 6: 474). See also: (Lehmann, 1986: 308). **However, we should be aware that actually we do not have a credible example of meaning shift 'skull, head' → 'bowl, cup' because all known today examples illustrate just the word play in poetic and historical texts.** That is Langobard historian Paulus Diaconus and Old Norse skalds resorted to outplaying on either different meanings of a word (Lang. *scala* 'bowl', *'skull', *'shell'), or opposition **skál* 'bowl' VS name of head (forms of ON *skálar*, *ǫlskálom*) with allusion to meanings 'shell', 'skull' of cognate words. Exactly the same poetic outplaying was used by George Gordon Byron of the verse «*Lines Inscribed Upon a Cup Formed from a Skull*». Thus, supposed semantic shift is neither proven as the fact at the level of speech practice nor at the level of language system.

Here we would like to add a remark. Lamaists in their religious ritualism traditionally use the sacred vessel *gabala* — bowl, sawed up from human skull (Lushin, 2015: 7: reference to A. Pozdneev's research). But despite seeming obviousness of usage *gabala* 'skull' as 'bowl' anyway we have a case of rethinking *original* semantic hierarchy 'bowl' → 'skull' in the opposite direction 'skull' → 'ritual bowl, cup'. The matter is that the term *gabala* is a borrowing from Sanskrit, cf. *kapála* with original meaning 'vessel' and secondary (metaphoric) semantics 'skull' (see above). Rethinking was made possible in the frame of ritual practice.

Iranian example with **kalā*-, **kallā*-, **kālā*- 'head' > Kurdish *kal*, *kala* 'skull, head', Yaghnobi *kalla*, dial. *kall* 'head' and *kálla* 'pitcher, jug made of burnt clay' (Edelman, 2011: 189) can not be taken into account because it is authentically is not known what is implied: vessel similar to head (then it is an example of 'head' → 'jug') or vessel made of head (it is doubtful)?

One may well wonder: does semantic change of such a kind exist in any language? Known us data of Indo-European languages do not answer this question as well as Turkic linguistic material, at least for now. There are epic texts where poetic image «*bowl made of skull*» is used, cf. description of terrible guise of the Erlik Kan — ruler of the underworld (in shamanistic incantations): «О ты, богатый Кан Эрлик, / Чьи волосы, лучась, искрятся, / Всегда служит тебе ведром / Грудь мертвеца; / Человеческие черепа — твои кубки, / ...» (Radloff, 1989: 362). But it is an example of known us poetic technique usage. At the level of language semantic mentioned shift is not attested.

As we have been able to see, linguistic data is different from conclusions of archeologists, whose investigations confirm wide usage of bowls made of human skulls (Lushin, 2015). The echoes of those practices were heard in ancient times, but its reliable traces in language have been not yet found.

Findings. Having considered the series of words from vocabulary of different languages, we come to several conclusions. 1. Semantic pattern ‘bowl, cup’ → ‘skull, head’ reveals signs of universality, being inherent in lexico-semantic systems of many languages. This is due to typological common processes into vocabulary of analyzed languages. Everywhere this semantic development proceeds at about the same scheme, including allusions, ideophonia and reliance on cultural background. 2. Semantic shift ‘skull’ → ‘bowl, cup’ really is not attested in known us data. Available for study examples in fact show a play on words, used by the authors of texts, or ritually determined rethinking of semantic relations in the opposite direction. 3. Linguistic data is different from conclusions of archeologists, whose investigations confirm wide usage of bowls made of human skulls. Therefore further researches in the field of etymology can give researchers linguistic evidences of skulls usage as bowls in antiquity.

Accordingly, we see the prospect of further research in expanding the range of searches for similar cases in order to describe and explain them.

REFERENCES

- Abayev V. I. (1995). Izbrannyê trudy: Tom II: Obshcheê i sravnitel'noê âzykoznanie [Selected Writings. Volume Two: General & Comparative Linguistics]. Vladikavkaz : Ir [in Russian].
- Benvenist E. (1974). Obshchaâ lingvistika [General Linguistics]. Moscow : Progress [in Russian].
- Levitskiy V. V. (2000). Ètimologicheskii slovar' germanskikh âzykov [An Etymological Dictionary of Germanic Languages]. Vol. 1. Chernovtsy : Ruta [in Russian].
- Litvina A. F., Uspenskij F. B. (2018). A Praise to Generosity, a Skull Bowl, and a Golden Cloak... The Outlines of the Cultural Interaction between Russians and Varangians. Moscow : HSE Publishing House [in Russian].
- Lushin V. G. (2015). Human Skull-Cups. *Ancients Cult Centers and Ritual Practises*. Zimovniki : Zimovniki Regional Museum, P. 5–13 [in Russian].
- Radloff W. (1989). Aus Sibirien. Lose Blätter aus Meinem Tagebuche. Moscow : Nauka.
- Starshaâ Edda (1963). Drevneislandskiê pesni o bogakh i geroâkh [Old Icelandic Songs about Deities and Heroes]. Leningrad : AS USSR [in Russian].
- Toporov V. N. (2010). Mirovoê derevo: Universalnyê znakovyê komplekxy [World Tree: Universal Sign Complexes]. T. 1. Moscow : RPDR [in Russian].

Trubachev O. N. (ed.) (1974–2005). Ètimologicheskii slovar' slav'anskikh âzykov: Praslav'anskiy leksicheskiy fond. Vyp. 1–32. Moscow : Nauka [in Russian].

Schuster-Šewc H. (1969). Mesto i problematika ètimologicheskogo issledovaniâ (Po materialam slav'anskikh âzykov) [Place and Issue of Etymological Research (in according to data of Slavic Languages)]. *Ètimologia* [Etymology]. 1967. Moscow : Nauka, P. 71–79 [in Russian].

Edelman D. I. (2011). Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Languages. T. 4. Moscow : Vostochnaya Literatura [in Russian].

Bosworth J. D. D. (1921). An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary (Based on the manuscript collections). Oxford : Clarendon press.

Edda (1914). Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern / [Herausgegeben von G. Neckel]. Bd. I. Text. Heidelberg : Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Graff E. G. (1834–1842). Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz oder Wörterbuch der althochdeutschen Sprache / [Etymologisch und grammatisch bearbeitet Dr. E. G. Graff]. Th. I–VI. Berlin.

Holthausen F. (1963). Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg : Carl Winter ; Universitätsverlag.

Klein E. (1966–1967). A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. Dealing with the origin of words and their sense development thus illustrating the history of civilization and culture. Vol. I–II. Amsterdam ; London ; New York : Elsevier Publishing Company.

Lehman P. Winfred. (1986). A Gothic Etymological Dictionary. Leiden : B. J. Brill.

MacBain A. (1911). An Etymological Dictionary of the Gaelic Language. Stirling : Eneas MacKay.

Mayrhofer M. (1992). Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen. Band I. Heidelberg : Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Monier-Williams Monier Sir. (1988). A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages. Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass.

O'Reilly E., O'Donovan J. (1864). Irish-English Dictionary, with a Supplement, containing many thousand Irish words, with their interpretations in English by John O'Donovan. Dublin ; London : James Duffy.

Orel V. (2003). A Handbook of Germanic Etymology. Leiden ; Boston : Brill.

Pauli (1878). Historia Langobardorum / [ed. L. Bethmann]. Hannoverae : Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani.

Smoczyński W. (2019). Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego, współpraca redakcyjna M. Oston, wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone, na prawach rękopisu [www.romanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf].

ЗНАЧЕННЯ ‘ЧАША’ ТА ‘ЧЕРЕП’ У ДЗЕРКАЛІ ПОРІВНЯЛЬНОЇ СЕМАНТИКИ: ПРОБЛЕМА ІСТОРИЧНОЇ ПРАГМАТИКИ Й АРХАЇЗАЦІЙНОГО ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

Олександр І. Іліади

доктор філологічних наук, професор кафедри перекладу і теоретичної та прикладної лінгвістики

ДЗ «Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет імені К. Д. Ушинського»,
Одеса, Україна

e-mail: alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com

ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5078-8316>

АНОТАЦІЯ

Статтю присвячено розгляду семантичного співвідношення індоєвропейських слів на позначення чаші та голови, черепа, які гіпотетично можуть становити культурний знаковий комплекс, що тягнє до універсальності. Результати спостереження дозволяють зробити кілька висновків. 1. Тип семантичного розвитку ‘чаша’ → ‘череп, голова’ демонструє ознаки універсальності, властиві лексико-семантичним системам багатьох мов. Це пов’язано з типологічно спільними процесами, що протікали (чи протікають) у лексиці аналізованих мов. Скрізь цей семантичний розвиток відбувається приблизно за однією схемою, враховуючи алюзії, ідеофонію та опору на культурне тло. 2. Семантичне зрушення ‘череп’ → ‘чаша, кубок’ не засвідчене у відомому нам матеріалі. Доступні для вивчення приклади насправді показують або гру слів, використану авторами історичних та епічних текстів, або ритуально зумовлене переосмислення семантичних відношень у протилежний бік. 3. Лінгвістичні свідчення розходяться з висновками археологів, дослідження яких підтверджують широке використання чаш із людських черепів. Відповідно, подальші студії в царині етимології можуть дати дослідникам лінгвістичні докази використання черепів як чаш у давнину.

Ключові слова: лексема, значення, етимологія, семантика, текст.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

- Абаев В. И. Избранные труды. Том II: Общее и сравнительное языкознание. Владикавказ : Ир, 1995. 724 с.
- Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика / [пер. с франц.; под ред., с вступ. статьей и коммент. Ю. С. Степанова]. М. Прогресс, 1974. 447 с.
- Левицкий В. В. Этимологический словарь германских языков. Т. I. Черновцы : Рута, 2000. 263 с.
- Литвина А. Ф., Успенский Ф. Б. Похвала щедрости, чаша из черепа, золотая луда... Контуры русско-варяжского культурного взаимодействия. Москва : Изд. дом Высшей школы экономики, 2018. 192 с.

Лушин В. Г. Чаши из человеческих черепов. Древние культы, обряды, ритуалы: памятники и практики. Зимовники : Зимовниковский краеведческий музей, 2015. С. 5–13.

Радлов В. В. Из Сибири: Страницы дневника / [пер. с нем. К. Д. Цивинной и Б. Е. Чистовой]. Москва : Наука, 1989. 749 с.

Старшая Эдда. Древнеисландские песни о богах и героях / [пер. А. И. Корсуна ; ред., вступ. ст. и коммент. М. И. Стеблина-Каменского]. Ленинград : Изд-во АН СССР, 1963. 259 с.

Топоров В. Н. Мировое дерево: Универсальные знаковые комплексы. Т. 1. М. : Рукописные памятники Древней Руси, 2010. 448 с.

Трубачёв О. Н. (ред.) Этимологический словарь славянских языков: Праславянский лексический фонд. Вып. 1–32. Москва : Наука, 1974–2005.

Шустер Швец Х. Место и проблематика этимологического исследования (По материалам славянских языков). *Этимология*. 1967. Москва : Наука, 1969. С. 71–79.

Эдельман Д. И. Этимологический словарь иранских языков. Т. 4. Москва : Восточная литература, 2011. 415 с.

Bosworth J. D. D. An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary (Based on the manuscript collections). Oxford : Clarendon press, 1921. 1302 p.

Edda. Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern / [Herausgegeben von G. Neckel]. Bd. I. Text. Heidelberg : Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1914. 331 S.

Graff E. G. Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz oder Wörterbuch der althochdeutschen Sprache / [Etymologisch und grammatisch bearbeitet Dr. E. G. Graff]. Berlin, 1834–1842. Th. I–VI.

Holthausen F. Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg : Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1963. XXXVI, 428 S.

Klein E. A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. Dealing with the origin of words and their sense development thus illustrating the history of civilization and culture. Amsterdam ; London ; New York : Elsevier Publishing Company, 1966–1967. Vol. I–II.

Lehman Ph. Winfred. A Gothic Etymological Dictionary. Leiden : B. J. Brill, 1986. 712 p.

MacBain A. An Etymological Dictionary of the Gaelic Language. Stirling : Eneas MacKay, 1911. 412 p.

Mayrhofer M. Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen. Band I. Heidelberg : Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1992. 803 S.

Monier-Williams Monier Sir. A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages. Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass, 1988. 1333 p.

O’Reilly E., O’Donovan J. Irish-English Dictionary, with a Supplement, containing many thousand Irish words, with their interpretations in English by John O’Donovan. Dublin ; London : James Duffy, 1864. 725 p.

Orel V. A Handbook of Germanic Etymology. Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2003. 683 p.

Pauli Historia Langobardorum / [ed. L. Bethmann]. Hannoverae : Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1878. 268 p.

Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego / współpraca redakcyjna M. Osłon. Wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone. Na prawach rękopisu. 2019. www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński.W.Słownik.etymologiczny.języka.litewskiego.pdf

Стаття надійшла до редакції 18.06.2022