Стародумова 1997: Стародумова. Е.А. Русские частицы (письменная монологическая речь). [Текст] : автореф. дис. … док. филол. наук / Е. А. Стародумова. – М., 1997. – 39 с.

Чистякова 1949: Чистякова, Л.М. Частицы в современном русском литературном языке : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук [Текст] / Л. М. Чистякова. – М., 1949. – 10 с.

Шахматов 1941: Шахматов, А.А. Синтаксис русского языка [Текст] / А. А. Шахматов. – 2-е изд. – Л. : Учпедгиз, 1941. – 620 с.

Шевченко 2007: Шевченко, С.Е. Морфология современного английского языка [Текст] / С. Е. Шевченко. – Курск : издательство «РОСИ», 2007. – 243 с.

Шокотько 2006: Шокотько, Л.Е. Из истории изучения частиц (по материалам грамматик XVI – XVIII вв.) [Текст] / Л. Е. Шокотько. – Режим доступа : http://www.rusnauka.com/SND/Philologia/9_shokot_ko.doc.htm. – Название с экрана.

Aijmer 2002: Aijmer, K. English discourse particles : evidence from a corpus [Text] / K. Aijmer. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2002. – 299 pp.

Hajiyev 2008: Hajiyev, E. The Status of Particles in Modern English [Text] / E. Hajiyev // International journal of computers. – Issue 4. – Volume 2. – 2008. – Pp. 432-441.

Koönig 1991: Koönig, E. The Meaning of Focus Particles : A Comparative Perspective. – London, New York : Routledge, 1991. – 232 pp.

Nevalainen 1987: Nevalainen, Tertu. Adverbial focusing and intonation [Text] / Tertu Nevalainen. – Lingua. – Issue 3. – Volume 73. – 1987. – Pp. 141-165.

Розглянуто результати теоретичних досліджень і традиційні класифікаційні параметри часток в українській та англійській мовах, виявлено спільні та відмінні риси обох партикуляційних систем із простеженням кількісного та якісного складу.

Ключові слова: партикуляційна система, частка, семантико-функційна класифікація, кількісний та якісний склад.

Oksana Orlenko

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF SPATIAL RELATIONS: *OVER* VS. *НАД, ЧЕРЕЗ*

*The author studies the differences of conceptualization of some spatial concepts in English and Ukrainian languages. The article contains the juxtaposition of the spatial relations represented by the lexeme **over** and the schematization of similar spatial relations by Ukrainian prepositions. The cases of usage of the English preposition **over** and the partially corresponding Ukrainian prepositions **через**, **над** along with **на** and **за** are described from the perspective of the contents conceptualized in prepositional constructions due to the interaction of members.*

Keywords: preposition, semantic relations, spatial relations, trajector, landmark, schematization, proto-scene, linguistic representation.

Spatial relations depict the location of an object, action (event), attribute and some spatial landmark in space [Всеволодова 1982: 6]. S. Levinson claims that spatial concepts are a foundation for a great number of non-spatial concepts, and this is motivated by the fact that space is a central cognitive domain for any moving creature, and human mind is deeply spatial, as most information about the world is acquired perceptually [Levinson 2003: 131]. The study of perceiving space, categorization and verbalization of spatial relations is one of the most **topical** areas in contemporary researches. A key linguistic means for expressing spatial relations is the preposition. In the prepositional system of each language, the semantics of primary prepositions is "the most abstract and semantically flexible, acquiring the secondary function that makes possible the discrimination of their functional and semantic paradigms as well as the establishment of some centres (nuclei) in their functional representations" [Загнітко 2007: 133], but the most frequently

evident content is nuclear, primary (mostly spatial). In this paper, **the focus** is on the difference of the linguistic representation of some spatial relations in English and Ukrainian. The mechanism of achieving the aim defined consists of specific **tasks**: 1) tracking the possible usage of the preposition *over* in English; 2) analyzing relations profiled by the Ukrainian prepositions *через* and *над* in syntactic constructions; 3) explaining the correlation of using the prepositions *over* and *через / над* in both languages; 4) defining the differences in the model and motivation of developing the semantic network of prepositions in different languages.

      The novelty of the analysis is defined with synthesis of theoretical and applied studies of conceptual content of prepositions in Ukrainian and the differences in space relation conceptualization in English and Ukrainian. **The theoretical value** of this study is the presentation of the models of developing the semantic network of the preposition, taking into account the specific features of the linguistic representation of spatial relations. Theoretical developments give reasons for **practical importance** of the proposed research, which may be used in cultural, linguistic, psycholinguistic, pedagogic and other studies, as well as developments in the application of models and motivation of lingual representation of spatial relations.

      The research is conducted in the framework of the dissertation which is devoted to the analysis of the semantic relations of English, Serbian and Ukrainian prepositions for revealing the mechanisms of perceiving and experiencing the world as well as representing knowledge by means of national languages.

      The research of English prepositions has been rather well-documented, meanwhile this type of studying Ukrainian and Serbian prepositions is at its initial stage. Grounded on the principles of Anglophone researchers, the author aims at studying the semantic relations of primary simple prepositions in two languages as a means for representing the perception of space, time and abstract notions.

      The theoretical background of the study is motivated by the researches of K. Brugman, A. Herskovits, G. Lakoff, R. Langacker, R. Przybylska, A. Tyler and V. Evans, I. Vykhovanets, A. Zahnitko [Brugman 1988; Herskovits 1986; Lakoff 1990; Langacker 2000; Przybylska 2002; Tyler, Evans 2003; Вихованець 1980; Загнітко 2004]. From the perspective of the schematization of the natural category in the meaning represented by the lexeme *over*, and by contrasting it to the schematization of relevant spatial relations in Ukrainian, one tracks differences in conceptualizing of some spatial concepts in English and Ukrainian which are the aim of this study. The object of this study is the semantic relations in the grammatical constructions with the English preposition *over* and with the partially corresponding constructions with the Ukrainian prepositions *над*, *через*. The subject of the study is 1000 contexts of the preposition *over*, 641 contexts of the preposition *через*, 694 contexts of the preposition *над* and its phonetic variants *наді*, *надо*. The source basis for the English language is the *British National Corpus* (BYU-BNC[1]). As the *Ukrainian National Linguistic Corpus* (Український національний лінгвістичний корпус)[2] is not accessible for the public as yet, the study is possible on the sources of the *Corpus of Ukrainian-Language Texts* (Корпус текстів української мови, КТУМ)[3]. The material for defining semantic categories conceptualized by primary prepositions in contemporary languages, however, should consist of texts produced during the last 30 years. These texts are not abundant in КТУМ. Besides, КТУМ has limited access to their statistics. That is why this research focuses on 26 Ukrainian-language texts (this number is gradually increasing), where the contexts of the prepositions under study were collected by thorough selection.

---

[1] BYU-BNC: British National Corpus. – Access mode : URL : http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/x.asp?w=1024&h=600. – Title from the screen.

[2] *Ukrainian National Linguistic Corpus* created by the Ukrainian Linguistic and Informational Fund of the National Academy of Arts and Sciences of Ukraine. – Access mode : URL : http://lcorp.ulif.org.ua/virt_unlc/. – Title from the screen.

[3] *Corpus of Ukrainian-Language Texts* is a project of the Linguistic Portal. – Access mode : URL : http://www.mova.info/corpus.aspx?l1=209. – Title from the screen.

The basic conceptual content of each preposition is defined through the contexts where the prepositions represent spatial relations. The conceptual content of the preposition can be abstracted from specific spatial scenes that lead to very abstract and schematized representation, which V. Evans and A. Tyler term a **proto-scene**. The proto-scene can be equated with the primary meaning associated with a particular preposition, and thus includes the conceptual and spatial information referring to the elements of a spatial proto-scene: a **trajector** (TR) and a **landmark** (LM) (terms by R. Langacker [Langacker 2000]). As idealized schemas, proto-scenes do not contain any detailed information neither about the nature of a TR or LM, nor detailed metric information about such notions as the exact shape of the LM or the degree of contact between the TR and the LM [Evans, Tyler 2003: 9]. The schema TR is a core element that empowers any entity, which can be interpreted as "focus" or central, to take this position. Moreover, there is a schema element of the background, i.e. landmark which is the starting point for defining the position of a TR. All the elements, which are significant for interpreting a scene, must be linguistically encoded [Tyler, Evans 2003: 65].

The proto-scene associated with *over* involved a spatial configuration in which the TR is located higher than the LM. A. Tyler and V. Evans address *The Oxford English Dictionary*: the primary sense is connected with the form of *over* and expresses the relation HIGHER THAN as well as correlates with the preposition *above* (see (1)) [Tyler, Evans 2003: 65]. The difference between *over* and *above* is that *over* stands for spatial relations where the TR is higher than the LM, but crucially within potential contact with the LM, while *above* describes spatial relations in which the TR is physically proximal to the LM (2). The functional element which is associated with the proto-scene *over*: the TR and LM are within each other's sphere of influence (see (3)) – is not natural for *above* [Tyler, Evans 2003: 77].

(1) *The picture is **over** the mantel.*
(2) *There are a few stray marks just **above** the line* [Tyler, Evans 2003: 77].
(3) *The aeroplane flew **over** Manhattan.*

The proto-scene of the Ukrainian preposition *над* is based on the relation: the TR IS HIGHER THAN the LM [СУМ 1974: 59], the contact between the TR and the LM is absent (4) and (5), but possible, like in (1) and (3).

(4) *Розплавився навіть давній латунний гуцульський мосяжний хрест, прибитий **над** входом* (Прохасько 2005).
(5) *А це означало б, що він неминуче пролетить і **над** Львовом* (Андрухович 2003).

G. Lakoff asserts that the central sense of *over* joins the elements of the senses of *above* and *across* [Lakoff 1990: 542], claiming that *over* profiles dynamicity, movement trajectory. A. Tyler and V. Evans object to this point of view and ground that a movement is profiled by a verb in the sentence, and a trajectory is profiled by the TR feature of moving in a certain way [Tyler, Evans 2003: 69-71]. In the case like (3), the schema enacted is identical to the one in (1). The preposition *over* in both cases only profiles the key spatial configuration of the TR as a figure concerning to the LM as a ground: the TR is located higher than the LM in the sphere of influence, and some contact is possible between the elements of the scene (*the picture* may fall on *the mantel*, *the aeroplane* may land on or fall on the territory of *Manhattan*).

In any case, the spatial scene represented by the preposition *over* include – or, at least, implies – more than one location point (or possibility) for the TR at the specific time, but only one point is central for the scene and defines the schema of relations. The Ukrainian preposition *над* has only one location point for a TR in the proto-scene (4), (5), unlike the proto-scene of the preposition *через* which offers a TR a possibility of its presence in more than one point of the scene, but profiles its location in the direct contact with the LM (6). In the prototypical situation, the LM is larger than the TR; according to [СУМ 1980: 304], the TR enters the limits of the LM on one side and leaves them on another, meanwhile the TR needs some time for this (7), (8). The LM is conceptualized as an obstacle on the way of the TR. The very specification of the LM has become the foundation for developing the derivative senses of the preposition *через*.

(6) *Дорога туди пролягала **через** пустир та неродючі пригірські городи* (Дереш 2006).

(7) *Іван не озираючись пішов **через** увесь передпокій…* (Андрухович 2003).

(8) *Ми пролазили **через** дріт і збирали гриби* (Прохасько 2005).

The proto-scene projects derivative senses on the basis of the image-schema and the additional features of the scene. In other words, the current conceptualization complex derives from the proto-scene, and the connection between the derived sense and the proto-scene is fundamental. In many cases, various senses, however, do not come directly from the proto-scene in the context of the sentence where the preposition is used [Tyler, Evans 2003: 79]. Derived senses construct a network with branches. Basing on the similarity of the situation, some senses produce clusters.

The A-B-C Trajectory Cluster

V. Evans and A. Tyler suggest a branched schema for illustrating the relations represented by the preposition *over* in various contexts [Tyler, Evans 2003: 80]. The largest cluster of derivative senses is conventionally called A-B-C Trajectory. All senses forming the A-B-C Trajectory cluster come from the reconsideration of the schema where points A and C are only implied in cases (9) and (10). The situation is characterized by the following elements: the verb *jump* defines point A as a starting point; *John* (TR) is not able to stay in the air and has to return to the ground – to point C; *the fence* (LM) is construed as an obstacle for the direct movement of the TR; *over* means the key position of the TR in this situation – over the LM, higher than the LM.

(9) *John jumped **over** the fence and went on.*

(10) *John climbed **over** the fence and went on.*

The presence of contact between the LM and the TR is probable, but this element is not relevant for the meaning of the preposition *over*. As G. Lakoff states, the contact is not visible on the schema, as the image-schema is neutral in this aspect [Lakoff 1990: 542-543]. That is why we stress that the same schema is applied in cases (9) and (10).

The derivative schema of spatial relations represented by the preposition ***через*** is construed similarly to the A-B-C Trajectory Schema of the preposition *over*. Points A and C are presented conventionally in the schema, the attention focuses on point B as the key position in the interaction with the LM, and, unlike in the proto-scene of ***через***, this point is located higher than the LM (11), (12). The LM is conceptualized as an obstacle in the proto-scene that is the main feature for associating the schema with the proto-scene.

(11) *У Свят-вечір не вільно подавати одне одному руку **через** поріг, розсипати сіль і бити дзеркала* (Андрухович 2002).

(12) *Ми з Хіппі скинули черевики, щоб їх, бува, не засмоктало, і по черзі перелізли **через** тин* (Дереш 2006).

The On-the-other-side-from Sense

The On-the-other-side-from Sense is an invariant of the A-B-C Trajectory Schema. Here *over* is applied for signifying the central spatial configuration where the movement of the TR is finished, and the TR is on the other side of the LM in comparison with the starting point of the trajectory [Tyler, Evans 2003: 81]. The fact that the preposition *over* does not profile the trajectory supports the usage of *over* in connection both with dynamic verbs (13), and with verbs showing the location of the TR (14). The presence or absence of the trajectory is defined by the context, but it is not fundamental for construing another sense of *over*.

(13) *Sam drove **over** the bridge* [Lakoff 1990: 544].

(14) *Arlington is **over** the Potomac River from Georgetown* [Tyler, Evans 2003: 81].

The only difference between these situations is that (13) schematizes the moving trajectory of the TR, and (14) depicts the trajectory of an implied witness's view which is on that bank of the Potomac where Georgetown is located, and, thus, this is the starting point for the trajectory of the view; the place, where Arlington is located, is the target point of the view, and the Potomac is the LM specified as an obstacle.

The Ukrainian equivalent for situation (13) could be presented as (15), and (14) is literally translated as *Арлінгтон розташовано **через** річку Потомак від Джорджтауна*, but in the

Ukrainian context this situation will demand a different preposition like in (16).

(15) *Семен переїхав **через** міст.*

(16) *За річкою – Єзупіль, але на нього можна лише дивитися з високого лівого берега* (Прохасько 2010).

In its representative proto-scene, the preposition *за*, like *over* in (13) and (17), includes an implied viewer that is "off-stage". Therefore, the starting point for the view is the place on the bank of the river, and the target point coincides with the locus of the TR, i.e. it stays on the opposite bank (18).

(17) *The ball landed **over** the wall.*

(18) *М'яч приземлився (впав) **за** стіною.*

The reconsideration of the preposition *over*, which takes place in the On-the-other-side-from Sense, contains changes unlike the proto-scene: the privileged position of point C and its interpretation as a point, near which the TR was located, as well as the change of the view point. The position of an implied viewer is shifted very closely to point A. V. Evans and A. Tyler assume that this sense has developed via the usage of *over* in the context where the On-the-other-side-from Sense was implicit, and has become conventionally associated with *over* as a distinct sense, – this process has been named *pragmatic strengthening* [Tyler, Evans 2003: 82].

Excess Schema (The Above-and-beyond Sense)

The Above-and-beyond Sense is realized when the usage of *over* is defined by the proto-scene with an additional implicatures: the LM represents an intended goal or target, and the TR moves beyond the intended or desired point [Tyler, Evans 2003: 83].

(19) *The arrow flew **over** the target and landed in the woods.*

Case (19) differs from case (9) as the TR moves beyond the LM which is interpreted as a target, and it is expected that the TR contacts the target. When the TR misses the target, it moves ABOVE and BEYOND the LM. Therefore, the scene conceptualizes MOVING TOO FAR, or it contains excess. Evidence for this sense being distinct comes from further semantic widening which is inexplicable from the contextual viewpoint [Tyler, Evans 2003: 83].

In Ukrainian, there are two variants of verbalizing a situation in such spatial scene (19): 1) the Excess Sense is represented by the verbal prefix *пере-* while the location in space relevant to the LM is represented by the preposition *через* (20); 2) the preposition *над* profiles the key position of the TR in such spatial configuration where it is higher than the LM is (21), and excessiveness is signalized by the features of the concept ЦІЛЬ 'target' which the prototypical arrow is to reach but it does not.

(20) *Стріла перелетіла **через** ціль і впала десь у лісі.*

(21) *Стріла полетіла **над** ціллю і впала десь у лісі.*

Nonetheless, neither *через*, nor *над* schematizes the Above-and-beyond Sense, like the preposition *over* does. This relation can represent the whole context, often linked to *через* and *за* prepositional constructions as in (22). The preposition *через* conceptualizes a spatial configuration where the TR stays in the space relevant to the LM, in the field of interaction, and the specification of the TR's location point depends on the context. In the spatial scene of the preposition *через*, the LM is conceptualized as an obstacle, and the features of the LM and the TR influence the way how the TR can overcome this obstacle. For instance, context (23) represents the scene where the TR misses the LM above, and in (24) the TR moves between the elements of the LM.

(22) *Часом стріли перелітали **через** ціль і падали аж **за** межею поля.*

(23) *З відстані ста кроків вони перелітали ще й **через** двадцятиметрове дерево, а з тридцяти пробивали дошку* (Прохасько 2005).

(24) *Стріла пролетіла **через** листя, не зачепившись за жодну гілку.*

The Excess Schema for the preposition *через* is linked to the conceptualization of the LM as part of a container (25). In this scene, the LM may be represented via the lexemes *край, верх, вінця*, denoting the upper boundary of a container wall.

(25) *Бармен ... наповняючи лямпки смолисто-тягучою, мов розтоплений бурштин,*

*рідиною, переливає **через верх**…* (Прохасько 2005).

The Covering Sense

Typical is the situation when the TR is smaller than the LM. Although, there are instances in the real world in which the object that is in focus (i.e., the TR) is larger or perceived to be larger than the locating object (i.e., the LM). Under usual conditions, the construction of the Covering Sense contains two changes in the typical representation of the proto-scene: firstly, the TR is accepted as being larger than the LM, and, secondly, the viewpoint is shifted from the 'off-stage' position to the 'higher than the LM' position [Tyler, Evans 2003: 90]:

(26) *The tablecloth is **over** the table.*

(27) *The fibreglass protector was **over** the swimming pool.*

In Ukrainian, the Covering Sense is characteristic for the preposition **на**. The obligatory feature of the proto-scene of the preposition **на** is a contact between the TR and the LM: the LM has a horizontal surface above which there is the TR (28). The size of the TR does not change schematization of the spatial scene as it is typical for the prepositions **on** and **over** [Tyler, Evans 2003: 91].

(28) *Скатертина лежить **на** столі.*

The Examining Sense

Any spatial scene can be seen from various viewpoints. The prototypical viewpoint is linked to the proto-scene where the viewer is 'off-stage'. Construing the sense of **over**, which is illustrated by (29), is the result of shifting a viewpoint. This is the viewpoint of the TR, and moreover, the viewpoint of the TR is oriented at the LM [Tyler, Evans 2003: 93].

(29) *Phyllis is standing **over** the entrance to the underground chamber.*

Here **over** is employed according to its proto-scene, and it denotes spatial relations between the TR, *Phyllis*, and the LM, *the entrance to the underground chamber*, where the TR is located higher, but very close to the LM: *Phyllis* stays in the position where she can observe *the entrance* and is able to notice details. If the object is not sufficiently close to the viewer, it is usually fuzzy for the viewer's perception and the viewer cannot notice details [Tyler, Evans 2003: 93].

The preposition **над** can indicate the difference of the sizes of the TR and LM. Cases (30), (31) testify that only part of the TR can be located just ABOVE the LM. Both **over**, and **над** are characterized with the appearance of a distinct sense of 'examining' motivated by the position of the TR in the proto-scene that is convenient for observing closely the LM.

(30) *Ще він побачив навколо себе голови – ціле товариство згромадилося **над** шахівницею, збуджено обговорюючи становище…* (Андрухович 2003).

(31) *Карл-Йозеф обережно відклав убік свого меча і першим схилився **над** заюшеним Пепою* (Андрухович 2003).

Thus, we have analyzed the basic spatial relations represented by the English preposition **over**. The contrasting of verbalizing similar spatial relations in Ukrainian has enabled us to conclude that distinct senses of **over** correlate with image-schemas, characteristic for various Ukrainian prepositions – mainly **над** and **через**, but partially **за** and **на** as well. We deduce that in Ukrainian the presented set of scenes are not conceptualized as a chain of connected variations, derived from the same proto-scene and possessing one or two changes in the scene that provoke a distinct sense, but as different scenes that represent various categories of spatial relations, and they are not connected via derivation.

The research is conducted in the framework of the dissertation which is devoted to the analysis of the semantic relations of English, Serbian and Ukrainian prepositions for revealing the mechanisms of perceiving and experiencing the world as well as representing knowledge by means of national languages. The research of English prepositions has been rather well-documented, meanwhile this type of studying Ukrainian and Serbian prepositions is at its initial stage. Grounded on the principles of Anglophone researchers, the author aims at studying the semantic relations of primary simple prepositions in two languages as a means for representing the perception of space, time and abstract notions.

References

Вихованець 1980: Вихованець, І. Прийменникова система української мови [Текст] / І. Р. Вихованець. – К. : Наукова думка, 1980. – 288 с. – Бібліогр. : с. 274-284. – 1500 пр.

Всеволодова 1982: Всеволодова, М. Способы выражения пространственных отношений в современном русском языке [Текст] / М. В. Всеволодова, Е. Ю. Владимирский. – М. : Русский язык, 1982. – 264 с. – Библиогр. : с. 250-253. – 5000 экз.

Загнітко 2007: Загнітко, А. Синтагматика прийменників зі значенням мети [Текст] / А. Загнітко, Н. Загнітко // Лінгвістичні студії : Зб. наук. праць. Випуск 15 / Укл. : А. Загнітко (наук. ред.) та ін. – Донецьк : ДонНУ, 2007. – С. 131-142. – 500 пр. – ISBN 966-7277-88-7.

Загнітко 2004: Загнітко, А. Українські прийменники : інвентар і структура [Текст] / А. Загнітко, І. Данилюк, Г. Ситар // Лінгвістичні студії : Зб. наук. праць. Випуск 12 / Укл. : А. Загнітко та ін. – Донецьк : ДонНУ, 2004. – С. 41-47.

СУМ 1974: Словник української мови : В 11-ти томах [Текст] / Гол. ред. І. К. Білодід, ред. тому В. О. Винник, Л. А. Юрчук. – Т. 5. – К. : Наукова думка, 1974. – 840 с.

СУМ 1980: Словник української мови : В 11-ти томах [Текст] / Гол. ред. І. К. Білодід, ред. тому С. І. Головащук – Т. 11. – К. : Наукова думка, 1980. – 699 с.

Brugman 1988: Brugman, C. The Story of Over : Polysemy, Semantics and the Structure of the Lexicon [Text] / C. Brugman. – New York : Garland, 1988. – 115 pp.

Evans, Tyler: Evans, V. Applying Cognitive Linguistics to Pedagogical Grammar : The English Prepositions of Verticality [Електронний ресурс] / V. Evans, A. Tyler. – 50 pp. – Access mode : URL : http://www.vyvevans.net/Applycoglxpedagogy.pdf від 09.09.2013. – Title from the screen.

Herskovits 1986: Herskovits, A. Language and Spatial Cognition: Interdisciplinary Study [Text] / A. Herskovits. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1986. – 208 pp. – Ref. : Pp. 201-205. – ISBN 0 521 26690 4.

Lakoff 1990: Lakoff, G. Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things : What Categories Reveal about the Mind [Text] / G. Lakoff. – Chicago : Chicago University Press, 1990. – 614 pp. – Ref. : Рз. 589-600. – ISBN 0-226-46804-6.

Langacker 2000: Langacker, R. Grammar and Conceptualization [Text] / R. Langacker. – Berlin – New York : Walter de Gruyter, 2000. – 427 pp. – Ref. : Pp. 401-418. – ISBN 3-11-016604-6.

Levinson 2003: Levinson, S.C. Spatial language [Text] / S. C. Levinson // Encyclopedia of cognitive science / L. Nadel (Ed.). – London : Nature Publishing Group, 2003. – Pp. 131-137. – Ref. : Pp. 348-367. – ISBN 0-511-03008-8.

Przybylska 2002: Przybylska, R. Polisemia przyimków polskich w świetle semantyki kognitywnej [Text] / R. Przybylska. – Kraków: Towarzystwo autorów i wydawców prac naukowych UNIVERSITAS, 2002. – 608 s. – Bibliogr. : S. 579-608. – ISBN 83-7052-582-2.

Tyler, Evans 2003: Tyler, A. The Semantics of English Prepositions : Spatial scenes, Embodied Meaning and Cognition [Text] / V. Evans, A. Tyler. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. – xii+254 pp. – Ref. : Pp. 238–245. – ISBN-13 978-0-521-81430.

Sources and Abbreviations

Андрухович 2002: Андрухович, Ю. Перверзія [Електронний ресурс] / Ю. Андрухович. – Львів : ВНТЛ-Класика, 2002.

Андрухович 2003: Андрухович, Ю. Дванадцять обручів [Електронний ресурс] / Ю. Андрухович. – К. : Критика, 2003.

Дереш 2006: Дереш, Л. Поклоніння ящірці [Електронний ресурс] / Л. Дереш. – К. : Книжковий клуб „Клуб сімейного дозвілля“, 2006.

Прохасько 2005: Прохасько, Т. З цього можна зробити кілька оповідань [Електронний ресурс] / Т. Прохасько. – Івано-Франківськ : Лілея-НВ, 2005.

Прохасько 2010: Прохасько, Т. 1000 місць і слів [Електронний ресурс] // Прохасько Т.

Ботакє / Т. Прохасько. – Івано-Франківськ : Лілея-НВ, 2010.

*У статті прослідковано відмінності в концептуалізації деяких просторових уявлень в англійській і українській мовах. Проведено зіставлення схематизації просторових відношень, які репрезентує слово **over**, зі схематизацією подібних просторових відношень прийменниками української мови. Описано випадки вживання англійського прийменника **over** та корелятивних (частково) українських прийменників **через**, **над** і почасти **на** і **за**, відштовхуючись від змісту, який концептуалізується у прийменникових конструкціях завдяки взаємодії членів.*

Ключові слова: прийменник, семантичні відношення, просторові відношення, траєктор, орієнтир, схематизація, протосцена, мовна репрезентація.

Available 1 October 2013.

Halyna Palytsya

**VERBALIZATION OF THE CONCEPT "TEACHING"
IN UKRAINIAN, RUSSIAN AND GERMAN**

The article focuses on the analysis of the paroemia language world image fragment: the peculiarities of modeling "pedagogical" paroemias have been traced in Ukrainian, Russian and German from the point of peculiarities of the concept "TEACHING" verbalization in the language consciousness of different ethnic groups; certain constituent parts have been singled out, such as: "an artefact of the teaching process", "a participant of a teaching process", "type of teaching", "result of teaching".

Keywords: concept, language consciousness, paroemia language world image, "pedagogical" paroemia, verbalization.

The topicality of the investigation. Recent decades illustrate the process of widening of the boundaries of the language investigation that is caused by the appearance of the researches connected with the interrelation not only thought and consciousness but with culture and ethnos outlook [Мацьків 2007: 5]. This aspect of a language functioning is considered to be important because the every culture plays an important role in the formation of a personality and language is the only content and means able to help interfere in the concealed sphere of mentality because it investigates the way of the world's division in this or that culture [Маслова 2001: 114].

Teaching is a very important fragment of an objective reality that is reflected in a human being's consciousness and is expressed in linguistic means of each language. But "the language world image in each language is unique, peculiar is determined with social, cultural, psychological, spiritual peculiarities of the nation, the tradition etc., that is a national specificity" [Космеда 2000: 231], that explains some differences in the presentation of the investigated sphere in Ukrainian, Russian and German. The research of the paroemia linguistic world images of different linguistic cultures is a vivid conviction of this fact because the paroemias reflect the specificity of perception of the objective reality by the representatives of the different ethnos in general and each fragment in particular. More over, paroemia is an archetype unit that reflects an ancient culture, traditions of each nation, represents mentality expressed in the language consciousness. All the above mentioned items are projected on the pedagogical sphere of a person's activity, illustrating some peculiarities of vision of the certain pedagogical situations by different aspects of the teaching-educational process and are nominated as pedagogical paroemias [Палиця 2011].

The degree of the problem studying. A huge theoretical contribution to the elaboration of this problem has been made by M. Alefirenko, N. Amosova, O. Babkin, Yu. Hvozdaryov, I. Hnatyuk, V. Mokiyenko, O. Molotkov, V. Uzhchenko, V. Teliya and the others. In recent years the investigation of the paroemia world image in the linguistic cultural aspect has been made by