SECTION 7. COMPARATIVE AND TYPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS

PANCHRONY AS A THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPT IN THE MODERN SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE

ПАНХРОНІЯ ЯК ТЕОРЕТИКО-МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНЕ ПОНЯТТЯ СУЧАСНОЇ НАУКИ ПРО МОВУ

Vakhovska O. V.
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor,
Postdoctoral Researcher
at the Department of Germanic
and Finno-Ugric Philology
Kyiv National Linguistic University
Kyiv, Ukraine

Ваховська О. В.
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
докторант кафедри германської
і фіно-угорської філології
Київський національний лінгвістичний
університет
м. Київ, Україна

This paper offers an outline of the major theoretical and methodological approaches that have so far guided the concept of panchrony in its evolution in the scientific worldview(s) of modern West European and American linguistics, starting from the traditions of structuralism (the beginning of the 20th century) and concluding with the (emerging) traditions of functionalism (the end of the 20th century, early into the 21st century), with the understanding that the concept of panchrony makes part of the legacy that the latter has inherited from the former, in view of the change of the linguistic paradigms.

Panchrony as a theoretical and methodological concept in the modern science of language suggests that natural language is independent, – and can and should therefore be studied independently, – from the restrictions of time and space [10]. Panchrony is inseparably linked to synchrony and diachrony that do put such restrictions, each in its own unique ways. Synchrony focuses on the static state of language, whereas diachrony looks at the dynamic change that language has undergone in its development [ibid.].

The scientific view of panchrony in **structuralism**, associated for the most part with the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure [13], explains panchrony in terms of **linguistic universals** (general rules and principles

regarding language make-up that exist independently of concrete linguistic facts and also of individual language speakers) and suggests that panchrony is impossible due to the fact that language is an autonomous system of **arbitrary signs**, which divides synchrony and diachrony sharply, hides causality in language change, and precludes the possibility to simultaneously study language from the generalized synchronic and diachronic, i.e. from the panchronic, point of view [10]. Synchrony (simultaneous co-existence of linguistic signs) and diachrony (chronological succession of linguistic signs) are dichotomous for structuralists, with synchrony gaining traction in their research, owing to the psychological realism that language enjoys among its speakers in its current static state. On that, no extralinguistic factors, such as time and space given in the world and construed in the human mind, must enter into the scientific account of language *per se* [ibid.].

The scientific view of panchrony in **functionalism**, associated in cognitive linguistics for the most part with the Polish linguist Przemysław Łozowski [10; 11], explains panchrony in terms of **functional universals** (cognitive and experiential patterns of human behavior, culture included) and suggests that panchrony is possible, and even imperative, due to the fact that language is not an autonomous but a cognition- and culture-dependent system of **motivated signs**, or **symbols** of human experience [10]. This introduces the extralinguistic factors into linguistic research, highlights causality in language change, unites synchrony and diachrony together, now treating these on a par, and includes the possibility to simultaneously study language from the generalized, i.e. panchronic, point of view, owing to the cognitive processes that drive the genesis of language [ibid.]. On that, the combination of diachrony of language with universal processes of human cognition is assumed to constitute panchrony [6, p. 55].

The **cognitive mechanism behind linguistic semiosis** that this paper suggests is panchronic is the conversion of human non-propositional into propositional thought, which is the conversion of mental images as modal mental representations (seeing the world) into word meanings as amodal mental representations (understanding the world), and back [1; 2; 14]. This conversion once supported the evolution of human cognition, when the archaic consciousness in humans transitioned to their modern one; this conversion now remains central to human communication with words, where it employs the visual and auditory areas of the human brain, orchestrating the respective organs of sense, along with the deep and shallow layers of the human mind, transcending the individual (un)consciousness into the collective unconscious [14]. (For the stages in the evolution of human consciousness, see [5]; for the neurophysiology of human communication with words, see [9]; for the layering of the human mind, the collective unconscious included, see [7; 12].)

The modal-to-amodal conversion occurred at the moment when the word was created and emerged into language, *and has* the **inner form of the word** as its first, – and panchronic, – product [14]. The inner form of the word is a fragment of this word's meaning [16] that at its own time motivated the emergence of this word in its peculiar outer form into language [3] (The outer form of the word is the phonemic and graphemic container for this word's meaning [16].) The inner form of the word is an archaic image that has pictorial resemblance to the referent of the word, in view of how this referent emerged into the consciousness of man who then gave this referent its name [14, p. 52]. The image in the human mind represents the respective thing in the world, and is this thing's symbol; as this image was formed perceptually, it is a perceptual symbol. (For perceptual symbols, see [4].)

The modal-to-amodal conversion occurs at the moment when the word is used and processed by the speakers of language, *and has* the **image-driven interpretation of the word** as its continuous product [14]. Whereas it is impossible for individual speakers to change the inner forms of words in their language, as these archaic images are inherited together with the worldview (the magic circle, to W. von Humboldt) and re-imagining them can only touch but not take them (on touching and taking, see [15]), the interpretations of words of language by its speakers are fluid, emergent, and variable, owing to individual experiences and cognitive styles and to the context (physical, social, cultural, immediate communicative; global, local [8]).

On that, the **modal-to-amodal conversion** is a panchronic mechanism of human cognition that regulates the process of linguistic semiosis, determining the genesis of the word as that of a sign-symbol. This cognitive mechanism operates at each of the stages in language development in time, diachrony and synchrony included, and is universal for the speakers of language by virtue of their embodiment.

Bibliography:

1. Ваховська О. В. Знако-символічна природа слова як одиниці мовної картини світу: еволюційний аспект – постановка проблеми. *Вчені записки Таврійського нац. ун-ту ім. В. І. Вернадського. Серія : Філологія. Журналістика.* 2023. Том 34(73), № 4. С. 167–175. doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2023.4/30

2. Ваховська О. В. Переклад: слово, яке обернулося образом. *Вчені записки Таврійського нац. ун-ту ім. В. І. Вернадського. Серія : Філ. журн.* 2022. Том 33(72), № 5 Том 2. С. 1–8. doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2022.5.2/01

3. Потебня О. О. Думка і мова. Харків : Адольф Дарре, 1892. 236 с.

4. Barsalou L.W. Perceptual symbol systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 1999. № 22. P. 577–609.

5. Gebser J. The ever-present origin. Athens: Ohio UP, 1986. 647 p.

6. Jarosz I. In search of the cultural motivation in language: *girl* and *woman* in James Joyce's 'Dubliners.' Berlin : Peter Lang GmbH, 2020. 194 p.

7. Jung C. Archetypes and the collective unconscious. *Collected works of C.G. Jung* / G. Adler, R.F.C. Hull. Princeton : Pr.UP, 1981. 480 p.

8. Kövecses Z. Conceptual metaphor theory and the nature of difficulties in metaphor translation. *Translating figurative language* / D. R. Miller, E. Monti. Bologna: Università di Bologna, 2014. P. 25–39.

9. Kumar S., Sumers T., Yamakoshi T., Goldstein A., Hasson U., Norman K., Griffiths Th., Hawkins R., Nastase S. Shared functional specialization in transformer-based language models and the human brain. *Nature Communications*. 2024. № 15. P. 5523. doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-49173-5

10. Łozowski P. In search of panchrony: Saussure *versus* cognitive linguistics. *Lublin Studies in Modern Languages and Literature*. 2023. № 47(2). P. 153–164. doi.org/10.17951/lsmll.2023.47.2.153-164

11. Łozowski P. The *will* and *be going to* constructions as panchronic inferences: in search of cognitive motivation. *Lege Artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. 2022. № 7(2). P. 39–75.

12. Minsky M. Society of mind. NY : Simon and Schuster, 1988. 336 p.

13. Saussure F. de. Course in general linguistics, ed. by Bally Ch., Sechehaye A., with collaboration of Riedlinger A.; transl. by Harris R. ; orig. published in 1916. London, UK : Duckworth, 1983. 236 p.

14. Vakhovska O. V. Emotions and consciousness: reconstructing emotion concepts' diachronic depths with the use of proto-language data. *Logos*. 2024. № 119. P. 49–58. doi.org/10.24101/logos.2024.26.

15. Weber S. A touch of translation: on Walter Benjamin's "Task of the translator". *Nation, language, and the ethics of translation* / S. Bermann, M. Wood. Princeton : Pr. UP, 2005. P. 65–79. doi.org/10.1515/9781400826681.65

16. Zhabotynska S.A. Saussure's theory of the linguistic sign: a cognitive perspective. *Papers of International Congress of Linguistics*. Université de Genève, 2013.www.cil19.org/uploads/documents/Saussure_Theory_Of_The_Linguistic_Sign-A_Cognitive_Perspective.pdf