

Vakhovska O. V.,
Candidate of Philological Sciences (Ukraine), Associate Professor,
MSc in Cognitive Science (Germany),
Postdoctoral Researcher at the Department of Germanic and Finno-Ugric Philology
Kyiv National Linguistic University
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7720-0970>
 WoS Researcher ID: U-9472-2017

THE CONTINUITY OF PANCHRONY IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Summary. 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. 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.

The scientific view of panchrony in structuralism, associated for the most part with the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, 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. 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*.

The scientific view of panchrony in functionalism, associated in cognitive linguistics for the most part with the Polish linguist Przemysław Łozowski, 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. This introduces the extralinguistic factors into linguistic research, highlights causality in language change,

uniting 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. On that, the combination of the diachrony of language together with the universal processes of human cognition is assumed to constitute panchrony.

Key words: cognitivism, diachrony, functionalism, panchrony, sign, structuralism, symbol, synchrony, system.

Problem statement. Panchrony as a theoretical and methodological concept in the modern science of language is inseparable from the concepts of synchrony and diachrony, together with which it has been chosen as the research object of this paper. The evolution of scientific views on the concept of panchrony in linguistics of the 20th and early 21st century is this paper's research subject.

At the beginning of the 20th century, Ferdinand de Saussure, standing on the methodological grounds of the science of language that had been formulated by him, including the definition of *language as a system of signs*, interprets panchrony in terms of *linguistic universals*, i.e. in terms of general rules and principles of language make-up that exist independently of concrete linguistic facts and of individual language speakers. At the end of the 20th century, cognitive linguists define language through its *symbolic and interactive nature*, and interpret panchrony in terms of *functional universals*, i.e. in terms of those mechanisms of human cognition and of those experiential patterns of human behavior that underlie language *per se*. It is now relevant and important to compare and contrast the two interpretations of panchrony, in view of the change of the structuralist to the functionalist linguistic paradigms.

Literature review. The concepts of synchrony, diachrony, and panchrony according to Ferdinand de Saussure. *Ferdinand de Saussure* [1] defines language as an autonomous, independent, and self-contained *system of signs* in which each of its elements is connected with its other elements, while the system itself as a whole equals its elements and the organization of these elements into a *structure*. F. de Saussure [ibid., p. 83–98] formulates a number of linguistic antinomies, stating in particular that the property of language as that of a system of signs is the *dichotomy of synchrony and diachrony* as two mutually exclusive aspects of language, each of which has more connections within itself than both aspects have between themselves. Thus, synchrony and diachrony appear as two interrelated parts of a single whole, each part defined as the negation of the other, but priority is given to the synchrony of the system (simultaneous co-existence of signs) as compared

to the development of the system in diachrony (chronological sequence of signs).

The distinction between synchrony and diachrony, according to F. de Saussure, is clear-cut and categorical, so any research of language must necessarily attribute the fact it examines to only one of these two aspects, appropriate for this fact, as synchrony and diachrony are not compatible. It is F. de Saussure [1, p. 94] who himself for the first time suggests the possibility of *panchrony* and a panchronic study of language (see [2, p. 159]), because *language* – like *a game of chess*, where certain rules are always true and always hold, – accommodates certain relations that hold true in all cases and forever. These are general principles of language make-up that exist independently of specific linguistic facts that are individual; these are universal rules that act in language as its laws, similarly to how natural laws act in physics and other sciences. Yet, a panchronic study of language, F. de Saussure believes, has no chances of success, because those facts of language that hold true everytime and everywhere do not have *value* (or significance; French *la valeur*), as they do not have *meaning*: thus, a panchronic study of language, to F. de Saussure, never deals with specific facts of the linguistic structure. The only panchronic characteristic of *the French word chose*, as the example is cited in [2, p. 159], are the sounds of this word that must be confirmed as existing in themselves; if these sounds-in-themselves are combined, they, from the structuralist perspective, make a formless mass that has no definition.

The dichotomy of synchrony and diachrony, as per F. de Saussure, presumes absence of a causal relationship between the properties of the earlier and later – historically successive – stages of language development, so the present state of language, i.e. synchrony, must not be regarded as motivated by the past states of language, i.e. diachrony [2, p. 161]. For the word *chose*, accordingly, there is no such (panchronic) point of view that would simultaneously combine both a diachronic perspective, in which this word *is opposed* to the Latin word *causa* as its actual origin, and a synchronic perspective, in which this word *is opposed* to every other word that can be associated with it in modern French [3, p. 83, as cited in 2, p. 159]. On that, *panchrony is impossible* not because one the same object, such as the word *chose*, cannot be viewed from two different perspectives in time, but because these two different perspectives require two different objects. In synchrony, *chose* belongs to *language* (language is *la langue* as general rules that operate in language as a system of signs, regardless of, and prior to, individual speakers; without these rules, *speech (la parole)* as individual speakers' concrete and meaningful use of language is impossible), and language as a system of signs is characterized by *psychological reality*, which is fundamental for F. de Saussure. In diachrony, *chose* belongs to the relations of continuity between certain separate facts of language, but these relations are unknown to language speakers, unsystematic, and, therefore, not characterized by psychological reality [2, p. 160].

This presumed absence of a generalizing (panchronic) point of view on facts of language is primarily explained by *practical considerations*, as Przemysław Łozowski shows [2, p. 159–163], since – although to generalize over certain universal properties of language, such as the continuity of phonetic changes, is possible, – any specific fact of language that could apparently suit a panchronic description does not belong to language as *la langue*. Thus, the word *chose* can be distinguished in synchrony in relation to other words that belong to a certain realization of the French

language at a certain moment in time (i.e. that belong to a certain *état de langue*), and can be distinguished in diachrony in relation to words that belong to previous *états de langue*, e.g. in relation to the Latin word *causa* that *chose* etymologically derives from, but there is no distinct and independent panchronic way to determine all the relations of the word *chose* [4, p. 101, as cited in 2, p. 160]. P. Łozowski [2, p. 160] continues that F. de Saussure involuntarily admits that in the structuralist toolset there is no practical tool that would allow to investigate language as a whole, i.e. to confirm sounds as existing in themselves and to simultaneously correlate these sounds with meanings that are confirmed as existing in themselves, too: the linguistic form alone could, if at all, be investigated panchronically but not the linguistic function, and even less so the pairing of the linguistic form and of the linguistic function. On that, sounds-in-themselves could presumably be studied panchronically but such sounds do not constitute a word.

F. de Saussure observes that it happens that one word no longer feels to have been derived from another word, as when Latin *comes-comitem* becomes in Old French *cuens // comte'* [1, p. 151–153, as cited in 2, p. 160], with the words *cuens* and *comite'*, due to the operation of sound changes. This, to F. de Saussure, indicates that one deals with two incompatible systems, since the compared values, i.e. the case system in Latin and the case system in Old French, are not comparable, whereas for structuralism the *comparability* of the objects one investigates is key. If one begins to generalize the results of the comparison of the incomparable, one departs from the distinction between synchrony and diachrony, does not investigate sounds-in-themselves, but instead panchronizes over the ways how these sounds had functioned differently before their evolution led to systemic changes in language [2, p. 160–161].

Therefore, F. de Saussure's refusal to accept the possibility of panchrony is explained, in addition to practical, by *methodological considerations* as well [2, p. 159–163], in particular by the structuralists' strong claim that the linguistic sign is not motivated, but arbitrary. Stating the autonomous nature of *language as a system of arbitrary signs*, F. de Saussure had at all costs to defend the dichotomy of synchrony and diachrony, as their dichotomy buttressed the autonomy of language. As P. Łozowski shows, absence of motivation in the linguistic sign, according to F. de Saussure, consists in that, first, the connection between *the form and the content of the sign* is arbitrary, and, second, the content of the linguistic sign *per se* is arbitrary. The second claim, i.e. that of the arbitrariness of the sign's content, most effectively buttressed the autonomy of language [2, p. 161], because the content as the meaning of a linguistic sign, unlike the form of a linguistic sign, is not the property of the sign-in-itself, but is the function of the value, or significance, of this sign in a certain language as a sign system, given that this sign refers to certain properties of the world and activates a certain concept as a reflection of these properties in the mind of the language speaker. That is why to state that the content of the linguistic sign is not arbitrary would mean to state that language is susceptible to the influence of external factors, which F. de Saussure denied: the only object in the science of language was declared to be *language in and for itself*. This was structuralists' rejection of the condition that language could be determined by anything beyond its system. This was structuralists' belief that the only generalizations that would apply to language are generalizations that apply to facts of language.

P. Łozowski [2, p. 162] concludes that the true reason why F. de Saussure states that if one takes the panchronic point of view, then the word *chose* must be analyzed as sounds-in-themselves and these sounds – as a formless mass that has no definition, – must appear devoid of significance, is not the objective impossibility to analyze the word *chose* in a different way, but the accord that this impossibility has with the methodological grounds defended by F. de Saussure to surely tame the extralinguistic by controlling its sources, i.e. by holding back time and space **manifested in the world and construed in the human mind**.

The aim of this paper is to outline 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.

Results and discussion. The concept of panchrony in cognitively-oriented linguistics. The extralinguistic has received its due attention with the emergence at the end of the 20th century of **functionalism** – a scientific paradigm in linguistics that focuses on the two major functions of language: **the cognitive function**, as language is used to manifest concepts that exist in the human mind, and **the communicative function**, as language is used by people for the purposes of communication, – which prompted the emergence of cognitive linguistics and of communicative linguistics, respectively [5].

The concept of panchrony, inherited from structuralism to functionalism, has acquired its new interpretation in cognitively-oriented linguistics, which is consistent with the driving forces of this new scientific paradigm generally [5, p. 7, 11–12]. On that, **panchrony** is (more and more often) defined in terms of the interaction of synchrony and diachrony, now treated on a par, but not as a dichotomous opposition. This definition of panchrony is (more or less) unanimous; yet, a shared understanding of the amounts, ways, mechanisms, and consequences of this interaction, as well as effective approaches to this interaction in linguistic research, are now only beginning to emerge [2, p. 154–157].

The concept of panchrony is becoming an ever more **relevant and important issue** on the agenda of the modern cognitive studies of language, where, as P. Łozowski shows [2, p. 154], two major trends are becoming visible. The first one is to change the methodological approach to panchrony; the second one is to introduce a new understanding of language, in view of the new understanding of panchrony [2; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10]. **Change in the methodological approach to panchrony** primarily involves the need to adhere to certain norms that must be adopted regarding the quantity and quality of the linguistic data that can and should be examined from the synchronic and the diachronic viewpoint, or both [2, p. 154]. This is intended to confirm the non-dichotomy of synchrony and diachrony, opening up new prospects of research in the direction of them both; here, the areas of intersection and overlap between synchrony and diachrony are termed panchrony. Conversely, **a new understanding of language** primarily involves the need to account for the extralinguistic, i.e. cognitive and cultural, factors that shape language. Here, the non-dichotomy of synchrony and diachrony is confirmed

by the circumstance that similar, if not identical, functionally determined regularities are observed both in synchrony and in diachrony; panchrony is then declared equal to these regularities, and is defined in their terms [2, p. 154, with a reference to 11, p. 503, 510]. Both trends agree with each other in that, first, panchrony is the result of the interaction of synchrony and diachrony; second, language is simultaneously a static system and a dynamic change of this system; third, panchronic research locates, or assumes the location of, linguistic facts both in synchrony and in diachrony, with the understanding that synchrony and diachrony can be both self-sufficiently separate from each other and still mutually interrelated [2, p. 155].

Opinions as to what **the panchronic approach to language has to do** are as follows:

To find a general view of language that will take into account both synchronic and diachronic facts of language at the same time [4, p. 102]. To define the relationship between synchrony and diachrony as equal; to refute the priority of the synchronic state of the language system as compared to the diachronic change of this system. The boundary between synchrony and diachrony is to be considered gradual and fuzzy [2, p. 156, 159].

To explain synchronic facts, taking into account the diachronic reality that has led to the emergence and functioning of these facts; to emphasize that the diachronic reality explains the synchronic facts [12, p. 251, 258–261]. The panchronic approach is applied (only or mostly) to those linguistic phenomena that simultaneously accommodate the synchronic-psychological and the diachronic relations [ibid., p. 258].

To trace the historical development of synchronic linguistic facts, which will provide a comprehensive understanding of these facts, making it possible to fix the linguistic meanings and forms that had been the starting points for these facts in their successive development, but once were lost [13]: panchrony is a hybrid of the diachronic and synchronic approaches [ibid., p. 25; cited in 14, p. 54–55].

To expose the motivation of the linguistic sign, as this motivation becomes the product of the iconic nature of the sign and encompasses both synchrony and diachrony; since diachrony is manifested in synchrony, synchrony must be expanded and augmented through the application of diachrony. Panchrony is the combinability and overlap of synchrony (the static synchronic state) and diachrony (the dynamic diachronic change) [11; cited in 2, p. 154].

To understand that in natural language, the past always accompanies the present [15, p. 235; cited in 14, p. 54], due to which diachronic data should be used in synchronic analysis so that the analyzed linguistic facts receive their comprehensive semantic interpretation: panchrony is the use of diachronic data in a synchronic analysis, detecting which linguistic expressions were used to manifest a certain concept at all stages in the development of a particular language [16; cited in 14, p. 54].

To show the nature of a modern phenomenon of language by exposing the historical and, importantly, cognitive origins of this phenomenon, i.e. by pointing to the factors that condition and explain the genesis of this phenomenon [17, p. 92]; to maintain a right balance between synchrony and diachrony [ibid., p. 7]. Diachrony shows itself in synchrony, while synchronic facts are mirrors that reflect their own history [ibid., p. 9; see the opinion in 2, p. 156].

To conceptualize language as simultaneously a synchronic system and a historical product of a sequence of individual dia-

chronic events, each such event motivated in one way or another at the moment it occurred. On that, the diachronic dimension is key in explaining synchronic linguistic facts [18, p. 553; cited in 2, p. 156].

To make it clear that language is not autonomous, as per Ferdinand de Saussure [1], and that language is not a separate module in the human brain/mind, as per Noam Chomsky [19]. To profess instead that language is endowed with a symbolic and an interactive nature [20]. Therefore, panchrony should be defined not in terms of linguistic universals, i.e. linguistic facts and relations that are always-and-everywhere true, but in terms of functional universals, i.e. cognitive and experiential patterns of human behavior [2, p. 163].

To constate the non-opposition of synchrony and diachrony in relation to each other; to combine and generalize the linguistic and the non-linguistic knowledge manifested in the signs of language; to show the unobservable aspects of human cognition via the scientific study of language and culture (cultural behavior) in their interaction, in particular taking into account the motivation that linguistic phenomena have in the phenomena of culture and individual experience [14, p. 51–52].

Longitudinal, complex, and systematic is the scientific study of panchrony by *Przemysław Łozowski*. The researcher defines *panchrony* in terms of a combination of diachrony and cognition, as it is the experientially-grounded views of the dynamically changing world by language speakers that motivate the semantics of linguistic signs [6, p. 51]. Panchrony is a methodology for the study of language, where *language* is the flexible tool that human cognition uses for the conceptualization and categorization of the world. On that, language should be studied from such a perspective that connects language changes with changes in how humans understand the world. Word meanings are unique for the speakers of individual languages, as these meanings result from different and divergent personal and socio-cultural *experiences*, and from the speakers' subjective view and evaluation of the world [7, p. 120–123]. Language has long and continuously recorded the experiences of its speakers; so, the phenomena of language should be studied in the context of the evolution of human cognition, in search for the cognitive filters that once allowed for those changes and factors that in their turn have shaped the connection between the forms and the meanings of linguistic signs. This way, the modern methodology of the panchronic analysis of language rises above the traditional distinction between synchrony and diachrony, relying instead on these two simultaneously, and the diachrony of language becomes inseparable from human cognition and experience [9, p. 165–166]:

'What can be recognized in language as panchronic comes from treating language as a cognitive tool of categorization, or from placing language change in the context of the evolution of human understanding, or – still better – from seeing language categories as ever-evolving derivatives of cognitive tensions. The very presence of cognitive factors in diachronic description is precisely the reason why instead of a linear succession of discrete language states in space and time (which is a broad definition of diachrony) we obtain a multi-directional progression of non-discrete categorization processes in language (which might be a working definition of panchrony). Unlike in diachrony, in panchrony language no longer functions in space and time, but it operates in human understanding of space and time,' as P. Łozowski puts it [10, p. 47–48].

Izabela Jarosz [14, p. 53–57] summarizes that the concept of panchrony has steadily been developing in cognitively-ori-

ented linguistics, where it is(was) interpreted in terms of *universal laws*, of *omnipresence of history*, of *cognitive universalism*, and, ultimately, of *diachrony plus human cognition*, which confirms the continuity of panchrony as a theoretical and methodological concept in the modern science of language.

Conclusion. This paper has outlined 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*. 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.

The scientific view of panchrony in *structuralism*, associated for the most part with the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, 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. 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*.

The scientific view of panchrony in *functionalism*, associated in cognitive linguistics for the most part with the Polish linguist Przemysław Łozowski, 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. 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. On that, the combination of the diachrony of language together with the universal processes of human cognition is assumed to constitute panchrony.

As long as for F. de Saussure '[a] panchronic synthesis is impossible <...> because of the arbitrary nature of linguistic signs'

[21, c. 51], this paper's **prospect** is to investigate the scientific issue of the **arbitrariness of the linguistic sign** against that of the **non-arbitrariness of the linguistic (sign)-symbol** [22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 27], assuming that it is this sort of non-arbitrariness that has made it possible to conceptualize panchrony in cognitive linguistics.

Bibliography:

- 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.
- 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.
- Holdcroft D. Saussure: signs, system, and arbitrariness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. 196 p. doi.org/10.2307/416567.
- Harris R. Reading Saussure. A critical commentary on the Course de Linguistique Generale. London, UK: Duckworth, 1987. 248 p.
- Zhabotynska S.A. The study of language: linguistic paradigms. *Studia Philologica*. 2019. № 1. P. 7–12. doi.org/10.28925/2311-2425.2019.12.1.
- Łozowski P. Language as symbol of experience: King Alfred's *cunman*, *magan*, and *motan* in a panchronic perspective. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2008. 208 p.
- Łozowski P. Tradycja jako panchronia, czyli w poszukiwaniu ciągłości kultury. *Tradycja w kontekstach kulturowych (Tradycja dla współczesności. Ciągłość i zmiana 4)* / Adamowski J., Wójcicka M. (Eds.); Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, 2011. P. 113–123.
- Łozowski P. Od semantyki do gramatyki, czyli o wyższości panchronii nad synchronią i diachronią. *Leksyka języków słowiańskich w badaniach synchronicznych i diachronicznych* / Gębka-Wolak M., Kamper-Warejko J., Moroz A. (Eds.); Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2014. P. 89–100.
- Łozowski P. Panchronia, czyli język jako symbol doświadczenia. *Metodologie językoznawstwa: od diachronii do panchronii* / Stalmaszczyk P. (Ed.); Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2018. P. 165–178.
- 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.
- Winters M.E. Diachrony within synchrony: the challenge of cognitive grammar. *Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution: Studies in Honour of René Dirven on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* / Putz M. (Ed.); Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1992. P. 503–511.
- Heine B., Claudi U., Hünnemeyer F. Grammaticalization: a conceptual framework. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991. 318 p.
- Persson G. *Think* in panchronic perspective. *Studia Neophilologica*. 1993. № 65(1). P. 3–18.
- 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.
- Malicka-Kleparska A. Panchroniczne zagadnienia onomazjologii w ujęciu gramatyki kognitywnej. *Problemy Gramatyki Kognitywnej* / Kardela H. (Ed.); Warszawa: Biblioteka Myśli Kognitywnej, 1994. P. 219–242.
- Kleparski G.A. Semantic change in onomasiological perspective. *Male and Female Terms in English* / Person G., Ryden M. (Eds.); Umeå: Acta Universitatis Umensis, 1996. P. 41–91.
- Kuteva T. Auxiliation. An enquiry into the nature of grammaticalization. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. 209 p.
- Mithun M. Functional perspectives on syntactic change. *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics* / Joseph B.D., Janda R.D. (Eds.); New Jersey, USA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003. P. 552–572. doi.org/10.1002/9781405166201.ch17.
- Chomsky N. Syntactic structures. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1957. 117 p.
- Langacker R.W. Cognitive grammar. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* / Geeraerts D., Cuyckens H. (Eds.); Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. P. 421–462.
- Culler J.D. Ferdinand de Saussure. New York: Cornell University Press, 1986. 160 p.
- Łozowski P. Unlocking the nature of the linguistic sign: in-between motivation and arbitrariness. *Językoznawstwo*. 2016. № 1(10). P. 154–167.
- 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.
- Vakhovska O.V. Emotions and the archaic consciousness of man: a diachronic semantic reconstruction of the names of emotions in English. *Amazonia Investiga*. 2023. № 12(69). P. 194–203. doi.org/10.34069/AI/2023.69.09.17.
- Ваховська О.В. Знако-символічна природа слова як одиниці мовної картини світу: еволюційний аспект – постановка проблеми. *Вчені записки Таврійського національного університету імені В.І. Вернадського. Серія: Філологія. Журналістика*. 2023. Том 34(73), № 4. С. 167–175. doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2023.4/30.
- Ваховська О.В. Знако-символічна природа слова як одиниці мовної картини світу: еволюційний аспект – програма трансдисциплінарного дослідження. *Проблеми гуманітарних наук: збірник наукових праць Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка. Серія 'Філологія.'* 2023. № 54. С. 25–34. doi.org/10.24919/2522-4565.2023.54.3.
- Ваховська О.В. Переклад: слово, яке обернулося образом. *Вчені записки Таврійського національного університету імені В.І. Вернадського. Серія: Філологія. Журналістика*. 2022. Том 33(72), № 5 Том 2. С. 1–8. doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2022.5.2/01.

Ваховська О. Спадкоємність панхронії у сучасній лінгвістиці

Анотація. У статті розглянуто основні теоретико-методологічні підходи до визначення поняття панхронії, які розкривають еволюцію цього поняття в науковій картині світу сучасної західноєвропейської і американської лінгвістики, починаючи з традицій структуралізму (початок ХХ століття) аж до традицій функціоналізму, що зародилися в кінці ХХ століття та продовжують розвиватися на початку ХХІ століття. Увіражено розуміння того, що поняття панхронії складає частину спадщини, яка перейшла у функціоналізм зі структуралізму під час зміни наукових парадигм у лінгвістиці.

Панхронія як теоретико-методологічне поняття сучасної науки про мову передбачає, що природна мова не залежить, – і тому може і має досліджуватися незалежно, – від обмежень часу і простору. Панхронія нерозривно зв'язана з синхронією й діахронією, що накладають такі обмеження на мову, кожна в свій спосіб. Синхронія зосереджується на статичному сучасному стані мови, тоді як діахронія – на динамічній зміні, яку мова зазнає протягом свого розвитку в історичному часі.

Структуралістський підхід до панхронії, асоційований насамперед з іменем швейцарського лінгвіста Фердинана де Сосюра, визначає панхронію в термінах лінгвістичних універсалій (загальні правила і принципи улаштування мови, які існують незалежно від конкретних мовних фактів і від окремих носіїв мови) і передбачає, що панхронія є неможливою через те, що мова – автономна система довільних знаків. Це чітко розрізняє синхронію від діахронії, приховує причинно-наслідкову природу мовних змін, і виключає можливість одночасно досліди-

ти мову з узагальненої синхронічної і діяхронічної, тобто з панхронічної, точки зору. Синхронія і діяхронія є для структуралістів дихотомією, причому пріоритет належить синхронії, оскільки мова, використовувана носіями в її сучасному статичному стані, наділена психологічним реалізмом: цей реалізм характеризує одночасне співіснування мовних знаків, на відміну від їхньої хронологічної послідовності. Отже, екстралінгвістичні фактори, як-от час і простір, що дані в світі й сконструйовані в мисленні людини, виключаються з наукового дослідження мови в собі й для себе.

Функціоналістський підхід до панхронії, асоційований у когнітивній лінгвістиці насамперед з іменем польського лінгвіста Пшемислава Лозовського, визначає панхронію в термінах функціональних універсалій (когнітивних і досвідних закономірностей людської поведінки, вклю-

чаючи культуру) і передбачає, що панхронія є можливою, і навіть обов'язковою, оскільки мова не є автономною, а є натомість когнітивно- і культурно-обумовленою системою мотивованих знаків, або символів людського досвіду. Це залучає екстралінгвістичні фактори у лінгвістичне дослідження, висвітлює причинно-наслідкову природу мовних змін, об'єднує синхронію і діяхронію, які тепер визначаються як рівні між собою, та надає можливість дослідити мову з узагальненої, тобто панхронічної, точки зору, завдяки врахуванню когнітивних процесів, які скеровують буття мови. Тим ясовано, що поєднання діяхронії мови разом з універсальними процесами мислення людини постає в якості панхронії.

Ключові слова: діяхронія, знак, когнітивізм, панхронія, символ, синхронія, система, структуралізм, функціоналізм.