CZY GARNEK W SIEDMIU OTWORACH POWINIEN BYĆ TAJEMNICĄ TEORETYKA TŁUMACZENIA?

Olha Vakhovska

kandydat nauk filologicznych (Ukraina), magister kognitywistyki (Niemcy),
docent Katedry Filologii Angielskiej i Filozofii Języka
Kijowskiego Narodowego Uniwersytetu Lingwistycznego (Kijów, Ukraina)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7720-0970
vakhovskayaolga@gmail.com

Adnotacja. W artykule omówiono pojęcie wewnętrznej formy słowa i ujawniono heurystyczny potencjał tego pojęcia w teorii tłumaczenia. Wewnętrzna forma słowa jest archaicznym sposobem motywującym pojawienie się tego konkretnego słowa w języku. W artykule podkreślono wyjątkową właściwość wewnętrznej formy słowa bycia obrazem mentalnym w zarodku: obrazem-ziarnem, z którego powinno rozwinąć się kilka reprezentacji mentalnych. Materiałem badawczym były rzeczowniki *an eye, an ear, a mouth* and *a nose*, z których każdy w języku angielskim ma swoje odrębne znaczenie i jest polisemantem; jednocześnie wewnętrzną formą tych rzeczowników jest ten sam archaiczny obraz – obraz otworu. Tak więc obraz otworu jest obrazem nasion, z którego rozwinęły się 4 znaczenia, każde z własnym unikalnym zestawem opcji leksykalno-semantycznych (ogólnie 138), z których każda opiera się na specjalnym zdaniu. Potwierdza to zdolność wewnętrznej formy słowa w myśleniu do generowania zróżnicowanego znaczenia figuratywnego i przekształcania się w różnorodne znaczenie, co umożliwia interpretację słów jako twórczego aktu myślenia.

Słowa kluczowe: wewnętrzna forma słowa, obraz mentalny, obraz-ziarno, tłumaczenie, polisemia, słowo, interpretacja.

MUST THE POT OF SEVEN HOLES BE A TRANSLATION THEORIST'S RIDDLE?

Olha Vakhovska

Candidate of Philological Sciences (Ukraine),
MSc in Cognitive Science (Germany),
Associate Professor at the Department of English Philology and Philosophy of Language
Kyiv National Linguistic University (Kyiv, Ukraine)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7720-0970
vakhovskayaolga@gmail.com

Abstract. This paper focuses on the word inner form as a theoretical concept in translation research. Word inner forms are archaic images that motivated words of a language at the moment of creation. This paper underlines in word inner forms their singular virtue to be mental images in the seed and to generate multiple mental representations. The case of this paper is the image of an opening as the word inner form of the polysemous nouns *an eye*, *an ear*, a *mouth*, and a *nose*. This is shown to be a seed image that has generated 4 distinct meanings, each with a unique set of senses (138 senses in total) underpinned by individual propositions. This paper confirms in word inner forms their power to generate an assorted pictorial content and to convert into a diverse array of propositions, which enables the image-to-word and word-to-image conversion in interpretation of individual words in translation.

Key words: interpretation, mental image, polysemy, seed image, translation, word, word inner form.

ЧИ МАЄ ГОРЩИК О СЕМИ ОТВОРАХ БУТИ ЗАГАДКОЮ ТЕОРЕТИКА ПЕРЕКЛАДУ?

Ольга Ваховська

кандидат філологічних наук (Україна), магістр когнітивної науки (Німеччина),
доцент кафедри англійської філології і філософії мови
Київського національного лінгвістичного університету (Київ, Україна)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7720-0970
vakhovskayaolga@gmail.com

Анотація. У статті розглянуто поняття внутрішньої форми слова й розкрито евристичний потенціал цього поняття у теорії перекладу. Внутрішня форма слова є архаїчним образом, який мотивував виникнення саме цього слова у мові. У статті підкреслено виняткову властивість внутрішньої форми слова бути ментальним образом у зародку: образом-насіниною, із якого мають потенцію розвинутися кілька ментальних репрезентацій. Матеріалом дослідження постали іменники *an eye*, *an ear*, a *mouth* та a *nose*, кожен із яких в англійській мові має своє окреме значення і є полісемантом; при цьому, внутрішньою формою цих іменників є один і той самий архаїчний образ – образ отвору. Тим самим, образ отвору є образом-насіниною, із якого розвинулися 4 значення, кожне із своїм унікальним набором лексико-семантичних варіантів (загалом, 138), в основі кожного

із яких лежить осібна пропозиція. Це підтверджує здатність внутрішньої форми слова у мисленні породжувати різноманітний образний зміст й обертатися у різноманітний зміст пропозиціональний, що уможливлює тлумачення слів як творчий акт мислення.

Ключові слова: внутрішня форма слова, ментальний образ, образ-насінина, переклад, полісемія, слово, тлумачення.

Въ созданіи языка нѣтъ произвола.
А. А. Потебня

Introduction. This paper focuses on the word inner form and explores the heuristic potential that this theoretical concept acquires in the context of translation.

This is a follow-up paper to Vakhovska (2022b) where word inner forms are discussed from the perspective of ***the theory of image-driven interpretations*** that I develop in step with cognitive advances of translation research. Ваховська (2022a), Vakhovska (2021b), Vakhovska & Isaienko (2021), and Vakhovska & Jusuk (2021) are also related to this work. In my view, interpretation is the backbone of translation: it is the creative act of giving a meaning to a sign, and of providing the meaning of a sign, which is driven by mental images and rests on the representational properties of the human mind. Interpretation is a virtue of image thinking in humans and in effect is converting in the mind word meanings into mental images, and vice versa. On the representational view, ***interpretation*** is "drawing" images in the mind, with the mind's phenomenal content converted into a propositional content, and back when propositions are converted into non-propositional thought:

> Translation is interpretation and not re-writing: not a word-to-word but an image-to-word correspondence, with the understanding that this image is a construal in the interpretive mind. A translator needs to internalize the authors' mental images and to find the words in the target language in order to re-"draw" these images (Vakhovska & Isaienko, 2021: 243).

Whereas mental images are non-propositional entities in the mind, natural languages have propositions, i. e. subject-predicate relations, at their basis (Chalmers, 2004; Kosslyn, Thompson, & Ganis, 2006), cf. the phenomenal experience of seeing that a flower is white vs. the thought that a flower is white. As a consequence of the image-to-word conversion[1], translation incurs inevitable semantic costs that the translator must minimize by finding in the target language such words that will make for mental images their optimal descriptions (Vakhovska, 2021b). In effect, the meaning of a source-language word must be converted into a mental image; this mental image must be re-converted into a meaning so that a word is picked in the target language and, most importantly, what ***this word describes*** corresponds to what ***this image depicts*** (Vakhovska, 2022b). This conversion requires a shift between the translator's *brain's visual and auditory regions*, with mental images and words processed accordingly (Vakhovska & Jusuk, 2021). This shift is imperative but yet not exhaustive for interpretation since depicting as well as describing involves a number of different-stage *representational changes* in the content of the human mind:

> Verbal communication is in essence converting the mental images that one "sees" with the mind's eye into words that others can hear and read as strings of phonemes and graphemes, and vice versa. In this communication, one switches from the visual (the mental images they "see") to the auditory (the words they hear and read) modes of perception. <...> Mental images are individual, subjective, and non-repetitive; words are communal and repetitive, they round the mind's content and operationalize it for the purposes of communication (*ibid.*: 63).

Translation therefore rests on a ***many-stage conversion*** that goes deeper than words of language; it goes (1) to the brain's different regions and (2) to the mind's different layers and, ultimately, to the point where the content of the oldest, deepest layers of the mind (i. e. archetypes[2] as primordial images in the collective unconscious) is converted into that of the mind's old, deep layers (i. e. archetypal images[3] that represent archetypes in consciousness) and further into myriad subjective images that can ever emerge in the conscious mind. The conversion, I wish to emphasize, is not exclusive to translation: it is at the heart of human communication generally, with interpretation playing a crucial role therein; translation in the course of evolution got specified in terms of communication with words across different languages and cultures, yet has remained nothing other than (mediation in) communication of human beings.

The role that word inner forms play in the image-to-word conversion I believe is that of ***seed images***: in the interpretation of individual words, it is from such images that multiple mental representations of different amounts of pictorial richness potentially evolve, and into which these representations otherwise shrink, cf. a seed AI is "an artificial general intelligence which improves itself by recursively rewriting its own source code without human intervention; it understands its own source code and knows its purpose, syntax, and architecture" (Yudkowsky, 2001).

---

[1] There is an understanding that this conversion is equally that of a mental image into (the meaning of) a word and, vice versa, that of (the meaning of) a word into a mental image: the image-to-word and the word-to-image conversion, respectively.

[2] Archetypes and archetypal images are treated in this paper according to Jung (1947; 1981).

[3] Archetypes and archetypal images are treated in this paper according to Jung (1947; 1981).

On that, word inner forms are *active, generative forces* that give form to the words' raw material and enliven this material with a peculiar spirit of theirs (Vakhovska & Isaienko, 2021: 244).

The inner form of a word is a fragment of this word's meaning that motivated the emergence of this word in its particular form into a language at the moment of this word's creation (the term by Потебня, 1892; see also Кубрякова, 2004; Zhabotynska, 2013). A word inner form is a primary, archaic image that shows in a unique way how the content of a thought relates to consciousness: «*отношеніе содержанія мысли къ сознанію; она [внутренняя форма слова] показываетъ, какъ представляется человѣку его собственная мысль,*» as Potebnya originally puts it (Потебня, 1892: 102). Virtually, the content of a thought relates to consciousness in a peculiar way, and this relation (*отношеніе* as an offering, cf. *нести* and *відношення*) is a mental image.

Whereas Vakhovska (2022b) elaborates on the cognitive properties of word inner forms and particularly on the relation that word inner forms have to archetypes and archetypal images, **the objective** of this paper is to underline in word inner forms their singular virtue to be *mental images in the seed* and to generate multiple mental representations. A word inner form, to Potebnya, binds a meaning with a sound and contains a number of mental representations *in posse*, each representation having a chance to become central, dominant and thus to uniquely substantiate this bond *in esse*: «*[внутренняя форма есть образ], заключающій въ себѣ въ зародышѣ множество признаковъ*» (Потебня, 1892: 103), «*[внутренняя форма есть] центръ образа, одинъ изъ его признаковъ, преобладающій надъ всѣми остальными*» (*ibid.*: 142). What matters in the context of my research is that a word inner form as an image allows for a holistic, integral perception, while a proposition decomposes this integrity into parts: «*Внутренняя форма, кромѣ фактическаго единства образа, даетъ еще знаніе этого единства <...> а сужденіе есть уже разложеніе этого единства*» (*ibid.*: 143, 156).

On this view, it is word inner forms that license polysemy in language, with one and the same word having its multiple senses in an intimate interrelationship: «*Этимъ [Внутренней формой слова] только можно объяснить, почему <...> одно слово совершенно согласно съ требованіями языка можетъ обозначать предметы разнородные*» (*ibid.*: 102). This paper presents **the case** of the English nouns *an eye*, *an ear*, a *mouth*, and a *nose* that name the major parts of the human face and come to be polysemous in the evolution of English. This paper's title brings these nouns together in the form of the riddle whose answer is a person's head "seen" metaphorically as a pot of seven holes. The head is not an arbitrary choice in this paper either and is intended to rejoice in the cognitive turn that translation studies have taken with their interest in the workings of the mind. I believe big benefits are being reaped from this interest; naturally, the question that the title asks has a passionate yes as an answer. What is more, seeds, as is the custom, grow in pots, word inner forms being seed images planted to grow in the mind.

This paper shows that the words *an eye* (n), *an ear* (n), a *mouth* (n), and a *nose* (n), though otherwise semantically distinct, have one and the same inner form – the image of an opening; this is a seed image that has generated 4 individual meanings, each with a unique set of senses whose total number for the four words is 138. This proves a conversion of the image of an opening into 138 senses; each sense is underpinned by a respective proposition. Accordingly, **Section 1** of this paper exposes the qualities that the image of an opening has in the archaic worldview; this is achieved via an analysis of the etymons of the four words with a reference to the mythological symbolism of the four openings. **Section 2** presents a cognitive linguistic analysis of the polysemy that the words have come to develop in modern English; here, the senses are arranged into semantic networks structured by propositions: this section shows what propositions exactly the image of an opening has converted into. This paper **concludes** with prospects for further research.

1. The image of an opening as the word inner form of the English nouns *an eye*, *an ear*, a *mouth*, and a *nose*

In the archaic worldview, the human body is a microcosm, a small universe as compared to the macrocosm of the big universe with all that exists therein.

The human head in this anthropomorphic model of the universe becomes the center of procreation and childbirth. It is intimately related to the number (which *per se* is a symbol of the universe) and particularly to the sacred number seven: similarly to the universe that has seven abysses, the human head has seven openings and each opening is an abyss; cf. Latin *caput* "a head" bears upon Proto-Indo-European **septm-* "seven" and also relates to Old Indo-Aryan **khappa-* "an abyss, an opening" (Маковский, 1996). On that, the riddle in the title is certainly not a random conceptualisation, even less so in light of the fact that a pot to the archaic mind is another metaphorical abyss itself.

In what follows, the etymological works by Onions (1966) and Маковский (1996; 2000) were used in combination to show that *the image of an opening* is the single word inner form of *an eye* (n), *an ear* (n), and a *nose* (n), and to interpret the archaic symbolism of the seven openings as micro- and macrocosmic creations.

***

An eye (n) (from Proto-Germanic **augon* "an eye" < Proto-Indo-European **ak-/*ok-* "to see; an eye") relates to the archaic meaning "to cut" that developed as "to cut > sharp > a stone;" cf. Ukrainian *око* "an eye." The eye is archaically thought of in terms of (1) water (and a water flow) as in Proto-Indo-European **ag-/*og-* "an eye" but Latin *aqua* "water" and (2) fire as in Proto-Indo-European **ag-* "fire; to burn;" cf. also the archaic myths about fiery rivers and seas, where this symbolism is combined. Similarly to water and fire, the eye is considered the seat of the soul and symbolizes the moon (water) and the sun (fire). The eye is the source of the divine power that can both heal and ruin: whereas the sun shines off the good, the moon and the stars can give off not only the good but also the evil; cf. German *Auge* "an eye" but Old Norse *ugg* "a fright, a turmoil" and also Russian *глаз* "an eye" but *зло* "the evil." The light that the eye symbolizes is intrinsically connected

with the sound: both are taken as miracles of the initial creation of the universe through the movement of deities. The eye via the symbolism of water is the feminine; cf. German *Auge* "an eye" and Latin *aqua* "water" but *vagina* "the pudendum." The eyes as a water surface reflect the changes happening in the soul, and a reflection in the water is a manifestation of the deity.

The eye is related to knowledge: this relation rests on the meaning "to cut" of the root **ghel-* (cf. Cymraeg *gylym* "a knife" and also Russian *сечь* "to cut > to see > to know, to understand") that developed as (1) "to shine, to sparkle;" cf. Middle High German *glast* "a luster" and also Irish *suil* "an eye" and Latin *sol* "the sun," (2) "liquid, fluidic > glass;" cf. Russian *стекло* "glass" < *с-тек-/течь* "to flow" and Old Gaelic *glaiss* "a river," and (3) "to shrink, to harden, to solidify;" cf. Old Indo-Aryan *gulah* "a bead." The eye metaphorically is the stone of the face; cf. Russian *глаз* "an eye" but Polish *glaz* "a stone." This is a transparent stone in the sense that one can see through it and there are reflections in it; this stone shines and gives off light.

***

An ear (n) (from Proto-Germanic **auzon-* < Proto-Indo-European **ous-* "an ear") relates to the meaning "to weave" of the Proto-Indo-European root **au-* that developed as "to weave > to connect > to take (in) > to perceive, to conceive, to understand." In the archaic view, the ear is seen as the pudendum and relates to a coitus; cf. Ossetian *us* "a woman" but Avestan *usi* "the two ears" and Old Church Slavonic *ucho* "an ear." The ear in the anthropomorphic microcosm is the place where the fire as the masculine fertilizes the water as the feminine. The divine word (Proto-Indo-European **uer-* "a word") is "that which enters the ear" and literally has the role of the sperm that impregnates the head; cf. Latin *auris* "an ear" but Ossetian *waryn* "to give birth." Through its fire symbolism, the ear relates directly to the meaning "gold" (cf. Latin *aurum* "gold") and as a symbol of wisdom is endowed with a divine power.

The sound that the ear is capable to take in is intrinsically related to the light: both are the primary elements of the divine creation of the universe; cf. Proto-Indo-European **ak-/*ok-* "to see; an eye" but **ag-/*eg-* "to make sounds." The light and the sound are compared to the divine movement that once created the universe; cf. Proto-Indo-European **ag-* "to move." As the night represents hearing, not seeing, and symbolizes the feminine (cf. Tocharian A *wse* "a night" and Ossetian *woes* "a woman"), the ear is the feminine, too.

***

A mouth (n) (from Proto-Germanic **muntha-* "a mouth" < Proto-Indo-European **men-t* "to knead, to chop up > to chew" < **men-* "to arch, to billow; to rise") relates to the archaic meaning "to project," with a semantic shift from "a chin" as a projecting body part to "a mouth;" cf. Latin *mentum* "a chin" and Cymraeg *mant* "a jaw."

The mouth in the anthropomorphic model of the universe is the seat of the soul (taken to mean fire; cf. Hittite *muwas* "a soul" < Proto-Indo-European **men-/*man-* "to burn") and is the center of childbirth; cf. Latin *mundus* "the universe," Old Indo-Aryan *mánas* "a spirit, a soul," Old English *mōþ* "a spirit, a soul" but Proto-Indo-European **moud-* "genitals," Russian *рот* "the mouth" but *родить* "to give birth," Latin *os, oris* "the mouth" but Ossetian *aryn* "to give birth." The mouth is believed to give birth, to breed, and to generate, and through the idea of childbirth symbolizes the pudendum; cf. Lithuanian *mutenti* "to copulate." In the archaic view, deities impregnate themselves by swallowing their own semen and spitting whole worlds out of their mouths; cf. Old English *swelgan* "to swallow" but *swegle* "the sun."

***

A nose (n) (from Proto-Germanic **nuso-* < Proto-Indo-European **nas-* "a nose") relates to the archaic meaning "to cut, to beat > to protrude, to project; to rise;" cf. Russian *нос* "a nose" but Ossetian *nos* "a scar," and also Russian *нож* "a knife" and Latin *gnoscere* "to know < to cut." The Proto-Indo-European root **nas-* "a nose" emerged as a linguistic taboo achieved by means of the negation element **ne-*. To the archaic mind, the nose is the seat of the soul and also is a symbol of the phallus, and has the vast symbolism of fire underpinning both.

The phallic meaning is related, on the one hand, to the idea of making phallic actions in order to mimic those of the creative deity ("to beat > to strike fire > fire") and to pay tribute to the deity this way; on the other hand, fire as "something in a vertical position > erect" has a phallic symbolism of its own and generally falls within the symbolism of poles as signs of the deity pointing at the upper, divine part of the macrocosm. The nose by analogy is a sign of the deity but in the microcosm of the human body; here, the nose symbolizes the world-mind. The nose as a symbol of fire and of sexual potency ("fire > impulse, passion > human fire"), just as the phallus, is an object of worship and an amulet; cf. Old Indo-Aryan *as* "a life, a soul," Icelandic *nara* "a life" but *nosi* "penis equi," Old Norse *knoss* "a precious possession < precious < pleasant < clean, immaculate, true < to procreate" (potency as related to power and wealth), Old English *ge-nisan* "to save," Lithuanian *deguns* "a nose" < Old Indo-Aryan *tok-* "male seed, semen; offspring" and Proto-Indo-European **dheg-* "to burn, to project, to thrust forward (about a fire)," and the English idiom *to pay through the nose* with *the nose* understood as wealth or riches. What is more, the nose pertains to speech where the sound and the soul overlap as manifestations of the creative deity; cf. English a *nose* and a *noise*.

***

The data show that the archaic image of an opening is the one that came to motivate the words *an eye*, *an ear*, *a mouth*, and *a nose* at the moment of their creation, and thus is the inner form of these words. This opening is a fiery abyss; its symbolism embraces the masculine and the feminine: whereas the nose is the masculine, the mouth

is the feminine; whereas the eye pertains to the light and thus is the masculine, the ear pertains to the sound and therefore is the feminine. It, apparently, is no mere chance that the old saying goes as "Men fall in love through their eyes, while women through their ears."

The opening that this paper discusses is an archetypal image; through its ingredients and associations such as the soul and also fire and water, this image relates to the archetypes of ANIMA and ANIMUS, while the circle as a representation of cosmic integrity and wholeness relates this image to THE SELF which is the archetype of order: the masculine and the feminine are part of cosmic order, and to recall in this regard the circle representing the Chinese philosophical concept of yin and yang I think would be quite pertinent.

2. The image of an opening as a seed image: networks of polysemy of the English nouns *an eye*, *an ear*, a *mouth*, and a *nose*

The lexical meanings of the nouns *an eye*, *an ear*, a *mouth*, and a *nose* comprise a set of senses each. These senses form networks of polysemy represented as semantic networks structured by propositions.

I adopt into this paper the cognitive linguistic approach to polysemy suggested by Жаботинская (2008) and borrow from Жаботинська (2019) the nomenclature of propositions with the help of which I arrange the senses of the nouns into semantic networks[4]. The propositions in S. A. Zhabotynska's theory of meaning are conceived as ones of the highest level of abstraction; they single out the primary conceptual entities and the basic attributes and relations that these entities can have, and are the finite, universal tool set of humans' propositional thought in its infinite configurations.

In keeping with the approach, my analysis starts with a dictionary search; the objective of this search is to compile a comprehensive list of the senses that *an eye* (n) has developed in English[5]. Next, the senses are arranged with the help of propositions into a semantic network; this network (1) shows how the senses of *an eye* (n) relate to each other and (2) organizes the semantic space of *an eye* (n) into several domains.

***

The noun ***an eye***, according to the lexicographic sources (see References), has 44 senses. Its network of polysemy is as follows:

1 the organ of sight of human beings and animals, containing light-sensitive cells associated with nerve fibers, so that light entering the eye is converted to nervous impulses that reach the brain: *She opened one eye, then the other, confirming his words*;

1.1 the eyeball[6]: *Her eyes fell when he looked at her*
    1 → 1.1 WH-whole *has* PR-part;
1.1.1 the iris of the organ of sight: *blue eyes*
    1.1 → 1.1.1 WH-whole *has* PR-part;
1.1.2 a sensory system of vision, retinal receptors: *Her eyes slowly became accustomed to the dark*
    1.1 → 1.1.2 WH-whole *has* PR-part;
1.1.2.1 the faculty of seeing, power of vision: *These bacteria are invisible to our eyes*
    1.1.2 → 1.1.2.1 CR-causer *makes* FT-factitive;
1.1.2.1.1 good discernment: *she has an eye for fresh talent*
    1.1.2.1 → 1.1.2.1.1 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;
1.1.2.1.2 estimation by sight: *faultless eye*
    1.1.2.1 → 1.1.2.1.2 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;
1.1.3 a look, glance, expression, or gaze: a *stern eye*
    1.1 → 1.1.3 CR-causer *makes* FT-factitive;
1.1.3.1 a sexually inviting or provocative look: *to make eyes at somebody*
    1.1.3 → 1.1.3.1 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;
1.1.3.2 attention; observation, scrutiny: *he tried to catch her eye, under the eye of a guard, in the public eye*
    1.1.3 → 1.1.3.2 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;
1.1.3.3 an opinion, point of view: *in the eyes of the law*
    1.1.3 → 1.1.3.3 CV-comparative *is as if* MT-correlate;
1.1.3.3.1 a particular way of seeing, understanding, or judging something: *Only a trained eye can tell the difference between the original painting and a good copy*
    1.1.3.3 → 1.1.3.3.1 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;
1.1.3.4 an aim or intention: *an eye to one's own advantage*
    1.1.3 → 1.1.3.4 AG-agent *acts upon* PT-patient;
1.1.3.5 a shade of color: *with an eye of blue*
    1.1.3 → 1.1.3.5 CV-comparative *is as if* MT-correlate;

---

[4] For considerations of space, I included into my analysis but excluded from this paper the networks of polysemy of the nouns *an ear*, a *mouth*, and a *nose* as this paper's concern is far from being polysemy proper. Readers who are interested in the shape that these networks take in the English language may wish to contact the author for more information.
[5] In this paper, polysemy is explored as a phenomenon of language, no reference to speech is intended.
[6] The first line, hereinafter, presents a sense as part of the lexical meaning of *an eye* (n), and the indented line beneath gives the proposition that has licensed this sense.

1.2 the region surrounding the eye; the aggregate of structures situated within or near the orbit that support, or protect the eye: *heavy-lidded eyes*, a *black eye*

 1 → 1.2 X *exists* THERE/LC-locative;

1.3 an organ sensitive to light, as in certain lower forms of life: *Eyes allow the earthworm to sense light and dark*

 1 → 1.3 CV-comparative *is as* AN-correlate;

2 a detective: *She hired a private eye*

 1 → 2 WH-whole *has* PR-part;

3 a screen of the TV set: *the eye of TV*

 1 → 3 CV-comparative *is as if* MT-correlate;

4 the part of the main deck of a vessel that is farthest forward: *it was hanging in the eyes of the ship*

 1 → 4 CV-comparative *is as if* MT-correlate;

5 a spot, a chip (a prototype as an abstraction)

 1 → 5 CV-comparative *is as if* MT-correlate;

5.1 a dark spot on a potato, from which a new stem and leaves will grow: *withered potatoes sprouting at the eyes*

 5 → 5.1 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

5.2 a spot on a feather: *eyes of a peacock*

 5 → 5.2 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

5.3 a spot on a butterfly wing: *She noticed small black eyes on the butterfly wings*

 5 → 5.3 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

5.4 the scar to which the muscle is attached in oysters and other bivalve shells: *the eye of oysters*

 5 → 5.4 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

6 an opening, a hole (a prototype as an abstraction)

 1 → 6 CV-comparative *is as if* MT-correlate;

6.1 an opening deliberately made in smth.: *to make an eye in a box*

 6 → 6.1 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

6.2 a hole, as in certain cheeses: *the boy looked through the eyes of cheese*

 6 → 6.2 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

6.3 a hole through the upper millstone: *the eye of the millstone*

 6 → 6.3 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

6.4 a hole in a tool, as for a handle: *the eye of an ax*

 6 → 6.4 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

6.5 the hole in a needle through which you put the thread: *strands of glass tiny enough to pass through the eye of a needle*

 6 → 6.5 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

6.6 a peephole: *he came up to the peepeye and looked into it*

 6 → 6.6 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

6.7 a small loop to receive a hook: *eyes on a dress*

 6 → 6.7 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

6.8 a ring through which something is passed: *to pass the rope through the eye*

 6 → 6.8 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

6.9 the mouth of a shaft: *he was standing at the eye of a shaft*

 6 → 6.9 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

6.10 an aperture of a camera: *Fashion models are completely comfortable with the eye of the camera*

 6 → 6.10 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

7 the center, crux of smth.: *the eye of the problem*, *the eye of an issue*

 1 → 7 CV-comparative *is as if* MT-correlate;

7.1 the center of action: *right in the eye of the controversy*

 7 → 7.1 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

7.2 the center of a target: *the bull's-eye*

 7 → 7.2 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

7.3 the center of a flower: *delicate flowers of light blue color, with white or yellow eyes*

 7 → 7.3 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

7.4 a choice central cut of meat: *eye of the round*

 7 → 7.4 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

7.5 a small area of low pressure and calm in the center of a tornado or cyclone: *the smaller the eye, the more intense the winds*

 7 → 7.5 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

8 the beginning, the source (a prototype as an abstraction)

 1 → 8 CV-comparative *is as if* MT-correlate;

8.1 the source of a spring or river: *the eye of the river dries up*

 8 → 8.1 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type;

8.2 the direction from which the wind is blowing: *He could not determine the eye of the wind*

 8 → 8.2 ID-identified/kind *is* CL-classifier/type.

The noun *an eye* has developed a mixed polysemy, with an interplay of radial and chain fragments in the network. The network has eight nodes and organizes the semantic space of *an eye* (n) into two domains: A LIVING BEING (its subdomain is A HUMAN BEING) and A NON-LIVING OBJECT (its subdomains are AN OBJECT OF NATURE, AN ARTIFACT, and A PHENOMENON).

***

The image of an opening proves a seed image that has converted into a most assorted propositional content, indeed. Tables 1 and 2 summarize my findings. Table 1 shows which propositions exactly (from among those generally thinkable by humans) the image has converted into. Table 2 lays open the domains within which the senses that the propositions license profile.

Table 1

The image of an opening and its generative power

Propositions	The image of an opening as the word inner form in			
	an eye (n)	*an ear* (n)	*a mouth* (n)	*a nose* (n)
X *is* THAT MANY / Qn-quantity		+		
X *is* SUCH / Ql-quality				+
X *exists* THERE / LC-locative	+	+		
X *exists* THEN / TM-temporative				
X *exists* SO / MD-mode			+	
AG-agent *acts/exists*				+
AG-agent *acts upon* PT-patient / AF-affected	+	+		+
CR-causer *makes* FT-factitive	+	+	+	+
WH-whole *has* PR-part	+	+	+	+
CR-container *has* CT-content		+	+	
OW-owner *has* OD-owned			+	
ID-identified / individual or kind *is* CL-classifier / kind or type	+	+	+	+
ID-identified / individual *is* CH-characteriser				
ID-identified / individual *is* PS-personifier / a proper name				
CV-comparative *is (as)* MS-correlate			+	
CV-comparative *is as* AN-correlate	+			+
CV-comparative *is as if* MT-correlate	+	+	+	+

Thus, the senses that the image of an opening has generated sit on various propositions; these propositions constitute the majority of those generally thinkable: the overlap in the table is almost complete. Absence of the propositions X *exists* THEN/TM-temporative, ID-identified/individual *is* CH-characteriser, and ID-identified/ individual *is* PS-personifier in the data I believe is quite natural: X *exists* THEN/TM-temporative tends to license adverbial meanings, while characterizing and personifying are very counterintuitive if the ontological properties of the four parts of the human face are considered (see Vakhovska (2021a) who discusses the propositions with respect to ontological knowledge).

Table 2

The semantic space of the nouns *an eye*, *an ear*, *a mouth*, and *a nose*

(Sub)Domains	*an eye* (n)	*an ear* (n)	*a mouth* (n)	*a nose* (n)
A LIVING BEING	+	+	+	+
A HUMAN BEING	+	+	+	+
A NON-LIVING OBJECT	+	+	+	+
AN OBJECT OF NATURE	+	+	+	+
AN ARTIFACT	+	+	+	+
A PHENOMENON	+	+	+	+

The senses of the four nouns prove to profile within the domains that provide a widest coverage of the humans' worldview in its utmost, broadest outreach.

My data confirm the potential of the word inner form to generate a most assorted pictorial content: «*[сила] внутренней формы возбуждать самое разнообразное содержаніе*» (Потебня, 1892: 187), and to convert into a most diverse array of propositions.

Conclusion. This paper has shown that the image of an opening is the word inner form of the polysemous nouns *an eye*, *an ear*, *a mouth*, and *a nose*. The image of an opening is shown to be a seed image that has generated 4 distinct meanings, each meaning having a unique set of senses (138 senses in total) underpinned by individual propositions.

This paper's epigraph has picked up from Потебня (1892) the view that there is neither arbitrariness nor whim in creating language, and I believe there must be none in translating language as well. The question "What are

the grounds for a word to mean what it means and not anything different?" must necessarily be addressed by translation theorists, and this paper has just pointed its way towards finding an answer. The **prospect** of this paper is to place the theory of image-driven interpretations into a broader epistemological context and to see what scientific and practical benefits might be reaped from such a placement.

Acknowledgement

Список використаних джерел:
1. Chalmers D. The representational character of experience. B. Leiter (Ed.), *The future for philosophy*. 2004. C. 153–181. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
2. Jung C. On the nature of the psyche. *Collected works of C. G. Jung*, volume 8. 1947. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.
3. Jung C. Archetypes and the collective unconscious. G. Adler & R. F. C. Hull (Eds.), *Collected works of C. G. Jung*, volume 9, part 1. 1981. Princeton : Princeton University Press.
4. Kosslyn S. M., Thompson W. L., & Ganis G. The case for mental imagery. 2006. Oxford : OUP.
5. Onions C. (Ed.). The Oxford dictionary of English etymology. 1966. Oxford : Clarendon Press.
6. Vakhovska O. Metaphors of emotions: Towards a data-driven formalization. *Вісник Київського національного лінгвістичного університету*, *24* (1). 2021a. C. 33–48. doi: 10.32589/2311-0821.24%20(1).2021.236030
7. Vakhovska O. Subjectivity in metaphor translation: A case for Russian translation of English metaphors of depressive emotions. *Когніція, комунікація, дискурс*, *23*. 2021b. C. 99–117. http://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2021-23-07
8. Vakhovska O. The sin of the translator: On words and mental images in translation. *Amazonia Investiga*, *11* (54). 2022b. C. 178–188. https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.54.06.17
9. Vakhovska O. & Isaienko O. Language, culture, and image-driven interpretations in translation: A case for the university translation classroom in Ukraine. *Amazonia Investiga*, *10* (47). 2021. C. 240–249. https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2021.47.11.25
10. Vakhovska O. & Jusuk F. Image-driven interpretations in professional communicative mediation: Bringing translation and psychotherapy together. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Humanities and Social Sciences*, *48* (261). 2021. C. 63–67. URL: https://doi.org/10.31174/SEND-HS2021-261IX48-11
11. Yudkowsky E. Seed AI. Lesswrong. 2001. Режим доступу www.lesswrong.com/tag/seed-ai
12. Zhabotynska S. Saussure's theory of the linguistic sign: A cognitive perspective. *Papers of the International Congress of Linguistics*, online, 20–27 July, 2013. Genève, Switzerland : Département de Linguistique de l'Université de Genève. Режим доступу: https://www.cil19.org/uploads/documents/Saussure_Theory_Of_The_Linguistic_Sign-A_Cognitive_Perspective.pdf
13. Ваховська О. В. Імперативи сучасності і переклад: від теорії перекладу до практики його університетського викладання. Babelyuk O. (Ed.), *Innovative pathway for the development of modern philological sciences in Ukraine and EU countries. Scientific monograph*. Volume 1. 2022a. C. 242–267. Częstochowa : Polonia University in Częstochowa. https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-196-1-10
14. Жаботинская С. А. Принципы лингвокогнитивного анализа и феномен полисемии. *Проблеми загального, германського та слов'янського мовознавства. До 70-річчя професора В. В. Левицького*. 2008. C. 357–368. Чернівці : Книги XXI.
15. Жаботинська С. А. Семантика лінгвальних мереж у навчальному комбінаторному тезаурусі. *Studia Philologica. Філологічні студії*. 2019. Вип. 13. C. 17–27. doi: 10.28925/2311-2425.2019.13.3
16. Кубрякова Е. С. Язык и знание. 2004. Москва : Языки славянской культуры.
17. Маковский М. М. Историко-этимологический словарь современного английского языка. 2000. Москва : Издательский дом «Диалог».
18. Маковский М. М. Сравнительный словарь мифологической символики в индоевропейских языках. 1996. Москва : Гуманитарный издательский центр ВЛАДОС.
19. Потебня А. А. Мысль и язык. 1892. Харьков : Типография Адольфа Дарре. Режим доступу https://archive.org/details/libgen_00702348/page/n11/mode/1up?view=theater

References:
1. Chalmers, D. (2004). The representational character of experience. In B. Leiter (Ed.), *The future for philosophy*, 153–181. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
2. Jung, C. (1947). On the nature of the psyche. In *Collected works of C. G. Jung*, volume 8. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.
3. Jung, C. (1981). Archetypes and the collective unconscious. In G. Adler & R. F. C. Hull (Eds.), *Collected works of C. G. Jung*, volume 9, part 1. Princeton : Princeton University Press.
4. Kosslyn, S. M., Thompson, W. L., & Ganis, G. (2006). The case for mental imagery. Oxford : OUP.
5. Onions, C. (Ed.). (1966). The Oxford dictionary of English etymology. Oxford : Clarendon Press.
6. Vakhovska, O. (2021a). Metaphors of emotions: Towards a data-driven formalization. *Messenger of Kyiv National Linguistic University*, *24* (1), 33–48. doi: 10.32589/2311-0821.24%20(1).2021.236030

7. Vakhovska, O. (2021b). Subjectivity in metaphor translation: A case for Russian translation of English metaphors of depressive emotions. *Cognition, communication, discourse*, *23*, 99–117. URL: http://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2 021-23-07

8. Vakhovska, O. (2022b). The sin of the translator: On words and mental images in translation. *Amazonia Investiga*, *11* (54), 178–188. URL: https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.54.06.17

9. Vakhovska, O., & Isaienko, O. (2021). Language, culture, and image-driven interpretations in translation: A case for the university translation classroom in Ukraine. *Amazonia Investiga*, *10* (47), 240–249. URL: https://doi.org/10.34069/ AI/2021.47.11.25

10. Vakhovska, O., & Jusuk, F. (2021). Image-driven interpretations in professional communicative mediation: Bringing translation and psychotherapy together. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Humanities and Social Sciences*, *48* (261), 63–67. URL: https://doi.org/10.31174/SEND-HS2021-261IX48-11

11. Yudkowsky, E. (2001). Seed AI. Lesswrong. Recovered from: www.lesswrong.com/tag/seed-ai

12. Zhabotynska, S. (2013). Saussure's theory of the linguistic sign: A cognitive perspective. In *Papers of the International Congress of Linguistics*, online, 20–27 July, 2013, Genève, Switzerland: Département de Linguistique de l'Université de Genève. Recovered from: https://www.cil19.org/uploads/documents/Saussure_Theory_Of_The_Linguistic_Sign-A_ Cognitive_Perspective.pdf

13. Vakhovska, O. (2022a). Imperatyvy suchasnosti i pereklad: vid teorii perekladu do praktyky yogo universitets'kogo vykladannya [Imperatives of today and translation: From a translation theory to the university translation classroom]. In Babelyuk O. (Ed.), *Innovative pathway for the development of modern philological sciences in Ukraine and EU countries. Scientific monograph*. Volume 1, 242–267. Częstochowa : Polonia University in Częstochowa. URL: https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-196-1-10 [in Ukrainian]

14. Zhabotynska, S. (2008). Printsypy lingvokognitivnogo analiza i fenomen polisemii [Principles of cognitive linguistic analysis and the phenomenon of polysemy]. *Issues of general, Germanic and Slavic linguistics*, 357–368. Chernivtsi. [in Russian]

15. Zhabotynska, S. (2019). Semantika lingvalnykh merezh u navchalnomu kombinatornomy tezaurusi [Semantics of lingual networks in the educational combinatory thesaurus]. *Studia Philologica*, *13*, 17–27. doi: 10.28925/2311-2425.2019.13.3 [in Ukrainian]

16. Kubryakova, E. S. (2004). Yazyk i znanie [Language and knowledge]. Moscow : Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury. [in Russian]

17. Makovsky, M. (2000). Istiriko-etimologicheskii slovar' sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka [A historic and etymological dictionary of the Modern English language]. Moscow : The Dialogue Publishing House. [in Russian]

18. Makovsky, M. (1996). Sravnitel'nyi slovar' mifologicheskoy simvoliki v indoevropeiskikh yazykakh [A comparative dictionary of mythological symbolism in the Indo-European languages]. Moscow : The VLADOS Humanitarian Publishing Center. [in Russian]

19. Potebnya, A. A. (1892). Mysl' i yazyk [Thought and language]. Kharkiv : Tipografiya Adolfa Darre. Recovered from: https://archive.org/details/libgen_00702348/page/n11/mode/1up?view=theater [in Russian, pre-reform orthography]

Lexicographic sources:

1. ABBY Lingvo On-line Dictionary. Recovered from http://www.lingvo.ua/
2. Collins English Thesaurus Dictionary. Recovered from www.collinsdictionary.com/english-thesaurus
3. Dictionary of the English Language. Recovered from www.thefreedictionary.com
4. English Thesaurus Dictionary. Recovered from www.thesaurus.com
5. General English Dictionary. Recovered from www.thefreedictionary.com/dictionary.htm
6. Macmillan Dictionary and Thesaurus. Recovered from www.macmillandictionary.com
7. Merriam Webster Dictionary. Recovered from www.merriam-webster.com