

**Міністерство освіти і науки України
Державний вищий навчальний заклад
«Донбаський державний педагогічний університет»**

**Філологічний факультет
Кафедра германської та слов'янської філології**

**Роман В. В.,
Коротяєва І. Б.**

**CONTRASTIVE LEXICOLOGY OF ENGLISH
AND UKRAINIAN LANGUAGES**

**Навчально-методичний посібник
для здобувачів першого (бакалаврського)
рівня вищої освіти спеціальності 035 Філологія (Германські мови та
літератури (переклад включно))**

Дніпро-Слов'янськ – 2023

**УДК
Р69**

Затверджено на засіданні Вченої ради ДВНЗ «ДДПУ»
(протокол № 9 від 29.06.2023 р.)

Укладачі:

Роман В. В., кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри германської та слов'янської філології ДВНЗ «ДДПУ»;

Коротяєва І. Б., кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри германської та слов'янської філології ДВНЗ «ДДПУ»;

Рецензенти:

Руденко М. Ю., кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри германської та слов'янської філології ДВНЗ «Донбаський державний педагогічний університет»;

Радзієвська О. В., кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, доцент (кафедра іноземних мов ДВНЗ «ДДПУ»);

Роман В. В., Коротяєва І. Б.

Р 69 Contrastive Lexicology of English and Ukrainian Languages :
навчально-методичний посібник. Дніпро-Слов'янськ : Вид-во Б. І. Маторіна,
2023. 73 с.

Представлений навчально-методичний посібник пропонує сучасний структурований матеріал з програмної тематики, що сприятиме ґрунтовній фаховій підготовці здобувачів першого (бакалаврського) рівня вищої освіти. Матеріал посібника розрахований як на аудиторну, так і на самостійну роботу здобувачів для здобувачів першого (бакалаврського) рівня вищої освіти спеціальності 035 Філологія (Германські мови та літератури (переклад включно)) денної та заочної форми роботи. Посібник сприятиме систематизації знань із зазначеної теми та формуванню спеціальних фахових компетентностей.

© Роман В. В., 2023

ЗМІСТ

ВСТУП	4
Theme 1. Contrastive lexicology of English and Ukrainian	5
Theme questions.....	12
Theme 2. Contrastive analysis of the formal structure of English and Ukrainian words	13
Theme questions	29
Theme 3. Comparison of the Categories and Types of Word-Formation in Contemporary English and Ukrainian	30
Theme questions	40
Theme 4. Comparison of compound formation in English and Ukrainian through an analytical approach.....	41
Theme questions	48
Theme 5. Methodological Considerations in Contrasting the Semantics of English and Ukrainian Words: A Comparative Study	49
Theme questions	55
Theme 6. Contrastive analysis of semantics of English and Ukrainian words	71
Theme questions	71
Список використаної літератури	72

ВСТУП

Протягом багатьох віків велика увага дослідників була приділена вивченню слова як мовного знаку, який нерозривно пов'язаний з його носієм, об'єктом та ментальною інтерпретацією. Слово виступає зовнішнім виявом духу народів, оскільки воно "означає" результати пізнавальної діяльності людини та відображає закономірності національного світобачення. Його дослідження, зокрема його формальних, семантичних та функціональних аспектів, входить до області лексикології.

У структурі контрастивної лінгвістики лексикологія має свою автономію, що виявляється в існуванні спеціального підрозділу - контрастивної лексикології. Контрастивні лексикологічні дослідження, які базуються на різних мовах, мають значущий внесок у розвиток теоретичних та практичних аспектів контрастивістики.

Курс "Порівняльна лексикологія англійської та української мов" призначений для ознайомлення здобувачів з основами сучасних знань у галузі контрастивної лексикології. Здобувачі вивчають теоретико-методологічні підходи, що сформувалися в англо-українських порівняльних дослідженнях, а також методи та прийоми, використовувані в рамках цих досліджень.

Автори мають завдання створити дидактичне середовище для засвоєння теоретико-методологічних основ порівняльної лексикології, опрацювати термінологічний апарат, методи та підходи до аналізу мовного матеріалу. Крім того, вони розглядають особливості контрастивного аналізу лексики, зокрема формальних та семантичних параметрів лексичних одиниць (англо-українська мовна пара).

Проблематика лекцій з контрастивної лінгвістики охоплює різні напрями, включаючи місце та роль контрастивної лексикології у порівняльному мовознавстві, методологічні засади контрастивного аналізу лексичних одиниць, особливості аналізу формальної та семантичної структури слів та інше.

Theme 1. CONTRASTIVE LEXICOLOGY OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

1. Comparative versus contrastive linguistics.
2. Three dimensions of classifying types of linguistic enterprise.
3. Fundamental assumption and subdivisions of comparative linguistics.
4. Contrastive lexicology as a subdivision of contrastive linguistics.
5. Tasks of contrastive lexicology. Its theoretical and practical value.

1. Comparative versus contrastive linguistics.

Language serves various purposes-it functions as a communication system, a conduit for thought, a tool for literary expression, a social institution, and a driving force for nation-building. Virtually every human being is accustomed to speaking at least one language, and it is challenging to envision meaningful social, intellectual, or artistic activities occurring without the presence of language.

The broad range and diversity of human thoughts and experiences place significant demands on language. One of the fundamental assertions arising from modern linguistic analysis is the presence of common features in all languages. This assertion can be substantiated by examining a few straightforward facts. Given that all languages involve spoken communication, they must possess phonetic and phonological systems. Additionally, since languages incorporate words and sentences, they necessitate both lexical and grammatical systems. Furthermore, the systematic meanings conveyed by these words and sentences imply the existence of semantic principles.

The sheer multitude of existing languages is awe-inspiring. Languages exhibit a non-uniform distribution globally, analogous to the varying diversity of plant and animal species in different regions. Europe. Importantly, all languages provide the means for their speakers to articulate any proposition conceived by the human mind. Hence, from the perspective of this criterion, all languages are entirely equal as instruments of communication and thought.

2. Three dimensions of classifying types of linguistic enterprise.

Comparative linguistics encompasses a broad category of linguistic pursuits grounded in the assumption that languages can be subjected to comparison. The foundational concept driving this lecture course is the idea of similarity among linguistic entities, and the extent of similarity between any two objects can be gauged by assessing the shared and distinct features characterizing them—essentially, their degree of feature matching.

A feature, in this context, is any property of an object deducible from our general knowledge of the world. Entities are considered similar if they share at least one feature, and they are deemed identical if neither possesses features lacking in the other.

To illustrate this concept, let's explore the riddle proposed by Andrew Chesterman in his work on contrastive functional analysis: "Why is a raven like a writing desk?" Originating from Carroll's "Alice in Wonderland," the riddle lacks a definitive answer in the book, despite Alice's belief that she could easily respond. Various answers have been suggested, categorizable based on different types of likeness:

1. Purely formal (two occurrences of the same sound).
2. Homonymic (same aural or visual form, different meanings, such as puns).
3. Semantic (same semantic feature).
4. Functional (similar function or purpose).

The diversity of responses to the riddle raises theoretical questions: What does it entail to compare or contrast two things? How does one establish similarities and differences? On what grounds are two distinct things selected for comparison? What does it mean to assert that two things are the same or similar? Why do different individuals perceive different likenesses between the same pair of entities?

In the realm of language and language behavior study, two fields—Translation Studies and Contrastive Linguistics-address these issues. Despite their

adjacency, it often appears that theoretical advancements in one field are overlooked in the other, and both could benefit from insights gained from each other.

Contrastive linguistics is dedicated to exploring various facets of both theoretical and applied linguistics. Its primary objective is the comparative examination of two or more languages or dialects, aiming to delineate their divergences and similarities. Through this study, the discipline seeks to elucidate the relationships between languages and their functions, contributing to enhanced cross-cultural understanding and communication between civilizations.

In the pursuit of understanding the nature of contrastive studies within the linguistic domain, three classificatory dimensions come into play. The first dimension involves two overarching approaches – the generalist and the particularist. On one hand, linguists focus on individual languages such as English, French, or Chinese. On the other hand, they explore the general phenomenon of human language, with specific languages serving as examples. G. Sampson cautions against regarding either approach as inherently superior to the other.

The second dimension divides linguists into those who study each language in isolation and those who adopt a comparative perspective. The former seeks to unveil the inherent uniqueness of a specific language, endowing its speakers with distinctive psychological and cognitive attributes. In contrast, the comparativist assumes that while each language possesses individuality, commonalities exist across languages, allowing for meaningful comparisons and classifications.

The third dimension, as delineated by F. de Saussure, distinguishes between "two sciences of language": diachronic and synchronic. Synchrony pertains to the static aspects of language, representing its current state, while diachrony involves evolutionary phases and changes over time.

Addressing the questions concerning contrastive linguistics: 1) It does not neatly align with either generalist or particularist categorizations but occupies an intermediate position on the scale between them. 2) It is intrigued by both the inherent genius of individual languages and the comparability between languages,

emphasizing differences rather than similarities. 3) It does not fit squarely within the labels of synchronic or diachronic, as its focus lies beyond the study of static linguistic phenomena and doesn't delve deeply into language families or historical factors. Consequently, contrastive linguistics appears to embody a hybrid linguistic enterprise.

3. Fundamental assumption and subdivisions of comparative linguistics.

Three key parameters prove to be particularly valuable when attempting to characterize contrastive linguistics within the broader context of comparative linguistics. Comparative linguistics serves as a comprehensive term encompassing various linguistic endeavors, all grounded in the belief that languages can be effectively compared. Juxtaposition, correlation, and comparison represent the distinctive features of human thinking, forming a universal foundation for cognitive activities. Essentially, nothing, including language, can be comprehensively studied without resorting to comparison. Linguistics employs diverse methods and techniques based on comparison to study individual or multiple languages. In contemporary linguistics, comparative linguistics has evolved into a complex field with numerous subdivisions.

General comparative linguistics further branches into Descriptive Synchronic Comparative Linguistics and Historical Comparative Linguistics. The latter, originating in the early 19th century in Germany, marked the inception of a scientific approach to linguistic comparison. Pioneered by scholars like F. Bopp, J. Grimm, Rasmus Kristian Rask and others, Historical Comparative Linguistics seeks to classify languages worldwide, identify their genetic families, and trace the evolution of related languages over time and space. Language families are often represented as trees, with each branch symbolizing the divergent continuation of a specific language state.

Synchronic comparative linguistics encompasses typological and contrastive linguistics. In the typological dimension, the approach is synchronic, categorizing

languages based on their present-day characteristics without considering historical or genetic connections. Languages within the same typological group may not share genetic relations. For instance, English and Chinese, despite lacking genetic ties, exhibit numerous shared grammatical properties, placing them closely in typological groupings. This synchronous approach considers languages based on their current features, irrespective of their historical backgrounds.

4. Contrastive lexicology as a subdivision of contrastive linguistics.

The primary objective of this lecture course is specifically focused on examining the similarities and differences within the lexical systems of English and Ukrainian. Lexical units, recognized as the fundamental structural components of expressions with distinctive structures, are the central focus of this task, falling under the domain of contrastive lexicology. Lexicology, as an independent branch of linguistics (derived from *λεξιχόου* – pertaining to words, vocabulary, and *λόγος* – the study), is primarily concerned with the sign nature, meaning, and usage of words. It raises significant questions about interpreting and evaluating the vocabulary of a language. While Western European or American linguists often include lexicological studies in grammar-related books, viewing the study of words as the realm of lexicology, Ukrainian linguists, in alignment with our perspective, regard lexicology as a distinct subdivision of language studies with the lexical system as its primary investigative focus.

Contrastive lexicology, positioned as a subdiscipline within contrastive linguistics, engages in the synchronic contrastive analysis of lexical systems. It delves into the examination of language vocabularies and lexical items, scrutinizing their structural, semantic, and functional characteristics. The purview of contrastive lexicology encompasses critical issues such as the absence of one-to-one correspondence between expression and content of words, disparities in the semantic structure of lexicons, and variations in usage. Additionally, it addresses decisive

criteria for evaluating the relative range of lexemes in contrast, considering socio-historical circumstances, borrowings, and their assimilation, among other factors.

Current research in the realm of contrastive lexicology indicates that the core elements shaping the agenda of contrastive lexicology encompass the following aspects:

1. Synchronic Orientation: While contrastive lexicology acknowledges the potential for examining issues and phenomena through a historical lens, its primary focus lies in providing insights into contrasting facts related to the contemporary state of language development. It aims to accomplish this within the framework of the most suitable language theory.

2. Granularity: Contrastive lexicology is committed to conducting in-depth analyses of similarities and differences that often elude typological generalizations. It serves as a complement to typology, often referred to as "small-scale typology." The field is particularly interested in the presence or absence of linguistic objects and their contrasts in form and function across two languages. The emphasis on fine granularity does not negate the importance of generalizations; however, these generalizations differ from the implicational statements and hierarchies found in typology.

3. Comparison of Language Pairs: The primary focus of contrastive lexicology revolves around bilateral vocabulary comparisons. This involves contrasting the vocabulary of a native language with that of a foreign language, or comparing the source language with the target language. Depending on the intended applications, it can also involve comparing the first language with a second language. Expanding the comparison beyond two languages is only feasible when the goal shifts from comprehensive comparisons to the analysis of small language fragments as an initial step towards typology. This restriction to a comparison of two languages allows contrastive lexicology to explore a wide range of variation parameters and approach the objective of establishing a comprehensive typology for a language.

The choice of languages for comparison varies across different approaches to comparative studies. Historical Comparative Linguistics focuses on languages within a single family, language typology encompasses a representative sample of the world's languages, cross-cultural communication selects languages used by interacting cultures and communities, and contrastive analysis chooses language pairs that play a role in language acquisition, bilingualism, or translation.

In summary, contrastive lexicology holds significant heuristic value for analyzing language-specific properties. It can be defined as a specific linguistic endeavor within the descriptive synchronic comparative linguistics domain. Its goal is to produce a description of one language's vocabulary from the perspective of another language, undertaking an in-depth analysis of the similarities and contrasts between them.

5. Tasks of contrastive lexicology. Its theoretical and practical value.

Contrastive lexicology is closely tied to the concept of culture, seen as the socially inherited customs accepted and shared by a community. The speech experience of individuals reflects their cultural experience, encompassing structures, spheres, and means of activity that influence the understanding and use of words. Edward Sapir emphasizes that each language, as a collective art of expression, possesses aesthetic factors—phonetic, rhythmic, symbolic, and morphological—that set it apart from any other language. Uncovering how the "colour and texture of its matrix" can be conveyed without loss or modification is crucial for the translation of literary works.

While English and Ukrainian exhibit numerous differences in their vocabularies, this diversity doesn't imply limitless variation in the types of lexical systems humans can adopt. Current research indicates shared lexical principles and tendencies across all human languages, contributing to the broader development of linguistic theory—an essential focus of contrastive lexicology.

The significance of contrastive lexicology becomes apparent when considering that it addresses one of the three main language aspects: vocabulary, with grammar and the sound system being the other two. Like a small set of Arabic numerals expressing any natural number in writing, a limited set of sounds and letters combines to articulate an extensive array of words in speech and writing.

The practical value of contrastive lexicology is substantial, meeting the needs of various applied linguistics branches such as translation, lexicography, terminology standardization, information processing, foreign language teaching, and literary criticism. Three distinct aspects characterize contrastive lexicological research: formal, semantic, and functional. The formal aspect explores formal means used in creating lexical units, such as affixation in English and Ukrainian. The semantic aspect involves contrasting the semantic structures of words and groups of words, while the functional aspect analyzes different stylistic classes of words, such as neologisms in English and Ukrainian.

Contrastive lexicology promotes a systematic approach to vocabulary facts and plays a pivotal role in the overall training of linguists. Recognizing that the study of words in lexicology is interconnected with other language system elements, a synthesis is essential after their separation for study convenience. The lexical level of the language system, offering clear insights into evolutionary processes in contrasted languages, serves as a foundational model for the contrastive exploration of other language levels.

Theme questions:

1. Explore the significance of comparing and contrasting two objects, delving into the meanings of "contrast" and "similarity."
2. Provide an explanation for the concept of "comparative linguistics."
3. Reflect on the role of contrastive linguistics within the broader field of comparative linguistics.
4. Compare typological linguistics with contrastive linguistics.

5. Examine the subject of contrastive lexicological studies.
6. Identify the fundamental components comprising the agenda of contrastive lexicology.
7. Define contrastive lexicology, outlining its scope and objectives.
8. Analyze Edward Sapir's main ideas and their relevance to the field of Contrastive Lexicology.
9. Evaluate the theoretical significance of contrastive lexicology.
10. Assess the practical applications and value of contrastive lexicology.
11. Discuss various aspects involved in the contrastive analysis of lexis.

Theme 2. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FORMAL STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN WORDS

1. The word as a fundamental unit of the language.
2. Criteria of the definition.
3. Morphemes: free and bound forms.
4. Morphemes: contribution to the meaning and function of the word.
5. Contrastive analysis of the morphemic structure of English and Ukrainian words.

1. The word as a fundamental unit of the language.

Of all the components in linguistic analysis, the word stands out as the most recognizable. Proficient speakers of any language seldom encounter challenges in breaking down a sequence of speech sounds into distinct words or determining where to insert spaces when constructing a sentence in writing. However, defining what exactly constitutes a word poses a complex and challenging question. The intricacies associated with the term "word" make it one of the most intricate aspects in the study of linguistic entities. In different typological groups of languages, the criteria employed to establish these entities vary, and each group forms a distinct system with unique patterns of formation and linguistic unit types.

First and foremost, it is crucial to delineate what units can be regarded as linguistic entities or units of language. A unit qualifies as a linguistic entity if it:

a) possesses an external (sound or graphical) form along with semantic content, b) is not generated during speech but is employed as something pre-existing and merely reproduced in speech.

As a result, individual sounds cannot be classified as linguistic entities since a single sound lacks meaning, such as [д] in день (day), which is meaningless in isolation. Only the external form of день can be dissected into sounds, but the word itself cannot. Thus, sounds function merely as structural units in constructing linguistic entities.

An inclusive account of the lexicon must encompass lexical semantic information. Our foundational assumption asserts that each linguistic unit maintains a constant and specific meaning. Concurring with Leonard Bloomfield's assertion that a phonetic form with meaning constitutes a linguistic form, we can categorize the word as a linguistic form. In an ideal scenario, linguistics would comprise two primary inquiries: phonetics, focusing on the speech event without reference to its meaning, and semantics, delving into the relationship between the event and the features of meaning. Recent studies in lexical semantics have aimed to elucidate the adaptability of word meanings, incorporating pragmatic reasoning. This expansion enhances formalism and proves beneficial for alternative interpretations of words within a discourse context.

We will adhere to Saussurian thought, asserting that the association between linguistic forms and their meanings is entirely arbitrary. Every arrangement of signs is assigned arbitrarily to certain aspects of the practical world. Typically, linguistic analysis commences with the form rather than the meaning. However, each linguistic form possesses a consistent and specific meaning, distinct from the meaning of any other linguistic form within the same language. When forms vary, their meanings also diverge.

2. Criteria of the definition.

Various linguistic criteria have been employed by different scholars, depending on the emphasis given to grammatical, semantic, phonological, or combined perspectives. For those prioritizing grammatical aspects, the word has been defined as an "ultimate or indecomposable sentence" (Henry Sweet) or as a "minimum free form" (Leonard Bloomfield). On the other hand, when semantic considerations took precedence, the word was seen as a sign representing a distinct notion or the linguistic equivalent of a separate concept. The inclusion of semantic and phonological criteria in a definition, such as "an articulate sound-symbol denoting something spoken about," led to formulations like that of Antoine Meillet, stating that a word is defined by the association of a particular meaning with a specific group of sounds capable of a particular grammatical application.

However, such definitions encounter challenges in distinguishing words from word-combinations, as exemplified by *трава* and *зелена трава*, both being combinations of sounds with a particular meaning suitable for specific grammatical use.

Each cited definition isolates crucial features of the word, culminating in the following summary: the word is a dialectical unity of form and content.

Internally, the word maintains stability, particularly in terms of the order of its component morphemes.

The word is the minimum significant linguistic unit capable of independent functioning and characterized by positional mobility, allowing permutation with other words in a sentence.

These features form the basis for differentiating between the word and the phoneme, as well as between the word and the morpheme. The phoneme and morpheme inherently rely on the word for their functionality. Consequently, the assumption is made that the word serves as the fundamental unit of the language

system, being the smallest on the syntactic and the largest on the morphological plane of linguistic analysis.

When attempting to define the term "word," it is crucial to highlight its essential characteristics that distinguish it from similar linguistic units such as phonemes, morphemes, or word-combinations. Some scholars have expressed doubts about the possibility of providing a satisfactory definition for the word, given its diverse presentations in different languages. Ferdinand de Saussure and Charles Balli have considered the notion of the word among the most ambiguous in linguistics.

Despite variations in how words manifest across languages, the word stands as a linguistic reality and serves as the principal functional-structural unit of language. Its paramount position among linguistic units is attributed to the crucial functions it fulfills. While different languages may identify words in speech streams differently, devising a universal definition for all languages is challenging but not impossible. Oleksandr Smirnitskiy has emphasized that the versatility of linguistic peculiarities in various languages should not hinder us from defining the word as a general linguistic unit, as distinct features can be identified despite deviations from typical cases.

The term "word" has undergone reinterpretation, and definitive criteria have yet to be established. Various criteria, including orthographical, phonological, semantic, and syntactic, have been proposed for distinguishing words. For instance, definitions abroad and in this country have associated a word with the combination of a particular meaning and a group of sounds suitable for specific grammatical usage. However, such definitions may not effectively differentiate words from word-combinations like *трава* and *зелена трава*, both being combinations of sounds with a particular meaning suitable for specific grammatical usage.

Each of these definitions highlights crucial features of the word or a combination of features. In summary, the word is characterized as a dialectical unity of form and content, internally stable in terms of morpheme order, and the minimum

significant linguistic unit capable of independent functioning with positional mobility, allowing permutation with other words in a sentence.

3. Morphemes: free and bound forms.

The following concepts, initially proposed by Leonard Bloomfield and expanded upon by other structuralists, delineate the principles of linguistic forms. According to Bloomfield, a linguistic form that is never uttered independently is categorized as a bound form, while those capable of standing alone are considered free forms. Certain linguistic forms exhibit partial phonetic-semantic similarities to others, such as "John ran," "John fell," "Bill ran," "Bill fell," "Johnny," "Billy," "playing," "dancing," "blackberry," "cranberry," and "strawberry." A complex form is one that bears partial phonetic-semantic resemblance to another form, with each constituent accompanying the others within the complex form. In contrast, a simple form or morpheme is a linguistic form devoid of partial phonetic-semantic resemblance to any other form.

The term "morpheme" originates from the Greek "morphe," meaning form, combined with the suffix "-eme," adopted by linguists to signify the smallest unit or minimum distinctive feature. Phonetically, a morpheme consists of one or more phonemes, as exemplified by the morpheme "pin," which shares phonetic resemblances with "pig," "pen," "tin," and "ten." Despite these phonetic similarities, meaning cannot be attributed to the phonemes since they are not linked to semantic resemblances.

A morpheme is identified as the smallest meaningful unit of form, and its corresponding meaning is termed a sememe. Linguists posit that each sememe represents a constant and distinct unit of meaning within the language.

While a complete list of morphemes constitutes the lexicon of a language, understanding the forms of a language necessitates considering additional significant features present in every utterance. The lexicon, combined with knowledge of each

sememe, may not fully elucidate the intricacies of linguistic forms found in actual speech. Describing the types of morphemes in a language is comparatively straightforward when compared to delineating the meaningful constructions in which these morphemes are employed. Syntax introduces alternative orders, as seen in examples like "John ran away," "Away ran John," and "Away John ran."

However, in morphology, the sequence is fixed, and the boundaries of morphemes are established by comparing them with other expressions. We examine utterances that differ from our original in only one specified portion, aiming to choose a basic alternant that provides the simplest description of facts in the long run. Following this principle of immediate constituents, Leonard Bloomfield proposed distinguishing certain classes of words:

1. Compound words, comprising more than one free form, such as "door-knob" and "wildanimal-tamer." The included free forms are the members of the compound word, with examples like "door," "knob," "tamer," and the phrase "wild animal."
2. Derived secondary words, containing one free form, like "boyish" and "oldmaidish." The included free form is termed the underlying form, as seen in examples like the word "boy" and the phrase "old maid."

B. Primary words that do not contain a free form:

1. Derived primary words, consisting of more than one bound form, for instance, "re-ceive," "de-ceive," "con-ceive," "re-tain," "de-tain," and "con-tain."
2. Morpheme-words, consisting of a single (free) morpheme, as illustrated by "man," "boy," "cut," "run," "red," and "big."

An example of this analysis, often reiterated by various authors, is Bloomfield's examination of the word "ungentlemanly." Upon comparing the word with other utterances, the listener identifies the morpheme "un-" as a negative prefix, given the frequent encounter with words following the pattern of "un-" plus adjective stem, such as "uncertain," "unconscious," "uneasy," "unfortunate," "unmistakable," and "unnatural." Similarly, the adjective "gentlemanly" is observed. The initial

analysis yields the immediate constituents "un – gentlemanly." Further analysis reveals that while "gent" occurs as a free form in colloquial usage, no words like "lemanly" exist either as a free or bound constituent.

Consequently, the final morpheme needs to be separated. This is justified by the presence of many adjectives following the pattern of noun stem + "-ly," such as "womanly," "masterly," "scholarly," and "soldierly," all conveying the semantic relationship of "having the quality of the person denoted by the stem." Additionally, the noun "gentleman" is encountered in other utterances.

The initial two stages of the analysis led to the separation of a free and a bound form: 1) un- + gentlemanly, 2) gentleman + -ly. The third stage presents some challenges. Division into gent- + -leman is clearly untenable since no such pattern exists in English. Therefore, the cut is gentle + man. A comparable pattern, where an adjective stem is combined with -man, is observed in words like nobleman. The term "gentle" is subject to discussion, and when compared with adjectives such as brittle, fertile, juvenile, little, noble, subtle, and others containing the suffix -le/-ile added to a bound stem, it conforms to a pattern relevant to our case.

In summary, breaking down the word at any level yields only two immediate constituents. Throughout the analysis, patterns characteristic of the English vocabulary guide the process. The combination of all constituents segregated at various stages results in the following formula: un- + {[(gent- + -le) + -man] + -ly}.

Regarding morphological types of words, the Ukrainian lexicological tradition differs slightly. Ukrainian words can be classified into the following morphological structures:

I. Non-derived words:

1. Non-derived words consisting of the root: тепер, тут, там, дуже, ма- ло, завжди, скрізь, можна, у, при, від, над, до, і, але.
2. Non-derived words consisting of the root and the ending: мов-а, вод-а, вез-у, весел-ий. This category also includes words with zero affix: вік, віз, ніс.

II. Derived words made up of roots, prefixes, and suffixes:

1. Words consisting of the root and the suffix: скрип-к-а, істор-ичн-ий.

Several suffixes can be used.

2. Words consisting of the root and the prefix: до-пис, пере-клад.

3. Combination of the root with prefixes and suffixes: пере-стриб-ну-ти, про-світ-и-ти, за-пєв-ни-ти.

III. Compound words created by combining two stems with or without infix: лісостєп, скороход.

4. Morphemes: contribution to the meaning and function of the word.

To represent the internal structure of words effectively, it is essential not only to identify each component morpheme but also to categorize these elements based on their contribution to the overall meaning and function of the larger word. Morphemes, based on their role in word construction, are categorized into roots and affixes (derived from Latin "affixus," meaning attached). Affixes are further classified, based on their position, into prefixes, suffixes, and infixes, and based on their function and meaning, into derivational and functional affixes, the latter also referred to as outer formatives (a term proposed by Eugene Nida, akin to our term derivational affixes).

When a functional affix is removed from a word, what remains is a stem (or base), which carries the lexical meaning. In many instances, the base also functions as the root. The principles governing the identification of stems and roots are distinct. Roots serve as the semantic cores of words, while stems are directly associated with inflectional affixes, identified based on structural principles. While roots and stems can coincide, they should be viewed from different perspectives. For instance, in the word "books," the element to which the affix -s is added corresponds to the word's root. However, in cases like "blackened," where the past tense affix -ed is added to the verbal stem "blacken" — a unit comprising the root morpheme "black" and the suffix -en — stems may differ structurally, encompassing root stems

(e.g., work -er), derived stems (e.g., beauti-ful -ly), and compound stems (e.g., long-hair -ed).

Stems combine with specific affixes, and their combinability or valency is influenced by various factors, including the grammatical category of stems (e.g., some suffixes are exclusive to nouns, adjectives, verbs, etc.), the semantic content of stems and affixes (e.g., negative stems cannot take negation prefixes), and phonetic characteristics of stems and affixes (e.g., certain stems ending in lip consonants can take suffixes with an initial vowel, as seen in "dist-ance").

Root morphemes can also combine with functional affixes without being overly complicated by them. In Ukrainian, there are instances where root morphemes function as bound morphemes, as seen in examples like "мандр-и," "мандр-ув-ати," and "мандр-івн-ий." Occasionally, root morphemes may resemble affixes when their meaning is weakened, such as "-man" in "seaman" and "postman" or "-люб" in "книголюб" and "правдо-люб." These morphemes are sometimes referred to as semi-affixes, with Smirnitskiy considering them as specific root morphemes usable only in compounds, sharing similarities with either suffixal or prefixal morphemes.

Functional affixes play a crucial role in conveying grammatical meaning, constructing various forms of a single word. The complete sets of these forms, when considered as inflectional patterns like declensions or conjugations, are termed paradigms. An inflectional paradigm represents the system of grammatical forms associated with a word, such as "near," "nearer," "nearest," or "son," "sons," "son's," "sons'." Derivational or lexical paradigms, on the other hand, consist of lexical derivatives generated from a root word, like "love," "lovely," "loveliness," "loveless," "lover," "loving," "lovingly," "lovable," "beloved."

Derivational affixes contribute to supplying the root with components of lexical and lexical-grammatical meaning, thereby forming different words. While lexicology primarily focuses on derivational affixes, functional affixes fall within

the realm of grammar. However, the entire domain of word-formation serves as a boundary area between lexicology and grammar.

Because both inflection and derivation involve the use of affixes, distinguishing between the two can be subtle, and it's sometimes challenging to determine the specific function of a given affix. To address this, three criteria are commonly employed to differentiate inflectional and derivational affixes.

1. Consistency in Part of Speech and Meaning: Inflectional changes do not alter either the part of speech or the underlying type of meaning in the base word. For instance, adding the plural suffix "-s" to "book" results in "books," which remains a noun and maintains the same semantic category as the base form. Although "books" now refers to multiple items instead of just one, the nature of the referred items remains unchanged. Similarly, a past tense suffix indicates that an action occurred in the past but does not modify the word's grammatical category (which remains a verb) or alter the fundamental meaning. The verb still signifies an action, regardless of whether the tense is past or non-past.

2. Order of Affixation: Another aspect of inflectional affixes involves the order in which they are applied to a stem in comparison to derivational affixes.

3. Productivity: The third criterion revolves around productivity, indicating the relative freedom with which affixes can combine with stems of the appropriate category. Inflectional affixes generally exhibit high productivity and have relatively few exceptions. For example, the suffix "-s" can attach to virtually any noun that allows a plural form. In contrast, derivational affixes typically apply to specific classes of stems. For instance, the "-ize" suffix can only combine with certain adjectives to create a verb, as seen in "modernize" but not "newize" or "legalize" but not "lawfulize."

5. Contrastive analysis of the morphemic structure of English and Ukrainian words.

The theoretical principles governing the morphological analysis of words apply to both English and Ukrainian languages. However, when classified within the Indo-European language family, English and Ukrainian fall into different categories of inflectional languages. English is characterized as analytic, while Ukrainian is primarily synthetic. The distinction lies in how linguistic relationships are conveyed—synthetic languages utilize word forms to express relations, whereas analytic languages prioritize sentences, expressing grammatical meanings through words arranged in a fixed order. It's essential to note that no language strictly adheres to pure synthesis or analysis.

English exemplifies analytic tendencies with only seven inflectional affixes, all of which are suffixes. In contrast, Ukrainian features numerous inflectional affixes, capturing nuances not present in English. Notably, Ukrainian encompasses both derivational and functional affixes, each with unique characteristics.

1. Suffixes express their meaning only in conjunction with the root morpheme. They can convey a generalized property or abstract notion when combined with the roots of adjectives denoting specific properties or features of objects. For instance, "добр-от-а" results in "добр-ий," "хоробр-ість" transforms into "хоробр-ий," and "крут-изн-а" becomes "крут-ий." The combination of the suffix with the root refines or alters the word's content and, along with the ending, indicates its grammatical category. Suffixes have the ability to change a word into a different part of speech.

2. Prefixes, in contrast, are distinct from derivational suffixes as they are added to the entire word rather than just the root. Moreover, they cannot alter the word's grammatical category. For example, "весна" becomes "провесна," "давній" transforms into "прадавній," "ходить" changes to "заходити," and "звично" turns into "незвично."

3. Postfixes, such as "-ся," are utilized to create reflexive verbs, as seen in "лити – литися" and "солодкий – насолоджуватися."

4. Infixes, on the other hand, connect two or more roots and occur within a stem. In Ukrainian, this function is fulfilled by three vowels: o, e. Examples include "лісотундра," "першодрукар," "працездатний,".

Functional affixes in Ukrainian are traditionally categorized into form-creating (формотворчі) and word-changing (словозмінні). Form-creating affixes differ from derivational ones in that they are combined with the stem of the same word, while derivational affixes are employed to create entirely new words by being attached to the stem. Form-creating suffixes are standardized and mandatory for all words within a specific part of speech, establishing a distinct system of word-forms (словоформи). For instance, infinitives consistently feature the -ти suffix, and past tense forms are constructed using the -в (or zero) and -л- suffixes, to which gender and number indicators are added: писати – писав, писала, писало, писали; нести – ніс, несла, несло, несли. Past and present active participles are formed with the -уч (-юч), -ач (-яч), and -л- suffixes: рожевіти – рожевіючий, зчорніти – зчорнілий. Past participles employ the -н (-ен), -т suffixes: побілити – побілений, збити – збитий; and present participles use the -учи (-ючи), -ачи (-ячи) and -ши, -вши suffixes for past participles: рожевіти – рожевіючи, зчорніти – зчорнівши.

Moreover, prefixes and suffixes contributing to the creation of an aspect pair of verbs are considered form-creating in Ukrainian, such as in летіти – прилетіти and летіти – влетіти. In the latter case, where the lexical meaning is specified, the prefix functions as a derivational affix.

The primary type of functional affix in Ukrainian is the word-changing affix, often referred to as flexion or ending (флексія або закінчення). This affix indicates the combination of words in word-combinations or sentences. Changeable parts of speech in Ukrainian exhibit distinct systems of word-changing (словозміна). Nouns, adjectives, numerals, and pronouns have different types of declension (відмінювання) distinguished by the system of endings, reflecting grammatical meanings of case, gender, and number, or only case (in cardinal numerals). Verbs, with their intricate system of conjugation (дієвідмінювання), employ endings as

main indicators of person, gender, and number. These abstract endings can be universally attached to words of a specific declension or conjugation type, creating a defined system of word-forms.

Within the declension system, the zero affix, which is not phonemically expressed, can carry grammatical meaning. For instance, with nouns in the genitive case, the absence of a visible affix represents a grammatical element, as seen in вікно – вікон, вишня – вишень, череда – черід.

Research conducted by Ilko Korunets has delved into isomorphism and allomorphy in the morphemic structures of English and Ukrainian words. The following statements are drawn from his findings. Morphemes, serving as minimal meaningful units in both languages, can be categorized as either free or bound. Free or root morphemes, as previously mentioned, are not lexically or functionally dependent on other morphemes. In both English and Ukrainian, they can manifest as standalone words (e.g., boy, day, he, four, день, кінь, річ, він, три) or constitute the lexical core of a word (e.g., boyhood, daily, fourth, денна, нічний, тричі). Essentially, root morphemes in these languages are not reliant on other morphemes within a word. On the other hand, bound morphemes cannot operate independently; they are tethered to the root or to the stem, which comprises the root morpheme and one or more affixal morphemes. Examples include days, spoken, fourteen, overcome, government, дивно, розумом, дні, нашим, among others. Bound morphemes, such as -s, -en, -teen, over-, -ment, -o, -ом, -і, -им in both languages, lack autonomy and are always contingent on the roots or stems of their respective words.

Root morphemes exhibit notable differences in English and Ukrainian due to their historical development. English boasts a larger array of morphologically unmarked words with regular root morphemes compared to Ukrainian. Consequently, English utilizes fewer inflections to convey morphological categories in comparison to Ukrainian. Additionally, numerous conceptually rich words in English lack affixes that would otherwise identify their lexicomorphological nature.

Despite being less abundant in Ukrainian, free root-morphemed words are still present in various lexico-morphological classes, such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives. Examples in both languages include arm, pen, boy, work, do, red, he, she, it, five, this, ten, here, far, ніс, лоб, чуб, ти, варт, хто, три, тут, де, він, etc.

Functional words can also comprise free root morphemes, appearing in both English and Ukrainian as words like but, till, on, not, through, just (a moment), мов, геть, так, певне, може, ох, дзень, гав, не, ні, від, на, під, etc. Furthermore, root morphemes in English are often integral to the stem, a characteristic particularly pronounced in contemporary Ukrainian. Examples include workers, friendliness, concerning, beautiful; робітництво, безмежність, переодягнутися, переробивши, тепленько, теплесенько, etc.

Affixal morphemes in both English and Ukrainian can be categorized into derivational and functional morphemes. These morphemes predominantly manifest as suffixes, occasionally as prefixes, with suffixes significantly outnumbering prefixes in both languages. The impact of prefixes in word-building is relatively limited in English and Ukrainian. The number of suffixes in English does not surpass 100, encompassing 60 noun-forming, 26 adjective-forming, 5 verb-forming, and 3 adverb-forming suffixes. Examples of noun-indicating/forming suffixes in English include -acy, -ance, -ion, -dom, -er, -ess, -hood, -ics, -ism, -ity, -ment, -ness, -ship, -ty, among others, resulting in words like democracy, alliance, delegation, freedom, writer, falsehood, politics, feudalism, government, management, fitness, likeness, penmanship, friendship, loyalty, etc. Similarly, adjective-indicating suffixes in English include -able, -al, -ial, -fold, -ful, -ic, -ile, -ish, -less, -ous, -some, -ward, -y, leading to words like capable, formal, presidential, manifold, grateful, laconic, futile, selfish, meaningless, dangerous, tiresome, eastward, happy, silly, etc. English verb-indicating suffixes include -ate, -en, -esce, -ify, -ise, resulting in words like negotiate, facilitate, blacken, shorten, acquiesce, beautify, purify, demobilise, organise. Adverb-indicating suffixes in English are -ly, -wards, -ward, -ways, as seen in words like quickly, slowly, southward/southwards, sideways, etc.

In Ukrainian, word-forming suffixes are more numerous and diverse, particularly with special suffixes designed to denote different genders of nouns, a feature practically absent in English. Examples of masculine gender suffixes for Ukrainian nouns include -ник, -івник, -ільник, -ч, -ік/-їк, -ець/-єць, -ар/-яр, -ир, -ист, -іст, -тель, -аль, leading to words like медик, господарник, рахівник, керманіч, кравець, хімік, прозаїк, боєць, шахтар, муляр, бригадир, збирач, діяч, окуліст, вихователь, скрипаль, etc.

In Ukrainian, feminine gender suffixes typically follow the masculine gender suffix in the noun stem, with examples such as вихователька, радистка, співанка, учениця, ткачиха, поетеса, ковальівна, моргуха, директорша, and Семенівна. English has corresponding suffixes like -or, -ess, -me, -rix, -ine, and -ette to denote masculine and feminine sexes, as seen in actor, emperor, actress, poetess, directrix, emperatrix, heroine, suffragette. However, in English, nouns with gender suffixes function similarly to nouns without such suffixes, as illustrated by sentences like "The actor/actress sang" and "The bird sang."

Unlike English, Ukrainian gender nouns necessitate corresponding gender forms in attributes and predicates. For instance, "молодий артист співав. Гарна артистка співала. Ранкове небо сіріло. Малі пташки співали, чорний ворон сидів, сива ворона сиділа, сіре котеня нявкало."

Ukrainian suffixes can also form feminine gender nouns denoting nonhuman beings like animals, birds, and insects, along with class nouns, abstract nouns, and collective nouns, such as снігурка, перепілка, цвіркунка, парубота, рідня, борня, біганина, боротьба, спритність, свіжина, балаканина.

Neuter gender suffixes in Ukrainian are predominantly used for abstract and collective nouns, as well as names of materials, babies, cubs, and nurslings, as seen in nouns like жіноцтво, учителство, неробство, бадилля, засілля, збіжжя, ключчя, сміття, горіння, велиння, терпіння.

Additionally, Ukrainian includes extensive groups of evaluative diminutive and augmentative noun suffixes, such as зіронька, сонечко, ручище, голівешка,

бицюра, кабанюра, and patronymic suffixes like -енко, -ук, -чук, -ун, -щук, -ець, as demonstrated by names like Бондаренко, Головащук, Петрук, Поліщук, Чергинець, Литвинець, Лівшун, Мовчун.

The number of diminutive noun-forming suffixes in Ukrainian is extensive, totaling 53, in contrast to the 16 suffixes in English, with only 4 being notably productive (e.g., gooseling, girlie, booklet, daddy, granny). Moreover, differences arise in the formation of statives between English and Ukrainian, as the latter often shares the same form with adverbs or modal words (e.g., прикро, душно, треба, краще, etc.). While both languages exhibit groups of suffixes, the quantity and quality differ significantly, yet they serve an isomorphic function in either word-forming or form-building in both English and Ukrainian. This alignment is evident in the following examples:

English Word-Forming Suffixes: a) Noun-forming suffixes: -er, -or, -hood, -ment, -ance (e.g., worker, sailor, falsehood, government, alliance, appearance). b) Adjective-forming suffixes: -y, -ful, -able (-ible), -less (e.g., rocky, joyful, reliable, useless).

Ukrainian Word-Forming Suffixes: a) Noun-forming suffixes: -ель, -ець, -ник, -інь, -ість, -ність (e.g., вчитель, борець, робітник, глибінь, чинник, давність, гордість). b) Verb-forming suffixes: -ну, -ти, -ува, -юва (e.g., куснути, зимувати, днювати). c) Verb-forming suffixes: -ise, -en (e.g., realise, shorten, blacken); -ate, -fy (e.g., elaborate, signify). d) Adverb-forming suffixes: -fold, -ce, -ward, -ly (e.g., twofold, thrice, nicely, homeward); adjective-forming suffixes: -к, -ив, -лив (e.g., близький, правдивий, міський, примхливий); adverb-forming suffixes: -но, -чі, -ки, -ма (e.g., пошепки, сидьма, двічі, горілиць, сонно, вічно).

Form-building suffixes in both languages, when attached to the root or stem of a word, bring about changes in the word's form and introduce nuances to its lexical meaning. Additionally, these suffixes may alter the lexical meaning of the stem, as exemplified by words like Ann – Anny, duck – duckling, hill – hillock, friend – friendship, London – Londoner, four – fourteen – forty, and in Ukrainian: дитина –

дитинча, лошак – лошачок, Харків – харків’янин, плітка – пліточка, хід – ходанина – походеньки, швидко – швиденько, хутко – хутенько.

Word-forming prefixes are predominantly employed in the English language, where they exhibit versatility in creating various parts of speech. Examples include:

Verbs: bedew, bemadam, embed, encamp, enable, denude, disable, endear;

Adjectives: anti-war, non-party, pre-war, post-war;

Statives: aboard, alike, asleep;

Adverbs: today, tomorrow, together;

Prepositions: below, behind;

Conjunctions: because, unless, until.

In Ukrainian, the use of prefixes is more limited, with only some conjunctions, prepositions, and adverbs being formed by means of prefixes. Examples include вдень, вночі, по-нашому, по-новому, набік, вдруге, втретє, оскільки, внаслідок, вгору, знизу, щонайменше. Isomorphism is observed in both languages concerning the use of two prefixes in English and multiple prefixes in Ukrainian before the root or stem, as demonstrated by words like misrepresentation and re-embankment.

In Ukrainian, three prefixes may be utilized to modify the lexical meaning of nouns, adjectives, past participles, and verbs, as seen in examples such as недовимолот, недовиторг, перерозподіляти, недовимолочений, не/перерозподілений, недовиторгувати, перерозподілити, etc.

Theme questions:

1. Discuss the concept of the word and various perspectives on defining it.
2. Provide an analysis of the concept of morpheme, exploring both its grammatical and lexical significance.
3. Examine different categories of morphemes, distinguishing between free and bound morphemes.
4. Explore various types of affixes and their classification.

5. Investigate the categorization of prefixes and their diverse types.
6. Explore the process of suffixation, delving into examples of English and Ukrainian suffixes

Theme 3. COMPARISON OF THE CATEGORIES AND TYPES OF WORD-FORMATION IN CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

1. Definition of the field of word-formation.
2. Principal types of word-formation.
3. Word-formation rules.
4. Productivity of different types of word-formation.
5. Contrastive analysis of affixation in English and in Ukrainian.

1. Definition of the field of word-formation.

Word-formation is commonly defined as a linguistic field that explores the patterns used by a language to create novel lexical units, namely words. In this context, word-formation examines composites that can be analyzed both in terms of their formal structure and semantic components.

The distinction between the creation of new lexical units and inflection has historically been a matter of debate. The prevailing view now acknowledges that while inflection generates all the word forms of a lexeme from the stem(s) in a given language, derivation leads to the formation of what is traditionally considered a distinct word.

Among the most widespread derivational processes found in numerous languages are affixation, prefixation, compounding, back-derivation, clipping, blending, and others. Current linguistic emphasis is placed on investigating various word-formation processes, recognizing that the ability to create and comprehend new words is an integral aspect of linguistic competence, comparable to the ability to construct and understand novel sentences.

The examination of the intersection between word-formation and syntax, encompassing syntactic and lexical derivation, transposition, and nominalization, holds significant linguistic interest. These aspects, directly related to the problems of naming and transposing linguistic signs in word formation, contribute to a comprehensive understanding of linguistic structures.

Studying the processes within individual words aids in delineating a language's overall word-formation system and determining the methods and pathways involved in creating new words.

2. Principal types of word-formation.

All aspects of word-formation can be examined through two perspectives: the historical process of word creation and the relationship between new words and other existing words in the language. It is essential to note that contrastive lexicology, as a specialized branch of descriptive synchronic comparative linguistics, focuses on describing the vocabulary of one language concerning another at their current developmental stages. Therefore, the primary objective is to analyze the types of word-formation that characterize the modern lexical systems of English and Ukrainian.

There are two principles for classifying types of word-formation:

I. Based on the morphemic structure of the initial word or words:

A. Derivation: This type involves a word with only one semantic center, with other morphemes serving as affixes. Example: brotherhood.

B. Compounding: In this type, a word has at least two semantic centers. Examples include red-hot, navy-blue, walking-stick, newspaper, and to whitewash.

II. Based on the relationship of components to the new word:

A. Morphological word-building: This involves creating new words using morphemes and altering the structure of existing words based on specific linguistic patterns. It includes derivation through suffixation, prefixation, and zero-derivation;

compounding by joining two or more stems; shortening through abbreviation; sound-interchange, which changes a unit in a morpheme to create a new lexical meaning (e.g., life → live); back-formation (e.g., editor → to edit); and reduplication (e.g., to murmur).

B. Morphological-syntactic word-building: New words arise through the transference from one part of speech to another, involving changes in both morphological and syntactic characteristics. Examples include substantivation of adjectives (e.g., the unemployed, the poor) and various types of conversion (e.g., to drink → a drink).

C. Lexico-syntactic word-building: This type involves the formation of new units through isolating elements from free word combinations. Examples include forget-me-not, marry-go-round, stay-at-home, happy-go-lucky, kill-me-quick (a hat), for-eyes-only (a film-star), pie-in-the-sky (promise), добраніч, нісенітниця.

Certain scholars, such as M. Zhovtobriuh, B. Kulyk advocate for the inclusion of lexical-semantic word-building within this classification. This type of word-building involves any alteration in the meaning of a word resulting from the historical development of the language. For instance, transformations like "to run – to move" and "to manage," or "машина – механізм" and "автомобіль." However, it's crucial to note that when a word undergoes a shift in meaning, it simply broadens its semantic system, becoming polysemantic. The emergence of a new word occurs only when the limit of semantic variation is reached, leading to the creation of a homonym. In such cases, homonyms no longer maintain a semantic connection with the original word.

3. Word-formation rules.

A key distinction between a rule of word-formation and a syntactic rule lies in the limited productivity of the former. Unlike syntactic rules, word-formation rules generate acceptable words only when those words have gained institutional acceptance in the language. This distinction becomes evident when considering

"actual words" like "sandstone" and "unwise" versus "potential words" such as "*lemonstone" or "*unexcellent." The latter, marked with an asterisk, are not acceptable as they do not adhere to the established rules of word-formation. Additionally, there is a category of "non-English words" like "*selfishless," where the suffix -less is added to an adjective instead of a noun, violating word-formation rules.

Rules of word-formation straddle the realms of historical and synchronic language study, offering a consistent set of models from which new words emerge. However, these rules, much like grammatical rules, undergo changes on a larger scale. Affixes and compounding processes may become more or less productive, and their range of meaning or grammatical applicability can evolve.

This discussion focuses on productive or marginally productive rules of word-formation, setting aside "dead" processes that may persist in certain words but lack contemporary productivity. For instance, the Old English suffix -th, although no longer used to create new words, endures in nouns like "warmth," "length," "depth," "width," and "breadth." Importantly, the historical study of a word doesn't impede its status as an illustration of present-day rules. For example, the word "unripe," existing in English since Anglo-Saxon times, can still serve as an example of a regular word-formation process in the language.

In the realm of word-formation, new formations created for specific occasions, known as nonce formations (e.g., "guidanceless" in "the poor child is as guidanceless as she is parentless"), are generally comprehensible but may face acceptability concerns. Excessive use of nonce formations is subject to criticism.

Throughout history, instances abound where a derived form has preceded the formally derived word itself. Notably, words like "editor" emerged prior to "edit," "lazy" preceded "laze," and "television" was in use before "televize." This process, involving the creation of a shorter word through the removal of a presumed affix, is termed back-formation. Back-formation is a concept rooted in historical linguistics but holds limited relevance in contemporary word-formation studies. For present-

day English speakers, the relationship between "laze" and "lazy" is akin to that of "sleep" and "sleepy." Nevertheless, new back-formations continue to emerge, particularly in the creation of denominal verbs. It's worth noting that these novel formations may be used with caution, especially concerning the full spectrum of verbal inflections. For example, "baby-sit" was preceded by the agential "baby-sitter," and the form "Will you baby-sit for me?" predates inflected forms like "He baby-sat for them." Some back-formations, marked by a lack of established acceptability, include "*They sight-saw" and "*She housekept."

4. Productivity of different types of word-formation.

Any examination of word-formation naturally focuses on processes currently in active use. The derivation of words from past word-formation processes holds little relevance from a synchronic standpoint. For instance, the term "gospel," formed in earlier English from the words "good" and "spell" (in the obsolete sense of "news"), is not considered a modern English word-formation. Similarly, "karate," though a combination of the Japanese words "cara" ('empty') and "te" ('hand'), is not viewed as an English word-formation. In contrast, words like "ice-cream," "conceptualize," "psychosomatic," "workaholic," "motel," and "bionic" have all emerged within English recently enough to be indicative of currently active processes. Native speakers instinctively recognize that most adjectives can be negated by adding the prefix "un-" and that abstract nouns can often be formed by appending the suffix "-ness" to adjectives.

However, discerning between productive and nonproductive processes is not always straightforward. In word-formation, there is no direct equivalent to the usage or non-usage of forms, as seen in examples like "*fulgrace-dis" (where -dis can only function as a prefix on syntagmatic grounds) and "emptyless" (where -less cannot be added to adjectives based on both semantic and grammatical considerations).

Examples like "thinkledge" (where -ledge is obsolete), "doorleg" (pragmatically excluded in the present world), and "snow-cream" (a possible but unused compound) highlight instances where certain word-formation attempts may not find acceptance. However, it is observable that certain methods of word-formation are more frequently employed for creating new words. If we designate these methods as productive, then it is fair to assert that affixation and compounding fall into this category. This assertion finds support in data provided by the Merriam Webster Dictionary. According to the Third International Dictionary, approximately two-fifths of new English words are currently formed through affixation, while about three-fifths result from compounding.

Oleksandr Taranenko, as discussed in the indicated article in Additional Resources, conducts an analysis of contemporary tendencies in Ukrainian word-formation. He emphasizes the predominant role of derivation, particularly affixation, in Ukrainian. Notably, Taranenko points to suffixal feminization as a highly productive phenomenon, attributing the rise of word-formation processes creating nouns to denote the feminine gender in modern Ukraine. Examples include "банкірка," "барменка," "бізнесменка," "піарниця," "продюсерка," "роботодавиця," "бойовичка," "рекетирка," "ваххабітка," "ісламістка," "шахідка," and others.

There is a perspective suggesting that productive means extend beyond those enabling the formation of new words at a given language stage, encompassing those capable of generating an unlimited array of new words. This distinction leads to the categorization of limited productivity and absolute productivity. Some word-formation methods, though not actively used presently, fall under this classification, such as the lexicalization of grammatical forms, sound-interchange, and stress-interchange.

The term "lexicalization of grammatical forms" refers to the creation of an independent word from a specific word-form. For instance, certain English and Ukrainian nouns in their plural forms have experienced lexicalization, gaining

autonomy and distinct meanings. For example, "bead" evolved into "коралик" and "beads" into "вервечка," while "colour" transformed into "колір" and "colours" into "прапор." In a synchronic analysis, the "-s" in such words is not considered a grammatical inflection denoting plurality; rather, it is viewed as a specific case of affixation. It is worth noting that this approach is not employed in contemporary English for the creation of new words.

Sound-interchange involves both vowel and consonant interchange. However, neither of these processes is currently productive, providing no framework for generating new words. Examples of sound-interchange include transformations such as "food" to "to feed," "a house" to "to house," "gold" to "to gild," "to speak" to "speech," "blood" to "to bleed," "defense" to "defend," and "present" to "presence."

Stress-interchange, while historically serving as a means of word-formation, has resulted in pairs like "cónflict" and "to conflíct."

5. Contrastive analysis of affixation in English and Ukrainian.

Affixation stands out as one of the most effective methods of word-formation, prevalent in both the English and Ukrainian languages. This process involves the creation of words by incorporating derivational affixes into stems, resulting in derived words that establish themselves as distinct entries in the mental lexicon of a speaker.

Affixes can be categorized in two ways: based on their placement within a word and their function within a phrase or sentence. According to their position in a word, affixes fall into two main groups: prefixes and suffixes. These two types of affixes differ significantly in their linguistic functions. Prefixes primarily bring about semantic modifications to the stem, while suffixes, in contrast, serve to alter the grammatical function, such as the word class, of the stem.

Derived words can be classified using two approaches:

1. Based on the root-morpheme (e.g., woman, womanly, womanish, womanized; добро, добрий, доброта, добряга).

2. Based on the affix morpheme (e.g., swimmer, speaker, drinker; погонич, підпасич, керманич).

The first classification method results in numerous small groups of derived words, whereas the second method yields a limited number of larger groups. It is common for certain affixes to exhibit more frequent and productive usage than others. Additionally, notable relationships often exist between affixes, particularly in terms of antonymy, as seen with pre- and post-, -full and -less.

To conduct a comparative analysis of suffixation in English and Ukrainian, we will organize affixes based on the resulting word class when attached to a base. This approach involves discussing noun suffixes, verb suffixes, etc. Furthermore, since specific suffixes are frequently associated with attaching to stems of particular word classes, it is convenient to refer to them as denominal suffixes, de-adjectival suffixes, and so on.

Suffixation can take the form of substantialization or zero-suffixation, representing a prominent method of word-building in Indo-European languages. Suffixation is distinguished by its capacity to combine with various other word-building techniques, including prefixation (e.g., un-predict-able, по-дорож-ник), compounding (e.g., blue-eye-ed, ясновид-ець), and postfixation (e.g., гурт-ув-ати-ся).

This word-building process proves versatile in generating all major parts of speech, with the exception of pronouns. Examples include nouns (teacher, kingdom, difference, вмикач, переселенець, танцюрист), numerals (seventh, семеро), adjectives (readable, денний, капроновий), verbs (threaten, страхати, гикати), adverbs (quickly, швидко, пішки, тричі), and more. Suffixes can be affixed to stems across all parts of speech, showcasing the versatility of this method in forming a wide range of words.

Suffixation emerges as an especially productive means for creating nouns. The concept of zero-suffixation, acknowledged by some linguists (Marchand, V.V. Lopatin) and contested by others (М. Докуліл, О.С. Кубрякова), involves truncating

the initial form and introducing a zero-suffix. Sound or stress interchange may accompany this process, as seen in examples like зрубати – зруб, різати – різь (з: з'), відсікати – відсіч (к: ч).

Zero-affixation is occasionally likened to cutting, representing a specific form of abbreviation, as in зам, зав, ехам, lab.

To delve into a comparative analysis of English and Ukrainian suffixes, let's explore those used for forming abstract nouns denoting status or activity.

ENGLISH: Derived nouns from base words:

-age – denoting a measure of or collection of: baggage, frontage, mileage.

-dom – not highly productive and often conveys pejorative overtones: officialdom (but not in stardom or kingdom).

-ery, -ry – (a) indicating the condition or behavior, as in drudgery, slavery. (b) signifying a location, such as nursery, refinery, bakery.

(c) used for non-countable concrete entities, for example, aggregate machinery, rocketry, with some flexibility in forming terms like gadgetry.

-ful – representing the amount contained in, as seen in spoonful, glassful (with considerable freedom in formation).

-hood – moderately productive, giving rise to words like boyhood, brotherhood, widowhood.

-ing – (a) used for noncount concrete aggregates, freely formed, e.g., tubing, panelling, carpeting, all referring to the material. (b) denotes activity connected with certain domains, such as cricketing, farming, and relatively freely formed terms like blackberrying.

-ism – indicating the doctrine of or practice associated with a particular ideology: Calvinism, idealism.

-ocracy – referring to government by a particular group: democracy, aristocracy.

-ship – limited productivity, found in words like membership, dictatorship.

UKRAINIAN: Derived nouns from base words:

-ств(о), цтв(о) – signifying a state or condition, as seen in геройство, молодецтво, материнство, дитинство, скотарство, бджільництво.

-ізм, ізм – indicating a doctrine or ideological direction, e.g., реалізм, натуралізм.

-чина, щина – used for expressing temporal shades or historical movements, as seen in бувальщина, панщина.

-няк – used for collective notions related to the type of trees and shrubs, like дубняк, вишняк.

-в(а) – representing a concept of collectivity, as in мошва.

-н(я) – often pejorative, as in комашня.

-ор(а) – denoting a group of children, as in дітвора.

-ин(а) – related to agricultural products, such as садовина, городина.

ENGLISH: Derived nouns from verbs:

-age – indicating the action or instance of, e.g., breakage, coverage.

-ation – representing the process or state of, e.g., exploration, starvation.

-al – denoting the action or result of, e.g., refusal, revival, dismissal.

-ing – indicating results from the action, as in building, opening.

-ment – signifying the result of, e.g., arrangement, management, amazement.

UKRAINIAN: Derived nouns from verbs:

-анн(я), -енн(я), -інн(я) – a broad generalization of the process or state, as seen in споживання, благання, зазіхання, терпіння.

-к(а) – representing objectified action or the result of a process, e.g., розробка, перевозка.

UKRAINIAN: Derived nouns from verbs:

-б(а), -от(а) – indicating a process or state, as seen in боротьба, сліпота, турбота.

-ин(а) – denoting bustling and disorderly actions, as in біганина, мішанина.

-тв(а) – nonproductive, found in words like битва, клятва, жертва.

-ізаці(я), -изаці(я) – used for organizing measures, as in класифікація.

ENGLISH: De-adjectival nouns:

-ity – freely productive, found in words like elasticity, diversity, regularity.

-ness – freely productive, seen in words like happiness, selfishness.

UKRAINIAN: De-adjectival nouns:

-ість – seen in words like радість, певність.

-ощі – found in words like хитрощі, гордощі.

-ин(а) – used for denoting time, space, or quality, as seen in старовина, височина.

-інь – used for indicating space, as seen in височінь, глибочінь.

-изн(а) – used for indicating a feature, as in жовтизна, сивизна.

-от(а) – used for expressing quality or characteristic, found in words like доброта, теплота.

Even a cursory analysis reveals notable differences in the quantity and semantic nuances of the examined affixes between the two languages.

Theme questions:

1. What is the definition of word-formation?
2. What principles are employed in classifying types of word-formation?
3. What are the primary categories of word-formation?
4. Discuss the distinctions among morphological, morphological-syntactic, and lexical-syntactic word-building.
5. How does a word-formation rule differ from a syntactic rule?
6. Which types of word-formation exhibit the highest productivity in both English and Ukrainian?
7. Outline the distinctions between English and Ukrainian suffixes used to create abstract nouns denoting status or activity, as discussed in the latter portion of the lecture.

Theme 4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMPOUND FORMATION IN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

1. Compounding as the type of word-formation.
2. Types of compounds and suggested classification in terms of syntactic paraphrase.
3. Contrastive analysis of noun compounds in English and Ukrainian.
4. Reduplicatives.

1. Compounding as the type of word-formation.

Compounding serves as a highly productive method of word-formation in both English and Ukrainian. It involves the creation of compound words, which can be formed easily when needed without necessarily becoming permanent elements of the vocabulary. The study of compounding encompasses both diachronic and synchronic perspectives. In this context, our focus is on a synchronic examination, addressing key questions:

1. Identification of the main features that set compounds apart from other linguistic units.
2. Analysis of the semantic structure inherent in compound words.
3. Exploration of the principles guiding the classification of compounds.

A compound is a lexical unit comprising more than one stem, functioning both grammatically and semantically as a cohesive single word. I. V. Arnold notes that these stems appear as free forms in English and Ukrainian lexicological tradition further categorizes compounding into:

1. Stem-combining, involving interfixes such as *o*, *e*, *ε* (e.g., доброзичливий, працездатний, життєрадісний) or occurring without them (e.g., триповерховий, всюдихід).

2. Word-combining or juxtaposition, which entails combining multiple words or word-forms into a single complex word (e.g., хаталабораторія, салон-перукарня).

While theoretically any number of stems can be involved, English compounds typically consist of two stems, except for a minor class of items that are usually abbreviated. Compounds in English typically result in nouns, verbs, or adjectives, and in Ukrainian, they include nouns, adjectives, and adverbs.

The structural coherence and integrity of a compound may hinge on factors such as unity of stress, solid or hyphenated spelling, semantic unity, and the combined effects of morphological and syntactic functioning. The indivisibility of a compound is evident in its resistance to the insertion of another word or word-group between its elements. For instance, in "a sunbeam," we can insert words like "bright" or "unexpected" between the article and the noun, but no such insertion is possible between "sun" and "beam."

2. Types of compounds and suggested classification in terms of syntactic paraphrase.

When analyzing the structure of a compound, it is essential to explore the relationships between its members. Compounding involves combining stems from the entire lexicon, encompassing a broad spectrum of semantic relations. While both bases in a compound are theoretically equally open, they typically exhibit a relationship where the first modifies the second. In essence, compounding can be likened to prefixation with open-class items. However, this does not imply that any lexical item can be placed in front of another to form a compound. The relations between the items in compounding must be such that classifying the second element in terms of the first is reasonable and useful. Compounds with this characteristic are

referred to as endocentric. In contrast, exocentric compounds lack a semantic center, as seen in examples like "scarecrow," where only the combination of both elements names the referent.

The semantic integrity of a compound is often idiomatic, meaning that the compound's overall meaning is not simply the sum of its elements. Consequently, the compound can differ significantly in meaning from a corresponding syntactic group, as illustrated by "a blackboard" versus "a black board." In some instances, the original motivation behind idiomatic compounds may be challenging to reconstruct, as exemplified by the term "blackmail," referring to obtaining money or profit from a person through threats.

Analyzing the semantic relationship between the constituents of a compound poses numerous challenges. Some linguists approach semantic connections within compounds by considering them in terms of syntactic relations. For instance, *A Comprehensive Grammar* by H. Marchand adopts a presentation mode that, where possible, links compounds to sentential or clausal paraphrases. This approach is illustrated with compounds like "daydreaming" and "sightseeing," which can be analyzed in terms of their sentential analogues: "X dreams during the day" and "X sees sights," respectively (i.e., verb + adverbial and verb + object).

V. Arnold criticizes this approach as a "mistake" because syntactic connections exist between words, whereas the study of compounds involves examining relations within a single word. While not all compounds directly originate from the clause-structure functions of the involved items, we still find this treatment of word-formation suitable for general description, emphasizing the language's productive capacity.

3. Contrastive analysis of noun compounds in English and Ukrainian.

Major compound categories in English, specifically Noun Compounds and Adjective Compounds, can be further categorized based on a grammatical analysis

of their elements and the indication of the relationship between them through syntactic paraphrase.

I. SUBJECT + ACTION: For instance, "вода спадає – водоспад" exemplifies this type, and it is represented by various ways of combining structural components:

Noun (subject) + deverbal noun (e.g., English: sunrise, rainfall, headache, bee-sting, frostbite, daybreak, heartbeat, rainfall; Ukrainian: небосхил, серцебиття, зорепад, сонцестояння, снігопад) This type is notably productive in both languages.

Deverbal noun + noun (subject) In English, this type includes compounds where the first component is a verbal noun ending in -ing (e.g., flying machine, firing squad, investigating committee), and it is highly productive. Ukrainian examples are less common, such as падолист (archaic) and трясогузка.

Verb + noun (subject) This type is exclusive to English, featuring examples like watchdog and playboy.

II. OBJECT + ACTION: For instance, "вказує дорогу – дороговказ" represents this type, and it is characterized by:

Noun (object) + deverbal noun

This type is moderately productive in English but prevalent in Ukrainian.

Examples include:

English: birth-control, handshake.

Ukrainian: душогуб, сінокіс, гречкосій, родовід.

In English, a subtype involves noun (object) + verbal noun in -ing, as seen in book-keeping and town-planning. The corresponding Ukrainian compounds have the -ння ending, such as сироваріння and містобудування.

Another subtype is noun (object) + agent noun. In English, this is highly productive and signifies concrete (usually human) agents, like matchmaker, stockholder, and hairsplitter. Notably, dishwasher and lawn-mower deviate from the typical -er suffix. Ukrainian examples, reflecting the diversity of agent noun-

forming suffixes, include м'ясорубка, законодавець, користолобець, квартирнаймач, and містобудівник.

Additionally, there's verb + noun (object), observed in English compounds like call-girl, push-button, and drawbridge. In Ukrainian, the first component is often an imperative verb, as seen in голиборода, крутивус, пройдисвіт, дурисвіт. This structural type, found in plant names (дерипліт, ломикамінь, ломиніс) and poetic characterizations of people (Вернигора, Перетанцюйбіс, Непийвода), belongs to the ancient layer of Ukrainian vocabulary. For instance, the ancient Ukrainian Sun God was named Дажбог, combining the imperative form of the verb dadjú (дай) and the noun bogú (щастя, добробут).

III. ACTION + ADVERBIAL: For example, "ходить пішки – пішохід" represents this type. In English, subtypes include:

Verbal noun in -ing + noun (adverbial component, transformable into a prepositional phrase), e.g., writing-desk, hiding place, walking stick.

Noun (adverbial component) + agent noun, e.g., city-dweller, baby-sitter.

Noun (adverbial component) + verbal noun in -ing, e.g., sunbathing, handwriting.

Noun (adverbial component) + noun (converted from verb), e.g., homework, gunfight.

In English, the 2nd and 4th subtypes can be combined, and this combined type is also found in Ukrainian, as seen in examples like місцеперебування, працездатність, and світогляд. Additionally, Ukrainian exhibits a productive compound formation type: adverb (adverbial component) + deverbal noun, as illustrated by скоропис, марнослів'я, and пішохід.

Previously, we discussed compound types involving the component 'action': subject + action, object + action, action + adverbial. Another category to note is 'verbless' compounds, such as silkworm (noun2 produces noun1), doorknob (noun1 has noun2), and raindrop (noun1 is of, consists of noun2). These compounds can express relationships like purpose (e.g., ashtray is for holding ash), composition

(e.g., raindrop consists of rain), or ownership (e.g., girlfriend is a friend who is a girl).

The most productive types of verbless compounds in both languages fall into the "subject and object" category:

Windmill (e.g., air-brake, steam engine, gas cooker): noun1 powers/operates noun2 ("the wind powers the mill").

Toy factory (e.g., honey-bee, silkworm, gold mine): noun2 produces/yields noun1 ("the factory produces toys").

Another category is "noun1 + noun2" compounds:

Bloodstain (e.g., hay fever, tortoise-shell, whalebone, food poisoning): noun1 produces/yields noun2 ("the blood produces stains").

Doorknob (e.g., window-pane, cartwheel, bedpost): noun1 has noun2 ("the door has a knob"). This is a highly productive type with inanimate nouns; animate nouns typically use a noncompound genitive phrase (e.g., the boy's leg).

Security officer (e.g., chairperson, fireman, deckhand): noun2 controls/works in connection with noun1 ("The officer looks after security"). This is a very productive type, typically involving a human agent. In some compounds, "man" has a reduced vowel /mɪn/ or might be viewed as a suffix. Ukrainian also has similar final elements in compounds.

Suffixoids, such as -грійка, -думець, -лов, as seen in examples like тілогрійка, одnodумець, птахолов, are noteworthy. It's important to note that combining-form compounds, often referred to as compounds with interfixes in Ukrainian scholarly tradition, are prevalent in scientific and academic domains. Many of these compounds have gained international acceptance, being adopted or adapted in various languages. For instance, the term psychoanalysis exemplifies this type, where noun1 (in its combining form) is connected to noun2 (reflecting noun2 in the context of noun1), conveying the meaning "the analysis of the psyche." This type is highly productive in both Ukrainian and English, and various relationships can be expressed. Typically, the first component is neo-classical and doesn't exist

independently as a noun stem. The model has been widely applied, even with common stems, often utilizing an infix (commonly -o or -i) as a link between the two parts, as seen in words like cryptography and insecticide. Stress patterns vary, and the primary stress often falls on the link vowel of the combining form. Common second constituents include -meter, -graph(y), -gram, -logy (Ukrainian counterparts: -метр(ія), -граф(ія), -лог(ія), -ман(ія)).

In the context of compounding, it's worth mentioning a highly productive type of back-formation related to noun compounds ending in -ing and -er. Examples of verbs derived from such compounds include sleep-walk, house-keep, dry-clean, and sight-see.

4. Reduplicatives.

Some compounds exhibit two or more constituents that are either identical or slightly different, as seen in examples like goody-goody, referring to a self-consciously virtuous person in an informal context. The distinctions between the constituents may involve initial consonants, as in walkie-talkie, or medial vowels, exemplified by criss-cross. Many reduplicatives, where elements are repeated for effect, are often informal or familiar, with a notable presence in child-parent interactions, such as din-din for dinner. Reduplicatives, also known as 'jingles,' serve various purposes:

Imitating sounds, as seen in rat-a-tat (knocking on a door), tick-tock (clock ticking), ha-ha (laughter), bow-wow (dog's bark).

Suggesting alternating movements, as observed in seesaw, flip-flop, ping-pong.

Conveying a sense of disparagement by implying instability, nonsense, insincerity, or vacillation, as in higgledy-piggledy, hocus-pocus, wishy-washy, dilly-dally, shilly-shally.

Intensifying, as illustrated by teeny-weeny, tip-top.

In the context of reduplication (Ukrainian: тихо-тихо, ледь-ледь, думав-дума́в), Ukrainian linguists identify certain types of compounds:

Synonymic unities, such as пане-брате, стежки-доріжки, часто-густо.

Semantic unities, exemplified by батько-мати, руки-ноги, хліб-сіль, діди-прадіди.

Appositional unities, as seen in машина-амфібія, дівчина-смуглянка.

Theme questions:

1. What is meant by the term "compound"?
2. How do compounds differ from syntagmatic word combinations?
3. What are the various structural types of compounds?
4. What are the different semantic categories of compounds?
5. In what ways do compounds exhibit spelling peculiarities?
6. Explain the distinction between endocentric and exocentric compounds.
7. How are components related in compounds?
8. What is the significance of reduplicatives in compounds?
9. What methodologies are employed in the contrastive analysis of noun compounds?

Theme 5. CONTRASTIVE STUDIES OF SEMANTICS OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN WORDS: METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

1. The study of meaning: semasiology and semantics.
2. Semiotics. Dimensions of semiosis in lexicological studies.
3. Comparability criterion: possible approaches to establishing *tertia comparationis* in contrastive lexicology.

1. The study of meaning: semasiology and semantics.

Long before the formalization of linguistics as a distinct academic discipline, profound inquiries into the nature of meaning were already underway. Over millennia, the question of meaning has been a focal point of philosophical discourse. Thinkers ranging from ancient luminaries such as Plato and Aristotle to modern philosophers like Ludwig Wittgenstein have contributed to the exploration of meaning. The study of meaning has transcended disciplinary boundaries, with insights emerging from philosophy, logic, psychology, literary criticism, and the history of language.

Within linguistics, the specific branch dedicated to unraveling the meaning of words is known as semasiology or semantics. While the terms semasiology and semantics are often used interchangeably, semantics encompasses additional dimensions. For instance, "pure semantics" denotes a branch of symbolic or mathematical logic pioneered by R. Carnap.

For an extensive period, the investigation of meaning remained embedded in the realms of philosophy, logic, psychology, literary criticism, and language history. The formal emergence of semasiology as an independent field occurred in the 1830s, marked by the propositions of German scholar Christian Karl Reisig (1772–1829). Lecturing in classical philology, Reisig advocated for the recognition of meaning studies as a distinct branch of knowledge. His lectures, published posthumously in

1839 by his pupil F. Heerdegen, played a pivotal role in shaping the trajectory of semasiology.

A seminal figure in the establishment and evolution of this nascent science was the French scholar Michel Bréal. His influential work, "Essai de sémantique" (Essay on Semantics), published in Paris in 1897, gained widespread recognition and spurred numerous investigations and monographs on meaning not only in France but also in other countries. Bréal's focus was on understanding how words, once endowed with a specific meaning, undergo changes—expanding or contracting, transferring between conceptual groups, altering in value. According to professor J. R. Firth, the historical study of meaning change was referred to as semasiology until 1900 when Bréal's work was translated into English as "Semantics."

In contemporary linguistic discourse, the term "semantics" has prevailed and now denotes the branch of linguistics specializing in the study of the meaning of linguistic units across all levels of language and language use. Widely accepted among linguists, the term semantics is applied to investigate the meaning of individual words in their various aspects and nuances.

Despite numerous attempts, there is currently no universally accepted definition of lexical meaning that fully encapsulates all its fundamental features and remains operationally useful. The term "meaning" stands out as one of the most ambiguous and contentious concepts in linguistic theory. Various renowned linguists have delved into the intricate nature of this phenomenon, as evidenced by the extensive bibliography of linguistic papers addressing lexical semantics.

2. Semiotics. Dimensions of semiosis in lexicological studies.

Meaning, as a concept, extends beyond the boundaries of linguistics and finds a profound exploration in semiotics, also known as semiology – the study of signs. Ferdinand de Saussure, a Swiss linguist, defined semiotics as the study of "the life of signs within society." In the structuralist tradition of Saussure's semiology,

language assumes a pivotal role as the exclusive key to the world of semiosis, which is the action of signs. Semiosis is characterized as the operation that, by establishing a reciprocal presupposition between the signifier and the signified, produces signs. Language, in this perspective, is the medium through which the structure of our perception of the world is shaped; nothing attains distinctiveness until language emerges.

Charles Sanders Peirce embarked on another significant semiotic endeavor, developing semeiotic, a proposed "science of sciences" because, in his words, "the entire universe is perfused with signs if it is not composed exclusively of signs." For Peirce, semiosis is the "intelligent or triadic action of sign," involving a triad of elements: the representamen as the signifying stimulus, the object represented by the sign, and the interpretant as the outcome of the sign in the mind of its interpreter. Semiosis, according to Peirce, encompasses any form of activity, conduct, or process involving signs, including the production of meaning. The application of different dimensions of semiosis to the contrastive studies of lexical meaning becomes a promising avenue.

In 1938, Charles William Morris presented *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*, proposing three dimensions of semiosis:

1. Syntactical dimension, dealing with combinations of signs without regard for their specific significations.
2. Semantical dimension, addressing the signification of signs in all modes of signifying.
3. Pragmatical dimension, focusing on the effects of signs on the interpreter.

These dimensions can be further modified by introducing the notion of interpretant. The word, in this context, is considered a sign, possessing a code dimension, an informational dimension, and a cultural dimension. These dimensions are applied to the study of word-formation in English and Ukrainian.

The informational dimension of semiosis, as explored in the studies, aims to unveil similarities and differences between lexical units through the analysis of the

actual realization of universal properties pertaining to meaning in English and Ukrainian.

On the other hand, the cultural dimension of semiosis in the studies seeks to uncover similarities and differences in the actualization of conceptual features of mental models underlying the processes of creating linguistic objects in different languages, which are inherently shaped by cultural influences.

In the realm of contrastive lexicology, the studies focus on the code dimension of semiosis, with the ultimate goal being the discovery of similarities and differences between lexical units through the analysis of the actual realization of chosen universal properties. The intricacies of the word, as explored in lexicology, become the subject of investigation within this broader semiotic framework.

3. Comparability criterion: possible approaches to establishing *tertium comparationis* in contrastive lexicology.

Before delving into any analysis of linguistic elements, the establishment of *tertium comparationis* is deemed essential. This concept serves as a comprehensive reference platform, laying the groundwork for the subsequent comparison of languages. *Tertium comparationis* entails defining relations of equivalence, similarity, and difference within the observed languages. It serves as the background of sameness and is a prerequisite for any justifiable and systematic study of contrasts in contrastive lexicology. The identification and understanding of *tertium comparationis* depend on the approach selected in the study of contrasts.

As previously mentioned, *tertium comparationis* involves defining relations of equivalence, similarity, and difference on three levels: the code dimension, the informational dimension, and the cultural dimension within lexical units.

In this particular lecture course, a semiotic approach to meaning is embraced, aligning it with semiosis—the action of signs, encapsulating the inseparable unity of representamen, object, and interpretant. The informational dimension of semiosis

posits that the meaning of a word is best understood by examining the relationship between the interpretant and the object, as established by the interpreter via the representamen. The analysis encompasses various contexts in which the representamen appears, revealing nuances in the relations between the object and the interpretant. This exploration unveils what is traditionally known as the notional nucleus of meaning, encompassing objective, nominative, representative, and factual components, abstracted from stylistic, pragmatic, modal, emotional, subjective, and communicative nuances.

Additionally, the emotional content of a word, its capacity to evoke or express emotions directly, is expressed through the connotative component of meaning, also known as emotive charge or intentional connotations. The study of this content occurs at the cultural level of semiosis, involving the cultural interpretant.

When linguists undertake the contrast of word meanings in a language, their interest may lie in characterizing the notional interpretant, cultural interpretant, or both of verbal signs. The notional interpretant encompasses the fundamental, essential components of meaning conveyed by the literal use of a word. For example, the basic components of the word "needle" in English might include descriptors like "thin." The cultural interpretant delves into the cultural implications and connotations associated with a word, providing a more comprehensive understanding of its meaning in a specific cultural context. This nuanced approach allows for a thorough exploration of the dimensions and subtleties inherent in lexical semantics.

The "feature approach" to contrastive analysis proves applicable across all three dimensions of semiosis, offering a systematic way to compare languages. In this method, the Tertium comparationis, or common feature, serves as a reference point for analysis within each dimension: code, informational, and cultural.

1. Code Dimension:

Example: Examining the means of expressing gender. The Tertium comparationis in this case could be derivational suffixes, which contribute

to the formal structure of words. The focus is on how gender is linguistically encoded in the structure of words across languages.

2. Informational Dimension:

Example: Investigating verbs related to speech activity. The Tertium comparationis involves the common feature of projecting on the invariant denotatum and microdenotata. For instance, in Ukrainian and English, verbs such as "казати" and "to say" respectively, represent diverse actions performed by different objects (persons), each with nuanced shades of meaning.

3. Cultural Dimension:

Example: Exploring means of expressing evaluative attitude. The Tertium comparationis could be the lexical choices in news reporting about accidents in Ukrainian and English papers. Analyzing differences in word choice reveals hidden ideologies and cultural standpoints, shedding light on how the same event can be represented differently in distinct cultural contexts.

Contrastive semantic studies within lexicology aim to understand the nature of contrasted languages through various objects of analysis:

Semantic Structures of Words: Objective: Compare and contrast the semantic structures of individual words and their development, including the causes and classification of these changes. This falls under the feature approach, scrutinizing how meanings evolve and diverge in different linguistic contexts.

Semantic Grouping and Relationships: Objective: Compare and contrast semantic grouping and relationships within vocabulary systems, such as synonyms, antonyms, and terminological systems. This field approach delves into the intricate web of relationships within a language's lexicon.

Mental Models Underlying Word Interpretation: Objective: Compare and contrast mental models that underlie the processes of interpreting words. This concept approach involves understanding the conceptual frameworks and

associations individuals have with specific words in different linguistic and cultural contexts.

In essence, the semantic approach in contrastive studies aims to unravel the layers of meaning, from the evolution of individual word meanings to the complex interplay within the semantic networks of languages. By applying these diverse approaches, linguists can gain profound insights into the intricacies of linguistic and cultural diversity, offering a nuanced understanding of the nature of contrasted languages.

,

Theme questions:

1. What is the distinction in terminology between semasiology and semantics?
2. What are the key ideas introduced by Charles Sanders Peirce in the field of semiotics?
3. How would you comment on the concept of interpretant and the various dimensions of semiosis? Additionally, how can additional resources contribute to this discussion?
4. What does the term "tertium comparationis" entail in cross-linguistic analysis?
5. What are the different methods employed in establishing tertium comparationis in the field of contrastive lexicology?

Theme 6. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF SEMANTICS OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN WORDS: FEATURE APPROACH

1. The nature of semantic change.
2. Types of semantic change.
3. Processes involved in changes of the semantic structure of words.

1. The nature of semantic change.

As mentioned earlier, lexical semantics, a branch of lexicological studies, focuses on the systematic exploration of word meanings. Descriptively, the primary areas within lexical semantics encompass the internal semantic structure of words, semantic relations within the vocabulary, and aspects of cognitive semantics. Within the realm of contrastive lexicology, this delineation has given rise to three methodological approaches: feature, field, and concept approaches. This lecture specifically delves into the feature approach, aiming to illustrate its application in contrasting the semantic evolution of English and Ukrainian words.

In this context, we seek answers to two fundamental questions posed by lexical semanticists: (a) How can we effectively describe the meanings of words? (b) How do we account for the variability in changes in meaning?

These questions are inherently connected, as a comprehensive description of meaning is integral to understanding and interpreting variations. Exploring semantic variation directs us in two key directions: firstly, towards the processes of selection from a range of permanently available possibilities; and secondly, towards the creation of new senses from existing ones, facilitated by mechanisms such as metaphor and metonymy, driven by contextual influences. An understanding of synchronic variation (observable at any given time in a language) is vital for comprehending diachronic change (changes over time). These observations form the basis of etymology, the study of word history.

Over extended periods, linguistic changes become apparent, manifesting in words shifting in meaning. Some undergo semantic narrowing, as seen in the

evolution of the English word "queen," which initially meant woman or wife but now specifically refers to the wife of a king. Conversely, other words broaden in meaning, and some either acquire new senses or vanish altogether. Additionally, languages borrow words from one another, leading to changes over time. The investigation of such processes falls under the domain of historical semantics. In essence, the study of semantic variation and change provides valuable insights into the dynamic evolution of language and the intricate paths words take over extended temporal spans.

The exploration of word meanings is motivated not only by linguistic inquiry but also by the practical concerns of dictionary writers. Their efforts involve establishing meaning correspondences between words in different languages or, in monolingual dictionaries, providing comprehensive definitions for all the words within a language using a simple core vocabulary. Within lexicology, a pivotal focus lies on uncovering both similarities and differences in word meanings. In the realm of contrastive lexicology, scholars are tasked with identifying similarities and differences in the processes of semantic changes occurring in words. To address this challenge, researchers employ the "feature approach," starting by selecting features of the semantic structure of words as the *Tertium comparationis*.

Semantic change, defined as the alteration of meaning represented by a set of semantic features, occurs due to the continuous usage of words in different senses, each not precisely the same as the previous. When new senses gain consensus within a speech community and become established in usage, a semantic change is said to have occurred.

In his work "On Language Change: The Invisible Hand in Language" (Rudi Keller, 1994), Rudi Keller posits that when the primary interest concerning semantic change revolves around the meaning of words, we can define the meaning of a word as its conventional use or the rule of its use. Thus, tracing changes in a word's meaning involves understanding how and why the rules of use for that word have

changed. Semantic changes are as common as changes in form and can be internally or externally motivated.

Externally motivated semantic changes occur when: a) Changes in the social life of a community necessitate new nominations for objects or phenomena. Examples include the introduction of words like "computer," "spaceship," "гривня," and "Рада" (Верховна рада). b) Existing objects or phenomena undergo modifications, leading to changes in the meaning of existing nominations to align with these modifications. Examples include the transformation of the Latin word "carrus" from meaning 'a four-wheeled wagon' to its contemporary usage denoting 'a motor-car' or 'a railway carriage.' Other instances include linguistic shifts like "зелені" (greenbacks), "шкура" (leather jacket), "Бушові стегенця" (Bush's thighs referring to American broilers), and "кучмовоз" (larger and sturdier two-wheeled vertical cart resembling a wheelbarrow).

These examples illustrate the dynamic nature of language, where semantic changes are intricately tied to social, cultural, and technological shifts, showcasing the evolution of words over time.

Speech communities play a pivotal role in the creation of new senses for lexemes, leading to alterations in the number and arrangement of semantic features (semes) that form the foundation of these senses. The dynamic nature of language allows for the addition, removal, or rearrangement of semes within the semantic structure of words. This phenomenon is evident in both English and Ukrainian lexical evolutions.

For instance, in English, the Old English word "fæger," initially meaning 'fit' or 'suitable,' has transformed into the Modern English word "fair." Over time, its meaning shifted to convey 'pleasant' and 'enjoyable.' Subsequently, it expanded to include a sense of 'beautiful and pleasant in conduct,' giving rise to a second modern sense of 'just' and 'impartial.' Simultaneously, the original meaning continued to evolve, taking on the sense of 'light complexion,' while a third sense emerged with

a somewhat pejorative connotation, indicating 'average' or 'mediocre.' An example sentence could be, "He only got a fair result in his exam."

In Ukrainian, a similar semantic expansion is observed with the word "поле," which originally meant 'безліса рівнина, порожній великий простір' (treeless plain, empty vast space). Currently, it is employed in various senses such as 'ділянка землі, відведена під що-небудь' (plot of land designated for something), 'простір, у межах якого відбувається якась дія' (space within which an action takes place), 'сфера діяльності' (sphere of activity), 'смужка вздовж краю аркуша паперу' (strip along the edge of a sheet of paper), 'відігнуті краї капелюха' (folded edges of a hat), and others.

Throughout this course of lectures, semantic change is conceptualized as the emergence of new senses for lexemes. This evolution is driven by various reasons and is rooted in diverse semantic processes, showcasing the adaptability and fluidity of language as it responds to societal, cultural, and contextual shifts.

2. Types of semantic change.

The term "semantic shift" serves as a neutral expression to describe changes in meaning without specifying the type of change. For example, the Latin verb "arrivare" originally derived from "ad ripam" ('at the shore') but has undergone a semantic shift, losing this original meaning over time. A comprehensive examination of changes in meaning reveals that these alterations can be categorized into different types, which pertain both to the expansion of a word's meaning range and the way in which speakers evaluate that meaning.

1. Semantic Expansion: Semantic expansion occurs when a word broadens its range of meaning over time. In Middle English, "bride" initially referred to a 'small bird.' Subsequently, the term "bird" took on a more general sense, and the word "fowl," which was originally a more general term, became restricted to 'farmyard birds bred especially for consumption.' Another example is the evolution

of the word "horn," which originally meant a 'bone-like protrusion on the heads of certain animals' but expanded to refer to a 'musical instrument' and later to a 'drinking vessel' of similar shape. The instance of "arrivare" shifted from simply 'being in a place without moving, as wheels slide in place (about a car)' to 'being in a difficult situation; not performing well and on time (about work)'.

2. Semantic Restriction: Semantic restriction is the opposite of expansion and occurs when a word narrows its meaning over time. An example is the word "meat," which originated from Middle English "mete" with the general meaning of 'food' but is now restricted to 'processed animal flesh.' Conversely, the word "flesh" narrowed in meaning to refer specifically to 'human flesh.' Borrowing from another language may contribute to this phenomenon. For instance, Old English "snīpan" (German "schneiden") was replaced by Old Norse "cut" as the general term, while the second Old English word "ceorfan" was restricted to 'carve.' The word "wit," initially meaning 'the faculty of thinking, good or great mental capacity,' underwent semantic restriction, and the borrowed word "reason" now carries the original meaning. In Ukrainian, the word "бігати," originally denoting 'the action of moving quickly on foot,' acquired the additional sense of 'тривожитися, піклуватися, турбуватися за когось, щось' (to be anxious, care for someone or something). Similarly, the Old Slavonic word "билина," originally denoting the name of a plant, now only means 'стеблина трави, травинка' (blade of grass).

3. Semantic Deterioration: Semantic deterioration refers to a disapproving shift in the meaning of a word over time. The term "knave," which originally meant 'male servant' in Old English, derived from 'boy' (cf. German Knabe). However, it deteriorated in meaning to signify a 'base or coarse person,' eventually falling out of common use and being replaced by the word "boy." Similarly, "villain" evolved from denoting an 'inhabitant of a village' to taking on the meaning of a 'scoundrel.' The word "peasant" now refers to someone displaying bad behavior, while the term "farmer" has become the norm. In official contexts, "peasant" is still used for small and/or poor farmers. In Ukrainian, an illustration of semantic deterioration can be

found in the word "бурса." Originally, it referred to 'нижче духовне училище' (lower spiritual school), but its meaning expanded to encompass any male clerical school. In modern Ukrainian youth environments, "бурса" denotes any educational establishment (school, professional training school, university) with ironic connotations.

4. Semantic Amelioration: Semantic amelioration involves cases where the meaning of a word is "improved" over time. Words undergo a transformation from humble beginnings to positions of greater importance. For instance, the term "nice" originated from Latin "nescius" ('ignorant') and, during its borrowing from Old French, evolved to mean 'silly, simple,' and later 'foolish, stupid.' Eventually, it developed a more positive connotation as 'pleasing, agreeable.' Many words have been elevated in meaning through association with the ruling class. For example, "knight" originally meant 'a young servant' and now refers to 'a man who fought for his feudal lord,' while "minister" originally meant 'a servant' and now signifies 'an important public official.' In Ukrainian, words like "офіс," "менеджмент," and "кур'єр" carry more prestige than their counterparts "контора," "управління," or "посильний."

Amelioration stands in contrast to semantic deterioration, and while less common, it involves words developing a more positive meaning. There are more instances of pejoration, where words acquire a negative meaning, often involving a lowering in social scale or the adoption of a derogatory emotive charge. Pejorated meanings are also common among words denoting diseases, bad habits, social evils, injustice, and other negative concepts.

Semantic changes can trigger shifts in markedness, leading to the specialization or generalization of meaning. This phenomenon involves a transformation in the stylistic status of lexical units, where a marked item becomes unmarked and vice versa.

1. Specialization of Meaning: In cases of specialization, a word with a new meaning is confined to the specialized vocabulary of a particular professional group.

For instance, the term "to glide," originally meaning 'to move gently and smoothly,' has specialized to now signify 'to fly with no engine.' Initially, a "jet" referred to a specific type of airplane, making it a marked item in the stylistic sense. However, over time, the term has become stylistically neutral, and a propeller machine is now considered the special kind.

2. Generalization of Meaning: On the other hand, generalization occurs when a word with an extended meaning transitions from specialized vocabulary into common use. For example, "barn" initially meant 'a place for storing barley' and has now generalized to mean 'a covered building for storing grain.' Similarly, "pioneer," originally referring to a 'soldier,' has generalized to denote 'one who goes before.' Another illustration is the word "vehicle," initially meaning 'a trolley,' which has generalized to encompass all means of transport. In Ukrainian, the word "столяр" first meant 'the man who made tables' but evolved to signify 'a specialist in processing wood and manufacturing things from it.'

These shifts in markedness through specialization and generalization showcase the dynamic nature of language, where words adapt and evolve in response to specific contexts and linguistic needs.

Semantic change is a multifaceted phenomenon, and in some instances, it intertwines with processes occurring at the structural level of linguistic analysis. Several key processes contribute to the semantic evolution of words:

1. Reanalysis: The process of reanalysis involves the reinterpretation of linguistic elements. For example, the Latin morpheme "min," meaning 'little,' is evident in words like "minor" and "minus." However, the emergence of terms like "minimum" and "miniature" led to the reanalysis of "mini-" as a morpheme denoting 'small,' which has become widely adopted in English and German, as seen in words like "minibar," "minicomputer," and "miniskirt."

2. Truncation: Truncation entails the deletion of an element without substitution. This process is often observed in word formation, where certain elements are understood but not explicitly expressed. Examples include the use of

"mini" in the context of "miniskirt." Additionally, compound phrases like "documentary film" and "feature film" may undergo truncation, reducing the head noun "film" to the qualifiers "documentary" and "feature."

3. Meaning Loss through Homophony: Homophony occurs when two distinct words with different meanings become pronounced the same way. In Old English, "lætan" meant 'allow,' and "lettan" meant 'obstruct' or 'hinder.' Over time, these words became homophonous, resulting in the survival of the meaning 'allow' while the obstructive sense was lost, except in expressions like "without let or hindrance."

4. Meaning Change in Discourse: Words may undergo semantic shifts based on their usage in discourse. For instance, words like "but" and "while" originally had different meanings ('outside of' and 'a period,' respectively). Today, they are primarily used as discourse markers to convey contrast or temporal relationships, as in "She rested for a while" or "She took a rest while the others were in the restaurant."

5. Semantic Effect of Grammatical Changes: Grammatical changes can influence semantic shifts. For example, the verb "talk" traditionally took the preposition "about" when discussing inanimate objects (e.g., "talking about the weather"). However, contemporary usage increasingly allows for omitting the preposition, as in "We're talking big money now," adding emphasis and immediacy to the conversation.

These processes highlight the dynamic interplay between semantic change and structural linguistic phenomena, showcasing the intricate nature of language evolution.

Semantic changes in present-day English and Ukrainian are evident through various phenomena such as expansions, restrictions, ameliorations, and deteriorations. Several examples illustrate the dynamic nature of language evolution:

1. Sanction: The word "sanction" demonstrates an unusual semantic development, having acquired two opposite meanings. It can signify 'to allow

something,' as in "They sanctioned the proposal," or 'to forbid something,' especially in the nominalized form, as in "Britain imposed sanctions on the country."

2. Decimate: "Decimate" originally meant to reduce something by one-tenth but has evolved to simply mean to reduce drastically, as seen in the sentence "The staff was decimated by the restructuring of the firm."

3. Joy: The term "joy" has experienced a semantic shift. Formerly, it exclusively denoted a 'pleasurable, euphoric state,' but now it is also used in the sense of success, as in "They got no joy out of the insurance company."

4. Philosophy: "Philosophy," originally a science concerned with reasoning and the pursuit of truth, has broadened its meaning. In contemporary usage, it often refers to 'policy,' as in the sentence "The company's philosophy is to be aggressively competitive."

5. Culture: "Culture," traditionally a collective term referring to the arts and human intellectual achievement, has taken on a new sense. It is now used to denote a 'general set of attitudes and behavioral types, usually in a public context,' as in "The culture of violence in our inner cities."

6. Students: The term "students" has undergone a semantic shift. While traditionally exclusive to those studying at universities, it is increasingly used for pupils, possibly to attribute more adult status to those still in school.

It is crucial to note that semantic changes do not occur in isolation. When one word in a group of semantically related words undergoes a shift, the others are immediately influenced and may react by filling the semantic 'space' left by the moving item. This interconnectedness emphasizes the dynamic nature of language evolution, and the issue of contrastive analysis of lexical fields applying the field approach will be explored in the subsequent lecture.

3. Processes involved in changes of the semantic structure of words.

Semantic change, regardless of its origin, relies on establishing new relationships between existing and new senses of words. Several processes underlie the foundation of these new relationships, with one significant process being metaphorization. Metaphorization is particularly pronounced on the lexical level, and a comparison of linguistic metaphors in English and Ukrainian reveals common features.

Metaphorization: Metaphor, derived from the Greek word "μεταφορά" (transposition), is the result of a semantic process wherein the form of a linguistic unit or expression of a linguistic category is transposed from one object of designation to another based on a perceived similarity between these objects in the speaker's mind. Metaphor essentially relies on comparison and has been extensively discussed by linguists such as Shibles, Тараненко, Теляя, and others. Metaphors can be based on various types of similarity:

A) Similarity by Physical Features:

1. Form and Sight:

Ukrainian: стріла крана (arrow of a crane)

English: head of a cabbage, teeth of a saw

2. Position:

Ukrainian: голова колони (head of a column)

English: foot of the mountain, a page, back of the sofa

3. Sounding:

Ukrainian: барабанити у двері (to drum on the door)

English: drum fingers

4. Peculiarities of Movement:

Ukrainian: коник – комаха (horse-fly), супутник – небесне тіло
(satellite – celestial body)

English: (examples not provided)

5. Peculiarities of Functioning:

Ukrainian: голова зборів (head of the meeting), голова правління (head of the board)

English: Head of the school (of an army, of a procession, of a household), the key to a mystery, leg of the chair

B) Similarity by Physiological and Psychological Impressions:

Synesthetic: Synesthesia, denoting simultaneous perception, reflects the semantic structure of physiological associations between different types of senses.

Synesthetic metaphors can be based on the perception of hearing, sight, touch, taste, etc.

Ukrainian: крикливий (shrill - clothing), високий/низький (high/low - sound), солодкий (sweet - smell, voice, hugs)

English: soft (voice)

Most frequently, these metaphors reflect the sense of touch, with terms like "гострий" (sharp - smell, shine) and "м'який" (soft - voice, light, movement). The sensory directions of sight and hearing are the most productive areas for the development of these metaphors.

Transference in the realm of metaphorization involves various processes, including shifts from the physical world to psychological, social, and abstract spheres, as well as the actualization of emotional-evaluative features. Here's a detailed exploration of these processes:

1. Transference from the Physical World:

Examples in Ukrainian: горіти (завзяттям), гострий (розум), дрібний (урядовець).

English examples: Long (speech), a short (path) – a short (time).

2. Transference through Actualization of Semantic Features:

Examples in Ukrainian: горить (взуття), прірва (безліч).

This involves emphasizing relatively indistinctive semantic features with emotional-evaluative character.

3. Imaginary Similarity:

Instances where similarity exists only in the speaker's imagination.

Example: Addressing someone unfamiliar as "друже – брате" for intimate communication.

Stephan Ullmann's Types of Transference:

a) Anthropomorphic: Involves ascribing human characteristics to non-human entities.

b) Zoomorphic: Involves ascribing animal characteristics to non-animal entities.

c) From Concrete to Abstract: The shift from tangible, concrete concepts to abstract ones.

d) Synesthetic: Involves associating experiences from one sense with another.

e) From Lexical Units Attracting Special Attention: Transference based on societal emphasis.

Societal Values and Lexical Units:

The last type reflects how certain lexical units hold specific positions on the social values scale.

Example: Shift from "religious" and "agricultural" metaphors (чорт, ірод, бусурман; нива, галузь, сіяти добро) to those emphasizing sports, technologies, space investigation, and medical science (цейтнот, хід конем, орбіта інтересів, запрограмуватися на що-небудь, больові точки).

Classification Based on Oppositions (Bad – Good):

Models of metaphoric evaluative lexical units are often classified based on the opposition bad – good.

Examples: "Light – dark" (світло знань – морок нецтва), "warm – cold" (теплий – холодний погляд), "відлига – заморозки" (у суспільстві), "up – down"

(верхи – низи суспільства, high – low position, підноситися – падати духом), “move – stand still” (суспільний рух – застій), and others.

This intricate interplay of metaphorical processes showcases the dynamic nature of language and its responsiveness to cultural shifts, societal values, and individual perceptions.

The second process underlying semantic change is metonymization, a semantic process where the form of a linguistic unit or expression is transferred from one object of designation to another based on their contiguity. Metonymy, derived from Greek *μετωνυμία* (renaming), relies on spatial, temporal, causal, symbolic, instrumental, functional, and other relations between objects as perceived by the speaker.

Metonymic transfer can be conditioned by various relations:

Spatial Relations:

Place names used for the people occupying it (e.g., the bar for lawyers).

Examples like "the town" referring to its inhabitants or "the House" for the members of the House of Lords or Commons.

Words like "аудиторія" and "клас" mean not just the premises but also the people in them.

Substance and Material Relations:

Dishes named for the substance they contain (e.g., "з’їв миску борщу" – ate a bowl of borscht).

Naming a thing after the material it is made of (e.g., "папір" – both the material and the documents).

Instrumental Relations:

Using the instrument instead of the agent, such as "the best pens of the day" for the best modern writers or referring to handwriting as "hand."

Functional Relations:

Transferring the name from one subject to another, like "воротар" evolving from meaning 'the guardian of the gate' to 'the person who defends gates in football.'

A common metonymic device is synecdoche, where a part of something is used to refer to the whole or vice versa. For example, "a pair of hands" for 'a worker' or using "ABC" for the entire alphabet. Unlike synecdoche, metonymy involves substituting a word closely linked to the referred thing, which is not necessarily a part of it.

Examples of metonymic transference include substituting:

The container for the thing contained (e.g., "склянка" – a cup, "зал" – a hall).

Metonymy plays a crucial role in shaping the meanings of words, allowing speakers to convey nuanced associations and facilitating the evolution of language over time.

Continuing with the discussion of metonymy, the process involves substituting one thing for another based on contiguity, and various types of metonymic transfers can occur:

Material for the Thing Made of It:

Ukr.: "чай, салат" (plant – dish), "золото" (gold – articles made of gold)

Eng.: "marble" (the statue made of marble), "silver" (coin), "glass" (articles made of glass)

Object for What is On It:

Ukr.: "стіл" (food), "лікті" (propped up)

Eng.: "dish"

Object for a Certain Activity:

Ukr.: "корона, скіпетр, трон" (crown, scepter, throne – monarch's power), "булава" (mace – hetmanate)

Eng.: "the crown"

Sign for the Thing Signified:

Ukr.: "номер" (a copy of a newspaper or magazine, a room in a hotel, a specific artist's performance), "трійка" (playing card, tram No.

Eng.: "from the cradle to the grave" (from childhood to death), "arena" (Latin 'sand' – a reminder of ancient amphitheater floors)

Feature for its Subject:

Ukr.: "магістр, граф" (about the title holder), "талант" (he is talented), "симпатія" (about a person), "весілля" (celebration)

Eng.: "the authorities" (were greeted)

Beyond metaphor and metonymy, other types of semantic change exist:

Hyperbole (Overexaggeration):

Based on intentional exaggeration to make the image more distinct.

Ukr.: "півтора чоловіка" (very few people), "море крові" (a sea of blood)

Eng.: "haven't seen you for ages," "I hate troubling you," "a thousand thanks"

Litotes (Simplicity):

Aiming to make a statement less categorical through indirect designation by negating the opposite notion.

Ukr.: "не заперечую" (I don't deny – I agree), "неважко" (not difficult – easy)

Eng.: "no coward," "not bad," "I could do with a cup of coffee"

These processes contribute to the richness and flexibility of language, allowing speakers to convey nuanced meanings and express various shades of emotion and emphasis.

Irony (Mockery):

Irony occurs when a word with a positive or assertive connotation is used to denote opposite characteristics, usually with a specific intonation.

Ukr.: "святий та божий" (holy and godly – sarcastically referring to someone), "частувати" (to treat with a stick – to punish), "нагородити" (to decorate – to scold), "бatalія" (battle – quarrel, fight)

Eng.: "a pretty mess"

Euphemism (Mild Expression):

Euphemism involves using a word or phrase for indirect, mild, and polite designation of certain objects, phenomena, or actions, often to avoid using their primary names.

Ukr.: "нерозумний" (unwise – instead of 'foolish'), "на заслужений відпочинок" (on a well-deserved rest – retired), "пішов з життя" (went from life – passed away), "знайтися" (to be found – to be born)

Eng.: "queer" (mad – referring to sexual orientation), "deceased" (dead), "elevated" (drunk)

These processes, including irony and euphemism, showcase the dynamic nature of language, its ability to adapt to social, cultural, and emotional nuances, and the creative ways in which speakers express meaning. They also demonstrate how language can be influenced by cultural shifts and societal norms.

Theme questions:

1. How do the key areas explored in lexical semantics align with the three methodological approaches used in comparative lexicological research?
2. What factors can lead to alterations in the meaning of a word?
3. Do you concur with Rudi Keller's assertion that "unraveling shifts in a word's meaning requires an understanding of how and why the regulations governing its use have changed"? State your rationale.
4. Enumerate and provide instances of the four primary categories of semantic evolution in English and Ukrainian.
5. Illustrate the association between semantic transformation and procedures related to the structural examination level.
6. On what processes of creating novel connections between the current and updated meanings of a word do semantic changes rely?

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Andreichuk N. I., Babeliuk O. A. Contrastive lexicology of English and Ukrainian languages: theory and practice : textbook. Kherson: Publishing House “Helvetica”, 2019. 236 с.
2. A course in Contrastive Lexicology of the English and Ukrainian Languages: навч. посібник. Київ : Видавничий центр КНЛУ, 2020. 460 с.
3. Comparative Lexicology of the Ukrainian and English Languages: навч. посіб. із порівняльної лексикології англ. та укр. мов. Нар. укр. акад. Харків : Вид-во НУА, 2018. 104 с. (не перевидавалось).
4. Contrastive Stylistics and Grammar of English and Ukrainian : lecture notes / compiler S. V. Baranova. Sumy : Sumy State University, 2021. 63 р.
5. Лексикологія англійської мови: навчально-методичний посібник. Уманський держ. пед. ун-т імені Павла Тичини; укладачі: І. О. Білецька, Н. В. Ставчук Умань: Візаві, 2019. 165 р.
6. Contrastive Grammar: Theory and Practice = Порівняльна грамати́ка: теорія і практика: навч. посіб: Київ. ун-т. ім. Б. Грінченка; Нац. ун-т «Києво-Могилянська акад.». К., 2019. 296 с.
7. English Lexicology : tutorial /O. L. Ilienکو, I. A. Kamienieva, Ye. S. Moshtagh ; O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv. Kharkiv : Publishing House I. Ivanchenko, 2020. 218 р. (не перевидавалось).
8. Howard Jackson An Introduction to English Lexicology: Words, Meaning and Vocabulary, 3rd Edition. Bloomsbury Academic. 2021.
9. Laurie Bauer An Introduction to English Lexicology (Edinburgh Textbooks on the English Language). Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh. 2021.

Інформаційні ресурси в Інтернеті

1. <http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/29701/1/4.pdf>
2. English Lexicology for Students: <http://englishlexicology.blogspot.com/>

3. Lexis – Journal in English Lexicology: <https://journals.openedition.org/lexis/>
4. Applied English Lexicology: A Course. – Available at: <http://eldum.phil.muni.cz>
5. Cambridge Dictionary. – Available at: <http://dictionary.cambridge.org>
6. English Grammar Links for ESL Students – Available at: <http://www.g1.umbc.edu/~kpokoyl/grammarl.htm>
7. Longman English Dictionary. – Available at: <http://www.ldoceonline.com/>
8. Macmillan English Dictionary and Thesaurus. – Available at: <http://www.macmillandictionary.com/>
9. Online English Thesaurus. – Available at: <http://www.lingvozone.com/free-online-thesaurus>
10. Original Reading Material on the WWW. – Available at: <http://www.short-stories.co.uk>
11. Resources for Studying English Words and Usage, Semantics, and Textual Structure. – Available at: <http://faculty.washington.edu>
12. The Internet Grammar of English. Survey of English Usage, Department of English Language and Literature at University College, London. – Available at: <http://www.ucl.ac.uk>.
13. Thesaurus. – Available at: <http://thesaurus.reference.com>
14. Vocabulary Resources to Enhance Your Word Skills: Focusing on the English vocabulary & etymology. – Available at: <http://www.wordfocus.com>
15. Word Play. – Available at: <http://www.wolinskyweb.com/word.htm>.
16. Words-R-Us. – Available at: <http://www.aureole.com>
17. Writer's Web. – Available at: <http://www.urich.edu/~writing/wweb.html>