....

Olga MIGORIAN,
orcid.org/0000-0003-3662-319X
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the English Language Department
of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
(Chernivtsi, Ukraine) viznukf@gmail.com

Tetyana PAVLOVYCH,
orcid.org/0000-0003-2483-6390
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the English Language Department
of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
(Chernivtsi, Ukraine) tetyana_777@ukr.net

THE PECULIARITIES OF THE PREFIXAL WORD-FORMATION PROCESS OF THE ONOMASIOLOGICAL CATEGORY OF NEGATION

The article deals with the study of the formation of the prefixal and onomasiological category of Negation in Old English, Middle English, Early New English and New English Periods. The description of this category is based on the analysis of above 738 prefixal derivatives. Structural and semantic patterns have been determined as reflected in lexico-graphical sources of different time reference. The complex diachronical study of the English prefixal derivatives from the point of view of their word-formation potential within the onomasiological category of Negation was made. The research focuses on the structural, notional and nominative peculiarities of substantive and verbal prefixal derivatives of the on-omasiological category of Negation during four periods of the English language development. It gives the possibility of analyzing the character of considerable changes in its semantic and onomasiological structures within the frame of the onomasiological category of Negation during the English language development. The main characteristics of the forma-tion of the onomasiological category of Negation have been described upon the basis of the combinable peculiarities of prefixes with verbal and also substantive derivative bases of different lexico-semantic groups as integral components of the patterns, which are typical ones for the prefixal and onomasiological category of Negation. Thus, in the article lexical and semantic groups of derivative bases are singled out as they actively organize onomasiological categories during dif-ferent time periods of English language development; structural and semantic models are outlined, the most productive are highlighted; the development of notional peculiarities of compatibility of lexical and semantic groups of verbal and substantive bases and prefixes of onomasiological category of Negation is observed.

Key words: *verbal derivative basis, substantive derivative basis, negation category, onomasiology, prefixation, word-formation, diachrony.*

Ольга МІГОРЯН,
orcid.org/0000-0003-3662-319X
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри англійської мови
Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича
(Чернівці, Україна) viznukf@gmail.com

Тетяна ПАВЛОВИЧ,
orcid.org/0000-0003-2483-6390
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри англійської мови
Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича
(Чернівці, Україна) tetyana_777@ukr.net

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ПРЕФІКСАЛЬНОГО СЛОВОТВОРЕННЯ ОНОМАСІОЛОГІЧНОЇ КАТЕГОРІЇ ЗАПЕРЕЧЕННЯ

У статті описуються особливості формування префіксально-ономасіологічної категорії заперечення у дав-ньоанглійський, середньоанглійський, ранньоновоанглійський та новоанглійський періоди. Різнобічне вивчення дериваційного аспекту формування префіксально-ономасіологічної категорії заперечення за весь письмово за-

....

фіксований період розвитку англійської мови дає можливість розкрити природу її смислової структури; простежити основні тенденції її розвитку в англійській мові, а також зміни її смислових меж та основного складу від епохи до епохи. Опис цієї категорії ґрунтується на аналізі 738 префіксальних похідних. Зроблено комплексне діахронічне дослідження англійських префіксальних похідних з точки зору їх словотворчого потенціалу в межах ономасіологічної категорії заперечення. Дослідження фокусується на структурних, смислових та номінативних особливостях субстантивних та дієслівних префіксальних похідних ономасіологічної категорії заперечення протягом чотирьох періодів розвитку англійської мови. Це дає можливість проаналізувати характер основних змін у семантичних та ономасіологічних структурах ономасіологічної категорії заперечення протягом її розвитку. Основні характеристики формування ономасіологічної категорії заперечення були описані на основі особливостей сполучуваності префіксів із субстантивними, а також дієслівними твірними основами різних лексико-семантичних груп як невід'ємних компонентів структурних моделей, які є характерними для префіксально-ономасіологічної категорії заперечення. Так, у статті виділено лексико-семантичні групи твірних основ, особливо ті, які активно утворюють ономасіологічну категорію в різні часові періоди розвитку англійської мови; окреслені структурні та смислові моделі, виділено найбільш продуктивні; спостерігається розвиток умовних особливостей сполучуваності лексико-семантичних груп дієслівних та субстантивних основ з префіксами ономасіологічної категорії заперечення.

Ключові слова: *дієслівна твірна основа, субстантивна твірна основа, категорія заперечення, ономасіологія, префіксація, словотворення, діахронія.*

Formulation of the problem. The study of word-formation processes, which resulted in the genesis of the current system of language derivative units and changes that have been subjected to its separate parts since their inception, is among the topical issues of modern theoretical linguistics.

The focus of this type of research is the formation problems of structural, semantic and onomasiological schemes within the same derivative word, one and the same word-building model. The idea of this approach is to show, if the new act of word-formation is always a reflection of the past acts of the nomination, and if so what is the nature of such a certainty (Kizyukevich, 1989: 47–55).

Problem analysis. The question of the diversity, specificity and onomasiological boundaries of the ways of morphological phenomena word-formation, which accompany the process of derivation and influence its "tactical" capabilities, is quite elaborated in well-known works of famous linguists (Zemskaya, 2004; Lopatin, 1974; Kubryakova, 2008; Poluzhin, 1992; Selivanova, 2008; Ulukhanov, 1980) and other authors. However, an integral and consistent perception that would represent the dynamics of those derivative and onomasiological mechanisms that has led the system of prefixal and onomasiological category of Negation to the formation of its present state has not been created yet. Therefore, there is an urgent need for a profound study of multidirectional evolutionary changes associated with the formation and further development of nominative processes that took place in the history of the development of this category.

The combination of diachronical and synchronic approaches in the English prefixal derivatives research will give us possibility, in our point of view, not only to generalize categorization regularities of environmental phenomena, but also to single out

and try to explain formation reasons of the system of phenomena that are specific for the onomasiological category of Negation. Environmental phenomena were grouped according to their meanings into the lexical and semantic groups to make the mechanism of the category formation with the help of prefixal units convenient.

The objective of the article is to investigate in detail the derivative aspect of the formation of the prefixal and onomasiological category of negation during the entire written period of the English language development.

To achieve the objective the following tasks should be done:

– to single out lexical and semantic groups (hereinafter – LSG) of derivative bases taking part proximately in the formation of the prefixal and onomasiological category of Negation;

– to observe the development of notional peculiarities of compatibility of LSG of verbal and substantive bases and prefixes of onomasiological category of Negation;

– to compare derivative peculiarities of formation of prefixal and onomasiological category of Negation arising from verbal and substantive bases, and within them, lexical and semantic origin of derivative bases studied as components of derivatives.

The object of the investigation is 11000 prefixal derivatives, of which 738 lexical units represent the onomasiological category of Negation during four periods of the English language development.

The subject of the article is structural, semantic and nominative peculiarities of verbal and substantive prefixal derivatives taking part in the formation of the prefixal and onomasiological category of Negation during all lexicalized periods of the English language development.

Statement of the main material. The investigation of onomasiological functions of derivative words related primarily to the investigation of the method of transformation of knowledge about the phenomena of reality into the content transmitted by the dissected structure of verbal nominative mark. Nowadays the definition proposed by O. Selivanova has become widespread. She said: "onomasiological structure of prefixal derivatives consists of the onomasiological basis, indicating a conceptual class, generic notion, and of the onomasiological sign, indicating the specific differences that distinguish the object within the class" (Selivanova, 2008: 153).

The prefixal onomasiologic sign of the derivatives under investigation is considered the notion of negation, the onomasiological basis is formed by the derivative bases of the derivatives. Negation in linguistic literature is assumed as expression through various linguistic devices of such state of things when the relationship between the elements of expression is perceived as a real or nonexistent at some point (Polyuzhyn, 2008: 30). To determine the conceptual class of the onomasiological basis, we have singled out lexical-grammatical and lexical-semantic groups of the derivative bases.

We have singled out 9 LSG of verbal derivative bases: 1) *verbs of phase* (V_1); 2) *verbs of motion* (V_2); 3) *verbs of presence* (V_3); 4) *verbs of location* (V_4); 5) *verbs of being* (V_5); 6) *verbs of feelings* (V_6); 7) *verbs of intellectual activity* (V_7); 8) *verbs of physical activity* (V_8); 9) *verbs of communication* (V_9) and 19 LSG of substantive derivative bases: N_1. *environment and geography*, N_2. *weather and natural calamity*, N_3. *geometry and size*, N_4. *time*, N_5. *subjects and substance*, N_6. *representatives of plants and animals*, N_7. *human being*, N_8. *houses and buildings*, N_9. *clothes*, N_{10}. *nourishment*, N_{11}. *emotions*, N_{12}. *intellect*, N_{13}. *culture and science*, N_{14}. *actions*, N_{15}. *movement and transport*, N_{16}. *communication*, N_{17}. *social entities and phenomena*, N_{18}. *diseases and their treatment*, N_{19}. *physical state*.

According to the results of the investigation, the largest number of LSG of the productive substantive bases is involved in the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation (OCN) – all 19 of investigated units. However, such a representation of the OCN was not a characteristic of the first two stages of the development of the English language. In the Old English language, it was represented by only five LSG with the notions of: *"human being"; "emotions"; "Intellect"; "actions"; "communication"*. In Middle English their inventory has been replenished with nine LSG*: "geometry and sizes"; "time"; "representatives of plants and animals";* *"clothes"; "nourishment"; "culture and science"; "social entities and phenomena"; "diseases and their treatment"; "physical state";* in the early English – *"environment and geography"*; *"weather and natural calamity"*; *"subjects and substance"*; *"houses and buildings"*; *"movement and transport"*.

While during four periods of development of the English language, the value of the category of Negation is acquired by a small number of LSG of verbal derivative bases that reflect the phenomena of the world: LSG with notion of *"motion"* and *"physical activity"*. We also discovered LSG of verbal derivative bases that emphasized negation during one or two stages in the development of the English language: LSG with the notion of *"communication"* – in Old English and Early English languages, LSG with the notion of *"location"*, *"intellectual activity"*, *"feelings"* – in Middle English.

The nucleus, the main structure, and the periphery of the onomasiological category of Negation at each stage of development of the English language were replenished with new components. The main structure of the Old English period consisted of the following LSG: N_{11}, N_{12}, N_{16}, in the Middle English, it was replenished with LSG N_7 and N_{14} and also with N_{17} and N_{19} that came from the periphery. In the Early New English the periphery LSG N_9, N_{13} together with LSG N_1, N_2, N_5, N_{15}, passed over to the main structure of the prefixal onomasiological category of Negation. The nucleus of this category in the Old English language was LSG N_{11} and N_{16}, in Middle English it expanded with the help of LSG N_{12} from the main structure, in the Early English period, this nucleus consisted of LSG N_7, N_{14}, N_{17}, which also came from the main structure. The periphery was formed in the Old English period with the participation of LSG N_7 and N_{14}, in Middle English these LSG were displaced into the main structure and formed it together with other LSG such as: N_3, N_4, N_6, N_9, N_{10}, N_{13}, N_{18} and in Early New English it was supplemented with LSG N_8.

Structural and semantic models, which are typical for the onomasiological category of Negation, remained productive or unproductive throughout the history of the English language development. For example, the model $Pr + N \rightarrow D$ is productive; the models $Pr + N_1 \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_2 \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_3 \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_4 \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_5 \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_6 \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_8 \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_9 \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_{10} \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_{13} \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_{15} \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_{18} \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_{19} \rightarrow D$ are non-productive, $Pr + N_{12} \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_{16} \rightarrow D$ are models that have already become productive in the Middle English Language, and models $Pr + N_7 \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_{14} \rightarrow D$, $Pr + N_{15} \rightarrow D$ have already become productive in the Early English period.

Let's consider the main characteristics that appear in LSG during the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation. To do this, we will trace the peculiarities of the compatibility dynamics of the LSG of the onomasiological category of Negation with its prefixes.

In the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation, the following basic LSG are involved: N_{11}, N_{12}, N_{16}. The semantic potential of LSG N_{11} of this category was implemented in ascending order during the four periods of the English language development. So, in the Old English language, it was combined with prefixes: **med-, or-, un-, wan-.** A significant number of prefixes of LSG N_{11}, which is half of the current prefixal inventory of the onomasiological category of Negation, was used in the Middle English period. They are: **dis-, mis-, non**-, at the same time derivatives of this onomasiological category, formed with the participation of **med-** are ceased to be used in this period. In the Early New English language, the category set of prefixes changed, as derivatives stopped to be formed with the help of authentic prefixes: **non-, or-, un-, wan-.** These prefixes were replaced by such prefixes as: **a-, semi-,** that participate in the formation of quite a large number of new lexical units. For example, *or-treowness (trust) – o.e. distrust.*

In the Old English language LSG N_{12}, forming the onomasiological category of Negation, combined with the prefix **un-**, which continues to participate in the formation of derivatives up to the New England period. In Middle English, this group began to combine with prefixes: **dis-, in-, non**-, with which the derivatives still exist, and prefixes: **over-, on-, re-.** But, derivatives, formed with the last three mentioned prefixes, were out of the use in Early New English. The modern inventory of LSG N_{12} prefixes of this category, was formed mainly in the Middle English and Early New English periods, where it began to be combined with prefixes: **mis-, non, under-.** For example, ***un**-gewittigness (mind) – o.e. madness.*

The high activity of LSG N_{16} of the onomasiological category of Negation was manifested in the Middle English period by the combinability with the prefixes: **dis-, ex-, in-** and also **mis-, or-, un-,** which began to participate in the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation in the Old English language. In the Early New English language, the prefixes inventory of the mentioned LSG was replenished at the expense of such units as: **ab-, non-, under-.** At the same time, the prefixes **or-** and **un-** went out of the use. For example, ***dis**-board – n.e. to disembark.*

The onomasiological category of Negation is also characterized by LSG, the word-building potential of which has expanded. They are: $N_7, N_{13}, N_{14}, N_{17}, N_{19}$.

LSG N_7 and N_{14} have formed the onomasiological category of Negation since the Old English period and underwent significant expansion of their word-building potential in the Early English language. So, LSG N_7 in the Early New English language combined with most of the inventory of prefixes that are involved in the formation of this category: **anti-, be-, ex-, non, semi-, under-.** The word-formation models of this LSG were replenished by Negation prefixes, which constitute a peculiar "foundation" of this category in combinability with LSG N_7, as they are involved in its formation during the four periods of the English language development. They are: **un-** from Old English and **dis-** from Middle English. During the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation, LSG N_7 was also combined with prefixes that ceased to form derivatives in the Middle English Language: **wan-**; and in the Early New English Language: **de-, non-,** but their disappear did not significantly affect its development. For example, ***wan-** + bode (messenger) – o.e. who bids a low price.*

The main extension of LSG N_{14} of the onomasiological category of Negation was in the Early New English Language, as the current inventory of prefixes of this category consists of the prefixes: **ex-, semi-, and under-,** which began to give the meaning of the negation to LSG N_{14} in Early New English, and the basic prefixes, which participated in the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation for last three periods of the English language development, are: **in-, non-.** The number of prefixes that stopped forming derivatives of the onomasiological category of Negation are not significant (2 lexical units). They are **dis-** in Middle English and **un-** in Early New English. This fact, however, did not dilute the word-building potential of LSG N_{14} during the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation. For example, ***non**-packing – m.e. unpacking.*

LSG N_{13}, N_{17}, N_{19} have formed the onomasiological category of Negation since the Middle English period but the significant realization of their word-building potential took place in the Early New English period. So, LSG N_{13} combined with the prefix **in-** in Middle English, and in the Early New English period its inventory was replenished at the expense of such prefixes as: **a-, apo-, extra-, non-, semi-.** For example, *ir-religiosite (religiosity) – m.e. irreligiousness.* LSG N_{17} came into the Middle English period with prefixes: **de-, mis-, non-,** and in the Early New English period the prefix **mis-** was forced out by the prefix **under-.** For example, ***mis**-order – m.e. absence or breach of order.*

Two prefixes of LSG N_{19}, which make up the half of its modern prefixal inventory, came into the use

in the Early New English period. They are: **non-** and **under-**. Among other prefixes of LSG N_{19} we focused on **un-**, since its derivatives were found only in the Old English Language, as well as on the borrowed prefix **in-** in the Middle English period, as this prefix together with LSG N_{19} has still been participating actively in the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation. For example, ***non-being – e.n.e. the condition of not being, non-existence.***

We also found LSG of the onomasiological category of Negation, the word-building potential of which is realized insignificantly or in no way, they are: $N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4, N_5, N_6, N_8, N_9, N_{10}, N_{15}, N_{18}$. These LSG began to form the onomasiological category of Negation in the Middle English or the Early New English periods.

LSG $N_3, N_4, N_6, N_9, N_{10}, N_{18}$ have been involved in the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation since the Middle English Language. So, LSG N_3 in the Middle English period was combined with the prefixes: **in-** and **un-**, which in the early New English were forced out by the prefix **under-**. For example, ***im-propotion – m.e. want of proportion, disproportion.*** LSG N_4 began to combine with the prefix **un-** in the Middle English Language, which was forced out by **non-** in the Early New English. For example, ***un-time – e.n.e. unseasonable, inopportune (non-seasonal).*** LSG N_6 was combined with the prefix **de-** in the Middle English period, which was forced out by **dis-** and **ex-** in Early New English. For example, ***dis-plume – n.e. to strip of plumes, moult (without action).*** LSG N_9, forming the onomasiological category of Negation, was combined with the prefix **dis-** in the Middle English Language and replenished its inventory with the help of such prefixes as: **be-** and **in-** in Early New English. For example, ***dis-helm – m.e. to deprive or disarm of one's helmet (deprive a helmet).*** The modern system of prefixes of LSG N_{10} of the onomasiological category of Negation was formed in the Middle English period with the help of prefixes **dis-** and **in-**, which, without any changes, have participated in the formation of this onomasiological category nowadays. For example, ***in-digestion – n.e. want of digestion.*** LSG N_{18} of the onomasiological category of Negation was combined with the prefix **un-** in the Middle English Language, which in the Early New English Language was forced out by two prefixes **a-** and **in-**. For example*, **a-catastasis – n.e. an unsettling (unstable state).***

LSG $N_1, N_2, N_5, N_8, N_{15}$ have been involved in the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation only since the Early New English period. So, LSG N_1 was combined with prefixes: **dis-, in-, under-**; LSG N_2 with **be-, in-**; LSG N_5 with **dis-, in-**; LSG N_8 with **dis-, under-**; LSG N_{15} with **dis-, ex-, under-**. For example, ***dis-room – e.n.e. to displace; be-flake – n.e. to take off an external layer, skin in thin flakes; dis-pearl – e.n.e. to deprive of pearls.***

A small number of verbal bases LSG, participating in the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation, does not allow to single out the nucleus, the main corpus and the periphery of this category. Structural and semantic models of these LSG were also not characterized by high productivity. There is an exception to the model $Pr + V_8 > V$, which was productive only in the Old English and Middle English periods. Another productive model was $Pr + V_6 > V$ in the Middle English Language. Other models such as $Pr + V_9 > V$, $Pr + V_2 > V$, $Pr + V_7 > V$, $Pr + V_4 > V$ were non-productive.

LSG V_8 took an active part in the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation in the first two periods of development of the English language. In the Old English Language, this group was combined with the prefixes: **be-, for-, to-**, for example**,** ***be-dælan (divide) – o.e. to deprive, rob, strip.*** In Middle English its inventory was replenished with **mis-**, but in this period LSG V_8 also stopped forming verbal derivatives with the prefix **for-**. In Early New English, its word-building potential was expanded with the help of the prefix **ex-** while authentic prefixes **be-, to-, mis-** went out of the use.

LSG V_9 participated in the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation only during the first two periods of the English language development; during next two phases, its verbal derivatives were not singled out. In the Old English Language it was combined with the prefixes **be-** and **for-**. For example, ***be-tellan – o.e. to clear a person of a charge.*** In Middle English its combinability was extended with the help of the prefix **mis-**, but the prefix **for-** went out of the use. In Early New English, LSG V_9 stopped to form verbal derivatives involving prefixes **be-** and **mis-**.

In the Old English Language LSG V_2 formed the onomasiological category of Negation with the prefixes **be-, for-, to-**, in Middle English its inventory was replenished at the expense of the prefixes **mis-** and **un-**. For example, ***un-lay – m.e. not to lay.*** However, in the Middle English period, the prefix **for-** went out of the use, and in Early New English prefixes **mis-** and **to-** stopped forming derivatives.

LSG V_4, V_7, V_6 participated in the formation of the onomasiological category of Negation only during one period of the English language development. It was Middle English. Thus LSG V_4 combined with prefixes **æt-, mis-, to-**; LSG V_7 and V_6 formed derivatives with the prefixes **a-** and **for-**. For example, ***a-schamien – m .e. to make ashamed,***

*put to shame; **for**-dwinan (blossom) – m .e. to fade away, dwindle away.*

Conclusions. The realization of the LSG of the onomasiological category of Negation has been representing ascending quantifiers during the four periods of the English language development, what proves the fact that the substantive derivative bases were not active during early stages of its formation. The main corpus and nucleus of the onomasiological category of Negation underwent expansion due to increased productivity of their components, and the periphery develops due to the appearance of new LSG. The onomasiological category of Negation has been represented by 2 out of 9 LSG of singled out verbal derivative bases during the four periods of the English language development. They are LSG denoting "*verbs of motion*", "*verbs of physical activity*". Other LSG of derivative bases denoting "*verbs of communication*", "*verbs of feelings*", "*verbs of location*", "*verbs of intellectual activity*" also acquired the notion of negation in certain periods of the English language development.

The onomasiological category of Negation was formed by the following nucleus LSG of substantive derivative bases: N_{11}, N_{12}, N_{16}; the word-building potential of LSG N_7, N_{13}, N_{14}, N_{17}, N_{19} has expanded; the word-building potential of LSG N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4, N_5, N_6, N_8, N_9, N_{10}, N_{15}, N_{18} is realized insignificantly or in no way. As to the LSG of the verbal derivative bases of this category, they are characterized by the LSG, the word-building potential of which is realized in a small or in no way. Besides, in each period of English language LSG of the verbal derivative bases were combined with diverse prefixes, the number of which was small (1–3 units). They are LSG V_8, V_9, V_2, V_6, V_7, V_4. Due to the mentioned results above, we have come to the conclusion that the onomasiological category of Negation is basically the substantive, but not the verbal category. The prospect for our further study is to investigate the role of adjective and adverbial derivatives in the formation of the prefixal and onomasiological category of Negation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Земская Е. А. Язык как деятельность: Морфема. Слово. Речь. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2004. 688 с.
2. Кизюкевич А. А. Структурно-семантические и оносемасиологические аспекты транспозиции как особого способа наименования явлений действительности : автореф. дис. на соиск. учен. степ. канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.19 «Теория языка». Москва, 1989. 19 с.
3. Кубрякова Е. С. Части речи в ономасиологическом освещении : монография. 2-е изд. Москва : ЛКИ, 2008. 120 с.
4. Лопатин В. В. Словообразование как объект грамматического описания (концепции и методы). Грамматическое описание славянских языков. Москва, 1974. С. 47–60.
5. Полюжин М. М. Диахронно-семантический аспект префиксального словообразования в английском языке : автореф. дис. на соиск. учен. степ. док. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 «Германские языки». Москва, 1992. 42 с.
6. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми : підручник. Полтава : Довкілля, 2008. 712 с.
7. Улуханов И. С. Структура лексических значений мотивированных слов. *Вопросы словообразования и фразообразования в германских языках* : сб. науч. тр. 1980. Вып. 164. С. 105–112.

REFERENCES

1. Zemskaya, E. A. (2004). Yazyk kak deyatelnost : Morphema. Slovo. Rech. [Language as Activity: Morpheme. Word. Speech]. Moskva : Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury, 688 pp. [in Russian].
2. Kizyukevich, A. A. (1989). Strukturno-semanticheskie i onomasiologicheskie aspekty transpozitsii kak osobogo sposoba naymenovania yavleniy deystvitelnosti [Structural, semantic and onomasiological aspects of transposition as a special way of nomination of reality phenomena]: extended abstract of Candidate's thesis: special. 10.02.19. "Language Theory". Moskva, 19 pp. [in Russian].
3. Kubryakova, E. S. (2008). Chasti rechi v onomasiologicheskom osvesheniy [Parts of speech in onomasiological interpretation]: monograph. Moscow: LKI, 120 pp. [in Russian].
4. Lopatin, V. V. (1974). Slovoobrazovanie kak obect gramaticheskoho opisaniya (kontseptsyi i metody) [Word formation as an object of grammatical description (concepts and methods)]. Grammar description of Slavic languages. Moskva, pp. 47–60 [in Russian].
5. Polyuzhyn, M. M. (1992). Diahronno-semanticheskiy aspect prefixalnogo slovoobrazovaniya v angliyskom yazyke [Diachronic and semantic aspects of prefixal word-formation in English]: extended abstract of Doctor's thesis: special. 10.02.04. "German Languages". Moscow, 42 pp. [in Russian].
6. Selivanova, O. O. (2008). Sychasna lingvistyka: napryamy ta problemy [Modern Linguistics: Directions and Problems]: textbook. Poltava: Dovkillya, 712 pp. [in Ukrainian].
7. Ulukhanov, I. S. (1980). Stryktyra leksicheskih znacheniy motivirovanykh slov [Structure of lexical meanings of motivated words]. Questions of Word Formation and Phrase Formation in Germanic Languages. Issue 164. Pp. 105–112 [in Russian].