

политической, общественной и спортивной областях. Контаминация представляет собой вариант языковой игры и одновременно вид словообразования. Сам строй немецкого языка благоприятствует возникновению такого вида языковой игры. Контаминация служит средством создания комического и одновременно оценочности высказывания. Структурно наиболее популярной и в немецком, и в русском языке является модель 2 (варианты а + б), т. е. слияние сегмента одного слова с другим словом. Определённые различия наблюдаются при этом в семантике немецких и русских контаминантов. С точки зрения экспрессивной оценочности русские политические контаминанты чаще и острее выражают сатиру, в отличие от немецких, которые демонстрируют склонность к юмору.

**Ключевые слова:** контаминация, типы и модели, языковая игра, язык политики, словообразование, экспрессивность, оценочность.

A. G. Golodov

#### **The problem of classifying contaminations (on the material of political journalism)**

*This article deals with structural classification of contaminants according to their types and models. Contaminants are subdivided according to their types which, in their turn, can include several models. Contamination is a verbal response to particularly interesting events in political, social and sport spheres. Contamination represents a variant of language game and a kind of word-building at the same time. The structure of the German language is favorable to this kind of language game. Contamination serves to create humorous effect and utterance evaluation. Model 2 (variants a + b) is structurally most popular both in German and English i. e. blending of a part of word with another one. Thus certain variants are observed in semantics of German and Russian contaminants. From the point of view of expressive appreciation Russian political contaminants express satire more acutely and often unlike German contaminants that are inclined to humour.*

**Key words:** contamination, types and models, language game, political language, word-formation, expressiveness, evaluation.

УДК 811. 161. 2

H. V. Kocherha

#### **FORMATION STAGES OF UKRAINIAN SUFFIX SUBSYSTEM IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORLD LANGUAGE PICTURE EVOLUTION**

*The article is focused on the analysis of Ukrainian suffixation prehistory in cognitive aspect. In the most general terms, the genesis and development of Ukrainian suffix means is divided into two stages – prehistoric and historic. The first one involves Nostratic, Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Slavic levels and relates to the periods when Ukrainian did not exist as a separate language system, but its material was created within the previous language systems. The feature of these language systems, which complicates their linguistic and cognitive interpretation, lies in the fact that all of them are not attested in writing but reconstructed; and it necessarily involves more or less fragmentary character and excludes the completeness and integrity of the description; it does not allow to interpret details and the description to typical generalizations. The historical stage of Ukrainian suffixation development, particularly its substantival part, involves the evolution of language means from Kievan Rus era to the present time. There are numerous written chronicles of the language at this stage. The processes related to the specific cognitive character of suffixation were originated in prehistoric periods which continued in the history of the Ukrainian language. Thus, the denotation of passivity, substantivity, etc. by means of the formants which later became suffixes, was reconstructed in Proto-Nostratic period; the suffixes which gave the stem general and abstract semantic existed in Proto-Indo-European era and were inherited in partial or transformed form by certain Indo-European languages. The suffix lexemes of the Latin language were borrowed by Slavs in Proto-Slavic period (during the oral contacts of language speakers), and this influence lasted throughout the history of the Ukrainian language mainly in the form of literary borrowing when Latin was not a living ethnic language. The contacts were primarily in the sphere of profession and position denotations. The suffix of verbal noun was borrowed from German through Polish despite the existence of Ukrainian means for this semantics. This fact can show not only the intensive Ukrainian-Polish language contacts but also the need of such a means in the language.*

**Key words:** suffixation, world language picture, lexeme, suffix subsystem of the language, semantics, cognitive derivatology.

**Problem formulation.** The investigation of cognitive derivatology in terms of Ukrainian suffix subsystem in the context of world language picture evolution pays insufficient attention to such problems as historical (diachronic) word formation, cognitive aspects of word formation (if compared with cognitive

research of vocabulary and phraseology), the need of historical word formation interpretation as the reflection of idiom-ethnic features of the language categorization in the world. The Ukrainian language, like any other, reflects the specific character of national mentality which is unique for each language-thinking of the world conceptualization. Morphological word formation is the main source of replenishing substantival system in all stages of Ukrainian historical development [1; 6]. Suffixation is a common way of derivation in all stages of Ukrainian and other Slavic languages historical development [14, p. 15]. The goal of Ukrainian suffix subsystem research is to construct the complex model of Ukrainian formation and historical development, in terms of affix means evolution, in particular, and to clarify its specific typological character in comparison to other Slavic and non-Slavic Indo-European languages in order to model the world language picture development in the Ukrainian mentality. O. M. Trubachov, stressing the connection of different branches of historical linguistics, points out that in terms of Slavic language material the antithesis of historical lexicology and historical word formation is largely artificial. He considers the antithesis of historical lexicology and etymology to be artificial too [11, p. 3].

Thus, it should be noted that etymological study is of paramount importance in the complex and cognitive interpretation of historical word formation of facts and mental-cultural context in which this word formation took place and interacted with other language means. The etymological study involves the use of comparative and historical research method of language material (Fakhrutdynova [12] applies comparative linguistic approach to historical word formation in the group of related languages; Burykin [3] – in the group of language family).

**The analysis of the latest research and publications.** While word formation and suffixation of the modern Ukrainian language is studied rather fundamentally (the publications of O. K. Bezpoyasko, I. R. Vykhovanets, T. V. Voznyi, K. H. Horodenska, V. O. Horpynych, A. P. Hryshchenko, V. V. Hreshuk, L. P. Didkivska, N. M. Zakhliupana, Y. A. Karpilovska, N. F. Klymenko, I. I. Kovalyk, M. V. Kravchenko, O. F. Pinchuk [Pinchuk 1975], L. M. Poliuha [Poliuha 1983], L. O. Rodnina [Rodnina 1970, Rodnina 1979, Rodnina 1980], Z. S. Sikorska [Sikorska 1985], L. A. Yurchuk, I. T. Yatsenko, etc.), «the achievements of Ukrainian historical derivatology are rather modest», since «only certain historical fragments of deriving the words formation means of certain classes became an object of special studios» [2, p. 4]. The word formation of the Ukrainian language in dynamic and cognitive aspects requires thorough investigation [5, p. 5].

Studying the history of scientific investigation of Ukrainian historical morphology, S. P. Samiylenko stresses the role of M. O. Maksymovych, O. O. Potebnia, K. P. Mykhalchuk, P. H. Zhytetskyi, P. O. Lavrovskyi, Y. F. Holovatskyi, O. Y. Ohonovskyi, I. Verkhtskyi, O. I. Sobolevskyi, O. O. Shakhmatov, V. O. Rozov, A. Y. Krymskyi, who «put and solved a lot of major problems of historical morphology of the Ukrainian language» [10, p. 39].

In the sphere of Ukrainian word formation history, particularly, suffix one, we should mention the publications and researches by S.P. Bevzenko [Bevzenko 1960], L. M. Berehovenko (Kostych) [Kostych 2004], P. I. Bilousenko [Bilousenko 1993], A. P. Hryshchenko, L. L. Humetska, O. V. Krovyska [Krovyska 1995], K. V. Lenets [Lenets 1977], A. V. Mayboroda, N. P. Moskaliova, H. M. Nayenko [Nayenko 2010], V. V. Nimchuk, L. M. Poliuha [Poliuha 1991], N. P. Romanova, S. P. Samiylenko 1964 [Samiylenko 1964; Samiylenko 1970], P. D. Tymoshenko, V. P. Tokar, etc.

V. O. Horpynych draws attention to the experience of studying noun word formation in the Ukrainian language by O. O. Potebnia who investigates the origin of noun suffixes in general Slavic and wider Indo-European contexts, the ability of some suffixes to create nouns of various lexical and grammatical groups and categories, word formation options, gender differentiation of suffix elements, etc [4, p. 122].

Considering the development of Ukrainian derivatology, M. T. Chemerysov points out that the linguists of 1920 – 1930s paid great attention to simultaneous word formation; however, the interest to the study of historical word formation increased sufficiently only in 1940 s (due to the efforts of the linguists aimed at other urgent tasks in the previous periods). The very slow publication of Ukrainian monuments restrained and thus it continues to restrain the development of the research in language history, in general, and in historical word formation, in particular [13, p. 82 – 83]. Fortunately, over the next decades, after the mentioned observation was made, the number of published text and lexical-graphical monuments of the Ukrainian language history was sufficiently increased due to the efforts of L. L. Humetska, Y. V. Zakrevska, V. V. Nimchuk, I. P. Chepiha, V. Y. Horobets, V. A. Peredriyenko, etc. By this reasoning, the investigation of suffix subsystem of the Ukrainian language in the format of diachronic and cognitive science is rather urgent and requires further scientific studies.

**The goal of the article** is to generalize the theory experience of the world language picture, accumulated at the modern stage of Ukrainian and foreign linguistics development, in general, and cognitive derivatology, in particular, in terms of its application in Ukrainian suffix subsystem.

**The presentation of the main material.** Ukrainian suffix system has some layers varying according to the formation time. In addition to suffixes the origin of which dates back to Proto-Slavic and Proto-Indo-European unity, the Ukrainian language retains the units that were formed in the era of Nostratic language unity existed 20 – 10 thousand years ago and became a protolanguage source of at least five language families, namely, Indo-European, Ural, Altai, Dravidian and Kartvelian languages. The element reconstruction of Nostratic protolanguage was made in the investigation of H. Pedersen, V. M. Illich-Svitych, A. B. Dolgopolsky, A. Bomhard, etc.

According to A. B. Dolgopolsky, Proto-Nostratic language was analytical as to its grammar organization; and syntactic units acquired the status of morphemes within a word only afterwards. Thus, suffixes and endings were formed from enclitic and proclitic units of Nostratic languages. The evidence of their initial lexical and grammatical independence is the preservation of these features in some branches of Nostratic macro-family. Among the Ukrainian suffixes having Nostratic origin, the following groups should be distinguished: «living» suffixes, which are productive still today, and «dead» suffixes, which are preserved as fossils lexeme items but have lost their productivity at Proto-Slavic or even Proto-Indo-European stage. There are also suffixes, which are petrified at a definite stage, and lost productivity only in some positions, retaining it in other ones.

The first group includes suffix *\*mA* – nominalization marker: Proto-Indo-European. *\*dhu-mo-s* [Dolgopolsky, p.27], where Sanskr. *dhuma*, Gr. *thumos* – Ukr. *дум*. Other groups are represented somewhat wider. Suffixes: *\*ti* – serves to form nomina actionis: *\*mētis* «thought» from *\*men-* «to think», where Sanskr. *matih*, Lat. *mens (mentis)*, Gr. *gnosis (\*gnosis)*, Arab. *taḍkar-un* «to remember» [Dolgopolsky, p.27] – Ukr. *пам'ять*. On the other hand, the same suffix has remained active as a verb infinitive marker: Ukr. *иму*, Sanskr. *Gantum*; *\*nV* – passive form marker: Indo-Europ. *\*pleno* «filled in» – bible. Hebrew *nišbar* «broken» [Dolgopolsky, p.28] – Ukr. *наповнений, наповнено*; *\*le* – formant for denoting a bearer of a feature: Kartv. *-l-, -il-* (suffix of verbal adjectives), Gr. *poikilos* «medley, colourful» [Dolgopolsky, p. 29] – Ukr. *бываючий, уналюй, стаючий*. Probably, the derivative of the same formant is available in the Ukrainian verb form in the past tense singular: *був, став, була, стала* which originate from the Past Participle *bylū, stalū, byla, stala*. The Ukrainian suffix system involves some elements, which connect it with other languages of Nostratic macro-family. Most of them are active means of form and word formation, productive verb suffixes or the suffixes of verbal derivatives even today.

Thus, there were the mentioned formants of grammatical categories of nomination, substantiation, passivity, feature bearer still in the Proto-Nostratic period long before the creation of Proto-Indo-European language.

Cognitive derivatology in Proto-Indo-European retrospective had its features. As A. Meillet notes, Proto-Indo-European morphology was characterized with rather complex system of meanings and means of their expression [9, p. 149].

An Indo-European word consisted of a stem, a suffix and an ending. A stem involves the general meaning of a word, a suffix determines the semantics more precisely, and an ending with alternating vowels and the place of increasing tone determines the role of the word in a sentence [8, p. 167]. Thus, A. Meillet determines an Indo-European suffix as a means of narrowing, the specification of a general meaning represented with a stem. Numerous suffixes were reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European language (while there was no prefixation in it according to traditional thought). A recently emerged source is an electronic research of Proto-Indo-European suffixation [Proto-Indo-European suffixes]. According to this source, in Proto-Indo-European language, the following suffixes were reconstructed: *-tis* (Old Gr. *-σις*, Proto-Germ. *\*-þiz*, Proto-Slav. *\*-ti* – «Infinitive suffix», or Infinitive flexion), comp. to Proto-Indo-European *\*méntis* and Proto-Germ. *\*mundiz*, Old Gr. *αὐτόματος*, Lat. *mēns*, Lithuan. *mintis*, Sanskrit. *matí*, Old Slav. *памАть (pa-meťi)*, *мънѣти (mĭnĕti)* – noun and verb denotation of mental activity (Infinitive ending affinity of Slav languages with the suffixes for denoting verbal nouns in other Indo-European languages shows substantive semantics of the Infinitive); *\*-mn* (Lat. *-men*, Old Gr. *давньогрецьк. -μα*, Proto Slav. *-me*), comp. to Proto-Indo-European *\*séhlmn̥* and Lat. *sēmen*, Proto-Slav. *\*sěme*, Ukr. *сім'я*; *\*-mós*, comp. to Lat. *Dūmi* (pl.), Lithuan. *Dūmas* (pl.), Old High Germ. *Toum* «steam, evaporation», Old Gr. *θυμός* «spirit», Sanskr. *dhūmá*, Lat. *fūmus*, Proto-Slav. *\*dymъ*, Ukr. *дум*; *\*-os*, comp. to Proto-Indo-European *\*neb<sup>h</sup>os* i Hittit. *nēpis*, Lubian *tappassa*, Lycian. *tabahaza*, Latv. *debess*, Lithuan. *debesis*, Proto-Celt. *\*nemos-*, Proto-Germ. *\*nibulō*, *\*nibulaz*, Old Gr. *νέφος*, Lat. *nebula*, Sanskr. *nābhas*, Avestan. *nabāh*, Proto-Slav. *\*nebo*, Ukr. *небо*; Proto-indo-European *\*sneyg<sup>wh</sup>os* and Balt.-Slav. *\*snoigos* (Lat. *sniegs*, Lithuan. *sniėgas*, Proto-

Slav. *\*sněgvъ*), Proto-Germ. *\*snaiwaz*, Sanskrit. *Snéha* «oiliness, mucus»; *\*-ós*, comp. to. Proto-Ind.-Europ. *\*nisdós* «net» (from *\*ni* «bottom», *\*sed-* «to sit» *\*-ós*) and Old Arm. *nist*, Lithian. *lizdas*, Irsk. (Irish) *nead*, Proto-Germ. *\*nestaz*, Snaskr. *nīḍá*, Lat. *nīdus*, Proto-Slav. *\*gnězdo*, Ukr. *znizdo*.

Due to this, all suffix elements experienced changes during the evolution from the Proto-Indo-European languages through Proto-Slav to Ukrainian and other modern Slav; some suffixes merged with the stem, the other turned into flexions. Thus, there is a reason to say about diachronic dimension, dynamism and historic character of suffix system of Ukrainian and other Indo-European languages. However, in general, Indo-European suffixation was preserved in the Slavic languages to a minor extent. «Indo-European suffixes were too short and insignificant to preserve their meaning to the era of common Slavic languages; therefore, they were replaced by new formations with longer and clear suffix element», – A. Meillet points out and stresses the process of attaching short Indo-European suffixes to an ending [9, p. 275]. Despite the facts mentioned above and insignificant preservation of Proto-indo-European suffixation in the Slavic languages, the parallels of a suffix and abstract semantics should be noted in the Slavic languages and Old Indian language (Sanskrit), that can show the Indo-European sources of corresponding Slavic suffixation and Proto-Indo-European dating of the genesis of corresponding meanings and their language embodiment. Particularly, the suffix that takes the form –тво after vowels (*лутво*, *ну-тво*) and is complicated with the consonant –с form after consonants (*брат-ство*, *козачство* from *\*козак-ство*, *пан-ство*), corresponds to Sanskrit –tvam. The formations with the mentioned suffix were rather spread in the Old East Slavic language (*буй-ство*, *множь-ство*). There is the same additional consonant in the Slavic suffix of the abstract semantics (Old East Slavic *быстр-ость*), which corresponds to Sanskrit –ti, Old Greek –ti, –si (Baltic and German correspondents of the suffix also involves s). These parallels were investigated by one of the classics of Indo-European studies A. Schleicher in the middle of the XIX century. The researcher compares, though less convincingly, the Slavic suffix –ск- (with the parallels, particularly in the Germanic languages) with the suffix –k- in other Indo-European languages, in Old Greek, in particular [16, p. 143–144]. The availability of abstract semantics vocabulary with corresponding suffixation, at least, accessible for comparative and historical study of its late development period in the Proto-Indo-European language, relates to the hypothesis of the existence of the Proto-Indo-European spoken literature language. The Ukrainian suffixation with general and abstract semantics is rooted in old proto-language states and shows the speakers' need to embody the corresponding meanings still in far pre-writing periods of the language development.

Concerning the fragments of the world language picture in Proto-Slavic and Slavic suffixation, an approach which implies taking into account «Proto-Slavic origins of suffix word formation» of the Ukrainian language and the involvement of comparative material from other Slavic languages should be recognized as entirely appropriate [2, p. 4–5]. In this respect, we consider a number of simple suffix formations. There was a developed system of suffixation with a significant differentiation of semantics in the Proto-Slavic language (e.g. See «Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages: Proto-Slavic Lexical Fund» ed. by O. M. Trubachov). «The Common Slavic Language, like the Common Indo-European language, widely uses suffixation and does not know prefixation and in-fixation», A. Meillet [9, p. 272]. According to the researcher's observation, almost all the productive Slavic suffixes in the historical era were formed on the Slavic background [9, p. 275]. A little part of productive types of Common Slavic suffixes exactly correspond to old Indo-European types: almost all of them are the result of combinations most of which are difficult to explain. In general, Indo-European elements, which acquire new use in the Common Slavic language, can be recognized. The novelty of these formations is shown by their lack in the Baltic languages [9, p. 285]. There are all reasons to see the dominance of dynamism over conservatism in the mentioned fact that helps to determine the main tendency of Slavic suffixation development as a reconstruction and the replacement of Indo-European suffixation. As to the Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Slavic material, there is still no clear differentiation of such notions as «suffixes», on the one hand, and «theme vowels», «dilators», on the other hand, in linguistics.

N. K. Mazurina points out that forming process of the Old East Slavic word formation system was rather complicated; a number of word formation elements, inherited from Proto-Slavic period, arisen in Old East Slavic period on the East Slavic language background and borrowed from the Old Slavic and other languages, took part in it [7, p. 3]. Proto-Slavic suffixation can give a rich material for studying the features of the world language picture. For example, one of the classes of Proto-Slavic nouns – nouns ending in –me (Old East Slav. *племя*, Gen. case *племене*) – is connected by the availability of Indo-European suffix –men- with the meaning of an object, the result of an action (comp. Old Gr. substantiated passive participle era-men-os «loved»). This suffix gives passive semantics to verbal stem. The nouns of this class have clear inner form in terms of Proto-Slavic word formation and Indo-European retrospective:

Proto-Slav. *\*ple-men-* (we give Early Proto-Slavic forms before the discovery of syllables) «плем'я», literally «full, filled in» (Indo-European stem *\*plo-* with the meaning «full»); Proto-Slavic. *\*vre-men-* < *\*vert-men-* «time», literally «rolling, rotating» (Indo-European stem *\*vert-* «roll, rotate», Sanskr. *vart-man* «course»); Proto-Slav. *\*pol-men-* «fire», literally «burning» (or concerning passive semantics of the suffix), «being burnt»; Proto-Slav. *\*se-men-* «family», literally «те, що сіють»; праслов'янськ. *\*zna-men-* «знамено», literally «те, що знають», «знаєме», i.e. a sign of troops. A particular attention is paid to Proto-Slav. *\*ka-men-* (Old East Slav. *камы*) from older form *\*ak-men-* with Indo-European parallels (Old Gr. *ak-mon* «ковадло», that primarily was, obviously, made from processed stone, Old Iran. *aš-man* «sky», that was thought to be of stone in terms of mythological thinking) and stem *\*ak-* «sharp»; literal meaning of the Slav name of stone is «pointed» and shows its role as a stone tool (comp. from the same stem of the Germ. name of hammer – Engl. *hammer*, Germ. *Hammer*, which also shows the stone tool). The study of reflex implementation of Indo-European active suffix *-nt-* in Slavic and other related languages has cognitive potential, e.g.: *-Qt-*, *-nt-*. The Proto-Slavic reflexes of Indo-European lexemes with «doer» suffix *-ter* are of great interest for the research in terms of suffix aspect of cognitive derivatology; they primarily form the names of the closest relatives from «childlike» stems: *pa-pa* – *\*pa-ter*, *ma-ma* – *\*ma-ter*; the mentioned suffix is used in Common Indo-European names of brother, sister, daughter. Some Proto-Slavic lexemes were formed according to the considered model: *\*vѣ-ter-* from Proto-Indo-European (studied in details by O. S. Mejnychuk ) *\*uei-* «віяти». A separate class of Proto-Slavic suffixes is formed by the morphemes of gender semantics which also represents the world language picture (contrasting *-ьсь* – *-ica* etc.). The suffix of Slavic verbal nouns *-nj-* (preceded by thematic vowel), implemented in the words of knowledge, names and similar, etymologically corresponds to the Germanic formant of Infinitive verb form *-en*. Related with the mentioned form is the Infinitive form of old Greek verb *-ein*, for example, *paideuo* «виховую» – *paideuein* «виховувати», *arkho* «починаю, очолюю» – *arkhein* «починати, очолювати», *keleuo* «наказую, велю» – *keleuein* «наказувати, веліти», etc. The correspondences can be established with the common stem and etymologically appropriate suffix, for example, Germ. *kenn-en* «знати» – Укр. *зна-ння* and others. Such correspondences etymologically confirm the famous theoretical and linguistic thesis about the Infinitive semantics, intermediate between the verb and the noun one. The verbal noun of abstract semantics represented by Ukrainian forms differs from German Infinitive formally, however, it has a lot in common semantically. Still in Common Slavic era, there were borrowed suffix elements: Latin suffix *-arius* for denoting a person of a certain profession was spread with the words with this suffix in Greek, Celtic, German and, through the latter, in Slavic languages [9, p. 298–299]. The extralinguistic aspect of the cognitive interpretation of the mentioned linguistic fact suggests the impact of Roman economy on the speakers of these languages. It is clear that the development of economy, social relations caused the need for naming new professions (A. Meillet gives such names as Old Slav. *мытарь* «збирач податей», *боукаръ* «писецъ» [9, p. 299]). Thus, the borrowings of Latin suffix elements with corresponding branch lexemes and terms were originated still in Proto-Slavic era and occurred throughout the history of the Ukrainian language.

A special place is occupied by complex suffixes being available in all Slavic languages and fixed by Old Bulgarian, Old Polish and Old East Slavic documents of the XI – XIII centuries. Their usage frequency in Ukrainian and Byelorussian is approximately the same (for from toponymic adjectonyms – 26,2% and 28,0% respectively), while in Russian they are used less (16,8%) [5, p. 34], that, in our opinion, correlates with the fact of participation of folk colloquial sources in the formation of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian literary languages compared with Russian; while in the latter, there was a combination of book church Slavic and folk East Slavic sources. V. O. Horpynych finds primarily phonetic reasons in the formation of complex suffixes [5, p. 35]; this fact, on the one hand, suggests semantic (thus, related to reflecting the world language picture) factors of the formation of such suffixes (and derived words with their participation) to be of secondary importance, however, on the other hand, it can consider the derivatives with such suffixes as markers of folk colloquial speech along with such markers as the suffixes of magnifying-thickened (augmentative) and diminutive-endearment (diminutive) semantics. The conclusion formulated above is confirmed by V. O. Horpynych's study relating to the mass penetration of colloquial dialect forms of suffixation to journalistic, official business and scientific styles of the Ukrainian language, to the Ukrainian artistic literary speech which eventually democratized word formation. The researcher attributes the mentioned phenomenon to the most important tendencies of the development of adjectonymic word formation of the Ukrainian language of Post-October period [5, p. 45]. Similarly in denonymic word formation, the most active interaction takes place between the subsystems of literary and colloquial dialect speech which «share» word creative resources mutually; however, not everything available in folk speech passes into the literary sphere and fixes in it [5, p. 52]. V. O. Horpynych stresses

that the reasons of the limitation for implementing suffixation models do not relate to semantics that is evident from the study of toponyms. These reasons should be seen in external language conditions of language system functioning, in the regularities of forming morpheme compatibility (i.e. in morphonology – Ed.) and in a tradition [5, p. 36]. The phonetic factors include, in particular, the exclusion (with few exceptions when there are one or two sonorants in pre-suffix part) of choosing such models of combining a base with a suffix forming the combination of four consonants [5, p. 37, 41–42]. Phonetic factors also imply the consideration of component structure of a word: in the modern East Slavic languages monosyllable stems interact, as a rule, with complex suffixes; and polysyllable stems – with simple ones. The place of stress in the word can also affect the choice of simple or complex suffix: when the stress is put on the flexion, that disappears with word formation, complex suffixes are used; the stress is put on the initial vowels and the intonation pattern of the base word is preserved. According to V. O. Horpynych's conclusion, in Ukrainian, all the parts of the phonetic system (phonemic, syllabic and prosodic subsystems) in conjunction with other factors create «word formation environment» which stipulates the choice of necessary model in word formation [5, p. 43]. Since there was a law of an open syllable in Old East Slavic and derivative suffixes had a vowel in preposition, there was no compatibility in this period of sharp morphological problems. After the omission of reduced vowels, the structure of finals and formants was changed; there appeared conditions for sound combinations, which were complicated for pronunciation or impossible in the language. Therefore, the rules of morpheme compatibility changed; there appeared a problem of «possible» and «impossible» implementations, «open» and «closed» ways of model actualization that, in its turn, activated the processes of elision, fusion, incorporation, as well as the related processes of variation, actualization, normalization [5, p. 60].

**Conclusions and prospects for further research.** The facts mentioned above give rise to state, that the choice of necessary word formation model is in most cases stipulated by «word formation environment», formed by etymon semantics, the type of final structure of motivated means, its potentiality of elision or fusion, the place of stress, the conditions of phono- and morpho-tactics, the articulation and pronunciation norm of a language, as well as analogy and local tradition, the actions of which are not subjected to modelling. In further studies, we plan to consider the role of Old Slavic in the development of Old Ukrainian (Old East Slavic) suffix subsystem of the language in terms of the world language picture.

#### Literature

1. Bevzenko S. P. Istorychna morfolohiia ukrainskoi movy: narysy iz slovozmyny ta slovotvoru / S. P. Bevzenko – Uzhhorod: Zakarpatske oblasne vydavnytstvo, 1960. – 415 s.
2. Bisovetska L. A. Vidimennyi sufiksalnyi slovotvir diiesliv u movi pysemnykh pamiatok Kyivskoi Rusi XI – XIII st. / L. A. Bisovetska : Dys. .. kand.. filol. nauk: 10.02.01 / NAN Ukrainy; Instytut movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni. – K., 1999. – 212 s.
3. Burykin A. A. Iz sravnitelno-istoricheskogo slovoobrazovaniia v altaiskih yazykah: mongolskii suffiks -bci (kalm. -bɣ) i yego ekvivalenty v tunguso-manchzhurskikh, tiurkskikh i koreiskom yazykah [Elektronnyi resurs] / A. A. Burykin. – Rezhym dostupu: [http://altaica.ru/LIBRARY/burykin/burykin\\_bci.pdf](http://altaica.ru/LIBRARY/burykin/burykin_bci.pdf).
4. Horpynych V. O. Naukove vyvchennia vid toponimichnoho slovotvoru v radianskyi period / V. O. Horpynych // Pidsumky i problemy naukovooho vyvchennia ukrainskoi movy v pozhovtnevyi period: Tezy dopovidei respublikanskoi naukovoii konferentsii / S. P. Samiilenko (hol red.). – K.: Radianska shkola, 1967. – S. 122 – 123.
5. Horpynych V. O. Teoretychni pyttannia vidtoponimnoho slovotvoru shidnoslovianskykh mov. – Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1973. – 168 s.
6. Lipykh V. M. Nuliovyy formant u slovotvirniy strukturi skladno-sufiksallykh imennykh ukrainskoi movy XI – XVIII st. (nazvy neosib) / V. M. Lipykh [Elektronnyi resurs]. – Rezhym dostupu: [http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc\\_Gum/SIz/2006\\_10/VULS10\\_PDF/Lipich.pdf](http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/SIz/2006_10/VULS10_PDF/Lipich.pdf).
7. Mazurina N. K. Slovoobrazovaniie sushchestvitelnykh so znacheniem litsa v russkom yazyke XI – XIV vv. / N. K. Mazurina: Avtoreferat dis. ... kand. filol. nauk : 10.02.01 / Moskovskii gosudarstvennyi oblastnoi universitet. – M., 2007. – 22s. [Elektronnyi resurs]. – Rezhym dostupu: <http://www.avto-ref.mgou.ru/ar/ar107.pdf>.
8. Meillet A. Vvedeniie v sravnitelnoie izucheniie indoevropeskikh yazykov / Antoine Meillet. – M.; L.: Gos. sots.-ekon. izd-vo, 1938. – 512 s.
9. Meillet A. Obshcheslavianskii yazyk / Antoine Meillet: Per. s frants. / obshch. red. S. B. Bershteina. – 2-ie izd. – M.: Progress, 2001. – 500 s.
10. Samiilenko S. P. Narysy z istorychnoi morfolohii ukrainskoi movy / S. P. Samiilenko. – K.: Radianska shkola, 1964. – Ch I. – 234 s.
11. Trubachev O. N. Praslavianskoe leksicheskoe nasledie I drevnerusskaia leksika dopismennogo perioda / O. N. Trubachev // Etimologiya. 1991–1993. – M.: Nauka, 1994. – S. 3–23. [Elektronnyi resurs]. – Rezhym dostupu : <http://www.philology.ru/linguistics3/trubachev-94.htm>.

12. Fahrutdinova V. R. Slovoobrazovaniie tatarskogo glagola b istoricheskom aspekte: dis. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.02 – yazyki narodov Rossiiskoi Federatsii (tatarskii yazyk) / Viliuza Robertovna Fahrutdinova; Institut yazyka, literatury i iskusstva im. G. Ibragimova AN Respubliki Tatarstan. – Kazan, 2007. – 194 s. [Elektronnyi resurs]. – Rezhym dostupu : <http://www.dissercat.com/content/slovoobrazovanie-tatarskogo-glagola-v-istoricheskom-aspekte>.

13. Chemerysov M. T. Doslidzhennia z istorychnoho slovotvoru ukrainskoi movy v pozhovtnevyi period // Pidsumky i problemy naukovoho vyvchennia ukrainskoi movy v pozhovtnevyi period: Tezy dopovidei respublikanskoi naukovoï konferentsii / S. P. Samiilenko (hol.red.). – K.: Radianska shkola, 1967. – S. 82 – 83.

14. Shtandenko U. M. Vidimennyi sufiksálny slovovir diiesliv u staroukrainskii movi XIV – XVIII st. / Uliana Myhailivna Shtandenko – K.: Instytut ukrainskoi movy NAN Ukrainy, 2008. – 208 s.

15. Dolgopolsky A. Nostratic grammar: synthetic or analytic // Аспекты компаративистики / Aspects of Comparative Linguistics. 2005. – Vol. 1. – p. 13–38.

16. Schleicher A. Germanisch und slawisch / A. Schleicher // Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete des Deutschen, Griechischen und Lateinischen. – 1852. – Band 1. – Heft 2. – S. 141–144.

Одержано редакцією 13.02.15

Прийнято до публікації 16.02.15

**Г. В. Кочерга**

#### **Етапи формування суфіксальної підсистеми української мови в контексті еволюції мовної картини світу**

*У статті проаналізовано передісторію української суфіксації в когнітивному аспекті. Генеза й розвиток суфіксальних засобів української мови в найзагальнішому вигляді можуть бути поділені на два етапи – передісторичний та історичний. Перший включає ностратичний, праїндоевропейський і праслов'янський рівні й стосується епох, коли української мови як окремої мовної системи ще не існувало, але її матеріал витворювався в межах попередніх мовних систем. Особливістю зазначених мовних систем, яка ускладнює їхню лінгвістичну, зокрема когнітивну, інтерпретацію, є те, що всі вони не засвідчені писемно, а реконструйовані, що неодмінно передбачає більшу або меншу фрагментарність й унеможливорює повноту й цілісність опису, а також не дозволяє інтерпретувати деталі й змушує обмежуватися типовими узагальненнями. Історичний етап розвитку суфіксації української мови, зокрема іменникової, включає еволюцію мовних засобів від епохи Київської Русі до нашого часу. Мова цього етапу засвідчена численними писемними пам'ятками. Уже в доісторичний період започаткувалися процеси стосовно когнітивної специфіки суфіксації, які продовжувалися в історії української мови. Позначення пасивності, субстантивності та ін. за допомогою формантів, що пізніше стали суфіксами, реконструюються з праностратичного періоду; суфікси, що надавали основі узагальнено-абстрактної семантики, існували вже в праїндоевропейську добу й успадковані, хоча б і в частковому й трансформованому вигляді, окремими індоевропейськими мовами. Суфіговані лексеми латинської мови запозичувалися слов'янами ще в праслов'янський період (в умовах усних контактів носіїв мов), і цей вплив продовжився протягом історії української мови вже у формі переважно книжного запозичення, коли латинська мова перестала бути живою етнічною мовою. Контакти відбувалися передусім у сфері позначень професій і посад. З німецької мови через польську був запозичений суфікс віддієслівного іменника, незважаючи на наявність власних мовних засобів для передавання відповідної семантики, що засвідчує не тільки інтенсивність українсько-польських мовних контактів, а й потребу віддзеркалення такого значення в мові.*

**Ключові слова:** суфіксація, мовна картина світу, лексема, суфіксальна підсистема мови, семантика, когнітивна дериватологія.

**Г. В. Кочерга**

#### **Этапы формирования суффиксальной подсистемы украинского языка в контексте эволюции языковой картины мира**

*В статье проанализированно предисторию украинской суффиксации в когнитивном аспекте. Генезис и развитие суффиксальных средств украинского языка в всеобщем виде могут быть разделены на два этапа: предисторический и исторический. Первый включает ностратический, праиндоевропейский и праславянский уровни и касается эпох, когда украинского языка как отдельной языковой системы еще не существовало, но его материал творился в пределах предыдущих языковых систем. Особенностью указанных языковых систем, которая затрудняет их лингвистическую, в частности когнитивную, интерпретацию, является то, что все они не заверены письменно, а реконструированы, что непременно предполагает большую или меньшую фрагментарность и исключает полноту и целостность описания, а также не позволяет интерпретировать детали и заставляет ограничиваться общими обобщениями. Исторический этап развития суффиксации украинского языка, в частности именной, включая эволюцию языковых средств от эпохи Киевской Руси до наших дней. Язык этого периода засвидетельствован многочисленными памятниками. В доисторический период зарождались процессы относящиеся к когнитивной специфике*



суффиксации, которые продолжились в истории украинского языка. Обозначение пассивности, субстантивности и др. с помощью формантов, что позже стали суффиксами, реконструируются для праиндоевропейского периода; суффиксы, которые предоставили основе обобщенно-абстрактной семантики, существовали уже в праиндоевропейский период и унаследованы, в частичном и трансформированном виде, отдельными индоевропейскими языками. Суффиксированные лексемы латинского языка заимствовались славянами еще в праславянский период (в условиях устных контактов носителей языков), и это влияние продолжилось в течении истории украинского языка уже в форме преимущественно книжного заимствования, когда латинский язык перестал быть живым этническим языком. Контакты происходили прежде всего в сфере обозначений профессий и должностей. С немецкого языка через польский заимствован суффикс отлагольного существительного, несмотря на наличие собственных языковых средств для передачи соответственной семантики, что может свидетельствовать не только об интенсивности украинско-польских языковых контактов, но и об потребности отражения такого значения в языке.

**Ключевые слова:** суффиксация, языковая картина мира, лексема, суффиксальная подсистема языка, семантика, когнитивная дериватология.

УДК 81'23

Л. В. Корновенко

## ПСИХОЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ ПОЭМЫ «ДЕМОН» М. Ю. ЛЕРМОНТОВА

*В статье представлен психолингвистический анализ текста поэмы «Демон» М. Ю. Лермонтова, основанный на методике В. П. Белянина. Определены особенности восприятия и интерпретации текста поэмы «Демон» М. Ю. Лермонтова носителями украинской культуры. Проанализированы результаты психолингвистического эксперимента, который проводился среди филологов-билингвов, изучающих русский язык и литературу. Восприятие и понимание рассматриваются как две стороны одного явления. Установлена вариативность восприятия одного и того же текста разными информантами. На основании результатов эксперимента сделан вывод о том, что определяющими факторами, которые обуславливают восприятие и интерпретацию текста М. Ю. Лермонтова, являются незаангажированный жизненный опыт информантов, знание истории, совпадение / несовпадение авторской модели мира и модели мира информанта.*

**Ключевые слова:** психолингвистика, языковая личность, М. Ю. Лермонтов, восприятие, интерпретация, вариативность восприятия, психолингвистический эксперимент.

**Постановка проблемы. Анализ последних исследований.** Проблема восприятия, понимания и интерпретации текста вызвала в последнее десятилетие большой интерес у ряда исследователей из разных областей науки. В целом историю изучения вопроса можно анализировать в нескольких планах. Во-первых, в широком смысле как краткий очерк украинской, российской и зарубежной психолингвистической науки вообще (см. работы таких ученых, как В. Б. Апухтин, В. П. Белянин, И. Н. Горелов, Т. М. Дридзе, А. А. Залевская, А. А. Леонтьев, Ю. А. Сорокин и др.) [1; 4; 10; 12]. Во-вторых, как историю психолингвистического изучения отдельного художественного текста (см. работы О. С. Зорькиной, Л. Н. Поликутиной, И. В. Третьяковой и др.) [6; 10; 12].

В-третьих, с учетом многолетнего интереса лингвистов и литературоведов к творчеству М. Ю. Лермонтова (В. В. Виноградов, Д. Е. Максимов, Е. Н. Михайлова, Е. Ф. Розен, У. Р. Фохт и мн. др.) [5; 6; 7].

Обращаясь к психолингвистической интерпретации текста поэмы М. Ю. Лермонтова «Демон», в данной статье мы хотели бы одновременно коснуться вопроса о его восприятии и понимании, что в свою очередь также составляет предмет настоящего исследования. С точки зрения филологической герменевтики, понимание есть процесс постижения смысла (или смыслов) текста (Г. И. Богин, В. В. Васильева, В. П. Мусиенко, И. В. Третьякова и др.) [2; 4; 5; 12]. Это своего рода диалог между говорящим и слушающим, пишущим и читающим, в процессе которого осуществляется деятельность по распределению смысла текста, именуемая текстовой деятельностью [3, с. 78]. Диалог этот можно рассматривать как процесс столкновения картин мира автора и интерпретатора, поскольку понимание любого художественного произведения обусловлено комплексом факторов социально-психологического и культурно-языкового характера, контекстом бытия реципиента. «Во всех психолингвистических исследованиях подчеркивается сложность и многоплановость процессов восприятия и понимания текста. Все ученые указывают на их тесную