

**THE NOTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FORMATION OF THE PREFIXAL
AND ONOMASIOLOGICAL CATEGORY OF PARTITIVENESS**

Migorian Olga,

*Chernivtsi National University named after Yu. Fedckovych,
Assistant Professor, Doctor of Philosophy, the Faculty of Foreign Languages*

Key words: *diachrony, onomasiology, word-formation, substantive derivatives, prefixes, lexicosemantic groups, category of Partitiveness.*

INTRODUCTION

Over the past half century the study of word-formation issue carried out so intensively, that nowadays we can state that there are a number of approaches and its comprehensive study in diachrony and synchrony. Some linguists studied the word-formation issue in the frame of etymology L. S. Vyhotskyi (2006), N. D. Holey (1989), Yu. A. Zatsnyi (1999), M. M. Poliuzhyn (1992), O. Jespersen (1954) others investigated the problems of derivation in the context of grammar, taking guidance to the structural analysis N. A. Antropova (2006), N. D. Ariutiunova (2007), A. V. Bondarko (2001), V. P. Danylenko (2007), J. D. MacColy (1981), D. Biber (2000), R. W. Langcker (2001). Representatives of lexical approach described mainly semantic interrelation between lexical units and different structures: I. K. Arkhipov (1984), Z. Valiukh (2011), V. H. Hak (1980), V. I. Zobotkina (1989), E. S. Kubriakova (2008), V. V. Levytskyi (2006), O. D. Ohuy (2003), O. O. Selivanova (2008), L. Bauer (1983), D. Kronenfeld (2003). The main task of historical and onomasiological investigation, underlain this paper, is to reveal the nature of the semantic structure of a notion; to observe the main tendencies of the historical development of prefixal derivation in English, changes of its notional limits and the basic body from era to era.

METHODS

The objective of the article is to describe the development of the notional characteristics of substantive prefixal derivatives that functioned within the frame of the onomasiological category of Partitiveness during four periods of the English language development. To achieve the objective the following tasks should be done:

- to single out lexicosemantic groups (hereafter LSG) of substantive bases taking part proximately in the formation of the prefixal onomasiological category of Partitiveness;
- to define the changes in the inventory of prefixes combining with every LSG of substantive derivatives within the frame of the onomasiological category of Partitiveness during four periods of the English language development;
- to observe the development of notional peculiarities of compatibility of substantive bases LSG and prefixes of onomasiological category of Partitiveness.

The object of the investigation is 11 000 prefixal derivatives, of which 141 lexical units represent the onomasiological category of Partitiveness during four periods of the English language development.

The subject of the article is structural, notional and nominative peculiarities of substantive prefixal derivatives taking part in the formation of the prefixal onomasiological category of Partitiveness (hereafter OCP) during all lexicalized periods of the English language development.

RESULTS

Identification of common peculiarities and differences of the units word-building ability of different lexical and grammatical classes and within them different lexical and semantic groups gives us the possibility to differentiate all words of English during four periods of its development, according to its word-formative capability, to observe common features in separate elementary phenomena, to create order among chaos (Antruchina [Антрушина], 1985). Because of it modern researches of derivation are challenged to reveal and describe those peculiarities of derivative bases, which make possible or impossible the process of word-formation of their derivatives. Let us proceed to the description of the notional characteristics of LSG development in the OCP formation. To analyze this issue the semantic peculiarities of dynamics of LSG combinability with the prefixes of this category were studied. According to the results of the investigation OCP is formed by LSG, derivational potential of which underwent significant realization: N 3 (e.n.e. 12 units, n.e. 17 units), N 5 (m.e. 2 units, e.n.e. 7 units, n.e. 10 units), N 12 (m.e. 1 unit, e.n.e. 5 units, n.e. 7 units), N 13 (m.e. 2 units, e.n.e. 9 units, n.e. 9 units). LSG N 3 has taken part in the OCP formation in combination with prefixes hemi-, hypo-, semi-, sub- since the Early New English period. For example, hemi-circle – e.n.e. a half circle, semicircle from hemi- “half” + circle, hyp-hen – e.n.en. short dash used to connect two words or separate one from hypo- “under” + hen “as one”; semi-circle – e.n.e. a half circle from semi- “half” + circle; sub-multiple – e.n.e. as being contained in it seven times exactly from sub- “under” + multiple “a number that you can divide by a smaller number an exact number of times”.

Due to various and comprehensive analysis of compatibility of definite bases with definite affixes we can define the factors upon which notional structure depends (Lytvinov [Литвинов], 2007). That's why according to O.C Kubriakova's definition, we observe notional structure as full information that notional structure can convey. As there is impact of a basis and an affix to each other, semantic shift occurs within a derivative.

DISCUSSION

But we should say that semantic shift is more noticeable in suffixal derivatives and semantics of prefixal derivatives is strictly formed according the formula pref+R (where pref is a prefix, and R is a basis), because prefix meaning is concrete (Kubriakova [Кубрякова], 2009).

To classify substantive bases, according to P.P. Litvinov, such LSG were singled out as of [4]: 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, N17 . social enti-ties and phenomena, N 18 . diseases and their treatment, N19 . physical state.

The ability of linguistic units to convey proportion whole-part with the help of linguistic tools is called partitiveness, a relatively new term in the linguistic literature (Lytvinov [Литвинов], 2007).

The number of LSG forming OCP during four periods of the English language development increases. In the Old English language (hereafter o.e.) OCP was represented by four out of nineteen singled out LSG of substantive bases of: environment and geography, time, movement and transport, in the Middle English language (hereafter m.e.) its inventory was enriched by LSG of: subjects and substance, houses and buildings, clothes, intellect, culture and science, in the Early New English language it was supplemented by LSG of: geometry and size, representatives of plants and animals, human being, emotions, actions. In the Middle English period LSG of substantive bases of: time,

movement and transport ceased to represent this category.

In the Middle English period LSG N 5 combined with prefixes contra- i demi- e.g.: contra-partie – m.e. duplicate of a legal document from contra- “with, together” + partie “a copy of a person or thing”, demi-lance – m.e. a lance with short shaft from demi- “half” + lance “a very long thin pointed weapon used in the past by soldiers on horses”, but in the Early New English period the prefix contra- was out of use. LSG N 12, N 13, like the previous LSG, represented OCP since the Middle English period, combining with the prefix semi-. For example, semi-conscience – m.e. semi-consciousness from semi- “half” + conscience “innermost thoughts”, semi-God – m.e. semi-God from semi- “half” + God. In the Early New English period N12 enriched the inventory of the OCP prefixes with the help of such lexical units as hypo- and sub-, that displaced semi-. For example, hypo-thesis – e.n.e. base, groundwork, foundation from hypo- “under” + thesis “a placing, proposition”, sub-category – e.n.e. subcategory from sub- “under” + category “name, class”; N 13 supplemented its inventory of prefixes with the help of hemi- and sub-. For example: hemi-cycle – e.n.e. a half round from hemi- “half” + cycle “circular motion”, sub-order – e.n.e. sub-order in biology; in architecture from sub- “under” + order “row, rank, series”.

Other LSG can be characterized as those, the derivational potential of which was realized in low degree or in no way: N 1 (o.e. 2 units, m.e. 2 units, e.n.e. 4 units, n.e. 6 units), N 4 (o.e. 3 units), N 6 (e.n.e. 2 units, n.e. 2 units), N 7 (e.n.e. 5 units, n.e. 8 units), N 8 (m.e. 1 unit, e.n.e. 2 units, n.e. 5 units), N 9 (m.e. 3 units, e.n.e. 3 units, n.e. 5 units), N 11 (e.n.e. 1 unit, n.e. 1 unit), N 14 (e.n.e. 2 units, n.e. 2 units), N15 (o.e. 1 unit).

LSG N1 formed OCP since the Old English period, but its derivational potential underwent slight enlargement, as on every stage of the English language development, it combines with few number of prefixes. So, N 1 represented OCP in the old English and Middle English periods with the help of the prefix mið- (mid-, meta-) e.g. mid-stream – o.e. midstream from mid- “middle” + stream “a course of water”, mi-d-air – m.e. the part of the air between the clouds and the air near the ground from mid- “middle” + air “atmosphere”, which was displaced by demi- and hemi- in the Early New English period. Here are the examples: demi-monde – e.n.e. half-world from demi- “half” + monde “world”, hemi-sphere – e.n.e. the half of a globe from hemi- “half” + sphere “a globe”.

LSG N 8, N 9 have taken part in the formation of OCP since the Middle English period and are characterized as those, which derivational potential didn't undergo enlargement. LSG N 8 and N 9 have been representing OCP with the help of the prefix demi- during last three periods of the English language development. For example: demi-vill – m.e., e.n.e. a half town from demi- “half” + vill “town”, demi-bastion – n.e. a work of the form of half a bastion, having one face and one flank from demi- “half” + bastion “fortress, tower”, demi-robe – m.e., e.n.e. a short garment from demi- “half” + robe “long, loose outer garment”, demi-suit – n.e. a short suit from demi- “half” + suit “set of matching garments”.

LSG N 4 and N 15 formed OCP in the Old English period, but in the Middle English period its derivatives were out of use and we didn't observe them any more. So, N 4 combined with mid- e.g. mid-summer – o.e. midsummer from mid- “middle” + summer “summer”, N 15 – 3 mid- (meta-) e.g. mid-weg – o.e. midway from mid- “mid- dle” + weg “course of travel”. LSG N 6, N 7, N 11, N 14 have been the components of OCP since the Early New English period. So, N 6 and N11 conjoined with the prefix demi- e.g. demi-lion – e.n.e. a half-lion from demi- “half” + lion, demi-relief – e.n.e. half-relief from demi- “half” + relief “alleviation of distress”, N 7 with demi-, semi-, sub- e.g. demi-human – e.n.e. a half-human from demi- “half” + human “a human being” semi-barbarian – e.n.e. one who is half-barbarian

from semi- "half" + barbarian "uncivilized or rude nature", sub-deacon – e.n.e. in the Romish church the deacon's servant from sub- "under" + deacon, N 14 with sub- e.g. sub-division – e.n.e. division into smaller parts from sub- "under" + division.

CONCLUSIONS

Results of our derivational and onomasiological study of OCP give us reasons to make such generalizations as:

1. LSG, that formed OCP during four periods of the English language development, varied. Their number increased, but not all LSG represent OCP, only 13 out of 19 differentiated LSG.

2. OCP is represented by LSG, the derivational potential of which is enriched:

N 3 , N 5 , N 12 , N 13 ; and LSG, derivational potential of which is realized in low degree or in no way: N 1 , N 4 , N 6 , N 7 , N 8 , N 9 , N 11 , N 14 , N 15 .

3. LSG, inventory of which was enriched, is characterized by the ways of combinability according to the following chronology:

a) The beginning of combination with prefixes in the Middle English period and the continuation of the process of substantive derivatives till nowadays. The LSG characterized by such features is LSG of N 13 with the prefix semi-;

b) The beginning of combination with prefixes in the Early New English period and the continuation of this process till nowadays. The LSG characterized by such features are LSG of: LSG N 3 with such prefixes as hemi-, hypo-, semi-, sub-; N 12 with hypo-, sub- ; N 13 with hemi-, sub-;

c) The compatibility with prefixes only in the Middle English period. The LSG characterized by such features is LSG of N 12 with the prefix semi-.

4. LSG, that did not become fully developed, are characterized by the ways of compatibility according to the following chronology:

a) The beginning of combination with prefixes in the Middle English period and the continuation of this process till nowadays. The LSG characterized by such features are LSG of N 5 , N 8 , N 9 with the prefix demi-;

b) The beginning of combination with prefixes in the Early New English period and the continuation of this process till nowadays. The LSG characterized by such features are LSG of: N 1 with the prefixes demi-, hemi-; N 6 , N 11 with demi-; N7 with demi-, semi-, sub; N 14 with sub-;

c) The compatibility with prefixes only in the Old English period. The LSG characterized by such features are LSG of N 4 ; N15 with the prefix mid- (meta-);

d) The compatibility with prefixes only in the Middle English period. The LSG characterized by such features is LSG of N 5 with the prefix contra-.

e) The compatibility with prefixes in the Old English and the Middle English periods, substantive derivatives of which grew out in use in the Early New English period. The LSG characterized by such features is LSG of N 1 with the prefix mid-(meta).

The prospect for our further study is the investigation of the role of adjective and adverbial derivatives in the formation of the prefixal and onomasiological category of Partitiveness.

REFERENCES

1. Anthusina G. B. (1985). [Антрушина Г. Б.] Lexicology английского языка: Book. The tool for the cold dental paw. in-toe. Moscow, [Лексикология английского языка: учеб. пособие для студентов пед. ин-тов. Москва,] p. 201.
2. Kubryakova, E. (2009). Types of language meanings: Semantics of the derived word. Moscow. [Типы языковых значений: Семантика производственных речник. Москва,] p.208.
3. Language and reality (2007): Collection of scientific works in memory of V. G. Gak. Moscow. [Язык и действительность: Сборник научных трудов памяти В.Г. Гака. Москва] p. 98.
4. Litvinov Pp (2007). English-Russian and Russian-English Synonyms. Moscow . [Литвинов П. П. (2007). Англо-русский и русско-английский синонимический словарь. Москва] p. 379.

Contacts:**Olga Migorian, Phd**

Faculty of Foreign Languages

Chernivtsi National University named after Yu. Fedckovych,

E-mail: migorina_ol@gmail.com