The Evolution of Etymons Denoting an Inhabited Place in Ukrainian and English

Gyvenamąją vietą žyminčių etimonų raida ukrainiečių ir anglų kalbose

LINGUISTICS / KALBOTYRA

Liudmyla Slavova
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

Natalia Borysenko
Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University, Ukraine

Oksana Kodubovska
Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University, Ukraine

Abstract

This article presents and discusses a study that focuses on appellatives that designate an inhabited place in Ukrainian and English. This research topic has not been in the limelight of contrastive linguistics so far. The study is based on the assumption that the notion of the *inhabited place* reflects the reality of the objective world associated with the residence of a group of people in a certain territory and is present in the semantic scheme and consciousness of a person. The article aims at identifying the basic semantic and structural changes in the vocabulary denoting an inhabited place in the Ukrainian and English languages emphasising the necessity to reveal regular semantic relations in modern languages using the data of language historical development. The corpus of the study is comprised of seven Ukrainian and four English etymons, which are divided into five groups in Ukrainian and four groups in English according to the peculiarities of their development in the languages under consideration. The material of the present research is comprised of dictionary entries associated with the etymons denoting an inhabited place in Ukrainian and English. The results of the study indicate that appellatives signifying an inhabited place in Ukrainian and English as distantly related languages show similar patterns of meaning and form development in diachrony, which is reflected in the dictionaries of Ukrainian and English and supported by the data from genetically related languages.

KEYWORDS: evolution of etymons, etymological analysis, etymological correspondences, inhabited place, contrastive semantics, lexeme, sememe, seme.

Introduction

Current studies in the field of contrastive semantics are aimed at resolving lexical and semantic issues (Koch, 2001), in particular singling out isomorphic and allomorphic features in the respective lexical systems of distantly related languages. The identification of common and ethno-specific features in the conceptualisation of the world by native speakers and exploration of how vocabulary reflects culturally specific information and accumulates knowledge about the life of a certain linguistic and cultural community are equally significant (Malkiel, 1993). The possibility of contrastive analysis of vocabulary is enabled by the presence of certain common features between a pair of languages, which is explained by socio-cultural contexts as well as by socio-cognitive variables. On the other hand, the historical development of a certain community contributes to the differences in its language and, arguably, its vocabulary. A contrastive semantic study of vocabulary takes into account the interlingual asymmetry that arises from comparing individual lexical units and their systematic groupings. The specificity of the nomination systems as well as different structures of denotation of functional and semantic equivalents explain the action of the principle of arbitrariness of the linguistic sign as a nominative unit (Vasilyeva, 1994).

Comparative linguistics pays special attention to lexical groups in diachrony (Antilla, 2000), since the semantic relations that exist in modern languages are consistent with the logic of historical development of the words. Moreover, models of semantic description contain mechanisms for analysing linguistic changes. The involvement of the parent language data, etymological and vocabulary evolution analyses demonstrate the appearance of new and disappearance of old semantic characteristics when the new meaning can be traced as the one that previously existed as a secondary meaning (Pizani, 1956). The study of the vocabulary evolutionary development in closely and distantly related languages reveals possible changes and transformations that occur in the internal form of the word and that are influenced by the socio-cultural and linguistic organisation of the ethnicities whose languages are analysed at different periods of their history (Antilla, 2000).

Traditionally, linguistic investigations of vocabulary items that designate an inhabited place are divided into two groups according to the opposition of proper and common names. The first group includes proper names, whereas the second one consists of appellatives, i.e., common nouns. Although there exists a well-established tradition of studying the former (Ekwall, 1960; Kupchynska, 2016; Watts, 2010), the latter has not been so far the subject of comparative linguistic investigation based on the material of Ukrainian and English. Whereas there have been successful attempts at researching the semantic properties and structure of the lexeme *settlement* in English (Kolisnychenko, 2017), the novelty of the present research lies in highlighting etymological and evolutional aspects of the vocabulary denoting *an inhabited place* in the Ukrainian and English languages. Arguably, the concept *inhabited place* is represented in the semantic scheme and consciousness of a person and reflects the reality of the objective world (Frumkina et.al., 1991) associated with the residence of a group of persons in a certain territory (CFOD, EOLD). The content of the concept is comprised of a set of features, properties of phenomena that are reflected in the concept itself. The scope of the concept is regarded as the plurality of objects (i.e., denotations) to which it relates.

The analysis of appellatives denoting an inhabited place focuses on the nouns that denote the fragment of reality inclusive of the semantic information communicated by these nouns, namely, places where people's permanent residence is organised (Kodubovska, 2018). The lexemes under investigation label and describe the objectively available fragment of reality and identify existing objects. Concurrently, we take into account the fact that there is no clear correspondence between real properties of objects and their reflection in the consciousness while identifying the

distinguishing features of denotative classes, although linguists recognise that the distinguishing features of denotations can be directly reflected in the meanings of the constituent (Seliverstova, 2004). The purpose of the present investigation is to identify and characterise etymons denoting an inhabited place in Ukrainian and English and single out similarities and differences in the patterns of their meaning and form development in diachrony, taking into consideration the data from genetically related languages and parent languages.

Theoretical Background

It should be noted that diachronic developments of individual lexical units and their groupings (Dobrovolska, 2017) have been in the focus of historical linguistics (Nesset & Makarova, 2014), because they enable scholars to trace the history of an individual word, the evolution of its meaning, productive word-building models, specific features and types of structural and semantic changes (Tsaregorodtseva, 2009; Shatalova, 2011) and, on a broader scale, the patterns of vocabulary development. Etymology, which is exclusively diachronic (Dworkin, 2015), involves the study of the word origin (Malkiel, 1993; Toporov, 2004), their primary word-formation structure and elements of their ancient meaning that help to identify the specificity of the development of the language's lexical system in general and its individual groups (Dworkin, 2015). Such an approach leads to the existence of both true and hypothetical etymology that is scientifically grounded and substantiated. After all, no other linguistic discipline collects such complete information about a word as etymology (Trubachev, 1976). However, the etymologisation process is hampered by the action of de-etymologisation, which is connected with word-formation processes (Koch & Hercus, 2013) making the research of word origin and development difficult enough.

One of the theoretical approaches in Indo-European etymology aims at establishing phonetic correspondence and semantic connections between the words compared (Otkupshchikov, 2005). Other theoretical approaches are associated with word-formation and focus on the study of formal word changes in morphology and derivation (Koch & Hercus, 2013) taking into account the specificity of the words and the state of lexicology development in a particular language. On the whole, the etymological approach is thought to be associated with the phonological, derivational, lexical, semantic, morphological, and syntactic systems on the crossroads of which the word appears, and its main aim is to identify its further trajectory, which in many cases is uneven and unpredictable (Goossens, 2010).

Using the etymological approach in the study of vocabulary makes it possible to perceive its current state as a result of the constant semantic changes that occur in the language throughout its development, and understand the reasons for these changes and their impact on the modern meaning of the word (Umnyashkin, 2011). Studying the origin of words allows us to trace and determine the specificity of changes in the structure of meaning of both a single unit and the evolution of a particular lexical group as words with similar meanings are generally subjected to similar semantic changes (Otkupshchikov, 2001). It is argued that the etymological comparison of individual words and lexical groups in distantly related languages of the Germanic and Slavic groups leads to disclosing the features of the vocabulary development in the languages compared and partially solving the problem of Slavic and Germanic ontogenesis (Varbot, 2011). At the same time, etymological research becomes more complete due to semantic analysis, although linguists state that the procedure of establishing the relative chronological stages of a lexeme semantic development is quite complicated (Gold, 2009).

So far, the research of the evolutionary development of individual lexemes and lexical groups has witnessed a number of successful attempts which involve research studies aiming at specifying the features of etymological nests development (Anokhina, 2019; Rybachkivska,

2015), but these are, unfortunately, not numerous and do not pertain to other types of lexical groups. Nevertheless, the diachronic study of changes in the form and meaning of word groups is of particular interest in understanding the historical processes occurring in the related languages. The evolutional aspect of the study of appellatives for the designation of an inhabited place is based on the fact that the compared languages belong to the Indo-European family and have common roots in parent Indo-European, from which Proto-Slavic and Proto-Germanic originate.

The Present Study and its Methodology

This study involves etymological analysis that is aimed at comparing the primary, historical structure of a word with its modern form and identifying historical changes in its form and meaning. The latter is used to clarify the specific features of the origin of the vocabulary for the designation of an inhabited place, to identify its genetic links with the parent language and other languages of the Indo-European family, and to etymologise the vocabulary group under investigation.

The dictionary entries in etymological, historical and explanatory dictionaries serve as the material of the present research. These dictionaries are used to classify etymons and evolutional changes in the structure of vocabulary designating an inhabited location. The methodology of the individual word history has been also incorporated in order to specify changes in the morphemic and semantic structure of words in the direction of narrowing or expanding the meaning, and record the periods of these changes. We bear in mind that a dictionary article codes not only the meaning of the word and the properties of its semantic structure, but reflects the features of its functioning as well. Thus, a dictionary definition may also contain information about the word transition from the active use to the passive one, its fading away from the language or joining a different layer of the vocabulary. Although the main aim of the research in question is to reveal basic semantic and structural changes in the vocabulary denoting an inhabited place, the information about the changes in the vocabulary layer the lexeme belongs to is quite significant in order to better understand its development.

The analysis begins with the determination of etymons and the processing of etymological data using the analysis of dictionary definitions to identify the components of the meaning of individual lexemes and to determine the proto-form, genetic relationships of the unit. In this work, we consider etymons as words in their original form and meaning, from which modern lexemes designating an inhabited place are derived in the languages analysed.

In the process of etymological analysis, we distinguish words belonging to the native vocabulary of the language, which are compared with words of the related languages and the history and meaning of which are traced back to the parent language. Since the analysis of the word-form is important in etymological research, the use of word-forming analysis aims at identifying the mechanism of creation of an individual word and its place in the word-forming subsystem of the language, which involves determining the relations of derivatives, word-forming formats, word-forming meaning, method of word-formation and word-forming type. It allows satisfying the requirement of a clear interpretation of a given word, detecting the word-forming activity of etymons, and defining word-forming formants.

We begin the semantic description by analysing the vocabulary definitions of the lexemes selected for the study. The latter includes the interpretation of a dictionary definition, an often underutilised resource (Silva et al., 2016), which is regarded as a common way of representing the meaning of a word (Geeraerts, 2003; Molina, 2008), namely interpretation as a traditional lexicographic description of lexemes in a natural language, which gives a correct picture of the meaning. On the other hand, the definitions of words in the monolingual dic-

tionaries describe, first and foremost, the significative layer of their meaning, related not to reality, but to its reflection in the human mind, representing the totality of essential features of objects denoted by lexical units. The definition of a dictionary article is one of the ways of describing semantic structures and demonstrating that, ideally, the definition is based on the establishment of a generic class together with the listing of various components of meaning (Lyons, 1995). Accordingly, semes are defined on the basis of the dictionary definition by means of logical analysis (Seliverstova, 2004) in order to match each word with a specific set of semantic components.

The general scientific comparison technique is used in the work to compare data obtained from the analysed languages. The method of identifying isomorphic and allomorphic features is used to distinguish common and distinctive features in the development of lexemes denoting an inhabited place, their semantic and morphemic structure. Contrastive analysis techniques are aimed at identifying common and distinctive features in the qualitative composition of the vocabulary denoting an inhabited place.

Results and Discussions

The Changes of Etymons in Ukrainian

The results of the analysis of etymons denoting an *inhabited place* are presented in the data set that involves Proto-Slavic (PSlav), Old Slavic (OSlav), Old Russian (ORu), Old Ukrainian (OUkr), which is subdivided into Early Old Ukrainian (EOUkr) and Late Old Ukrainian (LOUkr), and Modern Ukrainian (MoUkr), point to several groups that are associated with the specific features of their development in diachrony.

The **first** group includes lexical units that according to the dictionaries preserve the PSlav sememe 'inhabited place', but lose some semes which were present at the earlier stages of language development. For instance, ORu etymon *село* 'dwelling, the place of staying, village, estate, field, land, piece of land, trading place' (Sreznevskiy, 1912) has etymological correspondences in MoUkr *село* and Russian (Ru) *село*, as well as in Belorusian (Bel) *сяло*. OSlav *село* has the meaning of 'inhabited place, households, and buildings'. Cognates are widely represented in the Western Slavic languages, e.g., Polish (Pol) *sioło*, *siedlic* 'to inhabit', Czech (Cz) *selo* 'village' and Southern Slavic language, e.g., Bulgarian (Bulg) *село*, Macedonian (Maced) *село* (ESUM, V. 5, 2006). This derives from PSlav noun **sedlo* 'settlement' that is connected with the word **sěděti* 'to sit'. It is assumed that the lexical stem **sedlo* mixed with the PSlav **selo* 'arable land' akin to Lithuanian (Lith) *sala* 'island', Latin (Lat) *solum* 'soil', Old High German (OHG) *sal* 'house, dwelling' (ESUM, V. 5, 2006). Stems **sedlo* and **selo* differ in the Western Slavic languages only, e.g., Cz *selo* 'village, arable land', *sidlo* 'place of staying', and *sedlâk* 'rich peasant' (ibid.).

The evolution of the meaning goes the following way: in ORu it is 'a village with a church, a field, arable land, estate, village' (SDSYa, 1899). EOUkr *село* / *сѣло* means 'populated piece of land', 'village' (SSUM, V. 2, 1978), so the seme 'presence of the church' is lost already in EOUkr. At the beginning of the 20th cent. *село* 'village' designates both a large village with a church and any non-urban settlement (HSUM, V. 4, 1959). MoUkr lexeme *село* is defined in the dictionary as *населений пункт (звичайно великий) неміського типу, жителі якого займаються перев. обробітком землі* [an inhabited place (usually large) of a non-urban type where the settlers are engaged mostly in land cultivation] (VTSSUM, 2005) has the archseme (a common component of meaning due to which words can be grouped) 'inhabited place' and semes 'non-urban type', 'occupation of the settlers', 'size'.

Among the etymons of the **second** group, we single out units that develop the sememe 'inhabited place' adding new semes to it after PSlav splits into dialects. Thus, ORu *мѣсто* has

the meaning of 'place, settlement' (ESUM, V. 3, 1989). The dictionary of ORu defines *мѣсто* as *мѣсто, вмѣстилище, должность, открытое мѣсто, площадь, городъ* [place, container, position, open space, square, town] (SDSYa, 1899). The Common Slavic character of the word is supported by the etymological correspondences in the Eastern Slavic language (Ru *место* 'place', Bel *места* 'place' (archaic), the Western Slavic (Pol *miasto* 'town, market', Cz *město* 'town', *misto* 'place', Slov *mesto* 'town') and the Southern Slavic (Bulg *място* 'place, neighbourhood', Maced *место* 'place, town') groups of languages. OSlav *мѣсто* which means 'place' is derived from PSlav **město* 'place', with the earlier meaning 'the cover thrown onto the ground for placement', connected with *metati, mesti* 'to throw' (ESUM, V. 3, 1989). Ukrainian etymologists do not support the idea that MoUkr *місто* is akin to Lith *misti* 'nutrition' (Vasmer) or *mietas* 'stake' (ibid.). The development of the meaning unfolds this way: the cover thrown onto the ground for placement > place > square > settlement.

Although the meaning 'settlement' is fixed in the ORu appellative *мисто / мѣсто / мѣсто*, the analysis of the dictionaries proves that it receives the meaning of 'large inhabited place' in EOUkr (SSUM, V. 1, 1977) through 'market place, trading place' (ibid.) under the influence of Pol (ESUM, V. 3, 1989) and the Western Slavic languages in general where the meaning comes as a loan from Middle High German (MHG) *stat* (Vasmer). At the beginning of the 20th century, MoUkr *місто* means *мѣсто, базаръ, торговая площадь, рынокъ, городъ* [place, fair, marketplace, market, town] (HSUM, V. 2, 1958). In MoUkr, the appellative is defined as *великий населений пункт; адміністративний, промисловий, торговий і культурний центр* [a large inhabited place; administrative, industrial, trading and cultural centre] (VTSSUM, 2005). Thus, etymon *мѣсто* in the history of the Ukrainian language changes the form due to the vowels *ѣ/i* alteration in the root, preserves the archseme 'inhabited place', and develops the semes 'urban type' and 'size'.

The **third** group comprises the etymons which lose the archseme 'inhabited place' in the course of their development and are labeled as terms in a different meaning in modern dictionaries. Lexeme *городище* in ORu has the following semes 'place where there was a town before' (ESSYa, 1980), 'fortified settlement' and 'size' (little town) (SRYa, V. 4, 1977). It is derived from PSlav **gordišče*, which might have meant 'settlement' or 'place where there was a settlement, town, fortress'. According to the dictionaries, in ORu, the appellative had variants *городище* and *градище* 'place where there was a town before' (Sreznevskiy, 1893). In EOUkr, *городище* is defined as *місце, де було укріплене поселення, сєлище, село у Волинській землі та у Молдавському князівстві* [a place where there was a fortified settlement, village in the Volyn land and in Moldavian Kingdom] (SSUM, V. 1, 1977). In LOUkr, the lexeme is fixed in the forms of *городище, городисче, городишче, городишъче, хородище* and has two meanings: *поселення, укріплене валами і ровами* [settlement strengthened with shafts and ditches], and *місце, де збереглися рештки укріпленого поселення* [a place where the remnants of a fortified settlement have been preserved] (SUM16-17, V. 7, 2000). At the beginning of the 20th century, the appellative is defined as 'old fortification from earthen berm, place where there was a settlement before' (HSUM, V. 1, 1958); in MoUkr, the lexeme has lost the sememe 'inhabited place', is labeled as an archeological term and means *місце, де збереглися рештки укріпленого поселення* [a place where the remnants of a fortified settlement have been preserved] (VTSSUM, 2005). Besides, it serves as a name of villages in several regions of Ukraine.

The **fourth** group is comprised of etymons which preserve the sememe 'inhabited place' yet become archaic in the course of their development. For example, ORu etymon *городъ*, which in its second meaning is defined as 'fortified settlement, fortress' (the meaning is fixed in the 10th

century already (SRYa, V. 4, 1977) and a borrowed lexeme from OSlav *градъ* 'fortified settlement, fortress', 'inhabited place, town', 'wall, town wall' 'garden' (SRYa, V. 4, 1977) are marked by the dictionaries as such that existed in parallel in ORu. Etymological correspondences are present in the Eastern Slavic languages, MoUkr *город* (archaic), Ru *город*, and Bel *горад*.

PSlav noun with root vocalism –*o*– **gordъ* 'fenced place' is a common Slavic lexeme which is proved by the derivatives from the PSlav root in the Western (Cz *hrad*, Pol *grod*) and the Southern Slavic (Bulg *градът*, Serb, Cor *град*) languages. Besides, the word is related to Lith *gardas* 'fence' and Old Indian (OInd) *grhas* 'house'. It comes from Indo-European (IE) root **ghordho-*. A hypothesis that lexeme *городъ* was borrowed from the Germanic languages, e.g., Gothic (Goth) *gars*, or from the group *centum* to the group *satəm*, is considered to be false (ESUM, V. 1, 1982). Semantic changes in ORu went the following direction: first 'wall, fence', then 'fenced place', later 'fortification, fortress, town', although the meanings 'wall', 'town' existed in parallel (ibid.). EOUkr lexeme *городъ* means 'town' (SSUM, V. 1, 1977). In LOUkr the appellative *городъ* is labeled as *укріплене місце з оборонними спорудами* [fortified place with fortifications]; *населений пункт, місто* [inhabited place, town]; *місто з населенням города, укріплення* [town, fortification with their population] (SUM16-17, V. 7, 2000). At the beginning of the 20th century, it is defined as *місто* (HSUM, V. 1, 1958). In the second part of the 20th century, MoUkr *город* is interpreted as *рідко вживане та застаріле* [rarely used and outdated] (SUM, V. 2, 1971).

Etymon *въсь* in the meaning of a 'village' has several variants in ORu *весь, вьсѣ, вьсе*; it is present in OSlav in the form of *вьсь*. There is an etymological correspondence in Bel – *вёска* 'village'. The common Slavic origin is supported by the presence of the corresponding lexemes in the Western (Cz *ves*) and Southern Slavic (Bulg *вес*) languages. The appellative is related to Lith *vieškelis* 'road', OInd *vic-* 'village', Lat *vicus* 'settlement', Goth *weihs* 'village' (Vasmer). It comes from PSlav **vьsь*, which is derived from IE roots **uik-*, **yeik-*, **yoiko* (Vasmer; ESUM, V. 1, 1982). In ORu, it has the meanings of 'settlement, village', the 'district of the town named after the village joint to it' (SRya, V. 2, 1975). The appellative is fixed in the dictionary of EOUkr as *весь* (SSUM, 1977, V.1) and in LOUkr in the meaning of 'village' (SUM16-17, V. 4, 1997), whereas it is absent from Hrinchenko's dictionary. In MoUkr dictionaries, the appellative *весь* is labelled as *застаріле село* [archaic village] (SUM, V. 1, 1970).

The **fifth** group consists of words that become historicisms in the process of their evolution. The etymon *острогъ* in the meaning of 'a town or village with a stake wall, fortified place, wall of stakes in the fortress' comes from OSlav *острогъ* which is a common Slavic lexeme with correspondences in MoUkr – *острiг* 'fence with a roof', Cz *ostroh* 'fortification', Pol *ostróg* 'stakewall, palisade', Bulg 'pole' (ESUM, V. 4, 2003). It has the initial meaning of 'sharp' and is derived from OSlav *остръ*, from IE **ak–r–os* (ibid.). Changes in the meaning proceed in the following way: 'sharp' > 'stake, palisade' > 'wall of the stakes in the fortress' > 'town or village with a wall of palisade, fortification, fortress' > 'fortified inhabited place'. In the dictionary of EOUkr, it is labeled as an oikonym naming a town in the Volyn Land *Острогъ* (SSUM, V. 2, 1978), although the sememe 'inhabited place' does not show further development in Ukrainian. In Hrinchenko's dictionary, it is defined as *острогъ, тюрьма* [a jail, prison] (HSUM, V. 3, 1958). In MoUkr, it is labeled as a historicism (VTSSUM, 2005).

In ORu, *погостъ* is a derivative of the verb *погостити* 'to come for a visit', which comes from the verb *гостити* 'to guest' and ORu noun *гость* 'guest' and relates to PSlav *gostь* that comes from IE **ghostis* (ESUM, V. 1, 1982). In Kyivan Rus, *погостъ* meant a place for trade and an administrative and territorial unit (ibid.). Evolution of the meaning is, arguably, as follows, e.g., 'inn where the prince and clergymen stayed' > 'residence of the prince and

his retinue during the taxation', 'main settlement of the county' > 'settlement with a church > 'church in a settlement' > 'graveyard near the church' > 'graveyard' (SRYa, V. 4, 1977). In OUkr, the lexeme means *сільська община з самоуправлінням* [a self-governed village community] (SSUM, V. 2, 1978); the appellative is not fixed in Hrinchenko's dictionary. In MoUkr, it is a historicism in the meaning of an inhabited place: *у Київській Русі з середини 10 ст. – адміністративно-територіальна одиниця, велике селище з церквою та кладовищем (цвинтарем)* [in Kievan Rus, since the middle of the 10th century, an administrative and territorial unit, a large village with a church and a graveyard] (VTSSUM, 2005).

Thus, Ukrainian etymons denoting an inhabited place change their form and meaning in the process of their development in the Ukrainian language which is fixed in etymological, historical and explanatory dictionaries. The analysis of the dictionaries entries enables us to single out five groups of lexemes according to the type of their development in diachrony: 1) lexical units that preserve the PSlav sememe 'inhabited place', but lose some semes; 2) appellatives that develop the sememe 'inhabited place' adding new semes to it after the protolanguage is divided into dialects; 3) lexemes which lose the sememe 'inhabited place' and are labelled as terms; 4) etymons which preserving the sememe 'inhabited place' become archaic; 5) words that become historicisms in the process of their development. The appellatives denoting an inhabited place show a tendency to join the group of oikonyms if they become terms or historicisms.

Development of Etymons in English

The **first** group of etymons involves those that have developed the meaning 'inhabited place' in Old English (OE) after Proto-Germanic (PGmc) split into dialects. For instance, etymon *tûn* in OE had a number of meanings: *enclosure, garden, field, yard, farm, manor, home, house, mansion.* Later the meanings *group of houses, village, town* (CASD, 1916) are added. The lexeme originates from PGmc **tuna* – 'fenced area'. Etymological correspondences in related languages are Old Norse (ON) *tun* 'enclosure, courtyard, homestead; home field; town' and Old Frisian (OFri) *tūn* 'fence, enclosure, yard' (DSIES, 1988). However, the Old High German (OHG) *zūn* 'fence, enclosure' does not acquire the meaning 'inhabited place', whereas MHG *zūn, zoun* are used in the meaning of 'fence'. Today German *Zaun* has the same meaning (EDPG, 2013) which proves that the sememe 'inhabited place' appeared after OE emerges. In English, the meaning undergoes the following changes, e.g., 'fenced area' > 'group of houses' > 'town, village'. In the middle of the 12th century, after the Norman Conquest, the meaning 'compactly settled area larger than a village' appears under the influence of Old French (OFr) *ville*. In Middle English (ME), the changes in the form occur *tûn > town* when a vowel digraph shows the length of the sound. In Modern English (MoE), the word has developed a number of meanings. As a dialectal form it serves as a synonym to *hamlet*: *a cluster or aggregation of houses recognized as a distinct place with a place-name* (DMW) or *village*: *an English village having a periodic fair or market* (DMW); *still locally for what is no more than a village* (DSIES, 1988). The following definition emphasises the seme 'size' and designates an intermediate position of the notion of a *town* between two other notions *village* and *city*: *a compactly settled area usually larger than a village but smaller than a city* (DMW); such semes as 'presence of a name', 'presence of boundaries', 'presence of government': *a built-up area with a name, defined boundaries, and local government, that is larger than a village and generally smaller than a city* (EOLD) can also be added. Besides, the word-building formant *–ton* in the names of English towns reflects the time when the noun had the meaning 'estate' (Ayto, 2005), e.g., *Adlington, Ashington.*

The **second** group comprises English nouns denoting an inhabited place which belong to native Germanic vocabulary and become archaic or dialectal in the course of language evolution. For instance, *borough* from PGmc **burgs* 'fortified place, town' is derived from the stem **burg-* 'to protect' (EDPG, 2013). The lexeme is akin to OFr *burch* 'castle; city', ON *borg* 'town, citadel, small hill', and Goth *baurgs* 'fortified place, town' (DSIES, 1988). It might be related to OE *beorg* 'hill' and OHG *berg* 'mountain' with a different vocalisation, from PGmc **berga* 'mountain' or OE *beorgan* 'to keep safe' from PGmc **bergan*, and IE **bherg* 'to bring, to carry' (EDPG, 2013). OE etymon *burg / burh* in the meaning of 'fortified town': *any important dwelling within a walled enclosure, fort, castle* (CASD, 1916) in ME has the form *burgh*, which is marked in contemporary dictionaries as archaic (CFOD) or dialectal *Scots form of borough* (EOLD). The progression of the meaning is 'fortress' > 'fortified town' > 'town' (Ayto, 2005). In MoE, *borough* is *a medieval fortified group of houses forming a town with special duties and privileges* (DMW), *British historical a town sending representatives to Parliament* (EOLD); *a town, or a division of a large town* (CFEDT), *a town, or part of a large city, that is responsible for managing its own schools, hospitals, roads etc.* (LDCE). As the dictionary definitions show, in ME, semes 'fortified character' and 'presence of privileges and duties' are present, whereas in MoE the first one is lost and the second is converted into 'self-management'. Besides, now the appellative *borough* demonstrates the development of the sememe 'administrative unit': *a town or district which is an administrative unit* (EOLD) or 'constituency': *a town or urban constituency in Great Britain that sends a member to Parliament* (DMW).

The dictionaries of MoE provide the following meaning of the lexeme *burg*: *1) an ancient or medieval fortress or walled town; 2) North American informal a town or city* (EOLD). The appellative is treated as the one which either comes from OE etymon *burg* (CFOD) or is considered to be a borrowing of the 18th century from late Lat *burgus* 'castle, fort' (EOLD). There also exists an assumption that *burg* comes from *burrow – a corporate town, that is not a city, but such as sends burgesses to the parliament; a place fenced or fortified* (Johnson, 1785), which arises in ME in the Northern dialect as the form of the genitive *borrows* from *borrow* (*borough*) and from OE *burh / burg* (DMW). A colloquial form *burg – (informal) a town or city* (EOLD), which exists in American English since the mid-19th century, is explained as the result of syncope in the toponyms where the formant *-burg* is present as the second element, for instance, *Pittsburgh*. The form *brugh* which means *a town or borough* is dialectal (CFOD). Thus, as a result of changes in the form in MoE, several variants of the word *borough* with the meaning of a 'town' exist. It is also preserved as a word-building formant in oikonyms: *Kexbrough, Worsbrough*.

The **third** group of etymons includes those ones that actualise the archseme 'inhabited place' in PGmc, lose it after the parent language splits into dialects and survive in MoE in a different meaning. For instance, PGmc **haima–* has the meaning 'village, home' (EDPG, 2013). It comes from IE **koi–mo–*, derived with the help of the suffix from IE root **kei* 'to inhabit, to be at home, to lie' (EDPG, 2013). Cognates are present in the Germanic group, e.g., Goth *haims* 'village', ON *heimr* 'home' (DSIES, 1988), OFri *hēm* 'home', and Old Saxon (OS) *hēm* 'home'. In OE, the cognate *hâm* has a number of meanings, 'home, dwelling, house, manor, estate, hamlet' (CASD, 1916), 'inhabited place' included. The sememe 'inhabited place' disappears already in ME, whereas the OE lexeme *hâm* exists in MoE as *home* with the meaning of 'one's place of residence' (DMW). As a word-forming element, the variant *ham* is found in oikonyms: *Nottingham, Altrincham*.

The **fourth** group of etymons is comprised of those that altogether disappear from the language. For example, in OE, a noun *cotlîf* exists; it has the meaning of *hamlet, village, manor* (CASD, 1916) composed as a result of juxtaposition of two inherited stems *cot –* *'cot', cottage, bedchamber, den* (CASD, 1916) from PGmc **kuta–* 'shed', cognate with ON *kot* 'cottage, hut' (EDPG, 2013) and *lîf – 'life', existence* (CASD, 1916) from PGmc stem **lība– 'life, body'* (EDPG, 2013). The word fades away from the language already in the ME period.

The afore-mentioned English etymons could be divided into four groups according to the changes in the meaning and their development: 1) those that developed the meaning 'inhabited place' after Old English emerges; 2) the ones which already had the sememe 'inhabited place' in Proto Germanic and became outdated in the course of language development and belong today to archaisms or dialectisms; 3) lexemes that lose the sememe 'inhabited place', but develop in the English language with a different meaning; and 4) vocabulary items that were composed on the basis of inherited stems, but altogether disappeared from English during the ME period. A characteristic feature of the English etymons denoting an inhabited place that become archaic is their presence as word-forming elements in oikonyms.

Conclusion

The article presents a study that investigates the diachronic development of etymons denoting an inhabited place in two distantly related languages, i.e., Ukrainian and English that belong to different groups of the Indo-European family. The research is based on a contrastive analysis of two corresponding groups of vocabulary items which involve appellatives that denote an inhabited place. The concept 'inhabited place' is thought to involve an objectively existing fragment of reality that exists in the native speaker's consciousness. The investigation employs a diachronic etymological approach to data analysis. Specifically, the approach facilitated the identification of diachronic changes in form and meaning of the appellatives designating an inhabited place. The etymological approach enabled us to treat the present state of the lexemes in the Ukrainian and English languages as a result of their diachronic development.

As the study shows, both Ukrainian and English possess the following two groups of lexical units, the ones that preserve the meaning 'inhabited place' and those which acquire it after Proto-Slavic and Proto-Germanic split into dialects. The lexemes which are no longer in active use become archaic in these languages or turn to historicisms in Ukrainian and dialectisms in English.

Another isomorphic feature is connected with the presence of archaic lexemes in the group of oikonyms. In Ukrainian, archaisms move to the group of oikonyms and in English they become their word building formants. A common way of development is connected with the loss of the sememe 'inhabited place' when the lexemes are preserved in these languages in a different meaning. A unique feature of the English language is connected with the disappearance of inherited lexemes denoting an inhabited place in the Middle English period.

The results of the data analysis suggest that further linguistic insights into the question of diachronic change of form and meaning within vocabulary groupings are needed. Extending the analysis to the data from the Germanic (Dutch, German) and Eastern Slavic (Belarusian, Russian) languages will allow finding out if lexemes denoting an inhabited place have a similar history in all the languages of the groups mentioned above and whether the findings of the present research can be extrapolated to new linguistic material.

Abbreviations and Shortenings

Bel – Belorusian

Bulg – Bulgarian

CASD – A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary

CFEDT – Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus

CFOD – Collins Free Online Dictionary

Cor – Croatian

Cz – Czech

DMW – Dictionary by Merriam-Webster

DSIES – A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages

EDPG – Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic

EOLD – English Oxford Living Dictionaries

EOUkr – Early Old Ukrainian

ESSYa – Etimologicheskiy slovar slavyanskih yazyikov. Praslavyanskiy leksicheskiy fond.

ESUM – Etymolohichnyi Slovnyk Ukrainskoi Movy

Goth – Gothic

HSUM – Slovar ukrainskoi movy = Slovar ukrainskogo yazyka

IE – Indo-European

LDCE – Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English

Lat – Latin

LOUkr – Late Old Ukrainian

Lith – Lithuanian

Maced – Macedonian

ME – Middle English

MHG – Middle High German

MoE – Modern English

MoUkr – Modern Ukrainian

OE – Old English

OFr – Old French

OFri – Old Frisian

OHG – Old High German

OInd – Old Indian

ON – Old Norse

ORu – Old Russian

OS – Old Saxon

OSlav – Old Slavic

OUkr – Old Ukrainian

PGmc – Proto-Germanic

Pol – Polish

PSlav – Proto-Slavic

Ru – Russian

SDSYa – Slovar drevnego slavyanskogo yazyika, sostavlennyiy po Ostromirovu Evangeliyu, F. Mikloshichu, F. H. Vostokovu, Ya. I. Berednikovu i I. S. Kochetovu

Serb – Serbian

Slov – Slovak

SRYa – Slovar russkogo yazyika XI–XVII vv.

SSUM – Slovnyk staroukrainskoi movy XIV–XV st.

SUM – Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy

SUM16-17 – Slovnyk staroukrainskoi movy XVI–pershoi polovynyXVII st.

VTSSUM – Velykyi tlumachnyi slovnyk suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy

References

1   Anokhina, T. O. 2019. Etymological Stratigraphy of the Lexemes lacuna/ лакуна in English and Uktainian. Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development, 19, pp. 5-16. https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2019.19.01

2   Antilla, R. 2000. Greek and Indo-European Etymology in Action: Proto-Indo-European *ag-. Amsterdam. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.200

3   Dobrovolska, O. Ja. 2017. Middle English Names of Professional Entertainers: Etymology and Aspects of Usage. Kalbų studijos / Studies about languages, 31, pp. 5-22. https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.31.18644

4   Dworkin, S. 2015. Etymology. In: International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 8, (ed.) Wright, J.D., 2nd edition, pp. 207-211. Oxford: Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.53007-4

5   Ekwall, E. 1960. Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names. 4th Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

6   Frumkina, R. M., Mikheev, A. V., Mostovaya, A. D. and Rumina, N. A. 1991. Semantika i kategorizatsiya [Semantics and categorization]: monograph. Moscow: Nauka. (In Russian).

7   Geeraerts, D. 2003. Meaning and Definition. In: A Practical Guide to Lexicography, (ed.) Sterkenburg, P. van, pp. 83-93. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.6.11gee

8   Gold, D. L. 2009. Studies in Etymology and Etiology (with Emphasis on Germanic, Jewish, Romance, and Slavic Languages), (eds.) Gonzalez, F. R., Buades, A. L. Alicante: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alicante.

9   Goossens, L. (2010). Historical Linguistics. In: Variation and Change: Pragmatic Perspectives, (eds.) Fried, M., Östman, J.-O., Verschueren, J. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 100-109. https://doi.org/10.1075/hoph.6.08goo

10   Koch, H. and Hercus, L. 2013. Obscure vs. Transparent Cognates in Linguistic Reconstruction. In: Lexical and Structural Etymology, (ed.) Mailhammer, R, pp. 33-52. Boston-Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

11   Koch, P., 2001. Lexical Typology from a Cognitive and Linguistic Point of View. In: Language Typology and Language Universals / Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien / La typologie des langues et les universaux linguistiques, Vol. 2., (ed.) Haspelmath, M, pp. 1142-1177. Berlin-New-York: Walter de Gruyter.

12   Kodubovska, O. 2018. Latin Borrowings Denoting an Inhabited Place in English and German: Historical Aspect. Odessa Linguistic Journal, no. 12, pp. 61-66. https://doi.org/10.32837/2312-3192/12/9

13   Kolisnychenko, T. V. 2017. Typy 'Settlement' nominatsii [Types of 'Settlement' nominations]. Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philological Sciences, 2(86), pp. 73-77. (In Ukrainian).

14   Kupchynska, Z. O. 2016. Stratygrafiia arkhaichnoi oikonimii Ukrainy [Stratigraphy of the Archaic Oykonymy of Ukraine]: monograph. Lviv: NTSh. (In Ukrainian).

15   Lyons, J. 1995. Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511810213

16   Malkiel, Y. 1993. Etymology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611773

17   Molina, C. 2008. Historical Dictionary Definitions Revisited from a Prototype Theoretical Standpoint. Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics, no. 6(1). pp. 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1075/arcl.6.02mol

18   Nesset, T. and Makarova, A. 2014. Testing the Semantic Homogeneity Constraint: Analogical Change and Russian Verbs. Journal of Historical Linguistics, 4(2), pp. 161-191. https://doi.org/10.1075/jhl.4.2.01nes

19   Otkupshchikov, Yu. V. 2001. Ocherki po etimologii [Essays in Etymology]. Saint-Petersburg: S.-Petersburg University Publishing House. (In Russian).

20   Pizani, V. 1956. Etimologiya. Istoriya - problemy - metod [Etymology. History - problems - method]. Moscow: Izd-vo inostrannoi literatury. (In Russian).

21   Rybachkivska, L. E. 2015. Struktura slovotvirnykh gnizd z vershynamy-onimamy v suchasnii ukrainskii movi [The structure of word-formation nests with the tops of proper names in modern Ukrainian language]. Science and Education a New Dimension, Philology, III (12), no. 60, pp. 81-85. (In Ukrainian).

22   Shatalova, O. V. 2011. Sostav etimologicheskogo gnezda s glagolom-dominantoi класть v sovremennom russkom yazyke [The structure of the etymological nest with the verb-dominant класть in modern Russian]. Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N. I. Lobachevskogo, 6 (2), pp. 749-752. (In Russian).

23   Seliverstova, O. N. 2004. Trudy po semantike [Works in semantics]. Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury. (In Russian).

24   Silva, V.S., Handschuh, S. and Freitas, A. 2016. Categorization of Semantic Roles for Dictionary Definitions. In: Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Cognitive Aspects of the Lexicon, pp. 176-184, Osaka: COLING 2016.

25   Toporov, V. N. 2004. Issledovaniya po etimologii i semantike [Studies in etymology and semantics]. Teoriya i nekotoryye chastnyye eye prilozheniya [Theory and some of its individual applications], Vol. 1. Moscow: Yazyki slavianskoi kultury. (In Russian).

26   Trubachev, O. N. 1976. Etimologicheskiye issledovaniya i leksicheskaya semantika [Etymological studies and lexical semantics]. In: Printsipy i metody semanticheskikh issledovaniy [Principles and methods of semantic studies]. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 147-179. (In Russian).

27   Tsaregorodtseva, O. V. 2009. Istoriya i etimologiya russkikh svetooboznachenii - refleksov slavianskoi osnovy *svět- [History and etymology of the Russian designation of light-derivatives of the Slavic stem *svet-. Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 324, pp. 56-59. (In Russian).

28   Umnyashkin, A. A. 2011. Etimologiya bytovoi leksiki talyshskogo yazyka [Etymology of the

Talysh Language Household Vocabulary]. Izvestiya Rossiyskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im. A.I. Gertsena, 140, pp.103-113. (In Russian).

29 Varbot, Zh. Zh. 2011. Issledovaniya po russkoy i slavyanskoy etimologii [Research on Russian and Slavic etymology]. Saint Petrersburg: Nestor-Istoriya. (In Russian).

30 Vasilyeva, V. 1994. O logiko-semanticheskom aspekte v sopostavitelnoy onomasiologii (k voprosu o mezhyazykovoy asimmetrii) [On the logical and semantic aspects in comparative onomasiology (to the question of interlingual asymmetry)]. In: Teoreticheskiye i metodologicheskiye problemy sopostavitelnogo izucheniya slavyanskikh yazykov [Theoretical and methodological problems of comparative study of Slavic languages]. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 5-19. (In Russian).

31 Watts, V. 2010. The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sources

1 Ayto, J. 2005. Word Origins: The Secret Histories of English Words from A to Z. (2nd ed.) London: A & C Black Publishers Ltd.

2 Barkhudarov, S. G. (ed.), 1975-2016. Slovar russkogo yazyka XI-XVII vv. [Dictionary of the Russian Language of 11-17th centuries]. Moskva: Nauka.

3 Bilodid, I. K. (ed.), 1970-1980. Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy [Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language], V. 1-11. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (In Ukrainian).

4 Buck, C. D. 1988. A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226228860.001.0001

5 Busel, V. T. (ed.), 2005. Velykyi tlumachnyi slovnyk suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy [Great Explanatory Dictionary of Modern Ukrainian]. Kyiv-Irpin: VTF «Perun». (In Ukrainian).

6 Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus. Available at : https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/ [Accessed September 2019].

7 Clark Hall, J. R. 1916. A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, (2nd ed.) New York: The Macmillan Company.

8 Collins Free Online Dictionary. Available at: https://www.collinsdictionary.com [Accessed September 2017].

9 Dictionary by Merriam-Webster. Available at: https://www.merriam-webster.com [Accessed August 2019].

10 English Oxford Living Dictionaries. Available at: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com [Accessed September 2019].

11 Hrinchenko, B. (ed.), 1958-1959. Slovar ukrainskoi movy = Slovar ukraiynskogo yazyka [Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language], [Repr. vidtvorennia vyd. 1907-1909 rr.]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo AN URSR. (In Ukrainian).

12 Hrynchyshyn, D. H., Yedlinska, U. Ya., Karpova, V. L., Kernytskyi, I. M., Poliuha, L. M., Kersta, R. Y. and Khudash, M. L. (eds.), 1977-1978. Slovnyk staroukrainskoi movy XIV-XV st. [Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the 14th-15th cent.], Vol. 1-2. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (In Ukrainian).

13 Hrynchyshyn, D., Yedelinska, U., Zakrevska, Ya., Kersta, R., Poliuha, L., Chikalo, M. (eds.), 1997-. Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy XVI - pershoi polovyny XVII st.: u 28 vyp. [Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language of 16th - First Half 17th Cent.: in 28 Volumes] Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy. (In Ukrainian).

14 Johnson, S. 1785. A Dictionary of the English Language: In Which the Words are Deduced from Their Originals, and Illustrated in Their Different Significations by Examples from the Best Writers: To Which are Prefixed a History of the Language, and an English Grammar, 2 volumes, (6th ed). London: J. F. and C. Rivington.

15 Kroonen, G. 2013. Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic. Boston: Brill.

16 Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. Available at: https://www.ldoceonline.com [Accessed: August 2019].

17 Melnychuk, O. S., Bilodid, I. K., Kolomiiets, V. T., Tkachenko, O. B. et.al. (eds.), 1982-2006. Etymolohichnyi slovnyk ukrainskoi movy [Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Lnaguage], Vol. 1-7. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (In Ukrainian).

18 Sreznevskiy, I. I. 1912. Materialy dlya slovarya drevnerusskogo yazyka po pismennym pamyatnikam. Vol. 3: R-Ya.St-Petersburg: Tipografiya imperatorskoy Akademii nauk. (In Russian).

19 Sreznevskiy, I. I. 1893. Materialy dlya slovarya drevnerusskogo yazyka po pismennym

pamyatnikam. Vol. 1: A–K. St-Petersburg: Otd-
niye rus. yaz. i slovesn. Imp. AN. (In Russian).

20 Starchevskiy, A. V., 1899. Slovar drevnego
slavyanskogo yazyika, sostavlennyiy po
Ostromirovu Evangeliyu, F. Mikloshichu, A. H.
Vostokovu, Ya. I. Berednikovu i I. S. Kochetovu
[Dictionary of Ancient Slavic Language
Compiled after Ostromir Gospels, F. Miklosich,
A. Kh Vostokov, Ya. I. Berednikov, I.S. Kochetov].
St-Petersburg: Izd. A. S. Suvorina. (In Russian).

21 Trubachev, O. N., (ed.), 1980. Etimologicheskiy
slovar slavyanskikh yazykov. Praslavyanskiy
leksicheskiy fond [Etymological Dictionary of
the Slavic Languages. Proto-Slavic Lexicon],
Vyp. 7. *golvačcb - *gyžati. Moskva: Nauka. (In
Russian).

22 Vasmer, M. Etimologicheskiy slovar russkogo
yazyka [Etymological Dictionary of the Russian
Language]. Availabe at: https://vasmer.
lexicography.online [Accessed February 2018].

Santrauka

Liudmyla Slavova, Natalia Borysenko, Oksana Kodubovska. Gyvenamąją vietą žyminčių etimonų raida ukrainiečių ir anglų kalbose

Straipsnyje aptariamas tyrimas, kuriame nagrinėjami gyvenamąją vietą pavadinantys apelia-
tyvai anglų ir ukrainiečių kalbose. Šiai temai iki šiol nebuvo skirta daug dėmesio gretinamo-
sios kalbotyros kontekste. Tyrimas paremtas prielaida, jog gyvenamoji vieta yra semantinį
turinį turinti ir asmens sąmonės suvokiama objektyviojo pasaulio realija, apibūdinama kaip
tam tikra teritorija, apgyvendinta žmonių grupe. Šio tyrimo tikslas – identifikuoti pagrindi-
nius semantinius ir struktūrinius gyvenamąją vietą žyminčių žodžių pokyčius ukrainiečių
ir anglų kalbose. Taip siekiama pristatyti reguliarių semantinių ryšių šiuolaikinėse kalbose
atskleidimo, remiantis kalbų istorinės raidos duomenimis, svarbą. Tyrimo tekstyną sudaro
septyni ukrainietiški ir keturi angliški etimonai, suskirstyti į penkias ir keturias grupes pagal
jų vystymosi atitinkamoje kalboje ypatumus. Tyrimo duomenys buvo surinkti iš dvidešimt
vieno etimologinio, istorinio ir aiškinamojo žodyno. Tyrimo rezultatai rodo, jog, ištyrus anglų
ir ukrainiečių kalbų žodynais ir susijusių kalbų duomenimis paremtą diachroniją, gyvenamąją
vietą žymintys apeliatyvai tolimai giminingose ukrainiečių ir anglų kalbose išsiskiria pana-
šiais reikšmės ir formos raidos modeliais.

About the Authors

Liudmyla Slavova

Doctor of Sc. in Philology,
Associate professor at Taras
Shevchenko National University
of Kyiv, Ukraine

Research interests

Contrastive linguistics, con-
trastive semantics, cognitive
linguistics, linguistic personali-
ty, discourse analysis

Address

Taras Shevchenko National
University of Kyiv, vul. Volody-
myrska, 60, Kyiv, Ukraine

E-mail

slavovall16@gmail.com

Natalia Borysenko

Candidate of Sc. in Philology,
Associate professor at Zhyto-
myr Ivan Franko State Universi-
ty, Ukraine

Research interests

Discourse analysis, translation
studies, contrastive semantics,
pragmatics

Address

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State
University, vul. Velyka Berdy-
chivska, 40, 10008, Zhytomyr,
Ukraine

E-mail

nat.dbor@gmail.com

Oksana Kodubovska

Candidate of Sc. in Philology
at Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State
University, Ukraine

Research interests

Contrastive linguistics, contras-
tive semantics

Address

Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State
University, vul. Velyka Berdy-
chivska, 40, 10008, Zhytomyr,
Ukraine

E-mail

kodubovskaya@gmail.com