

UDC 811.161.2'373.611'366

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2663-6042.13.2020.214355>

## COMPONENTIAL STRUCTURE OF THE TYPICAL WORD FORMATION PARADIGM OF ADJECTIVAL ESSIVE VERBS IN *-y-ty* WITH THE SEMANTICS OF MENTAL STATE OF THE SUBJECT

Kushlyk O. P., Kishyk N. M.

*Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University*

*The article is devoted to the problem of the stem-centered approach as an important direction in the development of Ukrainian derivatology. Its methods, techniques, mechanisms of systematization and description of factual material make it possible to achieve results ensuring a consistent, systematic study of the derivational potential of words – linguistic units of the different lingual levels.*

*The proposed study focuses its attention on Ukrainian verbs of adjectival origin. They are divided into three structural-semantic types – inchoatives, essives and causatives. Their derivational potential is different and it is significantly influenced by the categorical status of verbs belonging to these three structural-semantic types. Inchoatives, essives and causatives usually correlate with verbs of process, state and action accordingly, each case being characterized by its differential features.*

*In addition to belonging to a certain part of speech, and thus to a structural-semantic type and lexical-semantic group, a considerable role in producing derivatives is played by the word-forming means.*

*The structure and content of the typical word-formation paradigm of essive verbs of the Ukrainian language with the semantics of mental state of the subject formed with the suffix *-y-* are determined taking into account the word-formation paradigmatic principle of factual material systematization, relevant to the stem-centered approach. The word-formation paradigm of these base verbs comprises two zones – substantive and verbal, the componential structure of which is limited. This limitation is conditioned by a set of features characteristic of essives in *-y-ty* with the semantics of mental state of the subject: the part-of-speech status of the stem, belonging to the structural-semantic type of essives, which correlates them with state verbs having differential signs of static character, temporal localization, special phaseness, passive role of the subject, word-forming means.*

**Keywords:** *stem, word-formation paradigm, word-forming meaning, word-forming means, word-forming potential, essive verb in *-y-ty* with the semantics of mental state of the subject, structural-semantic type, morphological zone.*

**Кушлик О. П., Кішик Н. М. Компонентний склад типової словотвірної парадигми відприкметникових есивних дієслів на *-и-ти* із семантикою психічного стану суб'єкта.** У статті порушено проблему основоцентричного підходу як важливого напрямку розвитку української дериватології, методи, прийоми, механізми систематизування й опису фактичного матеріалу якого дають змогу домогтися результатів, що забезпечують планомірне, системне вивчення дериваційного потенціалу слів – різноструктурних лінгвістичних одиниць.

Увагу у пропонуваній студії зосереджено на дієсловах української мови відприкметникового походження. З'ясовано, що їх об'єднують у три структурно-семантичні типи – інхоативи, есиви і каузативи. Зауважено, що дериваційний потенціал їх є різний і що значний вплив на вияв його має категорійний статус дієслів цих трьох структурно-семантичних типів. Усталилося співвідносити інхоативи, есиви і каузативи з дієсловами відповідно процесу, стану і дії з характерними в кожному випадку диференційними ознаками.

Помічено, що, окрім належності до певної частини мови, а відповідно – структурно-семантичного типу і лексико-семантичної групи, істотну роль для змоги продукувати похідні слова відіграє словотворчий засіб.

З урахуванням словотвірнопарадигматичного принципу систематизування фактичного матеріалу, адекватного основоцентричному підходові, визначено структуру та наповнення типової словотвірної парадигми есивних дієслів української мови із семантикою психічного стану суб'єкта, утворених за допомогою суфікса *-и-*. Установлено, що словотвірну парадигму цих вершинних дієслів формують дві зони – субстантивна і вербальна, компонентний склад яких є обмежений, що зумовлено комплексом особливостей, властивих есивним дієсловам на *-и-ти* із семантикою психічного стану суб'єкта: частиномовним статусом твірного слова, належністю до структурно-семантичного типу есивів, що співвідносить їх з дієсловами стану з диференційними ознаками статичності, часової локалізованості, особливої фазовості, пасивної ролі суб'єкта, словотворчим засобом.

**Ключові слова:** *твірна основа, словотвірна парадигма, словотвірне значення, словотворчий засіб, словотвірний потенціал, есивне дієслово на *-и-ти* із семантикою психічного стану суб'єкта, структурно-семантичний тип, морфологічна зона.*

**Defining the problem and argumentation of the topicality of the consideration.** The problem of systematic study of derivational potential of different lexical-grammatical categories of words in general and lexical-semantic groups in particular is becoming increasingly important in Ukrainian derivatology. Its

solution has become possible due to a recently formed stem-centered approach, oriented on the stem as a typology factor. The shift of emphasis from the word-forming means to the stem led to the solution of a number of tasks that had not been given proper attention, which accordingly caused “one-sidedness and incompleteness

of characteristics of the word-forming system” [5, 6]. The dependence of derivational potential of words on peculiarities of their part-of-speech status or lexical semantics, with additional characteristics modeled on the basis of the formant-centered approach, is a prerequisite for adequate reflection of the whole complexity of the word-formation system. However, not only the part-of-speech status of a stem word or its belonging to a certain lexical-semantic group can be important in determining the derivational potential of a word, but also the features characteristic of the base word that are determined by this part-of-speech status.

Defining the word-forming potential of verbs as one of the most complex morphological word classes with an extensive system of grammatical categories and their material indicators – grammatical forms – is one of the stages of comprehensive coverage of the whole motivational base of the Ukrainian language by the stem-centered aspect. Relevant factors determined by the peculiarity of verbs as a morphological class include, in addition to the above, their category status conditioned by the “nature of subject-object relations” [12, 133]. Taking into account a set of factors in determining the derivational capacity of verb stems is an important step in a consistent, systematic study of the derivational capacity of words, which contributes to the *topicality* of the proposed study.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** Linguistic studies show that scholars are interested in the problems of adjectival verbs in general and essive verbs in particular. For a long time, researchers focused their attention on the formant-centered approach to the study of essive verbs: they raised issues related to determining lexical-semantic groups of both stem and derivative units and outlining the common and different features of semantic relations between them [19], elucidating the structure and features of word-formation meaning of the derivative itself [3; 15], identifying the productivity of the word-forming means and the corresponding word-forming type [16; 18; 21], etc. However, recently there have been works in Ukrainian linguistics in which the authors focus on essive verbs through the prism of a stem-centered approach [4; 10, 179–200; 11, 202–223], which provides for establishing typical word-forming paradigms that would prove the derivational capacity of essives. The analysis of this material requires a detailed study taking into account all relevant factors.

**The object** of the proposed study is adjectival essive verbs of the Ukrainian language with the semantics of mental state of the subject.

**Setting the goals and tasks of the article.** The **purpose** of the article is to determine the componential structure of the typical word-formation paradigm of essive verbs of the Ukrainian language with the semantics of mental state of the subject, which were formed with the help of the suffix *-y-*. The realization of this goal involves a number of **tasks**, in particular: 1) to elucidate the principles of subsuming adjectival verbs under three structural and semantic types: inchoatives, essives, causatives; 2) to determine the set of word-formation means that can form essive verbs; 3) to state the number of morphological zones which combine derivatives, motivated by essive verbs in *-y-ty* with the

semantics of mental state of the subject; 4) to establish a continuum of word-formation meanings within each morphological zone.

**The outline of the main research material.** The structural-semantic type of essives, i.e. verbs with the word-forming meaning “to display a feature called by the base adjective”, is one of the three types of adjectival verbs. In contrast to inchoatives, i.e. adjectival verbs with the word-forming meaning “to acquire a feature and quality called by the base adjective”, and causatives, i.e. verbs with a word-forming meaning “to endow an object with a feature and quality called by the base adjective”, the structural-semantic type of essives has been relatively quickly enriched with new words recently. The belonging of adjectival verbs to structural-semantic types of inchoatives, essives or causatives, on the one hand, compartmentalizes their lexico-semantic grouping, and on the other – determines the conditionality of their word-forming potential through additional factors. For example, the distinction between inchoative, essive or causative adjectival verbs is to some extent connected with their correlation with the predicates of process, state and action, the valence and derivational capacity of which is different [11, 259]. In addition, base adjectival verbs of one structural-semantic type have features that are relevant to it and not relevant to others. In particular, the relevant signs for essives, which correlate with the predicates of state in the sentence, are their static character, temporal localization, phaseness (the sameness of all phases), passive role of the subject [13, 80–81]. This, in turn, affects the valence environment, which is indicative in determining the derivational capacity.

Verbs denoting mental states of the subject form a rather large lexico-semantic group of essive adjectival verbs. According to psychologists, more than 60 concepts nominate various mental states today. Such states comprise aggression, activity, apathy, cheerfulness, indifference, hopelessness, despair, confidence, fatigue, anger, depression, satisfaction, dissatisfaction, indecision, pessimism, depression, joy, frustration, anxiety, fear, etc. A significant proportion of adjectival verbs among the total number of verbs that name such states is conditioned by a large number of adjectives that express inner qualities of man (scientists estimate them at about 654 [4, 114]), as well as their usage frequency in speech.

Base essive verbs denoting mental state of the subject are formed from adjectival stems by means of suffix and combined (prefix-suffix, suffix-postfix, prefix-suffix-postfix) ways. In the Ukrainian language, derivatives formed by means of suffixes absolutely prevail. One of the productive word-forming means for the formation of verbs with this semantics is the suffix *-y-*, cf.: *brydyty, vorokhobyty, hordyty, zlostyvyty, lehkovazhyty, lukavyty, marnotratyty, marudyty, nastyryty, nedbaylyvyty, nedbalyty, nizhyty, osoruzhyty, papylyzhyty, paskudyty, ponuryty, sknaryty, khytryty*, etc., e.g.: *Paraska skladaie tsinu svoii vrodi y cherez te ne zovsim lehkovazhyt Zhdanovym kokhanniam* (Iu. Mushketyk); – *...mene u maibutnomu nichoho dobroho ne chekaie, tomu ya budu marnotratyty svoie teperishnie, poky vono ye* (R. Kushnir).

Some of the newly formed words are still on the stage of occasional usage, cf.: *zlovmysnyty, zlostyvyty*,

*zlochestyvyty, nakhabyty, nezghrabyty, nikchemyty, prykryty, prymityvyty, khrabryty, shustryty, etc.* e.g.: *Adzhe popry vse ya <...> nikoho ne obrazhay, ne hnityy, nichoho ne zazhyrav, ni z kym ne svaryvsia, ni proty koho ne zlostyvyv, tobtu zhyv bez vydymoho hrikha...* (Val. Shevchuk).

According to the degree of semantic content, verbs denoting mental state of the subject belong to absolute, i.e. those that are “self-sufficient for expressing their content and do not open mandatory right-handed positions for filling them with words- specifiers” [7, 5]. Therefore, they are characterized by optional combinability, absence of mandatory disseminators, which significantly weakens their word-forming activity.

The word-formation paradigm is considered to be an indicator of the word-forming ability of the analyzed (base) word within the stem-centered approach. It is defined as a complex system-forming unit which is a set of derivatives of one formation degree with the identical stem [6, 71; 5, 10] and opposed by word-forming means [1, 29].

The word-formation paradigm of Ukrainian essives in *-y-ty* with the semantics of mental state of the subject comprises two morphological numerically insignificant zones – substantive and verbal.

The *substantive zone* is represented by derivatives with word-forming meanings “feeling as a result of the objectified state” and “subject of the state”. It is generally assumed that verbs can form nouns with the meaning “objectified action”, or “objectified process”, or “objectified state”. The main indicator of such transpositional word-forming meanings is the suffix *-yn(-ia) / -enn(-ia) / -inn(-ia)*. In a given context, words with these meanings can often develop secondary word-formation semantics resulting from the performance of this action or the course of a process or state duration. Regarding noun deverbatives in *-nn(-ia) / -enn(-ia) / -inn(-ia)*, which arose from base essives in *-y-ty* with the semantics of mental state of the subject, only derivatives with a secondary word-forming meaning are likely to function in contexts, the primary being ousted to the periphery until it disappears. Most of these derivatives are used only in speech, cf.: *hordinnya, lehkovazhennya, marudinnya, mudrinnya, nedbalennya, nikchemlennya, khytrinnya, shustrinnya, khrabrinnya, e.g.: Samiilo Velychko peredaie rozmovu mizh pryntsyrovymy vorohamy: «Khan cherez svoho tlumacha vyrik do noho kilka sliv, haniachy yoho za bezrozsudnu i zbytkovu khorobrist ta lehkovazhennia yoho ordynskoiu syloi...»* (V. Karnatsevych); *Tsei protses rozpochynaietsia vid lehkoho mystetstva 30-kh rokiv i perekhodyt cherez lehke politychne vorokhoblennia bez politychnoho idealu azh do 70-kh rokiv...* (O. Hryniv); *I zadrinnia blyskavkoiu mainulo v yoho [Flehonta Petrovycha] dushi y nenache nozhem shpyhonulo yoho v sertse, i sertse zanylo* (I. Nechui-Levytskyi).

Another word-forming means which can form noun derivatives, though also with a secondary word-forming meaning – the feeling of man, is the suffix *-osch-i*, cf.: *hordoshchi, zadrushchi, mudroshchi, prykrushchi, khytroshchi, e.g.: Torhivlia zvychainymy rechamy, yakshcho vona vdala, vyklykaie zadrushchi, tym bilsh*

*prydbannia druha* (Val. Shevchuk); *Vona [dynamika] spriamovana v zmah za posidannia pravdy, za tvorennia dobra, za nasolodu krasoiu zhyttia, za peremohu nad samym soboiu, za sformuvannia v sobi blyskuchoho y nepodatnoho karakteru, za zbahachennia sebe spravzhnimy mudroshchamy...* (V. Melnyk); *Hetmanove sertse spovnylosia hordoshchiv – zvychainykh, liudskykh, malenkykh, y same cherez te, shcho zvychainykh, liudskykh, malenkykh, – stalo yomu osoblyvo zatyshno* (Iu. Mushketyk). In contrast to derivatives formed with the suffix *-nn(-ia) / -enn(-ia) / -inn(-ia)*, these derivatives are codified.

Even fewer derivatives appeared through zero suffixation. Such derivatives are represented by two models in the Ukrainian language: 1) VS (verb stem) + *-Ø-*; 2) VS + *-Ø(-a)*. In our study, substantives formed by the second model predominate, cf.: *marnotrata, nuda, prynada, osoruha*. Traditionally, verbal nouns with a zero suffix have a word-forming meaning of a single action, which serves the basis for a mostly productive meaning [14, 213]. Therefore, the ability of zero suffix derivatives to explicate a secondary meaning – feeling – compared to nouns in *-nn(-ia) / -enn(-ia) / -inn(-ia)* is greater, and given that deverbatives in *nn(-ia) / -enn(-ia) / -inn(-ia)* from essive verbs with the semantics of mental state of the subject completely ousted the primary word-forming meaning “objectified state”, there is no doubt about zero-suffix deverbatives, e.g.: *Nuda yoho [pana] muchyla, niiaka, robota ne yshla do ruk, niiaka dumka ne kleilasia v holovi* (I. Franko); *Adzhe popry vse ya zalyshavsia vilnyi vid zlochestyvoho zhyttia i na prynady svitovi ne spokushavsia...* (Val. Shevchuk).

The noun *prynada*, in addition to the named semantics, can also develop other meanings, in particular: 1) a thing used for attracting fish, birds, animals, etc.; 2) someone or something used for attracting somewhere // a thing used for distracting attention from something; 3) something appealing; temptation // attractive appearance features; 4) the attractiveness of something (VTSSUM, 1124), e.g.: *Pochepyt [did Arsen] cherez pleche staru shkirianu torbu z parenym zernom, shcho pakhne kuteiu (rybi na prynadu), ubhaie v kysheniu kruhlu bliashanu banochku z velykymy y malymy rybalskymy hachkmy, vudky v ruky i – haida do richky* (Hr. Tiutiunyk); *Shche ne vyspily v sadakh hrushi, ne zahuskly pakhuchi medy, lito shche vkhodyt u povnu sylu, shche poperedu yoho prynady...* (Iu. Mushketyk); *Chornym kazhanom mainula dumka: hetman mozhe y ne pryty na vyruchku. Shcho yomu toi malenkyi, shche y chuzhyi – pravobichnyi – Ladyzhyn u yoho velykii viini. Kynuv yikh, yak prynadu* (Iu. Mushketyk); *...a shchob khoch trokhy pomiakshyty yii, treba zbuduvaty svii dim i skhovatysia v nomu od usikh prynad i turbot tsoho svitu* (Iu. Mushketyk)

Essive-forming processes can involve both word-formation means with sufficient productivity and low-productive suffixes, in particular *-n(-ia)*, *-yn(-and)*, cf.: *vorokhibnya, vorokhibyny*. The specific feature of derivatives formed with the help of these formants is that they can develop a secondary, object meaning, as attested by lexicographic sources: *vorokhibnya, vorokhibyny – miatiezh* (SUM Hrinch., I, 256), *bunt*

(VTSSUM, 203), e.g.: *Ale pan Pototskyi ne dumav tam zalyshatysia; chekav tilky na dozvil korolia, shchob pustytysia v hlyb Ukrainy ta shchob zdavyty, zdushyty i kroviu pohasyty otoi narodnii zryv, yakyi vin use shche nazyvav vorokhibneiu y buntom* (Iu. Radzykevych). A synonym for the words *vorokhibnya* and *vorokhibny* may also be the noun *vorokhoba* formed by zero suffixation, which sometimes occurs in speech, e.g.: *Pokny kniaz poliuvav, chorni liudy halytski perebyly kniazhykh mytnykiv, shcho zdyraly podat povtoru i pidnialy vorokhobu* (R. Fedoriv).

Derivatives with the meaning “subject of state” create mutational word-forming types of the substantive zone. In modern Ukrainian it is expressed by suffixes, which are traditionally classified into: 1) suffixes of contextual expressiveness, cf. : **-nyk / -lnyk, -ik / -yk, -ar / -iar, -tel** and 2) suffixes of non-borrowed expressiveness, cf. : **-an, -ets / -iets, -un, -yk, -ak, -iy, -ay / -tiay, -an', -uk / -iuk, -k-, -ukh / -iukh / -liukh** [14, 48]. Among isolated suffixes of contextual expressiveness, the **-nyk** formant is relevant for creating substantives from adjectival verbs denoting mental state of the subject. According to M. Skab, 80% of nouns in **-nyk** refer to the non-production, and the rest – to the production sphere [17, 64]. The material under study is a clear proof of this, because all the formed units denoting character traits, will, nature, state of mind, temperament, name persons of the non-production sphere, cf.: *vorokhobnyk, zlovmysnyk, marnotratnyk, marudnyk, nakhabnyk, nikchemnyk*, etc., e.g.: *– I choho vin khodyt do mene, otoi vorokhobnyk? – promainula dumka v holovi Makara Ivanovycha. – Adzhe ya v zhe raz “ne piznav” yoho na vulytsi...* (M. Kotsiubynskyi).

A large part of derivatives – names of bearers of internal (including mental and emotional) features – are lexemes formed by suffixes of non-borrowed expressiveness. They include: **-Ø(-a), -un, -ak / -yak, -iy, -k(-a), -k(-o), -ets**.

Derivatives are formed by zero suffixation according to two models: 1) VS + **-Ø**; 2) VS + **-Ø(-a)**. In the material under study, derivatives formed according to the second model predominate. Expressing the grammatical meaning of the common genus, the so-called nomina communia are mostly colloquial, often with a touch of contempt, cf.: *zazdra, maruda, nastyra, nakhaba, nikchema, nuda, ponura, sknara*, e.g.: *Os ty nazyvaiesh mene marudoiu, a ya khotiv by podvytyts , shcho b same ty zrobyla na moiemu misti , koly taka vzhe ty sprytna* (P. Tychyna), *Ya vpyvavsia nihtiamy v ramu... i kriz zuby tsidyv: – Ty vulharnyi nikchema... Ty zhaliuhidnyi paskudnyk... Ty naiostannisha na zemli khudobyna...* (Iu. Koval). Given the peculiar expressive connotation, researchers call them bearers of evaluative characteristics and define as a person “having a property related to an action, propensity for an action” [20, 122]. In addition, the dynamic aspect contributes to the establishment of this characteristic as a person’s permanent trait – regardless of whether or not at some point the person performs an action that characterizes him/her [20, 122].

The word-forming type of derivatives created by the unproductive suffix **-un** is by far more rarely used. Derivatives with this formant are mostly combined into

two thematic groups, in particular: 1) nouns indicating the subject’s behavior, actions, deeds and 2) nouns determining traits of character and temperament [14, 55]. Isolated cases of derivatives motivated by essive verbs in **-y-ty** with the semantics of mental state of the subject belong to the first group, cf.: *khytrun*, e.g.: *U poizdi odyv khytrun pidiishov do stop-krana i do vho motsuvavsia, vdaiuchy, shcho ne mozhe povernuty vazhelia* (R. Ivanychuk).

Derivatives formed with the suffix **-ak/-iak-** are of the same expressively colloquial nature. The ability of this formant to explicate a certain expressiveness depends on the semantics of the stem. The range of negative evaluation extends from slight irony to sharp disapproval, cf.: *khytriak, shustriak* – irony; *brydak, mudrak* – disapproval [9, 28], e.g.: *Cherez pihodyny yoho predstavly Shmalenomou. – Tak otse toi shustriak, shcho vid nas khotiv zmytysia? – zustriv yoho hluzlyvo harno vdiahnenyi, nemolodyi vzhe panok* (Iu. Dmytrenko-Dumych); *Zadlia tykh mudrakiv, shcho otake pyshut abo pro se bazikaiut, ye u mene, shchob vy znaly, dobra skhovanka... Otaka! – dodav vin* [stanovyi] (Panas Myrnyi).

Only some isolated derivatives are formed according to a word-forming type with **-al** (*brydal*), **-as** (*brydas*), **-ets** (*zlostyvets, lukavets, khrabrets, falshyvets*), e.g. – *Ty bachysh, yakyi lukavets! – oburiuvavsia Pushkar; azh pochervonily vid khvyliuvannia* (O. Lupii); *Yomu [Syrovattsi] dobriache prysmerklo na dushi, vidchuv, yak vraz oslably nohy, sprobuvav zadobryty zlostyvtsiv zhartom* (Iu. Mushketyk); *Ye takyi krutiilo, falshyvets, slovoblud, zustrinetsia des tobi pyka taka merzenna, povzucha, shcho vik by yii ne bachyv, ne liudyna – hydotna* (O. Honchar).

The word-forming capacity of adjectival essive verbs in **-y-ty** with the semantics of mental state of the subject is not high and sporadic in the realization of derivational meanings of the *verbal zone*. From some base verbs, in particular those fixed in dictionaries, it is possible to form verbs with word-forming meanings “short manifestation of state” (delimitative verbs) and “final stage of manifestation of state” as a manifestation of temporal modifications.

The word-forming meaning “short-term manifestation of the state” is traditionally expressed by the prefix **po-**. The manifestation of duration can be actualized (in this case lexical elements are obligatory, in particular temporal nouns, adverbs, prepositional-noun constructions denoting time, which specify the course of duration), or non-actualized (in this case there are no corresponding lexical elements). The only codified deverbative with the so-called delimitative meaning is only *polehkovazhyty* in the word-formation paradigm of the base verb *lehkovazhyty*, e.g.: *Chy zakhoche Tonia iz nym druzhyty? Chy tilky tak pomanyt, polehkovazhyt ta y maine dali?* (O. Honchar). In this example, the duration of the state is not actualized. Despite the fact that derivatives with this word-forming meaning from other analyzed verbs are not found in the explanatory dictionaries, they are potentially possible, as evidenced in the works by different writers, cf.: *polukavyty, pomarudyty, pozlostyvty, pozlochestyvty, ponakhabyty, ponikchemyty, ponastryty, posknaryty*, etc.: *Tak todi v dekana tsei*

pan **pozlostyvyv** proty mene: "Ja zh vam kazav, Savo, ne strybaite vysoko, bo nyzko vpadete" (V. Ruban); *Des my mozheмо zhartuvaty, osoblyvo na Poltavshchyni, des my mozheмо **polukavyty**, beznevynno skhytruvaty, ale yak dominanty, z yakymy ne zhartuiut* (B. Oliinyk).

The meaning of limited duration of the state may also be indicated by a continuous-restrictive aspect of the verb action, or the so-called perdurative verbs. They are formed with the prefix **pro-** with an obligatory time specifier. The essive adjectival verb *marudyty* can form a derivative with such a meaning, cf.: *promarudyty*, e.g.: *Tak **promarudyv** do obidu, – chohos liachno tknutysia nadvir* (V. Danylenko). Without time specifiers, a verb with the prefix **pro-** mostly, including *promarudyty*, expresses a finite word-forming meaning, as evidenced by modern dictionaries (VTSSUM, 1158).

Other means of expressing the finite meaning in word-formation paradigms of essive verbs in the analyzed group are prefixes **z-/s-, pro-, o-**, cf.: *zvorokhobyty, zlekhovazhyty, zlukavyty, promarudyty, oskvernyty*, etc., e.g.: *Shkoda, shcho **zlekhovazhyv** pohrozoiu nytsoho tsyhana* (Iu. Mushketyk); *Teper znovu buv svavilnym rozbiinym otamantsem z Miiusu, yakyi kolys prycharuvav vidchaidushnym molodetstvom Stenku y **zvorokhobyyv** na tsarevytstvo Symeona* (Iu. Mushketyk); *Iieromonakh, shcho vzhe y tak buv zlodukhyi na sichovykiv, zamakhav khrestom, nakazav starosti zamknuty tserkvu. "Oskvernyly, oskvernyly. Na sviatyi porih krov prolyly"* (Iu. Mushketyk). In a definite context, the finite meaning can be expressed by the prefix **po-**, cf.: *pozazdryty*, e.g.: *Hovoryla [Mariika] malo, ale hovoryla tak malovnycho, shcho vin, poet, **pozazdryv** yii* (Iu. Vynnychuk).

In addition to deverbatives with temporal meanings, we can sometimes come across other derivational verbs motivated by adjectival essives in **-y-ty** with the semantics of mental state of the subject. However, the formation of such words is not of a systemic nature.

**Conclusions and directions for further research in this area.** The componential structure of the typical word-formation paradigm of essive verbs of the Ukrainian language in **-y-ty** with the semantics of mental state of the subject is relatively limited, which is conditioned by the fact that base verbs belong to the structural-semantic type of adjectival verbs that correlate with state verbs, as well as the word-formation means by which they are created. Differential features of such state verbs, in particular their static character, temporal localization, special phaseness, passivity of the role of the subject, affect their valence environment which is indicative in determining the derivation capacity. The *substantive zone* is represented by derivatives with a transpositional-mutational (with a tendency to mutational) word-forming meaning "result (consequence) of the objectified state" and mutational – "subject of the state"; *verbal zone* – by derivatives with modifying temporal word-forming meanings "non-continuous manifestation of the state" and "final stage of the state manifestation".

The ability to explicate this or that semantics determines the set of word-forming means that create derivatives of two morphological zones: components of the substantive zone are formed by means of suffixes, verbal derivatives – by prefixes.

The directions for further research are analysis of the word-forming potential of essive verbs formed by other word-forming means or belonging to other lexico-semantic groups.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Валюх З. О. Словотвірна парадигматика іменника в українській мові : монографія. Київ – Полтава : АСМІ, 2005. 356 с.
2. Волинець Г. М. Нульсуфіксація в словотвірній системі українського іменника : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01. Запоріжжя, 2009. 20 с.
3. Городенська К. Г. Структура відіменних дієслів. *Городенська К. Г., Кравченко М. В. Словотвірна структура слова (відіменні деривати)*. Київ : Наукова думка, 1981. С. 20–108.
4. Грещук В. Український відприкметниковий словотвір. Івано-Франківськ : Плай, 1995. 208 с.
5. Грещук В. Розділ І. Теоретичні засади основоцентричної дериватології. *Грещук В. В., Бачкур Р. О. та ін. Нариси з основоцентричної дериватології* / за ред. Василя Грещука. Івано-Франківськ : Місто НВ, 2007. С. 6–38.
6. Земская Е. А. О комплексных единицах системы синхронного словообразования. Актуальные проблемы русского словообразования : тезисы докладов и краткие сообщения III Республ. науч. конф. 21–23 сентября 1978. Ташкент, 1978. С. 29–35.
7. Іваницька Н. Б. Функціонально-семантичні параметри абсолютивних дієслів української мови : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01. Київ, 2000. 20 с.
8. Кавера Н. В. Семантична типологія предикатів стану : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01. Київ, 2008. 206 с.
9. Корольова В. В. Суфіксація як репрезентант негативної оцінки в назвах осіб української мови. *Дослідження з лексикології і граматики української мови* : зб. наук. праць / за ред. А. Поповського. Дніпропетровськ : ДНУ ім. О. Гончара, 2012. Вип. 11. С. 118–124.
10. Кушлик О. П. Словотвірна парадигматика похідних дієслів в українській мові : монографія. Дрогобич : Коло, 2015. 384 с.
11. Кушлик О. П. Типологія словотвірних парадигм похідних дієслів в українській мові : дис. ... докт. філол. наук : 10.02.01. Київ, 2016. 507 с.
12. Мединська Н. М. Проблема категорійного статусу дієслова. *Studia Linguistica*. 2011. Вип. 5. С. 126–135.
13. Межов О. Г. Типологія мінімальних семантико-синтаксичних одиниць : монографія. Луцьк : Волин. нац. ун-т ім. Лесі Українки, 2012. 464 с.
14. Олексенко В. П. Словотвірні категорії іменника : монографія. Херсон : Айлант, 2005. 336 с.

15. Пузік А. А. Відприкметникові дієслова у німецькій, англійській та українській мовах: автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : 10.02.17. Донецьк, 2000. 21 с.
16. Русанівський В. М. Спроба визначення семантичних груп дієслів на основі формальних критеріїв. *Структурно-математична лінгвістика* : респ. міжвідом. зб. Київ : Наукова думка, 1965. С. 56–65.
17. Скаб М. В. Розвиток назв діяча на *-ник* в українській мові. *Культура слова*. Київ : Наукова думка, 1985. № 33. С. 63–67.
18. Соколова С. О. Префіксальний словотвір дієслів у сучасній українській мові : монографія. Київ : Наукова думка, 2003. 283 с.
19. Сорочан О. В. Лексико-семантичні групи відприкметникових дієслів (семантичний та функціональний аспекти) : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01. Київ, 2005. 18 с.
20. Третевич Л. М. Про словотвірну семантику віддієслівних іменників з нульовими суфіксами в сучасній українській мові. *Словотвірна семантика східнослов'янських мов* : збірник статей / відп. ред. М. А. Жовтобрюх. Київ : Наукова думка, 1983. С. 120–129.
21. Юрчук Л. А. Суфіксальний дієслівний словотвір. *Словотвір сучасної української літературної мови* / за ред. М. А. Жовтобрюха. Київ : Наукова думка, 1979. С. 171–210.

#### DICTIONARIES

- ВТССУМ** – Великий тлумачний словник сучасної української мови / уклад. і голов. ред. В. Т. Бусел. Київ ; Ірпінь : ВТФ «Перун», 2009. 1736 с.
- ГСУЛМ** – Критська В. І. та ін. Граматичний словник української літературної мови. Словозміна / відп. ред. Н. Ф. Клименко. Київ : Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго, 2011. 760 с.
- СУМ Грінч.** – Словарь української мови : У 4-х т. / упоряд. з дод. власного матеріалу Б. Грінченко. Київ : Вид-во АН УРСР, 1958. Т. 1 : А–Ж. 494 с.; 1958. Т. 2 : З–Н. 573 с.; 1959. Т. 3 : О–П. 506 с.; 1959. Т. 4 : Р–Я. 563 с.

#### SOURCES OF ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

1. Винничук Ю. Українська модерна проза. Антрологія. Харків : Фоліо, 2018. 512 с.
2. Гончар О. Берег любові : роман. Оповідання. Статті. Твори : у 7-ми тт. Київ : Дніпро, 1988. Т. 6. С. 6–215.
3. Гончар О. Тронка : роман в новелах. Харків : Фоліо, 2007. 254 с.
4. Гринів О.І. Українська націологія : між світовими війнами : історичні нариси. Львів : Світ, 2008. 430 с.
5. Даниленко В. Квіти в темній кімнаті : сучасна українська новела. Київ : Генеза, 1997. 421 с.
6. Дмитренко-Думич Ю. М. Український вузол. Гетьманська держава (29 квітня – 15 грудня 1918 року) : художньо-публіц. роман-мозаїка. Кн. 1. Кобеляки : Кобеляки, 2000. 448 с.
7. Іванчук Р. Люлька з червоного дерева. Харків : Фоліо, 2019. 351 с.
8. Карнацевич В. Битва під Конотопом : роман. Харків : Фоліо, 2019. 121 с.
9. Коваль Ю. Цей лагідний-лагідний світ. Львів : Априорі, 2011. 576 с.
10. Коцюбинський М. *Intermezzo*: Вибрані твори. Серія «Класна література». Київ : Знання, 2017. 287 с.
11. Кушнір Р. Поведінка людини у формулах і моделях. Дрогобич : Коло, 2017. 160 с.
12. Мельник о. Василь (Василь Лімниченко). Релігія і життя (поетія, проза, драма, публіцистика, релігійні статті) / за заг. ред. проф. Р. Гром'яка. Тернопіль, 1999. 830 с.
13. Мирний Панас (П. Я. Рудченко). Зібрання творів у семи томах. Київ : Наукова думка, 1968. Т. 1. 560 с.
14. Мушкетик Ю. Яса : роман. Київ : Дніпро, 1990. 831 с.
15. Нечуй-Левицький І. Збір. творів : у 10 т. Київ : Наукова думка, 1967. Т. 8. 491 с.
16. Радзикович Ю. Полковник Данило Нечай. Вінніпег : Новий шлях, 1961. 271 с.
17. Рубан В. Помирав уражений проліском сніг : роман. *Київ*. 1994. № 8/9. С. 6–67.
18. Тютюнник Гр. Дивак : Вибрані твори. Серія «Скарби: молодіжна серія». Київ : Знання, 2020. 159 с.
19. Федорів Р. М. Отчий світильник : роман. Київ : Дніпро, 1985. 518 с.
20. Франко І. Зібрання творів у п'ятдесяти томах. Київ : Наукова думка, 1979. Т. 21. 503 с.
21. Шевчук Вал. «Пізнаний і непізнаний Сфінкс. Григорій Сковорода сучасними очима». Київ : Пульсари, 2008. 528 с.
22. Шевчук Вал. У череві апокаліптичного звіра : Історичні повісті та оповідання. Київ : Укр. письменник, 1995. 205 с.

#### REFERENCES

1. Valiukh, Z. O. (2005). *Slovotvirna paradyhmatyka imennyka v ukrainkii movi: monohrafiia* [The word-formation paradigm of the noun in the Ukrainian language]. Kyiv – Poltava: ASMI [in Ukrainian].
2. Volynets, H. M. (2009). *Nulsufiksatsiia v slovotvornii systemi ukrainskoho imennyka* [Zero suffixation in the word-formation system of the Ukrainian noun]. (Avtoreferat dysertatsii kandydata filolohichnykh nauk). Zaporizhzhia [in Ukrainian].
3. Horodenska, K. H. (1981). *Struktura vidimennykh diiesliv* [The structure of nominal verbs]. *Horodenska, K. H., Kravchenko, M. V. Slovotvirna struktura slova (vidimenni deryvaty)*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 20–108 [in Ukrainian].
4. Greshchuk, V. (1995). *Ukrainskyi vidpriyketnykovyi slovotvir* [The Ukrainian adjectival word-formation]. Ivano-Frankivsk: Plai [in Ukrainian].
5. Greshchuk, V. (2007). *Rozdil I. Teoretychni zasady osnovotsentrychnoi deryvatolohii* [Theoretical grounds of stem-centered derivatology]. Greshchuk, V. V., Bachkur, R. O. ta in. *Narysy z osnovotsentrychnoi deryvatolohii* / za red. Vasyliia Greshchuka. Ivano-Frankivsk: Misto NV, 6–38 [in Ukrainian].
6. Zemskaya, Ye. A. (1978). *O kompleksnykh edynitsakh sistemy sinkhronnogo slovoobrazovaniya* [On complex units of the synchronous word formation system]. *Aktualnye problemy russkogo slovoobrazovaniya*: Tezisy dokladov i kratkie soobshcheniya III Respubl. nauch. konf. 21–23 sentyabrya 1978. Tashkent, 29–35 [in Russian].

7. Ivanytska, N. B. (2000). Funktsionalno-semantychni parametry absoliutivnykh diiesliv ukrainskoi movy [Functional-semantic parameters of absolute verbs in the Ukrainian language]. (Avtoreferat dysertatsii kandydata filolohichnykh nauk). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
8. Kavera, N. V. (2008). Semantychna typolohiia predykatyv stanu [Semantic typology of the predicatives of state]. (Dysertatsiia kandydata filolohichnykh nauk). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
9. Korolova, V. V. (2012). Sufiksatsiia yak reprezentant nehatyvnoi otsinky v nazvakh osib ukrainskoi movy [Suffixation as a representative of negative evaluation in personal names in the Ukrainian language]. *Doslidzhennia z leksykologii i hramatyky ukrainskoi movy*: zb. nauk. prats / za red. A. Popovskoho. Dnipropetrovsk: DNU im. O. Honchara, 11, 118–124 [in Ukrainian].
10. Kushlyk, O. P. (2015). Slovtvirna paradyhmatyka pokhidnykh diiesliv v ukrainskii movi [Word-formation paradigm of derivative verbs in the Ukrainian language]: monohrafiia. Drohobych: Kolo [in Ukrainian].
11. Kushlyk, O. P. (2016). Typolohiia slovtvirnykh paradyhm pokhidnykh diiesliv v ukrainskii movi [Typology of word-formation paradigms of derivative verbs in the Ukrainian language]. (Dysertatsiia doctora filolohichnykh nauk). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
12. Medynska, N. M. (2011). Problema katehoriinoho statusu diieslova [The problem of the categorical status of the verb]. *Studia Linguistica*, 5, 126–135 [in Ukrainian].
13. Mezhov, O. H. (2012). Typolohiia minimalnykh semantyko-syntaksychnykh odynts [Typology of minimal semantic-syntactic units]: monohrafiia. Lutsk: Volyn. nats. un-t im. Lesi Ukrainky [in Ukrainian].
14. Oleksenko, V. P. (2005). Slovtvirni katehorii imennyka [Word-formation categories of the noun]: monohrafiia. Kher-son: Ailant [in Ukrainian].
15. Puzik, A. A. (2000). Vidpryketnykovi diieslova u nimetskii, anhliiskii ta ukrainskii movakh [Adjectival verbs in German, English and Ukrainian]. (Avtoreferat dysertatsii kandydata filolohichnykh nauk). Donetsk [in Ukrainian].
16. Rusanivskiy, V. M. (1965). Sproba vyznachennia semantychnykh hrup diiesliv na osnovi formalnykh kryteriiv [An attempt to determine semantic groups of verbs based on formal criteria]. *Strukturno-matematychna linhvistyka*: resp. mizh-vidom. zb. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 56–65 [in Ukrainian].
17. Skab, M. V. (1985). Rozvytok nazv diiacha na -nyk v ukrainskii movi [Development of names of the agent in -nyk in the Ukrainian language]. *Kultura slova*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 33, 63–67 [in Ukrainian].
18. Sokolova, S. O. (2003). Prefiksalni slovtvir diiesliv u suchasni ukrainskii movi [Prefixal verb formation in modern Ukrainian]: monohrafiia. Kyiv: Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].
19. Sorochan, O. V. (2005). Leksyko-semantychni hrupy vidpryketnykovykh diiesliv (semantychni ta funktsionalni aspekty) [Lexical and semantic groups of adjectival verbs (semantic and functional aspects)]. (Avtoreferat dysertatsii kandydata filolohichnykh nauk). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
20. Tretevykh, L. M. (1983). Pro slovtvirnu semantiku viddiieslivnykh imenykiv z nulovymy sufiksamy v suchasni ukrainskii movi [On word-formation semantics of verbal nouns with zero suffixes in modern Ukrainian]. *Slovtvirna semantika skhidnoslovianskykh mov*: zb. statei / vidp. red. M. A. Zhovtobriukh. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 120–129 [in Ukrainian].
21. Iurchuk, L. A. (1979). Sufiksalni diieslivnyi slovtvir [Suffixal verb formation]. *Slovtvir suchasnoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy* / za red. M. A. Zhovtobriukha Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 171–210 [in Ukrainian].

#### DICTIONARIES

**VTSSUM** – Velykyi tlumachnyi slovnyk suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy / uklad. i holov. red. V. T. Busel. Kyiv; Irpin: VTF “Perun”, 2009. 1736 s.

**HSULM** – Krytska V. I. ta in. Hramatychni slovnyk ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy. Slovozmyna / vidp. red. N. F. Klymenko. Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim Dmytra Buraho, 2011. 760 s.

**SUM Hrinch.** – Slovar ukrainskoi movy: U 4-kh t. / uporiad. z dod. vlasnoho materialu B. Hrinchenko. Kyiv: Vyd-vo AN URSR, 1958. T. 1: A–Zh. 494 s.; 1958. T. 2: Z–N. 573 s.; 1959. T. 3: O–P. 506 s.; 1959. T. 4: R–Ia. 563 s.

#### SOURCES OF ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

1. Vynnychuk, Yu. (2018). Ukrainska moderna proza. Antrolohiia. Kharkiv: Folio [in Ukrainian].
2. Honchar, O. (1988). Bereh liubovi: roman. Opovidannia. Statti. Tvory: U 7-my tt. Kyiv: Dnipro, 6, 6–215 [in Ukrainian].
3. Honchar, O. (2007). Tronka: roman v novelakh. Kharkiv: Folio [in Ukrainian].
4. Hryniv, O. I. (2008). Ukrainska natsiolohiia: mizh svitovymy viinamy: istoychni narysy. Lviv: Svit [in Ukrainian].
5. Danylenko, V. (1997). Kvity v temni kimnati: suchasna ukrainska novela. Kyiv: Heneza [in Ukrainian].
6. Dmytrenko-Dumych, Yu. M. (2000). Ukrainskyi vuzol. Hetmanska derzhava (29 kvitnia – 15 hrudnia 1918 roku): khudozhno-publits. roman-mozaika. Kn. 1. Kobeliaky: Kobeliaky [in Ukrainian].
7. Ivanychuk, R. (2019). Liulka z chervonoho dereva. Kharkiv: Folio [in Ukrainian].
8. Karnatsevykh, V. (2019). Bytva pid Konotopom : roman. Kharkiv: Folio [in Ukrainian].
9. Koval, Yu. (2011). Tsei lahidnyi-lahidnyi svit. Lviv: Apriori [in Ukrainian].
10. Kotsiubynskiy, M. (2017). Intermezzo: Vybrani tvory. Seriia “Klasna literature”. Kyiv: Znannia [in Ukrainian].
11. Kushnir, R. (2017). Povedinka liudyny u formulakh i modeliakh. Drohobych: Kolo [in Ukrainian].
12. Melnyk, o. Vasyl (Vasyl Limnychenko) (1999). Relihiia i zhyttia (poeziia, proza, drama, publitsystyka, relihiini statti) / Za zah. red. prof. R. Hromiaka. Ternopil [in Ukrainian].
13. Myrnyi, Panas (P. Ya. Rudchenko) (1968). Zibrannia tvoriv u semy tomakh. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1 [in Ukrainian].

14. Mushketyk, Yu. (1990). *Yasa: roman*. Kyiv: Dnipro [in Ukrainian].
15. Nechui-Levytskyi, I. (1967). *Zibr. tvoriv: U 10 t.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 8 [in Ukrainian].
16. Radzykevych, Yu. (1961). *Polkovnyk Danylo Nechai*. Vinnipeg: Novyi shliakh [in Ukrainian].
17. Ruban, V. (1994). *Pomyrav urazhenyi proliskom snih: roman*. *Kyiv*, 8/9, 6–67 [in Ukrainian].
18. Tiutiunyk, Hr. Dyvak (2020). *Vybrani tvory. Seriiia “Skarby: molodizhna seriiia”*. Kyiv Znannia [in Ukrainian].
19. Fedoriv, R. M. (1985). *Otchyi svityllyk: roman*. Kyiv: Dnipro [in Ukrainian].
20. Franko, I. (1979). *Zibrannia tvoriv u piatdesiaty tomakh*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 21 [in Ukrainian].
21. Shevchuk, Val. (2008). “Piznanyi i nepiznanyi Sfinks. Hryhorii Skovoroda suchasnymy ochyma”. Kyiv: Pulsary [in Ukrainian].
22. Shevchuk, Val. (1995). *U cherevi apokaliptychnoho zvira: Istorychni povisti ta opovidannia*. Kyiv: Ukr. Pysmennyk [in Ukrainian].