

РОЗДІЛ І. ФУНКЦІЙНА СЕМАНТИКА ЛЕКСИЧНИХ І ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНИХ ОДИНИЦЬ. СЛОВОТВІР

Olena Dotsenko

ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-7549-4290

UDC 81'114

DOI: 10.31558/1815-3070.2022.43.1

HOMOGENEOUS AND HETEROGENEOUS WORD-FORMATION ROWS WITH THE SUFFIX *-MENT*

У статті розглядається структура словотвірних рядів слів із суфіксом -ment. Автор аналізує ряди з погляду їх гомогенності та гетерогенності, складності та глибини. Словотвірні ряди об'єднано відповідно до класу слів. Класи слів виокремлено за допомогою реляторної мови аплікативної породжувальної моделі, яка використовується для дослідження R-структури похідних слів із суфіксом -ment. R=словам штучної мови відповідають L=слова природньої мови. Аналіз мотиваційних відносин слів засвідчив не тільки наявність повної та неповної мотивації, але й метафоричної мотивації. Мотиваційні відносини досліджуються з позиції синхронії, діахронічний аспект не вивчається.

Ключові слова: словотвірний ряд, множинна мотивація, дериваційний крок, полісемантичні слова, аплікативна породжувальна модель.

1. Introduction. Nowadays, English word-formation lacks research of word-formation rows. This is where the relevance of the article stems from. The aim of the paper is to investigate motivation relations between words in a word-formation row and describe these rows using the relator language of the applicative generative model introduced by S. K. Shaumian and P. A. Soboleva (1968). The object of the study is the rows with the suffix *-ment*. The structure of word-formation rows and their motivational relations represent the subject of the research. The theoretical framework of the article is highlighted in the works by such scholars as M. Aronoff (2011), J. Furdik (2008), V. Lehmann (2015), V. N. Musatov (2012), I. A. Shyrshov (1981), P. A. Soboleva (2012), I. S. Ulukhanov (2005), O. A. Zemskaya (1981).

Many attempts by P. A. Soboleva (1972), N. Ye. Vilenskaya (1986), Yu. A. Shepel (2006; 2013) have been made to study and describe one of the complex units of word-formation level i. e. a word-formation row. However, despite all the available linguistics researches, word-formation rows are not studied comprehensively which determines the novelty of the article. The word-formation row can be opposed to other word-forming units (e. g.: chains, paradigms, nests) in which derived words are grouped according to the commonality of the stem. In contrast to this, in a word-formation row a stem is a distinguishing component. Besides, derived words forming a row are not interrelated with motivational relations as compared to chains. These peculiarities of a word-formation row determine its theoretical significance.

2. The main theoretical concepts. The structural analysis of word-formation rows starts with the investigation of R-words called relators (each R-word, e. g., R_1 , R_2 or R_3 is a relator) in the applicative generative model. This model as «an artificial semiotic system stimulating natural languages» (Шаумян та ін. 1968: 30) was investigated by S. K. Shaumian and P. A. Soboleva (1968). Depending on the part of speech,

relators can be identified as R_1 to denote a verb, R_2 – a noun, R_3 – an adjective. Each subsequent relator represents one derivation step which results in a new word-forming or lexical meaning. Zero derivation step always indicates the morphemic (deriving) stem of R-word. This stem is termed as O and the relator determines its part of speech. For example, the noun *management* corresponds to R-word R_2R_1O , where R_1O is a zero derivation step and O displays the morphemic stem *manage*, and R_1 is a verb, i. e. a part of speech of the deriving stem *manage*. Next, the suffix *-ment* is added to the morphemic stem to form the noun *management* which will be written as R_2 and considered the first derivation step (Шепель 2006; 2013).

In this research word-formation rows are studied in terms of homogeneity and heterogeneity, so we will take into account works by Yu. A. Shepel who states that a row can be homogeneous if the meaning of i coincides at n (penultimate) step (Шепель 2006: 15). If the meaning of i at the penultimate derivation step does not coincide, the row is regarded as a heterogeneous one (Шепель 2006: 16). For example, the row *detachment*, *nonattachment*, corresponding to R-structures R_2R_1O , $R_2R_2R_1O$ is homogeneous as the relator R_2 is at the penultimate step in both words.

Below there is an explanation how we count derivational steps and what the penultimate step is.

R_1O is treated as a zero derivation step standing for the verb *detach* «to separate something from something else that it is connected to» (Collins). R_2 is the first and penultimate derivational step to denote the noun *detachment* «a group of soldiers separated from the main group in order to perform a particular duty» (Collins). So, in the word *detachment* R_2 is considered to be the penultimate derivation step.

The word *nonattachment* is represented as the following R-structure $R_2R_2R_1O$, where R_1O is a zero derivational step standing for the verb *attach* «to fasten, join, or connect» (Collins). R_2 is the first and penultimate derivational step for the noun *attachment* «the act of attaching or the state of being attached» (Collins). R_2 is the third and last derivational step meaning the noun *nonattachment* «the state or quality of not being attached» (Collins). This detailed description shows that R_2 in the word *detachment* and R_2 in the word *nonattachment* are penultimate steps with the meaning of nouns, so the word-formation row *detachment*, *nonattachment* is a homogeneous one.

The row *agistment*, *enlistment*, *reenlistment* with the structure R_2R_1O , $R_2R_1R_1O$, $R_2R_2R_1R_1O$ ($R_2R_1R_1R_1O$) is called heterogeneous due to the different parts of speech of the relator at the penultimate step – R_2 and R_1 .

Taking into account V. Lehmann's (Lehman 2015: 1024) statements that if a motivating word is polysemous, it is possible that derivation does not operate in all of its meanings. We support the scholar's idea concerning derivational categories that select specific senses of the motivating word. On the other hand, the motivated word can obtain a meaning that is not part of the motivating word. The word *agistment* ($agist_v > agistment$) includes the stem R_1O and the first derivational step R_2 which can be considered the penultimate step. In terms of polysemy and referring academic dictionaries, the motivating verbal stem *agist* with the meaning «to feed or pasture livestock for a fee» (Webster) completely motivates the derived noun *agistment* with several meanings «1) the act of agisting; 2) a contract or an agreement to agist; 3) the fee paid or the profit made in agisting» (Webster). The noun *enlistment* ($list_v > enlist_v > enlist-$

ment) means «1) the action of accepting someone into the armed forces or of joining the armed forces; 2) the period of time for which one is committed to military service; 3) an act of enlisting» (Cambridge) and it is completely motivated by the verb *enlist* which means «to enter or persuade to enter into an engagement to serve in the armed forces» (Cambridge) which is partially motivated by the verb *list* with meanings «1) to include in a list; 2) an archaic word for enlist; 3) (archaic) to enlist in the armed forces» (Cambridge). In a polysemous word *reenlistment*, R-word $R_2R_2R_1R_1O$ ($list_v > enlist_v > reenlist_v > reenlistment$) has partial motivation at the first and second steps. There is full motivation at the third step as the meaning of the deriving verb *reenlist* «to join the armed forces again, or to sign to stay in the armed forces» (Cambridge) is completely preserved in the derived noun *reenlistment* «1) an act of reenlisting; 2) a person who reenlists; the period of service following a reenlistment» (Cambridge). R-word $R_2R_1R_1R_1O$ ($list_v > enlist_v > enlistment > reenlistment$) has partial motivation in all steps.

Yu. A. Shepel (2006: 35) points out that the depth of a row is determined by the number of derivation steps in the longest derived words. So, the depth of the row *detachment*, *nonattachment* will be equal to two, which corresponds to two derivation steps. The number of word structures included in a row comprises the row complexity. The row is considered to be simple if its derived words have a similar R-structure and its number does not exceed one or two R-structures. For instance, the following row is simple:

R_2R_1O *embarrassment* (*embarrass* > *embarrassment*);

$R_2R_1R_1O$ *encompassment* (*compass* > *encompass* > *encompassment*).

Its complexity is equal to two because the row consists of only two words with a similar word-formation structure.

The following row can be an example of a complex row with the following R-structure:

R_2R_1O *attachment* ($attach_v > attachment_n$), *bafflement* ($baffle_v > bafflement_n$), *banishment* ($banish_v > banishment_n$), *detachment* ($detach_v > detachment_n$), *embarrassment* ($embarrass_v > embarrassment_n$), *harassment* ($harass_v > harassment_n$);

$R_2R_1O \vee R_2R_2O$ *solacement* ($solace_v > solacement \vee solace_n > solacement$), *placement* ($place_v > placement \vee place_n > placement$);

$R_2R_1R_1O \vee R_2R_2R_1O$ *outplacement* ($place_v > outplace_v > outplacement \vee place_n > placement_n > outplacement$);

$R_2R_1R_1O$ *enlistment* ($list_v > enlist_v > enlistment$).

The row below is composed of six R-structures such as R_2R_1O , $R_2R_1O \vee R_2R_2O$, $R_2R_1R_1O \vee R_2R_2R_1O$, $R_2R_1R_1O$ so its complexity is six.

Motivational relations play an important role in distinguishing the peculiarities of rows. Thus, J. Furdik states that «motivation is the most important principle of the organization of lexis» (Furdik 2008: 32). The scholar paid special attention to lexical motivation and considers it to be «... as a property or a web of relations among lexical items» (Furdik 2008: 80). We support the scholar's idea that «a lexical item is not arbitrary, but motivated» (Furdik 2008: 31).

The notion «motivation» was studied by I. A. Shyrshov (1981), I. S. Ulukhanov (2005), O. A. Zemskaya (2005), O. I. Blinova (2010) who consider a word-forming

motivation to be relations between two words with the same root and the meaning of one word fully or partially coincides with the meaning of the other word. I. A. Shyrshov (Ширшов 1981: 20) supposes that the motivation is a semantic derivability of one word from another, e. g., the meaning of the word *enrockment* «mass of large stones thrown into water to form a base» (Collins) can be semantically derived from the noun *rock* «a piece of rock or stone» (Collins).

According to V. N. Musatov (Мусатов 2012: 18), the metaphorical motivation implies that the transfer of meaning occurs in a derived word not in a deriving one, e. g. the word *parchment* (*parch_v* > *parchment_n*) with the meaning «the thin, dried skin of some animals that was used in the past for writing on» (Collins) is metaphorically motivated by the verb *parch* «to dry something out because of too much heat» (Collins).

M. Aronoff (Aronoff 2011: 36) states that the meanings of the stems are never lost, simply transformed. The words therefore can be partially motivated.

3. Methodology of the research. Three word-classes representing three word-formation rows are studied in the paper. These word classes consist of 77 words. The descriptive and structural methods were applied for investigating motivation relations in words. The structural method was realized with the help of the componential analysis to study the meaning of the derived English words with the suffix *-ment*. The comparative method was employed to compare meanings of the deriving and derived words. The method of continuous sampling for selecting words with the suffix *-ment* from academic dictionaries was used. The structure of the words was researched with the help of the applicative generative model.

4. Analysis of word-formation rows. P. A. Soboleva (2012: 79–80) points out two classes of R-words:

1) Classes of R-words with identical first relators (counting from the root O). There are four such classes: $\{R_i^n R_1 O\}$, $\{R_i^n R_2 O\}$, $\{R_i^n R_3 O\}$, $\{R_i^n R_4 O\}$, where R_i indicates any relator of the four, i. e. $R_1 \vee R_2 \vee R_3 \vee R_4$, R_i^n is the abbreviation of R_i applied n times. $\{ \}$ is an indication of a class of R-words. For example, R-structures of this class can be arranged according to word-families such as *develop*, *developer*, *development*, *developmental* etc. $\{R_i^n R_1 O\}$.

2) Classes of R-words with two identical final relators. There are sixteen such classes:

$\{R_1 R_1 R_i^m O\}$, $\{R_1 R_2 R_i^m O\}$, $\{R_1 R_3 R_i^m O\}$, $\{R_1 R_4 R_i^m O\}$, $\{R_2 R_1 R_i^m O\}$, $\{R_2 R_2 R_i^m O\}$ etc., where R_i^m is the abbreviation of R_i applied m times. R-words of this class are places in correspondence with word-series, i. e., words with an identical derivational formant, such as *abashment* ($R_2 R_1 O$), *annulment* ($R_2 R_1 R_3 O$), *enlistment* ($R_2 R_1 R_1 O$), *beguilement* ($R_2 R_1 R_2 O$), all belonging to the class $\{R_2 R_1 R_i^m O\}$.

The word class $R_2 R_1 X$ is represented (Table 1) by 50 words which have the following R-structures $R_2 R_1 O$, $R_2 R_1 R_3 O$, $R_2 R_1 R_1 O$, $R_2 R_1 R_2 O$, $R_2 R_1 R_1 R_2 O \vee R_2 R_1 R_1 R_3 O$ so the complexity is six and the depth is three.

R-word $R_2 R_1 O$ includes 27 words created from the verbal stem and they are fully motivated because the meaning of the deriving words is kept in the derived one, e. g.:

punishment (*punish_v* > *punishment_n*) – the deriving stem *punish* with the meaning «to cause someone who has done something wrong or committed a crime to suffer, by

hurting them, forcing them to pay money, sending them to prison, etc.» (Collins) fully motivates the word *punishment* «the act of punishing someone» (Collins). The same motivation occurs in the following words *ailment* (*ail_v* > *ailment_n*), *adornment* (*adorn_v* > *adornment_n*), *appointment* (*appoint_v* > *appointment_n*), *assailment* (*assail_v* > *assailment_n*), *arraignment* (*arraign_v* > *arraignment_n*), *assignment* (*assign_v* > *assignment_n*), *attachment* (*attach_v* > *attachment_n*), *bafflement* (*baffle_v* > *bafflement_n*), *banishment* (*banish_v* > *banishment_n*), *chastisement* (*chastise_v* > *chastisement_n*), *consignment* (*consign_v* > *consignment_n*), *detachment* (*detach_v* > *detachment_n*), *encroachment* (*encroach_v* > *encroachment_n*), *embarrassment* (*embarass_v* > *embarrassment_n*), *embellishment* (*embellish_v* > *embellishment_n*), *embezzlement* (*embezzle_v* > *embezzlement_n*), *harassment* (*harass_v* > *harassment_n*), *impeachment* (*impeach_v* > *impeachment_n*), *management* (*manage_v* > *management_n*), *nourishment* (*nourish_v* > *nourishment_n*), *ointment* (*oint_v* > *ointment_n*), *pavement* (*pave_v* > *pavement_n*), *polishment* (*polish_v* > *polishment_n*), *preachment* (*preach_v* > *preachment_n*), *publication* (*publish_v* > *publication_n*), *punishment* (*punish_v* > *punishment_n*), *treatment* (*treat_v* > *treatment_n*).

R-word R₂R₁R₃O is characterized by the partial motivation at the first derivation step and the full motivation – at the second one, e. g. the word *aggrandizement* (*grand_{adj}* > *aggrandize_v* > *aggrandizement_n*) is motivated by the adjective *grand* «important and large in degree; impressive and large or important; excellent or enjoyable» (Collins) whose meaning is partially saved in the verb *aggrandize* «to make someone more powerful or important» (Collins) and the meaning of the verb is fully kept in the noun *aggrandizement* «an increase in power or importance» (Collins). The following eight words resemble the same motivation: *annulment* (*null_{adj}* > *annul_v* > *annulment_n*), *curtailment* (*curt_{adj}* > *curtail_v* > *curtailment_n*), *enablement* (*able_{adj}* > *enable_v* > *enablement_n*), *enlargement* (*large_{adj}* > *enlarge_v* > *enlargement_n*), *embrittlement* (*brittle_{adj}* > *embrittle_v* > *embrittlement_n*), *disablement* (*able_{adj}* > *disable_v* > *disablement_n*), *embrittlement* (*brittle_{adj}* > *embrittle_v* > *embrittlement_n*), *enfeeblement* (*feeble_{adj}* > *enfeeble_v* > *enfeeblement_n*).

R-word R₂R₁R₁O has the full motivation at the first derivation step (*raze_v* > *erase_v*) and the partial motivation – at the second one, e. g. the word *eracement* (*raze_v* > *erase_v* > *eracement_n*) which means «the act of erasing; demolition» (Collins) is partially motivated by the verb *erase* which has two meanings «1) to remove something, especially a pencil mark by rubbing it; 2) to cause a feeling, memory, or period of time to be completely forgotten» (Collins) which is derived from the verb and is *raze* «to completely destroy a city, building, etc.» (Collins). The same motivation is observed in the following words *emplacement* (*place_v* > *emplace_v* > *emplacement_n*), *assuagement* (*suage_v* > *assuage_v* > *assuagement_n*), *refurbishment* (*furish_v* > *refurbish_v* > *refurbishment_n*), *replenishment* (*plenish_v* > *replenish_v* > *replenishment_n*).

R-word R₂R₁R₂O has the partial motivation at the first derivation step and the full motivation – at the second one, e. g. the word *beguilement* (*guile_n* > *beguile_v* > *beguilement_n*) means the act of beguiling or the state of being beguiled and is fully motivated by the verb *beguile* with meanings «1) to persuade, attract, or interest someone, sometimes in order to deceive them; 2) to charm, attract, or interest, sometimes in order to deceive» (Cambridge) and this verb is partially motivated by the noun *guile* with the

meaning «clever but sometimes dishonest behaviour that you use to deceive someone» (Cambridge). The following words are characterized by the same motivation relations *impoverishment* ($poverty_n > impoverish_v > impoverishment_n$), *enfranchisement* ($franchise_n > enfranchise_v > enfranchisement_n$), *advertizement* ($advert_n > advertize_v > advertizement_n$), *encompassment* ($compass_n > encompass_v > encompassment_n$), *amassment* ($mass_n > amass_v > amassment_n$).

R-word $R_2R_1R_1R_2O \vee R_2R_1R_1R_3O$ is a polysemous word with the multiple motivation i. e. it can be derived not only from the noun but also from the adjective, e. g. *enlightenment* with the meaning «the state of understanding something» (Collins). R-word $R_2R_1R_1R_2O$ *enlightenment* ($light_n > lighten_v > enlighten_v > enlightenment_n$) is motivated by the verb *enlighten* «to provide someone with information and understanding, or to explain the true facts about something to someone» (Collins) which is, in turn, metaphorically motivated by the verb *lighten* with the meanings «1) to become less dark; 2) to make a difficult situation or responsibility easier; 3) to make something lighter» (Collins) and it is partially motivated by the noun *light* «the brightness that comes from the sun, fire, etc. and from electrical devices, and that allows things to be seen» (Collins). R-word $R_2R_1R_1R_3O$ ($light_{adj} > lighten_v > enlighten_v > enlightenment_n$) can be derived from the adjective *light* with the meaning «lit by the natural light of the day» (Collins) and it partially motivates the verb *lighten* with the above-mentioned meanings which metaphorically motivates the verb *enlighten* from which the noun *enlightenment* is derived.

So, the word-formation row represented by R_2R_1X class (Table 1) is a homogeneous because there is R_1 at the penultimate step in each R-word.

Table 1 – R_2R_1X Class

Step No.	R-words	L=class
I	R_2R_1O	<i>adornment, ailment, appointment, assailment, arraignment, assignment, attachment, bafflement, banishment, chastisement, consignment, detachment, encroachment, embarrassment, embellishment, embezzlement, harassment, impeachment, management, nourishment, ointment, pavement, polishment, preachment, publication, punishment, treatment</i>
II	$R_2R_1R_3O$	<i>aggrandizement, annulment, curtailment, enablement, enlargement, embrittlement, disablement, enfeeblement</i>
II	$R_2R_1R_1O$	<i>enlistment, encompassment, amassment, erasement, emplacement, assuagement, refurbishment, replenishment</i>
II	$R_2R_1R_2O$	<i>advertisement, impoverishment, beguilement, enfranchisement, encompassment, amassment</i>
III	$R_2R_1R_1R_2O$ ($R_2R_1R_1R_3O$)	<i>enlightenment</i>

The word-class R_2R_2X is represented (Table 2) by 9 words which have the following R-structures R_2R_2O , $R_2R_2R_1O$, $R_2R_2R_2O \vee R_2R_2R_1O \vee R_2R_3R_3R_2O$, $R_2R_2R_1R_1O \vee R_2R_2R_2O$ so the complexity is six and the depth is three.

Table 2 – R₂R₂X Class

Step No.	R-words	L=class
I	R ₂ R ₂ O	<i>enrockment, escarpment, furniment, rabblement</i>
II	R ₂ R ₂ R ₁ O	<i>nonattachment, nonengagement</i>
II (III)	R ₂ R ₂ R ₁ O R ₂ R ₂ R ₂ O (R ₂ R ₃ R ₃ R ₂ O)	<i>underemployment, unemployment</i>
II (III)	R ₂ R ₂ R ₂ O (R ₂ R ₂ R ₁ R ₁ O)	<i>overallotment</i>

R-word R₂R₂O is characterized by the full motivation, e. g., the noun *escarpment* (*scarp_n* > *escarpment_n*) with the meaning «a steep slope or cliff, such as one that marks the edge of a range of hills» (Cambridge) is motivated by the noun *scarp* «a steep slope or cliff formed by folded or eroded layers of rock» (Cambridge). The same motivation is observed in the following words *enrockment* (*rock_n* > *enrockment_n*), *furniment* (*furniture_n* > *furniment_n*), *rabblement* (*rabble_n* > *rabblement_n*).

R-word R₂R₂R₁O has partial motivation at the first derivation step, e. g. in a word *nonengagement* (*engage_v* > *engagement_v* > *nonengagement_n*) the noun *engagement* has four meanings: «1) an agreement to marry someone; 2) an arrangement to meet someone or do something at a particular time; 3) the fact of being involved with something; 4) the process of encouraging people to be interested in the work of an organization, etc.» (Collins) and it is partially motivated by the verb *engage* with the meanings «1) to employ someone; 2) to interest someone in something and keep them thinking about it; 3) to become involved, or have contact, with someone or something; 4) to make one part of a machine fit into and move together with another part of a machine; 5) to attack or begin to fight someone» (Collins). There is partial motivation at the second derivation step (*engagement_v* > *nonengagement_n*) because the word *nonengagement* with the meaning «the failure to engage or participate in the pursuits or actions of a group» (Collins) partially keeps only one meaning of the motivating word *engagement* «the fact of being involved with something» (Collins). The word *nonattachment* (*attach_v* > *attachment_v* > *nonattachment_n*) has the same motivation.

R-word R₂R₂R₂O ∨ R₂R₂R₁O ∨ R₂R₃R₃R₂O has multiple motivation as it can be derived both from the noun and the verb and it has the following structure *underemployment* (*employ_n* > *employment_n* > *underemployment_n* ∨ *employ_v* > *employment_n* > *underemployment_n* ∨ *employ_n* > *employed_{adj}* > *underemployed_{adj}* > *underemployment_n*).

R-word R₂R₂R₁O has full motivation at the first derivation step because the deriving word *employ* with the following meanings «1) to have someone work or do a job for you and pay them for it; 2) to use something» (Cambridge) is completely kept in the derived noun *employment* «1) the fact of someone being paid to work for a company or organization; 2) the use of something for a particular purpose; 3) work that you are paid to do for a particular company or organization» (Cambridge). There is partial metaphorical motivation at the second step because *underemployment* with meanings «1) a situation in which someone or something is not used as much as they should be; 2) the fact of not having enough work to do, only working part time, or of having a job that does not use all your skills» (Cambridge) partially keeps the meaning of *employ-*

ment. R-word $R_2R_2R_2O$ has partial motivation at the first step because the deriving word *employ* as a noun has only meaning «be in smb's employ» (Cambridge) that partially motivates the word *employment* with a wider range of meanings which, in turn, motivates the word *underemployment* whose meaning was mentioned above.

R-word $R_2R_3R_3R_2O$ ($employ_n > employed_{adj} > underemployed_{adj} > underemployment_n$) has full motivation at the first step because the meaning of the deriving word *employ* as a noun is completely resembled in the derived adjective *employed* «having a job working for a company or another person» (Cambridge) which is partially kept at the second step in an adjective *underemployed* which partially motivates the word *underemployment* at the third step. The same motivation relations occur in a word *unemployment* ($employ_n > employment_n > unemployment_n \vee employ_v > unemployed_{adj} > unemployment_n \vee employ_n > employed_{adj} > unemployed_{adj} > unemployment_n$).

R-word $R_2R_2R_1R_1O \vee R_2R_2R_2O$ *overallotment* is a polysemous with multiple motivation. R-word $R_2R_2R_1R_1O$ ($lot_v > allot_v > allotment_n > overallotment_n$) has partial motivation at the first step because the meaning of the deriving word *lot* «divide (items) into lots for sale at an auction» (Cambridge) is indirectly kept in a derived word *allot* «to give a share of something for a particular purpose» (Cambridge). There is full motivation at the second step because the meaning of the word *allotment* «the process of sharing something, or the amount that you get» (Collins) completely coincides with its deriving verb *allot*. There is partial metaphorical motivation at the third step as *overallotment* with the meaning «1) in a share offering (=time when shares are offered for sale); 2) extra shares that are available if all the main shares are sold» (Cambridge) partially keeps the meaning of the noun *allotment*. R-word $R_2R_2R_2O$ *overallotment* ($lot_n > allotment_n > overallotment_n$) has full motivation at the first step because one meaning of the word *lot* as a noun «in an auction, an object or set of objects that are being sold» (Cambridge) is completely kept in the derived word *allotment* «the amount of shares that someone is given when new shares are being made available» (Cambridge), partial motivation is at the second step because the meaning of *allotment* is partially kept in the noun *overallotment*.

So, the row representing the word class R_2R_2X is heterogeneous because not only R_2 is at the penultimate step but also R_2 .

The word-class $R_2R_1X \vee R_2R_2X$ is represented (Table 3) by 18 words which have the following R-structures $R_2R_1R_1O \vee R_2R_2R_1O$, $R_2R_1R_2O \vee R_2R_2R_2O$, $R_2R_1R_1R_1O \vee R_2R_2R_2O$, $R_2R_1R_1R_1O \vee R_2R_2R_1R_1O$, $R_2R_1R_1R_2O \vee R_2R_2R_1R_2O$. The complexity is ten and the depth is three.

R-word $R_2R_1R_1O \vee R_2R_2R_1O$ has multiple motivation, e. g., R-word $R_2R_1R_1O$ *underachievement* ($achieve_v > underachieve_v > underachievement_n$) is characterized by partial motivation at the first step because meanings of the deriving verb *achieve* «1) to succeed in finishing something or reaching an aim, especially after a lot of work or effort; 2) to do or obtain something that you wanted after planning and working to make it happen» (Cambridge) is partially kept in the verb *underachieve* «to do less well than you could or should» (Cambridge) which, in turn, completely motivates the noun *underachievement* «the fact of doing less well than expected» (Cambridge). R-word $R_2R_2R_1O$ ($achieve_v > achievement_n > underachievement_n$) has full motivation at the

first step because the meaning of the verb *achieve* is kept in the derived noun *achievement* with the meaning «1) something very good and difficult that you have succeeded in doing; 2) the act of achieving something or of achieving things generally» (Cambridge) which partially motivates the noun *underachievement*. The following words are characterized by the same motivation relations *disagreement* (*agree_v* > *disagree_v* > *disagreement_n* ∨ *agree_v* > *agreement_n* > *disagreement_n*), *disengagement* (*engage_v* > *disengage_v* > *disengagement_n* ∨ *engage_v* > *engagement_n* > *disengagement_n*), *misgovernment* (*govern_v* > *misgovern_v* > *misgovernment_n* ∨ *govern_v* > *government_n* > *misgovernment_n*), *overinvestment* (*invest_v* > *overinvest_v* > *overinvestment_n* ∨ *invest_v* > *investment_n* > *overinvestment_n*), *readjustment* (*adjust_v* > *readjust_v* > *readjustment_n* ∨ *adjust_v* > *adjustment_n* > *readjustment_n*), *reassessment* (*assess_v* > *reassess_v* > *reassessment_n* ∨ *assess_v* > *assessment_n* > *reassessment_n*), *redeployment* (*deploy_v* > *redeploy_v* > *redeployment_n* ∨ *deploy_v* > *deployment_n* > *redeployment_n*), *redevelopment* (*develop_v* > *redevelop_v* > *redevelopment_n* ∨ *develop_v* > *development_n* > *redevelopment_n*), *resettlement* (*settle_v* > *resettle_v* > *resettlement_n* ∨ *settle_v* > *settlement_n* > *resettlement_n*), *reinvestment* (*invest_v* > *reinvest_v* > *reinvestment_n* ∨ *invest_v* > *investment_n* > *reinvestment_n*), *restatement* (*state_v* > *restate_v* > *restatement_n* ∨ *state_v* > *statement_n* > *restatement_n*), *underachievement* (*achieve_v* > *underachieve_v* > *underachievement_n* ∨ *achieve_v* > *achievement_n* > *underachievement_n*), *undernourishment* (*nourish_v* > *undernourish_v* > *undernourishment_n* ∨ *nourish_v* > *nourishment_n* > *undernourishment_n*).

R-word $R_2R_1R_2O \vee R_2R_2R_2O$ has multiple motivation at the first step, e. g., *disguisement* (*guise_n* > *disguise_v* > *disguisement_n*) representing R-word $R_2R_1R_2O$ with partial motivation at the first step because the meaning of the deriving noun *guise* «the appearance of someone or something, especially when intended to deceive» (Cambridge) is partially kept in the verb *disguise* «1) to give a new appearance to a person or thing, especially in order to hide its true form; 2) to hide an opinion, a feeling, etc.» (Cambridge). There is full motivation at the second step as the meaning of the verb *disguise* is completely kept in the derived noun *disguisement* with the meaning «the action of hiding smth or preventing it from being known» (Cambridge). R-word $R_2R_2R_2O$ (*guise_n* > *disguise_n* > *disguisement_n*) has full motivation at the first step because the meaning of the deriving noun *guise* is completely kept in the derived *disguise* as a noun with the meaning «something that someone wears to hide their true appearance» and it fully motivates the noun *disguisement* (Cambridge). The noun *disillusionment* (*illusion_n* > *disillusion_v* > *disillusionment_n* ∨ *illusion_n* > *illusionment_n* > *disillusionment_n*) has the same motivational relations.

R-word $R_2R_1R_1R_1O \vee R_2R_2R_2O$ can be derived both from the verb and the noun. R-word $R_2R_2R_2O$ *misalignment* (*line_n* > *alignment_n* > *misalignment_n*) has partial motivation at the first step because among 15 meanings of the deriving word *line* as a noun only one meaning «a row of people or things» (Cambridge) is partially resembled in the derived noun *alignment* with the meanings «1) an arrangement in which two or more things are positioned in a straight line; 2) in agreement between a group of countries, political parties, or people who want to work together because of shared interests or aims» (Cambridge). Partial motivation occurs at the second step because the deriving noun *misalignment* has two meanings «1) an arrangement in which the parts of a ma-

chine or structure do not fit together correctly, which causes problems; 2) a situation in which parts of a system are different, so the system does not work well» (Cambridge) which do not completely coincide with the meanings of the deriving noun *alignment*. R-word $R_2R_1R_1R_1O$ *misalignment* ($line_v > align_v > misalign_v > misalignment_n$) can be characterized by partial metaphorical motivation at the first step because the verb *align* with meanings «1) to put two or more things into a straight line; 2) to change something so that it has a correct relationship to something else; 3) to agree with or support another person, group, organization, or view» (Cambridge) partially resembles the meaning of the deriving word *line* as a verb «1) to form a row along the side of something; 2) to cover the inside surface of something» (Cambridge). There is partial motivation at the second step and full motivation at the third one because the meaning of *misalign* completely coincides with the derived word *misalignment* with meanings «1) an arrangement in which the parts of a machine or structure do not fit together correctly, which causes problems; 2) a situation in which parts of a system are different, so the system does not work well» (Cambridge).

R-word $R_2R_1R_1R_1O \vee R_2R_2R_1R_1O$ has multiple motivation at the second derivation step, e. g., R-word $R_2R_1R_1R_1O$ *disembodiment* ($body_v > embody_v > disembody_v > disembodiment_v$) has partial motivation at the first step because the deriving word *body* has the following meanings «1) give material form to smth abstract; 2) build the body-work of (a motor vehicle)» (Cambridge) which are partially kept in the derived verb *embody* «1) be an expression of or give a tangible or visible form to smth, provide with a physical form; 2) include or contain smth. as a constituent part; 3) form (people) into a body, esp. for a military purpose» (Cambridge) which, in turn, partially motivates the verb *disembody* «separate smth from its material form» (Cambridge). There is full motivation at the third step because the noun *disembodiment* «an act or instance of disembodiment or the state of being disembodied» (Cambridge) completely resembles the meaning of the verb *disembody*. R-word $R_2R_2R_1R_1O$ ($body_v > embody_v > embodiment_n > disembodiment_n$) has partial motivation both at the first step and at the second one because the derived word *embodiment* with meanings «1) a tangible or visible form of an idea, quality or feeling; 2) the representation of smth in a tangible or visible form» (Collins) partially resembles the meaning of the deriving word *embody*. There is partial motivation at the third step too because the meaning of the noun *embodiment* is indirectly resembled in the derived noun *disembodiment*.

R-word $R_2R_1R_1R_2O \vee R_2R_2R_1R_2O$ has multiple motivation at the second step, e. g., R-word $R_2R_1R_1R_2O$ *disenfranchisement* ($franchise_n > enfranchise_v > disenfranchise_v > disenfranchisement_n$) has the following meanings «1) the action of taking away the right to vote from a person or group; 2) a feeling in a person or group of having no power or opportunities, or of not being represented in the political system» (Cambridge) and it is completely motivated by the verb *disenfranchise* «1) to take away power or opportunities, especially the right to vote, from a person or group; 2) to take away a person's right to vote» (Cambridge) which is partially motivated by the verb *enfranchise* «to give a person or group of people the right to vote in elections» (Cambridge) with *franchise* as a deriving word with meanings «1) a right to sell a company's products in a particular area using the company's name; 2) a series of films that have

the same or similar titles and are about the same characters; 3) the right to vote» (Cambridge) where only the third meaning partially motivates *enfranchise*. R-word $R_2R_2R_1R_2O$ ($franchise_n > enfranchise_v > enfranchisement_n > disenfranchisement_n$) has partial motivation at the first step. There is full motivation at the second step because the meaning of *enfranchise* is completely resembled in a derived word *enfranchisement* «the fact of giving a person or group of people the right to vote in elections» (Cambridge) which partially motivates the noun *disenfranchisement*.

So, despite polysemous words that constitute the row representing the word class $R_2R_1X \vee R_2R_2X$, this row (Table 3) is homogeneous because $R_1 \vee R_2$ is at the penultimate step of each word in the row.

Table 3 – $R_2R_1X \vee R_2R_2X$ Class

Step No.	R-words	L=class
II	$R_2R_1R_1O$ ($R_2R_2R_1O$)	<i>disagreement, disengagement, misgovernment, overinvestment, readjustment, reassessment, redeployment, redevelopment, resettlement, reinvestment, restatement, underachievement, undernourishment</i>
II	$R_2R_1R_2O$ ($R_2R_2R_2O$)	<i>disillusionment, disguise</i>
III (II)	$R_2R_1R_1R_1O$ ($R_2R_2R_2O$)	<i>misalignment</i>
III	$R_2R_1R_1R_1O$ ($R_2R_2R_1R_1O$)	<i>disembodiment</i>
III	$R_2R_1R_1R_2O$ ($R_2R_2R_1R_2O$)	<i>disenfranchisement</i>

5. Conclusions. The analysis of the word-formation rows with the help of the applicative generative model helps study the structure of rows in terms of their homogeneity / heterogeneity, depth and complexity. The motivational relations between words in rows were investigated. Three word-classes such as R_2R_1X , R_2R_2X , $R_2R_1X \vee R_2R_2X$ were distinguished according to which three word-formation rows with the suffix *-ment* were built. So, the investigated rows are not deep because their depth equals three derivational steps. The complexity of rows representing R_2R_1X and R_2R_2X word-classes is six and in $R_2R_1X \vee R_2R_2X$ word-class – ten and it means that a word-formation row with multiple motivation and polysemous words is more complex. R_2R_1X word-class includes a homogeneous row, R_2R_2X word-class consists of a heterogeneous row, $R_2R_1X \vee R_2R_2X$ word-class comprises a homogeneous row.

This research leads to the conclusion that word-formation rows with the suffix *-ment* grouped according to three word-classes are more homogeneous than heterogeneous.

Further studies will be devoted to creating and analyzing semantic fields of words comprising word-formation rows with the suffix *-ment*.

References

1. Блинова О. И. Мотивология и ее аспекты. Москва: Красанд, 2010. 301 с.
[Blinova O. I. Motivologiya i yeye aspekty. Moskva: Krasand, 2010. 301 s.]
2. Виленская Н. С. Становление и развитие суффиксальных словообразовательных рядов английского языка: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.04. Москва, 1986. 23 с.
[Vilenskaya N. S. Stanovleniye i razvitiye suffiksalnykh slovoobrazovatelnykh ryadov angliyskogo yazyka: avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.04. Moskva, 1986. 23 s.]
3. Земская Е. А. Словообразование. *Современный русский язык* / под ред. В. А. Белошапковой. Москва: Наука, 1981. С. 80–110.
[Zemskaya Ye. A. Slovoobrazovaniye. *Sovremennyy russkiy yazyk* / pod red. V. A. Beloshapkovoy. Moskva: Nauka, 1981. S. 80–110]
4. Мусатов В. Н. Деривационные суффиксальные форманты, формирующие отраженную полисемию (на материале отглагольных существительных). Москва, ФЛИНТА: Наука. 2012. С. 127–148.
[Musatov V. N. Derivatsionnyye suffiksalnyye formanty, formiruyushchiye otrazhennuyu polisemiyu (na materiale otglagolnykh sushchestvitelnykh). Moskva, FLINTA: Nauka. 2012. S. 127–148]
5. Соболева П. А., Шаумян С. К. Основания порождающей грамматики русского языка: введение в генотипические структуры. Москва: Наука, 1968. 375 с.
[Soboleva P. A., Shaumyan S. K. Osnovaniya porozhdayushchey grammatiki russkogo yazyka: vvedeniye v genotipicheskiye struktury. Moskva: Nauka, 1968. 375 s.]
6. Шепель Ю. А. Словообразовательный ряд в системе словообразования. Днепропетровск: Наука и образование, 2006. 304 с.
[Shepel Yu. A. Slovoobrazovatelnyy ryad v sisteme slovoobrazovaniya. Dnepropetrovsk: Nauka i obrazovaniye, 2006. 304 s.]
7. Шепель Ю. А. Словообразовательный ряд и его роль в системной организации лексики. Днепропетровск: Белая Е. А., 2013. 240 с.
[Shepel Yu. A. Slovoobrazovatelnyy ryad i yego rol v sistemnoy organizatsii leksiki. Dnepropetrovsk: Belaya Ye. A., 2013. 240 s.]
8. Ширшов И. А. Множественность словообразовательной мотивации в современном русском языке. Ростов-на-Дону: Изд-во Ростовского университета, 1981. 117 с.
[Shirshov I. A. Mnozhestvennost slovoobrazovatelnoy motivatsii v sovremennom russkom yazyke. Rostov-na-Donu: Izd-vo Rostovskogo universiteta, 1981. 117 s.]
9. Улуханов И. С. Мотивация в словообразовательной системе русского языка. Москва: Либроком, 2010. 320 с.
[Ulukhanov I. S. Motivatsiya v slovoobrazovatelnoy sisteme russkogo yazyka. Moskva: Librokom, 2010. 320 s.]
10. Aronoff M., Fudeman K. A. What is Morphology? United States: John Wiley & Sons, 2011. 35 p.
11. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/> (16.04.2022).
12. Collins English Dictionary. Glasgow: Collins, 2015 URL: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/> (16.04.2022).
13. Furdík J. Teória motivácie v lexikálnej zásobe. *Theory of motivation in the lexicon* / M. Ološtiak (ed.). Košice: Vydavateľstvo LG, 2008. P. 11–23.
14. Lehmann V. Categories of word-formation. *Word-Formation: An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe* / P. O. Müller (ed.). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2015. P. 1020–1034.
15. Merriam-Webster's Advanced Learner's English Dictionary. Springfield, United States: Merriam Webster U. A., 2008. URL: <https://www.learnersdictionary.com/> (16.04.2022).
16. Soboleva P. A. Derivation structure of Russian lexico. *Trends in Soviet theoretical linguistics (Foundations of Language Supplementary Series)* / F. Kiefer (ed.) Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media, 2012. P. 77–105.

HOMOGENEOUS AND HETEROGENEOUS WORD-FORMATION ROWS WITH THE SUFFIX -MENT**Olena Dotsenko**

Department of Translation Studies and Linguistic Training for Foreigners, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine.

Abstract

Background: Modern word-formation in the English language lacks the sufficient investigation of word-formation rows which are often confused with word-formation nests and chains. Polysemous words pose a difficulty in identifying deriving stems in derived words with the suffix *-ment*.

Purpose: The paper focuses on structural peculiarities of word-formation rows using the relator language of the applicative generative model. The article aims at analyzing homogeneous and heterogeneous structures of rows, their depth and complexity, and peculiarities of motivational relations.

Results: With the help of the applicative generative model, the author identifies the deriving stem in each word from the synchronous point of view and distinguishes three word-classes (R_2R_1X , R_2R_2X , $R_2R_1X \vee R_2R_2X$) of word-formation rows. The research leads to the conclusion that there are two homogeneous rows and one heterogeneous among three word-formation rows. In terms of the depth the rows are not deep and their complexity is different depending on the number of R-structures in each row.

Discussion: The study concludes that word-formation rows with the suffix *-ment* are more homogeneous than heterogeneous despite the polysemy of words. It is necessary to carry out further research into creating semantic fields of word-formation rows with the suffix *-ment* and investigating their lexical, semantic and structural peculiarities. The choice of the research is determined by insufficient investigation of all aspects of a word-formation row in the English language.

Keywords: a word-formation row, multiple motivation, a derivational step, polysemous words, the applicative generative model.

Vitae

Olena Dotsenko got her Master's degree in English and German Languages and Foreign Literature at Kryvyi Rih Pedagogical State University at the Department of Foreign Languages. Now she is studying at Oles Honchar Dnipro National University. She is pursuing a Ph.D. in Philology. Her areas of research interests include English word-formation rows, their structure and semantic features.

Correspondence: edots@ukr.net

Надійшла до редакції 07 квітня 2022 року
Рекомендована до друку 21 квітня 2022 року