

UDC 811.161.2'366'367.633

DOI: 10.31558/1815-3070.2023.46.2

PREPOSITIONAL PARADIGMATICITY: SEMANTICS AND POSITIONALITY

Скваліфікована специфіка геометричного, топологічного, функційного, когнітивного та психолінгвістичного підходів до категорійного кваліфікації прийменника та прийменниковості, в межах якої схарактеризовані морфологія та синтаксис прийменника, з'ясовано синтаксемотвірні інтенції прийменникових одиниць, а також потрактована дефініція функційно-семантичного поля прийменника. Психолінгвістичний підхід розглядається із застосуванням понять фону й фігури та встановленням алгоритму упізнавання й діагностування останньої та її руху в межах фону, що є підґрунтям для тлумачення та лексикографування прийменника через асоціативне поле. Генетично первинний та ієрархічно вершинний статус просторовості актуалізує відповідні лінії переміщень субстанцій у ньому та утворення метафоричних і метонімічних моделей прийменника загалом і прийменника на зокрема як визначальних для внутрішньокатегорійного зміцнення, заповнення яких визначає силові поля граматизації постприйменникових компонентів і формування прийменникового еквівалента. Розлога семантична структура прийменника на, домінування в ній субстанційно просторових сем відбиває антропоцентричний статус аналізованого прийменника, його належність до субстанційних величин. Первинна граматиція приприйменникових іменників є змінною величиною та розгортається через актуалізацію певних ліній напряму (вгору, вниз і под.), орієнтовану на деталізацію наближення, віддалення, поглиблення та ін. Істотним постає розгляд семантичної цілісності та семантичної перервності прийменника на з визначенням його ядрової площини (просторова семантика), наближених до неї (об'єктного значення з охопленням різноманітних семантичних ролей) та повністю віддалених (причинного, означально-обставинного та ін. значень) множин. Ґрунтовно схарактеризований сучасний лексикографічний стан тлумачення прийменника на та з'ясовані його можливості у продукуванні вторинних прийменникових одиниць, що охоплюють прийменникові еквіваленти, прийменникові аналоги та ін. Окремо прокоментовані переходи у внутрішньосемантичній системі прийменника на з покроковим віддаленням від ядрової площини.

Ключові слова: морфологія прийменника, синтаксис прийменника, функційно-семантичне поле прийменника, семантична структура прийменника на, семантичне ядро, просторова семантика прийменника на, прийменниковий еквівалент.

1. Introduction. The question of the qualification of prepositional categorization has a long history. Its distinction and status in the part-of-speech linguistic system are debatable. The most popular is the definition of a preposition as the functional and/or non-self-dependent part-of-speech, which contains an internal contradiction, since functionality and/or non-self-dependency do not involve the definition of the corresponding functional potential, as well as the qualification of semantics types (cp. the lexicographic review of prepositions in all Slavic languages). Consideration of the preposition from among the means of dependence expression (formal and/or semantic) appears to be argumentative. The following questions are relevant: the capacity of the

prepositional unit class – from the established register (primary and secondary) in national languages to expansion due to the coverage of prepositional equivalents, analogs (this includes prepositional derivatives, remarked: *повище* ‘4. as a preposition in genitive case. It is used when indicating that someone, something rises or contains somewhere, or just exists’: *Угледивши на стіні повище вікон смужку, що полишила ніч чи повинь весняна; почувши, як співа в руці хитлива дужка* (Р. Movchan); *Те, що повище зір, керує і не лишень зорями, а й нами* (Dara Kornii); *понижче* ‘2. as preposition in genitive case. It is used to indicate a place or an object: a) just below which something is contained, moves or happens. *Не знаю, чи було де в краю так гарно положене приходство, як у Жукові. Мало що не цілий горб, **понижче церкви**, належав до нього* (В. Лепки); b) just below which the action is directed. *Тимко щосили розмахнувся веслом, имагонув старого **понижче спину*** (Н. Tiutiunnyk). Sometimes they can be specified by an analytical component: *понижче від* (*В голєє місце поміж його щитом і шоломом, саме **Понижче від бороди**; розтяло йому шпарко обидва* (I. Franko)). If we adhere to the classical view of the preposition as a part-of- speech class, then the number of its units is quite limited (for example I. Vykhoanets states the presence of 137 prepositional locative semantics units in the Ukrainian language (Vykhovanets, 1980: 218)). Taking into account the presence of compound prepositions, their main corpus is expanded to 256: *без, біля, близько², в (у), в ім'я, в інтересах, в (у) бік, в (у) залежності від, в (у) міру, в (у) напрямі до, в (у) порівнянні з, в (у) процесі, в (у) результаті, в (у) ролі, в (у) силу, в (у) сторону, в (у) супроводі, в (у) ході, верх², вздовж (уздовж)², вище², від, близько від, від імені, віддалік від, далеко від, залежно від, збоку від, ліворуч від, недалеко від, незалежно від, неподалеку від, неподалечку від, неподалік від, оподалік від, оподаль від, подалі від, подаль від, поодалік від, поодаль від, праворуч від, раніше від, раніш від, відносно², відповідно², внаслідок (унаслідок), во, вперед (уперед)², вповдовж (уповдовж)², впродовж (упродовж)², впрост (упрост)², всередині (усередині)², вслід (услід)², всупереч (усупереч), для, до, відповідно до, не до, подібно до, впритиск (упритиск) до, впритул (упритул) до, докіль², з (із, зі, зо), з метою, з нагоди, з приводу, з розрахунку на, згідно з, нарівні з, порівняно з, поряд з, разом з, судячи з, за, вслід (услід) за, за винятком, за допомогою, за посередництвом, за рахунок, слідом за, завдяки, задля, замість, заради, збоку², зверх², зверху², звиш, здовж², з-за (із-за), ззаду (іззаду)², з-над, з-перед, з-під (із-під), з-поза, з-поміж, з-проміж, з-понад, з-поперед, з-посеред, з-серед, зсередини² (ізсередини²), ід, к (ік), кінець², коло², кошитом, край², крізь, крім, круг², кругом², мимо², між, на, зважаючи на, на адресу, на базі, на благо, на випадок, на відміну від, на ґрунті, на засадах, на знак, на зразок, на користь, на кшталт, на межі, на основі, на підставі, на противагу, на честь, на чолі, незважаючи на, навкіл², навколо², навкруг², навкруги², навперейми², над, надовкола², надокола², назустріч², наокіл², наоколо², наокруг², наокруги², наперед², напереді², напередодні², наперекір², напереріз², наприкінці², напроти², навпроти², насеред, настід², насподі², настрічу², насупроти², насупротив², недалеко², неподалеку², неподалечку², неподалік², нижче², о, об, обабіч², обаполи², обік², обіч², обіруч², окіл², окрай², окрім, окроме, округ², округи², опісля², оподалік², оподаль², опостін,*

*опостінь, опріч, опріче, опроче, осторонь, перед (переді, передо), півперек², під, під знаком, під приводом, під час, після², по, побік², побіля, побіч², поблизу², поверх², повз (поз, поуз), повище², подовж², поза², позад², позаду², поздовж², покрай, помимо, поміж, помежи, помість², понад (понаді, понадо), пообіч², поперед², попереду², поперек², понід, попліч, попри, поряд², посеред, посередині², почерез, пред (преді, предо), при, прич, про, проз, проміж, промеж, просто, проти, против, противно, протягом, ради, раніше, раніш, серед (середі, середу), скрізь², спереду², стосовно, супроти², супротив², у вигляді, у випадку, у відповідності до, у відповідь на, у зв'язку з, узбіч, ціною, через, шляхом, щодо (Meizerska, 2010: 61–62). The proposed list can be significantly expanded (у відповідності з, згідно до, в напрямі з, висотою у (в), висотою до, висотою під, у віддаленні від, у віддаленні до та ін.), if we take into account usage options that have not acquired the status of codified, for example у відповідності до, згідно до, у зв'язку до etc., which sometimes appear calked or simply borrowed from other languages. According to functional approach to the preposition, its part-of-speech content expands to 1,000 or more derivatives, which directly depends on lexicographic practice – consider different meanings of a preposition within one dictionary article (Dictionary 2007) or analyze each meaning in a separate dictionary article (Kaniushkevych, 2008-2010; Lachur, 2019-2021; Vsevolodova, 2018). The first option is common for the vast majority of explanatory Slavic dictionaries (SUM Ukrainian language dictionary, 1970-1980; Murhoski, 2005; Tolkoven, 2003; 2005; 2006; 2008; 2011; Słownik, 2022) and non-Slavic (Duden, 2001) languages. Compliance with the requirements of the second option concerning prepositional units review multiplies their number by the corresponding set of values. In this case, the register is significantly expanded and covers more than three thousand prepositional units. The declared number of 256 prepositions is questionable from many points of view and raises a number of questions: 1) why normative and non-normative variants aren't differentiated (*крім, окрім* and archaic. *окроме; округ²* and archaic. *округи²*; *після* and conv. *опісля²*; *подалік* and conv. *оподалік²*, conv. *оподаль²*; *опостін* and conv., seldom *опостінь*; archaic. *опріч* and dial. *опріче, опроче*) options; 2) why some analytical constructions are covered (*у вигляді, у випадку, у відповідності до, у відповідь на*), and others are not even briefly mentioned (*на шляху до, у напрямі з, у напрямі на* etc.), the answer to which is difficult to find due to the lack of theoretical overview of the prepositional unit. For the appropriate understanding of the preposition, it is important to determine its status not only in the part-of-speech system, but also to establish its syntax-creating potential, as well as the intra-sentential status. A set of general theoretical questions emphasizes the need to consider the semantic integrity and semantic discontinuity of prepositional units.*

The main tasks of the review. The purpose of the review is to highlight the particularities of prepositional grammar based on the preposition *на* (as well as its derivatives, which contain this preposition) with the determination of the integrity and discontinuity of its semantics and the establishment of the qualifying basis of the characteristic. Due to this, it is necessary to determine the main theoretical approaches to the qualification of the preposition in general and the preposition *на* in particular, to

find out the possibilities of left- and right-sided deployment, as well as to characterize the main directions of semantic discontinuity of the preposition *на*.

2. Morphology and syntax of the preposition. The morphology of the preposition, the syntax of the preposition, the functional and grammatical field of the preposition. For a proper understanding of preposition system overall and prepositional semantics in its integrity and discontinuity, it is necessary to qualify separate initial concepts, among which the *morphology of the preposition* and the *syntax of the preposition* become significant, where the first covers its belonging to the main, primary, or secondary, distinction among the last ones of the prepositions with the establishing degrees of prepositionalization, as well as derivational characteristics of the prepositional unit.

The syntax of the preposition contains not only government – the indication of the noun and case forms, with which it forms a semantic integrity (according to one terminology (I. Meshchaninov, E. Kurylovych, I. Vykhoanets)) or which it governs (U. Engel, counting prepositions as participles, considered them capable of governing the nouns with the help of case (Engel, 1982: 385)), but also the formation of the semantic integrity of a linear unit.

The **functional-grammatical field** concept is also essential, which unites primary prepositions during the analysis with all derived units in the function of the preposition – those that have undergone complete prepositionalization and those that are at a certain stage of prepositional grammatization (\leftrightarrow grammaticalization), such as for example, motivated prepositions with *на*: *на межі, на рубежі, на чолі, на задку* etc. The main concepts should also include the semantic model of the preposition *на*, its internal semantic integrity and the semantic discontinuity of the preposition *на*.

Semantic integrity is associated with phraseological expression, motivating it by the fact that the meaning of the latter is not equal to the sum of its components, especially when it comes to idioms. How obvious is the semantic integrity of the preposition, and whether it is worth talking about it. The question is as complex as it is simple. The semantic integrity of prepositions is not discussed because they are inherently polysemantic, especially primary ones.

3. Basic approaches to preposition qualification. Attempts at syntactic classification of prepositions with a distinction between predicative and formal prepositions are known in linguistics (Nitsolova, 2008: 456–457), where the former ones connect structurally optional parts of the sentence with predicates (*къща в планината – къщтаб която се намира в планината 'будинок на гори – the house which is located on the mountain'*).

Formal prepositions connect arguments with a predicate, they are syntactically obligatory and do not have syntactic freedom (*говоря с момчето 'я розмовляю з хлопцем'*). The loss of syntactic freedom causes the corresponding desemantization, forms a semantic discontinuity. In syntactic classification, the question of the status of the preposition in the construction is essential – independent or dependent on the verb or noun (Hanenkova, 2015:16), since it forms a syntaxeme with the noun (*Каюка не може бути використаний для військової служби через хворобу серця* (R. Jandriashyk) – causator syntaxeme)), and the verb implies the regularity and/or

obligation of the corresponding syntaxemes (*Теобальд захворів через кохання до Горислави Галичанко* (N. Sniadanko) – the syntaxeme of the causator is motivated by the internal potential of the verb lexeme, although its presence is not ascertained in lexicographic practice: ‘Starting to get sick, becoming sick; get sick’ SUM 1972_{/3}: 378)). It is also acceptable to qualify the semantic content of the preposition itself, which forms the relevance of the latter. The semantics of the prepositional unit appears to be quite comprehensive, so its description can be based on establishing an exhaustive list of different meanings and their nuances, clarifying the features of their implementation, revealing the relevant contexts, or it is quite realistic to set an invariant meaning with tracing the features of its variant implementation. This approach is based on cognitive modeling, which makes it possible to determine the main meaning, and beyond it there are various use cases that form different bundles of secondary (derivative) values – to varying degrees approximated and/or distant from the core. Gradually, new derivatives are formed from such secondary values, so we can talk about the first, second, etc. degrees of distance. Chains of secondary meanings are often based on the metaphorical or metonymic use of prepositional units.

3.1. In the description of the preposition semantics, geometric (Seniv, 2005: 42, 47–65; Seliverstova, 1999: 29–33), topological (Habel, 1989), functional (Vsevolodova, Vladimirskyi, 1982; Vsevolodova, 2012a: 30–78; 2012b: 9–51, psycholinguistic (Landau, Jackendoff, 1993: 217–237; Piper, 2014: 275–294) approaches are used. The first, which reflected the methodology of the systemic and structural linguistic paradigm, dominated almost until the end of the 20th century with the active use of features of spatiality: length, width, depth, height, as well as dimensionality of objects – one-, two- and three-dimensional. The geometric approach did not fully take into account the compatibility of lexemes – the names of such objects (Vandeloise, 1992: 20), ср.: *яблука в мисці, хліб із борошна, сорочка в клітинку*, In the geometric approach is the concept of a localizer is determinant with internal and external differentiation of its parameters.

3.2. The second (topological) approach to the description of prepositions is based on taking into account the peculiarities of the form of the objects in relation to which they are used. Thus, in the characteristics of the preposition *in*, it is emphasized: “X is in Y, if the closed convex space of Y-a covers the closed convex space of X”, in this case “closed convex space” is, in fact, a description of the form of Y and X (Habel, 1989: 233–241), ср., for example: *павук у склянці, огірок у слоїку* etc. Considering the contradiction and inadequacy of the mental closure of space, researchers supplement the generalization of space with the relevant feature of ‘relevant emptiness’ as a container (ср. (Herskovits, 1982: 55–62)). If, for example, apples are placed on a plate, then they will be on top → *яблука на тарілці* (see, for example, reasoning: Herweg, 1989: 99–127).

3.3. The third (functional) approach to the description of prepositions is based on taking into account not only the spatial dimensions of the participants of communication, but also the corresponding status of the addresser and addressee, which fully correlates with the basic principles of the functional and communicative linguistic paradigm. The phrase *яблуко в склянці* appears quite normative, and *склянка в яблуці* is inappropriate, although the form of expression of the participants in both situations is completely

identical. The closure of prepositional units to a certain extent on the national and linguistic picture of the world motivates the need to use various relevant characteristics for them. Thus, in the French language, the characteristic of ‘something which is inside’ has been expressed by the preposition “dans” (French dans ↔ in (Vadeloise, 1985)). The functional load of the localizer and the localized object is one of the most important factors in determining the features of prepositions use in secondary positions, which are described by the types of main semantic roles (according to Ch. Fillmore and his followers), cp.: an agent is an active participant in a situation, an initiator or action controller; the patient is a passive participant; object of influence; the experiencer is a participant in the situation who perceives; stimulus – a source of information for the experiencer; addressee – participant – recipient of information; benefactive – a participant whose interests directly affect the situation, etc. (Kaniushkevych, 2011: 519–532; Zahnitko, 2020: 5, 540, 171, 627, 57), cp. *Чиновник сходить повагом, сердиться на візника* (P. Andriiashyk) object directive; *Він вискочив з диму, налетів на мене* (P. Zahrebelnyi) – object deliberative; – *Я навіть двері до твоєї кімнати зачинила на замок* (O. Teslenko) – instrumentative; *Вона довго складала гроші на газову колонку* (S. Andrukhovych) – destinative; *Йому відповіла сліпа тиша, глуха на обидва вуха* (Ye. Hutsalo) – rubricative; *Ти підняв руку на родича* (I. Bilyk) – patientive etc. Considering the proto-conceptual sources and semantic dynamics of the preposition до, A. Mykhaliov defines 15 differential semes in the semantic system of the word (1) the end point of movement; 2) distance; 3) distribution limit; 4) time limit of distribution; 5) action preceding; 6) result; 7) degree of reach; 8) comprehensiveness of quantitative coverage; 9) subject and/or person directing the action; 10) objects and/or persons touched; 11) objects and/or persons about whom gossip is spread; 12) objects and/or persons to which something relates; 13) characteristics of a person regarding his interest in something or his connection to the latter; 14) characteristics of the object regarding its dimensions – size, height; 15) actualization of the quantitative limit) as the most significant representatives of the corresponding semes states: “Based on the selected seme values (1) ‘end point of movement’, (2) ‘distance’, (9) and (11) ‘direction’, we have a classical example of the scheme SOURCE – PATH _GOAL, where the rest of the values are concentrated mainly on variations of the GOAL concept, leaving the SOURCE concept latent. Thus, one can notice the following semantic transitions originating from the seme ‘end point of movement’ > ‘limit’ (temporal [4], quantitative [15]) > ‘exhaustiveness of quantitative coverage/capacity’ (8) > ‘magnitude, dimensions’ (14) > ‘degree’ (7); > ‘border’ (3); > ‘result’; > ‘to touch (contact)’ (10) > ‘to have a connection to’ (11, 13)” (Mykhaliov, 2016: 71–72). The use of cognitive modeling allows the researcher to establish a solid concept of ‘source’ and predict current models of its expansion, which indicates the relevance of such an approach.

3.4. The psycholinguistic (fourth) approach to the analysis of prepositions takes into account the interrelationship of cognitive and mental functions with the study of the capabilities of language units overall, as well as prepositional ones in particular, to reflect the realities and relations of objective reality. The article «„What” and „where” in spatial language and cognition» (Landau, Jackendoff, 1993: 217–237) highlights the influence of language on spatial perception of speakers. The analysis was performed based on

English language with the use of ‘figure’ and ‘ground’ terms, that were earlier described by L. Talmy (ср. the terms ‘trajector and landmark’ (point of reference, reference object) of R. Langacker (Langacker, 2008: 70)). Trajector is a certain substance, in relation to which another participant in the situation is set – a landmark (by R. Langacker). Sometimes the ‘ground’ (‘landmark’) and ‘reference object’ can be distinguished: *the cat is near the mat* (кішка поряд із килимком), where *the mat* is a reference object, but the cat is not on it, and *the cat is on the mat* (кішка на килимку), where the ground and reference object coincide. Analyzing the features by which an object can appear as a ground, researchers determine a system of combinations of such features. The system contains the features of the ‘figure’ of the object (‘cube’, ‘ball’, etc.), its surface (‘solid’ (*на хаті* (solid) and *в хаті* (negative), ‘empty’, ‘negative’ (*notch, pit, hollow, etc.* – missing surface). Added to this is the fact that the background and its components contain an axial structure in which the ‘figure’ is organized in relation to the main one. The figure is thought of as something mobile, capable of moving in space and time (it also has spatial and temporal boundaries), and the ground is perceived as something immobile, devoid of boundaries. Hence, the phrase *будинок біля велосипеда* (ср. also *будинок у велосипеді*) appears to be a certain deviation from the norm, although in the context it can be perceived as usual (*ляльковий будинок біля велосипеда*, ср. also *ляльковий будинок у велосипеді*). According to B. Landau and R. Jackendoff, the asymmetry of spatial relations is motivated by the principles of space organization (asymmetry is confirmed in psychological experiments (Landau, Jackendoff, 1993: 217–237)), according to which one object is “mounted” into another or “is placed” inside it. Such an object has inherent properties updated for search.

Spatial relative grounds and figures can be expressed by prepositions (adverbs *недалеко* (*Він не бачив багато. Десь **недалеко** стояла ще хата Докії* (О. Kobylianska), *поряд* (*Зовсім **поряд** задзеленчав трамвай* (S. Ansrukhovych)), by verbs *розташовуватися, стояти, перебувати* etc.). The same preposition can reflect later relationships of objects with the reflection of individual properties and/or signs of the latter. This way, closure / non-closure is taken into account for the ground (*in / inside a cave, a bottle* ‘в / всередині печери, пляшки’, but *in / *inside a lake* ‘всередині озера’, since the lake is perceived as an open object), presence of ribs, surface, etc. Pointedness (↔ point analogy) can be significant for a figure because it is thought or perceived in such a status (Talmy, 1983).

Summarizing the observations of the followers of the psycholinguistic approach and taking into account the development of cognitive modeling in the analysis of prepositions, it is necessary to talk about four core spatial roles that can appear as relevant to the figure in the description of situations of movement and/or place of stay: 1) the starting point of the movement is the point at which the figure was in the beginning: *зернина випала з колоска*; 2) the definite (↔ final) point of the movement is the point at which the figure appeared after the movement: *зернина упала на землю*); 3) the trajectory of movement – the points through which the figure was successively moved from the starting point to the final point (*зернина падала через трубочку*); 4) the place in which the figure or situation of movement in general is localized (*зернина лежить на землі, зайчик бігав у садку*). For B. Landau and R. Jackendoff, the

trajectory is either a characteristic of movement (*до класу залетіла бджола*) or its orientation (*стрілка орієнтована на захід*). Therefore, three types of trajectory are differentiated: a) the trajectory of the figure movement description in terms of its inherent horizontal lines (*вгорі, збоку, позаду, попереду*); b) the trajectory of changing the figure's orientation in terms of its own situations (*перекинути → перекинутися, повернутися навколо (ліворуч, праворуч)*); b) a trajectory that takes into account the axis of the earth (*верх, низ, захід, схід, південь, північ*) (Landau, Jackendoff, 1993: 217–237).

In considering the preposition, the division of the ground also becomes significant, the presence of a number of topological dimensions in it: the surface, the inner sphere, the space around the ground, the space in front of the ground, etc. In general, the division of space has found a systematic implementation in the national and linguistic picture of the world, but the topological differentiation of space is by no means directly correlated with the logical and structural one (see observations of I. Melchuk (Melchuk, 1998: 53)).

Since the question of the semantic model of a preposition (meaning the typology definition) is little discussed today, it is more about semantic models, and a semantic model as an abstraction can be defined based on specific semantic models of certain prepositions. Therefore, consideration of the semantic model of the preposition *на* with the interpretation and differentiation of their internal integrity and discontinuity is taken as a basis.

The analysis of the integrity of prepositional semantics should be based on taking into account its paradigmaticity and syntagmality, where the capacity of the latter is correlated with the syntax-forming potential of the preposition, its functional-grammatical field, as well as with the semantic system, within which the main and secondary planes are consistently differentiated.

4. To the history of the question: the project and national-linguistic concepts.

At the beginning of the 21st century, M. Vsevolodova substantiated the concept of prepositions consideration within the project “Slavic prepositions in synchrony and diachrony”. The result of the announced project was not only the holding of a number of conferences of different status and different levels, the publication of several authoritative individual and collective monographs, the defense of a number of PhD and doctoral thesis, but also the creation of complete dictionaries of Ukrainian (H. Sytar, I. Danyliuk, etc.), Russian (M. Vsevolodova, K. Vynogradova, etc.), Belarusian (M. Koniushkevych), and recently the second volume of Polish (C. Lyahur) prepositions was published, the arrangement of the dictionary of Czech and Bulgarian prepositional units is in progress. One of the milestones in the development of the project was the formation of a fundamentally new systematic approach to the preposition as a part-of-speech with the definition of a number of defining concepts: the functional fields of the preposition, its equivalence, analogy, etc.

The modern Ukrainian prepositional fund does not appear to be a closed value, as it is constantly actively replenished due to special noun, adverbial and other derivatives such as *на адресу, в особі, на знак, в ім'я, у порядку, на противагу, в руках, від імені, в руслі, у світлі, у сфері, на шкоду, на честь, за рахунок, на ґрунті, на очах, на межі, на правах, на тлі, на руках, під кінець, під знаком, неподалік (→ неподалік*

від), *поблизу* (*поблиз*) (\rightarrow *поблизу від/поблизу до*), *подалік* (\rightarrow *подалік від*), *поряді* (\rightarrow *порід із*), *навкруги* (*навкруг*) (\rightarrow *навкруги з*), *довкруги* (*довкруг*) (\rightarrow *довкруги поід*), *уздовж* (*вздовж*), *напроти* (*навпроти*), *позаду* (*позад*), *поодаль* (*поодалеки*) etc. (some of them are not included to the dictionary: *позаду* (*позад*), *поодаль* (*поодалеки*) and similar), where the following prepositions are particularly active *з* (*із, зі, зо*), *під* (*піді, підо*), *на* etc. Among denominative derivatives, the preposition *на* is the most functionally loaded.

5. The active status of the preposition *на* is motivated by its specific status in the prepositional system, because it combines abstract and specific meaning. Besides, it's one of the most meaningful prepositions, and it's characterized by actual primary categorial semantics. If we look at the semantic system of the preposition *на*, it reflects almost the entire range of meanings, typical for the prepositional system in general: a) spatial (1 – 8 (+ 16 shades, of which: 1 = 4, 2 = 6, 3 = 6)) ; b) temporal (9 – 10 (+ 5 shades, of which: 9 = 5)); c) circumstantial (11 – 18, where there are defining and circumstantial ones (11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18), conditional semantics (12) (+ 2 shades, of which: 11 = 2)); d) circumstantial and targeted (19 (+ 7 shades)); e) circumstantial and causal (20); e) objective (21 – 32 (+ 1 shade (26))); f) defining (33 – 36 (+ 1 shade (33))) quantitative-defining (37 – 40 (+4 shades, of which: 37 = 3, 39 = 1)) (according to SUM: in 20 volumes). Spatial semantics covers 37.5% of the total semantic set of the preposition *на*, circumstantial and defining – 15.6%, circumstantial and targeted – 25%, circumstantial-causal – 1.6%, objective – 10.9%, defining – 7.8%, quantitative-defining – 12.5%.

Hierarchically, the highest substance-spatial semantics is the ground on which other meanings develop, gradually eroding semantic integrity and forming various dimensions of discontinuity. The status of the preposition *на* with a hierarchically top spatial meaning is fully motivated, since its primary function in the modern grammatical system of the Ukrainian language is the locative one, which is fixed in the case system (locative case: *на березі, на полі, на городі, на печі, на дорозі, на вікні, на підлозі, на столі, на комп'ютері*; but *в лісі, в селі* etc.; com. also *на селі* \leftrightarrow *в селі* і *на село* \leftrightarrow *в село*) and a regular occurrence with locative verbs, where *на* performs the function of a post-word unit (*знаходиться на відпочинку, перебувати на маневрах*, etc.) or predicative, according to R. Nitsolova (R. Nitsolova, 2008: 456–457).

The preposition *на* appears human-centered, since, together with other prepositional units, it expresses not only the place ('2. Subject, place, space'), but also the corresponding approximation and/or distance from the individual (2.1. – the final point; 2.2. – the direction of movement; 2.5. – an object to which another object is directed or turned to), a ground against which something (a figure) stands out (7), etc. Space is anthropocentric, actively interpreted, and because of this, the primary implementers of this semantics acquire the possibility of its dynamics and transformation into temporal, causal, etc.

Space in its field structure covers: 1) the space type in the corresponding dimensions: *точка – лінія – поверхня – обсяг*; 2) organization of space *центр / периферія; відкритий / закритий простір*; 3) location of objects, their spatial relationship (relative space): *близько / далеко; ліворуч / праворуч, вгорі / внизу* and

similar; 4) direction, orientation, coordination: *у напрямі на / на віддалі від, на шляху до / на шляху від* etc.; 5) measure of length, distance, surface, volume: *на десятки кілометрів, на сотні миль*; 6) perception of space: *вид, аспект, погляд, підхід* (according to V. Gak (V. Gak, 1972: 367–396). The complex structure of the spatial field determines the diversity of the prepositional system for marking its components. It is easy to identify the reasons for replenishing the prepositional system to implement the semantics of certain planes of the spatial field, ср.: *довжиною → на, діаметром → на, радіусом → на, обсягом → на, виміром → на, ємністю → на, розміром → на* etc. (*Мабуть, заважить (a fish – A.Z.) з півпуда, довжиною на всю підсаку, навіть хвіст виглядає, темний широчезний хвіст* (V. Shkliar); *А далі, за будівлею, – суцільна стіна древнього реліктового лісу, високий мур і смуга жовтих синучих пісків шириною на п'ять мі* (O. Berdnyk)).

The semantics of primary prepositions denoting space becomes the basis on which their reinterpretation is formed, the formation of primary discontinuity. The acquisition of secondary functions by such prepositions makes it possible to establish functional and semantic paradigms of such lexemes and to determine certain centers (cores) in their functional and contextual manifestations. This is confirmed by the preposition *на*, which combines specific and abstract meanings in the scope of its functions, developing logical meanings of *reason, purpose*, which can be complicated by nuances of *condition, assumption, accompaniment*, etc. The latter are consistently found under the condition of the compatibility of the preposition *на* with specific nouns that appear as actants and/or circonstants of locative verbs: *Тому вирішили розташуватися на селі* (M. Ivchenko) – locative actant; *Зовсім недавно пропав здичавілий пес, який поселився на пустищі* (Yu. Vynnychuk) – locative actant; *Я тут перед самою війною побудувався, а він на хуторі народився* (Yu. Vynnychuk) – locative; *Все більше здавалася мені казкою, що її розповідають дорослі на втіху малим* (A. Dimarov) – purpose circonstant.

The statement of O. Selyverstova about the unification of the main axis of the meanings of the preposition *на* in transformations such as ‘space → time’ is correct (it can be stated that this is the main way of semantic development of many prepositions, conjunctions, and adverbs), where the first axis is based on the variation of space types, the second is related to the variation of movement types (*дивитися на* – perceptual displacement, *зосередитися на* – mental movement, *кинутися на когось* – physical action), and the third axis is related to the basic concept of “support”, although the grammatical meaning of direction is preserved in all three axes: *Гривастюк спочатку допитливо дивився на мене, тоді нервово переплів пальці* (R. Andriiashyk); *Антоній відчув полегкість і, відбившись від слуги, зосередився на молитві* (H. Rahutiak); *Микола назвав Грушевича націоналістом, лікар кинувся на нього з кулаками. – Стійте! – крикнув Кривов'яз* (O. Berdnyk).

The concept of surface is most obvious when the preposition *на* is attached to a noun that has the semantics of ‘inner part’, ср.: *зошит знаходився на столі → у столі*, ср. similar *висловити на ім'я учителя*. In such constructions, there are two variants of the lexical meaning of the spatiality of the preposition *на* (according to O. Selyverstova), where the first covers the inseparability of the referent (the object, its spatial coordinates

are determined) from the surface of the relatum (the object for which the spatial coordinates are established): *напис на етикетці*, *малюнок на килимі*, which is consistently implemented in the actant roles of locative and directive: *Рибалки витягнули ятір на берег* (I. Nechui-Levytskyi), *Алессандро даремно сердився на Моріса* (O. Berdnyk); and the second option represents the possibility of choosing a preposition *на* when the relatum implements the function of support (Seliverstova, 1999: 29).

It's worth mentioning that post-noun linear position (*напис*, *малюнок*) also imposes an attributive meaning on the spatial meaning, which erodes the object's semantic integrity and forms the basis for attributive meanings, which is partly reflected in separate lexicographic definitions such as '34. *in a local case* It is used to denote an object from which something is made or produced – *Недавно в мене були земляки, то оце передали... Сливовиця на меду* (M. Oliinyk). The potential for acquiring such semantics is quite high (up to 100 similar models have been recorded according to GRAK materials (<http://uacorpus.org/Kyiv/ua>)).

The use of the preposition *на* to delineate virtual space is common, for example, *на 30 градусів довготи і 15 градусів широти*, since in such phrases the objective world is not represented, but the corresponding abstract network (it has a direct connection to mental generalizations), that is, coordinates (see the fifth component of the space field), ср. also *на відстані*, *на віддалі*, *на висоті*, *на глибині*: *Побратими взялися за руки, бо навіть на відстані кроку обриси людини губилися в імлі* (O. Berdnyk); *Зброя була найважливішою, бо зі старими гвинтівками воювати на висоті дві тисячі метрів неможливо* (Yu. Vynnychuk) etc. In this case, the nouns themselves acquire another parameter – abstract one, ср.: *відійти на відстань трьох кілометрів* and *відійти на три кілометри*, *знайти корабель у морі на десятому кілометрі від берега* and *знайти корабель в морі на 25 градусі довготи і 20 градусі широти*. In such phrases, the 'surface' component of the preposition *на* disappears, and the 'point' component is intensified, which is not a derivative of the semantics of the noun itself. This manifestation of the preposition *на* indicates the expansion of its meaning intentions and at the same time the relative loss of semantic integrity.

Reinterpretation and acquisition of a preposition *на* the meaning of virtual space (*на думці* (*Дорота спіймала себе на думці* (S. Andrukhovych)), *на споминах*, *спогадах* (*І тоді на мене накотила хвиля печалі, замішаної на спогадах про той день, коли ми сиділи на кухні зачинені* (S. Andrukhovych)), is obviously the source from which constructions with a temporal meaning in the Russian language later developed: *На протяжении целого века не происходило никаких существенных изменений*, which are expressed in the Ukrainian language by a preposition *протягом*, where the differentiation of spatial and temporal semantics is more clearly and representatively traced at the level of means of expression and fixing the corresponding means for each of them, although the construction with *на* is possible: *На Наума потепліло* (Panas Murnyi); *Вважається, що зароджуються відьми на Благовіщення, а на Юрійв день і на Івана Купала, та ще на Воздвиження вони збираються на Лисій горі для шабашів* (O. Berdnyk); *Юзі справили на роковини таку гарну-прегарну білу довгу сукню...* (Lesia Ukrainka). In Russian, unlike

Ukrainian, the preposition *на* can also mean a line delineating the length of the path, cf.: *На протяженні трьох кілометрів я не вистрив ні одного человека* ↔ Ukr. *Протягом трьох кілометрів я не зустрів жодної людини*.

The question of the status of the object semantics of the preposition *на* within the limits of its semantic integrity is significant. The semantic core is a spatial meaning, while object semantics is the closest to the core, as it expresses the corresponding directiveness (the second axis), *кричати на когось, зосередитися на чомусь, кинутися на когось / щось, дивитися на когось / щось*: although in lexicographic practice, its consideration after logical meanings appears to be established. The idea of the development of target and other values (destination) through the transformation of a directive value appears to be quite probable. This is motivated by the presence of the idea of the purpose in the meaning of the directive itself (in a rather weakened form): *Всі вони йшли на ярмарок, несли повні кошики черешень* (Yu. Lohvyn); *Сятери поспішають на допомогу* (B. Antonenko-Davydovych), and the meaning of the purpose is sometimes transformed into the semantics of the destination: *навчатися на лікаря* etc.

In this view, the third axis is a transformation of the first one, its distinction as a separate one is motivated by a significant number of similar formations and the diversity of the semantics itself. And it indicates the discontinuity of the semantic structure of the preposition *на*, where logical meanings acquire a certain autonomy, forming the ground for the formation of their own derived prepositional units. Hierarchically, the peak value of this axis is quite likely to be explained by metonymic transfer, cp.: *лежати на ліжку, дивані, землі* → *лежати на спині, животі, боці* (cp.: (Seliverstova, 1999: 31)). Next to it there is a meaning 'point to substance', which represents the force and/or forces that support the existence of the object *працювати на атомному човні, жити на воді і хлібові*. The connection of this meaning with the meaning of 'support' is very transparent. No less interesting is the manifestation of constructions, for example, *на матеріалі*, where not only metonymic transfer is possible, but also condensation determined by the context: *Моє дослідження написано на матеріалі численних експедицій* ← *Моє дослідження написано + У написанні дослідження використанні різні матеріали + Матеріали зібрані під час експедицій*. This motivates the qualification of 'support' as a basis, as an abstract concept.

The concept of support appears in the third axis of meanings as very abstract and covers: 1) the opposition of 'similarity / dissimilarity' in constructions such as *Син схожий / не схожий на батька*; 2) modification of the semantics of the tool in the Russian language, which in the Ukrainian language is consistently represented by the instrumental case without preposition: *ехать на поезде, лететь на самолете* → *говорить (петь, читать, декламировать) на украинском, русском языке / їхати потягом, летіти літаком* → *говорити (співати, читати, декламувати) українською, російською мовою*, пор.: **говорить (петь, читать, декламировать) на языке / *говорити (співати, читати, декламувати) мовою*. The last construction is peculiar, where the presence of an attribute appears syntagmally determined, without an attributive element the construction loses its normativity. The

latter once again confirms the derivation of such constructions and their closeness to the semantics of primary ones.

The reinterpretation of the support with the statement of the limiting point of locality is also peculiar for the phraseological prepositions, for example, *на адресу, на відзнаку, на знак, на користь, на пошану*. It becomes obvious that there is an extremely weak correlation between the original systemically fixed meaning of the preposition *на* and the cognitively modeled, and, accordingly, the contextually confirmed derivative.

The special functional status of the preposition and its part-of-speech categorization are reflected in the statement that the preposition “is at the intersection of two worlds – the world of morphology, where it appears a word, and the world of syntax, where it appears as a functional grammeme, an isomorphic morpheme in a word. The second interpretation prevents us from considering preposition formation within the limits of word formation, since prepositionalization is usually always transpositive (Koniushkevych, 2005: 62). Such a transposition (translation, according to L. Tenier (L. Tenier, 1988: 401)) is based on the gradual loss of primary part-of-speech semantics, *сз.: напрям, у, ч.* – “1. The line of movement or the line of placement of someone, something; 2. The way of activity, development of someone, something; 3. Social, scientific, literary, etc. school, stream; 4. A section of the front that deploys military operations in any direction (SUM) and *в напрямі* → *в напрямі з, в напрямі від* ↔ *до, в напрямі на, в напрямі до: Ми полетимо в напрямі з заходу на схід, себто використаємо цю готову швидкість (V. Vladko); В. І. Вернадський передбачав, що розвиток життя на Землі йтиме, можливо, в напрямі від біосфери до ноосфери, єдиного розуму Космосу (M. Rudenko); Фінляндські скоростріли скошили багато совітського війська, що старалося перейти ледом в напрямі на Сакіярні (V. Kozhelianko); Аеровел і Ліахім вийшли з приміщення Космічної Ради і, сівши в закритий салон, вилетіли в напрямі до Інституту Воскрешень (O. Verdnyk).*

One of the manifestations of the semantic discontinuity of the preposition *на* appears is its meaning of the emotional state stimulus (with an implicit purpose): *Кузина, схоже, знову загорілася ідеєю на заздрість усім на світі жінкам запопасти собі чоловіка-відьмака (O. Avramenko)*. The preposition *на* introduces a stimulus into a situation in which the feelings and perceptions of the experiencer are conditioned by it and directed at it (*сердитися на, ображатися на*): *Я сердився на залізничника, а це був негідник, якого мало задушити (R. Andriiashyk)*.

Analytical elements – prenominal and postnominal – initiate a semantic shift, during which the formal and grammatical objectivity is reduced, also the lexical and semantic one, which has the ‘line’ seme, integral to the four lexical-semantic variants, is easily diagnosed. In such formations as *в напрямі на* and similar, the preposition *на* loses its formal and functional-grammatical independence and must be considered within the limits of analytical prepositional units, where the initial preposition becomes the core component, and the noun is consistently grammaticalized.

6. Examining the preposition *на* and its analogues in the Belarusian language, M. Koniushkevych distinguishes between *на¹* and *на²* on the basis of government particularities, where *на¹* with 77 distinct values appears as accusative government,

and *на*² with established 32 values appears as instrumental government. Within the prepositions *на*¹ and *на*², the researcher establishes the semantic roles of the post-noun components expressed by the corresponding case forms. Prepositional analogues are qualified separately like *на абарону* (на оборону), *на абводзе* (на узбіччі), *на аблоні* (на периметрі), *на абочыне* (на узбіччі), *на абломках* (на уламках), *на абслугоўванні* (на обслуговуванні), *на абсягах* (на обсягах), *на абшарах* (на територіях), *на абшарах ад ... да* (на територіях від ... до), *на ... вышэй ад* (на ... вище від), *на ... ад* → *на паўкрок ад* (на ... від → на півкрок від), *на які час ад* (на який час від) – a total of **438 units** (a similar number with various errors is attested in the Ukrainian, Russian and Polish languages), which confirms the high intentionality of the preposition *на* and its syntactic potential, its wide functional and grammatical field.

If prepositional attribute is available, the noun does not completely lose its lexical and semantic objectivity, but within the limits of the prepositional analogue, it somewhat neutralizes its completeness: ср. *На дорозі до першого пострілу лежить ще велика перешкода – Дніпро* (В. Antonenko-Davydovych); *Не спрацював і ефект новизни, яку пірати встигли значною мірою розгубити на довгій дорозі до мети* (Voice of Ukraine. 2013.27.11); Віл. *Цяпер, бадай, не заставалася ніякага сумніву, што ўсе трое – на пэўнай дарозе да смерці* (Arche).

Ch. Lyahur in the Polish-Russian dictionary of secondary prepositions and units with the preposition function in real use distinguishes 615 prepositional analogues with the preposition *на*, covering various formations with these or those attributive or other specifiers, for example: *на północnym krańcu*, *на północnym skraju*, *на północnym wschodzie od*, *на północnym zachodzie*, and also case variants are possible: *на prawą stronę*, *на prawej stronie*, *на lewą stronę*, *на lewej stronie* etc.

7. Conclusions. In prepositional analogs, the most powerful derivational potential is inherent in primary prepositions, among which the preposition *на* is one of the most frequent. In prepositional analogues, the semantics of the preposition are superimposed on the meanings of the constituents, but it is the preposition that produces the syntaxeme, which confirms its regular syntaxeme-creating potential. The interval of conjunction with a noun, since there is an attributive component, forms a relative discontinuity in the syntagma model.

The semantic originality of the preposition *на* is based on the core substantive-spatial meaning, and the presence of logical and other semantics in the modern language significantly affects its semantic integrity, as it covers a significantly larger volume. In the semantic core of the preposition, there are distinct planes of semantic discontinuity (the first covers space → object, the second – space → reason, the third → reason → condition / goal / accompaniment, later – sign semantics is formed, etc.), which is connected with the expansion the functional range of the preposition *на* and its coverage in various cognitive generalizations of the relevant associative sets (ground → figure), which are realized in certain syntagma models with abstract nouns, intensive formation of metonymic models.

It is promising to determine the integral semantic space of the preposition *на* in various Slavic languages with the establishment of common and different planes of

semantic discontinuity, which makes it possible to qualify the trends of syntagmatic expansion of the preposition *на* and to identify directions of grammaticalization of new formations.

Reference

1. Vykhovanets, Ivan. The prepositional system of the Ukrainian language. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1980.
2. Vorozhbytova, Aleksandra A. "Non-self-dependent words as amplifiers of rhetorical expression in journalistic discourse". [In:] *Non-self-dependent words, syntactic connections and syntactic relations: interuniversity, collection of scientific papers Stavropol*, 1997.
3. Vsevolodova, Maiia. "The system of morphosyntactic types of Russian prepositions. Article 1. Fragment of the system - unmotivated (primary) prepositions". [In:] *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 9. Philology* 5, 2012a: 30–78.
4. Vsevolodova, Maiia. "The system of morphosyntactic types of Russian prepositions. Article 2: Fragment of the system - motivated (secondary) prepositions". [In:] *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 9. Philology* 6, 2012b: 9–51.
5. Vsevolodova, Maiia V., Vladimirskyi, Evgenii V. Ways of expressing spatial relations in modern Russian language. Moscow: Publishing House of Moscow University, 1982.
6. Vsevolodova, Maiia, Vynogradova, Ekaterina, Chaplyhina, Tatiana. Russian prepositions and means of the prepositional type. Materials for the functional and grammatical description of real use. Book 2: Register of Russian prepositional units: A – B (objective grammar). Moscow: USSR, 2018.
7. Gak, Vladimir G. "On the Problem of Semantic Syntagmatic". [In:] *Problems of Structural Linguistics 1971. Vol. IV. Questions of grammar and semantics*. Moscow: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR; Russian Language Institute, 1972.
8. Gak, Vladimir G. Theoretical Grammar of the French Language. Moscow: Dobrosvet, 2004.
9. Hanenkova, Tatiana S. The semantic structure of prepositions in the modern Macedonian language: PhD thesis majoring in Philology. Moscow: Institute of Slavic Studies RAS, 2015.
10. Dremov, Aleksei F. "The System Theory of Case and Preposition in the Practice of Teaching Russian as a Foreign Language". [In:] *World of the Russian Word* 3, 2001: 57–65.
11. Zahnitko, Anatolii. "Dictionary materials". [In:] *Ukrainian prepositions: Synchrony and diachrony: trial notebook*. Donetsk: Donetsk National University, 2003.
12. Zahnitko, Anatolii. Theoretical grammar of the modern Ukrainian language. Morphology. Syntax. Donetsk: LLC CPC "BAO", 2011.
13. Zahnitko, Anatolii. Modern linguistic dictionary. Vinnytsia: Works, 2020.
14. Zahnitko, Anatolii, Danyliuk, Illia, Sytar, Hanna, Shchukina, Inna. Dictionary of Ukrainian prepositions. Modern Ukrainian language. Donetsk: LLC CPC "BAO", 2007.
15. Kaniushkevych, Mariia I. Belarusian prepositions and their analogues. Grammar of real use. Materials for the dictionary: [In 3 p.]. P. 1: Djapazon A–L. Hrodna: HrDU, 2008; P. 2: Djapazon M–P. Hrodna : HrDU, 2010; P. 3: Djapazon R–Ja. Hrodna: HrDU, 2010]
16. Kozyna, Margaryta N. Stylistics of the Russian language. Moscow: Logos, 1996.
17. Koniushkevych, Mariia I. "On the potential of the prepositional system (based on of parametric and comparative prepositions)". [In:] *Polish among other Slavic languages*. Minsk: Instina, 2004.
18. Kucherenko, Illia. "The lexical meaning of the preposition". [In:] *Linguistics* 3, 1973: 12–23.
19. Luchyk, Alla A. Semantics of adverbial equivalents of words in the Ukrainian and Russian languages. Kyiv: Dovira. 2001.
20. Maliar, Tatiana N., Seliverstova Olha N. Spatial-distance prepositions and adverbs in English and Russian. München: Sagner, 1998.

21. Meizerska, I. "Dictionary of prepositions of the modern Ukrainian language: principles of creation". [In:] *Lexicographic bulletin* 19, 2010: 59–64.
22. Melchuk, Ihor A. Course on general morphology. Moscow; Vienna: Languages of Russian Culture, Vienna Slavic Almanac, special volume 38/1, Publishing group "Progress", 1997.
23. Mikhalev, Andrei. "From and to: proto-conceptual origins and semantic dynamics of the preposition "to" in Russian". [In:] *Język i metoda* 3, 2016: 69–75. URL <https://www.ejournals.eu/Language-and-Method/2016/2016/art/6704/>
24. Murgoski, Zoze. Dictionary of the Macedonian language. Skopje: "Blaze Koneski" Faculty of Philology, 2005].
25. Nikitina, Serafima E. "On the semantic variation of Russian prepositions" [In:] *Semantic and formal variation*. Moscow: Nauka, 1979.
26. Nitsolova, Ruselina. Bulgarian grammar. Morphology. Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Publishing House, 2008.
27. Piper, Predrag. "About space in the Serbian linguistic image of the world". [In:] *Slavic magazine* 62/3, 2014: 275–294.
28. Russian semantic dictionary. Explanatory dictionary, systematized by classes of words and meanings. T.I: Indicating words (pronouns). Naming words: nouns (All living things, Earth, Space). Moscow: Azbukovnik, 1998.
29. Seliverstova, Olha N. "Does the preposition have only grammatical meaning?" [In:] *Questions of Philology* 3, 1999: 26–33.
30. Seliverstova, Olha N "Semantic structure of the preposition на". [In:] D. Paiar, O.N. Seliverstova [ed:] *Studies in the semantics of prepositions: a collection of papers*. Moscow, 2000: 189–243.
31. Seniv, Mykhailo. Preposition in classical languages.: Yuho-Vostok, 2005.
32. SUM 11: Ukrainian language dictionary: In 11 volumes. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1970 – 1980.
33. SUM 20: Ukrainian language dictionary: In 20 volumes. Kyiv: Naukova dumka; Ukrainian Lingua-Information Fund, 2012 – 2022.
34. Solonitskii, Andrei V. Problems of the semantics of Russian primary prepositions. Vladivostok: Far Eastern University Press, 2003.
35. Toekoven: Interpretive dictionary of the Macedonian language. T. 1 – 5 [ch. order. K. Konesky]. Skopje: Institute for Macedonian Language Krste Misirkov, 2003 – 2011.
36. Cherkasova, Elena T. The transition of autonomous words into prepositions. Moscow: Moscow University Press, 1967.
37. Shchukina, Inna. "Prepositions of causal semantics: structure and functions". [In:] A. Zahnitko (ed.) *Ukrainian prepositions: Synchrony and diachrony: trial notebook*. Donetsk: DNU, 2003: 130–161.
38. Duden. Correct and good German: Dictionary of linguistic doubts. 5th, revised. Auflage. Mannheim etc.: Dudenverlag, 2001. 953 p. (The Duden in 12 vols.: The standard work on the German language; vol. 9.)
39. EJO 1999: Encyclopedia of General Linguistics, second, ed. revised, with supplement. Wroclaw; Warsaw; Krakow, 1999. 752 p.
40. EJP 1999: Encyclopedia of the Polish language, third ed, revised, with supplement. Wroclaw; Warsaw; Krakow, 1999. 508 p.
41. Engel, U. Syntax of contemporary German. Berlin, 1982. 308 p.
42. Habel, Ch. "Interim Report". [In:] *Spatial concepts in understanding processes* / Ch. Habel, M. Herweg, K. Rehkämper (Hrsg.). Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1989.
43. Herskovits, A. Space and the prepositions in English: Regularities and irregularities in a complex domain: Ph.D. theses. Stanford, 1982. 220 p.
44. Herweg, Michael. Approaches to a semantic description of topological prepositions. *Spatial concepts in understanding processes* / C. Habel, M. Herweg, K. Rehkämper (Hrsg.). Tübingen, 1989. p. 99–127.
45. Lachur, Cz. Polish secondary prepositions and units with a prepositional function in real use: [dictionary materials (in comparison with Russian). T. 1: a conto – apart from. Opole, Kępa:

- Wydawnictwo NOWIK Sp.j., 2019. Vol. 2: memory - in ticks. Opole, Kępa: Publishing House NOWIK Sp.j., 2021. 410 p.
46. Landau, B., Jackendoff, R. “ “What” and “where” in spatial language and cognition”. [In:] *Behavioral and brain sciences* 16,1993: 217–239.
 47. Langacker, R. *Cognitive grammar. A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
 48. Talmy, L. *How language structures space // Spatial orientation: Theory, research, and application* / H. Pick, L. Acredolo (ed.). New York: Plenum Press, 1983.
 49. Vandeloise, C. *The preposition in and the relationship container / contained*. LAUD, Linguistic Agency of the University of Duisburg (pre-published, 1985).
 50. Polish dictionary: URL https://pl.wiktionary.org/wiki/S%C5%82ownik_j%C4%99zyka_polskiego (10.01.2022)

Sources

1. Andriashyk, Roman *There is no return home. People out of fear*. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1983.
2. Andrukhovych, Sofiia. *Wives of their husbands*. Ivano-Frankivsk: Lileia-NV, 2005.
3. Antonenko-Davydovych, Borys. *Tvory: in 2 volumes. V. 1*. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1991.
4. Bahrianyi, Ivan. *Garden of Gethsemane*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 2001.
5. Berdnyk, Oles'. *Fire rider*. Kyiv: Molod, 1989.
6. Bilyk, Ivan. *Don't annoy the griffins*. Kyiv: Zapovit, 1993.
7. Vynnychuk, Yurii. *The Flashing Beacon*. Kyiv: Radianskyi pysmennyk, 1980.
8. Hutsalo, Yevhen. *Dead zone*. Kyiv: Radianskyi pysmennyk, 1986.
9. Dimarov, Anatolii. *On a horse and under a horse*. Kyiv: Molod, 1981.
10. Zahrebelnyi, Pavlo. *The Sixth Day*. Kyiv: 1956.
11. Ivchenko, Mykhailo. *Labor force*. Kharkiv: Folio, 2020.
12. Kobylianska, Olha. *Earth*. Kyiv: Nash format, 2021.
13. Kornii, Daria. *Trojan potion*. Kyiv: Vivat, 2021.
14. Lepkyi, Bohdan. *Stories: In 2 vol. V. 1*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1997.
15. Lohvyn, Yurii. *Golden hooves*. Kyiv: Ukrainskyi pysmennyk, 2003.
16. Movchan, Pavlo. *Selected stories: poems*. Kyiv: Prosvita, 2008.
17. Pahutiak, Halyna. *Urizka Gothic*. Kyiv: Duliby, 2009.
18. Sniadanko, Natalia. *Amarkord*. Kharkiv: Folio, 2011.
19. Teslenko, Oleksandr. *Curved space*. Kyiv: Radianskyi pysmennyk, 1985.
20. Tiutiunnyk, Hryhir. *Tymko*. Kyiv: Znannia, 2011.
21. Tiutiunnyk, Hryhorii. *Whirlpool*. Kharkiv: Folio, 2018.
22. Franko, Ivan. *Selected Stories: In 3 vol*. Kyiv: Kolo, 2005.
23. Shkliar, Vasyl. *Nostalgia*. Klub Simeinoho Dozvillia, 2014.

PREPOSITIONAL PARADIGMATIVITY: SEMANTICS AND POSITIONALITY

Anatolii Zahnitko

Department of General and Applied Linguistics and Slavic Philology, Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine.

Abstract

Background: The question of the qualification of prepositional categorization has a long history. Its distinction and status in the part-of-speech linguistic system are debatable. The most popular is the definition of a preposition as the functional and/or non-self-dependent part-of-speech, which contains an internal contradiction, since functionality and/or non-self-dependency do not involve the definition of the corresponding functional potential, as well as the qualification of semantics types.

Purpose: The study aims to highlight the particularities of prepositional grammar based on the preposition *на* (as well as its derivatives, which contain this preposition) with the determination of

the integrity and discontinuity of its semantics and the establishment of the qualifying basis of the characteristic.

Results: In the semantic core of the preposition, there are distinct planes of semantic discontinuity (the first covers space → object, the second – space → reason, the third → reason → condition / goal / accompaniment, later – sign semantics is formed, etc.), which is connected with the expansion the functional range of the preposition *на* and its coverage in various cognitive generalizations of the relevant associative sets (ground → figure), which are realized in certain syntagma models with abstract nouns, intensive formation of metonymic models.

Discussion: In prepositional analogs, the most powerful derivational potential is inherent in primary prepositions, among which the preposition *на* is one of the most frequent. In prepositional analogues, the semantics of the preposition are superimposed on the meanings of the constituents, but it is the preposition that produces the syntaxeme, which confirms its regular syntaxeme-creating potential.

It is promising to determine the integral semantic space of the preposition *на* in various Slavic languages with the establishment of common and different planes of semantic discontinuity.

Keywords: morphology of the preposition, syntax of the preposition, semantic structure of the preposition *на*, semantic core, spatial semantics of the preposition *на*, prepositional equivalent.

Vitae:

Anatolii Zahnitko is a Doctor of Philology, Professor, Corresponding Member of NAS of Ukraine, Professor at the Department of General and Applied Linguistics and Slavic Philology at Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University. Areas of research interests include functional linguistics, cognitive linguistics, comparative linguistics, categorical linguistics, lexicographic linguistics, text linguistics and lingvopersonology.

Correspondence: a.zagnitko@donnu.edu.ua

Надійшла до редакції 10 травня 2023 року
Рекомендована до друку 30 червня 2023 року