УДК 81’01/’08

© 2025 M. N. Mokhosoeva

GUSTATORY LEXEMES IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN: DERIVATIVE ASPECT

In the article the comparative research of periphery zone meanings in the semantic field «Taste» in the English and German languages has been carried out.

The periphery zone is formed by: 1) derivative meanings of polysemuos lexemes of the field’s core; 2) elements with the meaning of taste in a subordinate position – in derived meanings of different degrees.

Key words: *gustatory component, semantic field, periphery, derivative meaning.*

© 2025 М. Н. Мохосоева

ПРОИЗВОДНЫЕ ЗНАЧЕНИЯ ГУСТАТИВНЫХ ЛЕКСЕМ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ АНГЛИЙСКОГО И НЕМЕЦКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ)

В статье проводится исследование периферии семантического поля «Вкус» в английском и немецком языках. В изучаемых языках периферию поля составляют вторичные значения полисемантических лексем, входящих в ядро семантического поля «Вкус», а также элементы, имеющие признак вкуса в субординативной позиции – в производных значениях разных степеней.

Периферия семантического поля «Вкус» сформирована, исходя из словообразовательных возможностей наименований вкуса изучаемых языков. К периферии относятся метафорически и метонимически перенесенные значения густативних лексем.

Ключевые слова: *густативный компонент, семантическое поле, периферия, производное значение.*

1. Introduction. Gustative lexis (GL) denots taste. The object of the study is gustative vocabulary presented in the form of a semantic field.

The analysis of the vocabulary of taste was carried out mainly on the material of individual languages: Russian (N. E. Gronskaya, Zh. V. Lechitskaya, A. V. Makarova), Ukrainian (M. P. Bilous, A. V. Vysotsky, I. V. Gaidaenko), German (V. V. Gridasov), Latin (N. A. Timeychuk), Greek (N. K. Malinauskene).

The comparative studies of gustative vocabulary considered were based on English, Russian and French (A. Kh. Merzlyakova); English and Russian (A. V. Kutsenko); German and Russian (T. M. Matveeva) [Матвеева, 2005; Мерзлякова, 2003]. Despite the fact that taste perception has long been analysed by scholars of many fields, gustative lexemes have not been the subject of a comprehensive study based on the English and German languages, which determines the topicality of this research.

The aim of the study is to describe the general and specific features of gustative vocabulary

in English and German.

The research presents the corpus of gustative vocabulary in the form of lexico-semantic and thematic groups with a total of 2873 units (859 lexico-semantic variants in English and 918 in German).

Main part. Modeling the language system is a fairly effective way of learning it [Полевые структуры, 1989: 3]. Lexical groupings united on the basis of a common meaning, a common function, or a combination of these two features can be presented in the form of a field – a systemic formation characterized by hierarchical relations. Words related to GL are connected by semantic relations and form a hierarchical unity corresponding to the field structure [Кезина, 2004: 79-86].

By field structure, following Z. D. Popova and I. A. Sternin, we mean the unification of different elements of the language system that have the characteristics of a language field. Field structures include both lexico-semantic and lexico-grammatical groupings and truly semantic phenomena such as semanteme and sememe [Полевые структуры, 1989: 8].

According to V. V. Levitsky, such microsystems as the lexico-semantic field, lexico-semantic group, and synonymous series have the characteristic features of a «field structure» [Левицкий, 2006: 218]. These elements include the dominant word, the core, and the periphery of the zone [Левицкий, 2006: 218]. The zones of the field are connected by an associative connection with the stimulus-identifier in the center of the field [Полевые структуры, 1989: 33].

The field division of gustative vocabulary corresponds to the structure of the semantic field suggested by Yu. M. Karaulov, as well as to one of the five types of semantic fields identified by L. M. Vasiliev. The components of the field presented by Yu. M. Karaulov are connected by various lexico-semantic and lexico-grammatical relations. At the same time, the words included in the semantic field are united by a common (at least one) seme, which is included in the corresponding interpretation of each of these words [Караулов, 2009: 219].

Typology of the semantic field of L. M. Vasilyeva is represented by the following types of lexical associations with a common invariant: 1) semantic classes of one part of speech, which are in paradigmatic relations; 2) semantically correlated classes of words of different parts of speech, the units of which can be in both paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations with each other; 3) functional-semantic fields; 4) syntactic paradigms; 5) semantic-syntactic fields of mixed type [Васильев, 2006: 55].

The semantic field «Taste» characterizes another type of paradigms – semantically correlated classes of words of different parts of speech, entering paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. The field «Taste» is an interparticle hierarchically structured semantic field. The GL field, like any

other systemic-structural association, has a clear structure – a core and a periphery.

The unification of linguistic units into a semantic field occurs on the basis of a common invariant meaning. Despite a certain subjectivity in isolating semantic fields and defining their boundaries, the semantic field is not a methodological abstraction, but represents an objective linguistic structure [Лурия, 1982: 63; Залевская, 2005: 155].

Semes of the generic meaning TASTE, GESCHMACK cover the entire meaning of the field «Taste» and perform an integrating function. The core of the field is characterized by the maximum concentration of the taste feature, while on the periphery there is a weakening of the intensity of the feature. The criterion for distinguishing between different zones of the semantic field «Taste» is the degree of semantic closeness to the core meanings.

The national specificity of lexico-semantic fields is revealed in the number of words present in the field and in the nature of the opposition between the components of the field [Ельмслев, 2006: 48; Звегинцев, 2001: 211]. Quantitative features of the fields units in the compared languages also play a major role in the comparison [Croft, 2003; Korunets, 2003: 139-149].

When constructing the semantic field «Taste», the semantic volume of the polysemantic lexemes included in its composition is taken into account. This concerns, first of all, the polysemantics *taste, sweet, bitter, salty, sour*, which in direct meanings are included in the core of the semantic field under study, and in figurative meanings are located on the periphery. The validity of this approach is confirmed by a number of researchers using the field method. Thus, S. G. Shafikov believes that «depending on the research objectives, the field may not be limited to a set of meanings (semes) identified by a common seme, but be characterized by the depth formed by the semantic structure of polysemants» [Шафиков, 1999: 22].

The periphery of the semantic field «Taste» is formed based on the word-formation potential of taste nominations. The periphery includes metaphorically and metonymically transferred meanings of gustatory lexemes. The group is quite numerous (302 lexico-semantic variants in English and 322 in German) and includes lexemes belonging to other semantic fields.

The periphery of the field is made up of elements that have the attribute of taste in a subordinate position – in derivative meanings of different degrees (meanings No. 2, No. 3, etc.), cf.: English *light*[16] ‘weak’; English *weak*[10] ‘rare (about drinks)’; German *streng*[3] ‘sharp, acrid (taste, smell)’.

We also include secondary meanings of polysemantic lexemes, which form the core of the semantic field «Taste» in the periphery – *taste, sweet, bitter, salty, sour*, cf.: English *sour*[3] ‘angry, gloomy, irritated’; German *sauer*[7] ‘dissatisfied, gloomy’; German *sauer*[8] ‘angry at something, enraged’.

Figurative meanings of perceptual lexemes make perceptual metaphors, a special type of ontological metaphors. The identification of this type of metaphor is based on the theory of two equal types of knowledge: empirical, based on concrete sensory perception, and theoretical knowledge based on abstract logical thinking [Гридасов, 1999: 112].

In analyzing the material, we take into account the typology of sememes developed by M. M. Kopylenko and Z. D. Popova, according to which the direct nominative meaning corresponds to the primary denotative sememe D1, and the derivative-nominative meaning corresponds to the secondary denotative sememe D2. Sememes D2 are characterized by greater national specificity due to the socio-cultural determinacy of the process of transferring the perceptual feature.

The periphery of the semantic field «Taste» is represented by: 1) a group of units that have a gustative component in the semantic structure of the word; 2) a group of units that do not have a gustative component in the semantic structure of the word.

1) The first group can be exemplified by zoological names with a gustative component in the name and in the semantic structure, cf.: English *bitterling* zoological ‘a cyprinid fish with inedible bitter meat’ – ‘a fish of the carp family with inedible bitter meat’; German *Bitterling*[1] (m) zoological ‘kleiner karpfenähnlicher Fisch, dessen bitter schmeckendes Fleisch ungenießbar ist’ – ‘a small fish of the carp family with inedible bitter meat’.

The taste of roots, leaves, or fruits of some plants is reflected in their names, cf.: English *sweet-root*[1] (licorice, liquorice) botanic ‘the dried root of a Mediterranean plant which is used in medicines and to give flavour to food, especially sweets’ – ‘the dried root of a Mediterranean plant which is used in medicine and to give flavour to food, especially sweets’; German *Süßholz* (n) botanic ‘eine Süßholzstrauchwurzel die u. a. zur Lakritzgewinnung dient’ – ‘the root of the licorice bush, which is used, among other things, to obtain an extract of the sweet root’.

Let us consider an element of the thematic group of botanical names with a gustative component. The presence of lexical lacunae in this thematic group is associated with differences in the names in the languages under study, cf.: the German lexeme *Bitterkraut* (n) botanic ‘bitter’ corresponds to the English lexeme *smartweed* botanic ‘bitter’, which does not have a gustative component in its name; the German word *Säuerling*[1] (m) ‘sorrel’ corresponds to English *shamrock* ‘sorrel’, etc.

In the TG of botanical names, we observe the predominance of the units in the German language, compared to the names of the English language. Most often, the analogues of botanical names in German are units of the English language that: a) do not have a gustative component in the name, b) do not correspond to the monolexemic principle of vocabulary selection in the

study, cf.: German *Süßgras*[1] botanic (n) ‘manna grass’; English *manna*[3] botanic ‘manna grass’; German *Süßling*[2] (m) botanic ‘milkweed’; English *spurge* botanic ‘milkweed’; German *Süßdolde* botanic (f) ‘myrrh’; English *myrrhis / myrrh tree* botanic ‘myrrh’; German *Salzstrauch* (m) botanic ‘singil’; English *salt tree* botanic ‘singil’.

2) The subgroup of units that do not have a gustative component in the semantic structure of the word is represented by: a) 9 lexical-semantic groups, b) 31 thematic groups, c) residual groups.

Among the lexico-semantic groups of the periphery of the semantic field «Taste», the following adjective meanings are nationally marked:

a) with the meaning of *a hypocritical person*, where the *cloyingly sweet* taste is associated with flattery, cf.: English *sugary*[2] derogatory ‘flattering, cloying, sentimental’; *saccharine*[2] figurative, derogatory ‘cloying’; *honeyed*[2] figurative ‘flattering (about words)’, *honey-mouthed* ‘sweet-tongued, honey-mouthed, obsequious’; German *süß*[6] figurative ‘sweet-tongued, flattering’; *süßlich*[3] ‘flattering’; *bittersüß*[3] figurative ‘sugary’;

b) with the meaning *very heavy, unpleasant (about a state, experience)*, due to the associative connection of bitter taste with unpleasant sensations, cf.: English *distasteful* ‘bitter, painful’; *bitter*[1] (about an argument) ‘very unpleasant, with great anger and hatred’; *bitter*[2] ‘bitter, painful’; *salt*[4] ‘bitter, burning (about tears); German *bitter*[2], *bitter*[5] ‘heavy, painful’, *bitterlich*[3] figurative ‘bitter, sad, painful’; *bitter*[3] ‘angry, disappointed’; *bittersüß*[2] ‘painful, difficult and beautiful at the same time’; *sauer*[6] ‘to someone the work seems difficult to perform; a person copes with it only with great effort’; *herb*[2] ‘dejected, bitter’.

Among the thematic groups of the periphery of the semantic field «Taste», the national characteristics of the languages studied are best reflected in the groups with the meaning of *statement; character traits, mental and emotional state of a person; minerals, pools, lakes, etc.*

In English, the thematic group characterizing *statements* is represented by 22 meanings, for example: *tasteless*[2] ‘tactless (about a statement)’; *salt*[6] ‘obscene (about saying)’; *salt*[7] ‘caustic, sharp (about a joke); *salty*[2] ‘rude’; *spicy*[2] ‘spicy (about saying)’; *harsh, stark* ‘strong (about a statement)’; *savorless* figurat. ‘fresh’; *insipid* ‘uninteresting, boring’.

In German, the corresponding thematic group has 12 meanings, for example: *geschmacklos*[3] ‘tactless, obscene (about a statement)’; *gesalzen*[3] familiar-colloquial ‘rude’; *gepfeffert*[4] ‘salty (about sharpness, saying)’; *kräftig* ‘strong (about saying)’; *scharf* ‘strong (about saying)’; *fade*[2] ‘boring, empty’; *schal*[3] ‘ridiculous, empty’.

The thematic group denoting *character traits* includes 17 meanings in English and 14 lexico-semantic variants in German, cf.: English *tasteless*[4] ‘bad taste (behavior)’; *sweet*[5] ‘pleasant, friendly’; *sweet*[7] ‘having a good disposition’; *sweet-tempered* ‘friendly, with a gentle character’; *sweetie*[2] conversational ‘good, pleasant’; *bitterend* ‘principled, uncompromising’; German *abgeschmackt*[1]

'stupid, boring'; *süß*[6] [exaggerated] 'kind, friendly'; *süßsauer*[2], *sauersüß*[2] figurative 'cold, indifferent, forced, insincere'; *gallenbitter*[2] 'bilious, malicious person'; *gesalzen*[4] fam.-colloquial 'unfriendly, ungracious'; *fade*[3] conversational 'fearful, timid; mannered'.

The periphery of the semantic field «Taste» is also represented by a thematic group of nouns with the meaning of *a person's mental and emotional state*.The group contains 14 nouns in English and 13 in German, cf.: English *taste*[6] 'the quality of being appropriate and harmless'; *bitterness*[2] 'bitterness, acrimony'; *gall*[3] 'bitterness, anger, irritation'; *sourness*[2] 'sarcasm, harshness'; German *Geschmack*[6] (m) 'good manners, good tone, tact'; *Geschmacklosigkeit*[2] (f) 'indecency, bad tone'; *Bitternis*[2] (f), *Bitterkeit*[2] (f) 'suffering, grief'; *Sauernis*[2] (f) 'discontent, gloom'.

Thematic group of nouns with the meaning of *minerals, pools, lakes, etc* is characterized by peripheral status within the field «Taste». In German, composites of the «noun + noun» model display greater productivity of meanings in this group, cf. German *Bittersee (m)* 'bitter-salt lake'; *Salzwiese (f)* geological 'saline meadow (on the seashore)'; *Salzbrunnen (m)* 'salt spring'; *Salzablagerung (f)* 'salt deposits; salt deposits'; *Salzgrube (f)* 'salt mine'; *Salzlager (n)* 'layer [deposit] of rock salt'; *Salzquelle (f)* 'salty mineral spring'; *Süßwasserbecken (n)* 'fresh water basin' – a total of 16 meanings; English *bitter-spar* mineral 'dolomite'; *salt-pan*[2] 'salt lake'; *salt-marsh* 'salt marsh; lowland flooded by salt water'; *salt-pond* 'salt pond' – a total of 5 meanings.

The comparative analysis of the equivalent gustative vocabulary, along with equivalent verbal signs in form, has shown the gaps in the languages under study associated with the absence of a single-word nomination of a certain concept.

Lexemes of the German language, formed by compounding, often do not have single-word equivalents in English, cf. German *essigsauer*[2] – English *sour as vinegar*, German *Geschmackverstärker (m)* – English *taste intensifier*, German *Salzstrauch (m)* – English *salt tree 'chingil'*, German *Süßwasser (n)* – English *sweet water*, etc.

Due to the monolexemic principle of vocabulary selection in our study, the lexico-semantic and thematic groups of the «Taste» field do not contain English word combinations corresponding to German composites, e.g.: German *Geschmacksstörung (f)* 'temporary inability to sense taste'; German *Säurebestimmung (f)* med. 'determination of acidity'; German *Salzwechsel (m)* 'salt metabolism'; German figurative *Geschmacksverirrung (f)* 'bad taste, lack of taste'; German *Geschmackssinnesorgan (n)* 'taste organ'; German *Geschmacksknospe (f)* 'tongue receptor'.

The analysis confirms the presence of non-equivalent vocabulary in the languages under study, which is a manifestation of alomorphism, e.g.: English *salt-box* 'a house with two floors in the front and one floor in the back' (the name comes from the similarity with a wooden box in which salt was previously stored), English *untasted* 'untouched'; German *Salzburg (n)* literally 'salt castle' – 'Salzburg (a city and state in Austria), German *Bitterfeld (n)* 'Bitterfeld (a region

in Saxony)', *Salzach (f)* 'Salzach (the main tributary of the Inn)', *Sauerland (n)* 'Sauerland (a mountainous region in western Germany)'.

3. Conclusion. Comparative research enables to solve the problem of the relationship between the universal and the ideoethnic in language, allows to identify the national specificity of division and display of objective reality in language.

The field principle is the basis for the systemic organization of gustatory vocabulary. As a result of the comparative study of the semantic field «Taste» in English and German, it was established that their common features dominate over the differences.

The core of the field is characterized by the highest concentration of the taste feature, on the periphery a weakening of the intensity of the feature is observed. The criterion for distinguishing between different zones of the semantic field «Taste» is the degree of semantic proximity to the core meanings.

The periphery of the semantic field under study includes non-gustative meanings formed from gustatory vocabulary in a semantic way (metaphorical and metonymic transfers), as well as in a morphological way (using word-formation means).

In the languages under study, the direct meaning of gustatory vocabulary corresponds to a specific taste sensation; in semantic transformation, the derivative meaning is a metaphorical transfer of two types: a) with the preservation of sensory qualities, b) with the loss of sensory qualities with the meaning of internal properties, emotional impressions, and the mental state of a person.

The similarities identified are a consequence of the universality of taste perception, the origin of the compared languages from a single Indo-European language, and long-term contact between their speakers. A significant part of the gustative vocabulary in German is represented by composites, which in English correspond to phrases. The results of the quantitative analysis indicate that the dominant type of transfer in the gustative vocabulary is metaphorical.

Metaphorical transfers recorded in the explanatory dictionaries of the languages studied are represented by 346 lexical-semantic variants (English – 200 units; German – 146 units). A feature of the sensory type of metaphor is the transfer of the name of one feature to another based on the similarity of their perception.

Metaphorical transfer occurs in the following directions: 1) to the features of a person's character, condition and appearance; 2) to an action, process, feature that have characteristics of gustative vocabulary; 3) to other perceptual sensations (odorant, sound, visual, tactile); 4) to abstract concepts, mental processes; 5) to weather conditions; 6) to social features. The identified types of metaphorical transfers are common to the languages under study, but have different productivity.

The most productive is the transfer to a person's emotional state, internal character traits,

realized in 195 lexical-semantic variants (English – 103 units, German – 92 units); the second place in productivity is occupied by the transfer to an action, process, feature that has the characteristics of gustative vocabulary – 98 lexico-semantic variants (English – 63 units, German – 35 units); the third in productivity is the transfer to other perceptual sensations (odorative, auditory, visual, tactile) and makes up 33 lexico-semantic variants (English – 24 units, German – 9 units); transfer to abstract concepts, mental processes, weather conditions, human appearance has 9 lexical-semantic variants for each of these subgroups; transfer of gustative vocabulary to social features is represented by single lexical-semantic variants in the compared languages.

Despite significant similarities, gustative vocabulary in the compared languages is characterized by differences consisting in the presence (or absence) of a separate element of field organization, in their quantitative characteristics, and the features of their semantics.

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1. Васильев Л. М. Теоретические проблемы общей лингвистики, славистики, русистики. Уфа: БашГУ, 2006. 520 с.

2. Гридасов В. В. Перцептивная метафора как лексико-семантическая категория (на материале современного немецкого языка): дисс. … канд. филол. наук: 10.02.04. Барнаул, 1999. 163 с.

3. Ельмслев Л. Пролегомены к теории языка. Москва: КомКнига, 2006. 248 с.

4. Залевская А. А. Психолингвистические исследования. Слово. Москва: Гнозис, 2005 (ГУП Смол. обл. тип. им. В. И. Смирнова). 542 с.

5. Звегинцев В. А. Язык и лингвистическая теория. 2 е изд. Москва: Эдиториал УРСС, 2001. 248 с.

6. Караулов Ю. Н. Общая и русская идеография. 2-е изд. Москва: ЛИБРОКОМ : ЛЕНАНД, 2009. 354 с.

7. Кезина С. В. Семантическое поле как система // Филологические науки. 2004. № 4. С. 79-86.

8. Левицкий В. В. Семасиология. Винница: Нова кныга, 2006. 512 с.

9. Лурия А. Р. Этапы пройденного пути: научная автобиография. Москва: Изд-во МГУ, 1982. 181 с.

10. Матвеева Т. М. Перцептивная категория вкуса и лингвистические средства ее реализации: дисс. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.19. Челябинск, 2005. 200 с.

11. Мерзлякова А. Х. Типы семантического варьирования прилагательных в поле «Восприятие» (на материале английского, русского и французского языков): дисс. ... д-ра филол. наук: 10.02.19 . Уфа, 2003. 357 с.

12. Полевые структуры в системе языка: коллективная монография / З. Д. Попова, И. А. Стернин, Е. И. Беляева и др.; науч. ред. З. Д. Попова. Воронеж: Изд-во Воронеж. ун-та, 1989. 200 с.

13. Шафиков С. Г. Теория семантического поля и компонентной семантики его единиц. Уфа, 1999. 88 с.

14. Croft W. Typology and Universals. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 341 p.

15. Korunets I. V. Contrastive typology of the English and Ukrainian Languages. K.: Lybid Publishers, 2003. 459 p.

REFERENCES

1. Vasilev, L. M. (2006). *Teoreticheskie problemy obschey lingvistiki, slavistiki, rusistiki* [Theoretical problems of general linguistics, Slavistics, and Russistics s]. Ufa: BashGU. (In Russ.).

2. Gridasov, V. V. (1999). *Pertseptivnaya metafora kak leksiko-semanticheskaya kategoriya (na materiale sovremennogo nemetskogo yazyka)* [Perceptual metaphor as a lexico-semantic category (on the material of modern German language)]: diss. … kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.04. Barnaul. (In Russ.).

3. Elmslev, L. (2006). *Prolegomeny k teorii yazyka* [Prolegomena to the theory of language]. Moskva: KomKniga. (In Russ.).

4. Zalevskaya, A. A. (2005). *Psykholingvisticheskie issledovaniya. Slovo* [Psycholinguistic research]. Moskva: Gnozis. (GUP Smol. obl. tip. im. V. I. Smirnova). (In Russ.).

5. Zvegintsev, V. A. (2001). *Yazyk i lingvisticheskaya teoriya* [Language and linguistic theory]. 2-e izd. Moskva: Editorial URSS (In Russ.).

6. Karaulov, Yu. N. (2009). *Obshchaya i russkaya ideografiya* [General and Russian Ideography]. 2-e izd. Moskva: LIBROKOM : LENAND. (In Russ.).

7. Kezina, S. V. (2004). Semanticheskoe pole kak sistema [Semantic field as a system]. In *Filologicheskie nauki*. No 4. Pp. 79-86. (In Russ.).

8. Levitskiy, V. V. (2006). *Semasiologiya* [Semasiology]. Vinnitsa: Nova knyga. (In Russ.).

9. Luriya, A. R. (1982). *Etapy proydennogo puti: nauchnaya avtobiografiya* [Stages of the Passed Way: Scientific Autobiography]. Moskva: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo universiteta. (In Russ.).

10. Matveeva, T. M. (2005). *Pertseptivnaya kategoriya vkusa i lingvisticheskie sredstva ee realizatsii* [Perceptual category of taste and linguistic means of its realization]: diss. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.19. Chelyabinsk. (In Russ.).

11. Merzlyakova, A. Kh. (2003). *Tipy semanticheskogo varirovaniya prilagatelnykh v pole «Vospriyatie» (na materiale angliyskogo, russkogo i frantsuzskogo yazykov)* [Types of semantic variation of adjectives in the field «Perception» (on the material of English, Russian and French languages)]: diss. ... d-ra filol. nauk: 10.02.19. Ufa. (In Russ.).

12. *Polevye struktury v sisteme yazyka* [Field structures in the system of language: a collective monograph]: kollektivnaya monografiya / Z. D. Popova, I. A. Sternin, E. I. Belyaeva i dr.; nauch. red. Z. D. Popova. Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezh. un-ta, 1989. (In Russ.).

13. Shafikov, S. G. (1999). *Teoriya semanticheskogo polya i komponentnoy semantiki ego edinits* [Theory of semantic field and component semantics of its units]. Ufa. (In Russ.).

14. Croft, W. (2003). *Typology and Universals*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

15. Korunets, I. V. (2003). *Contrastive typology of the English and Ukrainian Languages*. K.: Lybid Publishers.

Мохосоева Марина Николаевна *– кандидат филологических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры английского языка для экономических специальностей (e-mail: m.mokhosoeva@mail.ru), Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Донецкий государственный университет» 283001, Донецк, Университетская, 24*

Mokhosoeva Marina Nikolaevna *– Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor of Department of English Language for Economic Purposes (e-mail: m.mokhosoeva@mail.ru), Federal State-Funded Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education «Donetsk State University» 24, Universitetskaya, Donetsk, 283001*

Поступила в редакцию 19 августа 2024 г.