

question enabling specialists to publish research, exchange expertise and data with colleagues within professional environments as well as apply the latest achievements in government-based settings. Thus, a number of current borrowings (if erroneous and/or inaccurate) must be reconsidered to conform to the rules of the Ukrainian language and become rid of unnecessary Russian influences. Secondly, non-specialist caregivers, such as parents, need to be able to understand and utilize the vocabulary when exchanging information within support groups, while acquiring training, and/or communicating with specialists. The problem arises when caregivers have already adjusted to the current though faulty translated vocabulary, and any alteration may lead to confusion. The author of this paper has faced the issue while interpreting for specialist and non-specialist groups of caregivers in various regions of Ukraine (both Russian language prevalent and Ukrainian language prevalent).

Both aspects need to be carefully considered when developing an intrinsic yet utilizable national terminology for a field that is significantly reliant on both professional and non-specialist services of care-giving.

ENGLISH SUFFIXES OF NOMINALIZATION:

A COGNITIVE LINGUISTIC ASPECT

Viktoriia Tokarchuk

**Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy,
Ukraine**

The study reveals cognitive linguistic mechanisms underpinning English substantive derivatives with the suffixes of nominalization.

Nominalization is a process of “turning something into a noun”. The process covers a broad range of transpositional phenomena that refer to word-class changing operations [3, p. 652]. Nominalized abstract nouns are commonly derived from verbs, adjectives or nouns: *management, kindness, primitivism, friendship, arrival, bribery*

etc. [2]. However, not all abstract nouns are morphologically derived words. For example, the abstract nouns *horror* and *theft* are not derived from the verbs **horror* or *thieve*. At the conceptual level of the two groups of nouns we find a conceptual shift from a relational entity into a thing commonly known as reification [4, p. 78–79]. Only the first case, however, is an instance of nominalization. Thus, nominalization refers to the formal aspect of the derived linguistic units.

A cognitive linguistic analysis of the nominalized units is a three-stage process. The first stage presupposes reconstructing the internal word form of the derived words. The second stage lies in identifying the formal derivational models of the words. The third stage assumes establishing correlations between conceptual and formal models of the analyzed words.

The methodology of the research employs the findings of the Semantics of Lingual Networks (SLS) by S. Zhabotynska [1]. The study adopts basic propositional schemas of SLS as instruments used for reconstructing the internal word form of the derived units. In case of nominalization, the internal word form is assumed to be construed by means of the INCLUSION schema “CN-container has CT-content” in which the container signifies the event and the content indicates the character of the event.

For the English substantive derivatives with the suffixes of nominalization the container is externalized through the suffix (e.g. *-ness*, *-ship*, *-(e)ry*, *-ism*, *-al*, *-ment* etc.) while the content can be externalized through various basic propositional schemas (see the full list of the schemas in [1]). The latter provides evidence for identifying the prototypical meaning of the derivatives with a particular suffix. For instance, the English substantive derivatives with the suffix *-ment* are regarded as substantivized actions while the derivatives with the suffix *-ness* are primarily substantivized qualities of objects.

The paper contributes to the understanding of human cognition mechanisms laid down in language. Further studies can shed light on the comparative analysis of the English and Ukrainian nominalizations, thus facilitating cross-border cooperation in the cognitive linguistic studies.

References:

1. Жаботинская С. А. Генеративизм, когнитивизм и семантика лингвальных сетей. *Doctrinamultiplex, verinasuna. Учень багато, істина одна*: зб. праць до ювілею Ізабелли РафаїлівниБуніятової / Київський ун-т ім. Б. Грінченка. Київ: Київ. ун-т ім. Б. Грінченка, 2018. С. 99–141.
2. Hitchings H. Those Irritating Verbs-as-Nouns. *The New York Times*. March 30, 2013. URL: <https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/03/30/those-irritating-verbs-as-nouns/> (Last accessed: February 11, 2019).
3. Коптjevskaja-Tamm M. Nominalization. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*: in 14 vols. / ed. by Brown K. Amsterdam; Boston: Elsevier, 2006. Vol. 6. P. 652–659.
4. Radden G., Dirven R. *Cognitive English Grammar*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007. XIII, 375 p. (Cognitive Linguistics in Practice; v. 2).
- 5.

***STAVISLAV PHENOMENON AS THE RESULT OF WESTERN CULTURE
INFLUENCE ON UKRAINIAN REGIONAL LITERATURE***

Julia Shuba

**Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy,
Ukraine**

The term “Stanislav phenomenon” was first used in 1992 by Volodymyr Yeshkilyev at Ivano-Frankivsk art exhibition *Ruberoid* when hereferred to a group of Ivano-Frankivskwriters and artists who were actively creating their worksin postmodernist manner, rejecting the dominating socio-realistic discourse of the former USSR. Among them were Yuri Andrukhovych, TarasProkhasko, YuriyIzdryk, HalynaPetrosanyak, Maria Mykytsei, YaroslavDovhan.