Синергетика в филологических исследованих : монография / Т. И. Домброван и др.; под общ. ред. Л. С. Пихтовниковой. Харьков : Харьковский национальный университет им. В. Н. Каразина, 2015. 340 с.

Тороп П. Тотальний переклад : монографія. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2015. 264 с.

Швачко С. О. Прислів'я англомовного дискурсу: онто-гносеологічна синкрета. *Вісник ХНУ імені В. Н. Каразіна. Іноземна філологія. Методика викладання іноземних мов*. Харків, 2016. Вип. 84. С. 177-188.

Швачко С.О. Об'єкти перекладознавства: монографія. Суми: СумДУ, 2019. 222 с.

Longman Exams Dictionary, Pearson Education Limited, 2006. 1833 p.

Shvachko S., *Kobyakova I.* Linguocognitive Aspects of Humour Category. *The Intersection of Cultures*. 2019. Vol. 1. P. 17−23.

KOVBASKO Yu.
(Vasyl Stefanyk PreCarpathian National University, Ivano-Frankivsk)
y.kovbasko@yahoo.com

ETYMOLOGICAL MODELS OF ENGLISH ADVERBS

The paper focuses on research and reconstruction of etymological models of adverbs in the Old and Middle English periods. Analysis of adverbs and their etymology is directly connected with one of the aspects of general-theoretical problems, i.e. part of speech affiliation of adverbs and a disputable issue of degrees of comparison. It has been hypothesized that the ability of adverbs to form degrees of comparison is presupposed by the fact whether their protoforms had potential to do this. The research is based on top 50 most frequently used adverbs in Present-day English (PDE). This list comprises not only lexical units formed by means of suffix '-ly', which are traditionally characterized by degrees of comparison, but also one- or many component adverbs formed by compounding. The units on the list represent various time samples in Old and Middle English. In the paper 3 basic etymological models of adverb formation – one-, two-, three- and multicomponent models have been reconstructed. In their turn they are divided into 22 subparadigms, 15 of which are actualized in the paper. The most common subparadigms are *Adj. + SUF; N. + SUF; Adv.* Among 50 lexical units under analysis 19 units are formed on adverbial stem; 14 – adjectival; 9 – nominal; 4 prepositional; 3 – verbal; 1 – pronominal. Among 19 PDE adverbs evolved from an adverbial stem 16 units do not form degrees of comparison, except *often, early, soon*; among 14 adverbs formed on the basis of an adjectival stem 12 units do not have degrees of comparison, except *rather, extremely*. PDE adverbs which have developed from other parts of speech are not characterized by degrees of comparison.
Key words: adverbs, degrees of comparison, etymological models, Old and Middle English.

Ковбаско Ю. Етимологічні моделі англійських прислівників. Стаття присвячена вивченню та реконструкції етимологічних моделей формування сучасних прислівників в давньоанглійському та середньоанглійському періодах. Дослідження прислівників та їх етимології безпосередньо пов'язане з одним із аспектів загальнотеоретичної проблеми визначення частиномовної приналежності прислівників у сучасній англійській мові, зокрема дискусійним питанням формування ступенів порівняння. Висувається гіпотеза, що здатність прислівників до утворення ступенів порівняння визначається потенціалом до такого формування у їхніх праформ. Дослідження базується на 50 найбільш вживаних прислівниках у сучасній англійській мові. Цей перелік охоплює не тільки одиниці сформовані за допомогою суфікса '-ly', що традиційно характеризуються ступенями порівняння, але й однокомпонентні чи багатокомпонентні прислівники утворені шляхом словоскладання. Одиниці, що належать до цього переліку, репрезентують різноманітні часові зрізи у межах давньоанглійської та середньоанглійської мови. У ході дослідження було реконструйовано 3 базові етимологічні моделі формування прислівників – одно-, дво-, три- та багатокомпоненті моделі, що поділяються на 21 субпарадигму, з яких у роботі актулізується 15. Найпоширенішими субпарадигмами є *Adj. + SUF; N. + SUF; Adv.* З-поміж 50 проаналізованих одиниць 19 сформовано на прислівниковій основі, 14 – прикметниковій, 9 – іменниковій, 4 – прийменниковій, 3 – дієслівній, 1 – займенниковій. Серед 19 сучасних прислівників утворених на прислівниковій основі 16 одиниць не мають ступенів порівняння, за винятком *often, early, soon*; серед 14 прислівників утворених на прикметниковій основі 12 одиниць мають ступені порівняння, за винятком *rather, extremely*. Прислівники утворені на основі інших частин мови характеризуються відсутністю ступенів порівняння.
Ключові слова: прислівник, ступені порівняння, етимологічні моделі, давньоанглійська та середньоанглійська мова

Introduction

There is no doubt that from the point of view of semantics adverbs belong to the notional parts of speech, but taking into consideration their morphological and word-building characteristics the approaches are quite different. Since the 18th century which marks "a great age for dictionaries and grammars in England" [Romaine 2007, p. 8] adverbs have been interpreted either as inflected (one of the features of notional word classes), see Allen [1841, p. 66;], Sievers [1885, p. 157], Wright [1908, p. 281], Rushton who distinguishes degrees of comparison in Anglo-Saxon adverbs

[1869, p. 235] or Bain who mentions that "adverbs are usually longer than the corresponding adjectives, and therefore more rarely admit of comparison by "er/est". In the old writers such cases as 'latelier', 'gentlier', 'hardlier', wiselier, 'easilier', 'rightlier' etc. were more common" [1863, p. 92]; or non-inflected (one of the features of functional word classes), see [Becker 1845, p. 162; Sweet, 1892, p.118]; or even a mixed class when "adverbs belong to a class of indeclinable words – particles; however, adverbs susceptible of comparison are not properly particles" [Fowler 1855, p. 255], and which require subdivision according to their form – into inflected and uninflected [Meiklejohn 1862, p.13].

Another issue under discussion is the origin of adverbs. Some linguists state that adverbs as a separate part of speech evolved on the basis of nouns and adjectives [Henry 1894, p. 188; Emerson 1921, p. 387; Biber 1999, p. 539]; or according to Strong adverbs are "in their origin crystallized cases of nouns (adjectival or substantival)" [Strong 1891, p. 357]. Others mention that many of them are "prepositional in their origin" [Murphy 1800, p. 127; Leonard 1908, p. 213], or "formed from adjectives, numerals and nouns" [Barrett 1861, p.132], or "are developed from substantives, adjectives, numerals, pronouns" [Maetzner 1874, p.386], or in general "most of them are corruptions or abbreviations of other words" [Bosworth 1823, p. 179; Crombie 1830, p.202; Hiley 1853, p.71; Bullions 1859, p.65; Morris 1880, p.187; Fewsmith 1905, p. 88 and others].

These two problematic issues emphasize the **significance, topicality and relevance of the study** of adverbs, their etymology, morphology, syntax and correlation with other word classes. Therefore, **the aim of the paper** is twofold; firstly, to reconstruct primary etymological models of top 50 most frequently used PDE adverbs; secondly, to study the correlation between the protoforms and PDE adverbs in order to trace interdependence between protoforms and capability of adverbs to form degrees of comparison.

The **object of the study** is represented by top 50 most frequently used PDE adverbs and their Old English (henceforth – O.E.) or Middle English (henceforth – M.E.) corresponding forms; interrelation between them is the **subject of the study**. We **hypothesize** that being derived from the lexical units which are capable of changing their morphological criteria adverbs are to be characterized by the existence of the same morphological features. To verify the hypothesis it is necessary to refer not to the synchronic analysis of PDE adverbs but to their protoforms in order to reconstruct etymological models and trace the correspondences between the protoforms and tendency of PDE adverbs to form degrees of comparison.

Consequently, the following **objectives** have been outlined:
- to make etymological analysis of top 50 most frequently used PDE adverbs;
- to reconstruct etymological models of PDE adverbs, specify their types:
- to carry out quantitative analysis of the models and their corresponding PDE adverbs;
Results and discussion

The basic morphological characteristic of adverbs, if not the sole one, is their ability to form degrees of comparison synthetically or analytically. At the same time, linguists traditionally observe, that only some adverbs of manner, degree, time and place can acquire this morphological feature. But such presupposition, to our mind, is ambiguous and unpersuasive, because, firstly, in every of the abovementioned groups of adverbs there is a great number of exceptions, for instance *already, here, mostly, rather* etc., and, secondly, such division is based on the semantic component, but not morphological within the frames of which the differentiation should be made.

We assert that morphological structure of adverbs must be studied in diachronic perspective and, therefore, we hypothesize that such morphological characteristic of adverbs as declinability, which is represented by degrees of comparison, depends on the base morpheme (protoform) of an adverb, i.e. if a base morpheme was declinable, then an adverb in PDE is characterized by the same feature, despite its semantic affiliation to any of the adverbial groups and the type of the suffix which participates in adverb formation. To verify the hypothesis we suggest performing etymological analysis of adverbs and to focus on the interdependence between the capability of PDE adverbs and their corresponding base morphemes to form degrees of comparison. The research

is based on top 50 most frequently used PDE adverbs which belong to various groups like manner, time, degree, negation, place etc.

Table 1
Top 50 Most Frequently Used Adverbs in PDE

not	always	almost	thus	properly
also	sometimes	especially	easily	soon
very	together	ever	eventually	specifically
often	likely	quickly	exactly	ahead
however	simply	probably	certainly	daily
too	generally	already	normally	highly
usually	instead	below	currently	immediately
really	actually	directly	extremely	relatively
early	again	therefore	finally	slowly
never	rather	else	constantly	fairly

Let's perform an etymological analysis of PDE adverbs:

- **Mod.E. not (adv)** ← **O.E. ne/na/nought (adv.)** Linguists state that *not* can also be derived from Old Frisian verb *neer/neier/nier*, which meant 'to negate' [Iyeiri, 2005, p. 67-68];

- **Mod.E also (adv)** ← **O.E. al/eall (adv.) + O.E. swa (adv.)** –adverb *also* was formed on the basis of two O.E. adverbs, the former was used to amplify semantics of the latter [OED];

- **Mod.E. very (adv.)** ← **O.F. verrai/verray (adv.)** – it is impossible to ascertain primary affiliation of the lexical unit to any of the word classes, as it was widespread, both as an adjective and an adverb, though the usage of *very* in adverbial meaning was specified earlier;

- **Mod.E. often (adv.)** ← **M.E. oft (adv.)** –adverb *often* is a commonly used form of M.E. adverb *oft*;

- **Mod.E. however (adv.)** ← **O.E. hu (adv.) + O.E. ǣfre/afre (adv.)** – *however* derives from two O.E. adverbs *hu* and *ǣfre*;

- **Mod.E too (adv.)** ← **O.E. to (adv.)** – the base morpheme of adverb *too* was O.E. adverb *to*;

- **Mod.E usually (adv.)** ← **L. usus (n.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** –adverb *usually* came from Latin noun *usus* via Old French (O.F.) adjective *usual* in combination with O.E. suffix *lice (ly)*. The base morpheme belonged to an uninflected group;

- **Mod.E really (adv.)** ← **L. rēs (n.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** – similar origin has adverb *really*, which combines O.F. adjective *real/reel* and O.E. suffix *lice*. However, the adjective itself comes from Latin noun *rēs*, which was uninflected;

- **Mod.E. early (adv.)** ← **O.E. ǣr (adv.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** – *early* is one of the traditional examples of modern adverbs formation by means of combining O.E. adverb *ǣr* and suffix *lice;*

- **Mod.E. never (adv.)** ← **O.E. ne (adv.) + O.E. ǣfre/afre (adv.)** – *never* is a combination of two O.E. adverbs, namely *ne* and *ǣfre;*

- **Mod.E. always (adv.)** ← **O.E. eall/ealne (adv.) + O.E. weg (noun)** – adverbs were often formed as an amalgamation of adverbs and nouns, as in case of an O.E. combination *eall* and *weg*;

- **Mod.E. sometimes (adv.)** ← **O.E. sum (pron.) + O.E. tima (noun)** – sometimes O.E. nouns were combined with pronouns like *sum*;

- **Mod.E. together (adv.)** ← **O.E. to (adv.) + O.E. gǣdere (adv.)** – the lexical unit *together* was formed on the basis of O.E. adverbs *to* and *gǣdere*;

- **Mod.E. likely (adv.)** ← **O.N. lik (adj.) + O.N. ligr (suffix)** – another classical example of O.E. adverbs is coupling together an adjective and a suffix. Sometimes these were Old Scandinavian suffixes *lik* and *ligr* – equivalents to O.E. suffix *lice;*

- **Mod.E. simply (adv.)** ← **O.F. simple (adj.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** –adverb *simply* is made after the same pattern –O.F. adjective *simple* + O.E. suffix *lice;*

- **Mod.E. generally (adv.)** ← **O.F. general (adj.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** –adverb *generally* is a combination of O.F. adjective *general* and O.E. suffix *lice;*

- **Mod.E. instead (adv.)** ← **M.E. ine (prep.) + O.E. stede (noun)** – linking of M.E. preposition *ine* and O.E. noun *stede* gave a possibility to form adverb *instead;*

- **Mod.E. actually (adv.)** ← **L. actus (n.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** – Latin nominal stems often took park in adverb formation together with O.E. suffix *lice*, it concerns adverb *actually* as well;

- **Mod.E. again (adv.)** ← **O.E. on (prep.) + O.E. gean (prep.)** – in the O.E. period, adverbs could be formed on the basis of prepositions exclusively, like *again*, which consists of *on* and *gean*;

- **Mod.E. rather (adv.)** ← **O.E. hraþor (adj.)** – the adverb *rather* derives from the O.E. adjective, but it is not capable of forming degrees of comparison as its protoform is the superlative degree of *hraþor* [OED];

- **Mod.E. almost (adv.)** ← **O.E. al/eall (adv) + O.E. mast (adv)** –*almost* is created on the basis of two O.E. adverbs *eall* and *mast*;

- **Mod.E. especially (adv.)** ← **L. species (n.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** –*especially* is a combination of Latin nominal stem *species* and O.E. suffix *lice*;

- **Mod.E. ever (adv.)** ← **O.E. ǣfre/afre (adv.)** – *ever* is an example of the evolution of O.E. adverb *ǣfre;*

- **Mod.E. quickly (adv.)** ← **O.E. cwic (adj.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** – adverb *quickly* is a traditional combination of O.E. adjective *cwic* and O.E. suffix *lice;*

- **Mod.E. probably (adv.)** ← **L. probabilis (adj.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** –Latin adjectival stem *probabilis* in combination with O.E. suffix *lice* formed PDE adverb *probably;*

- **Mod.E. already (adv.)** ← **O.E. eall/ealne (adv.) + O.E. rædi (adj.)** – sometimes occurred amalgamations of adverbs and adjectives, like O.E. *eall* and *rædi;*

- **Mod.E. below (adv.)** ← **O.E. be (prep.) + M.E. lah/looghe (adj.)** – *below* was formed on the basis of preposition *be* and adjective *lah/looghe*;

- **Mod.E. directly (adv.)** ← **L. directus (adj.) + M.E. ly (suffix)** –Latin adjective *directus* together with M.E. suffix *ly* made up modern adverb *directly;*

- **Mod.E. therefore (adv.)** ← **O.E. Þǣr/Þár (adv.) + O.E. for (prep.)** –*therefore* appeared as a result of combination of O.E. preposition *for* and adverbial stem *Þǣr*;

- **Mod.E. else (adv.)** ← **O.E. elles (adv.)** –adverb *else* has evolved from O.E. adverb *elles*;

- **Mod.E. thus (adv.)** ← **O.E. Þus (adv.)** – *thus* has undergone similar evolution from O.E. form *Þus*;

- **Mod.E. easily (adv.)** ← **O.F. aisie (adj.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** – combination of O.F. adjective *aisie* and O.E. suffix *lice* gave rise to the appearance of adverb *easily*;

- **Mod.E. eventually (adv.)** ← **L. eventus (n.) + M.E. ly (suffix)** – the protoform of PDE *eventually* was Latin noun *eventus* with M.E. suffix *ly;*

- **Mod.E. exactly (adv.)** ← **L. exactus (v.) + M.E. ly (suffix)** – the basis for *exactly* was created by Latin past participle *exactus* and M.E. suffix *ly*;

- **Mod.E. certainly (adv.)** ← **O.F. certainer (adj.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** –Old French adjective *certainer* and Old English suffix *lice* formed *certainly*. The main characteristic feature of the adverb and its adjectival stem was the usage of the degrees of comparison till the middle of the 18th century, which later disappeared [OED];

- **Mod.E. normally (adv.)** ← **L. norma (n.) + M.E. ly (suffix)** – the combination of Latin noun *norma* and English suffix *ly* introduced adverb *normally* into the language;

- **Mod.E. currently (adv.)** ← **O.F. corant/currant (n.) + M.E. ly (suffix)** – the same model was used for the *currently* –suffix *ly* was added to O.F. noun *corant;*

- **Mod.E. extremely (adv.) ← L. extreme (adj.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** – the adverb appeared on the basis of Latin adjective *exterus*, to be more exact on its superlative degree *extreme* and O.E. suffix *lice*, thus it cannot form its own degrees of comparison;

- **Mod.E. finally (adv.) ← L. finis (n.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** –adverb *finally* is composed of Latin noun *finis* and O.E. suffix *lice;*

- **Mod.E. constantly (adv.) ← L. constare (v.) + M.E. ly (suffix)** – various Latin verbs could be parts of English adverbs, for instance M.E. suffix *ly* was added to Latin verb *constare*;

- **Mod.E. properly (adv.) ← O.F. propre (adj.) + M.E. ly (suffix)** –Old French adjective *propre* became the stem and in combination with suffix *ly* formed English adverb *properly;*

- **Mod.E. soon (adv.) ← O.E. sóna (adv.)** –adverb *soon* has evolved from O.E. adverbial form *sóna*. The existence of the degrees of comparison can be explained by the fact, that during the Middle English period this lexical unit received new additional more widely spread meanings, than it had had before, as during the Old English period no degrees of comparison had been recorded [OED];

- **Mod.E. specifically (adv.) ← L. specificus (adj.) + M.E. ly (suffix)** – this adverb is a combination of Latin adjective *specificus* and M.E. suffix *ly;*

- **Mod.E. ahead (adv.) ← O.E. a (prep.) + O.E. heafod/hefd (n.)** – *ahead* was created on the basis of O.E. preposition *a* and noun *heafod*;

- **Mod.E. daily (adv.) ← O.E. dæg (n.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** – O.E. noun *dæg* and suffix *lice* formed adverb *daily*;

- **Mod.E. highly (adv.) ← O.E. heh/heah (adj.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** – the combination of O.E. adjective *heh/heah* and suffix *lice* made up adverb *highly;*

- **Mod.E. immediately (adv.) ← L. immediate (adv.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** – *immediately* was formed on the basis of Latin adjective *immediate* and O.E. suffix *lice* [OED];

- **Mod.E. relatively (adv.) ← L. relāt (v.) + L. ive (suffix) + O.E. lice (suffix)** – another three-component structure has been recorded, namely adverb *relatively*, which consists of Latin verb *relāt* and Latin suffix *ive* and O.E. suffix *lice*, which signified its assimilation in English;

- **Mod.E. slowly (adv.) ← O.E. slaw/slawe (adj.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** –adverb *slowly* was created in accordance with the traditional model, i.e. on the basis of O.E. adjective *slaw* and suffix *lice;*

- **Mod.E. fairly (adv.) ← O.E. fægere (adv.) + O.E. lice (suffix)** –adverb *fairly* is a combination of O.E. adverb *fæger* and suffix *lice*.

The process of distinguishing typical etymological models is based on the analysis of the word classes, which participated in adverb formation. Thus, the following models are singled out:

- **One-component model.** To this category belong the adverbs, which were created on the basis of one lexical unit (LU), without adding any other morphemes or lexical units. Such adverbs may be formed from various parts of speech and the model is the following:

1) **Adv. ← LU**

Adv. ← Adv.	Adv. ← Adj.
Adv. ← N.	---------------------------

Taking into consideration quantitate data, see Table 2, we assume that the main model of one-component adverb formation in the Old and Middle English periods was on the basis of O.E. adverbs. Apart from that, the examples of adverb formation by means of nominal and adjectival stems have been recorded.

- Two-component models, which are formed from two lexical units: the former is represented mainly by adverbs or prepositions, less often pronouns. The second component was represented by nouns, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, pronouns. In general, 9 subparadigms have been singled out.

2.1) Adv. ← LU + LU

Adv. ← Adv. + Adv.	Adv. ← Pron. + N.	Adv. ← Prep. + Adj.
Adv. ← Adv. + N.	Adv. ← Adv. + Prep.	Adv. ← Prep. + Prep.
Adv. ← Adv. + Adj.	Adv. ← Prep. + N.	Adv. ← Adj. + N.

Traditionally, linguistic adaptation took place by means of traditional English suffixes. It should be noted, however, that different Latin, Old French and Middle French lexical units took part in O.E. adverb formation. 4 main subparadigms have been recorded.

2.2) Adv. ← LU + SUF

Adv. ← N. + SUF.	Adv. ← Adj. + SUF.
Adv. ← Adv. + SUF.	Adv. ← V. + SUF.

If being compared with the first model, the second one consists of the stem, usually adjectival, and Old English or Middle English suffix (SUF), and this model has turned to be a classical one in PDE.

- **Three-component and multicomponent models**, i.e. adverbs consisted of two stems and a suffix or a stem and two suffixes, etc.:

3.1) Adv. ← LU + SUF + SUF,

Adv. ← V. + SUF + SUF	Adv. ← N. + SUF + SUF	Adv. ← Adj. + SUF + SUF
Adv. ← Num. + SUF + SUF	Adv. ← Adv. + SUF + SUF	---------------------------

The main characteristic features of the models is that the first components were represented by various Latin nouns; whereas the other components were always introduced by one Latin and one Old English or Middle English suffix. 5 major subparadigms have been recorded.

Another non-conventional way of adverb formation was the combination of several stems and suffixes. While joining the lexicon of the English language these multicomponent structures were assimilated by acquiring the Old English or Middle English suffixes.

3.2) Adv. ← LU + LU + SUF + SUF + SUF

Adv. ← N. + Adv. + SUF +SUF + SUF	---------------------------

Quantitative correlation of etymological models and their subparadigms is represented in Table 2.

Table 2
Quantitative correlation of etymological models

Etymological models		Subparadigm	Number of units
1	Adv. ← LU	Adv.	8
		Adj.	1
2.1	Adv. ← LU + LU	Adv. + Adv.	5
		Adv. + N.	1
		Adv. + Adj.	1
		Adv. + Prep.	1
		Pron. + N.	1
		Prep. + N.	2
		Prep. + Adj.	1
		Prep. + Prep.	1
2.2	Adv. ← LU + SUF	N. + SUF	9
		Adv. + SUF	3
		Adj. + SUF	13
		V. + SUF	2
3.1	Adv. ← LU + SUF + SUF	V. + SUF + SUF	1
Total			**50 units (100%)**

Therefore, on the basis of the quantitative analysis we make the following conclusions:

-        In the Old English and Middle English periods there were 3 main ways of adverb formation:

a) on the basis of a lexical stem only;

b) as a combination of two components – two lexical units or a stem and a suffix;

c) as a combination of three or more components;

-        The most frequently used etymological model is 2-component model, which equals 80%; then 1-component model – 18% and 3-component model – 2%;

-        Among the subparadigms of the etymological models the most common is the combination of the adjectival stem and suffix – 26%; nominal stem and suffix – 18%, solely adverbial stems – 16% and a combination of two adverbs – 10%;

-        Conventional way of adverb formation in PDE by means of "adjective+suffix" combination, in the Old English period was peculiar of various non-English stems, which, in this way, were assimilated in the language: thus among 29 adverbs, formed on the basis of a stem and a suffix or suffixes – 23 (79%) adverbs were of foreign origin, and 6 (21%) adverbs were created on O.E. stem.

Concerning the issue of establishing the regularities of degrees of comparison in PDE we assume that the first element of the combination always plays a determinative role, as it can undergo various morphological changes – in one-component and in two- or multicomponent models, only the first element of a combination can be changed, and the other elements are just grammatical modifiers, where such changes are recorded, but which do not specify them. Thus, to determine the ability of an adverb to form degrees of comparison or suffer some other changes, one should analyze the very protoform of the adverb, and if it could undergo any shifts, despite the language it had come from, then the newly created adverbs had to undergo the same changes. The results of the research prove that one-component adverbs and the adverbs, which were used as stems in two- or three-component and multicomponent models, had not undergone any morphological changes, thus we may conclude that adverbs as a word class do not sustain morphological changes at all. The units, which undergo morphological shifts, should become objects of additional research, as they must be analyzed beyond the lexical and grammatical class of adverbs.

Conclusion

- Among 50 PDE adverbs 19 lexical units are formed by adverbial stem, 14 units – adjectival stem, 9 – nominal stem, 4 – prepositional stem, 3 – verbal stem, 1 – pronominal stem;

- Among 14 modern adverbs, which have evolved from the adjectival stems 12 lexical units and their adjectival stems correspondingly are capable of forming degrees of comparison. 2 adverbs, namely *rather, extremely* do not form degrees as they are made on the basis of the comparatives or superlatives of the adjectives and, therefore, cannot form them for the second time. Due to this, we may conclude that in all cases, adverbs formed on the basis of the adjectival stem are characterized by degrees of comparison.

- Among 19 modern adverbs formed on the basis of adverbial stem 16 lexical units and their adverbial stems correspondingly are not capable of forming degrees of comparison. 3 adverbs, namely *often, early, soon* have these degrees.

In the Old English period *soon* did not acquire any degrees, which appeared only at the beginning of the Middle English period due to the semantic changes within the lexical unit. Though, one could speak of the rise of the new consistent adverb *sooner*, rather than degrees of comparison – *sooner – soonest*, as in accordance with the quantitative correlation, namely this unit is mainly used – 7.9% of the total number of the language usage of the words *soon, sooner, soonest* and only 0.1% of the total number characterizes the usage of the lexical unit – *soonest* [BNC].

The nature of adverb *early* is not homogenous, as its stem was used in the Old English period as an adverb, preposition, adjective and conjunction [ASD], i.e. one can speak of functional transposition within the frames of one and the same unit. Besides, in Old English existed parallel

forms – adjectival *ǣrlic* and adverbial *ǣrlice*. On the basis of this, it is possible to note "artificial" ways of degrees formation, which took place as a result of adhesion of two different lexical units – a protoform – *ǣr* and its degrees of comparison – *ǣror* and *ǣrost* and a parallel adverbial form *ǣrlice*, which had no degrees. But together they created a grammatical chain – *ǣrlice – ǣror – ǣrost* – thus, there is an incompatibility between the adverb and its degrees of comparison, which has risen from another stem. Such functioning of parallel forms and their "artificial" conflations led to composition of "irregular" degrees of comparison of adverb *early* in PDE, when *early* creates them not analytically, as it happens in case with the English adverbs ending in *–ly*, but synthetically – due to the Old English degrees of comparison *ǣror* and *ǣrost*.

Another controversial issue concerns the degrees of comparison for adverb *often*. The Old English stem *oft* formed the degrees synthetically – *oftor* and *oftost*, which had been in use till the second half of the 19th century [OED]. At a later stage these forms became archaic and disappeared from the usage, but other adequate analytical degrees of comparison did not appear, and instead a stable word-group *more often* evolved in the language with the quantitative correlation of 3.4% of the total number of the language usage of the words including *often*, while the percentage of the word-group *most often* equals only 0.9% of the total number [BNC].

Thus, due to their morphological characteristics, namely ways of degrees of comparison formation, adverbs *often, early, soon* are rather irregular lexical units, as in 88% adverbs formed on the adverbial stem are not characterized by degrees of comparison;

-       Among 9 modern adverbs, which have evolved from the nominal stem, none of the stems and none of the adverbs, respectively, are capable of forming the degrees of comparison, what is confirmed by quantitative measures, which range from 0 to 0,9% of the total number of adverbs. So, in all cases, adverbs evolving on the nominal stems cannot form degrees of comparison. One of the main characteristics of such adverbs is their foreign origin – 8 lexical units, while only 1 adverb had the Old English protoform;

-       Among 3 modern adverbs, which have evolved on the verbal stems, none can form degrees of comparison, what is confirmed by the quantitative measures ranging from 0 to 0,7% of the total number. In all cases these quantitative indices are not enough to assume that the adverbs can form degrees;

-       Adverbs, formed on the basis of the pronominal, prepositional and other types of stems, lack for any morphological characteristics (namely degrees of comparison), as well as their protoforms – prepositions, pronouns etc.

Therefore, analyzing morphological principle of determining adverbs as a part of speech, which is based on the traditional morphological characteristic – declinability (represented by degrees of comparison), it has been concluded, that the crucial role cannot belong to the semantic component, which lies in the heart of the conventional interpretation of degrees of comparison. Such analysis must be based on morphological components – root morphemes and affixes. Due to this, we assume that degrees of comparison as a grammatical feature depends on the root morpheme, which is the protostem of the word.

Further research in the field is of critical importance as adverbs still remain the most ambiguous and heterogeneous parts of speech, which require constant and comprehensive analysis, especially in the light of transpositional, derivational and other word formation processes.

References

Allen A., Cornwell J. A New English Grammar. London : Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1841. 168 p.
Bain A. An English Grammar. London : Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts & Green. 1863. 219 p.
Barrett S. The Principles of Grammar. Boston : Geo. C. Rand and Avery. 1861. 576 p.
Becker K.F. A Grammar of the German Language. London : Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans. 1845. 348 p.
Biber D., Johanson S., Leech G., Conrad S., Finegan E. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. London : Longman, 1999. 1204 p.
Bosworth J. The Elements of Anglo-Saxon Grammar. London : Harding, Mavor & Lepard. 1823. 332 p.
British National Corpus (BNC). URL: http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/
Bullions P. The Principles of English Grammar. New York : Pratt, Oakley & Co. 1859. 225 p.
Crombie A. The Etymology and Syntax of the English Language. London : John Taylor. 1830. 418 p.

Emerson O.F. The History of the English Language. London : MacMillan & Co., 1921. 415 p.

Fewsmith W. The Standard English Grammar. Philadelphia : Christopher Sower Company. 1905. 202 p.

Fowler W.C. The English Language in its Elements and Forms with a History of its Origin and Development. New York : Harper & Brothers. 1855. 753 p.

Henry V. A Short Comparative Grammar of English and German. London : Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1894. 394 p.

Hiley R. English Grammar and Style. London : Longman, Browns, Green and Longmans. 1853. 262 p.

Iyeiri Y. Aspects of English Negation. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, Tokyo : JBPC, 2005. 233 p.

Leonard M.H. Grammar and its Reasons. New York : A.S. Barnes & Company. 1908. 375 p.

Maetzner E.A.F. An English Grammar: Methodical, Analytical and Historical. Vol. 1. London : John Murray. 1874. 510 p.

Mejklehohn, J.M.D. The English Language, its Grammar, History and Literature. Toronto : W.J. Gage & Co. 1891. 466 p.

Morris I.J. A Philosophical and Practical Grammar of the English Language. New York : Thomas Holman. 1858. 192 p.

Morris R. Elementary Lessons in Historical English Grammar. London : Macmillan & Co. 1880. 254 p.

Murphy J.P. Principles of English Grammar. New York : William H. Sadler. 1800. 260 p.

Oxford English Dictionary (OED) 2nd Edition. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2009.

The English Language. Volume IV (1776-1997). S. Romaine (ed.). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 2007. 761 p.

Rushton W. Rules and Cautions in English Grammar. London : Longmans, Green & Co., 1869. 316 p.

Sievers E. An Old English Grammar. Boston : Ginn, Heath & Co. 1885. 235 p.

Strong H.A. Introduction to the Study of the History of Language. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1891. 435 p.

Sweet H. A New English Grammar. Logical and Historical. Oxford : The Clarendon Press. 1892. 500 p.

Wright J., Wright E.M. Old English Grammar. London, New York, Toronto : Oxford University Press. 1908. 351 p.

**КОЗЛОВА Т. О., НІКУЛІНА А. М.,
АВРАМЕНКО О. М., КОРНЮШИНА Н. С.**
(Запорізький національний університет)
ethstlab@yahoo.com

ФУНКЦІЙНА ПОТУЖНІСТЬ МАОРІЗМІВ В АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ НОВОЇ ЗЕЛАНДІЇ

Зростання ролі англійської мови як світової лінгва франка, збільшення обсягу її функцій у мультикультурних спільнотах унеобхіднюють дослідження проблем вітальності та адаптації регіональних культур до умов глобалізації. Разом із цим відчутною є тенденція до багатомовності, відродження етнічної ідентичності, розширення полікультурного простору, а тому й поступове посилення впливу автохтонних мов на англійську мову, зокрема на територіях формування первинних (національних) варіантів.

У статті досліджено лексику новозеландського варіанта англійської мови, кількісні та якісні параметри запозичення з мови маорі. Розглянуто структурно-семантичні та функційні особливості маорізмів, спричинені процесами ревіталізації автохтонної культури Нової Зеландії. Загалом проаналізовано 500 маорійських запозичень, виокремлених із регіональних словників, електронних баз даних та текстів, співвідносних з різними сферами комунікації. З'ясовано функційну потужність одиниць: їхній обсяг; активність у процесах оновлення лексики; співвідношення сфер комунікації, у яких уживані запозичення, зі сферами спілкування, властивими сучасній новозеландській англійськомовній спільноті.

Результати дослідження переконують, що поступове кількісне збільшення маорізмів, високий ступінь адаптації запозичень (словотворча активність, полісемантизм, фразеологізація), широта дискурсивного діапазону, частота вживання та продуктивність у процесах оновлення лексикону забезпечили посилення вітальності важливих складників автохтонного етносу в контексті розвитку бікультурного суспільства в Новій Зеландії. Особливості перебігу контактних відносин європейців та маорі, історії формування новозеландської англійськомовної культури позначилися на комунікативній потужності автохтонізмів. Їхні функційні можливості значно розширилися порівняно з історично первинною роллю елімінації культурних лакун.

Ключові слова: *новозеландський варіант англійської мови, запозичення, мова маорі, асиміляція, функційна потужність лексем.*

Kozlova T. O., Nikulina A. M., Avramenko O. M., Korniushyna N. S. The functional capacity of Maori loans in New Zealand English. The role of English as the world lingua franca and its functional importance in multicultural societies have necessitated further research into the issues of language vitality as well as the problems of regional cultures adaptation to the globalizing environment. In the last decade, there has been a noticeable tendency towards multilingualism, ethnic identity revitalisation, the extension of polycultural space, and gradual increase of autochthonous languages influence on English, particularly in the regions where primary (national) varieties of English evolved.

The article addresses the New Zealand English lexicon, quantitative and qualitative parameters of borrowing from Maori. It offers a comprehensive analysis of structural, semantic, and functional features of Maori loans in the context of autochthonous culture revival