

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
ОДЕСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ МОРСЬКИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
НАВЧАЛЬНО-НАУКОВИЙ МОРСЬКИЙ ГУМАНІТАРНИЙ ІНСТИТУТ
КАФЕДРА «ІНОЗЕМНІ МОВИ ТА ПЕРЕКЛАД»

МЕТОДИЧНІ ВКАЗІВКИ
ДЛЯ САМОСТІЙНОЇ РОБОТИ

з навчальної дисципліни

«Контрастивна лексикологія англійської та української мов»

для здобувачів 3 курсу

спеціальності В11 «Філологія» денної та заочної форм навчання

Одеса - 2026

Методичні вказівки для самостійної роботи з навчальної дисципліни «Контрастивна лексикологія англійської та української мов» для здобувачів 3-го курсу спеціальності В11 «Філологія» денної та заочної форм навчання. Корнєлаєва Є.В. Одеса: ОНМУ, 2026. 36 с.

Укладачі: кан.філол.наук, доцент, доцент кафедри «Іноземні мови та переклад» Одеського національного морського університету **Євгенія КОРНЄЛАЄВА**

Рецензенти: доктор філологічних наук, професор кафедри «Іноземні мови та переклад» Одеського національного морського університету **Валерія СМАГЛІЙ** та доктор педагогічних наук, професор кафедри «Іноземні мови та переклад» Одеського національного морського університету **Тетяна ЯБЛОНСЬКА**

Методичні вказівки ухвалені на засіданні кафедри «Іноземні мови та переклад» ОНМУ протокол № 4 від «05» жовтня 2026 року

Методичні вказівки схвалено на засіданні НМК ННМГІ ОНМУ протокол № 4 від «05» жовтня 2026 року

Методичні вказівки схвалено на засіданні Вченої Ради ННМГІ ОНМУ протокол № 4 від «05» жовтня 2026 року

ЗМІСТ

Передмова.....	4
Тема 1. Contrastive Lexicology as a Branch of Linguistic Studies.....	5
Тема 2. Etymological Structure of the English and Ukrainian Lexicons	8
Тема 3. Contrastive Word-Formation in English and Ukrainian.....	11
Тема 4. Lexical Semantics and the Structure of Meaning in English and Ukrainian.....	15
Тема 5. Paradigmatic Lexical Relations in English and Ukrainian.....	19
Тема 6. Semantic Change and Semantic Transfer in English and Ukrainian	22
Тема 7. Phraseology and Collocational Patterns in English and Ukrainian.....	26
Тема 8. Vocabulary Stratification, Terminology, and Lexical Innovation in English and Ukrainian	30
Рекомендована література та лексикографічні ресурси.....	35

ПЕРЕДМОВА

Методичні вказівки для самостійної роботи з навчальної дисципліни **«Контрастивна лексикологія англійської та української мов»** призначені для здобувачів 3 курсу спеціальності В11 «Філологія» денної та заочної форм навчання. Матеріал побудовано відповідно до тем лекцій і практичних занять, однак завдання для самостійної роботи не повторюють аудиторні вправи, а дають змогу опрацювати ті самі поняття на новому мовному матеріалі.

Мета цих вказівок - допомогти здобувачам систематизувати теоретичні знання та навчитися самостійно перевіряти мовні факти. Основна увага приділяється роботі зі словниками, корпусами, етимологічними та фразеологічними джерелами, термінологічними ресурсами й фаховими текстами, а також аргументованому зіставленню англійських і українських лексичних одиниць.

Вказівки охоплюють вісім тем курсу: предмет і методи порівняльної лексикології; етимологічну структуру англійського та українського лексиконів; словотвір; лексичну семантику; парадигматичні лексичні відношення; семантичні зміни та перенесення; фразеологію і колокаційні моделі; стратифікацію словникового складу, термінологію та лексичні інновації. Кожна тема містить мету, ключові поняття, методичні рекомендації, завдання для самостійної роботи, питання для самоконтролю та рекомендовані джерела.

Зіставлення англійської та української лексики має спиратися на чітко визначену спільну основу порівняння. Формальна схожість або наявність словникового відповідника ще не доводять повної еквівалентності. Під час аналізу потрібно враховувати семантичний обсяг, конотацію, сполучуваність, регістр, культурну специфіку, історичний розвиток і функцію одиниці в конкретному контексті.

Результат більшості завдань подається у стислій формі: у вигляді таблиці, матриці, схеми, семантичної карти, короткого профілю або невеликого висновку. Такий формат дає змогу зосередитися на точності аналізу й якості доказів, а не на обсязі письмової роботи.

У цих вказівках «актуальне джерело» означає найновіше доступне академічне, нормативне або офіційно підтримуване видання, придатне для конкретного завдання. «Автентичний контекст» - це зафіксований приклад реального вживання з корпусу, словника, академічного чи інституційного тексту, редактованого медіа або художнього твору, наведений у достатньому обсязі для однозначного тлумачення. Корпусні дані слід брати з усталених корпусних ресурсів, наведених у списку джерел, а не з простого підрахунку результатів веб-пошуку. Для електронних ресурсів потрібно зазначати URL і дату звернення. Якщо авторитетні джерела подають різні класифікації або вихідні дані, розбіжність слід зафіксувати й пояснити, на яке джерело спирається висновок.

1. Contrastive Lexicology as a Branch of Linguistic Studies

Aim of Independent Study

The aim is to consolidate the basic principles of contrastive lexicology and apply them to independently selected English and Ukrainian material. The work focuses on establishing a clear tertium comparationis, distinguishing equivalence, partial equivalence, non-equivalence, and lexical gaps, and combining several methods of lexical analysis when one method does not provide sufficient evidence.

Key Concepts

lexicology, general lexicology, special lexicology, descriptive lexicology, historical lexicology, contrastive lexicology, contrastive linguistics, comparative-historical linguistics, word, word-form, lexeme, lexical unit, lexical system, tertium comparationis, equivalence, partial equivalence, non-equivalence, lexical gap, definitional analysis, componential analysis, semantic-field analysis, word-formation analysis, contextual analysis, collocational analysis, translation-equivalent analysis, cultural-conceptual analysis, intercultural communication

Methodological Guidelines

- ✓ Keep word, word-form, lexeme, and lexical unit analytically distinct. A concrete inflected form belongs to a lexeme, while a lexical unit may be a word or another conventional lexical expression functioning as a unit in the lexicon.
- ✓ Begin a contrastive analysis by formulating a shared tertium comparationis. A bilingual dictionary pairing is only a starting hypothesis; establish the relation from meaning, usage, and context.
- ✓ Treat a bilingual equivalent as a hypothesis that must be checked against monolingual definitions, contextual use, collocation, register, and cultural information.
- ✓ Use lexical gap only when one language lacks a lexicalized unit corresponding to a relevant meaning or distinction in the other language. A lexical gap does not mean that speakers of the language cannot express or conceptualize the meaning.
- ✓ Combine methods where necessary. Definitional analysis may establish the semantic core, componential analysis may reveal differential semes, contextual and collocational analysis may show usage restrictions, and translation-equivalent analysis may reveal cross-linguistic asymmetry.
- ✓ Separate source evidence from your own analytical conclusion. Dictionary definitions, corpus examples, and usage labels are evidence; the classification of the cross-linguistic relation is the result of analysis.

Independent Study Tasks

Task 1. Lexicographic Comparison of a Lexical Microfield

- Compare English *shore*, *coast*, and *seaside* with Ukrainian *берег* and *узбережжя*.
- Consult current monolingual dictionaries in both languages and establish a shared comparison criterion.
- For each lexical unit, record its principal meaning, typical referent, relevant semantic restrictions, and one authentic or dictionary context.
- Determine which units overlap, which distinctions are lexicalized differently, and where one-to-one correspondence is impossible.

- Submit a compact comparison table and a 4-5 sentence conclusion.

Task 2. Context-Dependent Equivalence

- Analyse English *charge* in four authentic contexts representing different meanings. Include at least one noun use and one verb use.
- For each context, identify the active meaning, select the natural Ukrainian equivalent, and explain which semantic or grammatical feature determines the choice.
- Submit a four-context table and a 5-6 sentence conclusion showing why one dictionary headword may require several target-language lexical units.

Task 3. Testing a Potential Lexical Gap

- Investigate Ukrainian *нозамопик* and English *the year before last*.
- Verify the Ukrainian item in a normative explanatory dictionary and check whether contemporary English has a conventional one-word lexical counterpart with the same meaning.
- Distinguish absence of a one-word equivalent from absence of the concept.
- Identify the usual English means of expression and classify the relation from the perspective of lexicalization.
- Submit a 5-6 sentence conclusion supported by the sources consulted.

Task 4. Testing a Bilingual Dictionary Correspondence

- Compare English *salary* and *wage* with Ukrainian *заробітна плата*, *зарплата*, and *платня*.
- Use monolingual definitions and authentic contexts to compare payment type, periodicity, register, and typical professional context.
- Determine whether the units form direct pairs or partially overlapping sets.
- Submit a 150-200 word contrastive comment supported by dictionary evidence.

Task 5. Independent Contrastive Observation

- Select one English or Ukrainian lexical unit for which a bilingual dictionary gives several possible target-language equivalents. Choose a unit that has not already been analysed in the lecture or practical exercises.
- Formulate a clear tertium comparationis, verify the source unit and the proposed equivalents in monolingual dictionaries, and collect up to six short contexts that reveal relevant differences.
- Classify the correspondences as full in context, partial, or lacking a direct lexical equivalent where justified.
- Submit a table of no more than six rows and a 5-7 sentence conclusion.

Questions for Self-check

1. What is the object of lexicology?
2. How does contrastive lexicology differ from comparative-historical linguistics?
3. What is the difference between a word, word-form, lexeme, and lexical unit?
4. Why is the lexicon described as a system rather than an unordered list of words?
5. What is a tertium comparationis, and why must it be established before comparison?
6. Why does formal similarity not prove translation equivalence?
7. What is the difference between full equivalence, partial equivalence, and non-equivalence?
8. What is a lexical gap?

9. Why does a lexical gap not imply a conceptual gap?
10. What evidence should be used to test a bilingual dictionary equivalent?
11. What is the purpose of definitional analysis?
12. What does componential analysis reveal?
13. When is semantic-field analysis useful?
14. Why should contextual and collocational analysis accompany dictionary analysis?
15. How does contrastive lexicology support translation and intercultural communication?

Recommended Sources and Dictionaries

Revise the theoretical concepts using the works listed in the general bibliography. For lexical analysis, begin with current monolingual dictionaries in both languages. A bilingual dictionary may suggest possible correspondences, but these should be checked through definitions, collocations, register labels, and authentic contexts. Useful resources for this theme include Oxford Learner's Dictionaries, the electronic Словник української мови у 20 томах, BNC, COCA, ГРАК, and УНЛК.

2. Etymological Structure of the English and Ukrainian Lexicons

Aim of Independent Study

The aim is to practise evidence-based etymological analysis instead of inferring origin from form alone. The work includes distinguishing inherited vocabulary from borrowed vocabulary, tracing documented borrowing routes, separating the immediate source from the ultimate etymon, assessing assimilation, and comparing internationalisms, calques, semantic borrowings, and false friends in English and Ukrainian.

Key Concepts

etymology, etymological structure of a lexicon, native vocabulary, inherited vocabulary, borrowed vocabulary, loanword, source language, recipient language, immediate source, intermediary language, ultimate etymon, direct borrowing, indirect borrowing, assimilation, complete assimilation, partial assimilation, non-assimilation, graphic assimilation, phonetic assimilation, morphological assimilation, word-formational assimilation, semantic assimilation, barbarism, exoticism, internationalism, partial internationalism, pseudo-internationalism, calque, phraseological calque, semi-calque, semantic borrowing, false friends

Methodological Guidelines

- ✓ Distinguish historical origin from present-day lexical status. A word may be fully integrated into the recipient language while remaining historically borrowed.
- ✓ Establish the source language from documented etymological evidence rather than from graphic or phonetic resemblance. Record the immediate source, any intermediary language, and the ultimate etymon when the source provides this information.
- ✓ If an etymological dictionary presents alternative borrowing routes, record the alternatives instead of forcing a single unsupported path.
- ✓ Treat assimilation as multidimensional. Graphic, phonetic, morphological, semantic, and word-formational integration may proceed at different rates.
- ✓ Classify an item as a calque only when the evidence shows that a foreign model was reproduced through recipient-language material; structural similarity by itself is insufficient.
- ✓ Treat barbarism and exoticism as independent functional statuses rather than as automatic stages of assimilation.
- ✓ Formal resemblance between international lexical items does not establish semantic identity. Compare their current meanings and contexts before classifying them as full, partial, or pseudo-international correspondences.
- ✓ When analysing false friends, distinguish complete semantic divergence from partial overlap. Translation risk often arises when only one sense is shared.

Independent Study Tasks

Task 1. Comparing Etymological Evidence

- Select one borrowed English lexical unit and one borrowed Ukrainian lexical unit not analysed in detail in the lecture or practical exercises.

- For each item, consult two independent etymological sources where available. Record the immediate source, any documented intermediary language, and the ultimate etymon. If only one specialized source gives a documented route, state this limitation rather than presenting an uncertain reconstruction as established fact.
- Separate securely documented facts from disputed or alternative reconstructions.
- Submit two short etymological profiles and a 5-6 sentence comparison of the borrowing routes.

Task 2. Assimilation Profile

- Select one established borrowing in English and one in Ukrainian.
- Analyse the degree of graphic, phonetic, morphological, semantic, and word-formational assimilation.
- Support each judgement with dictionary, corpus, or grammatical evidence rather than with general impressions.
- Submit a five-dimension assimilation matrix for each item and a short contrastive conclusion.

Task 3. Semantic Symmetry of an Internationalism

- Select one formally similar English-Ukrainian international lexical pair not used as a main example in the source materials.
- Compare current monolingual dictionary definitions and at least two authentic contexts in each language.
- Classify the relation as a true internationalism, partial internationalism, or pseudo-internationalism.
- Submit a semantic comparison table and a 5-7 sentence conclusion supported by the evidence.

Task 4. Evidence Check for a Possible Calque

- Select one contemporary Ukrainian lexical unit or multiword expression that may have been modelled on English.
- Check chronology, structure, meaning, and available etymological or terminological evidence.
- If the evidence points only to accidental structural similarity or independent formation, state this explicitly instead of assigning the label calque.
- Submit a five-column record: Hypothesis / Transferred Element / Evidence / Classification / Degree of Certainty.

Task 5. Contextual False Friend

- Select one English-Ukrainian formally similar pair with a potential translation risk.
- Collect two authentic English and two authentic Ukrainian contexts that reveal shared and non-shared meanings.
- Check historical relation when it helps explain the resemblance, but base the translation judgement on the current semantic structure and present-day usage.
- Submit a four-context table and a short translator's note explaining the risk.

Questions for Self-check

1. What is the difference between native, inherited, and borrowed vocabulary?
2. What is an immediate source?
3. How does an immediate source differ from an ultimate etymon?

4. What is an intermediary language?
5. How do direct and indirect borrowing differ?
6. Why can etymological routes be disputed?
7. What dimensions of assimilation should be analysed separately?
8. Why does current morphological integration not erase foreign origin?
9. How does complete assimilation differ from partial assimilation?
10. What is the difference between a barbarism and an exoticism?
11. What is an internationalism?
12. What is a partial internationalism?
13. What is a pseudo-internationalism?
14. What is a calque?
15. Why is structural similarity insufficient proof of calquing?
16. What is a semantic borrowing?
17. What are false friends?
18. Why may partial semantic overlap be more dangerous than complete divergence in translation?

Recommended Sources and Dictionaries

For etymological analysis, give priority to sources that explicitly document transmission routes and historical stages. The *Етимологічний словник української мови* should be the main reference for Ukrainian material; for English, use established historical and etymological scholarship listed in the bibliography. Current explanatory dictionaries are needed separately to check present-day meaning and usage. When sources propose different etymologies, report the alternatives instead of combining them into one unsupported route.

3. Contrastive Word-Formation in English and Ukrainian

Aim of Independent Study

The aim is to consolidate the main word-formation processes in English and Ukrainian and compare how the two languages build new lexical units. Particular attention is paid to derivation and inflection, bases and affixes, productivity, compounding, conversion, shortening processes, and the translation of structurally non-parallel formations.

Key Concepts

word-formation, derivation, inflection, morpheme, root, stem, base, affix, prefix, suffix, circumfix, derivational affix, inflectional affix, prefixation, suffixation, prefixal-suffixal derivation, semi-affix, combining form, productivity, feminine, compound, compounding, head, modifier, nominal compound, adjectival compound, verbal compound, neoclassical compound, endocentric compound, exocentric compound, bahuvrihi compound, synthetic compound, interfix, conversion, zero-derivation, substantivation, clipping, apocope, aphaeresis, acronym, initialism, blending, back-formation, occasionalism, lexicalization, lexical economy, translation equivalence

Methodological Guidelines

- ✓ Distinguish derivation from inflection. Derivation creates a new lexeme, whereas inflection produces grammatical forms of the same lexeme.
- ✓ Keep root, stem, and base distinct. The base is defined by a particular derivational step, while the stem is the form to which inflectional endings attach.
- ✓ Keep semi-affixes and combining forms analytically separate. Base the distinction on their current function and structural behaviour, with historical origin used only as supporting evidence.
- ✓ Treat productivity as a current ability of a model to form acceptable new words. Productivity may be restricted by semantics, register, base type, or domain.
- ✓ In Ukrainian, take account of the interaction between derivation and obligatory inflection. Word-formation analysis should not ignore gender, case, or other grammatical integration where these properties affect the resulting lexeme.
- ✓ Apply language-specific criteria to compounding. English analysis commonly focuses on head-modifier relations and headedness; Ukrainian analysis must also consider interfixation, stem composition, word composition, and simultaneous suffixation where relevant.
- ✓ Treat English compound spelling as one diagnostic among several. Open, hyphenated, and solid forms may all represent compounds, so structural and semantic criteria should be considered together.
- ✓ When identifying conversion, establish the source and resulting word class. A natural Ukrainian equivalent may use overt affixation, substantivation, or a multiword expression rather than zero derivation.
- ✓ Distinguish clipping, acronymy, initialism, blending, and back-formation by formation mechanism, not by word length alone.
- ✓ In translation, preserve naming function, register, and stylistic value rather than mechanically reproducing the source word-formation model.

Independent Study Tasks

Task 1. Contrastive Mapping of Derivational Families

- Select one English lexeme and one Ukrainian lexeme that name the same general concept but need not be direct translation equivalents. Choose examples not already analysed in the lecture or practical exercises.
- Build a productive derivational family containing at least five established members in each language.
- For every member, identify the root, relevant base, derivational affix or process, word class, and semantic relation to the base.
- Compare whether the two families use the same root throughout, whether grammatical gender is morphologically expressed, and whether apparently parallel formations develop asymmetric meanings.
- Submit two derivational trees or tables and a 6-8 sentence contrastive conclusion.

Task 2. Word-Formation Asymmetry within One Conceptual Domain

- Analyse the independent sets *employ*, *employer*, *employee*, *employment*, *unemployment* and *працевлаштувати*, *роботодавець*, *працівник*, *зайнятість*, *безробіття*.
- Treat the English and Ukrainian lists as independent inventories; their position in the list does not imply translation equivalence.
- For each unit, identify formation, meaning, closest contextual counterpart, and whether the source and target forms are built on parallel or non-parallel bases.
- Submit a matrix with the columns Lexical Unit / Formation / Meaning / Contextual Counterpart / Structural Relation, followed by a 120-150 word conclusion.

Task 3. English Noun Compounds and Ukrainian Structural Solutions

- Select four current English noun compounds from one authentic academic, institutional, journalistic, or professional text not used in the lecture or practical exercises.
- For each compound, identify the modifier, head, and endocentric or exocentric status where applicable.
- Verify the unit in a dictionary or professional source and provide a natural Ukrainian equivalent.
- Classify the Ukrainian solution as a simple word, derived word, compound, adjective-noun phrase, noun-genitive construction, or another justified structure.
- Submit a comparison table and a 5-6 sentence conclusion.

Task 4. Lexicographic Study of Ukrainian Femininitives

- Select three current Ukrainian femininitives denoting professions or social roles, excluding *редакторка*, *менеджерка*, *дослідниця*, *провідниця*, *філологиня*, and *психологиня*, which are already used in the course materials.
- For each item, identify the derivational base and suffix, verify dictionary or normative status, and provide one authentic standard context.
- Give the natural English equivalent and explain how grammatical gender is or is not expressed in English.

- Use only forms attested in reliable current sources; record variation instead of silently normalizing a doubtful form.
- Submit a three-row table and a 5-7 sentence comment.

Task 5. Lexical Economy and Structural Equivalence

- Select three current English lexical units formed through conversion, clipping, blending, acronymy, or initialism. Represent at least two different processes and avoid source examples.
- For each item, identify the formation mechanism, source or base, current dictionary status, and one authentic context.
- Provide the natural Ukrainian equivalent and identify the mechanism or structure used in Ukrainian.
- Compare the degree of lexical compactness without treating a longer normative target expression as defective.
- Submit a table and a 6-8 sentence conclusion.

Questions for Self-check

1. How does derivation differ from inflection?
2. How do root, stem, and base differ?
3. What is the difference between a semi-affix and a combining form?
4. What does productivity mean in synchronic word-formation?
5. Why may productivity depend on register or semantic class?
6. Which word-formation processes are especially productive in English?
7. Why is suffixation especially important in Ukrainian?
8. What is prefixal-suffixal derivation?
9. How do Ukrainian feminines illustrate derivational productivity?
10. How does English compounding differ from Ukrainian compound formation?
11. What are head and modifier in an English compound?
12. What is an interfix?
13. Why is spelling not a decisive criterion of English compound status?
14. What is conversion or zero-derivation?
15. Why does Ukrainian often use overt morphology where English uses conversion?
16. What is substantivation?
17. How do clipping, acronymy, and initialism differ?
18. What is blending?
19. What is back-formation?
20. What is lexicalization?
21. How is lexical economy relevant to contrastive analysis?
22. Why should translation preserve function rather than mechanically reproduce word-formation structure?

Recommended Sources and Dictionaries

Revise terminology and classification principles using the word-formation studies listed in the general bibliography. Check whether a formation is current and established in monolingual dictionaries; when productivity or register is important, confirm the pattern in a corpus. For Ukrainian data, ГРАК and

YHJK can supplement normative dictionaries. For English, BNC and COCA can be used to check attested patterns and contexts.

4. Lexical Semantics and the Structure of Meaning in English and Ukrainian

Aim of Independent Study

The aim is to practise analysing the meaning actually realized in context. The work focuses on separating lexical meaning from grammatical meaning, distinguishing denotation and connotation, working with semes and sememes, identifying lexical motivation and lexical-field relations, and checking English-Ukrainian correspondences without treating a bilingual dictionary entry as proof of semantic identity.

Key Concepts

lexical meaning, grammatical meaning, denotation, connotation, emotive connotation, evaluative connotation, stylistic connotation, expressive connotation, semantic structure, seme, sememe, archiseme, differential seme, polysemy, homonymy, semiotic triangle, symbol, concept, referent, lexical motivation, phonetic motivation, morphological motivation, semantic motivation, componential analysis, lexical field, paradigmatic relations, syntagmatic relations, cultural specificity, contextual full equivalence, partial equivalence, lexical gap

Methodological Guidelines

- ✓ Analyse the sense activated in the selected context. Other senses listed under the same dictionary headword remain outside that particular instance unless the context genuinely activates them.
- ✓ Distinguish denotation from connotation. Two lexical units may refer to the same general object, quality, or situation while differing in emotional attitude, evaluation, register, expressive force, or cultural association.
- ✓ Base connotative labels on dictionary definitions, usage labels, stable contextual patterns, or other explicit evidence rather than on personal impression.
- ✓ Treat a seme as an individual semantic component and a sememe as the structured combination of semes corresponding to a particular lexical meaning. When comparing lexical units, first identify the shared archiseme, then determine the differential semes responsible for semantic contrast.
- ✓ Several translations in a bilingual dictionary are not evidence of polysemy by themselves. Check a monolingual dictionary to see whether the meanings are treated as related senses of one lexical unit.
- ✓ Use the semiotic triangle to distinguish linguistic form, mental concept, and contextual referent. The same lexical unit may refer to different individual referents, while two languages may organize the underlying concept through different lexical boundaries.
- ✓ When analysing lexical motivation, distinguish its current synchronic transparency from historical origin. A word may have been historically motivated but no longer be transparently analysable for contemporary speakers.
- ✓ In componential analysis, include only features that help distinguish the units under comparison; an oversized matrix with non-distinctive features weakens rather than strengthens the analysis.

- ✓ A bilingual dictionary should be treated as a source of possible equivalents rather than as proof of semantic identity. Verify potentially corresponding units in monolingual dictionaries and, where necessary, in authentic contexts.
- ✓ Classify a cross-linguistic relation as contextual full equivalence only when the relevant meaning, register, and use are compatible in the particular context. Use partial equivalence when the lexical units overlap but differ in semantic range, connotation, collocation, grammatical behaviour, or cultural components.

Independent Study Tasks

Task 1. Comparing Dictionary Definitions and Semantic Range

- Compare English *convenient* and Ukrainian *зручний*.
- Analyse the contexts *a convenient time for the meeting*, *a convenient location near the station*, *зручне крісло*, and *зручне взуття*.
- Consult current monolingual dictionaries for both lexical units.
- Identify the principal contemporary meanings, the shared archiseme when the data support one, and the differential semes that distinguish the units.
- Determine which meanings permit a natural direct correspondence and which require another target-language lexical unit.
- Submit a compact semantic table and a 5-7 sentence conclusion explaining why dictionary correspondence does not necessarily imply identity of semantic range.

Task 2. Contrastive Analysis of Connotation

- Choose one clearly delimited semantic area, such as a type of person, behaviour, quality, or emotional state. Select three semantically related English units and three Ukrainian units that are comparable within that area; do not assume that the two sets form direct translation pairs.
- Choose examples that have not already been analysed in the lecture or practical exercises.
- Establish the common denotative component and analyse only those emotive, evaluative, stylistic, and expressive connotations that are supported by evidence.
- Determine which English and Ukrainian units can correspond in neutral, approving, disapproving, formal, or informal contexts.
- Submit a six-item comparison table and a 120-150 word contrastive conclusion.

Task 3. Mapping the Semantic Structure of a Polysemantic Word

- Select one polysemantic English or Ukrainian word with at least three clearly established contemporary meanings.
- Choose a polysemantic word other than *sharp* or another item analysed in detail in the lecture or practical exercises.
- Using a current monolingual dictionary, identify three or four sememes, formulate the central semes of each sememe, and determine which components are shared across the meanings.
- Provide a natural target-language equivalent for each sememe and establish whether the target language uses one lexical unit or distributes the meanings among several units.
- Submit a compact semantic map or table and a 5-6 sentence conclusion on the degree of structural symmetry between the two languages.

Task 4. Lexical Motivation across Languages

- Select two English lexical units and two Ukrainian lexical units representing at least two types of lexical motivation: phonetic, morphological, or semantic.
- Use examples that are new to this task rather than items already analysed in the lecture or practical exercises.
- For each item, identify the type of motivation, explain which element motivates the lexical meaning, determine whether the motivation is transparent to a contemporary speaker, and find the closest target-language equivalent.
- Determine whether translation preserves or loses the original motivational relation.
- Where transparency is doubtful, consult an explanatory or etymological dictionary.
- Submit a four-item analytical table and a 5-7 sentence contrastive conclusion.

Task 5. Testing a Bilingual Dictionary Entry

- Select one English lexical unit for which a bilingual dictionary provides at least three Ukrainian equivalents, or one Ukrainian lexical unit for which at least three English equivalents are provided.
- Select a lexical item that has not already been analysed in the lecture or practical exercises.
- Select three authentic contexts in which the source lexical unit realizes different semantic or contextual properties.
- For each context, identify the active sememe, dominant semes, dictionary options, rejected options, selected equivalent, and justification.
- Classify the contextual relation as contextual full equivalence, partial equivalence, or a lexical gap where the evidence supports that classification.
- Submit a three-context table with the columns Source Context / Active Sememe / Relevant Semes / Dictionary Options / Selected Equivalent / Justification, followed by a conclusion of no more than 150 words.

Questions for Self-check

1. How does lexical meaning differ from grammatical meaning?
2. Why can two words share a denotation but differ significantly in translation?
3. What is the difference between emotive, evaluative, stylistic, and expressive connotation?
4. What is a seme, and how does it differ from a sememe?
5. What is the function of an archiseme in componential analysis?
6. Why are differential semes important in establishing partial equivalence?
7. Why should the semantic structure of a polysemantic word be established from a monolingual dictionary?
8. How does polysemy differ from homonymy?
9. What relations are represented by the semiotic triangle?
10. What is lexical motivation?
11. How do phonetic, morphological, and semantic motivation differ?
12. Why may historical motivation be irrelevant to synchronic interpretation?
13. What is the purpose of componential analysis?
14. Why should a componential matrix contain only relevant semantic features?

15. What is a lexical field?
16. How do paradigmatic relations differ from syntagmatic relations?
17. Why is partial equivalence more common than complete semantic identity?
18. What conditions are required for contextual full equivalence?
19. Why does a lexical gap indicate a difference in lexicalization rather than an absence of the concept?
20. How can cultural specificity alter translation potential?
21. Why should a bilingual dictionary be used critically in lexical semantic analysis?

Recommended Sources and Dictionaries

For semantic analysis, combine current monolingual definitions with contextual evidence. English data may be checked in Oxford Learner's Dictionaries and other current monolingual dictionaries; Ukrainian data should be checked in normative explanatory resources, including the electronic Словник української мови у 20 томах. Use bilingual dictionaries to identify candidate equivalents, and turn to corpus evidence when collocation, register, or distribution determines the choice.

5. Paradigmatic Lexical Relations in English and Ukrainian

Aim of Independent Study

The aim is to consolidate the main paradigmatic lexical relations and test them on authentic English and Ukrainian material. The work includes distinguishing polysemy from homonymy, analysing absolute synonymy and near-synonymy, justifying a synonymic dominant, examining semantic prosody, classifying antonymy, and comparing hyponymy with meronymy.

Key Concepts

paradigmatic relation, syntagmatic relation, polysemy, homonymy, full lexical homonym, homophone, homograph, homoform, synonymy, synonymic dominant, absolute synonymy, near-synonymy, ideographic synonym, stylistic synonym, contextual synonym, semantic prosody, antonymy, gradable antonymy, complementarity, converseness, directional antonymy, reverse antonymy, derivational antonyms, root antonyms, hyponymy, hyperonym, co-hyponym, lexical hierarchy, meronymy, meronym, holonym

Methodological Guidelines

- ✓ Begin by identifying the exact semantic relation to be tested. Membership in the same conceptual domain is not, by itself, evidence of a paradigmatic relation.
- ✓ Keep paradigmatic relations separate from syntagmatic relations. Paradigmatic analysis concerns systemic relations such as similarity, opposition, inclusion, formal identity, and part-whole organization, while syntagmatic evidence concerns actual co-occurrence and contextual restrictions.
- ✓ When distinguishing polysemy from homonymy, use current dictionary structure, semantic relatedness, grammatical behaviour, and contextual evidence. Etymology may provide supporting information, but synchronic semantic relatedness remains central.
- ✓ Treat semantically close words as potentially non-interchangeable until denotation, register, collocation, evaluation, and semantic prosody have been checked.
- ✓ Treat absolute synonymy as a highly restricted relation requiring identity of relevant denotation, connotation, register, collocational behaviour, and contextual distribution.
- ✓ A synonymic dominant is not simply the first word listed in a dictionary and is not automatically the best translation equivalent. Justify its status through semantic breadth, relative neutrality, frequency, and position within the synonymic row.
- ✓ When analysing antonymy, identify the semantic type before examining morphological structure. Negative prefixes or suffixes do not automatically create antonymy.
- ✓ Apply the appropriate logical test: degree modification for gradable antonymy, denial entailment for complementarity, participant-role reversal for converseness, and opposite trajectory or restoration of a previous state for directional and reverse relations.
- ✓ Keep hyponymy separate from thematic association. Use the "kind of" test: if X can naturally be described as a kind of Y, X may function as a hyponym of Y.
- ✓ In translation, first identify the active sense and paradigmatic relation. The target language may preserve the relation, reorganize it, or require a different level of lexical specificity.

Independent Study Tasks

Task 1. Polysemy or Homonymy: Lexicographic Evidence

- Select one formally identical or highly ambiguous lexical form in English and one in Ukrainian that have not been analysed in detail in the lecture or practical exercises.
- Use current monolingual dictionaries to determine whether the meanings are represented as different sememes of one polysemantic lexical unit or as separate homonymous lexical units.
- Compare semantic relatedness, grammatical behaviour, dictionary entry structure, contextual disambiguation, and natural translation of two contrasting meanings.
- If dictionaries organize the meanings differently, record the disagreement.
- Submit a comparative table and a 5-7 sentence conclusion explaining which evidence is most decisive.

Task 2. Near-Synonymy and Contextual Substitution

- Select one English synonymic row of three units and one Ukrainian row of three units from the same broad conceptual area. Use rows that have not already been analysed in the lecture or practical exercises.
- Identify the shared semantic core, justify the synonymic dominant, and compare register, evaluative colouring, and one characteristic collocation or context for each unit.
- Determine whether the units can substitute for one another without a relevant change of meaning or style, and then establish the most appropriate cross-linguistic correspondences.
- Submit two compact synonymic profiles, a cross-linguistic correspondence table, and a 120-150 word conclusion.

Task 3. Semantic Prosody and Translation Choice

- Select two near-synonymous English lexical units or two near-synonymous Ukrainian lexical units whose difference cannot be explained adequately by denotation alone.
- Using corpus or corpus-based dictionary evidence, collect at least five representative collocational contexts for each unit.
- Determine whether the units tend to occur in positive, negative, or neutral environments and whether this recurrent association can be described as semantic prosody.
- Check whether the nearest target-language equivalents preserve the same evaluative tendency.
- Submit two short collocational profiles and a 5-7 sentence contrastive conclusion.

Task 4. Antonymic Relation and Structural Asymmetry

- Select three antonymic pairs from English and three from Ukrainian. The complete sample must represent at least three semantic types of opposition studied in the lecture.
- For each pair, identify the shared semantic dimension, classify the relation, determine whether the opposition is expressed by different roots or derivational morphology, provide natural target-language equivalents, and check whether semantic and structural types are preserved.
- Where negative morphology is present, verify genuine semantic opposition.
- Submit a table with the columns Pair / Semantic Dimension / Type of Antonymy / Structural Type / Target Equivalent / Cross-Linguistic Comment, followed by a 5-6 sentence conclusion.

Task 5. Comparing Lexical Hierarchies and Part-Whole Networks

- Choose one clearly delimited conceptual domain not used for a large comparative task in the practical guidelines.
- Construct one English and one Ukrainian hyponymic hierarchy with at least three levels and one small meronymic network in each language containing one holonym and at least three meronyms.
- Apply the 'kind of' test to every taxonomic link and the 'part of' test to every part-whole link.
- Compare lexicalized hierarchy levels, differences in specificity, and non-parallel lexical boundaries.
- Submit two hierarchy diagrams, two part-whole diagrams, and a 6-8 sentence contrastive conclusion.

Questions for Self-check

1. How do paradigmatic relations differ from syntagmatic relations?
2. What is the principal difference between polysemy and homonymy?
3. Why is etymology supporting rather than sufficient evidence for the synchronic distinction?
4. How does a full lexical homonym differ from a homophone, homograph, and homoform?
5. What conditions are required for absolute synonymy?
6. Why is most lexical synonymy better described as near-synonymy?
7. What is a synonymic dominant?
8. Why is the synonymic dominant not automatically the best translation equivalent?
9. How do ideographic, stylistic, and contextual synonyms differ?
10. What is semantic prosody, and what evidence is required to establish it?
11. Why must antonyms belong to the same semantic dimension?
12. How does gradable antonymy differ from complementarity?
13. How does converseness differ from other antonymic relations?
14. What distinguishes reversive antonymy?
15. Why does negative morphology not automatically create an antonym?
16. What is the difference between derivational antonyms and root antonyms?
17. What is the relationship between a hyperonym, hyponym, and co-hyponym?
18. What does the 'kind of' test demonstrate?
19. How does meronymy differ from hyponymy?
20. What is the relationship between a meronym and a holonym?
21. Why may English and Ukrainian organize the same lexical hierarchy differently?
22. Why must the translator establish the active paradigmatic relation before selecting an equivalent?

Recommended Sources and Dictionaries

Use the semantic studies listed in the general bibliography to revise synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy. Current monolingual dictionaries and corpus evidence are needed for contextual distribution and semantic prosody. WordNet may be used as an additional structured English resource for taxonomic and part-whole relations, but its relations should still be checked against the meaning relevant to the task.

6. Semantic Change and Semantic Transfer in English and Ukrainian

Aim of Independent Study

The aim is to distinguish an established historical semantic change from a contextual semantic transfer and to support each classification with appropriate evidence. The work covers broadening, narrowing, amelioration, pejoration, metaphor, metonymy, conventionalization, demotivation, and the translation consequences of different patterns of lexicalization.

Key Concepts

semantic change, semantic transfer, semantic radiation, broadening, generalization, narrowing, specialization, amelioration, pejoration, metaphor, tenor, vehicle, linguistic metaphor, conceptual metaphor, source domain, target domain, living metaphor, conventional metaphor, lexicalized or dead metaphor, demotivation, structural metaphor, orientational metaphor, ontological metaphor, personification, metonymy, contiguity, synecdoche, lexicalization, contextual innovation, cultural specificity, denotative shift

Methodological Guidelines

- ✓ Begin by determining whether the phenomenon is diachronic or contextual. A historical change in conventional lexical meaning is semantic change; a metaphorical or metonymic use in one text may represent only semantic transfer.
- ✓ Keep the result of change separate from its mechanism. Broadening, narrowing, amelioration, and pejoration describe what happened to semantic range or evaluation. Metaphor and metonymy explain how a new meaning may have developed.
- ✓ Reconstruct semantic history from historical or etymological evidence rather than from present-day meanings alone. If an earlier stage is not documented, state that limitation instead of inventing a trajectory.
- ✓ When identifying amelioration or pejoration, distinguish a stable conventional change from temporary positive or negative evaluation in a particular context.
- ✓ Analyse metaphor through similarity between domains. Where useful, identify the tenor and vehicle at the level of the expression and the source domain and target domain at the conceptual level.
- ✓ Keep linguistic metaphor and conceptual metaphor analytically separate: the first is a particular expression, while the second is an underlying mapping that may motivate a family of expressions.
- ✓ Assess demotivation separately from conventionalization. A lexicalized metaphor may still have a transparent motivating image.
- ✓ Analyse structural, orientational, and ontological metaphors as conceptual types. Treat personification as a subtype of ontological metaphor when specifically human properties are attributed to a non-human target.
- ✓ Distinguish metaphor from metonymy by the type of association involved. Metaphor is based on similarity between domains, while metonymy is based on contiguity within the same frame, domain, or situation.

- ✓ Treat synecdoche as the part-whole subtype of metonymy within the theoretical framework of the course.
- ✓ In translation, consider both the semantic mechanism and the degree of conventionalization. A lexicalized metaphor normally requires a conventional target expression, while a living metaphor may require creative reconstruction.

Independent Study Tasks

Task 1. Evidence-Based Reconstruction of Semantic Change

- Select one English and one Ukrainian lexical unit with a demonstrable history of semantic change. Use items that have not been analysed in detail in the lecture or practical exercises.
- For each item, consult one reliable historical or etymological source and one current explanatory dictionary.
- Establish the securely documented earlier meaning, current meaning, approximate chronology where available, result of change, possible transfer mechanism, survival of the earlier meaning, and whether the nearest translation equivalent underwent a comparable development.
- Name a transfer mechanism only when historical or semantic evidence supports it; otherwise classify only the documented result of change.
- Submit a two-item diachronic table with the columns Earlier Meaning / Current Meaning / Result of Change / Possible Transfer Mechanism / Source Evidence / Target-Language Comparison, followed by a 6-8 sentence conclusion.

Task 2. Contextual Innovation or Lexicalized Meaning?

- Select one contemporary English lexical item and one contemporary Ukrainian lexical item that occur in transferred uses in current media, digital, academic, professional, or public communication.
- For each item, collect at least three authentic contexts and consult a current explanatory dictionary.
- Determine whether the transferred use is a contextual innovation, an established conventional transferred use, or a lexicalized meaning.
- Identify literal or primary meaning, transferred meaning, metaphorical or metonymic mechanism, dictionary codification, and recurrence across independent contexts.
- Treat frequency as supporting evidence, not as sufficient proof of lexicalization. Consider dictionary codification, recurrence in independent contexts, and stability of the transferred meaning together.
- Submit two short evidence profiles and a 5-7 sentence conclusion.

Task 3. Conventionalization and Demotivation of Metaphor

- Choose one metaphorical source domain other than FIRE / HEAT.
- Collect three English and three Ukrainian metaphorical expressions drawing imagery from the same general source domain.
- For each expression, identify tenor, vehicle, source domain, target domain, degree of conventionalization, transparency of the image, degree of demotivation, and a natural target-language equivalent.

- Determine whether the equivalent preserves the same vehicle.
- Submit a six-item comparative matrix and a 120-150 word contrastive comment.

Task 4. Conceptual Metaphor across English and Ukrainian

- Select one conceptual metaphor not used as the central object of the practical comparative task.
- Collect four English and four Ukrainian independently attested linguistic realizations of the same general mapping.
- For each expression, identify the source and target domains and the aspect of the target concept structured by the source. Classify the conceptual pattern as structural, orientational, or ontological when the evidence supports one of these types.
- Identify personification separately when human properties are attributed to a non-human target.
- Provide a natural translation and determine whether it preserves the same conceptual mapping and lexical vehicle.
- Submit a parallel English-Ukrainian conceptual map and a 6-8 sentence conclusion.

Task 5. Metonymic Pattern and Cultural Transparency

- Select one type of metonymic transfer studied in the lecture and collect three English and three Ukrainian examples representing the same general pattern.
- For every example, identify the metonymic expression, intended referent, relation of contiguity, conventionality, cultural or institutional knowledge required, and natural translation.
- If a case involves a genuine part-whole relation, classify it as synecdoche and explain why.
- Determine whether the target language preserves the same metonymic structure or requires explication.
- Submit a table with the columns Expression / Intended Referent / Type of Contiguity / Conventionality / Cultural Specificity / Translation Solution, followed by a 5-7 sentence conclusion.

Questions for Self-check

1. What is the difference between semantic change and semantic transfer?
2. Why does an individual metaphorical use not automatically constitute semantic change?
3. What is semantic radiation?
4. How does broadening differ from narrowing?
5. Why do broadening and narrowing describe results rather than mechanisms?
6. What is the difference between amelioration and pejoration?
7. Why is positive contextual evaluation insufficient evidence of amelioration?
8. What historical evidence is needed to establish evaluative semantic change?
9. How does metaphor differ from metonymy?
10. What are the tenor and vehicle of a metaphor?
11. What is the difference between a linguistic metaphor and a conceptual metaphor?
12. What are the source domain and target domain?
13. How do living, conventional, and lexicalized or dead metaphors differ?
14. Why must demotivation be analysed separately from lexicalization?
15. How can the same metaphor be classified on two analytical dimensions?
16. What is a structural metaphor?

17. What is an orientational metaphor?
18. What is an ontological metaphor?
19. Why is personification treated as a subtype of ontological metaphor?
20. What is contiguity?
21. Why is synecdoche treated as a subtype of metonymy?
22. What distinguishes lexicalization from contextual innovation?
23. How can cultural specificity affect metaphor and metonymy?
24. Why may a shared conceptual metaphor have different linguistic realizations?
25. Why should a lexicalized metaphor normally be translated differently from a living metaphor?
26. Why must the intended referent be established before translating metonymy?

Recommended Sources and Dictionaries

Diachronic claims should be supported by historical or etymological sources, while present-day conventionalization and lexical status should be checked in current explanatory dictionaries and corpora. The bibliography includes the principal theoretical works used in the lecture. If a source documents the result of change but not the mechanism, keep those two levels of analysis separate.

Aim of Independent Study

The aim is to practise identifying conventional multiword units and checking phraseological and collocational choices against dictionary and corpus evidence. The work focuses on distinguishing a phraseological unit, a free word combination, and a collocation, assessing fixedness and idiomaticity, comparing phraseological imagery, establishing phraseological equivalence or a phraseological gap, and selecting a natural translation strategy.

Key Concepts

phraseology, phraseological unit, free word combination, formulaic language, prefab, idiom, proverb, saying, cliché, winged word, biblicalism, phraseological variant, phraseological synonym, zoonym, somatic phraseology, semantic unity, structural stability, idiomaticity, reproducibility, expressiveness, motivation, imagery, fixed expression, semi-fixed expression, nominal phraseological unit, verbal phraseological unit, adjectival phraseological unit, adverbial phraseological unit, sentence-structured phraseological unit, comparative phraseological unit, binomial phraseological unit, open collocation, restricted collocation, figurative idiom, pure idiom, institutionalization, fixedness, non-compositionality, open-choice principle, idiom principle, collocation, collocational restriction, phraseological equivalence, phraseological gap, full phraseological equivalence, partial phraseological equivalence, zero phraseological equivalence, functional equivalent, paraphrase, explication, stylistic compensation, contextual transformation

Methodological Guidelines

- ✓ First establish the status of the multiword sequence. Recurrence alone does not make an expression phraseological; assess semantic unity, structural stability, idiomaticity, reproducibility, and expressiveness together.
- ✓ Distinguish a phraseological unit from a free word combination. A free combination is created according to productive grammatical and semantic rules, whereas a phraseological unit is reproduced as an established unit and has semantic, structural, or functional specificity.
- ✓ Treat idiomaticity as one diagnostic property, not as a synonym for phraseological status. Some conventional units are transparent but lexically restricted.
- ✓ When analysing structural stability, remember that fixedness is relative. A phraseological unit may permit limited grammatical or lexical variation and still retain its identity.
- ✓ Distinguish a phraseological variant from a phraseological synonym. A variant is an established alternative realization of the same unit; a synonym is a separate phraseological unit with related meaning.
- ✓ When applying Cowie's classification, treat open collocation, restricted collocation, figurative idiom, and pure idiom as positions on an operational continuum.
- ✓ Distinguish collocations from idioms. Collocations are semantically transparent but conventionally restricted. Grammatical correctness does not guarantee collocational naturalness.
- ✓ When analysing motivation and imagery, identify metaphorical, metonymic, somatic, zoonymic, biblical, literary, or culture-specific sources only where the evidence supports them.

- ✓ Test phraseological equivalence through meaning, pragmatic function, register, imagery, and conventionality rather than through formal similarity.
- ✓ Zero phraseological equivalence indicates the absence of a ready-made phraseological target unit, not impossibility of translation.
- ✓ When translating, identify the unit type, establish contextual meaning, determine register and stylistic colouring, then assess available phraseological correspondence and select a strategy.
- ✓ Communicative function has priority over mechanical preservation of the source image when the image is not natural in the target language.

Independent Study Tasks

Task 1. Phraseological Status in Authentic Context

- Select two English and two Ukrainian multiword expressions from current edited, institutional, journalistic, literary, or academic texts. Use expressions not already analysed in the lecture or practical exercises.
- For each expression, reproduce enough context for interpretation, verify dictionary or phraseological status, and assess semantic unity, structural stability, idiomaticity, reproducibility, and expressiveness.
- Determine whether the unit is best treated as a free word combination, collocation, formulaic sequence, or phraseological unit.
- Justify any borderline classification.
- Submit a four-item diagnostic matrix and a 5-7 sentence conclusion.

Task 2. Phraseological Variant or Phraseological Synonym?

- Select one English phraseological unit and one Ukrainian phraseological unit for which dictionaries or authentic usage indicate an alternative established expression.
- For each language, record the basic and alternative forms and establish whether the alternative is a phraseological variant or a phraseological synonym.
- Compare the changed element, meaning, imagery, register, grammatical structure, dictionary treatment, and natural equivalent in the other language.
- If sources differ, record the disagreement.
- Submit two short evidence profiles and a 5-6 sentence conclusion.

Task 3. Testing a Collocational Translation

- Select one English lexical node and one Ukrainian lexical node from the same general conceptual domain. Use a pair other than *decision* / *рішення* or another example analysed in detail in the lecture.
- For each node, collect four typical collocations from a corpus, corpus-based dictionary, or authoritative collocational dictionary.
- Identify structural pattern, degree of restriction, natural translation, the component that changes in translation, and whether literal substitution would create a grammatical but non-conventional combination.
- Verify the target combination independently.

- Submit an eight-item table with the columns Source Collocation / Pattern / Degree of Restriction / Natural Equivalent / Structural or Lexical Change / Evidence, followed by a 5-7 sentence conclusion.

Task 4. Verification of Phraseological Equivalence

- Select one English phraseological unit and one Ukrainian phraseological unit not analysed in the lecture or practical exercises.
- For each source unit, identify the best target solution and compare contextual meaning, pragmatic function, imagery, structure, register, expressive colouring, conventionality, and usage restrictions.
- Classify the relation as full, partial, or zero phraseological equivalence.
- If no ready-made equivalent exists, determine whether a functional equivalent, paraphrase, explication, or another strategy is most appropriate.
- Submit two contrastive equivalence records and a 120-150 word conclusion.

Task 5. Analysis of a Published Translation

- Select a published or institutionally translated passage of about 80-150 words for which both the English and Ukrainian versions are available. The passage must contain at least one phraseological or formulaic unit and one characteristic collocation.
- For each selected unit, identify source type, contextual meaning, register, pragmatic function, and the strategy used in the published translation.
- Determine whether meaning, function, register, and natural target-language co-selection are preserved.
- Suggest an alternative only if the published solution creates a demonstrable semantic, stylistic, or collocational problem.
- Submit the source and target fragments in a compact table and an analytical comment of 150-200 words.

Questions for Self-check

1. What does phraseology study in its narrow and broad senses?
2. How does a phraseological unit differ from a free word combination?
3. Why is no single diagnostic criterion sufficient?
4. What is semantic unity?
5. What is structural stability?
6. How does idiomaticity differ from general phraseological status?
7. What is reproducibility?
8. What role does expressiveness play?
9. What is formulaic language?
10. How does an idiom differ from a collocation?
11. How does a proverb differ from a saying?
12. What is a cliché?
13. What are winged words and biblicalisms?
14. How does a phraseological variant differ from a phraseological synonym?
15. What is the difference between a fixed and a semi-fixed expression?

16. How does Cowie's open collocation differ from a restricted collocation?
17. How does a figurative idiom differ from a pure idiom?
18. What are institutionalization, fixedness, and non-compositionality?
19. What is Sinclair's open-choice principle?
20. What is Sinclair's idiom principle?
21. Why can a grammatically correct translation still contain a collocational error?
22. What is a collocational restriction?
23. How do full, partial, and zero phraseological equivalence differ?
24. What is a phraseological gap?
25. Why does zero phraseological equivalence not mean untranslatability?
26. When is a functional equivalent preferable to literal image preservation?
27. When may paraphrase or explication be required?
28. What is the role of stylistic compensation?
29. Why must register be checked before accepting an equivalent?
30. Why should corpus evidence supplement dictionary evidence?

Recommended Sources and Dictionaries

Use the phraseological and corpus-based works listed in the general bibliography to revise the theory. Check idioms and fixed expressions in authoritative phraseological dictionaries, and use corpora to verify collocations, variants, frequency patterns, and register. For Ukrainian, the Фразеологічний словник української мови, ГРАК, and УНЛК are suitable resources; for English, BNC and COCA can be used alongside established dictionaries.

8. Vocabulary Stratification, Terminology, and Lexical Innovation in English and Ukrainian

Aim of Independent Study

The aim is to bring together the stylistic, social, professional, territorial, chronological, and innovative dimensions of vocabulary stratification. The work includes distinguishing professional vocabulary, professionalism, and term, analysing a terminological system, separating national variety from dialectal vocabulary, establishing the status of archaisms, historicisms, neologisms, and adapted borrowings, and checking stylistic equivalence and terminological equivalence in translation.

Key Concepts

vocabulary stratification, stylistic stratification, register, usage label, neutral vocabulary, formal vocabulary, informal vocabulary, literary vocabulary, colloquial vocabulary, slang, dialectism, regional vocabulary, national variety, professional vocabulary, professionalism, term, terminology, terminological system, terminological field, terminological variation, terminological consistency, current lexical status, archaic word, obsolete word, historical term, archaism, historicism, neologism, lexical innovation, adapted borrowing, graphic adaptation, phonetic adaptation, morphological adaptation, word-formational adaptation, stylistic equivalence, terminological equivalence

Methodological Guidelines

- ✓ Analyse vocabulary stratification as a multidimensional phenomenon. A lexical unit may simultaneously have stylistic, social, professional, territorial, chronological, and innovative characteristics.
- ✓ Assign register and usage labels only when they are supported by current dictionaries, corpora, standards, specialist resources, or sufficiently clear authentic contexts.
- ✓ Distinguish formal vocabulary from literary vocabulary. Formal vocabulary is primarily institutional or official; literary vocabulary may be elevated, poetic, or artistically marked.
- ✓ Distinguish colloquial vocabulary from slang. Colloquial words may simply mark informal interaction, while slang is more strongly connected with social groups, identities, expressive innovation, or reduced social distance.
- ✓ When analysing Ukrainian colloquial vocabulary, consider expressive derivation and suffixation. English may reproduce the pragmatic effect through a separate lexical or syntactic device rather than parallel morphology.
- ✓ Keep professional vocabulary, professionalism, and term separate. A professionalism is an unofficial or semi-official practitioner designation, while a term belongs to a specialized conceptual system and has definitional and systemic status. Informality alone is not sufficient evidence.
- ✓ Determine terminological status from appropriate domain-specific evidence. A general dictionary may confirm ordinary meaning but may not establish the preferred term in a specialized system.
- ✓ Analyse a term within its terminological system. Apparent bilingual equivalents may occupy different conceptual positions in the two systems.

- ✓ When several forms designate the same specialized concept, identify terminological variation. Once the preferred target designation is established for a document, apply terminological consistency unless variation is justified.
- ✓ Distinguish national-variety differences from regional or dialectal vocabulary. Two forms may both belong to codified standards, whereas a dialectism is territorially restricted and lies outside the general standard.
- ✓ Analyse chronologically marked vocabulary on two axes: current lexical status and current status of the referent. English and Ukrainian classification traditions use different criteria and should not be mechanically equated.
- ✓ When analysing neologisms, distinguish new words, new meanings, and new expressions from the broader process of lexical innovation. Verify novelty through recent evidence.
- ✓ For an adapted borrowing, analyse graphic, phonetic, morphological, and word-formational adaptation separately.
- ✓ In translation, distinguish stylistic equivalence from terminological equivalence and verify that the target unit occupies a comparable position in register, collocation, currency, social value, and professional system.

Independent Study Tasks

Task 1. Register Profile of Lexical Alternatives

- Choose one communicative function within comparable English and Ukrainian situations, for example informing, requesting, evaluating, or addressing someone in an institutional, academic, workplace, or informal context.
- Select three lexical alternatives in each language that can perform that function but differ in register or social marking.
- For each unit, record its current definition, relevant usage labels, evidenced register, an authentic context, appropriateness for the selected situation, the natural target-language correspondence, and whether the stylistic status is preserved.
- Submit a six-item register matrix and a 6-8 sentence contrastive conclusion identifying at least one risk of stylistic flattening and one risk of over-marking.

Task 2. Term, Professionalism, or Professional Vocabulary?

- Choose one specialized professional domain and select three lexical units: one clearly established term, one practitioner label that may function as a professionalism and therefore needs verification, and one additional item whose status is not obvious from form alone.
- Consult at least two relevant sources such as a specialist dictionary, professional standard, institutional terminology resource, authoritative professional publication, or authentic practitioner communication.
- Determine definition status, system membership, standardization, practitioner use, register, variation, and the most appropriate target-language designation.
- If the evidence does not permit secure classification, state this explicitly.
- Submit a table with the columns Unit / Domain / Definition Status / Standardization / Usage / Classification / Target Equivalent / Evidence, followed by a 5-7 sentence conclusion.

Task 3. National Variety or Dialect?

- Select one pair of English units representing a codified national-variety difference, one English regional or dialectal unit, and one Ukrainian regional or dialectal unit. Choose examples other than *flat / apartment*, *bairn*, and *razda*, which are already discussed in the course materials.
- For each item, identify geographical restriction, codification status, dictionary label, authentic context, neutral target-language translation, and whether geographical marking needs to be preserved.
- Identify the risk of false cultural localization.
- Submit a four-item comparison table and a 5-6 sentence conclusion.

Task 4. Chronological Status and Translation

- Select one chronologically marked English lexical unit and one Ukrainian lexical unit not analysed in detail in the lecture or practical exercises.
- For each item, establish two independent characteristics: current lexical status and status of the referent.
- For the English item, record the current dictionary label and determine whether the referent still exists. For the Ukrainian item, determine whether it is an archaism, historicism, or another chronologically marked unit and identify a modern synonym if one exists.
- Provide an authentic or historically appropriate context and propose a target-language translation preserving the relevant function.
- Compare the classification criteria before matching the English label *archaic* with the Ukrainian category *apxaiзм*. The target classification depends on both current lexical status and the status of the referent.
- Submit a two-axis comparison table and a 6-8 sentence conclusion.

Task 5. Lexical Innovation and Adapted Borrowing

- Select one current Ukrainian lexical unit based on an English borrowing and one current English lexical innovation. Use items not already analysed in the lecture or practical exercises.
- For the Ukrainian item, identify the English source form, current meaning, graphic, phonetic, morphological, and word-formational adaptation, one authentic context, and current stylistic or professional status.
- For the English item, determine whether it is a new word, a new meaning, or a new expression. Identify the formation mechanism if the item is formally complex, verify its current lexical status, establish register or domain, provide one authentic context, and find a natural Ukrainian equivalent.
- Determine whether Ukrainian uses borrowing, calquing, derivation, a multiword expression, or another solution.
- Treat unfamiliarity as a reason to verify lexical status, not as proof that an item is a neologism. Support the decision with recent lexicographic or corpus evidence.
- Submit two lexical innovation profiles and a 120-150 word contrastive conclusion.

Questions for Self-check

1. What is vocabulary stratification?
2. Which dimensions of vocabulary stratification are distinguished in the lecture?

3. Why may one lexical unit belong to several strata simultaneously?
4. What is register?
5. What is a usage label, and why should it be checked in current dictionaries?
6. How does neutral vocabulary differ from marked vocabulary?
7. How does formal vocabulary differ from literary vocabulary?
8. How does colloquial vocabulary differ from slang?
9. Why is social-group membership relevant to slang?
10. Why is Ukrainian expressive suffixation important in contrastive analysis?
11. What is professional vocabulary?
12. How does a professionalism differ from a term?
13. Why is informality alone insufficient for identifying a professionalism?
14. What properties are normally associated with a term?
15. What is a terminological system?
16. What is a terminological field?
17. Why can formally similar terms fail to demonstrate terminological equivalence?
18. What is terminological variation?
19. Why is terminological consistency important within one document?
20. How does a national variety differ from regional or dialectal vocabulary?
21. Why should a source-language dialectism not automatically be replaced by a target-language dialectism?
22. Why must chronologically marked vocabulary be analysed according to both lexical status and referent?
23. How does the English classification of outdated vocabulary differ from the Ukrainian distinction between archaism and historicism?
24. Why can an English archaic item correspond either to a Ukrainian archaism or a historicism?
25. What is a neologism?
26. How does lexical innovation differ from an individual neologism?
27. What mechanisms may produce lexical innovations in English and Ukrainian?
28. What is an adapted borrowing?
29. How do the four types of adaptation differ?
30. Why should the degree of adaptation be analysed separately on each dimension?
31. What is stylistic equivalence?
32. What is terminological equivalence?
33. Why must neologistic and terminological equivalents be verified in current and domain-appropriate sources?
34. What causes stylistic flattening?
35. What analytical procedure should precede translation of a stylistically marked unit?

Recommended Sources and Dictionaries

For this theme, match the source to the type of evidence required. Register and chronological labels should come from current dictionaries; terminological status should be checked in domain-specific standards, specialist dictionaries, institutional terminology resources, and professional documents; lexical

innovations require recent dictionary and corpus evidence. The general bibliography contains the terminology, slang, stylistics, and lexicology works used as the theoretical basis for these decisions.

РЕКОМЕНДОВАНА ЛІТЕРАТУРА, СЛОВНИКИ ТА ЕЛЕКТРОННІ РЕСУРСИ

Наукова та навчальна література

1. Andreichuk N. I., Babelyuk O. A. *Contrastive Lexicology of English and Ukrainian Languages: Theory and Practice : textbook*. Kherson : Helvetica, 2019. 234 p.
2. Baker M. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. 3rd ed. London ; New York : Routledge, 2018.
3. Bauer L., Lieber R., Plag I. *The Oxford Reference Guide to English Morphology*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2013.
4. Cabré M. T. *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications* / ed. by J. C. Sager ; transl. by J. A. DeCesaris. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1999.
5. Chamizo Domínguez P. J., Nerlich B. False friends: their origin and semantics in some selected languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2002. Vol. 34, no. 12. P. 1833-1849. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00024-3.
6. *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications* / ed. by A. P. Cowie. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1998.
7. Cruse A. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. 3rd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2011.
8. Crystal D. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. 3rd ed. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2019.
9. Dobrovolska S. R., Opyr M. B., Panchyshyn S. B. Coping with lexical gaps: strategic handling of non-equivalent items. *Закарпатські філологічні студії*. 2025. Вип. 40. Т. 1. С. 62-68. DOI: 10.32782/tps2663-4880/2025.40.1.9. www.doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2025.40.1.9
10. Durkin P. *Borrowed Words: A History of Loanwords in English*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2014.
11. Fabian M. P. *Contrastive Lexicology of English and Ukrainian*. Uzhhorod : Polygrafcentr "Lira", 2023. 114 p.
12. Geeraerts D. *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2010.
13. Goddard C. *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2011.
14. Jackson H., Zé Amvela E. *An Introduction to English Lexicology: Words, Meaning and Vocabulary*. 3rd ed. London : Bloomsbury Academic, 2021.
15. Kövecses Z. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2010.
16. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1980.
17. Mattiello E. *An Introduction to English Slang: A Description of Its Morphology, Semantics and Sociology*. Milano : Polimetrica, 2008.
18. Moon R. *Fixed Expressions and Idioms in English: A Corpus-Based Approach*. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1998.
19. Murphy M. L. *Semantic Relations and the Lexicon: Antonymy, Synonymy and Other Paradigms*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003.
20. Plag I. *Word-Formation in English*. 2nd ed. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2018.
21. Radden G., Kövecses Z. Towards a theory of metonymy // *Metonymy in Language and Thought* / ed. by K.-U. Panther, G. Radden. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1999. P. 17-59.

22. Sager J. C. *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1990.
23. Sinclair J. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1991.
24. Traugott E. C., Dasher R. B. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2002.
25. Брус М. П. *Фемінитиви в українській мові: генеза, еволюція, функціонування : монографія*. Івано-Франківськ : ДВНЗ "Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника", 2019. 440 с.
26. Верба Л. Г. *Порівняльна лексикологія англійської та української мов : навч. посібник для перекладацьких відділень вузів*. Вінниця : Нова книга, 2003. 203 с.
27. Клименко Н. Ф., Карпіловська Є. А., Кислюк Л. П. *Динамічні процеси в сучасному українському лексиконі : монографія*. Київ : Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго, 2008. 336 с.
28. Мацько Л. І., Сидоренко О. М., Мацько О. М. *Стилістика української мови : підручник / за ред. Л. І. Мацько*. Київ : Вища школа, 2003. 462 с.
29. Панько Т. І., Кочан І. М., Мацюк Г. П. *Українське термінознавство : підручник*. Львів : Світ, 1994. 216 с.
30. Ужченко В. Д., Ужченко Д. В. *Фразеологія сучасної української мови : навч. посіб.* Київ : Знання, 2007. 494 с.

Словники, корпуси та електронні ресурси

1. *Етимологічний словник української мови : у 7 т.* / редкол.: О. С. Мельничук (голов. ред.) та ін. Київ : Наукова думка, 1982-2012. Т. 1-6.
2. *Словник української мови : в 11 т.* Київ : Наукова думка, 1970-1980.
3. *Фразеологічний словник української мови : у 2 кн.* / уклад.: В. М. Білоноженко та ін. ; редкол.: Л. С. Паламарчук (голова) та ін. Київ : Наукова думка, 1993.
4. *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries* / Oxford University Press. URL: www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com
5. *Oxford English Dictionary* / Oxford University Press. URL: www.oed.com
6. *Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English* / chief ed. C. McIntosh ; eds. B. Francis, R. Poole. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2009. XII, 963 p.
7. *WordNet: A Lexical Database for English* / Princeton University. URL: www.wordnet.princeton.edu
8. *Словник української мови у 20 томах : електронна версія* / Український мовно-інформаційний фонд НАН України. URL: www.sum20ua.com
9. *Словники України online* / Український мовно-інформаційний фонд НАН України. URL: www.lcorp.ulif.org.ua/dictua
10. *British National Corpus (BNC)*. English-Corpora.org. URL: www.english-corpora.org/bnc
11. *Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)*. English-Corpora.org. URL: www.english-corpora.org/coca
12. *Генеральний регіонально анотований корпус української мови (ГРАК)* / М. Шведова, Р. фон Вальденфельс, С. Яригін, А. Рисін, В. Старко, Т. Ніколаєнко, А. Лукашевський та ін. Київ ; Львів ; Єна, 2017-. URL: www.uacorpora.org
13. *Український національний лінгвістичний корпус (УНЛК)* / Український мовно-інформаційний фонд НАН України. URL: www.svc.ulif.org.ua/UNLC/virt_unlc_4.5