ΛΌΓΘΣ

RACCOLTA DI ARTICOLI SCIENTIFICI CON GLI ATTI DELLA

VII CONFERENZA
SCIENTIFICA E PRATICA
INTERNAZIONALE

«Ricerche scientifiche e metodi della loro realizzazione: esperienza mondiale e realtà domestiche»

Bologna
Repubblica Italiana

6 giugno
2025

In Viaggio Con il Levi: Scienza, Tecnologia e Impresa &
ONG «Piattaforma scientifica europea»

Λ'ΟΓΟΣ

RACCOLTA DI ARTICOLI SCIENTIFICI

CON GLI ATTI DELLA
VII CONFERENZA SCIENTIFICA E PRATICA INTERNAZIONALE

«RICERCHE SCIENTIFICHE E METODI DELLA LORO REALIZZAZIONE: ESPERIENZA MONDIALE E REALTÀ DOMESTICHE»

Bologna,
Repubblica Italiana

6 giugno,
2025

Repubblica Italiana
«Associazione Italiana di Storia Urbana»

Ucraina
«UKRLOGOS Group»

2025

R 52 **Ricerche scientifiche e metodi della loro realizzazione: esperienza mondiale e realtà domestiche**: Raccolta di articoli scientifici «ΛΌΓΟΣ» con gli atti della VII Conferenza scientifica e pratica internazionale, Bologna, 6 giugno, 2025. Bologna-Vinnytsia: Associazione Italiana di Storia Urbana & UKRLOGOS Group LLC, 2025.

«UKRLOGOS Group» LLC, Ucraina

«Associazione Italiana di Storia Urbana», Repubblica Italiana

La raccolta contiene materiali dei partecipanti di VII conferenza scientifica e pratica internazionale multidisciplinare «Ricerche scientifiche e metodi della loro realizzazione: esperienza mondiale e realtà domestiche», che si è tenuta a Bologna il 6 giugno 2025.

The conference is certified by Euro Science Certification Group (**Certificate № 22903 dated April 3, 2025**);

The conference is also included in the catalog of International Scientific Conferences by ResearchBib; and registered by State Scientific Institution «Ukrainian institute of scientific and technical expertise and information» in the database «Scientific and technical events of Ukraine» (**Certificate № 418 dated June 12, 2024**).

La descrizione bibliografica dei materiali della conferenza è indicizzata da Google Scholar, CrossRef, OpenAIRE, OUCI, Scilit, Semantic Scholar, Mendeley, WarldCat e ORCID.

UDC 082:001

CONTENUTO

INTERLINGUAL CORRELATIVE SYNTHETISM AS A PARAMETER OF VERB SYSTEMS

Ivanytska Natalia[1], Ivanytska Nina[2]

---

1. Doctor of Philological Sciences, Full Professor
Head of the Foreign Philology and Translation Department
*Vinnytsia Institute of Trade and Economics of State University of Trade and Economics,
UKRAINE*
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9925-1285

2. Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Full Professor of Ukrainian Language Department
Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University, UKRAINE
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8111-3645

Annotation. *The paper provides a comparative analysis of the verbal systems of Ukrainian and English, examining the interlingual syntagmatic correlative relations between the two languages. The theoretical and methodological basis of the study is the work of domestic and foreign linguists in the fields of verbal combinatorics and valency theory. This work enabled the authors to formulate a theory of autosemantism and synsemantism of verbal nominations. This theory became key to establishing correlative synthetism within the described verbs. The article proves the hypothesis that the verbal systems of Ukrainian and English, formed by autosemantic and synsemantic units, have regular formal signs of nominative correlativity as components of the universal verbal category of «processuality».*

Introduction. The modern linguistic paradigm clearly distinguishes the contrasting aspects of interlinguistic studies [2; 3; 5]. Researchers in this field provide new insights into the theoretical understanding of linguistic units, regardless of the relatedness or number of languages and the number of differential features used for analysis. One of the objects of interlinguistic description that researchers have sufficiently explored and that is problematic and not fully exhausted in contrastive terms, particularly in the Ukrainian-English parallel, is verb systems. Significant achievements have been made in the linguistic interpretation of these systems. This is especially true within the framework of intrasystemic descriptions in Slavic and Germanic studies. Notable scholars include

O. Potebnia, V. Rusaniskyi, and Yu. Zhluktenko, I. Vykhovanets, K. Horodenska, A. Zahnitko, S. Sokolova, T. Masytska, F. Batsevych, I. Korunets, M. Kalko, O. Leuta, N. Medynska, B. Levin, C. Fries, R. Quirk, and T. Rappoport, A. McMillion, G. Leech, and F. Palmer, the range of problematic issues related to the comparative analysis of Ukrainian and English verb systems remains extensive. A comprehensive study of their lexical-semantic paradigms and formal-syntactic syntagmatics in projection onto a selected basis for comparison, or tertium comparationis, is relevant for bilateral comparison. In our concept, this basis is the processing category [2; 3; 8; 9].

Purpose and objectives. The proposed study **hypothesizes** that the Ukrainian and English verb systems, formed by autosemantic and synsemantic units, have enough formal manifestations (features and parameters) of correlativity and non-correlativity depending on the categorical groups (classifications) within the universal verbal processing category.

This article highlights the authors' approach to specific tasks related to one formal type of correlation expression: correlative synthetism in autosemantic and synsemantic verb systems in Ukrainian and English. In particular, we set the following tasks: 1) to theoretically substantiate the parameters of formal indicators of correlations in the compared verb systems of the Ukrainian and English languages; 2) to identify the features of correlative synthetism in the systems of autosemantic and synsemantic verbs in Ukrainian and English; 3) to identify cases of correlative synthetism in verb classes covered by different subcategories of the verb category «processivity».

Results and Discussion. The study examined a sample of 500 Ukrainian and 460 English verbs. These verbs were derived from Ukrainian-English and English-Ukrainian translation dictionaries. These terms were sourced from explanatory dictionaries of both languages. Moreover, the authors' card index of sentences with verbs was processed. This index covered 1,560 Ukrainian and 1,190 English syntactic constructions.

The theoretical framework of the study, particularly the concept of «syntheticism», aligns with the accepted definition of the term in Ukrainian and English grammatical descriptions.

In modern linguistics, the term «correlation» is defined as «mutual correspondence, interconnection, and causality of linguistic elements; a type of opposition based on the properties of one-dimensionality» [3, p. 38]. Using this term in the comparative analysis of Ukrainian and English verb systems is primarily justified by the bilateral approach, in which both systems are projected onto a common reference point (tertium comparationis), ensuring the relevance and validity of the results.

Correlative synthetics in the verbal systems of Ukrainian and English is considered a synthetic expression of procedural meaning characteristic of both languages. This type of syntheticism functions as a formal marker of verbal nomination and represents one of the parameters of the verbal system. It is present in autosemantic and synsemantic verbs. However, each group has specific features regarding the means of formal expression and the degree to which the parameters are represented for comparing linguistic units.

The theory of formalising manifestations and classifications of correlations in Ukrainian and English verb systems is based on the denotative features of procedural nominations. Specifically, it is based on the distinction between indivisible and divisible procedural denotations. Indivisible procedural denotations are fragments of reality that are perceived and understood independently of dependent denotations, mostly object or circumstantial: Ukr. *Дощить. Годинник **зупинився***, En. *It **rains**. The clock **stopped***. Disjointed procedural denotations are fragments of reality perceived and understood about other, subordinate denotations (objective or circumstantial): Ukr. *Ми повинні **пам'ятати імена** відомих людей* – En. W*e must **preserve the names** of great men;* Ukr. *Поліція **обступила будинок***. – En. *The police **surrounded the house.***

Focusing on the procedural denotatum ensures the selection of corresponding pairs of Ukrainian and English names primarily confirmed by lexicographic sources. At the same time, we consider it necessary to check the nominations against Ukrainian-English and English-Ukrainian translation dictionaries and explanatory dictionaries. Our focus is on the accepted criterion of analysis — the category of «processuality» in its three manifestations: «processuality-action», «processuality-state», and «processuality-relation».

We consider correlative synthetism in the system of autosemantic verbs of the Ukrainian and English languages to be the presence in both languages of single-word nominations of indivisible process denotations: Ukr. *замерзати* (про воду) – En. *to freeze*; Ukr. *линяти* – En. *to fade*; Ukr. *пахнути* – En. to *smell*; Ukr. *спати* – En. *to sleep.*

In cases of correlative synthetism, speakers nominate procedural denotations in both languages in a synthetic way (within word forms). Note that correlative synthetism is unaffected by morphological analyticism, i.e., analytical forms of components of the formal-syntactic structure or temporal or modal morphological analytical forms: Ukr. *Спочатку **йшов** дощ, а потім **розпогодилося***, En. *It **rained** and then it **cleaned.***

For analysis, we selected only those Ukrainian and English verbs that, in syntagmatics, showed absolute self-semanticism, as confirmed by the sentence-forming ability of such verbs to form two-part or one-part sentences of verbal

structure without obligatory adverbial complements: Ukr. **Дме** *вітер; Він* *полюбляє* **хизуватися**; **Тріщить** *лід; Газ* **горить**; *Надворі* **розпогодилося**; *Листя* **жовтіє**; *Літак* **розбився**; *Компанія* **збанкротувала**; *Перестань* **плакати**; *Він* *запросив мене* **танцювати**; *Квіти* **в'януть**; *Буря* **вщухає**; En. *Flowers (roses)* **fade**; *The prisoner* **escaped;** *Such things* **do not exist**; *The war (the story, the road)* **ended;** *Wait till your coat* **dries**; *Prices* **dropped**; *Can you* **draw**?; *He* **disappeared** *nearly ten years ago; It is five years since he* **died**; *The child began* **to cry**; *The lighting* **flashed** *and thunder* **crashed**; *He* **coughs** *very hard.*

In the synsemantic verbs of Ukrainian and English systems, we consider correlative synthetism to be the presence of single-word nominations of segmented processual denotations in both languages: Ukr. **обдурювати** *(обманювати) людей –* En. *to cheat people;* Ukr. **веселити** *публіку –* En. **to cheer** *the audience;* Ukr. **вибирати** *друзів –* En. **to choose** *friends;* Ukr. **розчищати** *дорогу –* En. **to clear** *the way;* Ukr. **зачиняти** *ящик –* En. **to close** *the box;* Ukr. **контролювати** *ринок –* En. **to command** *the market.*

The methodology for selecting synsemantic verbs was based on their syntagmatics, which dictionaries reproduce in one way or another. In addition, linguists widely used the elimination method to determine the degree of obligatoriness of elements in sentence structure. Synsemantic verbs were mainly selected from constructions representing the verbal type's two- and three-component semantic units: Ukr. *Максим з козаками* **досягнув** *берега і* **зайняв** *спуск до переправи* (Н. Рибак) – *досягнув* (чого?) *берега, зайняв* (що?) *спуск –* in two-part semantic units, we distinguish synsemantic verbs: *досягати займати*, укр. *Доки живі ще ваші матері, хай всі дороги вас до них* **приводять** (Г. Світлична) – in three-component semantic unity, we distinguish synsemantic verbs *приводити: хай приводять* (кого?) *вас* (до кого?) *до них.*

The analysis included Ukrainian and English synsemantic verbs. In syntagmatic analysis, these verbs revealed synsemantism, which was confirmed by their ability to form two- or one-part verbal sentences with a prepositional modifier: пор. укр. *Треба, щоб кожна людина твердо* **оцінювала** *свої* **сили**, **бачила** *свій* **ідеал** *наяву* (І. Цюпа); *З ярка* **чути** *було далекий* **шум**, *у ярках блукало сонце* (М. Хвильовий); **Дивиться** *мама крізь шибку* **в поле**; *буйну* **пшеницю косять** *комбайни* (А. Малишко); *Якщо* **чуєш жарт**, **шукай у ньому** *приховану* **правду** (О. Довженко) – synsemantic verbs *оцінювати, бачити, чути, дивитися, косити, шукати*, англ. *Historians once* **thought of the history** *of civilization as being* **limited to** *those* **areas** *whose influence* **spread to** *other* **areas**; *They* **offered us a lot of goods,** *delivery to be made in October; The government should not* **give money to the people**, *who already* **have money**, *I want* **to direct** *my* **efforts** *more* **towards** *my own* **projects** – synsemantic verbs *to think, to limit, to spread, to offer, to give, to have, to direct.*

Unlike the correlative synthetism of unarticulated procedural denotations that consistently accompany circumstantial names, in the synthetic forms of expression of a divided procedural denotatum, there are mandatory expanders of verbal names in both languages. In this case, we mainly form verbal-nominal (pronominal) or verbal-prepositional-nominal word combinations, which also reveal semantic-grammatical equivalence: Ukr. **псувати** *апетити* – En. *to spoil an appetite*; Ukr. **витримувати** *атаку* – En. *to stand an attack*; Ukr. **розклеювати** *оголошення* – En. **to stick** *advertisement*; Ukr. **включати** *насос* – En. **to start** *a pump*; Ukr. **розправляти** *крила* – En. **to stretch** *the wings*.

An analysis of synsemantic Ukrainian and English verbs revealed the presence of correlative synthetism in the systems of such verb groups. At the same time, it was found that this pattern of correlations is characteristic of verbs that express all three subcategories of the verb category «processuality»: «process-action» (Ukr. *змінювати* (що-н.) – En. *to change* (smth.); Ukr. *місити* (що-н.) – En. *to mix* (smth.); Ukr. *ховати* (що-н.) – En. *to hide* (smth.); Ukr. *закінчувати* (що-н.) – En. *to finish* (smth.)); «process-state» (Ukr. *турбувати* (кого-н.) – En. *to trouble* (smb.); Ukr. *заважати* (кому-н.) – En. *to disturb* (smb.); Ukr. *хвилювати* (кого-н.) – En. *to worry* (smb.)); «process-relation» (Ukr. *ставитися* (до кого-, чого-н. як-н.) – En. *to treat* (smb. somehow); Ukr. *стосуватися* (кого-, чого-н.) – En. *to concern* (smb.); Ukr. *відноситися* (до кого-, чого-н.) – En. *to refer* (smb. smth.).

We analyzed 740 English and 580 Ukrainian sentences with synsemantic verbs. The analysis revealed correlative synthetism in 532 Ukrainian and 410 English sentences with synsemantic verbs. For example, Ukr. *Їй довелося* **подолати** *багато* **перешкод**, *перш ніж вона* **досягла успіху** – En. *She had* **to overcome** *many* **obstacles** *before she* **achieved success;** Ukr. *Новина* **схвилювала мене** – En. *The news* **excited me.**

Accordingly, no signs of correlative synsemanticism were found in 208 Ukrainian and 170 English sentences with synsemantic verbs: : Ukr. *Його* **доправили на кораблі** *назад* **до Британії** – En. *He* **was shipped** *back* **to the UK**; Ukr. *Він* **надав дереву форми** – En. *He* **shaped a piece** *of wood*; Ukr. *Він* **веде радіопередачу** *щодня* – En. *He* **broadcasts** *daily;* Ukr. *Було надто мало води, щоб* **спустити корабель на воду.** – En. *There wasn't enough water* **to float the ship.**

Results. An analysis of the verbal systems of Ukrainian and English, based on Ukrainian-English and English-Ukrainian dictionaries, reveals the main correlative patterns in both languages verbal systems. These patterns are primarily traced in the lexical and grammatical features of the names of processes that each language describes.

A comparative analysis of individual verbs, verb series, and verb groups in Ukrainian and English, about their common tertium comparationis, has shown that

verbs have indicators of correlativity or non-correlativity. These indicators explain the standard and distinctive features of the compared units as parts of the grammatical structure of languages in general.

Formal manifestations of correlative relations in the verbal systems of Ukrainian and English reveal that correlative synthetism prevails. This grammatical phenomenon reproduces the denotative-ontological nature of procedural actions, states, and relations nominations.

Correlative synthetism permeates these verbal systems. In most cases, processual denotations in one language have single-word names in the other language. This suggests that correlative synthetism, based on the denotative-ontological nature of process nominations, is the foundation of correlativity and dominates other types of formal manifestations of correlative relations. In the verbal systems of compared languages, correlative synthetism reproduces the nature of language in its nominative function of designating actions, states, and relations between objects and phenomena. Verbal correlative synthetism is most transparently reproduced by pairs of autosemantic verbs, each of which nominates the corresponding denotatum with its phonemic composition within the verbal word form.

REFERENCES:

[1] Ділай, І. (2024). Дієслово в системі англійської мови. *Studia Methodologica*, (58), 27-35.
[2] Іваницька, Н.Б. (2011). Дієслівні системи української та англійської мов: парадигматика і синтагматика. Вінниця: СПД Главацька, 2011
[3] Іваницька, Н.Б. (2014). Зіставне мовознавство в системі лінгвістичних дисциплін. *Нова філологія* : зб. наук. праць., (64), 220-225.
[4] Ковтун, О.В. (2021). Контрастивна граматика оцінки: проблема тлумачення ключових термінів. *Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського. Серія: Філологія. Журналістика*, 32 (71), 150-167.
[5] Кочерган, М.П. (2006). Основи зіставного мовознавства: К.: Академія.
[6] Levin, B. (1993). English Verb Classes and Alternations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
[7] Potsdam, E. (2017). Syntactic Issues in the English Imperative. Routledge.
[8] Quiroz, B. Figueredo, C. (2021). From Grammar to Meaning. Cambridge University Press.
[9] Radford, A. (2016). Analysing English Sentences. Cambridge University Press.

SAVORING THE SIGNIFIER: LINGUISTIC INERTIA IN GASTRONOMIC NOMENCLATURE

Kateryna Lomazei[1]
Scientific supervisor: Oleksandr Gon[2]

---

1. Educational and Scientific Institute of International Relations
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, UKRAINE

2. Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Department of Foreign Languages
Educational and Scientific Institute of International Relations
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, UKRAINE
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0546-2899

A constant medium reflecting political changes, cultural upheavals, and societal changes is language. Yet as history reveals, despite its adaptability, it often conveys an unexpected inertia, particularly regarding well-known candidates firmly ingrained in global trade currents and collective consciousness. Within the framework of culinary nomenclature, this phenomenon is enhanced by the semiotic function of food as a marker of cultural heritage, where gastronomic terminology transcends mere descriptive utility to embody complex webs of collective memory, cultural authenticity, and economic identity [2]. Food names' linguistic crystallisation functions not only as lexical convenience but also as a storehouse of historical consciousness, maintaining within language structures the sedimentary layers of cultural interaction, colonial encounters, and commercial networks that have moulded our modern gastronomic scene.

Unlike an idealised *à la carte menu*, the world does not always offer us the luxury of choosing only what aligns with our current political or cultural preferences. From the perspective of linguistic analysis, can we demand that a centuries-old tradition instantly correct product names that have long become synonymous with a certain qualities simply because the geographical names from which they originate have undergone a transformation? This rhetorical question leads us to consider the intersection of linguistics, history and geopolitics, where ordinary names become artifacts testifying to the interplay between lexical longevity and sociopolitical shifts.

www. logos-science.com   **368**