MEANS AND METHODS OF OBJECTIZATION OF EMOTIONAL-EVALUATIVE SEMANTIC PLANS OF LEXICAL UNITS IN THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE

[a]NADIA BOYKO, [b]LIUDMYLA KOTKOVA, [c]OKSANA PRYKHODKO

[a]*Nizhyn State University named after Mikoli Gogol, 2, Grafska Str., 16611, Nizhyn, Ukraine*
[b]*Chernihiv Regional Institute of Postgraduate Pedagogical Education named after K. D. Ushinsky, 83, Slobidska Str., 14021, Chernihiv, Ukraine*
[c]*National Aviation University, 1, Lubomyra Huzara Ave., 03058, Kyiv, Ukraine*
email: [a]*bni_bni52@ukr.net*, [b]*kotkoval@ukr.net*,
[c]*oksana.prykhodko@npp.nau.edu.ua*

Abstract: The spectrum of emotional and axiological meaning plans of expressives is quite wide. It is based on the following main features of emotional lexical units that distinguish them from neutral lexical units: organic connection with non-verbal fragments of the national picture of the world; the impact of scientific and technical, socio-economic and cultural changes taking place in society; the primary role of the human factor; belonging to a specific lexical-semantic subsystems. Lexical expressions have a special status in the modeling of speech. Modern linguistics considers expressive vocabulary as a mandatory and important component of the system of expressive (figurative) means of texts. Lexical expressions take over the function of an intermediary between the denotative world (objective reality, the environment) and the inner world of a person, the range of his emotional states, intentions, between language and thinking. The analysis of lexical expressions through the prism of their stylistic functions in the structure of the text motivates the relevance of the proposed study. Its purpose is to reveal the stylistic functions of expressives in speech and in texts, to characterize the spectrum of emotional and evaluative semantic plans.

Keywords: Semantic plans, Emotional and evaluative components, Lexical units, Ukrainian language.

1 Introduction

Already at the beginning of the 19th century, V. von Humboldt focused the attention of linguists on the fact that language, as a result of active human activity, is thoroughly permeated with emotions, its sensory sphere and evaluative dimensions. The scientist characterized speech activity not only as a means of communication, mutual understanding, and information exchange, but also as a special and real world that combines external reality with internal intentions, psycho-emotional reactions and states, the entire inner world of a person [8]. However, for quite a long period, linguists did not pay due attention to the study of the means and methods of verbalization of the emotional and axiological spheres of human life, in particular, to the study of that subsystem of linguistic units that serve as means of expression, transmission, designation, and description of the inner world of a person. Means and methods of verbalization of sensory and axiological spheres of human activity have not been sufficiently researched until now, and the long-term ignoring of the problem by linguists, based on an anthropocentric approach to the study of linguistic phenomena, is rightly qualified as a "linguistic error" [15, p. 35]. Against the background of the development of psycholinguistics and modern war events in Ukraine, there is evident attention to studies devoted to the means and methods of verbalization of psycho-emotional reactions and states of a person, intra- and extra-lingual factors causing a departure from purely logical laws of speech activity, reorientation to the speech sphere, where sensory and axiological zones dominate. Emotive lexical units represent subjective vision, perception and ethnically motivated or individualized assessment of persons, any fragments of the environment. Modeling of emotive-evaluative meaning plans of lexemes correlates with the components of their semantic structures - denotative and connotative components, which is the basis for distinguishing proper nominative (neutral) and emotive-evaluative lexemes. All of the above motivates the relevance of the proposed article.

The representatives of the European Neo-Humboldtism (L. Weisgerber, G. Ipsen, P. Hartman, etc.) elaborated and continued the Humboldt' postulates. The beginning of the 20th century in foreign linguistics was marked by the development of a new direction called "idealistic linguistics" or "aesthetic school'. It envisaged an active study of the stylistic, expressive, and pictorial functions of language units at different levels, an emphasis on the dominance of the expressive and aesthetic functions of language in communicative activity, on the significance of the role of the human "spirit" in speech acts, in the processes of verbalization of the inner world of a person [5, p. 143].The emergence and development of the new direction is qualified as a peculiar reaction of its representatives (K. Fossler, the head of the aesthetic school, B. Croce, H. Hatzfeld, L. Spitzer, F. Schurr, etc.) to the insufficient attention of linguists to the problem of the human factor in speech activity personality and "shortcomings of the theoretical and practical activities of the young grammar school" [5, p. 143].

Anthropocentrism, which accumulated psycho-emotional, physical, sociological, cultural, and ethnic factors, actualized the discursive activity of the individual, which is in an inextricable connection with the surrounding world, fragments of the environment, language, time and space, became the basis of modern linguistic stylistic research. The anthropocentric approach actualized existential motives, focused on the individual who acts, reveals an individual worldview and understanding of the world, own emotions, feelings, assessments, and influences the course of events. The Ukrainian linguistic personality has a distinct Ukrainian-scientific worldview, national-cultural self-identification, and linguistic stability, which is reflected in the national linguistic picture of the world [6].

Functionalism became another important basic principle of linguistic stylistic studies. It actualized the study of linguistic phenomena "in the real time-space functioning of the language", made it possible to significantly deepen its knowledge and understanding through "additional stylistic nuances, connotations, meaning overtones, which are distinguished by linguistic signs, constitute an open system determined by the cultural and educational level of the speakers" [7, p. 25].

In modern linguistic-stylistic studies, emotionally valuable lexical units are qualified as a mandatory and important component of the system of expressive and figurative means of human speech activity in general and the speech of artistic and journalistic texts in particular. Emotionally valuable lexical units perform the function of an intermediary between the denotative world (objective reality) and the inner world of a person, the range of his sensory intentions, states, and axiological dimensions; between language and emotions [2, p. 27].

The problems and peculiarities of the functioning of the Ukrainian emotive-evaluative (expressive) vocabulary in artistic contexts were reflected in the works of I. Hrytsyutenko, S. Yermolenko, V. Ilyin, V. Kalashnyk, M. Kochergan, A. Moysienko, L. Pustovit, N. Sologub, L. Stavytska, V. Chabanenko, I. Cherednychenko, and other scientists; however, the problems of lexical semantics - modeling, verbalization and objectification of emotive-evaluative meaning plans of lexical units in the Ukrainian language - have been on the periphery of linguistic-stylistic scientific studies for a long time.

The modern stage of the development of Ukrainian linguistic thought is marked by the shift of the focus of research attention from traditional approaches to the problems of the intersection of the spheres of scientific knowledge with ethnopsychology, psycholinguistics, linguistic culture, etc., related to linguistics (works by S. Yermolenko, V. Zhaivoronka, O. Selivanova, etc.).

In the works of the Polish linguist Vezhbitska, the study of the verbalization of the category of emotionality through the prism of the analysis of emotional concepts is updated. Currently, single emotional concepts and their opposing pairs are actively being studied on the material of many languages. Ukrainian

linguists have proposed actual ways of categorizing emotional reactions and states of a person, his inner intentions, ethnically marked axiological dimensions of fragments of the national picture of the world, and are implementing various aspects of scientific research on the material of Slavic and non-Slavic languages. Among them, linguistic and cultural (S. Yermolenko, V. Zhaivoronok, I. Golubovska, Zh. Kolois, M. Bagan, etc.), semantic (O. Taranenko, T. Kosmeda, N. Boyko, O. Borisov, L. Kotkova et al.), psycholinguistic (V. Zhaivoronok, O. Selivanova, T. Kosmeda, etc.), functional (N. Guyvanyuk, V. Kalashnyk, O. Taranenko, A. Moisienko, V. Chabanenko, T. Khomych and etc.) approaches are distinguished. The expressive potential of phraseological units as verbalizers of emotional reactions and human states, a number of axiological opposites of phrases (Y. Pradid, M. Gamzyuk, G. Demydenko, etc.), tropes as representatives of emotional semantic plans (V. Kalashnyk, O. Taranenko, A. Moysienko, L. Kravets, etc.), emotional and sensory semantic components in the structure of a lexical unit (O. Taranenko, N. Boyko, T. Khomych), and others are revealed and tracked.

The purpose of the article is to reveal the specificity of means and methods of objectification of emotional and evaluative semantic plans of lexical units in the Ukrainian language.

2 Materials and Method

In the research, philosophy and psychology are defined as the main methodological principles, which are distinguished in modern linguistic stylistics. They are based on postulates formulated by scientists: 1) "knowledge of a certain people through its language, and knowledge and understanding of a language through knowledge of its creator and bearer - the people" [18, p. 348]; 2) Ch. Stevenson saw the specificity of axiological meaning in the use of language signs with a specific purpose; their dominant function is to influence the addressee, to cause different psychological reactions in him [17, p. 129]; 3) "when talking about anything, a person involuntarily talks about himself" [13, p. 715].

During the research, a complex of methods and techniques was used, the choice of which was determined by the subject of scientific analysis and the set tasks. In order to determine the key concepts of emotional and axiological semantics, a systematic review of linguistic scientific literature devoted to the linguistics of emotions, psycholinguistic analysis of the semantics of lexical units, and functional aspects of the studied material was carried out. The main scientific propositions are summarized on the basis of an interdisciplinary approach to the analysis of emotional and axiological semantics of lexical units, in the context of the theory of the linguistics of emotions and from the point of view of the dominance of the expressive function in the speech activity of communicators.

In the process of analysis, the method of linguistic observation was used - to determine the language level (phonetic, morpheme, morphological, lexical, semantic, syntactic, stylistic - word level or text level) of objectification of emotional and evaluative semantic plans of lexical units; the method of definitional analysis, which involves the detection of: 1) the composition of lexemes, which contain information about emotional reactions and states of a person in their dictionary interpretation; 2) classes of words with lexicographically fixed emosemes and axiosemes in the semantic structures of lexical units; 3) thematic groups of lexemes with explicit/implicit actualization of emosems and axiosems of positive or negative semantic plans in a specific dictionary definition; finding out whether emosemes and axiosemes are recorded in the definitions of direct or figurative meanings; whether cases of contextual modeling of emotive-evaluative semantic plans of lexical units are confirmed in explanatory dictionaries (in dictionary definitions of lexemes, etc.); descriptive method (to characterize the specificity of means and methods of objectification of emotional and axiological semantic plans of lexical units of the Ukrainian language); method of component analysis (to identify the features of the semantic structures of lexical units containing emotional and

evaluative components (sems) in a dominant position); method of contextual analysis (to determine methods of modeling emotional and evaluative semantic plans in usually neutral (inexpressive) words under the influence of connections, unexpected combinations with lexemes of other ranks within specially organized contexts), elements of quantitative analysis, etc.

The research is based on factual material collected from explanatory dictionaries of the Ukrainian language, artistic works of Ukrainian writers of different time limits, in particular, contexts that contain lexical units with expressive formally expressed (explicit) and internal emotional and axiological semantics, have specific means of verbalizing emotions and the axiom and factors contributing to the contextual objectification of the connotative components of the semantic structures of lexemes.

3 Results and Discussion

One of the key propositions that dominates Vezhbytska's concept of emotionality is the thesis about the probability of establishing connections between language and the national character of an individual. The researcher takes as a basis the reproduction of the inner world of a person, proposes to reveal its features based on the specificity of the national linguistic picture of the world [19, p. 293]. In this context, we note that in the functioning of the Ukrainian language in recent decades, there have been changes of a communicative and pragmatic nature, which led to the strengthening of the psychological rejection of the "wooden" ("oak") language (langue de bois), its clichés and rational standards. As a result, there is activation and replenishment of the stock of different levels of emotional and evaluative (expressive) tools, which have always been considered representatives of such important features of the Ukrainian mentality as emotionality, humor, a somewhat ironic view of oneself and life. Over the centuries, these features have performed a "kind of rescue-healing function" (V. Rusanivskyi), contributed to improving and maintaining the nation's mental health.

The objectification of emotive-evaluative semantic plans of lexemes can be observed at different levels of the language system - phonetic, morpheme (word-forming), morphological, lexical, semantic, syntactic, stylistic, at the level of the sentence and at the level of the text.

The methods (mechanisms) that ensure the realization of emotive-evaluative values of lexical units of the Ukrainian language are based primarily on phonetic, morphemic (word-forming) and lexical-semantic contrasts. They are the result of comparison of materially expressed (formal) indicators (means) or contextually determined emotional and evaluative meaning plans of lexemes with their neutral counterparts. For emotionally and evaluatively marked lexical units, a violation of the phonetic laws of the Ukrainian language is characteristic: the lack of balance between vowels and consonants, their repetitions and specific combinations that ensure the unusualness (expressiveness) of the sound design of the word. The unusual sound (phonetic objectification of emotionally and evaluatively marked semantic plans) of lexical units actualizes a number of basic (key) sems: 'emotionality', 'valuability' (kowtyoba, chalamidnyk, khalepa, khaltura, pribambasy, shusyukati, mymryty, burkotaty, varnyakati) (*pharynx, tramp, trouble, hack, gadgets, lisp, mutter, purr, snarl*) and auxiliaries: "figurativeness" (*soldafonskyi, vidmuvaty, vidbrykuvatysia-* to refuse something) (*martinet, witching, kicking*); "intensity" of a sign or action (talalai, babakhnuti, lushparyty, tarabanyty) (*bang, peel, rattle*), etc.

Traditionally, in the Ukrainian ethnic consciousness, the following sounds are considered as "unpleasant": 1) consonants [x], [ш], [ж], which associatively explain the basic connotative semes- 'emotionality' and 'appreciation' with a minus sign: *хавчати, хакати, халабуда, халупа, хам, хамаркати, хамло, хамлюга, хандра, харамаркати, харапудитися, харциз,*

хверцювати, хвиськати, хвища, хвойда, хиряк, хлистати, хлюст, хлющати, хльорка, хльосткий, хмикати, хникати, хоркати, хтокало; шамкати, шамотіти, шварготіти, швиргати, шарахатися, шваби (німці), шпиняти, шкабарчати, шарлатан, шарпак, шахрай, швендя, шпацірувати, шекерявити, нишпорка, etc. (khavchaty, khakaty, khalabuda, khalupa, kham, khamarkaty, khamlo, khamliuha, khandra, kharamarkaty, kharapudytysia, khartsyz, khvertsiuvaty, khvyskaty, khvyshcha, khvoida, khyriak, khlystaty, khliust, khliushchaty, khlorka, khlostkyi, khmykaty, khnykaty, khorkaty, khtokalo; shamkaty, shamotity, shvarhotity, shvyrhaty, sharakhatysia, shvaby (nimtsi), shpyniaty, shkabarchaty, sharlatan, sharpak, shakhrai, shvendia, shpatsiruvaty, shekeriavyty, nyshporka); 2) combination of "unpleasant" consonants with "unpleasant" vowels [u], [y], [e] (according to V. Levytskyi): *жеboniти, жевжик, жевжикуватий, живодер, живоїд, живолуп, житуха, жерти, хиряк, відчикрижити, шугати, шельма, жеретія, чикилдиха (горілка), хильнути* (zhebonite, zhevzhik, zhevzhikutii, zhivoder, zhivoder, zhivolup, zhituha, zherty, hiryak, odchykryzhity, shugat, shelma, zheretiya (a viper that climbs trees), chikildiha (vodka), khylnuti); 3) repetition of the same syllables: *абракадабра, бабахати (бабахнути, бабахнутися), бебехнути (бебехнутися), видовище, гергепа, цигикати, хихикати, довгоголовий, змикутити, викараскатися, гоготати (to laugh loudly, uncontrollably), вишпетити (swear a lot), затирити, нашкварювати, ошалапутити (to deceive), канюка, нерозторопний, потирити (bear), талалай, таратайка, татарва, татакати, тинятися, тутукати, розкокошитися (begin to show ridiculous arrogance, hot temper; to heat up), розкумекувати, тарарам (quarrel scandal), прибамбаси, улюлюкати, утирити (to sreal), утиритися, тетеріти (to be suddenly embarrassed, confused), ошелешений, чимчикувати, шушукатися* (abrakadabra, babakhaty (babakhnuty, babakhnutysia), bebekhnuty (bebekhnutysia), vydovyshche, herhepa, tsyhykaty, khykhykaty, dovhoholovyi, zmykytyty, vykaraskatysia, hohotaty, vyshpetyty, zatyryty, nashkvariuvaty, oshalaputyty, kaniuka, neroztoropnyi, potyryty, talalai, tarataika, tatarva, tatakaty, tyniatysia, tutukaty, rozkokoshytysia, rozkumekuvaty, tararam, prybambasy, uliuliukaty, utyryty, utyrytysia, teterity, osheleshenyi, chymchykuvaty, shushukatysia); 4) repetition of one consonant in combination with different vowels: *вибевкати, втелющитися, гателити (engorge), гуготіти, гугнити, зазіхати, збабіти, зверзти (to say nonsense), чучверіти (to become clumsy, crusty, rough)* (vybevkaty, vteliushchytysia, hatelyty, huhotity, huhnyty, zazikhaty, zbabity, zverzty, chuchverity); 5) repetition of one vowel in combination with different consonants: *агакало, балагурити, баламут, барахло, валандатися (to walk idly, loiter), втелепати (to understand), втеребити (to insert), галакати (to speak loudly), гороїжитися* (ahakalo, balahuryty, balamut, barakhlo, valandatysia, vtelepaty, vterebyty, halakaty, horoizhytysia); 6) the presence of "unpleasant" consonant compounds in the phonetic design of the word, which are associatively connected with the pejorative meaning of the lexical unit.Sound combinations with the vibrant [r] and sound combinations: [br] - *рашист, бракороб, бренькати, бабратися (to do something slowly), брехати, бридкий, бридота, бришкати (to behave swaggeringly; brag, boast); брутальний, бряжчати (to play a musical instrument clumsily or carelessly), брязнути (to throw with force, hitting something,* etc. (rashyst, brakorob, brenkaty, babratysia, brekhaty, brydkyi, brydota, bryshkaty; brutalnyi, briazhchaty, briaznuty); [dr]: *дразливий, драконівський, драла (швидко тікати куди-небудь), драб (діал. обідранець, босяк), драпати (швидко відступати, залишати яку-небудь територію), драпіжка (здирство, грабіжництво), дрейфити (боятися труднощів, небезпеки; лякатися, розгублюватися), дременути, дренчати(дренькати), дренькіт, дризнути (швидко побігти, утекти або сильно вдарити кого-небудь), дріботіти (говорити дуже швидко, скоромовкою),* etc. (drazlyvyi, drakonivskyi, drala, drab, drapaty, drapizhka, dreifyty, dremenuty, drenchaty (drenkaty), drenkit, dryznuty, dribotity).

Thematically, ignoring sound aesthetics and the experience of perceiving the unpleasantness of lexical units in the Ukrainian language is recorded in the phonetic forms of words that convey deviations from normative speech or reproduce sound effects accompanying walking, certain dynamic, sudden (unpredictable, unexpected) movements, actions, etc.: *бовкати, булькати, бурчати, варнякати, гарикати, гаркавити, гугнявити, джеркотати, дзенькати, бевкати, жеботіти, гелготати, лящати, мурмотати, мурмотіти, ляскати, мимрити, миркати, тріскотіти, харамаркати; чалапати, шкандибати, човгати, шастати, дотарабанити (to reach), брьохатися; гехати, гатити, хльостати, ляскати, бебехнути (throw with force), бемкати, беркицати (suddenly fall, overturning), бехати (to fall hardly; to hit hard), to roar (quickly move forward), хлопати, брязкати, бацати, чвакати, цмакати, теленькати, дзенькати,* etc. (bovkaty, bulkaty, burchaty, varniakaty, harykaty, harkavyty, huhniavyty, dzherkotaty, dzenkaty, bevkaty, zhebonity, gelgotaty, liashchaty, murmotaty, murmotity, liaskaty, mymryty, myrkaty, triskotity, kharamarkaty; chalapaty, shkandybaty, chovhaty, shastaty, dotarabanyty, brokhatysia; hekhaty, hatyty, khlostaty, liaskaty, bebekhnuty, bemkaty, berkytsaty, bekhaty, khlopaty, briazkaty, batsaty, chvakaty, tsmakaty, telenkaty, dzenkaty).

An indicator of phonetic objectification of emotional and evaluative meaning plans of lexical units can also be their novelty, exoticism (often in combination with foreign phonetic design) and even the incomprehensibility of the meaning for individual speakers of the language in a certain period of its development: *consulting, broker, establishment, impeachment, teenager, distributor*, etc. Let us compare with Stevenson's thoughts: "Sounding a word by itself can physiologically be able to express certain emotions, and this supports the skills formed in the process of use" [17, p. 130].

The phonetic objectification of emotional and evaluative meaning plans of lexical units is traced in artistic contexts, which are characterized by the use of sound symbolism. Its emergence is due to the interaction of different types of sensations -acoustic, motor, visual, etc.: *"Гармидер, галас, гам у гаї"* "Harmider, clamor, hum in the grove" (T. Shevchenko); *"Чути: кру! кру! кру! В чужині умру,/ Заки море перелечу,/ Крилонька зітру"* "Hear: cool! cool! cool! I will die in a foreign country,/ I will fly across the sea,/ I will destroy my wing" – the vowel U is a symbol of death, grief (B. Lepky); *"Осінній день, осінній день, осінній! О синій день, о синій день, о синій! Осанна осені, о сум! Осанна. Невже це осінь, осінь, о! – та сама"* "Autumn day, autumn day, autumn day! Oh blue day, oh blue day, oh blue! Hosanna to autumn, oh sadness! Hosanna Is it autumn, autumn, oh! - the same" (L. Kostenko).

Similar to sound-symbolic words in terms of their functional load, in artistic contexts, there are onomatopoeic lexemes and exclamation derivatives, which also appear as atypical, unusual against the background of neutral-nominative (phonetically unmotivated) *кудкудакати, нявкати, кахкати, кишкати, тпруськати (drive the cat away), рохкати, хрюкати, цявкати, айкати, агакати, гейкати, гетькати, пхекати, тюкати, окати, фукати, акати, ехати, говкати, кукукати, нумкати, собкати,* etc. (kudkudakaty, niavkaty, kakhkaty, kyshkaty, tpruskaty, rokhkaty, khriukaty, tsiavkaty, aikaty, ahakaty, heikaty, hetkaty, pkhekaty, tiukaty, okaty, fukaty, akaty, ekhaty, hovkaty, kukukaty, numkaty, sobkaty): *"Ось не мамай мені над душею"* "Don't worry about my soul!" (Ostap Vishnya); *"Не татуй, коли старші говорять"* "Don't touch when elders speak" (M. Stelmakh); *"Ухрюкалась [fed up] мені ваша ферма!"* "I'm fed up with your farm!" (Oles Gonchar), let us compare it with the dialectal *ухоркатися* (to get tired) (ukhorkatysia) (get tired).

Thus, the specificity of phonetic means of objectification of emotional and evaluative semantic plans of lexical units in the Ukrainian language consists in the violation of established norms and ways of sound design of the word, in ignoring the phonetic laws of the Ukrainian language (lack of melodious balancing of

vowels and consonants, their repetitions and atypical combinations), which gives rise to the sound unusualness (expressiveness) of the lexical unit. The objectification of emotionally and evaluatively marked semantic plans of lexical units involves matching the specific sound of the word-sign (sound complex) with the specificity of its semantic structure, with the dominance of the connotative component and its basic components - evaluative and emotive semes, often with a distinct actualization of imagery, intensity, parametricity, etc.

Active materially expressed (formal) indicators (means) of objectification of emotional and evaluative semantic plans of lexical units in the Ukrainian language include the morphemic (word-forming) level. Structural motivators serve as word-forming markers of emotive-evaluative lexical units and their semantic plans: the use of emotive-evaluative creative bases, subjective evaluation affixes, modification and transformation of phraseological units, and the creation of emotive-evaluative composites based on them, modeling of a specific category of lexical units - individually - author's occasionalisms, which with their formal innovation serve as a contrast to the usual neutral lexical units.

The works of O. Bezpoyasko, K. Horodenska, V. Hrestchuk, A. Hryshchenko, N. Klymenko, I. Kovalik, K. Lenets, L. Rodnina, H. Sagach, G. Semirenko, V. Tokar, V. Khristenok and other scientists are devoted to the study of means and methods of word formation in Ukrainian linguistics. The attention of linguists is primarily focused on the study of neutral (non-expressive) lexemes of various linguistic affiliations. Regarding the expressive means of word formation, it was found that the main attention of scientists was focused on the analysis of subjectively marked units of the suffix system of the Ukrainian language. Characterization of the productivity of suffixes that form ethnically marked augmentatives and diminutives, which with the development of emotional and evaluative semantic plans "grow into names of subjective evaluation", was carried out [13, p. 184]. However, emotional and evaluative semantic plans can also manifest as multi-structural lexical units, which are the result of the interaction of different word-formation methods, word-formation types and their models. Suffixes of subjective assessment, which contain semes of positive/negative emotional-evaluative characteristics (as well as neutral ones) belong to closed classes. The mentioned formants are combined with the creative bases of almost all meaningful parts of speech, explicating a fairly developed system of creating emotional and evaluative semantic plans of lexemes that serve as a means of expressing artistic contexts: "*Вона білобрисенька, носик у неї гудзиком, ноженятка у волохатенькихчеревиках.* "She is white-haired, her nose is a button, a little girl in hairy shoes..." (Ostap Vyshnya); "*Нічогенька пара?*" "Not a good couple?" (Oles Honchar); "*…щеміло там щось на самісінькому дні*", "*А дівуля, дівчинина, дівувальниця/ До кожуха, кожушенька так і горнеться,/ А бабуля, бабулиня, бабусенція/ До дівчиська, дівчиниська так і тулиться /– Сиротина ж, сиротуля, сиропташечка, Бабумамія, бабутатко, бабусонечко...*" "...there was something pinched at the very bottom" (Gr. Tyutyunnik); "And a girl, a virgin/ To a coat, a coat, and so on,/ And a grandmother, a grandmother, a grandmother/ To a girl, a girl, and huddles / - Orphan, orphan, Grandmother, grandmother, grandmother" (I. Drach); "*Коло тебенько я – дивись*" "I'm around you - look..." (M. Vingranovskyi), "*…від грязюки своєї, злодюги, і в ванні не відмиєтесь*" "... you can't wash yourself off your mud, you villain, even in the bath" (Oles Honchar).

Means of word-forming objectification of emotional-evaluative semantic plans of lexemes are: 1) emotional-evaluative creative basis (word): *барахольник, баляндрасник, бахурка, зажера, зануда,спесивець, привереда, перебреха* (barakholnyk, baliandrasnyk, bakhurka, zazhera, zanuda, spesyvets, pryvereda, perebrekha), etc.; 2) a single subjectively marked affix or a combination of several affixes, among which there is also an emotionally evaluative one: *бабій, лобур, бородай (-ань, -ач), хвостисько (-ичок, -ище, -яга, -яка, -яра), офіцерня, хитрун (-уха, -як, -ячок), ділок, літечко, живесенький, політикан,*

тихоня, дрімайло,кучерявенький, жовтісінький, частісінький, їстоньки (babii, lobur, borodai (-an, -ach), khvostysko (-ychok, -yshche, -yaha, -yaka, -yara), ofitsernia, khytrun (-ukha, -yak, -yachok), dilok, litechko, zhyvesenkyi, politykan, tykhonia, drimailo, kucheriavenkyi, zhovtisinkyi, chastisinkyi, yistonky), etc., 3) *белькотун (-уха), бовкун, брехач (-ун, -уха), бандюга, неотеса, верескун (-уха), харцизяка, мордань, нездарисько, свинтус* (від свиня 2) *підлизень, шкапійка* (від шкапа), *паршивенький, кицюнька, теребій, фіфочка, чванько, шмаркач, цяцінька* (від *цяця 3*) (belkotun (-ukha), bovkun, brekhach (-un, -ukha), bandiuha, neotesa, vereskun (-ukha), khartsyziaka, mordan, nezdarysko, svyntus (vid svynia 2), pidlyzen, shkapiika (vid shkapa), parshyvenkyi, kytsiunka, terebii, fifochka, chvanko, shmarkach, tsiatsinka (vid tsiatsia 3), etc.

The specific status in the Ukrainian language belongs to the ancient, but quite active and distinctive in terms of emotional and evaluative dimensions subcategory of diminutiveness (smallness). Although manifestations of diminutiveness can be traced in all Slavic languages, its objectification in them is far from the same, since the functional orientation of diminutive formations is determined not by communicative needs, but by expressive and figurative ones, which directly depends "on the peculiarities of the national-psychic composition of the speakers of one or another languages" [12, p. 34]. This is represented by the materials of bilingual dictionaries, which record the quantitative advantage of Ukrainian words with diminutive-ameliorative suffixes compared, for example, to Russian ones. Thus, one lexeme of the Russian language "rebenochek" (a child) in the dictionary corresponds to nine Ukrainian ones (*дитинка, дитиночка, дитинонька, дитинча, дитинчатко, дитиня, дитинятко, немовлятко,* figurative *лялечка*) (dytynka, dytynochka, dytynonka, dytyncha, dytynchatko, dytynia, dytyniatko, nemovliatko, figurative lialechka) [14, vol. 3, p. 183], and five Russian *мальчик, мальчишка, мальчонка, мальчонок, мальчуган* (malchyk, malchyshka, malchonka, malchonok, malchuhan) correspond to fourteen Ukrainian [14, vol. 1, p. 650–651]. The eleven-volume dictionary records even more - eighteen (*хлопійко, хлопцюга, хлопча, хлопчак, хлопчатко, хлопченя, хлопчик, хлопчина, хлопчинка, хлопчисько, хлопчичок, хлопчище, хлоп'я, хлоп'яга, хлоп'як, хлоп'ятко, хлоп'яточко, хлопак*) (khlopiiko, khloptsiuha, khlopcha, khlopchak, khlopchatko, khlopchenia, khlopchyk, khlopchyna, khlopchynka, khlopchysko, khlopchychok, khlopchyshche, khlopia, khlopiaha, khlopiak, khlopiatko, khlopiatochko, khlopak) [14, vol. 11, p. 84–86]. The given examples prove that the Ukrainian language has an exceptionally rich system of word-forming means - formal (mainly suffixal) verbalizers of emotional-evaluative semantic plans of lexical units - to reveal the subtlest emotional-sensual states of a person, emotional-evaluative intentions of the speaker and their objectification.

It is important to note that even when diminutive formations are used to verbalize and convey the physical smallness of a thing (used in an objective-distinguishing function), they become a means of actualizing anthropological coordinates, imply taking into account subjective factors, because it is common knowledge that "small is characteristic to be nice" (Sh. Balli).

The analysis of the actual material proved that the diminutive-ameliorative suffixes usually serve as single markers of the emotive-evaluative semantic plans of lexemes, combining with neutral creative bases: *звісточка, сонечко, місяченько, деньок* (zvistochka, sonechko, misiachenko, denok) (news, sun, moon, day). Diminutive-ameliorative suffixes are able not only to give neutral creative bases positive semantic shades, but also to influence the semantic structures of lexemes with an emotive-evaluative creative base, participating in the modification ("improvement" or "deterioration") of the semantic plans of lexemes. "Improvement" was observed in the cases of the combination of a diminutive-ameliorative suffix with a negative-evaluative creative base: *воріженьки, мордочка, типик, брехунець, наругонька, неволенька, негодонька, пузанчик* (contemptuous *купчик*), *інтрижка, поганенький, поганесенький, паскудненький* (vorizhenky, mordochka, typyk,

brekhunets, naruhonka, nevolenka, nehodonka, puzanchyk (contemptuous kupchyk), intryzhka, pohanenkyi, pohanesenkyi, paskudnenkyi), etc. Accordingly, "deterioration" is revealed in the semantic structures of lexemes with neutral (often abstract) creative bases, to which diminutive-ameliorative suffixes are attached: *теорійка, ідейка, поезійка, проблемка, темка, рішенець, статейка,землячок, царики, народець, писарець*(teoriika, ideika, poeziika, problemka, temka, rishenets, stateika, zemliachok, tsaryky, narodets, pysarets), etc. ("*читають рішенець, і Гнат дізнається, що його засуджено на заслання в Сибір*" "...the verdict is read, and Hnat learns that he has been sentenced to exile in Siberia" (M. Kotsyubynskyi).

Therefore, the diminutive-ameliorative suffixes of the Ukrainian language reveal a particularly wide range of emotional and evaluative meaning plans of lexemes. In artistic, journalistic contexts, oral speech, they usually explicate the semes connotations: kindness, tenderness, affection, sympathy, as well as contempt, irony, etc. Specially organized contexts reveal the ambivalent status of diminutive-ameliorative formants as part of lexical units.

Derived lexical units with augmentative-pejorative suffixes testify to an equally developed system of suffixes that explain the connotative semes: rudeness, contempt, etc. Emotionally and evaluatively marked formants provide negative characteristics of fragments of the environment, emotional-evaluative conclusions about persons or objects not directly, but only by interacting with creative bases.

The specificity of augmentative-pejorative formants of the Ukrainian language is in their emotional and evaluative diversity. Thus, the formants *-ak, -yak, -chak* provide the characteristics of a person, often expressing disapproval (*дивак, пияк*) (dyvak, pyiak) (weird, drunkard) and irony (*слизняк*) (slyzniak) (slug), and only occasionally the suffix *-yak* expresses approval (*добряк*) (dobryak) (kind). A number of formants together with the corresponding creative bases model an unfavorable characteristic of a person by action: *-ун (літун), -як (пияк), -ляк (кривляк), -ник (бабник)* (-un (litun), -yak (pyiak), -liak (kryvliak), -nyk (babnyk)) (with a hint of contempt). The formant *-ун* ensures the formation of emotional and evaluative names of persons according to internal and external characteristic features: *дикун, сліпун, товстун, коротун; -ил-о* (dykun, slipun, tovstun, korotun; -yl-o) - only on the outside - *здоровило*(zdorovylo) (healthy). The suffix *-ець*(-ets) serves as a companion for neutral meanings (*українець, борець, хлопець*) (ukrainets, borets, khlopets) (Ukrainian, fighter, guy), as well as ironic (*характерець, бабець*) (kharakterets, babets) (character, woman) and derogatory (*спесивець*) (spesivets) (angry). The combination of the formant *-ець*(-ets) with the corresponding creative bases actualizes semes 'approval', 'admiration' (*молодець*) (molodets) (well done). The mentioned suffix takes part in the modeling of emotional and evaluative names of persons according to a certain characteristic feature, peculiarities of behavior and relations between subjects: *безумець, задрипанець, плаксивець, скупець, ревнивець* (bezumets, zadrypanets, plaksyvets, skupets, revnyvets), etc. The formant *-ач* (-ach) together with the creative base ensures the formation of negative evaluative values - internal (*рвач*) and external (*носач*) features of a person. The pejorative color also has the suffix *-ил (о)* (-il (o)) (*здоровило*). The formants *-ук (-юк), -ул-я (юл-я)* – (uk (-yuk), -ul-ya (yul-ya)) participate in the reproduction of both positive and negative characteristics of a person (*гарнюк, чистюк, чистюля; старук, кривуля* (harniuk, chystiuk, chystiulia; staruk, kryvulia)). The augmentative-pejorative suffixes *-аш, -он* (-ash, -on) ensure the creation of a negative qualification of the subject by type of activity (*торгаш, солдафон*) (torhash, soldafon). The formants -уг(а), -юг(а), -аг(а), -яг(а) (-uh(a), -yuh(a), -ah(a), -yah(a)) manifest distinctly pejorative emotional and evaluative meanings (*вовцюга, панюга, бандюга, злодюга, босяцюга*) (vovtsiuha, paniuha, bandiuha, zlodiuha, bosiatsiuha). In combination with pejorative creative bases, they intensify their semantics, conveying condemnation, disdain for a person (*ледарюга, хамлюга, п'янюга*) (ledariuha, khamliuha, pianiuha). These formants are

characterized by the modeling of enlarged and coarsened semantic plans of lexemes that name animals, etc. The suffixes -*уган, -юган*(-ugan, -yugan) strengthen the meaning of disapproval of a person (*дідуган*) (didugan) or a fragment of the environment (*вітрюган*) (vitryugan), model the coarse-pejorative semantics of lexical units. The formants *-ан, -ань, -ень*(-an, -an, -en) serve as means of objectifying the negative characteristics of persons based on age, appearance, and mental abilities (*стариган, здорованъ, окань, дурень*) (staryhan, zdorovan, okan, duren); *-ур(а), -юр(а)* (-ur(a), -yur(a)) combine the semantics of objective increase with a negative evaluation (*собацюра, носюра*) (sobatsiura, nosiura), represent the sharply revealed semantics of rudeness and contempt (*босяцюра*) (bosiatsiura), sometimes reveal an ironic-humorous emotional semantic plan (*німчура, піхтура*) (nimchura, pikhtura) and gravitate towards colloquial language, giving neutral bases (roots) distinct shades of coarseness.

Individual pejorative lexemes with this suffix have a number of counterparts, represented by synonymous co-root models with other formants: *псюра – псяра – псюка – псюга – псяка, босяцюра – босяцюга* (psyura – psyara – psyuka – psyuga – psyaka, bosyatsyura – bosyatsyuga), etc. The suffix *-ій* (-iy)can be combined with both neutral formatives (*водій, колій*) (vodiy, koliy) and provide modeling of emotional and evaluative meaning plans, carrying out explication: pampering, humiliation (*матій*), lack or insufficient literacy (*грамотій*), negative social characteristics of persons (*крадій, вертій*). The formants *-ай, -яй* (-ai, -yai) take part in the modeling of negative evaluativeness *–горлай* (horlay). A high degree of functional activity is inherent to the suffix *-иськ(о)* (-ysk(o)), which, in combination with creative bases, conveys: a) a disapproving assessment of persons - *хлопчисько, чоловічисько, дідисько, паписько, нездарисько* (khlopchysko, cholovichysko, didysko, panysko, nezdarysko); b) the increased pejorative meaning of the general plan *-кабанисько, окунисько, сомисько, чоботисько, зборисько, туманисько, вітрисько*(kabanysko, okunysko, somysko, chobotysko, zborysko, tumanysko, vitrysko). Connecting with the foundations (roots) of abstract semantics, the analyzed formant appears as an active means of creating a coarse and pejorative evaluation - *сміховисько, посміховисько, страмовисько, стидовисько* (compare with neutral*пасовисько, житнисько*) (smikhovysko, posmikhovysko, stramovysko, stydovysko).

Feminine nouns with augmentative-pejorative suffixes combine the semantics of coarseness (enlargement) with a pejorative evaluation and explain a familiar-disparaging attitude to the subject of thought. This semantic and word-forming group is represented by the following formants: *-ух(а), -юх(а) – балакуха, -ах(а) – рибаха, -ук(а), -юк(а) – холодюка, грязюка, зміюка, -их(а) – мниха, -омах(а) – грудомаха, -щин(а) – літературщина, -аці(я)* (передає іронію) – *мудрація, -ек(а) – пащека, -енці(я) – штукенція, ег(а) – торбега, -ері(я) – машинерія, -неч(а) – гуркотнеча, -отн(я) – гуркотня, -отняв(а) – гуркотнява, -анин (а) – гупанина, -лів-+-к* (-ukh(a), -yukh(a) – balakukha, -akh(a) – rybakha, -uk(a), -yuk(a) – kholodiuka, hriaziuka, zmiiuka, -ykh(a) – mnykha, -omakh(a) – hrudomakha, -shchyn(a) – literaturshchyna, -atsi(ia) (peredaie ironiiu) – mudratsiia, -ek(a) – pashcheka, -entsi(ia) – shtukentsiia, eh(a) – torbeha, -eri(ia) – mashyneriia, -nech(a) – hurkotnecha, -otn(ia) – hurkotnia, -otniav(a) – hurkotniava, -anyn (a) – hupanyna, -liv-+-k) (indicates the result of an action that does not meet the social norm, standard) *–зрівнялівка* (zrivnialivka), etc.

Nouns of the common gender (feminine-masculine) with augmentative-pejorative suffixes usually provide negative characteristics of persons. The negative semantics of increase with a familiar-disparaging shade is provided by creative bases combined with formants: *-ак(а), -як(а): гуляка, задавак, мордяка, влодияка, кривлака* (-ak(a), -yak(a): huliaka, zadavak, mordiaka, vlodyaka, kryvlaka). The connotation with the "minus" sign has a rather wide amplitude- from disapproval (*-с (а) – плакса, рюмса*) ((-s (a) – plaksa, riumsa)) to contempt and irony (*-ош(а) – святоша* (-osh(a) – sviatosha) (pretend-pious,

hypocritical-righteous person). Only the formant *-яг(а)*(- yag(а)) combined ameliorative (*роботяга, добряга, скромняга, бідняга*(robotiayga, dobriyaga, skromniayga, bidniayaga) (sympathetically)) and pejorative (*бродяга*(brodiyaga) (with a tone of disapproval), *діляга*(dilyaga) (with a tone of contempt) evaluations. The participation of suffixes in the formation of negative emotional and evaluative semantic plans of lexemes implies: 1) the possibility of being combined only with certain evaluative bases and 2) the specificity of their phonetic design: -*юг(а) – жаднюга, хитрюга, п'янюга; -юк(а) – злюка; -ох(а) – забрьоха, -уд(а) – зануда, -ур(а), -юр(а) – замазура, -ендр(а) – скупендра, -индр(а) – скупиндра, -инд(я) – скупиндя, -ендряг(а) – скупендряга, -ердяг(а) – скупердяга, -ердяк(а) – скупердяка, -ос(а) – нечоса, -іс(а) – гульвіса, -ес(а) – неотеса, -іп(а) – гультіпа, -ох(а) – мандрьоха* (-yuh(a) – zhadniuha, khytriuha, pianiuha; -yuk(a) – zliuka; -okh(a) – zabrokha, -ud(a) – zanuda, -ur(a), -yur(a) – zamazura, -endr(a) – skupendra, -yndr(a) – skupyndra, -ynd(ia) – skupyndia, -endriah(a) – skupendriaha, -erdiah(a) – skuperdiaha, -erdiak(a) – skuperdiaka, -os(a) – nechosa, -is(a) – hulvisa, -es(a) – neotesa, -ip(a) – hultipa, -okh(a) – mandrokha), etc.

It was found that the pejorative suffix *-ищ(е)* (-ysh(e)) in the names of non-beings and the names of animals models mainly enlarged (coarse)-evaluative word-formative derivatives: *ножище, хвостище, бородище, павучище, вовчище* (nozhyshche, khvostyshche, borodyshche, pavuchyshche, vovchyshche), and, accordingly, in the nominations of persons - affective, negatively-evaluated: *бабище, свекрушище* (babyshche, svekrushyshche). "Improvement" of the evaluative value was observed only in the emotives*дружище* and*хлопчище* (*druzhyshche* and*khlopchyshche*), which have positive (or neutral) emotive evaluative roots.

Thus, the power of the emotional and evaluative semantic potential of augmentative formations is quite stable, subjectively oriented and indisputable, since they are practically unable to reveal the "pure" objective physical increase of a thing, their connotation is not connected and does not directly depend on parametric denotative semes. Reproduction of intensive-parametric features of the object without involving the emotional and evaluative conclusions of the speaker is usually provided by neutral phrases (compare: very strong wind (viter) and *вітрюга, вітрюган, вітрище* (vitriuha, vitriuhan, vitryshche); long beard (*boroda*) and *бородище* (borodyshche)).

The specificity of the meanings of derived emotives-diminutives (more often) and emotives-augmentatives (rarely) is determined by their position in the communicative activity of a person, their functional role in communicative processes and the type of nomination - neutral or expressive.

Augmentative-pejorative suffixes, which change "minus" to "plus" mainly within a specially organized context, appear to be more consistent in modeling the typical emotional and evaluative meaning plans of lexemes. Among the diminutive-ameliorative suffixes, it is difficult to single out diminutive semes (small things, diminutives), since they can simultaneously objectify both affection, tenderness, approval, etc., and the most diverse pejorative shades of meaning - from familiar (*інтрижка*(intryzhka) intrigue) to contemptuous (*землячок* (zemliachok) (countryman)). In addition to modeling binary emotive and axiological meaning planes, diminutive suffixes are able to "soften" the negative-evaluative semantics of the creative base (*бісеня, карапузик, миршавенький, наругонька, недоленька, пузатенький, скандальчик* (bisenia, karapuzyk, myrshavenkyi, naruhonka, nedolenka, puzatenkyi, skandalchyk), etc.); to strengthen it somewhat, actualizing the ironic-despicable potential, in particular seme *contempt* for this: *паскудненький, посіпачка, п'яниченька, фіфочка* (paskudnenkyi, posipachka, pianychenka, fifochka); add to the content of the neutral creative base semesof negative plans (disapproval, familiarity, irony, condemnation, disgust, etc.): *закоханець, інтелігентик, народець, писарець, працівничок, простачок, рецензійка,розумець, розумок, ролька, романець, романсик, секретарик, статейка, сюжетик, теорійка,*

типик, філософійка, хазяйчик, царик (zakokhanets, intelihentyk, narodets, pysarets, pratsivnychok, prostachok, retsenziika, rozumets, rozumok, rolka, romanets, romansyk, sekretaryk, stateika, siuzhetyk, teoriika, typyk, filosofiika, khaziaichyk, tsaryk) etc.

Sometimes, at the synchronic level, the means of objectification of the emotive-evaluative meaning plans of the lexeme may not be clearly identified and perceived by native speakers, but this does not significantly affect the connotative (emotional-evaluative) potential of the lexical unit. Etymological analysis makes it possible to identify the connections of the corresponding emotive-evaluative word with others, to find out its connections with units of other language levels. Thus, the semantics of the dialect lexeme of a *лебедаха* (poor man) can be motivated by identifying the interaction of two marked lexical units (as a result of contamination), one of which is a diminutive-ameliorative formation (*лебедик*is an affectionate address to a man), and the other is a sympathetic-indulgent *бідолаха* (poor man) (with the suffix of subjective assessment).

The conclusion that lexemes with diminutive formants provide the objectification of positive-evaluative semantic plans, and, correspondingly, those with augmentative ones rovide negative ones, should not be considered unconditional, since quite often the "affectionate" form serves as a means of realizing "prickly", "biting", "caustic" content.

The specific means of objectifying emotional-evaluative semantic plans of lexical units of the Ukrainian language include complex words that organically combine the brevity of emotional-evaluative conclusions and semantic multifacetedness and aptness, expressiveness. Lexical units formed by word composition (*баболюб, буквоїд, вертигуз, правдомовець, песиголовець, гріхотворець, білоручка, жмикрут, кривоніс, зірвиголова, ласогуб, багатознайка, пустоцвіт* (baboliub, bukvoid, vertyhuz, pravdomovets, pesyholovets, hrikhotvorets, biloruchka, zhmykrut, kryvonis, zirvyholova, lasohub, bahatoznaika, pustotsvit), etc.) reveal their connections with metaphorical (sequential and subordinating) word combinations. The method of their creation can be the transformation or contraction (the phenomenon of compression) of stable phrases -phraseological units (*душогуб* (dushohub) (to destroy the soul), *баляндрасити* (balyandrasyty), *теревенити* (terevenyty), *слизькоязикий* (slyzkoiazykyi) (slippery on the tongue), *вертихвіст, крутихвіст* (vertikhvist, krutikhvist) (to spin with a tail), *гаволов* (gavolov) (to catch a gawd), *вітрогін (вітрогон)* (vitrohin (vitrohon)) (wind-gun) – (to drive the wind), *пустоголовий* (pustoholovyi) (empty head), *крутиголова (закрутиголова)* (krutyholova (zakrutyholova)) (twist (spin) the head), *окозамилювач* (okozamyliuvach) (to make the eyes soft). Emotionally evaluative semantic plans of derivatives expressive composites can be motivated by both free phrases and phrasemes. Expression of the connotative components of lexemes is possible due to the addition of suffixes (*користолюбець*, *гріхотворець* (korystoliubets, hrikhotvorets) (self-interested person, sinner)) or the use of zero suffixation method (*грошолюб*, *лизоблюд* (hrosholiub, lyzobliud) (money-lover)).

Various types of metaphors representing the lexical-semantic way of expressive word formation serve as a powerful means of informal objectification of emotional and evaluative semantic plans of lexical units. Actually, the semantic indicators of lexical emotionality belong to implicit means; they involve taking into account the compatibility of lexemes, as well as the value orientations of the ethnos, which are specific to the particular language and culture of the people. Vezhbytska emphasizes that each language is nationally specific, so it can become a basis for reconstructing the features of the national mentality [20].

The most typical lexical-semantic transformations in the Ukrainian language include metaphorization, represented by a number of models such as "the name of a plant (fruit) -the name of a person" (*калина, тополя, лілія, лопух, мімоза, насіння, перець, печериця, пуп'янок, зілля, реп'ях, капуста, трава, перекотиполе, шишка,ягідка*(kalyna, topolia, liliia, lopukh,

mimoza, nasinnia, perets, pecherytsia, pupianok, zillia, repiakh, kapusta, trava, perekotypole, shyshka, yahidka), etc.). The source of a metaphor can be any lexical-semantic sphere, in particular, it is "a transformed image that maintains a connection with marked fragments of reality and is ideographically correlated with the "earthly" model of the world and the spiritual sphere of a person" [9, p. 91]. Metonymic transfers are mainly represented by two models: 1) "sign - its bearer" (beauty, talent, perfection, attractiveness, beauty, sympathy, glory, conscience, pride, dirty, blindness, darkness) and 2) "proper name - common name" (*пузир*, *авгур*, *донкіхот*, *іуда,каїн*, *крез*, *купідон*, *макіавелл*, *мегера*, *пілат*, *тартюф* (Bubble, Augur, Don Quixote, Judas, Cain, Croesus, Cupid, Machiavelli, Megera, Pilate, Tartuffe), etc.).

The objectification of emotional and evaluative semantic plans of lexemes is usually provided by derivative metaphorical bases, which are closely related to the metaphorical image of the creative base. Modifications of the image were observed against the background of the use of the existing metaphorical lexeme as a kind of base for creating new emotional and evaluative meanings (mainly from the bases of nouns): *ангелП – ангельський* (affectionate, submissive, gentle, kind), *лицар П – лицарський* (educated, emphatically polite), *гава П – гавити* (to be inattentive, unhurried), *глевтяк П – глевтякуватий* (clumsy), *гадюка П – гадючий* (dangerous, treacherous), *звір П – звіріти* (to become fierce, cruel; to be mad, to be mad), *змія П – зміїний* (angry, insidious, hostile), *зміїтися,їжак П – їжитися* (assume), *наїжачитися* (strain internally), *леміша 2П* (about an indecisive, characterless person) – *лемехуватий* (clumsy, lethargic, phlegmatic), *липа 2П* (about something fake) – *липовий П* (fake, real), *лис П – лисичити, мавна П – мавпувати, мавпування, баран П – обараніти* (become dark; get very confused), etc.

The analysis proved that the adverbial verbs always preserve the emotive-evaluative semantics of the motivator, although it is located in the consciousness of the speakers on more than one temporal or spatial slice and cannot be unambiguously perceived by them. Thus, the emotive to *розкокошитися* (rozkokoshytysia) (to start showing ridiculous arrogance, hot-temperedness; to get fired up) is formed in a prefixed way from another evaluative emotive – *кокошитися* (kokoshytysia) (to behave arrogantly, haughtily, to rebel, to brag, to show off), the lexical motivator of which is the dialectic *кокош* (kokosh) (rooster). The evaluative semantics of the derived verb is conditioned by the metaphorical image of a *півеньП* (cockerel) (kokosh P) - about a cocky and hot-tempered person.

At the semantic level, the contrast between emotionally and evaluatively marked word and its neutral correlate can be established on the basis of component analysis, characteristics of the components of the semantic structures of tokens. The semantic structure of the first lexeme is much richer, it is distinguished by the presence of such components as emotionality, evaluability, intensity, parametricity, imagery, etc., which are representatives of the connotative component in their most diverse combinations.

So, the analysis revealed that emotional-evaluative lexical units are characterized by a fairly wide field of transferable semantic plans, based on semes, fixed in direct (nominative) meanings, since derived figurative semes cannot arise spontaneously. Their character is motivated by a semantic invariant (denotative component), which manifests the position of a certain word in the lexical system of the national language. Realizing and understanding an expressive metaphor or metonymy is helped by national stereotypes, on the basis of which these transfers are based, and thought processes that provide awareness of the ways of their emergence, as well as directing mental efforts to overcome the logical incompatibility of combined meanings through the detection of semantic agreement between them.

4 Conclusion

The analysis of means of verbalization of emotive-evaluative semantic plans of lexical units of the Ukrainian language made it possible to single out static and dynamic functional spheres, formed principles of structuring of functional-semantic fields of emotionality and axiologicality, which explain, in addition to means, a wealth of different ways of expressing emotive-evaluative semantic plans of lexical units, mechanisms of their contextual implementation.

Emotionally-evaluative semantic plans of lexical units represent a phenomenon marked and motivated in a certain way. In the Ukrainian language, the following methods of objectification (motivation) of emotional and evaluative semantic plans turned out to be the most characteristic for them: phonetic, word-forming, and semantic. Each method has in its arsenal specific means, indicators that appear as direct verbalizers of emotional and evaluative semantic plans of lexical units. These include: phonetic (specific sound repetitions, sound imitation, sound symbolism, presence of specific sound combinations, phonetic exoticism of a lexical unit, etc.); word-forming (exceptionally rich, extensive and specific system of diminutive-ameliorative and augmentative-pejorative formants, motivation at the word-forming level, etc.); semantic (figurative (metaphorical and metonymic) values that arose as a result of expressive (usual or occasional) nomination).

The specificity of means and methods of objectification of emotional and evaluative semantic plans of lexical units of the Ukrainian language today is determined by the quantitative and methodical, methodological diversity of approaches to analysis, the actualization of the semantic level, objectified through the prism of features of the Ukrainian national character.

We see the prospects for further research in the understanding of basic extralingual factors, which involves taking into account the types of speech activity, the goal and task of communication, the gender of communicators, social status and the type of social activity of a person. These factors have an influence on the frequency and regularity of the use of emotive-evaluative lexical units, determine the limits of their functioning, form the specifics of the manner and style of expression, affect speech organization both at the level of a separate lexical unit, a number of linguistic means, microtexts, and macrotexts.

Today, Ukrainian linguists face very important tasks, among which there is the study of the processes of activation of the use of emotives, the functioning of emotive-evaluative lexemes as a linguistic reality of the war period, the relevance of the analysis of wartime texts and dictionaries.

Literature:

1. Bilodid I.K. et al. (Eds.). (1970–1980). Dictionary of the Ukrainian language: in 11 volumes. Institute of Linguistics. Kyiv: Scientific Opinion.
2. Boyko N.I. Verbalization of the world of emotions in the Ukrainian language: semantic aspect. Ukrainian linguistics. Kyiv. 2009. Issue 39. P. 26-34.
3. Boyko N.I. Ukrainian expressive vocabulary: semantic, lexicographic and functional aspects: monograph. Nizhin: LLC "Aspect-Polygraph Publishing House", 2005.
4. Boyko N.I., Kotkova L.I. Expressive potential of Volodymyr Vinnichenko's idiolect: lexical and phraseological components: monograph. Nizhin: Publication of the NSU named after M. Gogol, 2017.
5. Ermolenko S.S. Problems of studying expressive units of language. Modern foreign linguistics: questions of theory and methodology. Kyiv. 1983, pp. 140–159.
6. Ermolenko S.Ya. Modern and aesthetic signs of Ukrainian culture. Kiev: Institute of Ukrainian language of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 2009.
7. Ermolenko S.Ya. *Moznavstvo*. Kiev, 2017. No. 4. P. 20–27.
8. Humboldt V. *Selected works on linguistics*. Moscow: Progress. 2000.
9. Kotkova L.I. Lexico-semantic reminiscent of Vinnichenko's metaphor. The culture of the word. 2010. VIP. 72, pp. 91–94.
10. Levitsky V.V. Symbolic meanings of Ukrainian voices and voices. Movoznavstvo. 1973. No. 2, pp. 36–49.

11. Moysienko A. Dynamic aspect of the nomination: monograph. Kiev: Printing and Printing Center "Kyiv University". 2004. 100 p.

12. Pivtorak G.P. Form the infinitive in Ukrainian language. Moznavstvo. 1968. No. 4. S. 25–36.

13. Rusanivskyi V.M. & Taranenko O.O. (Eds.) (2000). *Ukrainian language*. Kyiv: "Ukr. Encyclical" named after M. P. Bazhana.

14. Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary: in 3 volumes. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1968.

15. Selivanova E.A. Cognitive onomasiology: monograph. Cherkas. state un-t im. Bohdan Khmelnitsky–Kyiv: Phytosociocenter, 2000.

16. Selivanova O.O. Current trends in modern linguistics (analytical review). Kyiv, 1999. 148 p.

17. Stevenson C. Some pragmatic aspects of meaning. New in foreign linguistics: Linguistic pragmatics. Moscow: Progress, 1985. Issue. 16. pp. 129–154.

18. Vezhbitska A. Semantic universals and basic concepts. Language. Semiotics. Culture. Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture, 2011.

19. Vezhbitska A. Comparison of cultures through vocabulary and pragmatics. Language. Semiotics. Culture. Small series. Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture, 2001.

20. Vezhbitska A. Language. Culture. Cognition: Per. from English. / resp. ed. M. A. Krongauz. Moscow: Russian dictionaries, 1996.

21. Zhaivoronok V.V. Signs of Ukrainian ethnic culture: vocabulary-dovidnik. Kiev: Dovira, 2006.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AI, AJ