



BUKOVINIAN STATE
MEDICAL UNIVERSITY

БУКОВИНСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ
МЕДИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ



ȘTEFAN CEL MARE
UNIVERSITY
OF SUCEAVA
СУЧАВСЬКИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ІМ. ШТЕФАНА ЧЕЛ МАРЕ

АКТУАЛЬНІ ПИТАННЯ СУСПІЛЬНИХ НАУК ТА ІСТОРІЇ МЕДИЦИНИ

AKTUALINI PYTANNIA SUSPILINIH
NAUK TA ISTORII MEDITSINI
(APSNIM)

CURRENT ISSUES OF SOCIAL
STUDIES AND HISTORY OF
MEDICINE

АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ
ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫХ НАУК
И ИСТОРИИ МЕДИЦИНЫ

ENJEUX ACTUELS DES SCIENCES
SOCIALES ET DE L'HISTORIE DE
LA MEDECINE

Спільний українсько-румунський науковий журнал
Joint Ukrainian-Romanian scientific journal

2021, 1 (29)

*Журнал засновано в 2013 р.
Перереєстровано 27.07.2015 р. у Міністерстві
юстиції України (Свід. № 21495-11295ПП – Сер. КВ)*

*Journal started publishing in 2013 year.
Re-registered in the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine
27.07.2015 p (Cert.of registr. № 21495-11295ПП – Ser. KB)*

*Журнал включено до Категорії "Б" Переліку
наукових фахових видань України з історичних
та філологічних наук (Наказ МОН України № 409
від 17.03.2020р.).*

*Journal is on the List of Scientific Professional publication
of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Category «B», entitled to publish main results of
dissertations in different fields of Historical sciences and
Philological sciences (order № 409 of 17.03.2020)*

Honorary editor: Dr. of Medicine, Prof. **Taras Boychuk** (Bukovinian State Medical University)

Editors-in-Chief: Dr. of History, Prof. **Antoniuy Moysey** (Bukovinian State Medical University)
Dr. of History, Prof. **Stefan Purici** (Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava)

Executive Editors: Ph.D., Assoc. Prof. **Antonina Anistratenko**, responsible for the electronic version of the journal
Ph.D., Assoc. Prof. **Yulia Rusnak** (Bukovinian State Medical University)
Ph.D., Lecturer **Tetyana Nykyforuk** (Bukovinian State Medical University)
Ph.D., Lecturer **Harieta Mareci Sabol** (Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava)

Editors Assistants: Ph.D., Associate Prof. **Inha Tymofijchuk** (Bukovinian State Medical University)
Ph.D., Lecturer **Vasile M. Demciuc** (Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava)

Executive secretaries: Lecturer **Iryna Kaizer**, Lecturer **Lidia Vylka**, Lecturer **Uliana Kemin**
Responsible for the Bibliographic description of the references: **Svitlana Tulevska**

INDEXING: Index Copernicus – 73,78 (2016) | Infobase Index – 2,8 (2016) | MIAR – 2,8 (2016) | SRJIF – 3,98 (2017) | JICIndex – 0,110 (2017)

Journal was registered in the international scientometric and bibliographical database Index Copernicus, Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), Ulrichs Web, Erih Plus, Scientific Indexing Services, Index of Turkish Education, Infobase Index, OAJI, World Cat, DRJI, Sherpa/Romeo, MIAR, Journal Factor (JF), Root indexing, Science Research Journal Impact Factor was published in database: Google Scholar, SCIARY (World Wide Science Educational Library), Scientific periodicals of Ukraine, Central and Eastern European Online Library (Germany).

EDITORIAL BOARD:

SOCIAL SCIENCES

History: Prof. *Onoriu Colăcel*, Dr. of History, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Assoc. Prof., *Serhiy Dobrshanskyi*, Ph. D., Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (**Ukraine**); Assoc. Prof. *Gennadii Kazakevych*, Dr. of History, Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University (**Ukraine**); Prof. *Michel Kerautret*, Dr. of History, Ecole des Hautes études en sciences sociales (Paris, **France**); Prof. *Zenon Kohut*, Dr. of History, Alberta University (Edmonton, **Canada**); Prof. *Anatoliy Kotsur*, Dr. of History, Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University (**Ukraine**); Prof. *Oleksandr Kurochkin*, Dr. of History, M. Rylskiy Institute of Art, Folklore and Ethnology, Academy of Sciences (Kyiv, **Ukraine**); Chief Research Worker *Elisaveta Kvilincova*, Dr. of History, Institute of Cultural Heritage, Academy of Sciences (Chisinau, **R. Moldova**); Prof. *Yuri Makar*, Dr. of History, Academician of the Ukrainian Academy of History, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (**Ukraine**); Senior Research Associate *Paul Meerts*, Dr. of History, Institute of International Relations Clingendael (The Hague, **Netherlands**); Prof. *Olimpia Mitric*, Dr. of History, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Prof. *Gheorghe Onișoru*, Dr. of History, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Assoc. Prof. *Nataliya Petrova*, Ph. D., I. I. Mechnikov National University of Odesa (**Ukraine**); Assoc. Prof. *Florin Pintescu*, Dr. of History, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Acad. *Stepan Pavliuk*, Dr. of History, Director of the Institute of Ethnology, Academy of Sciences (**Ukraine**); Acad. *Anna Skrypnyk*, Dr. of History, Director of the Institute of Art Studies, Folklore and Ethnology, Academy of Sciences (Kyiv, **Ukraine**); Prof. *Andrzej Wawryniuk*, Dr. of History, Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa w Cholmie (**Poland**);

Philologie: Prof. *Bertrand Badiou*, Dr. of Philology, Ecole normale supérieure (Paris, **France**); Prof. *Piotr Borek*, Dr. of Philology, Head of the Polish Philology Institute Krakiv Pedagogical University (**Poland**); Assoc. Prof. *Carmen Dărăbuș*, Dr. of Philology, Kliment Ohridski University of Sofia (**Bulgaria**); Prof. *Mircea A. Diaconu*, Dr. of Philology, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Assoc. Prof. *Evelina-Mezalina Graur*, Dr. of Philology, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Prof. *Adam Falowski*, Dr. of Philology, Head of the East Slavic Philology Institute Jagiellonian University (**Poland**); Prof. *Roma Franko*, Dr. Of Philology, University of Saskatchewan (**Canada**); Assoc. Prof. *Anastasiya Lepetiukha*, Kharkiv national pedagogical university named after H. Skovoroda (**Ukraine**); Assoc. Prof. *Simona-Aida Manolache*, Dr. of Philology, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Chief Research Worker *Anna-Maria Sorescu-Marinkovich*, Dr. of Philology, Balkan Institute at Serbian Academy of Sciences and Art (Belgrad, **Serbia**); Prof. *Hanna Martynova*, Dr. of Philology, Bohdan Chmelnytskyi Cherkasy National University (**Ukraine**); Prof. *Ovidiu Morar*, Dr. of Philology, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Prof. *Mihaela Violeta Munteanu*, Dr. of Philology, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca (**Romania**); Prof. *Rodica-Măriora Nagy*, Dr. of Filology, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Prof. *Felix-Narcis Nikolau*, Dr. Of Philology, Lunds universitet (**Sweden**); Prof. *Antoaneta Olteanu*, Dr. of Philology, Bucharest University (**Romania**); Assoc. Prof. *Oleksandr Rak*, Ph. D. of Philology, Bukovinian State Medical University (**Ukraine**); Prof. *Nataliya Rusnak*, Dr. of Philology, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (**Ukraine**); Dr. of Filology, Prof. *Svitlana Shabat-Savka*, Ph. D. of Philology, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (**Ukraine**);

Philosophy: Prof. *Sorin Tudor Maxim*, Dr. of Philosophy, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Prof. *Diego Sanches Mecka*, Dr. of Philosophy, National University of Distance Education (Madrid, **Spain**); Assoc. Prof. *George Neamțu*, Dr. of Philosophy, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Assoc. Prof. *Bogdan Popoveniuc*, Dr. of Philosophy, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Assoc. Prof. *Nina Zoriy*, Ph. D. of Philosophy, Bukovinian State Medical University (**Ukraine**).

HISTORY OF MEDICINE:

Assoc. Prof. *Carmen Cornelia Bălan*, Dr. of Psychology, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Dr. med. Dipl.-Psych, MBA, *Gerhardt Dammann*, Chief of Psychiatrische Klinik Münsterlingen and the psychiatric services Thurgau (**Switzerland**); Prof. *Alexander Fediv*, Dr. of Medicine, Bukovinian State Medical University (**Ukraine**); Prof. *Oleksandr Ivashiuk*, Dr. of Medicine, Bukovinian State Medical University (**Ukraine**); Prof. *Alfred Prits*, Dr. of Psychology, President of World Psychology Union Head of Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis Institute in Vienna (**Austria**); Assoc. Prof. *Nadia Laura Serdenciuc*, Dr. of Educational Sciences, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava (**Romania**); Prof. *Viktor Tashchuk*, Dr. of Medicine, Bukovinian State Medical University (**Ukraine**); Prof. *Dmytro Tyntyuk*, Dr. of Medicine, Chisinau State University of Medicine and Pharmacy N. Testemitsanu (**R. Moldova**); Prof. *Bohdan Vasylevskiy*, Dr. of Medicine, Chief of Psychosomatik Institute (Warsaw, **Poland**).

Актуальні питання суспільних наук та історії медицини. Спільний українсько-румунський науковий журнал. Серія "Філологічні науки" || Current issues of Social studies and History of Medicine. Joint Ukrainian-Romanian scientific journal. Series "Philological sciences" / Редколегія: А. Мойсей, Ш. Пурич. Чернівці–Сучава: БДМУ. 2021. № 1 (29). 129 с.

ISSN: 2311-9896; EISSN 2411-6181

The actual problems of world history, history of Ukraine, history of religion, ethnogenesis and traditional culture of peoples, archeology, philosophy, linguistics, literature and history of medicine are investigated in the journal. The journal is the international edition according to the sphere of extension and geography of the authors.

ББК 60я53+5г.я43

The journal is published in paper and electronic version with the resolution of the academic council of Higher State Educational Establishment of Ukraine "Bukovinian State Medical University" (Decision № 6 . Date: 25.02.2021).

The authors are responsible for the selection, accuracy of given information, citations, proper names, geographical names and other data.

Publishing: 2-4 issues a year. Languages: Ukrainian, Russian, English, French.

Address: Ukraine, 58000, Chernivtsi, Heroiv Maidanu str., 3, Department of Social Sciences and Ukrainian Studies. Tel.: (0372) 520871. **E-mail:** snim@bsmu.edu.ua; society@bsmu.edu.ua

The electronic version of the journal is available on the Web sites: <http://apsnim.bsmu.edu.ua>; <http://doaj.org> (DOAJ); <http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua> (National V. Vernadskij library web-site); <http://e-apsnim.bsmu.edu.ua> (OJS); <https://journals.indexcopernicus.com/representative/issue/list> (Copernicus ICI).

ЛЕКСИЧНА СЕМАНТИКА ДІЄСЛІВ НА
 ПОЗНАЧЕННЯ ПРОЯВУ СУПЕРЕЧКИ В
 АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Наталія СКРИЦЬКА, Тетяна НИКИФОРУК,
 Буковинський державний медичний університет,
 fedorkiv017@ukr.net

LEXICAL SEMANTICS OF THE VERBS DENOTING
 DEBATE IN ENGLISH

Natalya SKRYTSKA, Tetyana NYKYFORUK,
 Bukovinian State Medical University,
 ORCID 0000-0002-1498-4747
 RESEARCHER ID: S – 7000-2016; ORCID ID:0000-0001-5365-5578

Наталія Скрицька, Тетяна НикифоруК Лексическая семантика глаголов для обозначения проявления споров в английском языке. Семантическое значение глаголов для обозначения споров обосновывается культурой языка, привычками и традициями людей. Анализ глаголов для обозначения споров базируется на формализованном методе лексико-семантического анализа. Этот метод исследует семы, объединены в лексические единицы, а также связи между ними. **Актуальность** исследования заключается в необходимости формирования новых сем, а также определения глаголов высшей и наивысшей степеней полисемии, изучения моносемантических рядов лексического значения глаголов для обозначения споров в английском языке. **Целью** статьи является исследование семантики глаголов для обозначения проявления споров в английском языке. **Методы исследования:** описательный, аналитический, методы анализа и синтеза. **Выводы.** В результате исследования определены лексические и семантические особенности глаголов для обозначения споров в английском языке.

Ключевые слова: глаголы споров, семы, лексемы, полисемия, моносемантические ряды, высшая и наивысшая степени обозначения глаголов, лексическое значение глаголов споров.

Problem statement and its connection with important scientific tasks. The lexical set of English verbs denoting *debate* comprises 40 language units. Similar to contrasted Ukrainian lexemes, English language units have also been subdivided into three groups: verbs with the highest degree of polysemy, verbs with the middle degree of polysemy, and monosemantic ones.

The urgency of the research is to study lexical semantics of the verbs denoting debate in English.

The aim of the article is to identify common and distinctive semantic and monosemantic characteristics of the language units denoting *debate* in English language understudy.

The first group of words denoting *debate* in English is represented by 5 lexical units possessing 8-6 meanings (**to oppose, to argue, to fence, to struggle, to dispute**).

The first in this group is the lexeme **to oppose** which possesses 8 meanings characterizing it as a verb indicating the process of opposing someone as an antagonist: 'to set as an opponent or adversary', 'to be in opposition'. The meaning of resistance is clearly obvious in the seme 'to act against or furnish resistance to; combat' which correlates this lexeme with the verb **to dispute**. The two verbs are also semantically close in the semes indicating opposition 'to set against, esp. for comparison or contrast' and 'to set (something) opposite something else, or to set (two things) so as to be opposite one another'. The word **to oppose** also indicates the state of unfriendliness, enmity, and animosity – 'to be hostile or adverse to, as in opinion' as well as preventing, inhibiting and baffling – 'to hinder or obstruct'.

The analyzed lexeme reveals its semantics in the set phrase **as opposed to** defined as follows: 'as contrasted with'.

The language unit **to argue** is semantically close to the word **to dispute** in its meaning 'to participate in a formal debate'. The distinctive positive lexical feature of the analyzed verb is its ability to indicate discussing and clarifying the issue – 'to state the reasons for or against' and explaining, indicating – 'to maintain in reasoning', 'to show; indicate'. The indication to convincing and presenting support is obvious in the meaning 'to persuade or compel by reasoning'. In addition, the lexeme **to argue** is capable of forming set phrases revealing its semantics of *debate*: **argue around and around** – 'to argue (about something) in a circuitous, indirect fashion, without an end or satisfactory result', **argue back** – 'to respond angrily or rudely at an inappropriate or unwelcome time', **argue out** – 'to discuss opposing views, with the goal of resolving a dispute', **argue the toss** – 'to dispute something', **arguing for the sake of arguing** – 'continuing a disagreement solely out of obstinacy', **can't argue with that** – 'a phrase used when one cannot or does not want to dispute what another person has said or suggested'¹.

The following semantics meanings: 'to engage in skilful or witty debate, repartee, etc.' and 'to evade a question or argument, esp. by quibbling over minor points' semantically refer the lexeme **to fence** to the semantic space of debate and unites it with the word **to argue**. The studied word is also used in the following positive meanings: 'to construct a fence on or around (a piece of land, etc.)', 'to close (in) or separate (off) with or as if with a fence',

¹ Oxford Learner's Dictionary. URL: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/> (date 30.03. 2021) [in English].

'archaic to ward off or keep out'. The negative meanings of the lexeme include: 'to fight using swords or foils', 'to receive stolen property'.

The meaning of arguing and competing is characteristic to the verb **to struggle** – 'to compete or argue with somebody/something, especially in order to get something'. Other meanings of the lexeme describe it as a verb of fighting, wrestling: 'to fight against somebody/something in order to prevent a bad situation or result', 'to fight somebody or try to get away from them'. The analyzed word also denotes striving and attempting – 'to try very hard to do something when it is difficult or when there are a lot of problems' and toiling – 'to move somewhere or do something with difficulty'. The lexical unit also reveals its semantics in the set phrase **to struggle against someone or something** – 'to strive or battle against someone or something'².

The word **to dispute** possesses six meanings which describe it as the verb of arguing, debating 'to engage in argument or debate', 'to argue or debate about', 'to argue against', 'call in question', quarreling 'to argue vehemently; quarrel', 'to quarrel or fight about; contest' and opposing 'to strive against; oppose'. Thus, the verb is semantically close to all lexemes with the highest level of polysemy – **to oppose, to argue, to fence, to struggle**. In addition, the investigated language unit has the ability to form phrases: **dispute something with someone** – 'to argue with someone about something, such as an amount of money'.

The second group of lexemes denoting *debate* in English contains 26 verbs possessing 5-2 meanings and it represents the largest group in our investigation. It is composed of such lexical units as: **to debate, to wrangle, to disagree, to clash, to discuss, to contend, to contradict, to withstand, to contest, to question, to quarrel, to collide, to bandy, to resist, to defy, to fend, to bicker, to agitate, to counter, to belie, to confute, to dissent, to controvert, to quibble, to thwart, to brawl**.

The language units **to debate, to wrangle, to disagree, to clash** and **to discuss** are characterized by 5 meanings. The verbs **to debate** and **to wrangle** share the meaning of being involved in argument 'to engage in argument or discussion'. At the same time the words **to debate** and **to clash** coincide in the meaning 'to dispute or disagree about'. The meaning 'to argue or discuss (a question, issue, or the like), as in an assembly' semantically unites the verbs **to debate** and **to discuss**. The distinctive features of the word **to debate** are 'to participate in a formal debate' and 'to engage in formal argumentation with', 'to deliberate; consider'. In addition to above-mentioned features, the analyzed verb forms a phrase that allows to deeper disclose its semantics: **debate on something** – 'to hold a long and disciplined discussion on a particular subject'³.

The word **to wrangle** is characterized mainly by negative semantics defined as 'to argue or dispute, esp. in a noisy or angry manner', 'to argue or dispute', 'to obtain, often by badgering or scheming; wangle' containing the indications of altercation, sharp disagreement and bickering. The only positive sense of the analyzed verb denotes tending the cattle – 'to tend or round up (cattle, horses, or other livestock)'. Moreover, the semantics of debate is revealed in the set phrase denoting squabbling: **wrangle for an ass's shadow** – 'to argue over trivial matters'.

The semantics of conflicting actions is the common feature of the language units **to disagree** and **to clash**. The main meaning of the verb **to disagree** is 'to dissent in opinion (from another person) or dispute (about an idea, fact, etc.)' which reveals its semantics of holding different opinions. In addition to the meaning of conflict, the analyzed language unit denotes the failure to correspond to something. The negative meaning of being not suitable or satisfactory is revealed in the sense 'to be unacceptable (to) or unfavourable (for); be incompatible (with)'. The word is also characterized by its individual semantic feature 'to be opposed (to) in principle'. The analyzed lexeme discloses its semantics in the set expression **agree to disagree** – 'of two parties, to mutually accept that they simply do not (and will not) share the same view on a particular issue, in the interest of moving past the issue or avoiding further confrontation' which is used to denote the way of resolving a conflict.

The language unit **to clash** is mostly characterized by negative semantics revealed in its two meanings: 'to conflict; disagree', 'to engage in a physical conflict or contest (often fol. by with)'. The physical actions performed with a certain sound effect are expressed in the meanings 'to strike or collide with a loud, harsh, usu. metallic noise' and 'to strike with a loud, harsh, usu. metallic noise'. The negative quality of the color is disclosed in the meaning '(of juxtaposed colors) to be offensive to the eye'.

The word **to discuss** is characterized by positive semantics denoting the process of considering, deliberating: 'to speak with another or others about; talk over', 'to examine or consider (a subject) in speech or writing'. The process of human communication is expressed in the meaning 'to speak with another or others about something'. The lexeme also has specific lexical meaning of considering something in speaking or in the written form: 'to examine or consider a subject in speech or writing'. The positive semantic meaning 'to come to an agreement as a result of a discussion' indicates the way of overcoming various conflicts and concurring.

Eleven lexemes **to contend, to contradict, to withstand, to contest, to question, to quarrel, to collide, to bandy, to resist, to defy** and **to fend** (4 meanings) are characterized by both common and distinctive features. The verbs **to contend, to contest** and **to defy** are united by their common semantics denoting fight and struggle against smb. or smth.

The ability to form phrases is the characteristic feature of the language units **to contend, to contradict, to withstand, to contest, to question, to quarrel, to collide** and **to bandy**. **Contend against someone or something** – 'to fight or compete against someone or something' and **contend with a problem** – 'to put up with a difficulty; to struggle with the problems caused by someone or something'; **be no contest** – 'used to say that one side in a competition is so much stronger or better than the other that it is sure to win easily'; **to call in or into question** – 'to dispute; challenge' and 'to cast doubt upon; question'; **to quarrel out** – 'to engage in a dispute or argument over some issue'; **to quarrel with** (smth.) – 'to disagree with, argue against, or complain about something'; **bandy words** (with smb.) – 'to argue with somebody or speak rudely to them'; **to collide with someone or something** – 'to crash with or bump into someone or something'⁴.

The distinctive feature of the lexeme **to contend** is its ability to be used in negative and positive meanings: 'to struggle in rivalry, battle, etc; vie' and 'to argue earnestly;

² Ibidem.

³ Ibidem.

⁴ Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English for advanced learners, 6th Edition. URL: www.ldoceonline.com (date: 14.04.2021) [in English].

debate', '(tr; may take a clause as object) to assert or maintain'.

The lexical unit **to contradict** is characterized only by negative semantics which unites it with the language units **to withstand**, **to defy** and **to resist** in the same indicating the process of opposing someone: 'to assert the contrary or opposite of; to act or make efforts in opposition'. The verb under study also possesses the meaning of verbal differing or disproving: 'to speak contrary to the assertions of' and 'to imply a denial of'.

Apart from the meaning of opposing and resisting, the verb **to withstand** is characterized by the positive sense indicating endurance: 'to bear; tolerate the effects of'.

In addition to its semantics of opposing 'to withstand, strive against, or oppose', 'to withstand the action or effect of' and 'to act or make efforts in opposition', the word **to resist** is characterized by its semantic feature indicating restraining from something: 'to refrain or abstain from, esp. with difficulty'.

The language unit **to defy** has the specific meaning referring it to the military sphere – 'to invite to do battle or combat'. The characteristic feature of the verb is its negative semantic indication to instigating negative feelings and conflicts: 'to challenge or provoke (someone to do something judged to be impossible); dare'. It also has a positive semantics denoting the way of avoiding conflicts 'to elude, esp in a baffling way'.

The lexical meaning 'to challenge; dispute' indicating challenging and disputing unites the words **to contest** and **to question**. The distinctive feature of the verb **to contest** is its indication of instructions on how to resolve the conflict through both peaceful and military action: 'to struggle or fight for, as in battle'; 'to dispute'; 'to call in question; challenge'; 'to contend'.

The lexeme **to question** possesses its individual semantics of interrogating which is obvious in its two meanings: 'to ask questions of; interrogate', 'to ask; inquire'. It also possesses an indication of doubting: 'to make a question of; doubt'.

The language units **to quarrel** and **to bandy** share the semantic meanings of the quarrel 'to disagree angrily; squabble; wrangle', 'to exchange (words) in a heated or hostile manner'. Both lexemes have their individual distinctive features. The verb **to quarrel** is characterized by the meaning denoting terminating the relationship with other people – 'to end a friendship as a result of a disagreement; fall out' as well as denouncing – 'to make a complaint; find fault'⁵.

The verb **to bandy** contains the semantics of fighting and is defined as: 'to give and receive (blows)'. The language unit is also used to denote human actions and manners of communicating: '(often foll by about) to circulate (a name, rumour, etc)', 'to throw or strike to and fro; toss about'.

The word **to collide** is characterized by the individual semantics denoting 'to clash; conflict'. It also indicates various physical activities: 'to cause to collide' and 'to strike one another or one against the other with a forceful impact; crash'. The verb **to fend** is characterized by positive semantics denoting defending, fighting for the preservation of something, resisting 'to ward off (often foll. by off)', 'to defend', 'to resist or make defense' and 'to provide; manage; shift'.

The verbs **to agitate**, **to bicker**, **to counter**, **to belie**, **to confute** possess three meanings. The lexemes in this subgroup share common lexical features as well as are characterized by their distinct semantic peculiarities.

The words **to bicker**, **to counter**, and **to belie** are

semantically close in their meaning 'to oppose; to set (something) opposite something else, or to set (two things) so as to be opposite one another'.

The word **to bicker** is characterized by the individual semantics and has the negative meaning 'to engage in peevish argument; wrangle'. This meaning is also enhanced by the set phrase **bicker about (something)** – 'to argue or squabble with someone about something'. In addition, the studied language unit is also used in the positive meanings 'to run or flow rapidly' and 'to flicker; glitter' denoting various parameters of physical phenomena. The meaning of opposition is characteristic to the lexeme **to counter** which is defined as 'to move or act in opposition to; oppose'. The senses of responding in retaliation 'to offer in response' and 'to meet or return (a blow) by another blow' also describe the verb under study. The lexeme **to belie** is used in the meaning of contradicting and misrepresenting the information 'to show to be false; contradict', 'to give a false impression of; misrepresent'. The negative meaning of deceiving also describes the studied verb 'to be false to or disappoint'.

The language units **to agitate** and **to confute** share the semantics 'to participate in a formal debate'. The verb **to agitate** expresses disturbing and troubling someone used in the meanings 'to cause to move with violence or sudden force' and 'to upset; disturb'. The language unit under study is also used in the positive meaning 'to arouse interest in (a cause, for example) by use of the written or spoken word; discuss or debate'. The verb **to confute** possesses the meanings indicating disproving and refuting 'to prove to be false, invalid, or defective; disprove', 'to prove (a person) to be wrong by argument or proof'. The language unit also denotes the process of confusing 'to bring to naught; confound'.

Five lexemes **to dissent**, **to controvert**, **to quibble**, **to thwart** and **to brawl** have two meanings.

The verb **to dissent** possesses its specific semantics denoting disaccording 'to differ in sentiment or opinion, esp. from the majority (often foll. by from)' as well as rebuffing 'to reject the doctrines or authority of an established church'⁶.

The language units **to controvert**, **to quibble** and **to thwart** coincide in the meaning of 'to oppose; to set (smth.) opposite something else, or to set (two things) so as to be opposite one another' indicating oppose, resist and objection.

However, they also have their specific semantic features. Thus, the language unit **to controvert** also denotes refuting and denying 'to deny, refute, or oppose (some argument or opinion)' while the verb **to thwart** is characterized by the semantics of preventing and frustrating 'to oppose successfully or prevent; frustrate'. The lexeme **to quibble** expresses disagreement over minor issues 'to argue or complain about trivial matters; bicker, carp, or cavil'. The meaning of eluding from direct answers also characterizes the studied word 'to use evasive or ambiguous language; equivocate'. In addition, the language unit **to quibble** is used in the set expression **quibble over (something) with (someone)** – 'to argue, dispute, or contend with someone over or about something, especially that which is trivial or petty'.

The verb **to brawl** has negative connotation denoting fighting 'to fight or quarrel angrily and noisily; wrangle'. It is also characterized by the positive semantics denoting physical parameters of sound 'to make a bubbling or roaring noise, as water flowing over a rocky bed'. The language unit **to thwart** indicates movement 'to be or move across'.

The vocabulary denoting *debate* in the English language

⁵ Ibidem.

⁶ Ibidem.

is composed of 9 monosemantic verbs (*to altercate, to canvass, to deliberate, to squabble, to repugn, to discord, to disaccord, to recalcitrante and to feud*)⁷.

To altercate, to canvass, to deliberate and to squabble form the semantic microsystem with the following meaning: 'to engage in argument or discussion; to argue or discuss' which expresses a noise argument, heated discussion, debate, wrangle etc.

The language unit *to discord* semantically relates with the lexeme *to disaccord* in the meaning of 'to dispute or disagree about'.

Other verbs in this group do not share common semantic features. The lexeme *to feud* reveals extremely negative semantics 'to carry on or perpetuate a bitter quarrel or state of enmity; to continuously argue or

fight with someone about someone or something'. The verb *to repugn* indicates expressing vigorous opposition 'to oppose or conflict (with)', the semantics of the word *to recalcitrante* contains indications of a high degree of disagreement and disorder 'show strong objection or repugnance; manifest vigorous opposition or resistance; be obstinately disobedient'.

Our research has shown that each word is individual, but at the same time 6 monosemantic lexemes are interrelated in their meanings, forming the chain of direct and indirect connections.

The results of the analysis of the verbs denoting debate in English are represented in Table 3.2 manifesting the quantitative ratio and percentage of the singled out groups of verbs.

Table 1.1.

Lexical stock of the language units denoting debate in English

№	Group of verbs	Quantity	Percentage
1	Verbs with the highest degree of polysemy	5	12,5 %
2	Verbs with the middle degree of polysemy	26	65%
3	Monosemantic verbs	9	22,5%
	Total	40	100%

The data of the table prove that the verbs with the middle degree of polysemy comprise the largest group in the research sample making up 65% of all selected English language units. The group of monosemantic lexemes denoting debate is represented by 22,5% of lexemes while the group of verbs with the highest degree of polysemy is the least represented one and comprises 12,5% of the total sample.

Conclusion. Individual characteristics of the verbs denoting debate in English include:

- different semantic composition of the analyzed lexemes in the contrasted languages;
- overwhelming the negative meanings in the English language.
- different ratio of lexemes according to the degree of polysemy.

The relation of the lexical and semantic composition of the comparable words is represented by a matrix in which the lexical semantics of the studied verbs is revealed, their relations and the place in the language system, etc.

Наталія Скрицька, Тетяна Никифорок. Лексична семантика дієслів на позначення прояву суперечки в англійській мові. Лексичне значення дієслів на позначення прояву суперечки визначається культурою мови, звичками і традиціями народу. Аналіз дієслів на позначення прояву суперечки ґрунтується на формалізованому методі лексико-семантичного аналізу. Даний метод досліджує семи, об'єднані в лексичні одиниці, і, відповідно, зв'язки між ними. Завдяки цьому описано сферу впливу людини на повсякденне життя та відносини між людьми.

Історіографія. Дослідженням лексичного значення дієслів на позначення прояву суперечки в англійській мові займаються такі зарубіжні вчені, як А. Круз, Девід Крістал, Г. Ліч, М. М'юрфі, Пітер Метью та інші.

За основу дослідження взято такі лексикографічні джерела: Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English for advanced learners, 6th Edition, Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners, Mark Laster The Big Book of English Verbs 1st Edition, Oxford Learner's Dictionary.

Актуальність даної проблематики зумовлена необхідністю аналізу формування нових сем, вищих та найвищих ступенів полісемії та утворення нових моносемантичних рядів в лексичному значенні дієслів на позначення прояву суперечки. **Метою** статті є дослідження семантики дієслів на позначення

прояву суперечки в англійській мові. **Об'єктом дослідження** послуговували особливості лексичного значення дієслів на позначення прояву суперечки в англійській мові. **Методи дослідження:** описовий, аналітичний, методи аналізу і синтезу. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вивчення дієслів на позначення прояву суперечки із визначенням їхніх ступенів полісемії та дослідженням моносемантичних рядів ще не були предметом аналізу.

Висновки. У результаті дослідження визначено лексичне значення дієслів на позначення прояву суперечки в англійській мові, а також проаналізовано різних ступенів полісемії цих дієслів.

Ключові слова: дієслова суперечки, семи, лексеми, полісемія, моносемантичні ряди, вищий та найвищий ступені визначення дієслів, лексичне значення дієслів суперечки.

Скрицька Наталія – викладач кафедри суспільних наук та українознавства Буковинського державного медичного університету. Автор та співавтор монографії, понад 30 наукових робіт. Коло наукових інтересів: історія філософії, філософія мови, філософія культури.

Skrytska Natalya is a teacher of Department of Social Sciences and Ukrainian Studies of Bukovinian State Medical University. The author and coauthor of the monograph, above 30 scientific works. Research interests: history of philosophy, philosophy of language, philosophy of culture.

Тетяна Никифорок – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри суспільних наук та українознавства Буковинського державного медичного університету. Автор понад 80 науково-методичних публікацій. Коло наукових інтересів: теорія віриознавства загалом та поетика віршованих творів С. Воробкевича, викладання української мови як іноземної.

Tetyana Nykyforuk – Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor of Department of Social Sciences and Ukrainian Studies in Bukovinian State Medical University; Author of over 80 scientific and methodological articles. Executive secretary of Ukrainian-Romanian scientific journal "Current Issues of Social Studies and History of Medicine". Scientific research interests: the creation of poetry and poetics of S. Vorobkevych's verses, teaching of Ukrainian language as a foreign language.

Received: 18.01.2021

Advance Access Published: March, 2021

© N. Skrytska, T. Nykyforuk, 2021

⁷ Oxford Learner's Dictionary...op.cit.