Fazit ziehend, kann man sagen, dass performative Verben *ablehnen, absagen, verzichten;* latente performative Aussagen; Verneinungen oder Negationswörter; die Formel "Negation + Handlungsverb"; Teilnegation (Negation + Negiertes Satzglied), Negationsadverbien – konventionelle Formen der direkten Sprechaktes "Absage" sind.

Im Fall der Nichtübereinstimmung der Semantik des Satzes mit seiner illokutiven Bedeutung, geht es um einen "nicht-direkten" Sprechakt. Das Hauptziel des Sprechers, der die indirekten Mittel für den Ausdruck der illokutiven Stärke mit negativer Bedeutung ausnutzt, ist die Abschwächung der negativen Bewertung.

Die Dekodierung der Bedeutung des indirekten Sprechaktes verläuft konventionell unter Berücksichtigung des Situationskontextes. Die Realisierung der indirekten Absage wird nach den bestimmten Regeln des Sprachfunktionierens verwirklicht und wird durch bestimmte Taktik verursacht, die des Sprechers Erachtens als beste für die Erreichung des Ziels der Sprechakte ist.

Eine positive Ausdrucksweise bei der Absage oder bei der Bemerkung trägt dazu bei, eine positive Beziehung zwischen den Gesprächspartnern aufzubauern und zu erhalten.

1. Duden. Briefe gut und richtig schreiben. – Mannheim: Dudenverlag, 2006. – 862 S.

2. Helbig G. Busha J. Deutsche Grammatik. – Berlin und München: Langenscheidt KG, 2001. – 654 S.

3. Zimmermann K., Müller P. Indirekte und implizite Sprechakte // Deutsche Sprache. – 1977. – Bd.5. – S. 238-254.

T. I. Derkacz-Padiasek,
Wyższa Szkoła Humanistyczno-Ekonomiczna w Łodzi

A SURVEY OF RIVAL DIMINUTIVE FORMATIONS IN POLISH AND UKRAINIAN

The aim of this article is to present the rival diminutive formations or the process of parallel derivation in modern Polish and Ukrainian. The author will focus on Malicka-Kleparska's model of word formation, which is supposed to explain the mechanism of diminutivisation in Polish. We can suggest that this model can be generalised to other languages, for example Ukrainian.

Метою статті є представити конкуруючі демінутив-ні форми або процес паралельної деривації у польській та

українській мові. Автор зосередиться на моделі словотвору Маліцької-Клепарскої, яка, як передбачається, пояснює механізм демінутивізації у польській мові. Ми можемо припустити, що ця модель може бути прийнятною для інших мов, наприклад української.

1. Introduction

In the present article we focus on the cases of parallel diminutive derivation in modern Polish and Ukrainian (Malicka-Kleparska [7], Žovtobrjux [11], Didkivs'ka and Rodnina [10]). "Rival" forms are found when different suffixes can be used in the derivation of diminutives from the same base word. Rival formations in pure form are difficult to find, as the attachment of distinct formatives to one base normally results in semantic differentiation of the complex words [7, p. 97].

The occurrence of rival forms may be seen as a violation of the principle of blocking: potential derivatives are checked if synonymous forms with the same roots exist. Whether a potential formation is employed depends not only on pragmatic factors, but on language data as well. Malicka-Kleparska [7, p. 97] argues that "gaps in the appearance of potential words are seen as the result of the grammatical phenomenon – permanent lexicon blocking."

Plag [8, p. 9] states that the term 'blocking' refers to two different types of phenomena. Furthermore, Rainer (1988) stresses that two forms of synonymy blocking are attested, i.e. type-blocking and token-blocking [9, p. 80]. Type-blocking is a problematic concept that prevents the occurrence of more or less regular rival morphological processes (e.g.: *decency* vs. *decentness*). This process occurs when an affix blocks the application of another affix. As a matter of fact, each affix can be applied to a certain domain, however lexical, phonological, morphological, and semantic restrictions influence or limit the applicability of the affixes to a set of bases. As Plag [9, p. 82] suggests, "type-blocking occurs when the more special affix precludes the application of the more general affix". Token-blocking, on the other hand, concerns the blocking of potential regular forms by already existing synonymous words. This process is possible under three important conditions: synonymy, productivity, and frequency. Token-blocking is a psycholinguistic phenomenon which is the effect of word storage as well as word processing mechanisms, for instance, the blocking of **arrivement* by *arrival*, etc.

2. Malicka-Kleparska's model of word formation

Parallel derivation of diminutives is the formation of expressive derivatives from a single nominal base by distinct evaluative suffixes. We shall discuss the occurrence of rival diminutive formations, which consists in the addition of the semantic feature [+small], without any

syntactic changes [5]. In Ukrainian, the issue in question has been raised in the works of Žovtobrjux [11] as well as Didkivs'ka and Rodnina [10]. Consider the following parallel derivatives with the suffixes -*Ek* and -*Ik* in Polish as well as -*Ok* and -*Yk* in Ukrainian:

(1a) Polish BASE DIM1 DIM2

głos 'voice' głos-ek // głos-ik

kostium 'suit' kostium-ek // kostium-ik

łom 'crowbar' łom-ek // łom-ik

rosół 'broth' rosoł-ek // rosol-ik

chlew 'cow-house' chlew-ek // chlew-ik

(1b) Ukrainian viz 'cart' viz-ok // voz-yk

viter 'wind' viter-ok // vitr-yk

kapeljux 'hat' kapeljuљ-ok // kapeljuљ-yk

snip 'sheaf' snop-ok // snop-yk

knjaz' 'prince' knjaz-jok // knjaz-yk

Crucially, the diminutive formations in (1a) and (1b) have identical lexical meaning, though they differ in terms of the degree of expressiveness. For example, in Ukrainian, the suffix -*Yk* is considered more expressive than -*Ok*. Furthermore, an analysis of -*Ok* and -*Yk* formations shows that the frequency of occurrence of the rival derivatives in question differs. A historical comparison of pairs like *žyvotyk // žyvotok* 'belly-DIM', *mistok // mostyk* 'bridge-DIM', *rotyk // rotok* 'mouth-DIM', *snopyk // snopok* 'sheaf-DIM' shows that -*Yk* formations prevail over -*Ok* derivatives.

A close examination of such examples (1) reveals that there is one derivational semantic-syntactic operation realised on the formal level by means of two separate suffixation rules, which results in the appearance of diminutive forms with -*Ik* or -*Ek* in Polish as well as -*Ok* and -*Yk* in Ukrainian. The diminutives in question have equivalent lexical meaning, though they may differ in the degree of expressiveness. Malicka-Kleparska [7, 99] refers to this phenomenon as "unconditioned distribution of affixes". She suggests that the suffixation rules distributing the rival affixes in question would have to be somehow ordered: phonological, semantic and diachronic factors influence the process of diminutivisation. Malicka-Kleparska [7, p. 102] explains the occurrence of rival formations as a result of the interplay and conflict between word formation processes (which represent a tendency towards regularity) and the lexicon (the place for idiosyncrasies). In essence, two diminutive formations occur in (1a) and (1b), irrespective of the fact whether only one or both diminutives actually occur in the case of a particular base morpheme. The question of rule order does not arise; that is, the rules are regarded as parallel.

Malicka-Kleparska [7, p. 103] proposes a model of word formation, which is supposed to explain the mechanism of diminutivisation in Polish. Her model is based on the assumptions put forward in Allen [1, p. 199]. Under those assumptions, the lexicon is divided into two parts: conditional

and permanent. Allen claims that the conditional dictionary consists of all the words produced by properly constructed word formation rules (WFRs), including potential forms. The permanent dictionary, on the other hand, consists of idiosyncratic complex forms as well as perfectly regular words that enter the permanent lexicon from the conditional lexicon [1]. In addition, Aronoff [2, p. 45] suggests that both regular and irregular derivatives are in the permanent dictionary. Thus, Malicka-Kleparska [7, p. 103] assumes that "a slot in the permanent lexicon may be filled by a word but it does not have to be." Whether a regular form fills the slot it does not depend on WFRs but it is influenced by extralinguistic factors (frequency of use, social factors, etc.) or historical development.

Malicka-Kleparska [7] claims that lexical insertion rules (LIRs) cannot have a direct influence on the conditional lexicon. Thus, a form can be retrieved from the permanent dictionary, or, if the slot is empty, LIRs access a relevant derivative from the conditional lexicon through this empty slot. To put it differently, the permanent lexicon has no influence on the derivation of forms by overgenerating processes. However, it decreases the number of actually occurring derivatives [7, p. 103]:

(I)
BASE CONDITIONAL PERMANENT PERFORMANCE
LEXICON LEXICON
diminutive
slots
rękaw → rękawek rękawek rękawek
'sleeve' rękawik
chlew → → chlewek → chlewek
'pigsty' chlewik → chlewik
paw → → pawek
'peacock' pawik pawik → pawik

Malicka-Kleparska's model of word formation holds that the diminutives entered in the permanent lexicon block the occurrence of the rival formations, "which are, nevertheless, stored within the conditional dictionary as potential formations. The other slots remain empty; hence, LIRs may select either of two parallel derivatives from the conditional lexicon" [7, p. 104].

Malicka-Kleparska [7] presents some evidence in favour of her solution. One of the relevant arguments concerns the question of idiolects, i.e. the choice of rival diminutives can be determined by the peculiarities of the permanent lexicon based on extralinguistic factors and not on changes in word formation rules. Another piece of evidence is based on the fact that some prefixed or compound nouns in Polish possess two rival diminutives, although from the corresponding single (unprefixed) nouns, only one diminutive can be derived. Consider the following data:

(2a) BASE DIM DIM2
ząb ’tooth’ ząb-ek
most ’bridge’ most-ek
prąd ’current’ prądz-ik
bas ’bass’ bas-ik
(2b) trójząb ’tridnet’ trójząb-ek // trójzęb-ik
pomost ’platform’ pomost-ek // pomośc-ik
bioprąd ’biocurrent’ bioprąd-ek // bioprądz-ik
kontrabas ’contrabass’ kontrabas-ek // kontrabas-ik

The data in (2a) and (2b) show ambiguity in the distribution of the suffixes -*Ik* and -*Ek*. Malicka-Kleparska’s solution would seem to be as follows: the permanent lexicon consists of the diminutives in (2a), in contrast to diminutive formations in (2b). She maintains that the distribution of diminutives in Polish depends on the dynamic (WFRs) as well as static (the lexicon) parts of the morphological component. Malicka-Kleparska [7, p. 105] reasonably assumes the following:

i. WFRs subsume rules of derivation and affixation.

ii. Affixation rules may be ordered or parallel.

iii. The output of overgenerating word formation rules constitutes the conditional lexicon of potential forms.

iv. Certain regular and all irregular derivatives (as well as non-derived forms) enter the permanent lexicon built of slots for canonical meaning.

v. The slots are arranged according to stems.

vi. LIRs operate on and through the permanent lexicon.

Thus, Malicka-Kleparska’s model of word formation interprets the process of diminutivisation in the following way: a diminutive formation first of all enters the permanent lexicon and blocks the appearance of rival forms which have the status of potential derivatives. As a result, the number of parallel diminutive derivatives is fairly limited. The same phenomenon is observed in Ukrainian.

3. A brief analysis of Ukrainian data

In this section we shall concentrate on selected pairs of rival formations in Ukrainian. To begin with, we shall focus on derivatives involving the suffixes -*čyk* and -*ec’*. The suffixes in question differ in terms of degree of productivity, i.e. the formative -*čyk* is considered more productive than -*ec’*. Compare the following parallel -*čyk* and -*ec’* derivatives: *remin’* ’belt’ > *reminčyk*$_{DIM}$ // *reminec’*$_{DIM}$, *korin’* ’root’ > *korinčyk*$_{DIM}$ // *korinec’*$_{DIM}$, *parkan* ’fence’ > *parkančyk*$_{DIM}$ // *parkanec’*$_{DIM}$, *kavun* ’water-melon’ > *kavunčyk*$_{DIM}$ // *kavunec’*$_{DIM}$, *papir* ’paper’ > *papirčyk*$_{DIM}$ // *papirec’*$_{DIM}$, *kamin’* ’stone’ > *kaminčyk*$_{DIM}$ // *kaminec’*$_{DIM}$, *baran* ’sheep’ > *barančyk*$_{DIM}$ // *baranec’*$_{DIM}$, etc. As may be seen, the suffixes -*čyk* and -*ec’* can combine with the same base-forms. The question can be raised whether there are any semantic differences as regards -*čyk* and -*ec’* formations. An analysis of the diminutive formations under discussion

shows that, as a rule, the -*čyk* derivatives convey diminutive, diminutive-endearing as well as endearing meaning, while diminutives with the suffix -*ec'* express diminutive-endearing or endearing meaning only.

Other cases of rival diminutive formations in Ukrainian involve the following pairs of suffixes: -*Yk* and -*čyk*, -*Yk* and -*ec'*, -*Ok* and -*ec'/-c*(*e*) [10, 129], as illustrated by the examples in (3):

BASE DIM1 DIM2

(3a) -Yk // -čyk portfel' 'brief-case' portfelyk // portfel'čyk

brat 'brother' bratyk // bratčyk

vazon '(flower-)pot' vazonyk // vazončyk

(3b) -Yk // -ec' ohorod 'kitchen-garden' ohorodyk // ohorodec'

harbuz 'pumpkin' harbuzyk // harbuzec'

javor 'sycamore' javoryk // javorec'

(3c) -Ok // -ec' xutir 'small village' xutorok // xutirec'

kylym 'carpet' kylymok // kylymec'

mlyn 'mill' mlynok // mlynec'

(3d) -Ok // -c(e) kolin(o) 'knee' kolink(o) // kolinc(e)

pyv(o) 'beer' pyvk(o) // pyvc(e)

As may be seen, individual base nouns in (3) combine with two of the following diminutive suffixes: -*Yk*, -*Ok*, -*čyk*, -*ec'*, -*c*(*e*), which causes the occurrence of parallel derivatives. The principle of blocking fails to prevent the derivation of the diminutive duplicates. Let us first concentrate our attention on -*Yk* and -*čyk* parallel derivatives. Semerenko [12, p. 56] points out that the suffix -*čyk* has a smaller degree of emotionality than the suffix -*Yk* in current usage, though we suppose that the suffixes under consideration do not differ from this point of view. Thus, what is the reason for the occurrence of parallel -*Yk* and -*čyk* derivatives? In fact, the formations in (3a) express different meanings (the word *bratyk* associates with 'brother' as a kinship term and the noun *bratčyk* is a patronising term of address like *old man* in English) or they can differ in terms of the frequency of their usage (the noun *portfel'čyk* is more widely used than *portfelyk*). Let us now analyse the -*Ok* and -*ec'* rival formations (3c). Didkivska and Rodnina [10, 129] mention that there are fourteen -*Ok* and -*ec'* rival forms attested in modern Ukrainian. According to the criterion of frequency of usage, the -*ec'* formations prevail in five cases and -*Ok* derivatives predominate in nine pairs. For example, in the pair *dubok* // *dubec'* (< *dub* 'oak') the former derivative prevails in overall usage, but the formation *dubec'* is more common in the Southwestern dialect. Although the quantitative advantage of -*Ok* formations is attested, there are cases in which -*ec'* formations are more common, e.g.: diminutives *baranec'* 'ram-DIM', *xutirec'* 'small village-DIM' are more commonly used than *baranok*, *xutirok*, respectively [10, p. 130]. Remarkably, the -*Yk* and -*ec'* pairs are not numerous and that is why they do not give an apportunity for any far-reaching generalisations.

Another phenomenon of interest is the occurrence of rival formations within the class of kinship terms. By way of illustration, consider the following data in Ukrainian: *did* 'grandfather' > *didus'*$_{DIM}$ // *didok*$_{DIM}$ // *didočok*$_{DIM}$ // *didunjo*$_{DIM}$, etc.; *maty* 'mother' > *mama*$_{DIM}$ // *mamusja*$_{DIM}$ // *mamočka*$_{DIM}$ // *mamunja*$_{DIM}$, etc.; *tato* 'father' > *tatko*$_{DIM}$ // *tatočko*$_{DIM}$ // *tatus'*$_{DIM}$ // *tatusyk*$_{DIM}$, etc.; *baba* 'grandmother' > *babusja*$_{DIM}$ // *babunja*$_{DIM}$ // *babulja*$_{DIM}$ // *babul'ka*$_{DIM}$, etc. These data show that common terms denoting family relations can give rise to quite a considerable number of expressive derivatives formed by means of the following suffixes: *-us'-*, *-un'-*, *-očok*, *-ul'k*(*a*), etc. The expressive formations in question are often child-oriented and help children and adults alike to express their positive emotions towards near relatives.

Summing up, we have reviewed the phenomenon of "rival forms" in modern Ukrainian diminutivisation. Žovtobrjux [11, p. 207] claims that rival derivatives occur in different periods of the development of the Ukrainian language and that is the reason for the existence of synonyms based on a single root. It should be noted that full semantic equivalence of rival formations is rare and temporary [10, p. 130].

4. Rival formations in Polish

The purpose of this section is to examine in brief the occurrence of rival diminutive formations in Polish. A full discussion of this topic would mean going beyond the limits set for the present study. Grzegorczykowa and Puzynina [4, p. 178] stress that there are possible parallel formations produced by means of the suffix *-Ek* and *-uszek*, for example: *dzban* 'jug' > *dzbanek*$_{DIM}$ // *dzbanuszek*$_{DIM}$, *pąk* 'bud' > *pączek*$_{DIM}$ // *pączuszek*$_{DIM}$, *wianek* 'wreath' > *wianeczek*$_{DIM}$ // *wianuszek*$_{DIM}$, *garnek* 'pot' > *garneczek*$_{DIM}$ // *garnuszek*$_{DIM}$, etc. Dobrzyński [3, p. 90] points out that the majority of *-uszek* formations are used exclusively in dialects.

One more method of diminutive derivation is by means of the replacement Consonant – *-ś-*. Let us present parallel forms produced by attaching the diminutive suffixes *-Ek* and *-ś/-si*(*a*): *brzuch* 'belly' > *brzuszek*$_{DIM}$ // *brzuś*$_{DIM}$, *robak* 'worm' > *robaczek*$_{DIM}$ // *robaś*$_{DIM}$, *kochanek* 'lover' > *kochaneczek*$_{DIM}$ // *kochaś*$_{DIM}$, *spódnica* 'skirt' > *spódniczka*$_{DIM}$ // *spódnisia*$_{DIM}$, etc. The pattern of *-ś* formations is rather productive. Dobrzyński [3, 72] points out that more than 150 expressive formations are coined by means of this replacement. As a matter of fact, this replacement is one of the oldest of all Polish suffixes. Some *-ś* formations originated from the fifteenth century.

Another similar pattern of parallel formation is represented by the suffixes *-Ek* and *-usi*(*a*) and it can be exemplified by the following data [3, 56-59]: *trawa* 'grass' > *trawka*$_{DIM}$ // *trawusia*$_{DIM}$, *ławka* 'bench' > *ławeczka*$_{DIM}$ // *ławusia*$_{DIM}$, *flaszka* 'bottle' > *flaszeczka*$_{DIM}$ // *flaszusia*$_{DIM}$, etc. As a rule, *-usi*(*a*) diminutives are produced from noun bases terminating

in -*k*– which is a subject for truncation. The -*usi*(*a*) formations have an endearing meaning, sometimes, with jocose or ironical shade. The pattern of -*usi*(*a*) derivatives is quite productive in Polish.

It should be pointed out that in contemporary Polish one can observe the parallel use of the suffixes -*Ek*- and -*ci*(*a*). The suffix -*Ek* is the main diminutive forming affix and has a considerable quantitative advantage in this language. In fact, Polish also possesses quite a productive pattern of diminutive derivation which employs -*ci*(*a*) formations containing the palatalised consonant /ć/, which is common in expressive function [3, 16]. Apparently, we are dealing here with the phenomenon of [k] ~ [ć] replacement. Study a few parallel derivatives with the suffixes -*Ek* and -*ci*(*a*): *kawa* 'coffee' > *kawka*$_{DIM}$ // *kawcia*$_{DIM}$, *krowa* 'cow' > *krówka*$_{DIM}$ // *krówcia*$_{DIM}$, *łapa* 'paw' > *łapka*$_{DIM}$ // *łapcia*$_{DIM}$, *ryba* 'fish' > *rybka*$_{DIM}$ // *rybcia*$_{DIM}$, *żaba* 'frog' > *żabka*$_{DIM}$ // *żabcia*$_{DIM}$, etc.

We shall concentrate now on parallel forms produced by attaching the diminutive suffixes -*Ek* and -*uchn*(*a*) in Polish, for example: *córka* 'daughter' > *córeczka*$_{DIM}$ // *córuchna*$_{DIM}$, *morda* 'mug' > *mordka*$_{DIM}$ // *morduchna*$_{DIM}$, *ręka* 'hand' > *rączka*$_{DIM}$ // *rączuchna*$_{DIM}$, *ryba* 'fish' > *rybka*$_{DIM}$ // *rybuchna*$_{DIM}$, *kot* 'cat' > *kotek*$_{DIM}$ // *kotuchna*$_{DIM}$, etc. The Polish suffix -*uchn*(*a*) commonly forms expressive formations from personal nouns, from body parts as well as from nouns designating animals [6, 189]. Dobrzyński [3, 75] stresses that -*uchn*(*a*) formations have marked endearing character.

In particular, there are several kinship terms for which one can find a number of "rival" forms in Polish, as evidenced by the following examples: *wnuczka* 'granddaughter' > *wnusia*$_{DIM}$ // *wnuczusia*$_{DIM}$, *córka* 'daughter' > *córcia*$_{DIM}$ // *córunia*$_{DIM}$ // *córusia*$_{DIM}$ // *córuchna*$_{DIM}$ // *córeńka*$_{DIM}$, etc.; etc.; *żona* 'wife' > *żoncia*$_{DIM}$ // *żoneczka*$_{DIM}$ // *żonusia*$_{DIM}$, etc.; *ciotka* 'aunt' > *cioteczka*$_{DIM}$ // *ciotunia*$_{DIM}$ // *ciotula*$_{DIM}$ // *ciotuchna*$_{DIM}$, etc. The pattern in question is quite productive in Polish.

5. Conclusion

Polish and Ukrainian possess the pattern of rival formations coined by means of different expressive suffixes. For example, in Polish, there are the following suffixes by means of which rival formations are derived: -Ek and -Ik, -Ek and -uszek, -Ek and -ś/-si(a), -Ek and -usi(a), -Ek and -ci(a), -Ek and -uchn(a), etc.; in Ukrainian, we can find the following rival pairs: -Yk and -čyk, -Yk and -ec', -čyk and -ec', -Ok and -c(e), etc.

The potential of the mode of rival formation is limited in modern Polish and Ukrainian. The totality of the data analysed so far seems to indicate that phonological as well as diachronic factors may be responsible for the occurrence of rival formations. This tendency may be attributed to the principle of blocking. If rival forms do occur they can differ by the frequency of use of a particular item (according to the territorial principle), some of the formations seemingly become lexicalised, and a number of diminutives can acquire metaphorical meaning.

References

1. Allen, Margaret R. 1978. Morphological investigations. PhD dissertation. University of Connecticut.

2. Aronoff, Mark. 1976. Word-formation in generative grammar (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 1). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

3. Dobrzyński, Walenty. 1988. Z badań nad rozwojem polskich deminutywów. Apelatywne spieszczenia dezintegralne. Warszawa, Wrocław: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

4. Grzegorczykowa, Renata and Jadwiga Puzynina. 1979. Słowotwórstwo współczesnego języka polskiego. Rzeczowniki sufiksalne rodzime. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

5. Kreja, Bogusław. 1969. Słowotwórstwo rzeczowników ekspresywnych w języku polskim. Formacje na -ik-, -k-, -isko, -ina. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe.

6. Kreja, Bogusław. 2002. Studia i szkice słowotwórcze. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.

7. Malicka-Kleparska, Anna. 1985. "Parallel derivation and lexicalist morphology: the case of Polish diminutivisation." In E. Gussmann (ed.). Phono-morphology. Studies in the interaction of phonology and morphology. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictwa KUL, 95-112.

8. Plag, Ingo. 1999. Morphological Productivity. Structural constraints in English derivation. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

9. Plag, Ingo. 2002. Word-formation in English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

10. Дідківська, Л.П. and Л.О. Родніна. 1982. Словотвір, синонімія, стилістика. Київ: Наукова думка.

11. Жовтобрюх, М.А. (ed.). 1975. Морфологічна будова сучасної української мови. Київ: Наукова думка.

12. Семеренко, Н.В. 1992. "Формування української демінутивної суфіксації." Мовознавство 4, С. 51-59.

V.T. Dribniuk,
Chernivtsi National University,
Chernivtsi

ENGLISH MEDICAL ABBREVIATIONS

Дане дослідження є спробою відбору медичної абревіатури англійської мови та її класифікації за загальними типами абревіатури.

This research is an attempt to select medical English abbreviations and to classify them according to the general abbreviation types.