



¹ Doctoral degree in Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of Ukrainian Studies, Culture and Documentation, National University "Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic", Poltava, Ukraine.

² Doctor of Philological Science, Professor, Head of the Department of Grammar and Scientific Terminology, National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Institute for Ukrainian Language, Kyiv, Ukraine.

³ Doctoral degree in Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of Ukrainian Language, Poltava V. G. Korolenko National Pedagogical University, Poltava, Ukraine.



FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF WORD-FORMING CATEGORY IN THE DERIVATOLOGY OF THE MODERN UKRAINIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE

FORMAÇÃO E DESENVOLVIMENTO DO CONCEITO DE CATEGORIA DE FORMAÇÃO DE PALAVRAS NA DERIVATOLOGIA DA LÍNGUA LITERÁRIA UCRANIANA MODERNA

FORMACIÓN Y DESARROLLO DEL CONCEPTO DE CATEGORÍA DE FORMACIÓN DE PALABRAS EN LA DERIVATOLOGÍA DEL IDIOMA LITERARIO UCRANIANO MODERNO

Iryna DENYSOVETS ¹
denysovets.ira@gmail.com
Kateryna HORODENSKA ²
k.horodenska70@meta.ua
Tetyana NIKOLASHYNA ³
t.nikolashina@ukr.net



How to reference this paper:

Denysovets, I., Horodenska, K., & Nikolashyna, T. (2025). Formação e desenvolvimento do conceito de "categoria de formação de palavras" na derivatologia da língua literária ucraniana moderna. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 29, e025002. 10.22633/rpge.v29i00.19932

Submitted: 17/01/2025
Revisions required: 03/02/2025
Approved: 04/02/2025
Published: 19/02/2025

ABSTRACT: The relevance of the proposed study is determined by the need to trace the chronological stages of the formation of term names in order to define the concept of "word-forming category", which will contribute to the terminological arrangement in Ukrainian derivatology. The aim of the study is to comprehensively study the content of the concept of the "word-forming category" in the modern Ukrainian language, in particular its evolution, structural organization, and interaction with other categorical units of the language system, with an emphasis on terminological ordering in Ukrainian derivation. To achieve the goal, a number of special linguistic methods were used, in particular, diachronic, definitional, and functional analysis, as the historical-linguistic, comparative-typological, and semantic-structural methods. It was determined that according to the principles of modern functional-categorical grammar, a word-form is located between syntax and morphology, forming its categories in the structure of a sentence or phrase and using morphological means for this purpose.

KEYWORDS: Grammar. Derivatology. Morphological category. Syntactic category. Word-formation category.

RESUMO: A relevância do estudo proposto está relacionada à necessidade de traçar os estágios cronológicos da formação dos nomes dos termos, com o objetivo de definir o conceito de “categoria de formação de palavras”, o que contribuirá para a organização terminológica na derivatologia ucraniana. O estudo visa realizar uma análise abrangente do conteúdo do conceito de “categoria de formação de palavras” na língua ucraniana moderna, abordando sua evolução, organização estrutural e interação com outras unidades categóricas do sistema linguístico, com ênfase na ordenação terminológica na derivação ucraniana. Para atingir esse objetivo, foram utilizados diversos métodos linguísticos especializados, incluindo análise diacrônica, definicional e funcional, além dos métodos histórico-linguístico, comparativo-tipológico e semântico-estrutural. Constatou-se que, de acordo com os princípios da gramática funcional-categórica moderna, uma forma de palavra se situa entre a sintaxe e a morfologia, formando suas categorias na estrutura da frase ou oração e utilizando meios morfológicos para esse fim.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Gramática. Derivatologia. Categoria morfológica. Categoria sintática. Categoria de formação de palavras.

RESUMEN: La relevancia del estudio propuesto se determina por la necesidad de trazar las etapas cronológicas de la formación de nombres terminológicos con el fin de definir el concepto de "categoría de formación de palabras", lo que contribuirá al ordenamiento terminológico en la derivatología ucraniana. El objetivo del estudio es analizar de manera integral el contenido del concepto de "categoría de formación de palabras" en el idioma ucraniano moderno, en particular su evolución, organización estructural e interacción con otras unidades categoriales del sistema lingüístico, con énfasis en el ordenamiento terminológico en la derivación ucraniana. Para lograr el objetivo, se utilizaron una serie de métodos lingüísticos especiales, en particular el análisis diacrónico, definicional y funcional, así como los métodos histórico-lingüísticos, comparativo-tipológicos y semántico-estructurales. Se determinó que, según los principios de la gramática funcional-categorial moderna, la forma de la palabra se encuentra entre la sintaxis y la morfología, formando sus categorías en la estructura de la oración o frase y utilizando medios morfológicos para este fin.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Gramática. Derivatología. Categoría morfológica. Categoría sintáctica. Categoría de formación de palabras.

Article submitted to the similarity system



Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes

Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional (RPGE), Araraquara, v. 29, n. 00, e025002, 2025



10.22633/rpge.v29i00.19932

INTRODUCTION

The modern Ukrainian literary language presents a specific and structured system of grammatical categories, understood as integral units of multiple levels. These categories combine interrelated grammatical values in terms of content and are expressed through a specialized set of grammatical forms. They represent fundamental elements of the linguistic structure, permeating the language system and connecting with various levels. Given their functional versatility, the grammatical categories of the Ukrainian language, as essential components of linguistic organization, encompass three types of units: morphological, syntactic, and word formation (Kostusiak, 2012).

Syntactic categories, to which morphological ones are subordinated, occupy a hierarchically superior position, while word formation categories, located between the morphological and syntactic categories, interact closely with both. In this context, the study of the chronological stages of the concept of “word formation category” in the contemporary Ukrainian language has become increasingly relevant, contributing to the systematization of Ukrainian derivatology terminology.

The word formation category occupies a central position in the hierarchy of complex derivational units, thus serving as an essential theoretical and methodological foundation for understanding this system. The basis for this field was established by researchers such as Bogoroditskyi (1935), Dokulil (1962), Kovalik (1958a), Peshkovskiy (2001), Pokrovsky (1895), Potebnia (1968), and Vinogradov (1986). In the 19th and early 20th centuries, grammarians approached this category in correlation with other linguistic aspects, analyzing the semantics of words, the evolution of grammatical classes, and the formation of derivational categories associated with action, collectivity, and abstraction (Potebnia, 1968). They also investigated the transformations occurring in word formation regarding its structuring and separation (Pokrovsky, 1895). Moreover, they explored syntactic relations, demonstrating the interdependence between lexemes in discourse, in contrast to non-syntactic or derivational categories, which do not present such dependence (Peshkovskiy, 2001).

Bogoroditskyi (1935), emphasizing the semasiological aspect of morphology, considered only suffixal word formation categories, which are responsible for classifying the diversity of objects in the world. On the other hand, Dokulil (1962), in his theory, attributed to the word formation category the status of a primary unit in the description of the derivational system, arguing that it is more comprehensive than the derivational type, as it abstracts from the unit of the formative (derivator).

Recent theoretical and applied research on word formation in the Ukrainian language indicates that derivational categories are dynamic units, constantly evolving and actively present in speech. The evolution of the concept of the “*word-forming category*” shows a tran-

sition from static structural-semantic models to dynamic functional-categorical models. This perspective allows for the analysis of word formation categories as a result of the interaction between semantic, syntactic, and morphological factors, providing a deeper understanding of the processes of creating new words and their role in verbal communication.

This category is a specific linguistic concept that exhibits the following characteristics: dynamic nature, as it is not static but develops throughout the speech process; multifunctionality, performing different functions in verbal communication; interaction between the semantic, syntactic, and morphological levels in the formation of these categories; and contextuality, being analyzed within discourse rather than in isolation (Bilous, 2019; Bilukha, 2019; Kostusiak *et al.*, 2020).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study aims to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the concept of "*word-forming category*" in the contemporary Ukrainian language, especially considering its content and evolution over time. To achieve this objective, various research methods were employed to study word formation terms at different stages of their development. In particular, the classification and interpretation of the linguistic units analyzed, as well as the description of their differential characteristics, were carried out using the descriptive method.

Additionally, it is essential to map the stages of development of scientific approaches to the study of these categories in the works of Ukrainian and foreign linguists, highlighting the main methodological principles and the foundation for terminological organization in the field of derivation.

Definitional analysis clarified and defined the analyzed terminological units. This method determined the connections of a specific term within the system of word formation terms, aiming to identify the semantic components of a term in the meaning of another.

To outline the individual stages in the genesis of the Ukrainian language word formation terminology system, theoretical methods of conceptual and comparative analysis were applied, confronting existing theoretical approaches based on the generalization of philological, philosophical, methodological, and educational literature. Furthermore, the etymological analysis method, based on the comparative-historical method, was used.

For this purpose, various specialized linguistic methods were employed, such as diachronic analysis; definitional and functional analysis; the historical-linguistic method to examine the stages of the formation of this concept in Ukrainian linguistics; the comparative-typological method to reveal the peculiarities of the development of the "*word-forming category*"

concept in the context of other linguistic traditions; and the semantic-structural method to examine the semantic and formal characteristics of word formation categories.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The term “*word-forming category*” is based on the ontological, logical and linguistic basis, which was traced by foreign and domestic scientists at various stages of the development of linguistic science. For the first time, the theory of logical categories was developed on the basis of language by the Greek researcher Aristotle. His ideas, which appeared in the ontological and epistemological understanding, encompassed the categories of essence, quality, relationship, place, time, position, condition, action, and prudence (care, suffering). Aristotle classifies these categories as categories of being, categories of knowledge, and categories of language (Kostych, 2014).

Later (Kant, 2000) considered categories as forms of thinking in the context of classification of judgments. In his linguistic category concepts (Humboldt, 1984) who introduced the term *conceptual category* into scientific circulation, noted that grammatical categories are transformations and reincarnations of universal logical categories (Kovalik, 1987).

Ukrainian grammarians of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, in particular (Ogonovskyi, 1889; Smal-Stockyi; Gartner, 1893), identified word-formation classes and proposed their term names, without using the concept of “*word-formation category*” (Ogonovskyi, 1889).

Thus, Ogonovskyi (1889) singled out such word-forming classes of nouns: *nouns denoting gender* (patronymic names), *denoting lands* (territorial names), *nouns meaning young animals and persons* (names of young persons and animals), *nouns that mean plants that have already been harvested and from which fruits have been picked* (names of plants from which the harvest was harvested). In this context, the grammarian developed the idea that each suffix, performing the role of a word-forming formant, is a carrier of a certain meaning. Ogonovskyi (1889) identified almost all word-forming noun categories known to modern linguistics (except singularity), giving them appropriate names: 1) *nouns denoting the active person* (category of an actor or subject of an action, process, state); 2) *nouns expressing a tool or means* (tool category); 3) *nouns denoting the place where something happens or is located* (category of place); 4) *complex nouns* (team category); 5) *lesser nouns – diminutive* (the diminutive category or diminutives); 6) *nouns that express exaggeration* (category of increase - augmentatives, pejoratives) (Ogonovskyi, 1889).

Smal-Stotskyi and Gartner (1893) characterized nouns as follows: *names of workers after the tool or object of work* (professional titles), e.g.: *oarsman, carpenter, potter, shepherd*;

names of persons after belonging to the region, nation, state (national and territorial names), e.g.: *Rusyn, Bulgarian, burgher, peasant*; names of persons or animals after belonging to a certain kind (patronymic names and animal names), e.g.: *panych, Kuzmych, Bondarenko, goose, gosling, names of males - goose, foal; names of women, females - queen, fox, goddess, Bulgarian (female Bolharka)*. Smal-Stotskyi and Gartner (1893), in their grammatical work, taking into account the additions used to create new words, singled out and nominated such word-forming noun categories: 1) *the names of the doers* (teacher, ploughman, blacksmith); 2) *names of persons after some sign* (a monk, a naked man, a poor man); 3) *names of tools, items for some work* (plow, awl, oar); 4) *names of places where something happens or is* (fireplace, workshop, bedroom); 5) *lesser and affectionate names* (father (tatko), face (lychko), soul (dushechka)); 6) *enlarged and rude words* (swamp, girl / bahnys'ko, divchyshche); 7) *names of validity, events, states and their products* (life, reading, wealth / zhytye, chytanye, dostatok); 8) *names of signs* (kindness, youth, cunning); 9) *cumulative names* (hair, seven); 10) *names of individual persons or things after matter or a sign* (protein, yolk, peas).

The first attempt to identify word-forming categories based on the material of nouns and scientifically describe them belongs to Osadtsa (1862). In work "Grammar of the Russian Language", explaining the creation of nouns with the help of root elements (extensions), he noted that these linguistic units have different meanings. Taking into account such a criterion and a set of word-forming means (additions), the grammarian systematized the analyzed derivatives, indicating what exactly they express, and marked them with the appropriate terms: 1) *active person* (category of an actor or subject of an action, process, state), e.g.: *baker, scribe, creator, fisherman*; 2) *tool* (tool category), e.g.: *soap, incense, ink*; 3) *activity* (action category), e.g.: *sow, building, cry*; 4) *result of action* (action result category), e.g.: *moat, hay*; 5) *abstract nouns* (abstraction quality category), e.g.: *beauty, grace, laziness*; 6) *nouns formed from adverbs* (the category of the noun of the attributive sign), e.g.: *student, sinner, saint*; 7) *lesser and enlarged nouns (decrease / increase)*, e.g.: *bread, boy, horse/khlibets', khlopysko, konyshche*. So, Osadtsa (1862) singled out seven of the eleven word-forming noun categories known to modern linguistics (Grammar of the Russian language, 1862). The categories of place, collectivity, and singularity are not identified, and increases and decreases are qualified as one.

Attempts to classify nouns, taking into account the meaning and formant by which they were formed, are also reflected in the grammar of Shashkevich (1865). The scientist uses author's names to denote word-forming noun categories that present such semantics: 1) *person observing some activity* (actor or subject of action, process, state), e.g.: *savior, patron, inhabitant, writer, creator*; 2) *person or thing with special property* (attributive feature), e.g.: *sinner, student, collector*; 3) *place where something was or happened* (location), e.g.: *yard, hillock, field, pasture*; 4) *abstract nouns*, e.g.: *life, salvation*; 5) *enlarged nouns* (nouns with the

word-forming meaning of increase), e.g.: *a horse, a cow, a woman, a man, a dog / konys'ko, korovysko, babysko, cholovichys'ko, psyshche*; 6) *lesser nouns* (nouns with the word-forming meaning of diminutive), e.g.: *oak, pond, pipe, hand, grandpa / dubok", stavochoh", dudochka, ruchen'ka, didun'o*; 7) *mother nouns* (names with the word-forming meaning of collectivity, singularity, grammatical objectivity), e.g.: *veal, chicken, tithe, clay* (Shashkevich, 1865).

Unlike Osadtsa (1862) and Shashkevich (1865) singled out the word-forming categories of place, collectivity, and singularity and also distinguished the categories of increase and decrease but bypassed the categories of action and result of the action. Its names for the designation of word-forming categories are transparent and understandable for users of the corresponding synchronous slice.

According to Kovalik (1987), for the first time, the entire mechanism of the history of the formation and development of linguistic categorization processes was clearly clarified, and a complete picture of the formation and development of the system of linguistic categories in Slavic and Indo-European languages was created.

Potebnya (1968) was interested in the nature and historical patterns of the development of the word-forming category, in particular, the category of action. According to his concept, the names of actions etymologically include the meaning of place, result, tool, and sometimes, actor or executor of the action (Kovalik, 1958a).

The concept of "*word-forming category*" in the context of the close relationship between logical and grammatical categories was described by Peshkovskiy (2001), noting that it is a number of forms united semantically (Kovalik, 1987). The researcher defended the opinion that all linguistic categories have part-language dependence, distinguishing syntactic and non-syntactic (word-forming) categories.

It is a well-established opinion that the term word-forming category was introduced into derivation by the Czech scientist Dokulil (1962), who, in the work "*Word formation in the Czech Language*", considered the word-forming category as "a unit formed by a group of word-forming types united by a common derivational meaning regardless of the means of its expression" (Dokulil, 1962). Determining the scope of the word-form category in the word-form system among other complex units, the linguist calls it a more general concept than the word-form type because the word-form category differs from the latter by the absence of a common format (derivation), which serves as a means of expressing the word-form meaning. Dokulil (1962) notes that within the limits of affixal word formation, the word-forming type is determined by: 1) the unity of the onomasiological structure; 2) the unity of the lexical and grammatical character of the creative base; 3) the identity of the formant in all its mandatory parts. If we do not take into account a certain formant, we will get a word-forming category. According to the level of abstraction, word-forming categories are between proper grammatical and lexical-grammatical linguistic categories and show dependence on both of them. As

Dokulil (1962) notes, between word-formation and grammatical categories, there is a significant difference in the degree of abstraction and the quality of abstraction: word-forming categories, on the one hand, always cover certain lexical-semantic classes; on the other hand, they themselves are contained in more general lexical-semantic categories; in grammatical categories, we never find a simple greater or lesser generalization of lexical meanings; grammatical categories are only built on lexical meanings, but are abstracted from them.

However, Hrestchuk (2007) considers these considerations not entirely convincing, arguing that in the concept of Kovalik (1987), the word-forming category unites word-forming categories (a set of semantically homogeneous word-forming types) and if we compare the understanding of the word-forming category, it is easy to see that the concept of the word-forming category in Dokulil coincides with the word-forming category of Kovalik (1987) and Hrestchuk (2007).

In the work *"Russian language: Grammatical teaching about the word"*, Vinogradov (1986) describes the morphological system with a projection on word variables and word-forming parameters of language components. The linguist emphasizes that in the structure of categorical units of morphology, form-forming and word-forming tendencies clearly intersect, the orientation of which leads to the division of morphological categories into proper-morphological and morphological-syntactic ones. The latter are related to the reflection of the word-forming system of the language. In the context of the study of Russian word formation, Vinogradov (1986) singles out the word-forming categories of person, objectivity, and relativity, considering the concept of "word-forming category" to be less general and abstract compared to grammatical ones, since in the phenomena of word formation there is no complete alienation from the variety of concrete lexical-semantic groupings of words. Vinogradov (1986) generally predicted the multi-vector nature of the word-forming category, noting that as a result of the analysis of word-forming categories, at least of the suffix type, we come to the conclusion that it is necessary to distinguish the very process of forming a word-forming category, its replenishment with new words, as well as the morphological rules of creating words of the corresponding type and the laws of semantic development of a specific category, the potential parallelism of the development of the meanings of words of this category, in other words, two planes are clearly distinguished in word-forming categories: structural-grammatical and semantic-lexicological.

Nelyuba (2008) emphasizes that Ukrainian derivational studies were the first to formulate and describe in detail the main word-forming concepts: "word-forming grade," "word-forming class," "word-forming type," and "word-forming category," for the first time in Kovalik's works (1958b).

Kovalik (1958a), who is responsible for the development of the metalanguage of word formation, the normalization of word-forming terms in the context of a single hierarchical,

logically consistent system, in accordance with the traditional formal-grammatical approach, interprets the word-forming category as a complex unit of derivation, noting that this is a general abstract concept that encompasses the entire set of subordinate word-formation classes, related by one common meaning and which unite semantically homogeneous word-formation types.

The interpretation of the meaning of the concept of “word-forming category”, proposed by Kovalik, is closely related to the idea of the independence and orderliness of the word-forming system of the language as a system of subsystems, a whole, “the parts of which are among themselves in regular relationships and constant interconnections” (Kovalik, 1958a). The scientist singles out interconnected subordinate parts of the word-forming structure of the language (“subordinate word-forming classes” - a kind of generalization of word-forming categories at the level of parts of the language, for example, the name of a feature (adjective), each of which within all parts of speech is a system of word-forming quantities of a lower order, which can be called word-forming categories. Within the word-formation class of such a part of speech as an adjective, a system of word-formation categories of qualitative and relative with possessive adjectives is distinguished, and within the latter, separate word-formation types are revealed, the totality of which differs qualitatively within the mentioned adjectival word-formation categories) (Kovalik, 1958a).

In later theoretical works, the scientist consistently develops the concept of derivatives (a basic substantive linguistic unit of the word-forming level, characterized by the corresponding word-forming form and word-forming meaning), through the prism of this linguistic unit, interprets the word-forming system of the language “as an integral unity by its derivative”. It is natural that this is also reflected in the understanding and definition of the concept of “word-forming category”: “it is a set of derivatives with a common word-forming meaning, expressed by a certain complex of word-forming means” (Vocabulary of modern Ukrainian literary language, 1979).

Kovalik (1958b) proposed the classification of word-forming categories and classes on the example of nouns in the work “*On some issues of Slavic word-formation*”. For example, among nouns, he distinguishes *personal and non-personal names*. In the composition of the word-forming category of personal names, the scientist includes the following word-forming categories of personal names (equal): by the nature of their activity or profession; by their external features or internal qualities; by their nationality or territorial origin; according to their social status; by belonging to a certain ideological, political, philosophical or religious trend; on the basis of their relationship with the human environment; on the basis of their immaturity or inferiority; collective and individual names of persons (Hrestchuk, 2007). Kovalik (1958b) singled out the following word-forming categories: actor (*nomina agentis*), sign bearer (*nomina attributiva*), collective (*nomina collectiva*), location (*nomina loci*), action (*nomina acti*),

result (*nomina resultatis*) and tool (*nomina instrumenti*), abstraction. This classification was somewhat changed by Vyhovanets and Horodenska (2004) as the main such word-forming noun categories: 1) subject of action, process, state, etc. - combines names formed by suffixes: *-ach, -nyk, -tel, -ets, -ak, -ar, -iy*; 2) tool - combines names formed by suffixes: *-ach, -nyk, -ak, -ets, -un*; 3) locative (places) - unites locative names formed by suffixes: *-n, -ish, -j*; 4) grammatical objectivity - unites names formed by suffixes: *-j, -ist, -oshch, -izn, -ot, -yin, -stv (-tstv)*; 5) increments - combines names formatted with suffixes: *-ysk, -ysh, -ur, -ug, -uk*; 6) diminutives - combines names formed by suffixes: *-ok, -k, -ik, -its, -ets, -ts, -en, -ochk, -ichok, -ochk, -echk, -ichk*; 7) collectives - unites names decorated with suffixes: *-stv (-tstv), -n, -inn, -nyak, -nyk, -v*; 8) singularities – unites names decorated with a suffix *-in*.

In the 1960s, the direction of research into the phenomena of word formation “from content to form” of linguistic units was established (structural-semantic approach). In the 1970s, the direction “from form to content” of language units (morphological approach) began to develop. Later, both approaches merged. In the 1980s, the semantics and structure of a derived word were derived from the syntactic construction (phrase, sentence) underlying it and accompanied by word-forming changes of the original unit – its contraction, condensation, reduction, etc.

Developing the views of Kovalik (1958a), Tsyganenko (1983), in addition to the concepts of “word-forming type” and “word-forming category”, considers “word-forming category” as a set of semantically homogeneous word-forming types and “word-forming class”, that is, a generalization of word-forming categories at the level of parts of speech. Accordingly, single-function word-formation types form a word-formation class, and word-formation classes united by a common meaning form word-formation categories that belong to certain classes within parts of speech.

In the traditional Ukrainian word-formation, the following definition of the concept of “word-forming category” has become widespread: “This is a unit that is formed by a set of word-forming types based on the commonality of the derivational meaning without taking into account the formal means of expressing this meaning” (Vakaryuk, & Pantso, 2004). The only criterion for distinguishing word-forming categories, definitely recognized by all linguists, is the commonality of derivational meaning. A word-forming category is a two-level (has meaning and form) complex unit, in the formation of which a group of derivatives with a common word-forming meaning participates, and there is also an alternation of derivatives (word-forming means), the creative bases and methods of word formation can be different.

According to Klymenko’s definition, the encyclopedia “Ukrainian Language” presents two approaches to the interpretation of the concept of “word-forming category” (Klymenko, 2007): 1) *word-forming category* – it is a set of derived words that have formatives that belong to the same part of the language, are endowed with a common word-forming meaning and

use the same way of word formation; 2) *word-forming category* – it is a set of words with a common word-forming meaning, but different creative bases and methods of word formation. The first definition states that the basic unit of a word-forming category is a word-forming type. According to this approach, the word-forming category is considered in the unity of the plan of expression and the plan of content, and here it appears as a functional-formal unit. Word-forming types within the same word-forming category are complementary and mutually exclusive, and a word-forming category combines word-forming types with different word-forming formants. Each part of the language has its word-forming categories. Depending on the generalized semantics of creative bases, word-forming categories related to substantive and indicative nominative meanings of words are distinguished. Among nouns, word-forming categories of subject, procedural, and static features are established. In the word-forming category of carriers, procedural signs distinguish the meaning of the performer, tool, place, result of action, etc. According to the second approach, the plan of expression and the plan of content within a word-forming category are considered not in a hierarchical relationship, but as equal manifestations of a word-forming category and a word-forming type. According to the degree of abstraction, word-forming categories occupy an intermediate place between grammatical (highest) and lexical linguistic categories and show dependence on both. This definition is consistent with the understanding of the word-forming category presented by (Kovalik, 1987).

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

So, the word-formation category is a multifaceted abstract unit of derivationology. It includes a set of lexemes united by a common meaning but created using different word-formation bases and methods. This concept is a conceptual tool for modeling the linguistic picture of the world through the prism of word-forming processes.

The first prototypes of word-forming categories based on ontological, logical, and linguistic foundations can be traced back to the works of ancient Greek thinkers who, although they did not use modern terms, laid the foundations for their understanding. Within the framework of the Ukrainian linguistic tradition, the separation of word-forming units received significant attention only at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. Linguists of this period emphasized the classification of nouns according to semantics and method of formation (word-forming formant), but the term word-forming category was not yet used. Only in the middle of the 20th century, thanks in particular to the works of the Ukrainian linguist Kovalik (1958a) in parallel with the works of the Czech linguist Dokulil (1962), the concept of “*word-forming category*” receives a clear definition and enters the scientific discourse.

For a long time, the study of word-forming categories was limited to the framework of the structural-semantic approach, in which they were considered functional and formal units of the linguistic system. However, at the current stage of the development of derivatology, the functional-categorical approach is becoming more and more widespread. According to this approach, word-formation categories are formed not only at the level of the morphological structure of the word, but also within syntactic units, such as sentences or phrases. This opens up the possibility of applying semantic-syntactic criteria to distinguish and analyze word-forming categories, expanding the limits of their theoretical and practical understanding.

Therefore, the development of the concept of word-forming category reflects the evolution of scientific approaches to the study of linguistic phenomena, which gradually integrate structural, semantic and syntactic aspects into a single coherent system.

Taking into account the modern achievements in the theory of derivation and the development of the functional-categorical approach, we single out several promising directions for further research in the field of word formation and word-forming categories, in particular, an in-depth study of the functional-categorical approach. Since this approach focuses on the integration of morphological and syntactic elements in the formation of word-forming categories, a detailed analysis of the interaction of morpheme composition and syntactic structures in language formations will be promising. Determining the role of each component in the process of forming categories will make it possible to reveal new regularities and properties. An in-depth study of the semantic and syntactic criteria for distinguishing word-forming categories is also promising, particularly in the context of the Ukrainian language. This will make it possible to clarify how changes in the syntactic structure can affect the formation of new derivatives and their meanings and functionality in different types of texts. It is worth paying attention to the comparative analysis of word-forming categories in the Ukrainian language with other languages. This will allow us not only to reveal universal patterns of word formation but also to investigate the peculiarities of the functioning of these categories in different language systems. In the context of the development of language structures, word-forming categories can be vulnerable to the influence of social, cultural, and even media processes. It is promising to study how modern socio-cultural conditions (for example, the popularization of technical and scientific terms) change the structure and semantics of word-forming categories.

REFERENCES

- Bilous, A. O. (2019). *The word-forming category of agency in the Ukrainian language compared to the Polish and English languages*. [Master's Thesis, Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University]. <https://krs.chmnu.edu.ua/jspui/handle/123456789/207>
- Bilukha, O. A. (2019). *Word-formative category of temporal attribution of Ukrainian adjectives in comparison with Bulgarian and English languages*. [Master's Thesis, Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University]. <https://krs.chmnu.edu.ua/jspui/handle/123456789/217>
- Bogoroditskyi, V. A. (1935). *General course of grammar (from university readings)*.
- Dokulil, M. (1962). *Tvoření slov v češtině: Teorie odvozování slov*. Nakl. Československé akademie věd.
- Hrestchuk, V. V. (2007). *Derivatological concept of Ivan Kovalik: the doctrine of word creation*. City of NV.
- Humboldt, V. (1984). *On the differences in the structure of human languages and its influence on the spiritual development of mankind. Selected works on linguistics*. Progress.
- Kant, I. (2000). *Critique of pure reason*. Translated from the German by I. Universe.
- Klymenko, N. F. (2007). *Word-forming category*. Encyclopedia.
- Kostusiak, N., Navalna, M., & Mezhev, O. (2020). The functional-cognitive category of femininity in modern Ukrainian. *Cognitive Studies / Études cognitives*, 20, 2310. DOI: 10.11649/cs.2310. <https://journals.ispan.edu.pl/index.php/cs-ec/article/view/cs.2310/>
- Kostusiak, N. M. (2012). Word-forming categories in the grammatical system of the Ukrainian language. *Scientific journal of the National Pedagogical University named after M. P. Drahomanova*, 9, 68–73. <http://enpuir.npu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/22019>
- Kostych, L. The status of the word-forming category. *Ukrainian Linguistics*, 44(1), 29–41, 2014. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Um_%202014%20_1_5
- Kovalik, I. I. (1958a). *Teaching about word formation (word-forming parts of a word)*. Publishing House of Lviv University.
- Kovalik, I. I. (1958b). *The issue of Slavic noun word formation in East Slavic languages compared to other Slavic languages*. Publishing House of Lviv University
- Kovalik, I. I. (1987). To the question of conceptual and linguistic categories. *Linguistics*, 1, 16–20.
- Nelyuba, A. M. (2008). *Explicit and implicit economy in the word-formation nomination of the*

Ukrainian language. [Doctor's Thesis, Institute of the Ukrainian Language, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine].

Ogonovskyi, O. (1889). *Grammar of the Russian language for middle schools*.

Osadtsa, M. (1862). *Grammar of the Russian language*.

Peshkovskiy, A. M. (2001). *Russian syntax in scientific coverage*.

Pokrovsky, M. M. (1895). *Semasiological research in the field of ancient languages*. University type.

Potebnia, A. A. (1968). *From notes on Russian grammar*. Education.

Shashkevich, S. G. (1865). *A SMALL grammar of the Russian language based on readers for the III and IV groups of schools in the Austrian Empire used as an auxiliary book for teachers and trainers*. Vĕdny.

Smal-Stotsky, I. S., & Gartner, F. (1893). *Ruska grammar*.

Tsyganenko, H. P. (1983). *Word-forming meaning as a category of derivation: Word-forming semantics of East Slavic languages*. Naukova Dumka.

Vakaryuk, L. O., & Pantso, S. E. (2004). *Ukrainian language: Morphemics and word formation*. Bohdan, 2004.

Vinogradov, V. V. (1986). *Russian language: Grammatical doctrine of the word*. Higher School.

WORD formation of modern Ukrainian literary language. (1979). Scientific Opinion.

CRediT Author Statement

Acknowledgements: We thank the National University Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic (Ukraine).

Funding: None.

Conflicts of interest: None

Ethical approval: No need to submit to the ethics.

Data and material availability: The data and materials used in the work are not available.

Author's contributions: Iryna Denysovets – data analysis and interpretation, conception, ideation, writing and revision. Kateryna Horodenska – data collection. Tetyana Nikolashyna – collaboration in article writing and proofreading.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação

Proofreading, formatting, normalization and translation

