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Introduction. The content aspect of word formation is a system of word-formation meanings combined into word-formation categories.

Word-formation (derivational) meaning is a long-standing and still controversial subject of linguistics [see. Nemchenko 1985, 36-37, 150-153].

Especially often the problems of general and particular word-formation meanings are discussed, as well as the essence of word-formation meanings – total or difference, i.e. including or abstracting from the semantics of the producing word [Kim L.L. 1980, 3-8].

The concept of word-formation meanings varies from very specific, close to the lexical meaning, to extremely generalized, for example:

"The determining factor for word-formation meanings ... is the relation of the categorical meanings of the derivative and the producer, for example, process to substance, substance to process, attribute to attribute, etc. ..." [Soboleva 1980, 36].

Much less attention is paid to the identification of the essence, description and classification of word-formation categories in the derivatological literature [see. Nemchenko 1985, 139], which is explained by the great attention to the formal side of word formation and the choice of word-formation type as the main classification unit.

Often, word-formative categories are defined as a set of word-formative type, "united by a commonality:

1) derivational meaning;
2) the way of word formation;
3) producing bases ..." [Zemskaya 1973, 241-242].

However, the word-formation meaning is not revealed from a set of words belonging to the same word-formation type, but serves as a criterion for combining them into one word-formation type, for example:

- виноградина – горошина – льдина – макаронина;
- икринка – пылинка – росинка – чашника;
- железка – карамелька – мармеладка, which represent the derivational categories of unity.

The description of word-formation categories and word-formation type is determined primarily...
by the point of view on the nature of linguistic meanings. The recognition of semantic fields as relatively independent of linguistic embodiment allows qualifying the word-formation meaning as generalized, close to grammatical in the degree of abstraction, but expressed in the composition of the derived word by formant means specific for the given language.

**Literature review and methodology.** With this approach, word-formation categories, and not of the word-formation type, becomes the main unit of classification at the word-formation level. This corresponds to M. Dokulil's approach to derivational categories as a type of onomasiological category, the views of A.M. Peshkovsky on formal categories, comparing grammar categories with the role of rasters in printing (raster is a grid that is superimposed on the reproduced image).

"Through mental categories, human thinking brings reality to a scale commensurate with itself. Language, in turn, can embrace the entire complexity of a thought, only by throwing on it a grid of general concepts called grammatical categories" [Tenier 1988, 59].

Consideration of word-formation categories as a combination of word-building types inevitably limits them to one way of word-formation, with a different approach, the volume and significance of a word-formation category should not be limited by the framework of a certain way of word formation.

The word-formation category ... identifies the series of derivatives with different formants and methods of word formation based on the common word-formation meaning" [Manucharyan 1981, 201-202].

Recognition of word-formation categories as an analogue of grammatical categories makes it possible to raise the question of the organization of word-formation categories on the basis of opposed word-formation meanings (for example, magnification / diminutiveness, singularity / repetition), and not only on the basis of one word-formative meaning (for example, the producer of the action, the bearer of the attribute). It is with this approach that it is possible to reduce word-formation categories into macrocategories, to recognize inter-speech word-formation categories or the same type of word-formation categories in a circle of different parts of speech.

Close to this approach is the consideration of word-formation categories as a "semantic model, abstracting from specific word-building types" [Onheiser 1987, 216]. It is with this approach that derivational categories can be considered as a kind of linguistic categories that reflect conceptual categories and thus act as fragments of the picture of the world of a given language.

"Comparison of word-formative meanings and means of their expression is ultimately the detection and comparison of word-formative categories. Unlike the word-formative type, a word-formative category can serve as a unit of comparison not only for closely related languages and, therefore, is a more universal unit of analysis ... In this understanding, the word-formative category completely covers the word-formative zone of a particular nominal field, word-formative types act as a kind of concrete variants of this invariant "[Manucharyan 1987, 54-55].

So, a word-formative category is defined in principle in the same way as a grammatical category is the unity of word-formative meaning (meanings) and formant means of its (their) expression.

With the obligatory formant expression, the very form of the formant is secondary, especially in languages such as Russian, fusion languages, which are characterized by asymmetric polysemantic relationships between content and form.

Associated with this are allomorphism, the abundance of synonymous formants, the " melting " of morphemic seams, which manifests itself in numerous morphonological transformations, the presence of zero morphemes.

If the formant expression of derivational meaning is determined by the type of a given language, then the very set of derivational meanings tends to universality and is determined primarily by the reflection of the main, basic conceptual categories, in a reduced, condensed form, presented
E.S. Kubryakova rightly notes that the word-formation meanings of "case" origin are at the center of the content aspect of the word-formation system and that "word-formation plays a special role in expressing the case meanings ... there is not a single category described in the framework of the case grammar that does not have its analogies All the case meanings we know serve as the basis for onomasiological categories created with the help of word-formation means ... 

The derivative, assessed from this perspective, can be considered a special case complex, the specific meaning of which is based on its word-educational meaning, which, in our deep conviction, is a modeled means of generalized types of relations, chosen as the initial one and correlating with such ontological entities as object and substance, process and action, property and quality, etc. "[Kubryakova 1987, 40-43].

The categories of case grammar, including sirconstants, are, first of all, the meanings of the subject (splitting, depending on the motivators, into the derivational categories of the producer of the action and the bearer of the attribute: слушатель, метчик, завистник, дирижёр, бегун, ходок; красивец, глупец, хитрец, добряк, злюка, жадюга, богач and others).

These word-formational categories are expressed in numerous word-formational types, characterized by various shades of meanings and stylistic connotations of the lexemes belonging to them.

The expression of object relations at the word-formation level is presented poorer, which can be divided into two types: "that which is the object of action" (вкладыш, грызло, накладка, поношка, ученик and others) and "that which is the result of the action" (выкормыш, найдёныш, вылепок, зарубка, изгарина, обмылок, рисунок and others).

A powerful word-formation category in the Russian language is the word-formation category of tooling, which is described by the definition "what is produced (a certain action)". This category appears to be integral, internally homogeneous, although its intersections with the derivational categories "action producer" are possible. Derivative words can be attributed to the word-formation categories of tool-ability бритва, выбрасыватель, гасильник, дозатор, дробилка, жатка, зажигалка, кипятильник and others.

Discussion. The word-formation category "locativity" is represented by a number of semantic subtypes, which is quite consistent with the variety of adverbial spatial relations expressed by different types of sentences. These are the following types:

1. "The name of the place by the action performed in it" (белильня, мойка, моечная, переплётная, раздаточная, лежбище, нерестилище and others).
2. "A place (room) intended for living beings" (арестантская, больница, гостиница, диспетчерская, плотницкая; гусятник, индюшатник, птичня, пчёльня, скворечник and others).
3. "Container for substances or objects" (горчичница, конфетница, ладанка, маслёнка, молочник, мыльница, чайница; игольник, каретник, очешник, папиросница, шашечница and others).

These semantic types implement the basic meaning of locativity, position in space, "where" according to Aristotle, however, nouns, adjectives and adverbs can implement much more ramified and detailed relations: "precedence", "following", "juxtaposition", "location over the object ", "location under the object ", "location on the surface ", "location within space ", "location outside", "location around the limit", location along the limit", "intermediate", "crossing the limit", "being at the extreme point of the limit", "reaching the spatial limit", etc. [see about this: Nasyrova 1994, 16].

The conceptual category of time at the derivational level finds its expression through adjectives, adverbs and verbs.
Adjectives and adverbs can express meanings isomorphic to the meanings of localization: "precedence", "following", "simultaneity", "intermediate", "reaching the time limit", "coming from the time limit"; the specific time value is the value "repeatability" (multiplicity).

Compare: преддверие, предкавказский / предзимье, предвоенный; заозерье, заоблачный / послевоенный, послеоперационный; интервокальный – межконтинентальный; субтропики, субальпийский; довоенный, допушкинский, доньне and others.

The set of derivational meanings of case origin is ultimately determined by the set of actant and sitconstant positions necessary to represent information when constructing a sentence and a text, i.e. the need to designate the subject and object of action, the instrument of action, spatial and temporal localization.

Derivational meanings of case origin organize not only the system of derivational meanings of nouns, but also the names of adjectives and verbs, compare: складной, заливной – улыбчивый, бережливый: белеть, синеть – белить, синить. Opposed derivative words reflect different types of relationship between subject and object.

Of course, the set of derivational meanings is not limited to case meanings only. In languages with a morphological category of gender, the basic conceptual category for derivational meanings is the concept of the sex of a living being, primarily in the derivational categories of femininity (англичанка, англоманка, болтунья, любимица, моржиха, орлица, пассажирка, певица, поэтесса, редакторша and others).

The conceptual category "sex" is also reflected in the word-formation category "immature" (барчук, гадёныш, змеёныш, негритёнок, совёнок, турчонок), moreover, in a very peculiar way: at the "exit" the designation of the cub receives a generic characteristic through the masculine gender.

In the system of derivational meanings, the category of negation is also reflected: безденежье, безлюдье, бесполезный, несчастье, некрасивый, немало, нелегко and others.

A very significant role in the system of derivational meanings is played by the meanings of transpositional origin: "abstract procedural feature", "abstract non-procedural feature", "the formation of a feature", "general attitude to the subject" and others.

Quantitative semes in their nominal essence do not relate to basic ones in terms of constructing sentences of basic structural schemes, and, therefore, in terms of organizing the semantic structure of the derivative, however, in the general context of expanding information when constructing a sentence, a complex syntactic whole, a text, these semes play an essential role.

Quantitative semes are basic for derivational categories of collectiveness and singularity, closely interacting with the morphological category of number, participating in the classification of vocabulary and at the same time forming the categories of collective and specific nouns, respectively.

A.A. Reformatsky, considering collective nouns, noted: "In fact, there is a very big grammatical problem here: how is it" singular in form "and" plural in meaning "?"

It would be more accurate to say: "In the grammatical form of the singular, many are expressed" [Reformatsky 1987, 82].

Summing up collective nouns under the "grammatical" triangle (зверь – звери – зверьё, тряпка – тряпки – тряпьё), A.A. The Reformed separated them from the singularia tantum:

"The point here is that collective numbers, like singularia tantum, stand outside the grammatical category of numbers, but they have numbers that are consistent in the singular" [Reformatsky 1987, 83].

If the position that collective nouns do not belong to singularia tantum and both are outside the category of number, was not supported by most linguists [see. Grammar-70, 321-325; Grammar-
80, 470-474], then the indication of the obligatory "base of the triangle" in the singular form constituted the most important differential feature of word-formatively formed collective, in contrast to lexemes of the type народ, полк, стадо, стая, толпа and others. These nominations with the meaning of aggregate represent specific nouns and are usually non-derivative nouns.

Nouns of the type созвездие can be considered as an intermediate type: these are derived words (that is, there is a "base of the triangle"), but they also have a plural form: созвездие – созвездия (соцветие, соплодие, созвучие).

The grammatical paradox of collective nouns of nouns, which consists in the transmission of a plurality through the singular, does not remain unrealized in the system of functioning of collective nouns in comparison with plural nouns. Although in terms of logical relationships дети and детвора, солдаты and солдатия, тряпки and тряпён and the like can be considered as one-denotate, in the proper linguistic respect, these units differ significantly.

The semantics of collective nouns in a certain way correlates with the semantics of collective numerals (два – двое, пять – пятнадцать), and in a broader sense - with a poorly studied category of comitativity (compatibility).

The word-formation category "uniqueness" is formed by several subcategories, which in different ways reflect the ratio of semantic subclasses of derivatives and produce with a common meaning, "at the output", in derived words.

These are nouns with the meaning "unit of mass of matter" (бусина, горошина, картофелина, снежинка, чашинка, карамелька, мелок), "one of the same parts of paired objects" (брючина, рельсина) and personal nouns like горожанин, крестьянин, армянин, литвин, татарин, in which the grammatical meaning of the singular is emphasized by the derivational meaning of the singularity.

Regarding personal nouns, it should be emphasized that the dual design of singularity (grammatical and derivational) in them is not accidental (compare: брат, врач, доктор, инженер and others), since they either correspond to collective (крестьянство), or with tokens like горожанин, армянин, татарин, литвин (in the obsolete collective meaning), which, in addition to the meaning of plurality, also have a connotation of the totality.

Derivational categories of collectiveness and singularity contribute to the replenishment of the lexico-grammatical categories of collective and specific nouns and establish correlative links between them, as well as real nouns.

**Result.** The inter-speech word-formation category "subjective assessment" is based on the concept of real size-quantitative relations of specific nouns (for example: стол – столик, дом – домик), however, through the affectionate, derogatory uses of nouns (including abstract: идейка, положеньце), as well as the names of adjectives and adverbs (глупый, тоненький, быстренько, тихонечко) this word-formation category interacts with the qualitative evaluative and pragmatic sphere of the language.

This word-formation category can be expressed both by suffixes and prefixes. (всёёлький – развесёлый, миленький – премильный, плутышка – архипут); in the hierarchy of the derivational category, its relationship with the derivational category is not established, which is characteristic only for adjectives with the meaning "possessing in a softened, reduced degree of quality, called a motivating word" [Russian grammar 1980, 299] or adjectives with the meaning of incompleteness of the attribute (грубоватый, диковатый, пошловатый, зеленоватый, синеватый).

In our opinion, there are reasons to reduce these two word-formation categories into the category of "quality degree".

The methods of verbal action show many features of internal commonality with the word-formation category of subjective assessment.
Both those and other classes of derived words are focused not so much on the nomination of an action or feature (it has already been implemented in the producing word), as on its modification, primarily of a quantitative nature.

"Most of the ways of verb action are associated with the implementation in derived verbs of certain quantitative semes.

The manifestations of quantitative semantics in different modes of verb action are not the same, they can underlie the selection of a certain mode of action, which is reflected in its name, or can be hidden in the deep semantics of the verb; they can refer to the multiplicity or intensity of the action itself, or to the number of objects (less often subjects) ...

In the functioning of verbs of quantitative modes of action in speech or in a literary text, in publicistic works, etc. the effect of "quantity-to-quality transition" is very frequent [Khalikova 1997, 8-9]. M.I. Khalikova / The researcher identifies such derivational categories

- multiplicity (миснуть, стрельнуть, толкнуть, певать, захватывать),
- intensity (попить, подворовывать, распевать, разгуляться),
- temporary limitation of action (побеседовать, позаниматься, проворачиваться, прерывать),
- effectiveness (выпить, написать, прыгнуть, недодумать, нашить, перерубить),
- comitativity (перестреливаться, прищёлкивать, подпевать) [Khalikova 1997].

Thus, in the sphere of the verb, the conceptual category "quantity" is associated with the concepts of time (repetition, frequency, duration), the concept "degree" is realized as the intensity of action.

The internal relationship (or even unity) of a number of semantic deep components of derivational categories of subjective assessment and quantitative methods of verb action is demonstrated by comparing derivative words тёмненький – попеть (немного), злующий – переполнять, беловатый – недописать and others.

Among the word-formation categories of a transposition nature, action names of the type прыжок, толчок, рывок, кивок, зевок, бросок, гребок, calling "a separate act of action called a motivated word" [Russian grammar 1980, 163]. E.S. Kubryakova also writes about this word-formation type:

"... both temporal and aspectual meanings of generating verbs are by no means always erased in verbal nouns, sometimes they are reflected systemically. So, verbal names in -ok usually mean" quantum "of a certain action and are semantically correlated, perhaps, with single actions "[Kubryakova 1978, 93].

"Inheritance" of perfective meanings associated with singularity is also characteristic of a derived word. спасение (спасание), открытие (открывание), приезд (with a certain actualization) and so on, while for most of the action names, the values of singularity or multiplicity turn out to be absorbed or neutralized by the semantics of the name (for example, бег, ходьба, мытьё, раскручивание, although actions such as беготня, хождение, суета are presented as prolonged multi-act actions).

The meaning of quantity in the word-formation category "immature" is refracted in a peculiar way (цыганёнок, турчонок, негритёнок, волчонок, слонёнок, совёнок, щеглёнок, змейёнок, гадёнки, барчук), in which the category of quantity intersects with the category of time: an adult being - a non-adult, young being.

In linguistic consciousness, this feature is associated with quantitative parameters, since a child or cub of animals in the usual representation is distinguished by a smaller size, although the opposite ratio is actually and quite likely.
More complex relations are realized in cases where the value of quantity acts not as the main, but as an accompanying semantic feature of a word-formation category, for example, in the derived word-formation categories "carrier of the feature" (красавец, подлец, хитрец, глупец, злюка, добрый, жадюга, богач).

These lexemes usually have the dictionary definitions "very handsome person", "very angry person" and others.

Such relations are characteristic not for the entire word-formation category, but only for a part of the derivatives (derived words виновник, эстрадник, западник, in which quantitative semes are absent).

Quantitative semes are characteristic not only of the names of persons, but also of animals (головастик, пушистик). It should also be borne in mind that at the word-formation level the names of persons, animals, plants may not be differentiated (for example, рыжик, волосатик, пушистик).

Quantitative semes delimit the semantics of a number of suffixal derivatives and cognate substantivates: добрый – добрый, злюка – злой, скупец – скупой and others.

**Conclusion.** Thus, the area of implementation of quantitative semes covers a significant area of the content aspect of word formation, covering all cardinal parts of speech and being embodied in them in accordance with a set of grammatical categories and their deep semantic features.
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