



SVITLANA GRYTSENKO

Kijevo nacionalinis Taraso Ševčenkos universitetas, Ukraina  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kiev, Ukraine

# DINAMIKA KAIP NEPRIKLAUSOMOS KALBOS ŽENKLAS

Dynamics as an Immanent Language Sign

## SUMMARY

A language is a unity of the stable and variable, statics and dynamics, manifested in space and time and realized in chronological continuity – from the older forms of its existence to modern ones. Specifically reproducing the surrounding world, the language constantly undergoes the internal structural changes. Social factors, historical events and activities of bright personalities stimulate and, directly or indirectly, guide the directions of the language dynamics. The study of such a sphere of language dynamics is considered to be promising.

## SANTRAUKA

Kalboje atsispindi stabilumas ir kintamumas, statiškumas ir dinamiškumas, kalba pasireiškia erdvėje ir laike, ji apibūdinama chronologiniu tęstinumu nuo senųjų iki šiuolaikinių jos egzistavimo formų. Atkurdamą aplinkinį pasaulį, kalba nuolat struktūriškai iš vidaus kinta. Šiuos pokyčius sąlygoja įvairūs socialiniai veiksniai, istoriniai įvykiai ir ryškių asmenybių veikla, kurie tiesiogiai arba netiesiogiai skatina kalbą kisti, nukreipia kalbos vystymosi dinamiką įvairiomis kryptimis. Kalbos vystymosi dinamikos tyrimas laikomas perspektyviu.

## INTRODUCTION

A language as a phenomenon, that demonstrates the firmness and stability of its structure, the rules of use in various communication situations, simultaneously certifies the dynamism, the variability in the coordinates of space

and time. In each moment of its existence, from ancient times to the present, the language reproduces both a human as the centre of the universe and the wide world of the environment, known and mastered by a man. The interweav-

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: Dinamika, statiškumas, kalbų sąveika, adaptacija, derivacija, skolinių chronologija.

KEY WORDS: dynamic, statistic, interaction of languages, adaptation, derivation, chronology of borrowings.

ing of various extra-language factors, some of the historical events or activities of bright personalities stimulate and, directly or indirectly, influence the dynamics of language, determine the directions of its development. The most notable, often noticeable without special studies, are the changes in vocabulary and semantics due to the verbalization

of the dynamics of the society culture – transformations in the material-subject and production spheres, intercessions of some social and cultural dominantes by other ones, changes in the genetic code of culture, which determines its internal semantic boundaries and ensures unity and heredity of the national tradition.

### DYNAMICS OF LEXICON AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION

A language, like the society, that uses it, is constantly in motion and undergoes changes. The distinction between statics and dynamics in the language was formulated by the representatives of the Kazan linguistic school, in particular, it was emphasized that in the language there is no immutability, as in the whole in nature – everything is alive, everything is moving, everything is changing, and peace, stop, stagnation is the conditional phenomenon. This is a special case of motion with minimal changes; static of the language is only a special case of its dynamics or, rather, its kinematics (Бодуэн де Куртене 1973: 387). Scientists emphasize that the variability of the language is its natural, immanent state and it is confirmed both by linguistics-theorists (Косериу 1963: 156; Звегинцев 1963: 131; Серебренников 1970: 197; Белецкий 2012: 529; Кодухов 1974: 186; Семчинский 1988: 251) and by researchers of changes in the language structure at different language levels (Кудрявцева 2004; Клименко 2008: 6–7; Гриценко 2017) or areas of operation (Навальна 2011: 8–9). Linguists repeatedly drew attention to the connection between the variational nature of speech and the changes in the language

as a whole, henceforth, the metaphorical definition of the language as alive: «... living languages ... never stop in their constant active functioning, in their continuous improvement» (Бударов 1977: 257).

The existence of language is characterized by the coordinates of both space and time; the intersection of these coordinates and their combination creates a particularly complex phenomenon in its implementation in every act of speech, which is the language, observed by the researcher. A. Biletsky emphasized that among other sign systems the language is extremely complex, flexible, dynamic, able to change not only in time and space, but even in a separate act of linguistic communication and semiotic system (Белецкий 2012: 529). For language knowledge, a special meaning has the differentiation of the researcher's approaches from certain positions – conditional statics or real but not always clearly defined dynamics, although the unity of stability and mobility, stability and variability, statics and dynamics of language is indisputable (Серебренников 1970: 199).

The dichotomy of synchronization / diachrony is not only the opposition of

the language states, but also the presence of opposite dominant in its characterization because diachrony is not only dynamic, but also stable at the same time. On the contrary, synchronization is not only static but also dynamic (Кубрякова 1968: 114). Despite the close connection between the diachrony and the variability of the language structure, the functioning of its structural elements, the concept of diachrony and dynamics is not identical, as not identical is the notion of development and the language history (Кодухов 1974: 186), synchronization and statics as well (Кочерган 2008: 335).

Changes in any linguistic unit occur not as single acts that affect the isolated elements of the language, but capture all its system. Therefore, the language of the specified time interval is its state, which at the same time combines the past with new elements, phenomena, characteristic features (Реформатский 2001: 442). It is important that in any language change as a system it maintains «the dynamic balance between the tendencies to preserve its rules as they were, and the tendencies for changes that shape its future rules» (Семчинский 1988: 252).

The internal restructuring of the language takes place under the influence of two forces, one of which is connected with the implementation of the communicative needs of society, the second happens with the organization of language as a sign system. As a result, according to B. Serebrennikov, the language manifests the double dependence of its evolution: from the external environment, in which it exists, and the internal mechanism and structure (Серебренников 1970: 198). Communicative suitability as

a defining feature of the language appears, in particular, in counteracting its structural transformations, in inhibiting the changes and preserving the resources available in the structure of the language. A. Martine emphasized that the language is changing under the pressure of the communication needs in a constant conflict between the saving of efforts in speech and the function of language (Мартине 1965: 451). Therefore, an important feature of the language is *the selectivity of reproduction of innovative changes in society*, which also contributes to the preservation of language. The changes in language, first of all changes in vocabulary and semantics are influenced by changes in the culture of society: the dynamics of the material sphere, the renewal of production forms, changes in social relations, the transformation of cultural codes – all this involves verbalization either with the help of existing formal means or new language units. The reaction of society to outsourcing changes requires flexibility in language use as a tool for securing an innovative knowledgeable and, at the same time, as a tool for communicating information in the communication process. Therefore, a logical assessment of language as creativity and creative activity was formed (Гумбольдт 1984: 90).

The development of language is also associated with progress in language, which, according to O. Potebnya, is an undoubted phenomenon (Потебня 1993: 12). Much later developing this opinion, S. Semchinsky emphasized: «... those linguists are right who understand the process of language development as its progressive evolution»; «... a change that improves the functioning of the lan-

guage, a change that strengthens the systemic nature of each language subsystem and language as a whole, it is a change that promotes the language development, its progressive evolution» (Семчинський 1988: 254, 256). Such a progressive evolution of language is not always similar to a continuous ascending line, it has interspecific stages, deviations from the general direction of development, the different subsystems of the language inherent uneven pace of evolution. Therefore, progress as a general pattern of language being always has a specific form of declaration.

In the material and spiritual world, where all the objects and phenomena are in a state of constant motion, constant change, development can be said only in relation to objects that have a complex systemic structure. Development reports the essence of transformation and at the same time retains information about their nature. Note that the works of R. Descartes, B. Spinoza, G. Leibniz, I. Kant, G. Hegel, F. Schelling, J. Fichte, A. Comte, J. C. Mill, G. Spencer, A. Turgot, M. Condorcet, K. Sainte-Simon, C. Darwin, B. Grushin, and others are devoted to the philosophical comprehension of the category of development.

Not all changes in the structure of the object (the number of its components, the location, the nature of the dependencies between them) can be qualified as development, but only qualitative changes, resulting in the creation of another linguistic quality both at the level of structural elements and the relations between them and categories (Семчинський 1988: 261). In language, one can observe the opposite processes, when, as a result of changes, the elements of the

language gradually fade out from the use, while not deeply disturbing the system as a whole. Note that provided a stable number of constituent elements of the structure and changes in the configuration of the interrelations of elements and their functions, qualitative changes are also possible, that is, the development of language.

The complex nature of the linguistic object and the interaction of various factors, which are manifested in the speech, give rise to functional and substantive transformations of its elements; since the emergence of a new or disappearance of the structural component already existing in the language is not only a quantitative change, but a prerequisite for the creation of new connections, relationships that transform the existing communications in the language. Therefore, the language development can be imagined as a set of non-identical states of the same object at different time, the transition from the previous being to the next. At the same time, development takes place in time, which can not be modelled as a rhythmic progressive movement, as represented by the objective movement of time. First of all, it is necessary to take into account the fact that at all time intervals the intensity of change is not the same, not all objects overcome the same distance in their development during the specified period of time.

Movement, the change of an object are caused by external factors, and development is an internal movement, the source of which is the object itself, its structure and functions. Therefore, the Hegelian understanding of development as a result of the struggle of opposites, the competition of old and new elements of the ob-

ject, as overcoming contradictions and replacing the old contradictions with the new ones, naturally breaks down.

Some unspecified term of development is due to its widespread use in relation to various objects. In particular, development can take the form of transformation of one object into another (as a change of the old Ukrainian state of language towards the modern Ukrainian language), the differentiation of the object (divergence), the subordination of one object to another (assimilation), etc.

There are two interrelated forms of development: evolutionary (gradual, often hidden from observing the change in the structure of the object) and revolutionary (sharp, deep, sometimes unexpected changes). The given dichotomy – the evolution and the revolution of language – are often accepted by researchers as a generalization, a guide in assessments of language changes, which are characterized by unevenness and selectivity. It is important to understand the definiteness of the direction of change – progressive or regressive, development or degradation, as well as awareness of the cyclicity repetition of the traversed path, the possibility of including in the historically later stages of the object existence, many features of its being in previous time slices. Taking into account these peculiarities of language dynamics, researchers define development as an endless upward spiral movement, mainly progressive (though not without contradictions and retreats): from simpler to more complex forms, from lower to higher, more perfectly organized subsystems. Researchers suggest to share the progress of language into absolute and relative (Кочерган 2008: 353), although

during the analysis of linguistic changes, such an opposition is deprived of operational expediency, and these types of information seem to be difficult to differentiate. The dynamics of the language determines its openness to the non-linguistic world, the unequal value of the elements of different structural levels, the dissipation of language as a system, the tendency to maintain stability and internal self-organization. Thus, in historical retrospect, language is a dynamic system with its inherent variability under the influence of external and internal factors preserving the main functions, relative stability of the structure.

To understand the dynamics of a language, it is important to divide the factors of this process into: 1) non-linguistic or extralinguistic; 2) linguistic: a) external, or interlingual, and b) internal or intralingual (Семчинський 1973: 30). Indicative is the opinion of F. de Saussure on the optional inclusion of extralinguistic factors in the language development («... there is no need to know the conditions in which one or another language developed» (Соссюр 1977: 61)). A. Martine, who believed that «... only internal causal links are of interest to the linguist» (Мартине 1963: 353) also followed the same views (Шаумян 1958: 44; Звегинцев 1962: 190). Some linguists absolve extralinguistic causes of linguistic evolution (Байчупа 1967: 106); the determinants of the language dynamics are seen in the specific conditions of the society's existence, served by the language (Meillet 1926: 96; Sómmerfelt 1962: 17), and meeting communicative needs (Бударов 1965).

In the history of languages, there are such periods when the role of some fac-

tors (internal or external) is significantly increased in comparison with others, but this does not exclude the presence and operation of a combination of factors. External factors are important for the language study, when they are taken into account when analyzing the internal trends of language development and finding support in them. The latter is particularly significant in the study of historical changes in the vocabulary. So, Y. Sorokin rightly pointed out that historical lexicology in its conclusions is based, on the one hand, on the social preconditions that impose their imprint on the appearance and functioning of the word in linguistic practice, on the other hand, on the facts of the actual language, first of all on the vocabulary interrelationship in various semantic and ideographic associations, its formal structure, the limits and character of functioning in the speech (Сорокин 1965: 8). Therefore, the analysis of linguistic changes requires a comprehensive consideration of the nature, place and causes of linguistic evolution. In particular A. Maye stressed the need to take into account processes conditioned by: 1) the structure of language, 2) psychological, physical, spatial, social and other conditions of the functioning of the language; 3) influences of other languages. (Meillet 1926).

Important is I. Baudouin de Courtenay's opinion on the distinction of one factor, between the various factors of the language dynamics, which defines: «The cause, the engine of all changes in language is the desire for convenience, an effort to find relief in the three spheres of speech activity: in the sphere of pronunciation (phonation), in the field of listening and perception (audition), ... in

the field of speech thinking (cerebration)» (Бодуэн де Куртенэ 1973: 386).

Among the external causes of language development, linguists distinguish interlanguage, interethnic interaction, collisions of uneven language and cultural codes of ethnic groups (which are characterized by socio-cultural differences, inconsistencies in levels of production, principles of social system), population migration, peculiarities of linguistic policy, etc. The dynamics has different appearances, therefore – different areas of analysis, which take into account: the sphere of social existence of language; geographical space – the language of the respective territories, areas or distribution of the speakers of this language into new volumes; the degree of language proficiency of society members; level of language learning. None of the factors in the language development can be overestimated, since its manifestation has its limits. Thus, the relative stability of the language is the key to determining linguistic norms, codification of linguistic phenomena, support and preservation of linguistic traditions; it provides the transmission of speech from one generation to another; the dynamism of the language is associated with the reproduction of complex phenomena of extra-ordinary reality, changes in the life of a society in which this language functions and implements communication in society.

Language link with collective mental, intellectual activity leads to a change in the register of values available in the language, dynamics of a person's intellectual activity, the development of another, or the reproduction of a new product of their own intellectual activity. The

semiotic sphere, which is marked by a special complexity, is connected, on the one hand, with the process of cognition, the establishment of new relationships (correlations, derivatives, associations) from the earlier known, which propagates *intellectual derivation*, the growth of new in the field of intelligence, and on the other hand, with the verbalization of the linguistic elements of the known re-

ality. The sphere of speech dynamics – *the field of intelligence* – should also be studied, although, focusing on the substance of a language, more attention is paid to semantics today. The syntagmatics of verbal elements in the speech stream, their interconnectivity, which directly affects the formation of new meanings, which is also a manifestation of the lexicon dynamics, can also be affected.

### STATIC VS DYNAMICS OF UKRAINIAN LEXICON OF THE 16TH–17TH CENTURIES

Famous words by I. Baudouin de Courtenay – «... the language was not born suddenly, but was created gradually for many centuries: it is a consequence of peculiar development in different periods. ... every period created something new that, when the imperceptible transition to the next is the basis for further development ... The mechanism of a language and in general its structure and composition is now the result of all its previous history, all of its previous development. On the contrary, this mechanism is conditioned by further language development at certain times» (Бодуэн де Куртене 1963: 67–68) – again attracts the attention of linguists to the eternal problem of equilibrium between the relative statics and the dynamics of the language structure, which is a part of a broad program of language learning – the study of evolution changes in the language and the rise of its present state as a result of numerous formal, semantic and functional transformations of structural elements from ancient times to the present.

Most of the changes in the lexicon are influenced by the dynamics of society, its material and industrial spheres, cul-

tural dominant. The intensity of changes in different time intervals varies, due to the effect of the dominant factors inherent in the corresponding time interval. The emergence of a new or disappearance of the structural element in the language is not only a quantitative change, but a prerequisite for the emergence of new connections, relationships, and dependencies. In historical retrospect language is a dynamic system with its inherent variability under the influence of external and internal factors, while maintaining the basic functions and the relative overall stability of the structure.

An important factor in the dynamics of the Ukrainian language of the 16th–17th centuries became the broad contacts of Ukrainians with other peoples, who correlated with interlanguage interaction, which led to a change in the composition and functions of its structural elements. Eloquent for the study of the language history is not only the consequences of its interaction, but also features of its flow. Powerful foreign-language influence on the Ukrainian language of the mentioned above period was caused by the difficult political, religious, cultural

situation in Ukraine, and the spread languages (Ukrainian, Church Slavonic, Greek, Latin, Polish, Lithuanian, Czech, German, Armenian, Turkish, Kipchatka, Tatar, Hungarian, Italian, French) manifested the competition of various ideologies and political-economic systems, that verbalized in the language of Ukrainian written memos of the time.

Combination of different forms of lexicon change is multifaceted, resulting in different types of changes that differ in the number of new lexemes. One of the forms of lexicon development of the studied period was the formation of new meaning of specific and borrowed tokens as a result of metonymy, semantic attraction; generalization and specialization of meaning; use of borrowings in the form of constant phrases, clichés, terminology compounds. Most of these entities are formed from elements of the specific and foreign language genesis; sporadically certified combinations of tokens, which include only borrowing. The development of various thematic and lexical-semantic groups as a result of polysemanticization, inter-style translocation of borrowing contributed to the dynamics of the Ukrainian lexicon of the 16th–17th centuries. An important proof of this process was the use of semantic equivalents, both among borrowings and specific lexemes; at the same time, not only the semantic, but also the stylistic differentiation of borrowed and specific lexemes is not observed, which testifies to the high degree of process intensity. The activation of the abstract vocabulary formation, which testifies to the intellectualization of the language speakers, and the proliferation of distinctly connotated, evaluative elements, contributed to the

development of the Ukrainian lexicon of the researched period.

*The language evolution is expressed not only in change but also in constancy, since calm is a separate manifestation of dynamics under the condition of minimal changes.* This tendency of the lexicon dynamics can be traced in the Ukrainian language of the 16th–17th centuries, which inherited a significant part of the vocabulary unchanged or with minimal changes. Comparison of lexicon of different chronological sections – to the 15th century and 16th–17th centuries has shown that a number of lexemes, word forms, meanings, reproduced by memos earlier are missing in later memos, which makes it possible to assume their deactualization in speech and functional reduction. According to the peculiarities of the course and consequences, this phenomenon is not homogeneous: the missing lexemes, polysemantic lexemes with the lost meaning, borrowings with the lost form or those connected with the semantically identical derivative are outlined.

Memos of the studied period demonstrate a significant expansion of the Ukrainian lexicon by occupying foreign nominating units which existence in the previous period has not been confirmed by sources. The saturation of borrowing ideographic spheres depended on the state of development of relevant thematic and lexical-semantic vocabulary groups; relevance of nomination sphere; the presence of specific and non-language semantic doublets; style and genre of the memo. The vocabulary development outlines socio-cultural dominant for Ukrainians – ‘learning’, ‘knowledge’, ‘production activity’, etc. Constants of the concepts for the Ukrainian Society of 16th–



17th centuries (as in previous periods) remained the 'environment' ('living and inanimate nature'), 'man: external characteristic; mental activity and emotional states'. Saturation of some thematic groups of vocabulary with new elements and the immutability or reduction of others reflect the concept architectonics of the corresponding time, its dynamics. Based on the vocabulary of the surveyed Ukrainian-language memos the nucleus of the conceptual sphere includes: 'defense of the state / own property, war', 'faith / religion', 'justice / right'.

The texts of the Ukrainian memos of the 16th–17th centuries have shown that many borrowings were adapted in the recipient language, lost their isolation, acquired new links, in particular through semantic and / or formal derivation; this process is especially clearly manifested in the creation of a new formal semantic complex with a vertex-borrowed lexeme. Dynamics of the formal vocabulary structure, as a rule, is associated with a change in the meaning of the output lexeme. Formal derivation establishes motivational and word-formation models, outlining productive ones for the corresponding period of a language development. Taking into account an interlanguage interaction as an important factor of the Ukrainian language dynamics it focuses on the division of derivatives into monolinguals and hybrids. The use of resources of the Ukrainian language in formal or formal-semantic derivation convinces in its power as a source of lexicon development.

The analysis of derivatives of foreign genesis, the history of their appearance in the Ukrainian language of the 16th–17th centuries, as well as the study of the corresponding borrowings functions in

the language, which is the source of their occurrence, and in (possible) intermediate languages, allow to be evaluated hypothetically for each case or as those created in the source language, or arisen as a result of word formation in the language of the intermediary or in the recipient language; while the complexity of the final estimation of derivatives genesis is associated with the presence of affixes and word-formation models which are common for interacting languages. The marker of the Ukrainian language lexicon development is a large number of two-base, derived formations of different grammatical classes (nouns, adjectives, adverbs), which combine the specific and borrowed elements in its structure.

The study of the lexical system dynamics of a definite period is impossible without knowing the history of each borrowed word, which involves defining its time parameters: the clarification of functioning both in the source language and in intermediate languages, the establishment of the appearance time in the recipient language, as well as the study of the peculiarities of functioning, adaptation, in particular entering into word-formation and semantic relations with other elements. Memos of different times reproduce the continuity of the historical existence of many lexemes; time lags are traced in the functioning of individual borrowings, which are not evidence of the complete disappearance of lexemes in the recipient language during the relevant period, since the word is inherent in the functional, stylistic movement, hence – use in those stylistic segments that are not reflected by written memos of the investigated period. Relative chronological characteristics (indicating the time interval from one year to an-

other or the corresponding century) are proposed for a number of lexemes. Determining the time of lexeme appearance in reliance on the history of the designated reality contributed to the outline of borrowings, which nominate the notion of material culture, the history of their occurrence is clearly established, or determined by the time before which these borrowings could not appear in the recipient language. Taking into consideration the large amount of extra-language information, the context of the era for determining the time of lexical borrowing in the Ukrainian language, testifies that the history of realities and the history of their names are inseparable, therefore they have a considerable explanatory potential for the knowledge of the language facts.

Definition of the time, from which the Ukrainian borrowed language sign func-

tions, helps to clarify the source of borrowing, in particular, for alternative explanations available in science. In such cases, an important role is played by the information on the peculiarities of the analyzed lexemes existence in potential intermediate languages. The lexeme often shows a minimal difference in the time of its first fixation in intermediate languages by written memos; formal terms remain in this context (the character of the derivation nests in potential intermediate languages and the nature of the derivatives in the Ukrainian language as the recipient). Chronologicalization of borrowings remains an important means to achieve a comprehensive and objective characterization of nominative units dynamics, as well as the associated phenomena of extra-ordinary reality – the elements of material and spiritual culture.

## CONCLUSIONS

Lexicon of a certain era makes socio-cultural dominant clear, and in comparison with the previous stages of language being allows to outline their dynamics. Such concepts as: 'the person as a carrier of external features, ~ emotional states, ~ the subject of mental activity', 'the environment of a person', 'possession, property, the world of things as human possession / societies', 'right', 'defense, war', 'faith and its manifestations, external attributes', 'knowledge of the world' are distinguished by the number of elements and frequency of corresponding nominative units use in memos among the constants of the conceptual sphere of the Ukrainian society of the 16th–17th centuries. The dynam-

ics of the lexicon – the saturation or reduction of the lexical groups of the corresponding ideographic spheres – is, to a large extent, a reflection of the dynamics of the concept sphere – the comprehension and profiling of the known world.

Realizing that interlanguage contacts occurred primarily in oral form, and the texts only reproduce their results, the study of the lexicon development by its meanings goes beyond the language lexical level, since it provides new information on word-formation, the features of the grammatical and phonetic structure of the Ukrainian language of the corresponding time. Unfortunately, beyond the supervision are still the ques-

tions of the role of oral communication in the language development, clerk's idiolekt, his linguistic-ethnic affiliation,

it narrows the field simulation of interlingual interaction and the recognition of its role in the language dynamics.

## Literature and References

1. Байчура Узбек Ш. 1967. О некоторых факторах языкового развития, *Проблемы языкознания: доклады и сообщ. совет. ученых на X Междунар. конгрессе лингвистов (Бухарест, 28/VIII–2/IX 1967 г.)*: 102–106.
2. Белецкий Андрей А. 2012. *Язык – динамическая знаковая система*. In *Вибрані праці*. Київ: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бурого: 529–535.
3. Бодуэн де Куртенэ Иван А. 1963. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. Москва: Изд-во АН СССР. Т. 1: 384.
4. Бодуэн де Куртенэ Иван А. 1973. *Некоторые из общих положений, к которым довели Бодуэна его наблюдения и исследования явлений языка* In *Хрестоматия по истории русского языкознания*. Москва: Наука: 386–388.
5. Будагов Рубен А. 1965. Введение в науку о языке. Москва: Просвещение: 491.
6. Будагов Рубен А. 1977. Что такое развитие и совершенствование языка? Москва: Наука: 264.
7. Гумбольдт Вильгельм фон. 1984. *О различии строения человеческих языков и его влияния на духовное развитие человеческого рода (извлечения)*. *Форма языков*. In *Избранные труды по языкознанию*. Москва: Наука: 90–95.
8. Гриценко Светлана. 2017. *Динаміка лексики української мови XVI–XVII ст.* Київ: КММ.
9. Звегинцев Владимир А. 1962. *Очерки по общему языкознанию*. Москва: Изд-во Моск. ун-та: 382.
10. Звегинцев Владимир А. 1963. Теоретические аспекты причинности языковых изменений, *Новое в лингвистике* 3: 141–142.
11. Клименко Ніна. 2008. *Динамічні процеси в сучасному українському лексиконі*. Київ: Вид. дім Дмитра Бурого.
12. Кодохов Виталий. И. 1974. *Общее языкознание*. Москва: Высшая шк.: 303.
13. Косериу Эуджен. 1963. Синхрония, диахрония и история. Проблема языкового изменения, *Новое в лингвистике* 3: 125–142.
14. Кочерган Михайло П. 2008. *Загальне мовознавство*. Київ: Академія: 464.
15. Кубрякова Елена С. 1968. О понятиях синхронии и диахронии, *Вопросы языкознания* 3: 112–123.
16. Кудрявцева Людмила. 2004. *Моделирование динамики словарного состава языка*. К.: ИПЦ «Киевский университет».
17. Мартине Андре. 1963. Основы общей лингвистики, *Новое в лингвистике* 3: 347–558.
18. Мартине Андре. 1965. Структурные вариации в языке, *Новое в лингвистике* 4: 450–464.
19. Meillet Antoine. 1926. *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Paris: Honoré Champion. Vol. 1: 457.
20. Навальна Марина. 2011. *Динаміка лексики української періодики початку XXI ст.* Київ: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бурого.
21. Потебня Александр А. 1993. *Мысль и язык*. Київ: Синто: 191.
22. Реформатский Александр А. 2001. *Введение в языковедение*. Москва: Аспект-Пресс: 536.
23. Семчинський Станіслав В. 1973. *Взаємодія мов і фактори лінгвістичного розвитку, Українська мова і література в школі* 7: 25–37.
24. Семчинський Станіслав В. 1988. *Статика і динаміка мови. Функціонування мови* In *Загальне мовознавство*. Київ: Вища школа: 251–262.
25. Серебренников Борис А. 1970. Место вопроса о языковых изменениях в современной лингвистике In *Общее языкознание. Формы существования, функции, история языка*. Москва: Наука: 197–206.
26. Sommerfelt Arnold. 1962. *Diachronic and synchronic aspects of language*. s-Gravenhage: Mouton: 421.
27. Сорокин Юрий С. 1965. Развитие словарного состава русского литературного языка 30–90-е годы XIX века. Москва; Ленинград: Наука: 565.
28. Соссюр Фердинанд де. 1977. *Труды по языкознанию*. Москва: Прогресс: 696.
29. Шаумян Себастиан К. 1958. О сущности структурной лингвистики, *Вопросы языкознания* 5: 38–54.