Anzhalika H. Litvinovich
Warszawa, Polska Akademia Nauk

INSIGHTS INTO THE PECULIARITIES OF VERBAL LEXICAL SEMANTIC GROUPS IN RELATED LANGUAGES: ON THE MATERIAL OF POLISH AND BELARUSIAN DEFENCE VERBS

ABSTRACT: The aim of the study is to identify the features of the implementation of denotative and causative semantics within one lexical-semantic group (LSG) of verbs in related languages. The analysis of the LSG of defence in Polish and Belarusian showed that the same area of semantics has different configurations of the expression plan. Defence verbs, in addition to the denotative meaning, contain a causative component in their semantic structure. Defence verbs do not have regular formal means of expressing causative semantics. These verbs do not demonstrate a direct correlation between the denotative and causative components. Polish and Belarusian causative verbs expand the list of causation types. Principles of causation coding, common for both languages, are influenced by national peculiarities of reflecting reality.

KEYWORDS: verbal lexical-semantic group, causativity, Polish language, Belarusian language

Особенности глагольных лексико-семантических групп в родственных языках: на материале польских и белорусских глаголов защиты

АБСТРАКТ: Цель исследования – выявить особенности реализации денотативной и каузативной семантики в рамках одной лексико-семантической группы (ЛСГ) глаголов в родственных языках. Анализ ЛСГ защиты в польском и белорусском языках показал, что одна и та же область семантики имеет разные конфигурации плана выражения. Глаголы защиты, помимо денотативного значения, содержат каузативный компонент в своей семантической структуре. Глаголы защиты не имеют регулярных формальных средств выражения каузативной семантики. Эти глаголы не демонстрируют прямой корреляции между денотативным и каузативным компонентами. Польские и белорусские каузативные глаголы расширяют перечень типов каузации. На общие для обоих языков принципы кодирования каузации оказывают влияние национальные особенности отражения действительности.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: глагольная лексико-семантическая группа, каузативность, польский язык, белорусский язык

1. Common Slavic roots

Slavs: similar or different? It is generally accepted that the Slavs are the largest ethno-linguistic community in Europe. Despite differences in vocabulary, grammar and sound systems, the similarity of Slavic languages is hard to deny, as the following examples show:

> 'I am reading a book.' *Ya chytayu knihu*[1] (Bel.). *Ya chytaiu knyhu* (Ukr.). *Ya chitayu knigu* (Rus.). *Czytam książkę* (Pol.). *Čtu knihu* (Chech.). *Čítam knihu* (Slv.). *Cheta kniga* (Bulg.). *Čitam kniga* (Mac.). *Čitam knjigu* (Serb.). *Ja čitam knjigu* (Cr.). *Berem knjigo* (Sloven.).

Common Slavic roots, socio-cultural and linguistic contacts make it possible to compare certain linguistic objects in the related Polish and Belarusian[2] languages, although they belong to different linguistic subgroups – West Slavic and East Slavic, respectively. Lexicon, being the most dynamic element of the linguistic structure, reflects better than any other level the state and nature of the historical development of peoples and their culture.

Of particular importance for the study of related languages is the fact that their Common Slavic history can be confirmed with some degree of certainty by language data[3]. For example, in both Polish and Belarusian there is the word 'linden' – Pol. *lipa*, Bel. *lipa* which refers to the same plant. Most likely, the word ascends to Common Slavic **lipa*, and the ancient Slavs lived where these trees grew. In both languages there are numerous words with Slavic roots disclosing the common habitat of people, e.g., **ezero* 'lake' – Pol. *jezioro*, Bel. *vozyera*, **rěka* 'river' – Pol. *rzeka*, Bel. *raka*, **lěsъ* 'forest' – Pol. *las*, Bel. *lyes*. Common Slavic roots are traced in the terminology of kinship: **otъcъ* 'farther' – Pol. *ojciec*, Bel. *bats'ka* (*aytsyets* – stylistically marked), **mati* 'mother' – Pol. *matka*, Bel. *matsi*, **dětę* 'child' – Pol. *dziecko*, Bel. *Dzitsya / dzitsyo*. The reconstructed Common Slavic vocabulary shows that the ancient Slavs were mainly involved in agriculture: **orati* 'plow' – Pol. *orać*, Bel. *arats'*, **zьrno* 'grain' – Pol. *ziarno*, Bel. *zyernye*, **korva* 'cow' – Pol. *krowa*, Bel. *karova*, **kon'ъ* 'horse' – Pol. *koń*, Bel. *kon'*.

Apart from nouns, the names of the most universal actions are also considered to be of common Slavic origin. Along with **žiti* 'live' – Pol. *żyć*, Bel. *zhyts'*, **piti* 'drink' – Pol. *pić*, Bel. *pits'*, **ěsti* 'eat' – Pol. *jeść*, Bel. *yestsi*, here belong verbs with the semantic component 'defend'[4] constituting the analytical focus of this article.

---

[1] The BGN/PCGN system (https://www.translitteration.com/transliteration/en/belarusian/bgn-pcgn/) has been used for transliteration. Translation into English has been done by the author. Translation into Bulg., Mac., Serb., Cr., Sloven. has been done with DeepL: https://www.deepl.com/pl/translator.

[2] The article analyses the official language of Belarus.

[3] Common Slavic forms of words have been taken from: *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*, [в:] http://etymolog.ruslang.ru (20.05.2023); *Wielki słownik języka polskiego*, [at:] https://wsjp.pl (10.04.2023).

[4] The semantics of *defend* is wider than that of *protect* and includes the component 'protect'.

2. Verbs with the meaning 'defend'

Defending is an important part of our personal and social life. From childhood we protect our toys, defend our interests, views and beliefs, then we protect our family, home. Being an important part of our consciousness, it reflects the world view through language means.

Investigation of semantics, whether lexical or grammatical, is possible by identifying lexical groupings of different types. The topicality of the question lies in the fact that, in contrast to systemic relations in grammar, the systemic organization of vocabulary, and of verbs in particular, has a "covert"[5] nature and is not explicitly expressed in word forms.

Lexical semantic groups of verbs (LSGs) can be seen as systematized ways of representing linguistic reality, verbalizing the surrounding world. Since the conceptual and linguistic contents of languages differ, semantic groups as a way of representing linguistic world views depend strongly on the national perception of the world. A semantic group that covers a certain conceptual sphere of native speakers is uniquely governed by its own internal rules. The way in which the world is perceived and represented does not coincide with a similar phenomenon in different languages. The interlingual study of language fields is of particular interest, as it allows one to specify the units that each language chooses among a number of similar entities to describe the same situation.

Although much ink has been spilled over the analyses of Polish and Belarussian verbs[6], certain aspects of verbs semantic structure and peculiarities of verbal groupings organization in these two related languages require further consideration.

---

[5] B. Whorf, *Language, Thought, and Reality*, Cambridge 1956, p. 88.

[6] Studies on different aspects of Polish and Belarusian verbs, e.g., Z. Gołąb, *Próba klasyfikacji syntaktycznej czasowników polskich (na zasadzie konotacji)*, „Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego" 1967, z. 25; A. Kiklewicz, A. Korytkowska, J. Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, A. Zatorska, *Zintegrowany opis semantyczno-syntaktyczny czasowników bułgarskich, polskich i rosyjskich (verba cogitandi i verba sentiendi)*, Warszawa 2019; A. Kiklewicz, *Podstawowe struktury zdaniowe współczesnych języków słowiańskich: białoruski, bułgarski, polski*, Olsztyn 2010; K. Żelazko, *Czasowniki przechodnie o składni wielorakiej w języku polskim*, Wrocław 1975; С. Важнік, *Кантрастыўны сінтаксіс польскай і беларускай моў: Семантыка і дыстрыбуцыя дзеяслоўнага прэдыката*, Мінск 2008; В. Мартынаў, П. Шуба, М. Ярмаш, *Марфемная дыстрыбуцыя ў беларускай мове: Дзеяслоў*, Мінск 1967; Ю. Мацкевіч, *Марфалогія дзеяслова ў беларускай мове*, Мінск 1959; А. Міхневіч, *Проблемы семантыка-сінтаксічнага даследвання беларускай мовы*, Мінск 1976; Б. Норман, *Переходность, залог, возвратность: на материале болг. и др. слав. яз.*, Минск 1972; А. Рудэнка, *Дзеясловы с семантыкай разумовых працэсаў у беларускай мове*, Мінск 2000; Е. Руденко, Н. Ивашина, Н. Яумен, *Семантико-синтаксическое сопоставление славянских глаголов (на материале белорусского, польского, русского и чешского языков)*, Минск 2004; *Сопоставительный анализ восточнославянских языков*, Минск 2005; П. Шуба, *Дзеяслоў у беларускай мове*, Мінск 1968.

2.1 Denotative semantics

With this in mind, the research proposed here is aimed at performing a linguistic analysis and providing a comprehensive description of the peculiarities of denotative and causative semantics realization within one lexical semantic group in related languages. More specifically, the objectives are: to allocate the group of verbs with semantics 'defend' in Polish and Belarusian; to describe the peculiarities of internal organization of the LSGs of defence verbs in the two related languages; to analyse the groups of defence verbs with respect to causativity. To achieve these objectives and ensure the methodological homogeneity and comparability of the envisaged results, the same classification criteria and methods of linguistic interpretation will be applied to the object under study.

The system organization of vocabulary is revealed by means of specially developed techniques. A transformational-explanatory technique, used to select the verbs under study, belongs to a group of linguistic techniques applied to allocate semantic fields on a linguistic rather than a conceptual basis. Thus, the key criterion is the word, not the concept. The method is based on the principle of identification advanced by Sharl' Balli[7] and implies finding an identifier (dominant) that can reflect the idea in the most general and neutral form. According to the above technique, lexemes are considered semantically related to each other if at least one common component, a word, is found in their definitions. The basic verb, the dominant, expresses the main semantic idea of the whole class of verbs and is a part of the group. The members of this class are more specific than the basic verb, they add additional semantic features that vary the basic semantic idea of the class.

Since lexical semantic groups with the meaning 'defend' do not coincide in different languages, and no similar groups were found in either Polish or Belarusian, it seems appropriate to select a group of verbs applying the above criteria. As mentioned earlier, the object of the research are verbs with the integral seme 'defend' represented by *bronić* in Polish and *abaranyats'* in Belarusian.

To our mind, the general meaning of the LSG of defence in the two analysed languages is 'cause to be safe, to avoid everything harmful, dangerous, unpleasant, continue to exist, to remain in force, to survive'. Such a wide semantic spectrum is provided by the polysemic character of the verbs Pol. *bronić*, Bel. *abaranyats'* which represent the semantic idea inherent to the whole class.

By random sampling from the available contemporary dictionaries of more or less equal volume *Wielki słownik języka polskiego PAN* and the one-volume *Tlumachal'ny slownik byelaruskay litaraturnay movy: bol'sh za 65000 slow* (*Тлумачальны слоўнік беларускай літаратурнай мовы: Больш за 65.000 слоў* – 2016), the lexemes were selected for which the verbs Pol. *bronić*, Bel. *abaranyats'* were the dominants (identifiers). The unit of interpretation here is a lexical semantic variant, that is, a separate numerical meaning of the word in the dictionary. When the term "verb" is used to refer to the lexeme studied, the lexical semantic variant is meant.

---

[7] Ш. Балли, *Французская стилистика*, Москва 2001, с. 129-130.

The LSG of defence in Polish includes 26 verbs: *bronić 1, bronić 2, bronić 3, bronić 4, bronić się, ratować, ochraniać, chronić, chronić się, odpierać, strzec, strzec się, ukrywać, ukrywać się, odbijać, stawać, wstawiać się, osłaniać, asekurować, asekurować się, ubezpieczać, ubezpieczać się, zabezpieczać, zabezpieczać się, ujmować się, adwokatować.* In Belarusian, the same semantic area is covered by 13 verbs: *abaranyats' 1, abaranyats' 2, abaranyats' 3, abaranyatstsa, adbivatstsa, adstoyvats', akhowvats', baranits', vyharodzhvats', zastupatstsa, ustupatstsa, prykryvats', stayats'.* The difference in the number of units is due to the greater number of reflexive verbs in Polish.

The interlingual comparison of the semantic structure of Pol. *bronić* and Bel. *abaranyats'* showed that there is no straightforward correlation between all the meanings of these polysemantic verbs. The above-mentioned dictionaries distinguish 8 meanings for the Polish and 4 for the Belarusian verb.

Bronić 1) Przeciwstawiać się atakowi fizycznemu bądź zbrojnemu, ochronić, ustrzec, przed niebezpieczeństwem, zniszczeniem, uratować. 2) Zapobiegać działaniom lub zjawiskom zagrażającym komuś lub czemuś, osłaniać, być osłoną, chronić przed czymkolwiek, strzec. 3) Dowodzić przed sądem niewinności osoby oskarżonej. 4) Stanowić barierę uniemożliwiającą pojawienie się gdzieś niepożądanych osób. 5) Nie pozwalać na wykonywanie jakichś działań bądź na korzystanie z czegoś. 6) Uniemożliwiać zdobycie punktów przez przeciwnika podczas rywalizacji sportowej. 7) Próbować powtórzyć sukces odniesiony w rozgrywkach sportowych. 8) Zdawać egzamin związany z napisaną wcześniej pracą, uprawniający do uzyskania określonego tytułu.

Abaranyats' 1) Kaho-shto. Adbivats′ napad voraha, nye davats′ u krywdu kaho-n. 2) Kaho-shto. Zastsyerahats′ ad shkodnaha dzyeyannya kaho-, chaho-n. 3) Shto. Adstoyvats′ chyye-n. intaresy, pravy, pohlyady. 4) Kaho. Vystupats′ na sudzye v yakastsi abarontsy. / Publichna na pasyedzhanni vuchonaha savyeta adstayats′ navukovuyu vartats′ dysyertatsyi (prayekta, dyploma) z metay atrymannya adpavyednay vuchonay stupyeni abo patsvyardzhennya kvalifikatsyii[8].

Lexical semantic variants 1 and 2 of both analysed lexemes coincide. Meaning 1 reflects the situation when it is necessary to defend sb./sth. from an enemy (Pol. *bronić człowieka, ojczyzny*; Bel. *abaranyats' radzimu*), meaning 2 – the need to protect against an unpleasant, harmful effect of sb./sth. (Pol. *bronić pracowników przed zwolnieniami; bronić czyichś interesów, praw*, Bel. *abaranyats' sady ad vusyenya*). As seen from the above examples, lexical semantic variant 2 of the Polish verb *bronić* also includes an additional differential characteristic 'to protect the interests of someone' while in the semantic structure of the Belarusian verb *abaranyats'* this characteristic is presented as a separate meaning of the word (Bel. *abaranyats' 3: abaranyats' pryntsypy demakratyzmu*).

The sematic structure of both verbs includes the meaning 'to appear in court as a defender' (Pol. *bronić 3: bronić klienta, bronić przed sądem*, Bel. *abaranyats' 4:*

---

[8] Below, in this section, examples of the realization of meanings in the analysed languages have been taken from the two dictionaries mentioned above.

abaranyats' padsudnaha). The difference lies in the fact that as a shade of meaning for the Belarusian verb *abaranyats'* the dictionary gives the component 'to defend one's point of view publicly at a meeting of the Scientific Council with the aim to defend a thesis (project, diploma) and obtain an academic title or to confirm the qualification' (*abaranyats' dysyertatsyyu, prayekt, dyplom*). In the dictionary entry for the Polish verb *bronić*, the semantic component described above is highlighted in the separate meaning of the word (*bronić 8: bronić doktoratu, dyplomu, licencjatu, magisterki*). Another meaning singled out for *bronić* and not described for *abaranyats'* is 'to be, to serve as a barrier in protecting someone, something' (*bronić 4: mur, płot bronił; brama, furtka broniła*). Going a little further, it should be noted that contexts with the verb *abaranyats'* from Bielaruskaja Palička (BP)[9] show that the inanimate subject can also act as the doer of the action described by the predicate. <u>*Deklaratsyya* *abaranyaye ahul'*</u> *napryznannya pravy chalavyeka [...]* (Pravavyya vydanni // BP). The structure of dictionaries and the tasks of dictionary compilers explain the above differences.

Polish *bronić* contains some semantic components not inherent in Belarusian *abaranyats'*: *bronić 5* – 'to prohibit sth./doing sth.' (*bronić dzieciom wstępu na lód*); *bronić 6* – 'not to allow an opponent to score points during a sporting event' (*bronić karnych, bramki); bronić 7* – 'try to repeat the success in sports competitions' (*bronić medalu, mistrzostwa*). Thus, we see that a one-to-one correspondence between the semantic structures of correlated polysemantic words is hardly possible even in two related languages.

When considering polysemantic words, we inevitably face the problem of the meanings' interrelation within one lexeme. Synchronically, polysemy is seen as different meanings of the same word coexisting over a given linguistic period. In its diachronic aspect, polysemy is a process of changing the semantic structure of a word, i.e., a word may retain or lose its original meaning, acquire new meanings or shades of meaning in the process of historical development. It is intuitively clear that all eight meanings of *bronić* and the four meanings of *abaranyats'* do not equally represent the semantic structure of these verbs. Meanings 1 and 2 'the need to defend sb./sth. from sb./sth. dangerous and harmful' are primary, since this is how we understand these verbs when we hear or see them. All other meanings seem to be secondary in relation to these two.

Regarding the etymology of the analysed verbs, it is worth mentioning that the Common Slavic verb **borniti* 'defend', which is considered to be derived from the noun **borna* 'defence, defences', had derivatives with the meaning associated with the need for defence, protection: **borničь, *bornitel* 'defender', **bornišče* 'fortification'[10]. This brief etymological sketch allows one to assert that the primary meaning of the

---

[9] The digital corpora *Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego* (NKJP) and *Беларуская Палічка* (BP) have been applied to study the typical use of defence verbs in the living languages. BP is used to ensure consistency throughout the article, as some examples were taken from PB before the Беларускі N-корпус appeared in 2015.

[10] *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*, [at:] https://archive.org/details/B-001-004-137/essja02/page/n101/mode/2up; https://archive.org/details/B-001-004-137/essja02/page/n103/mode/2up (20.05.2023).

analysed verbs has been preserved from the Common Slavic period, and it is semantically independent and the least syntagmatically conditioned. The extended use of the primary meaning in different contexts gives rise to the development of secondary meanings on its basis.

One of the main features of all language structures is the availability of central and peripheral elements. Following Yuriy Apresyan[11] and Aleksandr Bondarko[12], we consider the core elements as units highly specialized to fulfil a certain semantic function in comparison to peripheral elements characterized by a secondary role in the semantic function implementation.

With regard to the above, the core of the lexical semantic group in Polish are the verbs *bronić 1, 2, 3, 4, bronić się, chronić, chronić się, ochraniać, odpierać, osłaniać, ratować, strzec, strzec się, ubezpieczać, ubezpieczać się, ukrywać, ukrywać się, wstawiać się, zabezpieczać, zabezpieczać się*. Lexical semantic variants *bronić 5, 6, 7, 8* are not included in the LSG as their meanings do not correspond to the general semantics of the group 'cause to be safe, to avoid everything harmful, dangerous, unpleasant, continue to exist, to remain in force, to survive'.

The peripheral units of the group are the verbs *asekurować, asekurować się, odbijać, stawać, ujmować się*. Two first verbs are stylistically marked as bookish in the dictionary, therefore can be treated as peripheral. The polysemic word *odbijać* is used in the defence group only in combination with inanimate nouns in the accusative case. *Przy okazji odbijam znany zarzut, że przyjęcie istnienia zła osobowego [...]* (D. Czaja: Lekcje ciemności, 2009// NKJP). The indicative syntagma in which the polysemant *stawać* can realize its meaning 'confidently support and protect someone, something' is verb *(stawać)* + preposition *(za, przy)*. *Córka z synem stanęli murem za matką, [...]* (S. Milewski: Ciemne sprawy międzywojnia, 2002// NKJP). The verb *ujmować się* meaning 'to defend' functions in the syntactic construction with the prepositions *za, o*. *[...] zawsze trzeba ujmować się za słabszymi [...]* (P. Cegielski: Szwecja i jej sąsiedzi …, Gazeta Wyborcza, 1996-03-22// NKJP).

The core verbs in Belarusian are *abaranyats' 1, 2, 3, abaranyatstsa, adbivatstsa, adstoyvats', akhowvats, baranits', zastupatstsa, ustupatstsa*, and to the periphery belong *vyharodzhvats', prykryvats', stayats'*.

Vyharodzhvats' in the LSG of defence has a figurative meaning: *vyharodzhvats' syabra*. *Prykryvats'* and *stayats'*, meaning 'to defend', occur only in certain contexts: *prykryvats' z awtamataw khvost kalony*; *stayats' haroy za syabrow*. The same refers to *abaranyats' 4*. Only in combination with certain vocabulary can it realize the meaning 'to defend in court', 'to defend the project (thesis) in order to obtain a certain qualification'. However, the meaning of this lexical semantic variant does not correspond to the general semantics of the group, and will not be discussed further.

---

[11] Ю.Д. Апресян, *Принципы организации центра и периферии в лексике и грамматике*, [в:] *Типологические обоснования в грамматике*, Москва 2004, с. 20.

[12] А.В. Бондарко, *Теория морфологических категорий и аспектологические исследования*, Москва 2005, с. 180.

As seen from the above analysis, the semantic field of defence in the two compared languages has its own characteristics. Although the primary meanings of the dominant verbs coincide, the semantic structures of these polysemantic verbs show some differences. The larger number of words in the lexical semantic group in Polish compared to Belarusian, and thus the availability of a wider set of differential features that make up the semantic complex of defence verbs in Polish (e.g., semantic features 'forbid', 'hide in order to protect', 'insure in order to protect' are singled out in the Polish and yet are not found in the Belarusian group) is worth associating with both linguistic and extralinguistic factors. In linguistics we distinguish the functioning of the primary meanings of the verbs *bronić* and *abaranyats'* in various contexts. And extralinguistic factors depend on the socio-historical development of languages. The intensity of linguo-ethnic, day-to-day, economic, religious and other relations carried out in Polish is significantly higher than in Belarusian. The modern literary Polish language is used in the official, public, professional environment, in mass culture, politics, religion, etc. The Belarusian literary language is used mainly in the professional environment of Belarusian scientists (mostly in the humanities), teachers, representatives of the artistic professions, various youth communities, the intelligentsia abroad.

2.2 Causative semantics realization

The issue that lies beyond the frontiers of lexical semantics is the ability of defence verbs to carry out causative semantics, to express cause and reason relations (causativity), often referred to as covert grammar.

Following Aleksey Nikitevich[13], we'll view causativity as one of the components of the so-called causal complex (causal, conditional, concessive-consequential, cause-reason relations) denoting motivation of an object to perform an action or to change a state. Causative verbs are the main means of conveying cause-reason relations and represent the core of a causative category.

The term "causative verb" ascends to Sharl' Balli's[14] writings where causative is the verb whose subject induces an action or a new state of another person or object. The main semantic arguments of a causative verb are one who acts and one who experiences the effect constituting the optimal (closest) environment of the causative verb. E.g.:

Subject	Causative verb	Object
Pol. *Chłopiec*	popchnął	*kolegę z klasy.*[15]
'The boy	pushed	his classmate.'
		Kolega z klasy upadł.
		'The classmate fell down.'

---

[13] А.В. Никитевич, *Русский глагол в составе номинативных рядов*, Гродно 2004, с. 76.

[14] Ш. Балли, *Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка*, Москва 1955, с. 124-125.

[15] Examples are given and translated by the author – A.L.

Bel.	Brat	pasadziw	dreva.
	'My brother	has planted	a tree.'
			Dreva rastsye.
			'The tree is growing.'

Causative verbs, being necessarily divalent and operating in relatively simple syntactic models, have a complex internal semantic structure: the subject affects the object through causation, and this leads to certain changes in the latter: the object can assume a new state, change the quality or perform an action.

Defence verbs bearing a unique denotative meaning, indicate a specific action of the causer which stimulates a new state of an object: *defend* → cause to survive, to be preserved, to be safe, etc. In our view, the causative component in the semantic structure of the verbs in question represents a peripheral element of their meaning if compared with lexemes *make, let, cause* where the seme of causation is dominant. In this sense, it is a particularly favourable approach to study such verbs in the aspect of causativity, since, being on the periphery of the class of causative verbs, they are uniquely suited to address specific problems of causativity.

2.1.1 Belarusian verbs of defence

We assume that Belarusian verbs *abaranyats' 1, 2, 3, adstoyvats', akhowvats, baranits '* belong to the class of causatives as they have a causative component inherent in their semantics verified with a *do so that* construction: Bel. *zrabits' (rabits') tak, kab*. Their causative history implies the fact underlying the causative action: the necessity to defend somebody or something from the danger or unpleasant situation threatening the object of the action. The causer performs an action in the result of which the object becomes free, safe, survives or remains preserved. A new state of the object of above-mentioned verbs can be expressed by non-causative correlates of different types: suppletive (a non-causative verb), analytical (an auxiliary verb and the past participle of a causative verb, an auxiliary verb and the appropriate noun/ adjective with/ without a preposition).

Abaranyats' 1: «*Nye, Radzivil abyatsaw abaranyats' hetyya zyemli*» (Charopka. Uladary Vyalikaha Knyastva// BP). Causer (C) – *Radzivil*, causative action (CA) – *abaranyats'*, consequence /result (C/R) – *zyemli abaronyeny (u byaspyetsy)*.

Abaranyats' 2: Abaronnyya hazy adnykh raslin buduts' abaranyats' inshyya rasliny ad mikraarhanizmaw (B. Mikulich. Zorka// BP). C – *hazy*, CA – *abaranyats'*, C/R – *rasliny zastalisya nyepashkodzhanymi*.

Abaranyats' 3: Vyyshla tak, shto ya abaranyaw intaresy madam Vil'naw (F. Maryyak. Klubok hadzyuk// BP). C – *ya*, CA – *abaranyats'*, C/R – *intaresy zakhavalisya (abaronyeny)*.

Adstoyvats': Tol'ki katalitski kafyedral'ny sabor i daminikanski manastyr udalosya zhawnyeram adstayats' (Charopka. Uladary Vyalikaha Knyastva// BP). C – *zhawnyery*, CA – *adstayats'*, C/R – *sabor i daminikanski manastyr u byaspyetsy (atsalyeli)*.

Akhowvats': Addzyely byelaruskay dyvizii myeli [...] akhowvats' most, pakul' pyaroydzye wsya kalona (K. Akula. Zmaharnyya darohi// PB). C – *addzyely byelaruskay dyvizii*, CA – *akhowvats'*, C/R – *most atsalyew*.

Baranits': *Litsviny muzhna baranili svoy kray* (Magnus Ducatus Litvania – Kroni-ka// BP). C – *Litsviny*, CA – *baranits'*, C/R – *kray u byaspyetsy*.

The verbs *zastupatstsa, ustupatstsa* are not marked with respect to direct transitivity. The prepositional indirect object can acquire a new state in the result of the causative action of the subject. *Dyy matsi za Larysu zastupitstsa, kali shto* (A. Yakimovich. Kvitok// BP). C – *matsi*, CA – *zastupatstsa*, C/R – *Larysa w byaspyetsy*. *Zaychyk ustupiwsya za yaho na skhodzye [...]* (I. Myelyezh. Lyudzi na balotsye// PB). C – *Zaychyk*, CA – *ustupatstsa*, C/R – *yon u byaspyetsy*.

Abaranyatstsa is an auto-causative verb[16]. The ability to put this verb into a diagnostic construction used to verify reflexive causativity[17] proves its auto-causative nature: the subject and object of the action coincide: *bats'ka muzhna abaranyawsya – bats 'ka muzhna abaranyaw syabye.*

The action of *adbivatstsa* is not targeted either at the object or subject as in the above example but at the counter agent: *yon adbivawsya ad vorahaw – *yon adbivaw syabye ad vorahaw*. With this in mind, *adbivatstsa* will not be discussed further as it does not contain a causative component in its semantic structure.

Subjects of the peripheral verbs *vyharodzhvats', prykryvats'* perform their actions causing new states of the objects. *Vo hetaha ya i chakaw! Kali ty pachnyesh yaye vyharodzhvats'* (V. Bykaw. Kar'yer// BP). C – *ty*, CA – *vyharodzhvats'*, C/R – *yana w byaspyetsy*. *Yamu nyeabkhodna bylo nyeyak prykryvats' myezhy [...]* (A. Krawtsevich. Tewtonski orden// BP). C – *yon*, CA – *prykryvats'*, C/R – *myezhy atsalyeli*.

In its direct meaning *stayats'* is a statal verb denoting a process within the realm of a subject. In the group of defence verbs the lexeme is included in its figurative meaning as an action verb with the causer able to change the state of the object. *[...] hrudz'mi za Radzimu stayats' Sluchchaki* (A. Zmahar. Paslukhay, shto kazha kurhan// BP). C – *Sluchchaki*, CA – *stayats'*, C/R – *Radzima w byaspyetsy*.

---

[16] A *S+V+O* model is a typical pattern to express the subject-object relations of a causative verb. The simplest transformation is the modification of an active verb which results from the elimination of the object and represents its auto-causative version. The action is centred in the subject. Thus, we have an inter-causative modification of the original verb since in the transformed model the causative seme is preserved: S (Act. + Caus1) + V + O (Pass. + Caus2) → S (Act. + Caus1) + V. The causative verb becomes unmarked with regard to the direct object (Г.А. Золотова, *Очерк функционального синтаксиса русского языка*, Москва 1973, с. 286-287).

[17] Belarusian forms -sja (-cca) and Polish się were once part of the Slavic integral subsystem of short pronoun forms. As Boris Norman (Б.Ю. Норман, *Переходность, залог, возвратность: на материале болг. и др. слав. яз.*, Минск 1972, с. 57) argues, these genetically unstressed forms used with verbs show the loss of their original pronoun characteristics with the simultaneous acquisition of new properties and functions not inherent in pronoun forms. This shows that the subject as well as the object can carry a causative state. This type of causation is called auto-causation and can be verified by the use of the verb in a diagnostic context where the reflexive element is substituted for the reflexive pronoun. The substitution may sound a bit artificial but is acceptable for diagnostic purposes.

Another way to verify a causative component is to transform a causative verb into a causative situation[18]. The method of paraphrasing (transformation) is a universal way of semantic description where the meaning is described by expanding it into one or more statements rather than by listing specific semantic features. The only condition for using such a procedure is that all the semantic elements of the original are preserved in the transformed construction[19].

The caused state, as the ultimate goal of the causative situation, is of a greater interest to the speaker or listener. Therefore, the theme-rheme structure of diagnostic constructions representing a causative situation will be as follows: consequent + causative link + antecedent. Conjunctions of cause or reason such as *for, as, because, since, etc.* and their equivalents in the analysed languages are used to join two parts of the causative situation.

All Belarusian defence verbs (except *adbivatstsa*) can function in a diagnostic construction <u>non-causative correlate</u>, *tamu shto, bo, etc.,* <u>causative verb</u>. E.g. *vyoski <u>abaronyeny (u byaspyetsy)</u>, tamu shto ikh <u>abaranyali</u> syalyanye; rasliny zastalisya <u>nyepashkodzhanymi</u>, bo ikh <u>abaranyali</u> khimichnyya elyemyenty inshykh raslin; sabor i daminikanski manastyr <u>atsalyeli</u>, tamu shto ikh <u>adstoyvali</u> vyerniki; syalyanye <u>w byas-pyetsy</u>, bo za ikh <u>zastupilasya</u> myastsovaya wlada; horad <u>atsalyew</u>, tamu shto za yaho <u>stayali</u> wsye zhykhary.*

2.1.2 Polish verbs of defence

In the causative history of Polish defence verbs the same causative component is revealed: the need to defend or protect someone, something from danger, trouble, to protect interests. The causative verb names a specific action that causes a new state of the object expressed by different types of non-causative correlates, thus forming with the causative verb a suppletive or incomplete formal opposition. Binary oppositions (causative verbs – non-causative correlates) indicate the systemic organization of the units of this microsystem.

The causative semantics of the Polish verbs *bronić 1, 2, 3, 4, bronić się, chronić, chronić się, ochraniać, osłaniać, ratować, strzec, strzec się, ubezpieczać, ubezpieczać się, zabezpieczać, zabezpieczać się, ukrywać, ukrywać się, odpierać, wstawiać się* is revealed with the help of a *do so that* construction: Pol. robić (zrobić) tak, żeby. The analysed causative verbs have synthetic (one-word) or analytical (two-, three-word) non-causative correlates: *być bezpiecznym, ocaleć, zachować się,* etc.

<u>*Bronić 1:*</u> *Yurga zmrużył oczy. <u>Bronić</u> ludzi, życie im ratować, jaka to po waszemu rzecz, zła czy dobra?* (A. Sapkowski. Miecz przeznaczenia// NKJP). C – *Yurga*, CA – *bronić*, C/R – *ludzie są bezpieczni.*

---

[18] The immediate constituents of a causative situation are an antecedent (a causing micro-situation including a causing subject and a causing state) and a consequent (a caused micro-situation including a subject and a caused state) joined by a causative link.

[19] R.D. van Valin, Jr., *The syntax-semantics-pragmatics interface: an introduction to role and reference grammar*, Cambridge 2005, p. 32.

Bronić 2: Uważam, że powinniśmy bronić *wartości, jak tylko można w tych dzisiejszych ... czasach* (D. Bieńkowski: Biało-czerwony, 2007// NKJP). C – *my*, CA – *bronić*, C/R – *wartości zostały zachowane (są chronione).*

Bronić 3: Kiedy McKinley dowiedział się o tym, postanowił bronić *robotników przed sądem* (P. Wierzbicki: Kim są polscy sędziowie, Gazeta Polska, 1998// NKJP). C – *McKinley (adwokat)*, CA – *bronić*, C/R – *robotnicy (grupa górników) są usprawiedliwieni.*

Bronić 4: Wtedy miasta bronił *mur i 15 baszt rozlokowanych na planie prostokąta* (Baszta w Olkuszu, Dziennik Polski, 1999-02-20// NKJP). C – *mur*, *baszty*, CA – *bronić*, C/R – *miasto przetrwało (ocalało).*

Chronić: Pracodawca jest obowiązany chronić *zdrowie i życie pracowników [...]* (Kodeks Pracy, Sejm RP// NKJP). C – *pracodawca*, CA – *chronić*, C/R – *zdrowie i życie pracowników jest w bezpieczeństwie.*

Ochraniać: Powiatowy rzecznik ma ochraniać *interesy obywateli* (Dziennik Powiatu Bytowskiego. L. Literski. 2000-05-26// NKJP). C – *Rzecznik*, CA – *ochraniać*, C/R – *interesy obywateli zostały zachowane.*

Osłaniać: I chyba miałam taką skłonność, aby osłaniać *chłopców przed różnymi kłopotami* (M. Jarosz. Nasze Zdrowie. 2004// NKJP). C – *ja (kobieta)*, CA – *osłaniać*, C/R – *chłopcy są bezpieczni.*

Ratować: Jesteśmy w pełni zdecydowani ludzi tych ratować *wszystkimi sposobami, [...]* (Ch. Skrzyposzek. Wolna Trybuna.1985// NKJP). C – *my*, CA – *ratować*, C/R – *ludzie są bezpieczni.*

Strzec: Stary starosta doskonale wiedział, że musi pilnie strzec *swego skarbu* (M. Kwiatkowska, M. Kwiatkowski, K. Wesołowski. Znane i nieznane. 2001// NKJP). C – *starosta*, CA – *strzec*, C/R – *skarb ocalał.*

Ubezpieczać: Widząc, że Piotrek go ubezpiecza, *[...], Marcin uspokoił się* (Ł. Kamykowski: Dom między lipą a bilbordem. 2008// NKJP). C – *Piotrek*, CA – *ubezpieczać*, C/R – *Marcin jest bezpieczny.*

Zabezpieczać: Lekarz rodzinny mający zabezpieczać *interes zdrowotny pacjenta powinien znać potrzeby swoich podopiecznych* (A. Łaska-Formejster. Proces kształtowania roli zawodowej lekarza rodzinnego. 2002// NKJP). C – *lekarz rodzinny*, CA – *zabezpieczać*, C/R – *zdrowie pacjenta jest chronione.*

Ukrywać: W czasach papieża Grzegorza VII [...] ukryto *na wyspie szczerozłote figury dwunastu apostołów naturalnej wielkości* (O. Budrewicz: Piekło w kolorach. 1997// NKJP). C – *ludzie*, CA – *ukrywać*, C/R – *figury apostołów ocalały.*

The verbs *bronić się, chronić się, strzec się, ubezpieczać się, zabezpieczać się, ukrywać się* are autocausative as they represent the opposition: action – causation of the action in smb's own favour. Their autocausativity is verified by means of substituting a reflexive element for a reflexive pronoun: e.g., *żołnierz dzielnie się bronił – żołnierz dzielnie bronił siebie; chronić się przed oszustami – chronić siebie przed oszustami; strzec się złych ludzi – strzec siebie przed złymi ludźmi.*

The verb *odpierać s*hould be mentioned separately. In its semantic structure a causative component is easily revealed with the help of the diagnostic construction:

odpierać ataki konkurencji – <u>zrobić tak, żeby</u> *ataki konkurencji ustały*. But the meaning of this verb is different from the general meaning of the analysed LSG. The object of the action is expected to stop its being but not to remain safe. In addition, it is not possible to describe a new situation of the object with the help of one of the following non-causative correlates: *być bezpiecznym, ocaleć, zachować się*. Should the group in question be divided into subgroups, *odpierać* would represent a separate one.

Wstawiać się is of particular interest. The action of the subject is targeted at the object in the accusative case with the preposition *za*. The function of **się** in relation to the object consists in eliminating direct transitivity and limiting indirect transitivity. Here **się** shows that the action, while excluding the object or making it indirectly related to itself, at the same time only partially covers the subject. Therefore, we cannot categorize this verb as autocausative. *Na drugi dzień przyszedł do mamy* <u>*wstawiać się*</u> <u>*za tatą*</u> *ksiądz Czerwonka z dużego kościoła* (Idź kochaj i niech ci nie pomoże żadna na ziemi rzecz. Tomek Tryzna. 2010// NKJP). In the semantic structure of this verb we find, though not very explicitly, the component 'cause' (*wstawiać się za tatą* – zrobić tak, żeby *trudna sytuacja dla taty się skończyła*). At the same time, it is not possible to find a non-causative correlate to denote the new state of the object. The new situation can only be represented descriptively.

It is clear from what has been said that the verbs *odpierać, wstawiać się* vary the general semantic complex of defence verbs with new shades of meaning. The new situation that arises as a result of causation is not indicated by the non-causative correlates *być bezpiecznym, ocaleć, zachować się* as is characteristic of the majority of units of the analysed lexical semantic group.

The peripheral verbs *asekurować, asekurować się, odbijać, stawać, ujmować się* contain the causative element in their semantic structure as well.

<u>*Asekurować*</u>: *Ale on nie odpowiada, tylko biegnie* <u>*asekurować*</u> *dziecko kolegi, które nas wyprzedziło* (T. Kwaśniewski. Dziennik ciężarowca. 2007// NKJP). C – *on*, CA – *asekurować*, C/R – *dziecko jest bezpieczne*.

The verb <u>*assekurować się*</u> is autocausative as the action returns to the subject. *Czas goni, a młodzież* <u>*się asekuruje*</u>, *startując do trzech, czterech szkół wyższych* (Gazeta Krakowska. 2006-07-12// NKJP).

The peripheral verb <u>*odbijać*</u>, similar to the central verbs *odpierać, wstawiać się*, conveys the cause-result semantics but expresses the causation of a new situation termination. *Rywalki, widząc szansę na zwycięstwo,* <u>*odbijały*</u> *nasze mało skuteczne ataki* (L. Jaźwiecki. Reprezentacja Be, Trybuna Śląska. 2004-01-09// NKJP). C – *rywalki*, CA – *odbijać*, C/R – *ataki ustały*.

New states of objects of the verbs *stawać, ujmować się* are expressed by non-causative correlates *być w bezpieczenstwie, być bezpiecznym. Córka z synem* <u>*stanęli*</u> *murem* <u>*za*</u> *matką [...]* (S. Milewski: Ciemne sprawy międzywojnia, 2002// NKJP). C – *córka, syn*, CA – *stawać*, C/R – *matka jest w bezpieczeństwie. Zapytana, jak osiągnąć ten cel, rozłożyła ręce. – Ale trzeba to zapisać, zawsze trzeba* <u>*ujmować się za*</u> *słabszymi* (P. Cegielski. Szwecja i jej sąsiedzi.1996-03-22// NKJP). C – *ona*, CA – <u>*ujmować się*</u>, C/R – *słabsi są bezpieczni*.

All the studied Polish verbs belong to the class of causatives. This is confirmed by their appropriate functioning in constructions such as non-causative correlate, *ponie-waż, bo, etc.* causative verb, e.g., *ludzie są bezpieczni, ponieważ bronią ich żołnierze; miasto przetrwało (ocalało), ponieważ mur bronił miasta; interesy obywateli zostały zachowane, ponieważ rzecznik ochraniał je; dzieci są w bezpieczeństwie, ponieważ strzegły się przed złymi ludźmi; ona ocalała, bo ukryła się na strychu przed Niemcami; ataki konkurencji ustały, ponieważ ktoś je odpierał; matka jest w bezpieczeństwie, bo córka i syn stanęli murem za matką.*

3. Conclusion

With regard to the above, it should be noted that the broad interpretation of causation in the article allows a large number of units to be included within the class of causative verbs. The question as to the scope and limits of the causative verbs class in Polish and Belarusian is solved as follows: to causative belong the verbs which are transitive (e.g. Pol. *bronić,* Bel. *abaranyats'*) or partially transitive (e.g. Pol. s*tanąć za,* Bel. *zastupatstsa za*). The cause-result semantics in their structure is revealed with the diagnostic *to do so that* construction. Causative verbs stand in binary opposition to their non-causative correlates and are capable of being transformed into a causative situation. The application of these criteria to the analysed lexemes have shown that all Polish and almost all Belarusian verbs (except *adbivatstsa*) can be referred to as causative.

Covering a certain denotative sphere and representing the unique world view of native speakers, Belarusian causative verbs with the meaning 'defend' manifest one type of causation: causative action – causation of a new state of the object, and Polish verbs broaden the cause-result semantics of the LSG with another type: causative action – causation of a new situation termination. Thus, universal for both languages the principles of coding causation are influenced by the national peculiarities of reality reflection.

Analyses of the individual LSGs with respect to causativity is of fundamental importance as this reveals the peculiarities of the expression of causative semantics on the part of verbs close in meaning.

Given that the availability of a core and periphery within a group is a typical feature of a field structure, LSGs of defence in Polish and Belarusian are identified as typical lexemic fields. Crucially, there is no correlation between causativity and the position of verbs either in the core or periphery of the group. The vivid expression of the semantics of defence does not imply the presence or absence of the causative seme in the semantic structure of the verb and vice versa. We can assume that causative verbs can be viewed as a continuum with verbs having different degrees of causative meaning in the core and periphery of the group.

In addition, when studying a particular linguistic phenomenon on the material of several languages, it is necessary to apply to them, as noted above, the same methods of analysis and interpretation. The use of common criteria for identifying the core and periphery of the Polish and Belarusian LSGs did not reveal a complete match in the

groups composition. The typological relevance lies in the fact that the same area of semantics (the plane of content) is distributed differently between core and periphery within each language and is therefore covered by a different set of lexical units, i.e., has different configurations in the expression plane.

The units of the lexical semantic groups in the two studied languages are characterized by partial overlap with elements of other fields. Peripheral verbs in meanings other than 'defend' may be included in the core or periphery of other LSGs. This is due to the presence of centrifugal and centripetal processes that ensure a constant dynamic of language subsystems.

All Polish and almost all Belarusian verbs are considered causative as they meet the necessary and sufficient criteria relevant to causative verbs presented in the article. Assuming that the Pol. verbs *wstawiać się, stawać, ujmować się* and the Bel. verbs *zastupatstsa, ustupatstsa, stayats'* are causative, the question arises as to the relationship between the semantics of causative verbs and their formal means of expression. The meaning of these units, as noted above, contains an indication of the reason for the action (Why was the action performed? Because there was sth./sb. threatening the object of the action). But the means of formal expression (the verbs take an indirect object with a preposition) do not correspond to those considered regular for causative verbs in Polish and Belarusian: a verb in the accusative case with a direct object. This asymmetry of form and content highlights the fact that the category of causativity in both the analysed Slavic languages is dynamic and does not always have regular means of expression and does not always need them. Two types of non-causative correlates (synthetic and analytic) in causative oppositions is a further confirmation of the dynamic nature of causativity.

Causative verbs being the core of the functional semantic category of causativity represent a field structure which should include verbs with the meaning 'defend' as peripheral elements. In the Polish and Belarusian languages the above lexemes refer to the periphery because their meaning is complicated by other semantic components, unlike the meanings of causative verbs proper (e.g., *force, determine, urge, cause*). Thus, while being not "pure" specialized means of conveying causal semantics, peripheral causative verbs are the best material to illustrate the nuances, distinctions and complex aspects of the causation theory.

References

Apresyan Yu.D., *Printsipy organizatsii tsentra i periferii v leksike i grammatike*, [v:] *Tipologicheskiye obosnovaniya v grammatike*, Moskva 2004.

Balli Sh., *Frantsuzskaya stilistika*, Moskva 2001.

Balli Sh., *Obshchaya lingvistika i voprosy frantsuzskogo yazyka*, Moskva 1955.

Bondarko A.V., *Teoriya morfologicheskikh kategoriy i aspektologicheskiye issledovaniya*, Moskva 2005.

Byelaruskaya Palichka, [v:] https://knihi.com.

Etimologicheskiy slovar' slavyanskikh yazykov. Praslavyanskiy leksicheskiy fond, [v:] http://etymolog.ruslang.ru.

Gołąb Z., *Próba klasyfikacji syntaktycznej czasowników polskich (na zasadzie konotacji)*, „Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego" 1967.

Kiklewicz A., Korytkowska A., Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska J., Zatorska A., *Zintegrowany opis semantyczno-syntaktyczny czasowników bułgarskich, polskich i rosyjskich (verba cogitandi i verba sentiendi)*, Warszawa 2019.

Kiklewicz A., *Podstawowe struktury zdaniowe współczesnych języków słowiańskich: białoruski, bułgarski, polski*, Olsztyn 2010.

Martynaw V., Shuba P., Yarmash M., *Marfyemnaya dystrybutsyya w byelaruskay movye: Dzyeyaslow*, Minsk 1967.

Matskyevich Yu., *Marfalohiya dzyeyaslova w byelaruskay movye*, Minsk 1959.

Mikhnyevich A., *Prablyemy syemantyka-sintaksichnaha daslyedvannya byelaruskay movy*, Minsk 1976.

Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego, [w:] https://pelcra-nkjp.clarin-pl.eu/.

Nikitevich A.V., *Russkiy glagol v sostave nominativnykh ryadov*, Grodno 2004.

Norman B.Yu., *Perekhodnost', zalog, vozvratnost': na materiale bolg. i dr. slav. yaz.*, Minsk 1972.

Rudenka A.M., *Dzyeyaslovy s syemantykay razumovykh pratsesaw u byelaruskay movye*, Minsk 2000.

Rudyenko Ye., Ivashina N., Yaumyen N., *Syemantiko-sintaksichyeskoye sopostavlyeniye slavyanskikh hlaholov (na matyerialye byelorusskoho, pol'skoho, russkoho i chyeshskoho yazykov)*, Minsk 2004.

Sopostavityel'nyy analiz vostochnoslavyanskikh yazykov, pod ryed. A.A. Lukashantsa, A.M. Myezyenko, Minsk 2005.

Shuba P., *Dzyeyaslow u byelaruskay movye*, Minsk 1968.

Tlumachal'ny slownik byelaruskay litaraturnay movy: bol'sh za 65000 slow, pad red. I.L. Kapylova, Minsk 2016.

Valin van R.D., Jr., *The syntax-semantics-pragmatics interface: an introduction to role and reference grammar*, Cambridge 2005.

Vazhnik S., *Kantrastywny sintaksis pol'skay i byelaruskay mow: Syemantyka i dystrybutsyya dzyeyaslownaha predykata*, Minsk 2008.

Wielki słownik języka polskiego PAN, [w:] https://wsjp.pl.

Whorf B., *Language, Thought, and Reality*, Cambridge 1956.

Zolotova G.A., *Ocherk funktsional'nogo sintaksisa russkogo yazyka*, Moskva 1973.

Żelazko K., *Czasowniki przechodnie o składni wielorakiej w języku polskim*, Wrocław 1975.

NOTE ON THE AUTHOR

Dr Anzhalika Litvinovich (Анжалика Литвинович) – specialist in the Office for Scientific Excellence of Polish Academy of Sciences. **Publications: papers:** *Belarusian nationally specific image of the universal concept of water*, [in:] *Language and ecology*, 2022, [in:] https://www.ecoling.net/_files/ugd/ae088a_3937ce28124144d5972bc2-f441734a9c.pdf; *Полевая организация глагольной лексики (на примере глаголов со значением 'защищать' в русском языке)*, "Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Linguistica Rossica" 2020, doi: 10.18778/1731-8025.19.08; *Лексика иностранного языка как важнейший компонент речевой деятельности*, "Народная асвета" Минск 2019, № 7, [w:] http://www.n-asveta.by/dadatki/2019/leksika.pdf; *Неспециализирован-ные средства выражения каузативной семантики в славянских и германских языках (на примере ЛСГ защиты)*, "Учен. зап. Казан. ун-та. Сер. Гуманит. науки. – 2021. – Т. 163, кн. 4–5", doi: 10.26907/2541-7738.2021.4-5.207-221; *Lexicology: workshops for students*, Grodno 2010, [w:] https://elib.grsu.by/doc/456.

ORCID: 0000-0003-4256-5352
Email: anzhalika.litvinovich@pan.pl