

РОЗДІЛ 2 ГЕРМАНСЬКІ МОВИ

UDC 811.111'02'367.335

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2026.45.2.12>

HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE: STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC FEATURES OF COMPLEX SENTENCES IN THE OLD ENGLISH PERIOD

ІСТОРІЯ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ: СТРУКТУРНО-СЕМАНТИЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ СКЛАДНОГО РЕЧЕННЯ ДАВНЬОАНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ ДОБИ

Dobrovolska S.R.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-2389-4890

Candidate of Economic Sciences,

Senior Lecturer at the Department of Foreign Languages and Translation Studies

Lviv State University of Life Safety

The article examines the structural and semantic features of complex sentences in Old English (700–1100). Two main types of complex sentences are considered – compound and complex sentences – along with their structure and the specifics of syntactic relationships between components of a polypredicative structure. The system of conjunctive coordination is analyzed, which was characterized by diversity in both content and form and had at its disposal numerous means of expressing semantic nuances.

The main classes of coordinating conjunctions are distinguished: connecting, contrasting, separating, and causal, each of which expressed specific semantic nuances. Additional means of expressing connections between coordinate clauses are studied, in particular fixed and reverse word order, structural parallelism, and inversion, which acted as auxiliary mechanisms for organizing syntactic relations. Particular attention is paid to the means of expressing subordinate relationships, among which asyndetic connection stands out as the most archaic type, and conjunctive connection and correlation as the most developed forms of subordination. The problem of insufficient differentiation between coordinate and subordinate conjunctions in the Old English period is considered, which led to functional homonymy and semantic ambiguity in sentence construction. The polysemy of subordinate conjunctions and their structural classification into simple and complex phrase constructions is analyzed.

Special attention is paid to the correlative type of connection and its transformation at the end of the ancient period, when correlative particles were reinterpreted and transformed into full-fledged conjunctions. It has been established that the structure of complex sentences throughout the Old English period showed a steady and distinct tendency towards the gradual improvement and systematization of the syntactic system. The study is based on the analysis of authentic Old English texts using historical glossaries and anthologies.

Key words: Old English, complex sentences, coordinating conjunctions, subordinate conjunctions, syntactic relations, correlation, polypredicativity.

У статті досліджуються структурно-семантичні особливості складного речення в давньоанглійській мові (700–1100 рр.). Розглядаються два основні типи складних речень – складносурядні та складнопідрядні, їхня будова та специфіка синтаксичних зв'язків між компонентами поліпредикативної структури. Аналізується система сполучникової сурядності, що характеризувалася різноманітністю як за змістом, так і за формою та мала у своєму розпорядженні численні засоби висловлювання смислових відтінків.

Виділяються основні класи сурядних сполучників: з'єднувальні, супротивні, розділові та причинно-наслідкові, кожен з яких виражав специфічні смислові відтінки. Досліджуються додаткові засоби вираження зв'язків між сурядними реченнями, зокрема фіксований та зворотний порядок слів, структурний паралелізм, інверсія, що виступали як допоміжні механізми організації синтаксичних відносин. Особлива увага приділяється способам вираження підрядного зв'язку, серед яких виділяються асиндетичне з'єднання як найбільш архаїчний тип, сполучниковий зв'язок та кореляція як найрозвиненіші форми підрядності. Розглядається проблема недостатньої диференціації сурядних та підрядних сполучників у давньоанглійський період, що призводила до функціональної омонимії та смислової нечіткості побудови речень. Аналізується полісемія підрядних сполучників та їхня структурна класифікація на прості й складні фразові конструкції.

Окрему увагу приділено корелятивному типу зв'язку та його трансформації наприкінці давнього періоду, коли корелятивні частки переосмислювалися та перетворювалися на повноцінні сполучники. Встановлено, що структура складних речень протягом давньоанглійського періоду демонструвала стійку виразну тенденцію до послідовного вдосконалення та впорядкування синтаксичної системи. Дослідження базується на аналізі автентичних давньоанглійських текстів із використанням історичних глосаріїв та хрестоматій.

Ключові слова: давньоанглійська мова, складне речення, сурядні сполучники, підрядні сполучники, синтаксичні зв'язки, кореляція, поліпредикативність.

Problem setting. A complex sentence as a polypredicative construction is a complex act of mental activity that reflects two or more situational events that are perceived as a single whole [25, p. 349]. According to the number of predicative centers, complex sentences are classified as compound and complex, characterized by conjunctive and non-conjunctive types of connection. In English linguistic terminology, parts of a complex sentence are commonly referred to as clauses [11, p. 112].

The structural organization of a complex sentence is based on the principle of coordination, which is implemented either synthetically (through the use of connectives) or asyndetically (without connectives). In contrast, a complex sentence is based on the principle of subordination and consists of two or more basic clauses, one of which functions as the main clause, while the others are subordinate clauses. The subordinate connection between them can be either conjunctive or non-conjunctive. Subordinate clauses come in various types: subject, object, attributive, circumstantial (place, time, condition, cause, etc.).

The aim of the study is to clarify the structural features of complex sentences in Old English and to identify the specifics of syntactic relationships between components of compound and complex constructions.

Analysis of recent research and publications.

The issue of sentence syntax in a diachronic aspect has not been sufficiently covered in scientific literature. There are only a few studies devoted to the description of the structure of certain types of sentences and the analysis of ancient texts [1; 3; 9; 21; 36]. At the same time, detailed scientific research in the field of historical English grammar is mainly represented by morphological studies and word combination syntax [8; 12; 14; 17; 25].

Scope of the research. In Old English (700–1100 AD), there was already a developed system of conjunctive coordination, characterized by numerous means of expression. This system was notable for its diversity in both content (semantic relations) and form (the structure of sentences contained in a complex coordinate clause) [2; 13; 18; 19]. The connection between coordinate sentences reflects the connections that exist between objects and phenomena in the real world, which is expressed in the structure of a compound sentence.

The means of expressing the connection between the components of a compound sentence can be represented by the following elements:

1. Components located in the second of the coordinate clauses, namely: anaphoric pronouns that replace words in the first sentence to avoid

repetition, or clarifying adverbs *þa*, *sōna*, *sifþan*, etc. For example (these and subsequent examples of sentences are taken from historical glossaries and anthologies and adapted for illustrative convenience [27; 32]): ...*þa zezaderode cyning his fierd, and for þæt he zewīcode betwuh hām twām herzum. ...modi король зібрав своє військо, і через це він опинився між двома арміями.*

2. Elements omitted in the second clause but coinciding with the words of the first sentence. Thus, the semantic connection between compound sentences determines their grammatical connection; as a result, in addition to the semantic connection, compound sentences are also grammatically connected.

The main means of expressing the semantic and grammatical connection of compound sentences are coordinating conjunctions. Connecting compound clauses, conjunctions organize their combination, give meaning to this combination, and ensure the possibility of the existence of a compound sentence as a semantic and grammatical whole. Conjunctions that function as connecting words in a compound sentence are grammatical markers of the semantic relationships that exist between parts of the sentence.

Old English conjunctions can be represented by the following classes, which are also distinguished in modern grammars [29; 30; 31]:

1. Connective conjunctions. The leading conjunction of this group could express various shades of meaning [31, p. 260]:

– **time-dependent relationships:** *He hā hēt earcian eal hæt hinunz-tol ætforan his dōmsetie and he him wearh tō zelæd. Потім він наказав приготувати всі знаряддя перед своїм суддівським місцем, і його привели до нього.*

– **oppositional relations:** ...*he zesæt on hære byriz and Max zesæt on Londinium hære byriz. ...він оселився у тому місті, а Макс оселився в Лондоні.*

– **cause-and-effect relationships:** ...*he sette his hand ofer hiora heortan and heora andzæat him eft tō hwīrfde. ...він доторкнувся рукою до їхніх сердець, і їхній розум повернувся до них знову.*

Along with the conjunction *and*, the following connectives functioned in the group of connective conjunctions [34, pp. 266-279]: the negative connective *ne* «і не», the paired negative connectives *nezher* (*ne*)...*ne* і *ne...ne* «ні...ні», the paired connective *nales* *hæt...ac eac* «не тільки, але і», the connectives *ēac* «також», *swā* «теж», *swā...swā* «теж...теж».

2. Contrastive conjunctions. The main conjunction in this group is *ac* «але», for example: *He ne hæfde folc zezaderod; and wolde winnan, ac he weard*

ofslæzen on h̄æm f̄ærelte... Він зібрав армію і хотів битися, але під час переходу він був убитий...

The group of contrastive conjunctions included the following words: *h̄onne* «але», *h̄ēah* «але», *hwæhree* «але», *hwæhre...h̄onne* «але...але».

3. Separating conjunctions. This category included [10, p. 71]: *ōh̄h* «або», *ōh̄he...ōh̄he* «або...або», *hwæder* «або», *æzder ze...ze* «або...або»: *Is me mid him dōm zewurce, ōh̄re me dēad nimeh̄. Я завоюю з ним славу для себе, або помру.*

Causal relationships were also represented in Old English, and the main conjunction of this group, *forh̄on*, was used both as a coordinating and a subordinating conjunction [34, p. 270]. The emergence of causal relationships as another full-fledged type of coordination only occurred in the Middle English period.

The above facts indicate that the components of a complex coordinate clause were always semantically related and characterized by certain semantic relationships. These relationships were diverse: relationships of addition, relationships of temporal dependence, relationships of negation, and cause-and-effect relationships.

In addition to conjunctions, fixed word order, reverse word order in one of the coordinate clauses, and structural parallelism were also used as means of expressing the connections between coordinate clauses [17; 22].

When the order of clauses in a complex coordinate sentence is fixed, this indicates not only the existence of a connection between them, but also the nature of this connection, i.e., it functions as a means of expressing semantic relations in a complex coordinate sentence. For example, in this case, the order of clauses in a compound sentence corresponds to the sequence of actions, for example: *Sē dæz zewaīt, and sēo niht zenēalāhte. Проїшов день, і настала ніч.*

In cases where it is impossible to change the order of the parts of a sentence, this may be due not only to semantic but also to structural factors. Such structural factors include: the presence of third-person personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns or adverbs, and even other elements of the text in the second clause of a compound sentence. In the example below, it is impossible to rearrange the clauses of a compound sentence because the subject in the second clause is expressed by a third-person singular personal pronoun: *...h̄æt izland is norh̄eastlanz; and hit is eahta hund mila lanz and twa hund mila brad. ...цей острів знаходиться на північному сході; і його довжина вісімсот миль, а ширина двісті миль.*

When the order of clauses in a complex sentence does not serve as a means of expressing their connec-

tion, i.e., when they can be rearranged without losing meaning, this phenomenon is rare. This so-called reversibility of coordinate clauses is generally not characteristic of the Old English period [19; 23; 25].

Cases of reversibility are found only in complex sentences in which the information is descriptive in nature: *...h̄onne læweh̄ broher ōherne on dēah̄, and sune sē læweh̄ his fæder; and h̄ā zintran ārisah̄ wiḥ h̄ām yl drum... ...modi брата видасть брата, і син зрадить свого батька, і молодші піднімуться проти старших...*

The presence of inversion [5, p. 365] in the second part of the sentence is an additional sign of the connection between the clauses of a compound sentence. Inversion is usually caused by the fact that at the beginning of the second clause there is a word (or phrase) that is more closely related in meaning to the content of the previous clause than all other words in the second clause. For example: *h̄æt land is swyhe mycel, and h̄ær bih̄ swyhe maniz buriz. Ця країна дуже велика, і там є багато міст.*

The rearrangement here is caused by the fact that at the beginning of the second clause there is a circumstance of place, expressed by the adverb *h̄ær*. Thus, the reverse word order in the second of the coordinate clauses functions as a means of expressing the connection between these sentences. However, it does not reflect the nature of this connection, i.e., it is not a means of expressing semantic relations in a complex sentence, and therefore is considered as additional.

Syntactic parallelism [6, p. 21] also serves as a means of expressing only the most general, undifferentiated connection between coordinate clauses: *...and wel hu fehst on h̄ā speche, and rihte hu hyt understentst. ...і добре ти схоплюєш мову, і добре ти розумієш її.*

The conjunctive coordination of Old English is characterized by a tendency toward concretization, toward clarification of the types of semantic relations or their nuances. For this purpose, clarifying lexical elements are used within complex sentences. For example: *...swylce ēac h̄issum tīdum cōm mycel hungor on Greka ealdorburn; and sōna a wōl wæs aefterfylizende. ...у цей час почався сильний голод у столиці греків, і незабаром за ним пішла чума.*

The clarifying adverb *sōna*, meaning «скоро, незабаром» [34, p. 276], is located here in the second clause of a compound sentence, contributing to a more pronounced sense of temporal sequence.

As for the ways of expressing subordinate relationships in Old English complex sentences, there are three types of connection between subordinate clauses and the main clause:

– **asyndetic (non-conjunction) connection** [28, p. 29].

The asyndetic (non-conjunction) type is the most archaic type of connection, characteristic of all Germanic languages, but limited in Slavic languages [4; 5]. With asyndetic connection between the main and subordinate clauses, various relationships are conveyed – causal, attributive, or explanatory: *Ɔa sōna zelomp, hā hit swā sceolde, lōta leohtode lēoda maghūm* (causal, explanatory). ...*тоді незабаром сталося, як мало бути, що світло засяло для людей. Ве hām ylsum fæderum, we fore spreced wæron...* (explanatory). *Тими самими проповідниками, про які ми говорили...*

Conjunctive connection. In the period under study, conjunctive words did not yet exist. They only appeared in the Middle English period. The main way of conveying subordinate relationships between the main and subordinate clauses was through conjunctions [7; 15; 23]. Old English had a fairly developed system of subordinate conjunctions, but the general underdevelopment of subordinate relationships was also reflected in the sphere of conjunctive relationships and sometimes led to semantic or structural ambiguity in the construction of complex sentences [17; 22].

Correlation. This is a type of connection represented by correlating parts of speech in the main and subordinate clauses. In Old English, correlation is most often found in subordinate clauses of circumstance or attribute [10, p. 71]. In a circumstantial complex subordinate clause, an adverb is located in the main clause, and a corresponding conjunction is located in the subordinate clause: *hā... hā* «тоді...коли»; *swā...swā* «так...як», «тоді...коли»; *honne...honne* «тоді...коли»; *hær...hær* «там...де», etc.

It should be noted that the correlation is represented mainly by homonymous forms of adverbs and conjunctions, which are recorded in dictionaries compiled according to the historical principle [16; 35], with the oldest adverbs and conjunctions functioning as correlates: *Ɔā sē hē hæt hīerde, hā wende hē hine est. Коли він почув це, тоді він пішов на схід. ... ond hæt zeweorc zeworct wæs, swā herzjde hē his rise. ...i коли ця фортеця була побудована, тоді зруйнував він своє королівство.*

In an attributive complex sentence, another type of correlation functions: in the main clause, there is a demonstrative pronoun with the meaning «той, та» (*sē, seō*) or a third-person personal pronoun, and in the subordinate clause, there is a relative pronoun *he*: *Hē he hē beheafdad, sē āras of dēahe. Той, кого він обезголовив, той повстав із мертвих.*

Old English was characterized by insufficient differentiation in terms of coordinating and subordinate conjunctions. Thus, the conjunction *hēah* could function as a progressive subordinate conjunction with the meaning «хоч» and as a contrasting conjunction with the meaning «але»; the conjunction *honne* as a subordinate conjunction had the meaning «коли», and as a coordinating conjunction – «але»; the conjunction *forhōn* «бо» functioned both as a coordinating and a subordinate conjunction [16; 35].

Subordinate conjunctions were characterized by highly developed polysemy [15; 17]. Thus, the conjunction *swā* can introduce four types of subordinate clauses:

– **time clauses:** ...and *swā hē him zeseah, hā axode hē hine tō hwī hē cōme. ...i коли він його побачив, він спитав його, до кого він прийшов.*

– **conditional clauses:** ...ic *zelyfe hæt hū mildheart ne wile anforlætan swā ic hæt zefremme. ...я вірю, що ти не перестанеш бути милосердним, якщо я це зроблю.*

– **causal clauses:** ...*hū scealt zrēot etan hīne līf dszas, swā hū lah līce wrohte. ...ти маєш їсти землю до кінця своїх днів, тому що ти вчинив страшну справу:-*

– **consequential clauses:** ...*hīe him sprācon swā hit nān man nyste... ...вони говорили між собою так, щоб ніхто не знав про це.*

Other conjunctions are also characterized by polysemy: for example, *hæs* introduces additional clauses, clauses of time, purpose, and cause; *forhōn* introduces cause and purpose.

In terms of structure, conjunctions were classified as **simple** and **complex**. Simple conjunctions are the oldest, but their number is significantly smaller than that of complex conjunctions. Simple conjunctions include the following [34, pp. 266-279]: *hæt* «що», *sihhan* «коли», *ær* «до того як», *hæs* «бо», *heah* «хоча», *forhōn* «бо», *swā* «бо», «коли», *honne* «коли», *hā* «коли», *zif* «якщо», *oh* «до тих пір поки». Here are some examples of sentences with these words: ...*his wæs zefohten sihhan hē of east cōt. ...ця битва була проведена, коли він повернувся зі сходу. ...hā cweh hē hām heahfædere, hæt hē hæfde twa zeswustra. ...він сказав патріарху, що в нього було дві сестри. ...mysel yfel dēh hē, zif he nele hys wōh zerihtan. ...багато зла спричинить він, якщо не захоче виправити свої помилки.*

Most subordinate conjunctions, also known as phrasal conjunctions, had a complex structure [31, p. 268]. The first element, which carried the main lexical load, was an adverb, preposition, or noun; the second element was represented by a

pronoun form (*hām* or *hāem*); the third element was the universal subordinate particle *he*: *æfter hām he* «після того як», *æf hāem he* «до того як», *mid hām he* «після того як», *for hāem he* «для того щоб», *hā hwīle he* «в той час як». For example: ... *mid hām he he forbēad hām him hæt he hit nanum men ne cūdde...* ...після того як він наказав йому, щоб він про це нікому не говорив... ...ond hē hī him āzeaf, *for hāem he hiora wæs oþer his sunu. ...i* він їх йому віддав, оскільки один із них був його сином.

As an indicator of subordinate connection in a conjunction, in addition to the universal subordinate particle *he*, the most common conjunction in Old English, *hæt* (which in the form *that* is also common in modern English [20; 24; 33]): ...*hē hær wunade oþ hæt hīne ān swan ofstan.* ...він там жив доти, доки його не вбив один пастух.

Certain conjunctions can function as both simple and complex: *heah – heah he*; *forþon – forþon he*; *æf – æf hāem he*. For example: ...*zxf hwā hās bōc āwritan wylle, hæt hē hī zerihte wel bē hære bysne, for þon he ic nāh zeweald, hēah hī hwā tō wōze zebrinze...* ... якщо хтось захоче таку книгу написати, щоб він її добре виправив за цим зразком, тому що в мене немає сил, бо в ній, можливо, є помилки...

Conclusions and prospects for further research.

Complex sentences as polypredicative structures in Old English were represented by two main types: compound and complex. The syntactic organization of Old English texts was characterized by complexity and could contain a significant number of coordinate and subordinate clauses.

Compound sentences are considered to be older in origin. They had a developed system of conjunctive coordination (*and*, *ac*, *ne*, *oþhe*). However, the most common conjunction was *and* (*ond*). Coordinate clauses were semantically related, and there could be relationships of combination, temporal dependence, opposition, and cause and effect between them. Coordinate conjunctions in the ancient language were classified as connecting, contrasting, and separating.

Additional means of connecting coordinate clauses were word order (fixed or reversed) and structural parallelism. There were two main types of complex sentences: non-conjunctive and conjunctive. Sentences with conjunctive subordination were not

sufficiently developed, despite the significant number of function words (conjunctions – *zif*, *hæt*, *oþ*, *hætte*, *swæ*) and pronouns (*hæt*, *hwilc*, *hwā*) that could perform this subordination. In terms of structure, conjunctions were classified as simple and complex.

The third type of syntactic connection was correlative, which occupied an important place in the system of subordination and was realized with the help of correlative particles.

At the end of the ancient period, the correlation system underwent a series of transformations, the main one being the reinterpretation of the meanings of correlative particles and their conversion into conjunctions – coordinate (*oþhe...oþhe*, *ne...ne*, *nāwþer...nāwþer*) and subordinate (*hā..hā*, *swā...swā*, *honne...honne*). The particle *he* was widely used, which could function as a conjunction or be used as its constituent part (*æf hāem he*, *hā he*, *hāra he*). In ancient texts, repetitions of connective conjunctions at the beginning of each clause were widely used. In ancient times, there was no clear distinction between coordinating and subordinating conjunctions (*honne*, *hēah*, *swā*).

Ancient complex sentences were characterized by considerable diversity – with subject clauses, object clauses, attributive clauses, circumstantial clauses (subordinate clauses of place, condition, cause, etc.). Different types of subordinate clauses were introduced by their characteristic conjunctions. Attributive clauses were introduced by various connectives, the most frequent of which was the particle *he*. Subject and adverbial clauses were introduced by the conjunction *hæt*, both used separately and in combination with other words (*hā he*, *hāra he*). Some subordinate conjunctions that introduced clauses were characterized by developed polysemy, i.e., they could introduce several types of subordinate clauses.

In general, it can be stated that the structure of complex sentences throughout the ancient period of the English language showed a tendency towards improvement and systematization. Prospects for further research lie in the comparative analysis of the structure of complex sentences in Old English and other Old Germanic languages, as well as in the study of the dynamics of the development of syntactic relations in the transition period from Old English to Middle English.

REFERENCES:

1. Андрейчук Н. І. Семіотика лінгвокультурного простору Англії кінця XV – початку XVII століття: монографія. Львів: Львів. Політехніка, 2011. 277 с.
2. Андрущенко О. Ю. Інформаційна структура речення та стратегії її маркування в давньоанглійських писемних пам'ятках. Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка. Житомир: Вид-во ЖДУ ім. І. Франка, 2011. Вип. 56. С. 33-37.

3. Андрущенко О. Ю. Темпоральні адверби в системі маркування інформаційної структури давньоанглійського речення. Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка. Житомир: Вид-во ЖДУ ім. І. Франка, 2012. Вип. 63. С. 109-113.
4. Вихованець І. Р. Граматика української мови (Синтаксис): підручник. К.: Либідь, 1993. 368 с.
5. Загнітко А. Словник сучасної лінгвістики: поняття і терміни. Т. 1. Д.: ДНУ, 2012. 402 с.
6. Загнітко А. Словник сучасної лінгвістики: поняття і терміни. Т. 3. Д.: ДНУ, 2012. 426 с.
7. Євченко В.В. Історія англійської мови посібник. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2016. 408 с.
8. Костюченко Ю. П. Історія англійської мови: підручник. К.: Вища школа, 1963. 426 с.
9. Михайлова О.В. Синтаксична організація речення у законодавчих текстах давньоанглійської мови. Вісник Харківського національного університету ім. В. Н. Каразіна. Серія: Романо-германська філологія. Методика викладання іноземних мов. Харків: Константа, 2006. № 725. Вип. 48. С. 114-118.
10. Хаймович Б.С. Стилий курс історії англійської мови: підручник. К.: Вища школа, 1975. 100 с.
11. Харитонов І. К. Теоретична граматики сучасної англійської мови: підручник. Тернопіль: Навчальна книга – Богдан, 2007. 160 с.
12. Шабаліна О. О. Синтактико-функційна специфіка використання ад'єктивних елементів у давньоанглійських поетичних текстах. Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія «Філологічна»: зб. наук. пр. Нац. ун-ту «Острозька академія», 2014. Вип. 46. С. 222-224.
13. Шахрай О. Б. Історичний коментар до читання й правопису сучасної англійської мови: навчальний посібник. Київ : Вища школа, 1976. 167 с.
14. Янков А. Англо-саксонський період розвитку англійської мови: монографія. К.: КНТ, 2018. 224 с.
15. Barber Ch. The English language: a historical introduction: manual. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 299 p. 56.
16. Barnhart C. L. The Second Barnhart Dictionary of New English / C.L. Barnhart, S.Steinmetz, R.K.Barnhart. NY Prentice Hall Press, 2019. 612 p.
17. Baugh A.C. A History of the English Language : manual. London: Routledge, 2002. 447 p.
18. Bregg M. The Adventure of English. The biography of a Language: monograph. NY: Arcade Publishing, 2019. 322 p.
19. The Cambridge History of the English Language. Vol. 1- 6. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005-2008.
20. Celce-Murcia M. The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teachers course. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1999. 854 p.
21. Crystal D. Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 490 p.
22. Historical English Grammar. Morphology an Syntax: a practical guide / Comp. by I.Klymenko. Krivyi Rih: KDPU, 2019. 45 p.
23. History of English. ewikiuk.top/wiki/History_of_English
24. Kharytonov I.K. Theoretical English Grammar. Ternopil: Bogdan, 2007. 160 p.
25. Hogg R. A History of the English Language: manual. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 495 p.
26. Hornby A. S. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982. 842 p. 57
27. Levytsky V.V. , Soloviova O.V. Anthology of the English Language: texts with comments, exercises and etymological glossary. Vinnytsa: Nova Knyha, 2012. 239 p.
28. Matthews P. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. 410 p.
29. Murphy R. English Grammar in Use: a self-study reference and practice book for intermediate students. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 328 p.
30. Palmer F. R. Grammar (Language & Linguistics Series). London: Penguin, 1971. 210 p.
31. Rayevska N. M. Modern English Grammar: manual. K.: Vischa Shkola, 1976. 304 p.
32. Schuka E. K. A Reader in the History of English: manual. K., 2007. 160 p.
33. Starikova O.M. Seminars in Theoretical Grammar: manual. K.: Vischa Shkola, 1984. 184 p.
34. Verba L. History of the English Language: manual. Vinnytsa: Nova Knyha, 2012. 296 p.
35. Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Portland House, 1989. 2078 p. 58
36. Yevchenko V. V. Writing and Literary Activity in the Vernacular in Anglo Saxon England. Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка. Житомир: Вид-во ЖДУ ім. І. Франка, 2013. Вип. 5 (71). С. 177-190.



Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу CC BY 4.0

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 23.02.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 30.03.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 07.05.2026