

5. Беспалько В.П. Слагаемые педагогической технологии / В.П. Беспалько – М. : Педагогика, 1989. – 191с.

6. Биков В.Ю. Теоретико-методологічні засади моделювання навчального середовища сучасних педагогічних систем / В.Ю. Биков, Ю.О.Жук. – К. : Атака, 2005. – С. 5-15.

7. Гандер Д.В. Теория и практика психологического обеспечения летного обучения (Психологическая служба в ВВАУЛ) / Гандер Дмитрий Владимирович. – Волгоград : КВВАУЛ, 1984. – 170 с.

8. Керницький О.М. Організаційні та педагогічні аспекти впровадження елементів випереджувальної освіти в процес підготовки курсантів та студентів у ВВНЗ / О.М. Керницький, Н.Б. Арсен'єва, І.М. Шалімова // Навчально-виховний процес: методика, досвід, проблеми. – Х.: ХУПС, 2009. – № 4 (114). С.4-7

9. Коваленко Е. Є. Методика профессионального обучения / Е. Є. Коваленко. – Х. : ЧП "Штрих", 2003. – 480с.

10. Макаров Р.Н. Теория и практика конструирования целевых моделей операторов особо сложных систем управления / Макаров Р.Н., Герасименко Л.В. – М. : МНАПЧАК, 1997. – 532 с.

11. Педагогічна майстерність / [ред. І.А. Зязюн]. – К.: Вища школа, 1997. – 349 с.

12. Полякова Г. Теоретико-методологічні основи реалізації компетентісно-орієнтованого підходу навчального процесу / Полякова Г. // Імідж педагога. – 2005. – № 9-10 (58-59). – С.22-24

13. Сисоєва С.О. Особистісно орієнтовані педагогічні технології: метод проектів / Світлана Олександрівна Сисоєва // Неперервна професійна освіта: Теорія і практика. – 2002. – № 1 (5) – С. 73–81

14. Ягупов В.В. Дидактичні принципи та гуманістична військова дидактика / В.В. Ягупов // Гуманізація навчально-виховного процесу. – Слов'янськ : Вид. центр СДПІ, 2000. – Вип. IX. – С. 3-10.

UDC:373.3.016:811.411.16'08

N. Bakulina,

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences

(Institute of Pedagogics, National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine)

LINGUISTIC BASIS OF THE SELECTION OF THE CONTENT OF INSTRUCTION AT THE LEXICAL LEVEL OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE FOR THE FORMATION OF LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL COMPETENCE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Presently, when the methodology of the Hebrew language teaching is only budding in Ukraine, the issue of linguocultural approach to language teaching and, in particular, to the formation of elementary school students' linguocultural competence is topical and calls for comprehensive research. In view of the aim being the formation of linguocultural competence of elementary

school students, the key objective within the Hebrew language teaching methodology is the selection of data about the national and cultural specifics of the given linguocultural community and the speech communication of the language individual and introduction of these into the instruction process. At the same time, the said issue should be scrutinized both from the linguistic and the methodological perspectives. The linguistic perspective will encompass an analysis of Hebrew aimed at establishing national and cultural semantics, while the methodological aspect will aim at determining the contents, ways and techniques of introducing, consolidating and activating language units, as well as text analysis and teaching methods.

Analysis of recent research conducted on the issue.

The selected issue is one of the topical issues within the domain of allied sciences, i.e. sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, lingual country studies, cultural studies and linguocultural studies, linguistics, pedagogics and psychology. Due to its interactive nature, the given scope of issues is potent to determine the following general directions of research: human being as a language individual; language as a system of cultural values embodiment; culture as the highest language level etc.

The initial thesis of the research is expressed in the statements of the linguistic branch of Neohumboldtianism that is characterized by the intention to study language in close relation with the culture of its speakers (W. Humboldt, E. Sepir – B. Wharf, L. Weisgerber), contrastive linguistics (M. Kochergan), lingual (O. Semeniuk, V. Parashchuk) and intercultural (F. Batsevych, V. Boldariiev) communication theories, also taking into account linguoculturological principles, theoretical and methodological bases (V. Vorobyov, V. Maslova, Yu. Prokhorov). The psychopedagogical basis of the present research is embedded in theoretical foundations and foreign language education technology (aim, contents, methods and teaching media) in the light of the cultures dialogue issue (Ye. Passov, Ye. Vereshchahin, V. Kostomarov, V. Furmanova, P. Sysoiev). To relevant research objects will also belong the issues of speech conduct (O. Leontiev), language and religion interaction (N. Mechkovska), speech etiquette (N. Formanovska), as well as the text as the highest unit of culture (V. Shakleyin). The linguodidactic basis of the research is expressed by conceptual foundations of competence-oriented language instruction (I. Hudzyk, V. Doroz).

The objects of content in view of the linguoculturological approach to teaching – according to F. Batsevych – encompass non-equivalent lexis, nonverbal communication means, background knowledge, language aphoristics and phraseology that are studied from the perspective of being reflectors of culture, national and psychological specifics etc. of a certain linguocultural community. [3, p. 101].

Analyzing the national and cultural elements of text contents and specific language means of their expression, A. Reichstein distinguishes the following main types: usual-notional (reality words); occasional-notional (contextual definitions of nationally specific factors); usual-background (language units possessing constant typical nationally specific background); occasional-background (language units possessing contextual nationally specific

background) [17].

The process of mastering a second or a foreign language is complicated by the existence of lacunas – the absence of certain language, speech and sociocultural phenomena in students' conscience. To nationally colored culture components that can give rise to various lacunas belong these: customs and traditions; routine culture; verbal and nonverbal conduct of speakers; "national worldviews" that mirror environment perception specifics and national thinking peculiarities. In view of this, in order to effectuate a linguoculturological approach to foreign language teaching, it is necessary to duly address the need to study specific mindset features and linguocultural manifestations of different ethnic communities as compared and contrasted with each other.

Research objective.

The linguocultural features of a certain language are mainly existent at the lexical language level. Thus, the objective of the article is to establish lexical basis precisely for the selection of the teaching at the lexical level of the Hebrew language for the formation of linguoculturological competence of elementary school students.

The selected issue requires that a linguistic analysis of specific features of modern Hebrew lexis be performed and that such features be taken into account in the practical teaching process in Ukrainian schools.

The body.

The lexis of modern Hebrew is closely related to the history of its formation and development, which is attested to by linguistic studies of the Hebrew language. [11; 20; 22; 30]. Since modern Hebrew is the successor of the Ancient Hebrew biblical, postbiblical and medieval languages, it inherited its basic lexis from the Ancient Hebrew language. Etymologically, the vocabulary of modern Hebrew is divided into the following categories: 1) words inherited from earlier periods (non-borrowed vocabulary); 2) innovation words that were coined in Hebrew on the basis of the existing ones or words existent in a certain epoch through productive word formation patterns by way of merging word combinations and those that arose due to onomatopoeia; 3) borrowed words [1, p.100-106; 7, p.409-413; 10, p.852-860; 29].

The specific feature of the formation of the lexical pool of the modern Hebrew language are multiple cases of lexical innovations that came into being due to purposeful activities of certain authors – writers, journalists and scientists, as well as of institutes – language formation bodies (the Hebrew Language Committee (ועד הלשון העברית), Va'ad ha-lashon ha-ivryt, 1890), later, the Hebrew Language Academy (האקדמיה ללשון העברית, Ha-Akademya la-lashon ha-ivryt, 1953)), which worked towards the cause of promoting Hebrew as a colloquial language, creating orthoepic norms, enriching vocabulary, and standardizing grammar. In this respect, the replenishment of modern Hebrew vocabulary during the formation period has much in common with artificial language formation process. Linguistic studies yield ground to ascertain that only a certain portion of inherited words that form the body of basic lexis preserved original semantics. A considerable part of Hebrew vocabulary suffered changes under the impact of Aramaisms (biblical and postbiblical periods), borrowings and calques from present-day Romano-Germanic and Slavic languages, the Arabian

language and colloquial Hebrew languages (Yiddish, Ladino).

Non-borrowed lexis of modern Hebrew is represented by the words of general Afroasian and general Semitic origin, for instance names of kinship (*em* אִם “mother”, *av* אָב “father”, *sav* סַב “grandfather”), names of body parts (*lashon* לָשׁוֹן “tongue”, *shen* שֵׁן “tooth”, *lev* לֵב “heart”, *pe* פֶּה “mouth”, *panim* פְּנִים “face”), numerals (*shalosh* שְׁלוֹשׁ “three” etc.), certain words denoting colors (*adom* אָדוּם “red”), verbs (*shata* שָׁתָה “to drink”, *taam* טָעַם “to cost”) etcetera.

Based on data furnished by linguistic research [31; 33; 39] nearly 22% of the lexical units of modern Hebrew account for words of biblical origin, another 22% are lexical units that came down from the Ancient Hebrew language; 16% are lexical units derived from the medieval period; innovations constitute 40% of the total lexis.

Ancient Hebrew (Hebraic), the vocabulary of which came to be almost entirely included in modern Hebrew, is the major source of lexis for the latter. At the same time, certain changes in semantics are observable (Ancient Hebrew *raṣon* “delight” > *ratson* “desire”).

Certain ancient synonyms evolved along divergent paths. In a number of cases, one of the components of Ancient Hebrew acquires a specific meaning in modern Hebrew (*shama* “heard, listened” – *geezin* “listened to the radio”; *asa* “did” – *paal* “acted”).

Biblical and Mishnaite words that exist in modern Hebrew make up synonym pairs, for example:

Biblical words	Mishnaite words
<i>safa</i> “tongue, language”	<i>lashon</i> “tongue, language”
<i>shemesh</i> “sun”	<i>hama</i> “sun”
<i>yareah</i> “month, moon”	<i>levana</i> “moon”
<i>adama</i> “earth, soil, country”	<i>karka</i> “earth, soil”
<i>erets</i> “country”	<i>medina</i> “country”
<i>ba</i> “comes”	<i>nihnas</i> “comes in”
<i>hikka</i> “to wait”	<i>gimtin</i> “to wait”
<i>hafats</i> “to desire”	<i>ratsa</i> “to desire”
<i>ulai</i> “perhaps”	<i>efshar</i> “perhaps”

When a synonym pair exists in which one counterpart is intrinsic to the biblical language and the other is characteristic of Mishnaite, as a rule, the biblical lexeme is preferred, which happens to be more frequently used. One of the factors influencing the choice of a certain lexeme as the primary one is the intention to avoid homonymy (including homophony that arises due to the obsolescence of some old phonemes). Hence, in the *shemesh* – *hama* pair, “sun”, the former (biblical) one is more often used, because there exists a homonym word *hama* “warm”. In some cases, Mishnaite lexemes are more frequently used for the same reason (e.g. Mishnaite *akhshav* instead of bibl. *ata* “now”, due to consonance with *ata* “you” (masculine)). At the same time, numerous biblical-Mishnaite pairs remain fully preserved (e.g. *po* – *kan* “here”).

Mishnaite Hebrew, along with the biblical one, has become an important component of the modern Hebrew vocabulary. Common forms in the Mishnaite language that are derived from secondary stems (developed from weak stems and perceived as integral three-consonant words) are commonly used in modern Hebrew

and can be more frequent than initial biblical forms (Mishn. *githil* – bibl. *gehel* “he began”). Inclusion of Mishnaite words into modern Hebrew lexis could have taken place through a medium, through other monuments of rabbinic medieval writings, such as Rashi Commentary on the Pentecost, the Passover Haggadah, prayer collections and so on, that are more familiar to the wider Jewish population than the Mishnah texts themselves. For example, the verb *hasal* in the meaning of “he finished” (Aramaism) came down to modern Hebrew through the Passover Haggadah (it is also used in the meaning of “he destroyed”, which meaning reflects biblical usage in the book of Deuteronomy 28:38).

A number of words and expressions of modern Hebrew stem from the medieval Jewish writings (*ihel* “he wished” (something for someone), *merets* “energy, vivacity”). To examples of words that date back to medieval Hebrew and are used in the modern language belong the following: *merkaz* “center”, *efes* “zero”, *gatslakha* “luck”, *hibur* “putting together”, *yagadut* “Judaism”.

Innovation words. Most authors from the cohort of maskilim, the followers of Haskala (the Enlightenment period, the second half of the 18th century) in Central and Eastern Europe, were primarily oriented towards the lexical units captured in biblical texts, rejecting the words of the Mishnaite and medieval language. However, quite shortly after, the scarcity of Ancient Hebrew lexical resources to meet the needs of conveying new notions and aspects of reality became obvious. Some lacunas were filled by means of extensions and change of meanings of words and phrases of the biblical language (bibl. *hashmal* “an alloy of gold and silver” – modern Hebrew “electricity”, *sofer* “writer”, “scribe”, *tapuakh zagav* “orange” – “golden apple”). At the same time, some of the Jewish Enlightenment figures sometimes initiated the usage of Mishnaite words (*hazit* “façade”) and medieval Hebrew words (*gitpatkhut* “development”, *sifrut* “literature”), however, this trend started developing only from the time of creative work of a writer who is the initiator of new classic Hebrew literature, Mendele Mocher Sforim, who used widely Mishnaite and medieval Hebrew (as well as Aramaic) lexical units along with biblical ones. Moreover, M. Mocher Sforim authored some neologisms (for example *gafzur* “match”). It is interesting that he, a native of Minsk province, studied and resided in Berdychiv, Zhytomyr and Odesa; he was fluent in Hebrew and Yiddish and wrote in these languages.

The revival of Hebrew as a colloquial language in Palestine brought forth the acute problem of vocabulary replenishment. To resolve it, the Language Committee developed a policy directed at adapting the lexis of all language layers – biblical, Mishnaite and medieval Hebrew. Lexical innovations were being created not only in semantics, but in form as well. Gaps were filled by way of coining a great number of neologisms derived from Hebraic stems and lexical calques (especially from Western-European and Arabic languages). These words, innovational in form, were created on the basis of Hebraic material derived from original stems in accord with known foreign language word formation models to express new meaning. An example of a lexical calque in Hebrew is the word *milon* מילון “dictionary”, which was introduced by E. Ben-Yehuda to replace the word combination of “sefer milim ספר מילים” “the book of words” (from the word *mila* “word” – *milon* “dictionary”) [5, p.98-99]; *shaa* “hour” – *shaon* “watch” [40, p.105-106]. The majority of such innovations have word-

formative affixes.

When necessary, Aramaic and Arabic stems were also used, for example: modern Hebrew *adiv* "polite" – Arab. *adib*; *zivda* "sour cream" – Arab. *zibdat*; *mitbakh* "kitchen" – Arab. *mitbakh* etc. [36]. Moreover, the Committee has rendered it possible to include in Hebrew words from other languages (Indo-European in particular) that were internationally spoken, for instance, *maseha* "mask, as something cast in mould" (a noun derived from the verb *nasah* "to cast in mould") emerged under the influence of the English *mask* and German *Mask*; *mehonit* "car" – German *Mechanismus*.

Found among the lexical innovations are also onomatopoeic words, e.g. *rishresh* "he rustled" > *rishrush* "rustle", proposed by H.-N. Bialik, a prominent Jewish poet who was born in Volyn region, received Jewish education in Zhytomyr and wrote in Hebrew.

Borrowed lexical units in modern Hebrew can be divided into borrowings inherited through the lexis of Middle East languages and the languages of previous epochs, as well as words directly borrowed into the modern Hebrew language (Aramaisms, Arabisms, borrowings from Indo-European, including Slavic and Jewish, languages).

Modern Hebrew inherited biblical words of *Old Egyptian* (*shoshana* "lily", *par'o* "pharaoh", *seren* "ruler" – modern Hebrew "captain"), *Akkadian* (*sefer* "book", *tanur* "oven", *igeret* "note, letter" as well as the Jewish calendar names: *elul*, *kislev*, *nisan*, *sivan*, *tamuz*) [32], *Sumerian* (*kise* "chair", Hebr. *arad* "bronze" from Sumerian *arudu* "bronze") and *Old Persian* (*pardes* "garden", *dat* "religion", *gizbar* "treasurer, cashier") origin.

Through Mishnaite Hebrew, modern Hebrew adopted words from *Old Greek* (postbiblical *gebēs* – modern Hebrew *geves* "plaster", *partsuf* "face", *teatron* "theater") and *Latin* (*mapa* "tablecloth, linen", *safsal* "bench").

Aramaisms played a tangible role in the formation of modern Hebrew lexis. Following Old Hebrew, the Aramaic language is the second major source for the replenishment of modern Hebrew vocabulary. Most Aramaic words and word combinations were adopted by modern Hebrew mainly from the postbiblical language [35]. Along with Aramaic borrowings in the Mishnaite language, modern Hebrew also inherited the Aramaic lexis elements of Babylonian Talmud. In the period following Talmud codification, Aramaic (along with Ancient Hebrew) had the status of the language of religion, which secured it a solid position in the system of Jewish traditional education. In modern Hebrew, words and idioms of Aramaic origin are widely used in all spheres and registers (*aba* "dad", *ima* "mom", *saba* "grandpa", *savta* "grandma", *daisa* "porridge", *barmitsva* "a boy of thirteen-years or older", *kaitana* "dacha, summer camp", *agav* "by the way", *mashkanta* "mortgage", *girsa* "version"). Often, Aramaic phrases mark a high "academic" speech style in modern Hebrew.

The Aramaic language also gave considerable material for lexical innovations, both formal and semantic. For example, the noun *atar* "location" – modern Hebrew *atar* "location, (archeological) excavation site, internet-site" was used to create the verb *iter* "he localized"; from the verb *shaddar* "was sending" – modern Hebrew *sider* "broadcasted (over the radio, television)", the noun *shidur* "radio, TV show" was derived.

Aramaisms constitute nearly 30% of the entire lexis of the Hebrew

language, most Aramaic lexical units lost their typical word-formative and conjugating features (e.g., the final alef), that is why modern Hebrew speakers do not perceive them as borrowings.

Borrowed from the *Arabic language* in the medieval period were scientific philosophical terms that later became source material for modern neologisms (from the noun *merkaz* “center” – Arab. *markaz* – the verb *rikez* “he focused” was derived, from which, in its own turn gave rise to the noun *rikuz* “concentration”). Words of Greek origin entered medieval Hebrew through the Arabic language; they are preserved in modern Hebrew lexis (*aklim* “climate” – Arab. *iklim* – Greek *klima*). Arabic also became the source of direct borrowings in modern Hebrew. E. Ben-Yehuda used Arabic stems (*hgr* – *higer* “resettled, emigrated”, *hagira* “emigration”) and words (*taarikh* “date”). Later modern Hebrew was enriched with Arabic vocabulary that reflects Middle East reality (*falafel* “falafel” a dish cooked from minced peas – chick-pea with spices and greens”). Arabic lexical borrowings constitute almost a quarter of modern Hebrew slang, which fact is attested to by important scientific research [8; 12; 37; 38]. Some words and phrases (and their Hebraized derivative forms), having expanded beyond the slang domain, became widely used in neutral oral speech (*keif* “pleasure, rush” – *kiyef* “received pleasure”, *mabsut* “delighted”, *habibi* “friend”, *akhlan!* “hi!”, *yala* “let’s go!”, *letekh* “fool”).

From the time of modern Hebrew becoming a colloquial language, a number of borrowings from *European languages* increased, primarily by virtue of international lexis of Latin and Greek origin. The main direct sources of borrowings in the early twentieth century were German and Russian languages, which determined the phonetic shape of the borrowings characteristic precisely of these languages. This phonetic form has been preserved later on as well, even to this day, despite the fact that presently the major source of international vocabulary is now English.

Internationalisms constitute a rather large group of borrowed words; to them belong nouns and abstract nouns, adjectives and verbs. Thus, names and abstract names have the suffix -ya, -a: *televisia* “television set”, *tendentsia* “tendency”. The suffix -a is adjoined to all borrowed international words: *universita* “university”, *analiza* “analysis”, *diska* “disc”. Adjectives of international origin are coined with the help of the suffix -i: *absolute* “absolute”, *objective* “objective”. Abstract nouns derived from attributes have the suffix -yut: *objectiviyut* “objectiveness”; the same suffix is present in internationalisms with the -ism suffix: *symbolism* “symbolism” – *simbolyut* “symbolicalness”. Actant nouns sometimes feature suffixes -ist.-ai, -an: *gimnazist* “gymnasium student”, *matematikai*, *matematikan* “mathematician”.

In many cases, in the literary language, along with international words (e.g. *informatsia* “information”, *kasetta* “cassette”, *universita* “university”, *telefon* “telephone”) their counterparts derived from Semitic stems are present (*meida*, *kaletet*, *miklala*, *sakh-rakhok*). The use of the latter is deemed to be more expedient, especially in formal registers. One of the directions of activities undertaken by the Hebrew Language Academy is coining and implementing such equivalent words. However, in the colloquial language, foreign-language words are used more widely. Borrowings are often hebraized. As a rule, these are verb forms (and their derivatives) coined from borrowed nouns: *tilpen* (coll.

tilfen "he phoned" – *telefon*.

In modern Hebrew, there exists a considerable portion of *German* borrowings: *bira* "beer", *gumi* "rubber"; names of months according to Gregorian calendar: *januar*, *februar*, *mars*, *april*, *mai*, *juni*, *juli*, *september*, *october*, *november*, *december*. Many are borrowings from *French* as well: *ambulans* "ambulance", *studio* "studio", *otobiografia* "autobiography", *oto* "auto". To denote specific features of reality, *Anglicisms* can be used: *ski* "ski", *gentleman* "gentleman", *jungel* "jungle"; the anglicized name of August is also found in use – *ogust*. Also borrowed from the English language are a number of lexemes that have become slang in modern Hebrew: *hai* "hi", *job* "a beneficial job". Musical terms were borrowed from Italian: *adagio* "adagio", *solfeggio* "solfeggio" and so on.

Some commonly used words and phrases are calques from European languages: *natan tshuva* "he answered", lit. "gave an answer" from German Antwort geben. The calqueing process gave birth to a number of neologisms (*ofna* "fashion – ofen "manner", influenced by *French* mode).

The *Jewish language of Yiddish* (jidiš, from German jidisch – Jewish) played an important role in the formation of modern Hebrew vocabulary. A number of suffixes were borrowed from Yiddish. Borrowings from Yiddish mostly exist in slang (25%); some Yiddishisms, however, can be used in neutral speech as well: *kunts* "a thing", *agbarosh* "rat" from Yiddish *akhbarosh*, a calque from German Mäusekopf. Words and phrases that are traceable to old Hebrew have entered modern Hebrew through Yiddish. They are often used in modern Hebrew in the meaning that is characteristic of their Yiddish usage and preserve the same phonetic form (*hevre* "company", *klezmer* "klezmer, a musician performing Ashkenazi folk music", *klei zemer* "musical instruments"). Some phrases being common in modern Hebrew are calques from Yiddish: *laason haim* "to have a good time", lit. "to make life" (machn dos lebn); *lo goleh* "it's not alright", lit. "it doesn't go" (es geht nit). Also possible are complex words with one element being derived from Hebrew and the other, from Yiddish (*hevre-man* "a cool man"). The interaction of Hebrew and Yiddish and the special role of colloquial language of Eastern-European Jews in enriching the Hebrew language, its phraseology and stylistics in particular, was described by F.L. Shapiro: "For a lengthy period of time, Yiddish absorbed a great number of Ancient Hebrew words and phrases that are presently an inalienable part of the Hebrew language. The impact of Hebrew upon Yiddish was so significant at one point that understanding the classic writers of Jewish literature who wrote in Yiddish, such as Sholom-Aleihem, Mendele, Perets and others, without some knowledge of Hebrew is very difficult. Yiddish is rich in metaphors, proverbs, sayings, specific word combinations radiating folk humor. At present, Yiddish performs the same impact on Hebrew, often imbuing it with peculiar folk coloring. One can confidently state that Yiddish is one of the fruitful agents to the process of Hebrew enrichment, not so much in the direct lexical sense as in furnishing the overall phraseological composition of the language" [30, p.134]. The questions of borrowing and interplay of Hebrew and Yiddish are also researched in works by B. Podolskyi [15, p.184-197] and E. Falkovych [26, p.666 -715.]. B. Podolskyi examines these language contacts from the point of view of language development history and their reflection in the linguistic concepts of family,

human and profession, enemy, body, paradise and hell, place and time etc. In his article, E. Falkovych points to phonetic features of Hebrew words in Yiddish, as opposed to modern Hebrew words; borrowed lexis and borrowed grammatical elements are scrutinized; examples of Hebrew grammar indexes used with words of Hebrew origin in Yiddish are provided.

In addition, Yiddish served as a medium for borrowings from *Slavic languages* to enter Hebrew (*nudnik* “bore” which gave birth to the verb *nidned* “he pestered”, a homonym to the already existing word “he swung”). This process commenced with the resettlement of Ashkenazi Jews – who spoke Yiddish – from German, Spanish and French territories to Slavic lands, Ukraine particularly, in 12th-14th centuries. According to M. D. Feller, who quotes V. Zhyrmunskyi, it is in Ukrainian, Belarusian and Polish lands that Yiddish evolved from a German dialect into an independent Hebraic-Germanic-Slavic language, acquiring such uniquely Eastern Slavic features as diminutive suffixes and certain pronunciation norms. More than a third of Yiddish lexis is Eastern Slavic by origin, the rest being Ancient Hebrew and German. While in Germany Yiddish, which contained, along with German ones, Ancient Hebrew stems (mostly denoting traditional national traditions, views and relationships), had been in essence a “mixed tongue” and even Jews themselves referred to it as to a “jargon”, on Slavic lands it became a language in its own right that contained borrowings from three sources – German, Ancient Hebrew and Slavic languages – and continued to acquire new things in its dialects that corresponded to linguistic features of key populations, depending on a territory in which a dialect was being formed. Hence, such Yiddish forms appear to be clearly Ukrainian, as *binder* “poor” (in the sense “deserving condolence”: *Binder* Yiddish – “Hebrew that deserves condolence” used by Sholom-Aleihem), *porenzih* “to do work about the house”, *peshchen* “to cuddle”, *pysk* “nuzzle”, *kanchyk* “whip”, *goroven* “to toil”, *golensih* “to shave”, *gorepashnyi* “miserable”, *loshek* “a young horse”, *karek* “nape”, *shchur* “rat”, *tate* “dad”, *shkodnik* “a humorous way of addressing a child”. In Halychyna, where villages and towns at times bore similar Polish and Ukrainian names, the Ukrainian name variant was prevalent in Yiddish (e.g. “Riashe”, not “Zheshuv”). Most of the names of craftsman tools and processes in Ukrainian Yiddish were also borrowed from the Ukrainian language [28, p.767-768].

Examples of Slavic borrowings in Yiddish and Hebrew are many Jewish last names both with the suffix –ich and the suffix –sky, and later, under the impact of Russification, with the suffix –ov. Jewish last names were created on the basis of the names of towns in Halychyna (Ternopilskyi, Brodskyi, Chortkiver, Kolomyier, Lemberger, Lvovskyi), Podillia (Proskurovskyi, Konstantynover, Berdychivskyi, Letychevskyi) and even the names of certain villages (Pogoriles, Polianker). Last names and person names appear: based on occupation – Furman, Dozorets (a corrector), Vudka (a fisherman), Torba (peddler), Tsymbalist, Gutnyk (glassblower), Shynkar, Kramar; based on a person’s individual features etc.: Kvitka, Nezdadniy, Kalika, Spivak, Soloveychuk. Hebrew roots received Slavic form: Rabinovych (a rabbi’s descendant), Kahanovych (a descendant of Kagan, a spiritual minister), Bekovych (Berko’s son), Itskovych (Itsko’s son), Moshkovych (Moshko’s son), Raikin (Raika’s son), Haikin (Haika’s son – Hayi). In colloquial Yiddish, names took on a form that is characteristic of colloquial Ukrainian: Moshko, Itsko, Berko, which later, after Russification, began

to be perceived as offensive. For the most part, linguistic borrowings represented certain names of realia of social and statehood life, Jewish daily life and religion, since Jewish communities had a rather secluded lifestyle which restricted language contacts.

In modern Hebrew, there exists a certain number of borrowings from the *Sephardic (Jewish-Spanish) language (ladino)* – askola “school” (in the broad sense), and those that are represented mostly in colloquial language (*spondzha* “mop”, *haveriko* “a friend”) and slang, where some words of Turkish origin also ended up.

In modern linguistics (M.I. Zand, O.B. Tkachenko), Hebrew is viewed in relation to other Jewish languages from the perspective of such language phenomena as substrate, superstrate, interstrate that are caused by the interaction of two (less frequently, a few) languages. In linguistics, the term substrate – from Lat. substratum – “basis, underlayer” designates the traces of the overcome language in the prevalent language, or in case of hybridization of two languages, in vocabulary, phonetics and grammatical structure” [21, p.475]. The Russian linguist M.I. Zand views Hebrew as an interstrate or a substrate [9, p.223-224], since despite the certain obsolescence of Hebrew, it never became completely extinct and now is a completely revived and living language and its elements have been preserved at all language levels of heir languages and were partially functioning in these languages. As the Ukrainian linguist O.B. Tkachenko put it, “interstrate designates each of the remnants of the previous language, mainly with Hebrew elements prevailing, in the next language of Jews from the period of loss of Hebrew as a colloquial language to the time when it was reinstated in that function within the European part of Palestine and the State of Israel. Unlike interstrate, in substrate, the language of indigenes is the dead language that is diluted in the elements that are preserved in the heir language; as regards superstrate, it is vice versa, the heir language is that of indigenes, whereas the language of comers is dead and diluted in the former” [24, p.12-13.]. Based on the language substrate theory, O.B. Tkachenko viewed the place of Hebrew from the viewpoint of the sociolinguistic function. Thus, he pointed out that “despite the fact that chronologically Hebrew as a linguistic formation, upon which a newer language is stratified, is reminiscent of a substrate, yet in terms of its high social (and sociolinguistic) function it approximates superstrate. However, since the superstrate orientation of Hebrew is something secondary, it would be more precise to describe it as a secondary superstrate, i.e., superstrate that evolved from substrate by virtue of its sociolinguistic role” [24, p.77].

Special significance for the present research is found in the works of Semitologists and Hebraists dedicated to language contacts of Hebrew and *Slavic languages*. Thus, A. Garkavi, Y. Guri, B. Podolskyi studied separate aspects of the interaction between Hebrew and Russian [4; 5; 6; 15; 16].

The issues of Ukrainian-Jewish and Jewish-Ukrainian language contacts are presented in works and separate publications by such Ukrainian linguists as I. Ohienko, V. Rybalkina, O. Tkachenko and M. Feller [13; 18; 19; 23; 24; 27; 28].

A research paper on letters and manuscripts performed in the nineteenth century by A. Garkavi testified that Jews who settled in Crimea during the New

Era spoke variants of Aramaic and Hebrew, and later started using in daily life a language styled Cnaanian (Canaanian, from Canaan – the Jewish name of Palestine). Cnaanian had a Slavic, mostly ancient Ukrainian, basis and featured ancient Hebrew lexis which pertained to Judean rites and customs. As regards the Cnaanian language, as M.D. Feller states, “Not a single large text piece written in the language came down to our day. But the existence of a peculiar blend of Slavic, most veritably Ukrainian (Rus), and Hebraic languages is attested to not by accounts in Western European sources but by the interpretation of Hebraic words in the manuscripts written in Ukraine and Belarus in which Rus words were spelled out with... Hebraic letters” [27, p.89]. Among Jewish female names used in Cnaanian are Chorna, Bila, Zlata (derived from Slavic words “balk-haired, blond, red-haired”, Pava, Slava or – using the Ukrainian-Belarusian suffix –ka: Meyerka (derived from Jewish male name Meyir – Meyir’s wife). Hebraic words in Jewish manuscripts rewritten on Slavic lands are explained by such forms as *plt* (raft) *gni(y)*, *lk* (elbow), *vs* (wax), *kpt* (kopyto – a name of footwear confirmed, in particular in B. Hrinchenko’s dictionary; Hutsul women wear kopytka to this day), *chvrt* “quarter”, *db* (oak – boat, mast) [27, p.90-91]. Scientists have come to believe that Jews who spoke Cnaanian represented a separate anthropological type. This is attested to by documents found in the Cairo genizah that was described by an Arabic-speaking historian Ibn Khurdadbikh (10th century) – a message of a Thessalonian Jew dating back to 800 A.D. about his remote relative who came from the North and did not speak any other language but Cnaanite (Slavic) [25, p.1172].

As linguists state, there were no direct contacts between Hebrew and Slavic languages, at least at the early stage of their historical formation and development; however, for centuries, owing to the interaction of languages and cultures, Hebraisms (from Lat. Hebraeus, Greek εβραϊκός (ἑβραϊκος) – Jewish) appeared in Slavic languages – words, less often word phrases, borrowed from Hebraic (Ancient Hebrew) language, as well as from modern Hebrew. These borrowings occurred owing to mediating languages – *Old Greek* and *Old Slavonic*. Therefore, letters *w* and *u* made it into the Slavic alphabet developed by brothers Cyril and Methodius; they were taken from Jewish writing. In addition to the written language, as trade relations developed, lexical units denoting new goods and life realia were permeating the language. Thus, for example, the word **שק** *sak* – «sack», made its way from Hebrew to Greek and then to European (English, French and German), Russian and Ukrainian languages; the word was adapted from French to Slavic languages as *sakvoyage*, and from German, as *rucksak* (*Ruecken* “back” + *sak*). Also, the word **קד** *kad* «pot», in Old Greek – *kados* and *kadion*, in Russian *kadka*, *kadushka*, and in Ukrainian – *kadib*, *dizhka*. The word *yuviley* (jubilee, Russian) came down to European languages from Latin; however, its source was the Hebrew word **יובל** *yovel* “ram horn” which Jews blew into in the fiftieth “jubilee” year. The ancient Hebrew word **כמון** *kammon* “caraway” was adopted into European languages through Old Greek and Latin. Thus, this word sounds like *kmyn* in Polish, Czech, Belarusian and Ukrainian, and like *tmin*, in Russian.

A rather large layer of biblical Hebrew lexis came into European and Slavic languages through the translation of Torah (Bible) into Old Greek. The so called Septuagint or the translation of ten commentaries was started by Jews as

far back as 3 century B.C. To this group of words belong Biblicisms, like *mesiya* (from **משיח** *mashiah* “the anointed one”), *raby* (**רבי** *rabbi* “my teacher”), *subota* (**שבת** *shabat* “a day-off”), *satana* (**שטן** *satan* “devil”), *amin* (**אמן** *amen* “correct, true”), *aliluya* (**הללויה** *gallelu-ya* “praise the Lord”), *paskha* (**פסח** *pesah*, Aramaic – *passover*), *kheruvym* (**כרובים** *keruvim* “angel”), *leviathan* (**ליתן** *livyatan* – “whale”, sea monster). The words *yevrey* and *iudey*, *yudey* (Ukr.) came to Ukrainian and Russian from Hebrew **עברי** *ivri*, **יהודי** *yegudi* through Aramaic and Greek languages, and the word **ממן** *man* “food that Jews consumed at times of tribulation near mount Sinai” has been preserved in Russian and Ukrainian not only as “manna from heaven”, but also as “manka” – “wheat farina”. Also owing to the translation of Torah (Bible) many names made their way into European and Slavic languages, into Russian and Ukrainian in particular, such as: Mykhailo (Ukr.), Mikhail (Rus.) from Hebrew **מיכאל** *Mihael* “who if not God?”, Yakiv (Ukr.), Yakov (Rus.) – from Hebrew **יעקב** *Yaakov* “from the verb “to follow”, Semen (Ukr.), Semoin (Rus.) – from Hebrew **שמעון** *Shimon* “from the verb “to hear”, Anna (Ukr., Rus.) – from Hebrew **חנה** *Hana* «from **חן** – grace, beauty”. In many languages, the Jewish name **יוחנן** *Johanan* “The Lord granted His grace” gave start to Greek *Ioannes*, Old Slavonia *Ioann*, Russian *Ivan*, Ukrainian *Ivan*, German *Johann*, English *John*, French *Jean*, Spanish *Juan*, Italian *Giovanni*, Polish and Czech *Jan* etc. Whereas the Greek language possessed its own phonetic peculiarities, the pronunciation did not always coincide. Thus, certain Hebrew sounds – *sh* and *ts* – were absent from the Greek language, that is why in Greek they were replaced with *s*; certain sounds had no equivalents at all: **ה**, **ע**, **ח**, that is why they were omitted to denote zero sound or were rendered as *g*, *kh*; changes in the orthoepic norm of Greek phonetics were taking place – the vowel *a* evolved into *i*; *e*, into *i*; consonant *b* changed to *v*; *t*, to *f*. Thus, the pronunciation of Jewish names in Greek and, further, in Slavic languages somewhat changed: Ester **אסתר** became *Espir*, Shimshon **שמשון** turned into *Samson*, Teom **תאום**, into *Foma*, Rut **רות** –, into *Ruf*, Shimon **שימון**, into *y Simeon* (Semen), Iyeshua **ישוע**, into *Isus*. These changes touched toponyms as well, e.g. Yerushalaim **ירושלים** – *Yerusalym* (Ukr.), *Iyerusalim* (Rus.), *Beit-Lehem* **בית לחם** - *Vifleyem* (Ukr.), *Vifleyem* (Rus.).

Modern translations of the Holy Scriptures into Ukrainian from the Hebraic original – the Hebrew language (other than the New Testament text which is written in Greek) – were performed by a prominent Ukrainian cultural and religious figure, historian and linguist Ivan Ogiyenko (Metropolitan Ilarion). Translating the bible text from the original, he insisted on the true sense of the text which he believed to be precursor to forming both spiritual and language and secular culture of the Ukrainian people. He purposefully mastered Hebrew and Yiddish and researched similarities in the Old Hebrew and the Ukrainian languages. Thus, in his article titled *The Recurring Infinitive* (1941) he analyzed syntactical constructions that are non-existent in Indo-European languages, while they are found both in Hebraic and in Slavic languages, for example, structures of the type “Skazaty skazhu, ale” (“Saying this, I will say, but”) are characteristic of both Hebraic and Ukrainian. In the researcher’s opinion, “Ancient Hebrew is in its structure closer to a Slavic language than to Greek, which is why a translation from the original would be closer to it. For a Ukrainian, it is an interesting fact that

Ancient Hebrew pronunciation in most cases coincides with the Ukrainian one" [13].

Hebraisms in the Ukrainian language were the subject matter of research writings by the Middle East Department Professor, an Arabic philologist V.S. Rybalkin [18, p.95]. As he notes, there are virtually no direct Hebraisms in the Ukrainian language: the initial mediating nexus is mostly Greek, from which Hebraisms entered Old Slavonic, and from there, to the Old Ukrainian language, wherefrom they found their way into the Ukrainian language. A smaller number of Hebraisms were adopted into Ukrainian through Yiddish; still fewer words came into it through German and French. In the Ukrainian language, Hebraisms belong predominantly to biblical and religious vocabulary (*Adam, hallelujah, amen, Gehenna, Eden, leviathan, manna, messiah, Moloch, hosannah, Savaoth, satan, seraphim, Talmud, Torah, Ham, cherub*), or convey specific ethnocultural realia (*jew, iudey, cabala, Karaites, kosher, matzo, melamed, payess, rabbi, Sabbath, heder, shames*). A portion of Hebraisms are argot words (*bahur "libertine", makhliuvaty "to cheat", tsymes "a dessert dish", khokhma "fun", shabash "witches' sabbath", shmon "search, raid"*) and separate lexical units (*behemoth*). New lexical borrowings from Hebrew (*kibuts, kneset* etc.) should also be placed among Hebraisms.

In modern times, Hebrew words have entered Slavic languages through the medium of German and Yiddish: Hebrew *kagal* קהל "Jewish community" (צ הים.), Hebrew *shabat* שבת – *shabes* (Yiddish) – *subota* (Ukr., Rus). "Saturday". Such words as *goy* גוי "non-Jew", *babalos* or *balabuste* בעל הבית "host", *mekhutonim* מחותנים "son- or daughter-in-law's parents" came to Russian and Ukrainian from Hebrew through Yiddish.

From modern Hebrew, a certain number of words permeated Slavic languages that denote Israelite realia and have no counterparts in other languages: *kibuts* קיבוץ, *kneseet* כנסת, *ulpan* אולפן, *aliya* עליה etc.

From late 19th and early 20th centuries, from the commencement of resettlement to Palestine of Russian- and Ukrainian-speaking Jewry, Russian (and sometimes Ukrainian) words and expressions associated with daily life and realia started appearing in Hebrew. B. Podolskyi and Y. Guri write about Russian words in Hebrew and the ways of their adoption [16, p.180-183; 5, p.98]. Thus, Hebrew vocabulary welcomed such words as *samovar* סמובר, *sarafan* סרפן, *rogatka* "slingshot" רוגטקה, *rubashka* "shirt" רובשקה in the meaning of "Russian shirt", *pogrom* פוגרום, *tataram* טטרם, *hooligan* חויליגן, *zhulik* "conman" ז'וליק, *pukh* "down" פוך as in the phrase שמיכת פוך *smikhat pukh* «blanket of down», *budka* "cabin, box" בודקה, *lom* "crowbar" לום, *babushka* בבושקה in three meanings: "elderly lady", "matryoshka", "shawl", the interjection *nu!* "c'mon!" נו!, the onomatopoeic *ding-ding* לדדדן. Somewhat changed Russian words were borrowed by Hebrew, such as *samatokha* סמטוכה "fuss", *pupik* פופיק "chicken stomach", *nudnik* נודניק "bore". From the Ukrainian language, the following words came to Hebrew *kozak* קוזק, *tsar* צר "tsar", *borsch* בורשץ "borsch". The words *zhuk* "bug" and *chubchyk* "fringe" were changed both phonetically and in terms of meaning, having ended up in Hebrew as *dzhuk* ג'וק "cockroach" and *chupchyk* צ'ופצ'יק "a thingie, any small part". In colloquial language the words *chainyk* "teapot" צ'ייניק, *kartoshka* "potato baked on fire" are sometimes used. Some

lexical borrowings in Hebrew reflect Slavic slang: *khaltura* חלטורה "side job", *balagan* בלגן "rout, mess", *bardak* ברדק "mess", *zhlob* זלוב "penny pincher". In Soviet times, such Russian words as *soviety* סובייטי "Soviet", *kolkhoz* קולחוז "superintendent of political affairs", *spets* ספצ "specialist", *troyka* טרויקה in the meaning of "three managers", *niet* ניט "no, a strict refusal" were borrowed, and during perestroika times – *perestroika* פרסטרויקה, *glasnost* גלאסנוסט «publicity», Duma דומה (parliament).

Some modern Hebrew words were coined with the help of Russian language suffixes. With the help of the –nik suffix (Rus.) –ניק "–nik" (to denote a party or organization member) such Hebrew words as *kibutsnik* קיבוצניק "kibuts member", *moshavnik* מושבניק "moshav (Jewish settlement) member" (еврейського поселення), *likudnik* ליקודניק "Likud party member", *kliumnik* כלומניק "wastrel", were created; coined with the help suffix –ist (Rus.) –יט "–ist": *tankist* טנקיסט "tankman", *traktorist* טרקטוריסט "tractorist"; diminutive suffix –chik (Rus.) –צ'יק "–chik": *zakenchik* זקנצ'יק "old", *bakhurchik* בחורצ'יק "lad"; *hayalchik* דוכנצ'יק "small", *dukhanchik* קטנצ'יק "small", *dukhan* דוכן "kiosk" (from *dukhan* דוכן "kiosk") (at present, some Hebrew words appear in the colloquial language not only in the diminutive meaning – *tikunchik* תקונצ'יק and its synonym *shiputsnik* שפוצניק "repairman", *pogromchik* פוגרומצ'יק «pogrom performer»).

Y. Guri distinguishes lexical, semantic and phraseological calques that were created in Hebrew by derivation from Russian [5, p.100-103]. Thus, in his view, the following Hebrew words are *lexical calques* from Russian: *levanim* לבנים "linen", *yakhfan* יחפן "tramp", *masait* משאית "truck", *shivyon nesesh* שיוון נפש "indifference", *pkak* פקק "traffic jam", *hazeret* חזרת "mumps", *beitsiya* ביציה "omelet", *gavai* גווי "daily life". To *semantic calques* (words that received new figurative meaning under the impact of foreign words) he includes the following: *gibor* גיבור core meaning: "hero", new meaning: "protagonist of a literary work or a movie"; *legakdish* להקדיש "to devote", "to appoint", *legistader* להסתדר "to line up", "to position oneself", *lakhtom* לחתום "to sign", "to subscribe to a printed issue", *nafuakh* נפוח "snotty", "arrogant", *tnua* תנועה "walking, driving", "public movement". As examples of *phraseological calques* (literal translation of all elements of a phraseological unit) the following can be provided: *teudat bagrut* תעודת בגרות "leaving", *bishel daisa* בשל דיסה "to put chestnuts in the fire", *al karey tarnegolet* על כרעי תרנגולת "chicken stick", *bipney shoker shvura* שבורה "back at the bottom of the ladder", *yadei zagav* ידי זהב "hands of gold" and others. Some phraseologisms as calques from Russian exist in the colloquial language as well: *ma itkha* (ma itakh)? מה אתך? "what's wrong with you?", *ma gain'yanim*? מה הענינים? "how is it going?", *eyn bead ma* אין בעד מה "you are welcome", *bamilim akherot* במילים אחרות "in other words".

To the category of phraseological calques belong also proverbs. Among the two hundred most frequently used ones presented in Y. Guri's work, 20% are phraseological calques from the Russian language [6]. We have selected and analyzed some of them, as well as furnished equivalent and similar examples from Ukrainian for further work at the initial stage of Hebrew teaching [2, p.7-11.]. Thus, examples of equivalent proverbs that not only coincide in meaning but are based on the same image are as follows: "מטאטא חדש מטאטא טוב" (literary translation: "a new

broom is a good broom”) has an equivalent in Russian that reads: “A new broom sweeps well” and in Ukrainian, where the saying is “A new broom sweeps clean (nice)”, or “Every broom sweeps well at first”) [14, p.354]; «אוזנים לכותל» “Even walls have ears” – Ukr., “ Even walls have ears ” – Rus. [14, p.309]. Unlike the said proverbs, similar proverbs coincide in meaning but are constructed upon different images. Thus, for example, the Hebrew proverb “ל קוץ במדבר פרח” (“In the desert, every thorn is a flower”), has an analogous counterpart in Russian – the proverb “When there is no fish, even crayfish will count as one” – and Ukrainian “When there is no fish, even crayfish will count as one”, and “When there’s no man around, even Thomas is a welcome man”, “In a steppe, even a maybug is a game”, “If there’s no singer, you’ll agree to listen even to sparrow chirrup”, “For a hungry man, even honey agaric will pass off as meat” [14, p.331]; “לא בכל יום פורים” (“Purim does not happen every day”) – “A cat won’t have the Butter Week forever” (Rus.), “A cat won’t have the Butter Week forever [the Lent will come also]”, “End of the Butter Week, dear cat!” (Ukr.) [14, p.342], «אל תזרוק אבן בבר ששתיתה» (“Don’t throw stones into the well you drank from”) – “Don’t spit into the well – you’ll need water from it” (Rus.), “Don’t spit into the well – you’ll need to drink from it”, “Don’t dirty the well, you’ll want water from it later” (Ukr.) [14, p.347]; «אם תרצו אין זו אגדה» (“If you desire it, it is no fairytale”) – “Patience and toil will overcome it all” (Rus.) “Patience and toil will give you everything”, “If you put your effort into it, you’ll be well off”, “He who works does not walk naked” (Ukr.) [14, p.425]; «תורה היא אורה» (“Torah is the light”) – “Learning is light and ignorance is darkness” (Rus.), «A learned person sees light and an ignorant person gropes in the dark”, “Knowledge makes you find the right way”, “He who learns progresses fast, and he who’s ignorant is stuck in one place (Ukr.) [14, p.434-435]. In pedagogical practice, work with proverbs not only enriches the vocabulary of elementary students; it also helps them submerge into the cultural and national diversity of the world; it teaches them to sense common and unique things in each culture and language, to better understand each other; it nourishes respect towards others; it is the source of forming intercultural competence as a component of students’ sociocultural competence.

Conclusions.

Hence, modern Hebrew lexis consists of words inherited from Ancient Hebrew of previous periods, including ancient borrowings, neologisms that were coined predominantly from Hebraic, Aramaic and Arabic stems, direct borrowings and calqued forms taken from different languages. The analysis of the vocabulary composition of Hebrew performed within the present paper, especially of interlingual borrowings from Russian and Ukrainian, must serve basis for selecting lexical units of the Hebrew language for the formation of oral speech and lexical skills in elementary students; these skills, in their turn, are a constituent part of the language, speech and sociocultural competence of students.

Perspectives of further research.

The issues touched upon in the article pertain to but one of the aspects of forming students’ linguoculturological competence in Hebrew teaching process, both at the elementary and further learning levels. We see the prospects of further research in theoretical and methodological elaboration of the issue of realizing the linguoculturological approach to Hebrew language instruction in Ukrainian schools.

LITERATURE

1. Айхенвальд А. Ю. Современный иврит / Александра Юрьевна Айхенвальд. – М. : Наука. Глав. ред. восточ. л-ры, 1990. – 147 с. – С. 100-106.
2. Бакуліна Н. В. Шляхи розвитку міжкультурної компетенції (на прикладі роботи над прислів'ями у процесі навчання мови іврит на початковому етапі) / Н. В. Бакуліна // *Культура народів Причорномор'я* : научн. журн. по матеріалам междунар. научн.-практ. конф., 21-24 мая 2008 г. / Крым. научн. центр НАНУ, М-во образования и науки Украины [и др.]. – Симферополь : Межвуз. центр «Крым», 2008. – Т.2. – № 137. – 382 с. – С. 7-11.
3. Бацевич Ф. С. Словник термінів міжкультурної комунікації / Ф. С. Бацевич. – К.: Довіра, 2007. – 205 с. – С. 101.
4. Гаркави А. Я. Об языке евреев, живших в древнее время на Руси, и о славянских словах, встречающихся у еврейских писателей / Авраам Яковлевич Гаркави. – СПб, 1866. – 65 с.
5. Гури И. Иврит и русский : языки далёкие и близкие / Иосиф Гури // *Очерки истории иврита*. – Тель-Авив, 2000. – 142 с. – С. 79 – 109.
6. Гури И. Всё хорошо, что хорошо кончается / Иосиф Гури // *Сборник пословиц (английский, русский, идиш, иврит)*. – Иерусалим, 1993.
7. Дрейер Л. М. Современный иврит / Л. М. Дрейер // *Языки мира : Семитские языки. Аккадский язык. Северозападносемитские языки* / РАН Ин-т языкознания / ред. колл.: А. Г. Белова, Л. Е. Коган, С. В. Лёзов, О. И. Романова – М., 2009. – 840 с. – С.409-413.
8. Животовский И. Сленг современного иврита / Илья Животовский // *Труды Второй молодежной конференции СНГ по иудаике – "Tirosh"*. Составление: Ассоциация студентов иудаики. Серия "Judaica Rossica". Выпуск 2. Москва, 1998.
9. Занд М. И. Идиш как субстрат современного иврита / М. И. Занд // *Семитские языки*. Вып. 2., Ч. 1. – М., 1965. – с. 223-224.
10. *Краткая еврейская энциклопедия*. – М. : Красный пролетарий, 1996. – 939 с. – С. 852-860.
11. Корниенко Ю. М. Лексикология и фразеология языка иврит / Ю. М. Корниенко. – М., 1978.
12. Крюков А. А. Социолингвистический феномен нового иврита : становление, лексико-стилистическое варьирование и сферы функционирования : дис. ... д-ра филол. наук : 10.02.22 / Александр Александрович Крюков. – М., 2004. – 375 с.
13. Огієнко І. Повторюваний інфінітив у слов'янських мовах : старослов'янсько – давньоєврейські порівняння / Іван Огієнко. – Братислава, 1941. – 56 с.
14. Олейник И.С., Сидоренко М.М.: Украинско-русский и русско-украинский фразеологический словарь. – К. : Радянська школа, 1978.
15. Подольский Б. Идиш и иврит / Борух Подольский // *Беседы об иврите и о многом другом*. – Тель-Авив, «Иврус», 2008. – 240 с. – С. 184 – 197.
16. Подольский Б. Иврит в русском языке и русский в иврите / Борух Подольский // *Беседы об иврите и о многом другом*. – Тель-Авив, «Иврус», 2008. – 240 с. – С. 148 – 183.

17. Райхштейн А. Д. Сопоставительный анализ немецкой и русской фразеологии / А. Д. Райхштейн. – М.: Высш. школа, 1980. – 143с.
18. Рибалкін В. С. Гейбраїзм / Валерій Сергійович Рибалкін // Українська мова. Енциклопедія. – К., 2007. – С. 95.
19. Рибалкін В.С. Іврит / Валерій Сергійович Рибалкін// Українська літературна енциклопедія: у 3-х т.. – К., 1990.– Т. 2. – С.296.
20. Рубенштейн А. Л. Некоторые пути развития лексикологии языка иврит / А. Л. Рубенштейн // Семитские языки. – М., 1965. – Вып. II. Ч.1. – С. 215-220.
21. Словарь-справочник лингвистических терминов. Пособие для учителей. –Изд. 2-е, испр. и доп. М., «Просвещение», 1976. – 543 с. – С. 475.
22. Старинин В. П. Структура семитского слова. Прерывистые морфемы / В. П. Старинин. – М. : Изд-во восточ. л-ры, 1965. – 116 с.
23. Ткаченко О. Б. Єврейське мовне відродження : унікальне явище чи універсальний досвід? / Орест Борисович Ткаченко // Єврейська історія та культура в Україні : матеріали конф., 22-23.11.1993. – К., 1994. – С. 156-162.
24. Ткаченко О. Б. Очерки по теории языкового субстрата / Орест Борисович Ткаченко. – К.: Наук. думка, 1989. – 208 с. – С. 12-13; 70-81; 148-149.
25. Украина. Краткая еврейская энциклопедия. Т.8. – Иерусалим, 1996. – 1344 с. – С. 1172.
26. Фалькович Э. О языке идиш. – Русско-еврейский (идиш) словарь / Под. Ред. М. А. Шапиро, И. Г. Спивака и М. Я. Шульмана. – М.: Рус. Яз., 1984. – 720 с. – С. 666 – 715.
27. Феллер М. Д. Пошуки, роздуми і спогади єврея, який пам'ятає своїх дідів, про єврейсько-українські взаємини, особливо ж про мови і ставлення до них / Мартен Давидович Феллер. – Дрогобич : Відродження, 1994. – 238 с.
28. Феллер М. Д., Кержнер А. Г. Українсько-єврейські мовні контакти / М. Д. Феллер, А. Г. Кержнер // Українська мова. Енциклопедія. – К., 2007. – С. 767-768.
29. Шапиро Ф. Л. Иврит-русский словарь (с приложением грамматического очерка языка иврит Б. М. Гранде) / Ф. Л. Шапиро. – М., 1963.
30. Шапиро Ф. Л. Некоторые пути и источники пополнения словарного состава современного языка иврит / Ф. Л. Шапиро // Семитские языки. – М., 1963. – С. 127 – 134.
31. Carfati G. Semantika ivrit. – Yerushalaim, 1979.
32. Ellenbogen M. Foreign Words in the Old Testament. – L., 1962.
33. Even-Šošan A. Hamilon hehadaš. Vol. 1-7. Yer., 1969-1974.
34. Khan G. Vowel Length and Syllable Structure in the Tiberian Tradition Biblical Hebrew. – Journal of Semitic Studies. – 1987, vol.32, N 1.
35. Klausner Y. Aramismim. – Ləšonenu, 1948, N 16.
36. Piamenta M. Hašpaa haaravit al hiduše Ben-Yehuda. – LLA, 1961, № 12.
37. Sappan R. Milon hasleng hayisraeli. – Yer., 1972.
38. Sappan R. Al kama targume šeila bilšon haitonut. – LLA, 1956, N 77.
39. Sivan R. Haivrit lərovdeha. – LLA, 1975, N 26 (5).
40. Sivan R. Šmonim šana (1890 – 1970). – LLA, 1970, N 21: 105, 106.