

УДК 81.372 + 81.373.611

Natalia Diachok, Alexandr Ivko

UNIVERBATION AS AN INTERLINGUAL PHENOMENON

The article deals with the definition of univerbation, which is a universal phenomenon for different languages. Modern linguistics considers univerbation as the active way to coin new words basing upon word combinations. But declaration of laws of univerbation does not involve such a semantic identity as word combination-univerb, motivation type, and other important features characterizing the phenomenon. Hypothesis of the study is in the fact that a word of any part of speech is only one of the speech modifications of an abstract (linguistic) nominative unit (being structural in its nature) which is called a nominatheme. On the one hand, it can be actualized in speech not only in the form of a word but also in polyverbal units; on the other hand, it can have any monoverbal nominative formation as the dominant of its language modification. Basing upon that fact, it can be assumed that univerbs are capable of representing two nominative types in a language and speech area respectively. The object under analysis is univerbalizing processes in the context of their diversity. «Word combination – word» parallels of the type under analysis are forms of an abstract lexical unit. It is called a nominatheme and is characterized by a number of formal peculiarities and semantic ones, typical for the lexical structures only. Nominative approach to the description of univerbs allows singling out polyverbal and verbal doublets of a basic linguistic unit. Verbal implementations of «verb combination + elliptical univerb» type nominathemes are subject to univerbalization, nominalization, and lexicalization forming three types depending on the complex of processes of their fixation in a language as well as on their linguistic functioning. The proposed consideration of univerbation is the specific example of the analysis performed on the basis of a complex approach to the study of verbal and linguistic nominative units. In future it will be possible to model the nominative units in different languages.

Keywords: derivation, motivation, nominatheme, nomination, word, word combination, univerb, univerbation.

Introduction. We consider a new approach to the study of univerbation phenomenon, which is universal for different languages, to be rather important not only from the viewpoint of its relevance but also from a perspective of topicality of drawing a line between principles of the linguistic nomination and verbal one.

Modern linguistics claims univerbation to be an active way to coin new words basing upon word combinations. However, declaration of laws of univerbation does not involve such a semantic identity as a word combination-univerb, motivation type, and other important features characterizing the phenomenon.

© Дьячок Н., Івко О., 2020

DOI: 10.24025/2707-0573.1(2).2020.201786

A univerbation process is really active although it is not a new one since its sources can be found even in, for example, the Old Russian language: «*белка – белая веверица* (common name of fur animals – squirrel, ermine, sable); *копейка – копейная деньга*; *варежки – варяжские рукавицы*; *перстатичы – перстатые рукавицы*, *ратник – ратный человек*» (Ishchenko, 2003, p. 53-54). For instance, «*Ведь наш брат, ратный человек, ходя наестся и стоя выпится*» (Загоскин, 1846) – «*Тут начались разные нестроения, обиды, насильства: ратник отнимал у мужика пищу, мужик не пускал ратника в избу*» (Долгоруков, 1788–1822).

V. N. Moiseienko supposes that Slavonic languages and dialects involve a number of original and borrowed names from other Slavonic languages. For example, such an adopted Latin complex name as *aqua vitae* was the initial naming unit for aqueous alcohol/vodka; it lived through various modifications, and became *wodka*. Modern Slavonic scholars believe that it is a Polish word *wodka*, being a univerbated equivalent of a Latin word combination *aqua vitae*, which came down to us. During univerbation in the Polish language, two-component Latin naming unit *aqua vitae* = *woda zycia* synthesized its second component within the univerbal suffix. In the process of semantic change, the first component obtained expressive hypocoristic form in *wodka* word structure. Moreover, in the context of the Polish language, *okowita* – «*alkohol raz tylko dystylowany, gorzaka, smierdziucha*» demonstrates partially combined variation of the two-component Latin word combination *aqua vitae*. Such modern Ukrainian usage as *оковита* mirrors the polonism (Moiseienko, 2003, p. 89).

Hypothesis of the study is in the fact that a word of any part of speech is only one of the speech modifications of an abstract (linguistic) nominative unit (being structural in its nature) which is called a nominatheme. On the one hand, it can be actualized in a speech not only in the form of a word but also in polyverbal units; on the other hand, it can have any monoverbal nominative formation as the dominant of its language modification. Basing upon that fact, it can be assumed that univerbs are capable of representing two nominative types in the language and speech area respectively.

Methods. The study is based on two key methods to define univerbs in different languages. They are descriptive and structural.

Results and Discussion. A number of definitions of univerbation as a process and univerb as the process result are available in this research. Their majority is considered as traditional; thus, the notions are related to the word-formation purely.

Univerbation is determined as the loss of both formal and semantic decomposition of the name, i.e. such phenomena as compounding, coalescence, elliptical omitting of one of the components of complex naming unit (ellipsis of the depended component of a word combination; ellipsis of a principal component of a word combination); affixal derivation; zero suffixation; and various abbreviation types (Isachenko, 1958, p. 339). Later studies demonstrate that the notion of the term is reduced to the definition of such a type of transforming a word combination into a word as a result of which the structure of the derivative word includes the stem of only one of the word combination components. Thus, the univerb is formally motivated by one word and semantically motivated by all the initial word combination. A. V. Isachenko determined such univerbation type with the term «*affix derivation*» (*наложенный платёж – наложка, подвергать печали – печалить, покрывать пудрой – пудрить, наивный человек – наивняга*) meaning zero derivation as well (*секретный замок – секрет, пилотный проект – пилот,*

наркотические вещества – наркота, кабельна телевизия – кабел). In this context, zero affixation (derivation) is understood as a process of adding a materially unexpressed affix to a generating basis.

Univerbation is considered as the process of a word combination compression (Y. A. Zemskaya, E. S. Kubriakova, V. V. Lopatin, N. Ya. Yanko-Trinitzskaya), as the phenomenon of secondary nomination (A. A. Bragina), as the implementation of the law of losing formal and semantic disjointedness of the nomination (E. N. Sidorenko), and as a particular case of lexical condensation (L. V. Kopot). However, all the linguists have a common point of view: the phenomenon is of derivational nature though an absolute coincidence of semantics of a word combination and its corresponding word makes it possible to suppose that the relations between a word combination and a word are not derivative at all, i.e. the relations are not the ones stipulating the origin of new nominative units.

As a rule, «there are relations of derivation between the initial word combination and its condensate» (Snitko, 1982, p. 88), i.e. the external motivation relations. However, if we rely on the fact that the external motivation is usually understood as «the relation between two nominathemes; and meaning of one of them (derivative) is formed with the help of the meaning of the second one (derivating) but do not coincide with it» (Terkulov, 2008, p. 78), then we can state that the examples listed above demonstrate no relations of external word-formation motivation between a generative unit and a derivative unit. It is proved by the following facts: «1) in this case, the meaning of a word is not determined through the meaning of a word combination but they coincide absolutely» (Diachok, 2015, p. 144) (*мобильный телефон – мобильник, карта пополнения счета – пополняшка, житель Парижа – парижанин*); 2) «in the process of a modification type there are no grammatical changes either (we can observe grammatical and gender identity of the main word of the initial word combination and its corresponding univerb» (Diachok, 2015, p. 144): *мобильный телефон – мобильник, кожаная куртка – кожанка; мобильный телефон – мобилка, мобила, кожаный плащ – кожанка, пальто из дубленой кожи – дубленка, капитальный ремонт – капиталка* as specific cases of univerbal analogy – quasiuniverbation).

Thus, almost all scientists adhere to a common point of view regarding this problem: the point at issue is the phenomenon of derivation nature, though identity of semantics of a word combination and a word corresponding give grounds to assume that word combination-word relations are far from being word-formative ones (e.g. *наружка – наружная реклама, незавершенка – незавершенное строительство* etc.).

With reference of the variety of approaches it is in the course of nature to find unified terminological equivalent to the process as well as those units being a result of the process. According to V. Terkulov's conception, we believe that it is expedient to consider each derivate as a univerbalized (verbalized) equivalent of a word combination, «that is, both lexical and grammar meaning, and syntactic function of a word originated as a result of verbal interpretation are absolutely equivalent to the word combination» (Terkulov, 2008, p. 134), and the verbal interpretation has originated owing to a process of elliptic univerbation. In large, we determine each certain unit under study as a nominatheme of «word combination + elliptic univerb» type. The nominatheme belongs to the structural type of nominatheme with dominant word combination; namely, it is a unit equal semantically to a word combination being identified at its level. Generally,

nominatheme is the certain abstract linguistic unit being realized in verbal forms (glosses, doublets); moreover, in this context, both word combination as well as a word equal to it semantically and grammatically are alternatives of one nominatheme (for example, *премиальная выплата* and *премиалка*, *коммунальная квартира* and *коммуналка*, *детеныш льва* and *львенок*, *настойка валерианы* and *валерьянка*).

It is obvious that in this context, word-formation relations are implemented between a word combination and its verbal equivalent; however, the relations are not external, derivative, but internal, intergloss motivational ones.

In this context, one of the main obstacles for relevant understanding and description of univerbation processes is the unstated denial of a non-word-centric approach to the study of nominative units as well as highlighting the principles of the word-centric approach. In our opinion, a complex approach to the study of the stated problem, combining peculiarities of the two abovementioned approaches materialized in the nominatheme theory, is the most appropriate one.

We realized that outstanding researchers expressed their views as for determining the main nomination unit: «Charles Bally (General linguistics and problems of the French language, 1955), V. A. Zvegintsev (Semasiology, 1957), L. Bloomfield (Set of postulates for the science of language, 1960), V. M. Zhirmunskii (On the word boundaries, 1961), I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay (Language and languages, 1963), A. Martinet (Fundamentals of general linguistics, 1963), J. Vachek (Linguistic dictionary of Prague School, 1964), S. D. Katsnelson (Content of word, meaning, and denomination, 1965), F. de Saussure (Course of general linguistics, 1977), J. Vendryes (Language. Linguistic introduction into the history, 2004), H. Frei (Saussure vs Saussure? Articles of different periods, 2006) and others» (Diachok, 2018, p. 144).

There were two approaches to determine the unit. V. M. Alpatov conventionally called the first of them as a word-centric one. According to the scientist, «it is based on the fact that a word is considered to be the main unit of a language; the analysis begins with the singling out the words being the point for further transition to singling out either shorter (morphemes) or longer (word combinations, sometimes sentences) linguistic units» (Alpatov, 1982, p. 66). «The approach prevailed in Russian philology up to, at least, middle-end of the 20th century. Not linguistic, but psycholinguistic factors were the basis for that. Along with the application of a word-centric approach in linguistics, the beginning of the 20th century gave us the principally new approach to single out linguistic units; I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay is believed to be the founder of the approach. Soon after, L. Bloomfield formulated the essence of a non-word-centric approach; he talked about the forms which he defined as the main linguistic units. In this context, his concept considers a morpheme as a minimum form. Further, a word, word combination, and sentence were singled out sequentially (Diachok, 2018, p. 145).

V. M. Alpatov states that «in terms of a non-word-centric approach, a word does not take the place that it takes in word-centric concepts» (Alpatov, 1982, p. 67). In this case, a researcher chooses the way from longer units to shorter ones or from the shortest to complex ones as for their structure and semantics. In this context, a word is not considered as the initial and most important unit; it is on a par with other linguistic units, moreover, it may be not even singled out at all.

It is clear that the principles of a word-centric approach should be considered critically as «1) word-centric theories cannot always determine a word as an integral unit: every time, speaking about a word, we should specify what word we mean

exactly – phonetic, lexical, or morphological; in this context, even such an approach does not eliminate contradictions: while determining the level words there are peripheral zones because of which it is hard to define whether it is a word or another unit; 2) the theories cannot determine a word as a linguistic universal as well, since it often has different parameters of existence in various languages» (Diachok, 2018, p. 146).

Non-word-centric approach is a universal one; that is why it has certain advantages comparing to the word-centric approach. In particular, V. M. Alpatov says that «...along with the psychologically adequate models, there should be developed the models to describe the world languages on the unified basis. The models are required to <...> detect universal properties of a language. To reach the goals going beyond the linguistic ones, non-word-centric models <...> are more appropriate than the word-centric ones» (Alpatov, 1982, p. 62; translated by author – N. D.).

First of all, the theory of nomination is connected with the detecting the way of conceptual forms of thinking interconnection. It helps to understand how nominations are created, fixed, and distributed in terms of various fragments of the objective reality.

These are the units having semantic identity in all its diversity confirmed by formal motivation, i.e. originating one unit from another at the level of form, that we will consider as structural variations of a linguistic invariant (nominatheme) not coinciding only with a word or only with a word combination in the formal context.

Identity criteria of the studied invariant (abstract unit) may be represented as follows: «1) nominatheme as a linguistic unit is able to absorb multiple differential characteristics not violating the concept of its essence; 2) nominatheme really functions in a speech in the form of one of its modifications (broadly understood – doublets); 3) nominatheme identity means doublet modification that is the total semantic identity of the counter-members; in terms of doublet modification, counter-members (doublets) always coincide both lexically and grammatically; 4) semantic and grammatical continuity of a nominatheme, i.e. the totality of textual and speech implementations of a specific nominatheme being potentially peculiar for it» (Diachok, 2018, p. 147).

It is expedient to single out nominathemes with a dominant-word (word dominant) and nominathemes with a word combination dominant. We determine each studied unit as a nominatheme of «word combination + elliptic univverb» type. It belongs to the category of structural varieties of nominatheme with the word combination dominant, i.e. it is the unit being semantically identical to a word combination. In general, nominatheme is some abstract linguistic unit implemented in verbal forms (glosses, doublets); moreover, in the specific case, for instance, a word combination and a word, being identical to it both semantically and grammatically, are the doublets of one nominatheme.

Thus, we consider each of such «derivates» as a univverbized (verbalized) equivalent of a word combination, «i.e. the word that has appeared as a result of verbal interpretation of a word combination has lexical and grammatical meaning as well as a syntactic function being absolutely identical to a word combination» (Terkulov, 2006, p. 134); and the verbal interpretation has appeared owing to the process of elliptic univverbation.

Thus, the univverb is the doublet of the corresponding word combination and verbal nominatheme implementation along with that; the nominatheme includes both of the components. «The very transformation of a word combination into a

word should be defined neither as derivation nor as lexicalization supposing semantic self-development of a verbal implementation of the initial nominatheme and decomposition of its actual identity» (Terkulov, 2008, p. 68), but as the univerbation is characterized not by changes but by preservation of the semantics of a word combination within a neologism – a word.

Consequently, a univerb should be understood as a word being semantically and grammatically identical to a word combination; the word that can differ stylistically from the (equivalent) word combination in terms of the available features of colloquialisms and slang, or the word should coincide stylistically with a word combination being a doublet of one nominatheme along with the word combination.

Univerbation may be also considered in the frameworks of Indo-European and Slavonic universology as the phenomenon is represented in the corresponding lingual products – univerbs – in the set of languages within a certain family and group.

In the English language we can find the correspondences of following types. *Identical twins – identicals*: «*She stopped to look at the two houses, Brier and Rose, like **identical twins** wearing slightly different clothing so that one could tell them apart*» (<https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>); «*At the mercy of the 'sames': a different in the middle of **identicals**. I drowned my sorrows on the school goalposts, as football was banned*» (<https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>). *Mass media – medias*: «*This distinction between cognitions (the informational building blocks, the stored bits of information) and specific attitudes or opinions is critical, for it not only emphasizes the public's growing dependence on the **mass media** for information but it also draws our attention to the consequences of such a dependence*» (Politics and the mass media in Britain. Negrine, Ralph. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul plc, 1992, pp. 1-115. 1624 s-units; <https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>); «*The opening passage of Henry James's *The Pupil* resembles the preceding extract in its in **medias res** technique, but in other respects one could scarcely find two more dissimilar beginnings to a story*» (Style in fiction. Short, Michael H and Leech, Geoffrey N. Harlow: Longman Group UK Ltd, 1987, pp. 11-146. 1663 s-units; <https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>). *Mobile phones – mobiles*: «*Camera crews and their front men cruised the available space looking for celebrities to interview. BT salesmen pushed **mobile phones***» (The floating voter. Critchley, Julian. London: Headline Book Pub. plc, 1993, pp. 1-150. 2461 s-units; <https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>); «*Exclusive **mobiles** and personalised names add the final touch to that special person's nursery* (Belfast Telegraph. Leisure material. 1845 s-units; <https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>) etc.

In the Ukrainian language there are following correspondence types. *Стати убогим – зубожіти*: «*Кого недавно ще звали приятелем, тепер величають ворогом; багатий став багатий **став убогим**, убогий багатим; жупани перевернулись на сямряги, а сямряги на кармазини*» (<http://www.mova.info/corpus.aspx>); «*За дванадцять років цієї дивної війни мілетяни геть **зубожіли**, насувалася голодна зима, найголодніша з усіх зим останнього дванадцятиріччя*» (<http://www.mova.info/corpus.aspx>). *Заплести косу – закосичити*: «*Поїсти, виспатися, вдосвіта прокинутися, умитися, **косу заплести** красиво, надягти ту зелену кофтинку з Міккі Маусом ...*» (<http://www.mova.info/corpus.aspx>); «*Хоч бува, як спека стомить, кетяг в тебе тут одломить пастушок засмаглий, босий, **закосичити** щоб коси юної смуглянки, кісоньки люблянки*» (corpus.org.ua). *Мобільний телефон – мобілка, мобільник*: «*Не його **мобільний телефон**, чужий. Вимкнений*» (corpus.org.ua);

«Дорога **мобілка** не потрібна, для прикладу використовуємо Siemens A50 з анонімною (і стерильною) сім-картою. Вікторія вийшла, витягнула **мобільник** і знову спробувала набрати номер» (korpus.org.ua).

As for the Russian language, the corresponding types are as follows. *Переводить в цифровой формат – оцифровывать*: «Кино окончательно **переводят в цифровой формат**» (<http://www.ruscorpora.ru>); «Сейчас стало возможным **оцифровывать** издания и размещать их в Интернете, чтобы любой желающий мог, не выходя из дома, побывать в библиотеке» (<http://www.ruscorpora.ru>). *Автоматическая коробка передач – автомат*: «Иными словами, к январю 1953 новинка GM превратилась в роскошный автомобиль, в котором **автоматическая коробка передач** существовала в качестве опции» (<http://www.ruscorpora.ru>); «Коробка, можно сказать, близка к идеалу, словно за небольшой сферической рукояткой нереальный агрегат для выбора передач, а компьютерное обучающее устройство – работает быстро и четко (как променяешь такое на бесчувственный "**автомат**"?») (<http://www.ruscorpora.ru>). *Авторитетный человек – авторитет*: «Самый **авторитетный человек** в здешней диаспоре – предприниматель Николай Дорошенко, тоже, кстати, из Узбекистана» (<http://www.ruscorpora.ru>); «Признанный **авторитет** в области баллистики, соратник Королева, он на пике научной карьеры круто изменил её направление, полностью отдавшись новой области – программированию» (<http://www.ruscorpora.ru>). *Издавать определенным тиражом – тиражировать*: «**Издавать** миллионным **тиражом** Булгакова или Пастернака?» (<http://www.ruscorpora.ru>); «Со времен Гутенберга человечество научилось **тиражировать** письменное слово, но мы, похоже, предпочитаем эпоху манускриптов, раннее средневековье...» (<http://www.ruscorpora.ru>) etc.

As for the Bulgarian language, we can observe following types. *Любопытна информация (новина) – любопытка*: «**любопытна информация** – търсената дума не е намерена» (<https://slovoed.com/search/all/любопытна+информация>); «**любопытка** – непозната дума без предложения за замяна, които ги има в речника» (<https://slovoed.com/search/all/любопытка>). *Найлонова торбичка – найлонка*: «Забраната се отнася за употребата, производството и вноса на **найлонови торбички** за пазаруване» (<https://dariknews.bg/novini/sviat/koia-e-dyrzhavata-koiato-prashta-v-zatvora-zaradi-prodazhba-na-najlonova-torbichka-2044877>); «Задържаха двама с наркотици, в колата имало кокаин, до нея – изхвърлени в **найлонка** 200 таблетки амфетамин» (<https://e-gazgrad.bg/задържаха-двама-с-наркотици-в-колата-и/>) etc.

In the Slovak language we can find following examples. *Obývacia izba – obývačka*: «Ale **obývacia izba** pôsobila bezducho» (http://korpus.juls.savba.sk:8080/manatee.ks/do_query?query=obývacia+izba+); «miešací stroj – miešačka, obývacia izba – **obývačka**, ani nepatrí medzi názvy» (http://korpus.juls.savba.sk:8080/manatee.ks/do_query?query=obývacia+izba+). *Kopirovací stroj – kopírka (kopírovačka)*: «Kopirovací stroj SHARP MX-M266NV Model MX-M266N představuje multifunkční systém pro pracovní skupiny 10 až 30 uživatelů. Základem modelu je výkonná kopírka, síťová tiskárna s rychlostí 26 stran/min., barevný síťový skener a automatický obracecí podavač originálů RADF» (<https://www.adavm.cz/kopirky-sharp/kopirovací-stroj-sharp-mx-m266n-detail>); «Zložená **kopírka** vyzerá celkom dobre» (http://korpus.juls.savba.sk:8080/manatee.ks/do_query?query=kopírka). *Mobilný telefón – mobil*: «Tak potom musíte mať ešte **mobilný telefón**» (<http://korpus.juls.savba.sk:8080/manatee.ks/>

do_query?query=mobilný+telefón+); «univerbizáciou vzniká jednoslovné pomenovanie **mobil** a k nemu sa zase dotvára prídavné meno...» (http://korpus.juls.savba.sk:8080/manatee.ks/do_query?query=mobil). *Mikrovlnná rúra – mikrovlnka* (Šiesta cena – **mikrovlnná rúra** Panasonic poputuje do Zlatna V» (http://korpus.juls.savba.sk:8080/manatee.ks/do_query?query=mikrovlnná+); «*Mikrovlnka Pre mnohých je **mikrovlnka** zbytočnosť, nechutná zhýralosť...*» (http://korpus.juls.savba.sk:8080/manatee.ks/do_query?query=mikrovlnka) etc.

The Polish language gives us the following examples. *Kuchenka mikrofalowa – mikrofalowka, mikrofalę*: «**Kuchenka mikrofalowa** KMFE172TEX 800 z dotykowym mechanizmem otwierania oferuje najłatwiejszy dostęp do przyrządzonej potrawy. Wystarczy jeden ruch, aby drzwi otworzyły się szybko i płynnie, co oznacza niezrównaną wygodę» (https://allegro.pl/oferta/kuchenka-mikrofalowa-electrolux-kmfe172tex-8291944229?bi_s=ads&bi_m=listing%3Adesktop%3Acategory&bi_c=MjFiMjUwNTYtZjY1MS00NzVjLWE4MjQtZjc4NDdmNjFYjNjAA&bi_t=ape&referrer=proxy&emission_unit_id=14714322-0257-4347-88ba-1c0cdd107cc0); «**mikrofalowka** Samsung. *Sprzedam mikrofalę Samsung jak nową. Mało używana. Jest jeszcze z folią na panelu sterowania. Sterowanie elektroniczne, moc 800 W*» (<https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/>). *Telefon komórkowy – komórka*: «**Telefon komórkowy**, pot. **Komórka** – telefon działający w oparciu o telefonię komórkową» (https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Telefon_komórkowy) etc.

Conclusions. Thus, the given above examples illustrate not only the universal character but also the activity and topicality of the described process in different languages. It is stipulated by certain intra- and extralinguistic factors: linguistic tendency to «wordness», economy of verbal efforts and graphic space etc. Materials of the research also demonstrate diverse models to form univerbs as a monoverbal speech and text implementations of «word combination + elliptic verbal univerb» nominathemes.

In our opinion, the study of univerbs represented by nouns and verbs relies upon the two main concepts. The first of them is defined as an onomasiological description. Its essence is to systematize nominathemes under consideration in onomasiological classes basing upon hierarchic dependence of three nominative characteristics: lexical and grammatical category; belonging to a lexical and semantic group of synthetic units; and onomasiological model which, in its turn, includes onomasiological basis and onomasiological attribute. The components of an onomasiological model define the structure to shape nominative meaning for every specific nominatheme implementation that is a word and a word combination corresponding to it. The second one deals with a describing process of the univerbation. Its essence is to demonstrate a formal transformation of a word combination into a word. The approach involves the development of the initial structure (a word combination) as well as a model of an adequate verbal unit.

The proposed consideration of univerbation is the specific example of the analysis. It has been performed on the basis of a complex approach to the study of verbal and linguistic nominative units. It is certain to model the nominative units in different languages in future.

References

- Alpatov, V. (1982). On two approaches to single out basic linguistic units. *Problems of linguistics*, 6, 66-74.
- Diachok, N. (2015). *Univerbation in the Russian language: structural and semantic and onomasiological description*: Thesis for the Degree of Doctor of

- Philology, speciality 10.02.02 – Russian language. O. O. Potebnia Institute of Linguistics of the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, Kyiv.
- Diachok, N. (2018). Univerbation as a universal lingual phenomenon. *Theoretical and applied problems of modern philology*, 6, 143-149.
- Isachenko, A. (1958). On the issue of structural typology of the vocabularies of the Slavonic literary languages. *Slavia*, 27, 3, 334-352.
- Ishchenko, I. (2003). Peculiarities of semantics and grammar of a derivative word. *Messenger of Amur University*, 3. Retrieved from <http://www.amursu.ru/vestnik/3/>
- Moiseienko, V. (2003). Once more on history of word водка (etymological description). *Slavonic Messenger*, 1, 84-95.
- Osipova, L. (2004). Suffix univerbation as a productive way to form new words in Russian colloquial speech. *The Russian language: historical background and the present: 2nd International congress of the Russian language researchers*. Retrieved from <http://www.philol.msu.ru/~rlc2004/ru/participants/psearch.php?pid=12514>
- Snitko, E. (1982). Derivation and its types in the Russian language. *Russian linguistics*, 4, 84-89.
- Sreznevskii, I. (1989). *Dictionary of Old Russian language*. Moscow.
- Terkulov, V. (2006). Once more on the basic linguistic unit. *Messenger of Lugansk National Pedagogical University named after Taras Shevchenko: «Philological sciences»*, 11 (106), 127-137.
- Terkulov, V. (2008). *Composites of the Russian language in the onomaseological context*: Thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philological Sciences: 10.02.02 – Russian language. Gorlovka.

Resources

<http://www.mova.info/corpus.aspx>
<http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>
<http://www.korpus.org.ua>
<https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>
<http://www.ruscorpora.ru>
<https://korpus.sk/>

Резюме

Дьячок Наталя, Івко Олександр

УНІВЕРБАЦІЯ ЯК ІНТЕРЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ ФЕНОМЕН

Постановка проблеми. Ми пропонуємо новий підхід до вивчення феномена універбації, який є універсальним для різних мов. Це є важливим як з погляду його актуальності, так і з погляду встановлення межі між принципами мовної та мовленнєвої номінації. В сучасній лінгвістиці універбацію розглядають як активний спосіб творення нових слів на базі словосполучень. Утім, декларування законів універбації не передбачає смислової тотожності «словосполучення – універб», мотиваційний тип та інші важливі особливості, що характеризують явище.

Мета: проаналізувати універбацію як активний спосіб утворення нових слів на основі словосполучень та запропонувати новий підхід до вивчення цього явища, що є універсальним для різних мов.

Методи. Дослідження ґрунтується на двох ключових методах визначення універбів у різних мовах – описовому та структурному.

Результати. Стаття ілюструє не лише універсальний характер, але й активність та актуальність описаного процесу для різних мов. Це зумовлено певними інтра- та екстралінгвістичними чинниками: мовною тенденцією до «словності», економією мовних зусиль та графічного простору тощо. Матеріали дослідження також демонструють різноманітні моделі творення універбів як моновербальних мовленнєвих та текстових реалізацій номінатом на зразок «словосполучення + еліптичний універб».

Висновки і перспективи. Гіпотеза дослідження полягає в тому, що слово будь-якої частини мови є лише однією з мовленнєвих модифікацій абстрактної (лінгвістичної) номінативної одиниці, яка (будучи структурною за своєю природою) називається номінатомою. З одного боку, її можна актуалізувати в мовленні не лише у формі слова, але й у полівербальних одиницях; з іншого боку, вона може мати будь-яке моновербальне номінативне вираження як домінуючу мовної модифікації. Виходячи з цього, можна припустити, що універби здатні репрезентувати два номінативні типи відповідно – у мовному та мовленнєвому просторі. Об'єктом, що аналізується, є процес універбації у контексті його різноманітності. Паралелі аналізованого типу «словосполучення – слово» – це форми реалізації абстрактної лексичної одиниці. Вона називається номінатомою і характеризується низкою формальних і смислових особливостей, характерних лише для лексичних структур. Номінативний підхід до опису універбів дозволяє виділити полі- та моновербальні дублети основної мовної одиниці. Кожна конкретна вербальна реалізація номінатом на зразок «словосполучення + еліптичний універб» є наслідком універбалізації, номіналізації та лексикалізації, утворюючи три типи залежно від комплексу процесів фіксації окремої одиниці в мові, а також від її мовного функціонування. Запропонований розгляд універбації є конкретним прикладом аналізу, проведеного за комплексного підходу до вивчення номінативних одиниць. Надалі можливим постає вивчення й моделювання номінативних одиниць у різних мовах.

Ключові слова: словотвір, мотивація, номінатема, номінація, слово, словосполучення, універб, універбація.

Abstract

Diachok Natalia, Ivko Alexandr

UNIVERBATION AS AN INTERLINGUAL PHENOMENON

Background. We consider a new approach to the study of univerbation phenomenon, which is a universal for different languages, as rather important not only from the viewpoint of its relevance but also from a perspective of actuality of drawing a line between principles of linguistic nomination and verbal one. Modern linguistics considers univerbation as the active way to form new words basing upon word combinations. But declaration of laws of univerbation does not involve such a semantic identity as word combination-univerb, motivation type, and other important features characterizing the phenomenon.

Purpose: to analyze univerbation as the active way to form new words basing upon word combinations and propose a new approach to the study of this phenomenon, which is a universal for different languages.

Methods. The study is based on two key methods to define univerbs in different languages. They are descriptive and structural.

Results. The paper illustrates not only the universal character but also activity and topicality of the described process in different languages. It is stipulated by certain intra- and extralinguistic factors: linguistic tendency to «wordness», economy of verbal efforts and graphic space etc. Materials of the research also demonstrate diverse models to form univerbs as monoverbal speech and text implementations of «word combination + elliptic verbal univerb» nominathemes.

Discussion. Hypothesis of the study is in the fact that a word of any part of speech is only one of the speech modifications of an abstract (linguistic) nominative unit (being structural in its nature) which is called a nominatheme. On the one hand, it can be actualized in speech not only in the form of a word but also in polyverbal units; on the other hand, it can have any monoverbal nominative formation as the dominant of its language modification. Basing upon that fact, it can be assumed that univerbs are capable of representing two nominative types in language and speech area respectively. Object under analysis is univerbalizing processes in the context of their diversity. «Word combination – word» parallels of the type under analysis are forms of abstract lexical unit. It called nominatheme and characterized by a number of formal peculiarities and semantic ones typical for the lexical structures only. Nominative approach to the description of univerbs allows singling out polyverbal and verbal doublets of a basic linguistic unit. Verbal implementations of «verb combination + elliptical univerb» type nominathemes are subject to univerbalization, nominalization, and lexicalization forming three types depending on the complex of processes of their fixation in a language as well as on their linguistic functioning. The proposed consideration of univerbation is the specific example of the analysis performed on the basis of complex approach to the study of verbal and linguistic nominative units. In future it will be possible to model the nominative units in different languages.

Keywords: derivation, motivation, nominatheme, nomination, word, word combination, univerb, univerbation.

Відомості про авторів

Дьячок Наталя, доктор філологічних наук, професор, Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара, кафедра загального та слов'янського мовознавства, e-mail: dyachok74natalya@gmail.com

Diachok Natalia, Doctor of Science, Philology, Professor of the Department of General and Slavonic Linguistics of Oles Honchar Dnipro National University; e-mail: dyachok74natalya@gmail.com

ORCID 0000-0003-3949-3423

Івко Олександр, кандидат філологічних наук, викладач, Кременчуцький педагогічний коледж ім. А. С. Макаренка.

Ivko Olexandr, PhD, lecturer, A. S. Makarenko Kremenchug Pedagogical College.

Надійшла до редакції 28 квітня 2020 року
Прийнято до друку 26 травня 2020 року