

NOUN FAMILY OF WORDS AND SPECIFICITY OF ITS MORPHONOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Fedurko M. Yu., Kushlyk O. P.

INTRODUCTION

The changes in the socio-political and economic life of modern Ukraine led to an active reorganization of the vocabulary system of the Ukrainian language. There appeared and continue appearing a lot of new words – not only borrowed ones, but also specifically Ukrainian, implementing the potency, the rules and the regularities of its own word-formation system. For their adequate comprehension the plan of the content of this system as well as the plan of expression are equally important, since every abstract essence seeks to be materialized, just as any form is supposed to have the corresponding content.

The phenomena and the regularities that arrange the plan of expression of the word-formation means of the Ukrainian (and any other) language belong to its morphonological level and are the object of morphonology as a part of linguistics. They correct not only the rules of an external expression of the root and affixal morphemes, but also the formal modification of their qualitative or quantitative nature in the processes of word-formation (for paradigmatic morphonology – word-changing) interaction, causing the appearance of allomorphs of one morpheme. Under the qualitative changes, we understand the transformations achieved by alternating vowels and consonant phonemes, a word-stress also; under the quantitative changes – clipping and building up of morphemes. The rules of their usage come into force after the selection of the word-formation morphemes with the support on their content characteristics in accordance with the needs of a specific nominative act.

Modern numerous studies have confirmed that the most complete understanding of the potency of the word-formation nomination in the languages, the Ukrainian language for instance, helps to formulate the analysis of such an integrated unit of classification and description of the derivation system as a word-formation “nest” (family of words). Being the system of the derivational relations of the derivatives set with a common root, it makes it possible to identify not only the whole set of

affixes that can interact with a certain root, and the whole set of the word-formation meanings, implemented with their help, but it is also possible to identify the patterns of a formal adaptation of derivative morphemes, both linear and paradigmatic deployment.

Including into the derivation process of these or other mechanisms of modification of the external structure of a morpheme is not an involuntary process: it is always the result of certain factors. Accordingly, a particular attention is paid to their nature, the possibility of an interaction and role. The study of the morphonological structure of the Noun derivatives gives grounds for the conclusion that the dominant role of the phonetic (phonological) and morphological factors, which in the interaction form the morphonological position: before the morphemes with a certain phonemic composition and grammatical function of the morphemes of the corresponding phonemic structure undergo / do not undergo the transformation. Other factors (etymological, lexical, word-formation, euphonic) perform the accompanying function.

The mechanisms and methods of influencing the appearance of word-formation morphemes make it possible to distinguish among the positions of palatalization (non-transitional and transitional), depalatalization, vocalisation, devocalisation, clipping, and building up. Each morphonological transformation in the structure of the derivative is a peculiar response to a morpheme / morphemes on the demand of a morphonological position, which allows the gluing of some phono-grammatical elements and excludes the possibility of interaction of the others. The morphonological position is related not to a specific unit, but to the classes of units, motivated by their specific features, and the effect of its mechanisms is expected in the production of new vocabulary units that are demanded by the individual (individual-author) and public speech practice.

1. Morphonological Model and its Derivational Significance

Numerous noun derivatives indicate that their generation was accompanied by two or more morphonological transformations (alternating consonant phonemes and accent, alternating vowels and consonants, etc.). Therefore, to predict the morphonological structure of a new derivative word, the emphasis is on the concept that adequately reflects the dynamic nature of the word-formation act and, in many cases, the emphasis is on the obligatory component – the morphonological transformation (transformation, operations).

In our opinion, this requirement corresponds to the concept of the morphonological model in the following definition: “The morphonological model is not only a static unit of description, which reflects the immediate reality of the language, it is also an analogue of the rules of transformation inherent in the morphs of one morpheme in the corresponding paradigm [word-building also, the author’s addition – M. F.], and therefore such model can be considered as a model for the synthesis of forms in a single paradigm”¹. Its content is the rule (the system of rules) of the formal transformation of the root (the stem) of the constructive word and / or word-formation affixes during their derivational interaction, since the structure of not-markers signs – is morphonemes (in another outline – alternative rows) and submorphemes (formally identical to affixal morphemes, but asemantic segments, capable of being modified according to the same rules and influencing the way of forming of the word-building and morphonological structure of words) – they characterize certain regularities and a strict correlation of all elements. The morphoneme and submorpheme, in our understanding, are generalized, abstract entities, constituents of morphemes, which, on the plane of concrete words, represent morphons and submorphs.

The Noun word-formation “nests” (the Noun family of words) differ in their number and quality of morphonological models, their configuration at certain stages of the word-formation, because the nouns that serve their vertices are heterogeneous in terms of the morphonological structure.

Depending on the nature of the rules one should distinguish the following: the models of palatalization (C//C') and depalatalization (C'//C) – for the system of consonants, vocal (V//V, V//Ø, Ø //V, in which Ø is a phonemic zero) for the vocal system; the models of buiding up of the suffix (Hc) or the word-building stem (Ho) and the clipping (Yo) – for the quantitative transformations in the structure of morphemes, the accentological models(Ac, Ao) adjust the character of the accentuation. In our study, the concept of a morphonological model becomes particularly important because the derivative word (and the development regularities of primarily its morphological structure are investigated) is often the arena of the application of several morphological rules. Although we are aware that the application of a

¹ Кубрякова Е. С., Панкрац Ю. Г. Морфонология в описании языков. М. : Наука, 1980. С. 103.

particular model depends on the morphonological characteristics of the root (the stem, its ability/inability to the application of certain morphonological procedures).

The above mentioned facts give the grounds to differentiate elementary and non-elementary morphonological models (further: MM). The elementary model – if the morphonological structure of a derivative word is marked with one morphonological transformation of a qualitative or quantitative character. For instance, the derivatives *дубо́к, гайо́к, сино́к, ставо́к, чобіто́к* (від *дуб, гай, син, став*) are formed by means of an elementary MM “Ac”, the basis of which is the shift of stress, regulated by the following rule: in the derivative words with the modification word-formation meaning the suffix **-ок is always stressed, if the word-formation nouns belong to any word-stress paradigm (further – w-s.p.), the exception is word-stress paradigm a**. The latter conform to the other rule, which adds to the word stress a constant characteristics, for instance: *цвях – цвя́шок*. Their structure is affected by the other morphonological rule: **before the suffixes with an initial zero morphonome /z/, /k/, /x / must be alternated with /ж/, /ч/, /ш/ – the model “C//C’”**, an elementary one. The model “C//C’” represents the highest degree of of alternation generalization, because it includes all varieties of the alternations with palatalization, in particular: T//T' (intransitive palatalization of pair of non-palatalized/ palatalized phonemes, T//Č та T'//Č (a transitive palatalization of of these phonemes), K//Č (a transitive palatalization of backlingual phonemes and /z/), R//R' (an intransitive palatalization of sonorants), P//Pl, P//Pl' (a transitive palatalization of labial phonemes). In the sentences, written below, we use the most general symbol, giving additional information if necessary.

Functioning of the model “C//C’” is observed in the word-formation rows *сніг – сні́жний, гріх – грі́шний, місяць – міся́чний, кири́лиця – кири́личний, пше́нця – пше́ничний, столи́ця – столи́чний, крини́ця – крини́чний, полу́ниця – полу́ничний* and *череві́к – череві́чок, я́щик – я́щикок, го́рщик – го́рщикок, же́вжик – же́вжичок*, in which the word-formation substantives are not identical to their morphonological structure: the ones are formally not the members, the others – contain submorphemes in their structure. It is important to emphasize the following: a part of word-formation substantives with the submorpheme *-ик*, for instance, *язи́к, бали́к, кулі́к*, belonging to a word-stress paradigm *в*, illustrates a different pattern of a word-stress in the nouns

with a diminutive suffix *-ок*, hence the subordination to the regularities of the other morphonological model (MM) –“C//C'+Ac”.

It is a non-elementary model, because it is based on two, not one, morphonological models, which conform to the above mentioned rules, that interact. The mentioned above fact confirms the idea of the following: the morphonological models consist of relatively autonomous blocks², among them: the block of consonant and vowel alternations, the block of word-stress alternations, the block of linear transformations of the stem and/or the affix.

Emphasizing the relative independence of some blocks of non-elementary morphonological models, we single out the hierarchy of the formal transformations in the structure of the derived word. The following example can be illustrated: the formation of expressive pejorative derivatives *п'яню́га, бандю́га, садю́га*, мотивованих субстантивами *п'яни́ця, банди́т, сади́ст* (the morphonological model “Y+C//C'+Ac”). The morphonological transformations take place in such sequence because, on the one hand, the alternation of non-final (beforesuffixal/ beforemorphemic) consonants cannot take place earlier than clipping, which will place these consonants in a morphonological relevant position – the position of the stem's end. The word-stress shift, on the other hand, may take place only after adding the suffix, because the word-stress is often connected with the suffix in the derived word, though being “an individual characteristics of a word”, it is its “superstructure”³. The sample of the Noun word-formation nests (the Noun family of words) confirms this idea, supported by Ye. Kurylovych: the majority of suffixes – the Noun and the Verb suffixes – is not indifferent to the word-stress. The suffixes become either stressed – these are the auto-accent ones, the syllabic suffixes or the suffixes determine the word-stress a certain place in a word – these are pre-accent and post-accent suffixes, which may be syllabic and asyllabic⁴.

As follows from the above-mentioned, the model “Y+C//C'+Ac” may be used to the stems, not-identical in their word-formation structure, i. e., formed according to the models of different word-formation types,

² Толстая С. М. Морфонология в структуре славянских языков. М. : Индрик, 1998. С. 247.

³ Курилович Е. Очерки по лингвистике. Биробиджан : ИП “Тривиум”. С. 437.

⁴ Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / Гл. ред. В.Н. Ярцева. Москва : Сов. энциклопедия. 1990. С. 25.

c. f.: *п'я́н-ий* – *п'я́н-и́ц-я*, *ба́нд-а* – *банд-и́т*, *сад/и́зм*⁵ – *сад-и́ст*. The same morphonological model can mark the structure of the same-root derivatives with different word-formation suffixes, but of the same word-formation level: *Испáн/и́-а* – *испáн-е́ць*, *испáн-ськ-ий*, *Югосла́в-и́-а* – *югосла́в*, *югосла́в-ськ-ий* – the model “У”.

The examples provided above, illustrate the following item: each of morphonological model characterizes not a separate word (words), not even not a separate word-formation type (types). The morphonological models have a generalized character, because they make it possible for the new derivatives to appear from the words of a **different** word-formation structure, at **different** levels of the word-formation and in the interaction with **different** word-formation affixes. It is important for the morphonological structure and the root/the stem (as the object of a morphonological position) and the word-formation suffix (as its subject) to coincide.

Owing to their mechanisms of different positions, the morphonological models differ in their sets of morphonological transformations. However, they differ not only in their sets. The features, which characterize other linguistic phenomena, are typical of the morphonological models – regularity, activeness, productivity.

Regularity – the most important characteristics of the morphonological models, because it corresponds to the necessary condition of a systematic description of morphonology. To reveal it is the primarily task of morphonology⁶. The notion of regularity of the morphonological model is closely connected with the notion of predictability and repeatability: knowing the morphonological characteristics of the formation stem and the word-formation affix, it is easy to predict the morphonological structure of the derivative, and the identity of the morphonological structure of the morphemes of a certain class makes it possible to apply a morphonological model repeatedly. Regular morphonological models are implemented in all (or in most) derivatives that have common conditions for their application, as we observe in the example of the model “Ø//N+C//ǃ”: *ла́стівка* – *ла́стиво́чка*, *жи́нка* – *жи́ночка*, *украї́нка* – *украї́ночка*, *леби́дка* – *леби́до́чка* чи “V//Ø+T'//ǃ”: *пе́рець* – *пе́рчик*, *за́єць* – *за́йчик*, *хло́пець* – *хло́пчик*, *си́тець* – *си́тчик*, *па́лець* – *па́льчик*.

⁵The "/" separates the submorph of the root or suffix.

⁶Булыгина Т. В. Проблемы теории морфонологических моделей. М. : Наука, 1977. С. 213.

Not all researchers share the idea of the necessity of applying the notion of regularity to the morphological modifications. O. O. Reformatyskiy, for example, considered morphology as a “piece-by-piece”⁷ language, refusing thereby to give its phenomena a status of regularity. More reasons, in our opinion, have those scientists (T. V. Bulyhina, O. S. Kubryakova and Yu. H. Pankrats, K. Kovalyk, T. V. Popova, S. M. Tolstaya), who include the morphological phenomena to the list of the regular ones, while insisting, at the same time, on the special nature of the morphological regularity: the morphological rules are mostly selective, since “the regular alternation is often implemented in the above-mentioned contexts”⁸, and characterize a limited circle of lexims. Sometimes the phonological structure of the stems allows for the adoption of the alternative solutions concerning the morphological formulation of derivative words, and this results in the appearance of completely normative doublet: *Вене́ція – венеці́йський* and *венеціа́нський*, *негр – негрита́нський* and *не́грський* or even stylistically marked: *Аме́рика – америкáнський* and *амери́цький*, *ба́ски – ба́скський* and *баскíйський*. Thus, the selective character of the morphological rules, the presence of morphological variants in the system of a language is not the reason for denying the regularity of morphological changes; on the contrary, they only visualize it, subjecting the patterns noted by Ferdinand de Saussure: “Synchronous laws are general but not obligatory. That is, in the language there is no force that would guarantee the preservation of the regularity inherent in a certain phenomenon”⁹.

In each particular case of the morphological irregularity it is important to find out what this irregularity is – a deviation from the norm or the manifestation of another, perhaps, less universal morphological law. At the same time, it is very important not to make hasty conclusions, relying solely on the separate facts. So, on the background of the derivatives from the Nouns, which end in *-ня*, non-motivated, anomalous look the morphological change $\emptyset//o$ in the derivatives *ку́хня – ку́хонька, кухо́нний; су́кня – су́конька* as compared to $\emptyset//e$, which dominates in the majority of the derivatives, for example, *ста́йня – ста́єнний, ві́шня – віше́нька, шпакі́вня – шпакі́венька*.

⁷ Реформатский А. А. Фонологические этюды. Москва : Наука. 1975. С. 118.

⁸ Kovalik K. Morfonologia. *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*. Warszawa: PWN. 1998. S. 92.

⁹ Сосюр Ф. де. Курс загальної лінгвістики. К. : Основи. 1998. С. 109.

Instead, the introduction of the noun *кухня* to the circle of substantives, such as *ікра*, *цёрква*, makes it possible to formulate another morphonological rule, less powerful: **in the word-formation stems with the finals of the sample C₁Ø//VC₂ ø//o, if the segment C₁ is represented by the morphonemes {z}, {k}, {x}.**

The regular morphonological models are productive and non-productive. The productivity of the morphonological model is manifested in the extent to which it is actively used by the word-formation structures that are formally “ready” for its application, regardless of whether they belong to the productive or non-productive word-formation types.

The productive are the models “Ac”, “Hc+Ac” – they, besides fixed in the dictionaries, are also used by the current derivatives, for example, *галузевий* – *галузов-ік* (a worker of a branch industry), *силовий* – *силов-ік* (employee of the security forces); *комп'ютер* – *комп'ютер-из/ація*, *фермер* – *фермер-из/ація*, *вексель* – *вексел-из/ація*, *Америка* – *америк-ан/из/ація*, *Макдональд* – *макдональд-из/ація*.

The notion of the activity of the morphonological model is correlated with the notion of the activity of the word-formation type (model) and correlates with the notion of its lexical power: the more derivative words are marked by its intervention, the higher is its activity. Active, therefore, we must recognize those MM, under the schemes of which the maximum of derivatives are formed from the list of possible.

Taking into account the morphonological factor in the processes of neologization of the vocabulary, it is important to trace the patterns of the formation of the morphonological characteristics of the derivatives of all degrees of the Noun word-formation “nests” (the Noun family of words) for the manifestation of the nominative potencies of the substantive vocabulary. In order to make it the most economical way, we will use the notion of a morphonological model as a basic one, remembering, in the meantime, the words of S. M. Tolstaya: “Each block of a complete morphonological model requires a separate description, that is, it is necessary to describe (through the notion of a model) the alternation firstly, the linear transformations and only after that to construct a general morphonological model”¹⁰. It allows abstracting both from a particular position, from a particular transformation, and from a specific

¹⁰ Толстая С. М. Морфология в структуре славянских языков. М. : Индрик, 1998. С. 247.

morpheme, and correlating with the entire set of morphemes of a certain morphonological class and morphonological variety.

2. Morphonological Classes of Substantive Family of Words

Insisting on the necessity of studying of the morphonological features of complex units of word-formation, we proceed from the assumption that the morphonological characteristics help not only to differentiate the root and the affixal morphemes, not only to mark the certain morphemic seams, but also to carry out a number of more complex functions – to differentiate the classes and the series of forms, the paradigmatic and word-formation rows, etc.

Nowadays the word-formation nest, its subunits (word-formation paradigms, word-formation chainlets) are at the center of the Ukrainian language derivative studies. See the works of E. A. Karpilovska (1990), M. P. Lesyuk (1991), V. V. Greschuk (1995), L. I. Korzhyk (1999), Z. O. Valyukh (2005), O. P. Kushlyk (2015) and the others. And it is not accidental, because these units serve as a valid ground for proving of the word-formation systemicity¹¹. In addition, the word-formation in the direction from the source of derivation to the derived word is studied much less today than in the vice versa direction¹². Instead, a perspective approach is relevant not only in view of the possibility of obtaining the comprehensive information about the system of word-formation of each particular language, but also in terms of the comprehensive knowledge of the laws of the words synthesis of a certain structure, despite the fact that “the predictions in the word-formations are general and undefined” due to “the non-standard and irregular word-formation nests, often an individual character of their structure”¹³.

For instance, the nouns *консисторія* and *гімназія* form the adjectival derivatives in a different way, in accordance with the dictionaries – *консисторський* and *гімназіальний, гімназійний*, in spite of their similarity in form as well as their similarity in content: these words are the components of one semantic sphere – “the names of institutions, organizations”. However, this does not mean that the situation cannot be changed, that is, the adjectives of the zones of these

¹¹ Грещук В. В. Український відприкметниковий словотвір. Івано-Франківськ : Видавництво “Плаїт” Прикарпатського університету ім. В. Стефаника. 1995. С. 20.

¹² Jadacka H. Rzeczownik polski jako baza derywacyjna. Opis gniazdowy. Warszawa : PWN. 1995. S. 12.

¹³ Кубрякова Е.С., Соболева П.А. О понятии парадигмы в формообразовании и словообразовании. *Лингвистика и поэтика*. Москва : Наука. 1979. С. 16–17.

nests will always represent only those derivatives. The individual author's new words *консисто́ріальний* і *консисто́рійний* sound convincing: *Але консисто́ріальний суд твердив, що він учинив гріх – покохав у сані чернечім (Ю. Мушкетик); Ще Педько сказав, що не визнає суду консисто́рійного, бо не є монахом, а вимагатиме суду світського (Ю. Мушкетик)*, the words differ from *консисто́рський* not only in the word-formation affix, but in the morphological characteristics and the stylistic colouring – the potency of the word-formation stem.

As the word-formation nest has not only the plan of content, but also the expression, it's important to have an exhaustive idea of its morphological structure, the constituents of which are all varieties of the morphological models used in the processes of creation of various derivatives at each derivation stage (step). To do this, it is necessary to analyze the nests with the vertices of a certain grammatical class (for example, the Nouns), to establish the models of the morphological marking of derivatives at each stage of the nest, to identify the most relevant morphologically among them, and then to highlight, by comparison, the common and distinctive features in the morphological registration of the nouns of different morphological structure, because each root has its own “internal” valency, “its type of compatibility with suffixes and prefixes”¹⁴.

In connection with the lack of an academic word-formation Dictionary of the Ukrainian language, this procedure was preceded by the construction of noun word-formation nests based on the “Root Nest Dictionary of the Ukrainian language”, compiled by Ye. A. A. Karpilovskaya (2002) and “School Word-Formation Dictionary” by N. F. Klymenko, Ye. A. Karpilovska, L. P. Kyslyuk (2005). Initially, two principles were recognized: a) the principle of the structural-semantic evolution of one derivative word from another; b) the principle of the content domination over the form. This means that when establishing the word-formation relationships, the priority was given to the content, not to the form – let's compare the point of view of V. G. Golovin: “The dialectical unity of form and content will not be destroyed if in the word the formal limits of morphemes coincide with the semantic boundaries; for this, however, one must admit that

¹⁴ Лесюк М.П. Словотвірне гніздо як об'єкт дослідження словотвору. *Словотвірна та семантична структура української лексики*. Львів. 1991. С. 52–53.

semantically, and not formally, motivating words are the basis for derivation”¹⁵. In the word-formation “nest” (a word-formation family of words), formed on the basis of a semantic motivation, there dominates the parallel, paradigmatic type of word-building: the broad paradigmatic bonds of related words correlate with the communicative orientation of the word-formation process; the whole spectrum of their values the words, which serve the basis of derivation, hold the related words alongside, and these latter characterize the centripetal connections¹⁶.

The formation of the Noun word-formation “nest” (a family of words) and their morphological interpretation it is taken into account: a) the phenomena of the step-by-step word-formation; b) the plurality of the word-formation structure of the derived word, based on the plurality of the motivational relations; c) the differences in the structural interpretation of the derivatives for each motivational correlation: they are subdivided into non-identical fragments in the form aspect, which may have a different morphological interpretation.

The structure of the word-formation “nest” and the number of its components are predicted by the lexico-semantic characteristics of vertex words, namely: the type of a lexical semantics, the degree of the information content, the activity in speech, the style characteristics. The morphological characteristics, although they cannot affect the derivation processes significantly, but they are extremely important: they perform the role of those correctors, which enable (in case of some formal obstacles) the rise of many derivatives. The attention was paid, first of all, to the 1st level of the word formation as the most important in the perspective derivation analysis procedure. It is precisely that the 1st degree derivatives give the clearest idea of the word-formation potentials of the vertex words of a single structural variety, so that one can foresee the correct form of any of their derivatives in the case of the omitted stage in the word-formation “nest”. It is only necessary that they receive a certain “inquiry” from the society or an individual.

The task of a morphological qualification of the word-formation “nests” included the following items: it was necessary to find out which morphological models, at what stages and how actively they are used, how these models interact with each other (which configurations they form), as well as which word-building components are “responsible” for

¹⁵ Головин В.Г. Очерки по русской морфемике и словообразованию. Воронеж. 1990. С. 69.

¹⁶ Головин В.Г. Принципы выделения словообразовательных частей слова и их характеристика: автореф. дис. докт. филол. наук : 10.02.01. Санкт-Петербург. 1991. С. 22.

the morphological specificity of the word-formation nest (a word-formation family of words). A final stage of the analysis – the definition of the morphonological class of the word-formation “nest”. The study of the actual material showed that the morphological identity of the the word-formation “nest” corresponds first of all to the root of the vertex word: morphologically, heterogeneous vertices are unequally (in the aspect of the form) connected with the affixes of one morphonological variety, thus preventing the classification of the word-formation “nests” to different morphonological classes. Proceeding from the above-mentioned, we associate one morphonological class with the word-formation “nests”, whose vertices have identical roots in terms of morphonology, that is, there are such contact zones that do not require the use of opposing rules – palatalization / depalatalization / lengthening / clipping. One group is formed, for example, by the Nouns *брат, кум, дід, син, каба́н, каву́н, вода́, гора́, ву́хо, марал*, etc., because their stems (roots) – morphonologically unclassified forms to a unit velar consonant, which is preceded by a non-dropped vocal segment (a morphonological form of the final – C_1VC_2). This circumstance implies the application of the same morphonological rules to the selected bases in the processes of the word-formation, in particular: shifting the accent (*брату́нь, кума́сь, діду́ньо, сино́к, кабане́ць, кавуне́ць, води́ця, вуха́нь*), the rules of palatalization, often in the combination with the rules of the accent alternation (*кабаню́га, кавуня́ччя, во́дяний, ву́шко, горя́ни*), building up the suffix (*куми́вський, діди́вський, марали́вник*). It is important that the word-formation morphemes should be placed in the positions, necessary for the transformations.

When the vertex words are morphonologically non-identical, the “nests” exhibit an excellent morphonological structure. The term “the morphological structure of the “nest” denotes an ordered set of the morphonological schemes used during the formation of the derivatives of each of its degrees. In the same way, the concept of “the morphonological structure of the word-formation paradigm” is outlined: “Under the morphonological structure of the substantive paradigm, we understand the following characteristics of paradigms, such as the number of different types of the stems and their distribution between the cases ”¹⁷.

¹⁷ Толстая С. М. Морфонология в структуре славянских языков. М. : Индрик, 1998. С. 104.

We consider it relevant to distinguish between the concrete (individual) and the generalized (typical) morphonological structure. The individual morphonological structure fixes those morphonological models that make it possible to produce derivatives of a particular “nest”. The generalized morphonological structure does not characterize a separate “nest”, but a class (subclass) of the “nests”; it fixes the transformations that are used (can be used) when creating words derivatives (in our case, the nouns) of a certain morphological variety. This means that between the typical and individual morphonological structures, the differences are not qualitative but quantitative: not all morphonological schemes in the individual morphonological structure can be implemented, or their list may be richer than in the typical one.

On the example of the word-formation “nest” of the nouns *калі́на* and *топо́ля*, we will try to prove that the presence of different morphonological structures within the limits of the word-formation “nest” of one lexico-grammatical level is programmed by the peculiarities of the morphonological structure of their vertex words. Each of these nouns belongs to the lexical-semantic group of tree and bushes names. The semantic proximity of these lexims enables the word-formation interaction of their stems with the same affixes. But in the aspect of the form this interaction is not one-way, let’s compare: *калі́на* – *калі́нка*, *калі́нонька*, *калі́нник*, *калі́новий* (zero of morphonological transformations, schematically – “O”) і *топо́ля* – *топо́ленька* (with the alternation of л’//л – the morphonological model “С’//С”), *тополéвий* (the same alternation with the shift of the stress – model “С’//С + Ас”, which is illustrated in the derivatives *тополі́на*, *тополі́ця*, *тополі́ний*). The most important ground for the absence of heterogeneity is the different quality of the final consonants of the stem: it is non-palatalized in the noun *калі́на* and palatalized in the noun – *топо́ля*. The second ground is less definite, but perhaps not the most relevant for choosing the suffix from a number of synonyms – a formal (morphonological) division of the root of the noun *калина* (*кал/ин-*). The submorph *ин-* restricts the root to be combined which begin in the suffixes with /и/, in particular, *-ин(а)*, *-иц(я)*, *-ин(ий)*. If, for example, the “Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language” fixes the derivative *каліні́на* ‘калінове дерево’, along with *малі́нич*, *бузи́ніна*, then the explanatory dictionaries don’t fixate the above-mentioned derivatives. This fact gives grounds for concluding the peripheral nature of these derivatives in the system of a contemporary

Ukrainian word-formation. The given facts of the morphonological not heterogeneity of vertex words determine the classification of the analyzed word-formation “nests” to different morphonological classes.

In the morphonological structures of the “nests” of semantically different nouns *ведмідь* and *хміль* r there are much more coincidences: *хміль* – *хмелік* as in *ведмідь* – *ведмédик* – the morphological model “V//V+C//C”; *хмеліна*, *хмеліти*, as in *ведмédиця*, *ведмеді́ха* – “V//V+C//C+Ac”. They are programmed with the formal identity of the final endings of their vertices (in both nouns, the final consonants /ð’/ and /л’/ belong to palatal morphemes, which are preceded by the same vocal {e₁}, represented in the position of a closed syllable with a phoneme /i/). The Noun word-formation “nests” *ведмідь* and *хміль* are programmed with the possibility to interact with the suffixes of the identical morphonological structure. Consequently, the morphonological homogeneity of the vertex words correlates with the morphonological homogeneity of the word-formation “nests” headed by them, which gives grounds for attributing them to one morphonological class. In the course of the analysis, it was found out that there are 9 word-formation “nests” among the nouns.

The I-st morphonological class is formed by the word-formation “nests”, headed by the Nouns of the structure (CV)C₁VC₂, in which C₂ – a single velar consonant, and V – a non-dropped vocal morphoneme: *газéта*, *лободá*, *морóз*, *пінгвін*, *бджолá*, *зимá*, *лоб*, *дорóга*, *собáка*, *кáша*, etc. In the combination with the suffixes – the subjects of the positions of velarization – C₂ does not change, whereas during interaction with the suffixes of the opposite morphonological meaning it is the subject to palatalization, for example: *газéта* – *газéтка*, *газéтник*, *газéтний* (MM “O” – zero of the transformations) and *газетяр* (MM “C//C’+Ac”). The alternation of the accent in other cases may be an independent adaptive means: – *морозéць*, *морозі́ще*; *лоб* – *лобі́ще*, *лобóк*, *лоба́нь*, *лоба́стий*, *лоба́тий*, *лобові́й*.

The II-d morphonological class is closed to the Ist class, in which the C₂ root is represented by a morphonological complex: *лі́тр*, *када́стр*, *горн*, *ли́ст*, *хві́ст*, *ша́хта*, *пальто́*, *цикл*, etc. However, if the build-up operation of a suffix morph in the previous class is a peripheral morphonological phenomenon used sporadically and to the stems of mostly borrowed entities, then for this class of the “nests” it serves as a differential sign, – so much high is the productivity of the morphonological model “Hc”, especially when creating derivatives from

the borrowed nouns: *мізма – мізматіт, цикл – циклічний, плєвра – плєвральный, центр – центральный*. In addition, the build-up process in this case is sometimes double, in which the suffix is spread at once by two segments, for example, – *ат/ич/*: *міазма – міазматичний* or – *оз/*: *спирт – спиртозний*. Another morphologically relevant feature of this class – these stems foundations almost do not interact with the consonant suffixes.

The the III-d morphological class is represented by the word-formation “nests” whose vertices have the final (or the roots in general) $C_1VC'_2$ -type: *король, кінь, óсінь, місяць, кужіль, броня, мить, мідь, клуня, корість, повсть*, etc. As it can be seen from the above-mentioned examples, the segment C'_2 represents most often a single palatal consonant from a pair of palatal / non-palatal classes. Its hardening is a distinctive feature of the morphological structure of this class of the word-formation “nests”; before the suffixes of the palatalizing action and the suffixes of the ambivalent positions, it is not subject to the transformation, for example: *квасо́ля – квасо́ліна, квасо́ління, квасо́левий та квасо́лька, квасо́ляний; во́лоть – во́лотевий, во́лотістий та во́лоття*.

In the IV-th morphological class of the word-formation “nests” are united, the end of the root of which has the form of $C_1\emptyset/VC_2$. The alternation \emptyset/V is the stem of the models-differentiators of this morphological class of the “nests”: *іскра – іскорка; цєрква – цєрковця, ша́бля – ша́белька* (ММ “ \emptyset/V ”), *вікно́ – віко́нце, віко́нниця, віко́нний; лю́стро – люсте́рко; казна́ – казе́нний, казе́нщина, петля́ – петелька* (“ $\emptyset/V+Ao$ ”). In addition to the vocal, the consonant segment can be also changed in this case – C_2 : *це́гла – цеге́льня, пла́хта – плахі́ття, крі́сло – крісе́льний, крісе́льце; пі́сня – пісе́нник* – by applying the alternations $C//C'$ та $C'//C$.

These four analyzed morphological classes can be combined into one superclass, using the characteristics of the formal integrity (indivisibility) of the stem of the vertex substantive. They are opposed by the classes of the word-formation “nests”, headed by the formally divisible nouns, for example: *воло́шка, па́рубок, мужі́к, футури́зм, мелоди́я*, which are united by clipping, used at the 1st level of the word-formation more / less actively in almost every one of them. As for the nests of those morphologically-bounded substantives that do not resort to this adaptation means (for example, “*малина*”, “*ад'ютант*”), they

do not differ in their morphonological design from the “nests” of the CVC and CVC’-vertices, and therefore we consider them to be the subclasses of the latter, emphasizing, however, on their morphonological homogeneity.

The Word-formation “nests” with the vertex words *космэтика, футуризм, космос, пленум, градус* form **the V-th morphonological class**. In addition to the defining feature – clipping – in this case other ways are applied – the alternation of the accent, the final consonants, building up of the suffix: *му́жик – мужва́* and *му́жичо́к, му́жицький; ко́смос – космо́чний*.

The VI-th morphonological class is the word-formation “nest” of the nouns, which end in *-ія*: extremely numerous, on the one hand, neither homogeneous in terms of origin, nor in terms of meaning and structure – on the other hand, it is characterized by the complexity of the morphonological characteristics, and therefore needs to be singled out.

The word-formation “nest” of the nouns with the submorphs of ØC-forms is distributed among **the VII-th** and **the VIII-th classes**. To **the VII-th** class, belong the word-formation “nests” on the analogy with the word “*галка*”, which, in addition to clipping, also use actively the alternation Ø // V in the combination with K(C’)//Č, for example: *га́лка – га́леня’* and *га́лочка*. **The VIII-th class** is formed by the ones from the nouns of C₁/#C₂-structure, which use the alternation V//Ø, that is *па́рубок, за́ець*.

The IX-th morphonological class forms the word-formation “nest” of the non-declinable borrowed nouns, such as: *либрéто, шосé, алóе*, some of which favor the operation of clipping of the final vowel (*либрéтист*), the others – building up the root (*шосéйний*), and the others – use both: clipping and building up (*алóйний*).

Consequently, each word-formation “nest” (the word-formation family of words) has a certain morphonological structure, the components of which are morphonological models of the formal adaptation of the word-formation morphemes, applied at each of the levels/stages of the word-formation, if they meet the requirements of the content compatibility. The peculiarity of each of the structures determines the first level of the word-formation, at which the stem of the particular formality interacts with the word-formation affixes of a different morphonological structure with the help of certain morphonological transformations, determining, on the one hand, the morphonological characteristics of the derivatives of the subsequent

stages and motivating, on the other hand, the attribution each of the “nests” to a certain morphonological class.

CONCLUSIONS

The continuous updating of the vocabulary of the modern Ukrainian language requires a thorough study of the regularities, means and possibilities of Ukrainian word-formation, as it is the leading source of enrichment of its lexical composition. Nowadays, it has been established that the Slavic languages (including the Ukrainian one) have well-developed morphological systems. Their means (the alternation of vowels and consonant phonemes, the accentuation, clipping, building up of morphemes) mark the processes of the word-change and the word-formation in the case of the formal incompatibility of the morphemes used, despite the fact that morphonology of the word-change and morphology of the word-formation are two separate chapters within morphonology as a science.

The most complete understanding of the derivation system of a particular language and its generative possibilities gives the rise to the study of its complex units, primarily the word-formation “nests” (family of words). Taking into account the topicality of the morphonological transformations and their interaction in the structure of the derived words, it is important to find out the role of the morphonological means of the language in the formation of a plan of the expression of the word-formation “nests” and in their differentiation. For this purpose, more than 1,500 of the substantive word-formation “nests” have been analyzed, and their morphonological structure as a component of the expression plan with the help of the concept of the morphonological model. The morphonological model fixes all modifications of the plan of expression of the word-formation morphemes during the derivation procedure. The configuration of the models of different word-formation “nests” does not coincide. This gave rise to the selection of nine morphonological classes of Ukrainian word-formation “nests”.

The most important feature of such study is that the facts of the word-formation morphonology are studied in this research in the perspective direction, that is, from the source of derivation word. This allows not only to answer in detail the question of the connecting (at the level of the form) properties of the substantive roots and the derivatives from them, not only to highlight the dominant synchronous

morphonological system, which subordinate the processes of creation of new derivatives, but also to predict the possible shifts in it.

SUMMARY

The article focuses on the topicality of studying the morphonological structure of the Noun word-formation “nests” (family of words). It is been confirmed that the morphonological transformations of the word-formation morphemes are an active component of the derivative processes. They are regulated by certain morphonological rules that form the essence of the corresponding morphonological laws and the basis of the morphonological models that are differentiated by the qualitative (palatalization, depalatalization, building up, clipping) criteria and the quantitative (elementary, non-elementary) criteria. The topicality of the launching mechanisms of one or other model of the corresponding phono-grammatical conditions has been proved. It is formed by the connecting segments of morphemes, primarily the root (the stem) and the word-formation suffix, because this morphemic “seam” is the most topical for the morphonology of the Noun derivation. It has been determined that each word-formation “nest” (family of words) has its own morphonological pattern, which gives grounds for enrolling it into one of the morphonological classes of the Noun word-formation “nests”.

REFERENCES

1. Jadacka H. Rzeczownik polski jako baza derywacyjna. Opis gniazdowy. Warszawa : PWN. 1995. 216 s.
2. Kovalik K. Morfonologia. *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*. Warszawa : PWN. 1998. S. 59–97.
3. Булыгина Т. В. Проблемы теории морфонологических моделей. М. : Наука. 1977. Ст. 213.
4. Головин В. Г. Очерки по русской морфемике и словообразованию. Воронеж. 1990. 157 с.
5. Головин В. Г. Принципы выделения словообразовательных частей слова и их характеристика : автореф. дис. ... докт. филол. наук : 10.02.01. Санкт-Петербург. 1991. 44 с.
6. Грещук В. В. Український відприкметниковий словотвір. Івано-Франківськ : Видавництво “Плай” Прикарпатського університету ім. В. Стефаника. 1995. 208 с.

7. Кубрякова Е. С., Панкрац Ю. Г. Морфонология в описании языков. М. : Наука, 1980. 119 с.
8. Кубрякова Е. С., Соболева П. А. О понятии парадигмы в формообразовании и словообразовании. *Лингвистика и поэтика*. Москва : Наука. 1979. С. 5–23.
9. Курилович Е. Очерки по лингвистике. Биробиджан : ИП “Тривиум”. 490 с.
10. Лесюк М. П. Словотвірне гніздо як об’єкт дослідження словотвору *Словотвірна та семантична структура української лексики*. Львів. 1991. С. 52–53.
11. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / Гл. ред. В. Н. Ярцева. Москва : Сов. энциклопедия. 1990. 685 с.
12. Реформатский А. А. Фонологические этюды. Москва : Наука. 1975. 134 с.
13. Сосюр Ф. де. Курс загальної лінгвістики. К. : Основи. 1998. 324 с.
14. Толстая С. М. Морфонология в структуре славянских языков. М. : Индрик, 1998. 318 с.

Information about the authors:

Fedurko M. Y.

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,
Head of the Department Philological Disciplines and Methods
of Their Teaching in Primary School,
Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
64/17, Stryyska str., Drohobych, 82100, Ukraine

Kushlyk O. P.

Doctor of Philology,
Professor at the Ukrainian Language Department,
Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
16/3, A. Sheptytskyj str., Drohobych, 82104, Ukraine