

MORPHONOLOGICAL UNITS IN THE SYSTEM OF UKRAINIAN WORD-FORMATION FROM THE NOUN

Fedurko M. Yu., Czyżewski Feliks

INTRODUCTION

1931 is considered to be the year of the formation of a new linguistic discipline – morphonology, in the history of a linguistic science. In the very year, a programme article, written by M. S. Trubetsky, “Gedanken über Morphonologie” was published in the “Travaux de Cercle Linguistique de Prague”, No. 4. Defining morphonology as a science of the principles of a morphological use of the language phonological means, he identified three aspects of each and outlined the tasks of each of them. Three years later, in the work “Das morphonologische System der russischen Sprache”, the scientist proposed a model of applying his model of morphonology to the analysis of the morphonological facts of a particular language.

The works of M. S. Trubetsky became a kind of summary of the searches and achievements in this area of linguistics for many generations of the researchers. After all, the question of the compatibility of sounds and their mutual influences were analysed by the authors of ancient Indian grammars. In particular, Panini in his “Vosmyknyzhya” / “Eight Books”, paid a considerable attention to the analysis of the equivalents of the modern morphonological transformations to the phenomena of sandhi (ie, the changes in sounds at the morphemic sutures and on the verge of words) and vrddhi and hunas (the alternation of vowels in the roots). Therefore, the topicality of the morphonological patterns for grammar was already understood by the researchers.

All morphological problems, discussed since M. S. Trubetsky period, can be grouped into two groups: 1) the general theoretical problems of morphology; 2) the problems analysis of the morphonological systems of languages with a high degree of phenomena activity of the morphemes formal modification by their combination in the processes of word-change and word-formation. In the list of the first are the most relevant issues on the status of morphonology and its units, the classification of the automatic (due to the existing phonetic laws) alternations, the correlation / incompatibility of the morphonological transformations with the plan of a language content and the presence / absence of isomorphology among the morphonological phenomena of word-change and word-formation.

Modern researchers of morphonology are unanimous in the opinion on the expediency of distinguishing the morphonology of word-change and word-formation in view of the specific nature of the rules and patterns inherent in them. The provisions on the functional significance of the transformation means of the plan of expression of morphemes, their correlation with certain morphonological or word-formation categories and rules, nowadays, also do not raise any admonition. The matter looks different with the first two questions. Some researchers consider only phonemic (historical, morphonological) alternation to be the object of morphonology, while the others consider both variants of alternations within morphonology. Equally debatable is the question of the appropriateness of morphonology units distinguishing, especially taking into account its intermediate status in the level organization of a language. But even the supporters of a positive solution to it do not illustrate any unanimity. Some of them consider it advisable to distinguish two morphonological units – a morphoneme and a sub-morph (intermorph), the others – only one of them.

The analysis of the morphonological phenomena in the system word-formation from the Noun, the study of the morphonological structure of all morphonological types of non-substantive word-formation nests convinced us of the opinion on the special character of the morphonological level of a language. It is not only intermediate (at which there takes place the transition from the insignificant linguistic entities to the significant ones), but also independent (it may refer to a system of new relations). The so-called independence of morphonology gives grounds for justification and selection of the morphonological units, in particular in the sub-system of the word-formation from the Noun.

From the history of distinguishing and analysis of the morphonological units

With the singling out of the morphonological issues into an independent field of linguistics, in the linguistic literature the discussion began on the expediency of allocating morphonemes and sub-morphs (or interfixes) as morphonological units. O. S. Akhmanova, G. Aronson, S. B. Bernstein, O. S. Kubriakova, E. A. Makayev, L. Pysarek, T. V. Popova, O. O. Reformatskyi convinced that morphonology, as a doctrine of the phonological representation regularities of morphemes and their rows, does not need a special unit: all cases of the morphemes formal variation, in their opinion, can be adequately described in terms of alternations. T. V. Bulyhina, D. S. Wort, V. B. Kasevych, K. Kovalik, V. V. Lopatin, R. Laskowski, S. M. Tolstaya, M. S. Trubetsky, Z. Harris, V. H. Churhanova, on the contrary, substantiated the linguistic reality of the

morphological units, their importance for the correct description of languages with a high activity of the morphological phenomena.

Both approaches have the supporters and the opponents among the current researchers of morphonology. Thus, N. I. Danilina, investigating the morphonological systems of non-related languages (classical, Germanic, Slavic, and finding the relation among them in synchrony and diachrony, refuses to use the term “morphoneme”. In her opinion, in “any of its meanings it has the correct alternative nominations”¹. The term “morphoneme” is not used by S. Zdziebko in the analysis of the consonant morphonology of the Polish language². Describing the morphological level of the language synthesis model, I. B. Itkin, on the contrary, uses the term and the concept of “morphoneme”, instead he considers it to be inappropriate in the concept of “sub-morph”³. In the work of O. I. Antypov on the problems of Russian dialect morphonology, the term “morphoneme” is not represented, but the author used the term “sub-morph”⁴.

Using the concept and the term “morphoneme”, the representatives of different linguistic schools and areas do not demonstrate a unified view of a morphoneme as a distinct linguistic phenomenon. The Polish scientist H. Ulaszyn, who introduced this term, understood it as a phoneme in the semasiological-morphological function⁵, that is, as an elementary component of the morph, undergoing the alternation within the morpheme. In the spirit of H. Ulaszyn’s ideas, Russian researcher V. H. Churhanova formulated the concept of a morphoneme as an elementary unit of morphonology: a morphoneme is a unit that reflects the unity of the strong (it is represented by a phonemic series with a strong phoneme) and the weak (a phonemic series without a strong phoneme, for example, {o} in the first syllable of the Russian word *корова* (a cow)) phonemes of one class, interpreted as a component of a real morpheme (morph)⁶.

M. S. Trubetskoy, a contemporary of H. Ulaszyn, based his vision of morphonemy on J. Baudouin de Courtenay’s thought of “the homogeneous phonemes that arose from a single phoneme”⁷: it is “a complex image of two or more phonemes that can, in accordance with the conditions of the

¹ Данилина Н. И. Морфонологические системы в синхронии и диахронии (на материале неблизкородственных языков) : автореф. дис. ... докт. филол. наук : специальность 10.02.19. Саратов, 2012. С. 11.

² Zdziebko S. Modelling morpho-phonology : consonant replacements in Polish. *Studies in Polish Linguistics*. 2012. № 7. С. 129–164.

³ Иткин И. Б. Русская морфонология. – М. : Гнозис, 2007. С. 56.

⁴ Антипов А. Г. Морфонологическая категоризация словообразовательной формы : автореф. дис. ... докт. филол. наук : 10.02.01. – Кемерово, 2002. – 38 с.

⁵ Ulaszyn H. Laut, Phonema, Morphonema. *Travaux de Cercle Linguistique de Prague*. 1931. V. 4. P. 61.

⁶ Чурганова В. Г. Очерк русской морфонологии. М. : Наука 1973. С. 35–36.

⁷ Бодуэн де Куртэнэ И. А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. В 2 тт. М. : Изд-во АН СССР. 1963. Т. 1. С. 272.

morphological structure of the word, substitute each other within the same morpheme”⁸. This definition has been repeatedly criticized, especially for an excessive psychologism. O. Reformatskyi criticized it severely: “The searches of a linear semantics forced M. Trubetsky to introduce an unrealistic and unnecessary unit for the structure of a language – it has no counterpart in an objective linguistic reality; there is only correspondence or alternation of a morpheme variants”⁹.

In his later work “Das morphonologische System der russischen Sprache”, M. S. Trubetsky, for the definition of a morphoneme, focuses on the main task of morphonology: to investigate the nature and extent of the morphonological changes, combinatorial and free: “Each alternation receives correspondence in the linguistic consciousness of the speakers in the form of a morphoneme – a morphonological unit, that can be represented as a set of phonemes, involved in a particular alternation”¹⁰. Close to this interpretation of a morphoneme – as a set of the phonemic alternatives – is inherent in the works of N. Ye. Ilyina, Z. F. Oliverius, M. V. Panova and the others. The supporters of the generative method (T. V. Bulyhina, D. Wort, R. Laskowski, M. Halle) consider a morphoneme as an element of the deep (abstract, vocabulary) form of a morpheme, from which all the surface forms can be deduced by means of the corresponding rules. According to R. Laskowski, a morphoneme is an elementary unit of a morphonological form of a morpheme – abstracted from the morphological contexts of an ideal form of a morpheme, which can be represented by one or more distinct phonological forms. The inventory of morphonemes should be established on the basis of the analysis of all the alternative series inherent in a particular language. It is essential that a morphoneme, as an abstract unit, may not coincide with any of its representatives, such as, for example, the morphoneme of the Polish language {*r*'}, represented on the surface (phonetic) level by / *ż* /: *piekarze* and /*r*/: *piekarnia*¹¹. Each morphoneme is created by the distinctive features. For vowels, it is forcefulness, a high elevation, a front row, longitude; for consonants – sonority, voiceless, voiced characteristics, a back row, labiality, an anterior row, alveolarity, continuity, explosiveness. The primary purpose of these characteristics is to distinguish the morphonological representations of the morphemes¹².

⁸ Trubetsky N. S. Sur la “morphologie”. *Travaux de Cercle Linguistique de Prague*. 1929. V. 1. P. 85.

⁹ Реформатский А. А. О соотношении фонетики и грамматики. *Вопросы грамматического строя*. М. : Изд-во АН СССР. 1955. С. 99.

¹⁰ Трубецкой Н.С. Избранные труды по филологии. М. : Прогресс. 1987. С. 88.

¹¹ Laskowski R. Budowa morfonologiczna polskich przyrostków rzeczownikowych. *Język polski*. 58. 1973. S. 133.

¹² Laskowski R. *Studia nad morfonologia współczesnego języka polskiego*. Wrocław : WPAN. 1975. S. 19–23.

The diacritical function of a morphoneme is also emphasized by S. V. Bromley: this is an abstract alternate row with a fixed distribution of its elements between the certain forms of the grammatical system, for example: the 1-person singular form of the present tense – all other forms that represent the allomorphs, the number of which is motivated by the list of the specific alternative rows. Each of them has its own set of differential features, such as “a dental sound – a palatal sound” – in allomorphs with *с’//ш*, with *з’//ж* of the same Russian verbal forms *носитъ – ношу*, *возитъ – вожу* or “a dental sound – a palatal, explosive sound – an affricate sound” of the allomorphone *т’//ч* in the opposition of *лететь – лечу*¹³.

A peculiar, different from the analyzed one, approach to the interpretation of morphoneme was proposed by J. Kuryłowicz. According to the scientist’s opinion, a morphoneme is an excessive morph, which can be considered only in the case of a double phonological characterization of a grammatical category, cf., *das Kind* (in German) “дитина (a baby)” – *die Kinder* (in German) “*dimu (kids)*”, but *Band* (in German) “стрічка (a ribbon)” – *die Bänder* “стрічку (ribbons)”¹⁴. The scientist refers to this notion any variable part of the morpheme – and the phoneme-alternative, and each of the extensors of the morpheme, and the accent curve. The same broad understanding of a morphoneme is characteristic of the works of V. V. Lopatin¹⁵ and V. O. Horpynych, cf., “For the word-formation, one can adopt the following definition of a morphoneme: it is a row of the morphonological phenomena, caused by accommodation in morphs of the motivational words and derivatives, formed in a certain word-formation position”¹⁶.

All the analyzed views on a morphoneme are combined in the two mutually opposite ones. The representatives of the first view define a morphoneme as an element of the contextual representative of a morpheme, that is, as an element of a morph (H. Ułaszyn, V. H. Churhanova), and the representatives of the second view – as an element of a morpheme, regardless of how they define the morphoneme – or as a set of phonemes, located in the relations of alternation (M. S. Trubetskoy, A. A. Zemskaia, M. V. Panov, N. Ye. Ilyina, V. V. Lopatin, Z. Oliverius), or as a certain abstraction, invariant (D. Wort, P. Laskowski, K. Kovalik, T. V. Bulyhina, S. V. Bromley).

¹³ Бромлей С.В. Морфонология и грамматика. *Общеславянский лингвистический атлас*. 1974. С. 33.

¹⁴ Kuryłowicz J. The notion of morpho(pho)neme. *Directions for historical linguistics : A symposium* / Ed. by W. P. Lehman and Y. Malkiel. Austin : London. 1968. P. 70.

¹⁵ Лопатин В. В. Русская словообразовательная морфемика. 1977. С. 291.

¹⁶ Горпинич В. О. Сучасна українська літературна мова : Морфеміка. Словотвір. Морфонологія. К. : Вища школа, 1999. С. 17.

The differences in approaches to the interpretation of morphonomy have the consequence of differences in the design of their inventory. For linguists focused on the phonological level of language, and therefore on the phonological nature of morphoneme, it matches (or almost coincides) with the phonological inventory. In those who uphold the functional essence of morphonomy, the number of them is determined by the alternate series available in the language and significantly exceeds the number of phonemes.

We share the opinion of those linguists, who support the level status of morphonology: it has two levels (lower and higher; a lower level is adjacent with a phonological one, a higher level is adjacent with a morphological one); morphonology has two units – a morphoneme (morphophoneme) and a sub-morph (more precisely – a sub-morpheme). In the systematic study of morphonology, V. H. Churhanova was one of the first to use the term “sub-morph”. In her opinion, it is a unit that expresses the “morphonological unity of the regularly organized elements of the sound structure of a word, not distinguished at the morphological level, with the elements distinguished”¹⁷. Another Russian researcher S. M. Tolstaya supports the author’s efforts to provide a representation of the morphonological level of a language with the help of the homogeneous units peculiar to it, but she considers this definition contradictory for at least two reasons. Firstly, she erases the contradistinction between the two-plan and one-plan units of a language. Secondly, she defines the paradigmatic unit through the units of another level of abstraction of a morphoneme, as the components of the morph¹⁸.

E. A. Zemskaya interprets the term “sub-morph” much more narrowly: these are the parts of the root morphemes that have no meaning in the word, but only coincide with affixal sets of phonemes and different types of alternations¹⁹.

For the Slovak researcher J. Bosak, the sub-morphs are the results of the development of relations between the form and the content and / or the products of a synchronous desemantization. They either emphasize the opposition between the stem and the word-forming affix, or express the derivative seams, or help to avoid the undesirable alternations or to combine formally incompatible word-forming morphemes. Other terms used in linguistic science – interfix, formative, asemantema, struktema – do not reflect the formal and functional essence of these linguistic phenomena. The term “sub-morph” expresses such an important attribute

¹⁷ Чурганова В. Г. Очерк русской морфонологии. М. : Наука. 1973. С. 38.

¹⁸ Толстая С. М. Морфонология в структуре славянских языков. М. : Индрик, 1998. С. 58–59.

¹⁹ Земская Е. А. Современный русский язык. Словообразование. М. : Просвещение. 1973. С. 81.

of them as independence, and hence the ability to relate to the content plan only through the segments with a full morpheme status and to be considered in relation to their invariants – morphemes²⁰.

Consequently, the recognition / non-recognition of a morphoneme and a sub-morph as specific linguistic units, the choice of the method of their interpretation depends on the theoretical and methodological guidelines of the author, from his advocated approach to the interpretation of morphonology, its subject and tasks. Considering morphonology to be a special sphere of the language system, we admit its right to have its own units – a morphoneme as a result of generalization of phonemes and a sub-morph as a result of generalization of sub-morphs.

Morphonemes of the word-formation from the Noun

Recognizing morphoneme as a morphological unit requires fulfilling the following tasks: 1) to outline the criteria for their selection; 2) to determine an inventory of morphonemes; 3) to detect the system connections between them. In our study, we follow a functional approach to delineating the essence of a morphoneme, and following S. M. Tolstaya's point of view, we recognize it as an abstract, generalized unit, a component of a morpheme²¹ (see) in J. Baudouin de Courtenay's work: "In alternatives, the correspondence, coincidence, and difference of morphemes is reduced to the correspondence, coincidence, and distinction of the phonemes from which they consist, say [*mog-mož*] splits into *m//m*, *o//o*, *g//ž*"²². We consider the phonemes to represent the morphonemes, since "the units of any intermediate levels can be defined as the specific integrants of the units of the nearest of the higher ones, implemented in the units of the nearest lower level"²³.

In order to establish the inventory of Ukrainian morphonemes, the following criteria are relevant primarily: 1) vocal / consonant; 2) constancy / variability; 3) velar / palatal.

The roots of the following words illustrate the presence of a constant vocal morphonemes {*a*}, {*o*}, {*y*}, {*e*}, {*i*}, {*u*}: *xáta/xat* – *xat-ín-a*, *xát-k-a*; *sová/sov* – *sóvka*, *sovj-átk-o*, *sov-ín-ий*, *sov-í-ти*; *zubá/zub* – *zúbka*, *zub-ríи*, *zub-иц-е*, *zúb-част-ий*, *zub-ниий*; *verbá/verb* – *verb-иц'а*, *verb-н'ак*; *лiс* – *лiс-ók*, *лiс-н-ий*, *за-лiс-и-ти*; *син* – *син-ен'-á*, *у-син-ов/и-ти*. In different words with the same root they are represented by the same phoneme. Variable morphonyms are also possible in the roots, such as {*o₁*}

²⁰ Bosák J., Byzássvová K. Východiska morfémovej analýzy. Morfematika-slovotvorba. Bratislava : Veda. 1985. S. 80.

²¹ Толстая С. М. Морфонология в структуре славянских языков. М. : Индрик. 1998. С. 57.

²² Бодуэн де Куртэнэ И. А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. В 2 тт. М. : Изд-во АН СССР. 1963. Т. 1. С. 276.

²³ Маслов Ю. С. Об основных и промежуточных ярусах в структуре языка. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1968. С. 79.

(нога́/ніг – ніжка), {o₂} кров – кр^ів-ц'-а, крив-áв-ий, (но)кр^і-ти – покр^ов – покр^івля; {e₁} (сел^о/сіл – сіл'-це); {e₂} (вест^і – вод-і-ти – прив^од-и-ти – пр^івід); {a₁}: хан^ати – с-хон-і-ти, etc.

Non-constant vocal morphonemes are also possible in affixes. These are:

1) the morphoneme {o₁} (with the alternatives /o/ in an open syllable and /i/ in a closed syllable) of the suffix -ість: мел^одія – мел^оді-н-ий – мел^оді-н-і-сть / мел^оді-н-ост-і;

2) the morphoneme {o₃} of the suffix -ов-/-ев-; the alternative /o/ functions after the stems which end in: a) a hard morphoneme, except {ж}, {ч}, {ш}, {дж} (ліс – ліс-ов-ій, ст^{ен} – ст^{ен}-ов-ій); b) a soft morphoneme, but combined with a stressed inflexion (грязь – гряз'-ов-ій, стил^ь – стил'-ов-ій); the alternative /e/ is possible to be used after the stems, which end in: a) a soft morphoneme, realized by a hard alternative (the exception – the stems, which end in -ня, -тя: насін^{ня} – насінн'-ев-ий, житт^я – житт'-ев-ий) in the adjectives with an unstressed inflexion (фор^ель – фор^ел-ев-ий, штол^ьня – штол^ьн-ев-ий); b) in {ж}, {ч}, {ш}: груш^а – груш-ев-ий; the alternative /i/ is used in the following word-formation model: мал^ін-ов-ий – мал^іні-в-к-а, груш-ев-ий – груш^і-в-к-а;

3) the morphoneme {i₁} in the suffixes -іст / -ист, -ічн- / -ичн-, -ізм / -изм, -ік- / -ик-, -інг / -инг, -іт/-ит, -ін/-ин: журн^ал – журн^ал-іст / хор – хор-іст, ггієна – ггієн-ічн-ий / клім^ат – клім^ат-ічн-ий, хімія – хімі-ік / сат^іра – сат^ір-ик, К^учма – кучм-ізм / патрі^от – патрі^от-ізм;

4) the morphoneme {y₁} as a component of the verbal suffix -ува-: ч^ари – чар-ув^а-ти – чар^ів-ий, (за)чар^ова-н-ий.

The Noun roots also illustrate zero morphonemes: {#₁} (я'с^ола – я'сел-к-а – ∅//e); {#₂} (ноч^ови – ноч^ов-к-и with the alternation ∅//o, rarely ∅//i: крих^ота – крих^іт-н-ий, церк^ова – церк^ів-к-а), {#₃} (вітер – віт^ор-іл-о with the alternation e//∅); {#₄} (кіг^оть – кіг^от'-áст-ий with the alternation o//∅). A small part of the verbal roots also contains them: {∅-e-и-о-і} б^ра^ти/б^{ер}у – заб^ір^ати – заб^ір/заб^ору; {∅-e-о-і-а} г^он^ати/ж^{ен}у – (про)г^он^іти – прог^ін, прог^ан^яти. They are found in the suffixes: {#₄} (став – став-^ок – став^оч-ок, but став^ок-^ов-ий).

The palatability characteristics / the velar characteristics is the very characteristics on which the varieties of the consonant alternative types, typical of a modern language, are based; the palatal alternative types: вод-á – вод'-áв-ий (ð//ð'), сел-ó – сел'-áн-и (л//л'), д^ір-á – д^ір'-áв-ий (p//p') and the depalatalization alternative types: ч^ел^ядь – ч^ел^яд-і^н (ð//ð), топ^ол'-а – топ^ол'-ен^ьк-а (л'/л), см^ер^ть – см^ер^т-н-ий (т'/т). The palatalization / depalatalization is intransitive: тол^окн-ó – тол^окн'-áн/к-а

(н//н'), *росá* – *рós'-аний* (с//с'), *пра́ца* – *прац-е-лю́б* (ц//ц) і перехідною: *вовк* – *вóвч-ий* (к//ч), *Соло́х-а* – *Соло́ш-ин* (х//ш).

Under the same conditions (for example, in the positions of palatalization), different consonantal phonemes illustrate different behaviours:

1) are not palatalized (/ж/, /ч/, /ш/, /дж/, /н'/, /л'/, /р'/, /j/): *міш-а* – *міш-к-а* (cf, *рук-á* – *руч-к-а*), *пожéж-а* – *пожéж-н-ий* (cf, *сніг* – *сніж-н-ий*), *зор'-á* – *зór'-ан-ий*;

2) they undergo only an intransitive palatalization (/л/, /н/, /р/, /ц/): *сіл-а* – *сіл'-н-ий* (л//л'), *глін-а* – *глін'-ан-ий* (н//н'), *багр-а* – *багр'-ан-ій* (р//р');

3) only a transitive palatalization (/г/, /к/, /х/, /т/, /ц'/, /д'/, /т'/, /з'/, /с'/, /дз'/, /б/, /н/, /в/, /м/, /ф/): *сніг* – *сніж-ок* (г//ж), *ног-á* – *ноз'-а* (г//з'), *рук-á* – *руц'-а* (к//ц'), *вух-о* – *вус'-о* (х//с'), *місяц'* – *місяч-éньк-о*, *ведмід'* – *ведмéж-ий* (д'/ж), *солóm-а* – *солómj-ан-ий* (м//mj);

4) an intransitive and transitive palatalization (/д/, /т/, /з/, /с/, /дз/): *верблю́д* – *верблю́д'-ячий* (д//д'), *верблю́ж-ий* (д//ж).

The above-mentioned and the phonemes behavior in positions of depalatalization give grounds to single out the morphonemes classes:

– {н}, {л}, {р}, {ц} as a result of generalizing of the alternatives {н-н'}, {л-л'}, {р-р'}, {ц-ц'} in the palatalization positions;

– {н'}, {л'}, {р'}, {ц'} as a result of generalizing of the alternatives {н'-н}, {л'-л}, {р'-р}, {ц'-ц} in the depalatalization positions;

– {к}, {г}, {х}, {т} as a result of generalizing of the alternatives {к-ц'-ч}, {г-з'-ж}, {х-с'-ш}, {т-дз'-дж} in the palatalization positions;

– {б}, {м}, {ф}, {в} as a result of generalizing of the alternatives {б-бj-бл'-бл}, {н-нj-нл'-нл}, {м-мj-мл'-мл}, {ф-фj-фл'-фл}, {в-вj-вл'-вл} in the palatalization positions;

– {д'}, {т'}, {з'}, {с'}, {дз'}, {ц'} as a result of generalizing of the alternatives {д'-ж}, {т'-ч}, {з'-ж}, {с'-ш}, {дз'-дж}, {ц'-ч} in the palatalization positions and {д'-д}, {т'-т}, {з'-з}, {с'-с}, {дз'-дз}, {ц'-ц} – in the depalatalization positions;

– {д}, {т}, {з}, {с}, {дз} as a result of generalizing of the alternatives {д-д'-ж/дж}, {т-т'-ч}, {з-з'-ж}, {с-с'-ш}; {дз-дз'-дж};

– {ж}, {ч}, {ш}, {дж}, {j} – the consonant morphonemes, which are realized in different positions by the same phoneme;

– {ж₁}, {ч₁}, {ш₁} as a result of generalizing of the alternatives {ж-г}, {ч-к}, {ш-х}; these morphonemes are more often represented by the verbal roots: *кричати* – *крик*, *пищати* – *писк*, dialectal *ю́шитися* – *ю́ха*, and in the nominal roots they are morphonological rarities: *протезе* – *протез-ува́-ти*;

– {ч₂}, {ш₂} as a result of generalizing of the alternatives {ч-ц'}, {ш-с'} of the word-formation pairs: *дочка – доця, сорочка – сороця, подушка – подуся*;

– {ц₁}, {с₁}, {з₁} as a result of generalizing of the alternatives of the loan roots (stems) {ц-т} (*перцепція – перцептивний*), {с-т} (*емісія – емітент*), {з-т} (*синтез – синтетичний*); the word-formation pairs on the analogy with *спазм – спастичний* demonstrate the alternation *зм//ст* – the morphoneme {зм}.

The analysis of paradigmatics in the morphonemes system of the noun word-formation gives grounds to state that there are 16 vocal {а, о, у, е, и, і, о₁, о₂, о₃, е₁, і₁, у₁, #₁, #₂, #₃, #₄} and 41 consonant morphonemes {ж, ч, ш, ј, дж, л, м, р, т, з, к, х, ц, ц', д', т', з', с', дз', б, п, м, в, ф, д, т, з, с, дз, л', н', р', ж₁, ч₁, ш₁, ч₂, ш₂, ц₁, с₁, з₁, зм}

Sub-morphemes of the word-formation from the Noun

Since morphonology also distinguishes the morpheme sublevel, it is necessary to distinguish and to characterize its unit representatives in the morphonological description. They must illustrate the signs that are common with morphemes in the language, but not equal to them, do not reach their status. The most important ones in their list are: having a morphonemic structure peculiar to the morphemes of a particular language and occupying the same position in the word stem; outwardly coincide with language morphemes and be modified according to the same rules; to influence the way of a word-formation and morphonemic structure of words. The term “sub-morpheme” expresses: a) the dependent nature of these units, their subordination to the morphemes in which they act and only through which they participate in the expression of a particular (class or categorical) value; b) their potential to exist in several positionally predetermined formal manifestations – the sub-morphs, regulated by the morphological norms of a language. The sub-morphs, therefore, are indented on the plane of real words (non-derivatives and derivatives) as special components of their minimal significant parts – the root and affix morphs. On condition of the form coincidence of these two entities – morphemes and sub-morphemes, we consider them homonymous units. This is how the meaningful relations between different implementers – suffixes, suffixal relations – one suffixeme are considered by E. A. Karpilovska: “We see the manifestation of the content dimension in those suffix relations that can be homonymous with suffixes. Within the homonymity spectrum, we identify the links that are similar to both these functional types of suffixes or one of them”²⁴.

²⁴ Карпіловська Є. А. Суфіксальна підсистема сучасної української літературної мви : будова і реалізація. К. : Ін-т мовознавства ім. О. О. Потебні НАН України. 1999. С. 249.

By the term “suffixal relations” the researcher covers only sub-morphs, such as *-аль* in *містєрія – містєрі-аль/н-ий*, *-ей* in *Європа – європ-ей/ський*, *-т* – in *арго – арго/т-ізм*, considering it to be the most explicit among all suggested in the linguistic literature “the position of these elements in the stem of a word and their purpose in it”. K. Kovalik offers a close meaning of the term “intermorph” for the characteristics of the same segments²⁵.

Both researchers do not agree to recognize these elements as purely structural: according to the degree of involvement in the construction of the semantic structure of the derivative word, they distinguish the semantically empty components and the components that express a certain additional meaning. N. F. Klymenko attributes to these segments (asemantems) a purely constructive function. This is the construction material that helps to “eliminate the difficulty of combining morphemes at their seams and to express the motivational relationships between words more clearly...”²⁶.

As the factual material attests, the sub-morph class is not homogeneous. The scientists classify them on the basis of different criteria. V. V. Lopatin’s classification is based on 3 criteria: functional, formal and regular²⁷.

On the basis of the former, they are divided into 3 groups of sub-morphs: a) the sub-morphs, relevant for the presence / absence in all morphs of some morpheme – root or suffix; b) the sub-morphs, relevant for the compatibility of morphemes with certain morphs; c) the sub-morphs, relevant to certain morphonological transformations of the stem. According to the second criterion, the sub-morphs are divided by the researcher into those, which coincide in a form aspect with the affixal morphs in the language. The criterion of regularity allows us to distinguish frequent the sub-morphs that are regularly allocated under certain conditions and the single sub-morphs (combined with one or more stems, as *-ит* in *негритянський*).

I. I. Kovalyk accepts the division of the sub-morphs into “functionally equivalent to the root morphs”, for example, *з-вик-а-ти*, and the sub-morphs “parallel to the form morph”, as in the word-form *люб-ов-ї*²⁸. He permits the possibility of functioning in the word two sub-morphs – root and affixal or two affixal.

²⁵ Kowalik K. Budowa morfologiczna przymiotników polskich. Wrocław : Ossolineum. 1977. S. 99.

²⁶ Клименко Н. Ф. Основи морфеміки сучасної української мови. К. ІЗМН. 1998. С. 7.

²⁷ Лопатин В. В. Русская словообразовательная морфемика. 1977. С. 58–60.

²⁸ Ковалик І. І. Вступ. Дериватологія (словотвір) як самостійна лінгвістична дисципліна та її місце у системі науки про мову. *Словотвір сучасної української літературної мови : монографія*. – К. : Наукова думка. 1979. С. 23.

Jan Bosak insists that there are 4 varieties of the sub-morphs in the language: a) residual sub-morphs in words with a defective division; b) thematic (formers of verbal stems); c) connective (in compound or derivatives, suffixes); d) asemantic segments of an actual synchronous derivation, that is, through a stepwise word-formation²⁹.

In our study, we distinguish between the root and affixal sub-morphemes. The root class is formed by 4 subclasses:

1) the sub-morphemes of specific, but secondary noun roots, in particular: {/#₄т'-}, {/e₁н'-}, {/#₃л'-} {/#₃н'-}, {/#₁к'-}, {/#₄к'-}, {/#₁ц'}, {/#₃ц'}, {/ик}, {/иц'-}, {/ар'-}, {/с'к'-}, {/ин-}, {/ук-}: *ніг/оть, рем/інь, дят/ел, телен/ень, боч/к-а, паруб/ок, сон/ц-е, пал/ець, яз/ик, капл/иц'-а, палам/ар, Мін/ськ, мал/ин-а, полон/ин-а, байстр'/ук.*

2) the reflexes of the constituents of ancient roots, as {/ер-} in *брат – брат/ер-ський*, or ancient suffixes, as {ес-} in *не́бо / небеса – неб/ес-н-ий*, {ен-} in *імя́ / імені – ім/ен-ний, ім/ен-н-я*, {ат-} in *порося́ / порося́ти – порос/я́т-к-о*;

3) more / less regularly repeated final segments of the stems of loan substantives that in donor languages usually function as morphemes – word-forming and form-building: {/іj-}, {/іj}, {/ізм}, {/іст}, {/оз}, {/ер}, {/ор}, {/ум}, {/ос}, {/ис}, {/ін}, {/он}, {/ік-}, {/ат}: *аналог/іj-а, алю́в/ій, фаши/ізм, атеј/ізм, арт/іст, анабі/о́з, гáнгст/ер, акт/о́р, мінім/ум, ко́см/ос, скéпс/ис, аспі́р/ін, анальг/ін, нейл/о́н, дедер/о́н, матемáт/ик-а, лóг/ік-а, плаг/іáт.*

4) wideners ({/й-}, {/т-}, {/н-}, {/ш-} – of the stems of immutable borrowed substantives that prepare formally atypical roots for the interaction with word-forming suffixes: *желé – желé/й-ний, фула́ – фула/н-іст, аргó – аргó/т-ізм, кінó – кінó/ш-ний, крокі́ – крокі/ј-увáти*. Sometimes these units are found in the form of variable lexemes – usually borrowed: *вéда – ведај-ізм*, rarely – and specific, but only if the suffix interacts not with the stem but with the word form as a whole, for example, *себé – себé/ш-ник: Кара прийшла йому ... кара від Бога, за те, що приховав скарб від ігумена, що не віддав його Нестору на книгозбірню... Для себе приховав! Себешиник окаянний (R. Ivanchenko)*. V. V. Lopatin³⁰, N. O. Yanko-Trynytska³¹ widen the effect of this regularity not only to the formations of the type *áлгебра – алгебраический, проза – прозаический*, but *тема – тематический*.

The affixal sub-morphemes widen the word-forming suffixes, on condition their original morphs cannot be involved into the derivative

²⁹ Bosák J., Byzássvová K. Východiska morfémovej analýzy. Morfematika-slovotvorba. Bratislava : Veda. 1985. S. 61.

³⁰ Лопатин В. В. Русская словообразовательная морфемика. 1977. С. 77.

³¹ Янко-Триницкая Н. А. Словообразование в современном русском языке. М. : Индрик. 2001. С. 250.

interaction with the roots (stems) of a particular morphonological class. Often, the segments are such wideners {-ij/} / {-ej/}, {-iv/} / {-ov/}, {-ан/}, {-ин/}, {-ч/}, {-ист/}, {-ар/}, {-ич/} / {-ич/}, {-ал' /}, {-ив/}, {-ам/}, {-оз/}, {-он/}, {-із/} / {-уз/}, {-л' /}, {-уфік/}. A significant fact is that most of them have limited the right and left valence. The limited left valence emphasizes the motivation of the suffixes by the characteristics of the generative stem, and it is important that they are not only (or more precisely, not primarily) morphonological. T. V. Bulyhina, identifying the causes of the formal transformations such as the “clipping / extension of certain segments”, notes: “A more differentiated approach (in particular, the allocation of different classes of generative stems) allows us to identify a sufficiently rigorous regularity of the corresponding derivatives construction, associated in a number of cases with the semantic rather than morphonological reasons”³².

So, the extension of the suffix morphs *-ець*, *-ськ-* by the sub-morph {-ан/} occurs when the word is: а) the name of the state on condition when a generative word – is: а) the name of the state in *-ика*: *Аме́рика – америк-а́н/ець*, *америк-а́н/ськ-ий*; *А́фрика – африк-а́н/ець*, *африк-а́н/ськ-ий*; *Коста-Рі́ка – костарик-а́н/ець*, *коста-рик-а́н/ськ-ий*; б) a proper name with the morphoneme {к} in the final position of a generative stem: *Ма́рокко – марокк-а́н/ець*, *марокк-а́н/ськ-ий*, *Франці́ск – франциск-а́н/ець*; в) a proper name in *-ія* on condition of its partial clipping: *Вікто́рія – вікторі-а́н/ець*, *Прето́рія – преторі-а́н/ець*; г) the name of a state or the surname in *-а (-я)* with a final sonorant in a stem: *Бі́рма – бірм-а́н/ець*, *бірм-а́н/ськ-ий*; *Потебна́ – потебн'-а́н/ськ-ий*. Supporting the idea of the root (*кіно/ш-н-ий*, *кофе/й-н-ий*) and affixal (*кант-і/а́н-ськ-ий*) extensions and explaining their appearance in a derivative for a purely pragmatic purpose, I. H. Myloslavskyi considers the segments of {-ин/}, {-ан/} (*ялт-і́н/ський*, *кант-і/а́н/ський*) to be the suffixes that express, though with excess, the adjectival meaning: *-ин-*, *-ан- = -ськ-*³³.

Family names of males, rarely general names, can form names of persons according to their social, political, religious, etc. group or view. In this case, the sub-morph {-ан/} needs the sub-morph {-і/}: *Фейерба́х – фейербах-і/а́н/ець*, *Кант – кант-і/а́н-ець*; *Гегель – гегель-і/а́н/ець*; *термідо́р – термідор-і/а́н/ець*. The same morphonological structure – with the sub-morphs *-і/ан/* (*-ім/ан/*) – have some derivatives from the borrowed names of planets and cities: *Марс – марс-і/а́н/ськ-ий*,

³² Булыгина Т. В. Проблемы теории морфологических моделей. М. : Наука. 1977. С. 47.

³³ Милославский И. Г. Вопросы словообразовательного синтеза. М. : Изд-во Московского университета. 1980. С. 29–30.

Неа́поль – *непол-іт/а́н/ськ-ий*. Apparently, on the analogy with the latter, Lesya Ukrainka formed the adjective *палермітанський* (← *Палермо*): *Се так гріється хлоп'ятко – вірить в кров палермітанську, що кружляє в нього в жилах....* And the derivatives of the group c) may have served as a model for the adjective *італьянський*: *А від злості та натуги ніжна мова італьянська так спотворилась....*

None of the above-mentioned sub-morphs can extend the adjective suffix -н-, it has its “own” modifiers: {-ич/} ({-іч/}), {-ар/}, {-оз/}, {-аль/}, {-ив/}: *геометрія* – *геометр-іч/н-ий*, *калейдоскоп* – *калейдоскоп-іч/н-ий*, *молекула* – *молекул'-ар/н-ий*, *гангрена* – *гангрена-оз/н-ий*, *кафедра* – *кафедр-аль/н-ий*, *реферат* – *реферат-ів/н-ий*. Some of them allow (or even require) their extenders to form the sub-morphic complexes {-іал'/}, {-ат/оз/}, {-ат/ич/}, {іст/ич/} ({-ист/ич/}): *бронхи* – *бронх-і/аль/н-ий*, *ідеалізм* – *ідеал-іст/іч/н-ий*, *плюралізм* – *плюрал-іст/іч/н-ий*, *проблема* – *проблем-ат/іч/н-ий*. All of them are quite clearly differentiated by the positions.

The factual material confirms the topicality for the morphonology of the Noun word-formation of the opposition of sub-morphs on the basis of their preservation / non-preservation in the structures of the derived words. The attention should be paid first to the root sub-morphemes of the 1st and 3rd subclasses, as well as the suffixal sub-morphemes. The suffix extenders, on condition of clipping of the suffix, are mainly preserved in the structure of the generative stems: *Марс* – *марс-і/а́н/ець* – *марсіа́н-к-а*, *Аме́рика* – *америк-а́н/ськ-ий* – *американ-ізм*. The root sub-morphemes of the subclasses mentioned are subdivided into those that are preserved in all positions without exception, and those, that are preserved only in the part of the positions. The preserved sub-morphemes are primarily the following ones: {/ар'-}, {/ин₁-}, {/иц'-}, {/ом'-}, {/#₁л-}, {/ер-}, {/ур-}, to elicited – {/#₁ц'₂-}, {ськ-}, {#₂к₁-}, {#₃к₂-}, {ізм-/изм-}, {ик-}, {іj-}, {ij}, {ис-}, {ос-}, {ат-}, {ум-}, {ам-}, cf.: *бо́нд/ар* – *бо́нд/а́р-ськ-ий*, *бонд/ар-е́нк-о*, *бонд/ар-і́вн-а*, *бонд/ар-і́х-а*, *бонд/а́р-н'-а*, *бонд/ар-к-а*, *бонд/ар-ств-о*, *бонд/ар'-ува́-ти* and *фаиш/і́зм* – *фаиш-і́ст*, *алю́мін/ій* – *алю́мін-а́т*, *жр/ець* – *жр-і́ц'-а*.

Consequently, sub-morphemes, like morphonemes, play a significant role in shaping the expression plan for the derivative words of a language. In the vast majority of cases, the knowledge of the conditions of their functioning (and to this knowledge, every speaker, according to J. Boduen de Courtenay, “comes due to the degree of the accumulation and consolidation of the psycho-phonetic associations in a speaker’s soul”³⁴)

³⁴ Бодуэн де Куртэнэ И. А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. В 2 тт. М. : Изд-во АН СССР. 1963. Т. 1.

allows one to predict or their appearance in the derivatives that spread one of the components of the word-formation structure, or, on the contrary, their clipping.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the morphonological structure of derivatives of the Noun word-formation nests of different morphonological types gives grounds for the recognition of morphonology as a special level of the language sub-system. Its special status is determined by its two, we can assume, mutually opposing characteristics: intermediate characteristics and independence. The first of these characteristics is related to the semiotic independence of the morphonological phenomena and the means: the morphonological rules and patterns merely ensure the transition from the minor linguistic entities to signic. The second characteristics – with the functional load of the morphonological transformations, the creation of a system of new relations on this basis. This gives grounds for the separation within the morphonological level, on the one hand, two sublevels, and on the other hand, – specific for each of them units.

The morphoneme is a lower-level unit, which is directly in contact with the phonological language level. A higher-level unit that interacts with morphology is a sub-morpheme. It is defined as a generalized, abstracted from the morphological contexts, minimal component of a morpheme. The phonemes appear on the plane of real words (word forms). The most important consider the opposition of morphonemes on the basis of vocal – consonant, constant – variable, velar – palatal.

The sub-morpheme is a component of the morphonological structure of the morpheme, which in its form coincides with one of the specific or borrowed affixal morphemes that function in the system, but does not reach their level in terms of meaning. The sub-morpheme, as an abstract unit, is represented by sub-morphs, which may differ in their phonemic composition in accordance with the current morphonological patterns. In the study, we classify the sub-morphemes into the root and affixal. In the root class we distinguish 4 sub-classes on the basis of the corresponding features. Also important for the characterization of the sub-morphs is their juxtaposition with respect to the sign of preservation / non-preservation in the composition of the derivative word. The emphasis is also placed on the semiotic functions of the sub-morphs.

SUMMARY

The article deals with the expediency of distinguishing specific units of the language system – morphonological ones. On the basis of the analysis of the opinions of scientists, representatives of different linguistic schools and

directions, the conclusion is made about the specificity of the morphonological level in the systematic organization of language. It is determined, on the one hand, by its intermediate (between phonetics and morphology) character and, on the other, by the fact of using asemantic elements (phonemes) to identify and distinguish significant units (morphemes and words). This is in favor of the complexity of the morphonological level, the allocation within it of two sublevels (lower and higher) and two units (morphoneme and sub-morpheme). A sub-morpheme is a unit of its higher sublevel, one that directly interacts with the morphological one. The most relevant features of each unit are identified and characterized. In morphoneme, it is vocal / consonance, constancy / variability, velarity / palatability. In submorphs, it is a coincidence in terms of expression with affixed elements, asemanticity, attachment to root or suffix morphemes, preservation / non-preservation during derivative procedures.

REFERENCES

1. Антипов А. Г. Морфонологическая категоризация словообразовательной формы : автореф. дис. ... докт. филол. наук : 10.02.01. Кемерово, 2002. 38 с.
2. Бодуэн де Куртэнэ И. А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. В 2 тт. М. : Изд-во АН СССР. 1963. Т. 1. 324 с.
3. Бромлей С. В. Морфонология и грамматика. *Общеславянский лингвистический атлас*. 1972. М. 1974. С. 25–49.
4. Булыгина Т. В. Проблемы теории морфологических моделей. М. : Наука. 1977. С. 288 с.
5. Горпинич В. О. Сучасна українська літературна мова : Морфеміка. Словотвір. Морфонологія. К. : Вища школа, 1999. 207 с.
6. Данилина Н. И. Морфонологические системы в синхронии и диахронии (на материале неблизкородственных языков) : автореф. дис. ... докт. филол. наук : специальность 10.02.19. Саратов, 2012. 38 с.
7. Земская Е. А. Современный русский язык. Словообразование. М. : Просвещение. 1973. 304 с.
8. Иткин И. Б. Русская морфонология. М. : Гнозис, 2007. 272 с.
9. Карпіловська Є. А. Суфіксальна підсистема сучасної української літературної мови : будова і реалізація. К. : Ін-т мовознавства ім. О. О. Потебні НАН України. 1999. 297 с.
10. Ковалик І. І. Вступ. Дериватологія (словотвір) як самостійна лінгвістична дисципліна та її місце у системі науки про мову. *Словотвір сучасної української літературної мови : монографія*. К. : Наукова думка. 1979. С. 5–57.

11. Лопатин В. В. Русская словообразовательная морфемика. 1977. 315 с.
12. Маслов Ю. С. Об основных и промежуточных ярусах в структуре языка. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1968. С. 69–80.
13. Милославский И. Г. Вопросы словообразовательного синтеза. М. : Изд-во Московского университета. 1980. 296 с.
14. Реформатский А. А. О соотношении фонетики и грамматики. *Вопросы грамматического строя*. М. : Изд-во АН СССР. 1955. С. 92–113.
15. Толстая С. М. Морфонология в структуре славянских языков. М. : Индрик. 1998. 318 с.
16. Трубецкой Н. С. Избранные труды по филологии. М. : Прогресс. 1987. 560 с.
17. Чурганова В. Г. Очерк русской морфонологии. М. : Наука. 1973. 239 с.
18. Янко-Триницкая Н. А. Словообразование в современном русском языке. М. : Индрик. 2001. С. 250.
19. Kowalik K. Budowa morfologiczna przymiotników polskich. Wrocław : Ossolineum. 1977. 207 s.
20. Kuryłowicz J. The notion of morpho(pho)neme. *Directions for historical linguistics : A symposium* / Ed. by W. P. Lehman and Y. Malkiel. Austin : London. 1968. P. 65–81.
21. Laskowski R. Budowa morfonologiczna polskich przyrostków rzeczownikowych. *Język polski*. 58. 1973. S. 133.
22. Laskowski R. Studia nad morfonologia współczesnego języka polskiego. Wrocław: Ossolineum. 1975. 144 s.
23. Trubetzkoy N.S. Sur la “morphologie” *Travaux de Cercle Linguistique de Prague*. 1929. V. 1. P. 80–91.
24. Ułaszyn H. Laut, Phonema, Morphonema. *Travaux de Cercle Linguistique de Prague*. 1931. V. 4. P. 53–61.
25. Zdziebko S. Modelling morpho-phonology: consonant replacements in Polish. *Studies in Polish Linguistics*. 2012. № 7. С. 129–164.

Information about the authors:

Fedurko M. Yu.,

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

Czyżewski Feliks,

dr. hab., prof.,

Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej
Republic of Poland