NOMINATIVE STATUS OF THE NAMES OF HOMEMADE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

T. Prystaiko

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,
Head of the Department of General and Slavic Linguistics,
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University
tamarapristayko@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0002-4639-0046

N. Diachok

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Professor of the Department of General and Slavic Linguistics,
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University
dyachok74natalya@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0003-3949-3423

Introduction. A problem of linguistic and speech nomination is still rather topical being not completely solved in terms of the theory of modern linguistic. That is confirmed by numerous opinions of linguists concerning the one-word nominations that can replace a word combination. Those words form certain thematic and lexico-semantic groups which partially represent a cultural fund of native speakers of some specific language. One of such lexico-semantic groups includes the names of beverages. Analysis of each unit like *малиновка*, *яблонежка*, *сливянка*, *вишнежка* etc., belonging to the corresponding group and being the reflection of everyday life and culture of the nation, is the basis to understand peculiar national mentality represented by the speech. Those lexical elements were studied from the viewpoint of lexicology, word formation, pragmatics, and, rather rarely, from the viewpoint of modern theory of nomination and clear differentiation of lexical transformations and modifications; that defines the **topicality** of our research. Its hypothesis is the understanding that in terms of the conditions of internal motivation, when lexical meaning of the “derivative” unit experiences no changes – only its external shell experiences certain change (modification) relative to the “formative” one, we should speak about univerbation as the act of form-building, taking into consideration the fact that a word combination and a word with identical meaning are modifications or doublets of a certain abstract nominative unit, marked conditionally by such term as *nominatheme*.

Objective of the research is to determine the nominative status of the lexemes denoting homemade alcoholic beverages in the Russian-language discourse. The essence of the **tasks** is in the following: 1) to determine the motivational features of the names under study; 2) to analyze the dependence of nominative status of the beverage names on the motivation type; and 3) to demonstrate the univerbal features of those units.

Methods and methodologies of the research. The research involves a series of methods which have made it possible to study the problem in the maximum subjective way and draw certain conclusions. A continuous sampling method has been applied to accumulate the actual material. A methodology of distributive analysis has helped differentiate the concepts. Etymological analysis has become the key to identify real origin and genetic status of a particular univerb.

Results and discussion. For the first time, the term *univerbated word (univerb)* was used as a subject of studying in the work “Normative shortenings in the modern Russian language” by T. Sokolovska. It means “the one-word names being derivatives from the basic attribute with the help of the most widely used suffix *-к(а)* and preserves stylistic connection with the sphere of its origin (i.e. with the speech) as well as synonymic connection with the formative compound naming units” (Sokolovska, 2000).

Note that the terms *univerbated word (univerb)* have entered the linguistic circulation comparatively recently in comparison with the term *univerbation*, defining a productive way of word formation and nomination; along with the terms *substantivation* and *abbreviation*, the term *univerbation* have been represented in the Russian language grammar for a long time. Thus, the term was first proposed by K. Brugmann (in 1904) to denote a process of the origin of a sound unit on the basis of word combinations. The terms *univerbation* has a number of synonyms proposed by linguists being involved in the study of that word-forming (as they thought) linguistic process: *contraction* or *semantic condensation*, *inclusion*, *semantic compression*. *Univerbation* is the best variant since other represented terms reflect the essence of the corresponding process only approximately.

Thus, in terms of wide interpretation, univerbation is a manifestation of synthetism in word formation, i.e. representation of a complex of meanings by “one word” (simple, derivative or compound); those meanings are reflected by word combinations in terms of analytical structures. Such an interpretation of the analyzed process and phenomenon makes it possible to attribute it to the domain of abbreviation, substantivation, suffixation, and formation of compound words. In terms of narrow interpretation, univerbation means creation of a word on the basis of analytical, somewhat stable name unit. Thus, researchers traditionally include a series of formations like *абрикосовка (абрикосовая наливка)*, *агрусовка (наливка изагруса)*, *анисовка (анисоваяводка)*, *березовик (березовыйсок)*, *изюмовка (настойка на изюме)*, *имбировка, имбирка (имбирная водка)*, *кизиловка (кизильовая настойка)* into the derivative units of compressive word formation, consider it as a result of secondary nomination, or believe it to be the manifestation of the law of loss of formal and semantic partitioning of a name, or determine it as one of the types of lexical condensation, or interpret it as a product of word combination synthesis into a derivative word.

Majority of linguists think about univerbation as the phenomenon of derivative nature, though identity of analytical (word combination) and synthetic (word) semantics of a unit is the significant basis for the assumption that the relations between a word combination and a word are not of word-forming nature at all, e.g.: *клубничная наливка* and *клубниковка*, *клюквенная настойка* and *клюковка*, *напиток из липового меда* and *липец*, *липовый сок* and *липовица*, *медовый напиток* and *медовуха*, *облепиховая настойка* and *облепиховка*, *настойка изсельдерея* and *сельдереевка* etc. Contrary to his predecessors, having decided to offer a unified terminological equivalent for the mentioned word-forming processes and the units appeared as a result of their action, professor V. Terkulov (2006) proposes to qualify every synthetic – word – unit as a univerbated (verbal) equivalent of a word combination, “i.e. the word, appeared as a result of verbal interpretation of a word combination, has the lexical and grammatical meaning as well as syntactical function being absolutely identical to a word combination”, and the verbal modification as the one appeared as the effect of elliptic univerbation. Each separate verbal implementation and its corresponding word combination is united by the concept of nominatheme like “word combination – univerb”, which in turn is the component of structural varieties of nominathemes with a dominant-word combination, i.e. being semantically identical unit being identified at the level of word combination. Generally, a nominatheme is a certain abstract (linguistic) unit implemented in the verbal forms (glosses, doublets). In terms of our research, modifications of one nominatheme are represented by the word combinations and the word being identical to it semantically and grammatically; the word is stylistically identical or differs from the equivalent word combination in its slang features. It is clear that the concept proposed by V. Terkulov does not specify the fact, which structural unit of the two is the basis for language. Nevertheless, “it eliminated all contradictions in the attribution of different structural units by identifying generic linguistic unit which system-based importance means possibility for any structural speech implementation to represent the identical meaning being modeled” (Terkulov, 2006: 132). According to the linguist, it is a unit of such kind that is the basis of nominativeness – nominatheme.

Thus, we consider that a univerb is a word which is identical semantically and grammatically to a certain word combination, differing stylistically from the equivalent word

combination but being the modification, doublets of one nominathemes. That is why univerbation differs considerably from the word formation in its traditional sense. It is no doubt that the word-forming relations are always motivated. However, motivations can be different; consequently, not all the motivating relations can be considered as the word-forming ones. Specialist in derivatology O. Tikhonov notes that “word-forming motivations are just a part of the motivating relations” peculiar for a word-forming pair (formative – derivative); he emphasizes that “each derivative word occurs in the language on the basis of clear semantics of a formative word” (Tikhonov, 1985: I, 37–38). Motivation is considered as the semantic stipulation of the meaning of formative and derivative words by the meanings of their components. In terms of the word-forming act, some units are the source of motivation; others, being the results of that act, are motivated. Thus, if during the origin of a new word, its lexical meaning (taking into account its etymological cognation) differs from the formative meaning, then we observe the external (word-forming, linguistic, system-based) motivation. If lexical meanings of the formative and derivative units (analytical or synthetic in their structure) are identical (i.e. finally those units have common meaning), then we can see the internal (relational, speech) motivation. Though, formation of that sample involves the means being homonymic to the word-forming ones.

I. Dumchak (1998) in his paper “Univerbation in the Ukrainian language” studies the category of univverb equivalents and their corresponding word combinations: “stable word combinations become the assets of lexis only after the process of lexicalization, which results in “transformation of a word combination in a stable linguistic unit functioning as the equivalent of a separate word” (Dumchak, 1998: 6). Moreover, the linguist believes that “apart from isofunctionality of a word, nominative word combinations are characterized by semantic integrity, structural stability, determined certain order of components, speech reproducibility”, and that is the reason why “stable nominative word combinations are the segmented complex names, which semantics is being rethought as the dependent component loses its main nominative meaning; they are often found in the specified order in social linguistic practice, they are so active that they may be considered as reproducible rather than coined again in the speech” (Dumchak, 1998: 6–7).

As it was mentioned before in papers by N. Diachok and O. Ivko, univerbation is opposed to quasiuniverbation, i.e. formation of univerbs by analogy. However, one should differentiate between quasiuniverbation and mechanism of analogy, accompanying the phenomenon of univerbation (Diachok & Ívko, 2020: 23).

Difference of grammatical gender of a main word of the initial word combination and a univverb is considered to be a key feature of quasiuniverbation: *дубленое пальто – дубленка, автоматическая коробка передач – автомат* etc. However, the accuracy of the qualification of one or another phenomenon depends on the sequential analysis of the origin of each univverb, especially determination of the time of its origin comparing to the time of origin of its corresponding word combination. If a word combination existed in language/speech before the univverb origin and its origin was recorded in the tests later, then we can observe the phenomenon of univerbation along with the principle of analogy, which changes the grammatical gender of the univverb and includes it into the class of the univerbal forms being the most widespread from the viewpoint of generic assignment.

Relying on the criteria of the determination of univerbation and quasiuniverbation, we propose the following classification of the units under study.

1. Names of beverages – univerbs.

Водка с перцем – перцовка: “Само по себе разумеется, что в этой атмосфере все изящные вымыслы француз ской кухни – бархатне соусы, душистые паиштеты и ароматне ликеры – показались бы пресными или приторными и что для возбуждения вкуса и аппетита здесь нужна **перцовка**, настойка на зверобое и русские щи и кулебяка, которые устоят и противу пушечного ядра!” (Ф. Булгарин. Русская ресторация (1843); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>) – “Многим из них это было вовсе ничего и казалось немного чем крепче хорошей **водки с перцем**; другим, наконец, сильно надоедали такие беспрестанные припарки, и они бежали на Запорожье, если умели найти дорогу и если сами

не были перехватываемы на пути” (Н. Гоголь. Тарас Бульба (1835–1841); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>).

Персиковая наливка – персиковка: “**Персиковка – п. наливка**; водка, настоящая на персиковых косточках” (Dal', 1981: II, 102; <https://alcofan.com>).

Рябиновая настойка / наливка – рябиновка: “Терновка, вишневка, дулевка, **рябиновка** и **другие наливки** на домашнем хлебном вине, изредка вина сикийское, монастырское и волошское услаждали неразборчивый вкус так же, как позже вина венгерские, рейнские и французские” (О. Сомов. Гайдамак (1825); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>).

Сливяная наливка – сливянка: “Сливняк, сливяновка, **сливянка – сливяная наливка**, вино, водка, настоящая на сливах” (Dal', 1982: IV, 220); “Сливянка – **наливка из слив**” (Н. Гоголь. Вечера на хуторе близ Диканьки: предисловие к первой части (1831–1832); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>).

Смородиновая наливка – смородиновка: “Вместе с турецким товаром в квартиру проникла сиротская вонь паленой резины и курева, вытеснив запахи блинчиков, борща и земляничного варенья; гераней и амариллисов, собачьей шерсти, проявителя гидрохинонового; сосновой стружки, лаванды и мяты, разложенной в матерчатых мешочках по полкам платяного шкафа; **смородиновой наливки**, которая осенью стояла в пятилитровых бутылках под папиным столом и, сбраживаясь, палец за пальцем поднимала резиновые перчатки, надетые на стеклянные горлышки...” (Екатерина Завершнева. Высотка (2012); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>) – “Вишневки, сливянки и **смородиновки** вместе со стерляжьей ухой разогрели патриотизм Ивана Петровича” (А. Виноградов. Повесть о братьях Тургеневых (1932); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>).

Терновая наливка – терновка: “При третьей перемене поставлялись на стол наливки: вишневка, **терновка**, сливянка, яблонька и проч. и проч” (Г. Квитка-Основьяненко. Пан Халявский (1839); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>).

Тумовая водка – тумовка: “**Тумовая водка**, также **тумовка**, реже **тумовый брэнди** (азерб. tutarağı, арм. թթխողի) – крепкий алкогольный напиток, традиционный для ряда...” (<https://alcofan.com>) – “В стаканчики плеснулась домашняя **тумовая водка**, голубоватая и прозрачная” (Лев Минц. Не щадя живота своего. Вокруг света, 1993; <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>) – “Однако тут же на столе появляются лаваш, зелень, сыр, мясо и непременно в любой карабахской сельской семье, домашнего приготовления, обжигаящая **тумовка**” (Владимир Киселев. Жизнь сквозь прицел. Общая газета, 1998; <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>).

Малиновая наливка – малиновка: “**Малиновка – наливка на малине**” (Dal', 1981: II, 292); “В конце обеда, за здоровье и успехи новоприбывших выпили по рюмке **малиновой наливки**, шесть бутылок которой Емилъян привез из Петербурга от моего товарища по Академии и сотрудника Миссии” (архиепископ Николай Японский (Касаткин). Дневники святого Николая Японского: в 5 т (1895); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>) – “Мы ведь не французы, – сказал Семен Тихонович, осматривая бутылки, – чортова напитка – кофию не пьем, а вот милости просим отведать наших домашних наливочек, кому какая по вкусу придется; хороши, право хороши, язык проглотить; есть и кудрявая, сиречь рябиновочка, есть и **малиновка**, да такая, что от рюмки сам сделаешься малиновым” (С. Жихарев. Записки современника (1806-1809); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>).

Вишневая наливка – вишневка: “Чиновник выпил чашку чаю, две рюмки *cherry brandy* (**вишневой наливки**) и уехал” (И. Гончаров. Фрегат “Паллада” (1855); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>) – “Шампанского, конечно, у меня нет, но есть отличная, собственной стряпни, наливка – **вишневка!**...” (А. Писемский. Масоны (1880); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>).

2. Names of beverages – quasiuniverbs.

Травник – настойка на травах: “**Травник – настойка на какой-л. траве**” (устар.) (SO, 1984: 716; TSRYA, 2008: 994; BTS, 2000: 1337); разг. “**настойка на какой-л. траве**” (MAS, 1984: IV, 395).

Травняк – водка на травах: “Настаивать **травняк** 6 месяцев” (<https://www.litmir.me>) – “А ещё есть у меня **настойки на травах**” (Евгений Чижов. Перевод с подстрочника (2012); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>).

Шипучка – шипучий напиток: “**Шипучка** – играющий **шипучий напиток**, из налива воды на плоды или на ягоды, с прибавкой сахара и кизлярки, водки” (Dal', 1982: IV, 634); разг. “шипучий напиток” (SO, 1984: 796; разг. TSYA, 2008: 1107; MAS, 1984: IV, 716; BTS, 2000: 1498).

Липовица – липовый сок: “**Липовица**, **липовый сок**, отцеживаемый весной, питье” (Dal', 1981: II, 253).

Клубничник – клубничная настойка: “**Клубничник** будет готов через две-три недели” (<https://www.litmir.me>) – “Я сидел перед окном, дегустируя новый сорт **клубничной настойки** (пошла клубника), когда Эйхлер, потирая худенькие лапки, вошел ко мне” (К. Букша. Эрнст и Анна (2002); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>).

Змеевка – змеиное вино: “**Змеевка** (вино или водка со змеей, **змеиное вино**) – экзотическое спиртное Востока ... Водка со змеями – спиртовая настойка на кобрах или других ... Хотел былокупитьродителям в подарок змеевка “сувенирная” – продается в туристических лавках и на любых развалах” (<https://alcofan.com>).

Вишняк – вишневая настойка / наливка: “Так приготавливается первый **вишняк**. Чтобы получить второй **вишняк**, вишни, которые остались в бутылки, залить водкой и дать им постоять 2 месяца, а потом снова разлить в бутылки” (<https://www.litmir.me>) – “Поднимает фужер, густая **вишневая наливка** ходит плотной волной, точно занавес” (Я – чайка. Марина Вишневецкая. Вышел месяц из тумана (1997); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>); “Отцу она положила новый талес, бутылку **вишневой настойки**, банку малинового варенья и кисет табаку” (И. Бабель. Шабос-Нахаму (из цикла “Гершеле”) (1920–1928); <https://processing.ruscorpora.ru>).

Some of the represented quasiuniverbs are the result of secondary modification; they are illustrated by two schemes demonstrating the sequence of processes.

Scheme 1.

Word(U)

NomWCom

WCom,

where **NomWCom** is the nominatheme with the dominant-word combination, **Word(U)** is the univerb (synthetic implementation of the nominatheme), and **WCom** is the word combination (analytical implementation of the nominatheme).

Scheme 2.

KWCom

KNomWCom

Word(D) → **KU**

NomW

WCom,

where **NomW** is the nominatheme with the dominant-word, **Word(D)** – is the word-derivative, **WCom** is the word combination; **KU** is the quasiuniverb, **KWCom** is the quasi word combination, **KNomWCom** is the quasi nominatheme with the dominant-word combination, invariant, abstract unit occurred in terms of the corresponding quasiuniverb and quasi word combination.

For example:

Scheme 1.

клубниковка (U)

nominatheme

(клубничная водка)

клубничная водка (WCom).

Scheme 2.

Scheme клубничная водка (KWCom)
 quasi nominatheme
 (клубничная водка)
 клубничник (D) → клубничник (KU)
nominatheme
 (клубничник)
 клубничная водка (WCom).

Thus, being the synthetic implementations of certain nominathemes, univerbs are capable of forming certain lexical and semantic as well as thematic groups.

“While inheriting the ideas of predecessors (L.M. Vasylieva, A.P. Zahnitko, Yu.M. Karaulova, M.P. Kochergina, L.O. Novikova and others), R.I. Gafarova highlights that the suffixal univerbs enter into the paradigmatic relations that form lexico-semantic fields. The lexico-semantic fields fall into the semantic close clusters – lexico-semantic groups and thematic groups” (Diachok, 2019: 104). For instance, a semantic group is “the component of a thematic field structured on the basis of total covering of one or another subject area...” (Zahnitko, 2007: 125). It is considered that “lexico-semantic groups unite the words in terms of their lexical meaning while thematic groups consist of the words in terms of commonness of subjects and phenomena of reality defined by the words” (Gafarova, 2008: 146).

We define “the relation between the notions of a lexico-semantic field, thematic group, and lexico-semantic groups as the hierarchical subordination of those concepts to each other: **lexico-semantic field – thematic group – lexico-semantic group**” (Gafarova, 2008: 143).

The units under analysis belong to the lexico-semantic field “Names of inanimate objects”, thematic group “Food”, lexico-semantic group “Beverages”. That lexico-semantic group contains some more sub-groups like “Alcoholic beverages”, “Refreshing beverages”, “Hot beverages” etc.

Conclusions. Thus, the analyzed units are univerbs – synthetic implementation of the nominathemes like “word combination – elliptic univerb”; we attribute them to the ones belonging to the univerbs or quasiuniverbs depending on the ways and chronology of their origin in speech and language. They form the lexico-semantic field “Names of inanimate objects”, thematic group “Food”, lexico-semantic group “Beverages”, subgroup “Homemade alcoholic beverages”. That lexico-semantic group contains some more subgroups like “Alcoholic beverages”, “Refreshing beverages”, “Hot beverages” etc. Prospects for further studies of that group of words are in its analysis from the viewpoint of the derivative potential in both Russian and other Slavic languages.

REFERENCES

- Gafarova, R. I. (2008). Suffiksalye univerby russkogo yazyka: semantika, derivatsionnyye otnosheniya [Suffix Univerbs of the Russian Language: Semantics, Derivative Relations]. *Candidate's thesis*. Khar'kov [in Russian].
- Dumchak, I. M. (1998). Univerbatsiya v ukrayins'kiy movi [Univerbation in the Ukrainian language]. *Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis*. Ivano-Frankivs'k [in Ukrainian].
- Diachok, N. V. (2019). *Osnovy univerbatsii: strukturno-semanticheskiy kriteriy* [Foundations of univerbation: structural and semantic criterion]. Slovyans'k: Vid-vo B. Í. Matorína [in Russian].
- Diachok, N. V., & Ívko, O. S. (2020). *Materialy k slovaryu univerbov sovremennogo russkogo yazyka. Izdaniye dopolnennoye* [Materials for the dictionary of universities of modern Russian language. Revised edition]. Slovyans'k: Vid-vo B. Í. Matorína. [in Russian].
- Zahnitko, A. P. (2007). *Suchasni linhvistychni teorii: monohrafiya* [Modern linguistic theories: monograph]. Donets'k: Yuho-Vostok [in Ukrainian].
- Sokolovskaya, T. D. (2000). *Normativnyye sokrashcheniya v sovremennom russkom yazyke* [Standard abbreviations in modern Russian]. Moscow: Institut russkogo yazyka imeni A. S. Pushkina [in Russian].

Terkulov, V. I. (2006). *Yeshche raz ob osnovnoy yedinitse yazyka* [Once again about the basic unit of language]. *Visnyk Luhans'koho natsional'noho universytetu im. T. H. Shevchenka – Bulletin of T. G. Shevchenko Luhansk National University*, 11 (106), 127–136 [in Russian].

Tikhonov, A. N. (1985). *Slovoobrazovatel'nyy slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Word-formation dictionary of the Russian language]. Moscow: Russkiy yazyk [in Russian].

DICTIONARIES

BTS (2000) – *Bol'shoy tolkovyy slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Great Dictionary of Russian language]. Sankt-Peterburg: Norint [in Russian].

Dal' (1981–1982) – Dal', V. I. *Tolkovyy slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo yazyka* [Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language]. Moscow: Russkiy yazyk [in Russian].

MAS (1981–1984) – *Slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Dictionary of the Russian language]. Moscow: Russkiy yazyk [in Russian].

SO (1984) – Ozhegov, S. I. *Slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Dictionary of the Russian language]. Moscow: Russkiy yazyk [in Russian].

TSRYA (2008) – *Tolkovyy slovar' russkogo yazyka s vklyucheniym svedeniy o proiskhozhdenii slov* [Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language with the inclusion of information about the origin of words]. Moscow: Azbukovnik [in Russian].

Анотація

Постановка проблеми. Проблема мовної та мовленнєвої номінації залишається актуальною й остаточно не вирішеною у межах теорії сучасного мовознавства. Про це свідчить безліч думок лінгвістів щодо однослівних найменувань, здатних замінити словосполучення. Ці слова складають певні тематичні та лексико-семантичні групи, що частково репрезентують культурний фонд носіїв окремої мови. Однією з таких лексико-семантичних груп є назви напоїв. Аналіз кожної одиниці, що уналежнюють до певної групи, як джерела віддзеркалення побуту та історії культури народу є підставою для розуміння його своєрідного світобачення, що втілюється у мовленні. Ці елементи лексичного ладу мови вивчалися з позицій лексикології, словотвору, прагматики та вкрай рідко – з позицій сучасної теорії номінації, з позицій чіткого розмежування лексичних трансформацій та модифікацій, що й визначає актуальність нашого дослідження.

Метою статті є визначення номінативного статусу та структурно-семантичний опис лексем на позначення саморобних алкогольних напоїв у російськомовному дискурсі.

Методи дослідження. Метод суцільної вибірки застосовано для накопичення фактичного матеріалу. Завдяки методиці дистрибутивного аналізу здійснено диференціювання понять. Етимологічний аналіз постав основним у визначенні реального походження й генетичного статусу того чи того універба.

Основні результати дослідження. Універбом ми вважаємо семантично і граматично тотожне певному словосполученню слово, що стилістично відрізняється від еквівалентного словосполучення та є разом з ним модифікацією, дублетом однієї номінативи. Універбація істотно відрізняється від словотвору у традиційному його розумінні. Вмотивованість розглядають як семантичну зумовленість значення похідного та складного слів значеннями їх складників. У словотвірному акті одні одиниці постають джерелом мотивації, а інші, які є результатом цього акту, є вмотивованими. Якщо у процесі появи нового слова його лексичне значення (з урахуванням етимологічної спорідненості) відрізняється від значення похідного, то спостерігаємо зовнішню вмотивованість. Якщо лексичні значення твірної й похідної одиниць тотожні, то йдеться про внутрішню вмотивованість. Але формотворення цього зразка оперує засобами, що є омонімічними словотвірним. Процесу універбації протиставлена квазіунівербація, тобто утворення універбів за аналогією. Утім, потрібно розрізняти квазіунівербацію й механізм

аналогії, що супроводжує універбацію. Послугуючись критеріями визначення універбації та квазіунівербації, запропоновано двокомпонентну класифікацію досліджуваних одиниць.

Висновки і перспективи. Досліджувані одиниці є універбами – синтетичними втіленнями номінатем на зразок “словосполучення – еліптичний універб”; також їх ми уналежнюємо до таких, що входять до складу універбів або квазіунівербів у залежності від шляхів та хронології їхньої появи в мовленні та мові. Вони складають лексико-семантичне поле “Назви неістот”, тематичну групу “Продукти харчування”, лексико-семантичну групу “Напої”, підгрупу “Саморобні алкогольні напої”. Ця лексико-семантична група містить ще декілька підгруп на зразок “Алкогольні напої”, “Прохолодні напої”, “Гарячі напої” тощо. Перспективи подальших досліджень цієї групи слів полягають в аналізі їх з позицій дериваційного потенціалу в російській та інших слов’янських мовах.

Ключові слова: номінатема, універбація, квазіунівербація, універб, квазіуніверб, тематична група, лексико-семантична група.

Abstract

Background. A problem of linguistic and speech nomination is still rather topical being not completely solved in terms of the theory of modern linguistic. That is confirmed by numerous opinions of linguists concerning the one-word nominations that can replace a word combination. Those words form certain thematic and lexico-semantic groups which partially represent a cultural fund of native speakers of some specific language. One of such lexico-semantic groups includes the names of beverages. Analysis of each unit, belonging to the corresponding group and being the reflection of everyday life and culture of the nation, is the basis to understand peculiar national mentality represented by the speech. Those lexical elements were studied from the viewpoint of lexicology, word formation, pragmatics, and, rather rarely, from the viewpoint of modern theory of nomination and clear differentiation of lexical transformations and modifications; that defines the topicality of our research.

Purpose of the research is to determine the nominative status of the lexemes denoting homemade alcoholic beverages in the Russian-language discourse.

Methods. A continuous sampling method has been applied to accumulate the actual material. A methodology of distributive analysis has helped differentiate the concepts. Etymological analysis has become the key to identify real origin and genetic status of a particular univverb.

Results. We consider that a univverb is a word which is identical semantically and grammatically to a certain word combination, differing stylistically from the equivalent word combination but being the modification, doublets of one nominathemes. That is why univverbation differs considerably from the word formation in its traditional sense. It is no doubt that the word-forming relations are always motivated. However, motivations can be different; consequently, not all the motivating relations can be considered as the word-forming ones. Motivation is considered as the semantic stipulation of the meaning of formative and derivative words by the meanings of their components. In terms of the word-forming act, some units are the source of motivation; others, being the results of that act, are motivated. Thus, if during the origin of a new word, its lexical meaning (taking into account its etymological cognation) differs from the formative meaning, then we observe the external motivation. If lexical meanings of the formative and derivative units are identical, then we can see the internal motivation. Though, formation of that sample involves the means being homonymic to the word-forming ones. Univverbation is opposed to quasiunivverbation, i.e. formation of univverbs by analogy. However, one should differentiate between quasiunivverbation and mechanism of analogy, accompanying the phenomenon of univverbation. Relying on the criteria of the determination of univverbation and quasiunivverbation, we propose two-component classification of the units under study.

Discussion. The analyzed units are univverbs – synthetic implementation of the nominathemes like “word combination – elliptic univverb”; we attribute them to the ones belonging to the univverbs or quasiunivverbs depending on the ways and chronology of their origin in speech and language. They form the lexico-semantic field “Names of inanimate objects”, thematic group

“Food”, lexico-semantic group “Beverages”, subgroup “Homemade alcoholic beverages”. That lexico-semantic group contains some more subgroups like “Alcoholic beverages”, “Refreshing beverages”, “Hot beverages” etc. Prospects for further studies of that group of words are in its analysis from the viewpoint of the derivative potential in both Russian and other Slavic languages.

Keywords: *nominatheme, univerbation, quasiuniverbation, univerb, quasiuniverb, thematic group, lexico-semantic group.*