

How to Cite:

Diachok, N. V., Kuvarova, O. K., Prystaiko, T. S., Kirkovska, I. S., & Semak, L. A. (2021). Verbal compression as the implementation of universal tendency of compensative processes in the lingual world. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 344-357. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS4.1580>

Verbal Compression as the Implementation of Universal Tendency of Compensative Processes in the Lingual World

Natalia V. Diachok

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Olena K. Kuvarova

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Tamara S. Prystaiko

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Inga S. Kirkovska

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Liudmyla A. Semak

Dnipro State Agrarian and Economic University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Abstract--The objective of the research is to describe mental and verbal primary and secondary (modern) compressive transformations. Main research methods are represented by the descriptive and structural ones making it possible to demonstrate characteristic aspects of univerb- and composite-formation (including abbreviation) as the processes corresponding to the essence of verbal compression. A tendency to compensative processes in speech and language is represented by the formations capable of complete substituting of the analytical primary names of objects, signs, and actions of the reality. In other words, a compensative process implies, apart from its main task, – balancing of the number of verbal units, – contraction of sounding duration and writing form of those units, i.e., substitution of analytical, multicomponent, nominative formations for the synthetic, monocomponent ones; that means saving time and space as the means of information conveyance. That tendency originates in the Common Slavic period. Univerbs and abbreviations, including telescopisms, are real forms of nominative units of analytical representation (word combinations) and potential alternative forms of synthetic (verbal) nominative units as the same time.

Keywords---abbreviation, compensatory tendencies, nominative unit, psycholinguistic factors, univerbation, verbal compression.

Introduction

Topical thoughts of the linguists concerning the fact that “the most customary and, at the same time, the most perfect type of thinking is connected with the language; verbal and cogitative activity is the most complicated type of human activity. To become somebody else’s property, an idea should be objectivistic, it should get some embodied form” (Serebrennikov, 1988), have become the reason of this research, which essence is in determination and description of prerequisites of the origin of nominative units being the result of verbal compression. The latter is one of the brightest examples illustrating the coexistence of two seemingly “mutually exclusive” (Eremkina, 2003), tendencies characterizing a pragmatic purpose of the nomination act: the tendency to save linguistic resources along with the tendency to preserve the completeness of the information being conveyed. At the same time, the phenomenon of compression itself also supposes wider – linguo-psychological – understanding. That is the phenomenon which can give the facts for adequate explanation of the features of transformations of analytical structures of speech and thinking into certain synthetic units.

According to the comments by Vygotskii (1999), “linguistics sees the development of the notional aspect of speech as the changes in a subject context of words; however, it denies the idea that during the historical progress of some language, notional structure of a word meaning changes as well as the psychological nature of that meaning; the idea that the linguistic thought moves from the lowest and primitive forms of generalization to the highest and the most complicated ones being expressed in some abstract notions; and, finally, the idea that not only subject context of a word but the nature of the reality representation and generalization in a word is experiencing specific changes during the historical development of a language”.

Potebnya (2012), highlighted that “Every single time a speaker faces the necessity to transform the “extralinguistic content”, i.e., a nonsegmented thought formed under the effect of external and internal factors, and express it according to the concrete communication tasks in terms of strict linguistic forms. That transformation of a nonsegmented thought into a linguistic form and its representation outwardly is the necessarily creative act occurring automatically under one and the same typical conditions with little intellectual efforts or, in terms of other conditions, requiring an ultimate intensification of the speaker’s thinking abilities and deep knowledge of language (AlHammadi, 2016; Szekely et al., 2004). While clothing his / her thoughts in words, a speaker is making a choice (basing on his/her knowledge of language) among the varieties of linguistic means. That is the way how a speaker participates in the common circulation of linguistic processes, obeying simultaneously the standards and usage, or going beyond both of them in his/her individual speech formation”. That is possible due to apperception – one of the fundamental properties of human mentality, a

process as a result of which the elements of conscience become clear and well-defined (Melnyk et al., 2021; Zaitseva & Zatsnyi, 2021).

Materials and Methods

Researchers highlight that “psycholinguistics uses theoretical and empiric methods of both psychology and linguistics to study thinking processes being the basis of the language mastering and use” (Slobin & Green, 1976). An idea as for real human speech and its understanding “where there are numerous intermediate psychological variables changing the behavioral pattern created on the basis of an ideal linguistic model of language ability” is of the utmost importance. Thus, the memory span does not allow a person to originate and understand a sentence that exceeds a specific length and level of complexity” (Slobin & Green, 1976). Moreover, the nature of human memory limits perception and reproduction of the number of morphemes and syllables in a word. In this context an idea by Bekhtereva et al. (1977), is rather interesting; she stresses that a great share of verbal memory is stored in economic, compressed or even in a connected complex form: “... the brain is capable of recording in a long-term memory with further outputting of the whole blocks into the operating memory”. The researcher trends to the idea that the capacity and importance of a “block-type” memory should be the initial point to search for the stereotypy forming, as we consider, the basis of the verbal compensative processes.

The objective of the research is to describe mental and verbal primary and secondary (modern) compressive transformations. To reach the objective, following problems should be solved: 1) to describe psycholinguistic causes of verbal compression; 2) to analyze genetic basics of verbal and thinking processes; 3) to identify features of the formation of univerbs, abbreviations etc. from the viewpoint of chronology; 4) to determine the reason of verbal compression processes. Main research methods are represented by the descriptive and structural ones making it possible to demonstrate characteristic aspects of univerb- and composite-formation (including abbreviation) as the processes corresponding to the essence of verbal compression. To identify the transformation forms of nominative units, a method of distributive analysis is involved. The theory elaboration is based on a genetic method, in terms of which some represented objects and some system of “admissible operations on the objects” are considered as the starting point (Leontiev, 1997). Certain etymologization techniques were applied as well.

Results and Discussion

A tendency to compensative processes in speech and language is represented by the formations capable of complete substituting of the analytical primary names of objects, signs, and actions of the reality. In other words, a compensative process implies, apart from its main task, – balancing of the number of verbal units, – contraction of sounding duration and writing form of those units, i.e. substitution of analytical, multicomponent, nominative formations for the synthetic, monocomponent ones; that means saving time and space as the means of information conveyance (Echarri, 2006; Chandra & Dwivedi, 2020). That tendency originates in the Common Slavic period. It is interesting that the first

results of such processes were observed during the transformation of complex figures, images of thinking human activity into the synthetic verbal units. Since “somatism is considered chronologically as one of the most ancient layers of lexis”, being thus “perceived as the primary linguistic units”, try to use them as an example to model the primary processes of a verbal and thinking compression using the techniques of etymological analysis as well. In this context, [Shpitko \(2017\)](#), studying the Common Slavic derivative lexemes nominating the human head front from forehead to chin, notes that there is a limited number of such units: «1) Russian *лицо*, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Serbian *лице*, Croatian *lice*, Ukrainian *обличчя*; 2) Belorussian *твар*, Polish *twarz*, Czech *tvář*, Slovakian *tvár*, 3) Slovenian *obrâz*». It is no doubt that those nominative units are the derivatives of the Common Slavic origin being proved by the materials of etymological and word-formation studies as well as etymological dictionaries. For instance, **lice* is considered a Slavic innovation, which word-forming basis is represented by verb **liti* ([Králík, 2015](#)), being the same for lexemes **likъ*, **oblikъ*, and **obličьje* as well. A derivative **obličьje* “face, image, appearance” is formed with the help of suffix **-ьje* from noun **oblikъ* (<**likъ* < **liti*). Etymologists suppose that the notion “to form by casting (Russian *litiyo*)” is the producing unit for Slavic lexemes **likъ*, **lice*, and, in its turn, the name of face, image, appearance itself (Russian *лицо*, *облик*) is formed from the verb **liti*, being the implementation of cultural meaning of casting and foundry practice, a craft in the early ancient Slavic age ([Trubachev & Zhuravlev, 1975](#)). “The stated etymological theory is also confirmed by such structures as Russian *вылитый отец* (they say like that about a son who looks like his farther very much) [ibid.]». The abovementioned has helped [Shpitko \(2017\)](#), to conclude that there is following model of the formation of modern meaning of lexemes *лицо* and *обличчя*: “a mould made by casting (of metal or wax)” > “human contours” > “human face”. Etymologies of the mentioned units illustrate clearly the primary verbal and thinking compression.

However, not only somatism is the representations of this process. [Potebnya \(2012\)](#), wrote that “subjects are called in a language according to one of their signs taken from the total amount of the other signs: *река* – flowing (Kor. *рик*, Skr. *рич*, to flow, or, which is more probable, *ри*, the same as in Old Ukrainian *ринуть* and German *rienen*), *берег* – protecting, guarding (Serbian *Брѣгъ*, hill, consequently almost the same as German *Berg*, being, according to Grimm, from the meaning preserved in *bergen*, to hide, to protect, our *беречь*), or, according to the constant epithet – steep, abrupt (compare: Greek *φράγ* – *φυμι* = Greek *φ*), *небо* – covering, *туча* – pouring, *трава* – being devoured, serving as food etc. It clearly comes to the front that all those signs mean the names of activities: one should have the word *тпру* (*-ту*) for the activity of devouring in order to use it for designating grass as food”.

One or another word- and/or form-building means, appeared in a language during certain stages of its development, implement formally the lingual compensative processes stipulated by saving of verbal efforts. For instance, the Common Slavic stage (before the middle of the 1st millennium A.D.) is characterized by the occurrence of 1) models of suffixal word- /form-building (**pã-rěktī* – Old Russian *поречи*, Polish *porzeć*, Czech *pořeknout*, Slovenian *poreč*, Bulgarian *порицавам*; **nã-rěktī* – Old Russian *напечи*, Polish *narzeć*, Czech *nařeknout*, Slovenian *nareč*, Bulgarian *нарека*; **zã-rěktī* – Old Russian *запечи*, Polish *zarzeć*,

Czech *zařeknout*, Slovakian *nariekat'*, *vyrieknuť*, Slovenian *zareč*, Bulgarian *запека* etc.); 2) models of suffixal word-formation:

- postverbal nouns with suffix **-l-ō* (**-dl-ō*) (**rēktī* – **rēk-lō*, Old Russian *печи – рекло*);
- adjectives with suffix *-н-* (*-ьн-*) (Old Russian *нарочьнъ, порочьнъ, урочьнъ*, Russian *нарочный, урочный*, Czech *obročny*);
- nouns with suffix *-ик-* (*-иц-а*) of Indo-European origin (**-k-*), added originally to the old stems (Russian *урочник*, Ukrainian *урочник*, Czech *uročník*);
- nouns with suffix *-иц-е*, originating from **-isk-je(o)* (Old Russian *отроцище, отроцищ*);
- nouns with suffix *-ств-о* (stem in *-ст-* + suffix *-в-о*) (Russian *отрочество, пророчество*, Ukrainian *пророцтво*, Polish *proroctwo*, Czech *prorocství*, Slovakian *prorocstvo*);
- postverbal nouns with suffix *-тель-*, formed on the basis of Indo-European **-tel-* (Russian *порочитель*, Bulgarian *порочител*, Serbian *порочитель*).

Later, according to the principle of linguistic analogy dictated also by psychological features of speech modelling, words were formed in terms of the already existed samples: “Being a representative of a special series of words, each derivative word becomes easily a role model (during word-formation by analogy) and, similarly, a simple object for its identification and understanding in the image and likeness of the units from its class as well. That may allow assuming that the derivative words are easier to recognize, understand, and create than the underived words, requiring accurate reproduction” (Serebrennikov, 1988).

Such transformations are also connected with the formation of a linguistic view of the world that, in its turn, depends on the peculiarities of human mentality, its ability to generate images represented in a word. Lexical inventory “is closely connected with the fragmentation of our surrounding reality with the emphasis on certain values in the outer (nature and society) and inner human being (human mentality etc.) (Aryani, 2019; Ginaya et al., 2018). Although, as we have already mentioned, not all elements of conceptual systems “are attached” to the linguistic forms, and not all subjects, phenomena, processes, and properties are given their names in the subject world, the opposite idea is true: everything, which is called by a separate word, singled out by the human mind, attracted human attention for one reason or another, have already entered the fund of knowledge shared with other people”.

A process of partitioning “with the help of singling out and further nomination” of the surrounding reality is of absolute interest. Serebrennikov (1988), put emphasis on the principles being the basis for such partitioning “under condition that during the act of nomination the name acquires a form of a derivative word”. That thesis allows us to widen the understanding of the derivative word concept: all the nominative units are derived – some of them are derived from the figures of human verbal and thinking activity (they are considered genetically primary, underived), the others are derived from those first units in terms of the established models of word- and form-building (they are considered derived as such).

Researchers claim reasonably that “in the developed language, basic elements (units) of a conceptual system act as the ones having their names; moreover, their categorical schemes have already been formed: prerequisites for the categorization of all newly formed names are already available. Thus, rendering of any designated unit to comply with the categorical scheme, being already formulated in this language, is a verbal and thinking act” (Serebrennikov, 1988). For instance, Nikolaieva (1991), singles out two statements characterizing the reasons of linguistic development in general. First, that is the statement that the tendency to convey constantly growing amount of information per time unit is performed by a language in two ways: by compression and by supersegmentation. Secondly, it is a statement that in terms of languages being evolved to a greater extent than others, the formulated tendency is implemented in a greater degree.

It is no doubt that analysis of the nomination process helps reveal its essence, “identify the known stereotypes of the object correlation with its future name, determine the parameters effecting actively at the moment when different objects are being nominated”. We agree completely with the opinion of linguists (who have analyzed the linguistic material in the context of its attribution to the human verbal and thinking activity) as for the fact that the knowing and use of the underived and derived lexical units in speech differs significantly. That is because of the following: “the underived lexis is adopted (memorized and used) in a “single-unit” way, contrary to which it is possible to master the derived lexis in a “module-by-module” way”. For instance, Fillmore (1984), wrote: “Unmotivated words are somewhat more “complicated” as they are to be memorized and understood separately while motivated words are easier to remember and understand even in cases when their meaning is not “figured out” automatically from the meanings of its parts”.

Among the topical processes of verbal compression, we specify the processes of elliptical univertation, abbreviation, and some types of stem-composition recorded in modern Indo-European languages. They may be classified as follows.

- The process when word interpretation of an abstract nominative unit with an analytical-type dominant “is created by means of ellipsis”, modification of a word combination into a word, which stem or the word on the whole “is its component” (Terkulov, 2008). They are the following:
 - ellipsis towards the dependent word (Russian *столовая комната* – *столовая*; Ukrainian *молода дівчина* – *молода, наречена дівчина* – *наречена*; German *abnorme Person* – *abnorm*, *anomal Person* – *anomal*);
 - ellipsis towards the main word (Russian *детская площадка* – *площадка*; Ukrainian *дитячий майданчик* – *майданчик*; English *playing field* – *field*; French *terrain de jeux* – *terrain*);
- elliptic univertation that can result in
 - nouns (Russian *лавровый лист* – *лаврошка, самка льва* – *львица, женищина-прокурор* – *прокурорша*; Ukrainian *учасник АТО* – *атовець, нічний світильник* – *нічник*; English *mobile phones* – *mobiles*);
 - adjectives (Russian *очень добрый* – *добрейший, крайне сложный* – *наисложнейший*; Ukrainian *надзвичайно небезпечний* –

- найнебезпечніший, дуже потрібний – найпотрібніший; German sehr nett – am nettesten; English very kind – kindest);*
- verbs (Russian *делать макет – макетировать, выставлять пикеты – пикетировать; Ukrainian заплітати косу – закосичувати(ся); French faire du blanc – blanchir; English to make white – whiten);*
 - participles (Russian *пропитанный маслом – промасленный; Ukrainian покритий фарбою – пофарбований);*
 - adverbial participle (Russian *покрыв золотом – вызолотив, покрывая золотом – вызолачивая; Ukrainian зробивши білим – вибіливши);*
 - adverbs (Russian *невероятно тонко – тончайше, невероятно сложно – наисложнейше; Ukrainian дуже гостро – найгостріше; German unglaublich schwierig – das Schwierigste; English very hard – hardest);*
 - interjections (Russian *огромное спасибо – спасибище; Ukrainian маленькі привіти – привіткульки, невеличке вітання – вітаннячко) (Diachok & Ivko, 2020).*
- Processes when verbal interpretation of an abstract nominative unit with the analytic-type dominant “is created by composite compression of a word combination” (Terkulov, 2008). The following is classified here:
 - abbreviation (Russian *собственный корреспондент – собкор; Ukrainian державний службовець – держслужбовець, державна транспортна служба – держтрансслужба; English British Council – BC, British National Corpus – BNC, modulator and demodulator – modem; French de professionnel et logiciel – progiciel, de deutsch et English – denglish; German Motorrad und Fahrrad – Moped, Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst – DAAD);*
 - proper formal compression when we can observe simple interpretation of a collocation as a word (Russian *вяло текущий – вялотекущий, с ума сшедший – сумасшедший; Ukrainian швидко плінний – швидкоплинний; English long playing – long-playing, mad man – madman; German wahn sinnig – wahnsinnig);*
 - compressive univerbation when compression is accompanied by the word-building imitation (Russian *широкий в плечах – широкоплечий, ученик первого класса – первоклассник; Ukrainian з довгим тілом – довготелесий, дівчина з білими бровами – білобровка, учень першого класу – першокласник; English with broad shoulders – broad-shouldered; German mit breiten Schultern – breitschultrig).*

For the recent decades, the represented processes have demonstrated their active development. The resultative units of that process – elliptic univerbs, abbreviations, telescopisms, composites – are such verbal derivatives that are motivated by the initial word combination and formed according to the already existing models, thus they are reproduced in a “model-by-model” way: Ukrainian *уналежнювати (вважати належним), вияскравити (зробити яскравим), затуманитися (вкритися туманом); Russian нобелянт (нобелевский лауреат), минсковать (выполнять Минские договорённости), нострифицироваться (проходить / пройти нострификацию), ночник (ночная вечеринка), синхронист (синхронный переводчик); Bulgarian любопитка (любопитна информация (новина)), найлонка (найлонова торбичка); Slovakian*

obývačka (obývací izba), kopírka / kopírovačka (kopírovací stroj), mikrovlnka (mikrovlnová rúra); Polish mikrofalówka / mikrofała (kuchenka mikrofalowa), komórka (telefon komórkowy); English identicals (identical twins), medias (mass media), mobiles (mobile phones); German Ladenfräulein – продавщица, Büfettfräulein – буфетчица, Dachwerk – крыша, Schuhwerk – обувь, Laubwerk – листва; French motel (de motorway et hotel), modem (de modulateur et démodulateur).

As for the “model-by-model” formation of univerbs, abbreviations, and similar units, the observation by [Mustafinova \(2001\)](#), is true; while studying abbreviation, she makes a conclusion that as soon as one or another cognitive model is formed, the abbreviation process based on the mechanism of compression starts covering the word combinations being not of frequency nature but representing the cognitive structures, which shows the knowing of one thematic/associative field. In other words, a law of analogy, being universal for the mental processes, comes into effect.

A “model-by-model” word-building based on the pragmatic desire of a person to talk less spending minimum of linguistic and physical resources along with the conveyance of maximum information is supported by the depths of human brain’s cognitive resources. According to [Bekhtereva \(1988\)](#), being fixed in the memory, minimization of the use of structural brain capacities creates prerequisites for optimal development of special human activity – superior functions of the brain. That requires one condition: establishing of stable and repeated relations between the performed function or activity and cognitive system of a person which will help make the activity components to be operational... One of the correlates of neurophysiological links providing a stereotyped activity in the conceptual system of an individuum is represented by the conventional stereotypes “which demonstrate a cognitive structure representing the knowledge about the repeated situation, its part or a specific object” ([Dmitrieva, 1996](#)). Assume that the elliptic univerbs, composites or abbreviations are the result of “condensing” of stereotypic nominations. In this case, a cognitive model representing each of the mentioned units has a lot in common with the conventional stereotype; moreover, it is formed in ontogenesis as a stereotype.

[Mustafinova \(2001\)](#), considers that during the functioning of any dynamic system, there is a stage when the activity elements become operational, and relations between them experience their stabilization. This is that stage when a compression mechanism may occur – a mechanism based on the overall integrative function of brain/thinking in terms of the available factors of frequency and reproducibility of the activity. Thus, “compression of stable relations is the universal mental mechanism”, which should function in the verbal activity as well. That process acquires different forms in a language: abbreviation, univerbation, graphic contractions etc. Consequently, there is a series of reasons for the occurrence of univerbs, composites, and abbreviations, among which intralinguistic and extralinguistic ones can be singled out ([Haggard, 1973](#); [Yarkoni, 2010](#); [Suwija et al., 2019](#)). For instance, it is considered that “univerbation is a special case of the manifestation of one of the common tendencies in the language development, i.e., a tendency to the regularity of intralinguistic relations, to the formation of linguistic automatism. Besides, that

activation is also caused by the action of one of the main laws of lexis development – striving to overcome the internal contradiction between the compartmentalization of the nomination form and unity of its meaning” (Diachok, 2015).

Psychological prerequisites analyzed above are no doubt among the extralinguistic ones. Apart from that, extralinguistic circumstances meaning the abrupt acceleration of “the current life pace, that is structurally expressed in the processes of elimination of the partition-formed nominations and univerbation, i.e., compression of nominative word combinations of integral semantics and frequent usage into a word” (Shanskiy, 1969). While studying the verbal compression processes, it is quite important to take into consideration that the intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors always complement each other being often indivisible, syncretic. “Psychological factor is a factor of self-regulation of the number of morphemes and syllables in a word within the limits optimal for the human operative memory. As it has been stressed before, capacity of the human operating memory imposes certain constraints both on the number of morphemes in a word, i.e., on its depth, and on the amount of its syllables, i.e., on its length. For example, most words of the modern Russian language consist of 2–5 morphemes and 2–5 syllables; it helps conclude that those parameters determine morphological and phonetic volume of words being optimal for the operative memory” (Diachok, 2015), in the Indo-European languages. Morphological and phonetic structure of univerbs and telescopisms just correspond to the optical structure of words. For instance, Russian univerbs *пекарша* (*женщина-пекарь*), *конфетница* (*ваза для конфет*) consists of 3 morphemes and 4 syllables; univerbs *дальняк* (*дальний свет*), *глупец* (*глупый человек*), *курсак* (*курсовой проект*) consists of 3 morphemes and 2 syllables; univerbs *ажурки* (*ажурные чулки*), *зачетка* (*зачетная книжка*) consists of 3 morphemes and 3 syllables; compare with English *twenties* (*twenty years*), *puzzled* (*to be like a puzzle*), *the oldest* (*the most old*), *mobiles* (*mobile phones*).

We believe that it is necessary to study cognitive and psychological basis of the tendency to save linguistic means. According to Bekhtereva (1988), a mechanism of condensing of expanded forms into their compressed analogue is universal for the human mental activity. We consider that in the process of word combination compression into a univerb can detect the operations which are impossible to observe in the human brain during the thinking activity. It is possible to draw an analogy between the results of compression in a language, i.e. the obtained contractions – peculiar codes of the expanded word combinations and the codes formed in the human head during the mental activity (Joopudi et al., 2018; de Leon & Kay, 2020). While analyzing the functioning of abbreviations and their complete analogues, that “the occurrence of both is possible only under conditions of the available stiff referential relations between the complete and contracted variants. Both codes are operational and capable of individual functioning in its system without the immediate attribution with its complete analogues (non-verbalized thinking activity of a person and his/her ability to make decisions and conclusions mentally, and free functioning of abbreviations (as well as univerbs. – *Auth.*) in a text and speech)”. Both codes preserves only meaningful elements of the initial expanded form being the indicators for reconstruction of a complete form (the abbreviation letters are used to reconstruct

the initial expanded word combination; the code signals in the human brain are used to reconstruct a complete word being further verbalized). Zharina (2011), tells that “the projecting of cognitive knowledge on a language (on the corresponding linguistic units) is characterized by the considerable reduction of speech efforts”. She believes that the first reason here is the pre-text cognitive and thinking operations “which implementation is stipulated by the property of human thinking not to express explicitly the knowledge about real world, being in the fund of panhuman knowledge, or knowledge forming a conceptual framework of some specific nation as well as the knowledge which restoration in case of communicative failure is possible by the operations of logical induction”. In terms of theory of discourse, Van Dyke (2000), stated that “in case of the available sequence of propositions, it is necessary to eliminate those propositions which are not the conditions of interpretation”. Moreover, “the phenomenon of univerbation tells about not only saving of verbal efforts but about the striving of a language for “verbalization”, the tendency to synthetism or, at least, to balancing of analytism and synthetism” (Gafarova, 2009).

Luchik (2006), explains the dependence of occurrence of, for instance, equivalents of a word by action of two opposite forces (tendencies). On the one hand, those are the tendencies forcing the system to evolve; on the other hand, they are the ones restraining the changes. She supposes that “as a result of the action of two opposite tendencies, any natural language experiences the formation of various forms which do not belong to any of its structural categories. Such elements are considered mostly as the units of transient levels of a linguistic system”. In this context, appraisive aspect of the problem (whether it is good or bad for us to convey and get more and more reduced, compressed information) is not considered. Nikolaieva (1991), thinks that a language can “move towards the conveyance of greater amount of information per time unit by modification of linguistic units, i.e., words and their components” without any violation of perceptive laws stipulating certain capacities of compression. She is also sure that the implementation of this tendency in terms of content is symmetric or even parallel to the development of a phonetic aspect. In this case it is possible to talk about compression as well.

Observations of lexicographers show that the semantic development of the vocabulary of standard languages of recent decades is characterized by the intralinguistic stipulation in terms of comparatively small number of semantic innovations aimed at denominating something new. However, it is obvious that there are other reasons favouring active formation and wide spreading of synthetic – verbal – equivalents of word combinations of nominative units with the dominant word combination (Norris & Kalm, 2021; Ritzhaupt et al., 2008). One should also bear in mind that during the lexical and semantic analysis of a word, such components peculiar for each word as referential meaning, associative component, and emotive aspect must be taken into consideration. In our opinion, in case of most verbalized word combinations, associative component goes to the foreground in terms of preserved referential meaning peculiar for the motivating word combination.

Osipova (1991), states that at least Russian speech of the late 20th century is characterized by heavy growth of univerbs with suffix -κ- as well as their wide use

in mass-media texts. “This is not by accident if we take into account the statements of linguistic existence of a person and social-psychological situation of that time. In terms of numerous words, there appeared peculiar enantiosemy, mutual rejection of the referential function and associative component, lexical meaning of the producing stem and verbal-colloquial tone of suffix -к-”: Russian *арбитражный суд* – *арбитражка*, *лабораторная работа* – *лабораторка*, *несознательная позиция* – *несознанка*, *пятиэтажный дом* – *пятиэтажка*, *охранное отделение* – *охранка*, *очаровательный человек* – *очаровашка*, *кисломолочная продукция* – *кисломолочка*, *полукопченая колбаса* – *полукопченка* etc.”

Univerbs of the mentioned type are not only the colloquial equivalents of two-word nominations, “compressed characteristics” or “words-qualifiers” as [Osipova \(1991\)](#), points out. She considers – and we cannot but agree with her opinion – that their role and importance go beyond the range of purely linguistic analysis: such derivatives occurred and continue occurring as a result of inter-style contradiction caused by the social factor (e.g., frequent selection of the colloquial speech units instead of official nominations): English *You are a real homester and prefer staying at home!*

Thus, a mechanism of complete word combination compression into a certain code is a natural human ability being operated unconsciously during each act of speaking or memorizing the information. [Bekhtereva et al. \(1977\)](#), supposes that the compressed code forms are the basic operative units of intellectual and mnemonic activity. As [Mustafinova \(2001\)](#), notes aptly, “a mechanism of compression (having a univerbation process as one of its implementation forms in verbal processes – *Auth.*) functioning in neurophysiological, mental, and verbal processes experienced stage-by-stage formation continuing its formation up to now”.

Conclusion

The aforementioned demonstrates that univerbs and abbreviations, including telescopisms, are real forms of nominative units of analytical representation (word combinations) and potential alternative forms of synthetic (verbal) nominative units at the same time. Features of the occurrence of those units tell mostly about the form-building than the word-building in the traditional interpretation of those concepts. If we transfer univerbation as well as abbreviation into the system of word-building coordinates, then the process will be determined as the internal (verbal) word-formation stipulated by the internal motivation leading, in its essence, to the occurrence of a new but only verbal unit; that brings us back again to the concept of form in which a linguistic nominative unit is represented. The research makes it possible to conclude that the process of univerbation and abbreviation are characteristic for different languages at different stages of their development: both during the period of functioning of proto-languages – source languages, and during the modern stage. From the viewpoint of time and mechanism of occurrence in speech, compressives – the result of the processes of verbal compression – are represented by two classes. Class one includes the units obtained by mental and verbal primary (early) transformations; class two consists of the units obtained as a result of secondary (modern) compressive

transformations. Those transformations are stipulated by apperception – one of the fundamental properties of human mentality. Complete justified striving to save expressive means with further simplification of the communication process is the considerable factor favouring the growing activity of the univerbation and abbreviation processes. The research material demonstrates the phenomenon of syntagmatic saving resulting in the contraction of the expanded linear structure of nominations and their substitution with shorter units being more convenient for communication.

References

- AlHammadi, F. S. (2016). Psycholinguistic determinants of immigrant second language acquisition. *Lingua*, 179, 24-37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2016.03.001>
- Aryani, M. R. D. (2019). The Ellipsis of Grammatical Functions in Coordinative Structure of Japanese Language. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Culture*, 6(5), 92-101.
- Bekhtereva, N. P. (1988). *Zdorovyy i bol'noy mozg cheloveka* [Healthy and Pathological Human Brain].
- Bekhtereva, N. P., Bundzen, P. V., & Gogolitsyn Yu, L. (1977). Brain codes of mental activity. *Leningrad: Science, Leningrad Branch*, 165.
- Chandra, G., & Dwivedi, S. K. (2020). Query expansion based on term selection for Hindi-English cross lingual IR. *Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences*, 32(3), 310-319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksuci.2017.09.002>
- de Leon, R. P., & Kay, A. C. (2020). Political ideology and compensatory control mechanisms. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 34, 112-117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.02.013>
- Diachok, N. (2015). *Univerbation in the Russian language: structural and semantic and onomasiological description*. Artyomovsk: Gorlovsky State Pedagogical Institute Foreign Languages.
- Diachok, N., & Ivko, A. (2020). Univerbation as an interlingual phenomenon. *Language: codification, competence, communication*, (1 (2)), 72-82.
- Dmitrieva, N. (1996). *Conventional stereotype as a means of regulating the perception of verbalized content*. Moscow: State Academy named after Maimonides.
- Echarri, P. (2006, September). Revisiting the history of lingual orthodontics: a basis for the future. In *Seminars in Orthodontics* (Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 153-159). WB Saunders. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.sodo.2006.05.002>
- Eremkina, G. (2003). *On the prospects for the development of the abbreviated way of word formation in terminology. Lexical and grammatical innovations in modern Slavic languages*. Dnipropetrovsk: Dnipro.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1984). Lexical semantics and text semantics. *New directions in linguistics and semiotics*, 32, 123-147.
- Gafarova, R. 2009. *Suffixal Univerbs of the Russian language: semantics, derivative relations*. Simferopol: Crimean Engineering and Pedagogical University.

- Ginaya, G., Rejeki, I. N. M., & Astuti, N. N. S. (2018). The effects of blended learning to students' speaking ability. *International journal of linguistics, literature and culture*, 4(3), 1-14.
- Haggard, M. (1973). Abbreviation of consonants in English pre-and post-vocalic clusters. *Journal of Phonetics*, 1(1), 9-24. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0095-4470\(19\)31378-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0095-4470(19)31378-6)
- Joopudi, V., Dandala, B., & Devarakonda, M. (2018). A convolutional route to abbreviation disambiguation in clinical text. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 86, 71-78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2018.07.025>
- Králik, L. (2015). Brief etymological dictionary of Slovak, Bratislava.
- Leontiev, A. (1997). *Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics*. Moscow: Sense.
- Luchik, A. (2006). Dictionary of word equivalents of the Ukrainian language.
- Melnyk, N. I., Bogush, A. M., Vertuhina, V. M., Trofaila, N. D., & Rohalska, N. V. (2021). Comparative research in the field of professional education of preschool teachers: comparative content analysis as a method of authentic interpretation of concepts. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 231-245. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS2.1342>
- Mustafinova, E. (2001). *Abbreviation in Russian: a cognitive aspect*. Moscow: State Institute of the Russian Language named after A. Pushkin.
- Nikolayeva, T. (1991). Diachrony or evolution (about one trend of language development). *Linguistic issues*, 2, 12-25.
- Norris, D., & Kalm, K. (2021). Chunking and data compression in verbal short-term memory. *Cognition*, 208, 104534. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2020.104534>
- Osipova, L. (1991). Suffixal univerbs with non-objective semantics in Russian. *High school scientific reports: Philological Sciences*, 5, 61-69.
- Potebnya, A. (2012). *Thought and language*. Moscow: Direct-Media.
- Ritzhaupt, A. D., Gomes, N. D., & Barron, A. E. (2008). The effects of time-compressed audio and verbal redundancy on learner performance and satisfaction. *Computers in human behavior*, 24(5), 2434-2445. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2008.02.017>
- Serebrennikov, B. A. (1988). The role of the human factor in the language: Language and the picture of the world. *Moscow: Science*, 80.
- Shanskiy, N. (1969). The development of the word-formation system of the Russian language in the Soviet era. *Thoughts on modern Russian*, 11, 155-166.
- Shpitko, I. (2017). Semantic model of motivation and nomination of somatism "face" in modern Slavic languages. In: *Internation research and practice conference "Contemporary issues in philological sciences: experience of scholars and educationalists of Poland and Ukraine"*. Lublin: Lublin Science and Technology Park S.A.
- Slobin, D., & Green, J. (1976). *Psycholinguistics*. Moscow: Progress.
- Suwija, N., Suarta, M., Suparsa, N., Alit Geria, A.A.G., Suryasa, W. (2019). Balinese speech system towards speaker social behavior. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(5), 32-40. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.754>
- Szekely, A., Jacobsen, T., D'Amico, S., Devescovi, A., Andonova, E., Herron, D., ... & Bates, E. (2004). A new on-line resource for psycholinguistic studies. *Journal of memory and language*, 51(2), 247-250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2004.03.002>
- Terkulov, V. I. (2008). *Composites of the Russian Language in the onomasiological aspect* (Doctoral dissertation, dissertation [Kompozity russkogo yazyka v

- onomasiologicheskom aspekte: diss. na soiskanie fluchen. stepeni doktora filol. nauk]).
- Trubachev, O. N., & Zhuravlev, A. F. (1975). *Etimologicheskiy slovar'slavyanskikh yazykov* [Etymological dictionary of Slavic languages]. Vols 1–37.
- Van Dyke, J. M. (2000). The Fundamental Human Rights to Prosecution and Compensation. *Denv. J. Int'l L. & Pol'y*, 29, 77.
- Vygotskii, L. S. (1999). *Mysl'i slovo* [Thought and Word]. *Myshlenie i rech'* [Thinking and Speaking], Moscow, Labirint, 276-337.
- Yarkoni, T. (2010). The abbreviation of personality, or how to measure 200 personality scales with 200 items. *Journal of research in personality*, 44(2), 180-198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.01.002>
- Zaitseva, M., & Zatsnyi, Y. (2021). American courtroom discourse: psycholinguistic aspect. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1), 305-317. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5n1.1601>
- Zharina, O. (2011). Cognitive foundations of expression: speech economy in Russian and English. *Bulletin of the Southern Federal University: Philological Sciences*, 1, 165-171.