Truncation and trimming in ukrainian theoretical derivatology

Iryna Denysovets[1]

Kateryna Horodenska[2]

Tetyana Nikolashyna[3]

Iryna Pavlova[4]

[1]PhD in Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of Ukrainian Studies, Culture and Documentation National University «Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic», Poltava, Ukraine.
[2]Doctor of Philological Science, Professor, Head of the Department of Grammar and Scientific Terminology, National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Institute for Ukrainian Language», Kyiv, Ukraine.
[3,4]Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of the Ukrainian Language, Poltava V. G. Korolenko National Pedagogical University, Poltava, Ukraine.

Truncation and trimming in ukrainian theoretical derivatology

Iryna Denysovets[1], Kateryna Horodenska[2], Tetyana Nikolashyna[3], Iryna Pavlova[4]
[1]PhD in Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of Ukrainian Studies, Culture and Documentation National University «Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic», Poltava, Ukraine.
[2]Doctor of Philological Science, Professor, Head of the Department of Grammar and Scientific Terminology, National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Institute for Ukrainian Language», Kyiv, Ukraine.
[3,4]Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of the Ukrainian Language, Poltava V. G. Korolenko National Pedagogical University, Poltava, Ukraine.
Email ID: denysovets.ira@gmail.com, k.horodenska70@meta.ua, t.nikolashina@ukr.net, livelyfamily13@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
The relevance of the proposed study is due to the need to fully trace the formation of a system of terms to define the concept of «cutting off» the phonemic end or a certain part of the creative basis in the process of forming new words in the Ukrainian language, which will contribute to the terminological ordering in Ukrainian derivatology. The article investigates the formation of the terms truncation and trimming in Ukrainian derivatology, the influence of the corresponding terms of Russian derivatology on this process was noted. The correlation of the term «truncation» to numerous terms in different periods of development of linguistics was characterized. We paid special attention to those based on the clipping (rejection) of the part of the creative basis, accompanied by phonetic changes and without them, in particular with such as the affix-free (suffix-free) method of creation, rederivation (inverse word formation), zero suffixation, elision, apocope, telescopy, etc. The characteristic features of two terminological units at the present stage of development of Ukrainian derivatology were singled out: truncation as a morphological phenomenon and trimming as an independent way of word formation. It was found that truncation of the creative basis is possible not only during affixation, but also in the absence of any affixes in derived words. We can observe this phenomenon in the creation of complex words of different types. It is called an abbreviation truncation of bases or an abbreviation type of abbreviation, on the basis of which the abbreviation type of word formation was distinguished. Alternatively, we can call it an abbreviation, the essence of which is the formation of the word-abbreviation due to the reduction of words of the corresponding nominative phrase. The tendency of the term elision to function has been traced, in particular, it has been found out that this term has not become widely used in Ukrainian word formation, obviously because the phenomenon it causes is not very characteristic of word-forming acts of the Ukrainian language.

Keywords: truncation, fixed method of creation, rederivation, elision, trimming.

INTRODUCTION
At each stage of language development and its standardization there is a need to study linguistic phenomena that do not have the same interpretation, clear definition, a single terminological name to codify and introduce it into language practice. One of the most important in Ukrainian linguistics is the problem of formation and codification of the derivatological terminology of modern Ukrainian literary language, first of all, long searches for adequate terminological names for the concepts of word formation as a separate branch of linguistic knowledge.
One such concept is truncation of the creative basis. According to research on word formation in Ukrainian and other languages, it appeared after the basic principles of word formation were formed: creative (word-forming) basis, word-forming affixes (word-forming suffixes, word-forming prefixes), word-forming meaning, word-forming act, method of word-formation, etc. Its appearance was caused by a morphological reason, namely the impossibility to combine the creative basis and the word-forming suffix during the formation of a new word. This happened due to the fact that between them there were phonemic combinations, not typical for the Ukrainian language, which do not meet the norms of distribution of phonemes at morpheme junctions. To

combine them, you need to discard one or two, and sometimes more finite phonemes of the creative basis: vowel or consonant or even phonemic combination.

Expansion and deepening of the theory of word-formation methods, the foundations of which were laid in the first grammars of the Ukrainian language and in the descriptions of the grammatical system, led to the separation of the word-formation method, based on truncation (cutting off) of the creative basis. It is called the affixless way of word formation within the affixless word formation as opposed to the affix-based. This method involves the formation of new words without affixes (prefixes and suffixes). However, the scope of the concept of «affixless method» is broader than truncation, because without affixes new words are formed by the method of addition, including abbreviations, lexical-syntactic, lexical-semantic, morphological-syntactic and others. Therefore, the term *affixless method*, which was narrowed down to the *suffixless method*, word theorists considered unsuccessful (Vinogradov, 1975). In some grammars of the Ukrainian language within the infinitive word formation it is singled out in an independent way of *truncation*, according to which new words are formed by discarding part of the creative basis (Vyhovanets et al., 1982). Other researchers used the concept of «truncation» narrowly, basically to name the processes of formation of mostly colloquial words due to the truncation of adjectives and noun bases within the abbreviation method of word formation, which is known to be based on the reduction of words of the basic nominative phrase (Kovalyk, 2007).

The result of the search for the exact name of the suffixless method was the introduction of the term «*method of zero suffixation*», and later «*a null suffix method of creation*».

As we can see, the problem of cutting off the creative basis has attracted the attention of Ukrainian linguists in two aspects: morphophonological as a condition for combining neighboring phonemes during the formation of new words and word-formational as a way of creating new words, but we still do not trace the clarity and unanimity of the terminological name of these phenomena. In scientific usage, such well-known terms as truncation, suffixless (suffixless) method of creation, zero suffixation, zero suffix method are used. Less common are elision, apocopa, desufixation, regressive word formation, rederivation (reverse word formation), telescopy, trimming, etc.

The relevance of the study is due to the need to fully trace the formation of a system of terms to define the concept of «cutting off» the phonemic end or a certain part of the creative basis in the process of forming new words in the Ukrainian language, which will contribute to the terminological ordering in Ukrainian derivatology.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The aim of the study is to analyze the stages and features of the formation of terms used in Ukrainian word formation to define the clipping (rejection) of the phonemic end or part of the creative basis in the process of new words formation and to justify the expediency of using some and the inexpediency of other terms.

To achieve this goal, a number of methods were used to study word-forming terms at different stages of their functioning. In particular, the classification and interpretation of the studied language units, the description of their differential features made it possible to use the descriptive method. The comparative method revealed differences in several terms to define the same concept and the specifics of their functioning against the background of common features. Clarification, specification of definitions of the analyzed term units was carried out by means of the analysis of definitions, нand on the basis of which the connections of a separate term within a word-forming terminology system were determined to identify the semantic components of the semantics of one term in the meaning of another. To trace the individual stages of the genesis of the word-forming terminology of the Ukrainian language, the method of etymological analysis was used, which was based on the comparative-historical method.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Truncation, as already mentioned, was first called a morphophonological phenomenon associated with the morphological adaptation of the phonemic end of the creative basis with the phonemic beginning of the word-forming suffix. It was considered one of the types of mutual adaptation of morphemes, along with the alternation of phonemes and interfixation during affix word formation (Zemskaya, 1973; Horodenska et al. 1981; Kravchenko, 1988).

This is quite noticeable in the studies of the 60-80s of the twentieth century, devoted to the study of the suffixal creation of nouns, adjectives and verbs in the Ukrainian language (Word formation, 1979; Kravchenko, 1988). Some researchers have used or given the term *elision* in parentheses in parallel with the term truncation, for comparison: «…truncation (elision) is based on certain patterns of combination of word-forming morphemes in a word» or «in the system of word formation of reduced-emotional nouns elision does not belong to the common morphological phenomena, on the basis of which the word-forming act is realized» (Kravchenko, 1988). This identification was unfounded, given the definition of elision in later reference works, for comparison: elision is loss of the final vowel in the word preceding the word with the initial vowel or merging vowels.

V.O. Gorpinich interpreted the phenomenon of truncation in the 90s of the twentieth century in two vectors. On the one hand, it is a morphophonological process of truncation of finite sound segments during the transformation of a motivational word into a creative basis in the process of forming a new lexema, preparation of the creative basis for the accession of the word-forming means (Horpynych, 1999). Here he preferred the term *elision* and identified the causes and types of structural *elisions*. On the other hand, the linguist singled out different subtypes of truncations: *apheresis* – truncation of the initial syllables of the word (*Varvarka → Varka*); *syncope* – truncation of the middle part of the word (*Maritsa → Mitsa*); *apocope* – truncation of the final parts of the word (*Magdalena → Magda*); *abbreviation* – truncation of phrase components (*filolohichnyy fakultet → filfak*) (Horpynych, 1999). None of these subtypes belong to elision, since truncation in such words is not a means of preparing the ground for affix compatibility and does not provide for the replacement of the deformant part with a formant part. Truncation here performs not a morphophonological but a derivational function, because it is a way of word formation.

In our opinion, the introduction of the term *usichennya (truncation)* into the Ukrainian word-forming usage on the definition of a morphophonological phenomenon was due to the influence of the word-forming terminology of the Russian language, where in the same period of its formation the term *usecheniye* (*truncation*) became widespread, correlated on the basis of species with the verb of the imperfect form *usekat (truncate)* and a verb of the perfect form *usech*. In the Ukrainian language, the noun *usichennya* by species meaning is correlated with the verb of the perfect form *usikty*, whereas with the verb of the imperfect form *usikaty* correlates noun *usikannya*. Dictionaries of the Ukrainian language present this type pair of verbs mainly with the stylistic mark *obsolete*. More accurate and stylistically unmarked semantic equivalents to the Russian species pair *usekat – usech* and noun *usecheniye* would be a Ukrainian species pair of verbs *vidsikaty (cut off) – vidsikty* and their derived nouns *vidsikannya – vidsichennya* or species pairs *vidkydaty (reject) – vidkynuty, utinaty – utnuty (utyaty)* and nouns *vidkydannya, utynannya* with the value of the imperfect form. As we can see, the tendency to the uniformity of Ukrainian word-forming terminology with Russian then won. However, the very term *truncation* with the meaning of the method of word formation has not become common in Ukrainian derivatology. But on the basis of truncation as a procedure for the formation of new words created definitions of several now known ways of word formation, in particular: *affixless (regressive), regressive (inverse), rederivation (inverse derivation), zero suffixation (null suffix method), etc.*, which, despite the marked commonality, have their differences.

Due to the distinction between affix and non-affix word formation in the middle of the twentieth century in Ukrainian linguistics, an *affixless*, or *regressive (inverse)*, way of creating words was singled out, the essence of which, by definition, (Kovalyk, 2007), is to discard part of the creative basis to allow the addition of the word-forming suffix. In the section «Basic structural ways of word formation and their interrelation» of his «The teaching of word formation» he described the regressive (inverse) way and noted that among the Slavic derivative names and especially the names of inanimate objects there are derivatives that appeared in this way. He also called it *suffixless* due to the lack of suffixes (Kovalyk, 2007). However, many linguists disagreed with the term *suffixless* method, justifying their objection for various reasons. He was rejected, for example, by the famous Russian linguist (Vinogradov, 1975), because, in his opinion, if we interpret this or that derivative token as *affixless*, then there is no answer to the question by which means its derivational value is expressed. That is why he proposed to introduce the concept of «zero suffix» and «null suffixation» instead of the suffixless method (Vinogradov, 1975). Ukrainian germanist (Zhluktenko, 1958) called this method of word formation regressive (inverse), because some other ways of word formation, for instance, syntactic and morphological (conversion), are also suffixless. He also emphasized that in Slavic textbooks and grammar textbooks all attention is focused on morphological (affixal) and syntactic-morphological (basic composition) ways of word formation, and others are only mentioned. On this basis, the concept of «affix-free (suffix-free, morpheme-free) way» is considered unsuccessful, because if we use such a term, it is unclear how the mechanism of word formation is carried out (by means of which formal (material) means new words appear or what the word-forming meaning is expressed). This method does not indicate the carrier of the word-forming meaning (Horpynych, 1999).

In the linguistic practice of the 60's – 70's of the twentieth century we come across the use of the term *rederivation*, or *inverse word formation* to define the method of creation, in which the materially expressed affix does not take part, and there is a truncation of a creative basis, however the truncated token is perceived not as a derivative, and as creative for that word which has been truncated. The first theoretical descriptions of this phenomenon are found on the example of the English language in the work «Language» of the American scientist (Bloomfield, 1968), which gives examples of reduction (truncation) of creative words and characterizes derivatives as structurally simpler units.

In Ukrainian derivatology, as opposed to Russian (Shansky, 1968), the terms rederivation (inverse word formation) have not become widespread, because the phenomenon they denote is limited and unproductive. In the encyclopedia «Ukrainian language» (Klymenko, 2004) defined *inverse derivation*, *rederivation* as a kind of morphological way of word formation, the consequence of which is a lexical unit that is simpler in structure

than the creative word, and illustrated it with a pair: *doyar (milker) - doyarka (milkmaid)*. She qualified it as an unproductive way of word formation, which can be traced in the diachronic approach to word-forming phenomena (Klymenko, 2004). Usually the nouns formed in this way have an uncodified character, however there are tokens which have arisen by means of rederivation, have entered organically into a lexicon and have become applied to the general public, for comparison: Russian *zont (umbrella)* (← from Dutch *zonnedek*). However, (Rusanivsky et al., 1978) interpreted this example differently, emphasizing that in rare cases the suffix can be separated from the root. If you compare with each other *zont* and *zontik*, then we can conclude that the second was formed from the first as its reduced form by a suffix *-ik*. In fact, the first was formed from the second. The word *zontik* came to Ukrainian from Russian, where it came from Dutch. Its original form – *zondek* – turned into *zontik*, and ending *-ik* compared to such words as *hvostik* (tail), *kotik* (cat), *pivnyk* (rooster), etc., began to be perceived as a diminutive suffix. The suffix stood out here from the root. He called this phenomenon a *complication of the basis* (Rusanivsky et al., 1978).

In the late 60's – 70's of the twentieth century the term *affixless (suffixless) method* in Russian linguistics was replaced by the term *zero suffixation*. The idea of the zero suffix is based on the concept of the zero morpheme, first introduced by (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963), who, in particular, noted that, in addition to morphemes that consist of a certain pronunciation-auditory value, we must also accept zero morphemes, for example those that are devoid of any pronunciation-auditory composition.

In the 80s of the twentieth century in Ukrainian linguistics (Tretevich, 1980) justified the advantage of the term *null suffixation* over others, such as *regressive word formation, truncation, suffixless way of word formation* and proposed the first study of nouns of the Ukrainian language, which became a way of null suffixation.

Reference editions of the Ukrainian language also recorded the term *apocope* to denote a particular way of word formation, the essence of which is defined with some differences: in some it is the formation of new words due to the reduction of the final part of the word, for comparison: *metro (subway)* → *metropoliten, kino (movie, cinema)* → *kinematohraf* (Ganych et al., 1985); in others it is a truncation according to the abbreviation pattern of the final part of the creative basis (word) regardless of the morpheme boundary: *badminton* → *bad, dyuralyuminiy (duralumin)* → *dural, plexiglass* → *plex, specialist* → *spec, operupovnovazhenyy (operative)* → *oper*. However, in Ukrainian theoretical derivatology this term is not common, and derived words formed on such a pattern illustrate other ways of word formation, mostly suffixless or abbreviation.

A new stage in the use of the term *truncation* is associated with the works of A. M. Nelyuba. He emphasized that in modern linguistic practice this term denotes two completely different phenomena: *truncation* as a preparatory - morphophonological - stage in the creation of the word and *truncation* as a direct way of word formation. Therefore, he proposed to clearly distinguish these phenomena, introducing into scientific circulation two terms: *truncation* as a means of morphophonological, additional, supplementary way in the creation of the word and *trimming* as an independent method of derivation, as a result of which new units appear called *cuttings* (Nelyuba, 2007).

We follow way of thinking of (Nelyuba, 2007) and support the idea that *trimming* at the word-forming level is a separate way of creating derivatives, which emerged as a result of formal economy in language, the tendency to rationalize and pragmatism. Nouns formed by the method of ducking have the same semantics as the creative word. In addition, the derived word differs from the creative in terms of use and stylistic color.

(Nelyuba, 2007) stated that the lion's share of *trimming* derivatives arose as a result of cutting nouns. Their creative bases differ in structure (complex and simple) and etymology (own and borrowed). Such derivatives differ in the degree of size of the cut part and the corresponding suffix or inflectional completion. A special group of tokens are derived from words of foreign origin, which in the Ukrainian language can be inconvenient to pronounce, because usually such words have a complex structure, for comparison: *trench coat* (eng.) → *trench*. Trimming of borrowed words testifies to the level of their mastering in the Ukrainian language, to their relevance to the modern Ukrainian language (Nelyuba, 2007). These nouns function mainly in the colloquial sphere, in uncodified usage (jargon), with a high degree of expressiveness.

In the monograph «Phenomena of economy in the word-forming nomination of the Ukrainian language» (Nelyuba, 2007) provided an exhaustive classification of cuts, the criteria for which were the following factors: 1) part-of-speech affiliation, 2) the structure of the creative basis (complex, simple, abbreviation), 3) «Location» of the concave part in the structure of the creative basis (beginning, middle, end), for comparison: adjective nouns with a cut suffix *-n-* (*nehatyvnyy (negative)* → *nehatyv*); cuts from complex nouns with a cuts of first or second part (*vint* → *vinchester (Winchester), dep* → *department, telephone* → *phone, prima donna (diva)* → *prima, mass media* → *media, multfilm (cartoon)* → *multik, deodorant* → *dezik* – with subsequent affixation); noun cuts with a cut end of a simple word (*operative* → *oper* – without further affixation*; phlomaster (felt-tip pen)* → *phlomik* – with subsequent affixation); noun ducks with a cut middle part (*physra* ← *physcultura (physical culture)*); contextual formations; artificial re-registration (*shpora* ← *shparhalka (note used to cheat during examination)*). Quite often invariant nouns that do not have in the language of single-structure words-equivalents with a materially expressed suffix are subject to trimming, for comparison: *kenga* ← *kenhuru (kangaroo)*; not only the suffix or the final part of the word, but also the part of the root morph or affixoid can

also be cut (*logo ← logoped (speech therapist)*). Some of the derivatives indicate the possibility of trimming the already existing cut, for comparison: *bezlimitnyy (unlimited) → bezlimit → bezlim* (in this case, the last link is noun).

Trimming of the creative basis is a process that takes place during the word-forming act, as a result of which the generative base is not fully represented in the derived word, but appears in abbreviated form, meaning it consists of fewer phonemes, for comparison: *pianino (piano) → pian(ino)ist, libretto → librett(o)ist, kenhuru → kenhur(u)enya (little kengaroo), defile → defil(e)yuvaty (perform an action during defile), mafiozi (mafia man) → mafioz(i)nyy*. Trimming of the creative basis is also observed in the process of creating complex words, it is mostly subject to the first creative basis, for comparison: anhliyskyy (English) + ukrayinskyy (Ukrininan) → *anhlo-ukrayinskyy* (instead of *anhlo(iysko)-ukrayinskyy*).

In linguistic practice, there are two main classes of derivatives formed by the method of trimming of the creative basis: nouns formed from nouns (*flyaga ← flyagschka (flask), kolgoty ← kolgotky (tights)*); nouns formed from adjectives (*prymityv ← prymityvnyy (primitive), normative ← normativnyy, facultativ ← facultativnyy (optional class), statsionar ← statsionarnyy (stationary), ofitsioz ← ofitsioznyy (official), eksklyuzyv (exclusive) ← eksklyuzyvnyy, astral ← astralnyy, dembel ← demobilizovanyy (demobilized soldier), psych – psychichno khvoryy (mentally ill), fiolet – fioletovyy (violet color)*). The lion's share of these derivatives functions in oral speech, mainly in youth slang, for comparison: *marginal ← marginalnyy, bisexual ← bisexualnyy, positiv ← positivnyy, negativ ← negativnyy, tusa ← tusovka (party), constructiv ← constructivnyy*.

Cut derivatives are lexically and semantically heterogeneous. These are uncodified units that denote persons (*serg ← sergant (sergeant), uchilka ← uchitelka (teacher), studik ← student, fan ← fanat*), phenomena in the educational process (*stypuha ← stypendia (scholarship), infa ← informatcya (information), abitura ← abiturienty (entrants)*), technical means (*kondyor ← konditcioner (air conditioner), flesha ← fleshka (flash drive), comp ← computer*), institutions (*univer ← universitet (university)*) etc.

It should be noted that trimming is activated under the influence of graphic abbreviations, in particular in youth speech (schoolchildren and students), for comparison: *phyzra* (written *phyz-ra*) ← *phyzkultura (physical culture), ukr. lit. ← Ukrainian literature.*

The method of trimming, isolated by A.M. Nelyuba, has not yet acquired a generally accepted terminological character. It is not recorded in modern linguistic encyclopedias and is not codified in dictionaries of linguistic terms. One of the reasons is the labeling, a somewhat colloquial tone of the token of the *trimming*, and the term should be stylistically neutral.

CONCLUSION

Thus, in Ukrainian theoretical derivatology, the term *truncation* appeared in connection with the need for morphophonological adaptation of the phonemic end of the creative basis with the phonemic beginning of the word-forming suffix in the process of their combination and the formation of a new word. It was considered one of the types of mutual adaptation of morphemes, along with the alternation of phonemes and interfixation during affix word formation. With this meaning it is codified both in word formation and in word-forming morphophonology. Isolated attempts to call the term *truncation* a separate way in the affixless Ukrainian word formation were not supported, apparently due to the establishment of this term with a morphophonological function.

A characteristic feature of the formation of Ukrainian word-forming terminology associated with the cutting off (rejection) of part of the creative basis, was the identification of the affixless method (affixless word formation) with the null suffix method, or zero suffixation.

At the present stage of development of the theory of word-formation methods, the use of a new term of trimming is substantiated to define an independent method of creating new units - cuts, however, it has not yet been codified. The main functions of trimming are the elimination of several consonants that complicate the pronunciation of words that are not typical of the Ukrainian language or sound combinations and suffixes of creative words, inorganic for the middle location of the derived word.

REFERENCES

1. Bloomfield, L. (1968). Language. Moscow: Progress. [in Russian].
2. Baudouin de Courtenay, I. A. (1963). Selected works on general linguistics. Moscow: Education. [in Russian].
3. Vinogradov, V. V. (1975). Questions of modern Russian word formation. Moscow: Education. [in Russian].
4. Vyhovanets, I. R., Horodenska, K. H., & Hryshchenko A. P. (1982). Grammar of the Ukrainian language. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
5. Ganych, D. I., Oliynyk, I. S. (1985). Dictionary of linguistic terms. Kyiv: Higher School. [in Ukrainian].

6. Horodenska, K. H., Kravchenko, M. V. (1981). Word-forming word structure. Kyiv: Scientific opinion. [in Ukrainian].
7. Horpynych, V. O. (1999). Modern Ukrainian literary language. Morphemics. Word formation. Morphonology. Kyiv: Higher School. [in Ukrainian].
8. Zhluktenko, Yu. A. (1958). Conversion in modern English as a morphological and syntactic way of word formation. *Questions of linguistics*, 5, 53–65.
9. Zemskaya, E. A. (1973). Modern Russian language. Word formation. Moscow: Education. [in Russian].
10. Klymenko, N. F. (2004). Apocopa. Ukrainian language. Encyclopedia. Kyiv: Ukrainian Encyclopedia Publishing House. [in Ukrainian].
11. Klymenko, N. F. (2004). Truncation. Ukrainian language. Encyclopedia. Kyiv: Ukrainian Encyclopedia Publishing House. [in Ukrainian].
12. Kovalyk, I. (2007). The doctrine of word formation. Selected works / compiler V. V. Greshchuk. Ivano-Frankivsk – Lviv: City. [in Ukrainian].
13. Kravchenko, M. V. (1988). On the question of the phenomenon of truncation in Ukrainian word formation (in derivatives of noun origin). *Ukrainian linguistics*. 1988, 15, 33–40.
14. Nelyuba, A. (2007). Phenomena of economy in the word-forming nomination of the Ukrainian language. Kharkiv: Publishing House. [in Ukrainian].
15. Rusanivsky, V. M, Pylynsky, M. M., & Yermolenko, S. Y. (1978). Ukrainian language. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
16. Word formation of modern Ukrainian literary language. (1979). Kyiv: Scientific opinion. [in Ukrainian].
17. Tretevich, L. M. (1980). Zero suffixation of nouns in modern Ukrainian. Uzhgorod. [in Ukrainian].
18. Shansky, N. M. (1968). Essays on Russian word formation. Moscow: Moscow State University. [in Russian].