

## A Word and a Word Combination in Language and Speech

Natalia Diachok<sup>1</sup>, Olena Kuvarova<sup>1</sup>, Tetiana Vysotska<sup>2</sup>, Svitlana Korotkova<sup>2</sup> & Iryna Khurtak<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of General and Slavic Linguistics, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

<sup>2</sup>Department of Translation, Dnipro University of Technology, Dnipro, Ukraine

Correspondence: Natalia Diachok, Department of General and Slavic Linguistics, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, 49010, 72 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro, Ukraine.

Received: May 8, 2022

Accepted: November 30, 2022

Online Published: December 17, 2022

doi:10.11114/smc.v10i3.5829

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v10i3.5829>

### Abstract

Objective of the research is to identify and describe a nominative linguistic unit and its structural modifications based on the non-word-centered approach to the study of linguistic tasks: 1) to determine differential and integral features of a word and a word combination as the universal language and/or speech (textual) units; 2) to describe the differentiation parameters of a word and a word combination as the nominative units; 3) to single out principles of the classification of language and speech (textual) units. Descriptive and structural methods are the basic research methods helping demonstrate the characteristic features of the language and speech units under consideration as well as the processes of their origin and functioning. A method of distributive analysis is applied to determine the transformation forms of nominative units. Theorization is based on a genetic method, in terms of which some specified objects and some system of the “admissible actions on the objects” are considered to be the starting point. The abovementioned facts demonstrate that the definition of a main nominative linguistic unit is the singling out of such a unit that encompasses the main – nominative – function. A lingual substance of any form (synthetic and analytic) may be considered as that unit – the unit capable of comprehensive conveying of the concept content and complete expressing of the meaning of a subject, object, sign, action etc. In general, the nomeme is defined as some abstract linguistic unit implemented in verbal and polyverbal forms (glosses and doublets).

**Keywords:** word, word combination, word-centered approach, non-word-centered approach, nomeme

### 1. Introduction

A problem concerning definition of word and word combination as the nominative language elements is still one of the essential ones in modern linguistics. In particular, it is topical in terms of the analysis of nomination units, their structure, and status as well as features of their modification and functioning. Over a long period of time, many linguists (Ch. Bally (1865-1947), V.A. Zvegintzev (1910-1988), L. Bloomfield (1887-1949), V.M. Zhirmunskii (1891-1971), I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay (1845-1929), A. Martinet (1908-1999), J. Vachek (1943-2017), S.D. Katsnelson (1907-1985), F. de Saussure (1857-1913), J. Vendryes (1875-1960), H. Frei (and others) have been solving the problem using two methods: word-centered and non-word-centered (Pudikova et al., 2019).

The first method is based on the idea that the main linguistic unit is represented by “a word, and analysis starts with the singling out of the words being the very beginning of the transition to the separation of both shorter (morphemes) and longer (word combinations, sometimes sentences) linguistic units” (Alpatov, 1982). The second method founded by I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay is based on the statement that not only a word (a synthetic unit) but also a word combination (an analytical unit) may be considered as a central component of a language system. Later, L. Bloomfield, who considered that the substances that he called “forms” were the main linguistic units, formulated principal provisions of that approach: he believed that a morpheme was a minimum form; then, he emphasized a word combination and a sentence. From the viewpoint of non-word-centred approach, “a word is not of such importance as in the word-centred concepts” (Alpatov, 1982). A word combination is the unit of the same significance in this case. It means that a word, in terms of this concept, is not identified as a primary and main unit; it is among other linguistic units. In certain cases, there may be even no need in its singling out (e.g. if it is a constituent part of some analytical nominative unit).

An idea on the nominative nature of word combinations that is represented by A.P. Zagnitko (2003) is the manifestation of a non-word-centered approach: “Main function of a word combination is the nominative one”. Earlier, V.V. Vinogradov

(1975) formulated the essence of a word combination determining it as a nominative unit being integral in its sense; as a united, though partitioned, nomination. A non-word-centered approach is a universal one as it is focused on the units of different structural complexity. V.M. Alpatov (1982) emphasizes its maximum efficiency: "...the psychologically adequate models should be accompanied by the formation of the model that could describe the world languages on the equal basis. Such models are necessary to <...> identify the universal language properties. In terms of those purposes, which are not final for linguistics, non-word-centered models <...> are more appropriate than the word-centered ones".

Due to that fact, the fundamentals of word-centered approach should be subject to critical analysis. That statement is based on the fact that first of all they "cannot identify a word as an integral unit – each time speaking about a word, it is necessary to clarify what word is meant – phonetic, lexical or morphological; in this context, even such an approach does not eliminate any contradictions <...> – and while identifying the level words there are peripheral zones, for which it is hard to define what is now, a word or some other unit (Terkulov, 2010); secondly, they do not identify "a word as some linguistic realia as it often has different parameters of existence in different languages" (Terkulov, 2010).

Objective of the research is to identify and describe a nominative linguistic unit and its structural modifications based on the non-word-centered approach to the study of linguistic tasks:

- 1) to determine differential and integral features of a word and a word combination as the universal language and/or speech (textual) units;
- 2) to describe the differentiation parameters of a word and a word combination as the nominative units;
- 3) to single out principles of the classification of language and speech (textual) units.

Descriptive and structural methods were used to conduct this study. These methods helped to study and analyze the features of differentiation of words and phrases as nominative units, as well as the processes of their origin and functioning. A method of distributive analysis is applied to determine the transformation forms of nominative units. Theorization is based on a genetic method, in terms of which some specified objects and some system of the "admissible actions on the objects" (Afanasev et al., 2019) are considered to be the starting point.

## 2. The Concept of the Nomination and Features of Its Use

A word and a word combination are considered from the viewpoint of their nominative potentials. Generally, the essence of the theory of nomination is in the specification of the relations between the notional forms of thinking, i.e. in the clarification of the fact "how nominations are created, stabilized, and distributed in terms of different fragments of the objective reality" (Popova, 2009). A concept of nomination reflects both "the process of creation, stabilization, and distribution of the name in terms of different fragments of reality" and "a meaningful linguistic unit formed in the process of nomination" (Diachok, 2015). Nomination can be primary and secondary; moreover, there are different approaches to the definition of these types: some researchers (A.A. Ufimtseva (1974), Y.S. Kravtsov et al., (2020) and others) take structural component of the nomination units as the differentiation principle, while for others (M.A. Popova (2009), D.N. Shmeliov (1982) and others) differentiation principle is represented by the chronology of nomination processes. N. Diachok in 2015 noted that "the distinguishing features of the identified methods, the identification of the primary and secondary nomination are the things, on which definition and description of nominative linguistic means depend". According to D.N. Shmeliov (1982), nominative toolset is seen "not only as a result of goal-setting linguo-creative human activity, but as a consequence of different formal and semantic transformations of the available linguistic material hidden from the immediate native speakers and not been aware by them".

A concept of primary nomination reflects a process of "giving a name to the object that does not have its linguistic denomination" (Diachok, 2015), e.g.: Rus. *заяц* "an animal", *защитная пленка* "a material for temporary protection of some object", Ukr. *стресорний фактор* or *стрес-фактор* "extreme effect of the environment", Bulg. *найлонова торбичка* "a household item", Pol. *telefon komórkowy* "a device for long-distance communication", Eng. *mass media* "a communication medium", Fr. *de motorway et hotel* "a place to have rest" etc.

The essence of primary nomination is implemented in its two types:

- 1) naming of a new concept, object, phenomenon, action with the help of an old name (metaphorization), e.g.: Rus. *заяц* "a passenger without ticket", Ukr. *держак* "a word-down broom", Eng. *ebony* "a black race representative", Fr. *canard* "a newspaper hoax, a wrong note, a lump of sugar", Germ. *Zement* "tooth cement, filling";
- 2) repeated nomination of a thing, object, action, process, that has its name already, by means of structurally other unit, e.g.: Rus. *защитная пленка* – *защитка*, Ukr. *стресорний фактор* or *стрес-фактор* – *стресор*, Bulg. *найлонова торбичка* – *найлонка*, Eng. *mass media* – *medias* etc.

M.A. Popova (2009) states that any variety of the nomination process means "fixation of the selected phenomena of the reality with the help of linguistic signs (as well as linguistic means – auth.) <...> In the process of nomination, there is

certain striving for motivation of the selection of one or another sound complex to identify the reality scene”. As the nomination elements, A.A. Ufimtseva (1974) proposes to consider “content words; the same semiological class of the signs of primary definition includes word combinations acting in a language as the partitioned nomination equivalent to a word, i.e. having a function of nomination of a single object or a class of objects”.

E.N. Sidorenko (2011) represents following classification of units “expressing linguistic meanings:

- word;
- prepositional-case form;
- word combination of special type, being semantically equivalent to a word;
- lexia (“compound word”);
- phrasal component expressed by a subordinate part of a complex sentence with syntactic articles or without it”.

In terms of this register, only word is a synthetic nominative unit; the rest is the analytic or partitioned ones. In the context of onomasilological research, a word is interpreted as a basic universal nomination unit as it can be found in every language in this function. However, according to E.N. Sidorenko (2011), apart from a word, the nomination means are represented by units being “structurally more complex comparing to a word and aimed at expressing different linguistic meanings”. They include prepositional-case forms, lexias, word combinations with the meaning identical to the corresponding words as well as phrasal nominates. “A problem of structural types of nomination occurred due to the fact that linguistics went beyond the word analysis, i.e. owing to the liberation of a researcher from the captivity of word-centralism. However, to the fullest extent, it is connected with the difference between a language and speech” (Sidorenko, 2011).

It is natural that in the context of a word-centered approach the main linguistic unit is represented by a synthetic unit – a word, a lexeme. It is capable of correlating “with the objects, processes, reality events, their signs and correlations, being freely reproduced in speech, and acts to organize an utterance” (Nurgali et al., 2021). Depending on the field of its functioning, a notion of that unit is formed either in a specific language or in a group of cognate languages. It is defined as a main nominate in terms of “communicative-cognitive activity of native speakers” (Popova, 2009). Yu.A. Gvozdarev (2008) singles out from the interpretation of the concept of word given by V.V. Vinogradov (1975) the features of that linguistic unit having complemented a register of its signs offered later by other authors of linguistic theories. Thus, a word is an integral, ultimate, semantically and grammatically indecomposable unit, being a nominative sign of a social medium and a repository of knowledge, forming speech, entering into syntactic relations, and having – according to V.V. Vinogradov – impenetrability, i.e. it is impossible to put any component inside it (Gvozdarev, 2008). V.V. Vinogradov (1975) was practically the first to touch upon a problem of identity, having analyzed critically a theory by A.A. Potebnya (1835-1891) who considered all grammatical forms of a word as well as all implementation of its meanings by the independent units.

A lingual substance called a word has other terminological markers as well. For instance, O. Selivanova (2010) considers a lexeme as an abstract unit “of lexical level of a language system in a body of all lexico-semantic variants, which are characterized by formal-grammatical and semantic unity”. This term was first proposed by A.M. Peshkovskii in 1918, who stated that one should differentiate “two images: one, that we start experiencing while pronouncing a certain word, and another – while pronouncing one or another word combination with that word” (Peshkovskii, 1959). O.M. Sokolov (2010) called lexeme a certain “phonetic-orthographic complex correlated with semantic and orthographic paradigm, i.e. a complex of variants not destructing that identity”. Ukrainian linguistics interprets this term unambiguously: “an abstract unit of the lexical level of the language system as a whole of all lexico-semantic variants which are characterized by formal-grammatical and semantic unity” (Selivanova, 2010).

On the contrary, representatives of foreign linguistics describe the lexeme essence quite differently. A. Martinet describes it as an abstract unit of the vocabulary being opposed to a word as the representative of a lexeme in speech; secondly, he talks about a lexeme as about a notional element opposed to a functional one (e.g. morpheme) (Pudikova et al., 2019). According to U. Weinreich (1954), any linguistic unit, including a fixed collocation, is a lexeme.

It was V.V. Vinogradov (1975) who identified the difference between a word and a lexeme. He interpreted the word duality, indicated by A.M. Peshkovskii, by differentiation between the concepts of word and lexeme, “i.e. a lexical unit of a language as a system of forms and functions recognized against the background of language structure on the whole, or word form and a word”. P.S. Kuznetsov (1964) ranks a word-onomatheme together with the abovementioned nominative units; he believes that its essence is revealed owing to its speech implementation. The linguist emphasizes that “a linguistic unit is practically identical to the speech one, coinciding with it in length”. As opposed to it, a word-syntagma is considered, being defined as a material implementation of a concrete word-onomatheme. Thus, the first unit is interpreted as the nominative language one while the second unit is interpreted as the speech one.

Linguistic theory has fixed the opinion about relative dynamics and certain reproducibility of such phenomenon as nomination. In this context it is customary to consider that language nomination is “the *creation* of new nominative units while speech nomination is the *use* of ready-made units in the process of situational nominating” (Kravtsov et al., 2020).

The most relevant approach to lingual nomination is represented by V.I. Terkulov (2010), who highlights rightly the following: “first of all, opposition of language and speech nomination is the opposition of language (invariant) and speech (variant) units along with the establishment of implementation mechanism of the first and the second ones. Consequently, in this situation syncretic use of the term “nomination” is rather expedient as it helps unite the process and result into a single static-dynamic complex”.

One way or another, the main postulate of this research is the thesis concerning a real description of a nominative language system: in the context of the represented description, analysis of “the relations between nominative units of different structure (highlighted by the authors) is rather important” (Koshekov et al., 2021). Even in terms of the reference frame where a word is considered to be the basic nomination unit, there are some red flags and, therefore, the cause for more detailed study of the criteria for determining nominative lingual elements. Studying nominative potentials of the Russian and Belarusian languages, L.I. Maidan (1982) referred to the opinion by V.M. Nikitevich who emphasized about fifty years ago the following facts: “A notional word is always a name (of an object, sign, action etc.), i.e. it is always a *nomeme* (highlighted by the authors). Language does not have an unambiguous correspondence between the meaning and the way of its expression. A process of word formation is only a part of the process of formation of derivative nominations which may be not only one-syllabus ones” (Nikitevich, 1985). Thus, the highlighted term means an abstract linguistic nominative unit that is capable of implementing in oral and written speech not only in a word but in the analytical representations as well.

L.I. Maidan (1982) stresses that the given “facts are seen to the full extent while comparing different languages, even closely related ones. Analysis of Russian and Belarusian texts indicate such tendency as striving for semantic conciseness at the expense of a word combination condensing into a word. Nominative nature of word combinations, making them close to a word, is confirmed by their synonymy and their acting as “a lexical equivalent of a word” (Maidan, 1982).

Earlier, in 1909, while developing a typological classification of languages, F.N. Fink analyzed universal features of human speech and demonstrated that it “consists of two procedures: 1) analysis of a situation, i.e. its partitioning into components, and 2) synthesis by means of a language” (Diachok, 2015). As an example, the “actor and action” situation can be used, which structural implementation varies in different languages: “in Chinese it is implemented term by term: each element is expressed by a separate word (*ta* “he”, *lai* “comes”); in similar Turkish case, one word *geliyor* would be used to include both situation components; as for English, *he is coming* turns to have more words than the situation elements” (Diachok, 2015). The same is observed during comparative analysis of other nominations of the indicated situation: English *he decides* and *he makes a decision*, Russian *решает* and *принимает решение*, German *er beschließt*, Turkish *o karar verir* “he decides, he makes a decision”, Polish *on decyduje* and *podejmuje decyzję*, Bulgarian *той решава* and *той взема решение* etc. Thus, in terms of nomination methods, F.N. Fink identified eight types of languages with the remark that the list is open to be complemented.

Linguists insist on the idea that a tendency to “the singling out of word combinations and other units along with the words, as the ones having semantic and, consequently, nominative integrity” (Diachok, 2015) is rather topical. Therefore, there arises the opinion on the word as “not a basic but formal variety of the nominative unit” (Terkulov, 2007). R.P. Rogozhnikova (1983) described about 650 lexical chunks of the Russian language being equivalent to a word. Those are the collocated word combinations with separate writing but being single semantic-structural integrity, such as: *на днях, в дальнейшем, для вида, на радостях, на практике, не раз, при себе, скорее всего, в действительности* etc. They are perceived as the organic whole and are equal to a word, having the same syntactic functions in speech as the uninflected words (adverbs, modal verbs, prepositions, conjunctions, particles, interjections) but not being the words as they consist of several words, notional and functional ones. At the same time, they cannot be called phraseological word combinations as they do not have that figurative meaning that is characteristic for phraseological units. Such combinations can be found in English, e.g.: *so so* (“no great things”), *take part* (“to participate”), *by all means* (“for sure”) etc. Similar to words, many of those combinations, being equivalent to a word, have nominative function and express lexical meaning. In terms of certain criteria, i.e. reproducibility and grammatical formalization that A.I. Smirnitiskii (1956) mentions among the basic word features, the described combinations may be united with the words to be included into one class of linguistic units.

L.I. Maidan points out that, for instance, that “a word combination is capable of conveying such nuances that are not possible for conveying by a word. Certain peculiarities of the morphemic structure of a primary word that can be the derivative may result in the fact that the required derivative meaning is expressed only by means of a word combination” (Maidan, 1982). By the way, that is one of the reasons of the development of a word-based quasi-word combination

demonstrating the topical or potential quasi-univerbation, as a result of which a structure of the equivalent derivatives in various languages may be different – both synthetic and analytic.

As it has been mentioned before, V.M. Nikitevich (1985) considered correctly that “a word is not a single means of nomination”. He indicated the availability of structurally different nominative units. “The scientist calls each of those units *nomeme* and considers and believes that every speech nominative syntagma is the representation of its linguistic equivalent, that erases the differences between the language and speech nomination” (Diachok, 2015). He told about the internal motivational relations between a verb and a word combination as about a natural example in that situation; in the context of those relations, a verb and a word combination were considered as the equivalent ones being equal from the viewpoint of their speech/textual implementation: Rus. *краснеть – становится красным, побледнеть – стать бледным*; Bulg. *пробледнява – става бледи, изчервяване – става червени*; Eng. *to wet – to make wet, to harden – to get hard*; while, for instance, Polish and German demonstrates either synthetic or analytic equivalents: Polish. *zmoknąć* «to dampen / to become damp», *robić się ciemno* «to darken / to grow dark»; German *bläss werden* «to pale / to turn pale», *abnehmen* «to thin / to grow thin».

The aforementioned shows that the material implementations of linguistic nomination units are represented by their semantically identical units of speech nomination – synthetic and / or analytic modifications of a concrete *nomemes* (V. M. Nikitevich), *nominathemes* (V. I. Terkulov), *lexemes*, *complex lexemes* (Yu. S. Maslov), i.e. the invariants capable of materializing in their different structural varieties. Among the represented terms for denoting a nominative language invariant, one can select the term *nomeme* proposed by V.M. Nikitevich (1985) as it is the closest in its form to other terms identifying the rest of the system level units: *phoneme*, *lexeme*, *phraseme*, and *syntaxeme*.

### 3. Characterization of the Concept of Invariance of Linguistic Substance

Invariant as the language substance is interpreted in the framework of structural approach. The essence of the fundamental postulate is in the differentiation “of a language as a relatively closed sign system of invariant units and speech / speech activity as the medium of its functioning, as the way to implement linguistic units in the form of plurality of their variants” (Khaybullina et al., 2020). V.I. Terkulov (2007) highlights that the invariant may be defined as “an abstract unit unrelated to its concrete implementations, that represents that similarity being found, to some extent, in a set of homogeneous concrete units that have a status of its variants or doublets”, occurred as a result of the invariant modification. In this case, the notion of distribution is quite important; linguistics means by that notion “a totality of all environments where they can be found, i.e. a total of all (different) positions” (or usages) of the elements relative to the usage of other elements” (Korbozerova, 2021).

In this case, it is expedient to single out two types of distribution of material representatives of the nominative language unit – additional and free. First type is “such relation of the units when each of them is possible only in its environment, context and nowhere else” (Turyzbek et al., 2021). Second type of distribution creates the conditions for free variation of units; it means that “while functioning as the implementation of one and the same lingual essence, the units of a certain structural level may have similar environment” (Diachok, 2015). Having generalized the experience of predecessors, authors propose to single out *nomemes* of a synthetic and analytic type. Variations of the synthetic-type *nomemes* are represented by “all the semantically identical units identified at the word level” (Diachok, 2015):

a) a word, being implemented in its forms, including prepositional ones, depending on the context (Rus. *дом, дома, дому, домом, на доме, домами, о домах*; Ukr. *будинок, будинку, будинком, на будинку, будинків*; Pol. *dom, w domu, Dużo domów, domu, chodźć między domami*; Eng. *the house, houses, in front of the house*; Germ. *das Haus, zu Hause, Häuser, gegenüber dem Haus*; Fr. *la maison, à la maison, maisons, dans les maisons*); here we can also include the word-equivalent abbreviations (Rus. *спасибо – спс, пожалуйста – пж, человек – чел, преподаватель – препод*; Ukr. *завідувач – зав, викладач – викл, вищий (навчальний заклад – виш*; Eng. *doctor – doc, madam – ma’am, mister – Mr, robot – bot*);

b) a word (or its form) expanded by other – dependant – word (or word form) that clarifies functionally the first-word semantics (Rus. *двухэтажный дом, честный человек, способный ребенок*; Ukr. *двоповерховий будинок, чесна людина, здібна дитина*; Pol. *dwupiętrowy dom, człowiek uczciwy, zdolne dziecko*; англ. *two-storey house, fair man, capable child*; Germ. *zweistöckiges Haus, gerechter Mann, fähiges Kind*; French *maison à deux étages, homme juste, enfant capable*); juxtapositions can be also included here (Rus. *платье-футляр, диван-кровать, интернет-кафе*; Ukr. *сукня-футляр, диван-ліжка, інтернет-кафе*; Pol. *sukienka płaszcz, Kafejka internetowa*; Eng. *sheath dress, Internet cafe, hair-raiser, mother-in-law*; Ger. *die Mehrzweck-Küchenmaschine, die Umsatzsteuer-Tabelle, das Musik-Erleben, die Schwimm-Meisterschaft, der Kaffee-Ersatz*; Fr. *après-midi, beaux-arts, e chou-fleur, le chef-d’oeuvre*).

Varieties of the second-type *nomemes* are represented by all the semantically identical units identified at the word combination level (Diachok, 2015):

a) a collocated word combination (including the one with a functional word) that is close to a phraseological unit in its collocation degree but is not a phraseological unit yet (Rus. *железнодорожный вокзал, привокзальная площадь, театральные кассы*; Ukr. *залізнична станція, трамвайна зупинка, жувальна гумка*; Pol. *guma do żucia, Kolej żelazna, kasa teatralna*; Eng. *station square, chewing gum, central park*; Ger. *zentraler Platz, Kleidungs Fabrik*; Fr. *chewing-gum, eau pétillante, gare ferroviaire*);

b) a phraseological unit (including the one with a functional word in its structure) (Rus. *прокрустово ложе, неверный шаг, белая ворона*; Ukr. *побити горицики, Адамове ребро, аршин у плечах*; Pol. *robić z igły widły, rogata dusza, mieć węża w kieszeni*; Eng. **when pigs fly, wolf in sheep's clothing, broken heart**; Germ. *Auf der Bärenhaut liegen, Berliner Luft, Auf der Bärenhaut liegen*; Fr. *la moutarde me/lui monte au nez, c'est la fin des haricots, en faire un fromage*);

c) a “univerbated (verbal) equivalent” of a word combination – a word coined as a result of verbal modification of a word combination, identical to a word combination in terms of lexico-grammatical aspect, i.e. it demonstrates identity of lexical and grammatical meanings and syntactic function” (Diachok, 2015).

A univerbated equivalent of a word combination as a structural type of an analytical-type nomeme has the following type representation.

1. Verbal representative of a nomeme occurs as a result of ellipsis:

a) ellipsis of a main (Rus. *бильярдная комната – бильярдная, выходной день – выходной*; Ukr. *приречена жінка – приречена, молода дівчина – молода*; Pol. *młoda dziewczyna – młoda*; Eng. *aponymous person – aponymous*; Germ. *apotal Person – apotal*) or a dependent word (Rus. *газовая плита – плита, лестничная площадка – площадка*; Ukr. *шкільний майданчик – майданчик, футбольне поле – поле*; Pol. *plac zabaw – plac, klatka schodowa – klatka*; Eng. *football field – field, school playground – playground*);

b) elliptic univerbation, as a result of which there appears nouns (Rus. *защитная пленка – защитка*, Ukr. *жінка-декан – деканеса*, Pol. *telefon komórkowy – komórka*, Czech *film s agentem 007 Jamesem Bondem – vondovka*, Eng. *personal property – personalty*), adjectives (Rus. *очень мудрый – мудрейший*, Ukr. *найбільш сильний – найсильніший*, Eng. *more wide – wider*), verb (Rus. *сделать маникюр – наманикюровать*, Ukr. *побути зіркою – позіркувати*, Eng. *to make a contribution – to contribute, stayed overnight – overnigheted*), participles and adverbial participles (Rus. *покрытый лаком – лакированный, пропитывая маслом – промасливая*, Ukr. *зробивши чорним – вичернивши*), adverbs (Rus. *невероятно тонко – тончайше*, Ukr. *дуже гостро – найгостріше*; Germ. *unglaublich schwierig – das Schwierigste*; Eng. *very hard – hardest*), and interjections (Rus. *огромное спасибо – спасибоще*).

2. Verbal representative of a nomeme occurs as a result of composite compression of a word combination:

a) abbreviation (Rus. *социальное страхование – соцстрах*; Ukr. *медична сестра – медсестра*; Eng. *British National Corpus – BNC*, Germ. *Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst – DAAD*, Fr. *de deutsch et English – denglish*);

b) formal compression (Rus. *ума лишенный – умалишенный, с ума сведший – сумасшедший*; Ukr. *швидко плинний – швидкоплинний*; Eng. *long playing – long-playing*, Germ. *wahn sinnig – wahnsinnig*);

c) compressive univerbation (Rus. *дельфин с белыми боками – белобочка*, Ukr. *учень п'ятого класу – п'ятикласник*, Eng. *with dark hair – dark-haired*, Germ. *mit dunklen Haaren – dunkelhaarig*).

#### 4. Conclusions

The abovementioned facts demonstrate that the definition of a main nominative linguistic unit is the singling out of such a unit that encompasses the main – nominative – function. A lingual substance of any form (synthetic and analytic) may be considered as that unit – the unit capable of comprehensive conveying of the concept content and complete expressing of the meaning of a subject, object, sign, action etc. In other words, that linguistic unit – nomeme – can be represented both by a word and a word combination during the speech/textual implementation, being different in their forms. In general, the nomeme is defined as some abstract linguistic unit implemented in verbal and polyverbal forms (glosses and doublets).

#### References

- Afanasev, A., Mukhametshina, R., Tolbayeva, D., & Nurgali, K. (2019). Leo Tolstoy's sphere of concepts in the development of women's education. *Opcion*, 35(Special Issue 22), 906-920.
- Alpatov, V. (1982). On two approaches to identifying the basic units of the language. *Linguistic Issues*, 6, 66-74.
- Diachok, N. (2015). *Univerbation in the Russian language: structural and semantic and onomasiological description*. Kyiv: National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- Gvozdev, Yu. (2008). *Modern Russian language. Lexicology and phraseology*. Moscow, Rostov-on-Don: MarT.

- Khaybullina, A. A., Nagumanova, E. F., & Nurgali, K. R. (2020). Genre strategy of modern Russian-language poetry in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 9, 2609-2615.
- Korbozerova, N. M. (2021). Dynamics of syntactic processes in the pre-national period of the Spanish language. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17, 1283-1293.
- Koshekov, K. T., Kobenko, V. Y., Anayatova, R. K., Savostin, A. A., & Koshekov, A. K. (2021). Automatic classification method of the speaker's emotional state by voice. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1791(1), 012051. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1791/1/012051>
- Kravtsov, Y. S., Tkalych, M. H., Korbozerova, N. M., & Ponomarenko, O. V. (2020). Communicative rationality as a problem fields and semantic emphasis of educational paradigm. *Astra Salvensis*, 391-401.
- Kuznetsov, P. (1964). Experience of formal definition of a word. *Linguistic Issues*, 5, 75-77.
- Maidan, L. (1982). Nominative series of verbal personal substantives in Russian and Belarusian. In: N.A. Lukyanova (Ed.), *Materials of the XX scientific conference "Student and scientific and technical progress"*. *Philology*. (pp. 9-13). Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk State University.
- Nurgali, K. R., Suleimenova, S. B., & Bogdanova, Y. V. (2021). Conflict and ways of individualising mass images in early Kazakh prose. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(3), 1277-1289.
- Peshkovskii, A. (1959). What, finally, is the essence of formal grammar? In: A. Peshkovskii, I.A. Vasilenko, I.R. Paley (Eds.), *Selected Works* (pp. 74-100). Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
- Popova, M. (2009). Definition of the concept of "nominative unit" in the context of the study of lexical and phraseological innovations. *New in Slavic Philology*, 4, 173-178.
- Pudikova, G. N., Perminova, V. A., & Korbozerova, N. M. (2019). Formation of linguistic culture in the process of teaching lexical disciplines to university students. *Espacios*, 40(41), 28.
- Rogozhnikova, R. (1983). *Dictionary of combinations equivalented to a word*. Moscow: Russkiy yazyk.
- Selivanova, O. (2010). *Linguistic encyclopedia*. Poltava: Dovkillya-K.
- Shmeliov, D. (1982). *Nomination methods in modern Russian*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Sidorenko, E. (2011). Linguistic meanings in modern Russian: Typology, means of expression. *Russian Studies: Collection of Scientific Papers*, 11, 41-47.
- Smirnitkii, A. (1956). *English lexicology*. Moscow: Publishing House of Literature in Foreign Languages.
- Sokolov, O. (2010). *Implicit morphology of the Russian language*. Nizhyn: Hidromaks.
- Terkulov, V. (2007). *Word and nominateme: an experience of the complex description of the main nominative unit of the language*. Horlivka: Publishing House "GDPIIM".
- Terkulov, V. (2010). *Nominateme: an experience of definition and description*. Horlivka: Publishing House "GDPIIM".
- Turysbek, R. S., Sarekenova, K. K., Baitanasova, K. M., Myrzakhmetov, A. A., & Aimukhambet, Z. A. (2021). The role of historical figures and legend motifs in the modern prose structure in expressing the idea of statehood. *Astra Salvensis*, 2021, 383-393.
- Ufimtseva, A. (1974). *Types of word marks*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Vinogradov, V. (1975). *Selected Works. Studies in Russian grammar*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Weinreich, U. (1954). Languages in contact: Findings and problems. *Linguistic Circle of New York*, 30(3), 380-388. <https://doi.org/10.2307/410136>
- Zagnitko, A. (2003). *Fundamentals of Ukrainian theoretical syntax*. Horlivka: Publishing House "GDPIIM".

## Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](#) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.