

АКТУАЛЬНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ ЛІНГВІСТИКИ ТА ЛІНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГІЇ

УДК 81`36

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2024-2-28-10>

Oleksandr IVKO

*PhD in Philology, Lecturer,
Regional College "Kremenchuk Anton Makarenko
Humanitarian and Technological Academy" (Ukraine)*
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-5912-8638>

Natalia DIACHOK

*Doctor of Sciences in Philology, Full Professor,
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, (Ukraine)*
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3949-3423>

THE LEXICON OF CONTEMPORARY WAR TIME: COMPRESSIVE PROFESSIONAL SLANG UNITS IN THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE

Статтю присвячено висвітленню сутності компресивних процесів, що зреалізовано у професійній термінології та сленгу українських військових, волонтерів. Вона постає продовженням серії праць, присвячених актуальним процесам у мові та мовленні. Особливу увагу приділено процесам абрєвіації та універбації як таким, що здатні створювати стислі модифікації номінативних одиниць – як аналітичних, так і синтетичних, тобто які постають процесами внутрішнього, мовленнєвого, досистемного словотвору.

Актуальність праці очевидна: на часі висвітлення не лише загальних історичних подій, але і явищ, які поступово стають історією української мови та історією славістики загалом. Дослідження мовних феноменів, що відбивають сучасний стан будь-якої мови, завжди привертає увагу лінгвістів. Отже, явища неологізації, з одного боку, та актуалізації конкретних процесів, з іншого, наявні в тій чи тій мовній системі, викликають неабияку зацікавленість фахівців та постають предметом аналізу.

Мета дослідження – визначення продуктивності компресивів як одиниць, що належать воєнному дискурсу, з одного боку, та як актуального мовного матеріалу загалом – з іншого. Завдання: 1) виокремити компресиви з-поміж традиційних дериватів; 2) визначити критерії виділення найосновніших компресивних процесів – абрєвіації та універбації; 3) сформулювати причини появи сленгзмів досліджуваного зразка; 4) довести важливість вивчення компресивів у воєнному дискурсі.

Основними *методами* дослідження постають описовий і структурний, які сприяють демонстрації особливих аспектів універботворення та абрєвіації як процесів, що відповідають сутності мовленнєвої компресії. Для визначення форм трансформації номінативних одиниць застосовано методику дистрибутивного аналізу.

Військовий дискурс є сферою функціонування мови, яка здатна продукувати неологізми, що виникають внаслідок різних видів компресії. Це пов'язано з динамічністю мовлення військових, а надто з потребою умістити максимальну кількість інформації у мінімальний відрізок часу, прагненням до чіткості, лаконічності форм й водночас змістовності мовлення. З-поміж досліджуваного лексикону українських військових виокремлюємо іменники (що утворюються завдяки абрєвіації, універбації та імітації універбації), дієслова та їхні форми (які частіше постають наслідками універбації). Поява досліджуваних компресивних найменувань відповідає загальній тенденції єдності процесів номінації, сутність яких полягає у модифікуванні аналітичних або комплексних синтетичних одиниць у більш короткі мовленнєві сегменти, що є універсальною рисою сучасного стану загалом індоевропейських мов.

Ключові слова: воєнний дискурс, номема, компресиви, військовий жаргон, сучасні номінативні процеси, абрєвіація, універбація.

For citation: Ivko, O., Diachok, N. (2024). The Lexicon of Contemporary War Time: Compressive Professional Slang Units in the Ukrainian Language. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, vol. 2, issue 28, pp. 170-179, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2024-2-28-10>

Introduction

The article seeks to reveal the concept of compressive processes implemented in the professional slang of Ukrainian military people and volunteers – all those connected with warfare. It continues a series of works [Bondareva, 2023; Diachok, 2015; *Diachok, Kuvarova, Vysotska., Korotkova, Khurtak, 2022*] covering the current processes in language and speech, particularly in a certain subcode of the Ukrainian language. The main focus here is placed on abbreviation and univerbation, as well as the processes able to create compressed modification of nominative units (both analytical, and synthetic), i.e., the processes belonging to internal, speech-based, pre-systematic word formation.

The topicality of the research lies not only in the revelation of the impact extralinguistic historic events exert on the language, but also in the analysis of the phenomena that gradually become the history of the Ukrainian language and Slavic studies as a whole. The research into the linguistic phenomena that reflect the current state of any language has always been the center of linguists' attention. Therefore, the phenomena of neologization, on one hand, and updating of specific processes, on the other, existing in a particular language, encourage experts' interest and represent the focus of the study.

We previously mentioned that the functions of Slavic language systems in their live speech implementation offer linguists room for solving a set of relevant tasks. They include, among other, the revision and, consequently, the new interpretation of a separate group of processes and phenomena, whose essence has been considered unequivocal and unchangeable. The revision targets separate word formation patterns in language and speech, as well as the implementation of the outcomes of these word formation acts as separate types of nomination. This up-to-date understanding of linguistic facts is an indispensable component of the modern knowledge of the Slavic languages structure in general, and that of the Ukrainian language in particular.

It is commonly known that linguistic units are produced via different patterns of word formation. In modern linguistics, the synchronic approach makes it possible to distinguish between the patterns of word formation depending on the type of the main word formation devices, or formants [Selivanova, 2010; Ponomarenko, 2017; Müller, Ohnheiser, Olsen, Rainer, 2015].

The pattern of word formation is defined as a specific kind of difference between the derivatives and the base words. This difference embodies the word formation device or a set of devices, thus a formant. Such differences are combined into classes, which are further referred to as word formation patterns. The history of Slavic studies suggested several classifications leaning on the concept of the word formation pattern [Nikitevych, 1978; Grzegorzczkova, 1984; Nagórko, 1997; Ponomarenko, 2017]. Their authors defined this concept via determining the formant, with the help of which a new lexical unit had been created. They believed this criterion was enough to identify the word formation pattern.

However, modern language and speech material requires a comprehensive approach to its investigation. Therefore, when it comes to interpreting this or that word formation pattern, we suggest using the set of criteria, which are no less important than the aforementioned one. This set includes, except for the formant type, the concept of word formation base and a type of motivation. Moreover, with respect to all possible (formal and semantic) transformations of the derived word versus the base one, our idea is to arrange the existing classification as the following groups:

- 1) morphological patterns, where belong all cases of affixation based on the simple (one-root) word;
- 2) non-morphological patterns, where belong all cases of word formation via an affix-free formant, i.e., all types of meaning transfer and conversion;
- 3) complex patterns, where the words are formed based on collocations or word combinations;
- 4) mixed patterns, where belong words formed not only via various formants, but also via various word formation bases;
- 5) abbreviation as a syncretic word formation pattern, where belong shortenings based on word combinations, as well as on the simple – one-root – base.

As to the final pattern, it is noteworthy that abbreviation can be considered both as the word formation pattern, and as the form-building pattern. In each specific case, the key role belongs to the type of motivation. Generally speaking, the set of criteria for such differentiation leans primarily on the motivation principle, since the essence of word formation or its imitation is currently reflected in the concept of motivation.

Traditionally, motivation is seen [Selivanova, 2010; Ponomarenko, 2017] as a semantic dependence of the meaning of any derived, including compound, word on the meanings of its constituents; in word formation, certain units serve as the sources of motivation, while others, which result from word formation, are defined as determined motivated ones.

The main statements that outline our vision of the modern nomination theory are as follows: 1) if a new word's lexical meaning differs from that of its base word (in terms of etymological connection), it is reasonable to talk about external – word-building, system-based – motivation; 2) if the lexical meanings of the derived and the base unit (either a word, or a word-combination) coincide, are identical, it is reasonable to talk about internal – relational, speech-based – motivation. This process is actually a special form-building process, which uses the homonymic word formation devices.

We believe that the units that correlate as word – word, word – word-combination, word-combination – word, do not reflect word-formation connections, being etymologically similar; they represent analytical and synthetic implementations of respective invariants – nomemes (following the terminology suggested by V. Nikitevych) [Nikitevych, 1985].

Therefore, the determination of the status of the derivational or relational process depends, above all, on the type of motivation relationships between the derived and the base units. Hence, the number of affixation types, compounding, general abbreviation, word-based abbreviation as the means of word formation in a traditional sense do not correspond to the genuine linguistic reality. Such examples, particularly, abbreviations and univerbs, can be qualified as the output of internal (speech-based) word formation. Its essence coincides with the principles of form-building, the main criterion for the determination of which is the semantic similarity between the invariant and its speech or textual implementations – the so-called doublets.

Certainly, such units exist in the military discourse. Yet, not all professional lexis and slang words that are currently relevant have been explored in detail; this is particularly applicable to the units that have appeared in language and speech due to compression. In the Ukrainian language, such units are produced quite actively. This is connected not only with the accelerated life pace as a whole, but also with the strive for accuracy and at the same time form brevity of each element of the military vocabulary. Hence, it is clear that this very vocabulary continues to attract linguists – all those who comprehensively explore the modern motivation processes.

Consequently, the aim of this research is to demonstrate the productivity of compressives as units belonging to the military discourse, on one hand, and as the up-to-date linguistic material as a whole, on the other. Objectives stemming from the aim formulation are as follows: 1) to separate compressive from the traditional derivatives; 2) to determine the criteria for distinguishing the main compressive processes – abbreviation and univerbation; 3) to formulate the causes of the emergence of the investigated slang; 4) to prove the importance of studying compressives in the military discourse.

Research methods and techniques

The main research methods include the descriptive and structural ones, as they encourage the summarizing of the special aspects of univerb formation and abbreviation as the processes that match the concept of speech compression. We have utilized the distributive analysis approach to determine the types of nominative units' transformation.

Results and discussion

The significance, and therefore, relevance belong to the research material, which is a variety of lexical shortenings used in the speech of people directly or indirectly related to warfare. The military discourse contains Ukrainian slang lexical elements, a part of which can be classified as compressives, such as *зачохлити* (Engl. to cover), *БПЛА* (Engl. UAV), *плитняк* (Engl. plate carrier), *затрофеїти* (Engl. win trophies), *ТРО* (Engl. TRD – territorial defense), *ТРОшник* (Engl. TRD-officer), *теплак* (Engl. thermal imager), *бронік* (Engl. body armor) etc. Following the trend of saving speech effort, the dynamics of the investigated discourse implies the use of shortened, syntagmatically reduced nominations. To the main ways of building such shortenings belong abbreviation and univerbation.

The military discourse is represented in a language by the professional vocabulary and slang. “Slang, professional jargon and argo are rigorously opposed to the standard literary language for its purpose, as one of the functions of the nationwide literary language is to unite various social groups into one whole – the nation; slang seeks to bring closer together one group of people and oppose it

to society as a whole” [Dorda, 2008, pp. 69–72]. **This broad approach gives reason to remark that military slang is built and thus distinguished amid the appropriate professional vocabulary, on one hand. On the other, relevant slang units are created through the impact exerted by the general word formation tradition with the use of the general linguistic tools.**

L.M. Palamar argues that professional vocabulary “belongs to substandard field-specific lexis; it is not presented in terminology dictionaries, as it functions primarily in oral and colloquial speech of professionals in a certain field. If terms may be known to people who have no tight connections to the certain professional field, professional vocabulary is understood only by experts, as professional vocabulary has a specific application area and emerge as part of professional communication as the secondary forms of expression” [Palamar, 2000, p. 104].

In view of the above, slang, if seen broadly, can contain certain terminology, particularity, military terms. We study the material from this perspective.

Military slang is a system of lexical elements that arose in the military community and are clear, first and foremost, **to military people. Obviously, this thematic field, just like any other, has a center and a periphery**, and has no clear borders, which determines slang movement not only within the field (from the center to the periphery and vice versa), but also beyond its borders, which implies a different status (target, social) of the investigated units. Many of those emerged in the previous century. Yet, the language of military people continues to acquire the elements that are able to reflect current realia. Certain slang words are clear to wider community, while other are used by the military or individuals connected to warfare. The military slang can also contain compressive slang words belonging to other subcodes, for instance, youth one: *оцифровувати (переводити у цифровий формат)* (Engl. *to digitize – convert to digital format*), *лайкувати / лайкати (ставити ‘лайку’)* (Engl. *to like – put ‘likes’*), *норм (нормально)* (Engl. *norm – normally*) etc. Such units certainly represent the periphery of the investigated thematic field.

These units appear for various reason. **Most frequently, they stem from the strive for a group-specific ‘codification’, decoding which requires appropriate, including field-specific, knowledge and experience.** Moreover, their emergence can be explained by speech expression, reflection of a special (sometimes ironic, even disdainful) **attitude to life and its realia. They result from speech acceleration under the accelerated life pace.** It is a sort of a collective pragmatic linguistic games, which ends with a specific person’s leaving a specific group or transition to another society with its linguistic and communication peculiarities.

Therefore, as mentioned above, to the main active processes that enrich, particularly, the speech of military people and language as whole with the investigated units, belong abbreviation and univerbation. Yet, it is reasonable to explore the output of these processes through defining the main nominative unit – nomeme.

“A word and a word combination are studied from the point of view of their nominative potential. Generally speaking, the essence of the nomination they lies in the specification of relationships between the ideas of types of thinking, i.e., in clarifying the ways nominations are created, stabilized and distributed in terms of various fragments of objective reality. The concept of nomination reflects both the process of name creation, adaptation and distribution in terms of various fragments of reality, and a meaningful language unit built during the nomination” [Diachok etc., 2022].

Previously, **we repeatedly mentioned the fact that the implementations of the language nomination units are presented by the identical speech nomination units – synthetic and / or analytical modifications of respective nomemes, lexemes, compound words, that is, invariants capable of being implemented in various – synthetic or analytical – structural variations** [Diachok, 2015].

Among the terms referring to the nominative language invariant existing in the linguistic science, we prefer the term *nomeme* suggested by V.M. Nikitevych [Nikitevych, 1985]. Our preference leans on a few reasons. First, it best reflect the essence of the central nominative unit. Secondly, this name sounds similar to other terms that nominate the units of the main systematic levels, such as phoneme, lexeme, phraseme, syntaxeme.

As a language substance, the invariant is interpreted in terms of the structural approach. The main postulate lies in the distinction of the language as a certain semiotic system of invariant units and speech as the means of language functioning seen as the way of implementing language units in thousands of its variants.

We distinguish between synthetic and analytical nomemes. **The variants of the synthetic nomemes are represented by “all semantically identical units, which can be distinguished at the level of words”** [Diachok, 2015, p. 107]. In this case, we consider the following types of nomeme modification.

I. A word implemented in its forms, particularly, prepositional ones, depending on the context; this type may include abbreviations equivalent to the word (*А* – *армія* [A – army], *БГ* – *боеголовка* [WH – warhead], *БПО* – *бронепоезд* [AT – armored train], *БТ* – *бронетехніка* [AV – armored vehicles], *г-л* – *генерал* [g-l – general], *головком* – *головнокомандувач* [chief-comm – commander-in-chief], *ДМБ* – *демобілізація* [DMB – demobilization], *ЕШ/еш.* – *ешелон* [ECH/ech – echelon], *зр./зраз.* – *зразок* [smr – sample], *ЗРЧ* – *заручник* [HA – hostage], *Зх.* – *Захід* [W – West], *к-л* – *капрал* [c-l – corporal], *к-н/кап.* – *капітан* [cap – captain], *КА* – *катер* [CU – cutter], *ком.* – *командир* [comm. – commander], *команд.* – *командувач* [command. – commander], *лейт.* – *лейтенант* [lieut. – lieutenant] etc.).

II. A word-combination implemented in its forms, particularly, synthetic ones. The variations of this nomeme pattern are represented by all semantically identical units that are distinguished at the level of word-combinations [ibid, pp. 106–107].

Among those, we separately distinguish a “univerbalized (verbal) equivalent” of the word-combination, i.e., a word that has emerged as a result of the verbal modification of the word-combination, and is identical to the word-combination from the lexico-grammatical viewpoint [ibid, c. 110].

As the structural type of the analytical nomeme, the univerbalized equivalent of the word-combination has its own hierarchical structure, within which it is important to distinguish a few levels.

1. The level, at which the verbal representative of the nomeme emerges due to ellipsis – elliptical univerbation, which may produce nouns (*бронік* – *броньований жилет* [bronik – armored vest], *плитняк* – *жилет з плитами* [plytnyak – a vest with plates], *плитоноско* – *плитоносниий жилет/жилет для плит* [plate carrier – plate carrier vest], *розвантажка* – *розвантажувальний пасок* [unload – unloading belt], *медуха / медичка* – *медична сумка* [medukha – medical bag], *ТРОшник* – *боець ТРО* [TROshnyk – TRO fighter], verbs (*волонтерити* – *бути волонтером* [to volunteer – to be a volunteer], *мінуснути* – *зробити «мінус» (ворогу)* [to minus – make “minus”], *задвохсотити* – *зробити «двохсотим»* [to cargo 200 – make cargo 200], *затрофеїти* – *здобути трофеї* [to win trophies], *зафіналіти* – *довести до фіналу* [to finalize – to bring to the end]), **participles and adverbial participles** (*зафіналюючи* – *доводячи до фіналу* [finalizing – bringing to the end], *затрьохсотений* – *зроблений «трьохсотим»* [made ‘by three-hundred’ – wounded]).

2. The level, at which the verbal representative of the nomeme emerges due to the univerbal compression of the word-combination (*першокурсник* – *курсант першого курсу* [freshman – first-year military student]).

3. The level, at which at which the verbal representative of the nomeme emerges due to the complex compression of the word-combination – abbreviation (*РСЗВ* – *реактивна система залпового вогню* [RSFS – reactive salvo fire system], *БМД* – *бойова машина десанту* [AAV – amphibious assault vehicle], *БМП* – *бойова машина піхоти* [IFV – infantry fighting vehicle], *ДРГ* – *диверсійно-розвідувальна група* [SIG – sabotage and intelligence group], *БПЛА* – *безпілотний літальний апарат* [UAV – unmanned aerial vehicle]).

Besides, the nomemes with the word-combination as the dominant can be represented by their several structural variations simultaneously, whereby they are formally seen as complex nomemes.

Therefore, the processes of abbreviation and univerbation, which modern linguistics refers to as word-forming, appeared to be the most interesting for our research. However, the essence of these processes does not meet the word formation canons, to be more specific, both synthetic, and analytical unit have the identical lexical meaning. If during the formation of a new unit the semantics does not become more complex, that is, the new meaning does not appear, such transformation cannot be considered word-forming. It is logically interpreted otherwise, for instance, as the internal, speech-based word formation, or as the form-building process.

Abbreviation. There is a huge number of definitions for abbreviation as a process and abbreviation as a unit resulting from this process.

L. Bulakhovsky described this linguistic phenomenon as the speakers’ urgent need: “These days, people have to rush to be able to work hard, which this or that way accelerates their speech pace. It has become essential to preserve the strength to give it the most beneficial use; the same is true for language” [Bulakhovsky, 1928–1929, p. 33].

O. Selivanova defined abbreviation through its output. In her opinion, “abbreviation is usually a noun made via the reduction of a simple word, or the components of a compound word, or the elements of the base word-combination to the level of sounds or letter, syllables or other word frag-

ments” [Selivanova, 2010, pp. 5–6]. However, there is still discussion around the issue of telescopisms (telescopes), abbreviated words that are supposed to be considered either as lexicalized units, or as doublets of **certain nominative word-combinations or words that have a common – identical – lexical meaning**.

Obviously, **most linguists share opinion on the derivational nature of abbreviation, in which respect any abbreviation is a result of lexicalization, i.e., a separate independent word. It is only O.O. Selivanova, who acknowledges other relationships between the initial word combination and the abbreviation.**

A total match, or similarity, of the semantics of the “base” word-combination or word and the respective abbreviation leads to the **assumption about non-word-forming (rather form-building) relationships existing between the word-combination and the abbreviation, or the word and the abbreviation**, for instance:

БМД [AAV] – *бойова машина десанту* [amphibious assault vehicle];

РСЗО [RSFS] – *реактивна система залпового вогню* [reactive salvo fire system];

ДШВ [AAT] – *десантно-штурмові війська* [amphibious assault troops];

ген.-лейт. [l-g] – *генерал-лейтенант* [lieutenant general].

We suggest interpreting the **mentioned compressive units as univerbated (verbal) equivalents** of the respective word-combinations or words, that is, as synthetic units that have emerged due to the verbal interpretation of the word-combination or the word respectively, have the identical lexical and grammatical meaning and syntactic function.

And **vice versa: every interpretation of the initial word or word-combination, respectively, directly depends on the abbreviation process**. In general, a separate language unit capable of being implemented synthetically and/or analytically in speech and text is defined as the *nomeme*, such as “word-combination + abbreviation” or “word + abbreviation”. It belongs to the structural types of *nomemes* with the dominating word-combination or the dominating word, respectively, i.e., it is a semantically identical unit identified at the level of the word-combination or the word.

Consequently, it is reasonable to interpret the abbreviation of any type as the word, which is semantically and grammatically identical to the certain word-combination or the separate lexeme and which, in certain cases, can be stylistically different from this (equivalent) word-combination or lexeme, yet remains a variant of the common *nomeme*.

In this respect, we consider the relationships between the abbreviation and the respective word-combination or lexeme as equal relationships provided that there is semantic similarity.

Univerbation. Linguistics still has no common interpretation for this phenomenon. Univerbation is seen both in a broad, and in a narrow sense of this term. In the broad sense, univerbation implies the derivation *synthetism*, whereby the meaning that is initially implemented via several units is expressed in one word. In other words, this view of univerbation used to mean both abbreviation (*БМП – бойова машина піхоти*), and *ellipsis* (*ротний – ротний командир*), and *elliptical univerbation*, or univerbation in the narrow sense of this word [Diachok, 2015, pp. 25–30], for instance:

Волонтерити [to volunteer] – *бути волонтером* [to be a volunteer];

Затрофеїти [to trophies] – *взяти трофеї* [win trophies];

ТРОшник [fighter] – *боєць ТРО* [TRO fighter];

Броня [armor] – *броньована техніка* [armored vehicles];

Бронік [armor] – *броньований жилет* [armored vest].

Furthermore, **univerbation is defined as the word formation act based on a certain word-combination**, whereby the output of this process – the *univerb* – has a similar meaning. In general, this broad concept implies shortening, *nominalization* and *suffixation*. Therefore, it is interpreted as almost any mechanism of a new word emergence based on the word-combination as the syntactic unit. Summarizing the definitions of the existing types of word-combinations-to-words transformation, certain scholars use such terms as *condensation*, *univerbation*, or *univerbization* [Diachok, 2015].

The **narrow sense of this term highlights univerbation among other so-called derivation processes: it implies building a lexical unit on the basis of one of the elements of the certain multi-component nomination**. Other synonyms also indicate the aforementioned process. Suffixal univerbation is a part of the overall phenomenon. It stands out for the existence of two formally connected *nominate* units sharing the same semantics: *analytical* and *synthetic*. Univerbation produces a synthetic unit, which is referred to as ***univerb*, *unverbate* or *unverbism*** [ibid, 2015].

We see the aforementioned phenomenon as a specific type of internal – speech – derivation characterized by internal motivation and determined by the similarity of the semantics of the initial nominative unit and its discourse implementations, which formally differ from each other.

Obviously, the emergence of univerbs was preceded by the number of extra- and intralinguistic factors, which are believed to be the reason for their rise in speech / language. Firstly, it is the tendency for regulating inter-linguistic connections, for building speech automation. Secondly, it is the strive of any language for its units syntheticism, i.e., for “one-wordedness”. Thirdly, it is an attempt to overcome internal controversies between the segmentation of the nomination form and the unity of its meaning. Fourthly, it is a human mental need to communicate the necessary amount of information in the shortest possible time, etc.

The research of various compression processes must lean on the understanding of the fact that intra- and extralinguistic factors always complement each other, are often inseparable and combine both systematic, and applied peculiarities of this or that language.

Complex nomemes and their implementation. As we mentioned earlier, nomemes with the word-combination as the dominant can be implemented in modern military discourse in their several structural variations simultaneously – in the forms that are semantically identical. The research material has demonstrated at least two structural types of language invariants capable of being fully implemented in both oral, and written speech. This means that various structural forms of the same invariant function simultaneously, which can be presented in the following way.

1. Word-combination + abbreviation + elliptical univerb, for instance:

<p><i>безпілотний літальний апарат</i> <i>unmanned aerial vehicle</i> (nomeme)</p>	<p><i>БПЛА</i> <i>UAV</i> (abbreviation) <i>безпілотник</i> <i>unmanned</i> (univerb).</p>
--	--

2. Word-combination + univerbal composite + elliptical univerb, for instance:

<p><i>броньований жилет</i> <i>armored vest</i> (nomeme)</p>	<p><i>броньований жилет</i> <i>armored vest</i> (word-combination) <i>бронезилет</i> <i>armorevest</i> (univerbal composite) <i>Бронік (1)</i> <i>armored</i> (univerb);</p>
<p><i>броньований транспортер</i> <i>armored personnel carrier</i> (nomeme)</p>	<p><i>броньований транспортер</i> <i>armored personnel carrier</i> (word-combination) <i>бронетранспортер</i> <i>armorecarrier</i> (univerbal composite) <i>Бронік (2)</i> <i>carrier</i> (univerb).</p>

The examples of the synthetic forms of the second type (*бронік 1* and *бронік 2*) illustrate homonymy, which is determined by the verbal implementations of two different nomemes (*броньований жилет* and *броньований транспортер*).

3. Word-combination + univerbal composite + abbreviation, for instance:

	<i>бойовий комплект</i>
	<i>battle kit</i>
	<i>(word-combination)</i>
<i>бойовий комплект</i>	<i>боекомплект</i>
<i>battle kit</i>	<i>battlekit</i>
<i>(nomeme)</i>	<i>(univerbal composite)</i>
	<i>БК</i>
	<i>БК</i>
	<i>(abbreviation).</i>

It is obvious that “the nominative unit of this or that language cannot be referred to a word only, as it is stated by the advocates for word-centrism. It is reasonable to explore this unit as a certain invariant able to contain the features of a word and its forms or the features of a word combination and its forms, respectively. To the most important factors for defining the language invariant belong nominativeness and the semantic and grammatical similarity between all its forms of various structure” [Bondareva, 2023, p. 9–10].

Conclusions

Military discourse represents the field of language functioning able to produce neologisms that emerge as a result of various types of compression. This is connected with the speech dynamics as a whole, as well as with the need of native speakers, who are military or related to warfare, to communicate maximum information in the shortest possible time. They aim to communicate clearly and concisely while preserving the meaning of their messages. It is extremely important to comprehensively explore and analyze such modern (slang and commonly used) compressives, as they contribute to the modern history of language development. It is this fact that encourages the advancement of modern theories of neolinguistic phenomena.

Among the investigated vocabulary of Ukrainian military people, we highlight the following: nouns; verbs and adverbial participles; adverbs; interjections.

Nouns are formed via:

a) abbreviation (based both on a few words, and on one – simple or compound – word), for instance: *ВМС* (*військово-морські сили*) [NF (naval forces)], *БК* (*боекомплект*) [ammo (ammunition)], *БРДМ* (*бойова розвідувально-дозорна машина*) [CRSV (combat reconnaissance and surveillance vehicle)];

б) unverbation, for instance: *броня* (*броньована машина*) [armor (armored car)], *ТРОшник*, *трошник* (*боець ТРО*) [TROer (TRO fighter)];

в) simulation of unverbation (through suffixation of a simple word, whereby the derivative is of colloquial – slang – nature), for instance: *теплак* (*тепловізор*) [thermal (thermal imager)], *бронік* (*бронезилет*) [armored (armored vest)].

Compressive verbs and their forms more often result from unverbation, for instance: *завдохотити* [make cargo 200], *затрофеїти* [to win trophies], *мінуснути* (*зробити ‘мінус’ ворогу*) [to minus – make ‘minus’].

The emergence of investigated compressive nominations follows the overall trend of uniting the nomination processes that seek to modify analytical or complex synthetic units into shorter speech segments, which is a universal trait of the modern state of Indo-European languages.

Bibliography

Бондарева, О.О. (2023). *Номема комплексного зразка та особливості її втілення у мовленні та тексті*. О.К. Куварова (Ред.), *Матеріали XI міжнародної конференції «Лексико-граматичні інновації в слов'янських мовах»* (с. 9-12). Дніпро: Ліра.

Булаховський, Л.А. (1928-1929). *Основи мовознавства. Соціальна природа мови*. Харків: Всеукраїнський заочний інститут народної освіти.

Дьячок, Н.В. (2015). *Універбація в російській мові: структурно-семантичний та ономасіологічний аналіз* (дис. докт. філол. наук). Інститут мовознавства ім. О.О. Потебні НАН України, Київ.

Дорда, В.О. (2008). Джерела американського студентського сленгу. В.М. Манакін (Ред.), *Нова філологія. Збірник наукових праць* (с. 69-72). Запоріжжя: ЗНУ.

Микульчик, Р. (2005). Сучасні українські аббревіатури: перспективи і стан дослідження. *Вісник Національного університету «Львівська політехніка». Серія «Проблеми української термінології»*, 538, 12-15.

Никитевич, В.В. (1978). *Словообразование и словообразовательная грамматика*. Алмата: КазГУ.

Никитевич, В.В. (1985). *Основы номинативной деривации*. Минск: Высшая школа.

Паламар, Л.М. (2000). *Мова ділових паперів*. Київ: Либідь.

Пономаренко, С. (2017). *Сучасна українська мова: Морфеміка. Деривато-логія. Морфологія*. Миколаїв: ЧНУ ім. Петра Могили.

Селіванова, О.О. (2010). *Лінгвістична енциклопедія*. Полтава: Довкілля-К.

Diachok, N., Kuvarkova, O., Vysotska, T., Korotkova, S., Khurtak, I. (2022). A Word and a Word Combination in Language and Speech. *Studies in Media and Communication*, 10 (3), 21-27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v10i3.5829>

Grzegorzczkova, R. (1984). *Zarys słowotwórstwa polskiego: Słowotwórstwo opisowe*, Warszawa: PWN.

Jadacka, H. (2001). *System słowotwórczy polszczyzny (1945–2000)*, Warszawa: Wydawn. Naukowe PWN.

Müller, P.O., Ohnheiser, I., Olsen, S., Rainer, F. (Eds.). (2015). *Word-Formation. An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Nagórko, A. (1997). *Zarys gramatyki polskiej (ze słowo twórstwem)*, Warszawa: PWN.

Partridge, E. (1979). *Slang Today and Yesterday*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Spears Richard, A. (1982). *Slang and Euphemism*. New-York: New American Library.

THE LEXICON OF CONTEMPORARY WAR TIME: COMPRESSIVE PROFESSIONAL SLANG UNITS IN THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE

Oleksandr S. Ivko, Regional College “Kremenchuk Anton Makarenko Humanitarian and Technological Academy” (Ukraine)

e-mail: alll.ivko@gmail.com

Natalia V. Diachok, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University (Ukraine)

e-mail: dyachok74natalya@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2024-2-28-10>

Key words: *military discourse, nomeme, compressives, military jargon, professional vocabulary, current nominative processes, abbreviation, univerbation.*

The article seeks to reveal the concept of compressive processes implemented in the professional slang of Ukrainian military people and volunteers. It is a continuation of a series of works covering the current processes in language and speech. The main focus here is placed on abbreviation and univerbation as the processes able to create compressed modification of nominative units – both analytical, and synthetic, i.e., the processes belonging to internal, speech-based word formation.

The topicality of the paper lies in its focus on phenomena that gradually become the history of the Ukrainian language and Slavic studies as a whole, including neologization and adjacent phenomena.

The research aims to define the productivity of compressives as units of military discourse, on one hand, and as the emergent linguistic material, on the other. The objectives of the study are as follows: 1) to separate compressives from the traditional derivatives; 2) to determine the criteria for distinguishing the main compressive processes – abbreviation and univerbation; 3) to formulate the causes of the emergence of the investigated slang; 4) to give reasoning for the study of compressives in military discourse as a prospective research issue.

The main research methods include the descriptive and structural ones, as they help demonstrate the specificity of univerbs and abbreviation as instances of speech compression. We have utilized the distributive analysis approach to determine the types of nominative units' transformation.

Military discourse is the field of language functioning that fosters the production of neologisms emerging as a result of different types of compression. It reflects the dynamic nature of military discourse with its need to convey maximum amount of information within the minimum period of time, striving for clearance, laconic forms, and rich content. Within the range of Ukrainian military lexicon under analysis, we single out nouns (formed by means of abbreviation, univerbation, and simulation of univerbation) as

well as verbs and their verb forms (which often result from univerbation). The emergence of compressive nominations in question follows the general tendency of lexical nomination towards modifying analytical or complex synthetic units into shorter speech segments, being a universal feature of the current state of the Indo-European languages as a whole.

References

- Bondareva, O. (2023). *Nomema kompleksnoho zrazka ta osoblyvosti yiyi vtillennya u movlenni ta teksti* [A nomema of a complex pattern and features of its embodiment in speech and text]. In O.K. Kuvarova (ed.). *Materialy 11 mizhnarodnoyi konferentsiyi «Leksyko-hramatychni inovatsiyi v slovyanskykh movakh»* [Materials of the 11th international conference "Lexical and Grammatical Innovations in Slavic Languages"]. Dnipro, Lira Publ., pp. 9-12.
- Bulakhovskiy, L. (1928-1929). *Osnovy movoznavstva. Sotsial'na pryroda movy* [Basics of Linguistics. The Social Nature of Language]. Kharkiv, Vseukrainsky zaochny instytut narodnoi osvity Publ., 87 p.
- Grzegorzczkova, R. (1984). *Zarys słowotwórstwa polskiego: Słowotwórstwo opisowe* [Outline of Polish word formation: descriptive word formation]. Warszawa, PWN Publ., 49 p.
- Diachok, N. (2015). *Univerbatsiya v ruskom yazyke: strukturno-semanticheskaya i onomasiologicheskaya analiz* (dys.dokt. filol. nauk) [Univerbation in the Russian language: structural and semantic and onomasiological description (Doctor thesis)]. Kyiv, Potebnia Institute of Linguistics, 430 p.
- Diachok, N., Kuvarova, O., Vysotska, T., Koratkova, S., Khurtak, I. (2022). A Word and a Word Combination in Language and Speech. *Studies in Media and Communication*, vol. 10, issue 3, pp. 21-27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v10i3.5829>
- Dorda, V.O. (2008). *Dzherela amerykanskoho studentskoho slenhu* [The Sources of American Student Slang]. In V.M. Manakin (ed.). *Nova filolohiya. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats* [New Philology. Collection of scientific papers]. Zaporizhzhia, ZNU Publ., pp.69-72.
- Jadacka, H. (2001). *System słowotwórczy polszczyzny (1945-2000)* [Word-forming System of Polish (1945-2000)]. Warszawa, Wydawn. Naukowe PWN Publ., 201 p.
- Mykulchyk, R. (2005). *Suchasni ukrayinski abreviatory: perspektyvy i stan doslidzhennya* [Modern Ukrainian abbreviations: prospects and current study]. *Visnyk Natsionalnogo universitetu «Lvivska politekhnika». Seriya «Problemy ukrayinskoyi terminolohiyi»* [Journal of Lviv Polytechnic National University. Series "Problems of Ukrainian terminology"], vol. 538, pp. 12-15.
- Nagórko, A. (1997). *Zarys gramatyki polskiej (ze słowo twórstwem)* [Outline of Polish Grammar (Word Creation)]. Warszawa, PWN Publ., 317 p.
- Nikitevich, V. (1978). *Slovoobrazovaniye i slovoobrazovatel'naya grammatika* [Word Formation and Derivational Grammar]. Alma-Ata, Kazakh State University Publ., 61 p.
- Nikitevich, V. (1985). *Osnovy nominativnoy derivatsii* [Basics of Nominative Derivation]. Minsk, High school Publ., 158 p.
- Palamar, L.M. (2000). *Mova dilovykh paperiv* [Language of Business Papers]. Kyiv, Lybid Publ., 296 p.
- Partridge, E. (1979). *Slang Today and Yesterday*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 488 p.
- Ponomarenko, S. (2017). *Suchasna ukrayinska mova: Morfemika. Deryvato-lohiya. Morfonolohiya* [Modern Ukrainian Language: Morphemics. Derivative Logic. Morphology]. Mykolaiv, ChNU Publ., 300 p.
- Selivanova, O. (2010). *Linhvistychna entsyklopediya* [Linguistic Encyclopedia]. Poltava, Dovkillya-K Publ., 711 p.
- Spears Richard, A. (1982). *Slang and Euphemism*. New-York, New American Library, 412 p.
- Müller, P.O., Ohnheiser, I., Olsen, S., Rainer, F. (eds.). (2015). *Word-Formation. An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*. Berlin–Boston, De Gruyter Mouton, 758 p.