

COMPOUNDS IN RUSSIAN: CROSS-LANGUAGE INTERACTION AND DISCREPANCIES¹

Сложные слова в русском языке:
межъязыковые взаимодействия и противоречия.

Elena Petrukhina

Lomonosov Moscow State University (Moscow, Russia)

elena.petrukhina@gmail.com

Елена Васильевна Петрухина

Московский государственный университет им. М.В. Ломоносова
(Москва, Россия)

elena.petrukhina@gmail.com

ISSN: 1698-322X ISSN INTERNET: 2340-8146

Fecha de recepción: 13.10.2017

Fecha de evaluación: 17.12.2017

Cuadernos de Rusística Española n° 13 (2017), 15 - 28

ABSTRACT

The aim of the article is to analyze new trends in Russian, which are greatly influenced by the English language. Compound words (composites) reflect changes in the views of society, including those influenced by cultural and linguistic interaction. Compound words express current meaning complexes, which are important for the ethnic group in a given period of its existence. Russian compounding uses models of Russian folk word formation, Old Slavonic and Western European languages; these models can be used to study the history of linguistic contacts.

Keywords: Cross-language Contacts, Russian Word Formation, Compounding, Influence of the English Language, Borrowed Formants.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Целью статьи является анализ новых тенденций в русском словосложении, на которые большое влияние оказывает английский язык. В сложных словах (композициях) отражаются изменения в воззрениях общества, в том числе и под влиянием культурно-языкового взаимодействия. Сложные слова выражают актуальные комплексы смыслов, важные для этноса в тот или иной период его существования. В русском словосложении используются модели русского народного словотворчества, старославянского и западноевропейских языков, по этим моделям можно изучать историю языковых контактов.

Ключевые слова: межъязыковое взаимодействие, русское словообразование, словосложение, влияние английского языка, заимствованные форманты.

1. The research was supported by Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR), grant 17-04-00532a.

INTRODUCTION

1.1. *Internationalization and compounding as active processes in Russian word formation*

In Slavic studies, internationalization is considered one of the leading trends in the development of the contemporary Slavic languages, with internationalisms being interpreted as lexical units, word-formation tools and patterns, borrowed from foreign languages, which can be found in all Slavic languages. The issue of foreign borrowings and derivation from foreign roots in Russian and other Slavic languages is covered in a vast linguistic literature, which examines the internationalization of vocabulary and the adaptation of borrowings to the lexical system and the system of word-formation in Slavic languages (Кориакowcewa 2009; Клименко, Карпіловська 2010; Петрухина 2010). We witness a sort of a new "intraslavic association" stage, which is especially apparent in word formation (Ohnheiser 2003: 334).

The borrowing of formants of the type *евро-* /*evro-*/ "euro", *веб-* /*web-*/ "web", *шоу-* /*shou-*/ "show"² and active formation of composites is considered an important fact of vocabulary internationalization. Recorded already in the middle of the last century, this phenomenon gained momentum with the spread of new information technologies and the general strengthening of globalization processes. The borrowing of similar elements in the Russian language is much more active than the assimilation of foreign suffixes and prefixes (Улуханов 2010: 35). A number of studies analyze the status of such borrowings in Slavic languages and the conditions in which they occur (Аврамова 2010; Bozděchová 2010; Горбов 2010, 2015; Эдберг 2014; Соколова, Эдберг 2016). The possibility to borrow an entire word-forming family at a time (cf. *шоу* – "show", *телешоу* – "teleshow", *шоумен* – "showman", *шоу-бизнес* – "show business", etc.), as well as the formation of hybrid nominations with borrowed and native elements on the Russian (broader – Slavic) basis (*шоу-площадка* /*shou-ploshhadka*/ – "show platform", *шоу-новости* /*shou-novosti*/ – "show news") contribute to new processes in the Russian and Slavic compounding. But the issue of how borrowed and native Russian elements are related in the composition of such two-component nominations still remains unexplored, the only exception being the article (Капатынский, Вакрелийска 2013), which analyzes names of cafés, restaurants, salons in St. Petersburg and Moscow. In addition, up to now there has been no research on how these models are related to the types of compound names that are long-established in the Russian language.

2. We provide transliteration and translation for the Russian examples, and, if necessary, some kind of a calque as well after the transliteration, i.e., we translate every part of the composite, in order to explain its structure, e.g. *самотек* /*samotyok*/ 'self-flow' – "drift". We give Russian transcription even in the cases where the Russian pronunciation corresponds to that in English, as well as English translation in all cases – to preserve the uniformity of the language material description. In addition, when necessary, we marked in bold the correlative parts in the Russian and English composites or word combinations in the cases where we consider the literal calques excessive (e.g. *жизнелюбивый* /*zhiznelyubivyj*/ – "life-loving").

1.2. Methodology and methods of research

Our research lies within the explanatory description of the Russian language, when the study and interpretation of simultaneous connections and relations between linguistic phenomena is conducted taking into account historical processes, in particular, data on the origin of the formants and models. This approach allows us to identify not only the universal processes in the Russian word formation, determined by globalization trends, including the influence of English, but also special characteristics of Russian. In addition, it provides an opportunity to draw typologically meaningful conclusions about the dynamics of analytism and incorporation in the Russian language. The language material was retrieved from Runet texts with the help of the Google and Yandex search engines. These tools help us to analyze the productivity of the compounding patterns pertinent to this study and to check the occurrence of specific derivatives in speech, as well as to run a prognostic search on possible combinations of composites' components. The language material was also checked by the lexicographical sources, including dictionaries of foreign words.

2. CROSS-LANGUAGE INTERACTION IN RUSSIAN COMPOUNDING SYNCHRONICALLY AND DIACHRONICALLY

In the last thirty years, a new common Slavic integration manifests itself in the active use of English borrowings in Slavic languages that gives rise to new word-forming ranks and word-formation clusters; in the enhancement of international affixes (of Greco-Latin origin, such as *антн-* /*anti-* – “*anti-*”, *мультн-* /*mul'ti-* – “*multi-*”, *-фнлн* /*-filiya-* – “*-philia*”), in the formation of derivatives not only with borrowed, but also with native stems; in the strengthening of different types of compounds (without interfix) and their serial realization; in the functional transformation of certain components in borrowed lexical units into bound word-formation formants of the type *арт-* /*art-*, *-мейкер* / *maker*, etc. Among the neologisms-composites, the Russian language includes obvious borrowings (of the type *шоу-бнзнес* – “*show business*”), perceived as derivatives due to the use of one of the composite parts as an independent lexical unit, calques (cf. *кофе-пауза* /*kofepauza-* – “*coffee break*”), those formed from elements borrowed into Russian at different times (cf. *курорт-отель* /*kurort-otel'* – “*resort hotel*”), as well as derivatives in which foreign components are combined with native Russian ones (*арт-праздник* /*art-prazdnik'* – “*art festival*”, *арт-данные* /*art-danny'e-* – “*art data*”).

We would like to emphasize that it is impossible to study compound neologisms with borrowed parts without taking into account the types of compound words that exist in Russian, along with their history. This is due to the fact that intensive growth of the derivative activity of the patterns in question would be impossible without the support of native Russian patterns or those long-established in the Russian language. Therefore, it is not only the analysis of the compatibility between Russian and foreign elements that we consider to be of high priority in the study of new composites, but also the relation between such foreign patterns and Russian compounding models, which consolidated in Russian in its previous development periods. This refers to the

compounding models with an attributive prepositional part (*сон-трава* /*son-trava*/ "sleep-grass"); with affixoids (*полу-* /*polu-*/, *само-* /*samo-*/ "half", "self": *полумера* /*polumera*/ "half-measure", *самотек* /*samotyok*/ 'self-flow' – "drift", *самоуправство* /*samoupravstvo*/ 'self-manipulating' – "arbitrariness"); with long borrowed Greco-Latin formants (such as *авто-* /*avto-*/ "car": *автопарк* /*avtopark*/ – "car park") and abridged compound Sovietisms of the type *зосучреждение* /*gosuchrezhdenie*=*gosudarstvennoje*+*uchrezhdenie*/ – "government institution", *мануплощадка* /*tantsploshhadka*=*tantseval'naja*+*ploshhadka*/ – "dance floor" and others.). In addition, the history of compound words in Russian provides interesting insights on how historical processes in society resulted in changes in the combinations of topical meanings that require typical ways of expression.

According to V. Vinogradov, "methods of Russian folk word formation crossed with influences of the Old Slavonic (and hence the Greco-Byzantine) and Western European ... languages in the history of Russian literary compounding forms" (Виноградов 1994: 406). In recent decades we have seen the intensive influence of the English language. It is known that in the formation of the Russian system of composites, old Slavonic types of compound words played an important role. We are talking primarily about compound nouns with an interfix, representing calques of Greek composites in translated texts of spiritual and religious content (including those with the elements *добро-* /*dobro-*/ – "good-", *бого-* /*bogo-*/ – "god-", *благо-* /*blago-*/ – "well-", *зло-* /*zlo-*/ – "evil", *правдо-* /*pravdo-*/ – "truth", *живо-* /*zhivo-*/ – "life", *миро-* /*miro-*/ – "peace", *душе-* /*dushe-*/ – "soul" etc.). In Slavic studies, there are many works examining composition as one of the most characteristic features of book-religious texts of ancient Rus, which study the complex process of creating new language units according to Greek models on the Slavic basis; see the review of this scientific literature in (Чернышева 2009: 70-72). Creating compound words along the lines of the Greek ones in order to convey new Christian notions activated compounding models in the Russian language, and also contributed to the adaptation of compound suffixal words with the suffixes *-ени(е)* /*-eni(e)*/, *-иј(е)* /*-ij(e)*/, *-тель* /*-tel'*/, *-ец* /*-ets*/ to the lexical and word-formative system of the ancient Russian language. Old Russian written texts abound in compound words, calques of Greco-Byzantine models that convey the most complex concepts of new knowledge and the Christian worldview. Created on the Slavic basis and supported by Old Russian word-formative relations, compound words, according to many studies, modified the original Greco-Byzantine model as they interacted with the content of the entire text in the interpretation of the translator. All this created conditions for their active creation and use in Old Russian written literature. For example, in accordance with the adjusted data (including additional materials), the Dictionary of the 11th-17th centuries' Russian (СлРЯ XI–XVII 1975) includes 563 compound words only with the *благо-* /*blago-*/ component (Чернышева 2009: 72); more than 200 words with the *добро-* /*dobro-*/ component (without additional materials) (Вендина 2007: 149). The lexical units *благо* /*blago*/, *добро* /*dobro*/ (and others mentioned above) were typical root elements of compound words, able to interact with many names as they express the key concepts of the Christian faith.

In the 18th – 20th centuries, many compound words formed on the Church Slavonic models (Greco-Byzantine models) were lost. According to the Consolidated

dictionary of the contemporary Russian language (Сводный словарь 1991: 90-91), the contemporary Russian language has preserved about 150 compound lexical units involving *благо-* /*blago*/, taking into account suffixed derivatives (e.g., *благополучие* /*blagopoluchie*/ – ‘well-getting’ – “well-being”), *благодарить* /*blagodatit'*/ – ‘well-giving’ – “grace”, *благодарить* /*blagodarit'*/ – ‘to well-give’ – “to thank”). The same dictionary (1991: 282-283) records only 50 compound words with the *добро-* /*dobro*/ root (cf. *добропорядочный* /*dobroporyadochnyj*/ ‘good-decent’ – “decent”, *доброжелательность* /*dobrozhelatel'nost'*/ ‘good-wishing’ – “friendliness”, *добродушие* /*dobrodushie*/ ‘good-soulness’ – “kind-heartedness”, *добросовестность* /*dobrosovestnost'*/ ‘good-conscientiousness’ – “integrity”). The nature of those composites has changed – they are no longer productive models, open to new derivatives and occasional use.

In the 20th century, new models of word formation with the enhanced role of abridged words were formed. Redistribution of different word-formation models is one of the signs of transitional periods. Thus, according to V. Zhivov, the emergence and spread of abridged (contracted) words (such as *исполком* /*ispolkom* = *ispolnitel'nyj*+*komitet*/ – “executive committee”, *революционный суд* /*revtribunal* = *revolyucionnyj*+*tribunal*/ – “revolutionary tribunal”, *госучреждение* /*gosuchrezhdenie* = *gosudarstvennoe*+*uchrezhdenie*/ – “government institution”) and the increased role of abbreviation, typical for Russian in the 1920's, are explained by conscious repulsion from the pre-revolutionary language standard (Живов 2005). This process echoes the intensification of the nominal composites model with the first attributive element and the approval of its new modifications, such as *бизнес-план* /*biznes-plan*/ – “business plan”, *Горбачев-фонд* /*Gorbachyov-fond*/ – “Gorbachev Foundation”, *клиент-банк* /*klient-bank*/ – “client-bank” in the 1990s. The expansion of such models is also explained pragmatically – by the ever-increasing prestige of English, “because this model simulates the structure of the English nominal phrase with a prepositional attributive, adjacent to the head noun” (Горбов 2010: 36). There is a rapid growth of the number of neologisms-composites with borrowed elements, that are bounded rather than free in the Russian language (such as *арт-группа* /*art-gruppa*/ – “art group”, *медиа-среда* /*media-sreda*/ – “media environment”). Such neologisms easily enter the Russian language, drawing on the existing models with affixoids. Affixoids (prefixoids and suffixoids, depending on the position) are morphemes of the transition type. They have a lexical meaning, similar to that of the root morpheme (etymologically affixoids are root morphemes, mostly borrowed), but differ from the latter not only in boundness, but also in functional similarities with affixes – in standard (not an individual) nature of meaning and use, regular connection with a number of roots. In Russian, there is a whole class of such bound formants, both those borrowed at different times (cf. *теле-* /*tele-*/, *био-* /*bio-*/, *аква-* /*akva-*/ – “aqua-”, *техно-* /*tehno-*/ – “techno-”, *гидро-* /*gidro-*/ “hydro-“, etc.) and native Russian ones (*пол(у)-* /*pol(u)-*/ – “half-“, *сам-* /*sam-*/ – “self-“, *-вед* /*-ved*/ – “leader”, *-вод* /*-vod*/ – “leader”), see Dictionary of affixoids (Козулина и кол., 2009). Affixoid morphemes in compound neologisms express standard meanings relevant for a society at a given time period.

3. ANALYZING COMPETITION OF SYNONYMOUS FORMANTS AND MODELS OF DIFFERENT ORIGIN (-ЛЮБ- /-LYUB-/ // -ФИЛИЯ /-FILIYA/, -МАНИЯ /-MANIYA/)

We shall analyze the dynamics of the interaction among different composites models by looking at a specific example. Thus, the Church Slavonic model of compound names with the root *люб-* /-lyub-/ (“love”) in the contemporary Russian language was superseded by composites with international formants *-филия* /-filiya/ – “-philia”, *-фил* /-fil/ – “-phil”, *-мания* /-maniya/ – “-mania”, *-ман* /-man/ – “-maniac”. The monuments of Old Russian books present two models (both Greco-Byzantine calques) of compound words with the root *-люб-* – in the first part (*любоначалие* /lyubonachalie/ ‘love-superiority’ – “lust for power”, *любостяжание* /lyubostyazhanie/ ‘love-attainment’ – “cupidity”) and second part (*властолюбие* /vlastolyubie/ ‘power-love’ – “love of power”). The second model became more widespread. The object name is in the first component of such compounds: *трудолюбие* /trudolyubie/ ‘labor-love’ – “diligence”, “industry”, *чадолюбие* /chadolyubie/ ‘child-love’ – “love of children”, *сребролюбие* /srebroyubie/ ‘silver-love’ – “avarice”, *самолубие* /samolyubie/ ‘self-love’ – “vanity”. Following these models, many compound names appeared in the Russian language in different time periods: *властолюбивый* /vlastolyubivyj/ – “power-loving”, *властолюбие* /vlastolyubie/ – “love of power”, *вольнолюбивый* /vol'nolyubivyj/ – “freedom-loving”, *вольнолюбие* /vol'nolyubie/ – “love of freedom”, *жизнелюбивый* /zhiznelyubivyj/ – “life-loving”, *жизнелюбие* /zhiznelyubie/ – “love of life”, *миролюбивый* /mirolyubivyj/ – “peace-loving”, *миролюбие* /mirolyubie/ – “love of peace”. Adjacent to this group are word-formative types of persons' names, such as *жизнелюб* /zhiznelyub/ ‘life-lover’ – “swinger”, *правдолюб* /pravdolyub/ ‘truth-lover’ – “truth-seeker”, as well as *корыстолюбец* /kory'stolyubets/ ‘lucre-lover’ – “profit seeker”, and others.

V.V. Vinogradov suggested that a clear morphemic structure of compound words with *-люб-* /-lyub-/ in the second part of the composite, in spite of their literary character, can make them an active model for new compounds, such as *театролюбие* /teatrolyubie/ – “love of theater” – *театролюбивый* /teatrolyubivyj/ – “theater-loving”, in the contemporary Russian language (Виноградов 1994: 152). But many words formed on this model, have kept bookish style and have not become common (cf. *братолюбивый* /bratolyubivyj/ – “brother-loving”, *братолюбие* /bratolyubie/ – “brotherly love”, *славолюбивый* /slavolyubivyj/ – “glory-loving”, *славолюбие* /slavolyubie/ – “love of glory”), and some have even come out of use (e.g., *книголюбивый* /knigolyubivyj/ – “book-loving”, *книголюбие* /knigolyubie/ – “love of books”). The Russian model was pushed aside by composites with borrowed formants *-мания* /-maniya/ / *-ман* /-man/, *-филия* /filiya/ /-фил /-fil/.

The *-мания* /-maniya/ formant (from the Greek mania 'madness, passion, desire') as the second part of compound word brings the meaning of 'passion for what is expressed in the first part of the word'; moreover, it may also carry the meaning of 'morbid tendency to what the first part of the word names'. Compound words with the *-ман* /-man/ formant refer to a person experiencing this passion. Cf. *киномания* /kinomaniya/ – “cinemaniya”, *киноман* /kinoman/ – “cinemaddict”, *кофемания* /kofemaniya/ – “coffeemania”, *кофеман* /kofeman/ – “coffee-addict”, *игромания* /igromaniya/ – “gambling addiction” / *игроман*

/igromaniya/ – “*gambling addict*”, etc. In the contemporary Russian language, this model has become productive – in the Runet, one can find compound words ending in *-мания* */-maniya/* formed from any noun, naming an object or phenomenon, which at least to some extent may become a hobby. In many cases, this is an unhealthy passion associated with consumption and shopping – *магазиномания* */magazinomaniya/*, *игрушккомания* */igrushkomaniya/* – “*toy-mania*”. One can also find *-ман* */-man/* correlates for the majority of the given derivatives in the Runet electronic texts.

These models have those with the *-филия* */-filiya/* and *-фил* */-fil/* formants (also of Greek origin) competing with them. Neologisms ending in *-филия* */-filiya/* represent a more unhealthy addiction than synonymous *-мания* */-maniya/* composites. So they are not used for the names of magazines, websites or cafés, unlike the *-мания* */-maniya/* neologisms, cf. “*Кофемания*” */Kofemaniya/* (“*Coffeemanía*” – name of a café), a computer magazine “*Игромания*” */Igromaniya/* (“*Gambling addiction*”) (and its rubric “*Видеомания*” */Videomaniya/* – “*Videomanía*”), “*Igromania.ru*” – a website on computer games. Many composites with the *-филия* */-filiya/*, *-фил* */-fil/* formants are antonyms of those ending in *-фобия* */-fobiya/*, *-фоб* */-fob/*, whose semantics has undergone complex changes - from the expression of pathological fears to irrational, negative attitude toward somebody, something (e.g. *ксенофобия* */ksenofobiya/* – “*xenophobia*”, *руссофобия* */russofobiya/* – “*russophobia*”, *зверофобия* */zverofobiya/* – “*animal phobia*”).

4. NEW AFFIXOIDS OF ENGLISH ORIGIN

The presence of models with native Russian and Greco-Latin affixoids in the Russian language creates the basis for replenishing the class of such word-building formants with attributive meaning from the English language (such as the prefixoids *медиа-* – “*media*”, *арт-* – “*art*”, *веб-* – “*web*”, *-мейкер* – “*maker*”). We searched for new composites in the Runet texts using the Google and Yandex search engines, including the models of prognostically constructed compounds. Most composites, formed by the author of the article, were found on the Runet websites (such as *арт-проспект* */art-prospekt/* “*art-avenue*”, *арт-улица* */art-ulica/* “*art-street*”, *арт-квартал* */art-kvartal/* “*art-quarter*”).

Modern dictionaries of foreign words (Крысин 2009) record only a few borrowings with the formant *-мейкер* – “*maker*”: *маркет-мейкер* – “*market maker*”, *имиджмейкер* or *имидж-мейкер* “*image maker*”. In recent years, dozens of new derivatives (our material contains 38 examples) have appeared in the media and Runet – *суши-мейкер* “*sushi-maker*”; *шоу-мейкер* “*show-maker*”, *климат-мейкер* “*climate-makers*”. The first part of such neologisms is usually represented by earlier-borrowed units. This strengthens the segmentability of these words and their perception as derivatives. The number of such neologisms in the media and advertising has been growing in recent years. Cf. the combination of this element with Russian stems in advertising and newspaper texts – *платье-мейкер* */platje-mejker/* “*dress-maker*”, *праздник-мейкер* */prazdnik-mejker/* “*festival-maker*”, *слухмейкер* */sluhmaker/* – “*rumor-maker*” (however, we find variation in the spelling of such words – with a hyphen, as a single word or separately).

The number of neologisms with the *медиа-* /*media-*/ and *арт-* /*art-*/ prefixoids, which include derivative borrowings, and calques, and derivatives, created by using a combination of these elements with many Russian roots (which confirms the status of these elements as word-building formants of a special type), is also growing:

медиа- /*media-*/ (46 composites considered), double spelling – together and with a hyphen – has been recorded: *медиапартнерство* /*mediapartnyorstvo*/ – “*media partnership*”, *медиапокупка* /*mediapokupka*/ – “*media purchase*”, *медиапространство* /*mediaprostranstvo*/ – “*media space*”, *медиа-профсоюз* /*media profsoyuz*/ – “*media trade union*”, *медиарынок* /*mediarynok*/ – “*media market*”, *медиасеть* /*media set*/ – “*media network*”, *медиа-среда* /*media-sreda*/ – “*media environment*”, *медиа-художник* /*media-hudozhnik*/ – “*media artist*” etc.;

арт- /*art-*/ (our catalog includes 53 composites) – the hyphenated spelling is more frequent: *арт-группа* /*art-gruppa*/ – “*art group*”, *арт-группировка* /*art-gruppirovka*/ – “*art grouping*”, *арт-данные* /*art-dannye*/ “*art data*”, *арт-событие* /*art-sobytie*/ – “*art event*”, *арт-столица* /*art-stolitsa*/ “*art capital*”. The *арт* /*art*/ element can also be on the second place in a compound derivative, cf.: *фото-арт* /*foto-art*/ – “*photo art*”, *соц-арт* /*socz-art*/ – “*socialist art*”, *ОРФО-арт* /*ORFO-art*/ – “*ORTHO-art*”. The given examples include many neologisms, the creation of which according to this model on the Russian basis is beyond doubt. In fact, the nature of the other part of the composite (borrowed or original) is not so important anymore – the *арт* /*art*/ element took its place among other affixoids. The above and similar models (e.g., those with the *веб-* /*web-*/ “*web*”, *масс-* /*mass-*/, *мон-* /*top-*/ formants) are highly productive and generate new composites. Activation of the model with affixoids that occurs under the influence of borrowings from the English language explains how this model is modified. By its derivational characteristics and genesis, the model with affixoids is similar to composites, both parts of which are free and can be used as independent lexical units (such as *фитнес-зал* /*fitnes-zal*/ “*fitness room*”, *шоу-площадка* /*shou-ploshhadka*/ “*entertainment area*”), as in both cases, individual lexical units correspond to them in the source language.

After a while, some borrowed formants, which entered the Russian language as affixoids, start to be used as free lexical units. Thus, the *-мейкер* (“*maker*”) affixoid active since the mid-nineties, has been used alone for the past few years, outside of a composite, for example: *Теперь вы знаете, кто такие мейкеры и что мейкерами можете стать вы сами: нужно просто начать создавать что-то, используя свои руки и голову! Надеемся, что идея создания чего угодно СВОИМИ руками стала вам ближе!* URL: <https://makerfairemoscow.com/yamaker/>; the date of the application 11.05.2016) “*Now you know who makers are and you yourself can become makers – you just need to start creating something, using your hands and head! We hope that the idea of creating anything with YOUR OWN hands will become more familiar to you!*”

In the contemporary Russian and Slavic studies, the question of the status of nomination units, such as *бизнес-система* /*biznes-sistema*/ "business system", *кофе-пауза* /*kofe-pauza*/ "coffee break", remains controversial. Firstly, they are treated as word combinations with analytical adjectives (Крысин 2001: 189-196). This view is supported in the well-known work by M. Panov on analytical adjectives in the Russian language, which he singled out in such native Russian language units as *меч-рыба* /*mech-ry'ba*/ "swordfish", *чудо-молот* /*chudo-molot*/ "magic hammer" (Панов 1971). Secondly, such nominations in Russian and other Slavic languages are treated as compounds (Русская грамматика 1980: 245; Аврамова 2010). This view is supported in the recent publication by A. Gorbov, which showed that "borrowed attributive elements, such as *шоу-*, *фитнес-*, *интернет-*, similar in meaning to a relative adjectives, are not autonomous word forms in the analyzed entities "and, as a rule, do not have the movement property" (Горбов 2015: 43). Indeed, in their structure and relations between parts within the nominative complex, the analyzed formants differ from free combinations of two names in their integrity, as well as in the subordinate position of the first name, which in itself, as a rule, cannot get a definition (cf. the possibility in the English analytical combination such as *film maker* - *action film maker*). We propose to call independent lexical units that can form from ten up to several hundred compounds, "radixoids". This term emphasizes that as part of composites, such lexical units become generic in nature, which is typical of affixes, without losing its lexical meaning and the status of an independent lexical unit beyond the composite.

As already mentioned, in comparison with the compound words, long-existing in Russian, compound nominative units of this type have characteristic features, as they are easily formed in speech, almost like free word combinations, and form a series of derivatives with the same formant. The fuzzy border between the word combination and compound word is nothing new for the Russian language, either, if we take into account the ratio of compound words and combinations of independent words in which one performs an appositional function. Compare one-piece impenetrable composites *летчик-испытатель* /*lyotchik-istry`atel'*/ "test pilot", *генерал-майор* /*general-major*/ "major-general" and combinations of two hyphenated separate names, one of which is an apposition – *летчик-экспериментатор* /*lyotchik-e`ksperimentator*/ "experimenter pilot", *генерал-артиллерист* /*general-artillierist*/ "artillery general". Combinations with the appositions can be written differently, for example: **Генерал, артиллерист, не согласился изменить план военных учений.** "The general, an artillery man, refused to change the plan of military exercises.". Both names can receive a definition: *Этом летчик, смелый экспериментатор, принял предложение ученых.* "This pilot, a bold experimenter, accepted the scientists' offer.".

5. RESULTS FROM THE STUDY OF CROSS-LANGUAGE INTERACTION AND DIVERGENCE IN THE FORMATION OF NEW COMPOSITES

V.V. Vinogradov, studying the history of Russian words, repeatedly noted that some of the words reflect the society's style and worldview in a certain era with particular force and acuteness (Виноградов 1994). As shown by our research, the above types of

composites are indicative in respect of worldview – they express typical complexes of typical meanings, which are important to a society in a certain period of its existence. A history of such derivatives provides rich material for studying changes in the worldview of the ethnic group. We shall formulate some other findings of our study.

A rapid growth in the number of complex names with borrowed parts affects the world-formation system of Russian language, enriching it with new formants of the affixoid and radixoid type and changing the status and productivity of the model itself, both types of the model converging. Therefore, regardless of the bound or free nature of the formants, we shall consider this model as part of the formation of compound words (composites).

The results of the study also allow to conclude that the new composites with borrowed formants discussed above correspond to the earlier-formed models of compound nouns existing in the Russian language.

The study of current processes in compounding revealed some contradictions in the Russian-English cross-language. In particular, there is a problem of spelling of new composites as a contradiction between the existing rules and the influence of the English language – in the Runet texts, the first attributive formant is often spelled separately (e.g. дайвинг магазин /*dajvinyng magazin*/ "diving shop", like in the English language, which does not conform to the Russian orthography rules.

An increased compounding activity has a typological influence on the Russian language, developing incorporational ways of expressing attributive syntactic relations in the nominal group. In the composite, the name with the attribute function is integrated with a different name (incorporated in a different name), having a morphological design, the attributive function of the first name not being expressed morphologically in any way.

The expansion of such composites with borrowed parts affects the syntactic relations in word combinations, and supports the emergence of analytical polynomial structures with grammatically unexpressed attributive relations between the constituent words, alien to the Russian language (which is typical of the English language). Such analytical combinations of words are found mainly in translated advertising texts. Cf.: **Пемолукс гель сода эффект** /*Pemolyuks gel' soda e`ffekt*/ "**Pemolux gel soda effect**", *Комет чистящий порошок лимон* /*Komet chistyashhij poroshok limon*/ "*Comet lemon cleaning powder*" (Левонтина 2006) (it would be better to write *Гель «Пемолукс» с эффектом соды* /*Gel' "Pemolyuks" s e`ffektom sody*/ "*Gel "Pemolux" with the effect of soda*", *Чистящий порошок «Комет» с запахом лимона* /*Chistyashhij poroshok "Komet" s zapahom limona*/ "*Cleaning powder "Comet" with lemon scent*". Polynomial phrases with unexpressed syntactic relations between words do not correspond to the structure of the Russian language, in which incorporation is only possible within the combination of two lexical units. Polysyllabism of such structures eliminates the question of composites, their use mainly in the nominative case and punctuation formlessness in advertising texts distinguishes them from a number of conventional appositions. Along with borrowings, such combinations attract Russian words which begin to follow analytical syntactical relations, not typical for the Russian language.

On the one hand, the increase in the number of complex composites and an increased activity of this word formation model corresponds to the activation of such word formation methods in the contemporary Russian language as addition and fusion, marked

by many researchers, e.g. see (Улуханов 1996: 59–72; Петрухина 2007), and increases the tendency to synthetism in word formation, even to polysynthetism – incorporation. On the other hand, the flow of such composites contributes to the emergence of word combinations with unexpressed grammatical relations between the names incorporated in them, indicating the pressure of analytical structures on the Russian language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BOZDĚCHOVÁ, I. (2010): “Kompozita v proměnách moderní české slovní zásoby odborné a neologické“. В кн.: *Відображення історії та культури народу в словотворенні: Доповіді XII Міжнародної наукової конференції Комісії зі слов'янського словотворення при Міжнародному комітеті славистів*. Київ. С. 35-47.
- KAPATSINSKI, V., VAKARELIYSKA, S. M. (2013): “Compounds in Russian. A growing family of constructions”. *Constructions and Frames*. № 5 (1), pp. 69-87.
- KORIAKOWCEWA, E. (red.) (2009): *Przejawy internacjonalizacji w językach słowiańskich*. Siedlce.
- OHNEISER, I. (red.) (2003): *Komparacja systemów i funkcjonowania współczesnych języków słowiańskich. I. Słowotwórstwo / Nominacja*. Opole.
- АВРАМОВА, Ц. (2010): “О некоторых (новых) явлениях в славянском словообразовании с типологической точки зрения”. В кн.: *Новые явления в славянском словообразовании: система и функционирование: Доклады XI Международной научной конференции Комиссии по славянскому словообразованию при Международном комитете славистов / Под ред. Е. В. Петрухиной*. Макс-Пресс. Москва. С. 100-116.
- БАЛТОВА, Ю. (2010). “О словообразовательной и лексической интерпретации некоторых интернационализмов в славянских языках”. В кн.: *Новые явления в славянском словообразовании: система и функционирование: Доклады XI Международной научной конференции Комиссии по славянскому словообразованию при Международном комитете славистов / Под ред. Е. В. Петрухиной*. Макс-Пресс. Москва. С. 90-100.
- ВЕНДИНА, Т. И. (2007). *Из кирилло-мефодиевского наследия в языке русской культуры*. Изд. Института славяноведения РАН. Москва.
- ВИНОГРАДОВ, В. В. (1994): *История слов*. Изд. Института русского языка им.В.В. Виноградова РАН. Москва.
- ГОРБОВ, А. А. (2010). “Топ-метод экспресс-номинации эконом-класса: о русских именных композитах с атрибутивным элементом в препозиции к вершине”. *Вопросы языкознания*. № 6. С. 26-36.
- ГОРБОВ, А. А. (2015). “Атрибутивные компоненты сочетаний типа бизнес-план: аналитические прилагательные?” *Вестник Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета*. Серия 9. Вып. 3. С. 36-48.
- ЖИВОВ, В. М. (2005). “Язык и революция. Размышления над старой книгой А. М. Селищева”. *Отечественные записки*. № 2.
- КЛИМЕНКО, Н. Ф., КАРПІЛОВСЬКА, Є. А. (ред.) (2010): *Відображення історії та культури народу в словотворенні: Доповіді XII Міжнародної наукової конференції*

- Комісії зі слов'янського словотворення при Міжнародному комітеті славистів.*
Київ.
- КРЫСИН, Л. П. (2001). “Новые аналитические прилагательные и явления хиатуса”. В кн.: *Жизнь языка: Сб. ст. к 80-летию М.В.Панова.* Языки славянской культуры. Москва. С. 189–196.
- ПАНОВ, М. В. (1971): “Об аналитических прилагательных”. В кн.: *Фонетика. Фонология. Грамматика. К 70-летию А. А. Реформатского.* Наука. Москва. С. 240-254.
- ПЕТРУХИНА, Е. В. (2007): “Актуальные вопросы системного словообразования”. В кн.: *Славистика: синхрония и диахрония. Сборник статей к 70-летию И. С. Улуханова.* Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН. Азбуковник. Москва. С. 142–154.
- ПЕТРУХИНА, Е. В. (2010): “Возможности, функции и конкуренты словопроизводства в современном русском языке”. В кн.: *Новые явления в славянском словообразовании: система и функционирование: Доклады XI Международной научной конференции Комиссии по славянскому словообразованию при Международном комитете славистов.* / Под ред. Е. В. Петрухиной. Макс-Пресс. Москва. С. 424–442.
- Русская грамматика* (1980). Наука. Москва. Т.1.
- СОКОЛОВА, С. В., ЭДБЕРГ, Б. Х. (2016). “Что такое валют-рынок? Характеристика именных композитов в русском языке по результатам корпуса и эксперимента”. В кн.: *Новая Россия: традиции и инновации в языке и науке о языке,* Уральский федеральный университет им. Первого президента России Б. Н. Ельцина. Екатеринбург. С. 178–187.
- УЛУХАНОВ, И. С. (1996): *Единицы словообразовательной системы русского языка и их лексическая реализация.* Азбуковник. Москва.
- ЧЕРНЫШЕВА, М. И. (2009): *Уходящие слова, ускользящие смыслы.* Изд. Московского гос. университета печати. Москва.
- ЭДБЕРГ, Б. Х. (2014): *Аналитические прилагательные и аналитизм в современном русском языке:* MA thesis. UiT The Arctic University of Norway. Tromsø.

DICTIONARIES

- КОЗУЛИНА, Н. А., ЛЕВАШОВ, Е. А., ШАГАЛОВА, Е. Н. (2009). *Аффиксоиды русского языка. Опыт словаря-справочника.* Нестор-История. Санкт-Петербург.
- КРЫСИН Л. П. (2009): *Толковый словарь иноязычных слов.* Эксмо. Москва.
- СЛРЯ XI-XVII (1975): *Словарь русского языка XI-XVII вв.* Вып. 1. Москва.
- СВОДНЫЙ СЛОВАРЬ (1991): *Сводный словарь современной русской лексики.* В 2-х томах. Т.1. Москва.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AVRAMOVA, S. (2010): “O nekotoryh (novyh) javlenijah v slavjanskom slovoobrazovanii s tipologicheskoj točki zrenija”. V кн.: *Novye javlenija v slavjanskom slovoobrazovanii:*

- sistema i funkcionirovanie: Doklady XI Mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii Komissii po slavjanskomu slovoobrazovaniju pri Mezhdunarodnom komitete slavistov / Pod red. E. V. Petruhinov. Maks-Press. Moskva.*
- BALTOVA, Ju. (2010). "O slovoobrazovatel'noj i leksicheskoj interpretacii nekotoryh internacionalizmov v slavjanskih jazykah". V kn.: *Novye javlenija v slavjanskom slovoobrazovanii: sistema i funkcionirovanie: Doklady XI Mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii Komissii po slavjanskomu slovoobrazovaniju pri Mezhdunarodnom komitete slavistov / Pod red. E. V. Petruhinov. Maks-Press. Moskva.*
- BOZDĚCHOVÁ I. (2010). "Kompozita v proměnách moderní české slovní zásoby odborné a neologické". V kn.: *Vidobrazhennja istorii ta kul'turi narodu v slovtvorenni: Dopovidi XII Mizhnarodnoi naukovoï konferencii Komissii zi slov'jans'kogo slovtvorennja pri Mizhnarodnomu komiteti slavistiv. Kiïv.*
- CHERNYSHEVA, M.I. (2009): *Uhodjashhie slova, uskol'zajushhie smysly*. Izd. Moskovskogo gos. universiteta pečati. Moskva.
- EDBERG B.H. (2014): *Analiticheskie prilagatel'nye i analitizm v sovremennom russkom jazyke*: MA thesis. UiT The Arctic Univeristy of Norway. Tromsø.
- GORBOV, A. A. (2010). "Top-metod jekspress-nominacii jekonom-klassa: o russkih imennyh kompozitah s atributivnym jelementom v prepozicii k vershine". *Voprosy jazykoznanija*. № 6.
- GORBOV, A. A. (2015). "Atributivnye komponenty sochetanij tipa biznes-plan: analiticheskie prilagatel'nye?" *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. Serija 9. Vyp. 3.
- KAPATSINSKI, V., VAKARELIYSKA, C. M. (2013): "Compounds in Russian. A growing family of constructions". *Constructions and Frames*. № 5 (1).
- KLIMENKO, N.F., KARPILOVS"KA, E. A. (red.) (2010): *Vidobrazhennja istorii ta kul'turi narodu v slovtvorenni: Dopovidi XII Mizhnarodnoi naukovoï konferencii Komissii zi slov'jans'kogo slovtvorennja pri Mizhnarodnomu komiteti slavistiv. Kiïv.*
- KRYSIN, L. P. (2001). "Novye analiticheskie prilagatel'nye i javleniya hiatusa". V kn.: *Zhizn' jazyka: Sb. st. k 80-letiju M.V.Panova. Yazyki slavyanskoj kul'tury*. Moskva. S. 189–196.
- KORIAKOWCEWA, E. (red.) (2009): *Przejawy internacjonalizacji w językach słowiańskich*. Siedlce.
- OHNHEISER, I. (red.) (2003): *Komparacja systemów i funkcjonowania współczesnych języków słowiańskich. I. Słowotwórstwo / Nominacja*. Opole.
- PANOV, M.V. (1971): "Ob analiticheskikh prilagatel'nyh". V kn.: *Fonetika. Fonologija. Grammatika. K 70-letiju A. A. Reformatskogo*. Nauka. Moskva.
- PETRUKHINA, E.V. (2007): "Aktual'nye voprosy sistemnogo slovoobrazovanija". V kn.: *Slavistika: sinhronija i diahronija. Sbornik statej k 70-letiju I.S. Uluhanova*. Institut russkogo jazyka im. V.V. Vinogradova RAN. Azbukovnik. Moskva.
- PETRUKHINA, E.V. (2010): "Vozmozhnosti, funkcii i konkurenty slovooproizvodstva v sovremennom russkom jazyke". V kn.: *Novye javlenija v slavjanskom slovoobrazovanii: sistema i funkcionirovanie: Doklady XI Mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii Komissii po slavjanskomu slovoobrazovaniju pri Mezhdunarodnom komitete slavistov*. Maks-Press. Moskva.
- Russkaya grammatika* (1980). Nauka. Moskva. T.1.

- SOKOLOVA, S.V., EDBERG, B.H. (2016): "Chto takoe valjut-rynok? Harakteristika imennyh kompozitov v russkom jazyke po rezul'tatam korpusa i jeksperimenta". V kn.: *Novaja Rossija: tradicii i innovacii v jazyke i nauke o jazyke*. Ural'skij federal'nyj universitet im. Pervogo prezidenta Rossii B. N. El'cina. Ekaterinburg.
- ULUHANOV, I.S. (1996): *Edinicy slovoobrazovatel'noj sistemy russkogo jazyka i ih leksicheskaja realizacija*. Azbukovnik. Moskva.
- VENDINA, T.I. (2007). *Iz kirillo-mefodievskogo nasledija v jazyke russkoj kul'tury*. Izd. Instituta slavjanovedenija RAN. Moskva.
- VINOGRADOV, V.V. (1994): *Istorija slov*. Izd. Instituta russkogo jazyka im. V.V. Vinogradova RAN. Moskva.
- ZHIVOV, V.M. (2005). "Jazyk i revoljucija. Razmyshlenija nad staroj knigoj A. M. Selishheva". *Otechestvennye zapiski*. № 2.

DICTIONARIES

- KOZULINA, N.A., LEVASHOV, E.A., SHAGALOVA, E.N. (2009). *Affiksoidy russkogo jazyka. Opyt slovarja-spravochnika*. Nestor-Istorija. Sankt-Peterburg..
- KRYSIN L. P. (2009): *Tolkovyj slovar' inojazychnyh slov*. Jeksmo. Moskva.
- SIRJA XI-XVII (1975): *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI-XVII vv. Vyp. I*. Moskva.
- SVODNYJ SLOVAR" (1991): *Svodnyj slovar' sovremennoj russkoj leksiki*. V 2-h tomah. T. I. Moskva.