

**BASIC SYSTEM-FORMING UNITS IN THE THEORY OF WORD FORMATION  
AND IN LATEST RESEARCH ON UKRAINIAN WORD FORMATION**

**UNIDADES BÁSICAS FORMADORAS DO SISTEMA NA TEORIA DA FORMAÇÃO  
DE PALAVRAS E NAS PESQUISAS MAIS RECENTES SOBRE A FORMAÇÃO DE  
PALAVRAS UCRANIANAS**

**UNIDADES BÁSICAS FORMADORAS DEL SISTEMA EN LA TEORÍA DE LA  
FORMACIÓN DE PALABRAS Y EN LAS INVESTIGACIONES MÁS RECIENTES  
SOBRE LA FORMACIÓN DE PALABRAS EN UCRANIA**



Kateryna HORODENSKA<sup>1</sup>  
e-mail: k.horodenska70@meta.ua



Iryna DENYSOVETS<sup>2</sup>  
e-mail: denysovets.ira@gmail.com

**How to reference this paper:**

Horodenska, K., & Denysovets, I. (2026). Basic system-forming units in the theory of word formation and in latest research on Ukrainian word formation. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 30, e026041.  
<https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v30i00.21150>



| Submitted: 23/02/2026  
| Revisions required: 17/03/2026  
| Approved: 03/04/2026  
| Published: 08/05/2026

---

**Editor:** Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes  
**Deputy Executive Editor:** Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

---

<sup>1</sup> National Academy of Science of Ukraine (NASU), Kyiv – Ukraine. Doctor of Philological Science, Professor, Head of the Department of Grammar and Scientific Terminology, National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Institute of the Ukrainian Language.

<sup>2</sup> National University «Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic» (NUPP), Poltava – Ukraine. PhD in Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of Ukrainian Studies, Culture and Documentation, National University «Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic».

**ABSTRACT:** The article is devoted to the study of the basic system-forming concepts of Ukrainian word formation – word-formation type and word-formation model. The aim of the study is to analyze the scientific foundations for distinguishing the word-formation type and the word-formation model in Ukrainian derivatology. To achieve this goal and solve the tasks set, the methods of observation and systematization, analysis of definitions, generalization, as well as descriptive, comparative and functional methods were used. The replacement of the traditional description of the meanings of individual word-forming prefixes and suffixes of nouns, adjectives, and verbs. Three differential components are characterized. The generally accepted independent status of the word-forming type, based on three obligatory (constitutive) components, in modern Ukrainian derivation is stated. The difference in the isolation and terminology of the second system-forming quantity – word-formation model, the definition of which was also developed in Ukrainian word formation by I. Kovalyk, is clarified.

**KEYWORDS:** Word-formation type. Word-formation pattern. Derivation. Word formation. Word-formation meaning.

**RESUMO:** *Este artigo se dedica ao estudo dos conceitos básicos do sistema de formação de palavras na língua ucraniana – tipo de formação de palavras e modelo de formação de palavras. O objetivo do estudo é analisar os fundamentos científicos para distinguir o tipo de formação de palavras e o modelo de formação de palavras na derivatologia ucraniana. Para atingir esse objetivo e cumprir as tarefas estabelecidas, foram utilizados os métodos de observação e sistematização, análise de definições, generalização, bem como métodos descritivos, comparativos e funcionais. Foi substituída a descrição tradicional dos significados de prefixos e sufixos formadores de palavras individuais de substantivos, adjetivos e verbos. Três componentes diferenciadores são caracterizados. Afirma-se o status independente geralmente aceito do tipo de formação de palavras, baseado em três componentes obrigatórios (constitutivos), na derivação ucraniana moderna. Esclarece-se a diferença no isolamento e na terminologia da segunda quantidade formadora de sistema – o modelo de formação de palavras, cuja definição também foi desenvolvida na formação de palavras ucraniana por I. Kovalyk.*

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** *Tipo de formação de palavras. Padrão de formação de palavras. Derivação. Formação de palavras. Formação de significado de palavras.*

**RESUMEN:** *El artículo está dedicado al estudio de los conceptos básicos formadores del sistema en la formación de palabras ucraniana: el tipo de formación de palabras y el modelo de formación de palabras. El objetivo del estudio es analizar los fundamentos científicos para distinguir el tipo y el modelo de formación de palabras en la derivatología ucraniana. Para alcanzar este objetivo y resolver las tareas propuestas, se utilizaron los métodos de observación y sistematización, análisis de definiciones, generalización, así como métodos descriptivos, comparativos y funcionales. Se aborda la sustitución de la descripción tradicional de los significados de los prefijos y sufijos formadores de palabras en sustantivos, adjetivos y verbos. Se caracterizan tres componentes diferenciales. Se afirma el estatus independiente generalmente aceptado del tipo de formación de palabras, basado en tres componentes obligatorios (constitutivos), en la derivación ucraniana moderna. Asimismo, se aclara la diferencia en el aislamiento y la terminología de la segunda unidad formadora del sistema — el modelo de formación de palabras—, cuya definición también fue desarrollada en la formación de palabras ucraniana por I. Kovalyk.*

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** *Tipo de formación de palabras. Modelo de formación de palabras. Derivación. Formación de palabras. Significado formador de palabras.*

## INTRODUCTION

The basic concepts of the doctrine of word formation in Ukrainian linguistics began to be formed by I. I. Kovalyk in the 1950s–1960s (Kovalyk, 1958a, 1958b, 1958c, 1958d, 1961b) and were completed in the late 1970s of the twentieth century (Kovalyk, 1970; Zhovtobriukh, 1979). These include the concepts of the word-formation type and the word-formation model. They were substantiated on theoretical foundations that objectively reflect the essence of word-formation processes in affixal derivation. On the concept of the word-formation type as the main one in the system of word formation, an академічний (academic) description of the word formation of all parts-of-speech classes of words in the Ukrainian literary language was created in the second half of the twentieth century (Zhovtobriukh, 1979). However, such consistency has not been observed in the application of the word-formation model, which has been used within the analysis of derivatives of individual word-formation types. The terms *word-formation type* and *word-formation model* as designations of the corresponding concepts have been codified in word-formation dictionaries (Vakariuk et al., 2007) and in the encyclopedia *Ukrainian Language* (Klymenko, 2007a, 2007b). In courses and grammars of the Ukrainian literary language for students of philological specialties of higher educational institutions, only the concept of the word-formation type is presented as the basic unit for the classification of derived words (Hryshchenko, 1993; Plusch, 2010). However, the practice of using the word-formation type and the word-formation model in studies of Ukrainian word formation of the first quarter of the twenty-first century demonstrates their identification (Karpilovska, 2010; Kysliuk, 2017; Taranenko, 2015), in connection with which the problem of practically distinguishing these word-formation entities on the basis of clear scientific criteria arose. It has gained relevance and acuteness, since the applied identificational approach has already led to the removal of the word-formation type from the set of system-forming units of Ukrainian word formation, and to a revision of the qualification of the word-formation type as a basic word-formation entity of the lowest rank, which deeply and fully reflects the nature and essence of the word-formation process.

Therefore, despite the long tradition of researching the basic concepts of Ukrainian word formation, the issue of a clear distinction between word-formation type and word-formation model remains relevant and requires systematic analysis. The proposed study is focused on the theoretical justification of the need to distinguish between word-formation type and word-formation model as categories that are different in meaning and not interchangeable, and on substantiating the fallacy of their identification in the modern linguistic discourse, which

threatens the loss of clear criteria for the systematization of derived units and the methodological inconsistency of word-formation analysis. This involves rethinking the metalanguage of modern derivation and analyzing the mechanisms of hierarchical interaction of the studied quantities, according to which the word-formation model qualifies as a formalized version of the implementation of an invariant word-formation type. The consistent disclosure of such a mechanism constitutes the conceptual basis of the study.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The aim of the study is to analyze the scientific foundations for distinguishing the word-formation type and the word-formation model in Ukrainian derivatology and to substantiate the groundlessness of their identification in works devoted to the study of contemporary Ukrainian word formation. The main objectives of the study are, on the basis of a comparative analysis of the definitions of the word-formation type and the word-formation model, as well as their common and distinctive components, to prove the independent status of these two word-formation entities within the system of word formation and the need for their practical differentiation.

To achieve the stated purpose and solve the outlined objectives, the following methods were used: observation and systematization, analysis of definitions, generalization, descriptive, comparative, and functional methods.

To achieve the goal, a number of research methods of word-forming terms at different stages of their functioning were used. In particular, the classification and interpretation of the studied language units, the description of their differential features was made possible by the use of the descriptive method.

Clarification and concretization of the definitions of the analyzed term units was carried out with the help of definition analysis, on the basis of which the connections of a separate term within the word-forming term system were determined in order to identify the semantic components of the semantics of one term in the meaning of another.

To trace individual stages of the genesis of the basic system-forming units in the theory of word formation and in latest research on Ukrainian word formation, theoretical methods of conceptual and comparative analysis were used, which compared existing theoretical approaches based on the generalization of philological, philosophical, methodological, educational literature. The method of etymological analysis, which is based on the comparative-

historical method, was used.

To achieve the goal, a number of special linguistic methods were used, in particular, *diachronic analysis* made it possible to clarify the dynamics of the formation of the terms *word-formation type* and *word-formation model* in Ukrainian derivational studies; *definitional and functional analysis* consists in clarifying and concretizing the definitions of the analyzed concepts of “*word-formation type*” and “*word-formation model*”; *the historical-linguistic method* for the analysis of the stages of formation of the concepts of “*word-formation type*” and “*word-formation model*” in Ukrainian linguistics; *the comparative-typological method* to reveal the peculiarities of the development of the concepts of “*word-formation type*” and “*word-formation model*” in the context of other linguistic traditions; *semantic-structural method* for the analysis of semantic and formal characteristics of word-formation type and word-formation model.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

One of the fundamental concepts in the field of systematization and classification of derivatives, primarily affixal derivatives, in the theory of Ukrainian word formation is recognized as the concept of the word-formation type, designated by the term *word-formation type* (Zhovtobriukh, 1979), which was preceded by the term *word-forming type*. This is due to the fact that in the works on which the doctrine of word formation began to take shape, only the adjective *word-forming* was used in terminological designations. In the reflections of I. I. Kovalyk (1958c, 1958d, 1961b):

The difficulty in defining the concept of the word-forming type lies in the fact that word-forming types manifest themselves differently with different methods of word formation. Therefore, it is very difficult to give a single, general definition of the concept of the word-forming type that could be applied to all existing living methods of word formation (morphological with its varieties, syntactic, semantic, regressive, phonetic, contamination). (Kovalyk, 1958c, p. 5)

The initial word-forming unit for the comparative characterization of Slavic names of persons according to their national and territorial affiliation will be word-forming types. The word-forming type, as a word-forming concept of the lowest rank, reflects the nature and essence of the word-forming process more deeply and fully. (Kovalyk, 1958d, p. 141).

The smallest generalized word-forming unit is the basic nodal system-forming complex unit, which is manifested in a series of specific derivatives on the basis of the identity of the part-of-speech affiliation of the derivational base, the derivational formant, and the word-forming meaning, namely the word-forming type, which is realized in particular concrete words of the same type. (Kovalyk, 1961b, p. 41)

Even after 1970, when I. I. Kovalyk differentiated the use of the adjectives *word-forming* and *word-formation* in terminological designations (Kovalyk, 1970), in the works of some researchers on Ukrainian word formation one can still observe inconsistency in the use of the terms *word-formation type* and *word-forming type*. Unfortunately, this phenomenon was not avoided even in the first comprehensive academic work *Word Formation of the Modern Ukrainian Literary Language* (Zhovtobriukh, 1979), since in the structural sections devoted to suffixal word formation of nouns and prefixal-suffixal word formation of nouns, adjectives, and verbs, the term *word-formation type* is used (pp. 57–306); in the structural section on compounding, the term *word-forming type* is employed (pp. 328–330); in the structural section on suffixal verbal word formation, the term *structural-semantic word-formation type* is used (pp. 173–188); in the structural section on suffixal word formation of adjectives, the term *derivational varieties of derived adjectives* is applied (p. 127). For the systematization of derived nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs formed by the prefixal method, this work does not use the term *word-formation type* or *word-forming type* at all (Zhovtobriukh, 1979, pp. 233–283).

Prior to the identification of the word-forming (word-formation) type as the main, basic unit of word formation, that is, until the middle of the twentieth century, Ukrainian linguists studied the meanings of individual morphemic segments–word-forming affixes. For example, in O. Syniavskiyi's work *Norms of the Ukrainian Literary Language* (2018), in the section "Word Formation", the meanings of nominal, adjectival, and verbal suffixes and prefixes are described in considerable detail and presented alphabetically. Similarly, in the *Course of the Modern Ukrainian Literary Language* (1951), edited by L. A. Bulakhovskiyi, in the section "Word Formation", separate subsections characterize nominal, adjectival, and verbal prefixes and suffixes.

The beginning of a new approach to the interpretation of word-formation analysis and word formation was laid by H. Marchand in Western linguistics, and by G. O. Vinokur and I. I. Kovalyk respectively in Russian and Ukrainian linguistics.

Some contemporary researchers have concluded that the initial foundation for distinguishing one of the main concepts in the doctrine of word formation—the word-formation type—was laid as early as the late nineteenth century in the grammatical works of P. Diachan and S. Smal-Stotskyi, since they presented part-of-speech classifications of suffixes, which represented a grouping of lexical units based on the commonality of the part-of-speech affiliation of the base words, the formant, and the method of word formation (Horda, 2016).

Without denying this historical foundation, V. V. Greshchuk stated that it is precisely I. I. Kovalyk who holds priority in defining the constitutive features of the word-formation type, and expressed his disagreement with those researchers who overlooked this fact and, in defining and analyzing the word-formation type, referred to the works of Russian linguists or the Czech linguist M. Dokulil, who creatively used the works of I. Kovalyk devoted to the issues of the word-formation type (Greshchuk, 2007, 2016).

Further evidence of I. I. Kovalyk's priority in shaping the scientific foundations of the word-formation type is provided by the fact that in the 1950s he disagreed with the then widespread definition of it as any series of words characterized by semantic unity and unity of the method of word formation. I. I. Kovalyk considered this definition insufficiently precise and unsatisfactory, first because it lacks a specific word-formational generalization that is obligatory for every scientific concept of word formation and does not go beyond the level of lexis. A word-forming type is not a “series of words”, but that word-formationally essential and common element that is manifested in a corresponding series of words. As a word-formational rather than lexical concept, the word-forming type is a “supralexical” generalization that arises as a result of abstraction from concrete word-formationally homogeneous words with concrete lexical meanings (Kovalyk, 1958c).

Second, the widespread definition of the word-forming type is overly general, since its other components—“semantic unity and unity of the method of word formation”—are very broad notions. It does not clarify how exactly semantic unity and unity of the method of word formation should be understood. However, if the method of word formation is interpreted as the basic types of word formation, it becomes obvious that unity of the method of word formation and semantic unity, as excessively broad concepts, do not contribute to the precision of defining the concept of the word-forming type. Third, the widespread definition does not indicate which of the two elements presented is primary and obligatory and which is facultative, optional, or whether they are equal and equivalent. Fourth, from this definition of the concept of the word-forming type it is unclear what semantic and word-formational unity are, when the

method of word formation is usually qualified as the basic types (means) of word formation. Fifth, he warned against using the expression “a series of words is productive or unproductive”, as was done immediately after the definition of the word-forming type (Kovalyk, 1958c, p. 5).

In view of these objections, I. I. Kovalyk stated that, in affixal word formation (morphological and syntactic-morphological), the word-forming type should be defined as a generalized word-formational concept that encompasses three necessary components:

1. Word-formational-semantic unity, which means the ability of a derivative belonging to a certain word-forming type to indicate a specific class of semantically homogeneous words within a given part of speech (for example, among nouns—names of place, agent, instrument, etc.). This feature of the word-forming type can briefly be termed unity of word-formational categorical meaning.
2. Unity of the lexico-grammatical and structural character of the word-formational base as the initial basis of the word-formational process (for example, a structurally uniform nominal, adjectival, verbal, numeral, pronominal base, etc.).
3. Identity of the affixal (suffixal, prefixal, or prefixal-suffixal) component of the derived words. The unity of all these integral elements in a series of word-formationally related words testifies to the presence in it of a particular word-forming type (Kovalyk, 1958c, p. 5).

The absence in a series of suffixal words of any of the three named necessary components in affixal word formation already indicates their word-formational heterogeneity. For example, the pairs *chytalnia* – *chytalka*, *bereznyk* – *berezniak*, *vyshnyk* – *vyshniak*, *kurylka* – *kuryl'nia*, *lypnyk* – *lypniak*, *loznyk* – *lozniak*, *sousnyk* – *sousnytsia* are word-formational synonyms (word-formational doublets) that belong to different word-forming types, because despite the presence of etymologically identical word-formational bases and common semantics, they have different corresponding suffixal elements, that is, they exhibit different word-formational forms (Kovalyk, 1958c). At the same time, I. I. Kovalyk warned that the main, essential, and necessary elements of the word-forming type are the unity of the word-formational base and lexico-semantic unity, whereas the last element—the affixal one—is facultative and not obligatory for all types of word formation (Kovalyk, 1958c).

The researcher also noted the advantages of the word-forming type over the word-forming affix as a basis for comparison in Slavic word formation. Their essence lies in the fact that

the word-forming type, which includes the word-formational base and the affixal component, expresses the nature of the word-formational phenomenon better than the affixal component alone, which is only one of the constituent elements of the type and, obviously, by itself does not depict the full picture of the word-formational process. An abstractly taken suffix by itself, isolated from concrete formations, represents an excessively general and still word-formationally undetermined potential entity, which in the process of forming series of concrete words can perform one or another role depending on the semantic nature of the initial word-formational base. (Kovalyk, 1958b, pp. 20–21)

On these theoretical foundations formed in the 1950s, M. A. Zhovtobriukh finally defined the word-formation type in the 1970s in the academic work *Word Formation of the Modern Ukrainian Literary Language*. In the updated definition, he replaced the adjective *word-forming* with *word-formation*, used some borrowed terms, and placed first among the three components the affiliation of the base word (stem) to a particular part of speech:

A word-formation type is a certain word-formational structure with a corresponding word-formational meaning, constituted by the affiliation of the base word (stem) to a particular part of speech, the derivative, the derivator, and the derivational (word-formational) meaning. (Zhovtobriukh, 1979, p. 34)

The concept of the word-formation type, based on three obligatory components, has become generally accepted in contemporary Ukrainian derivatology. What is noticeable, however, is the differing sequence of these obligatory components in various authors' treatments when identifying the word-formation type. Even in the encyclopedia *Ukrainian Language*, in the definition of the word-formation type, in contrast to I. I. Kovalyk's initial definition, commonality of the part-of-speech affiliation of the derivational bases is placed first: "A word-formation type is a formal-semantic scheme for constructing derived words motivated by base words of a particular part of speech, by means of the same word-forming formant with the same meaning" (Klymenko, 2007b, p. 645).

However, in some recent grammars of the Ukrainian language for students of philological specialties of higher education institutions, the word-formation type is defined by four word-formational features: 1) derivation from words of one part of speech; 2) a common method of word formation; 3) a common word-formational meaning; 4) an identical word-forming formant (Pliusch, 2010). In our view, the feature of the method of word formation is redundant, since it is marked by the word-forming formant used: a word-forming suffix indicates the suffixal method, a word-forming prefix the prefixal method, a word-forming prefixal-suffixal pair the prefixal-suffixal method, a word-forming postfix the postfixal method, a word-forming suffixal-postfixal pair the suffixal-postfixal method, and a word-forming complex prefix + suffix + postfix – *sia* the prefixal-suffixal-postfixal method.

The practice of studying derived words in Ukrainian shows that some researchers did not use the word-formation type as a word-formational unit of systematization even when it had already become established. For example, in the academic work *Word Formation of the Modern Ukrainian Literary Language* (1979), some authors employed the concept of the word-formation type and the corresponding term to denote it, whereas others used the concept and term *derivational variety*. In particular, denominal qualitative adjectives formed with the suffix *-n-* and united by the general qualitative-adjectival semantics ‘having a quality corresponding to the meaning of the base noun’ were divided into three derivational varieties depending on the structural features of the base nouns and the specifics of the combinability of this suffix with the respective nouns: 1) adjectives formed from base stems correlated with root morphemes; 2) adjectives formed from base stems complicated by prefixal morphemes; 3) adjectives formed from derived suffixal nouns—deadjectival, deverbal, and depronominial nouns (Zhovtobriukh, 1979, pp. 122–123).

It is worth noting that contemporary Ukrainian derivatology recognizes the possibility of applying the concept of productivity to the word-formation type as well, in contrast to the traditional application of this concept only to word-forming means and methods of word formation: “The concept of productivity is also inherent in derivatology when applied to word-forming resources (roots, affixes), as well as to methods and types of word formation” (Zhovtobriukh, 1979, p. 44). And further:

In derivatology, degrees of productivity of affixal word-forming means—suffixes, postfixes, roots, etc.—are determined. However, it is also possible and necessary to determine the degree

of productivity of methods of word formation in the process of creating new words. (Zhovtobriukh, 1979, p. 45)

In word-formation theory, it has been proposed to distinguish different degrees of productivity of word-formation types. In particular, I. I. Kovalyk divided them into living—productive, low-productivity, unproductive, declining—and dead types, while at the same time noting that “establishing an appropriate scale of productivity is an extremely complex matter, since objective scientific criteria for determining the degree of productivity of both individual affixes and individual word-formation types have not yet been developed” (Zhovtobriukh, 1979, p. 45). An indicator of the degree of productivity of a word-formation type at different stages of language development is considered to be the presence of a corresponding number of lexical innovations, that is, its potential ability to form new words. According to this criterion, Ukrainian derivatology conventionally distinguishes productive, low-productivity, and unproductive word-formation types, that is, three degrees of their productivity. However, in existing studies four degrees are also attested: highly productive, productive, low-productivity, and unproductive word-formation types (Zhovtobriukh, 1979, pp. 290–304).

It is important to emphasize that the word-formation type makes it possible to take better account of such a parameter that is decisive for word formation as productivity, which cannot be achieved by comparing affixes alone (Greshchuk, 2007), since the same suffix in a particular language or in related languages may be productive in some word-formation types and low-productive or unproductive in others (Kovalyk, 1958b).

In the encyclopedia *Ukrainian Language*, a general characterization of word-formation types of Ukrainian derivatives is presented according to productivity, part-of-speech distribution, and other features. In particular, it states:

In the Ukrainian language there are about 200 word-formation types. Some of them are highly productive (new words are actively formed according to their patterns), others are low-productive (they are rarely replenished with new words), and there are also unproductive ones (they unite closed lists of words). Word-formation types are represented by different parts of speech ... Word-formation types can be suffixal (the word-forming formant is a suffix) ... prefixal (the formant is a prefix) ... and prefixal-suffixal (the formant is a prefix and a suffix simultaneously). (Klymenko, 2007b, p. 645)

In Ukrainian derivatology, word-formation types, in addition to being distinguished by degree of productivity, are divided into regular and irregular ones. A regular word-formation type is quantitatively numerous, its derivatives have a regular word-forming affix, whereas an irregular word-formation type is small in number, and its derivatives use an irregular word-forming affix (Klymenko, 2007b, p. 645). However, in works devoted to the formation of specific derivative units of the Ukrainian language, word-formation types are usually not characterized according to the feature of regularity/irregularity.

In the system of word formation, as I. I. Kovalyk believed in the 1950s, in addition to the concept of the word-forming type, the concept of the word-forming model also deserves identification and terminologization, since this word-formational unit had not yet been clearly defined (Kovalyk, 1958c). He interpreted the word-forming model as “an appropriate combination of building material (that is, a word-formational base + affix) without an existing lexico-word-formational meaning” (Kovalyk, 1958c, p. 13). Later, I. I. Kovalyk confirmed the definition of the word-forming model, in contrast to the word-forming type, by commonality of only two elements—the grammatical class of bases and the formant—abstracting it from word-formational semantics (Kovalyk, 1964).

V. V. Greshchuk (2016), analyzing the concept of the word-forming model in I. I. Kovalyk’s interpretation, called it a pattern in which the formula of combining the relevant word-formational building material is expressed, that is, the derivational base and the affix, without an existing lexico-word-formational meaning, since in his definitions the derivatologist also used the terms *word-forming pattern* and *word-forming formula* (Kovalyk, 1961a, p. 11). The word combination *word-forming model*, and later *word-formation model*, underwent terminologization because the modeling method, as V. V. Greshchuk notes, was applied to word-formational units—elementary and complex—their word-formational structure and systemic organization (Greshchuk, 2016).

The term *word-formation model* is interpreted more or less uniformly in reference publications of the modern Ukrainian language (encyclopedias, dictionaries, manuals), for instance: “Word-formation model—a pattern, type, scheme according to which words are formed and regularly reproduced in a given language” (Yermolenko, 2001, p. 168). And, “[a] word-formation model is a scheme for forming words within the same word-formation type that does not affect their word-formational semantics but differs in morphological features” (Klymenko, 2007a, p. 642).

This definition is illustrated by the following examples: 1) within one type of denominal adjectives with the suffix *-цьк-* and the meaning of relationality, there are models with interfixes and without them, cf. *fikhte-an-s'k-yi*; with alternation and without it, cf. *Kryvyi Rih* → *kryvoriz'kyi* and *hertsog* → *hertsogskyi*; in the type with *-ovyi-* with and without morph overlap, cf. *manho* → *manhovyi*, *apel'syn* → *apel'synovyi*; 2) the type of names of persons according to the instrument of action denoted by the base word is realized by models with truncation of the base and without it, cf. *taks(i)* → *taksyst*, *motor* → *motoryst*. It is also noted that a single word-formation type does not have more than two word-formation models, whereas the same morphological model may occur within different word-formation types, e.g., the alternation *h-zh*, cf. *druh* → *druzhok*, *zberehty* → *zberezhennia* (in deverbal nouns) (Klymenko, 2007a).

Word-formation model (also derivational model, word-formation pattern) is an abstract scheme, a template of the structural organization of homogeneous derivatives, characterized by the affiliation of the base and derived words to the same part of speech and by identity of the formant. (Vakariuk et al., 2007, p. 165)

In Ukrainian word formation, there is a known attempt to single out a five-model word-formation type of deverbal prefixal-suffixal qualitative adjectives that express a meaning opposite to that of the base verbal stems. Its word-formation models were interpreted as the result of combining verbs with the particle *ne* and the suffixes *-n-* (*nevhomonnyi*, *nevpynnyi*, etc.), *-ann-* (*-iann-*), *-enn-* (*nevblahannyi*, *nezrivniannyi*, *nezbahnennyi*, etc.), *-m-* (*nevlovymyi*, *nevmolymyi*, etc.), *-uch-* (*-iuch-*), *-ushch-* (*-iushch-*) (*nemynuchyi*, *nevmyrushchyi*, etc.), *-lyv-* (*nezghovirlyvyi*, *nekvaplyvyi*, etc.) (Zhovtobriukh, 1979). It is quite evident that these word-formation models were distinguished not according to the criteria defined in the codified definition of the word-formation model.

The application of word-formation models as formal schemes for creating derivatives in the analysis of neologisms helps to reveal the recurrence of the structure of derivatives and to establish not only their systemic character but also the mechanisms and methods of their formation. The word-formation model is considered dynamic (functional), since it “makes visible the processes of deriving some linguistic objects from others” (Karpilovska, 2010, p. 32).

Studies of Ukrainian word formation conducted in the twenty-first century indicate that, despite the transparency and clarity of the definition of the word-formation model, some authors

have identified the practical use of the terms *word-formation model* and *word-formation type*, calling a word-formation model what has already been conventionally qualified, or is qualified by derivatologists, as a word-formation type.

In particular, in the work *Modern Ukrainian Word-Formation Nomination: Resources and Development Trends* (2007), L. P. Kysliuk used only the term *word-formation model* and did not use the term *word-formation type* at all, which gives grounds to recognize the identification of the word-formation type with the word-formation model, its substitution by the word-formation model, and, ultimately, the removal of the very concept of the word-formation type from the system of word formation. We illustrate this conclusion with four quotations from that work.

During that period, the use of many word-formation models that differed from Russian ones was prohibited or reduced to a minimum. For example, relative adjectives in *-ov(yi)* were displaced in favor of models in *-n(yi)*; adjectives in *-ivn(yi)* and nouns in *-ivnyk* were replaced by models in *-uval'n(yi)* and *-uval'nyk*; verbs with the calqued prefix *obez-* replaced the native prefix *zne-*. Russian word-formation models were insistently recommended, such as: nouns in *-k(a)* with the meaning of process; names of persons in *-shchyk*, *-chyk*; models of compound words with the component *-podibnyi*, *-vydnyi*, etc. (Kysliuk, 2017, p. 308)

The evidential facts of normative changes in the word-formation norm of the Ukrainian language include more than 15 word-formation models characteristic of the Ukrainian language and codified in the works of linguists of the 1920s, which were removed as a ‘manifestation of nationalist sabotage’ and replaced through administrative intervention by Russian word-formation models. (Kysliuk, 2017, p. 308)

In the first issue of the journal *Movoznavstvo* for 1934, an article by P. Horetskyi, ‘Nationalist distortions in the issues of Ukrainian word formation’ (pp. 37–51), was published, in which the presented word-formation models and the works of Ukrainian linguists who defended their use were subjected to devastating criticism. (Kysliuk, 2017, p. 308)

Models introduced directive-ly into the Ukrainian system of word formation to denote: a person with the suffixes *-chyk-*, *-shchyk-* (*valial'shchyk*), active action–the participle in *-uiuchy* (*mitynhuiuchy*), the prefix *obez-* instead of *zne-* in verbs (*obezbolyty*), deverbal nouns of action and result in *-ovka* instead of *-uvannia* (*rykhtovka*), in the presence in the Ukrainian word-formation system of other models for realizing these notions, formed doublets which, under the

pressure of coercive prescriptive norms, displaced native, distinctive Ukrainian models. (Kysliuk, 2017, p. 309)

In all the cited quotations, the term *word-formation model* is used instead of the term *word-formation type*, which is employed in the academic work *Word Formation of the Modern Ukrainian Literary Language* in the sections on suffixal noun and verb formation, as well as on prefixal-suffixal word formation (Zhovtobriukh, 1979).

Another example may be cited. In his studies of the intensive dynamization of Ukrainian word formation at the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century, O. O. Taranenko used the terms *word-formation models* and *structural-semantic word-formation models*, by which he referred to activated word-formational processes caused by the need “for a substantial renewal of the complex of nominative means of the language”, conditioned by the emergence / actualization of

a significantly larger and, most importantly, different than before range of concepts requiring linguistic expression, and the focusing of society’s priority attention on spheres of its life and social values different from those previously (in connection with the country’s transition to another type of socio-economic and political relations and the formation of its own statehood) ... for the expansion of general stylistic (nominative-expressive) and specifically stylistic possibilities of linguistic self-expression of society, which is now intensively realized within the literary language in the strengthening of elements of colloquialization and even jargonization of word formation ... in the processes of intensification of occasional word formation, and in phenomena of language play. (Taranenko, 2015, pp. 9–10).

However, it is evident that the analyzed activated models of prefixal verbs, suffixal nouns, relative adjectives, and other units are neologisms (which the author mostly referred to as formations with a particular prefix or suffix) that arose on the basis of word-formation types historically formed in the Ukrainian literary language.

I. D. Farion (2003) also unjustifiably replaced the word-formation type with the word-formation model: “For example, a word-formation model in *-shchyk*, *-chyk* with the derivational meaning of an agent name (*dostav-shchyk*, *zahruzh-chyk*). The native word-formation model is *vantazhnyk*, *hazetiar*” (p. 253).

Relying on the definition of the word-formation model codified in Ukrainian derivatology, in the cited contexts it would have been necessary to use the term *word-formation type*.

In modern Ukrainian derivatology, until recently there prevailed an interpretation of the word-formation model as a word-formational unit subordinate to the word-formation type with a specific word-forming suffix, with which the suffixes of word-formation models correlate as variants within a common word-formational meaning, but each of them combines with a particular structural type of derivational verbal bases. For example, within the word-formation type with the suffix *-nyk*, word-formation models with the following variants are distinguished:

1. *-l'nyk*, which attaches to infinitive bases with the elements *-a-* (*-ia-*) (*brakuval'nyk*, *hoduval'nyk*, *siial'nyk*, etc.), *-y-* (*vozylnyk*, *plavlynyk*, etc.), *-i-* (*-i*) (*kleil'nyk*);
2. *-il'nyk*, in which the vowel *i* derives from the Old Slavic *ѣ*, which ended the infinitive, or appeared by analogy (*vozil'nyk*, *kladil'nyk*, etc.);
3. *-ivnyk* (*-ovnyk*), combined with truncated verbal bases (*budivnyk*, *voiovnyk*, etc.) (Zhovtobriukh, 1979).

Similarly, to the word-formation type, the measure of productivity has also been applied to the word-formation model, on the basis of which Ukrainian derivatologists have distinguished productive, low-productivity, and unproductive word-formation models (Zhovtobriukh, 1979). However, according to this feature they are characterized less consistently than word-formation types.

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The outcome of long-term research into the problems of the formation of the word-formation type and the word-formation model in Ukrainian linguistics is the recognition of these notions as basic units among the system-forming entities of word formation and as forming the foundation of their hierarchy.

In Ukrainian derivatology, the word-formation type and the word-formation model as scientific word-formational concepts are “supralexical” generalizations. They arose as a result of abstraction from concrete word-formationally homogeneous words with specific lexical meanings and are grounded in what is word-formationally essential and common to a

corresponding series of words. The word-formation type, as a formal-semantic scheme for constructing derived words, is distinguished by three criteria (components): commonality of the part-of-speech affiliation of the derivational bases, the word-forming formant, and the word-formational meaning, whereas the word-formation model is distinguished by two criteria common to a given series of words: the affiliation of the base and derived words to the same part of speech and the identity of the formant.

Of fundamental importance is the fact that the word-formation model is a scheme for forming words within the same word-formation type, that is, a narrower word-formational entity. Therefore, the use of the term *word-formation model* instead of *word-formation type*, and the systematization of derivative units by word-formation models rather than by word-formation types, as observed in studies of Ukrainian word formation over recent decades, is unfounded and unscientific.

## REFERENCES

- Bulakhovskiy, L. A. (Ed.). (1951). *Course of modern Ukrainian literary language*. Soviet School.
- Farion, I. (2003). Word-formation norms in the context of national-cultural orientations. *Volyn-Zhytomyrschyna*, 10, 250–267.
- Greschuk, V. (2007). Ivan Kovalyk's contribution to Ukrainian and Slavic linguistics. *Bulletin of the Precarpathian National University. Philology*, 15–18, 3–11.
- Greschuk, V. (2016). Modeling the word formation process in derivation. *Grammar Studies*, 2, 92–96.
- Horda, O. M. (2016). *The formation and development of word-formation terminology in Galician school grammars of the Ukrainian language (second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries)* [PhD thesis, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv].
- Hryshenko, A. P. (Ed.). (1993). *Modern Ukrainian literary language*. Higher School.
- Karpilovska, Y. A. (2010). Secondary nomination in modern Ukrainian: Development trends. *Linguistic Studies*, 20, 27–32.
- Klymenko, N. F. (2007a). Word-formation model. In *Ukrainian language: Encyclopedia* (p. 642). “Ukrainian Encyclopedia” named after M. P. Bazhan.
- Klymenko, N. F. (2007b). Word-forming type. In *Ukrainian language: Encyclopedia* (p. 645). “Ukrainian Encyclopedia” named after M. P. Bazhan.
- Kovalyk, I. I. (1958a). *The doctrine of word formation: Word-forming parts of a word*. Lviv University.
- Kovalyk, I. I. (1958b). *The question of noun word formation in East Slavic languages in comparison with other Slavic languages*. Lviv University.
- Kovalyk, I. I. (1958c). On some issues of Slavic word formation. *Studies in the Ukrainian Language*, 3–24.
- Kovalyk, I. I. (1958d). Word-forming category of Slavic names of persons according to their nationality and territorial affiliation. *Issues of Slavic Linguistics*, 5, 139–153.
- Kovalyk, I. I. (1961a). *Questions of word formation of nouns of East Slavic languages in comparison with other Slavic languages* [PhD thesis, Lviv State University].
- Kovalyk, I. I. (1961b). *The doctrine of word formation: Word-forming characteristics of the word. The relationship of the doctrine of word formation to other linguistic disciplines*. Lviv University.
- Kovalyk, I. I. (1964). *Word formation of nouns in Serbo-Lusatian languages*. Ivan Franko State University of Lviv.

- Kovalyk, I. I. (1970). The main problems of the study of word formation. *Ukrainian Language and Literature in School*, 10, 22–29.
- Kysliuk, L. P. (2017). *Modern Ukrainian word-formation nomenclature: Resources and development trends*. Dmytro Burago.
- Pliusch, M. Y. (2010). *Grammar of the Ukrainian language: Morphemics. Word formation. Morphology*. Slovo.
- Syniavskyj, O. (2018). *Norms of the Ukrainian literary language* (Series “Ukrainian Grammatical Classics”). Dmytro Burago.
- Taranenko, O. O. (2015). *Updated models in the word formation system of the modern Ukrainian language (late 20th – early 21st centuries)*. Dmytro Burago.
- Vakariuk, L., & Pantso, S. (2007). *Ukrainian word formation in terms: Dictionary-reference*. Dzhura.
- Yermolenko, S. (Ed.). (2001). *Ukrainian language: A brief explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms*. Lybid.
- Zhovtobriukh, M. A. (Ed.). (1979). *Word formation of the modern Ukrainian literary language*. Naukova Dumka.

### ***CRediT Author Statement***

---

- Acknowledgments:** We thank the National University «Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic», Poltava, Ukraine.
  - Funding:** None.
  - Conflicts of interest:** None.
  - Ethical approval:** No need to submit to the ethics board.
  - Data and materials availability:** The data and materials used in the work are not available.
  - Author contributions:** Kateryna Horodenska (data analysis and interpretation, conception, ideation, writing and revision), Iryna Denysovets (data collection, collaboration in article writing and proofreading).
- 

**Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação**  
Review, formatting, standardization, and translation

