DONETSK STATE UNIVERSITY

A manuscript copy

Brovets Andrey I.

Decryptive stimuli as a mean of forming equivalent relationships of a complex reduced word

Scientific specialty 5.9.5. Russian language. Languages of the peoples of Russia

Dissertation is submitted for the degree of candidate
of philological sciences

Translated from Russian

Academic supervisor:
Doctor of Philology, Professor
Terkulov Vyacheslav I.

Donetsk
2024

Contents

List of conditional abbreviations

AG acronym group

AC abbreviation construct

EN equivalence nest

DS decryption stimulus / decoding stimulus

IDS interpretative decoding stimulus / interpretative decoding stimulus

CW / CAW compound word / complex abbreviated word

TE textual equivalence

1. Introduction

1.1. Relevance

The dissertation study is devoted to the justification and description of the decryptive stimulus of the abbreviation – a word or phrase, which is a decoding of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation in the equivalent phrase.

Most dictionaries have abbreviations ([136]; [137]; [138]; [139]; [140]; [145]; [143]; [146]; [147]; [141]; [144]; [150]; [148]) the equivalence of the abbreviation is described within an abbreviation pair consisting of the abbreviation itself and the corresponding one phrase. The approach in which the interpretation of the abbreviation is carried out through the only possible dismembered equivalent is the result of the intention, as D. I. Alekseev writes, "to pay special attention to the diachronic aspect of the study" [3, c. 3]. The experimental laboratory for the study of abbreviations at Donetsk National University, working on the compilation of the "Explanatory Dictionary of Complex Words of the Russian Language" (hereinafter referred to as the Dictionary) edited by V. I. Terkulov, distinguishes between the synchronous and diachronous aspects of the consideration of abbreviations.

The purpose of diachron analysis is to establish the real production between a complex word and its corresponding phrase. The clarification of the word-forming direction, meaningless for the traditional view of abbreviation, becomes relevant due to the identification of the facts of a) "quasi-abbreviation," when the abbreviation (*air ticket*) is formed from the usual word (*ticket*) by directly attaching an abbroconstructure to it – an abbreviated component (*avia*), and not as a result of the compression of the phrase; b) "pseudouniverbalization," which implies the deployment of the phrase from the abbreviation (*air ticket* > *aviation ticket*), and not vice versa [118]. A similar idea was formulated by V.V. Borisov, describing a model of correlative abbreviation, according to which the abbreviation can be formed not from the previously existing complete unit, but in parallel with it [13].

The purpose of synchronous analysis is to establish all phrases motivationally related to a complex word and used with it or in parallel with it in the texts. This need is explained by the regular textual practice of the multiple interpretation of the complex word noted by us. As a rule, not one phrase (forming an abbreviation pair) corresponds to it, but several such phrases (forming an equivalence nest). For example, the word *agitrolick* in the texts corresponds not only to the phrase agitation *roller*, but also (with different frequency of use) the phrase *roller with agitation*, *a roller for agitation*, *a roller of an agitation nature*, *an agitation roller*, *a roller of agitation*. All these phrases are considered by us as units of the equivalence nest of the abbreviation *agitrolik*, which acts as an alternative to the abbreviation pair and is described in the Dictionary.

The relevance of the study is determined by the resulting contradiction between the abbreviation pair and the equivalence nest, the difference between which consists in the number of phrases corresponding to the complex word. Since, within the framework of the traditional approach, the interpretation of the abbreviation is carried out through a single phrase, the description of the decoding of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation is not of particular interest: such decoding is usually reduced to relative adjectives (*car accident – car accident*; *veloshlem – bicycle helmet*). The equivalence nest includes several collocations, and a description of the decryptions of the abbreviated component in them becomes necessary, since it is these decryptions that make up the difference between all collocations of the same equivalence nest. For example, with the abbreviation *parking*, the phrases car *parking, car parking, parking for cars, parking for vehicles*, etc., forming one equivalence socket and differing forms *of automobile, cars, for cars, for vehicles* are used as equivalents. These forms are decryptive stimuli that differently represent the abbreviated component of *the car* in the texts. The description of decryptive stimuli is relevant:

- in *a pragmatic aspect*, since it makes up the hypothesis that regular stereotypes of decoding its abbreviated component are used to form abbreviations equivalent to the abbreviation – models common to various equivalence nests;

- in *a descriptive aspect*, since it allows you to more voluminously represent the equivalence of a complex reduced word;

- in *a prognostic aspect*, since by extrapolating decryptive stimuli of one nest to other nests, it allows you to formalize their analysis and description;

- in *the application aspect*, since it constitutes the material for the Dictionary.

The study was conducted on the topic of the state assignment "Structural and functional parameters of the existence and development of the Russian language of the XX-XXI centuries in its regional and general language aspects" (No. State Registration of the NIOKTR 1023111500001–7–6.2.1; 6.2.2).

1.2. Object and Subject

The object of the study is a word or phrase that acts as a decipherment of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation.

The subject of research is the structural and semantic characteristics of decryptive stimuli, which are the basis for their typology and the level of stereotype.

1.3. Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the study is a comprehensive description of the system of decryption stimuli of complex reduced words of the Russian language as part of a synchronous approach to abbreviation.

The set goal involves solving the following **tasks**:

1) describe linguistic and lexicographic approaches to the interpretation of the equivalence of the abbreviation;

2) present the theory of synchronous abbreviation of the Donetsk derivatological school;

3) define the decryption stimulus of the abbreviation as a linguistic concept;

4) give a structural typology of decryptive stimuli;

5) perform actant-sirconstant classification of decryption stimuli;

6) consider the concept of a simulated decryption stimulus;

7) analyze the structural and semantic features of modifiable decryptive stimuli.

1.4. Theoretical and practical significance

The theoretical significance of the study is that the results obtained in it complement linguistic ideas about the equivalence of a complex reduced word, which allows us to further consider the abbreviation not in isolation (exclusively as part of an artificially constructed abbreviation pair), but in direct connection with the text as the main source of correlation of the abbreviation and the corresponding phrases. The developed typology of decryption stimuli, based on the structural-semantic relationship between the abbreviation and the phrase, allows you to detail and scale the sockets of equivalence of abbreviations through prediction techniques. The distinguished class of simulcast abbreviations, the equivalent phrases of which double-interpret the abbreviated component of the abbreviation, can serve as a starting point in the study of homonymy in abbreviation. Also, the facts of abbreviated pleonasm in the equivalence nest analyzed in the work acquire lexicological significance.

The practical significance of the dissertation is that the observations described in it were reflected in the "Explanatory Dictionary of Complex Words of the Russian Language," and are also presented in a readable special course on abbreviation. The results obtained are applicable when compiling abbreviations dictionaries, as well as in translation and editorial practice. The conclusions made can be used in the university courses "Modern Russian. Lexicology, "" Modern Russian language. Morphemic and word formation. "

1.5. Scientific novelty

The scientific novelty of the work is that it is the first time:

1) a synchronous approach to abbreviation is presented, demonstrating that not one, but several equivalent phrases that arise due to updating alternative decryptive stimuli in the text and forming an equivalence slot, and not an abbreviation pair traditionally represented in abbreviations dictionaries, usually correspond to a complex reduced word on the current language slice;

2) states the existence in the language of a branched system of decryption stimuli that carry out parallel multiple decryption of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation;

3) interpretive grammatical and lexical decryptive stimuli are taken into account, usually not described in traditional dictionaries even within the framework of abbreviated pairs;

4) the facts of the abbreviated pleonasm in the equivalence nest are analyzed.

1.6. Methodology

The purpose and objectives of the study led to the use of various **methods** and approaches. The methods of distributive analysis and logical-semantic modeling were used when searching and predicting abbreviations equivalent to the abbreviation. In determining the regularity and stereotyping of decryptive stimuli, quantifiable and comparative methods were used. The semantics of different decryptive stimuli of one abbreviation were compared using component analysis. To formalize the onomasiological structure of the study units, the onomasiological analysis method was used in terms of onomasiological structures/models, which include onomasiological basis and onomasiological sign. A dictionary definition analysis method was used to confirm the textual equivalence relationships. When describing the different structural types of decryption stimuli, analysis was used for the components themselves.

1.7. Study hypothesis

The hypothesis of the **study** was based on the assumption that stereotypical decryptions of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation act on the synchronous slice of the language – decryptive stimuli, the actualization of which leads to the formation of textual equivalent relations of the abbreviation, including multiple ones.

1.8. Material

The research material was more than 13 thousand complex words included in the file cabinet of the Explanatory Dictionary of Complex Words. An additional source of material was dictionaries of abbreviations and abbreviations ([136]; [137]; [138]; [139]; [140]; [145]; [143]; [146]; [147]; [141]; [144]; [150]; [148]). The materials of the file cabinet of the compiled "Explanatory Dictionary of Complex Words of the Russian Language" were used.

1.9. Theoretical and methodological basis

The basis of the study was the work of V.V. Borisov on correlative abbreviation, E.V. Klobuchar and S.V. Gudilova on the linguistic specifics of non-derivative complex words (quasi-composites), M. A. Yarmashevich on the nominative ability of the abbreviation, V. G. Gak and Yu. D. Apresyan on semantic coordination, L. A. Baranova on the abbreviation-uzual homonymy, E. A. Dyuzhikova on the comparison of abbreviation with verbiage, E. S. Kubryakova on the semantics of the derived word, O. V. Blumina on the onomasiological study of the composites, V. ic complex descriptions of Terokulov.

1.10. Degree of reliability and testing of results

The results of the dissertation study were presented at the following conferences:

1. Brovets, A.I. Decryption tactics of the abbreviation group. 52nd International Scientific Philological Conference named after L. A. Verbitskaya (St. Petersburg, 2024).

2. Brovets, A.I. Semantic analysis of decryption incentives of abbreviations. 51st International Scientific Philological Conference named after L. A. Verbitskaya (St. Petersburg, 2023).

3. Brovets, A.I. Lexicographic description of decryption incentives of abbreviations. 50th International Scientific Philological Conference named after L. A. Verbitskaya (St. Petersburg, 2022).

4. Brovets, A.I. Decryptive stimulus of the Russian abbreviation: structural-semantic characteristic. 23rd Open Conference of Philology Students at St. Petersburg State University (St. Petersburg, 2020).

5. Brovets, A.I. Decryptive stimulus of a complex reduced word: the principle of interpretation. 22nd Open Conference of Philology Students at St. Petersburg State University (St. Petersburg, 2019).

6. Brovets, A.I. Decryptive matrix of complex words as a lexicographic source. Round table within the framework of the International Scientific Conference of Students, Graduate Students and Young Scientists "Lomonosov-2022" "Results of the creation of the" Explanatory Dictionary of Complex Words ": 7 years of collective work" (Moscow, 2022).

7. Brovets, A.I. Decryptive stimulus of a complex reduced word: lexicography. VI International Symposium "Russian Language in the Multicultural World" (Yalta, 2022).

Based on the results of this study, four articles were published in international peer-reviewed journals indexed in the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Federation and Scopus.

1. Brovets A.I. Modifiable interpretive decryptive stimulus of a complex reduced word. (2017). Bulletin of Moscow University. Philology. 6(9). 98–107. https: // vestnik.philol.msu.ru/issues/VMU_9_Philol__2017_6.pdf.

2. Brovets A.I. Decryption stimulus of a complex reduced word: to the problem of definition and description. (2019). Rusistics. 4(17). 487–501. https: // www.doi.org/10.22363/2618–8163–2019–17–4–487–501.

3. Brovets A.I. History of abbreviations dictionaries. (2021). International Graduate Bulletin. Russian language abroad. 3. 70–76. https: // elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=46518455.

4. Brovets A.I. Decryption stimulus as the basis of a synchronous approach to abbreviation under conditions of constituting semiosis. (2023). Current problems of philology and pedagogical linguistics. №1. 70–80. https: // doi.org/10.29025/2079–6021–2023–1–70–80.

1.11. Author's personal contribution

The author of this work took an active part in the direct implementation of all stages of the dissertation research, in determining its goals and tasks, choosing its object and subject, planning and structuring scientific work, in finding and in-depth studying scientific sources, in describing the progress of the study and systematizing the results obtained, in writing and writing the manuscript of the dissertation, the main publications on the work performed. The main theoretical and practical provisions of the dissertation, the results of the study were reflected in the published scientific articles and theses of the author. The ideas and developments of the co-authors were not used in the dissertation study.

1.12. Main scientific results

1. Words or collocations acting as stereotypes of decoding of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation (decryption stimuli) and forming the multiple equivalence of the abbreviation in the format of a socket, and not an abbreviation pair, were analyzed [16, p. 74]. 2. 3 structural types of decryption stimuli specialized on the expression of different types of semantics are identified [17, p. 100]. 3. Abbreviations are described, the abbroconstructure of which has the possibility of

simultaneous ambiguous decryption by decryption stimuli used in the function of "homonyms" or "paronyms" [14, p. 76]. 4. Decryptions of the abbroconstructure were revealed, structurally more complex than the abbroconstruction, but semantically representing pleonasm [15, p. 495].

1.13. Basic Provisions for Protection

1. There are diachronous and synchronous abbreviations in the language, identified through diachronous and synchronous analysis. Abbreviations in the diachronous approach are complex words that actually arose on the basis of phrases and are opposed to diachronous quasi-abbreviations formed from an ordinary word by attaching an abbreviated component to it. Thus, diachron analysis sets the derivation direction. Abbreviations with a synchronous approach are complex words that have motivationally related equivalent phrases on the actual slice of the language, which are used together or in parallel with the abbreviation in the texts. Thus, synchronous analysis establishes the relationship of textual equivalence, taking into account not the derivational presence or absence of the source phrase, but the perception of the doubleness of the word and the phrase.

2. An abbreviation under synchronous consideration usually has not one equivalent phrase that forms an abbreviation pair, but several such phrases that form an abbreviation equivalence socket. Combinations of one equivalence nest are associated with an abbreviation of motivational relationships and a functional-semantic identity, which allows them to be used as absolute synonyms of the abbreviation in texts.

3. The formation of equivalent abbreviation relationships in the equivalence nest is determined by the synchronous action of decryptive stimuli – stereotypical deciphers of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation, that is, words or phrases used to replace it in the equivalent phrase. The presence of several equivalent phrases in one abbreviation is explained precisely by the existence of several decryptive stimuli in one abbreviated component.

4. The texts use acronyms equivalent to phrases with decryptive stimuli of different structural types. The most universal is the adjective with generalized semantics, which we call the presentation. Forms with a relative adjective are semantically universal, not updating the system of values, which is presented in interpretive decryptive stimuli. Among the latter, we highlight relatives that are represented by substantive prepositional forms, and modifiers that differ in an additional word that is absent in the structure of both complex word and presentative and relative decryptive stimuli.

5. Semantically, relatives have an extensive system of meanings, among which we note mediative, comitative, destinative, locative, possessive, distributive, causative, deliberative, allative.

6. Some complex words come into the so-called. simulant equivalent relationships when their abbreviated component can be decrypted ambiguously. For example, *an electro* construct has *decryptive* electrical and *electronic* stimuli. We note cases when the symbolic equivalence: a) is due to extralingual duality and reflects it according to the principle of homonymy; b) is not due to non-linguistic duality and implements the principle of paronymy.

7. Modifiable decryptive stimuli are used in texts according to two tactics: some, due to an additional token, update the meaning of the abbreviation, semantically complicate it, others are pleonasm.

2. Decryptive stimulus as a unit of synchronous approach to abbreviation

2.1. Linguistic and lexicographic approaches to describing the equivalence of a compound word

Abbreviation becomes the most productive way of word formation in Russian at the beginning of the 20th century. in the post-October period, but in this period, despite the obvious usual status of thousands of specific abbreviated lexemes, the actual linguistic discussion about abbreviations is hampered by puristic moods. D. I. Alekseev writes: "At one time, especially in the 30s and 40s, it was argued that abbreviations in Russian were declining, that they had no future. It was considered a kind of scientific duty to condemn abbreviations and call for their expulsion from speech. In the conclusions of research, this desired was often passed off as valid. A distorted idea of the history of the abbreviation and its prospects in Russian is one of the main reasons for the practical underestimation of abbreviations "[3, p. 3].

However, over time, it became less and less possible not to notice this huge lexical layer, and there was a need for a comprehensive description of abbreviations – including lexicographic. At this time, the first dictionaries of initial abbreviations and abbreviations appeared, the approach to the description of abbreviated units was fixed, which involves the interpretation of the abbreviation through the only possible dismembered equivalent. "Objective evidence of increasing the role and specific gravity of abbreviations in modern languages is the emergence in recent decades of a large number of general and specialized dictionaries of abbreviations, and the number of such dictionaries has been growing sharply in recent years: of the more than 100 dictionaries of abbreviations registered by us for various languages more than three quarters were published in the period after 1950, "writes one of the leading researchers of the abbreviation V.V. Borisov [13, p. 11].

The traditional approach to the dictionary description of abbreviations is based on the principle of an abbreviation pair, which implies the statement of the word-forming direction between the producer and the derivative. This seems to be a

consequence of the fact that in the linguistic study of abbreviation there was an intention, as D. I. Alekseev writes, "to pay special attention to the diachronic aspect of the study" [3, p. 3]. The shortage of synchronous (or functional) interest in abbreviations is felt, for example, in the interpretive potential of dictionary entries that implement the principle of paraphrase for the semantization of a shortened unit. However, different dictionaries of abbreviations implement the principles of describing abbreviations in different ways, and the choice of principle is usually due to the purpose (theoretical or applied) of the dictionary.

The most famous collection of abbreviations is **the "Dictionary of Abbreviations of the Russian Language**" edited by D. I. Alekseev. The dictionary was repeatedly reprinted (first edition – 1963, second – 1977, third – 1983, fourth – 1984). The fourth edition contains 17,700 dictionary entries. The dictionary mainly presents abbreviations of the initial type (*traffic police, housing and communal services*), as well as some abbreviations of the mixed type (*BaltNIIRH, ZakVO*), syllabic abbreviations (*girupr, zavgar*) and truncations (*gas, head*).

The dictionary includes both appellates (*registry office – civil registration, KTB – design and technological bureau*), and onyms – names of states, parties, organizations, institutions, production enterprises, instrument brands, etc. (*ZhMI – Zhdanovsky Metallurgical Institute*; *GATOB – State Order of Lenin Academic Opera and Ballet Theater*; *ZAGES – Zemo-Avchal hydroelectric power station named after V.I. Lenin*).

Dictionary entries have the following structure:

- heading word;

- peculiarities of pronunciation (**wind farm** [wind farm] wind eclectrostation "; VJ [ve-ya] "**Questions of** linguistics");

- grammatical features. Information is given about the grammatical type of contraction and the possibility of declension (**by teachers,** m. *And g., No.*);

- deciphering the abbreviation. In the decryption, letters or syllables that form the title word are bold;

- peculiarities of use. For some words, brief interpretations are given: z. – spool (unit of weight). Specific versions of word usage are also given**: ZAZ-** [zaz] – Zaporizhzhya Automobile Plant (*in* car labeling; *for example*: ZAZ-965 and ZAZ-966 "Zaporozhets").

- for words of terminological nature, marks are given**: HEC** [HEC] – secondary frequency standard *(electric*)

The Dictionary of Modern Russian Abbreviations and Abbreviations by N.N. Novichkov was published in 1995 and contains about 12,000 dictionary entries. The material was initial abbreviations (*YUMSH – youthful seaworthy school*), complex reduced words (*caper – captain of the first rank*) and word truncation (*cap*. – *capital*). In addition to appellates, the dictionary also covers proper names – names of states, parties, organizations, institutions, banks, etc. (*SOUTH AFRICA*, *UNESCO*).

Dictionary entries have a simple structure:

- heading word;

- stylistic mark;

- decoding of the abbreviation;

- a brief interpretation for onyms: **Yugavia** Southern Airlines (airline).

A team of authors edited by E. G. Kovalenko compiled **the "New Dictionary of Abbreviations of the Russian Language**," published in 1995. The work itself is characterized by the authors as "the most complete description of abbreviations of the Russian language ever published in the world" [145, p. 2]. The dictionary includes about 32,000 abbreviations and other abbreviations. The object of the description in it is abbreviations of various types: alphabetic abbreviations, acronyms, complex abbreviations, graphic abbreviations and complex abbreviated words. Due to the practical orientation of the dictionary, the system of marks and explanations in it is minimal: there are no grammatical marks and information about pronunciation. Examples of dictionary entries are:

Aircraft Simulation Aircraft makeshift *(about a homemade flying vehicle)*

AB autolock

The direct lexicographic continuation of "New Dictionary..." is obtained in the work **"New Abbreviations in Russian 1996–19**99," published in 1999 (reprinted in 2000) already under the editorship of I. V. Fagradyants and inheriting the format of the description of the "New Dictionary." The dictionary includes about 10,000 abbreviations, and the edition itself consists of two parts. The first part describes abbreviations not included in the "New Dictionary," as well as those that arose in the Russian language in the period 1996–1999. The second part is devoted to the names of federal executive bodies and bodies under the Government of the Russian Federation as of the 01.04.99 and the rules for their spelling. The structure of the dictionary entry assumes two mandatory (abbreviation and its decoding) and two optional positions (stylistic marks and semantic clarifications given in brackets):

auto hydraulic lift car hydraulic lift

AGP automatic hydraulic lift (*automobile hydraulic lift*)

Avtodor (reg.) Ministry of Highways *(Highway Administration)*

aviation sports complex aviation sports complex

AVN Academy of Military Sciences

ABS automated banking system

Both of the aforementioned "paper" dictionaries, created by one author's team and reflecting the dynamism of the lexical system over time (1995–2000), became the source for the electronic "**Dictionary of Abbreviations of the Russian Language**," prepared by the publishing house "Electronic and Traditional Dictionaries" ("ETS") in 2003. The dictionary increased by 5,000 new abbreviations. In thematic terms, the material was also supplemented by brand names, letter designations in labels of various kinds of goods and products, abbreviated literary and political surnames and pseudonyms, abbreviated names of series of books and magazines, etc. The abbreviations presented in the electronic dictionary cover the period of the XIX-XX centuries. In addition to "classic" abbreviations, the dictionary

contains, for example, derivatives from department stores and abbreviations with the meaning of a person:

hand-to-hand (open) fighter who owns hand-to-hand combat techniques

Ruopovets *(reg.)* Employee of RUOP *(Regional Directorate for Combating Organized Crime)*

However, as you can see, the structure of the dictionary entry remained minimalistic due to the extremely limited number of marks and clarifications and also assumes as mandatory the abbreviation itself and its decoding, which in some cases are accompanied by stylistic and conceptual comments. Probably, the proportional ratio of complex reduced words and initial abbreviations has changed in favor of the latter:

Syrian *Arab News Agency – SANA*

SAIMBA Brain Biopotential Research and Analysis Automation System

self-construction of independent development *(illegal).*

Of particular interest is the "**Thematic Dictionary of Abbreviations of the Modern Russian Language**" by S.V. Fadeev (1998), which for the first time practices the thematic principle of building a dictionary of abbreviations of the Russian language. The dictionary includes initial and syllabic abbreviations, complex words, graphic abbreviations, word truncations (*MUR, physics department, headquarters, b/p, fab., P.*). About 20,000 abbreviations are distributed across 65 main topics ("Agencies," "Optics," "Science and Technology," "Philology," "Names of Famous People," "Societies and Organizations," etc.) and 19 sub-themes ("Academies," "Institutes," "Student Organizations" in the topic "Education and Science").

The dictionary describes both appellates (*road accident*) and onyms: the names of states, enterprises, institutions, organizations, etc. (ARE – *Arab Republic of Egypt*; *VSONNK – United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus*; *RPZ – Ramensky Instrument-Making Plant*).

Structure of dictionary entry:

- heading word;

- for borrowed abbreviations, a mark is given indicating the source language, an original abbreviation is given and its decoding: **LISP** English. LISP. List Processor – Programming language for processing lists;

- decoding of the abbreviation;

- brief additional information on the meaning of the abbreviation: **SAP** special automatic patrol (*police*); **MP** or **m.p**. place of printing (*on documents*).

The dictionary is equipped with an alphabetical index of all abbreviations available in the dictionary.

In 2003, the "Nesting **Explanatory Dictionary of Composites**" by A. V. was published. Petrova, where the author describes 1600 complex nouns combined into 91 nests on a root basis. The object of the description in the dictionary entry is a complex name noun with a verb component of the lexico-semantic group of physical action. The volume of nests in the dictionary by the number of words included in them varies from 3 to 130 units. A.V. Petrov sets three main tasks for the dictionary: 1) grouping derivatives in accordance with their word-forming structure; 2) comparison of their semantic structure; c) unification of the formula for interpreting derivatives of the same type.

The dictionary presents composites that implement such methods of Russian word formation as pure addition *(rail-laying, forestation, iron-casting*), addition with suffixation (*flycatcher, virsheplet, cheese* maker), addition without a connecting vowel (*aircraft builder, coffee grinder, radio communication*), truncation (*scrap metal, electric shaver, sanitary penetrator*), splicing with suffixation (*undergrowing, dusting*). The dictionary entry has the following structure: 1) header word block; 2) block of word-forming structure; 3) interpretation block; 4) droppings block; 5) a block of illustrations.

AUTOSBO 'RK/A, -i, g.

// /Auto (mobile) + assembly; car assembly\\\

1. Car Assembly. * Auto Assembly Schedule. 2. *peren.*, meton. Car assembly shop. * Each plant, building has its own architectural appearance and style. The forge, as it were, takes off, the auto assembly, on the contrary, splayed, the foundry billowed with pipes [Zlobin, Kama meetings. – № 9. – M., 1974. – S. 147].

BIOSCIENCE'Z, -i, g.

// /Bio (logical) + communication;

1) biological link (in 1 value)\\\

Communication, interdependence of living organisms. * Biocommunication of marine life.

2) biological link (in 2 values)\\\

Message, hypothetical connection with kem-, than-L. at a distance with the help of brain biorecurrences. * Does there exist or does not exist an unknown species of biorange in nature? Some scientists convincingly confirm the existence of thought contacts with their experiments, in other researchers the same experiments give a negative result [Mezentsev, In the labyrinths of wildlife].

The Dictionary of Abbreviations of the Modern Russian Language by G.N. Sklyarevskaya contains more than 6,000 actively used units, including the latest (for 2004) abbreviations. The dictionary presents abbreviations of the initial type and truncation of words (*USE, minimum wage*; *muses*., *Munits*.). The compiler notes that only common names are included in the dictionary, among which are appellates (*NSP – sales tax*; *BO – onboard equipment*), as well as the names of government agencies, institutions, foundations, educational institutions, magazines and newspapers, book series (*MHD – Moscow City Council*, *ICE – the house of stage veterans, NG – Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, *PC – Parliamentary Hour*).

The dictionary entry contains the following information:

- heading word;
- features of pronunciation and stress;

- grammatical litter. The dictionary article presents information about the grammatical type of contraction and the possibility of declension (**gòsdép**, -a, *m.*; *GOPB*... nescl., g.);

- mark (**PEB**... *(*obsolete). Brief comments also act as functional droppings **(**ZK... In documents: prisoner);

- Tolkovia. Note that the compiler of the dictionary identifies the decoding of the abbreviation with its interpretation;

- encyclopedic information that contains additional information about some of the abbreviations described (**AVIX**... "Aviation and Computer Systems" (research and production center);

- examples of use are given "if necessary to show the genus and declension" of some abbreviations (**ABT**... *Performed* by ABT).

In 2009, the "**Dictionary of Abbreviations of Foreign Language Origin**" by L. A. Baranova was published, the dictionary of which includes about 1,000 abbreviations. The dictionary consists of two parts. The first part describes Russified borrowed abbreviations used in written texts in Cyrillic spelling. The second part includes abbreviations used in Russian-language texts in Latin spelling.

The dictionary entry has the following structure:

1. Title abbreviation.

2. Variants of spelling (through a slash line) or use (along with a synonym given next to it in parentheses with a mark **of other**) abbreviations.

3. Mark indicating the scope of use (for terms).

4. Features of pronunciation and stress (in square brackets).

5. The method of borrowing (only in part 1) and an indication of the language from which the abbreviation is borrowed.

6. Original abbreviation (in Part 1 only).

7. The corresponding expanded phrase.

8. Translation and/or interpretation (often including cognitive information).

9. Features of use (comment).

10. Links to other dictionary entries.

11. Presence of derivatives.

12. Illustrations (in italics) in the form of quotes or collocations.

Example of a dictionary entry:

Wi-Fi / WiFi / Wi-fi / wi-fi (inf.) [wi-fi], abbr. < English Wireless Fidelity – lit. ‘wireless precision’ – wireless connection technology.

When purchasing a mobile phone, the buyer should immediately make sure or check with the seller that the device being purchased is equipped with a special wireless network interface – not all mobile phones are equipped with a wi-fi system. The operation of wi-fi does not depend on whether you are on a home network or roaming – a wireless connection is established with a local access point (AiF–M., 2008, No. 31).

Special attention should be paid to the isolation of the so-called quasi-abbreviations – words perceived by native speakers as abbreviations and received characteristic deciphers that are secondary to the word – acts of linguocreative activity (yuppie, SOS, etc.).

In 2012, in collaboration with N.V. Gabdreeva and M.T. Gurchiani, **the Dictionary of Composites of the Russian Language of the Latest Period** was published, the object of which is two-base words, the first part of which is mainly borrowed, and therefore does not have a detailed correlation: *business education*, *city manager*, *skatder*, *toaster grill*, *face art*, *bowling club*, etc. The structure of a dictionary entry is usually binary: it includes a "composite" and its interpretation. In some cases, an etymological reference is provided that contributes to the explication of the internal form of the word, aimed, as well as interpretation, at the semantization of the described word.

In cases where the first part of the "composite" has a lexical equivalent, dictionary presentation occurs on two models:

1) formal conformity:

Auto-chair ■ – car chair.

2) idiomatized:

Sportbike ■ (ang. sportbike) – a light highway motorcycle with aluminum suspension parts and a powerful engine.

The Dictionary of Abbreviations and Acronyms of the Russian Language by I.A. Eliseev (2015) contains over 30,000 abbreviations. The dictionary is represented mainly by abbreviations of the initial and mixed type (*OSCE, ABk*) and graphic abbreviations (*s/x*). As in the sources discussed above, this dictionary contains appellates (*Navy, CJSC*) and onyms – names of states, associations, institutions, educational institutions, etc. (*AASSR – Abkhaz Autonomous SSR, AVAI – Armavir Military Aviation Institute*, ZVMO – *Notes of the* All-Union Mineralogical Society).

Note the peculiarities of decoding abbreviations. The decryption elements (letters and syllables) that make up the abbreviation are in bold. In addition, the compiler drew attention to the electability (i.e. the absence of some decryption elements in the abbreviation) and considered it necessary to highlight such elements in italics: **ABL** aluminum *paint based on* bakelite varnish.

Structure of dictionary entry:

- heading word;

- for abbreviations of foreign language origin: mark is given, as well as the original abbreviation and its decoding: **ZAPU (***Zimbabwe* A**f**rican P**e**ople's U**n**ion, ZA**PU**);**

- decoding of the abbreviation;

- explanatory data indicating the scope of the abbreviation, mark and a short interpretation for some abbreviations: **ER** protection of troops (*a set of measures*).

In parallel with the abbreviation, the uni-store process operates in Russian. Currently, the term "department" specializes in denoting the compression of a phrase, in which "the derived word includes the basis of only one of the members of the phrase, therefore the derivative (department store) in form is correlated with one word, and in meaning – with the entire motivating phrase (*test book – count*)" [37,

p. 42]. Department stores became the subject of description in the "**Dictionary of Department Stores of the Modern Russian Language**" by G.V. Klimenko and E. M. Merkova (2019). The dictionary is of the explanatory-word type: in addition to deciphering department stores, dictionary entries also have interpretations of meanings. The dictionary has about 600 department stores related to common vocabulary: (*gas station, sleeveless, drone, around the world*).

Dictionary entries have the following structure:

- heading word;

- grammatical features (the inflection is indicated in Gen. p. and grammatical gender);

- decryption. The word-forming structure is given, the elements that make up the department store are highlighted in bold**: Avtozapravka** -i, **g.Gas** station **+** k (a);

- interpretation: **Academy**... Leave provided during study at a higher educational institution (mainly for one academic year) for a valid reason: illness, family circumstances, etc.

- examples of use: **Anonymous**... *Among the different papers, an* anonymous person was neatly filed into the folder [S. Gorev. Melekes case // Criminal department (2011)].

Abbreviations are most frequent among special vocabulary – terminological or slang (for example, student). N. N. Tyutyunnikov's "**Brief Dictionary of Military Abbreviations" (2020) contains 6243 dictionary entries describing 4824 abbreviations, 93 complex abbreviated words, 1099 other abbreviations and 227 designations of units of quantities. Dictionary entries are distinguished by the presence of a bibliographic reference to** documents that contain a specific abbreviation, as well as the years of publication of the corresponding sources. The dictionary also contains reference information on various and identical abbreviations of words and phrases adopted in documents of different years and areas of military affairs.

Dictionary entries of those parts of the dictionary that are devoted to abbreviations and complex words have the following structure:

- abbreviation in bold;

- a word or phrase that has been abbreviated;

- bibliographic reference to the sources used, placed in square brackets;

- year or interval of years of publication of used sources, placed in parentheses;

- optional one or more marks placed in parentheses at the end of the dictionary entry, with additional information about the abbreviated word or phrase.

The dictionary of N. N. Tyutyunnikov provides for a mark "sl.," Indicating the spelling of abbreviated words and phrases in other word forms:

STS – ocean theater of operations [49, 52, 53, 57, 59, 66] (1989–2007), (pl.) Ocean theater of operations.

Complex words are represented in much smaller numbers and do not have variants of word forms of abbreviated words and phrases:

toxodose – toxic dose [48] (1988);

rastranline – demarcation line [20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 35] (1982–2013);

corpost – correction post [59] (2003).

In the last decade, there has been an increase in the popularity of online dictionaries – including due to the possibility of their permanent addition without a reissue **procedure. An example of such a dynamic dictionary is the Russian-language Internet resource Sokr.Ru**, which has 158,907 abbreviations and 28 million visits (as of February 2021). The named electronic dictionary-list selects the above printed dictionaries. The card, which is an analogue of the dictionary entry, includes requisite information (card number, date of addition, date of correction), the actual abbreviation, the corresponding phrase (one), the abbreviated component of the abbreviation (the presence of which combines all words having this component: *auto*, *avia*, *velo*, *moto*, etc.), a link to the source of use of the abbreviation [16, p. 73].

Example of a card:

Record No. 158055

Added 11.10.2002

Fixed 29.12.2004

auto kit

car kit

autos

Source: http: // www.loglink.ru/news/record/?id=371.

Equivalent phrases, as a rule, give the speaker sufficient information about the meaning and functioning of the units formed from them. Sometimes these lexemes – abbreviations or department stores – are idiomatized; in this case, it is not enough to give equivalent phrases to understand their meaning. For example, the complex reduced word *armored sleeve* (*armored sleeve, armored sleeve*) in reality does not mean an item of clothing, as it may seem at first glance – by analogy with *an armored suit, body armor, armor,* etc. *An armored vessel* is a 'flexible structure pipeline, usually made of galvanized steel, characterized by high impact resistance and fire resistance'.

You can set the value of such lexical units only contextually. In traditional abbreviations dictionaries, the meaning of the abbreviation is usually explained through paraphrase. The idiomatic nature of abbreviations and their equivalent phrases justifies the need to give abbreviated units instead of paraphrases a full interpretation of lexical meaning. On the other hand, a full interpretation of a complex word is impossible without taking into account all the phrases corresponding to it. Often abbreviations are equivalent not to one, but to several phrases: they form not a predictable abbreviation pair, as most dictionaries imagine, but an equivalence nest [118, p. 75]. Similar nests of equivalence are described in the now being created "Explanatory Dictionary of Complex Words of the Russian Language" edited by V. I. Terkulov.

This dictionary is intended as a multi-volume edition. Its dictionary includes about 70 thousand nominative units and about 600 abbreviation groups, that is, groups of words that have the same prepositive abbreviated component (*auto*, *electro*, *avia*, etc. d.). For the first time in the history of linguistics, complex words – common nouns and nouns – became the object of description in the dictionary. Dictionary entries are compiled on the basis of synchronous interpretation and synchronous analysis of abbreviations. The dictionary gives all frequency equivalents of complex words found in the texts. It provides an interpretation of the meanings of complex words, gives their phonetic and grammatical characteristics. The dictionary also presents synonyms of complex words. Dictionary entries end with a list of otabreviature derivatives [118, p. 77]. The dictionary uses a system of reference points representing the quantitative characteristic of the abbreviation and equivalent phrases. Reference points from 1 to 0.001 show cases when the abbreviation is used less often than the phrase. To indicate this block, use the ◄ sign. Reference points from 1.1 to 500 show cases when the abbreviation is used more often than the phrase. To indicate this block, the sign ► [14, s is used. 73].

The dictionary entry consists of the following blocks:

an interpretation block;

a block of text equivalents;

lexical equivalents block;

block of otabbreviature derivatives.

Àvtoparkóvka, ***-i***, zh. The enterprise that protects *cars* in temporary parking lots, such a parking lot itself ◄ 1: *car parking, car parking* ► 10: *parking for a car, car parking, car parking, parking for cars, parking for cars, parking for cars*; 20: *car parking, parking for vehicles*; 40: *car parking, car parking*; 90: *parking for motor vehicles*; 200: *parking for a car* ● *a car garage, a car park, a parking lot, a garage, parking, parking, a ✶parking lot*.

The juxtaposition of abbreviation dictionaries leads to the conclusion that the lexicographers' field of view is extended over time; various thematic and translation

dictionaries appear, but complex words and abbreviations in them are described still through paraphrase. In the lexicographic tradition, descriptions of initial abbreviations prevail, while complex words are practically not considered by the compilers of abbreviations dictionaries, who explain this by the fact that "such words are usually easily understood and do not need to be deciphered" [147, p. 12]. However, the idiomatic nature of abbreviations and their equivalent phrases, on the one hand, and the possibility of heterogeneous decoding of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation, on the other hand, justify the need to give the described units a full interpretation of the lexical meaning. A significant limitation in the lexicographic description of abbreviations is the predominantly diachronous nature of such descriptions, which assumes only one phrase as equivalent to the abbreviation. However, this approach is less informative for a native speaker, who "is more important than what makes a word containing an abbroconstruction, but what the meaning of this word is, what words and phrases he can use as equivalents of an abbreviation in the text, how the meaning of the abbreviation changes depending on the meaning of the phrase associated with it" [147, p. 13].

2.2. Synchronous abbreviation: the concept of an equivalence socket and a decryptive stimulus

The description and multi-purpose analysis of complex reduced words in relation to equivalent phrases carried out by the Experimental Laboratory for Research of Abbreviations Trends (hereinafter referred to as the Laboratory) substantiate the distinction between diachronous and synchronous approaches to the study of abbreviations. **Diachron analysis** involves the etymologization of the abbreviation, that is, the establishment of the derivational status of the derivative between the abbreviation and the corresponding phrase (s). See [113, p. 14] for details on the diachronous approach. Created by the Laboratory team, the Tolkovo-equivalent dictionary of complex reduced words of the Russian language (hereinafter referred to as the Dictionary) uses a toolkit of a mainly **synchronous**

approach to abbreviation, which is necessary to identify a complex reduced word and all textual syntactic equivalents formally related to it – regardless of the relationship of production between them [113, p. 15].

Textual equivalence implies coexistence in the texts of abbreviations and collocations (collocations), derivationally related to it and capable of replacing it as an absolute synonym [119, p. 36]. Cf., for example, the complex words *household*, *electrical supplies*, *veloshel* and their textual syntactic equivalents *economic block*, *power supplies*, *helmet for a cyclist*. **The abbreviation constructs** (abbreviated components of the abbreviation) *of khoz*, *electro*, led are perceived on a synchronous slice of the language as equivalent to the words *economic*, *electric power*, *cyclist*, while the non-reduced components of abbreviations and phrases coincide entirely. All complex reduced words with the identical abbreviation construct (*astrogorodok*, *astropribor*, *astroznak* and sub.) Form **an abbreviation group** (*astro*).

Synchronous analysis of texts convinces that one complex word often corresponds to several equivalent phrases that make up the **equivalent socket of** the abbreviation [116, p. 9]. The latter is the object of the lexicographic description of the above Dictionary. For example, the abbreviation *electrical supply* (the 2,100 of use in the Google search engine in these units) finds in the texts such syntactic correlates as electricity *supplies* (402,000 use...), *electricity supplies* (128,000 use...), electricity supplies (120,000 use...), *electric* supplies (5,480 *use...), electric supplies* (56 use...). Thus, the equivalence socket of the electrical supply abbreviation consists of five text equivalents with different degrees of frequency, different morphological, onomasiological and semantic characteristics.

Comparative analysis of equivalence nests allows us to argue that: a) multiple interpretation of one abbreviation contributes to the concretization of various semantic and grammatical meanings that are updated and differently priority in each text; b) for the formation of syntactic correlates of the abbreviation, there are regular stereotypical decryption models called **decryption stimuli** [19, p. 12]. Thus, decryptive stimuli, *a car accident*, *a motor vehicle accident* and *a road accident*,

acting as syntactic substitutes for the abbreviation *auto accident*, actualize a different meaning stimulated by the semantics of the text: a bus is considered a motor vehicle, but not a car, and this stimulates the use of the equivalent *of a motor vehicle accident* in the event of a bus collision, while a car accident can be described as both *a motor vehicle accident* and a *car accident*. However, in the event of a collision of cars in the forest or in the field, a decryption stimulus *road accident* is de-identified. Wed. also text equivalents of a complex reduced word *with a veloshlem*, which implement various grammatical semantics: *a cyclist's helmet* – after, *a helmet for a cyclist* – destination; *helmet for bicycle* – unit part, *helmet for bicycles* – plural part; *bicycle helmet* – pass, *bicycle helmet, helmet to bicycle* – destination, *helmet to bicycle* – locative. It is fundamental that the decryption stimulus *bicycle helmet* accumulates the total value of the listed equivalents.

Comparative analysis of decryptive stimuli draws attention to those that are structurally more complex than the abbreviation and some of its correlates inside the equivalence nest. For example, the complex reduced word *aircraft exhibition*, in addition to the structurally adequate equivalents of the *aviation exhibition* and *aviation exhibition*, is also decrypted using the phrase *aircraft exhibition*, which is structurally and semantically more complex than the abbreviation and its first two equivalents, since it includes a component *of technology that* is absent in the structure of the complex reduced word. Wed. also the above mentioned correspondences, the last element of which is formally and semantically distributed: *electrical supplies – electricity supplies – **electricity*** supplies; *veloshlem – bicycle helmet – helmet for **cycling***; *car accident – car accident – **motor vehicle** accident*.

These facts convince to distinguish decryption stimuli on the principle of their complication (structural, semantic, grammatical) in relation to the abbreviation. First of all, it is customary for the Laboratory team **to distinguish between presentative decryptive stimuli**, including the onomasiological basis and the onomasiological [trait] grammatically subordinated to it1, expressed adjectively (abstract value, zero degree of interpretation, interpretive equality to **the abbreviation), and interpretive**

decryptive stimuli capable of having two types of structure: a) onomasiological basis, onomasiological trait 2 and onomasiological trait subordinated to it1 (possibility of trait 3); b) onomasiological basis and grammatically subordinate onomasiological trait1 expressed by a syntactic actant with case-numeric semantics (sometimes with a preposition) [21, p. 410].

Thus, the presentative decryptive stimulus of the abbreviation *auto accessory* is the phrase *automotive accessories*, in which *accessories* are an onomasiological basis, *automotive* – grammatically subordinate to the basis (by agreement) onomasiological indicia1. The interpretive decryptive stimulus of the same complex reduced word for the first model is the phrase *accessories for autotuning*, in which *accessories* are an onomasiological basis, *auto* (*automobile*) is an onomasiological trait 1, grammatically (morphemically or by means of coordination) subordinate to the onomasiological trait 2 *of tuning*. Interpretive decryptive stimuli of the same abbreviation for the second model are the phrases *car accessories, accessories for a car, accessories for a car, accessories for cars*, in which *accessories* are an onomasiological basis, and *a car, for a car, for a car, for cars* – grammatically (by controlling) subordinate to the basis of onomasiological features 1, expressed substantive forms with case-numerical semantics and (except for the first case) with prepositions.

Distributive analysis of texts reveals at least 10 formal-structural models of decryptive stimuli, however, from a semantic-onomasiological point of view, the following typology seems to be the most complete at the moment. Presentative decryptive stimuli, the onomasiological feature of which is usually expressed by a relative adjective and carries out the most abstract reference, are divided into **presentative ones themselves** (according to V. I. Terkulov, "semantically the most predictable and justified generalized stereotypes of unmarked decryption of abbrokonstruct") and **included-simulated** decryptive stimuli, semantically unjustifiably used due to the possibility of a dual "paronymic" interpretation of the abbreviation construct. For example, the actual presentative decryptive stimuli of

the abbreviations *bandit group, material bag, branch are* the phrases *bandit group, clothing bag, veterinarian,* according to regular models and directly implementing the semantics of complex reduced words.

About simulated abbreviation constructs (i.e. those that can have two interpretations at the same time), see in detail in [18]. To characterize the decryptive stimuli under consideration, one should mention two main types of simulants – **absolute**, the twofold interpretation of which corresponds to the existence in reality of two different referents and serves for their nomination, and **included**, the dual interpretation of which reflects "the interpenetration of the features of two equivalents of the abbreviation construct and their mixing within the interpretation of **one** (highlighted by us. – A. B.) referent "[18, pp. 48–49].

For example, an absolute simult interpretation is noted for the complex words *of the electric guitar* (*electric guitar, electronic guitar*), *fountain pen* (*automatic pen, car pen*), *astroprognosis* (*astronomical forecast, astrological forecast*), *electric rod* (*electronic fishing rod, electric fishing rod*), *diftok* (*differential current, diffusion current*), *automaking* (*automotive production, automated production*), *storage (oil storage, oil storage*). Each pair of text equivalents of the abbreviation denotes two different referents: for example, *automotive production* is the manufacture of cars, and *automated production* – containing automatic mechanisms, but functioning with the participation of a human operator; *electric guitar* – a device that converts vibrations of metal strings into oscillations of electric current, and *electronic guitar* – a digital device with a built-in polyphonic synthesizer and a multi-touch touch screen; *oil storage* is a place for storing oil, and *oil products storage* is a place for storing fuel (gasoline, diesel fuel, kerosene, etc.), lubricants, electrical insulating media, solvents, petrochemical raw materials, etc.

The included simulants are, for example, *electrical cigarette* abbreviations (*electronic cigarette, electric cigarette*), *subscription fee* (*subscription fee, subscription fee*), *differential* charge (*differential offset, differential offset*), *electric collar* (*electric collar, electronic collar*), *electric music* (*electronic music, electric*

music), *electric lighter* (*electronic lighter*, *electric lighter*), **both** equivalent phrases of which serve for the nomination **of one** referent – in contrast to the absolute simulator, **each** of the syntactic correlates of which, while maintaining textual equivalence with an abbreviation, is semantically and ontologically justified. Thus, such complex words, which for various reasons can be interpreted in two ways in the text, make up a group of on-simulated decryption stimuli, which, along with the presentative ones themselves, form a class **of presentative decryption stimuli**. The latter differ in generalizability, qualification of semantics expressed by a relative adjective.

Interpretive **decryptive stimuli** include, firstly, phrases equivalent to the abbreviation, formally more complex than the abbreviation, that is, they include an additional onomasiological feature that is absent in the structure of a complex reduced word (*aircraft exhibition – exhibition **of aircraft equipment***). Such decryptive stimuli are called **modifiable interpretative** [17, p. 101]. Secondly, these are the text equivalents of the abbreviation, formally equal to it, that is, coinciding in the number of onomasiological signs, however, expressed in substantive and prepositional forms capable of updating the grammatical values of the number and case (*motor parts – spare parts for motorcycles – spare parts for motorcycles – spare parts for motorcycles – spare parts for motorcycles – spare parts* for motorcycles – spare parts for motorcycles – *spare parts for motorcycles*). Such decryptive stimuli are called **relative**, and depending on whether they express the value of the case or number, they are called **actant relative** and **actant numeric**.

2.3. Simulated decryptive stimulus

During the description of the abbreviation group (AG) with the ***electro*** component, the possibility of dual interpretation of the abbroconstructure (AC) of its units was discovered, due to the presence in the language of two correlates of this AC – ***electrical*** and ***electronic***. For example, AK ***electro*** as part of the compound reduced word (CCC) can act as an equivalent of both the word ***electric and the word***

electronic, since ***the electric rod*** is both **an electronic rod** "a battery-powered device for giving the mormash oscillating movements in the water column," and **an electric rod** "a device for poaching fish with electricity."

An important feature that allows us to identify and determine this phenomenon is **the simultaneous relevance** of syntactic correlates *(electrical* and *electronic)* in the interpretation of AC. To describe this **simultaneous dual** equivalence, we proposed the concept **of a simultant**[1], and the purpose of the proposed article is to describe simulated abbroconstructs and CCCs of the "electro" group. The description involves a comparative analysis of related linguistic concepts, which determines the autonomy of the proposed approach, the establishment of the causes and features of simulant equivalence, its types and classes, and a description of the methodology for determining simulants. This approach allows a more differentiated and structural representation of the equivalence nest (SE), which makes up the ideological base of the "Explanatory-Word-Forming Dictionary of the Russian Language" (hereinafter referred to as the Dictionary), to substantiate the concept **of pseudo-univerbalization** put forward earlier [20] – the situation of expanding the phrase from CCC. The information obtained also allows us to clarify the terminology used in the dictionary entry, to supplement and specify the traditional concepts of abbreviation theory.

The CCC equivalence issue is somewhat illuminated (see, for example, [2], [13]). However, the works of V. I. Terkulov devoted to the description **of the textual equivalence (TE)** of the complex reduced word [112] and the nest of equivalence regulated by it [110] have greater ideological and **theoretical significance for the considered problem of** symbolism. Thus, V. I. Terkulov notes that "contrary to the practice of traditional Dictionaries of complex reduced words, in which usually one phrase is given as the equivalent of the abbreviation <... >, we found a textual multiplicity of such equivalents" [110, p. 12]. Using the example of AG "electro" we will demonstrate this by means of ***CCC*** electrical supply, in which the following

[1]< lat. Simultaneus, Fr. simultané – "**simultaneous**." This feature is the basis of the nomination, since it is relevant for the proposed term and serves to distinguish the simultant from related concepts.

correlates were found: electricity supplies, electricity supplies, electricity supplies, electrical supplies. A similar multiplicity of equivalents gives V. I. Terkulov grounds to conclude about the existence of GE, which the author defines as "a collection of units with CCC in textual equivalence relations" [110]. The latter means the possibility of interchanging in the text with a complex word of its syntactic equivalent – and vice versa.

The idea of TE serves as the basis for the isolation of simulants, however, the volumes of the concepts **of "GE component**" and **"equivalent of simulant AC"** are not the same[2]. The multiplicity of correlates within the GE is directed, rather, to the **plan of expression** – a certain set of language (more precisely, speech) characters serving to express **one** concept (cf. all equivalents of CCC *electrical supply*, which are contextually and referentially equal to each other and the main word). This is also confirmed by **the synonymous potency of** units of one GE that are capable of textual interchangeability. T. o., in the alterations of one GE, apparently, we can talk about formal (or speech) multiplicity.

Equivalents of simultane AC, on the contrary, appeal to the **containment plan**: replacing one of them with another (for example, ***an electric*** electronic one in the context of interpreting the CCC ***electric rod***) is denotatively unequal, although this serves to isolate the simultant. The shift in emphasis from the formal side (GE component) to the substantive (simultant) is also confirmed by such a detected consequence of simultant equivalence as **semantic attraction**. The latter consists in the approximation of the values of equivalents *electric* and *electronic* and, therefore, formalizes their correlation. However, the very fact of such a convergence assumes **the original semantic non-identity of** equivalents, which is not found in non-symmetric units of one GE. Apparently, a simulated AK, unlike GE, reflects semantic (or linguistic) multiplicity or its imitation.

So, equivalents of the simult AK, simultaneously relevant with the so-called. interpretations, but having non-identical semantics, should be delimited from the

[2]Further comparative analysis is valid only for the studied AG "electro" and its type of simular equivalence. During the subsequent development, clarifications are possible – depending on the types identified.

non-symmetric units **of one** GE, which has only nominally different correlates. [3]It is important, however, to clarify that the syntactic equivalents of the simultant – depending on its type – belong to one or two equivalence sockets. However, this does not introduce contradictions: the correlates of the simultant included in one GE are based on the **semantic multiplicity of** AK values (which is not characteristic of nest units). This is confirmed, for example, by the quantitative predominance of derivationally and nominally primary variants, which reflects that original semantic non-identity leveled by the semantic attraction.

For example, a simulant ***plug*** has the equivalents ***of an electric lighter*** and ***an electronic lighter***, which are included in **one GE** – according to the type of simulant (see below classification of simulants). In the text, the quantitative ratio of these two correlates may be different (with the predominance of one of them or equal), however, the total percentage of lexemic occurrence in all texts will be higher for the source word – derivationally and nominally the primary equivalent. So, for the selected CCC, we have installed the following word-forming circuit: ***electronic lighter*** > ***electric lighter*** > ***electric lighter***[4]. The last syntactic equivalent is less common than the first (12000 / 107000 in Google.ru on the 26.03.2016). In other words, the GE interprets differently the **form of** its unbalanced components, while the equivalents of the simult AC, sometimes included in one GE (if in the conceptual identity field), interpret **semantics** through the form.

Considering the previously simultant (AK *electro*) in the semantic attraction mode, we determined that its ambiguity is formed as a parallel equivalence to different source words[5]. N. A. Pugieva, among the sources of word-forming polysemia, [6]refers to **polycorrelativity**, which reflects "the fact of polysemia of a

[3]In other words, within one GE, one denotate **is referenced by two** or **more** only nominally different components. For example, units ***of an electric bus, an electric bus*** and ***an electric bus*** denote one concept in three nominally different ways, being components of the GE.

[4]The word-forming pair *of electric lighters* > *electric lighter* confirms the idea **of pseudouniverbalization**. Wed: *electric cigarette* > *electric cigarette; electric welder* > *electric welder*.

[5]But AK *(electro-)* as part of the CCC *(electric market)* is not always the equivalent of a source word *(electric* or *electronic),* sometimes it, acting as a morpheme, joins the word directly.

[6]We doubt the fairness of classifying these units as **polysemia**, especially since this phenomenon was previously described in the framework **of word-formation homonymy**. However, due to the limited scope of the article, we will leave the former, author's, name solely for methodological purposes.

derived word, which arises as a result of the correlation of different lexical meanings of the derivative with different (usually single-root) producers" [80, p. 133]. For example, the verbal noun ***is transplanted*** in the first three meanings – "Plant in another place," "Digging (plant), plant in another place," "Plant, put on something. another "- correlates with the verb ***to transplant*** *(Transplant of tissues and organs)*, and in the fourth -" Go to continue the trip from one mode of transport to another "- ***transfer*** *with the verb (Go without transfer)*.

Simult AK *electro*, despite similarities with polycorrelate (a multi-valued derivative, the semems of which relate to different single-root producing/source words), has a number of fundamental differences from it. First, the polycorrelate is more **discrete** than the simultant, in both grammatical and semantic relationships. **Grammatically**, the values of the derivative may differ, for example, in the nature of the nominal control (stimulated by the verb transition of the producer): *transplantation of plants, hearts*, but *transplantation to 77 buses*, while the simulated AK does not affect the grammatical distribution of CCC. **The semantic syncreticity of** the simultant is confirmed by **the simultaneous relevance of** its equivalents in the interpretation, which explains **the semantic attraction** of ***correlates electric*** and ***electronic***. In reality, this means that in the process of decoding the AK, **ambiguity** arises, which a) complicates the unambiguous interpretation (*electrosigaret* – one referent), b) makes it impossible (*electric rod* – two different referents). The context eliminates the ambiguity of polycorrelate. Secondly, polycorrelate directly demonstrates the derivational dependence **of** *content on form (the semantics of a derived word on the "form" of the producing), which is easily determined, for example, in a syntactic context (No change can be made).* Simultant (and more broadly – CCC), we repeat, does not have analytical means for such delimitation, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, cannot clearly reflect derivational connections due to the convergence of equivalent values and the emergence of actual dual motivation. Thirdly, polycorrelativity reflects a derivational fact that does not require an actual interpretation of the derivative

through the producing, the reduction of the structure of the former to the structure of the latter, while the main problem of symbolism boils down to the interpretation of the AC. Finally, the distinction between the two concepts is also methodical in nature, since they operate with various signs: complete and abbreviated [15, p. 492].

An abbreviation group (AG) is a collection of complex reduced words combined by an identical AK (for example, ***electro***, ***auto, nefte)***. In other words, AK, joining certain words (abbromorphema) or being the abbreviated equivalent of a word within the CCC (abbroequivalent), forms an AG from their number. The abbo group "electro" has several more than 200 processed units – various in terms of equivalence types, structure, position of AK, derivational nature, relation to symbolism. Thus, the structural difference consists, for example, in the delimitation of CCC with an adjective prototype of the structure *(power plant* < ***electric*** *station)* and substantive *(electrical supply* < ***electricity*** *supply)*. Three AK positions were allocated for the CCC: preposition (*electric motor*), interposition (*city electric network, hydroelectric power station*) and post-position (collective ***farm***) irrelevant for this AG. With regard to interposition, which is a modified preposition, we hypothesized about its weakened reference – based on experimental data [77, p. 83]. In the presented AG, only full words are connected with AK *electro, without truncating the basis (cf.: manager, military correspondent, battalion commander, Ministry of Finance)*. Based on the fact of the existence of AG, we will characterize AK *electro* as regular (cf.: *pig farm, cheese factory, semfond, ship performer, sobes, symphojaz)*, which contributes to the development of linguistic analogy and symbolism.

We refer **to the reasons for the simulated equivalence of a word and a phrase, firstly, decryptive stimuli** – background knowledge, which stimulate the possibility of a different interpretation of CCC. The survey results (see the methodology for determining simultants) demonstrate an undifferentiated idea of the difference between the concepts of "electric" and "electronic." As a rule, electrical devices include those that work directly from electricity, cannot function

remotely from it and are not difficult to arrange. For example, ***an electric kettle*** or ***an electric drill***. Electronic devices are usually considered with a more complex device, which allows, in particular, to work without direct electric power (for example, from a battery) and have a wider functionality. [7]Often, when characterizing electronic devices, the mandatory presence of chips in them is mentioned[8]. For example, ***electronic watches*** or ***electronic automation***. However, the *electro* component can indicate not only the type of power supply *(electric scooter* – from the mains), but also the principle of operation (the use of electricity in a device indicated by an uncorrected word as a stimulator: *an electric collar*). But the electric collar works on batteries and is controlled by a remote control, that is, it is difficult to arrange. T.O., there is interpenetration of features within the interpretation of one referent. The decryption stimulus may be based on the contradiction of the everyday knowledge created by the language and the scientific knowledge existing in the register of physical terms. Important in the interpretation of the simulated AK, which can also be concluded from the results of the survey, is the ratio of the frequency of use of CCC and the equivalent phrase. So, if the phrase (for example, *an electronic cigarette*) prevails quantitatively (V. I. Terkulov called it a "developing abbreviation" [106, p. 102]), that is, it is used with **one of the equivalents of AK in full form**, then this apparently stimulates the corresponding interpretation (by means of the equivalent*) of the electronic* CCC *(electric cigarette)*. Among decryptive stimuli, we distinguish between formal ones, which serve to coagulate the unsymulated components of the GE *(electric bus – electric bus –* **electric** bus), and **semantic ones**, which distinguish between equivalents of simulated AKs *(electronic guitar – electric guitar)*. A decryptive stimulus exists at the idiolect level.

The second reason for simulant equivalence is **the objective (extralinguistic) duality** of the object denoted by an uncorrected word, expressed in language by two different equivalents (*electric, electronic; automatic, automobile)* of one AC *(**electrical; auto-***). See above example with CCC ***electric rod***. For example, in

[7]http: // www.bolshoyvopros.ru/questions/80989-v-chem-otlichie-elektronnogo-pribora-ot-elektricheskogo.html
[8]http: // forum.lingvo.ru/actualthread.aspx?tid=93969

reality, there are two objects at the same time, for example, **an electronic guitar** "a digital device with a built-in polyphonic synthesizer and a multi-touch screen" and a more traditional **electric guitar** "a device with electromagnetic pickups that convert vibrations of metal strings into vibrations of electric current" – in this case, it is absolutely justified that they, not being identical in reality, are differently indicated in the language. T.O., the second reason is associated with the objective existence of **two referents** and is separated from the idiolect.

On the material of AG "electro," we distinguish **three main types** of simultants that are in direct dependence on the established causes of simult equivalence. The most indicative reflects the essence of the proposed concept **of an absolute symultant** – a homonymous AK, the twofold interpretation of which is parallel to the extralinguistic, denotative duality of the object denoted by a complex word. Wed. the words *electric rod, electric guitar*, the AK of which acts as a single-root hyperonym in relation to its source words. Among the absolute simultants is AK in the word electrodiagnosis: on the one hand, it is "the use **of electricity** to study the functional state or capabilities of organs and systems," and on ***the*** **other, "checking the electronic** systems of a car in order to identify and prevent malfunctions." The absolute simultant is associated with the existence of two referents, that is, with semantic (language) multiplicity.

The second type of simultant – **included** – reflects interpenetration of the features of two equivalents of AC *(electronic and electric)* and their mixing within the interpretation of **one referent**. Wed. A CCC *electric collar, an electric adapter, an electric igniter,* which have a primary nominative-derivational equivalent *electronic,* but during deployment they obtain and correlate *electric*, and the word *electric* music, derivationally correlating with the electronic adjective, but sometimes interpreted through the electrical equivalent **created**. This type of simultant is not related to the existence of two referents, but is characterized by imitation of semantic multiplicity, acting as the main source of pseudouniverbalization as a derivational modeling of language reality. The included

simultants have a chain (based on the "introduction" of a new decryption stimulus) formation of pseudouniverbate, while the absolute ones are characterized by the parallel formation of homonyms.

The **third type** of simultants does not include AK, but complex reduced words in their entirety, the non-reduced component of which acts as a hyperonym. For example, a CCC *electrical appliance*. The electric kettle is an electric device *(> electrical device),* the electronic cigarette is an electronic *device (> electrical device)*. So, it is impossible to unambiguously interpret the CCC *electrical device, since there are both electrical and electronic devices. However, this CCC can hardly be attributed to absolute simulants: it does not have formally* related correlates-hyponyms (in other words, it is impossible to deploy a CCC *electrical appliance into an electric kettle* or *an electric cigarette*). On this basis, we refer such examples to **isolated simultants** (working term). Wed: *electrical device, electrical element, electrical tool, electrical device, electrical equipment, electrical circuit, electrical installation.* It is possible that the *use of isolated simultant a) is situationally weakened (an electrical appliance* for designating both an electric kettle and an electronic cigarette), b) is situationally marked (*an electrical appliance* for designating an electric kettle).

Three of the listed types of simultants – absolute, included and isolated – we classify into **a structural-semantic class**. We distinguish two classes of simulants. **A structure semantic class** implements two or more expression plans and as many content plans. It includes, for example, AK *electro-* and *auto-*, since their equivalents differ in both structure and semantics. **The structure class** provides for one content plan and two or more expression plans. For example, *the head of the department* and *the head of the department*, which exist in parallel and have no semantic differences. However, the structure class may also include CCC with AK *electro*: cf., for example, *an electric car* (*electric car, electric car); electric bus (electric bus, electric bus); electrical supply.* Based on the two selected classes, we can also assume the existence of a third – **semantic**, which may consist in the presence of

one expression plan and two or more content plans. For this, apparently, the equivalents of AK should be homonym words, which will later undergo semantic attraction. The latter in relation to AG *electro* is confirmed by the results of a survey conducted on a social network.

Table 1

CCC	**Number of votes: *electric***	**Number of votes: *electronic***
electric rod	25	23
electric burner	30	18
electrical reconnaissance	16	37
electric guitar	30	20
electrodiagnosis	9	39
electro-music	7	44
electric collar	31	22

So, the structural-semantic class of simultants, including AG *electro*, differs from GE units in semantic multiplicity, and from polycorrelate in semantic, derivational and grammatical syncreticity and dynamic correlation. Causes of simult equivalence: decryption stimuli, objective symbolism. The classes of simulants are structural-semantic, structural, and (potentially) semantic. Types of simulants within the structural-semantic class: absolute, included, isolated. Conflicting survey results support our findings about simultant and semantic attraction.

The idea of symbolism as **a simultaneous ambiguous** interpretation of AK is easily extrapolated to the idea of decryptive stimuli, which are inherently text-functional adaptations of meaning. ET – a variant included in the system (GE) of the same variants of text decryption of the invariant (abbreviation). ***The electrical*** and ***electronic***, ***automatic***, ***automotive*** and ***automated*** simulants are the same options that implement ***the electrical*** and ***auto*** invariants. An important (and etymological) sign of the simultant is precisely the concurrency of several options, that is, the

possibility of alternating use of the latter in conditions of the same text distribution. This most closely relates to the peer-to-peer characteristic alternation. Wed.: ***Electronic*** *cigarette* – ***electric*** *cigarette (electric cigarette)* and *electric car* – *electric car* ***(****electric car).* These examples combine, on the one hand, lexical (absolute symbolism), and on the other, metonymic characteristics of variation. Wed. examples with grammatical variation (structural class of simulants): ***an electric*** *stove* – an ***electric*** *stove* and *a car with an electric motor* – a *car* ***on*** *an electric motor* (*an electric car).* However, the principle of symbolism, concluded in the simultaneously relevant equivalent potency, is much broader applicable to DS in general and IDT in particular. The representation of the simulator allows you to assign the status of equivalents to all text embodiments of the abbreviation (derivationally associated with it) – both constituting a presentation base with the latter, and being an IDT of different ranks. Symbolism retains the status of a member of equivalent relationships with respect to the abbreviation for the IDT, since the criterion of simultaneous relevance recognizes IDS2 as no less alternative than a presentative decryptive stimulus.

2.4. Decryptive stimulus: structural-onomasiological analysis

Work on the "Tolkovo-equivalent dictionary of complex reduced words of the Russian language" (hereinafter referred to as the Dictionary), now being created by the Experimental Laboratory for the Study of Abbreviation Trends (ELITA) at the Department of Russian Language, DonNU, involves a multi-level analysis of complex reduced words (CCC). The initial basis for each of the laboratory development areas is **the abbreviation group (AG)** – "a set of complex reduced words combined by the identical AK (abbreviation construct, for example***, astro-, electro-, auto-***. – A. B.) "[18, p. 46]. Preventive analysis of AG allows you to determine whether the equivalents of its AK constitute one core (onomasiological and semantic unity) or not. For example, AK ***electric****,* in addition to equivalents ***of electric*** *(****electric kettle*** *–* ***electric*** *kettle),* ***electricity*** *(****electrical supplies*** *– electricity*

supplies), forming one core, also includes equivalents ***of electronic*** *(****electric cigarette – electronic*** *cigarette),* ***electronics*** *(****electric market – electronics*** *market*), acting as units of the second core. We call such an AG **binuclear**. AG ***cycling***, the AC of which is sold only in the equivalents ***of cycling*** *(****cycling*** *–* ***cycling), bicycle (bicycle camera*** *–* ***bicycle camera), cyclist*** *(cycling –* ***cyclist's*** helmet), is defined by us as **single-core**. Delimitation on this feature, preceding a holistic, multidirectional description of the CCC, is due to the specifics of the analysis (for example, the definition of equivalent terminals for CCC in quantivative analysis).

The specificity of the Dictionary provides for a synchronistic approach to the description of CCC: several types of interpretation (lexical meaning, synonyms, antonyms, hyperonyms), description of CCC equivalents, clarification of the prescriptive features of the abbreviation, and this makes it necessary to describe the foundations of synchronous-equivalent analysis of CCC. The synchronic description of CCC uses the concept **of an equivalence socket (GE)**, which is defined as "a collection of units that are with CCC in textual equivalence relations (hereinafter TE)" [107]. For example, the GE ***astrogorodok*** includes such correlates as ***an astronomical town, a town of astronomers, a town for astronomers, an astrophysical town, a city of astronomers, a city for astronomers***.

The isolation of GE actually means that AK within one CCC can have not one, but several syntactic equivalents (which, however, was noted earlier [109]), and this, in turn, suggests the existence of regular stereotypical models for the formation of such equivalents. We call such models **decryptive stimuli (DS) – stereotypes of decoding AK**. Thus, GE is a collection of ET implementations of one CCC. Here are some examples of ET: ***astrogorodok*** – ET [destination + object] – ***astronomical town***, ***wiring*** – ET [destination + object] – ***electrical wiring; astrodietes*** – DS [mediative + object] – ***astrological diet***, ***electric machine*** – DS [mediative + object] – ***electric machine; astrogorodok*** – DS [object + possessing] – ***the town of astronomers***, ***veloshlem*** – DS [object + possessing] – ***the cyclist's helmet***. Thus, DS is an invariant that is realized mainly by stereotypical models, but it can also reflect

irregular features that are specified in the syntactic equivalent (cf.: ***astrophysical town***[9]).

DS is one of the options for interpreting a complex reduced unit, and depending on how the formed syntactic equivalent relates to CCC: it strictly reproduces or complicates its structure, "calculates" or modifies its semantics – we propose to distinguish two types of DS according to the result of its implementation in the text equivalent – absolute (**presentation**) and clarifying (**interpretation**). For example, ***an electric soldering iron (~ electric soldering iron)*** and ***an astronomical device (~ astroprabor)*** are, in our opinion, classic presentations, since they implement the regular model "^{adl1ed} (< AK) + ex1ed," although their decryptive stimuli are not the same: electric soldering iron – DS [mediative + object] – ***electric*** soldering iron; astroprabor – DS [destination + object] – ***astronomical*** instrument. So, the interpretive is a type of DS that structurally and semantically complicates the original unit (CCC). Examples of interpretations: an ***electric-powered razor/electric-powered razor/electric-powered razor < electric shaver; astrophysical town/astronomer town < astrogorodok.***

The need to distinguish between the two distinguished types of DS is dictated by the fact that the CCC equivalents encountered in the texts may be limited to the latter (modifying their structure or simplifying it) or not at all. Traditionally, such units are not considered when describing the CCC, although synchronous (otherwise equivalent) analysis, in our opinion, quite pretends to be included in the field of consideration, since the interpretatives are directly related to the DS (act as equivalents of the CCC in the text) and can provide analysis with additional models of the DS. For example, the CCC equivalents ***of an electric bus/electric bus*** are an electric ***bus/electric bus.*** The latter two are formally and semantically more complex than CCC, however, in our opinion, cannot be excluded from the GE, since they freely become text equivalents of CCC, which are the object of a synchronous description. Note, however, that further delineation may be more difficult and this

[9]It should be noted that the reduced equivalent is of little use.

statement is only a statement of the problem, since, firstly, a more fractional list of ETs should be identified and, secondly, a methodology for delineating them should be developed.

One of the staged questions is about the status of non-original prepositions in the structure of the equivalent. For example, should *the power supply* ***be correlated by*** *means of electricity* (1430 uses per 27.10.16) by the presentation of the CCC ***power supply*** or does the non-cervical preposition modify the value and structure of the original unit so that the phrase should be attributed to the number of interpretations?

The problem of binuclear AH and the existence of DS as a possibility of multiple interpretation of AK within GE is closely related to the previously distinguished concept **of simultant**, justifying the "simultaneous dual equivalence" of AK [10][18, p. 41]. We noted above that for the interpretation of one CCC, many equivalents can arise – through stereotypical models (DS). Despite the fact that the study of our team is descriptive in nature, we highlight several reasons (or, possibly, ways) for the occurrence of the indicated multiple equivalence (or symbolism). However, it should first be noted that by highlighting the ET as one of several possible syntactic implementations of CCC within the GE, it should probably be recognized that each of such implementations is **a concretization of a certain meaning** (semantic, grammatical, relational).

The first cause (or method) of simulated equivalence is **functional-grammatical coagulation**, which implies the occurrence of two or more DS in connection with the clarification of the significance of one of the CCC accents (se). For example, the CCC ***astrogorodok*** can be interpreted as ***an astronomical town*** and ***a town of astronomers***. Despite the fact that these equivalents are single-core and make up one nominee (field of conceptual identity [112]), their ETs are different: ***the astronomical town*** is DS [destination + object], the ***town of astronomers*** is DS [object + possessing]. From an onomasiological point of view,

[10]However, cases of dual interpretation of the word itself were found***: head of the*** department > ***head of the department*** and ***head of the department***.

such a correlation is presented as a privative opposition to unmarked ***(astronomical town)*** and marked ***(astronomer town***) elements. Textual analysis confirms the accent-situational infinity of each of the correlates, namely, it gives reason to conclude at least two basic values of the CCC ***astrogorodok***: 1) "Observatory in which research activities are actively carried out"; 2) "Excursion and tourist site equipped with astronomical instruments (often outdated), museum." It is noteworthy that the first value is more often realized in the equivalent ***of the town of astronomers***: *In the evening, if the weather is clear, we will go to the* ***town of astronomers****, to the famous astrophysicist and founder of the Astroturist project Sergei Nazarov*; *By the time the first satellite was launched into space in 1957, a whole* ***town of astronomers*** *with unique stellar and solar telescopes had already grown here in the village of Scientific, at that time – one of the best in the world* (http: // www.evpatori.ru/krymskij-nauchnyj-centr-rossijskoj-akademii-nauk.html). The second value is represented by the equivalent ***of an astronomical town***: *Near Bakhchisaray there is the village of Scientific, this is* ***an astronomical town****, there are night (or rather late-evening) tours of telescopes, talk about stars and give a look at them*. Our reasoning indirectly confirms the significance of the equivalent ***town for astronomers****,* in which even greater accent-grammatical coagulation occurs*: A huge role in the creation of the astrophysical complex was played by the president of the Academy of Sciences of the Azerbaijan SSR, petrochemical scientist Yusif Mammadaliev, after whom the nearby scientific* ***town for astronomers*** was named. One of the formal methods of justifying this coagulation method can be quantifying each of the equivalents at different intervals and comparing indicators that can establish the relevance of one of the accents. The shift in quantitative indicators is the fact that one ET is preferred to another. Such variation, in our opinion, does not exist by itself, but is determined by the synchronous action of so-called decryption stimuli, that is, forms that stimulate such interpretations. These are a kind of keys to the interpretation of the abbreviation, which anticipate the interpretation of the abbreviation. Such a technique will make the analysis more

directed and focused on specific equivalents. Thus, this reason (or method) of symbolic equivalence is to clarify the emphasis (sema, shade of meaning) of CCC in alterations of one concept through grammatical semantics (mainly due to prepositional and substantive-adjective variation).

The second reason (or method) is associated with **a binuclear AK**, or **an absolute simultant** – "homonymic AK, the dual interpretation of which is parallel to the extralinguistic, denotative duality of the object denoted by the complex word" [18, p. 48]. For example, CCC ***astroprognosis*** (and ***astrological forecast***, and ***astronomical forecast)***, ***astroznak*** (and ***astrological sign***, and ***astronomical sign)***, ***electric rod*** (and ***electronic rod***, and ***electric rod)*** have a double interpretation, which is associated with the reference of different objects of reality. Thus, we are talking about **semantic coagulation**, which consists in clarifying the value of AK within two different concepts (nominative) through two different nuclear equivalents.

The third reason (or method) for multiple CCC interpretation is related to the formal possibility of relational (inflective) variation of the text equivalent without any functional or semantic accentuations. For example, CCC ***zavkaf***, realized as head of the department (> ***head of the department)*** or ***head of the department*** (> ***head of the department)***, ***head teacher*** – ***head of*** the educational part/part. So, we call this reason **relational coagulation**, which is carried out only paradigmatically and does not affect semantics.

To list the causes (or methods) of symbolic equivalence, we sent the statement that DS is a fact of coagulation (concretization) of a certain meaning – accent-grammatical, semantic, relational. However, it is worth noting that such coagulation is unthinkable with respect to complex reduced words, the AA of which acts either as an **abbreviation morpheme (AM)** – "morphematized AA used outside of connection with any phrases, but only by analogy, stereotyped, directly joining the producing word in the formation of CCC" [113], as well as as as an affixoid. For example, CCC ***astroarchaeology***, ***astrobiology***, ***astrobotanics*** have a critically low equivalence potential: correlates with the adjective ***astronomical***, firstly, are the

only equivalents for them, and secondly, few. We explain this limitation of equivalence and DS by the fact that the given examples, firstly, are quasi-abbreviations that arose directly from words and do not imply derivationally preceding phrases (and, therefore, excluded from the regular equivalence field), and secondly, they are not particularly common, since the same quasi-abstract ***air ticket***, due to greater usefulness, has a greater equivalent potential, which manifests itself at least in superior quantitative use correlated ***air ticket*** (9760 uses in the 27.10.16 nominee). On the one hand, such units are very limited in the formation of stereotypical equivalents, and on the other hand, they are the **basis for the emergence of interpretations**. This is logical: behind each fact of word formation (albeit the direct attachment of abbromorphema to the word) is an extralinguistic task – in other words, the formed word is designed to call something. V. I. Terkulov notes that "double relativity becomes a factor in the formation of an associative morphemic value in AK on the basis of the subject verbal value" [114, p. 74]. This comment is easily extrapolated to the essence of the interpretations described above, which often semantically and structurally complicate the original unit. This complication is fully substantiated by the example of quasi-abbreviatures: associativity, bi-relationality of their semantics requires clarifying elements in the structure of the syntactic equivalent. For example, a CCC ***air ticket*** includes such equivalents as ***a flight ticket, an air transportation ticket*** (examples of V. I. Terkulov), which we refer to interpretations. Two more problematic questions – about the attribution to interpretations of whole proposals/structures ***(electrical installation*** > ***installation carried out by electrical appliances)*** and equivalents with synonymous replacements ***(air ticket – plane ticket)***.

In conclusion, it should be added that the multiplicity of equivalents can also be explained by the fact that CCC is not always the original unit for word production. Only in the case of quasiabbreviation, the abbreviation is the original unit (language representative of the referent), the interpretation of which may be required. In other cases, the original unit may be a concept (speculative object), the interpretation of

which is carried out freely – using any available lexical and syntactic means of the language, and only the addressee of the speech depends on whether this interpretation will take the form of a phrase, sentence or CCC. For example, **the idea** of "electrical switchboard" can be expressed in different ways: ***a switchboard*** (word), ***an electrical switchboard*** (CCC), ***an electrical switchboard*** (phrase), ***a room in which an electrical switchboard*** (sentence) is located. Priorities are determined by communication conditions.

Chapter Conclusions

1. Many studies on abbreviation, influenced by lexicographic practice, do not distinguish between the synchronous and diachronous aspects of the existence of the abbreviation, identifying the facts of real word-forming production and synchronous motivation between a complex reduced word and its corresponding phrase.

2. The synchronous approach describes equivalence relationships between an abbreviation and its corresponding phrases. It should be noted that most often not one phrase corresponds to a complex word in the texts, as stated by traditional dictionaries of abbreviations, but several. This fact justifies the need to describe the abbreviation equivalence not within the word-forming pair, but within the equivalence socket.

3. Describing a decryption stimulus system is an important task of the synchronous approach, since they are one of the few ways to semanticize an abbreviation. An urgent problem is the prediction of decryption stimuli of complex reduced words, which allows you to represent the equivalent potential of the abbreviation in the Dictionary as voluminously as possible.

4. The concept of a decryptive stimulus, which means a way to deploy an abbreviated abbreviation construct, is justified by the existence on a synchronous slice of the language of not abbreviated pairs, but equivalence nests. All decryptive

stimuli of abbreviations in terms of the degree of formal-semantic complexity are divided into presentative and interpretive.

5. Simulated decryption stimuli spread an abbroconstruction that can be interpreted in two ways. We distinguish between absolute and included simulants. By absolute we mean simultants, the use of which is justified by non-linguistic reality, where two different referents are represented, denoted by two signs of the language. The absolute symultant forms the homonymy of abbreviations. The included simulants are used when one of the predictable, but semantically unfounded decryptive stimuli is selected by the native speaker to interpret the abbreviation in the text.

3. Interpretive decryptive stimuli as a source of abbreviation equivalence socket formation

3.1. Lexical interpretive decryptive stimulus: formalization of structure

The modification interpretive decryptive stimulus of the abbreviation requires special study, since its equivalent potential with respect to a compound word is less obvious than that of presentative and relative decryptive stimuli, and poses at least two questions: whether it is formed according to regular models and in what opposition it is with the abbreviation.

Complex reduced words with one abbreviation construct, as well as their presentative and relative text equivalents, assume an onomasiological basis and a subordinate to it by coordinating or controlling the onomasiological [indicia1]. At the same time, it seems fair to say that the abbreviation and the presentative text equivalent, expressed by the adjective form with generalizing semantics, are equal to each other in terms of the degree of interpretive implementation. In other words, the abbreviation construct of a compound word expresses not critically fewer values than its attributive equivalent consistent with the main word as part of the phrase. The grammatical categories of the presentative stimulus are nonominative (the number and case are consistent with the basis of the text equivalent) and do not reflect extralinguistic characteristics, while the trait element of the relative decryptive stimulus is specialized for expressing grammatical characteristics of the number and case. Wed. *auto accessories* (generalized meaning) – *car accessories* (generalized meaning) – *car accessories* (semantics a) belonging to b) one object) – *accessories for cars* (semantics a) intended b) for many objects). The abbreviation value is specialized/distributed.

This distribution is most pronounced by a modification interpretive decryptive stimulus, understood as the fact that **the phrase of the second onomasiological feature, which reassigns the first onomasiological feature, subordinate to the basis, appears in the equivalent abbreviation**. For example, for the complex word *electric car*, in addition to presentative and relational equivalents such as an electric

car and *a car on electricity*, such decryptive stimuli were found*: a car with an electric motor/on an electric motor* (*with an electric engine/on an electric engine*); *motor vehicle/electric drive (electric drive/electric drive); powered vehicle (electrically powered); a car with an electric motor/on an electric motor (with an electric motor/on an electric motor); electric vehicle (electric); car on electric traction (on electric traction).* Also, the texts note all these onomasiological signs [2] (*engine, drive, power, motor, stroke, traction*) for the onomasiological basis *of autó*: *car with an electric motor, car on an electric drive*, etc.

Thus, the presentative equivalent including *the basis of the car* and its subordinate feature [1] *on electricity* differs from the interpretive equivalent including the same basis *of the car* to which the complex of the feature [1] *on the electric*, subordinate feature [2] *on the engine* is subordinate). Wed. also: *car instructor – car driving instructor, author's guide – car operation manual, car accessories – accessories for car tuning, car owner – owner of road transport, air base – base of aviation equipment, autofuel – fuel for road transport, car mechanic – fitter of road transport – fitter for car repair*.

Some modification interpretive equivalents allow different subordinate relationships between the first and second features. For example, in addition to the listed presentative and relational equivalents, for the abovementioned abbreviation, auto *accessories, auto tuning accessories, car tuning accessories* (control) are also noted. However, for example, for the correlate of the complex word *autofuel*, only coordinated relations are possible*: fuel for road transport*.

A comparative analysis of abbreviations (and presentative phrases) and their modification interpretive decryptive stimuli demonstrates synecdochical relations between them: the abbreviation usually relates to its modification equivalent as a hyperonym with a hyponym (*aircraft exhibition*: general *aviation exhibition*, "at which instead of or in addition to aviation equipment can be presented carrier companies, aviation services, service equipment" [115, p. 31], and a private *exhibition of aircraft equipment*). Wed. also *autofuel*: *automobile fuel* (general) –

fuel for car models (more private) – *fuel for car model engines* (most private). However, the inverse relationship is realized by the complex shortened word *car owner* (*car owner*) and its modification interpretive equivalent *vehicle owner*: the abbreviation is a hyponym in relation to the interpretive correlate, since, as mentioned above, motor vehicles, in addition to a passenger car, include buses, trucks, trailers, semi-trailers, special vehicles. This case, however, does not negate the assumption of synecdochical relations between the abbreviation (and the presentative equivalent) and its modifying interpretive realizer in the text, since such relations differ in the hyper-hyponymic load of their members.

Fundamentally, regardless of the direction of such a load, the hyponym **does not replace** the hyperonym (or vice versa), but together **forms the** structure of the modification interpretive decryptive stimulus – there is a kind of "spiral" stringing of features. The complex word *oil storage deserves* attention, the relative decryption stimulus of which – *oil storage* – is not in synecdochical relations with its modification decryption stimulus *storage of oil products*, since, as noted above, oil products are substances obtained from oil, and not oil itself, that is, completely different referents are implied. This case is probably explained by the fact that the complex word *oil storage* is a composite that can have both relative, compositional decryption *of the oil storage*, and presentative, obabbreviature decryption *of the oil storage*. It is noteworthy that the presentation phrase *oil storage* and the very complex reduced word *oil storage* are combined by synecdochical relations with the modification decryption stimulus *oil storage*, since they have generalizing semantics. Such abbreviation constructs, which assume both a composite and an abbreviation implementation, are called mutant – see more in [90].

This word-forming fact, when the synecdochic $^{\text{trait 2}}$ appears in the structure of the decryption stimulus, grammatically reassigns the trait 1 to itself and structurally coexists with another member of the synecdochic relations as part of the text equivalent of the abbreviation, is called **pseudo-uni-verbalization synecdoche**

(pseudo-uni-verbalization in [109, p. 84] is the process of inverse uni-varbalizations – the expansion of a phrase based on a complex word).

3.2. Degree of abbreviation interpretation in the equivalence socket

Analysis of modification interpretive decryptive stimuli revealed acronyms equivalent to the abbreviation, in which there are not two onomasiological signs (as it was described), but three. For example, the abbreviation *autofuel*, in addition to the modification equivalent with a basis and two features $^{\text{of fuelB}}$ *for* $^{\text{auto1 models2}}$, has and correlates $^{\text{fuelB}}$ *for* $^{\text{auto1 model 2 engines, where}}$ the third onomasiological feature of *engines* appears, subordinating the first two. In other words, two roots are found in the structure of the equivalent phrase *fuel for auto-model engines that are not present in the structure of the abbreviation autofuel* and its presentative equivalent *automotive fuel*. It seems significant that the growth of onomasiological features in the structure of equivalent phrases implements the above-described model **of grammatical reassignment of primary features to secondary ones** ($^{\text{features 1}}$ and $^{\text{features 2}}$, which formed the word *automodile*, are subordinated by coordinating $^{\text{the features 3}}$ *of the engines*). This fact requires taking into account the interpretive gradation, and depending on the number of onomasiological features in the structure of modification interpretive decryptive stimuli, the latter receive ranks. So, for the interpretive equivalent, *the helmet for cycling races* (< *veloshlem*) marks the first rank of interpretation, and for the phrase *fuel for car-model engines* (< *autofuel*) – the second rank of interpretation. Other examples of second-rank modification equivalents were found*: car owner – vehicle owner*; *auto-instructor – vehicle driving instructor*; *a car mechanic – a mechanic for repairing vehicles*; *auto mechanic – vehicle repair mechanic*; *auto mechanic – mechanic of a motor transport enterprise*; *Author's Guide – Manual for Operation of Motor Vehicles*. So, for the abbreviation, *the car owner* can give the following markup of decryption incentives: *the car owner* is the presentation decryption stimulus itself; *car/car/car owner* –

relative actant-numeric decryption stimulus; *motor vehicle owner, motor vehicle owner, motor vehicle owner* – first rank modification interpretive decryption stimulus, *motor vehicle owner/motor vehicle* owner – second rank modification interpretive decryption stimulus. In our opinion, the presence of a relative component in the modification interpretive decryptive incentives of *the owner of vehicles, accessories for vehicles deserves attention.* Modification phrases of the second rank are less common than other decryptive stimuli, however, their inclusion in the relationship of textual equivalence with an abbreviation predetermines their placement in the Dictionary and theoretical comprehension.

3.3. Variation of onomasiological features in the abbreviation equivalence socket

Pseudouniverbalization synecdoche is a prerequisite for the formation of a modification interpretive decryption stimulus. One of the optional characteristics of the latter is the variability of any of the onomasiological features. For example, the equivalent slot of the abbreviation *electric car* includes the above phrases *of a car with an electric motor/electric drive/electric motor/on power supply/on electric stroke/on electric traction.* Metonymic variation of onomasiological trait occurs 2 within the first rank of interpretation. However, such an alternative may be presented weakly or not at all, while it is possible exclusively in the structure of the modification interpretive phrase, since the onomasiological trait 1 and the basis cannot vary due to its relevance to the equivalence of the phrase to the abbreviation.

It is significant that the variation of features occurs within one rank and quantitatively fills it, while pseudouniverbalization synecdoche structurally and semantically spreads a complex reduced word. Such variation is called **intra-rank alternation**, and each onomasiological trait that metonymically varies within one rank is called alternant. Wed. also an alteration of the sign 2 for the abbreviation *autofuel*: fuelB *for* auto1transport2, fuelB *for* auto1models2, fuelB *for* auto1machine2. Thus, an alternation is "the appearance and presence of two or more features within the same rank of

interpretation in the abbreviation equivalent" [21, p. 410]. Probably, as the rank of interpretation increases, intra-rank alternation becomes less and less possible, which states the first rank of the modification phrase and the onomasiological characteristic corresponding to it2 as an "ideal" condition and object of intra-rank alternation, since in presentative and relative decryptive stimuli it is potentially impossible. Alternation can be lexical (*fuel for vehicles/car models/cars) and* grammatical (*car with an electric motor/on an electric motor; vehicle/vehicle fuel).*

3.4. Sources of interpretive relationships in equivalence nests

The question of the sources of interpretation and alternation of the text equivalent of the abbreviation can hardly be exhausted using synchronous and diachronous abbreviation analysis tools, however, the equivalence nests and abbreviation groups processed for the Dictionary still give some reason for reasoning. Obviously, different complex reduced words can have a different number of modification interpretive equivalents, and some of them cannot have them at all. It is equally obvious that for the same first rank of interpretation corresponding to the second onomasiological feature, different abbreviations have a different number of alternants. Since the equivalent implementation of the abbreviation in the text is closely related to its abbreviation construct, it may seem fair that it is the characteristics of the abbreviation construct (the number of its implementations: velo – *bicycle*, *bicycle*, *cyclist*, *for bicycle*, *for cyclist*, etc.; the possibility of a simulated interpretation: *auto – automobile*, *automatic*, *automated*) provide the possibility of a different level of interpretation of the abbreviation.

In our opinion, the unified nature of the abbreviation construct is not the main source of the interpretive possibility of the abbreviation, since in this case this possibility would have to be extrapolated to all units of the abbreviation group combined by one construct. However, this does not happen: cf. The higher equivalence socket *of the electric car* and the complex reduced word *of the electric cigarette*, which is implemented in the texts exclusively presentatively.

More convincing when clarifying the sources of the appearance of modification text equivalents should be recognized, in our opinion, the semantic, grammatical and onomasiological **valence of the basis of the abbreviation**, which uses the required number of characteristic elements in accordance with the nomination situation (cf. complex words *gorelektrotransport*, *electric heater*). This assumption in [21] is substantiated by the idea of semantic agreement, which assumes that in any statement, the same-name seeds are repeated at least twice. In other words, the phrase is deemed adequate if each of the words, in addition to the differential characteristics, includes a common feature for both and does not contain incompatible features. For example, sentence *Linguist explores* language. The word *linguist* has a terminal *type of activity*, including various potential fillers: *to investigate*, *analyze, compare, study,* etc., as well as a terminal *object* that can be filled with words such as *language*, *grammar*, *morpheme*, etc. The word *to explore* assumes the subject of action: *linguist*, *scientist*, *physicist*, etc. The presence of such adjacent terminals provides semantic agreement [6; 30, pp. 370–375].

With regard to the abbreviation, this may mean that the presence of adjacent terminals in the structure of the basis and potential modification phrase ensures their filling and the formation of interpretive equivalents of the abbreviation. For example, the basis of *fuel* has a *terminal destination, the goal*: *for the reactor*, *for aviation, for transport*; $^{\text{sign } 2}$ *transport* has a *terminal mediative, means*: *electricity*, *fuel*. Adjacent, mutually directed terminals and seem to provide decryptive compatibility *of autofuel – fuel for road transport.*

An attempt to suggest that pseudouniverbalization synecdoche and intra-rank alternation contribute to the closure of the semantic-onomasiological structure of a complex reduced word seems somewhat reasonable. In other words, the openness of the structure of the abbreviated word depends on a) the number of presented and b) unfilled semantic terminals – the more they are, the more likely the interpretive possibility of the abbreviation. This means that if a complex word "has a number of semantic terminals, its structure can be considered open; as these terminals are filled

in the decryption stimulus, the structure is closed; the minimum number of terminals indicates the closure of the structure of the complex word "[20, p. 1146].

The processing of materials for the Dictionary made it possible to select a priori closed structures. Firstly, these are **secondary abbreviations** (*city electric network*, *electric heater*), each of the abbreviation constructs of which, when decrypted, corresponds to one onomasiological feature. Secondly, **the abbreviations of the "terminological" type** (*state farm, State Duma, Ministry of Finance*), which are also implemented in the text with phrases with an equal number of signs. Thirdly, **complex derivatives of abbreviations** (*race car driver* < *auto racing*; *electric welder* < *electric welding*). Fourth, **quasiabbreviatures** [115, p. 32], suggesting a secondary, two-relational structure and often interpreted "predicatively," a sentence, not a phrase (*astroarchaeology, biotoualet*). The situation of closing the structure of a complex reduced word is associated with a frequent change in the semantic case of the text equivalent and is associated with the fact that the growth of onomasiological features and their alternation are more limited, the higher the rank of interpretation, that is, the more closed the structure of the abbreviation.

Complex words, the textual implementation of which is possible exclusively in modification interpretive equivalents, draw attention to themselves. For example, *the head of the chemical service*, *the head of the chemical laboratory*, *the head of the chemical part*. Probably, *zavchim* is a secondary abbreviation that reflected structural-semantic generalization: the omission of onomasiological bases *by the service, laboratory, partly* testifies to their irrelevance for nomination and serves as the basis for intra-rank alternation. At the same time, the complex word *zavchim* can probably be recognized as an absolute simultant.

3.5. Abbreviation pleonasm in the equivalence socket

The search and synchronous description of regular stereotypical decryptions of the abbreviation construct (abbreviated component) of a complex reduced word, which are text substitutes of the abbreviation and called **decryption stimuli** (DS)

[19, p. 12], made it possible to determine among the latter the typology from the point of view of the onomasiological identity with the abbreviation. In other words, collocations forming one equivalence nest [21, p. 409], i.e. corresponding to one abbreviation, may structurally and semantically differently represent this abbreviation in texts.

So, among decryptive stimuli, **presentative** ones are distinguished – corresponding to adjectives with qualifying, generalized semantics, which allow data from the DS in the privative opposition to act as an unmarked component in relation to other types of DS. For example, the presentative equivalent of the abbreviation of *auto racing* is ***car*** *racing*. **Interpretive** decryptive stimuli refine the value of the abbreviation construct and are divided into **relative** and **modification** by the method of refinement [22, p. 20]. Relative equivalents actualize actant-numeric, prepositional-case semantics (*car racing*, ***car racing***). The modification decryption stimulus is always formally (in terms of the number of root morphemes) more complex than the abbreviation, common onomasiological features that are absent in the structure of a complex reduced word. In other words, the sets of onomasiological features of the abbreviation and its modification correlate do not match. For example, the phrases of *car racing*, *car model racing, car racing*, equivalent to the same abbreviation, reveal new signs *of amateurs*, *models*, *cars that* are not presented in the word *auto racing*.

In all the examples found, a new secondary feature for the abbreviation in the structure of the modification DS grammatically (by coordination or control) reassigns to itself the first onomasiological feature subordinate to the basis itself as part of the presentative and relative phrases (*veloshlem/bicycle helmet – helmet for cycling/cycling races).* It is significant that the condition of grammatical **reassignment of primary onomasiological features to secondary ones is** adequate for modification equivalents, which will include not one new one for the abbreviation, but two, and therefore this fact is assigned **the second modification rank** (*auto fuel/car* fuel/car fuel – *car model fuel/car model fuel* – fuel for *car model*

engines). *Zero* rank in this case is marked for presentative and relative equivalents, and the first rank corresponds to one new characteristic for the abbreviation.

For many modification DS, in the alterations of one rank of modification, **an alternative variation** (**alternation**) of onomasiological features is noted, which is **lexical**, the alteration itself (*automobile plant: car* ***production/disposal/repair*** *plant), and* **grammatical (***bicycle logger: trunk for a bicycle/for a bicycle/to a bicycle/for a* ***bicycle)***. Theoretically, the first rank of modification is recognized as optimal for lexical alternation, since in the presentative and relative DS it is potentially impossible, and for the second rank modification is not noted. Lexical alternation forms a characteristic paradigm – a number of options, the involvement of one of which can be dictated by the requirements of the text, considerations of the author or ontologically justified versions of the reference.

The selection and analysis of text equivalents of abbreviations for the created "Tolkovo-equivalent dictionary of complex reduced words of the Russian language" convince that the onomasiological features new for the abbreviation in the structure of the modification DS can, with varying degrees of semantic relevance, clarify the meaning of the complex reduced word. This fact abolishes the idea of the modification DS as a member of synecdochic relations with an abbreviation. In other words, all modification equivalents can be separated on the basis of whether they form hyper-hyponymic relations with an abbreviation in which the latter acts as an unmarked member of the privative opposition. Often, a number of alternative variable features are found in the structure of the modification DS, new for the abbreviation and not equally relevant to its meaning. In the interests of semantic description of such cases, three types of alternation are proposed.

The relevant alternation assumes the absolute relevance of the second onomasiological trait for the abbreviation. Structural (characteristic) complication corresponds to semantic complication, which creates conditions for privative opposition. Thus, the relevant alternation is marked for the vertical characteristic series of *the car* ***assembly/disposal/repair*** *plant*, since each of the characteristics of

the series corresponds to a separate plant. Thus, the abbreviation *auto-plant* is a hyperonym and an unmarked member of the privative opposition in relation to a modification phrase with any of a number of proposed features. An oil storage facility that is relevant and marked for the abbreviation is a product feature in the *ET storage facility*, since petroleum products include substances obtained from oil, and not the oil itself. Grammatical alternation can also be relevant. The phrases *bicycle trunk, bicycle trunk, bicycle trunk, bicycle* trunk, equivalent to the abbreviation *bicycle loader*, denote a trunk intended for **installation on a bicycle**, while the ET *trunk for a bicycle* denotes a trunk intended for **placing a bicycle** (on a car).

Doublet alternation states the presence of new onomasiological features in the structure of the modification DS, which semantically do not spread the abbreviation, are assumed and exhausted by the meaning of its basis. In this case, synecdochic and hyper-hyponymic relations between a complex word and a modification phrase are impossible. Privative opposition is replaced by equipolent opposition. For example, a feature *for selling* in an ET *car store* is irrelevant for modification, since any store specializes in sales. The text equivalent *of the car service is* formally more complex than the word *car service* (the condition of characteristic complication is met), however, semantically, due to the zero relevance of the service feature, the abbreviation is equal to its modification correlate.

The third type of alternation does not differ significantly from doublet and assumes a synonymous series of alternants expressing one referent. Several plans of expression correspond to one content plan, which repeats the principle **of the included simulator** [18, p. 46]. For example, the semantic terminal "mediative" for the abbreviation *electric car* in the phrases *motor/electric* ***motor/electric motor/electric motor/electric*** *drive/electric drive* is filled with a number of features selected, the preference of one of which is not determined ontologically. The listed equivalents in different ways (by **terminal synonymy)** signify the same object of reality (the same car). Wed. *electronic/electric cigarette* < *electric cigarette.* The

preference for one of the onomasiological features in a number of homogeneous ones is dictated by the requirements of the text and the intuition of the author.

Within the modification DS, the abbreviation design can be interpreted directly (*bicycle store* – ***bicycle clothing*** *store* – ***bicycle clothing*** store) or indirectly participate in interpretation (*automobile plant* – ***car*** production plant). It follows from this that not every decryptive stimulus and onomasiological feature formally corresponds to an abbreviation construct, which can be spread by both a word and a phrase.

The question of the essence, sources and scaling to the system of abbreviation of the phenomenon of doublet alternation seems relevant. First of all, the very fact of the appearance of irrelevant onomasiological features, semantically exhausted by the original structure and actually duplicating it, is interesting. As an attempt to comprehend this fact of the abbreviation tautology, the working concept **of terminal synonymy** is proposed. Suppose the onomasiological $^{\text{structure1}}$ "institution + object" stimulates the appearance of the onomasiological feature "destinative," the terminal of which is filled semantically with valence features. It is significant that for $^{\text{structure1}}$ (car ***disposal/production*** *plant*) such filling is alternative, i.e. relevant, while for structure2 (*car store*) it may not be alternative, i.e. doublet.

It is hypothesized that *the selling* trait is extrapolated to decryptive stimuli of a similar onomasiological structure. The ignored semantic adequacy of the emerging features creates conditions for parallel use of them as **synonyms** (including included-simulated) of one semantic terminal – for example, a "mediative" terminal for motor/motor/drive features *that* propagate the abbreviation *electric car*.

The alternative of one onomasiological structure necessarily produces **a number of features** that serve to ontologically distinguish its particular characteristics: the plant that a) produces; b) repairs; c) disposes of cars. This series becomes stereotypical when its components begin to be used in other structures, regardless of the "dictionary" logic.

Onomasiological signs *for sale/repair/maintenance/assembly* fill the terminal "destination" for structures in which such filling may be uncontested – for example, *car service (car service), car driving* instructor (*auto instructor), allergic dermatitis (allergodermatitis).* The last example convinces that the appearance of doublet onomasiological signs seems to be also influenced by the official nomenclature, speech turnover of office work.

The subsequent description of doublet onomasiological features within the framework of the modification decryption stimulus, the assessment of their determination (onomasiological structure or other factors) and interventional potency form the prospect of further development.

Chapter Conclusions

1. The decryption stimulus as a regular stereotypical model of abbreviation decryption is justified by the idea of an equivalence socket and is fixed taking into account textual equivalence. The formation of lexical interpretive decryptive stimuli implements the model of pseudouniverbalization synecdoche (the appearance of a second onomasiological feature in the equivalent abbreviation, which reassigns the first onomasiological feature, subordinate to the basis before).

2. For modification decryption stimuli, so far two ranks of interpretation have been found, increasing as onomasiological features (otherwise, roots) are introduced and implementing a model of reassignment of primary features to secondary ones.

3. The principle of filling each rank of the modification interpretive equivalent with metonymically varying features is called alternation. The source of interpretation of the abbreviation is the valence of its basis.

4. The presence of an additional feature can be semantically relevant (*bike shop – bike dress store*) or pleonastic (*car factory – car production plant) when* the semantics of the abbreviation basis are duplicated. It is hypothesized that the appearance of pleonastic onomasiological signs can be explained by analogy, mutual extrapolation of stereotypical sign series.

5. It is assumed that the modification decryption stimulus is the "closure" of the semantic-onomasiological structure of the complex reduced word.

4. Lexicographic description of decryptive stimuli

4.1. Cognitive and formal aspects of the functioning of decryptive stimuli

The abbreviation equivalence nest, which is, in fact, the subject of a dictionary entry in the created "Explanatory-equivalent dictionary of complex abbreviated words of the Russian language," the first volume of which (letters A-B) includes 2.5 thousand equivalence nests – includes all collocations found in equivalent texts within which the syntactic specification of the abbroconstructure is carried out (i.e. abbreviated component of the abbreviation). For example, in a dictionary entry *Àvtopodrazdeléniye* in a block of equivalents with ranking by frequency, the phrases ***automobile*** *subdivision*, ***motor transport*** *subdivision*, ***auto technical*** *subdivision* are given, in which the selected simple and complex adjectives syntactically specify the abbo-construct of *the car* in the word *auto subdivision*.

The facts of the heterogeneous textual implementation of specific abbroconstructs within the abbreviations equivalent to the phrase form the content of the problem of equivalence of a complex reduced word. To describe this equivalence, the Laboratory team uses the concept **of a decryption stimulus** of the abbroconstructure, which can be determined taking into account several mutually agreed principles. The preference of one of such principles may serve as a basis for highlighting options for interpreting the decryption stimulus, the description of which is the purpose of this article.

The first principle, taking into account the cognitive grounds for the equivalence of abbreviations, allows you to define the decryption stimulus as "background knowledge that stimulates one or another version of the interpretation of the abbroconstructure" [18, p. 47]. The idea of a decryptive stimulus as a thought key to the interpretation of an abbreviation is reflected in its name itself and is determined, on the one hand, by the correlation stereotype "each abbreviation corresponds to a phrase" existing in the minds of native speakers, and on the other hand, by the regularity of the abbroconstructs themselves, which exist on a

synchronous slice of the language in parallel with the interpretations characteristic of them: for example, *state – state*, *air – aviation*.

Thus, the cognitive principle allows you to determine the decryption stimulus as a regular stereotype of the deployment of the abbroconstructure, that is, the form already known enough to the native speaker, used in the **formation of** equivalent phrases by analogy. This formulation takes into account, in addition to cognitive ones, also word-forming, that is, diachronous considerations. In addition, this statement needs to be clarified that not all decryptive stimuli are equally a) stereotypical and b) regular. This is practically confirmed by the unequal indicators of the number of uses of equivalents of one abbreviation, which in the Dictionary is reflected, among other things, in the form of reference points, combining equivalent with different indicators of regularity.

The stereotyping of various decryptive stimuli seems productive based on the existing structural-semantic classification of the latter, which includes **presentative ones** expressed by a relative adjective with qualifying semantics (***car*** *accident – autoavaria*), and **interpretive** decryptive stimuli, among which relative, expressed in case and prepositional forms and actualizing values of the number and case are distinguished (*car accident – car accident*), and **modifiable** decryptive stimuli, including significant components that are absent in the structure of the abbreviation (***road*** *accident – car accident*) [22, p. 19].

With diachronous t. z. the most predictable (= stereotypical) is a presentative decryption stimulus characterized by the smallest degree of cognitive effort. It is semantically universal, since in conditions of privative opposition it most often acts as an unmarked member of it, in contrast to relative and modifiable decryptive stimuli that produce a grammatical or lexical interpretation of the abbroconstructure. But the **stereotyping** parameter of the presentative decryption stimulus means that it appears in most equivalence nests, while an analysis of the frequency indicators of the use of a particular abbreviation and equivalent phrases may indicate in favor of greater **regularity** of interpretive decryption stimuli inside the nest.

Quantisative analysis demonstrates an unequal ratio of quantitative indicators in the same types of decryptive stimuli in different equivalence nests. The frequency of the three presented types of decryption stimuli can be cut by comparing both the reference points of specific equivalence nests and the number of uses in one text of the abbreviation and the corresponding phrase in which this or that type of decryption stimulus is implemented.

Using the second method in Table 1, using the example of three equivalence nests, three situations of the quantitative ratio of presentative, relative and modifiable types of decryptive stimuli are presented. The name of the situation corresponds to the quantitatively dominant type of decryption stimulus in the equivalence socket. The letter P denotes the frequency, which decreases as the numerical indicator increases. The quantitative results obtained by the second method correspond to the ratio of the reference points of the three compared equivalence nests.

Table 1. Regularity of decryption stimuli

Abbreviations	**H**	**Presentation situation**	**Relative situation**	**Modifier situation**
gasoline, gas production, air show	1	***motor** gasoline*	***gas** production*	***aerospace** salon*
	2	*gasoline **for cars***	***gas condensate** production*	***aviation** salon*
	3	*gasoline **for motor vehicles***	***gas** production*	*aviation cabin*

In addition to the above method, it is possible to assess the quantitative potential of different types of decryptive stimuli in relation to specific abbreviation groups (a set of complex words with the same abbroconstructure) through frontal search of the Dictionary. Such a search, for example, reports that the word form *of aviation* in the abbreviation group *of air* is 91 times less in demand, than a set of forms *aviation* + *aviation* + *aviation* in them. Units. Search in the dictionary for already processed equivalence nests seems more productive for formulating

conclusions about the stereotyping and regularity of decryptive stimuli, rather than single queries in search engines using the example of individual equivalence nests.

The above makes it possible to argue that such characteristics of decryptive stimuli as regularity and stereotyping are not identical to each other. A presentative decryption stimulus characterized by the least cognitive effort is recognized as stereotypical in form, which corresponds to its representation in **most** equivalence nests, in a certain number of which it can be much less regular compared to interpretive decryption stimuli. The principle is the very fact of its reproducibility (albeit inert) even in cases where the interpretation of the abbroconstructure by a relative adjective is not semantically justified.

On the one hand, stereotypical decryption stimuli, provided that they are semantic unfounded, can be contrasted with regular ones, and on the other hand, unique decryption stimuli can be contrasted with them. The latter can be quite regular within the equivalence nest, but are found in a small number of nests. For example, in absolutely all small nests, where *aerospace*, *aviation engineering*, *air sports*, *and air chemistry* decryption incentives appear with sufficient regularity, there is also a decryption aviation stimulus *that* is stereotypical.

The idea of a decryptive stimulus as a stereotype of the interpretation of the abbroconstructure is illustrated by the example of complex words with the so-called **simulated abbroconstructs**, which, due to a coincidence in form, are able to simultaneously different syntactic interpretation [18, p. 41]. For example, the abbroconstructs *of auto*, *arch*, *geo*, *electro* in the words *auto registrar*, *archdevelopment*, *geowire*, *electric cigarette*, interpreted in equivalent phrases by two (*automatic* and *automobile*, *geographical* and *geological*, *electrical* and *electronic*) or three (*archaeological*, *archival*, *architectural*) different adjectives, the choice of which is justified, including individual representations of native speakers of the nomination objects.

However, in order to demonstrate the cognitive basis of the decryption stimulus, the appeal is more clearly not to absolute simultants, two or several

different interpretations of which correspond to two or several different objects of reality (*automatic* and *automobile recorders*, *archaeological*, *archival* and *architectural activities*, *geographical* and *geological networks*), but to the included simultants, the different interpretation of which is not extralinguistic (*electric* and *electronic cigarette*) [18, p. 47]. In other words, two language nominations (*electronic* and *electric*) correspond to one actually existing type of cigarette, the scientifically more correct name of which is *electronic*. The phrase *e-cigarette* is much more common than *an electric cigarette*, and in diachronous terms is recognized as a source for the abbreviation *electric cigarette*, which, in turn, serves as a source for the **secondary phrase** *electric cigarette*. The formation of the latter on the basis of the word by pseudouniverbalization [114, p. 72] is explained precisely by the action of the decryptive *electric* stimulus, which is stereotypical for interpreting the abbroconstructure *electro*. The facts of pseudouniverbalization based on diachronous abbreviations and diachronous quasi-abbreviatures [115, p. 32] are justified with the so-called actions of decryptive stimuli as keys of the interpretation of the abbroconstruct.

The dictionary description of each abbreviation group is organized hierarchically: first, a **lemma** is given (a dictionary form that is a prototype for a decryption stimulus), and **tokens** are listed under the lemma (all empirical forms of lemma implementation, that is, decryption stimuli themselves). This approach, carried out in terms of corpus linguistics, also serves to predict tokens with the ability to verify them in equivalent phrases. Token prediction is carried out according to the principle of extrapolation of the lemme token mesh1 to the $^{\text{lemme}}$ token mesh2. If the predicted token is empirically confirmed, one cell of the $^{\text{lemmy2}}$ table is filled, if such a token is marked only for $^{\text{lemmy1}}$, but is not found in the texts for $^{\text{lemmy2}}$, the corresponding cell of the $^{\text{lemmy2}}$ table forms a gap.

In this case, a decryptive stimulus, which is an absolute synonym for a token, is understood as a specific, that is, empirically marked in the texts **form of representation** of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation in the equivalent

phrase. Obviously, such an idea of a decryption stimulus is completely synchronous, not taking into account the relationship of real production between the abbreviation and the corresponding phrase, nor the stereotype/uniqueness parameters. As a result of the analysis of the ratio of these interpretations, it is planned to clarify the concept of **the encryption** stimulus of the abbroconstructure.

4.2. Synonymous potential of decryptive stimuli

The phenomenon of synonymy is not so deprived of attention that knowledge of synonyms is not just "classic school," but also everyday knowledge. However, lexical synonyms are usually heard, while synonymous relationships are characteristic of the entire language system at its different levels. The problem of synonymy nevertheless sounded in the world linguistic polylog, which collects not conferences, but symposia [104, p. 152] on synonymy and is a platform for the development of the lexicographic "picture of the world" of synonymy.

Grammatical synonymy becomes the subject of linguistic interest later, although in some of its parts it is described by M. V. Lomonosov, A. Kh. Vostokov, F. I. Buslaev, A. A. Shakhmatov, who do not use, however, the term itself. The modern stage of linguistic science poses new problems related to grammatical synonymy, and the classical one is the delineation of morphological variants (doublets) and morphological synonyms. Different solutions are offered – of a stylistic nature, with the so-called. literary norms that take into account the distinction between form and content, etc., however, the consensus boils down to the following: grammatical variants are united by an identical meaning, while grammatical synonyms mark various semantic shades.

The concept of morphological synonymy, in our opinion, would be interesting to extrapolate to the system of abbreviation of the Russian language. In the works of representatives of the Laboratory for the Study of Abbreviation under the leadership of V.I. Terkulov, synchronous and diachronous approaches to highlighting complex words are delimited. In diachron analysis, the relations of real production between a

word and a phrase are determined. In a synchronous approach, equivalence relations between the abbreviation and its corresponding phrases are described, which are often represented in greater numbers than one, can be interchangeable with the abbreviation in equivalent texts and make up the equivalence socket of this abbreviation [113, p. 14]. The existence of abbreviated nests on the current language slice justifies the concept of a decryptive stimulus, which means the way to represent the abbreviated component of the abbreviation in the equivalent phrase.

The basic typology developed by the Laboratory provides for "delineation of presentative and interpretive decryptive stimuli" [19, p. 14]. Presentative decryptive stimuli are implemented in relative adjectives with qualifying semantics and are the most predictable when decrypting an abbreviation (*drama theater* – ***drama*** *theater*). Interpretive decryptive stimuli are divided into relative ones, which are represented by prepositional forms of nouns (*drama theater* – ***drama*** *theater*), and modifiable ones, which are represented by phrases with an additional onomasiological feature that is absent in the abbreviation itself (*agricultural industry* – ***agro-industrial*** *industry*).

Unmarked members of the privative opposition are equivalent phrases with a presentative decryption stimulus, while "phrases with interpretive decryption stimuli that implement the formal and semantic interpretation of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation act as marked members of the opposition" [21, p. 410]. Thus, the presentative decryption stimulus is semantically universal in the sense that it can replace the interpretive in texts, whereas the opposite substitution is not always possible.

The interchangeability of decryptive stimuli in the text allows them to be evaluated as grammatical synonyms, which in the Dictionary of Linguistic Terms are understood as "words with synonymous grammatical indicators," as well as "equivalent grammatical constructs" [7, p. 407]. E. I. Schendels, when describing the phenomena of grammatical synonymy on the material of the German language, defines grammatical synonyms as "different grammatical forms that have a similar

grammatical meaning in the language system (system synonyms) or converging in their grammatical meaning under the influence of speech conditions (contextual synonyms)" (Cit. to: [130, p. 194]).

In his work, E. I. Shendels identifies the features of grammatical synonyms that are also relevant for decryptive stimuli of complex reduced words:

First, "grammatical synonyms have a similar but not the same meaning" (Cit. to: [130, p. 194]). This condition is obvious for equivalence nests that include several relative decryption stimuli. For example, for an *auto accessory* socket, relative decryption incentives are *given car accessories, car accessories, car accessories, car accessories, car accessories* having a possessive, destructive, qualifying and locative semantics, but essentially denoting one denotate.

The conceptual identity of the given decryptive stimuli, their correlation with the abbreviation *auto accessory is* confirmed by the facts of textual equivalence, that is, by the parallel use of the abbreviation itself and its equivalent phrases in the texts, interchangeable with each other. Textual equivalence is consistent with another criterion of grammatical synonyms, which are "characterized by the possibility of interchangeability" [116, p. 10].

Using the example of the given nest, equivalence is also confirmed by the characteristics given in the work of E. I. Schendels, according to which "grammatical synonymy is fully manifested on the identical lexical material," and "grammatical synonyms are different morphological forms and different syntactic constructions that come together in some values and differ in others" (Quoted by: [130, s. 194]). As you can see, equivalent phrases differ from each other only in inflectional semantics expressed by different prepositional morphological forms, while two lexical units (*accessory, car*) are presented in all five examples.

All four given parameters of grammatical synonyms are characteristic of relative decryptive stimuli, while modifiers are characterized by a similar, but not the same value, as well as the possibility of interchangeability.

Modifiable decryptive stimuli are distinguished on the basis of two criteria: formal, which involves the presence of an additional onomasiological feature in the structure of an equivalent phrase, and semantic, which involves the refinement of the lexical semantics of the abbreviation and the difference of values with a relative decryptive stimulus. For example, the abbreviation *gas station* has equivalent phrases with both relative (*refueling* ***for cars***) and modifiable decryptive stimuli (*refueling* ***for vehicles***). If the relative interpretation interprets the word as an enterprise for servicing cars, then modifiable indicates that not only cars are served at the refueling, but also motorcycles, tractors, etc.

However, the implementation of the formal and semantic criteria is not mutually agreed, since as a result of the study we found modifiable decryptive stimuli that demonstrate only structural complication, but are meaningfully pleonastic (*aviation specialist – specialist* ***in the field*** *of aviation*; *car service – car* ***service****; auto law –* ***car driving*** *rights*).

Thus, complex words in Russian have a wider decryption potential than is understood in traditional lexicographic and theoretical works, which usually fix abbreviated pairs, and not synchronously justified nests of equivalence. The latter include phrases of different types motivationally related to the abbreviation, distinguished by the method of representing the abbreviated component of the abbreviation. There are three main methods: adjective interpretation of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation (presentative decryption stimulus), substantive interpretation of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation (relative decryption stimulus), lexical interpretation of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation (modifiable decryption stimulus). As a result of the study, it was determined that decryptive stimuli (especially relative ones) have the features of grammatical synonyms.

4.3. Draft dictionary of decryptive stimuli for abbreviations of the Russian language

In the I volume (words on A-B) of the "Explanatory Dictionary of Complex [11]Words of the Russian Language," created by the Experimental Laboratory for Research on Abbreviation Trends, 2.5 thousand abbreviations are described. In the structure of a dictionary entry, a block of text equivalents of an abbreviation has fundamental significance, which means "phrases that are used as absolute synonyms (doublets) of a complex word in equivalent texts and include components perceived by native speakers as equivalents of abbreviation constructs" [114, p. 72]. As a rule, there are several such equivalent phrases for one abbreviation, and from their number a nest of equivalence of a complex word is formed – in contrast to the traditional lexicographic principle of describing a complex word and the **corresponding one** phrase as an abbreviation pair.

In words correlated with the abbreviation in the texts, the abbroconstructure of this abbreviation can be equivalent to morphologically different words and word forms. The latter arise, as a rule, according to regular and stereotypical models and are called in the Laboratory's methodology by decryption stimuli of the abbreviation [19, p. 12]. V. A. Ryazanova understands the decryption stimulus as "implicit knowledge involved in deploying an abbroconstructure in a particular text" [91, p. 303]. This idea is supported by the heterogeneity of decryptive stimuli morphologically and semantically.

All decryptive stimuli are proposed to be divided into presentative and interpretive. The presentative equivalent of an abbroconstructure is a relative adjective with qualifying semantics that typically neutralizes shades of grammatical and lexical meanings used in the treatment of an abbreviation. For example, the decryption stimulus *is automotive* for the abbreviation *auto-shotguns* (the text equivalent is *a car circle*). Also, presentative decryptive stimuli allow a simulated interpretation of the abbreviation (see [18, 45–50]), which assumes the possibility of parallel double

[11]In this work, the terms *abbreviation* and *compound word* are used as absolute synonyms.

(three-sided, etc.) interpretation of the abbreviation construct by adjectives with different roots. For example, an abbo-construct *of a car that* can be decrypted as *automatic, automobile, automated.* We have highlighted the absolute and enabled simulants. The first explains the ambiguous interpretation of the abbreviation by the existence in reality of various objects corresponding to variants of this interpretation (cf. *Electric rod*: *electric rod* and *electronic rod* – two different objects). The included simultant reflects "interpenetration of the features of two qualifications and their mixing within one referent" [18, p. 44]. Enabled simulants are used when a native speaker is attracted to one of the predictable, but semantically unfounded decryptive stimuli to deploy an abbreviation in the text. Wed *electrosigaret*: semantically justified decryptive stimulus ***e-cigarette*** and secondary, stereotypical – ***electric*** *cigarette*.

Interpretive decryptive stimuli, on the contrary, update the grammatical and lexical meanings of the abbreviation and are divided into relative and modifiable. Relative decryptive stimuli express the grammatical values of the number and case and, depending on the expressed values, are divided into actant (*aviation safety – aviation safety*) and actant-numeric (*autocouple – a circle for motorists*). Modifiable decryptive stimuli are structurally and semantically more complex than abbreviations and their presentative-relative equivalents, since they have additional onomasiological features in their structure, and additional sema reveal the meaning. For example, the decryption stimulus of *bicycle clothes* for the abbreviation *bicycle stores* (the equivalent phrase is *a bicycle clothes store*).

Obviously, one of the most regular and therefore easily predicted decryptive stimuli is the presentative, suggesting the interpretation of the abbroconstructure by means of a relative adjective with generalized qualifying semantics: *a bicycle logger* is ***a bicycle*** *trunk*. In this case, the attributive phrase often turns out to be uninformative and cannot always be used to etymologize the abbreviation. For example, the abbreviation *bicycle loader* can mean both a trunk that is attached to a bicycle and a trunk that is placed on a car for transporting a bicycle. In this case, the

presentative decryption stimulus *bicycle* does not tell us anything about where the trunk should be attached, while relative decryption stimuli *on the bike* and *under the bike,* actually marked in equivalent texts, implement the abbreviation specification in the text.

It is the decryption stimulus that is recognized as one of the main means of semanticizing the abbreviation. However, since, on the one hand, the regularity and stereotyping of decryption stimuli ensures the stable appearance of new abbreviations, and on the other hand, the specifics of the use of decryption stimuli as implicit knowledge determine the heterogeneity of the decryption stimuli themselves, it is necessary to state and describe all empirically marked decryption stimuli for each abbreviation. Probably, such a description can be organized mainly according to the list principle and therefore be carried out separately from the "Explanatory-equivalent dictionary of complex words of the Russian language," which specializes, among other things, in describing the lexical meaning of each abbreviation.

The principle of organizing a dictionary entry can include three levels: the level of the abbreviation group (*auto*), the level of the lemma (dictionary form: *car*) and the level of the token (empirical form: *cars; car; of the car; in a car; into cars; into the car; for cars; for a car; from cars; from the car; to the vehicle; to cars; by car; on cars; on cars; per vehicle; about cars; about cars*).

Examples of dictionary entries are:

Benzo

Benzin, -a, m., Units A mixture of light hydrocarbons, a colorless combustible liquid, an oil processing product: gasoline ✓ *(*gasoline plant – gasoline *warehouse); gasoline ✓(*gas station – *gasoline refueling); gasoline* ✓ (*gasoline tank – gasoline tank*); gasoline ✓ *(gas burner – gasoline burner*); gasoline ✓ (*gas station – gasoline column*).

Avia

Aviation, -i, g., Unit 1. Theory and practice of air travel on aircraft heavier than air. 2. Air vehicles, air fleet: ✓ aviation *(*air fire – *shelling* by

aviation)*;* Aviation ✓ *(*air attack – air attack); ✓ aviation *(*air communication – communications aviation)*;* ✓ in aviation *(*air service – *service in* aviation)*;* ✓ for aviation *(*air base – *base for* aviation)*;* ✓ from aviation *(*air room – *noise from* aviation)*;* Aviation ✓ *(*aviation inspector – *aviation inspector*); Aviation ✓ *(aircraft surveillance – aviation surveillance*).

Aviahim

Àviakhimíchesky*:* ✓ aviation-chemical (*airstrip – airstrip*); ✓ aviation-chemical (*airprocessing – aircraft-chemical processing*); ✓ aviation-chemical (*airstrikes – aircraft-chemical works*).

The theoretical novelty of such a dictionary is that the textual multiplicity of the interpretation of one abbreviation is recognized through regular stereotypical models of abbroconstructure equivalence. The practical significance of this dictionary is that a detailed typology and a tabular full-scale description of the decryptive stimuli noted in the texts will allow: a) to create another means for interpreting the meaning and functions of the abbreviation; b) expand the idea of the abbreviation in general and about specific complex words, in particular, taking into account their decryptive capabilities.

Chapter Conclusions

1. The most predictable (stereotypical) is the presentative decryptive stimulus, represented by a relative adjective with qualifying semantics and characterized by the smallest degree of cognitive effort (veterinary institute). It is semantically universal, since in conditions of privative opposition it most often acts as an unmarked member of it, in contrast to interpretive decryptive stimuli that produce a grammatical or lexical interpretation of the abbroconstructure. The stereotype of the presentative decryption stimulus means its presence in most equivalence nests, while an analysis of the frequency indicators of the use of a particular abbreviation and equivalent phrases may indicate in favor of greater regularity of interpretive decryption stimuli inside the equivalence nest.

2. There is a cognitive interpretation of the decryption stimulus, according to which it is understood as the stereotype of decoding the abbroconstructure. This definition is justified, firstly, by the correlation stereotype "the phrase corresponds to each abbreviation," and secondly, by the regularity of the abbrokonstructs themselves. The cognitive basis for interpreting a decryptive stimulus is illustrated, firstly, by the example of the equivalence of abbreviations with the so-called simulated abbrokonstructs, and secondly, by the facts of pseudouniverbalization based on diachronous abbreviations and diachronous quasi-abbreviatures. According to the formal interpretation, the decryption stimulus is a specific, that is, empirically marked in the texts form of representation of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation in the equivalent phrase. This concept of a decryption stimulus is completely synchronous, not taking into account the relationship of real production between the abbreviation and the corresponding phrase, nor the stereotyping/uniqueness parameters.

3. The interchangeability of decryptive stimuli in the text allows them to be evaluated as grammatical synonyms. Traditionally, the given parameters of grammatical synonyms are characteristic of relative decryptive stimuli, while modifiers are characterized by a similar, but not the same value, as well as the possibility of interchangeability.

4. In modern Russian, a significant number of partially reduced abbreviations are noted, which is constantly increasing. The most predicted equivalent phrase, in which the abbreviation construct of the abbreviation corresponds to a relative adjective, is not informative and cannot always be used to etymologize the abbreviation. Since the formation of equivalent abbreviations of phrases is carried out according to regular and stereotypical models, a detailed typology and description of all empirically marked decryptive stimuli will provide abbreviations of the Russian language with an additional means of interpretation.

Conclusion

The decryption stimulus as a regular stereotypical model of abbreviation decryption is justified by the idea of an equivalence socket and is fixed taking into account textual equivalence. Decryptive stimuli are heterogeneous in terms of semantic-grammatical refinement and can differ in terms of structural-semantic complication of the original abbreviation. All decryptive stimuli are divided into presentative, formally and semantically reproducing abbreviation (basis and attribute 1 subordinate to it with zero degree of interpretation, abbreviation equality), and interpretive, which propagate the structure of the abbreviation and "specialize" its meaning (basis, attribute^{2} and attribute^{1} subordinate to it, feature ^{3} possibility). The former are divided into presentative and on-simult. The second – for relative and modification.

The formation of the latter implements the model of pseudouniverbalization synecdoche (the appearance of the phrase of the second onomasiological sign equivalent to the abbreviation, which reassigns the first onomasiological sign subordinate to the basis before). In this respect, the abbreviation is equal to the presentative phrase and combined with it by the concept of the presentative basis (basis + trait ^{1}).

For modification decryption stimuli, two ranks of interpretation are noted, increasing as onomasiological features (otherwise, roots) are "built up," which do not have an abbreviation in the structure and implement the model of reassignment of primary features to secondary ones.

The principle of filling each rank of the modification interpretive equivalent with metonymically varying features is called alternation. Alternation can be lexical and grammatical. The optimal rank for lexical alternation is the first rank.

The main source of interpretation in general and alternation in particular is, in our opinion, the semantic-grammatical and onomasiological valence of the basis of the abbreviation. The idea is based on the theory of semantic agreement of V. G.

Gak. It is assumed that the modification decryption stimulus is the "closure" of the semantic-onomasiological structure of the complex reduced word. In this regard, a priori closed structures are distinguished, which include secondary abbreviations deciphering presentatively, CCC of a "terminological" nature, which, as equivalents, also implement their own presentative basis; CCC derivatives, quasi-abbreviatures that have a secondary, two-relational structure and are often interpreted "predicatively," a sentence rather than a phrase.

Relevant, doublet and included-symbolic types of lexical alternation are highlighted in terms of the semantic relevance of its features. The relevant alternation assumes the absolute relevance of the second onomasiological trait for the abbreviation. Structural (characteristic) complication corresponds to semantic complication, which creates conditions for privative opposition. Doublet alternation states the presence of new onomasiological features in the structure of the modification DS, which semantically do not spread the abbreviation, are assumed and exhausted by the meaning of its basis. In this case, synecdochic and hyper-hyponymic relations between a complex word and a modification phrase are impossible. Privative opposition is replaced by equipolent opposition. The third type of alternation does not differ significantly from doublet and assumes a synonymous series of alternants expressing one referent. Several plans of expression correspond to one content plan, which repeats the principle of the included simulator.

Within the modification ET, the abbreviation construct can be interpreted directly or indirectly to participate in the interpretation. It follows from this that not every decryptive stimulus and onomasiological feature formally corresponds to an abbreviation construct, which can be spread by both a word and a phrase.

It is hypothesized that the appearance of doublet onomasiological signs can be explained by analogy, mutual extrapolation of stereotypical series, which creates conditions for a special principle of alternation – terminal synonymy.

There are abbreviations that can only be deployed using the IDT. These are probably secondary abbreviations with structural-semantic generalization. Omission

of the onomasiological basis indicates its irrelevance for nomination. S t. Z. decryption is essential that the absence of a basis is the basis for alternation.

Causes of simult equivalence: background knowledge, objective symbolism. The classes of simulants are structural-semantic, structural, and (potentially) semantic. Types of simulants within the structural-semantic class: absolute, included, isolated.

Decryptive stimuli, including modification stimuli, rely on the idea of simulant equivalence, which interprets the correlates of the abbreviation different in terms of interpretive force as its equivalents. The criterion of simultaneous relevance of several equivalents of the simulator, that is, the possibility of alternating use of the latter in conditions of the same text distribution, most accurately correlates with the peer-to-peer characteristic alternation. Symbolism justifies the status of the equivalent of all text embodiments of the abbreviation (derivatives associated with it), since the criterion of simultaneous relevance recognizes the second-rank modification stimulus as no less alternative than the presentative decryption stimulus.

The most predictable (stereotypical) is the presentative decryptive stimulus, represented by a relative adjective with qualifying semantics and characterized by the smallest degree of cognitive effort (veterinary institute). It is semantically universal, since in conditions of privative opposition it most often acts as an unmarked member of it, in contrast to interpretive decryptive stimuli that produce a grammatical or lexical interpretation of the abbroconstructure. The stereotype of the presentative decryption stimulus means its presence in most equivalence nests, while an analysis of the frequency indicators of the use of a particular abbreviation and equivalent phrases may indicate in favor of greater regularity of interpretive decryption stimuli inside the equivalence nest.

There is a cognitive interpretation of the decryption stimulus, according to which it is understood as the stereotype of decoding the abbroconstructure. This definition is justified, firstly, by the correlation stereotype "the phrase corresponds

to each abbreviation," and secondly, by the regularity of the abbrokonstructs themselves. The cognitive basis for interpreting a decryptive stimulus is illustrated, firstly, by the example of the equivalence of abbreviations with the so-called simulated abbrokonstructs, and secondly, by the facts of pseudouniverbalization based on diachronous abbreviations and diachronous quasi-abbreviatures. According to the formal interpretation, the decryption stimulus is a specific, that is, empirically marked in the texts form of representation of the abbreviated component of the abbreviation in the equivalent phrase. This concept of a decryption stimulus is completely synchronous, not taking into account the relationship of real production between the abbreviation and the corresponding phrase, nor the stereotyping/uniqueness parameters.

The interchangeability of decryptive stimuli in the text allows them to be evaluated as grammatical synonyms. Traditionally, the given parameters of grammatical synonyms are characteristic of relative decryptive stimuli, while modifiers are characterized by a similar, but not the same value, as well as the possibility of interchangeability.

In modern Russian, a significant number of partially reduced abbreviations are noted, which is constantly increasing. The most predicted equivalent phrase, in which the abbreviation construct of the abbreviation corresponds to a relative adjective, is not informative and cannot always be used to etymologize the abbreviation. Since the formation of equivalent abbreviations of phrases is carried out according to regular and stereotypical models, a detailed typology and description of all empirically marked decryptive stimuli will provide abbreviations of the Russian language with an additional means of interpretation.

References

1. Alamayrekh E. Yu. Some clarifications of the definition of the concept of "abbreviation "/E. Yu. Alamayrekh // Bulletin of the Russian University of Peoples' Friendship. Series: Theory of Language. Semiotics. Semantics. – 2016. – № 4. – pp. 224–231.

2. D.I. Alekseev About the place of abbreviation in the system of Russian word formation, syntax and stylistics of the modern Russian language/D.I. Alekseev // Scientific works of Kuibyshev ped. in-ta. – T. 133. – Kuibyshev, 1974. – pp. 23–28.

3. D.I. Alekseev Abbreviated words in Russian/D.I. Alekseev. – Saratov: Publishing House of Saratov State. Un-ta, 1979. – 328 p.

4. Aliyeva N. A. Actants and sirconstants // Scientific notes of the Tauride National University named after V.I. Vernadsky. – 2014 – T. 27 (66). – № 3. – pp. 246–252.

5. Andronova A.V. Controversial issues of typology of complex words/A.V. Andronova // Bulletin of Nizhny Novgorod State University. Series: Philology. – 2003. – № 4. – pp. 124–135.

6. Y.D. Apresyan Lexical semantics (synonymous means of language)/Yu. D. Apresyan. – Moscow: Nauka, 1974. – 367 p.

7. O.S. Akhmanova Dictionary of Linguistic Terms/Ch. Ed. M.V. Lazov. – M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1966. – 608 p.

8. Baranova L. A. Abbreviated and uzual homonymy and homonymy of original and borrowed abbreviations as a means of language play at the junction of languages/L. A. Baranova // Bulletin of Dnipropetrovsk University. Series: Linguistics. – 2012. – T. 20, issue 18. – pp. 3–8.

9. Baranova L. A. Features of the disabbreviation of original and borrowed abbreviations in modern Russian/L. A. Baranova // Uch. zap. Tavrich. nat. un-ta named after V.I. Vernadsky. – Simferopol, 2011. – T. 24 (63). – NO. 1, PART 1. – pp. 317–323.

10. Barinova S.O. Typology of English-language abbreviations used on the Internet: dis.... Cand. philol. sciences: 10.02.04/Barinova Sofya Olegovna. – St. Petersburg, 2008. – 277 p.

11. Bereznitskaya E. A. Semantics of the abbrokonstructure "agit "/E. A. Bereznitskaya // New horizons of Slavic studies: materials III International scientific readings of students and young scientists in memory of G. I. Richter. – Donetsk, 2016. – pp.111–116.

12. Blumina OV The foundations of the onomasiological classification of Russian and Ukrainian composites with the meaning "procedural "/O. V. Blumin, V. I. Terkulov // Slavic languages: units, categories, value constants. – Volgograd, 2010. – pp. 216–231.

13. Borisov V.V. Abbreviation and acronym. Military and scientific and technical abbreviations in foreign languages/V.V. Borisov. – M.: Voenizdat, 1972. – 320 p.

14. Brovets A.I. Decryptive stimulus as the basis of a synchronous approach to abbreviation in the conditions of consituative semiosis/A. I. Brovets // Actual problems of philology and pedagogical linguistics. – 2023. – №1. – pp. 70–80.

15. Brovets A.I. Decryptive stimulus of a complex reduced word: to the problem of definition and description/A.I. Brovets // Rusistics. – 2019. – T. 17. – № 4. – pp. 487–501.

16. Brovets A.I. History of Abbreviations Dictionaries/V. A. Ryazanova, A. I. Brovets // International Graduate Bulletin. Russian language abroad. – 2021. – № 3. – pp. 70–76.

17. Brovets A.I. Modification interpretive decryptive stimulus of a complex reduced word/A.I. Brovets // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 9: Philology. – M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University. M.V. Lomonosov, 2017. – №6. – pp. 98–107.

18. Brovets A.I. About simulated abbrokonstructs (based on the material of the abbreviation group "electro")/A. I. Brovets // Russian in the multicultural world: X International Scientific and Practical Conference (June 8–11, 2016): Sat. scientific. articles. In 2 tons/holes ed. E. Ya. Titarenko. – Simferopol: IT "ARIAL," 2016. – T.1. – pp. 41–52.

19. Brovets A.I. Approaches to understanding the decryption of complex words/A. I. Brovets // Right to the word. Донбасс.ru: collection of materials of an open scientific and practical conference. – Lugansk, 2019. – pp. 10–15.

20. Brovets A.I. Semantic analysis of decryptive stimuli of abbreviations/A.I. Brovets // Abstracts of reports of the 51st International Scientific Philological Conference named after Lyudmila Alekseevna Verbitskaya. Abstracts of reports. – St. Petersburg, 2023. – pp. 1146–1147.

21. Brovets A.I. Synchronous decryption of complex words/A. I. Brovets // Russian in the multicultural world: a collection of scientific articles of the IV International Symposium (June 9–11, 2020)/otv. ed. G. Yu. Bogdanovich, E. Ya. Titarenko. In 2 volumes – T. 1. – Simferopol: KFU Publishing House, 2020. – pp. 408–412.

22. Brovets A.I. Dictionary of decryptive stimuli of abbreviations of the Russian language/A.I. Brovets // Slavistics: new names in science: Sat. scientific. tr. adapted from II Rep. full-time correspondence scientific-practical. conf. students and young scientists. – Gorlovka: Publishing House of the NGO HPE "GIIA," 2018. – pp. 18–23.

23. Brovets A.I. Interpretation of the meanings of abbroconstructs of complex reduced words/A.I. Brovets // Russian language in the multicultural world. Collection of scientific articles of the V International Symposium, included in the program of the International Festival "The Great Russian Word." In 2 volumes. Otv. editor E.Ya. Titarenko. – Simferopol, 2021. – pp. 133–137.

24. Vasilevskaya E.A. About Russian verbiage (Phrase, verbiage, affixation)/E. A. Vasilevskaya. – Moscow, 1968. – 35 p.

25. A. Verigina Abbreviations-names of Donetsk educational institutions: structural and semantic analysis/A. A. Verigin // New horizons of Russian studies: a scientific journal. – No. 2. – Donetsk, 2017. – pp. 57–58.

26. Vinogradov V.V. Russian language: grammatical doctrine of the word: textbooks. Manual for universities/Otv. ed. G. A. Zolotova. – 3rd ed., Ref. – M.: Vysch. sh., 1986. – 640 p.

27. Vinokur G. O. Notes on Russian word formation/G. O. Vinokur // Selected works on the Russian language. – M.: Uchpedgiz, 1959. – pp. 419–443.

28. Vostokov A. Kh. Russian grammar/A. Kh. Vostokov. – St. Petersburg, 1839. – 402 p.

29. Vishnyakova E.A. Place of abbreviation in the word-forming system of modern English/E. A. Vishnyakov // Scientific statements of Belgorod State University. Series: Humanities. – 2014. – № 6 (177). – T. 21. – pp. 62–66.

30. Gak V.G. To the problem of semantic syntagmatics/V. G. Gak // Problems of structural linguistics. – M.: Science, 1972. – pp. 367–395.

31. Gerasimova M.N. Some features of analytical adjectives in modern Russian (based on the material of the national corpus of the Russian language)/M.N. Gerasimov // Cherepovets scientific readings. – Cherepovets, 2015. – pp. 39–42.

32. A. Gorbov Attributive components of combinations of the business plan type: analytical adjectives?/A. A. Gorbov // Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Series 9. Philology. Oriental studies. Journalism. – 2015. – № 3. – pp. 36–48.

33. Grammar of the modern Russian literary language/otv. ed. N. Yu. Shvedova. – M.: Science, 1970. – 767 p.

34. Yu. S. Dubkova Semantic-pragmatic differentiation of word-forming resources of the Russian language (based on material from composites with borrowed foundations of aviation and aero-)/Yu. S. Dubkova // Russian philology. – 2011. – № 1–2. – pp. 23–27.

35. E. A. Dyuzhikova Modeling as a cognitive basis for the formation of the inference of English abbreviations // Bulletin of the Moscow City Pedagogical

University. Series: Philology. Language theory. Language education. – 2015. – № 2(18). – pp. 29–36.

36. K. Y. Emelyanova Abbrokonstrukt and affixoid: to the question of the connection of concepts/K. Yu. Emelyanov // Bulletin of Donetsk National University. Series D: Philology and Psychology. – 2020. – № 3–4. – pp. 126- 132.

37. Efremova T. F. Russian word production and the possibilities of its linguistic description for educational purposes/T.F. Efremov, G.V. Klimenko // Linguistic description of the Russian language for educational purposes. – M.: APN USSR, 1981. – 88 p.

38. Zaitseva E.A. Phenomena transitional between abbreviation and addition (based on the material of the names of the person)/E. A. Zaitseva // Izvestia of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences. – T. 16. – № 2(4). – 2014. – pp. 941–943.

39. Zemskaya E.A. Word formation as an activity/E. A. Zemskaya – Moscow: Science, 1992. – 221 p.

40. Zemskaya E.A. Active processes of modern word production/E. A. Zemskaya // Russian language of the late twentieth century (1985–1995). – Moscow: Languages of Russian culture, 1996. – pp. 90–141.

41. G.K. Kasimova Metaphorical meanings in the structure of modification formations/G.K. Kasimov // Izvestia PSPU named after V.G. Belinsky. – 2012. – № 27. – pp. 275–278.

42. Kakhovskaya L. F. Abbreviation as a way of word formation: autorefit. dis.... Candidate of Philological Sciences: 10.02.01/Kakhovskaya Larisa Frolovna. – Minsk, 1980. – 22 p.

43. A.V. Kashcheeva Quantivative and qualitative methods of research in applied linguistics/A.V. Kashcheev // Social and economic phenomena and processes. – 2013. – № 3(49). – pp. 155–162.

44. E. V. Klobukov Linguistic specificity of non-derivative complex words (quasicomposites)/E.V. Klobuchar, S.V. Gudilova // Language, consciousness, communication: Sat. articles. – M., 2001. – No. 20. – pp. 12–25.

45. Kosareva O.G. Abbreviation as one of the means of saving and expressing speech (on the material of the modern press)/O. G. Kosarev // Foreign languages in school. – 2004. – № 2. – pp. 85–89.

46. I. Kramarenko Abbreviation group "abon" in Russian/I. I. Kramarenko // Science and peace in the language space: a collection of scientific works II the Republican Correspondence Scientific Conference (November 23, 2016, Makeevka)/ed.: E. V. Gorokhov, N. M. Zaichenko et al. – Makeevka: DonNASA, 2016. – pp. 495–499.

47. Krestyaninova E. S. Abbreviation group "house" in Russian/E. S. Krestyaninova // New horizons of Russian studies: materials IV International scientific readings of students and young scientists in memory of G. I. Richter/ed.: V. I. Terkulov, V. V. Fedorov and others – Donetsk: DonNU, 2017. – pp. 28–33.

48. E. Kubryakova Nominative aspect of speech/E. S. Kubryakov. – M.: Science, 1986. – 158 p.

49. E. Kubryakova The role of word formation in the formation of the language picture of the world/E. S. Kubryakova // The role of the human factor in language: Language and the picture of the world. – Moscow: Nauka, 1988. – pp. 141–172.

50. E. Kubryakova Vocabulary as a nomination process and its distinctive formal and meaningful characteristics/E. S. Kubryakova // Theoretical foundations of vocabulary and issues of creating complex lexical units: intercollegiate collection. scientific works. – Pyatigorsk: Pyatigorsk ped. in-t foreign. languages, 1988. – pp. 3–23.

51. E. Kubryakova Types of language values. Semantics of the derived word/E. S. Kubryakov. – M.: Science, 1981. – 199 p.

52. E. Kubryakova Parts of speech in onomasiological lighting/E. S. Kubryakova. – M., 1978. – 114 p.

53. V. Kudryavtseva Suffix department in modern Russian (substance system): author. dis.... Cand. philol. sciences: 10.02.01/Kudryavtseva Vera Andreevna. – Alma-Ata, 1983. – 26 p.

54. Kuzmina R.V. Homonymization as a result of abbreviation/R.V. Kuzmina // Izvestia of higher educational institutions. Humanities series. – 2011. – T. 2. – No. 3. – pp. 215–218.

55. Levashov E. A. Once again about affixoids/E. A. Levashov // Russian speech. – 2008. – № 3. – pp. 50–52.

56. A. T. Lipatov Synthonymy and abbreviation/A. T. Lipatov // Baudouin readings: Baudouin de Courtenay and modern linguistics. – Kazan: Publishing house Kazan. un-ta, 2001. – T. 1. – pp. 162–165.

57. Lopatin V.V. Russian word-forming morphemics. Problems and Principles of Description/V.V. Lopatin – Moscow: Science, 1977. – 315 p.

58. Lopatin V.V. Suffix department and related phenomena in the field of new word education/V.V. Lopatin // New words and dictionaries of new words. – Leningrad, 1978. – pp. 72–80.

59. Lykov A.G. Word and sentence as units of language/A. G. Lykov // Modern linguistics: theory and practice. – Krasnodar, 2002. – PART 1. – pp. 84–89.

60. Lykov A.G. Word as an adjacent unit of language/A. G. Lykov // Units of different levels in language and speech: intercollegiate collection. – Krasnodar, 1976. – Part 3. – pp. 41–49.

61. Lyalyuk A. A. Abbreviation and onomasiological field "Buildings": dis.... Cand. philol. sciences: 10.02.01/Lyalyuk Anna Alexandrovna. – Donetsk, 2020. – 234 p.

62. Lyalyuk A. A. Onomasiological and field approaches to the study of abbreviated words/A. A. Lyalyuk // Actual problems of philology and pedagogical linguistics. – № 2 (26). – Vladikavkaz, 2017. – pp. 146–150.

63. Maksimenko O. I. New trends in abbreviation (based on the material of Russian, English and German)/O. I. Maksimenko // Bulletin of the Russian University of Peoples' Friendship. Series: Theory of Language. Semiotics. Semantics. – 2017. – T. 8. – № 1. – pp. 174–181.

64. Martine A. Fundamentals of General Linguistics/A. Martinet; ed. V. A. Zvegintsev. – M.: Yeditorial URSS, 2004. – 568 p.

65. N.K. Makhmudova The reasons for the formation of abbreviations in various languages /N.K. Makhmudova // Baltic Humanitarian Journal. – 2016. – T. 5. – № 2(15). – pp. 58–60.

66. Miloslavsky I.G. On the regular increase in meaning during word formation/I. G. Miloslavsky // Questions of linguistics. – 1975. – № 6. – pp. 65–72.

67. Mikhailova E.N. Models of word formation in the mutant abbreviation-composite group "bread "/E. N. Mikhailova // New horizons of Slavic studies: materials of the III International Scientific Readings of Students and Young Scientists in Memory of G. I. Richter (28.04.2016) /ed.: V. I. Terkulov, V. V. Fedorov and others – Donetsk: DonNU, 2016. – pp. 151–158.

68. Mikhailova E.N. Model for predicting relative decryptive stimuli/E. N. Mikhailova // New horizons of Russian studies. – 2018. – No. 6. – pp. 74–80.

69. Mikhailova E.N. Mutant abbreviation-composite group "Gruzo" in Russian/E. N. Mikhailova // Science and the world in the language space: a collection of scientific works II the Republican Correspondence Scientific Conference (November 23, 2016, Makeevka)/ed.: E. V. Gorokhov, N. M. Zaichenko and others. – Makeevka: DonNASA, 2016. – pp. 522–527.

70. Mikhailova E.N. Onomasiological models of compliance in AG "benzo "/E. N. Mikhailova // New horizons of Slavic studies: materials III International scientific readings of students and young scientists in memory of G. I. Richter/ed.: V. I. Terkulov, V. V. Fedorov and others – Donetsk: DonNU, 2017. – pp. 42–46.

71. Mikhailova E.N. Onomasiological features of the relative decryption stimulus of a complex reduced word/V.I. Terkulov, E.N. Mikhailova // New horizons of Russian studies. – 2018. – No. 4. – pp. 33–38.

72. Mikhailova E.N. Presentative decryptive stimulus as a primary source of expansion of semantics/E. N. Mikhailova // Development of intellectual and creative potential of youth: from the past to modernity. – 2018. – PART 2. – pp. 47–48.

73. Mikhailova E.N. Principles of highlighting relative decryptive stimuli based on the material "gazo" (part 1)/E. N. Mikhailova // Donetsk readings 2017: Russian world as a civilizational basis for the scientific, educational and cultural development of Donbass: Materials of the International Scientific Conference of Students and Young Scientists (Donetsk, October 17–20, 2017). – T. 4: Philological sciences. Part 2: Linguistics, literary criticism, cultural studies, journalism/under the general editorship of prof. S.V. Bespalova. – Donetsk: Publishing House of DonNU, 2017. – pp. 46–48.

74. Nagel O.V. Russian noun word-forming types of syncretic semantics: cognitive-functional aspect: autoref. diss. for study. degrees of candidate philol. sciences: special. 10.02.01 "Russian Language "/O. V. Nagel. – Tomsk, 2005. – 18 p.

75. R. I. Mogilevsky Essays on the abbreviation of Slavic languages: autoref. dis.... Dr. Philol. sciences: 10.02.19 – Samarkand, 1984. – 33 p.

76. Petrova E. Yu. Diachron analysis of the components of the abbreviation group of the city/E. Yu. Petrov // Science and the world in the language space: a collection of scientific works II the Republican Correspondence Scientific Conference. – Makeyevka: DonNASA, 2016. – pp. 534–539.

77. Piotrovsky R. G. Information and statistical parameters of the language/R. G. Piotrovsky // Problems of linguistics. – M., 1967. – 91 p.

78. Podrezova K. N. Lexical abbreviations in modern French/K. N. Podrezov. – Voronezh: Publishing House of Voronezh. gos. un-ta, 1968. – 201 p.

79. Potebnya A. A. From notes on Russian grammar. – M.: ART, 1988. – 150 p.

80. Pugieva N. A. Polysemantism of the verb word, its place and role in the explanatory dictionary/N. A. Pugieva // Principles of compiling a nesting explanatory dictionary of the modern Russian language: Tutorial on a special course. – Grozny, 1991. – pp. 74–137.

81. Reformed A. A. Introduction to linguistics/Ed. V. A. Vinogradov. – M.: Aspect Press, 1996. – 536 p.

82. Rivne V. Yu. About simulated abbrokonstructs (based on the material of the abbreviation group "geo")/V. Yu. Rovnaya // Science and the world in the language space: a collection of scientific works II the Republican Correspondence Scientific Conference (November 23, 2016, Makeevka)/ed.: E. V. Gorokhov, N. M. Zaichenko et al. – Makeevka: DonNASA, 2016. – pp. 544–548.

83. Russian grammar: [in 2 vols.]/Akad. sciences of the USSR, In-t Rus. language; [Ed.: d. Philol. n N. Yu. Shvedova (ch. Ed.), Etc.]. – Moscow: Nauka, 1980- 1982. – 783 p.

84. Ryadinskaya S.V. Case grammar of C. Fillmore and modern understanding of role semantics of the verb/S. V. Ryadinskaya, V. A. Migachev // Foreign languages in professional education: linguometod. context: interwash materials. scientific-practical. conf. – Belgorod, 2006. – pp. 175–180.

85. Ryazanova V. A. Abbreviation groups in structural and onomasiological aspects: dis.... candide. Philol. sciences: 5.9.5/Ryazanova Valeria Alexandrovna. – St. Petersburg, 2023. – 212 p.

86. Ryazanova V. A. Models of education of components of the composite-abbreviation group "Nefte "/V. A. Ryazanov // New horizons of Slavic studies: materials III International scientific readings of students and young scientists in memory of G. I. Richter. – Donetsk, 2016. – pp. 171–177.

87. Ryazanova V. A. Comparative analysis of the nests of equivalence of mutant groups "Nefte" and "Gazo "/V. A. Ryazanova // Science and the world in the

language space: a collection of scientific works II the Republican Correspondence Scientific Conference. – Makeevka, 2016. – pp. 544–548.

88. Ryazanova V. A. Decryption stimulus and decryption matrix: description model/V. A. Ryazanov // Russian language in a multicultural world: I International symposium. T. 2. – Simferopol, 2017. – pp. 198- 204.

89. Ryazanova V. A. Decryption stimulus as a factor in the formation of a mutant group/V. A. Ryazanov // New horizons of Russian studies: a scientific journal. – T. 2. – Donetsk, 2017. – pp. 33–37.

90. Ryazanova V. A. Mutant abbreviation-composite groups in the word-forming system of the language/V. A. Ryazanov // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 9: Philology. – 2017. № 6. – pp. 108–116.

91. Ryazanova V. A. Textual models of the formation of structural varieties of equivalence of mutant (hybrid) composites/V. A. Ryazanov // Russian language in the multicultural world: II International Symposium. – T. 2. – Simferopol, 2018. – pp. 301–306.

92. Ryazanova V. A. Decryptive stimulus as a source of interpretation of a complex word/V. A. Ryazanov // The sociocultural environment of the university and the linguistic development of the personality of a foreign student: a collection of materials from an international scientific and practical conference. – M., 2019. – pp. 84–88.

93. Ryazanova V. A. Typology of abbreviation groups: principles and implementation/V. A. Ryazanov // Bulletin of Donetsk National University. Series D. Philology and psychology. – 2020. №1. – pp. 114–122.

94. Ryazanova V. A. Multiple interpretation of complex words in equivalent phrases/V. A. Ryazanova // Bulletin of the Moscow State Pedagogical University. Series: Philology. Language theory. Language education. – 2021. – № 3(43). – pp. 143–148.

95. Ryazanova V. A. History of Abbreviations Dictionaries/V.A. Ryazanova, A.I. Brovets // International Graduate Bulletin. Russian language abroad. – 2021. – № 3. – pp. 70–76.

96. Ryazanova V. A. Specifics of dictionary interpretation of semantics of abbreviations/V. A. Ryazanov // Scientific notes of the Crimean Federal University named after V. I. Vernadsky. Philological sciences. – 2022. – T. 8. – № 1. – pp. 158–169.

97. Segal M. M. Abbreviations in modern English/M. M. Segal // Questions of English philology: sat. scientific works. – L.: Publishing House of LGPI, 1962. – pp. 216–288.

98. Selivanova E. A. Cognitive onomasiology/E. A. Selivanova. – K.: Phytosocycenter, 2000. – 248 p.

99. T. S. Sergeeva Abbreviation in the system of lexical abbreviations/T. S. Sergeeva // Philological sciences. Questions of theory and practice. – Tambov: Publishing house "Literacy," 2013. – NO. 6, PART 2. – pp. 174–179.

100. Smirnova I. R. About the composite abbrokonstructure/I.R. Smirnova // Bulletin of Donetsk National University. Series D: Philology and Psychology. – 2019. – № 2. – pp. 62–70.

101. Solopov V.I. Education and lexicalization of abbreviations in oral military communication (in the material of Russian and English): author. dis.... Cand. philol. sciences/Solopov V.I. – M., 1989. – 23 p.

102. L.V. Sosnina Adjective composites of the Russian language: structural and onomasiological aspects: diss.... Doc. philol. sciences: 10.02.01/Sosnina Lyudmila Vasilievna. – Donetsk, 2017. – 429 p.

103. Sukhobrus L. S. Combinations of juxtaposite type in Russian: principles of description: dis.... Candidate of Philological Sciences: 10.02.02/Sukhobrus Lyudmila Stanislavovna. – Bakhmut, 2017. – 219 p.

104. A. Sukhotin The problem of "abbreviated" words in the languages of the USSR/A. M. Sukhotin // Writing and revolution. – Moscow-Leningrad, 1933. – № 1. – pp. 151 − 160.

105. Syrovatskaya A.A. Syllabic abbreviations with the construction of bio- in Russian: graduation work: 45.03.01/Syrovatskaya Anastasia Alexandrovna; Crimea. fed. V.I. Vernadsky – Simferopol, 2015. – 87 p.

106. V.I. Terkulov Nests of equivalence of complex reduced words in the abbreviation group with the abbroconstruction BIO. I. Terkulov, A. A. Syrovatskaya // Actual problems of philology and pedagogical linguistics: quarterly scientific journal. – № 3 (19). – Vladikavkaz, 2015. – pp. 99–105.

107. V.I. Terkulov The nest of equivalence of the abbreviation in synchronous lighting/V. I. Terkulov // Russian in the multicultural world: I International symposium. – T. 2. – Simferopol, 2017. – pp. 140- 147.

108. V.I. Terkulov Hierarchy of decryptive stimuli in the nest of equivalence: to the formulation of the problem/V.I. Terkulov, E.S. Krestyaninova // New horizons of Russian studies. – 2018. – № 4. – pp. 27–33.

109. V.I. Terkulov Interference in composites and partially reduced words/V.I. Terkulov // Actual problems of philology and pedagogical linguistics. – 2016. – № 3(23). – pp. 82–86.

110. V.I. Terkulov To the equivalence typology "complex word – phrase "/V. I. Terkulov // Russian language in the multicultural world: IX International Scientific and Practical Conference (June 8–11, 2015)/ov. ed. E. Ya. Titarenko: Sat. scientific. Art. In 2 parts. – PART 1. – Simferopol: Antikva LLC, 2015. – pp. 6–18.

111. V.I. Terkulov Composites and complex words: about the adjacency of phenomena/V.I. Terkulov // Russian language in the multicultural world: X International Scientific and Practical Conference (June 8–11, 2016): Sat. scientific. Art.: in 2 hours – Simferopol: LLC "Antiqua," 2016. – PART 1. – pp. 230–241.

112. V.I. Terkulov Composites of the Russian language in the onomasiological aspect: dis.... Dr. Philol. sciences: 10.02.02/Terkulov Vyacheslav Isaevich. – Gorlovka, 2008. – 472 p.

113. V.I. Terkulov Materials for the Dictionary of Terms of the Experimental Laboratory for the Study of Trends in Abbreviation/V.I. Terkulov // East Slavic Philology: Sat. scientific. tr. – Issue 3 (29): Linguistics. – Gorlovka: Publishing House of the NGO HPE "GIIA," 2016. – pp. 13–25.

114. V.I. Terkulov Methodology for predicting equivalence relations for complex words/V. I. Terkulov // Linguistic research and their use in the practice of teaching Russian and foreign languages: Materials of the I International Scientific and Methodological Conference (May 21, 2018) – Donetsk, 2018. – pp. 69- 79.

115. V.I. Terkulov On the varieties of abbrokonstructs: abroequivalent and abbromorphema/V.I. Terkulov // Continuality and discreteness in language and speech: materials of the 5th International Conference. – Krasnodar, 2015. – S. 30–33.

116. V.I. Terkulov About abbreviation/V.I. Terkulov // Pedagogical treasury of Donbass. – № 1. – 2016. – pp. 8–11.

117. V.I. Terkulov Complex appellates as an autonomous variety of abbreviations/V.I. Terkulov // Rusistika. – № 1. – M., 2020. – pp. 97–112.

118. V.I. Terkulov Complex reduced words: synchronous and diachronous aspects of description/V.I. Terkulov // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 9: Philology. – 2017. – № 6. – pp. 73–97.

119. V.I. Terkulov Text as an indicator of abbreviation equivalence/V.I. Terkulov // Language. Text. Discourse. – No. 16. – Stavropol, 2018. – pp. 34–41.

120. V.I. Terkulov Typology of abbreviated components of abbreviations/V.I. Terkulov // Izvestia of Volgograd State Pedagogical University. – 2015. – № 3 (98). – pp. 127–134.

121. V.I. Terkulov Typology of formal equivalent abbreviations of the complex word/V.I. Terkulov // Stalingrad carnation: Sat. materials international conf

./Ed. I. A. Parishioners and V. I. Suprun. – No. 3. – Volgograd: Fortess, 2018. – pp. 82–91.

122. V.I. Terkulov Department, quasi-department, pseudo-department: definition of terms/V.I. Terkulov // Science and the world in the language space: a collection of scientific works II the Republican Correspondence Scientific Conference. – Makeyevka: DonNASA, 2016. – pp. 37–41.

123. V.I. Terkulov Department: problem setting/V.I. Terkulov // Scientific notes of Trans-Baikal State University. Series: Philology, History, Oriental Studies. – 2010. – № 3. – pp. 135–142.

124. I.S. Ulukhanov Motivation in the word-forming system of the Russian language/I.S. Ulukhanov. – M., 2005. – 314 p.

125. Ukhanov G.P. On the attitude of complex reduced words to phrases with the same subject relevance/G.P. Ukhanov // Scientific reports of higher education: philological sciences. – № 1. – 1961. – pp. 187–196.

126. Filippova L. S. Modern Russian. Morphemic. Word formation: study. manual/L.S. Filippova. – M.: Flint: Science, 2009. – 248 p.

127. Fillmore C. Case of the case/C. Fillmore // New in foreign linguistics. – No. X. – M., 1981. – pp. 369–495.

128. K.I. Chukovsky Alive as life: about Russian/N.V. Korneychukov. – M.: Children's literature, 1966. – 208 p.

129. Shadyko S. Abbreviations in Russian (in comparison with Polish): author. dis.... Dr. Philol. sciences: 10.02.01/Shadyko Stanislav. – M., 2000. – 45 p.

130. Shapovalova A.P. Experience in constructing a general theory of abbreviation (Based on the material of French abbreviated lexical units): diss.... Dr. Philol. sciences: 10.02.19/Shapovalova Alexandra Petrovna. – Rostov-on-Don, 2004. – 421 p.

131. Shansky N. M. Affixoids in the word-forming system of the Russian language/N. M. Shansky // Studies in the modern Russian language. – M., 1970. – pp.157–171.

132. Shumarin S.I. Lexicographic representation of semantic and derivational processes in the field of abbreviation/S. I. Shumarin // Problems of history, philology, culture. – 2011. – № 3(33). – pp. 94–96.

133. M.A. Yarmashevich Abbreviation in modern European languages: structural, semantic and functional aspects: diss.... Dr. Philol. sciences: 10.02.19/Yarmashevich Marina Arkadyevna. – Saratov, 2004. – 480 p.

134. M.A. Yarmashevich Sign of abbreviation units/M. A. Yarmashevich // Bulletin of OSU. – 2002. – № 6. – pp. 106–110.

135. M.A. Yarmashevich Department as a type of abbreviation/M. A. Yarmashevich // Bulletin of OSU. – 2003. – № 5. – pp. 4–8.

Illustrative material

136. D.I. Alekseev Dictionary of abbreviations of the Russian language: about 17,000 abbreviations/D. I. Alekseev, I. G. Gozman, G. V. Sakharov; ed. D.I. Alekseeva. – Ed. 4th, erased. – M.: Russian language, 1984. – 485 p.

137. L.N. Baranova Dictionary of abbreviations of foreign language origin: about 1,000 abbreviations: deciphering and pronunciation, use in speech/L.N. Baranova. – M.: ASTPressBook, 2009. – 320 p.

138. N.V. Gabdreeva Dictionary of composites of the Russian language of the recent period/N.V. Gabdreev. – M., 2012. – 275 p.

139. Eliseev I. A. Dictionary of abbreviations and acronyms of the Russian language/I. A. Eliseev. – M.: Infra-M, 2015. – 716 p.

140. G.V. Klimenko Dictionary of department stores of the modern Russian language: Educational edition. – M., 2019. – 110 p.

141. Short dictionary of military abbreviations: about 5,000 abbreviations/Comp. N. N. Tyutyunnikov. – M.: Publishing house "Pen," 2020. – 446 p.

142. National Russian Language Corps. – Access mode: www.ruscorpora.ru.

143. Novichkov N. N. Dictionary of modern Russian abbreviations and abbreviations: About 12,000 abbreviations and abbreviations/N. N. Novichkov. – Publishing House: Infoglob, 1995 – 298 p.

144. New abbreviations in Russian. 1996–1999/ed. I.V. Fagradyants. – M., 2000. – 160 p.

145. New dictionary of abbreviations of the Russian language: about 32,000 abbreviations/Ed. E. G. Kovalenko. – M., 1995. – 668 p.

146. A.V. Petrov Nesting explanatory-word-forming dictionary of composites/A.V. Petrov. – Simferopol, 2003. – 286 p.

147. Sklyarevskaya G. N. Dictionary of Abbreviations of the Modern Russian Language/G.N. Sklyarevskaya. – M.: Eksmo, 2004. – 448 p.

148. Dictionary of abbreviations and abbreviations of the army and special services: about 7,000 words/comp. A. A. Shchelokov. – M.: AST: Geleos, 2003. – 318 p.

149. Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language/Ed. D.V. Dmitriev. – M.: Astrel: AST, 2003. – 1578 p.

150. S.V. Fadeev Thematic dictionary of abbreviations of the modern Russian language: about 20,000 abbreviations/S.V. Fadeev. – M., 1998. – 537 p.