

УДК 811.111'373.611'373.2:569.723

doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30970/vpl.2019.71.10298>

WORD-BUILDING AND MOTIVATIONAL FEATURES OF ENGLISH OFFICIAL HIPONYMS

Natalia ALEKSIEIEVA

*Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University,
English grammar department,
24/26, French Boulevard, Odessa, Ukraine, 65058,
phone +380974342467
e-mail: natalie.m.alekseeva@gmail.com*

This article is devoted to the peculiarities of the word-building and motivation of the official hipponymicon of the English language. The investigation sets out various characteristics of horse names, which clearly distinguish them from other onymic categories, in particular: there is a vast difference between the official and nonofficial nomination; official hipponyms is the most systematic and unified category among other zoonyms; there are no horse names which are of high frequency in official nomination; the system of hipponyms is multifaceted and horse names engage all word-building devices in their formation; nominal hipponyms are formed without any objective motive and constitute part of the official hipponymicon; wordplay facilitates the creation of nominal hipponyms. Official hipponymicon of the English language as an onomastic subcategory is unstable and is constantly updated. The reasons for the owners to create special names are extra-linguistic – new names are invented to avoid repetitions, since denotational uniqueness is a regulated policy. Horse names engage all word-building devices in their formation: affixation, shortening, abbreviation, compounding, syntactic constructions, occasionalisms and borrowings, as well as onimisation and transonimisation. The survey shows that a large amount of the analysed hipponyms are occasionalisms. They serve as a flexible tool for horse naming in a situation where there is a constant need for the expansion of the hipponymicon. The official hipponymicon reflect newly coined words and realias which appear in the English language. The author claims, that horse names can no more be considered peripheral items in the English naming system.

Keywords: hipponym, hipponymicon, word formation, word-building pattern, motivation, motive, wordplay.

The formulation of the problem. The names of horses are scarcely studied in the realm of onomastics. However, it is horse breeding that is one of the leading branches of animal husbandry in the modern world. According to statistics prepared by the British Horse Society, the estimated population of GB horses in 2010–2011 is just below one million horses (988,000) [21]. Similar studies were carried out in 2017–2018, which show that total number of horses owned in the U.S. is 7,600 000 [24]. Racing is the second best attended sport in Britain after football. We may conclude that Great Britain and the USA are countries with the highest horse populations. The key role of the horse in determining the British and American identity, its importance as one of the essential components of Englishness has been repeatedly affirmed by scientists. Taking into account all those factors, onomasticians cannot ignore such onymic category as hipponyms, which in a certain way characterizes the “linguistic consciousness” of its creators and also contains peculiar social and cultural codes.

The **aim** of this paper is to explore the hipponymic system of the English language with the focus on its word-building and motivational peculiarities. The realization of the set

goal includes in its scope the following objectives: 1) to highlight the main features of the hipponymicon as a particular onymic category; 2) to characterize the peculiarities of the official nomination; 3) to define the ways of word formation of hipponyms in modern English.

Proper names that denote horses in the English language are the **object** of the research, and the **subject** are the peculiarities of word-building and motivation of English official hipponyms. The study **material** (2000 English hipponyms) was selected from breed registries for horses in Great Britain and the United States, using a representative sampling method.

The analysis of recent researches and publications. The names of horses have become the object of extensive onomastic research a short time ago. The term “hipponym” was first popularized by Russian linguist N. Podolskaya in the fundamental work “Словарь русской ономастической терминологии” (1978, 1988) in response to the new insights and perspectives on zoonymics in the then onomastics [6: 51]. A question about nature and structure of hipponyms was repeatedly discussed in their works by T. Romanova [7], N. Ryadchenko [8], O. Salmina [9] and others. In the context of a general analysis, hipponyms were studied by S. Varkhol [4], M. Siusko [12], M. Torchynskiy [14], P. Chuchka [16].

The coining of such term in the European onomastic science dates from 2014, when it was first used a number of times in the research paper entitled “We are surrounded by onymies: relations among names, name-types, and terminological categories” by R. Coates. While mentioning the most frequently occurring traditional onomastic categories, which occupy a central position in the English onomasticon (anthroponyms, toponyms, etc.), the author also identifies hipponyms, which he designates as the names of horses [19: 10]. In this regard, it should be noted that Coates’s work has some extremely important implications for our investigation today.

The **novelty** of this inquiry and its **scientific significance** is determined by the research on the zoonymic subcategory, which has still been very poorly investigated and tends to occupy marginal positions. The relevance of the topic stems from the lack of research studies on this issue.

The presentation of the main research materials. In previous studies, attempts have been made to classify the elements of the hipponymicon, to describe various types of hipponyms in relation to their structural features and to analyze the motivational characteristics of the names of horses [1; 2; 3]. Unfortunately, the main ways of the word formation of hipponyms were left beyond the scope of these pieces of research.

The following lines will therefore be confined to the specificity of English hipponyms, as a separate paradigmatic zoonymic category. This specificity, in turn, contributes to the identification and explanation of the main patterns of hipponymic word formation. A major thrust of the present analysis is based on the opposition of two groups – official and nonofficial horse names. The former, which includes show names, birth names and national names, is obligatory in the official documentation, appears in the press, feature films and documentaries. Official names are spoken out by a commentator during sports competitions, thus are also used in the process of communication. The latter group consists of barn or stable names, which are formed only for use in speech, as an alternative to the official names, formalized in writing. The creation of informal names is accompanied by the desire to adapt official names to colloquial speech. Often an informal name, used to refer to an animal, is a shorter version of its official name, though sometimes

it has nothing to do with the registered name – the use of the names from these two independent onymic categories often do not overlap. Official naming, in any case, is considered to be primary as compared with nonofficial.

We now turn to the detailed analysis of the official hipponymicon. Interestingly, the official nomination is attributable mainly to the extralinguistic factors, which are expressed in a broad system of nomination rules approved by international regulatory bodies, which serve as rigid regulators of naming process¹.

It is worth noting, that in the countries under study the percentage of horses that are not registered and whose keeping does not comply with international rules and standards is very small. Regardless of the purpose of acquiring and maintaining a horse, it requires, first and foremost, to be registered, which in a way allows to follow the horse through its life, makes it possible for owners to preserve information on past performance (show and race records), horse pedigrees, auction history and so on. On the official website for the registration of Arabian horses in the United States and Canada, it is highlighted that “registration increases the value of your horse, makes it more attractive to buyers, and opens the door to many local, regional and national events available only to registered horses” [20]. No fewer than 50,000 name applications are submitted annually only in the United States [23].

“What we do here at the Jockey Club is we have an approval process whereby the owners of the Thoroughbreds will submit the names to us, and we enter those names into a computer system and run them through a check of the phonetics of the name”, Jockey Club registrar R. Bailey stated in his interview [26]. Not coincidentally, the article in which this interview was published is called “The Science of Naming a Racehorse”, since the choice of the name of a horse with a pedigree is really a huge science. The headline of the article in *The Washington Post* – “Think picking a baby name is tough? Try naming a thoroughbred” – also illustrates the fact of horse nomination being a complex process [4].

The degree of distinctiveness horse names display allows to point up their main characteristics, which distinguish them from other onymic classes and determine the specificity of their formation:

- the official names of horses are not formed according to the same principles as other names: a significant difference between a hipponym and other zoonymic subclasses lays in the close connection between the official passport form of the name and the sports

¹The list of rules is presented on the official website of the Jockey Club, which has been charged with maintaining the main breed registry of the United States. The document clearly identifies 17 classes of names prohibited for nomination, in particular: “1. Names consisting of more than 18 letters (spaces and punctuation marks count as letters); 2. Names consisting entirely of initials such as C.O.D., F.O.B., etc.; 3. Names ending in “filly,” “colt,” “stud,” “mare,” “stallion,” or any similar horse-related term; 4. Names consisting entirely of numbers. Numbers above thirty may be used if they are spelled out; 5. Names ending with a numerical designation such as “2nd” or “3rd,” whether or not such a designation is spelled out; 6. Names of living persons unless written permission to use their name is on file with The Jockey Club; 7. Names of persons no longer living unless approval is granted by The Jockey Club based upon a satisfactory written explanation submitted to the Registrar; 8. Names of racetracks or graded stakes races; Names clearly having commercial, artistic or creative significance; 10. Names that are suggestive or have a vulgar or obscene meaning; names considered in poor taste; or names that may be offensive to religious, political or ethnic groups; 11. Names that appear to be designed to harass, humiliate or disparage a specific individual, group of individuals or entity; 12. Names that are currently active either in racing or breeding; 13. Names of winners in the past 25 years of grade one stakes races; 14. Names from the restricted list (Hall of Fame members, Eclipse Awards winners, Kentucky Derby winners, etc.); 15. Names similar in spelling or pronunciation to already existing names; 16. Names of horses previously recorded in *The American Stud Book* by the same sire or out of the same dam as the foal for which the attempt is made. 17. Names of horses appearing within the first five generations of the pedigree of the foal for which the attempt is made” [25].

sphere, that regulates and governs the naming process. By their nature, the subcategory of the official hipponyms is the most systematic and unified category among other zoonyms;

- each name should be clearly different from the existing ones: the official naming rules exclude the choice of identical (similar to already registered) name for a new registration. Therefore, in its official use, a single, artificially created name never turns into a standard, repeatedly used name, which is typical of anthroponyms. The foregoing indicates the absence of a formed traditional repertoire of hipponyms, as well as the impossibility of the hipponyms to be inherited, their belonging only to one generation;

- the process of horse naming is continuous and will never be ended, which makes it appropriate to define hipponymic space as an open and evolving complex system with a high naming variability.

Much of the above-mentioned could be summed up in the following paradox: being clearly delineated and governed by a well-established body of extralinguistic norms, official horse naming at the same time is characterized by maximum variability, mobility and diversity due to the “legal impossibility” to recycle already registered names. The noteworthy feature here is that equestrian rules of naming serve both as a stabilizing and destabilizing force, not designed to counter the flow of new names (including borrowings) and not able to establish the sustainability of the functioning of the system.

Summing up the facts set forth above, we emphasize that the English-language hipponymic system is well-developed and displays active and vivid process of word formation, in which the specificity of this category of names is manifested.

The formation of proper names as compared with the appellatives presents in general rather broad sphere of linguistic studies. A wide range of onomastic studies is devoted to word formation of onyms, which displays a greater variety of word-building patterns as compared with word formation of appellatives. At the present stage of development of onomastics, researchers distinguish three main types of word formation such as morphological, lexico-syntactic, and lexico-semantic, which are also true for hipponymic word-building [14: 376]. In what follows, we are going to discuss each of them in more detail. Three main types of morphological derivation can be singled out:

- 1) affixation (derivational and inflectional affixes), for instance: *Dreamium* consists of the root morpheme *dream* and the suffix *-ium*, attached to the end of it; *Dreamette* has the same root morpheme and the French suffix *-ette*; *Outthink* consists of the prefix *out-* attached to the root morpheme *think*; *Enrapture* has the same structure; hipponyms *Overabundance* and *Inagotable* are formed by means of attaching both prefix and suffix to the root morpheme, thus both affixes attribute to formation of a new word (confixation); horse name *Seafaring* is formed by adding the inflection *-ing* to the root morpheme. An interesting fact is that it is impossible to distinguish all types of word-forming affixes, since they do not have an elaborated system and are systematically enriched by borrowings. Thus, it is possible to conclude that hipponyms are formed with the help of a great variety of derivational units;

- 2) shortening (contraction), which implies removing of some parts of words: *Lyr* ← *Lyric*, *Melo* ← *Melodia*, *Mon* ← *Monarch*, *Tess's Sis* ← *Tess's Sister*. In the formation of hipponyms this word-building pattern is rarely observed;

- 3) abbreviation, which include blending (telescoping), that is, merging parts of words into one word. For example, hipponym *Thorobrown* is formed by a combination of one part of a word *Thoroughly* with another word *Brown* to coin a new word. This type of word formation is especially productive in creating hipponyms, since there is a tradition

in horse breeding to create a name that incorporates the names of the sire, dam or other forebears. The following examples serve a vivid illustration of it: *Alysheba* ← *Alydar* + *Bel Sheba*; *Bedrock* ← *Rollick 'n Roll* + *In My Water Bed*; *Constoot* ← *Iron Constitution* + *Root Toot Toot*. Obviously, in the case of the formation of hipponyms such word-building pattern as blending acquires new features, as not only words but also word combinations may be compressed to create a new name. Hipponyms of this type often create humorous effect. In a significant number of cases, hipponyms are formed by the combination of an appellative or an onym with an abbreviation, which is a means of encryption, since full abbreviations are prohibited, for example: *A. J.'s Beauty*, *Mr. E. T.*, *Tiz High P. S. I.*

Besides the above mentioned three basic types of morphological derivation, the researcher identifies conversion as an interim, morphological-syntactic way of word formation, the essence of which is the transition of words from one part of speech to another (in the case of proper names – to nouns), that is, their substantivation. However, we must state that hipponyms cannot be qualified as those formed by conversion, since conversion itself implies a change in the morphological paradigm of the appellative, which we cannot discern unless the word is given in context. At the same time, we bear in mind that “objectiveness, as the most significant feature of the category of proper names, requires from all the words belonging to this category substantiveness” [10: 109].

We now turn to the types of lexico-syntactic derivation. Within its framework, hipponyms are formed by compounding, which we define as the compression of a free word combinations into one word-form without cutting any parts of initial lexemes: *Moonarrival*, *Uncleson*, *Tribalvibe*, *Diamondgoldrush*, *Lovedontstophere*. Interestingly, some onomasticians tend to distinguish between compounding, composition and forming of “ukstaposuts”, although they mention that the distinction between such ways of word formation is blurred [14: 365]. But as far as the word-building of hipponyms is concerned, such subdivision is not necessary.

Compounding is one of the most productive ways of word formation. It is connected with the necessity to meet certain restrictions we listed above. Therefore, the hipponym *Angelonmyshoulder* would have been rejected by the Jockey Club registrar, if it hadn't been formed by means of compression, as with a limitation of exactly 18 characters it would have consisted of 20 characters instead of 17. Other examples of the same pattern are: *Awholenewballgame* (17 signs), *Champagneforlunch* (17 signs), *Walkamileinmyshoes* (18 signs). However, it should be noted in this connection that the way of word formation described above is fairly perfunctory, as the only difference between such names and these made up of compound constructions is in their graphical layout.

Next, there is a syntactic type of word formation, which is classified by M. Torchinsky as a subdivision of the lexical-semantic type of naming and defined it as “the use of various syntactic constructions (word combinations, sentences or phrases) in the function of a separate nominative unit” [14: 510]. Different structures fall under this category, such as: noun phrase (*Fashion Design*, *Knight Road*, *Devil Baby*), adjective phrase (*Charming Jasper*, *Clever Wildcat*, *Racing Melody*); verb phrase (*Ain't Jokin Around*, *Born to Run Slew*); the synthetical genitive structure (*Alfrie's Friends*, *Addison's Hope*); fixed phrases denoting well-known things (*Imagine Dragons* – music band, *Harry Potter* – novel, *Lambergini G S F* – car brand); degrees of comparison (*Good Better Best*, *Better n' Best*); descriptive constructions (*Finally Sunday*, *Fit for Applause*, *Never Out of Style*); syntactic constructions (*You Must Be Joking*, *You'd Be Surprised*, *You Know Who I Am*, *My Name Is Ralpie*, *Am I Especial*); tautological phrases (*Tommy Tom Tom*, *Nite Nite*

Nadola, Ouch Ouch Ouch); rhyme phrases (*Handy Dandy, Clickit Or Trickit, Kerri Is Scary, He Ain't No Saint*); imperative sentences (*Go My Champ, Put Family First, Listen to Me*); auxiliary verb contractions (*I'm a Dream Maker, I've Got It Too*); grammatical norm violations (*Here My Are*); idioms (*Outofsiteoutofmind, White Lie, Call It a Night*); proverbs (*No Risk No Reward*); informal contractions (*I Ain't Yur Honey, Wanna Be an Angel, Gonna Get Ya*). It appears paradoxical that though informal contractions are used mostly in spoken English and some informal writing, they serve as a productive way of naming specifically in the official sphere.

At this point, we may conclude, that the major part of English hipponymic system consists of two- or three-word phrases and reflect a wide range of structures.

Next, there is onimisation, which is considered as one of the sources of enlarging of the onomasticon within the lexico-semantic type of word formation. It presents the transference of appellatives into proper names. For instance, *Paint, Lovetrip, Bar, Ticket* can be used both as a common and proper noun.

It is noticeable, that horse names may derive from a range of parts of speech. Moreover, those parts of speech that A. Ufimtseva claims to be a priori non-nominative (using the term nomination in a broader sense, as a lexical nomination), namely: pronouns, adverbs of time and place, verbs of action, prepositions, conjunctions, particles, are all actively used in the formation of hipponyms [15: 49]. The following examples are suggestive of it: *Moreover* (conjunctive adverb), *Here Again* (adverbial phrase), *Hey Why Not* (interjection + negative question), *Eso* (Spanish pronoun), *But* (conjunction), *And Again* (conjunction + adverb of time), *Upside Down* (adverb of manner), *Ugh* (interjection), *Tictac* (onomatopoeia), *Always* (adverb of time).

Within the lexico-semantic type of word formation we may also distinguish transonimisation, which is the process of forming of hipponyms, derived from other onyms: *Angelina Maria, Steven* (anthroponyms); *Missouri, Seattle Slew, Australia* (toponyms); *Sir Percy Blakeney* (poetonym – the hero of the novel *The Scarlet Pimpernel*); *Porsche Pink, Suzuki* (poreyonyms), *Winnertakesitall, No Fooling Me* (musiconyms), etc. and pluralization, as can be seen in: *Thanks Tips, Headlines, Better Reasons, That Rocks*.

As far as transonimisation is concerned, we shall refer to Coates's work, where he puts emphasis on the fact that naming some individual after some other individual comes naturally without any categorical boundary at all. Here is the way he researched: "On 4 August 2011, I collected and analysed the names of all the racehorses running at six British racehorses on that day. I found that 90 out of 309 (about 29 %) carried names which were historically the proper name of some other thing: a person, a place, a mountain, an artistic work, and so on" [18: 128]. Thus, the author claims the existence of English cultural rule, according to which "Human personal names may be bestowed on horses; or, the form of human personal names is suitable for the names of horses" [19: 10]. We may add here, that the form of any onymic category is suitable for the name of a horse.

Furthermore, within the lexical-semantic type of word formation M. Torchinsky identifies accentuation – a change in stress. But though it can be used in creating official hipponyms, it would be very hard to discern, because of the difficulty of collecting data on their pronunciation when racing.

Another productive way of creating hipponyms is borrowing, which N. Podolskaya identifies among three major ways (along with onimisation and transonimisation) of enlarging of the onomasticon [5: 40–53]. It is not surprising, that it serves as one of the most productive ways of word formation with the names borrowed from Spanish (*Abuelo*

Bello, La Chiquita, Madre Selva, Nunca Mires Atras), French (*Cheval, Chevrolet, Joliesse*), German (*Schwaube, Schumacher, Schlossed*), etc. Transliterated forms of Russian common and proper names also serve as a source to form new names: *Vapnyarka, Sharapova, Yaroslav, Ognenniy*. Such a diversity of borrowed forms is due to the international nature of the functioning of official horse names.

As we have seen, the system of hipponyms is multifaceted and horse names engage all word-building devices in their formation. Taking into account the statement of M. Torchinsky about the need for a clear demarcation of different onymic classifications, in particular structural, word-forming and motivational, we consider it appropriate to indicate the most significant motivational peculiarity of formation of the names of horses, since the originality of the official hipponymicon is due to the diversity of word-building models and the peculiarities of motivation [14: 445].

Names may therefore be divided into 13 classes, according to the nature of their motivation in the manner described more fully elsewhere [1: 11]. Within this classification we have identified nominal hipponyms, which are of particular interest to us. Such hipponyms are formed without any objective motive and are selected solely on the principle of absence of a similar name in the registry. At this point it is important to look at it in greater detail.

The productivity of forming of nominal hipponyms is due to the constant need for new names, as the correlation with the breed, the appearance of a horse, or its character, has reached its limits. The result of a “forced” nomination is the creation of a large number of artificial names, which do not reflect any characteristic of an animal. Often, the meaning of the primary word is in no way combined with the denotatum, putting it another way: the onym in no way corresponds to the hipponymic semantics. However, the use of nominal names as horse names, oddly enough, is not inappropriate.

The ideas concerning this peculiarity were set out in Coates’s seminal work “Eight Issues in the Pragmatic Theory of Properhood” (2007). He claims, that “if we concentrate for a moment on hyponymy, or at any rate the actually-recorded names of horses, we will soon discover that absolutely any linguistic material can serve as a horse-name. The “system” – if anarchy can truly be called a system – of British racehorse names is one of total onymic freedom, and there are no hipponymic types” [18: 128]. Such a broad scope of sources behind the act of naming correlate with the fact, that there is no social or cultural norm in the English language, that a certain name may be categorized as a horse name.

Nevertheless, V. Toptun does not question the systematic nature of zoonyms: “Zoonymy is not a chaotic set and not separate isolated facts, but integral, interconnected groups, which, when verified, reveal such a connection that predetermines their systemic description” [13: 77].

Hence, nominal hipponyms are of particular interest to researchers, because it is in this field, where the highest degree of innovation and arbitrariness of naming is manifested. The most productive way of horse naming is the creation of occasional names, which are defined as “words and figures of speech that do not correspond to the common use and reflect the individual taste of the speaker and individual word formation” [11: 494].

The peculiarity of horse naming lies in the principle of wordplay, which brings to the fore the way hipponyms are constructed, their sound image, while their meaning and conceptual sphere go to the background. For instance, with the purpose of realization of expressiveness the use of transonimization is accompanied by an insignificant lexical substitution of components. On the one hand, the newly created onym refers to a

transformed primary word, and on the other hand, it generates a new meaning of a proper name, based on a wordplay, producing a humorous effect, for example: *Fiftyshadesofhay* (*Fifty Shades of Gray* – American drama film), *Redhot Fillypepper* (*Red Hot Chili Peppers* – American rock band), *Poni Colada* (*Pina Colada* – national drink in Puerto Rico).

Another unusual way of wordplay is the hipponymization of an idiom with its slight transformation: *Of the Devil* ← «speak of the devil» (contraction), *Worth a Pennie* ← «worth every penny» (substitution), *No Kidding Around* ← «kidding around».

Some occasional hipponyms are formed by means of substitution of a separate segment of the primary word with another one. We distinguish the following derivation techniques: 1) adding a suffix to a primary word: *Tigeresque* ← tiger, *Fantastikate* ← fantastic, *Tallence* ← tall; change of prepositive component: *Missnifique* ← magnifique, *Saintsation* ← sensation, *Tamtastic*, *Dreamtastic Day* ← Fantastic; 3) hipponymization of an appellative, accompanied by a slight spelling change: *Dearling* ← *Darling*; *Very Possebull* ← possible, *Thats Brown Suger* ← sugar, *Purrfect Alibi* ← perfect; 4) the end of one root morpheme serves as the beginning of another: *Notasimplegal*, *Momentime*.

The following stylistic devices are also actively used: alliteration – *Best Bet Betty*, *Witch Won Will Win*, *Little Lady Lexi*; oxymoron – *One Million Carats*, *Moore No More*, *Bad as in Good*; tautology – *Redredred*, *Berry Berry*, *Nuj Nuj Wink Wink*; parallelism – *Waytocutewaytocool*.

The survey shows that a large amount of the analysed hipponyms are occasionalisms. They serve as a flexible tool for horse naming in a situation where there is a constant need for the expansion of the hipponymicon. Such names are rather figurative and expressive, since the owners try to “ennoble” the name, to show the potential of their own imagination and ingenuity.

Another paradox of this class of onyms is that although official hipponyms are formalized in writing, they function equally in language and in speech – during the race, when they are spoken out by a commentator and aimed at the mass audience. Thus, taking into account the fact that the name of a horse will be repeatedly spoken out by the commentator at equestrian competitions, owners pick up the names with a view to their being applied in speech, and therefore deliberately create humorous effect that promotes better memorization. New, fanciful hipponyms easily take on the attractive function – they are made to attract attention, to awaken interest and just for the entertainment of the general public. Examples of such unusual names are *Suddenbreakingnews*, *Another Horse*, *Arrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr*, *Badly*. This is how they sound in the context: “*And here comes Bob Little riding Badly*”.

Some hipponyms bear the semantics of diminutiveness: *Mollie Lil Girl*, *Shamie*, *Smartzie*.

We also identify hipponyms, „the body” of which, serves as a kind of meta-language of the nominative process. These are descriptive constructions, for instance: *Myname'snotfred*, *So Be It Rachael*, *Ahorsecalledan*, *My Name Is Forest*, which question the very laws of nomination.

It is worth noting, that proper names are primarily cultural elements. The reflection in the hipponymicon of linguistic innovations that have just been introduced into the active vocabulary is, therefore, the best illustration of it. In 2011, the hipponym *Selfie* was entered into the official American Jockey Club Registry, whereas in 2013 *Selfie* was selected as the Word of the Year by Oxford Dictionary. Another hipponym *Refudiate* entered the registry

in 2010, the same year it was chosen as the Word of the Year by New Oxford American Dictionary. *Refudiate* is composed of the parts of the words *refute* and *repudiate*.

Conclusion. Nowadays both the English and the American may claim to be the most equestrian nations in the world. Horse names in this regard can no more be considered peripheral items in the English naming system. The name of a horse serves as a verbal indication of its uniqueness, an important part of its image and an obligatory component of branding. Turning to the analysis of the hipponymic material, it is necessary to consider two separate subsystems of official and nonofficial hipponyms, which are differently organized and are characterized by different tendencies of development, and therefore do not overlap.

Official hipponymicon of the English language as an onomastic subcategory is unstable and is constantly updated. The reasons for the owners to create special names are extra-linguistic – new names are invented to avoid repetitions, since denotational uniqueness is a regulated policy. Horse names engage all word-building devices in their formation: affixation, shortening, abbreviation, compounding, syntactic constructions, occasionalisms and borrowings, as well as onimisation and transonimisation. The official hipponymicon reflect newly coined words and realias which appear in the English language.

The category of hipponyms is the most paradoxical one. Being regulated by rigid rules, the formation of hipponyms at the same time is highly dependent on the subjective preferences of nominees. Here nominal hipponyms, which are created without any objective motive are of particular interest to us. Wordplay facilitates the creation of nominal hipponyms. In this case, the “inviolability” of the word is denied – the primary words can be “split” into parts and “recompiled” in a different way. Such freedom of “naming behavior”, a kind of linguistic avant-garde is a unique feature of the formation of official horse names. Hipponyms prove the inexhaustibility of language resources in solving any tasks of the nomination.

Prospects of our further research in this direction may involve the study of word-building and motivational peculiarities of English nonofficial hipponyms.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. *Алексеева Н. М.* Мотиваційна структура офіційного гіппонімікону англійської мови / Н. М. Алексеева // Записки з ономастики: [зб. наук. праць]. – Одеса : Астропринт, 2018. – Вип. 21. – С. 5–19.
2. *Алексеева Н. М.* Особливості функціонування офіційних гіппонімів на позначення скакових коней / Н. М. Алексеева // Записки з ономастики: [зб. наук. праць]. – Одеса : Астропринт, 2017. – Вип. 20. – С. 5–17.
3. *Алексеева Н. М.* Структурна типологія гіппонімів / Н. М. Алексеева // Мова : [наук.-теор. часопис]. – Одеса: Астропринт, 2018. – Вип. 29. – С. 61–68.
4. *Ворхол С.* Значение зоонимии в исследовании проблем этногенеза славян (круг проблем) // Ономастика Поволжья : материалы VIII конф. по ономастике Поволжья / отв. ред. В. И. Супрун. – Москва : Изд-во Ин-та этнологии и антропологии РАН, 2001. – С. 208–218.
5. *Подольская Н. В.* Проблемы ономастического совообразования / Н. В. Подольская // Вопросы языкознания. – Москва, 1990. – № 3. – С. 40–53.
6. *Подольская Н. В.* Словарь русской ономастической терминологии. – Москва : Наука, 1988. – 192 с.

7. Романова Т. П. Система русских официальных иппонимов и формирование ее типологических черт : автореф. дис. на соискание степени канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.01 / Романова Татьяна Павловна. – Воронеж, 1988. – 22 с.
8. Рядченко Н. Г. Зоонимия как класс ономастической лексики / Н. Г. Рядченко // Актуальные вопросы русской ономастики. – Киев, 1988. – С. 88–96.
9. Салмина О. В. Традиционный пласт русской зоонимии (на материале кличек животных с. Покровка Самарской области) / О. В. Салмина // Разноуровневая характеристика лексических единиц : сб. науч. ст. по материалам докладов и сообщений конф., 19-20 июня 2001 г. – Смоленск, 2001. – С. 174–184.
10. Суперанская А. В. Общая теория имени собственного / А. В. Суперанская. – Москва : Наука, 1973. – 365 с.
11. Сучасний словник іншомовних слів / уклали: О. І. Скопенко, Т. В. Цимбалюк. – Київ : Довіра, 2006. – 789 с.
12. Сюсько М. И. Способы и типы деривации в зоонимии / М. И. Сюсько. – Киев : УМК ВО, 1989. – 48 с.
13. Топтун В. М. Взаємозв'язки антропонімів та зоонімів в українських говорах Чернігівщини / В. М. Топтун // Наукові записки [Ніжинського державного університету ім. Миколи Гоголя]. – 2010. – С. 75–77. – (Серія : Філологічні науки ; № 2).
14. Торчинский М. М. Структура онімного простору української мови: [монографія] / Михайло Миколайович Торчинський. – Хмельницький: Авіст, 2008. – 550 с.
15. Уфимцева А. А. Лексическая номинация (первичная нейтральная) / А. А. Уфимцева // Языковая номинация (Виды наименований). – Москва : Наука, 1977. – С. 5–85.
16. Чучка П. П. Слов'янське/неслов'янське в зоохімії Закарпаття / П. П. Чучка // Українська славістична конференція. – Чернівці, 1964. – С. 61–63.
17. Шебештян Я. М. Сучасна українська літературно-художня зоонімія: функції, склад та структура : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.01 “Українська мова” / Я. М. Шебештян. – Чернівці, 2008. – 20 с.
18. Coates R. Eight Issues in the Pragmatic Theory of Properhood / R. Coates // Acta Linguistica Lithuanica. – 2007. – 66. – P. 119–140.
19. Coates R. We are urrounded by onymies: relations among names, name-types, and terminological categories, in Names in Daily Life / R. Coates // Proceedings of the XXIV ICOS International Congress of Onomastic Sciences. – Barcelona, 2014. – P. 6–13.
20. Arabian Horses Registration [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <https://www.arabianhorses.org/registration/>
21. Equestrian Statistics [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : www.bhs.org.uk
22. Horse names released by Jockey Club [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <https://www.registry.jockeyclub.com/registry.cfm?page=releasedNameSearch&letter=A&CFID=65719575&CFTOKEN=4ca9a3b8793ce85-2114D770-5056-BE0C-9773DCA9B5005C07>
23. No Easy Task To Name Names [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/sports/1992/01/04/no-easy-task-to-name-names/51968299-4a5b-46b6-9766-a608c9027501/?utm_term=.0e8a43d69a1f
24. Pet Industry Market Size & Ownership Statistics [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : https://www.americanpetproducts.org/press_industrytrends.asp

25. The Jockey Club Registry [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <https://www.registry.jockeyclub.com/registry.cfm?page=tjcRuleBook#six>

26. The Science of Naming a Racehorse [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=4634884>

27. Think picking a baby name is tough? Try naming a thoroughbred [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : www.washingtonpost.com/news/animalia/wp/2016/05/05/think-picking-a-baby-name-is-tough-try-naming-a-thoroughbred/?utm_term=.ea4c647d52c9

28. Warchoń S. Słownik etymologiczno-motywacyjny słowiańskiej zoonimii ludowej. T. I–V / S. Warchoń. – Lublin : Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2007–2016.

REFERENCES

1. Aleksieieva, N. M. (2018). *Motyvatsiina struktura ofitsiinoho hipponimikonu anhliiskoi movy. Zapysky z onomastyky* [Notes on Onomastics]. Odesa: Astroprint, vol. 21, 5–19.

2. Aleksieieva, N. M. (2018). *Osoblyvosti funktsionuvannia ofitsiinykh hipponimiv na poznachennia skakovykh konei. Zapysky z onomastyky* [Notes on Onomastics]. Odesa: Astroprint, vol. 20, 5–17.

3. Aleksieieva, N. M. (2018). *Strukturna typolohiia hipponimiv. Mova: [nauk.-teor. chasopys]*. Odesa: Astroprint, vyp. 29, 61–68.

4. Vorhol S. (2001). Znachenie zoonimii v issledovanii problem etnogeneza slavyan (krug problem). In: *Onomastika Povolzhya: materialy VIII konf. po onomastike Povolzhya / otv. red. V. I. Suprun*. Moskva: Izd-vo In-ta etnologii i antropologii RAN, 208–218.

5. Podolskaya, N. V. (1990). Problemy onomasticheskogo sovoobrazovaniya. *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya*. Moskva, № 3, 40–53.

6. Podolskaya, N. V. (1988). *Slovar russkoj onomasticheskoy terminologii*. Moskva: Nauka.

7. Romanova, T. P. (1988). *Sistema russkikh oficialnykh ipponimov i formirovanie ee tipologicheskikh chert: avtoref. dis. na soiskanie stepeni kand. filol. nauk: spec. 10.02.01*. Voronezh

8. Ryadchenko, N. G. Zoonimiya kak klass onomasticheskoy leksiki. In: *Aktualnye voprosy russkoj onomastiki*. Kiev, 88–96.

9. Salmina, O. V. (2001). Tradicionnyj plast russkoj zoonimii (na materiale klichek zhivotnyh s. Pokrovka Samarskoj oblasti). In: *Raznourovnevaya harakteristika leksicheskikh edinic: sb. nauch. st. po materialam dokladov i soobshenij konf., 19–20 iyunya 2001 g.* Smolensk, 174–184.

10. Superanskaya ,A. V. (1973). *Obshaya teoriya imeni sobstvennogo*. Moskva: Nauka.

11. *Suchasnyi slovnyk inshomovnykh sliv* (2006). / uklaly: O. I. Skopnenko, T. V. Tsybaliuk. Kyiv: Dovira.

12. Syusko, M. I. (1989). *Sposoby i typy derivacii v zoonimii*. Kiev: UMK VO.

13. Toptun, V. M. (2010). Vzaiemozviazky antroponimiv ta zoonimiv v ukrainskykh hovorakh Chernihivshchyny. In: *Naukovi zapysky [Nizhynskoho derzhavnogo universytetu im. Mykoly Hoholia]. Serii : Filolohichni nauky, № 2, 75–77*.

14. Torchynskyi, M. M. (2008). *Struktura onimnogo prostoru ukrainskoi movy: [monohrafiia]*. Khmelnytskyi: Avist.

15. Ufimceva, A. A. (1977). Leksicheskaya nominaciya (pervichnaya nejtralnaya). In: *Yazykovaya nominaciya (Vidy naimenovaniy)*. Moskva: Nauka, 5–85.

16. Chuchka, P. P. (1964). Slovníanske / neslovníanske v zookhímii Zakarpattia. In: *Ukrainska slavistychna konferentsiia*. Chernivtsi, 61–63.
17. Shebeshtian, Ya. M. (2008). *Suchasna ukrainska literaturno-khudozhnia zoonimii: funktsii, sklad ta struktura: avtoref. dys. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia kand. filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.01 "Ukrainska mova"*. Chernivtsi.
18. Coates, R. (2007). *Eight Issues in the Pragmatic Theory of Properhood*. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica*, 66, 119–140.
19. Coates, R. (2014). We are urrounded by onymies: relations among names, name-types, and terminological categories, in Names in Daily Life. In: *Proceedings of the XXIV ICOS International Congress of Onomastic Sciences*. Barcelona, 6–13.
20. *Arabian Horses Registration*. Retrieved from <https://www.arabianhorses.org/registration/>
21. *Equestrian Statistics*. Retrieved from www.bhs.org.uk
22. *Horse names released by Jockey Club*. Retrieved from <https://www.registry.jockeyclub.com/registry.cfm?page=releasedNameSearch&letter=A&CFID=65719575&CFTOKEN=4ca9a3b8793ce85-2114D770-5056-BE0C-9773DCA9B5005C07>
23. *No Easy Task To Name Names*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/sports/1992/01/04/no-easy-task-to-name-names/51968299-4a5b-46b6-9766-a608c9027501/?utm_term=.0e8a43d69a1f
24. *Pet Industry Market Size & Ownership Statistics*. Retrieved from https://www.americanpetproducts.org/press_industrytrends.asp
25. *The Jockey Club Registry*. Retrieved from <https://www.registry.jockeyclub.com/registry.cfm?page=tjcRuleBook#six>
26. *The Science of Naming a Racehorse*. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=4634884>
27. *Think picking a baby name is tough? Try naming a thoroughbred*. Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com/news/animalia/wp/2016/05/05/think-picking-a-baby-name-is-tough-try-naming-a-thoroughbred/?utm_term=.ea4c647d52c9
28. Warchoń, S. (2007–2016). *Słownik etymologiczno-motywacyjny słowianskiej zoonimii ludowej. T. I–V*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

*Стаття надійшла до редколегії 10. 04. 2019
прийнята до друку 10. 06. 2019*

СЛОВОТВІРНО-МОТИВАЦІЙНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ОФІЦІЙНИХ ГІППОНІМІВ

Наталія АЛЕКСЄЄВА

*Одеський національний університет ім. І. І. Мечникова,
кафедра граматики англійської мови,
Французький бульвар, 24/26, Одеса, Україна, 65058,
тел. +380974342467
e-mail: natalie.m.alekseeva@gmail.com*

Проаналізовано процес творення офіційних найменувань коней у сучасній англійській мові. Матеріал дослідження (2 000 англомовних гіпонімів) було відібрано методом репрезентативної вибірки з британських та американських реєстрових списків, присвячених номінації коней. Визначено, що суттєвою відмінністю гіпонімів від інших підкласів зоонімів є тісний зв'язок офіційної паспортної форми імені зі спортивною сферою, яка регулює та регламентує номінативний процес – за своєю природою офіційні гіпоніми є найбільш систематизованим та уніфікованим розрядом зоонімів. Офіційні правила іменування виключають вибір вже існуючого імені для нової номінації, тому, в офіційному вжитку одиничне, штучно створене ім'я ніколи не перетворюється на шаблонне, «штамповане», як це властиво антропонімам. Звідси слідує й відсутність сформованого традиційного репертуару гіпонімів, а також неможливість гіпонімів бути спадковими. Серед інших особливостей, відзначено, що процес творення гіпонімів є безперервним і ніколи не буде завершеним, що є підставою говорити про незамкнутість гіпонімного простору та високу варіативність іменослову.

З'ясовано, що офіційна гіпонімія як лексична підсистема англійської мови є нестабільною, їй властиве постійне оновлення. Виокремлено три основні словотвірні типи власних назв – морфологічний, лексико-синтаксичний та лексико-семантичний. Встановлено, що система творення гіпонімів є багатогранною та представлена майже усіма можливими способами словотворення, поширеними у сучасній англійській мові: афіксація, контракція, абрєвіація, телескопія, зрощення, синтаксичний спосіб творення. Основними ресурсами поповнення гіпонімікону слугують іншомовні запозичення, а також процеси онімізації та трансонімізації. Джерелом номінації слугує як вже існуючий мовний ресурс, так і okazіоналізми. Гіпонімне творення характеризується лінгвістичною грою, вільним відношенням до форми слова.

Ключові слова: гіпонім, гіпонімікон, словотворення, словотвірна модель, мотивація, мотив, мовна гра.