

THE ATTITUDE OF WORD-BUILDING TO DIFFERENT LINGUISTIC PROCESSES

Valeh NASIBOV

Department of humanities, Baku Slavic University, Baku, Azerbaijan.

ABSTRACT

About the separation of principles in the processes of word building, form building and word change. The current article deals with separation of language events from each other as word building, form building and word change. This principle is determined on the bases of the given processes expressing the planning characteristics and the formation of degrees. As a result, form building is considered to be the cross zone word building and word change processes. Hence the language system that is studied. It follows that, form building is an intersection zone of word building and word change which is a sign of sustainability. However, form building (forms of verbs, type forms, comparison degree forms of adjectives and etc.) is related to the level of word building, but not word building.

Keywords: *Word-Formation, Morphogenesis, Inflection, Irregularity, Bindingness, Derivational Meaning, Significance, Grammatical Meaning*

INTRODUCTION

One of the debating points of the modern Russian morphology is an issue of identification of the boundaries of word-formation, morphogenesis and inflection. The solution of the problem, in its turn, is connected with issues, such as definition of these subsystems (the consistency of the phenomena and possibility of their differentiation are postulated) and their characteristics (of elements) in terms of expression plane and content plane.

In the linguistic literature the processes of word-formation, morphogenesis and inflection as related phenomena are distinguished and compared at least by three criteria:

- 1) Semantic and formal (positional and dispositional) characteristics of elements (morphemes) involved in the realization of the process;
- 2) Relations between units where these processes are studied; derivative words, lexical items, and word-forms are singled out as such units;
- 3) Differences of the function of these units.

However, these criteria are not sufficient to identify the boundaries of the processes studied. The difficulty of problem solution is that the conceptual opposability of such processes as field of study fails to definitely correlate with identification of the boundaries of word-formation, morphogenesis and inflection as real objects. It was due to the fact that the studied processes often occur simultaneously and within one lexical item; at the same time, one can observe mutual supposability between them that result in the crossing of, sometimes – a situational equivalence of these phenomena.

On the other hand, the difficulty of identification of boundaries of the processes arises from an insufficient specificity and study of all the properties of elements involved in them.

With the development of issues related to the study of expression plane of elements (their distributive and disposition characteristic) and that part of content plane that is connected with structural (relational) features of the elements (valency, positional, and combinatorial characteristics), it is an aspect (a constituent) of content plane related to a meaning that remains undeveloped or little-developed.

Therefore, the problem of linguistic meaning types and their correlation with particular linguistic phenomena should be considered to be one of key issues (according to many researchers, the one related to the identification of boundaries of morphological phenomena).

The distinction of given and definable properties of the unit is a moment of principle in the solution of the problem.

In the linguistic literature dedicated to the subject studied, it is characteristic that certain boundaries of word-formation, inflection and morphogenesis, as well as types of meanings (lexical, grammatical) are accepted as given. The objective of such research is to correlate the elements, units of these morphological processes and designated types of meanings that, to our opinion, fails to help identify distinctive features of the studied phenomena, though such formulation of the question may be relevant for the general description of morphological processes.

To identify the boundaries of the processes studied, one should accept types of meanings as given, correlate the types of meanings and their physical media (phonic substance) and then identify the status and boundaries of morphological processes. The presence of one-to-one correspondence between types of meanings and their media can be considered as realness of opposable processes, and the absence of such correlation indicates the shifting and ambiguity of the processes themselves. Besides, the presence of the former may serve as evidence of unbiased existence of traditionally designated processes of word-formation, inflection and morphogenesis (within the boundaries identified by linguistic tradition), and that of the latter – as evidence of the need for the revision of relevancy of such an identification. The problem of a meaning is considered from three points of view, sometimes crossing ones: logical semantics and epistemology of cognitive processes. At the same time, it should be noted that linguistics has no common methodology of its own for the consideration of a meaning and, mainly, and uses techniques of logical semantics¹.

A meaning is a general methodological concept with the projection into language in terms of linguistic (lexical, grammatical, derivational) meaning.

A meaning means either certain relationship (relationship between the image of objects and the consequences the image generates; relationship between sign and its comprehension; sign-object relationship), or a certain image (image of cognition, a perfect image of a subject, and an invariant image of cognition).

In general terms the linguistic meaning is also determined by the notion of “relationship”: segment-notion relationship, segment-subject reflection relationship, segment-subject relationship, etc.

The following special definitions of linguistic meaning are known in the linguistic literature: “inner form” (A.A.Potebnia), semantic opposition, unity of the nominative (denotative and

¹ Compare: a denotative, significative, and structural meaning in linguistics and syntactic and pragmatic ones – in logic. The methods of semantics research, such as method of semes, method of thesaurus, and statistical method also are distinctive.



significative) and syntactical (structural) meanings, unity of true and formal meanings (F.F.Fortunatov), formal and semantic significance (S.O.Kartsevsky), grammatical and lexical meanings (V.V.Vinogradov) (General linguistics, 1972; Problem of language and meaning, 1968 etc.); a common feature for all situations and reactions in the act of speech (compare: Sapir-Whorf theory), “complex of linguistic unit functions” (A.A.Shakhmatov); relationship, unity of reflections of physical appearance and a respective subject” (B.N.Golovin), etc.

These definitions of linguistic meaning differ in the extent of specificity, intuitive completeness, and applicability for practical purposes.

The designated types of linguistic meanings in a definite way are compared and opposed to each other. In addition, the derivational meaning in some concepts is defined as a type of lexical one and opposed to the lexical meaning as such within the lexical meaning.

The definition of lexical meaning is based on the relationship of sign (morpheme, word) to elements, facts of the external world, their reflection or notions forming the external world in our mind. This type of meaning is considered to be basic for word. And the grammatical meaning is regarded as a secondary one and defined with respect to sign (morpheme), intralingual facts.

The following statements are typical for determining the correlation of lexical and grammatical meanings: “The grammatical meaning of a language form is opposed to its real one. The real meaning of a word depends on its compliance as a verbal one to one or another phenomenon of the external world; the grammatical meaning of a word is the one it has in respect of other words” (Akhmanova, 1982).

“So far as one and the same word changes, as far as something central, properly lexical ..., on the other hand, - something connotative, variable, at the same time belonging not to the given specific word, but the known class or category of words, something distractible from specific words – grammatical” (Smirnitsky, 1952, p. 190). Along with that, there are some concepts where the grammatical meaning is regarded as “a central or principal or construing property of words as parts of speech”, that is as some construct. It is obvious that determination of the correlation of lexical and grammatical meanings as central and connotative ones within a word depends on the degree of consideration of the latter; that is on whether a word is considered as a unit (element) of vocabulary or as a functional unit of speech. In a word as a unit of vocabulary, the lexical meaning on the basis of which the place of a word in the lexical system is found is a central and defining one; and in a word as a functional unit of speech, the grammatical meaning is singled out as a classifying and organizing property, as a meaning “abstracted from lexical dictionary ones and a formalized relational meaning” (M. Dokulil).

However, although the definition of lexical meaning as central one connected with the external world, and that of grammatical meaning as connotative one related to functionality enables to identify some signs of these types of meanings, it definitely fails to mark the boundaries between them (types of meanings). For example, such types of meanings traditionally designated as grammatical ones – that of gender, time, number, and, of course, grammatical meaning of aspect – have elements of lexical meaning.

The lack of hard differentiation in attributing these meanings to grammatical or lexical ones, use of the notion of “syntactic meaning” instead of “grammatical one” by some researchers indicates that these types of meanings are closely interwoven with each other (Zaliznyak, 1967).



The derivational meaning regarded as type of lexical one is defined as follows: “The generalized categorical meanings that have a specialized expression, but are not binding, are called a word-formation meaning” (Koubryakova, 1974, p. 148); at the same time, the generalized lexicality of a word-formation meaning is noted.

In scientific papers that are not aimed at the special study of linguistic meaning and its types, the use of such definitions for other purposes is appropriate and justified, but the definition of these types of meanings is based on the enumeration of criteria that fail to reveal, but indicate them. In this case, the presence of common features with various types of meanings and indefiniteness of degree of relevance of listed features for differentiation of types of meanings lead to those difficulties that are typical for their differentiation and, consequently, for the identification of the boundaries of word-formation, morphogenesis and inflection.

From these positions the derivational meaning can be considered as an overlap of grammatical and lexical meanings (the difference in the lexical meaning of these units accompanies those in grammatical categories or paradigms of the derivative and derivating), but the grammatical meaning - as an overlap of morphogenetic and inflectional meanings² (morphogenetic meaning - as an overlap of categorial meanings within a morphological level, and inflectional one provided by categorial meanings and appearing in the course of connection of words at a syntactical level., i.e. while forming word-forms) and this predetermines an overlap of word-formation meaning by the very morphogenetic part of grammatical meaning.

We proceed from the fact that the word as a unit of speech activity and as an object within which these types of meanings are singled out must be considered from two positions: in terms of vocabulary unit and capability of this unit to form units of a greater degree of complexity (word combination, sentences) (Sherba, 1974, p. 26). Consequently, designated minimal meanings must be characterized in terms of the lexical system (systematicity of vocabulary is possible if the system means regularity) and in terms of the grammatical system understood as interrelation of elements characterized by the signs of expression plane and content plane. These interrelations appear on functioning of a word. At such a statement of a question the system of means providing the functioning of a word and the morphology as a science is a grammar section where the means of realization of these or other connections revealed in syntax are studied.

Therefore, one can say that any word as a unit of vocabulary (after the other researchers, e.g. P.S. Kuznetsov, a word means a segment singled out between two gaps in writing or by two pauses in spoken language with an expressed stress) bears a certain relationship to the reflection of phenomena, pieces of the external world, i.e. has a nominal or nominative function which can be named as a lexical meaning. But the given meaning without including in the functional system remains an unrealized potency. At a functional level the potency is realized and filled with a meaning.

The realization of a word presupposes the making of a word by the laws of one or another language. While making a word as a unit of the functional system, the identification of compliances between forms of collocated words occurs and this leads to the formation of various words of collocated words.

² In the available works a global grammatical meaning is actually considered as one consisting of morphogenetic and inflectional meanings.



Opportunities for forming various forms of a word are predetermined (along with the other factors) by the lexical meaning. Probably that’s what L.V. Scherba meant when he wrote: “However, hardly we consider table, bear to be nouns because they decline, rather we decline them because they are nouns”. (Sherba, 1974, p. 79).

Thus, the grammatical meaning is a relation between forms of words becoming apparent in their functioning. However, it doesn’t say that all the changes which occur in a word serve to establish relations between forms of words.³

At the first level of consideration of a lexical item or a word as a unit of vocabulary the changes partially modifying the lexical meaning of a word may occur. These changes bring to the expansion or narrowing of the lexical meaning. Meanings that are products of these processes in particular, progressing within a word as units of vocabulary are considered as derivational. That’s why the lexical meaning consists of indigenously (properly) lexical and derivational (word-forming) meanings.

The lexical meaning as such acts as an initial and binding, and the derivational one - as the change of this central one and is non-binding.

The notion of linguistic meaning and its types are closely interwoven with that of significance⁴ that is considered as a feature of a segment to be a medium of a certain connection defining the supposability and compatibility of one-type elements in a linear series.

The designated types of meanings are dissimilar in order of their appearance in a syntagmatic line of bindingness / non-bindingness, but beyond the syntagmatic line –regularity / irregularity that also may be taken as a basis of differentiation. These prerequisites enable to differentiate morphological processes occurring in a word, through their relationship to types of meanings and order of their appearance (Table 1).

A basic underived stem is characterized from these positions by availability of lexical meaning as such (LM), significance (SG), and bindingness (BD).



Table 1: morphological processes occurring in a word, through their relationship to types of meanings and order

Morphological processes	Expression plane features (EPF)			Order of EPF appearance				Levels of modifications of the basic meaning	
	Derivational meaning	Grammatical meaning	Significance (SG)	irregularity	regularity	bindingness	Non-bindingness		
Word-formation	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	I level	Level of word forming
								II level	
Morphogenesis	+	-	+	+	-	-	+		
Inflection	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	III level	level of word making
	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	IV level	

³ Our task is not to give a new definition to types of meanings and it is hardly possible without any fundamental change of existing concepts of language. An attempt is made sort types of meanings in terms of differentiation of word consideration levels with the purpose of their unique use for the identification of the boundaries between the processes occurred within a word.

⁴ Although we think that significance is a feature of a segment to be a medium of a certain connection (or type of connection), significance is defined by means of coordination of this feature by content and expression planes, but we allow single-out significance as a feature of expression plane where it occurs in full.

Explanatory notes to Table. The definition of the grammatical category of aspect and opposition of aspectual pairs by their semantic distance (momentariness –duration, effectiveness, intermittence, etc.) as well as the forms such as: a house – a little house, white – whiter, allows us to think that the non-radicals have a derivational meaning. The subdivision of inflection into two classes is based on the fact that the endings of gender, number, person, and tense correlate with particular lexical changes (weak lexicality), and the case-endings - only with grammatical ones (Gladky, 1969), in which case the syncretism relates to the degree of expression.

The irregularity of morphogenesis and word-formation is determined by the fact that there are various methods for making of forms and words (suffixation, prefixion, etc.). Such methods to the same extent are not typical for all the words of the same group.

Thus, if the presence of the lexical meaning as such and, consequently, a root or an underived stem can be taken as a basic one, the availability of modifications transforming these roots into functional units may be a conclusion from this position.

The irregularity of the derivational meaning traditionally leads to the difficulties in defining the features of a word-formative paradigm that in most works on word formation is identified with family, series of word. The necessity of lexical and inflectional meanings as such means that these meanings are sufficient for functioning of words.

If the lexical meaning as such is sequentially undergone every possible modifications, then modifications, III and IV levels means that the morphological processes exhausted all the possibilities, and for a further development the means of the syntactic level are needed, i.e. emergence of syntactically conventional, phraseologically conventional, stylistically conventional meanings of a word, etc.

The above-formulated rules result from the determination of peculiarities of morphological processes with their further differentiation (word-formation and inflection). It stops the unidirectionality of our search restricted by the fact that the given notions predetermine the further progress and result of the research. “In general, during the research of both the problem of a word and all other similar ones it is necessary to be daring in approaching to traditional notions, especially terms. It would be ridiculous to ask what the sentence is. First of all, it is necessary to find out what the linguistic reality has in this field, then to give this or other names to observed phenomena (Sherba, 1974, p.44).

It appears that the above-said is also fair for the issue in question first of all related to the definition of typology of morphological processes on the basis of the designated ordered features (see, for example, Koubryakova, 1974, p. 232).

Thus, the processes of element interaction that have properties listed in the table (see modifications, I and II levels) shall be referred to word-formation.

The change in belonging of an etymon (a word-formative stem) to a certain group or inflectional paradigm (inflectional means) within the group results from such interaction.

References

Akhmanova O.S., Dictionary of linguistic terms M., 1982.

General linguistics. Underlying structure of language. M., 1972.



Gladky A.V., Defining the notion of case and gender of nouns// RO, 1969, № 2.

Koubryakova E.S., Principles of morphological analysis. M., 1974.

Problem of language and meaning. M., 1968.

Sherba L.V., Linguistic system and speech activity. L., 1974.

Smirnitsky A.I., Word // Matters of theory and history of language. M., 1952.

Zaliznyak A.A., Russian nominative inflection, M., 1967.

