WORD-FORMATION FAMILY IN DERIVATION-SEMANTIC SPACE OF DIFFERENTLY STRUCTURED LANGUAGES

V.G. Fatkhutdinova

Kazan (Volga) Federal University, 18, Kremlyovskaya Street, Kazan **(RUSSIAN FEDERATION)**

ABSTRACT

The article considers the main tendencies of comparative and topological study of cognate words on the material of the Russian, Tatar and Spanish languages, the morphological structure of which has strongly pronounced differences. It proves the status of word-formation family as a lexical microsystem. It becomes established how it is modified and transformed the semantics of equivalent roots in terms of word-formation families of each of the languages, which types of notions receive word-forming determination. Comparative study of the objects and ways of nomination within the framework of derivation-semantic space of the Russian, Tatar and Spanish languages allows to reveal idioethnic character of naming of the elements of universe, to reconstruct the mechanism of speech thought act and associative links, which expands the understanding of language as human cognitive activity.

Key words: linguistic typology, semantics, derivatology, word-forming family, nomination

1. INTRODUCTION

Comparative study of word-forming systems of differently structured languages sets the following tasks: to devise the typology of word-forming meanings, to establish the similarities and differences within an interval of derivational means and in the structure of a derivative word, to determine the ways of formation of equivalent nominative units, to reveal the specific character in the organization of derivation-semantic space of each of the languages.

Currently, much progress has been achieved by linguistic typology dealing with comparison of natural languages to be both the most spread and small, vanishing on the semantic basis and within the framework of functional theories [1]. Contrastive linguistics [2], embracing all the levels of language system, the main of which are morphological [3] and syntactic [4] keeps on actively developing. At the same time, an underdeveloped in typological relation remains a word-forming level of language, which is connected most likely with deficiency of a single conceptual apparatus and metalanguage. Helpful in solving this problem may be «canonical typology», the main purpose of which is explicit formulating of notions, used in both descriptive linguistics and linguistic typology. It is done in order to consistently describe the phenomena of concrete languages on the one hand and to compare different languages on the other hand by means of the notions [5].

The subject of our investigation has become the paronymous words of three typologically distant languages – Russian, Tatar and Spanish, the morphological structure of which has strongly pronounced differences. In contemporary linguistic literature it has been already accumulated a large scope of material about morphological structure of a word in Slavonic, Romano-Germanic and Turkic languages, particularly, certain criteria in mechanism of effects of synthetic and analytic, fusion and agglutinative tendencies have been established [6: 4]. All these find reflection in specific character of functioning their grammar and word-forming systems as well.

2. METHODS

In the process of investigation the contrastive-typological and contrastive methods of analysis of language facts allowing to logically describe the derivation processes and their results of many-structured languages were used.

3. THE MAIN BODY

In the Russian language to designate the groups of related (cognate) words one uses a special term «slovoobrazovatelnoye gnezdo» /«word-formation family», which does not have an adequate expression in other languages. In spite of its evident metaphoric character, it appears to be set and widely used in the Russian philology. One of the famous word-formation dictionary of the Russian language [7] is compiled according to «word family» principle. Such principle of arrangement of derivatives enables to trace derivation relations of words in paradigmatics (relations of coderivation) and in syntagmatics (relations of sequential derivation). But the term «word-formation family» is not «canonic» [8]: the notion «family words» correspond to it in English, more seldom - «morphological clusters», in Spanish - «la familia de palabras», «la familia lexica» [9].

At the same time it proves to be relevant in Russian, as certain groups of the related words comprise hundreds of words: for example, 259 words are derived from the adjective *белый* (white) in the Russian language, and 581 words –. from the verb *нести(carry)*. In this connection the issue of formal-structural and semantic interrelations of derivatives within a family proves always important for the Russian word-formation.

It should be noted that at the initial stage of investigation the word-forming family as the total sum of the related words came in view of structural linguistics, but in terms of contemporary linguistics the contrastive analysis of system-structural and structural semantic characteristics of these units in different languages becomes less informative.

Word-formation family as any other language entity has a plane of content and a plane of expression. From the point of view of the content plane it represents a system of word-family and lexical meanings of words entering into it, from the point of view of the expression plane – a group of word-forming structures with one and the same root morpheme and different affixes. Therefore, contrastive study of word-formation families of system-different languages assumes first of all

their bilateral structural and semantic analysis. Considering that semantics of root morpheme becomes complex, but does not vanish completely in its derivatives, it seems to be important for contrastive word-formation to establish how semantics of correlative roots modifies, alters, transforms within the scope of word-formation family of each of the languages.

The most interesting and prospective seems to us the contrastive study of word-formation families in the plane of content, as to be relative lexical and nominative subsystems. «Correlation of content and plan in differently structured languages reflect two sides of one problem: how languages divide the surrounding world and what language means are used to designate its reality» [10:728]. Such interpretation allows to represent a word-forming family as a total sum of nominative units being systematically organized, the derivation and existence of which to be conditioned by both language (system) and extralinguistic factors.

In this connection it is essential to define the status of word-formation family as lexical microsystem and determine its role in system lexical organization. First of all, a rather frequent idiomaticity of semantics of derivative words and their regular polysemy should be noted. In the vocabulary of the Russian language a derivative word is a system-forming factor, and this function is conditioned by specific feature of its lexical meaning.

As is generally known, the semantic structure of derivative word is constituted not only by word-formative motivated meanings but categorial, lexical and grammatical, governing rules of entry of words into speech. At the same time, the main bearer of lexical semantics in the structure of a word is root, therefore, lexical meaning of the derivative word in terms of word-formation family is formed with consideration taken of all three components, which gives reason to believe word-formation family to be a set of lexical units. One may have all reasons to consider word-formation family as being lexical microsystem – unique, complex, but well-defined by semantic and formal bounds – by community of root morpheme.

The role and place of word-formation family in lexical and semantic system of natural language is determined in a circle of dimensions of its semantic space. As is generally known, three-dimensional model of lexical system is formed by three axes: paradigmatic, syntagmatic and derivational. «Derivational axis is split into two: word-forming (formally derivational) and epidigmatic (semantic-derivational)»; the basic unit of derivatics is a word-formating type, and word-formation family is «a particular variety of lexical group» [11:124]. Thus, word-formation family, along with semantic field, lexical-semantic and thematic group, synonymic line and antonymous pair, should be accepted a unit providing lexical systemacy. Close link between word-formation and lexicology and also the other levels of language was stressed in Spanish linguistics as well [12].

But it is necessary to emphasize that in three-dimensional model of the semantic universe of language the word-formation family, being on the derivational axis, takes, however, a special position, drawing closer with other units of lexical system of its paradigmatic organization and syntagmatic properties of lexemes being included into it.

To a special role of word-forming family in ideographic lexical description is indicated also by a contemporary lexicographic practice. So, the authors of «The Russian Semantic Dictionary» [13] use the notion «the closest word-formation family», which «is included into dictionary entry on a par with the interpreted word-meaning, grammatical and orthoepic information, stylistic and chronological notes, definition, illustrative sentences, phraseological combinations and idioms»; it comprises «the closest derivative words, motivated by this word-meaning» [13: XX].

Comparative study of word-formation families must be carried out within the framework of principal tendencies of synchronous-comparative study of vocabulary of these languages, that is, in terms of typological analysis of vocabulary. For contrastive lexicology the interlanguage analysis of correlative cognate words is of great importance. Heterogeneousness of lexical units and system relations existing between them, national lexicon scope and multidimensional character, presence of irregular and asystemic relations between separate elements of the dictionary make the comparison of lexical-semantic systems to be a task of extraordinary difficulty. Therefore, methodologically and methodically relevant on contrastive studies of such kind is using the notion of microsystem, one of which is word-forming family.

Contrastive analysis of word-formation families as units of lexical microsystem acquires a special significance from the point of view of the problem of morphemic decomposition of the natural language. «One cannot consider a system character of vocabulary to be well studied at all, if there are word-forming relations to be revealed and described, as they accumulate dynamic aspect of the language» [14: 26].

Studying the composition and structure of word-formation families, we can establish the cross points and zones of interpenetration of two levels of language – word-forming and lexical. Such point of intersection in this case can be nominative unit as the result of word-forming determination of an primary notion expressed originally by a non-derivative word. « Just as in a derived word, this central unit of word formation as a drop of water reflects the essential characteristics of the system, in act of nomination carried out by means of word-formation there occur the whole variety of relation with the other spheres of language» [15: 417].

So, one and the same notions in different languages, reflecting naïve views of a man of the surrounding world, can be word-formatively marked or closed for the acts of word-formation, that is, as the semantics develops the words can acquire or not acquire a word-forming determination in language.

A primary non-derivative word, being a bearer of common semantic component for all words, undergoes modification in word-formation family, which is indicative of semantic mobility of a root. In terms of content a root of the word is, on the one hand, a stable notion which remains fixed, identical with cognate words; on the other hand, it is a dynamic, movable notion being able to alter and generate new types of knowledge. In different languages new types of knowledge can be given a different form, to revelation of which must be directed the comparative and typological and contrastive analysis of correlative isonyms.

The object of contrastive analysis can become word families, the primary words of which are different parts of speech – nouns, adjectives, verbs and the others. They may belong to various combinations of words on subject-thematic basis. The primary words of correlative word-formation families can be referred to the same lexico-semantic or thematic groups. The relation of one and the same classes of derivative words to lexical semantics is seen by many linguists in various word-forming activity of separate lexico-semantic groups of individual members of these groups, in particular, higher word-forming activity of their central units in comparison with peripheral.

Reference of primary words to one or the other lexico-semantic group substantially determines structural and semantic basis of word-formation families. Hence, by means of its primary word a word-formation family is organically connected with the whole lexico-semantic system of language and can pretend to a status of its full macrounit.

With theoretical and applied aims (for example, when learning non-native language) it is reasonable to study derivational potential of semantic universals, to which are referred the names of parts of body, naturefacts and artefacts, terminological vocabulary, the adjectives denoting colours, the verbs of motion and the other universal groups of words. As

an illustration, let us give comparative characteristics of nominative units of the Russian, Tatar and Spanish languages entering into correlative word-formation families with the primary word *шея(neck)*. It should be noted that the names of parts of body in spite of their certain triviality in contrastive investigation have not been sufficiently studied from the viewpoint of organization of derivation-semantic space of natural language. Interlanguage analysis of somatisms is concentrated as a rule on their semantic structure and compatibility, and word-forming characteristics and derivational potential of these words usually remain out-of-sight of the scholars.

In all three languages there exist word-formation families with the primary words expressing mutually monosemantic notions: *шея* (Russian) – 46 derivatives; *муен* (Tatar) – 5 derivatives; *el cuello* (Spanish) – 5derivtives. In the Spanish language for naming this part of body the other nominations are also used - *el pescuezo* (шея/neck) and *la serviz* (шея/neck, затылок/nape of the neck). The vector type of interlanguage correspondences in this case has certain influence on similarities and differences in derivational potential of the analyzed words.

The comparative analysis of word-formation families with referent words *шея, муен* and *el cuello* has shown that in Russian and Spanish there are corresponding associative names serving to designate physical parameters of a man; in Tatar (and sometimes in Spanish) in this case the analytical descriptions are used, but their structure factually matches the structure of corresponding Russian compound words: *длинношеий*(Russian)/ *long-necked* - *озын муенлы* (Tatar) - *cuellilargo* (Spanish); *долгошеий* (Russian) - *озын муенлы* (Tatar) – *cuellierguido* (Spanish); *короткошеий* (Russian) - *кыска муенлы* (Tatar) – *cuellicorto* (Spanish); *толстошеий* (Russian) /thick-necked- *калын муенлы* (Tatar) – *cuelligrueso* (Spanish); *тонкошеий* (Russian) / thin-necked - *нэзек муенлы* (Tatar) – *cuelliangosto* (Spanish); *кривошеий* (Russian)/ crookedneck – *кэкре муенлы* (Tatar) - *de pescuezo torsido* (Spanish).

In the Russian and Spanish languages in the corresponding word-formation families there are nominations denoting artefacts, in particular, the name of an article being put on the neck of a man or an animal: these words are *ошейник* (Russian) / collar and *муенчак* (Tatar). In the Tatar language the verb *муенчаклау* is derived from the noun *муенчак* – 'одевать ошейник'(to put on the collar) and its grammatical forms *муенчаклану* (the form of passive voice) and *муенчаклату* (the form of the Causative Voice); besides the root *муен* is also used to form another word - *муенса* (бусы, колье, ожерелье, любое украшение, надеваемое на шею). In the Spanish language to designate these notions the word *el collar* (ожерелье, колье, ошейник) is used, in the internal form of which there is no a motivational feature of «шея».

The Russian derivatives, denoting nape, - *зашеек* and *зашеина* have a peculiar word-forming structure. The word *зашеек* is rendered into Spanish by the equivalents *el cogote, la nuca* (if it is about man) – затылок/ back of the head, and also *el morillo* – загривок/ withers (if it is about animal), into Tatar - *муен тамыры* (word for word, «корень шеи»/ the root of the neck). In the Russian word-formation family there is the noun *ошеек* – 'часть мясной туши, прилегающая к шее', also compare *зашеина* in the second meaning – 'мясо из задней части шеи животного'. Both words are rendered into the Tatar language by way of description - *муен ите* (word for word, "meat from the neck"), and into the Spanish language by the non-derived polysemantic lexeme *la aguja (carne, costillas)*.

Peculiar for the Russian language is the word *перешеек* / *isthmus* – 'neck of the land connecting the mainland with the peninsula' – and its derivative *перешеечный*; they are conformed in Spanish with the noun *el istmo* and the adjective *istmico (ca)*, in which there is no motivational feature being analogous to Russian. In the Tatar language this notion is most likely to have a structural semantic calque: перешеек – *муентык* (neck, narrow part of something).

The national and specific components in nominations of the Russian word-formation family are the adverbs *взашей* and *взашеи* – 'kicking out of the neck, booting out, chucking out'. In the Tatar language to render this meaning one uses several detailed descriptions, which include the word *жилкэ* (затылок/beck of the head) instead of *муен*: прогнать взашей / chuck somebody out – *жилкэсенэ биреп (тондырып), артына тибеп куып чыгару* (word for word, стукнув по затылку, пнув вдогонку, прогнать). In the Spanish language the word combination «гнать взашей» ("chuck somebody out") can have the following equivalent set expressions: *echar (despedir) con cajas destempladas* (выгонять кого-либо), *poner de patitas en la calle* (выгонять кого-либо на улицу), in the word-for-word translation of which there is no the word *шея*.

For the Tatar word-formation family a specific derivative is the adjective *муенсыз* (word-for-word, без шеи/ without neck), which means 'бесхарактерный'/weak-willed, from which the word *муенсызлану* – 'проявлять бесхарактерность, беспринципность'/ "to show weakness of will, unscrupulousness" is formed. In the Russian language the word *бесхребетный* (derived from *хребет/spine* 'позвоночник, спина'/backbone, back) with the same meaning – 'not having resoluteness, unprincipled' corresponds to the adjective *муенсыз*. For the Spanish language such nominations are not characteristic: *бесхребетный* / spineless (weak-willed) - *sin carácter, sin prinsipios*.

We do not find the derivatives with a specific word-forming structure in the Spanish word-formation family, but to the sphere of the unique one should refer the semantic structure of the primary word *el cuello*, which, except neck, means also 'ворот, воротник, воротничок'/ collar: *cuelo vuelto* - отложной воротник / lay-down collar, *cuello levantado* - стоячий ворот / stand-up collar, *cuello de tirilla* - косой ворот / collar with side fastening, *agarrar por el cuello* - схватить за ворот/ take by the scruff of the neck.

The specific character of combinative power in each of the languages leads us outside the scope of the concrete word-formation family to closely-related semantic sphere. So, the word *ворот (воротник)* – 'вырез в одежде для шеи, элемент одежды, прилегающий к шее' / low neck - in the Tatar language acquired a specific word-forming determination in the sphere of substantive derivation: *яка* (ворот/collar) – *якалык* (материал, предназначенный или достаточный для воротника / material intended for the collar); in the sphere of verb: *яка* - *якалау* (брать, взять, хватать за шиворот/ seize smb by the scruff of the neck); *якалану* (the form of the Passive Voice of the verb *якалау*); *якалату* (the form of the Causative Voice - позволять брать себя за шиворот); *якалашу* (forms of co-mutual voice – драться/to fight, хватать друг друга за шиворот/ to seize each other by the scruff of the neck).

In the Russian language the word *шиворот* (the morphemic structure: *ши/ворот*) enters into the set expression «взять за шиворот»/" to take by the scruff of the neck" and «шиворот-навыворот»/ "upside-down" and from the point of view of synchronism, in spite of evident etymological closeness, enters no longer into the word-formation family «ворот», let us also compare the expression «взять за шкирку»/ seize by the scruff of the neck. The national-specific in the Russian language in this case will be the derivative word *косоворотка*, which is rendered into the Tatar and Spanish languages которое на татарский и испанский языки передается при помощи развернутых описательных конструкций: *кыек якалы ирлэр кулмэге* (мужская верхняя рубашка с косым воротом); *camisa rusa con cuello de tirilla que se abotona a un lado* (русская рубашка с косым воротом, которая застегивается на одну сторону) (*Russian shirt with collar fastening on one side*).

Attention is attracted to the fact that it is characteristic for the Spanish language in the sphere of nominative units to have «topographic» blending in designation of the zones of the head and the neck. The same nomination can designate different parts of the body and the head from the point of view of the Russian linguistic consciousness: *el pescuezo – затылок/back of the neck, шея/neck, горло/throat*. This type of equivalences is confirmed by the contrastive analysis of the set expressions: *torcer a uno el pescuezo* – свернуть шею /break neck, *agarrar por el pescuezo* – схватить за горло/ take by the throat, *apretar (estirar) a uno el pescuezo* – повесить кого-либо/hang somebody.

The word *el cerviz* (затылок/back of the head) is included into the following set expressions, when rendering them into the Russian language the nominations of the other parts of body are used: *bajar la serviz* (literally, опускать затылок) - гнуть спину/break one's back, унижаться/ cringe to somebody; *levantar la serviz* (literally, поднимать затылок) – задирать нос/ stick one's nose up; *ser de dura cerviz* (literally, иметь крепкий затылок/strong back of the neck) – быть неукратимым, непокорным /indomitable, compare with Russian «с высоко поднятой головой/ with one's head held erect». The derivatives from *cerviz* (in Latin *cervix, cervicis* – шея/neck) are used as medical terms in Spanish and Russian: *cervical, cervicular* – шейный / cervical (о позвонках/about vertebrae), затылочный, цервикальный/ cervical; *la cervicodinia* – затылочная боль/ occipital headache. It should be noted that the metaphorical meaning in Spanish is acquired by the notion «fatty, heavy back of the neck»: *el cerviguillo* – fatty occiput, *cervigudo (da)* – с жирным затылком, in the transferred meaning 'упрямый, упорный/stubborn, obstinate'; also compare *cogotudo (da)* from *el cogote* (затылок) – with heavy back of the neck, высокомерный, надменный/ arrogant; (American) разбогатевший человек, выскочка/ upstart. It is noteworthy that in both Russian and Spanish to designate a clip on the back of the head the derived words with analogous inner form are used: *подзатыльник* and *el cogotazo*; in Tatar the expression *дать подзатыльник* is translated by way of description: *муен тамырына кундыру* (literally, to give a clip on the back of the head).

The conducted analysis proves that with the development of new paradigms of linguistic knowledge, that is, linguo culturological and cognitive-semiotic approaches in interpretation of linguistic facts [16], the contrastive word formation expands the sphere of its application in direction to the study of national and specific and idioethnic component in the word-forming structure of the derivative word.

Thus, the comparative analysis of three word-formation families of the Russian, Tatar and Spanish languages allows within the framework of the same semantic space to reveal those types of the notions for designation of which the derivational means have been used. «Word formative models and the derivative lexemes formed according to these models, reflect, on the one hand, on the other – form communicative meaningful blocks of meanings, acting as the important coordinates in the language picture of the world, realizing derivational facility of the language, national stereotypes of nomination and communicative needs of the society» [17: 195].

4. SUMMARY

The algorithm of the contrastive study of word-formation families of differently structured languages includes a range of successive operations. In the process of analysis it is essential: 1) to determine the correlative root morphemes of the compared languages as the object of the investigation; 2) to reveal the cases of interlanguage symmetry and asymmetry of word-formative structure and semantics of the derivative words in correlative word-formation families; 3) to reveal the system restrictions of two languages on the derivational development of the root morpheme; 4) to establish the coverage of semantic identities of the families-analogues; 5) to uncover the mechanism of word-formation relations within the framework of word-formation family; 6) to define the degree of intensity of derivational processes by forming of cognate words of each of the words.

5. CONCLUSION

The contrastive study of methods and ways of nomination within the scope of derivation-semantic space of word-formation families of different languages allows to show the idioethnic character of an adverb of the elements of the universe, reconstruct the mechanism of speech thought act and associative links, which broadens our conceptualization of the language as means of cognitive activity of a man.

The revelation of interlanguage nominative equivalence implies the identification of both a conceptual content of the correlated units and comparison of language means and ways of its expression. Similarities and differences in language categorization, facts of differentiated attribution of the fragments of the outworld cannot be always explained by apparent structured typological differences of the contrasting languages as our material demonstrates, they are often conditioned by the priorities in language consciousness of each nation.

The conflict of interests
The author confirms that the presented data do not contain the conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

1. Dixon, R.M.W., 2010. Basic linguistic theory. V. 1: Methodology. Oxford University Press, pp: 400.
2. Tekin, Ö., 2012. Grundlagen der Kontrastiven Linguistik in Theorie und Praxis. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, pp: 300.
3. Carstairs-McCarthy, A., 2010. The evolution of morphology. (Studies in the evolution of language 14). Oxford University press, pp: 253.
4. Shopen, T., 2007. Language typology and syntactic description. Volume II: Complex Constructions. Cambridge University Press, pp: 488.
5. Brown, D., Chumakina, M., Corbett G.G. (eds.), 2013. Canonical morphology and syntax. Oxford University Press, pp: 312.

6. Shyrokova, A.V., 2000. Comparative typology of many-structured languages (phinetics, morphology). M.: «Dobrosvet», pp: 200.
7. Tikhonov, A.N., 1985. Word-Formation Dictionary of the Russian Language: In 2 volumes. M.: The Russian language.
8. Corbett, G.G., 2010. Canonical derivational morphology. In: Word structure. V.3. Issue 2., pp: 141 – 155.
9. Miranda, J.A., 1994. La formación de palabras en español. Salamanca: Colegio España, pp: 241.
10. Fatkhutdinova, V.G., 2014. Nominative derivation specificity in the typologically distant languages. In: Life Science Journal. № 11 (10), pp: 728 – 731.
11. Denisov, P.N., 1980. Vocabulary of the Russian language and principles of its description. M.: The Russian language, pp: 353.
12. Díaz Hormigo, M.T., 2000. Disciplinas linguüsticas y formacíon de palabras. Cádis: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Cádis, pp:146.
13. Shvedova, N. Yu. (eds.), 2000. The Russian semantic dictionary. Explanatory dictionary, systematized according to word classes and meanings. / the RAS. Institute of the Russian Language. Volume. 1. M.: Azbukovnik, pp: 807.
14. Shirshov, I.A., 1999. The theoretical problems of clustering. M.: « Prometheus», pp: 236.
15. Kubryakova, Ye. S., 2004. Language and knowledge: On the way to knowledge acquisition of language: Parts of speech from cognitive point of view. The role of language in cognition of the world. M.: The languages of Slavonic culture, pp: 560.
16. Durst-Andersen, P., 2011. Behind the language. The culture of the mental universe of language and communication. Copenhagen: International Publishers, pp: 200.
17. Petrukhina, Ye. V., 2001. A Russian derivative word as cognitive model of interpretation of the phenomena of reality. In: The Russian language: historical destinies and modern times: The international congress of the investigator of the Russian language: The works and materials. M.: The Publishing House of MSU, pp: 195-196.