

Nominative derivation specificity in the typologically distant languages

Venera Gabdulchakovna Fatkhutdinova

Kazan (Volga Region) State University, Kremlevskaya Street, 18, Kazan, 420008, Russia

Abstract. In the study based on the material of Russian and Tatar derived words you can reveal the nominative derivation specificity, which is a characteristic of most natural languages. We also have established the causes of interlingual asymmetry in the ratio of derivative and non-derivative lexical units: first of all it's the systemic-structural differences between Russian and Tatar languages, due to their belonging to the different morphological types, as well as the specificity of linguistic consciousness, namely the signs and associations that are underlined the name and reflected in its inner form.

[Fatkhutdinova V.G. Nominative derivation specificity in the typologically distant languages. *Life Sci J* 2014;11(10):728-731] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 117

Keywords: linguistic typology, word formation, semantics, nominative unit, word's inner form

Introduction

A comparative study of acts of naming individual fragments of reality in the different languages represents the topical problem for the contemporary linguistics, the solution of which will allow you to reveal the national stereotypes of nominations caused by the communicative needs of one or another linguistic community. This problem is solved sequentially by the linguistic typology that covers all levels of the language system. Among the typologically oriented researches in the field of vocabulary and semantics we shall call the works of N. Evans [1], M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm [2], in the field of comparative word formation - the works of V. Fatkhutdinova [3], Morphology - A. Carstairs-McCarthy [4], Syntax - T. Shopen [5] and others. The Theory of Nomination is closely related to the discursive and cognitive paradigm of the modern linguistics, represented by the well-known works of A. A. Kibrik [6] and L. Talmy[7].

The subject of our study was the derivative nominative units, reflecting the derivation processes specificity and the typological differences between Russian and Tatar languages. It should be noted that the lexical and structural and semantic features have the areal variants of each languages as well, in respect of Tatar see [8]. However, it is important for us to reveal the specifics of derivational relations in the languages of inflectional and agglutinative types, which are the Russian and the Tatar. Just the "detailed elaboration of differences", more attention to the details, according to P. Epps and A. Arkhipov, determines the modern trends in the Typology and the grammatical description of languages [9: 2].

Methods

In this work we use the comparative and typological method for the linguistic facts analysis that allows us to characterize the specificity of

nominative derivation in the languages of different morphological structure in full. In addition, we apply here the method of structural and semantic, onomasiological and cognitive tests.

Main body

For the modern linguistics there is an indisputable fact that the derivation opens the great opportunities for conceptual, cognitive and ethno-cultural interpretation of reality. According to T. I. Vendina, it helps to understand which elements of extra linguistic reality and in what way are marked as derivational, why they are retained by consciousness, because the very choice of a real phenomenon as an object of formative determination indicates its significance for native speakers. The researcher who turned to the study of a particular linguistic culture, "inevitably faces the necessity of semantic analysis of the word and those motivational features that are updated in language creative act, because these features are an inherent quality of any object – the real and the unreal" [10:49].

In linguistics, it is assumed to distinguish two opposing sections of semantics - semasiology and onomasiology. This opposition is based on the area of analysis: in semasiology - from form to meaning, and in onomasiology, on the contrary, from the meaning to the main means of its expression. In case of comparative study of derivatives of the nominative units, in our opinion, it is necessary to use not the opposition, but the incorporation of onomasiological and semasiological approaches. The ratio of the expression plane and the content plane in differently structured languages reflects the two sides of one problem: how the languages divide the outside world and which linguistic means are used to designate its realities. The answers to these questions can be provided by "cognitive onomasiology" [11], appealing

to the linguistic consciousness of any ethnic community.

Comparative analysis of derivatives of the nominative units of the Russian and Tatar languages primarily involves identifying the degree of their structural and semantic equivalence. The interlingual correlations can be presented by non-derivative and derivative words as well as combinations of words equivalent to them. In other words, the thing that gets the undivided name in one language is marked in another language by word-formation or syntactic means. For example, if in the Tatar language the word *hat* with the meaning 'paper with written text that is sent to someone for notification about something, for communication with someone at a distance' is a non-derivative, in the Russian language it is determined in the word-formation way: the noun *pis'mo* (letter) is formed from the verb *pisat'* (write). It should be noted that the diminutive words *pis'misko* (small letter), *pis'metso* (small letter) natural for the Russian language, with subjectively assessed type of meaning are virtually absent in the Tatar language. If the Russian language in order to refer to a postal employee who is carrying letters and newspapers to the recipients, uses the derivative nominative unit *pochtal'on* (postman) (motivating basis *pochta* (post) + unifix *-l'on*), then in the Tatar language it corresponds to the noun phrase - *hat tashuche, hat taratuche* (lit. one who is carrying the letters). The structure and semantics of this phrase coincides with the inner form of obsolete and practically not used in modern Russian language word *pis'monosets* (postman). Certainly, some of the equivalents are detected at the word formation level: *pisat' – pisatel'* (writing – writer): *yazu – yazu-chy*; *pis'mennaia rabota* (written task) - *yaz-ma esh*. In the correspondence identified by us an important place is occupied by the following correlation: in the Russian language - the synthetic and in the Tatar language – the analytical method for forming the nominative unit: *prinesti - alyp kilu, unesti - alyp kitu, zanesti - kertep chygu, vinesti - alyp chygu, chygaryp kuyu*. Therefore, when comparing it is possible to find not only the different compartmentalization in the objectification of language content, but also the specifics of the nominative execution: the Russian verb *razdat'* is the entirely executed nomination, and its Tatar correspondence *taratyp chygu* is the dividedly executed nominative unit. According to V.F. Vasileva the semantic conciseness of the derivative and explicit informational content of the analytical nomination that is bigger comparing to it contributes to the fact that the identical "facts of thoughts" in comparable languages are expressed with varying degrees of detailization [12:11].

The results of the cross-language analysis of one-word and multiword (dissected) nominations are of great importance in order to solve the problem of linear ultimacy of the linguistic sign. In every language there are different structural formulas for the transmission of information: on the one part, there are one-word nominative signs where the signified is expressed by one signifier, and multiword nominative signs when the expression of the signified requires the discrete units linearly exceeding the limit of one word. During the semantization of the concept by means of another language there can be a change of the nominative sign and the signified will be expressed by different structural signifiers. Thus, the Russian language to refer to the dry trees, forests, as well as branches, twigs, uses the following nominative units: *suhostoy, suhostoinik* (from *suhoy* (dry) + *stoiat'* (stand): these nominations are used for naming the trees withered at the grassroots; *suholom* (from *suhoy* (dry) + *lomat'* (break); *sushniak* (from *sushit'* (drying) + suffix with a value of collectivity *-niak*), compare also *burelom* (from *buria* (storm) + *lomat'* (break) - 'trees, broken or fallen by the storm' and *valeznik* (from *valit'* (cut down) - 'dry twigs; trees, fallen to the ground'. The words with diminutive value: *sushniachok* and *valeznichok* are made from nouns *sushniak* and *valeznik*. The very presence in the Russian language of such derivatives shows the importance of the given natural facts for the Russian people: because for them the forest is an important component of the habitats and the possibility to make a fire is equivalent to survival, compare the absence in the vocabulary of the Russian language of the diminutive **burelomchik*. The listed derivatives are translated into the Tatar language by one free phrase - *kory agach* (lit. dry trees), indicating the irrelevance of the given concept for the Tatar language consciousness.

Without a doubt, both the synthetic derivation with its compressive function and analytical nominations with their strictly fixed denotative reference are important for each of the languages, but their different correlation during the objectification of the same realities is one of the main causes of cross-language asymmetry.

Comparative aspect of the study of derivatives of the nominative units in different languages allows to set interlanguage and intralanguage categorical relations: for example, to imagine how a static attribute is modified into the dynamic attribute, flowing through time and space: *stariy – staret'* (*kart - kart-a-yu*); how the procedural features assumed to be extended in time and space are transformed into nominations of substantial objects: *nagrevat' – nagrevatel'* (*zhilytu - zhilyt-kych*), thus revealing the interlanguage correspondence between

the onomasiological categories of objectivity, procedure or attribution.

Being the result of secondary signification, a derivative word appears on the basis of existing words within the word-formation processes and by means of word-building means becoming available in this language system. Nominative technique itself in any language, of course, is related to its morphological structure that helps to explain the lack of nominative unit in one of the compared languages by the system limitations. Thus, by virtue of agglutination in the Tatar language there are not prefixed verbs and their subsequent derivatives, such as *hodit'* (joru) → *vihodit'* (chygu) → *vihod* (chygu uryny, lit. place to go out) → *vihodnoy* (jal kone, lit. free day).

Position of the affixes - says V.A. Plungyan - in the word form is rigidly fixed; two major positional classes of affixes (prefixes preceded the root, and the suffixes followed the root) in natural languages do not usually contain the same elements. In other words, the situation where the same morpheme in the language in some word forms is a prefix, and in other word forms acts as a suffix with the same value is relatively atypical [13:88]. The same can be said about the derivative correspondences in differently system languages: the assumption that the meanings of the Russian verbal prefixes can be transmitted into the Tatar language using any suffixes is not supported by the language facts: *brat'* (alu) – *vibrat'* (sailau), *zabrat'* (alyp kitu), *ubrat'* (alyp kuyu).

It is not always possible to explain the presence or absence of any nominations in the compared languages only by the influence of the system limitations. The evidence can be the data in another language, such as Spanish. So, one of the most common ways of the nominative derivation in Spanish and Russian is prefixing, and in particular, the verbal prefixes of the Latin origin. We can agree that the typology of the preverbs systems can be considered as interlingual phenomenon [14]. However, despite the active formation of verbs in the Spanish language using the prefix *con-(com-, co-)*, *contra-, des-, non-, re-, sobre-, trans-*, it is difficult to accept that they form a regular structure-semantic correlations with the Russian prefixed verbs expressing the spatial or other types of values, such as: *contra-marchar* (go backwards), *des-pintar* (remove paint). Consequently, the same methods of derivation in each of the languages are associated with their onomasiological categories and implement specific derivational values demonstrating the specificity of the objective reality division by word-building means.

Along with purely derivational aspect when the derivational semantics and ways of its expression are viewed in comparative terms, the comparative

semasiological and cognitive analysis acquires great importance in establishing cross-language nominative equivalence acquires, involving the identification of all conceptual content of the correlated language units.

Substantial side of derivative nominations, its deep structure is closely related to the concept of the inner form of the word, reflecting the nature of the logical-semantic processes in the formation of these units. The internal form of the word in our paper is defined as "semantic and structural relatedness of the morphemes that are the components of the word with other morphemes of the language; the sign that is the basis of nomination during the formation of a new lexical meaning" [15:85].

The inner form of derivative words is expressed brightly during the comparison of typologically distant languages. "In the inner shape of the individual words in different languages, we find not only the specific original ways to show concept in its sound shell - that itself is very important - but also the features of well-known similarities in the methods to identify concepts in different languages" [16:51]. Comparing the nomination means in different languages, comparing correlative nominations and nomination principles of the various realities, we know the national identity of these languages, and reveal how the mechanism of linguistic consciousness of their carriers works. A similar approach is presented in the famous book of the Danish scientist-typologist P. Durst-Andersen the basic concept of which is "cultural-mental universe" of the natural language, interacting with its grammatical semantics. According to the author, culture and national consciousness of native speakers especially set up not only their cognitive but also perceptive abilities and organize the process of verbal communication [17:5].

In comparative derivation the inner form of the word appears in the nature of the semantic relation of the derivative word to motivating basis. We will consider the inner form of the Tatar verb *tashlau* (throw). It is directly motivated by the noun *tash* (stone) that identifies the following proposition: originally the action was associated only with a specific subject, namely the stone. From the standpoint of the Russian linguistic consciousness, this ratio of the motivating word to the derivative is understandable and explainable (compare the idioms universal for many languages in which the stone is an instrument of action: *throw the stone in someone* - 'defame someone'; *stoned* - 'condemned', *the time to throw and collect stones*, etc.), but at the same time unusual in its internal form. The Russian verb *kamenet'* (turn to stone), formed from the same producing base has very different meanings - 'to become as hard as stone'; 'to become fixed, lifeless (about the person, body parts)'; 'to become insensitive,

indifferent; harden'. It is largely a result of the metaphorization. The given predicate is translated into the Tatar language with the circumlocutory phrase: *tashka ailenu* (literally turn into stone) and *hereketcez kalu* (be without movement).

Conclusion

The derivational language system is closely related to its nominative technique, since the main function of word formation is the creation of a new name. The comparative derivation has the direct access to the general theory of nominations and cannot be separated from the comparative study of the nominative space of the studied languages in general. The comparative analysis of derivative nominative units in Russian and Tatar languages gave us a chance to identify similarities and differences in the methods of fact representation when nominating one and the same denotata.

Findings

Russian and Tatar derivatives, as a means of the identical conceptual content marking, may possess the varying degrees of linear ultimacy: the synthetic (undivided) nomination is characteristic to a greater extent for the Russian language, for the Tatar is contrary the analytical (dissected).

The correlation of two methods of word formation for two languages does not guarantee the equivalence of word formation structure for the correlating words, as evidenced by the facts of interlingual asymmetry in the system of nominative ranks.

The causes of interlingual asymmetry in the nominative technique may be as follows: a different ratio of primary and derivative lexis in the vocabulary of each language, the systemic-structural differences between languages that are manifested themselves in the individual set of derivational tools and models.

Finally, the differences in the nominative derivation of Russian and Tatar languages may be determined by the specifics of language consciousness and the cognitive attitudes of their speakers. The inner form of correlative nominative units, which are based on the different signs and associations, indicates the originality of derivational processes occurring in the languages of different kind.

Corresponding Author:

Dr.Fatkutdinova Venera Gabdulchakovna
Kazan (Volga Region) State University
Kremlevskaya Street, 18, Kazan, 420008, Russia

6/12/2014

References

1. Evans, N., 2011. Semantic typology. In: The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology. Oxford University Press, pp: 504-533.
2. Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M., 2012. New directions in lexical typology. *Linguistics. An Interdisciplinary Journal of the Language Sciences*. 50 (3): 373 – 394.
3. Fatkhutdinova, V. G., 2013. Derivational potential of Russian and Tatar parametric adjectives in the aspect of Semantic Typology. *TIPOLOGIA LEXICA*. Granada: Jizo Ediciones, pp: 241 – 247.
4. Carstairs-McCarthy, A., 2010. The evolution of morphology. Oxford University press, pp: 253.
5. Shopen T., 2007. Language typology and syntactic description. Volume II: Complex Constructions. Cambridge University Press, pp: 488.
6. Kibrik, A. A., 2011. Reference in Discourse. Oxford University Press, pp: 651.
7. Talmy, L., 2000. Toward a Cognitive semantics. Volume I: Concept Structuring Systems. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp: 495.
8. Yusupova, A. S., 2013. Flatures of the Language of Tatars Living in China. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*. 17 (2): 168-172.
9. Epps P. and A. Arkhipov, 2009. New challenges in typology: Transcending the borders and refining the distinctions. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp: 428.
10. Vendina, T. I., 2012. Russian traditional spiritual culture: heritage in the word. *Metaphysics. Scientific Journal*, 4 (6): 49-64.
11. Koch, P., 2008. Cognitive onomasiology and lexical change: Around the eye. In: From polysemy to Semantic Change. Towards a typology of lexical semantic associations. Amsterdam / Philadelphia, pp: 107-138.
12. Vasileva, V. F., 2003. Semantic characterology in the context of the comparative study of languages (on the material of Czech and Russian languages). Moscow University Bulletin. Philology, 2: 7 – 17.
13. Plungyan, V. A., 2000. General Morphology: Introduction to the range of problems. M.: Editorial URSS, pp: 384.
14. Laer Van, S., 2010. The presentation in Latin: study of preverbs ad-, in-, and ob-per-augustéene in the Republican and poetry. Brussels: Latomus, pp: 501.
15. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1999. M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, pp: 685.
16. Budagov, R. A., 1953. Essays on linguistics. M.: Publ. Academy of Sciences Press of the USSR, pp: 280.
17. Durst-Andersen, P., 2011. Behind the language. The culture of the mental universe of language and communication. Copenhagen: International Publishers, pp: 200.