

THE GROWTH OF AGGLUTINATIVITY IN THE WORD-FORMATION SYSTEM OF THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Marzhan U. Suleibanova

Chechen State University, Grozny, Russian Federation

Abstract: *The growth of agglutinativity in the semantics of the derived word is manifested in the elimination of the ambiguity of word-formation morphemes and thus in an increase in the number of morphemes, always characterized by the same value. This is most clearly expressed in the prefixed way of producing names. Many prefixes, both Russian (раз-, co-, сопх-) and borrowed (анму-, арху-, ультра-), are distinguished by the unity of meaning in combination with the fundamentals of different semantics and even different parts of speech. In the language of the 20th century, there is a significant increase in the productivity of this way of formation in the system of nouns and adjectives. The number of suffixing morphemes, which have a single meaning and are combined with strictly defined fundamentals, is also increasing. Many young, actively developing word-formation types are formed by borrowed affixes. The growth of agglutinativity in the formation of a verb is seen mainly in the activation of the prefixal method, which plays an incomparably greater role in the verb system than in the formation of names. On the contrary, suffixes in the verb system are distinguished by inflectionality, cohesion with inflectional morphemes.*

Keywords: agglutinativity, polysemy of word-formation morphemes, productivity growth.

The most common trend in the development of the modern word-formation system, which is found in many particular processes, is the growth of agglutinative features in the semantics and structure of the derived word.

What is the meaning of the term „agglutinativity” in relation to the Russian language? Agglutinativity is a property opposite to fusion. In the semantics of the derived word, it is found in a one-to-one correspondence between the signified and signifier, in the „separate presentation of information elements in the composition of the word form”,¹ in the structure of the derived word in free „gluing” morphemes,² in the absence of morphological mutual adaptation of

¹ A. A. Reformatsky, *Morphological typology and the problem of classification of languages*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1965, p. 84.

² J. Greenberg, *Quantitative Approach to the Morphological Typology of Languages. New in linguistics*, Moscow, 1963, pp. 60-90; I. Lekov, „Deviations from the inflectional system in the Slavic languages”, in *VYa*, 2, (1956), pp. 18-26; M. Cholakov, „Towards the

morphemes when they are combined. The growth of agglutinativity in the semantics of the derived word, i. e. the growth of one-to-one relations between the signified and the signifier, contributes to the dismemberment of words into morphemes, since a certain part of the meaning of the word is associated with each morpheme; thus, semantic dismemberment supports structural dismemberment.

Main part

The growth of agglutinativity in the semantics of the derived word is manifested in the elimination of the ambiguity of word-formation morphemes and thus in an increase in the number of morphemes, always characterized by the same value. This is most clearly expressed in the prefixed way of producing names. Many prefixes, both Russian (*раз-, со-, сверх-*) and borrowed (*анти-, архи-, ультра-*), are distinguished by the unity of meaning in combination with the fundamentals of different semantics and even different parts of speech. In the language of the 20th century, there is a significant increase in the productivity of this way of formation in the system of nouns and adjectives.

The number of suffixing morphemes, which have a single meaning and are combined with strictly defined bases, also increases. For example, the specialization of a number of suffixes is increasing. Middle names of residents with a suffix *-анин*, names of persons by profession with a suffix *-щик* and many others. Many young, actively developing word-formation types are formed by borrowed affixes, which acquire a single clear meaning in the Russian language of the Soviet era (for example, nouns with *драм, -трон, -рама*, and some others).

In the formation of the verb, the growth of agglutinativity is manifested mainly in the activation of the prefixal method, which plays an incomparably more important role in the verb system than in the formation of names. On the contrary, suffixes in the verb system are distinguished by inflectionality, cohesion with inflection morphemes.³

The most characteristic phenomenon is the increase in the role of prefixes not only in the verbal word-production (which was widely characteristic of Russian language before), but also in the formation of verbs from other parts of speech, primarily from nouns and adjectives. The production of verbs from names in a suffixed way covers only a few

Problem of Agility in the Slavonic Tongues”, in *Bulletin of the Institute for Bulgarian Language*, volume XI, 1964, pp. 95-99.

³ V. V. Vinogradov, *Russian language*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1947, pp. 440-442.

derivational types; the prefixal-suffixal types of abbreviated verbs are most actively developed. The prefixes often appear as elements devoid of derivational significance; they only support suffixes that are too weak to play the role of the sole „designer” of the word. Fusional means of word formation is insufficient and requires support from agglutinative prefixes.

The growth of agglutinativity in the structure of the derived word is found in phenomena leading in different ways to the obsolescence of the mutual adaptability of morphemes when they are combined:

1) alternations at the junction of morphemes are weakened (the rigor of the implementation of alternations in the old types decreases, new word-formation types appear, devoid of alternations);

2) the use of interfixes, i. e., ligament elements, which play the role of laying between morphemes and eliminating the need for alternations at the junctions of morphemes, is growing;

3) the imposition of morphemes is used more widely than before („interference of morphemes”); this phenomenon combines the features of agglutination and fusion: when applied, morphemes retain their phonemic composition and linear distinguishability, although some of them are two-functional, and this is not typical for agglutinative morphemes.⁴

Changes in the structure of the derived word, conducive to the growth of agglutinativity of Russian word formation, are stimulated by social factors, primarily the expansion of the composition of speakers of the literary language. Russian is becoming the language of inter-ethnic communication, the second native language for people of different nationalities of the Soviet Union. Many Russian people who previously spoke colloquial or territorial dialects take possession of the literary language. In this case, naturally, the ways of mastering a literary language are changing. Language is not learned from parents, not at home. Learning a literary language from extra-familial sources weakens the stability of some linguistic elements (for example, traditional alternations) that are not directly related to the transfer of lexical and grammatical meanings, and contributes to the heightened process of increasing the productivity of some word-building types and reducing the productivity of others. There is a sort of simplification of the system, leading to the „pushing of exceptions” (i. e., types and models that were previously little or unproductive, further weaken productivity, and productive types

⁴ E. A. Zemskaya, „On one particular compound of word-formation morphemes in Russian”, in *VYa*, 2, (1964), pp. 84-88.

and models enhance it).

This socially conditioned process of „pushing exceptions” takes place in different tiers of the language (morphological, phonetic), giving a general direction to their development.⁵

The growth of the agglutinativity of the word-formation system is also promoted by the significant influence on the literary language of the Soviet epoch by the word-building subsystems of terminology, professional and colloquial speech, which for various reasons is characterized by greater agglutinativity than literary word formation. Such reasons were the deliberate „construction” of terms, the desire for uniformity of their structure; freedom of conversational and vocational education from the impact of the norms of the literary language, limiting the word production in one way or another.

Calling the growth of agglutinativity the most common trend in the development of the system of modern word formation, we do not mean that the Russian language loses its inflectional character.

We note the leading line of development, which is found in a variety of changes, each of which is not so significant, but which are strong in their uni-directionality and multiplicity.

Agglutination leads to a reduction in the code (at least potential): the set of morphemes and morpheme units is reduced.

The desire to reduce the role of morphological alternations is the way to reduce the number of morpheme variants. Specialization of morphemes helps reduce their ambiguity, crowding out some of them—that is, reducing the number of code points as well. However, does this entail an increase in the length of the text during which the derivation values are expressed?

First of all, it should be emphasized that morphological alternations in the Russian language are always caused by the subsequent morpheme; they are her identity and identity. For example, the case in the form of *о лесе* (cf. *без леса, в лесу*) is expressed: flexion - <э>, changing of hard consonants to soft ones before flexion and non-impact flexion. The main indicator is inflection, since only it can be the only indicator of the case (cf. *о еже, о мече*); the name of the consonants and the type of stress are its attendants.

In morphological alternations, the words are easily distinguished: *твердение* (from *твердеть*) and *тверждение* (from *твердить*), *правление* (from *праветь*) and *правление* (from *править*), *поглупение* (from *поглупеть*) and *оглупление* (from *оглупить*), in the vast majority of cases, the change of

⁵ E. D. Polivanov, *For Marxist linguistics*, Moscow, 1931, p. 46.

morphemes *-ить/-ение* is accompanied by alternation in the root; the change of morphemes *-еть /-ение* are usually not accompanied by it. Destruction of alternations would result in the fact that it would be impossible within the limits of a word to distinguish *-ение* correlative with *-ить* (with the meaning of an intransitive verb) from *-ение* correlative with *-еть* (with the meaning of an intransitive verb). For example, *чернить, чернеть-чернение* (having < н' > at the base excludes the possibility of alternations). Identifying *-ение¹ (/ /-ить)* и *-ение₂ (/ /-еть)* can no longer be through the word, but throughout a large segment of the text: *чернение от времени* and *чернение материи сажеей*.

However, such cases in word-formation are rare: in a modern word-formation system, redundant information is so great that reducing the code so far only in rare cases leads to lengthening of texts, during which this derivational value is recognized.

Processes of increasing the regularity of word-formation types play an important role in the development of the word-formation system of the Russian language of the Soviet era. Such types are called regular, „according to which a morphological unit with a given affix with a standard value can always be formed from a certain type of foundation”.⁶

Derived words referring to such types stand in the way of turning into word forms, and the corresponding derivational morphemes become relational.

What does the transformation of derivational types into regular ones? The growth of their productivity. Increasing the productivity of word-formation types „makes completely non-inflectional affixes into almost inflexive”.⁷ In this case, two circumstances play an especially important role:

1) the standardity of the meaning of affixes in combination with a certain type of base;

2) a strict pattern of the combination of an affix with a certain type of basis (i. e. restrictions on the compatibility of an affix - if they exist, they must obey strict laws).

As an example of regular derivational types, feminine nouns - names of females correlative to masculine nouns, can be cited. For example, nouns with suffixes: *-щик/-щица, -ник/-ница, -ист/-истка, -ец/ка*.⁸

There is a strong relationship between the cognate masculine and

⁶ *Russian language and Soviet society*, Alma-Ata, Avenue, 1962, p. 31.

⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁸ G. O. Winokur, *Notes on Russian word formation*, Moscow, 1959, p. 439.

feminine nouns of the types mentioned. From each masculine noun, a feminine noun with a standard meaning is freely produced.

In the Russian language of the Soviet era, many word-formation types increase their regularity. These are verbal nouns with *-ка*, adjectives with *-ость*, adjectives with the suffix *-ек-*, derived from surnames, nouns and adjectives with the prefixes *анти-*, *архи-*, *ультра-*, *сверх-*, *не-* and some others, adjectives with prefix *без-*, formed on the basis of combinations of nouns with the preposition *без*, some types of prefixal verbs. Affixes forming high regularity word-formation types stand in the way of their transformation into relational morphemes (*-ка*, *-ость*), or prepositional particles, freely connected with words of different classes (*анти-*, *сверх-*, *архи-* and others).

The increase in the regularity of the named and a number of other word-building types, caused by the growth of their productivity, is mainly due to the same two factors external to the word-formation system of the literary language, which was mentioned above. This is the influence of general vocabulary on the general literary word formation, as well as the effect on the literary language of colloquial speech, which is peculiar to freedom from many restrictions operating in a strictly normalized literary language.

The words of different parts of speech are combined into the paradigm of a single lexeme (with this understanding, they become individual word forms within the paradigm of one lexeme). However, this should not seem to be something heretical, destroying all the basics of grammar. In Russian linguistic science, such an association has long been made: the verb paradigm includes participles and verbal adverbs. Participle is a regular type of verbal adjectives, and verbal adverb is a regular type of verbal adverbs. The idea of belonging of possessive adjectives with *-ов*, *ин* in the Old Slavonic and Old Russian languages to the paradigm of the existence name has been repeatedly expressed by scholars.⁹ It is quite fair, because these formations are functionally close to the genitive case and are not inferior to case forms in the regularity of production.

Thus, „it is necessary to emphasize the fundamental possibility of combining morphological units (word forms) belonging to different parts of speech in one lexeme. In German, *das Lesen* and *lesen* or *das Laufen* and *laufen*, etc., belong to the same paradigm (it is said that in

⁹ N. S. Trubetsky, *On the possessive adjectives (possesiva) of the Old Church Slavonic language*. „Zbornik at the part of A. Beli”, Beograd, 1937, p. 16; A. Vayan, *Guide to the Old Slavonic language*, Moscow, 1952, p. 158.

these cases the verb is „substantiated”, as if there is some historical process here, and not the simultaneous coexistence of units included in one lexeme).

The possibility of coexistence within the same lexeme of word forms belonging to different parts of speech is justified by the fact that the distribution of morphological unity in parts of speech and the distribution of morphological unity in lexemes is based on completely different principles that do not overlap each other.¹⁰

The growth of regularity of a number of derivational types leads to a change in the composition and nature of the paradigms of different parts of speech. The number of paradigms is increasing, in which different parts of speech are united by close forced connection. Thus, the verb paradigm includes (more precisely, it is ready to enter) nouns with *-ка* with procedural meaning *посадить-посажу... посадка*), adjective paradigm-nouns with *-ость* with the meaning of an abstract feature (*бронзовый, бронзового ... бронзовость, сборный, сборного... сборность*), noun paradigm-adjectives with the prefix *без-*, meaning no thing called producing the basis (*аэродром, аэродрома, без аэродрома, безаэродромный...*) *кондуктор, кондуктора, без кондуктора, бескондукторный*).

This feature of modern word formation is deeply internally connected with its other characteristic feature, which facilitates its manifestation and development. New word-formation connections between parts of speech are born in the modern language. Their birth contributes to the phenomenon, which can be called the use in the formation of ready-made structures, semantically not related to the derived word.

The traditionally recognized only type of relations between producing and derived is destroyed: a derivative can semantically correlate with one element, and structurally with another. This new type of correlation does not contradict the basic tendency of the development of modern word formation-the growth of agglutinativity: the word-forming affix freely „glues” to the ready-made structure existing in the language. As a result of this, parts of speech that were not previously interconnected word-formative, that is, not acting in relation to each other as producing and derivative, enter into such relations. Contrary to the traditions and laws of Russian word formation of the 19th century, they begin to be derived from the basics of the adjective adverbial nouns with *-о* (such as *водопадно, осторожно*), semantically directly related to nouns, names with procedural meanings (such as *химизация*,

¹⁰ *Russian language and Soviet society*, p. 31.

тракторизация, векторизация, дождевание, гнездование, шлакование) from the fundamentals of nouns and adjectives; formations with *-ствующий*, attributed by different researchers to participles or adjectives with procedural meaning (such as *хулиганствующий, радикальствующий*) from the bases of essential names; nouns with the meaning of abstract attribute, properties (such as *этажность, ходимость*) from the basis of nouns and verbs.

These new word-formation connections are born now and sharply distinguish modern word formation from the 19th century word-formation, when adverbs were produced only from the fundamentals of qualitative adjectives, nouns and adjectives with procedural meaning-only from the bases of verbs, etc. Formations that violate these laws were isolated and were perceived as „word-formation monsters”. In modern language, they constitute numerous groups of words and form new word-formation types.

As a result, there is a restructuring of the entire system of word formation. The points of the system, previously isolated, not in contact with each other, are connected by a deep internal connection. The role of nouns as the generating bases of modern word formation is sharply increasing. In connection with this, the semantics of derived words of different parts of speech are changing. New residual adverbs of adverbs with *-о*, names of quality with *-ость*, names of actions with *-изация, -фикация* differ from traditional words of the same categories underscored by objectivity, the „materiality” of their meaning.

The connection of two changes: the restructuring of paradigms, the transformation of derivational affixes into relational (with increasing regularity) and the birth of new word-formation connections means that in the first and second cases the freedom of production of language units increases. This is evident in the case of the transformation of derivational morphemes into relational. At the birth of new derivational relations between the generators and derivatives, the restrictions imposed by the language system are also lifted, with the result that the freedom to form new units increases.

When studying the grammatical system of the language, the concept of markedness - unmarkedness plays an important role.

If two language units having something in common in semantics are opposed to each other so that the meaning of one is narrower than the value of the other, then the first is marked and the second is unmarked. Such relationships bind, for example, units *фрезеровщик-фрезеровщица, артист-артистка, учитель-учительница*. Nouns *фрезеровщица, артистка, учительница* indicate that they denote persons only

female, whereas words *фрезеровщик, артист, учитель* do not contain such a restriction: *Учителя нашей школы-Иванова и Семенова-поедут летом в Крым; Мария Ивановна-хороший учитель.*

Thus, the marked members of the opposition are units *фрезеровщица, артистка, учительница*, as they contain a limiting meaning: 'a female, and words *фрезеровщик, артист, учитель* are unmarked, as they do not contain such a restriction (that is, they denote a person of either sex). Tagged members of the opposition have a narrower and, at the same time, more detailed value than unmarked members.

That is why in certain typical contexts it is possible to replace any marked member with an unmarked.¹¹ So, the phrase „*Семенова-хорошая учительница (спортсменка, чертежница)*” can be changed into the phrase „*Семенова-хороший учитель (спортсмен, чертежник)*”.

Backward substitution - members unmarked with marked ones - in the same contexts is not always possible. In the phrase „*Иван Петрович-хороший учитель*”, we cannot replace the last word with a feminine noun (*учительница*), because it has a narrower meaning than the word *учитель* (it introduces a detailed meaning „female”, which is contrary to the context).

The possibility (or impossibility) of such substitutions serves as a diagnostic check for identifying marked and unmarked members of the opposition.

An example of the opposition, both members of which are marked, can be the words *красавица* and *красавец*: *красавица* means a female face, beauty means a male face. It is impossible to say „*Миша у нас красавица*” or „*Красавец Наташа стояла перед зеркалом*” impossible.

Oppositions, one member of which is unmarked, are called privative, that is, inequitable; Oppositions, both members of which are marked, are called equipalent, that is, equivalent.

In privative oppositions, members are contrasted on a more abstract basis than in equipalent oppositions. In our examples, we have two kinds of oppositions:

- 1) a female-a person of any gender;
- 2) a female-a male.

It is quite obvious that in oppositions of the first kind the degree of abstraction is higher: one of the language units in them has a

¹¹ M. Dokulil, „K otazce morfologických protikladu”, in *SaS*, no. 2, 1958; B. Trnka, *Morfologické protiklady. O vğdeckem poznání soudobých jazyků*, Prague, 1958; R. Jakobson, *Zur Struktur der russischen Verbums. Charisteria Guilelmo Mathesio quinquagenario*, Prague, 1932; *Travaux de l'institut de linguistique*, II. Paris, 1958; Kf Izkov a H., „K pojeti neutralizace v morfologii”, in *SaS*, no 1, 1965; *Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague*, t. 2. Prague, 1966.

generalized meaning common to both members, whereas each language unit in oppositions of the second kind has a narrow meaning and a member that expresses a common meaning („face of any gender”) is absent.

We have not considered all possible relationships between word-formation innovations and norms of the literary language. They are complex, diverse and contradictory.

The most typical cases are when new developing phenomena of word formation, corresponding to actively active word-formation tendencies, are perceived as a violation of lexical norms. Undoubtedly, this is a temporary phenomenon. It reflects the struggle of the old with the new. However, the outcome of this struggle is not always easy to foresee, since both the old and the new have their defenders. The first is patronized by the stability of the literary language as the main means of ensuring the continuity of the history and culture of the people, its consciously protected traditionalism; the development and strengthening of the new (word-building changes) is supported by the course of the historical development of the language system, which in turn is determined by the complex game of internal and external factors affecting the language.

These circumstances determined the nature of the material being studied. We studied the data of oral and written speech of different genres, often not yet becoming facts of the language, since they reveal the most distinctly word-formative innovations that characterize the potentials of the development of the language system.