

ON THE FUNCTIONAL PARALLELISM BETWEEN WORD FORMATION AND FORM-BUILDING IN RUSSIAN

JERZY KALISZAN

The Russian word formation (lexical morphology) and form-building (grammatical morphology, i.e. inflection and grammatical stem-building) are closely connected subsystems showing a lot of parallels both on the expressive and semantic levels. In this respect, a special attention attract those parallels of these subsystems where, with the aid of means and mechanisms typical of each of them, the same or similar meaning can be expressed. In such cases, we have to deal with homoreference which is possible owing to the fact that some word formation categories in terms of character and degree of generalization of their semantics are similar or identical to the grammatical categories (Зайнуллин / Мурясов 1982: 84).

In the most typical way, homoreference of grammatical and word formation structures manifests itself in a correlation of case forms with relative adjectives. This correlation may be clearly observed, among other things, in semantically equivalent (related to the same referent) formations such as (дом) *отца* – *отцов* (дом), (сумка) *тёти* – *тёткина* (сумка), (нора) *лисы* – *лисья* (нора), (пожар) *леса* – *лесной* (пожар), (кость) *слона* – *слоновая* (кость), (чтение) *актёра* – *актёрское* (чтение) and so on. As the examples show, the case endings may be considered as functional analogues to the derivative suffixes.

Homoreference of derived words and word forms also reveals itself in the sphere of expression of the meaning of plurality. More specifically, the synonymy of collective nouns and plural forms is taken into consideration here, cf.: *студенчество* – *студенты*, *пролетариат* – *пролетарии*, *офицерё* – *офи-*

церы, шоферня – шофёры, пенсионерия – пенсионеры, беднота – бедные N, интеллигенция – интеллигенты, листва – листья, инструментарий – инструменты, орнаментика – орнаменты, аппаратура – аппараты and so on. The collective plurality expressed by a number of derivational means and characterized by a high degree of abstraction can be treated as a parallel with grammatical plurality denoted by the plural forms. Leaving out the fact that the collective nouns indicate an inseparable (continuous, nondiscrete, or uninterrupted) character of signifié, and the plural forms – its discrete character, one can say nevertheless that the former repeat – at least in a certain part of lexical material – the principal opposition ‘one – more than one’ forming the basis of grammatical category of plural. There can be no doubt that a semantic closeness between two aforementioned categories of plurality – the collective and discrete ones – was the main cause of transposition of the former collective nouns such as *братья, князья* into the plural forms. The same reason shaped the basis of substitution of original plural forms of concrete nouns by the forms like *колья, деревья* going back to the collective nouns like *колье, деревье* (Азарх 1984: 205–206; Марков 1974: 69–80; Колесников 1976: 95–96).

Apart from collective nouns, as an analogue of plural forms the nouns with general-collective meaning can be considered (Брусенская 1986; Тукова 1992). The latter are usually treated as a result of semantic derivation based on the trope ‘the part → the whole’ (synecdoche). We are talking here about the nouns in singular form which can be used, for example, in the following contexts: *Весь город был очищен от врага; В нашем лесу растёт и сосна, и берёза*. The distinguished nouns in sentences given here express, in common with collective nouns, the meaning of homogeneous plurality which constitutes a modification of the invariant meaning of plurality. In this connection, the general-collective nouns can potentially compete both with collective nouns and plural forms, causing synonymic triads such as *купец ‘купцы’ – купцы – купечество, пролетарий ‘пролетарии’ – пролетарии – пролетариат, зверь ‘звери’ – звери – зверьё* etc.¹

Deep functional analogies between derived words and word forms may also be observed in the sphere of expression of feature intensity. For example, adjectival derivatives like *тихонький, лёгонький, толстенный, высоченный, большущий, хитрющий* or *предобрый, премилый, архиважный, архиглупый, расчудесный, распрекрасный, сверхглубокий, сверхмогучный, суперсовре-*

¹ There is, nevertheless, a certain difference between general-collective nouns, on the one hand, and collective nouns and plural forms, on the other hand. The former express the meaning of plurality in an analytical way, by means of an appropriate context or a concrete situation, whereas the latter contain this meaning in their structure, expressing it with the aid of suffix (*студенчество, сосняк*) or inflectional ending (*студенты, сосны*).

менный, супербогатый, ультрамодный, экстрамодный, denoting a high or a top degree of quality, semantically resemble the grammatical forms of superlative such as *самый высокий, самый хитрый, выше всех, глупее всех, важнее всего, легче всего, важнейший, глубочайший* etc.

To the derived words are particularly related the adjectival forms with suffix *-ейш-/-айш-* which are relatively seldom used as superlative forms. At present many of such forms express, for the most part, the elative meaning, i.e. the meaning of absolutely high degree of quality, completely devoid of comparison elements. Therefore, one can say that in such structures the suffix *-ейш-/-айш-* semantically amounts not to the adverb *наиболее* (like in case of superlative degree), but to the adverbs *очень, весьма* or *чрезвычайно, исключительно*, cf.: *честнейший человек = очень честный человек, сильнейшая гроза = очень сильная гроза, глупейший поступок = чрезвычайно глупый поступок*. Just this absolute-evaluative meaning of adjectival structures considered here, their usage out of comparison, makes it possible to regard them not as superlative (grammatical) forms but as derived words.

At last, as a convincing example of functional parallelism of word formation and form-building in Russian, the synonymy of deverbative adjectives with suffix *-л-* and participial forms with suffix *-(в)ш-* may be taken into consideration. This kind of synonymy is represented by a number of semantically equivalent structures like *вылинялый – вылинявший, заплесневелый – заплесневевший, размяклый – размякший, спелый – спевший, увялый – увядший, усталый – уставший* and so on.² Undoubtedly, this semantic equivalence of compared structures became the cause of the transformation of some participial forms into the adjectives. Thus, in contemporary Russian, many formations like *бывший, загоревший, заиндевелый, обрюзгший, увядший, устаревший* and so forth, can be performed just in the function of adjectives and be treated not only as participles, i.e. grammatical verbal forms, but also as deverbative derivatives.

To sum up, the Russian word formation and form-building represent isomorphic morphological subsystems showing a series of parallels in expressing the same or very similar types of linguistic meanings and, to a certain extent, they can duplicate and complement each other. It provides quite sufficient evidence that a clear-cut boundary between word formation and form-building in Russian does not exist.

² Such a synonymy finds its corroboration in lexicographical practice, where the meaning of adjectives with suffix *-л-* are almost regularly explained by the participial forms of the same root, cf.: *пересохлый – ‘ставший чрезмерно сухим, пересохший’; поблёклый – ‘ставший блёклым, поблёкший’; полёглый – ‘пригнувшийся к земле, полёгший’; протухлый – ‘тухлый, протухший’* (Евгеньева 1981–1984).

References

- Азарх, Ю.С. 1984. *Словообразование и формообразование существительных в истории русского языка*. Москва.
- Брусенская, Н.А. 1986. *Обобщенно-собирательное значение форм единственного числа конкретных существительных*. In: "Русский язык в национальной школе", № 10.
- Евгеньева, А.П. 1981–1984. (ed.). *Словарь русского языка*, т. 1–4. Москва.
- Зайнуллин, М.В / Мурашов, Р.З. 1982. *Грамматика и словообразование*. In: *Актуальные проблемы русского словообразования*. Ташкент.
- Колесников, А.А. 1976. *О грамматическом статусе собирательных имен существительных русского языка*. In: "Русский язык в школе", № 6.
- Марков, В.М. 1974. *Историческая грамматика русского языка. Именное склонение*. Москва.
- Тукова, Т.В. 1992. *Омореферентность форм собирательности и единственного числа имен существительных русского языка*. "Филологические науки", № 4.