

МОВОЗНАВСТВО. ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 81'373.611

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/69-3-20>**Maria NEVREVA,***orcid.org/0000-0001-9923-1041**Candidate of Philological Sciences, PhD,**Associate Professor at the Foreign Languages Department**National University "Odessa Polytechnic"**(Odessa, Ukraine) m.n.nevрева@gmail.com***Iryna DUVANSKA,***orcid.org/0000-0002-9863-3564**Senior Lecturer at the Foreign Languages Department**National University "Odessa Polytechnic"**(Odessa, Ukraine) irusia.odessa@gmail.com***Olena PETROVA,***orcid.org/0000-0003-0637-0806**Senior Lecturer at the Foreign Languages Department**National University "Odessa Polytechnic"**(Odessa, Ukraine) olpet132@gmail.com***DEFINITION AND CONTENTS OF LINGUISTIC CONCEPTS FUNCTIONING
IN WORD-FORMATION FIELD**

The article considers the philosophical concepts 'type' and 'model' used in theoretical and applied linguistics and frequently introduced in the methodology of any scientific research, and in the case described in the article – in word-formation methodology. The point is that over time with the intensive use of some well-known and seemingly long-established linguistic terms, serious terminological and definitional inconsistencies are observed, preventing a clear understanding of the research methodology or the goals and objectives facing linguistic scientists. It can lead to misunderstanding and discrepancies in the results of scientific research, is already quite well known in dissertation descriptions and scientific papers. In order to avoid the incorrect use of generally accepted linguistic terms that have undergone certain interpretations in their definitions and content in the course of dissertation research or other scientific developments, we should carefully analyze and eliminate such interpretations since they can lead to serious both theoretical and practical errors. Studying of dissertation works showed that researchers analyzing word-formation systems in various languages do not always correctly use the appropriate terminology. The presented article demonstrates that familiar terms can have in different works a completely various meaning. So the purpose of the work is to describe the definitions and content of the concepts of a philosophical nature 'type' and 'model' used in the field of word formation and often mixed to help form the correct and clear understanding of these concepts in the course of creating a research methodology. Since the article describes the concepts 'type' and 'model' on the basis of the phenomena of word formation the corresponding examples are presented which were taken from the authors' research, performed in this area, to support their position in this or that affirmation. The article also contains various viewpoints of theoreticians which not only add but also contradict each other. A review of the literature related to the definition of linguistic terms necessary for their introduction into articles and dissertations on the topic of word formation showed that the philosophical concepts 'type' and 'model' are not at all identical in content, and this fact should be taken into account when describing theoretical issues and choosing the necessary methodology.

Key words: *derivative, word-forming format, root, suffix, prefix, type, model.*

Марія НЕВРЕВА,

orcid.org/0000-0001-9923-1041

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри іноземних мов

Національного університету «Одеська політехніка»
(Одеса, Україна) *m.n.nevreva@gmail.com*

Ірина ДУВАНСЬКА,

orcid.org/0000-0002-9863-3564

старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов

Національного університету «Одеська політехніка»
(Одеса, Україна) *irusia.odessa@gmail.com*

Олена ПЕТРОВА,

orcid.org/0000-0003-0637-0806

старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов

Національного університету «Одеська політехніка»
(Одеса, Україна) *olpet132@gmail.com*

ВИЗНАЧЕННЯ ТА ЗМІСТ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИХ ПОНЯТЬ, ЩО ФУНКЦІОНУЮТЬ У СФЕРІ СЛОВОТВІРУ

У статті розглядаються філософські поняття «тип» і «модель», які використовуються в теоретичній і прикладній лінгвістиці та часто вводяться в методологію будь-якого наукового дослідження, а в описаному в статті випадку – в методологію словотвору. Справа в тому, що з часом при інтенсивному використанні деяких загальновідомих і, здавалося б, давно усталених лінгвістичних термінів спостерігаються серйозні термінологічні та дефініційні неузгодженості, які перешкоджають чіткому розумінню методології дослідження або цілей і завдань, які стоять перед ученими-лінгвістами. Це може призвести до непорозумінь і розбіжностей у результатах наукових досліджень, вже досить добре відомих в описах дисертацій і наукових працях. Щоб уникнути некоректного вживання загальноприйнятих лінгвістичних термінів, які зазнали певних тлумачень у своїх визначеннях і змісті під час дисертаційних досліджень чи інших наукових розробок, слід ретельно проаналізувати та виключити такі тлумачення, оскільки вони можуть призвести до серйозних як теоретичних, так і практичних помилок. Вивчення дисертаційних робіт показало, що дослідники, аналізуючи системи словотвору в різних мовах, не завжди коректно використовують відповідну термінологію. Представлена стаття демонструє, що знайомі терміни можуть мати в різних творах абсолютно різне значення. Тому метою роботи є опис дефініцій і змісту понять філософського характеру «тип» і «модель», що використовуються в області словотвору і часто змішуються, щоб допомогти сформуванню правильне і чітке розуміння цих понять в ході створення методології дослідження. Оскільки в статті описуються поняття «тип» і «модель» на основі явищ словотвору, наводяться відповідні приклади, взяті з досліджень авторів, проведених у цій галузі, для підтвердження своєї позиції в тому чи іншому твердженні. У статті також містяться різні точки зору вчених-теоретиків, які не тільки доповнюють, але й суперечать одна одній. Огляд літератури щодо визначення лінгвістичних термінів, необхідних для введення їх у статті та дисертації на тему словотвору, показав, що філософські поняття «тип» і «модель» зовсім не тотожні за змістом, і цей факт повинен бути врахованим при описі теоретичних питань і виборі необхідної методики.

Ключові слова: *дериват, словотвірний формат, корінь, суфікс, префікс, тип, модель.*

Problem statement. The study of word-formation system of the English language is one of the most promising areas in theoretical linguistics although developed in sufficient detail. If we turn to modern scientific works describing various parts of speech of the English language (Рогачева, 2000; Nevreva, Lebedeva, Gvozd, 2016) we find that despite the huge variety and multifaceted themes the morphemic analysis is present as an obligatory component of the study.

But it is not only the scientific field in which units of the word-formation system of a language are considered that is attractive to linguists. One of the

most important aspects of analyzing such a system is obtaining the results that are essential for developing optimal methods for training specialists to read and understand scientific text.

It is known that for the successful implementation of any scientific work in order to obtain the best results it is necessary, first of all, that all scientific concepts introduced into the work system be accurately and consistently defined. In our case – that all the features of word-forming units are accurately and unambiguously characterized from the standpoint of those concepts that are accepted in theoretical linguistics.

However, this is not always possible, especially in such a complex issue as word formation where the different points of view of theoreticians and practitioners are often contradictory. Moreover, linguistic science itself is rather mobile and dynamic, constantly changing with the accumulation of new research results, which thus have a serious impact on theoretical issues. So there is a constant interaction between the theoretical and practical spheres of linguistics. It is not surprising that over time with the intensive use of some well-known and seemingly long-established linguistic terms, serious terminological and definitional inconsistencies are observed, preventing a clear understanding of the research methodology or the goals and objectives facing linguistic scientists.

The situation when the lack of sufficient certainty regarding some concepts and terms characterizing them, subsequently led to misunderstanding and discrepancies in the results of scientific research, is already quite well known in dissertation descriptions and scientific articles.

First of all it concerns the terms ‘type’ and ‘model’ that are the most frequently used terminological units in the field of word formation. Their definitions and contents are often mixed and there are a great number of cases of using these terms one instead of the other. So we can say that we are observing the obvious distortion in using these two terms while studying the description of various scientific research in general and word formation in particular.

Taking into account all of the above, we can say the following: in order to avoid the incorrect use of generally accepted linguistic terms that have undergone certain interpretations in their definitions and contents in the course of dissertation research or other scientific developments, we should carefully analyze and eliminate such interpretations since they can lead to serious both theoretical and practical errors. For this purpose the article will demonstrate the analysis of authoritative literary sources and draw appropriate conclusions.

Since we are talking about the phenomena of word formation in language the authors will further provide corresponding examples from their research performed in this area to support their position in this or that affirmation.

Latest research analysis. In the linguistic literature one can find a fairly large number of publications on the topic of word-formation features of lexemes that function not only in fiction discourse but also in the texts of technical type of discourse. Firstly, as already mentioned, almost all dissertation works, especially the modern ones, carried out on the basis of the analysis of parts of speech, necessarily include descriptions of their word-formation features (Рогачева, 2000; Nevreva, Lebedeva, Gvozd, 2016).

Secondly, there is also a keen interest of foreign scientists in this topic, both in their past research and modern publications (Lehmann, 1982; Croft, 2003; Sneddon, 1996; Kloss, 1969; Blends, 1977). For example, at one time the so-called Leipzig Glossing Rules were carefully developed (Leipzig Glossing Rules Conventions for interlinear ...).

However word-formation analysis was mainly aimed exclusively at the practical study of speech units without attempting to understand the terms that name individual concepts and have been accepted in theoretical linguistics for a long time, but which have already undergone some changes in the process of their use.

An attempt to understand the extent of such changes, as well as the possible consequences for young scientists who incorrectly use (or will use) certain linguistic terms that came to this science from philosophy, determines the novelty of this article.

Goal of the article. The purpose of the work is to describe the definitions and contents of the most important concepts of a philosophical nature ‘type’ and ‘model’ frequently used in the field of word formation and mixed in order to help form the correct and clear understanding of these concepts in the course of creating a research methodology.

Basic material. In word formation as a branch of linguistics in addition to the basic unit (derived word) and the minimum unit (formant), complex units have been recently distinguished – ‘word-formation type’, etc. However, the very concept ‘word-formation type’ is not yet sufficiently defined since it appeared in this area of linguistics recently.

Some researchers understand ‘word-formation type’ as a scheme showing which parts of speech are involved in the word-formation act and which of them is productive and which is derivative. For example, $V + \text{Suf.} = N$ is a scheme that explains that a noun is formed from a verb stem using a suffix: $\text{boil} + \text{er} = \text{boiler}$. However, nouns are formed using the same scheme: $\text{separation} = \text{separat(e)} + \text{ion}$; $\text{equipment} = \text{equip} + \text{ment}$; $\text{delivery} = \text{deliber} + \text{y}$. Therefore, within the schemes, word-formation models are distinguished that describe the generating stem, a specific affix and a derivative word. So, in the scheme $V + \text{suf.} = N$ there are different models: $V + \text{ion} = N$; $V + \text{ment} = N$; $V + \text{y} = N$, etc.

Other authors use only the term “word-formation model,” meaning by it a stable typical structure with a generalized lexical-categorical meaning and realized when it is filled with some lexical material. In this case the underlying stem and the derivative of this model must be connected by a sound correlation, which is supported by both semantic commonality and the semantic difference between the deriving and the derivative (Marchand, 1951: 95).

Some authors, when defining the concept 'word-formation model' believe that the concept 'model' itself is determined not so much by a mechanical enumeration of the morphemes included in its content (in other words, the structure of a model and its morphemic composition are not identical concepts), but rather by identifying those specific linguistic units (affixes and stems) it is composed of. At the same time they identify structural-semantic varieties in models – 'patterns' – since a model is a structural, formal analogue of a derived word. Its content is limited to indicating word-forming affixes in combination with a system of inflections and the categorical characteristics of the generating stem. A pattern, in contrast to a model, is a structural-semantic scheme of a derived word. The content of this concept includes: 1) affixes with a system of inflections; 2) the semantics of the generating basis to the degree of generalization or specification in which this semantics affects the meaning of the derived word.

Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. (A Grammar of Contemporary English) offer instead of the term "word-formation type," uses the term "series," with the help of which he defined any association according to one or another structural feature of word units in a language. The capacity of these series, their stability, their importance for the system of a given language can be very different.

A number of linguists define the term "word-formation type" as a structural-semantic scheme for the formation of a derivative word, which is characterized by a common method of word formation, a common word-forming formant and a common formal and semantic relationship between the underlying stem and the derivative (Marchand H., 1951: 94–129). In the word-formation system of the language there are many word-formation types that have different word-formation meanings, different means of expressing them and different formal indicators, and within the same word-formation type the word-formation varieties can function conditioned by various morphological and phonetic factors.

In other cases the researchers classify derivatives of certain word-formation models as different word-formation types. Thus, different word-formation types include substantive adjectives which are characterized by different word-formation meanings. Within the framework of one word-formation model, word-formation types are distinguished, for example, with the following word-formation meanings: having what is called by a deriving noun; having the properties of, similar to, what is denoted by the deriving noun.

Thus, different types of approaches to defining the concepts 'word-formation type' and 'model' is obvious. Meanwhile, the concepts 'type' and 'model' are

used, as is known, not only in linguistics, but also in other sciences. In the content of the term 'type', with all the diversity of its use in different sciences, it usually means the identification in the manifold of phenomena of a particular sphere of certain groups or classes that unite these phenomena by the similarity of a number of properties or characteristics. Such groups (classes) distinguished from the set of phenomena under consideration are usually abbreviated as types in the general sphere.

The term 'model' in contrast to the term 'type' has the specific meaning of a pattern of something, or a form, a scheme, according to which something is copied. Varieties of objects and phenomena of the same type are usually called 'models'.

The use of the concepts 'type' and 'model' in different sciences in approximately similar meanings allows us to talk about the concepts 'type' and 'model' in a general meaning and consider the concepts of word-formation type and model of a word as particular in relation to the general concept of type and model in general.

Taking into account the above we will make an attempt to give a general description of the concepts 'word-formation type' and 'model'. So, 'word-formation type' is a general structural scheme for constructing a derivative word, which takes into account, first of all, the external, formal, materially expressed features of the derivative word. However, these characteristics cannot be the same for all types of derivatives. They depend on the method of word formation, the structure of the underlying stem and word-formation means. In affix word-formation, for example, words are formed by adding stems or words with affixes (suffixes and prefixes), and in word composition – as a result of adding two or more stems or words.

In derivative words formed by the suffix method – *driver, percentage, engineering, evaporator, reinforcement, rationalization* – the following words are used as a producing base: root – *drive*, prefix – *percent*, suffix – *engineer*, prefix-suffix – *evaporate*, complex-prefix – *reinforce*, complex-suffix – *rationalize*; and as a word-forming means (formant): suffixes *-er, -age, -ing, -or, -ment, -ation*. The word-formation types of the indicated derivative words can be presented in the form of structural formulas: R + S, PR + S, RS + S, PPR + S, RSS + S, where: R is a root morpheme, S is a suffix, P is a prefix.

In prefix derivatives – *compound, deblocking, noncondensables, nontransposition, evaporation* – the underlying stem is, respectively, the words: root – *pound*, suffix – *blocking*, prefix-suffixal – *condensables*, complex-prefix – *transposition* and complex-suffix – *vaporation*, and the word-forming formant – prefixes: *com-, re-, non-, e-*. Obvi-

ously the derivational types of these words can be represented by structural formulas: P+R, P+RS, P+PRS, P+PR, P+RSS.

A derivative word formed by means of word composition method consists, as it is known, of two or more stems (words) each of which can be a root or an affix. The derivational type of a compound word is determined by the structure and order of arrangement of the components. For example, the derivative word 'network' is formed by adding two simple words (net + work), the derivative word 'rising-film' is formed by adding a suffix and a simple word (rising + film); the derivative word 'distillate-reflux' – by adding the suffix and prefix words (distillate + reflux). The derivational types of complex words therefore have structural formulas: R + R, RS + R, RS + PR, etc.

In synchronic aspect the number of word-formation types has the character of a finite set or a closed system. The experience of industry frequency dictionaries compilation shows that the set of word-formation types is relatively small and varies slightly both in composition and quantity in texts of various technical fields.

A derived word along with the certain structural features has semantic features as well, i.e. has an external form and lexical meaning. The form and content of the derivative word are the same. Therefore, a

word-formation type can be realized only after filling it with lexical content. Within the same word-formation type, word-formation varieties determined by semantic factors can function. We call such semantic varieties of derived words within one word-formation type 'word-formation models'.

Three different qualities of a word-formation model are usually distinguished: 1) productivity, i.e. the number of lexical units formed according to its model; 2) activity – the ability of the model to form new derivatives; 3) frequency – frequency of repetition of a given model in the text (Kloss, 1969). It seems that the qualities of productivity, activity and usage are also characteristic of the word-formation type.

Conclusions. Studying of dissertation works showed that researchers analyzing word-formation systems in various languages do not always correctly use the appropriate terminology. The presented article demonstrates that familiar terms can have in different works a completely various meaning.

A review of the literature related to the definition of linguistic terms necessary for their introduction into articles and dissertations on the topic of word formation showed that the philosophical concepts 'type' and 'model' are not at all identical in content, and this fact should be taken into account when describing theoretical issues and choosing the necessary methodology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Рогачева Н. В. Морфемна структура іменників у текстах різних функціональних стилів (на матеріалі англійської мови) : автореф. дис... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04 «Германські мови». Київський держ. лінгвістичний ун-т. К., 2000. 25 с.
2. Nevreva M. N., Lebedeva E. V., Gvozd O. V. Statistics of noun morphological derivation in the scientific functional style text corpora. *European Journal of Literature and Linguistics*. "East West" Association for Advanced Studies and Higher Education. GmbH, Vienna, Austria, 2016. № 4. С. 31–34.
3. Lehmann Chr. Directions for interlinear morphemic translations. *Folia Linguistica*. N.-Y., 1982. № 16. P. 199–224.
4. Croft W. Typology and universals. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 2nd ed. P. 19–25.
5. Sneddon J.N. Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar. London: Routledge, 1996. 387 p.
6. Kloss H. Notes concerning language-nation typology. In J. Fishman, C. Ferguson, & j. Das Gupta (eds.). *Language problems of developing nations*. N.-Y.: John Wiley & Sons. 1969. P. 69–85.
7. Blends A. J. A structural and systematic view. *American speech*. 1977. № 52. P. 47–74.
8. Leipzig Glossing Rules Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses. Berlin, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, 2008. 11 p.
9. Marchand H. Phonology. Morphology and Word-Formation. "Neuphilologische Mitteilungen". *Bulletin de Societe neophilologique de Helsinki*. Helsinki, 1951. № 4. P. 94–129.
10. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Grammar of Contemporary English. London : Longman, 1972. 1120 p.

REFERENCES

1. Rohacheva N. V. (2000) Morfemna struktura imennykh u tekstakh riznykh funktsionalnykh styliv (na materiali anhliiskoi movy). [The morpheme structure of nouns in the texts of different functional styles (on the material of the English language)] : Avtoref. dys... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.04 "Hermansky movy". Author's abstract. dis... cand. Philol. Sciences: 10.02.04 "German language". 25 s. [in Ukrainian].
2. Nevryeva M. N., Lyebedyeva Ye. V., Hvozhd' O. V. (2016) Statistics of noun morphological derivation in the scientific functional style text corpora. *European Journal of Literature and Linguistics*. "East West" Association for Advanced Studies and Higher Education, 4. S. 31–34.
3. Leman Khr. (1982). [Directions for interlinear morphemic translations/ *Folia Linguistica*, 16. S. 199–224
4. Kroft V. (2003) Typology and universals Cambridge University Press. S. 19–25.

5. Sneddon Dzh. N. (1996) Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar/ London: Routledge. 387 s.
6. Kloss KH. (1969) Notes concerning language-nation typology Language problems of developing nations. S. 69–85.
7. Blends A.J. (1977) A structural and systematic view American speech, 52. S. 47-74.
8. Leipzig Glossing Rules Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses. 2008. 11s.
9. Marshan KH. (1951) Phonology. Morphology and Word-Formation. “Neophilologische Mitteilungen Bulletin de Societe neophilologique de Helsinki, 4. S. 94–129
10. Kvirik R., Hrinbaum S., Lich H., Startvik Dzh. (1975) Grammar of Contemporary English. 1120 s.