

## ON THE FORMAL PARALLELISM BETWEEN WORD FORMATION AND INFLECTION IN RUSSIAN

JERZY KALISZAN

The Russian word formation (lexical morphology) and inflection (grammatical morphology) are coexisting subsystems demonstrating a lot of parallels both on expression and meaning level and being in the state of active interaction and close interdependence.

The parallelism of the Russian word formation and inflection reveals itself first of all in the main principles and mechanisms of the building of words and word forms: both words and word forms are built according to the appropriate models as a result of an individual word formation or form-building act and with the aid of morphological means, the morphemes. As Balalykina and Nikolaiev write, “The mechanism of both processes is identical: in them two morphologically significant elements, the underlying stem and the formant (affix), take part. The affix as an element of word or word form reflects a determined typical (grammatical or derivational) meaning in the series of constructions of the same structure. The stem (derivational or inflectional) expresses a typical categorial meaning of part of speech to which the word with an appropriate stem belongs. Therefore, the authors continue, the derivational and inflectional forms have binary (two-member) composition in which the morphological elements constituting a derivational or grammatical form are significant elements. For example, the derivative *учи-тель* and the form *учи-л*: they are binomial: the stem *учи-* expresses the categorial meaning, the formants – the typical meanings (*-тель* – the agential meaning, *-л* – the meaning of the past)” [Балалыкина, Николаев 1985: 17]<sup>1</sup>.

The word formation and inflection in Russian are also characterized by common rules of changing of the morphological structure of the word. In particular, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Translation into English is mine – J.K.

processes of metanalysis should be taken into consideration. In regard to word formation, the metanalysis consists in the changing of boundaries between underlying stem and derivational affix as a result of falling out of the vocabulary of an appropriate underlying word. Ultimately, the derivational affix enlarges at the expense of another affix which constitutes a part of the stem, cf. *готовн-ость* ← *готовный* and *готовность* ← *готовый*; *гони-тель* ← *гонити* and *гон-итель* ← *гнать*; *лечбн(ый)* ← *лечьба* ‘лечение’ and *леч-ебн(ый)* ← *лечить*; *косточ-к(а)* ← *костъка* and *косточк(а)* ← *кость*; *о-бессилеть* ← *бессилеть* ‘слабеть, недомогать, лишаться сил’ and *обес-сил-е(ть)* ← *сила* [Земская 1973: 16; Немченко 1984: 85–86; Шанский 1975: 215–216]. Such an enlargement of some affixes at the cost of underlying stems may be observed in the sphere of inflection where it manifests itself in “the shortening of stems in favour of inflectional endings” [Бодуэн де Куртене 1963]. This process can be illustrated by such historical facts as the transfer of a thematic vowel *-a-* to the ending in declension of nouns with former *-a-*stem: *рука-ми* → *рук-ами*; an absorption of a verbal thematic vowel by the endings: *несе-т, несе-м* → *нес-ет, нес-ем* [Богородицкий 1935: 101].

The parallelism between derivational and inflectional processes is also revealed in a historical changeability of paradigmatic relations in both spheres, in a divergence of synchronic and diachronic correlations both of words and word forms. In word formation, this kind of divergence often occurs as so-called rederivation, where the former derived word becomes the underlying word and, on the contrary, the former underlying word becomes the derived word. To a large extent, rederivation manifests itself in the nouns with *-ство*, such as *буйство, пьянство, злорадство*, which lost their indirect semantic connections with adjectives (*буйный, пьяный, злорадный*) and began to correlate with the verbs with *-ствовать* (*буйствовать, пьянствовать, злорадствовать*), cf.: *пьяный* → *пьянство* → *пьянствовать* and *пьянствовать* → *пьянство* [Балалыкина, Николаев 1985: 45–46; Николаев 1987: 56–65]. Rederivation is also revealed in the sphere of inflection where it may be observed, for example, in the difference between synchronic and diachronic correlations of short- and full-form adjectives. The present-day short forms of adjectives are interpreted as the secondary forms derived from the full ones, while from the historical point of view they are original forms which became a basis for full-form adjectives [Николаев 1987: 56–57; Распопов, Ломов 1984: § 58].

The parallelism of word formation and inflection finds its expression in the obvious fact that the main derivational and inflectional means is the morpheme. Admittedly, the repertoire of morphemes and their functions is different in word formation and inflection. Nevertheless, these two types of morphemes show many similarities between them. The most expressive similarity of derivational and inflectional morphemes is shown in cases where the same suffix as a means of forming both words and word forms can be used. For example, the suffix *-j-* forms the collective nouns like *вороньё, офицерьё, свежъё*, and at the same time the so-called non-standard plural forms, like *братья, колья, листья, перья*, which are historically going back to the collective nouns. The affix *-ся* used in the forming of passive and reflexive-middle

voice forms can simultaneously serve as a derivational verbal formant (or co-formant), cf. *строить* ‘to build oneself a house’, *брататься*, *гордиться*, *выспаться*, *прилуниться*.

Some affixes are able to combine the word-building and form-building functions even within one lexeme. For instance, the ending *-а* (and the entire system of endings) in the words like *кума* (from *кум*), *супруга* (from *супруг*), *маркиза* (from *маркиз*) may be considered such a “combiner”. Expressing the grammatical meanings of number and case this ending at the same time denotes the derivational meaning of femininity [Милославский 1975: 66]. As another example of syncretical morphemes can be the inflected parts of nouns, such as *мороженое*, *шапильная*, *слепой*, *управляющий*, *премиальные*, which demonstrate not only the number and case meaning but also the derivational meaning [Милославский 1975: 66].

The parallelism between word formation and inflection in Russian may be clearly observed from the point of view of productivity of the derivational and inflectional means. Both types of means can be either productive or unproductive. For example, the substantival suffixes *-тель*, *-ник*, *-ист*, *-ость*, *-(е)ни(е)*, the adjectival suffixes *-н-*, *-ов-*, *-ск-* or prefixes *не-*, *сверх-*, *супер-*, the verbal prefixes *вы-*, *на-*, *до-*, *раз-*, the adverbial suffix *-о/-е*, are characterized by a high degree of productivity. In this respect, all of them are comparable with such grammatical (inflectional) morphemes as the substantival endings of plural *-и*, *-а* (*кони*, *земли*, *парты*, *занятия*), the adjectival or adverbial comparative suffix *-ее* (*быстрее*, *холоднее*), the verbal imperfective suffix *-ива-* (*выращивать*, *переписывать*), the participial suffixes *-ущ/-ащ-*, *-ем/-им-*, *-ви/-ш-*, *-енн/-нн-*, *-а*, *-в* (*читающий*, *читаемый*, *писавший*, *прочитанный*, *читая*, *написав*), etc. The opposite of the above-mentioned morphemes are absolutely unproductive morphemes, both derivational and inflectional ones. By them are meant, among others, the substantival suffixes *-аль* (*враль*, *каталь*, *стригаль*), *-знь* (*болезнь*, *боязнь*, *жизнь*), or the prefix *на-* (*наклен*, *нагруздь*, *паужин*), the adjectival suffix *-ч-* (*гончий*, *ловчий*, *певчий*), the verbal prefix *низ-* (*низойти*, *низринуться*). On the other hand, there occur certain unproductive grammatical morphemes like the adjectival or adverbial comparative suffix *-е* (*выше*, *моложе*, *шире*), the inflectional ending *-ми* of instrumental of plural (*дверьми*, *дочерьми*, *лошадьми*), the ending *-а* of oblique cases of numerals (*сорока*, *ста*, *девяноста*), the ending *-м* of the 1st person of singular of verbs (*дам*, *отдам*, *ем*, *надою*).

The Russian word formation and inflectional systems show a deep isomorphism on the level of variation of the structural elements used by them. Thus, in word formation acts the various cases of variation of underlying stems and derivational suffixes take place, cf. *друг* – *дружок*, *заяц* – *заячий*, *крепкий* – *крепость* or *бетонщик* – *паркетчик*, *подбежать* – *подойти*, *иммобильный* – *ирреальный*, respectively. In acts of building of word forms, one has to deal with the variation of inflectional stems and inflectional (form-building) affixes, cf. *друг* – *друг’я*, *время* – *времени*, *чайка* – *чаек* or *дворцов* – *пальцев*, *веселее* – *веселей*, *вёзший* – *читавший*, respectively.

The parallelism (isomorphism) of word formation and inflection in Russian is not limited to the level of morphemic (morphological) derivation. These subsystems of

morphology also display the obvious similarities on the level of non-morphemic, semantic derivation. For example, the well-known and universally recognized facts of semantic word formation, thoroughly investigated by the contemporary representatives of Kazan Linguistic School, mainly by V. Markov [Марков 1981], may be treated as a parallel with the facts of semantic form-building. To the latter belong the typical cases of non-morphemic derivation of verb forms: 1. past on the base of present: *Сёстры к ней нагнулись, спрашивают: Что с тобой?*; 2. future on the base of past: *Отнимите у меня перо – и я помер*; 3. future on the base of present: *Я будущей зимой уезжаю за границу*; 4. present on the base of future: *Осторожен он, сору из избы не выносит, ни о ком дурного словечка не скажет*; 5. past on the base of future: *Кругом не слышалось почти никакого шума. Лишь изредка в близкой реке с внезапной звучностью плеснёт рыба и прибрежный тростник слабо зашумит, едва поколебленный набежавшей волной.* [Балалыкина, Николаев 1985: 21–22; Николаев 1987: 14–15; Бондарко 1965; *Русская грамматика* 1980: 632–636]. The vast possibilities of a functional transposition of verbal forms can also be observed in the sphere of verbal mood, where there take place such semantic processes as building of 1. indicative on the base of imperative: *Я с ним шучу, а он ударь меня по голове*; 2. imperative on the base of conditional: *Ефим, ты бы пошёл к нему!*; 3. indicative on the base of conditional: *Я просил бы вас сделать это*; 4. conditional on the base of indicative: *Ах ты какой, Федя, ну, послал кого за водкой – и вся тут*; 5. conditional on the base of imperative: *Приди я вовремя, ничего бы не случилось*; 6. imperative on the base of indicative: *Поедешь туда немедленно и привезёшь его к нам!*; 7. debitive on the base of imperative: *Все ушли, а я сиди дома.* [Исаченко 2003: 495–505; *Русская грамматика* 1990: 278; *Современный русский язык* 1989: 190–194; Янко-Триницкая 1982: 111–112].

Apart from the aforementioned formal, superficial resemblances between word formation and inflection, there are vast areas of their semantic parallelism (homoreference), where by means specific for each of them the same or similar meaning can be expressed. This aspect of parallelism of word-building and form-building processes in Russian requires special attention and should be thoroughly studied and widely described.

## References

- Балалыкина Э.А., Николаев Г.А. 1985. *Русское словообразование*, Казань.  
 Богородицкий В.А. 1935. *Общий курс русской грамматики*, Москва – Ленинград.  
 Бодуэн де Куртене И.А. 1963. *Заметки об изменяемости основ склонения, в особенности же об их сокращении в пользу окончаний*, in: Бодуэн де Куртене И.А., *Избранные труды по общему языкознанию*, т. 2. Москва.  
 Бондарко А.В. 1965. *Некоторые особенности переносного употребления времен глагола*, „Русский язык в школе”, № 5.  
 Земская Е.А. 1973. *Современный русский язык. Словообразование*, Москва.

- Исаченко А.В. 2003. *Грамматический строй русского языка в сопоставлении с словацким. Морфология*, т. 2. Москва.
- Марков В.М. 1981. *О семантическом способе словообразования в русском языке*, Ижевск.
- Милославский И.Г. 1975. *Свойства русских флексий*, „Русский язык в школе”, № 3.
- Немченко В.Н. 1984. *Современный русский язык. Словообразование*, Москва.
- Николаев Г.А. 1987. *Русское историческое словообразование*, Казань.
- Распопов И.П., Ломов А.М. 1984. *Основы русской грамматики*, Воронеж.
- Русская грамматика*, под ред. Н.Ю. Шведовой. 1980. т. 1, Москва.
- Русская грамматика*, под ред. Н.Ю. Шведовой и В.В. Лопатина. 1990. Москва.
- Современный русский язык. Теоретический курс*. 1989. Москва.
- Шанский Н.М. 1975. *Русский язык. Лексика. Словообразование*, Москва.
- Янко-Триницкая Н.А. 1982. *Русская морфология*, Москва.