

Adverbial Analytic Derivation: Functional Approach

The article contrasts the functions of adverbial analytic derivation to those of synthetic derivation in typologically different languages, i.e. analytic English, on the one hand, and synthetic Russian and Ukrainian, on the other hand. The study concludes that the adverbial analytic derivation can function as means of (i) functional differentiation, (ii) competition, (iii) compensation in the above-mentioned languages.

Keywords: *analytism, analytic derivation, derivation type, functional differentiation, competition, compensation.*

Investigation of analytism has attracted considerable attention within the past years in numerous studies on typology, contrastive linguistics, derivatology, and general linguistics (see, for example, [1; 2, 23–38; 6, 153–154; 7, 9–10; 8; 9, 325]). These studies have given rise to understanding of analytism as of typological feature that is pervasive cross-linguistically and can coexist with other typological features within morphological, derivational, and syntactic levels of a language structure.

²⁸ Haidarzhii K. A. Senior Teacher at Department of English Philology, Petro Mohyla Black Sea State University, Mykolaiv, Ukraine

However, the functions of analytism in general and derivation analytism in particular still remain insufficiently investigated. Mainly it happens because of the tendency not to use the term *analytism* in the same way, as discussed in [2]. This tendency misleads to acknowledging some linguistic units to be analytic (adverbial) units without any evidence, e.g. Ukrainian *всупереч фактам*, Russian *в голом виде*, English *according to*. Moreover, modern derivation still lacks consistency in choosing the appropriate terminology when dealing with typological features (for more criticism on terminology of derivatology, see my article [5]). Thus, derivational analytism as a linguistic phenomenon still demands thorough investigation.

The goal of the present paper is to provide a consistent contrastive analysis of the functions of adverbial analytic derivation in typologically different languages. The choice of the part of speech is predetermined by the conspicuous difference between number and quality of contrastive studies dealing with adverbs and those dealing with other nominal parts of speech.

The above-mentioned goal implies further reference to the following issues: (a) distinguishing the appropriate linguistic unit for contrastive derivational studies, (b) outlining the algorithm for distinguishing analytic derived adverbs, and (c) defining the functions of analytism in adverbial derivation in typologically different languages.

The comparative analysis of the functions of adverbial analytic derivation predetermines the attention of the present research to the terminology of modern derivatology. Taking into consideration that modern derivatology operates with numerous terms that denote different derivation units, it is worth identifying the linguistic unit that is the most suitable for contrastive derivational studies. Traditionally, when dealing with derivation, the preference has often been given to a morpheme. Nevertheless, modern derivation is revealing inapplicability of a morpheme for profound contrastive studies. This revelation can be supported with the following evidence: 1) languages possess relatively very limited lists of morphemes; 2) it is possible to discover only few parallels between lists of morphemes in languages that are not closely related in the genealogical aspect.

While denying the status of a morpheme as the most scientifically appropriate linguistic unit for derivational investigations in typological aspect, modern derivation studies pay more and more attention to the notion of a derivation type. A derivation type is understood as an abstract constructional derivation unit that performs the function of modeling derivatives belonging to a particular part of speech and possesses the binary formal structure “derivation base + derivation formant” and semantic structure which includes parts of speech and activated semes of both derivation base and derivative [3]. After having examined the terms *analytism* and *derivation type*, it is possible to fuse them and introduce the term *analytic derivation type*. The notion of the analytic derivation type is subordinate to the one of the derivation type according to the characteristics *the arrangement of the formal structure*. It implies that the analytic derivation type performs the function of modeling derivatives and possesses a divisible formal structure. Since the main aim of the present work is to contrast functions of adverbial analytic derivation in typologically different languages, further reference is of much relevance to what Dubova [2] found about applicability of abstract constructional units (with a derivation type among them) for contrastive studies, which coincides with the findings of the present work.

Being an abstract constructional unit, a derivation type notion can be easily transformed into a model. The

model of derivation type may be represented as follows: $\left[\frac{A}{B} \rightarrow \frac{C}{D} \right]$, where square brackets determine the

length of the derivation type, the symbol “ \rightarrow ” demonstrates the direction of derivation from the derivation base to the derivative, semantic structure (including the part of speech and activated semes of the derivation base and the derivative) is shown in the numerator, and formal structure (containing the derivation base and the derivation formant) is recorded in the denominator. The transformation of the derivation type into a model facilitates the analysis of any typologically marked derivation units, including analytic derived adverbs.

Having introduced the appropriate linguistic unit for contrastive derivational studies, i.e. a derivation type, the basic principles of the algorithm for distinguishing analytic derivatives should be considered. The algorithm should meet the following requirements: (i) consistency, (ii) differentiation of analytic derivatives from linguistic units with the formally similar structure, i.e., phraseological units, analytic forms, and phrases (for more details, see my article [4]). In (Table 1), the results of working out the algorithm for distinguishing analytic derivatives are displayed as differentiating criteria.

Table 1.

Criteria for differentiating analytic derivatives from linguistic units with the formally similar structure

Differentiating criterion	Linguistic units with the formally similar structure		
	phraseological units	analytic forms	phrases
Lack of expressivity	+	–	–
Functioning as a component of a morphological paradigm	–	+	–
Correlation with one denotation	–	–	+

Note. The symbol “+” implies that an analytic derivative can be differentiated from the corresponding linguistic unit according to the given differentiating criterion. The symbol “–” implies that an analytic derivative cannot be differentiated from the corresponding linguistic unit according to the given differentiating criterion.

According to the above-mentioned differentiating criteria, only two groups of linguistic units can be recognized as analytic adverbs. These groups include: (1) qualitative analytic derivatives that denote inherently non-graded qualities, e.g. English *in a pleasant way*, Russian *соответствующим образом*, and Ukrainian *відповідним чином*, and (2) quantitative analytic derivatives that denote inherently graded qualities, e.g. English *very slowly*, Russian *достаточно внимательно*, and Ukrainian *трохи різко*. Let’s consider the reasons for recognizing these linguistic units as analytic adverbs.

Firstly, being expressively neutral, the above-mentioned linguistic units are opposed to adverbial phraseological units, e.g. English *above board*, Russian *сломя голову*, and Ukrainian *всіма правдами і неправдами*.

Secondly, linguistic units like English *in a pleasant way*, *very slowly*, Russian *соответствующим образом*, *достаточно внимательно*, and Ukrainian *відповідним чином*, *трохи різко* cannot be referred to analytic forms because they do not function as components of morphological paradigms.

Thirdly, the correlation with one denotation definitely differentiates linguistic units like English *in a pleasant way*, *very slowly*, Russian *соответствующим образом*, *достаточно внимательно*, and Ukrainian *відповідним чином*, *трохи різко* from phrases like English *unbelievably prominent*, *admire a (long) way*, Russian *пронзительно яркий, интересоваться (художественным) образом*, and Ukrainian *прискіпливо уважний, вихвалятися (військовим) чином*. This conclusion can be made after analyzing semantic structure of the components English *a little / a bit / a little bit, quite, very, too, (in +) way, manner*, Russian *немного, достаточно, очень, слишком, образом, способом, путем*, and Ukrainian *трохи / децю, досить, дуже, надто / занадто, чином, способом, шляхом*. On the one hand, components English *a little / a bit / a little bit, quite, very, too*, Russian *немного, достаточно, очень, слишком*, and Ukrainian *трохи / децю, досить, дуже, надто / занадто, чином* have already specified their function as derivative formants (in other words, means of expressing the derivational semantics of graded quality), which can be observed when making a lexicographic analysis of the corresponding dictionary entries. On the other hand, components English *(in +) way, manner*, Russian *образом, способом, путем*, Ukrainian *чином, способом, шляхом* can function both as lexemes and derivative formants (in other words, means of expressing the derivational semantics of non-graded qualities), which can be supported with the evidence of a lexicographic analysis of the corresponding dictionary entries.

Thus, modern English, Russian, and Ukrainian have developed a set of analytic derivative formants that can enlarge the repertoire of adverbs.

Identification of the groups of analytic adverbs in modern English, Russian, and Ukrainian facilitates the quantitative and qualitative analyses of functions of adverbial analytic derivation in typologically different languages.

The quantitative analysis of adverbial analytic derivation consists of several stages. The first stage is distinguishing sets of analytic adverbs in texts of different styles, the second stage is modeling derivation types according to which the adverbs are patterned, and the third stage is to compare the obtained results in typologically different English, Russian, and Ukrainian. In (Table 2) the results of random sample from texts of different styles are displayed together with the number of corresponding derivation types.

As it is shown in (Table 2), quantitative indices of adverbial analytic derivation in analytic English are insignificantly higher than those of synthetic Russian and Ukrainian, which can imply the slightly higher functional potential of adverbial analytic derivation in English.

Table 2.

Semantics	Quantity of analytic derivation types / quantity of analytic adverbs		
	English	Russian	Ukrainian
Inherently non-graded qualities	5 / 117	4 / 87	4 / 85
Inherently graded qualities	2 / 60	3 / 86	3 / 71
Total	7 / 177	7 / 173	7 / 156

Likewise, the qualitative analysis of adverbial analytic derivation consists of several stages. They are (1) distinguishing the dominant typological feature that is opposed to analytism in adverbial derivation, (2) determining the functional relation of adverbial analytic derivation types to those being marked by the opposed dominant typological feature. The reference to scientific words on adverbial derivation clearly states that the dominant typological feature opposed to analytism in adverbial derivation is synthetism. After observing the peculiarities of coexistence of adverbial analytic and synthetic derivation types in English, Russian, and Ukrainian it becomes clear that the adverbial analytic derivation can function as means of (i) functional differentiation, (ii) competition, (iii) compensation in the above-mentioned languages.

Functional differentiation can be of different types. Structural functional differentiation is illustrated by the coexistence of the analytic derivation type (1) which is not limited by any structural restrictions, and the synonymic synthetic derivation type (2) which functions as a model for deriving adverbs only from adjectives that contain the suffix Russian *-ск-*, e.g. Russian *по-хозяйски, по-дурацки*:

$$\text{Russian} \left[\frac{\text{Adj(quality)}}{\text{derivation base}} \rightarrow \frac{\text{Adv(non - graded quality)}}{\text{derivation base}_{\text{instr.}} + \text{образом}} \right] \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Russian} \left[\frac{\text{Adj(quality)}}{\text{derivation base}} \rightarrow \frac{\text{Adv(non - graded quality)}}{\text{по} + \text{derivation base} + \text{и}} \right]. \quad (2)$$

The stylistic functional differentiation is exemplified with the coexistence of the analytic derivation type (3) which is stylistically neutral and the synonymous synthetic derivation type (4) which functions as a stylistically marked model for deriving adverbs belonging to the belles lettres style, e.g. Ukrainian *архінебезпечно*:

$$\text{Ukrainian} \left[\frac{\text{Adv(graded quality)}}{\text{derivation base}} \rightarrow \frac{\text{Adv(excessive degree)}}{\text{надто} + \text{derivation base}} \right] \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Ukrainian} \left[\frac{\text{Adv(graded quality)}}{\text{derivation base}} \rightarrow \frac{\text{Adv(excessive degree)}}{\text{архі} + \text{derivation base}} \right]. \quad (4)$$

Semantics is a differentiating feature between the analytic derivation type (5) which is semantically neutral and the synthetic derivation type (6) which carries the negative connotation:

$$\text{English} \left[\frac{\text{Adv(graded quality)}}{\text{derivation base}} \rightarrow \frac{\text{Adv(excessive degree)}}{\text{too} + \text{derivation base}} \right] \quad (5)$$

$$\text{English} \left[\frac{\text{Adv(graded quality)}}{\text{derivation base}} \rightarrow \frac{\text{Adv(excessive degree)}}{\text{over} + \text{derivation base}} \right]. \quad (6)$$

Relations of competition between typologically different derivation types can be illustrated with the coexistence of synonymous analytic derivation type (7) and the synthetic derivation type (8):

$$\text{Russian} \left[\frac{\text{Adv(graded quality)}}{\text{derivation base}} \rightarrow \frac{\text{Adv (defficient degree)}}{\text{немного + derivation base}} \right] \quad (7)$$

$$\text{Russian} \left[\frac{\text{Adv(graded quality)}}{\text{derivation base}} \rightarrow \frac{\text{Adv (defficient degree)}}{\text{derivation base + оваро}} \right]. \quad (8)$$

As for a compensation function, it is inherent to all the adverbial analytic derivation types with the semantics of sufficient degree in English, Russian, and Ukrainian, as well as to the adverbial analytic derivation type with the semantics of high degree in English.

In conclusion, the present paper has attempted to investigate the functions of adverbial analytic derivation in typologically different languages. The analysis of the findings of modern derivatology has succeeded in shedding light on a derivation type as the most appropriate linguistic unit for contrastive derivational studied, as well as on criteria for differentiating analytic derivatives from linguistic units with the formally similar structure. Accordingly, two groups of linguistic units have been recognized as analytic adverbs, i.e. qualitative analytic derivatives that denote inherently non-graded qualities and quantitative analytic derivatives that denote inherently graded qualities. Identification of the groups of analytic adverbs in modern English, Russian, and Ukrainian has facilitated the quantitative and qualitative analyses of differentiation, competition, and compensation functions of adverbial analytic derivation in English, Russian, and Ukrainian. Consequently, it has been made clear that there is only a slightly higher functional potential of adverbial analytic derivation in English in comparison to synthetic Russian and Ukrainian. Thus, the present paper provides a rather unexpected argument against the assumption that the dominance of analytism on the morphological level leads to its dominance on other language levels, including the derivational level.

Література

1. Вихованець І. Р. Аналітизм / І. Р. Вихованець // Українська мова: Енциклопедія. – К.: Вид-во «Укр. енцикл.» ім. М. П. Бажана, 2004. – Р. 23 – 24.
2. Дубова О. А. Типологічна еволюція морфологічних систем української і російської мов / О. А. Дубова. – К.: Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2002. – 302 р.
3. Клименко Н. Ф. Словотвірний тип // Українська мова: Енциклопедія. – К.: Вид-во «Укр. енцикл.» ім. М. П. Бажана, 2004. – Р. 622 – 623.
4. Стародуб К. А. Репрезентанти аналітизму на морфемно-дериваційному рівні та критерії їх виокремлення / К. А. Стародуб // Лінгвістичні студії. Збірник наукових праць. Вип. 23. – Донецьк: Вид-во ДонНУ, 2011. – Р. 88 – 92.
5. Стародуб К. А. Типологія дериваційних одиниць / К. А. Стародуб // Наукові праці: Науково-методичний журнал. Т. 98. Вип. 85. Філологія. Мовознавство. – Миколаїв: Вид-во ЧДУ ім. Петра Могили, 2009. – Р. 103 – 108.
6. Dezsö L. Approaches to typology: complex types vs. processes and dimensions / L. Dezsö // Syntaxtypologische Studien zum Germanischen. – Tübingen: Narr, 1982. – P. 149–155.
7. Elsen H. Formen, Konzepte und Faktoren der Sprachveränderung / H. Elsen // Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik. – 2001. – Vol. 29. – P. 1 – 2.
8. Friedman V. A. Balkans as a Linguistic Area / V. A. Friedman // Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics / [ed. Keith Brown]. – Oxford: Elsevier, 2005. – P. 657 – 672.
9. Kastovsky D. Diachronic Perspective / D. Kastovsky // The Oxford Handbook of Compounding [ed. by Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Štekauer]. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. – P. 323 – 340.