

UDC 372.881.1

On some ways of nominal word formation

Larisa B. Gatsalova

Doctor of Philology,
Senior Researcher of the Department of Ossetian Philology,
North Ossetian Institute for Humanitarian and Social Research named after V.I. Abaev,
Vladikavkaz Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
362040, 10 Mira av., Vladikavkaz, Russian Federation;
e-mail: larabella8@mail.ru

Larisa K. Parsieva

Doctor of Philology,
Senior Researcher of the Department of Ossetian Philology,
North Ossetian Institute for Humanitarian and Social Research named after V.I. Abaev,
Vladikavkaz Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
362040, 10 Mira av., Vladikavkaz, Russian Federation;
e-mail: parsieva_larisa@mail.ru

Abstract

As in any language grammar is the most original, sustainable and little dependent on foreign cultural influences sphere, it should be the one in the focus of research interests concentrated on the extraction and classification of ethnic worldview of one nation or another. In the models, forms and means of grammar a package of formulas adopted at the national level is compiled. This package of formulas objectively fixes ethnic experience and fulfills the axiomatic function. The article deals with analyzing linguistic and cultural features of the persons nominations as a derivational category, expressed by suffixal method. It refers to the designation of persons nominations with productive suffixes of Ossetian language's Iron and Digor dialect – on/-an, -ug, -ag, reveals different semantic aspects of these nominations, shows the importance of the derivational category in the actual problem area of the Ossetian morphemics. The authors are also interested in the presentation of persons' nominations derivational category by means of suffixation in languages from close locations and in accordance with Caucasian substrate/adstrat theory in Ossetian language. Mentioned suffixes have huge derivational potential in the semantic field of persons' designation, proper nouns, but their lexical realization isn't considerable compared with the perspectives of their implementation in the innovative cluster of Ossetian language. Considered types of suffixation of the persons nominations semantic category are a reflection of linguistic and cultural peculiarities of the Ossetian language in its both dialects.

For citation

Gatsalova L.B., Parsieva L.K. (2018) On some ways of nominal word formation. *Kul'tura i tsivilizatsiya* [Culture and Civilization], 8 (1A), pp. 189-195.

Keywords

Ossetian language, derivational category, derivational potential, derivative word, suffixation.

Introduction

One of the least studied complex units of word formation in modern linguistics is a derivational category. However, the study of the theoretical aspects of this issue, as well as of the derivational categories inventory in particular ethnic languages is of current importance.

As in any language grammar is the most original, sustainable and little dependent on foreign cultural influences sphere, in particular, such part of it as word formation, it should be the one in the focus of research interests concentrated on the extraction and classification of ethnic worldview of one nation or another. In the models, forms and means of grammar a package of formulas adopted at the national level is compiled (in our case, the formulas of word-formation models, types, subcategories and categories). This package of formulas objectively fixes ethnic experience and fulfills the axiomatical function.

The presentation of word-formative categories of persons' nominations

In this article we are interested in the presentation of word-formative categories of persons' nominations by means of suffixation in languages that are in close proximity from the point of view of their speakers' localization, and from positions of the theory of the Caucasian substrate/adstrat in Ossetian language [Dotsoeva, 1993, 15].

Existing approaches to defining the essence of a word formative category are quite diverse. So, E.A. Zemskaya understands a word formative category as an abstract and complex unit, which is formed by a set of motivated words, «united by the community of derivational meaning in the distraction from formal means of expression of this meaning, a common way of word formation and the community of speech generators parts» [Zemskaya, 1973, 87]. Similarly, this concept is defined by I.S. Uluhanov [Uluhanov, 1975]. Z.M. Volotskaya in another way approaches to the definition of this complex unit: "Word-formative category is a set of derivatives characterized by the presence of common semantic component. These derivatives can differ by types of semantic relations with their generators" [Volotskaya, 1975, 352]. This article provides an analysis of linguistic and cultural peculiarities of persons' nominations as derivational categories, represented by suffixal method.

One of the widespread derivational models of a semantic category of the person's nomination in Ossetian language is suffixation. It should be emphasized that in this case we face with the problem of two semantic categories match – designations of a person and locality, as the inseparability, in differentiability of two marked semantic fields is determined by linguistic and cultural specificity of their internal content level, expressed by general formal means.

The semantics of the suffixes

Among the most productive ways of naming persons in the Ossetian language is suffixation -оn/-аn и -ar . Denominative nouns and adjectives with suffixes -оn, -аn, -ar form the following meanings:

a) indicate the nationality:

кæсг-он “the Kabardinian, Kabardian”,

мæхъхъæл-он “the Ingush, Ingush”,

æcc-он "the Balkar, Balkarian",
 гуырдзи-ар "the Georgian, Georgian",
 турк-ар "the Turk, Turkish",
 уырысс-ар "the Russian",
 цæцæйн-ар "the Chechen, Chechen", etc.

For example: "Афтæ дзырдтой, зæгъгæ, дам, уый Алыбеджы фыдыфыд раджы кæддæр балхæдта иу кæсгонæй" – "It was told that a long time ago it was bought by the grandfather of Alibek from one Kabardinian" (Basaev T. Stories).

Зги迪 Рæсугъд æндæр æ фидæ раги рамардæй 'ма е дæр æ кизгæ Рæсугъдæн уотæ ниффæдзахста: «Цалинмæ кæсгон æлдар Адилгеријæй дæ бæрæг базонай, уæдмæ лæгмæ куд нæ фæццæуай, уотæ».

"Zgid beauty's father died long time ago, too, bequeathing his beautiful daughter: "Until Kabardian Prince Adilgeri will not say his word, do not marry anyone other" (Нарты кадджытæ. – Nart Saga).

Уым уыди уырыссæгтæ (ед. ч. уырыссаг), ирæттæ, гуырдзиæгтæ (ед. ч. гуырдзиаг) æмæ украинæгтæ (ед. ч. украинааг). – There were Russians, Ossetians, Georgians and Ukrainians.

Албайнаг æрлæууыди иу чысыл дурын хæдзары раз. – The Albanian stopped near a stone house. (Mamsirati D. Дардбæстаг хæлар).

b) indicate dialectal and subdialectal attribution (there are two dialects in Ossetian language - Iron and Digor).

ир-он "the Iron, Iron",
 дыгур-он "the Digor, Digor" and so on;

къуыдайр-ар "the Kudar, Kudar", comes from the Kudar Pass and speaks Kudar subdialect of Iron dialect of Ossetian language (къуыдайраг ныхасыздæхт);

туалл-ар "the Tual, Tual", comes from the Tual Pass and speaks Tual subdialect of Iron dialect of Ossetian language (туаллаг ныхасыздæхт);

үæллагкойм-ар "the Ullagkom, Ullagkom", comes from the Ullagkom Pass and speaks Ullagkom subdialect of Iron dialect of Ossetian language language (үæллагкоймаг ныхасыздæхт);

чысайн-ар "speaks Chesan subdialect of Iron dialect of Ossetian language", etc.

c) indicate the attribution to any social group, organization, institution:

бадил-он "the Badilyat, Badilyat",
 партии-он "a party member, party",
 фæскомцæдис-он "a komsomol member, komsomol",
 колхоз-он "a collective farmer, kolkhoz" и т.д.

For example: Аслæнбег бадти стьолы фарсмæ æмæ ныхас кодта иу колхозонимæ. – Aslanbek was sitting at the table and talking to one collective farmer. (Коцойты А. Джанаспи. – A. Kotsoev. Djanaspi).

d) indicate characters:

фæдис-он «alarm participant»,
 цуан-он «hunter»,
 хæст-он «warrior»,
 сидт-он «recruit» и др.

For example: Цуанонтæ æркъул кодтой, næ фæллад судзæм, зæгъгæ. – Hunters leaned, we are to have a little rest, they said (Нарты кадджытæ. – Nart Saga).

e) indicate the area, where the person comes from:

сакъадах-он «an isles man, island»,

хъаукк-аг «a countryman, country»,
шалдойн-аг «a shaldon resident, shaldon» (Shaldon – a popular name of one of Vladikavkaz districts)

хох-аг «mountaineer, mountain»,
сахайр-аг «townsman, town»,
иубæст-он «fellow countryman, fellow countryman» и т. д.
f) indicate the locality, where the person comes from
джызæйл-аг «Gizel resident, Gizel» – comes from the settlement Gizel;
ногир-аг «Nogir resident, Nogir» – comes from the settlement Nogir;
дзæуджыхъаукк-аг «Vladikavkaz resident, Vladikavkaz» – comes from the city Vladikavkaz;
циколай-аг «Chikola resident, Chicola» – comes from the settlement Chikolaetc

For example: Хохаг æй кæй ницæмæ æрдардта, уый йæм ноджыдæр диссагдæр фæкаст. – Even more surprised him that the mountaineer wasn't not interested in him (L.Tolstoy. Хъазахъхъ).

g) indicate maiden name of a married woman:

- with the suffix-он

Хъаныхъ-он – «from the Kanukov family, Kanukova»,
Тлатт-он – «from the Tulatov family, Tulatova»,
Парси-он – «from the Parsiev family, Parsieva»,
Осмæн-он – «from the Osmanov family, Osmanova»,
Гуæцæл-он – «from the Gatsalov family, Gatsalova»,
Мали-он – «from the Maliev family, Malieva» etc.;

– with the suffix -ан:

Моргу-ан – «from the Morgoev family, Morgoeva»,
Теди-ан – «from the Tedeev family, Tedeeva»,
Цæгæри-ан – «from the Tsagaraev family, Tsagaraeva»,
Къоми-ан – «from the Komaev family, Komaeva»,
Томи-ан – «from the Tomaev family, Tomaeva» etc.

The number of anthroponyms with the component-ан in this semantic class is considerably lower, which is probably connected with the fact that the suffix – он is more archaic than the suffix -ан, that is indicated by some of the men names - historical characters and heroes of legends and sayings: Сослан Цæразон, Таймураз Козырон, Хъарадзая Мамион, Къоста Фæрнион, Тулабег Тæрион.

For example:

«Æхуæдæг бæцифæдбæл Тæрион Тулабегмæ фæххабар кодта» – «And he immediately informed Tulabeg Tarion» (4). Consciously continuing the tradition, Professor T.A. Guriev sometimes signs «T. Gurion».

As to anthroponyms Сослан, Тамерлан, Ирлан, -ан presumably has a different etymology and doesn't correlate with the suffix we talk about. They consist of two words: Coc+лан (Turkic coc «stone», улан «young man», или «Alan»), Тимур+улан, алан, Ир «Iriston» (Iron nomination for Ossetia) + алан.

Some of the words are used in two variants - with the suffix -он and with the suffix-аг: æссон – асыйаг "the Balkar, Balkarian", хæххон - хохаг "mountaineer, mountain", as well as variants of girls' names, for example: Доцон – Доцотаг "from the Dotsoev family, Dotsoeva".

In the «Grammar of the Ossetian language» our assumption is confirmed by the statement that – аніс «a kind of suffix, - он with the same meaning», «mainly in later South Ossetian dialects» [Grammar..., 1963, 69].

It is the suffix -ar with the help of which such key words in the grammatical persons naming system are formed, as, for example:

байзæддаг «heir» (lit. «the one who remained after the death of his parents»),
 бинойнаг «family member»,
 адæймаг, удгоймаг, гоймаг «human being»,
 нæлгоймаг «man»,
 сылгоймаг «woman»,
 мойаг «destined to become a husband, bridegroom»,
 сиахсаг «future son-in-law»,
 усаг «destined to become a wife»,
 чындзаг «future daughter-in-law».

For example: Абонæй фæстæмæ уыдзынæ Хæмыцы бинойнаг. – From now on you'll be the wife of Hamits (Нарты кадджытæ. – Nart Saga).

Remark that бинойнаг is formed from the word бын «наследство» by adding at first suffix-он to it, and then suffix- ар [Bagaev, 164, Kharaeva, 2012]. Words мойаг, сиахсаг, усаг, чындзаг in this group of words additionally receive semantics «is intended for anything».

There is a suffix -æг in the Ossetian language, which indicates the proper names of people (Үæрхæг, Уырызмæг, Күйдзæг, Ёхсæртæг). In addition, you can use it to form from all the present tense verbal stems nouns denoting principal figures:

фыссæг «writer», from фыссын «to write»;
 ахуыргæнæг «teacher», from ахуыркæнын «to teach»;
 кусæг worker» from кусын «to work»;
 ныййарæг «parent», from ныййарын «to give birth», etc.

Conclusion

The semantics of the suffixes -он, -ан and -ар is not limited to the above-mentioned cases: they are actively involved, though in varying degree, in the formation of nouns and adjectives with another meaning [Gureeva, 2016; Mityagina, 2011]. Considered types of suffixation of the persons nominations semantic category are a reflection of linguistic and cultural peculiarities of the Ossetian language in its both dialects – Iron and Digor. It is also important that considered suffixes have enormous derivational potential in the semantic field of persons' designation and anthroponomy, but their lexical realization is insignificant compared with the possibilities of their implementation in the innovative cluster of Ossetian language.

References

1. Akhvlediani G.S. (ed.) (1963) *Grammatika osetinskogo yazyka* [Grammar of the Ossetian language]. Ordzhonikidze. Vol. 1.
2. Bagaev N.K. (1965) *Sovremennyi osetinskii yazyk. Chast' I (fonetika i morfologiya)* [The modern Ossetian language. Part I (phonetics and morphology)]. Ordzhonikidze.
3. Dotsoeva L.B. (1993) *Distributsiya binarnykh sochetanii fonem v sovremennom osetinskom» literaturnom yazyke. Doct. Dis.* [Distribution of binary combinations of phonemes in modern Ossetian literary language. Doct. Dis.]. Vladikavkaz.
4. Kharaeva L.Kh. (2012) Etimologicheskoe gnezdo v svete teorii semanticeskogo polya [Etymological nest in the light of the theory of the semantic field]. *Izvestiya Kabardino-Balkarskogo gosuniversiteta* [Proc. of KBSU], 2, 1, pp. 7-74.
5. Mityagina V. (2011) *Ritualisierte kommunikative Handlungen im institutionellen Diskurs und Probleme der Translation*. Nümbrecht: KirschVerlag.

6. Novikova E.Yu., Mityagina V.A., Gureeva A.A. (2015) Tipologiya kommunikativnykh deistvii v ekskursionnom diskurse [Typology of communicative actions in excursion discourse]. *Izvestiya VGPU* [Proc. of VSPU], 7 (102), pp. 91-97.
7. Salagaeva Z.M. (comp.) (1961) *Osetinskii fol'klor* [Ossetian folklore]. Ordzhonikidze.
8. Ulukhanov I.S. (1975) O slovoobrazovatel'noi kategorii [On the word-formative category]. *Izvestiya AN USSR* [Proc. of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR], 34, 1, pp. 27-36.
9. Volotskaya Z.M. (1975) Opyt opisaniya odnoi slovoobrazovatel'noi kategorii (na materiale proizvodnykh naimenovanii mesta) [Experience of the description of one word-formative category (on the material of derived place names)]. In: *Aktual'nye problemy russkogo slovoobrazovaniya* [Actual problems of Russian word-formation]. Tashkent: Ukituvchi Publ.
10. Zemskaya E.A. (1973) *Sovremennyi russkii yazyk. Slovoobrazovanie* [The modern Russian language. Word formation]. Moscow.

О некоторых способах именного словообразования

Гацалова Лариса Борисовна

Доктор филологических наук,
ведущий научный сотрудник отдела осетинского языкознания,
Северо-Осетинский институт гуманитарных и социальных исследований им. В.И. Абаева,
Владикавказский научный центр Российской академии наук,
362040, Российская Федерация, Владикавказ, просп. Мира, 10;
e-mail: larabella8@mail.ru

Парсиева Лариса Касбулатовна

Доктор филологических наук,
ведущий научный сотрудник отдела осетинского языкознания,
Северо-Осетинский институт гуманитарных и социальных исследований им. В.И. Абаева,
Владикавказский научный центр Российской академии наук,
362040, Российская Федерация, Владикавказ, просп. Мира, 10;
e-mail: parsieva_larisa@mail.ru

Аннотация

В предлагаемой вашему вниманию научной статье рассматриваются лингвокультурные особенности наименования лица как словообразовательной категории. В исследовании анализируются обозначения наименований лиц при помощи продуктивных суффиксов иронского и дигорского диалектов осетинского языка –он/-ан, -аг, -æг. Также в статьедается описание различных семантических аспектов таких наименований. Рассмотренные авторами исследования суффиксы обладают большим деривационным потенциалом в семантическом поле называний лиц, собственных имен, но их лексическая реализованность незначительна по сравнению с возможностями их использования в инновационном кластере осетинского языка. Авторы данной научной статьи приходят к выводу, что анализируемые типы суффиксации семантической категории лиц являются отражением языковых и культурных особенностей осетинского языка в его обоих диалектах.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

Гацалова Л.Б., Парсиева Л.К. On some ways of nominal word formation // Культура и цивилизация. 2018. Том 8. № 1А. С. 189-195.

Ключевые слова

Осетинский язык, производная категория, деривационный потенциал, производное слово, суффиксация.

Библиография

1. Ахвlediani Г.С. (ред.) Грамматика осетинского языка. Орджоникидзе, 1963. Т. 1. 364 с.
2. Багаев Н.К. Современный осетинский язык. Часть I (фонетика и морфология). Орджоникидзе, 1965. 488 с.
3. Волоцкая З.М. Опыт описания одной словообразовательной категории (на материале производных наименований места) // Актуальные проблемы русского словообразования. Ташкент: Укитувчи, 1975. С. 351-355.
4. Доцоева Л.Б. Дистрибуция бинарных сочетаний фонем в современном осетинском» литературном языке: дис. ... канд. фил. наук. Владикавказ, 1993. С. 8-38.
5. Земская Е.А. Современный русский язык. Словообразование. М., 1973. 328 с.
6. Новикова Э.Ю., Митягина В.А., Гуреева А.А. Типология коммуникативных действий в экскурсионном дискурсе // Известия ВГПУ. 2015. №7 (102). С.91-97.
7. Салагаева З.М. (сост.) Осетинский фольклор. Орджоникидзе, 1961. 345 с.
8. Улуханов И.С. О словообразовательной категории // Известия АН УССР. 1975. Т. 34. № 1. С. 27-36.
9. Хараева Л.Х. Этимологическое гнездо в свете теории семантического поля // Известия Кабардино-Балкарского госуниверситета. 2012. Том 2. №1. С. 7-74.
10. Mityagina V. Ritualisierte kommunikative Handlungen im institutionellen Diskurs und Probleme der Translation. Nümbrecht: KirschVerlag, 2011. P. 81-89.