

SECTION 6. LINGUISTICS

DOI: 10.46299/ISG.2023.MONO.PED.1.6.1

6.1 Scientific value of the inter-level category “autosemantism / synsemantism” of the substantial word

It has become an assumption of common knowledge in linguistics and beyond to define category as a peculiar type of abstract model (generalization) based on the opposition of at least two generalized counterparts (with a lower degree of abstraction), represented by a set of language expressive means (forms of expression). The above mentioned terms come to be acknowledged as categorical values. For example, the category of gender of nouns in the Ukrainian language refers to the categorical notions of masculine, feminine and neutral properties of objects; the category of number is represented by the opposition of singular and plural form classes whereas the category of aspect points to the aspectual distinctions represented by perfect and non-perfect aspect, etc.

Linguistic categories disclose a complex process of multilevel representation involving generalization mechanisms: from a word via its denotation to a category. Each word proves to appear in the generalized category of non-verbal (non-linguistic) reality. If we make a certain emphasis on autosemantic words, such as nouns, non-verbal (extra linguistic) reality comes to be represented by denotations characterized by certain nominations that claim to be the first elements of generalization. Thus, on articulating, perceiving or reading the word “book”, native Ukrainian speakers can easily distinguish between the above mentioned denotation with all available characteristics peculiar to it despite every possible divergence and ambiguity associated with the notion in question.

Verbal notions (words) have always been the case to reproduce the generalized process of human consciousness. Hence, words come to be defined as a primary phase of generalization followed by the so-called “avalanche-like” stage of generalization isolated from the denotative features of the corresponding elements. There has been a starting point of ‘manipulating’ first-level generalization via words by uncovering

common key features (mainly semantic or formal). The second stage of generalization embraces a large quantity of word grouping. At the same time, these groupings are characterized by relative diversity depending on distinctive features that come to be the original arguments for the general relevance of case.

Of particular importance in the process of generalizations is an imperative feature that acts as a classification dominant to create relevant generalization procedures. The frame of references in this context comes to be attributed to the established linguistic convention related to distributional interactions of nouns:

- concreteness / abstractness;
- proper names / common names;
- their generic and numerical characteristics as well as case paradigm.

There was a process of appropriate classifications on the basis of opposing features in all these cases. The linguistic units groups are the result of classification with inherent generality that received a theoretical generalization in the form of metalinguistic names, the totality of which is the theory of language. For example: word forms *нууу*, *нууеи*, *нууе*; *нучауу*, *нучауеи*, *нучауе* ... are common ones for those who perform, or will perform the actions (the person whose name was referred to in the statement, or a person who is a stranger to the subject). As for such oppositions, a significant status of generalization was obtained by the person as the “implementer” of the respective process.

Thus, the grammatical functions of first, second, third persons, regardless to the quantitative representation of the performers of the action have appeared in linguistics: (compare: ... *я нууу* – *ми нууемо* (first person); (*ми нууеи* – *ви нууете* second person); ... *він (вона, воно) нууе* – *вони нуууть* (third person). Some remarks have to be made about the *autosemantic* word to which both lexicologists and grammarians have drawn their particular attention. There is no point saying that a dictionary of any language is made up of *autosemantic* words, which according to their synsemantic function words are relatively small. Semantics and grammar have been mixed up in the *autosemantic* word as the main element of the language; a lot of syntactic problems are concentrated, which are among the topical and insufficiently understood in modern

grammar science. Many of these questions are solved by the scholars in the interaction of different conceptual approaches, specifying, concretizing particular details of traditional grammar, thus developing and deepening categorical grammar of modern approaches to the interpretation of linguistic realities. The advanced study of the *autosemantic word* in modern linguistics successfully combines the most important directions and approaches; their strength (fundamentality) in grammar and semantics.

The category is the division of the whole, the opposition of the parts, and the beginning of the formation of the highest generalizations. Only the coherent substance that can be divided into parts with signs of opposition makes it possible to form a category. Based on these obvious general statements, one can analyze the notion concerning category “autosemantism / synsemantism”. The aim of the research is to prove the status of “autosemantism / synsemantism” as a categorical feature of *autosemantic* words. The object of study is a system of categories of *autosemantic* words. The subject of the research is the *autosemantic* Ukrainian words in the extension of the denotation. The study was performed on enormous material of the subject names and procedural denotes of the Ukrainian language.

Nowadays three main directions of development of the theory can be seen in modern linguistics. Traditionally, the division of words according to their *content and function* is traditionally established, which is basically based on the lexical meaning of the content and its absence in the function. Content words are still traditionally called “autonomous”, “autosemantic”, “categorical”, “complete”, “basic”, “independent”, and “lexicographic”. The linguistic essence of such names is that they all reproduce the most important feature of this group of words – their ability to name concepts and thus reproduce the linguistic division of reality. *Function* words or as they are called, “synsemantic”, “grammatical”, “dependent”, “minor”, “dependent”, “empty”, “syncategorematic”, “formal” have the opposite meaning to *content* notions. Function words are used to express different semantic-syntactic relationship between *content* words. As mentioned above, the division of words into *content and function categories* is the axiomatic truth that, however, it is constantly criticized and revised. These include contradictions about the meaning of prepositional words, the differences of

opinions and interpretations on how auxiliary verbs and verbal connections act in compound sentences, a fundamentally new interpretation of the parts of speech (I. Vykhovanets, A. Zahnitko, K. Horodenska).

On the basis of the theory of “autosemantism – sysemantism” the doctrine of the analyticism of the components of the sentence syntactic structure in its formal-grammatical aspect was successfully developed (I. Vykhovanets, K. Horodenska, M. Mirchenko, A. Zahnitko, A. Hryshchenko, Yu. Lebid, N. Ivanytska).

Therefore, the theory of *content* words is limited: “autosemantism – sysemantism” gained its recognition as one of the differential features of notional words, which is revealed via establishing their connective features (Ivanytska, 2012). It is worth saying that researchers focus mainly on the verb. Such studies have been particularly popular in connection to the development of valence doctrine. Much attention is paid to the verbs with autosemantism – sysemantism, deepened understanding of the main characteristics of the verb traditionally well-established properties that is demonstrated by the examples of Ukrainian verbs. Comparing the verbs *to shine* (The Sun shines) and *to introduce* (The teacher introduces new technologies into the learning process.) shows that, despite both of them are *content* notions they implement their semantics in different ways.

The *content* word *to shine* reproduces the meaning contained by its phonemic composition, and to implement the semantics of the word *to introduce*, the necessary context is needed - the *content* words dependent in certain grammatical forms. This feature of *content* words, concerning lexicology and grammar, was the basis for scientists to conduct an interspecific division of *content* words by their semantic and grammatical nature (Vykhovanets, 1988; Hulyha, 1967; Popova, 2009).

The global problem of autosemantism / synsemantism, a partial expression of which is the absoluteness / relativity of a content word semantics, is solved in modern linguistics due to multiaspectual sentence structure, including formal-syntactic, semantic-syntactic and semantic structure of simple verbal structure. According to the theories mentioned we can use such feature as the main criteria for separating content words by their ability to fill the relevant components of the sentence structure.

(Ivanytska, 1986; Ivanytska, 2017). The formal-syntactic (positional) structure of a sentence assumes the presence of optional components of adverbial or prepositional dependence in the case of autosemantic words, and obligatory components in the case of synsemantic words. (Ivanytska, 2004; Ivanytska, 2014; Masytska, 1998).

The autosemantism of the verb typically expresses itself in the predicate syntaxeme, according to the semantic-syntactic aspect, which “expresses the semantically determined compatibility with another part of speech – the noun.” According to A. Zahnitko point of view such verbs are, “...self-sufficient for the formation of their individual syntactic structures and use as monovalent / one-valent” (Zagnitko, 2011). I. Vykhovanets, classifying predicates, typically expressed by verbs, in a semantically elementary simple sentence, calls them “empty?” and “single” (Vykhovanets, 1993): *Смеркає; Дитина росте; Сестра радіє; Малюки граються; Листя зазеленіло; Дерево вросло* etc. They are often two-participants (“double?two-seats”) *Дитина розбила іграшку* or trivalent (“triple”): *Поет присвятив поему другу*.

Thus, the doctrine of valence, which broadly coincides with the theory of compatibility, greatly contributed to the solution of the tasks set in the research. When pronouncing, listening or reading the word “дерево”, Ukrainian speakers clearly distinguish such a subject denotation with its inherent features, although each person’s associative field of formation of the concept of “дерево” will be different.

In all cases, verbal nominations (words) reproduce the generalised process of human consciousness. Words, therefore, are the primary stage of generalisation. Then the “avalanche-like” procedure of generalisations removed from the denotative features of the corresponding substances comes. The process of “manipulation” of generalisations of the first order words through the selection of common features in them (mostly semantic or formal) begins.

There are many groups of words in the second stage of generalisations. In this case, such groups are quite diverse depending on the criteria that make up the starting point of the relevant generalisations. Thus, a generalised feature, for example, in the Ukrainian verbal nominations of subject denotations, is the feature “genus”, which,

combining word names, at the same time divided them into three groups according to formal indicators – endings.

Of great importance in the process of generalizations is the main feature that acts as a classification dominant and appears as such, on the basis of which the relevant generalisations are made. Let's remember at least the division of noun words by features:

- specificity / abstractness;
- proper names / common names;
- by generic and numerical characteristics;
- classification by case paradigm (Vykhovanets, 1988).

In all these and other cases, there was a process of appropriate classifications on the grounds that are opposed in one way or another. The resulting classification of a group of language units with their inherent commonality receives a theoretical generalization in the form of metalinguistic names, the set of which is the theory of language. For example: word forms *нишу, нишею, нише, нисаму, нисамею, нисаме* – find commonality in who performs (will perform) actions (the person on whose behalf the statement is spoken, or a person who is a stranger to the subject of the statement). In the perspective of such oppositions, as we see, the significant status of generalisation was given to the person as the “implementer” of the corresponding process. Thus, grammatical meanings appeared in linguistics: first person, second person, third person, regardless of the quantitative representation of the performers of the action (cf. *я нишу – ми нишемо* > first person; *ти нишею – ви нишете* > second person; *він (вона, воно) нише – вони нишать* (third person)).

Focus on compatibility provided pre-selection and distribution of full words. The above-mentioned features practically diagnosed words in terms of their formation of obligatory or optional combinations with dependent word forms. Of course, in the system of the Ukrainian language we trace a significant quantitative advantage of the functioning of word names (autosemantic and synsemantic) in constructions with a filled adverbial position. Moreover, this position is most often predicted by the synsemanticism of word forms: *доводиться (кому + ким, чим), відчутти (себе + ким,*

чим), уявлятися (кому + ким, чим), зосереджуватися (на чому), зосередження (на чому), впровадження (чого і у що), вартий (чого), кращий (від чого). Already at the level of phrases such words show synsemanticism. While transposing phrases into sentences, such words fill in the appropriate syntactic positions, and the word forms that depend on them fill the positions that are mandatory for them.

A significant factor in distinguishing of autosemantic / synsemantic full-meaning words is also the syntactic connection, which anyway reflects the obligatory / non-obligatory combination of full-meaning words in a phrase. Synsemantic words include words with strong control and those tokens (lexical items, lexemes) that combined with dependent components and the connection of weak control are classified as autosemantic. However, as the research shows, such an approach to distinguishing between autosemantic and synsemantic words isn't always effective.

We believe that the main criterion for distinguishing of autosemantic and synsemantic words isn't the form of expression of the contractual relationship, but such phenomena as the obligatory as well as non-obligatory of the adverbial syntactic connection and the associated sign of the strength of the contract. Obligatory, as I. Vykhovanets notes, is the necessity, regularity, but non-obligatory – the probability, importance, irregularity of the dependent component. Based on the establishment of such links there are notions of obligatory and optional compatibility, which are used in the study.

A significant role in words in this distribution is played by lexicographic fixations in the corresponding syllables in their concretized semantic variants. Of course, dictionaries / even the most complete 11-languishing explanatory dictionary of the Ukrainian language don't have special marks that would indicate the distinction of autosemantic and synsemantic words. However, in general, this dictionary quite objectively reproduces and illustrates with examples the linguistic nature of this phenomenon. The fixation of the categorical meaning of transition “перехідний”, “неперехідний” in the corresponding verbs is a partial reflection of their autosemantic and synsemantic properties. The mark “перехідний” indicates the symptomatic nature of the verb in one sense or another, and therefore, objectifies its classification as

semantic. Accordingly, the mark “неперехідний” in such cases can serve as an indicator of verbal autosemantism.

Analysis of literature, that directly or indirectly touches the problem of nature of momentous words, certifies that researchers consider the basic criteria of differentiation of words: semantic (denotative), grammatical (syntactic copulas) and character of connectivity with dependent words or components in the structure of sentence. Each of these criteria includes differential signs that help define autosemantic / semantic words as separate lexico-grammatical digits of vocabulary. At the same time all of them are not confined some elements of subjectivism, inaccuracies, ambiguous description of that or other word in direct, and especially in portable.

The study used a complex methodology that contained a number of techniques for analyzing specific words against the background of their functioning in the language system. Such an analysis of vocabulary, focused on the delimitation of units of the autosemantic and sinemantic nature, foresees, first of all, the identification of formal indicators that would maximize the objectivity of separation. The decomposition of these word bits is based on the inherent in each word signs of conjugation with a certain range of forms that spread it. In our interpretation, interoperability appears as a lexical-syntactic property of full-value words, which is manifested in the formation of a set of subordinate word forms, which depends on the conditions of the syntactic linking of the corresponding grammatical word categories (Ivanytska, 2017).

Thus, the work of scientists in the field of studying the very nature of autosemantism / synsemantism of full words and the analysis carried out in this direction can be briefly summarized in such basic conclusions:

1. All full words in their projection on denotations are different (we are talking about some revision of the ... concepts: “full word”, “full part of speech”).
2. All full words are unambiguously divided (are subject to unambiguous division) by connecting parameters on the syntagmatic axis.
3. Based on the proposed method, full words are divided into autosemantic / symsemantic.

4. Each of the selected groups has sufficient (enough) interpretive capacity (ability) to consider it as a generalized meaning in the dichotomy of autosemantism / synsemantism.

5. Formal indicators of autosemantic meaning are the absence of mandatory structures on the syntagmatic axis of compatibility.

6. The formal indicator of synsemantic meaning is the presence of obligatory structures on the syngmatic axis of compatibility.

Based on such consideration and comparing autosemantism / synsemantism with other categories, we conclude that autosemantism / synsemantism can be assigned to interlevel linguistic categories.