



УДК 81`44

## THE TECHNIQUE OF DETERMINING THE STRUCTURAL-MORPHOLOGICAL TYPE OF LANGUAGE

**Dubova O.A.***d.philol.s., prof.***Mochalova N.S.***senior instructor**Admiral Makarov National University of Shipbuilding,**Mykolaiv, 9 Geroiv Ukrainy ave.,54007*

**Abstract.** *The work examines the principles of creating a methodology applicable for determining the structural-morphological type of a language. This technique is based on the concepts of the type of language and the type in the language and is based on the application of the form of modelling as a means of determining the structural-morphological resources of a specific language.*

**Key words:** *amorphity, analyticity, syntheticity, structural typology, type of language.*

### **Introduction.**

Linguistic typology has accumulated considerable experience in the study of structural-morphological types of languages, but there are hardly any grounds for saying that there is a universally recognized structural typological classification in which a proper place can be determined for each ethnic language of the world. This situation has arisen due to the problems of developing a methodology, the application of which will allow determining the structural type of a specific language.

Summarizing the history of the methodology used in structural linguistic typology, we can name the main three methodological approaches to defining a type of language: 1) observation without accurate statistical confirmation; 2) standart approach; 3) quantitative approach. The first of these approaches was used at the initial stages of the formation of linguistic typology and its essence involved the fact that the structural type was determined by the most common (to the researcher's point of view) manifestations of structural typological properties in the language. This approach was typical for the typological concepts of F. von Schlegel, V. von Humboldt, F. Bopp, and others. The weakness of the observation method was proved primarily in its subjectivity, which was also accompanied by differences in the definition of structural types of languages.

Suggestions to introduce reference approach to defining a type of language



belong to the representatives of the Linguistic Circle of Prague and consist of determining the correspondence of a specific language to a specific standard language, as a certain abstract sample represented by a set of typological features that are united by implicative or causal relationships (3). The standart approach did not become widespread in structural-typological studies due to the fact that, firstly, it does not take into account the fundamental polytypology of the world languages and, secondly, it does not overcome the conceptual and terminological differences in the interpretation of the types of languages, and also identifies these types in different levels of the language system.

In order to provide precise statistical characteristics to a quantitative assessment of findings of various structural types in the language, there was introduced a quantitative approach, which appeared primarily in the methodology of quantitative analysis developed by J. Greenberg, according to which statistical indices were determined (1). This technique, in contrast to observation, was supposed to provide an objectively reasoned solution to the question of the correlation of various typological features in the study of a specific language. However, the objectivity of the statistical indices determination is questionable since certain methodological flaws are revealed in the determination of statistical indices. First, absolute conclusions regarding the language system in general are based on the results of the examination of selective or limited speech material without taking into account the specificity of variant-invariant relationships between speech and language units. Second, this technique does not take into account such a criterion of quantitative determination as the productivity / non-productivity of a language unit in its speech implementations. Third, the principle of applying quantitative definitions only to homogeneous objects is violated. Such a violation is manifested in the fact that the number of synthetic or analytical units is determined without taking into account the level stratification of the language system and the property of these units to correspond to different levels. In particular, common in Indo-European languages preposition-noun combinations, combinations like “personal pronoun + predicative form of the verb” “auxiliary verb + participle” can be considered both as morphological analytical means and as syntactic units. The use of quantitative methods at different levels of identification of such and similar units will give different quantitative indicators for the manifestations of analyticity in the morphological system, which can cause (and even actually causes) contradictory conclusions about the structural type of a language.



Therefore, developing a method for determining the morphological type of a language remains one of the urgent problems for modern structural typology.

**Main text.**

The development of the methodology of morphological typological language identification involves solving two problems: 1) to overcome the contradictions between the fundamental polytypology of natural languages and to determine which certain structural-morphological type they correspond to; 2) to determine the means for calculating structural and typological manifestations in a language.

Polytypology of natural languages makes it necessary to mark a conceptual distinction between the concepts of *type of language* and *type in the language* (2). A type of language is a certain classification rubric of a typological classification (taxon), in which a set of specific languages is united by common typological features. A type in the language is one of the linguistic typological features. Manifestations of several types in the language are characteristic of polytypological languages.

Structural-morphological types in the language are determined by the peculiarities of form formation, since such a function as grammatical variation of lexeme, that is, form formation, corresponds to the morphological level of the language. According to this function, we define three main morphological types in the language: amorphity, analyticity, syntheticity. Amorphity is manifested in the absence of grammatical variation of the lexeme, analyticity and syntheticity is manifested in the presence of such variation. Grammatical variation of lexemes occurs with the help of formally divisible elementary nominative units consisting of the main structural component and the formative. Distant arrangement of these components is a manifestation of analyticity, and compact arrangement is a manifestation of syntheticity.

For a polytypological language to be correspondent to a certain type of language is determined by the dominant typological feature, that is, the type in the language. The dominance of a typological feature is established by the quantitative prevalence of its manifestations in a specific language. The quantitative ratio between units representing different types in a language can be defined within a certain closed number. This number can be obtained by counting language units, not speech units. It is the units of the language that belong to the unit-types that can make up a closed number and at the same time represent the language in general. Therefore, we can recognize as suitable for the representation of the morphological level of the language



a unit that has the following characteristics: a) belongs to the units of the construction type, b) has a non-elementary (binary) structural and semantic organization, c) consists of functionally differentiated structural components (lexical base and formative) united according to the principle of mutual connection, d) reveals an abstracted representation of the lexical base and a concrete representation of the formative. To mark such a unit, we offer the term *form of modelling*. In the first approximation, the representation of the *form of modelling* is materialized in the form of the following formula:

$$\left[ \left( \frac{\text{lexical meaning}}{\text{type of base}} \right) + \frac{\text{morphological meaning}}{\text{formative}} \right] \quad (1)$$

(Author's development)

The binary structure of the form of modelling can have a content that corresponds to the repertoire of bases and formatives of a specific language. Individual form of modelling of a certain language are revealed by identifying the morphological forms of words according to the type of lexical base, morphological meaning, and specific formative. In particular, one form of modelling is revealed by comparing the morphological forms of words in each of the following groups: (Ukrainian) *принесімо, робімо, збережімо, створімо* (*let's bring, let's do, let's save, let's create*) etc. – form of modelling

$$\left[ \left( \frac{\text{procedural lexical meaning}}{\text{verb base pres.tense}} \right) + \frac{\text{morph.mean. imper.m., compatible person}}{-i - \quad -mo} \right] \quad (2)$$

(Author's development)

(Eng.) *will rise, will move, will work, will change* – model of forming

$$\left[ \frac{\text{morphol.mean. 2-3 per. Future Simple Tense}}{\text{will}} + \left( \frac{\text{proced. lex.meaning}}{\text{verb base-infinitive}} \right) \right] \quad (3)$$

(Author's development)

Therefore, the technique of determining the structural-morphological type of the language involves the following algorithm: 1) determining the number of notional parts of a language, the lexemes of which have / do not have grammatical variation; 2) structuring and determining the number of analytical form of modelling in a language; 3) structuring and determining the number of synthetic form of modelling in a language; 4) determining the type of a language according to the dominant type in a language according to the quantitative ratios of manifestations of amorphity, analyticity, and syntheticity. The proposed technique actually allows not only to



identify the type of a language, but also to determine the general structural and typological characteristic of a language according to a certain hierarchy of types found in this language.

### **Summary and conclusions.**

The principles for creating a technique for determining the structural-morphological type of a language were considered. This technique is based on the application of the concepts of *type of language* and *type in the language*, as well as the form of modelling as a unit-construct, with the help of which it is possible to give a comprehensive description of the formation of a certain language. The methodology (technique) of determining the structural-morphological type of a language according to the dominant type in the language was developed.

### **References:**

1. Гринберг Дж. Квантитативный подход к морфологической типологии языков: Пер. с англ. // Новое в лингвистике. Вып. 3. – М.: Изд-во иностр. лит-ры, 1963. – С. 60 – 94.
2. Родионов В.А. „Тип языка”, „типовой признак” (Эволюция понятий лингвистической типологии) // Известия АН СССР. Серия лит. и языка. – 1987. – № 3. – С. 208 – 220.
3. Тезисы Пражского лингвистического кружка // Пражский лингвистический кружок. – М.: Прогресс, 1967. – С. 17 – 41.

*Scientific supervisor: d.philol.s., prof. Dubova O.A.*

© Dubova O.A.