

Jelena Stanojčić
independent researcher
(Belgrade)
jelastanojdic@gmail.com

Оригинални научни рад
UDC: 811.163.41'373.7
811.111'373.7
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18485/prevod.2022.41.88.1>

IDENTIFYING MEANING AND LEXICAL BIFURCATION OF THE LEXEME „SOCIJALNI“ / „DRUŠTVENI“ – TRANSLATION OF NOUN PHRASES AND UNDERSTANDING THEIR MEANING IN A CONTEXTUAL FRAMEWORK: MORPHOLOGICAL AND LEXICAL SYSTEM ANALYSIS (AMONG SPEAKERS OF THE NEW MILLENIUM)

In this paper the author brings the results of her research of contextual and morpho-syntactic automatic identification of dual meaning of the loanword *social* in the Serbian language. The occurrence of the lexical pair *društveni: socijalni* in standard Serbian poses the question of identifying the meaning of both members of the given formula. Therefore, the author finds that the speaker's full lexical and social competence, i.e. the ability to distinguish (a) semantic moment in (con)text and (b) morphological/lexical moment, is means to identify the meaning of the loanword *socijalni*, *-a*, *-o*. Inasmuch, the speaker should be fully aware that there are two separately existing lexemes *društveni* and *socijalni*. The latter is a loanword with no motivating word (from the basis of which it could be derived – by the rules of Serbian derivation). The author compares this situation of discourse/text comprehension with situation in English /French (other implied language givers).

Key words: social, socijalni, društveni, loanword, derivative, language-giver, recipient-language, discourse/text, language contact, Serbian, English, bifurcation, morphology, sociolinguistics, semantics.

Рад доноси резултате ауторкиног истраживања контекстуалног и морфолошко-синтаксичког аутоматског препознавања двојног значења позајмљенице социјални у српском језику. Постојање лексичког пара друштвени: социјални у српском стандарном језику поставља питање идентификовања значења једног и другог члана те формуле. Ауторка пореди стање језичког разумевања дискурса/текста у којем се јављају дате лексеме са стањем у енглеском / француском (имплицираним другим језицима-даваоцима).

Кључне речи: лексема-позајмљеница, српски, енглески, језик-давалац, језик-прималац, морфолошко-лексички, семантички, социјални, друштвени

1. In its research apparatus, the linguistic field of discourse analysis has – based on science – very exact means of defining both overt and implied content of all types of discourse/texts that occur in communication between speakers of the same language community. Exactly because he speaks in general, common language, the speaker/author would have to show in their text that they are familiar with the rules of language competence. This does not only refer to a developed ability to master the grammatical system of their language (an ability developed on the basis of the human innate linguistic abilities¹). Also, it encompasses the ability to understand and identify as fully as possible the inventory of civilizational-cultural values of the socio-political community to which they belong.

And – when it comes to the problem that we have posed before us in the title of the paper – I will illustrate this dual speaker's competence (to master the grammar system and culture) from the defined linguistic rules (in the field of processes) in the domain of languages in contact. In this domain we find questions about the occurrence and usage of so-called *loanwords*.

2. It is a definitive fact that in Serbian there is a widespread use of the lexeme *socijalni*, *-a,-o* – grammatically classified as *adjective*. From the aspect of word formation, the lexeme is classified as a *derivative word* according to automatic analytic association with adjectives ending in suffix *-an/-ni*.²

As a *derivative*, it should have its *motive word*, like other domestic derived adjectives, such as *brižan/brižni* (< *brig[a] + -an/-ni), *jadan/jadni* (< *jad[ø] + -an/-ni), *kućni* (< *kuć[a] + -ni). Or, in terms of derivation, the lexeme should possibly be linked with the noun **social*, which doesn't belong to the literary (standard) language. There is simply no such word there. In the usual system of morphological analogy (that is a language constant in each language),

1 Ideas of Noam Chomsky have pervaded the science of language in such great extent that we almost do not feel the need to cite them as a quote, or even a paraphrase. His theorems, and even hypotheses, for example – his definition of innate language competence, i.e. the ability to learn and use the language – we take as a textbook definition. This attitude is evident when a linguist, for example, writes about innate abilities: „American linguist Noam Chomsky pointed out that language is somewhat innate, and that children are born with what he calls a Language Acquisition Device, which is a unique kind of knowledge that fits them for language learning. Therefore, humans are inherited with this ‘Language Acquisition Device’, and it exists in the human brain. What's more, Chomsky argues that when a child comes into the world, he is born with a specific innate endowment, not only with general tendencies or potentialities, but also with knowledge of the nature of language“ (Ling 2014: 98).

2 See definition and detailed overview of forms and derivations of adjectives in Сревановић 1974: 538–587.

the Serbian language would seek for a formation that does not exist – in internal structure of the entire inventory of its language forms. But, it did not find it. And when it comes to the adjectival „derived“ word *socijalni*, *-a*, *-o*, in order to get a formational formula like *društvo: društveni*, the Serbian language has resorted to a lexical solution. Since it did not find a local lexeme in the Serbian lexical inventory, speaking in terms of usual grammatical terminology – it borrowed one from one of influential language-givers, with which it had been in direct or indirect contact. From there stems a language formula in Serbian *društvo: društveni – socijalni* (in which lexemes *društveni* and *socijalni*, depending on the context – are complete or partial synonyms).³

Observing the origins of adjectival lexeme *socijalni* from the aspect of formal formation elements, only two formulas are possible:

(a) a formula by which the foreign word (adjective) *social*, in its entirety, is a formational root word to which is added the Serbian suffix *-ni*, *-na*, *-no*, and

(b) a formula by which the lexeme is *socijalni*, *-na*, *-no* – formed from the root word of the noun *socijala*, *-e* f. by adding the Serbian suffix, *-ni*, *-na*, *-no* (as in domestic derivatives: *slavni*, *-na*, *-no*; *jadan*, *-na*, *-no*, *bedni*, *-na*, *-no*, whose motive words are *slava*, *jad*, *beda* – which means that addition is made to a foreign lexeme. After all, this is a very frequent formula in the Serbian language, and can be seen in numerous derived adjectives, such as *kontinentalni*, *-na*, *-no*; *centralni*, *-na*, *-no*; *labijalni*, *-na*, *-no*; *mentalni*, *-na*, *-no*; *sakralni*, *-na*, *-no* etc.

The formula with the noun *socijala* – according to some rules of forming a standard language – is yet less likely, not for purely linguistic principles (it is realizable and realized in a special language layer). It is less likely by the rules of satisfying the demands of a specific socio-political, civilization and cultural environment – because it belongs to *jargon*, i.e. „conversational“ language, as classified in *Dictionary of the Serbian language*, published by Matica srpska (Речник МС 2011).⁴

3 We consider two dimensions along which words can vary: semantic and stylistic, or, equivalently, denotative and connotative. If two words differ semantically (e.g., *mist*, *fog*), then substituting one for the other in a sentence or discourse will not necessarily preserve truth conditions; the denotations are not identical. If two words differ (solely) in stylistic features (e.g., *frugal*, *stingy*), then intersubstitution does preserve truth conditions, but the connotation – the stylistic and interpersonal effect of the sentence [...] is changed“ (DiMarco et al. 1993: 120). See also: Драгићевић 2001: 239–242.

4 See: *Dictionary of the Serbian Language* (Serb. Речник српскога језика) of Matica srpska (2011) where these terms are listed with respective linguistic layers in which they are used: „**socijala** f.(pl. Ø) **conversational**, social, economic status – We cannot hire on the basis of one’s social status. **socijalan**, -lna, -o a. (det.) relating to society, which is related to society, **društveni**: ~ question, ~ politics, ~ insurance, ~ literature, ~ labor. **b.** adjusted to life in society, **društven**: ~ behavior. • a social case, a person forced to seek help from society... and adverb – **socijalno** **ADV.** 1. in a social way: behave. 2. with regard to care, social security: ~ endangered; **socijalnost**, **-osti** f. the adapting to life in society, respecting the interests and needs of other people“ – translation J. Stanojčić.

3. Citing examples in English and French (in latter – only generally, without details) which correspond to Serbian lexemes, I did not go into defining the loanword's origin, which would define these languages as (direct or indirect) language-givers in relation to Serbian, in this case.

Such a definition would require a more thorough research of both linguistic and historical aspect of contacts between the Serbian and West European languages and aspects of their cultures. Here, examples from these languages are given merely to be arguments for their usage in our language.

In English and French,⁵ lexeme-adjective *social*, *social* (with its derivate adverb *socially*; *socialement*) from historical aspect is derived by historical development defined by English etymology as a lexeme the root of which is: „*socius* ‘companion’, ‘ally’, probably originally ‘follower’, from PIE⁶ **sokw-yo-*, suffixed form of root **sekw-* (1) ‘to follow’. Compare Old English *secg*, Old Norse *seggr* ‘companion’, which seem to have been formed on the same notion. Related: *Socially*.“⁷ Naturally, in different contexts – it has variant related meanings. In modern English / French, in semantic aspect (but not in – word-formation, except in a very far etymology) – undoubtedly stands by the noun *society* / *société*.⁸ This is evidenced – and concisely formulated – in an illustrative text in the reliable „Encyclopaedia Britannica“:

„**Social** structure, in sociology, the distinctive, stable arrangement of institutions whereby human beings in a **society** interact and live together. **Social** structure is often treated together with the concept of **social** change, which deals with the forces that change the **social** structure...“⁹

Therefore – if this (word-formational) formula would be translated to Serbian, we would get Serbian word-formational formula: **društvo: društvēni*. That is to say – absolutely equal to English / French formulas.

As it is common in two language systems that are in direct or indirect contact, while both of them belong to the same language family (in our case – to the group of Indo-European languages) – the process of so-called borrowing of both lexemes and word-formational models – is an absolutely natural process. The result of it is the existence of loan words in the language-receiver. From the aspect of sociolinguistics – it realizes processes by which „ethnic and national cultures, together with their languages idioms, join [...] the trends of modernization and international civilization“ (Bugarski 2005: 41).

5 Linguists who study other languages based on the same ground – said this, naturally.

6 PIE = Proto-indo-european.

7 See: „Online Etymology Dictionary“ (<https://www.etymonline.com/word/social>. 7/20/2018).

8 In German one finds situation that is partially similar to Serbian situation: the German formula denoting this relation is – Engl./Fren. Social/social = Sozial and for Engl. *society* [*social community, high society*] /French *société* = Germ. *die Gesellschaft*. And – this would be equal to Serbian relation *socijalni, -a, -o: društvo* (instead of *društveni: društvo*).

9 Encyclopaedia Britannica (<https://www.britannica.com/.../7/17/2018>)

As general linguistics gave the definition long ago, in that domain even today researchers can generalize it by a simplified statement of (universal) spreading of „language elements by [...] borrowing“, which – according to the author of this generalization – results in the fact that all languages have „internationalisms – words and expressions that exist in a large number of languages in similar form and with the same meaning – and therefore considerably facilitate understanding among their speakers, primarily in professional registers, but also in mundane ordinary domains“ (Bugarski 2005: 40).

4. In this way – within the frame of problem interpretation (formulated in the title of this paper) – I could state – that, for instance, every syntactic sequence given in the „Vocabulary of Terms“ in English – could have its (absolutely) corresponding equivalent in Serbian. Even without any special interpretation, there could surely be a strictly interpretational formula (with also acknowledging grammarians–purists):

language giver		recipient language
European Code of <i>Social Security</i>	>	*Evropski kodeks <i>društvene</i> sigurnosti
European <i>Social</i> Fund	>	* Evropski <i>društveni</i> fond

This formula is linguistically founded, applicable, and even sustainable, as it is frequently verbalized in administrative discourse of both language communities (language giver and recipient language), which are being observed here.

5. However – evidently, it is not absolutely so. Namely –

- (a) In the language-giver, for instance, in English, bifurcation is realized only on the semantic level, and the interpretation of two or more meanings the speaker realizes only by applying the analysis of discourse/textual units. It is done automatically by the speaker/collocutor competent in the socio-language community to which they belong. This originates from fact that two terms in question – (1) the term associated with institution (e.g. in syntactic sequence: *In Britain, the social security administration is very organized...*), and (2) any (other) term contained in a lexeme’s semantic field of the noun *society* (e.g. in sentence/sequence *The social changes are visible in Africa...*) – are expressed by one single lexeme – adjective *social*.
- (b) In the recipient-language, in Serbian – bifurcation is realized on two levels:
 - (1) On semantic level, when, in the same way as in English (and other languages with the same root), the meaning of lexemes *društveni ~ socijalni* is recognized by the speaker’s/collocutor’s automatic analysis of textual unit containing this lexeme (adjective). For example, the English sentence given above: *In Britain, the*

social security administration is very organized could have its corresponding equivalent in 2 (two) versions that mean the same in Serbian:

U Britaniji, administracija društvenog osiguranja je vrlo organizovana.

U Britaniji, administracija socijalnog osiguranja je vrlo organizovana.

However, in Serbian as the recipient-language – what prevailed is partial bifurcation on two levels – (1) *semantic level* and (2) *formal*, and thus the speaker/collocutor will chose the lexeme *socijalni, -a, -o* for the given context.

- (2) Formal (morpho-lexical) level is formed by a lexeme that filled an „empty place“ in the inventory of Serbian. Namely, the speaker of the Serbian language community accepted the lexeme *socijalni* – as normally codified in their language.

Thereby, most frequently –

- (a) the speaker will use both lexemes that are in their language (lexical) inventory – in discourse/text in both everyday informative communication and in professional discourse. For instance, an English sentence will have 2 (two) lexical versions in translation to Serbian:

<i>The social changes are visible in Africa...</i>	>	(1) Vidljive su <i>društvene promene</i> u Africi... (2) Vidljive su <i>socijalne promene</i> u Africi...
--	---	--

... And (b) the speaker will use, in discourse/text of special domains of human activity – the lexeme *socijalni* as an attribute (denoting possession), primarily in sequences that have the meaning of special, institutionalized activities. And they will use them – despite the fact that lexemes *društveni* and *socijalni* have the same semantic root (= belonging to the term „društvo“), and are consequently synonyms when they are in the speaker’s native language.¹⁰

6. Hence, in translating from English / French / German... languages to Serbian, we arrived at the situation given in the table below:

10 „In popular professional texts, [...] aimed to broader and less professional public [...] the usage of some different lexemes, those that are more understandable and easier for ‘common people’ [...] These pairs of synonyms – let us name them professionally and scholarly popular – are justified and they are no danger for terminological preciseness due to the fact that authors of texts aimed to the broad audience have no reason to insist on exact unambiguous usage of professional or scholarly terms“ (Silaški 2012: 58) – translation J. Stanojčić.

social services	>	<p><i>Socijalne</i> usluge: usluge koje pružaju agencije i institucije (vladine i nevladine) radi zadovoljavanja određenih ličnih ili (1) <i>društvenih potreba</i> korisnika, kao što su deca, porodice, stari i hendikepirani. (2) <i>Socijalne usluge</i> se mogu pružati u domovima korisnika ili, pak, u institucijama u koje su korisnici smešteni...</p>
-----------------	---	---

That is to say – in sociolinguistic definition the most relevant fact is that „Though most language contact situations lead to unidirectional, rather than bidirectional linguistic results, conditioned by the social circumstances, it is also the case that linguistic structure overwhelmingly conditions the linguistic outcomes. Morphology and syntax are clearly the domains of linguistic structure least susceptible to the influence of contact, ... On the other hand, lexicon is clearly the most readily borrowable element, and borrowing lexicon can lead to structural changes at every level of linguistic structure“ (Sankoff 2001: 19).

A language „product“ originating from this is the state in which, in the concrete language – in Serbian, in the first example (1) is used lexeme *društveni*, and in the second one (2) lexeme *socijalni*. The first one has the meaning of „needs (of individuals, families etc.) in society as a political community“. The second one – means legal, official institution in the domain of (state, communal, corporation’s) care for citizens in a given socio-political community.

7. In other words, citing DiMarco–Hirst–Stede, who consider that there are „two dimensions in which words can vary: semantic and stylistic, or, equally, denotative and connotative“, we arrive at their conclusion that if „two words differ in meaning (e.g. mist, fog) replacing one another in one sentence or discourse, that sentence or that discourse will not necessarily preserve the requirement of truth...“ Namely, as they continue – „denotations are not identical. If the two lexemes differ (only) by stylistic characteristics (e.g. *frugal*, *stingy*), mutual substitution will preserve the fulfilled requirement of truth, but the connotation – the sentence style effect as a personal relationship effect – has been changed“ (DiMarko et al. 1993: 120).

8. The fact that the lexeme-adjective *social* in English belongs to both (a) the sphere of denoting things in general sphere, in common communication, and (b) the sphere of denotation in special (institutionalized) domains, is founded on the given lexeme’s polysemy.

In Serbian – the affiliation of the term-adjective *socijalni* to either one or the other sphere is characterized, too, by polysemy of the both lexemes, but also by having two lexemes in the lexical system: adjective *socijalni*, and adjective *društveni*.

Being characterized by polysemy, and, taken one versus the other, both are at disposal to the speaker of the recipient-language, with equal primary

semantic value. But they have, too, a functional prospective that the context frequently annuls small semantic differences between variant related meanings. Namely, as stated by the linguists, synonyms are transformed to lexemes that have absolutely equal meaning.¹¹ This fact is of importance for the lexeme-adjective *socijalni*, particularly because, according to analogy (of the forming suffix *-ni*), it is classified into derived words.

This is – as underlined in our general linguistics – in the very nature of (a bit wider) semantic field, for which the linguists, analysing an another class of language form – say that it contains a „general component of meaning as a semantic invariant that keeps units of the field together“ (Ковачевић 2012: 26) ... and that also „different meanings are expressed by different forms“, in which situation – the author continues – „...this setting does not exclude implication that each form carries a different meaning“ (Ковачевић 2012: 30).

9. Whether the speaker will use the term *socijalni* with its (a) general meaning, or with its (b) narrower (specialized) meaning, they are going to decide themselves according to their understanding of a concrete discourse/text in which one of these two lexemes should be used. (Lyons 1990: 573–575, 725). Naturally, if their „language sense“ is developed (Белић 2000: 527) and the speaker possesses a level of social competence – they will opt for the one that erases possible ambiguity and thus ensure correct understanding of the discourse/text. If the speaker has a satisfying level of language and social competence – they will opt for the lexeme that will neutralize ambiguity of a given discourse/text and provide its understanding.¹² Goes without saying that such speaker is trained in organizing the discourse/text that demands a particular vocabulary (e.g. discourse/text in economics, law, history, sociology, medicine or other professional or scholarly fields). It means that the speaker is fully informed – as well as culturally and lexically competent – to enter into „implicit contextual reference“, i.e. to automatically comprehend „the meaning of a certain word [...] from the context“ (Marjanović 1984: 15).

11 The Serbian term is *istoznačnice* (Драгићевић 2007: 244–256).

12 John Lyons indicates this fact by words: „For example, the following utterance-signal (1) *They passed the port at midnight* has at least two distinct interpretations, according to whether the form *port* is taken to be a form of the lexeme ‘port₁’ meaning ‘harbour’ or of the lexeme ‘port₂’ which denotes a certain kind of fortified wine. Which of these two interpretations is intended by the speaker would be generally clear from the context in which the utterance occurs. The utterance-signal itself, however, is inherently ambiguous; and the linguist must describe it as such“ (Lyons 1990: 396–397).

References

- Белић Александар, „О значењу језичког осећања за вршење синхроничке језичке анализе“, *Изабрана дела. XIII том. О различитим питањима савременог језика*, Београд, Завод за уџбенике, 2000: 39.
- [Belić Aleksandar, „O značenju jezičkog osećanja za vršenje sinhroničke jezičke analize“, *Izabrana dela. XIII tom. O različitim pitanjima savremenog jezika*, Beograd, Zavod za udžbenike, 2000: 275/276]
- Драгићевић Рајна, *Придеви са значењем људских особина у савременом српском језику: творбена и семантичка анализа*, Београд, Институт за српски језик САНУ, 2001.
- [Dragičević Rajna, *Pridevi sa značenjem ljudskih osobina u savremenom srpskom jeziku: tvorbena i semantička analiza*, Beograd, Institut za srpski jezik SANU, 2001]
- Драгићевић Рајна. *Лексикологија српског језика*. Београд: Завод за уџбенике, 2007.
- [Dragičević Rajna, *Leksikologija srpskog jezika*, Beograd, Zavod za udžbenike, 2007]
- Ковачевић Милош, *Узрочно семантичко поље*, Београд, Јасен, 2012.
- [Kovačević Miloš, *Uzročno semantičko polje*, Beograd, Jasen, 2012]
- Стевановић Михаило, *Савремени српскохрватски језик: (граматички системи и књижевнојезичка норма). 1. Увод. Фонетика. Морфологија*, 3. изд., Београд, Научна књига, 1975.
- [Stevanović Mihailo, *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik: (gramatički sistemi i književnojezička norma). 1. Uvod. Fonetika. Morfologija*, 3. izd, Beograd, Naučna knjiga, 1975]
- Бугарски Ранко, *Језик и култура*, Београд, Библиотека XX век, Krug, 2005.
- DiMarco Chrysanne et al., „The semantic and stylistic differentiation of synonyms and near-synonyms“. *AAAI Spring Symposium*. March 23–25. Stanford, California. (Technical Report SS-93-02), 120–127. <https://www.ling.uni-potsdam.de/~stede/Papers/aaaisymp93.pdf> 16.07.2018.
- Ling Chen. „On Innate Mechanisms of Language Acquisition“. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* Vol. 4, No. 28 (2014), 97–100. citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.663.1352&rep=rep1... 30.07.2018.
- Lyons John. *Semantics*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Марјановић Ана. *Развој значења речи*. Београд: Прсвета, 1984.
- Sankoff Gillian, „Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact“. Trudgill Peter et al. (eds.). *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 2001: 638–668.
- Силашки Надежда, *Српски језик у транзичији: о англицизмима у економском регистру*, Београд, Центар за издавачку делатност Економског факултета, 2012.

Initial Language Source

- Heimo Heringa, *Rečnik socijalne sigurnosti*, Beograd: Council of Europe, 2006. <https://www.coe.int/t/dg3/sscssr/Source/GlossSERBcyrillic.pdf>. 23.05.2019.
- Речник српског језика*, Нови Сад, Матица српска, 2011.