

# THE LANGUAGE STATUS OF SUBJECTIVELY-EVALUATIVE DERIVATIVES (A CASE STUDY OF THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE)

Elena A. Makleeva<sup>1</sup>  
Vera A. Kosova<sup>1</sup>  
Darina Antonakova<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Kazan Federal University

<sup>2</sup> Prešov University in Prešov  
elena.makleeva@hotmail.com  
+79093081937

## ABSTRACT

The suffixes of subjective evaluation of nouns have high expression. For a long time, such formations were considered to be the forms of words and not independent words, as a result of which a tradition of not including them in dictionaries has been formed, which can cause difficulties in interpreting the meaning of these derivatives by persons for whom the Russian language is not native; in addition, even in lexicographic sources, such derivatives may have incorrect interpretations. All this determines the relevance of this research. The main methods used in the paper are a descriptive method, comparative analysis method, descriptive-analytical method. Modern linguistics tends to refer to the suffixes of subjective evaluation to word formation, however, the theoretical understanding of their status in the language is not always unambiguous and has a long history. Initially, several scholars believed them to be dependent, considering these names to be forms of inflection, rather than derivation. The article traces the evolution of determining the status of the suffixes of expressive evaluation beginning from the 18th century to the present. It is shown that from the point of view of modern linguistics, the formations of subjective evaluation are independent words, and not the forms of words and have a modifying word-formation meaning. However, it should be remembered that many suffixes of the Russian language are characterized by ambiguity, therefore the same suffix can act both as a modification and as a mutation.

**Keywords:** word-formation, suffixes of subjective evaluation, Kazan linguistic school, the category of subjective evaluation, modification.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Various issues of word formation are traditionally reflected in works by Russian (see, for example, [Akhmetzyanova, et al.], [Kolossova], [Miftakhova, et al.], [Ukhanova, et al.], [Volskaya, et al.]), and foreign scholars (see, for example, [Steriopolu], [Townsend], [Offord], [Hippisley], [Muller, et al.]). One of the important areas of word formation which has long attracted the attention of linguistic scientists is an expressive-evaluative derivation. So, even M. V. Lomonosov in *The Russian Grammar* singled out augmentative and “derogatory” nouns, he divided the latter into affectionate and contemptuous [Lomonosov, p. 103-105].

K.S. Aksakov, in *Background of the Russian Grammar*, discussing “diminutive endings”, writes that “the diminutive form draws attention not to the singularity of an object, but to its very form, and therefore to its appearance” [Aksakov, p. 63]. Speaking about evaluation that diminutive suffixes give to derivative words, the scholar comes to the conclusion that “the object becomes *милым*/ lovely”, that is, “apart from the size of the external, the diminutive expresses another, hence there is the meaning of *милого* / lovely: small is attached to lovely” [Aksakov, p. 65]. Speaking of evaluative-expressive suffixes, it is necessary, first, to determine their place in the language system. In modern linguistics, the so-called suffixes of subjective evaluation are usually referred to word formation, however, the theoretical understanding of their status in the language is not unambiguous and has a long history. Initially, several scholars believed them to be dependent, considering these nouns to be the forms of inflection, rather than derivation.

## 2.METHODS

The theoretical works of leading scholars in the field of word formation served as a methodological platform for the research. A given topic determines the choice of methods of linguistic analysis. The main methods used in the paper are the descriptive method, comparative analysis method, descriptive-analytical method.

## 3.RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For the first time, the category of the subjective evaluation was singled out as the grammatical category of the noun along with the grammatical categories of gender, number and case in the famous work by A.A. Shakhmatov *Russian Syntax* [Shakhmatov, p. 422]. In his judgment, this category is revealed “not morphologically ... but via word-formative suffixes” [Shakhmatov, p. 452]. The scholar suggests differentiating words with augmentative, diminutive, affectionate and derogative meanings. Shakhmatov writes that “the suffix formations related here do not modify the real meaning of the main word... therefore, these suffixes have a different meaning than other word-forming suffixes with the help of which the ideas that are completely different from the idea expressed by the corresponding main word are expressed, the ideas that are independent of it” [Shakhmatov, p. 453].

V.V. Vinogradov, relying on the work by K.S. Aksakov, A.A. Shakhmatov, A.A. Potebnya, says that the category of subjective evaluation of nouns finds “expression in the forms of the same word” and concludes that “diminutive and affectionate suffixes are the suffixes to be not word-formation suffixes, but form-formation ones” [Vinogradov, p. 101], since they only indicate the degree of evaluation, without changing the lexical meaning of the word. An important argument in favor of his theory is the fact that the derived word refers to the same grammatical gender as the forming one.

Vinogradov’s point of view is robust and is present in the latest research. So, T.F. Yefremova, describing the theoretical foundations of the compilation of *Explanatory Dictionary of the Word-Formation Units of the Russian Language*, writes, “Formative categories in this dictionary include: <...> diminutive, augmentative, derogative suffixal formations of nouns” [Yefremova, p. 8]. However, in this case, the prevailing morphemic nature of Russian word-formation which is expressed in its ability to express word-formation meanings by means of morphemes like grammatical ones is not considered.

According to the traditions of the Kazan Linguistic School (KLS), we refer the suffixes of subjective evaluation to word-derivation. V.A. Bogoroditsky in *Essays on Language Studies and the Russian Language* writes that “word formation refers to the part of the word called stem and inflection is concerned with the endings that are added to the stem when declining and conjugating. Thus, word formation is the study about the material side of words associated with their own meaning, word change is the study about the formal part of words through which words function in a sentence in one or another syntactic role” [Bogoroditsky 1939, p. 204].

An important role in identifying the linguistic nature of the phenomenon in the question was played by the concept of word-formation meanings set forth by the Czech linguist M. Dokulil [Dokulil, p. 1962]. The scholar identifies three types of derivative words: transpositional derivatives – the derivative word acquires a new categorial-grammatical meaning while preserving the lexical meaning; modification derivatives in which there is a slight change in the lexical meaning while maintaining part-word correspondence with the generating word; mutational derivatives that differ in significant transformation by the meaning of forming the word [Dokulil, p. 1962].

The word-formation status of the category of subjective evaluation is confirmed by the fact that it does not have an obligatory expression, while the main criterion for distinguishing a grammatical category is the obligatory expression of a corresponding meaning. In modern linguistics, the entire set of Russian derivatives of nouns united by a commonality of evaluative semantics and expressive-characterizing functions is considered as a highly productive word-formation category of subjective evaluation, related to the modification type [Zemskaya, p. 1992].

Y.S. Azarkh, in a fundamental historical study *The Problem of Relation Between Formation of Word and Formation of Form in the History of the Russian Language (Noun)*, writes that, when modified, the derivative word includes the lexical meaning of the forming word. The derivative and the forming word are in the relations of the privative opposition. The derived word receives an additional semantic feature. Moreover, the members of a word-formation pair belong to one part of speech and one lexico-grammatical category. Nouns have the following features: diminutiveness, augmentation, subjective evaluation, collectiveness, individuality, “femininity”, and lack of maturity [Azarkh, p. 68].

Summarizing the results of many years of research by various scholars, the authors of *Russian Grammar* distinguish the modification meanings of “femininity, lack of maturity, similarity, collectivity, singularity; subjective-evaluative meanings; this also includes nouns with the suffixes of stylistic modification ” in addition to the suffix nouns, and the essence of the word-formation modification “consists in adding an additional element of meaning to the basic meaning of the motivating word” [Russian Grammar, p. 180]. The derivatives with the following suffixes belong to the nouns with a modification subjective-evaluative meaning in modern Russian language:

-ик / ik, -чик / chik, -ок/-ёк /ok(yok), -ек / yek, -ышек / yshek, -ец / yets, -к(а) / k(a), -очк(а) / ochk(a), -иц(а) / its(a), -ц(а) / ts(a), -ц(о)/-ец(о) / (ye)ts(o), -ц(е)/-иц(е) / (i)ts(e), -к(о) / k(o), -ышк(о) / yshk(o), -ечк(о) / yechk(o), -ик(о) / ik(o), -ишк- / ishk-, -ушк- / ushk-, -ушек / ushek, -оньк-/-еньк- / onk/yenk, -онк- / onk, -ёшк(а) / yoshk(a), -очк(а)/-ечк(а) /ochk(a) yechk(a), -ул(я) / ul(ya), -ун(я)/-юн(я) / u(yu)n(ya), -ус(я)/-юс(я) u(yu)s(ya), -уш(а)/-юш(а) / u(yu)sh(a), -аш(а)/-яш(а) a(ya)sh(a), -ан(я)/-ян(я) / a(ya)n(ya), -ищ- / ishch.

The derivatives of this chain express such derivational meanings as:

a) diminutive meaning which, as a rule, is accompanied by affectionate or derogative expression, and in the case of impossibility of size qualification, the meaning is only affectionate or only derogative; it is expressed via the suffixes -ок / ok, -ик / ik, -чик / chik, -ец yets, -к(а)/-очк(а) / k(a)/ochk(a), -иц(а) / its(a), -ц(о)/-ец(о) / ts(o)/yets(o), -к(о) / k(o), -ишк- / ishk, -ушк(а) / ushk(a), -онк- / onk, -ёшк- / yoshk;

b) diminutive meaning which is not accompanied by tones of expression; “it is expressed as the meaning of type in the words with suffixes -етт(а) / ett(a) (симфониетта), -етк(а) / etk(a) (статуэтка, вагонетка), and as the meaning of the subtype – in the words with the suffixes -к(а) / k(a) (картинка, батарейка), -ок / ok (шумок), -иц(а) / its(a) (частица)” [Russian Grammar, p. 264];

c) affectionate meaning which is not accompanied by diminution; it is expressed in the words with the unstressed suffix -ушк- / ushk, the suffixes -оньк- / onk, -очк- / ochk, -ул(я) / ul(ya), -ун(я) / un(ya), -ус(я) / us(ya), -уш(а) ush(a), -ан(я) / an(ya), -аш(а) / ash(a), -ик / ik, -ок / ok, -ук / uk;

d) augmentative meaning: “when motivated by the nouns – by the names of the objects that are qualified by size, a large object is designated via the words with this meaning”, when motivated by “other nouns – an object that far exceeds the usual normal properties of an object designated by a motivating word”; augmentative meaning can be expressed by means of the suffixes -ищ- / -isch, ин(а) / in(a) [Russian grammar, p. 264].

#### 4.SUMMARY

The study of the literature of the subject makes it possible to state about the debatable nature of the considered category. For a long time, many issues connected with the study of the suffixes of subjective evaluation remained unresolved. For long periods of time, when determining the linguistic status of the formations of subjective evaluation, the viewpoint of the grammatical nature of names proper dominated. Several authoritative scholars call such derivatives forms, rather than independent words. However, at present, the dominant viewpoint is the idea of the formations of subjective evaluation as independent words. Representatives of the Kazan Linguistic School adhere to this position.

So, according to E.A. Balalykina and G.A. Nikolayev, word-building meaning is “the meaning of the word-formation chain, expressed by one form or another of the formants in the presence of word-formation relations between the forming word and the formative” [Balalykina, Nikolayev, p. 71]. Unlike the lexical meaning, the word-formation meaning is typical, and it differs from the grammatical one in that it reflects the relationship between the derivational and derived stems, its content is “typical for this word-building pattern and can be reproduced in other word-formation pairs” [Balalykina, Nikolayev, p. 72]. G.A. Nikolayev and E.A. Balalykina distinguish the following main types of word-formation meanings in nouns:

a) in derivatives motivated by verbs the meanings such as the carrier of a processual feature and the meaning of an abstract processual feature are presented,

b) in derivatives motivated by adjectives the meanings such as the carrier of a feature and the name of an abstract feature are presented,

c) in derivatives motivated by nouns the general word-formation meaning is presented – the carrier of an objective feature [Balalykina, Nikolayev, p. 76–82].

In addition, the authors, speaking of the basic modifying word-formation meanings, along with the meanings of “femininity”, “lack of maturity”, collectivity,

singularity, distinguish subjective-evaluative meanings: “diminutive, affectionate, augmentative with additional emotionally expressive evaluation” [Balalykina, Nikolayev, p. 82]. One of the most significant works related to the topic of interest is the doctoral dissertation by S.G. Sheydayeva *The Category of Subjective Evaluation in the Russian language*. The author conducted a systematic study of subjective-evaluative formations of different parts of speech as the members of a single language category. The researcher dwells on the linguistic status of the formations of subjective evaluation. Having described in detail the history of the issue, S.G. Sheydayeva concludes that the formations of subjective evaluation “are independent words” [Sheydayeva, p. 21], they act as words “with a modifying word-formation meaning” [Sheydayeva, p. 22].

## 5.CONCLUSION

Understanding the issue under study from these positions is effective and allows distinguishing between different functional variants of morphemes. Thus, the functional morphemes analysis is possible only if the status of the vocabulary of subjective evaluation is clearly defined. The functional approach prescribes the following logic for the study of derivatives with the suffixes of evaluation.

First of all, it is necessary to carry out a comprehensive semasiological analysis of nouns with the so-called suffixes of subjective evaluation, which enables to distinguish the nouns with the meaning of subjective evaluation from the derivatives where this meaning is presented as an additional connotative component or is completely absent. The next stage involves a synthesis of the results of the onimasiological analysis. This will make it possible to draw the conclusions about the system status of noun suffixes, because the comprehensive analysis of the category of subjective evaluation can be done only after a detailed functional analysis of all derivatives traditionally included in it. So, in our previous works, a detailed functional analysis of derivatives with the suffixes -уш- /-ush-, -ух- / -ukh-, -ушк- / -ushk- was carried out, as a result of which functional-semantic variants of the mentioned suffixes were identified and described (see, for example, [Makleyeva]).

## 6.ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

## REFERENCES

1. Akhmetzyanova L.M., Gilazetdinova G.Kh. Lexico-semantic and linguo-stylistical analysis of A. Vvedensky's and D. Kharms' art texts // *XLinguae*. – 2018. – Volume 11, Issue 2. – Pp. 455–470.
2. Kolosova E. Variation in the verb formation in the Russian language // *Current issues of the Russian language teaching XII* P. 185 - 193 - *Актуальные проблемы обучения русскому языку XII* / A. Sokolova (ed.). Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2016. P. 185-193. ISBN 978-80-210-8403-2. DOI 10.5817/CZ.MUNI.P210-8403-2016.



3. Miftakhova A.N., Varlamova M.Y. Computer terms as a result of derivational processes in the group of nouns denoting a person // EDULEARN17 Proceedings 9th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies July 3rd-5th, 2017 — Barcelona, Spain. – P. 5721–5725.
4. Ukhanova T.V., Kosova V.A. Russian adjectives with confixes from an anthropocentric viewpoint//Journal of Language and Literature. - 2016. - Vol.7, Is.2. – P.328-331.
5. Volskaya A.S., Korneyeva T.A., Markova T.D. Word-formation, morphemic, etymological analysis in school // Amazonia Investiga. Vol. 7, Núm. 15 (2018). – pp. 190-195.
6. Steriopolo O. Form and Function of Expressive Morphology: A Case Study of Russian / O. Steriopolo. – 2008. – 204 P. – URL: [http://www.steriopolo.com/download/FORM\\_AND\\_FUNCTION\\_ed.pdf](http://www.steriopolo.com/download/FORM_AND_FUNCTION_ed.pdf)
7. Townsend Ch.E. Russian Word formation / Ch. E. Townsend. – Slavica Pub, 1975. – 272 p.
8. Offord D. Using Russian: A Guide to Contemporary Usage / D. Offord. – Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 205 p.
9. Hippiisley A.R. Indexed Stems and Russian Word Formation: A Network Morphology Account of Russian Personal Nouns / A.R. Hippiisley. – 1998. – Linguistics, Volume 36, Issue 6, Pages 1093–1124.
10. Word-Formation: An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe // Ed. by Muller P.O., Ohnheiser I., Olsen S., Rainer F. – V. 4. – Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 2016. – 702 P.
11. Lomonosov M.V. Russian Grammar / M.V. Lomonosov. – Saint Petersburg, 1788. – 214 p. – URL: [http://elib.gnpbu.ru/text/lomonosov\\_rossiyskaya-grammatika\\_1788/go,212;fs,1/](http://elib.gnpbu.ru/text/lomonosov_rossiyskaya-grammatika_1788/go,212;fs,1/), free.
12. Aksakov K.S. The Background of Russian Grammar. Part 1, Issue 1 / K.S. Aksakov – M.: published by L. Stepanova, 1860. – 176 p. – URL: <http://e-heritage.ru/ras/view/publication/general.html?id=43891556>, free.
13. Shakhmatov A.A. Russian Syntax / A.A. Shakhmatov. – M.:The URSS Editorial, 2001. – 624 p.
14. Vinogradov V. V. The Russian Language (Grammatical Theory of Word) / V.V. Vinogradov. – the 3d edition, revised. – M.: Vysshaya Shkola, 1986. – 639 p. – URL: <http://slovari.ru/default.aspx?s=0&p=5306>, free.
15. Yefremova T.F. Explanatory Dictionary of Word-Formation Units of the Russian Language. – M.: AST: Astrel, 2005. – 638 p.
16. Bogoroditsky V.A. Essays on Language Study and the Russian Language / A.V. Bogoroditsky. – 4th edition, revised. – M.: Uchpedgiz, 1939. – 224 p.
17. Dokulil M. Tvoření slov v češtině. Teorie odvozování slov / M. Dokulil. – Praha: Academia, 1962. – 1. díl. – 263 s.
18. Zemskaya E.A. Word Formation as Activity / E.A. Zemskaya. – M.: Nauka, 1992. – 222 p.

19. Azarkh Y. S. The Problem of Relation Between Formation of Word and Formation of Form in the History of the Russian Language (Noun): Dissertation for Doctor of Philology / Y.S. Azarkh. – Moscow, 1983. – 451 p.
20. Russian Grammar: In 2 Volumes / Edited by N. Y. Shvedov. – M.: Nauka, 1980. – Vol. 1: Phonetics. Phonology. Stress. Intonation. Word Formation. Morphology. – 783 p.
21. Balalykina E.A., Nikolayev G. A. Russian Derivation: Manual / E.A. Balalykina, G.A. Nikolayev. – Kazan: The Kazan University Press, 1985. – 184 p.
22. Sheydayeva S.G. The Category of Subjective Evaluation in the Russian Language: Dissertation for Doctor of Philology / S.G. Sheydayeva. – Izhevsk, 1998. – 275 p.
23. Makleyeva E.A. Functional and Semantic Potential of the Derivatives with the Suffixes -уш- / ush, -ух- / ukh , -ушк- / ushk: Author's Thesis for Candidate of Philology. – Kazan, 2018. – 23 p.