

KOSTIANTYN MIZIN

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4449-0067>

Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi Hryhorii Skovoroda State Pedagogical University

LIUBOV LETIUCHA

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0481-850X>

Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi Hryhorii Skovoroda State Pedagogical University

OLEKSANDR PETROV

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4641-3559>

Vinnitsia Mykhailo Kotsiubinsky State Pedagogical University

REPRESENTATION OF SUBJECTIVELY-EVALUATIVE DERIVATES IN MODERN RUSSIAN: VERBAL EVALUATIVES

KEYWORDS: category of subjective evaluation, evaluative, derivative, verb

ABSTRACT: A verb, as one of the basic parts of speech, is the primary concern of derivation process-oriented studies. However, verb-based subjectively-evaluative derivatives have not been the object of research yet. The article discusses potential capacities of verbs to form subjectively-evaluative derivatives on the level of derivation in modern Russian. To avoid terminological confusion and to distinguish axiological vs. derivational evaluation the latter is represented by the term *evaluative*. The study argues an unjustified idea that the suffix *-ahy-* is an evaluative of subjective evaluation. These verbs are referred to the derivatives of objective evaluation. We have provided a set of factors for the classification of subjectively-evaluative verbal derivatives, according to which they were classified. The analysis of language and speech material has allowed us to find the ways evaluative verbs are formed and the register of word forming affixes as a means of representing category of evaluation in the morpheme and word forming structure of the word.

1. Introduction

Contemporary linguistic science enjoys considerable knowledge of the category of evaluation (Abdikerimova 2015) and about the means of expressing values in speech (Kiklewicz 2013; Marinova 2017). However ways of implementing of the category of evaluation requires further research. So far, in Russian linguistic studies, lexicologists have focused on the category of evaluation from the perspective of the connotative meaning of a word (Volf 2002). At the same time a speaker's statement may contain a parametric evaluation which includes such units as an object's size, degree of a feature or an action, manifestation etc. A review of vast linguistic literature on this issue suggests that these days the peculiarity

of the category of evaluation remains open for further investigation. Unlike axiological evaluation in lexicology, evaluation on the derivational level correlates with the term *evaluativity*¹ (from the Eng. *evaluation*). Therefore, an evaluative meaning is a meaning which is either added to the semantics of a word due to the size and evaluation affixation operators or due to other derivate means, while the unit that carries an evaluative meaning is defined here as *e v a l u a t i v e*.

In our opinion, a circle of evaluative lexemes, with regard to which part of speech they belong to, is wider than it is commonly believed. This made it necessary to study the verb as a basis of subjective evaluatives. As one of the major parts of speech, the verb is in the center of the study of derivation processes. However, verb-motivated subjectively-evaluative derivatives have not been in the focus of some special study. In addition, as language has a parallel response to changes in society there are some aspects about linguistic axiology to be clarified. We have summarized some observations on the issue of derivative characteristics of verbal evaluative lexemes.

The reason why the research of subjectively-evaluative derivates is so complicated can be related to the fact that a verbal word possesses a multi-layered semantic structure. As a result, there are

such “mysterious” formations that do not fit into the commonly established schemes of grammatical forms. [...] These formations include verb forms ending in *-ануть* (*двигануть, стукануть*, etc.) (Markov 2006, 1).

Based on the above mentioned considerations, the purpose of our study is, first, to define the derivative potential of Russian verbs in terms of their ability to form subjectively-evaluative derivatives with regard to the distinction between the notions of “objective” vs. “subjective” evaluation; second, to develop verbal evaluatives classification according to their methods of formation; third, to establish ways the category of evaluation is represented in the morphemic derivational structure of the word.

2. Evaluation characteristics and types of verbal evaluative formation

The analysis of the material, involving explanatory dictionaries, fiction and journalistic texts, oral speech, made it possible to reveal that the number of verbal evaluatives with subjectively-evaluative semantics is smaller compared to other parts of speech (Letiucha 2014). The sphere of their usage is the colloquial style and

¹ Evaluative morphology dates back to English linguistics in 1990s of the 20th century. The object of its research is morphological, primarily derivational means for expressing evaluation (Prieto 2005; Stump 1993).

common language where their use is also limited situationally (e.g., communicating with children and animals). However, some linguists at times tend to increase the number of derivatives at times. In our opinion, it may be explained by the equation of the terms “subjective” vs. “objective” evaluation.

Derivatives of subjective vs. objective evaluation are related to different word formation processes and absence / presence of a new meaning. Mutational formants add an evaluative meaning (qualitative or quantitative) to the lexical meaning of a word while modification formants attach emotional and stylistic meanings (Luk’yanova 1986).

V. Markov grounded the need

for a special category of the subjective evaluation in the verb system in the same way as is done for nouns and adjectives. Formations with the suffix *-апу-* [...] should be referred to this category in particular (2006, 14).

We are not inclined to refer verbs with the suffix *-апу-* so categorically to the verbs of subjective evaluation, considering Markov’s conclusions rather hasty. First, without debating on the issues of modality theory, we would like to point out some well-known facts. Most linguists differentiate between subjective and objective modality. This problem was studied to full extent by E. Benvenist (1974, 292-294), who claimed the language and speech to be subjective by their nature. In this respect the opinion of Y. Stepanov (2004, 241-242) is considered the most distinguished. He supposes that modality is neither subjective nor objective, but it is an objective-relative category.

We incline to think that absolutizing any property of modality is not quite acceptable. Surely, language is subjective by its nature but at the same time it has a spectrum of means to convey subjectiveness as well as objectiveness including derivation of valuating verbal evaluatives. The modality theory, developed by Ch. Bally (2001, 69-82) in West European linguistics and by V. Vinogradov (1975, 55) in Russian linguistics, considers an emotional and expressive evaluation as one of the types of modality i.e. a subject’s attitude towards the objects of reality.

Therefore, it gives us grounds to single out the subjectively-evaluative meaning similarly to the subjective modal meaning. This study is based on the “conventional”, “the most common, primary group” of subjectively-modal meanings, referenced in “The Russian Grammar” (RG, 215):

Their [...] grouping is based on contrasting evaluation-characterizing and evaluation proper meanings. Following the authors of “Russian grammar”, to the evaluation-characterizing subjectively-evaluative verbal meanings we refer the meanings that “combine an ability to express a subjective attitude to the utterance with the characteristics which can be regarded as non-subjective, conditioned by the fact itself” (Ibidem, 215).

This can be characterized according to “the completeness or incompleteness of detection (intensity² values, completeness, a high degree of display or, alternatively, weakness, incomplete detection)” (Ibidem, 215). Based on this, we choose to consider an evaluation-characterizing subjectively-evaluative verbal meaning close to an objective evaluation.

Evaluation proper meanings of subjective modality contain “a speaker’s personal, subjective attitude to the content of the message [...] together with a particular emotional attitude, positive or negative evaluation” (Ibidem, 216). We refer verbal evaluatives with this particular meaning to the cases of subjective evaluation.

Secondly, the authors of the “Russian Grammar“, analyzing the quantitative and temporal modes of action, state that while forming verbs which imply one act or briefness, “it is colloquial³ verbs with the suffix *-ану-* that more vividly signify the expressivity of a one-act verb: *долбить – долбануть, рубить – рубануть*” (Ibidem, 597). Indeed, there is an expressive seme in the semantics of the analyzed verbs. However, all these verbs are characterized by the seme of ‘degree of intensity’ (as a type of parametric feature), and the expressivity is achieved due to the fact that these verbs have a stylistic label “colloquial” i.e. there is a stylistic rather than emotive evaluation. Depending on the lexical meaning of the motivating verb and the context, these derivatives may include not a subjective evaluation but an objective one (evaluative-characterizing meaning). If we turn to the interpretation of these derivatives, we can find the following: “*Стегануть – сильно стегнуть*” (SRYA, 258); “*Хлестануть – сильно ударить чем-л. гибким; хлестнуть*” (SRYA, 603); “*Рвануть – резко, сильно дернуть*” (SRYA, 687) and others.

Since “the suffix *-ану-* can’t be considered an allomorph of the suffix *-ну-*, because there is no full semantic identity between them” (Ulukhanov 2017, 3), it is appropriate to think that the derived word has a different meaning compared with the motivator and has a separate dictionary entry⁴. A mutational formant gives an evaluative meaning of quantity to the lexical meaning of the word. By using such verbal derivatives a speaker primarily emphasizes a real change in the original meaning of the word rather than the speaker’s attitude to the subject of speech or the addressee, e.g.:

- (1) У меня и диплом медицинский есть... И с маху хлестнул (Елена Хаецкая).
- (2) Злыбин снял со стены хлыст и, изогнув его, изо всей силы стеганул по воздуху (Лидия Чарская).
- (3) Да, мы готовы рвануть и догнать страны Запада (NKRYA).

² Our spacing.

³ Our spacing.

⁴ There is a separate dictionary entry for words like these. However, only a few modern explanatory dictionaries of the Russian language contain them.

3. Context and intonation influence

The contextual situation and intonation organization of utterances are a bright means of marking the speaker's attitude to the subject of speech. They are also important factors determining the semantics of subjectively-evaluative verbal evaluatives in Russian. On the one hand, depending on these determinants evaluative verbal derivatives become a source of information about the speaker him/herself, their positive and negative character traits.

On the other hand, by ignoring the influence of context and intonation some authors, in our opinion, make disputable conclusions related to the definition of subjective vs. objective evaluation of the verbs. To prove that verbs with *-ану-* suffixes relate to subjective-evaluative verbs, Markov makes an example: “[...] Compare «ну и играем же мы», in the sense of playing with enthusiasm and passion” (2006, 15). The author also develops the idea that the meaning of the single action in this case is, to some extent, similar to the meaning of diminution or augmentation which can signify affection, derogation, contempt and irony.

Indeed, the fragment *ну и играем же мы* can have some qualitative shades of meaning, listed by the author, but only in the context Markov proposed (in this case, it is equivalent to the sentence). However, it is not the verb with the affix *-ану-* that is used as a means of expressing emotions but the context and intonation. Emotive sense is explicated on the syntagmatic level as an exclamatory particle *ну и* as well as the intensifying particle *же*. The modus meanings they explicate penetrate the dictum part of an utterance and together with the parametric feature ‘degree of intensity’ of the verb *играем* complicates its semantic structure.⁵ Beyond the context this verb has only objective evaluation in the form of a parametric feature ‘degree of intensity’.

The meaning of the sentences is emotionally marked by the intonation of the context that consists of interrogative or exclamatory sentences:

- (4) Ребята пробовали гривенники зубами, упивались их блеском, звоном, и у кого-то вырвалось: – Вить, *играем*? Витьку будто на воздух подняло (Николай Ляшко).
- (5) Железка! Всякие супчики бывают – можно *игрануть*! (Борис Лавренев).

⁵ It is noteworthy to mention the presupposition analysis of particle semantic identification. It is based on the opposition of propositional meaning and “modal frame” (the term by A. Wierzbicka) of an utterance. This analysis was first used by Ch. Fillmore who stated that the meaning of a sentence consists of two semantically simple propositions. One of them implies the main information content of utterance, and other explicates connotative meaning (Arutyunova 1973, 123), carried by particles as well.

In these examples, the verbal derivatives in letter-spacing may have different evaluative intention depending on the subject's communicative intentions. Thus, we qualify them as subjectively-evaluative verbal evaluatives.

4. Classification of subjectively-evaluative verbal evaluatives

Taking these factors into account, we propose the following classification of subjectively-evaluative verbal evaluatives: 1) emotives where emotive and evaluative components are actualized; 2) evaluatives proper in the lexical meaning of which one can observe simultaneous intensification of a feature, called generating basis, and subjective evaluation of the reality fact. The material we classified has helped to outline a register of derivative affixes of subjectively-evaluative verbs, e.g.:

- (6) Баю-бай, огонь горит, деткам *спатоньки* велит... (Марина Дяченко, Сергей Дяченко).
- (7) Все-таки 7.42 АМ. Пора *спаточки!* (NKRYA).
- (8) Кому *сказатеньки*, Как важно жила барынька? (Владимир Хлебников).
- (9) Я с детства люблю, как говорят у нас в Одессе: “Вкусно *покушанькать*” (“Караван историй”, 2003/3).
- (10) Значит, в магазин мне идти, *жранькать* готовить вам? (“Новый мир”, 2003/6).

These evaluative derivatives are derived from verbs with suffixes *-оньк-*, *-очк-*, *-еньк-*, *-аньк-* which add a shade of affection to their general meaning. A dimensional component is not expressed. These subjectively-evaluative verbal derivatives (as a result of primary derivation) with emotive and evaluative component of affection, are classified here as modification type emotives of lexical derivation. Besides, these examples demonstrate a potential for increasing communicative situations where such emotives are used. Lexicographical literature, fixing this kind of verbatives, mention that they belong to the children's speech or are used in communication with children (first two sentences). At the same time, the next examples prove the fact that this type of derivatives is also used in the speech of adults. After studying the use of such derivatives in speech, we noticed that they are primarily used as emotives with a hypocoristic meaning. The derivatives with the shade of ridicule and disapproval (i.e. a full range of pejoratively coloured units) mainly equated to irony are not so commonly found:

- (11) А второе или третье места... Это все для успокоения души, что б не *плаканькать* (forum.pskovonline.ru “Конкурс Евровидения”).
- (12) Ученые Гарварда рассказали, что нужно *кушанькать* (NKRYA).

Due to the fact that these derivatives belong to non-literary speech, such formations are not described in any authoritative sources, so in this study we offer our own version of defining a verbal morph of subjective evaluation *-аньк-*. The verbal evaluatives *покушанькать* and *жранькать* have a common meaning “to eat”, but as it appears it does not matter much, because the speech has similar formations with different semantics: the first is motivated by the verb *покушать*, the second – *жрать*. Both derivating stems end in the vowel *а-* which is an infinitive suffix. We can assume that the suffixal morph *-аньк-* is an infix “inserted” into the morphemic structure of the word before the categorial affix like *-еньк-/оньк-* in adverbs, e.g.: *крепко* → *креп-+-еньк-+-о*, *жрать* → *жр-+-аньк-+-а(ть)*. It is possible that sound and letter specific form of the suffix with the initial “а” results from regressive assimilation, so-called phonetic attraction.

“The Great Dictionary of the Russian Language” by S. Kuznetsov (2003, 55) contains: “*Бай-бай, баю-бай* – 1. int. used for cradling a baby as a chorus in the lullaby. 2. in a tale (when referring to a child). Sleep. It is time to bye-bye: *Баиньки*, int. in the function of the predicate = бай-бай (2 meaning)”. This lexeme is commonly found in the language of fiction, e.g.:

- (13) Олечка, лапочка, ну пора ж *баиньки*, – касаясь ее ушка, шептал он, одновременно заговорщицки подмигивая двум девушкам за спиной Максима (Семен Данилюк).
- (14) Лезь, Ванюшенька, лезь, милый. Лезь *баиньки*. Давай (Василий Шукшин).

In the first sentence, the word *пора* as a predicate requires an infinitive, a noun in the dative case, or a noun with the preposition *на*, and in the second sentence, the word *баиньки* is an adverbial modifier of purpose. We refer this evaluative to the infinitive considering it as a subjective evaluation emotive with the suffix *-иньк-* of a modified type of lexical derivation with a hypocoristic meaning.

In our opinion, reduplication derived verbs can be referred to evaluative verbal derivatives, e.g.:

- (15) “*Бегу-бегу*”, – донеслось откуда-то сверху (NKRYA).
- (16) “*Молчу-молчу*”, – отозвалась женщина (Дарья Донцова).

This type of formation by duplicating the whole word actualizes a parametric feature represented by the seme ‘action identification’ and this defines them as intensives of objective evaluation resulted from mutational derivation. Technically, the reduplicants are free from emotivity and expressivity but this can be expressed by non-verbal means: mimics, gestures and intonation. In this particular case we mean evaluatives proper as an intensification of the feature, called by the motivator

молчу, бегу ('action intensification') makes it quite appropriate for this communicative situation, in which the speaker expresses his unwillingness to object, i.e. there is an actualization of the evaluative seme, as well which is specified by intonation. Moreover, derivatives, created by reduplication, serve a restrictive function as they are used in colloquial speech.

5. Conclusion

The analysis of theoretical and practical material proves that derivative representation of verbal subjectively-evaluative derivatives require more profound and exact description. We refer the verbs ending in *-ану-* to representants of objective evaluation as they signify some real changes in the initial word rather than an attitude to the utterance. This way they specify its qualitative definiteness. Dictionary definitions may accompany such derivatives with expanded interpretation.

Evaluation characteristics of verbal evaluatives, contextual situation and intonation are considered in this article as crucial factors for classifying subjectively-objective verbal evaluatives. According to what has been mentioned above, we have offered a classification of subjectively-evaluative verbal evaluatives: emotives and evaluatives proper.

The classified and analysed language and speech material allowed us to find out the register of derivative affixes of subjectively-evaluative verbs: the suffixes *-оньк-/-еньк-* widely used for forming nouns, adjectives, adverbs; verbal suffixes proper *-аньк-, -иньк*. These derivatives are marked with the label "diminutive" in lexicographical literature. However, we admit that evaluative verbal derivatives can have a negative evaluation which mainly depends on a communicative situation and is expressed by intonation and non-verbal means.

References

- ABDIKERIMOVA, G. (2015), *Kategoriya otsenki kak sostavlyayushchaya kartiny mira v sredstvakh massovoy informatsii*. In: *Przegład Wschodnioeuropejski*. VI/1, 197-206. [Абдикеримова, Г. (2015), Категория оценки как составляющая картины мира в средствах массовой информации. В: *Przegład Wschodnioeuropejski*. VI/1, 197-206.]
- ARUTYUNOVA, N. D. (1973), *Idei sintaksisa i semantiki v rabotakh Ch. Fillmora*. In: *Voprosy yazykoznanija*. 1, 117-124. [Арутюнова, Н. Д. (1973), Идеи синтаксиса и семантики в работах Ч. Филлмора. В: *Вопросы языкознания*. 1, 117-124.]
- BALLY, SH. (2001), *Obschaya lingvistika i voprosy frantsuzskogo yazyika*. Moskva. [Балли, Ш. (2001), *Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка*. Москва.]
- BENVENIST, E. (1974), *Obschaya lingvistika*. Moskva. [Бенвенист, Э. (1974), *Общая лингвистика*. Москва.]

- KIKLEWICZ, A. (2013), Sotsial'nyye tsennosti v sisteme sovremennoy kul'tury. In: Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski. IV, 273-294. [Kiklewicz, A. (2013), Социальные ценности в системе современной культуры. В: Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski. IV, 273-294.]
- KUZNETSOV, S. A. (red.) (2003), Bol'shoj tolkovyy slovar' russkogo yazyka. Sankt-Peterburg. [Кузнецов, С. А. (ред.) (2003), Большой толковый словарь русского языка. Санкт-Петербург.]
- LETIUCHA, L. P. (2014), Otsenka kak element yazykovoy kartiny mira: vozmozhnosti glagolov russkogo yazyka v plane porozhdeniya otsenochnykh derivatov. In: Filologicheskoye obrazovaniye v Rossiysko-evropeyskom obrazovatel'nom prostranstve. Surgut, 82-85. [Летючая, Л. П. (2014), Оценка как элемент языковой картины мира: возможности глаголов русского языка в плане порождения оценочных дериватов. В: Филологическое образование в Российско-европейском образовательном пространстве. Surgut, 82-85.]
- LUK'YANOVA, N. A. (1986), Ekspressivnaya leksika razgovornogo upotrebleniya (problemy semantiki) [avtoreferat dissertatsii]. Sverdlovsk. [Лукьянова, Н. А. (1986), Экспрессивная лексика разговорного употребления (проблемы семантики) [автореферат диссертации]. Свердловск.]
- MARINOVA, Ye. (2017), Tsennostnyye orientiry novogo vremeni skvoz' prizmu aktual'noy sochetayemosti slova. In: Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski. VIII/2, 273-282. [Маринова, Е. (2017), Ценностные ориентиры нового времени сквозь призму актуальной сочетаемости слова. В: Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski. VIII/2, 273-282.]
- MARKOV, V. M. (2006), Kategoriya sub'yektivnoy otsenki i russkiy glagol. W: Uchenyye zapiski Kazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta 148/2, 14-22. [Марков, В. М. (2006), Категория субъективной оценки и русский глагол. В: Ученые записки Казанского государственного университета. 148/2, 14-22.]
- NKRYA (2018), Natsional'nyy korpus russkogo yazyka. In: <http://www.ruscorpora.ru>. [НКРЯ (2018), Национальный корпус русского языка. В: <http://www.ruscorpora.ru> [доступ: 19 IV 2018].]
- PRIETO, V. (2005), Spanish Evaluative Morphology: Pragmatic, Sociolinguistic, and Semantic Issues. Florida.
- RG (1980), Russkaya grammatika v 2-kh chastyakh. Moskva. [РГ (1980), Русская грамматика в 2-х частях. Москва.]
- SRYA (1988), Slovar' russkogo yazyka v 4-kh tomakh. Moskva. [СРЯ (1988), Словарь русского языка в 4-х томах. Москва.]
- STEPANOV, Yu. S. (2004), Imena, predikaty, predlozheniya (semiologicheskaya grammatika). Moskva. [Степанов, Ю. С. (2004), Имена, предикаты, предложения (семиологическая грамматика). Москва.]
- ULUHANOV, I. S. (2017), Glagolnoe slovoobrazovanie sovremennoy russkogo yazyka. T. 2: Glagoly, motivirovannyye glagolami. Moskva. [Улуханов, И. С. (2017), Глагольное словообразование современного русского языка. Т. 2: Глаголы, мотивированные глаголами. Москва.]
- STUMP, G. (1993), How Peculiar Is Evaluative Morphology? In: Journal of Linguistics. 29/1, 1-36.
- VINOGRADOV, V. V. (1975), Izbrannyye trudy: Issledovaniya po russkoy grammatike. Moskva. [Виноградов, В. В. (1975), Избранные труды: Исследования по русской грамматике. Москва.]
- VOLF, E. M. (2002), Funktsionalnaya semantika otsenki. Lingvisticheskoye nasledie XX veka. Moskva. [Вольф, Е. М. (2002), Функциональная семантика оценки. Лингвистическое наследие XX века. Москва.]

