

3. Hornáková, A. Motivation to learn professional foreign language // Sučasni doslidžennia z inozemnoi filologii.- Užhorod 2008, 723- 724 p.
4. Javor M. Slobodomurárske hnutie v českých krajinách a v Uhorsku v 18. storočí. – Prešov: Vydavateľstvo PU, 2009. ISBN 978-80-8068-971-1.
5. Javor M. Slobodomurárske hnutie v Košiciach do r. 1978. Prešov: FF PU, 2009. ISBN 978-80-8068-985-8.
6. Pažuchová, M. Nemecké slová v slovenčine a slovenských nárečiach. Prešov 1978.
7. Uherová, Z. Kommunikation am Telefon // Sučasni doslidžennia z inozemnoi filologii. - Užhorod 2008, 350 – 352 p.

Zusammenfassung

Die Lehnwörter aus dem Deutschen ins Slowakische werden auf einzelnen Sprachebenen in die Zielsprache den inneren Sprachgesetzmäßigkeiten nach eingegliedert. Auf der semantischen Ebene gibt es Einheiten der Fachlexik, die didaktisch im Fremdsprachenunterricht eingesetzt werden kann, weil die Lehnwörter teilweise Fremdsprachenkompetenz darstellen.

PROPERTIES OF EVALUATIVE SUFFIXES IN RUSSIAN

Panocová R.

P.J. Šafárik University, Košice, Slovakia

In linguistics, the term evaluation may be used in Grandi's words [2005:188] „when referring to various linguistic constructions concerning different levels of analysis of languages: phenomena of phonetic iconicity [see Gregová 2009], derivation by affixes, reduplication processes, apocope, etc.“. The term evaluative morphology refers predominantly to morphological processes of diminutivisation and augmentativisation. It is well-known that diminutivised forms of words in many languages primarily indicate positive or negative evaluation and not a small size. Scalise [1984] proposed to establish evaluative morphology as an independent component in his stratal conception of morphology with its intermediate position between derivational and inflectional morphology [see also Körtevélyessy 2009]. According to Scalise [1984:132-133] evaluative suffixes change the semantics of the base, allow the consecutive application of more than one rule of the same type, and at every application the result is an existent word, their position is always external with respect to other derivational suffixes and internal with respect to inflectional ones, they allow repeated application of the same rule, they do not change the syntactic category of the base, that is the word-class, nor the syntactic features or the subcategorisation frame of the base.

Independent and/or separate category of evaluative suffixes suggested by Scalise [1984] does not necessarily hold universally for all world languages. Evidence based on

the data from certain languages, e.g. Fula [Katamba 2003] points to the inflectional nature of diminutives, whereas the data from other languages are clearly in favour of derivational character of diminution, e.g. Dutch [Booij 1996]. Bybee [1985] expressed the model of morphological continuum with pure inflection and pure derivation at two ends. Combining and developing further Scalise's and Bybee's approach Melissaropoulou and Ralli [2007] suggest that diminutive suffixes are placed between inflection and derivation in a continuum and the fact whether they are closer to one end or another is a matter of linguistic variation and of the properties of the particular suffix. This accounts for the fact that certain processes or features may be derivational in one language but inflectional in another. The authors also suggest that word formation processes and affixes occur in a scalar hierarchy within the continuum, which explains why some diminutive suffixes do not behave like typical derivational suffixes.

Traditionally, Russian linguists including Vinogradov, Aksakov, Šachmatov [all cited in Vinogradov, 1986:100-101] consider evaluative suffixes in Russian inflectional (формообразующие) not derivational (словообразующие). Their two crucial arguments are firstly, that Russian evaluative suffixes, i.e. diminutive and augmentative suffixes do not significantly change the meaning of the base and secondly, all evaluative forms of a single word are of the same gender, e.g. дом - *домишко* - *домище* – *домина*; house MASC – house DIM MASC– house AUG MASC, house AUG MASC [1986:100]. Providing that evaluative suffixes in Russian are inflectional, they cannot function as heads of their formations.

Contrary to the above mentioned claims, in this paper it will be attempted to point to derivational character and headedness properties of Russian evaluative suffixes. Position of evaluative suffixes and restrictions governing selection of bases by evaluative suffixes will be examined in detail in order to prove derivational nature of evaluative markers in Russian. Derivational character of Russian evaluative suffixes will then serve as a basis for further investigation of their headedness properties.

Position of Russian evaluative suffixes

As already mentioned by Scalise [1984:132-133] „position of evaluative suffixes is always external with respect to other derivational suffixes and internal with respect to inflectional ones”. This property holds for Russian evaluative suffixes, especially the fact that inflectional suffixes, e.g. case and/or plural marking always follow diminutive and augmentative suffixes and may be illustrated by the following examples:

- (1)
 - (a) книж-**ечк-а**
book-DIM.FEM.NOM.SG/‘little book’
 - (b) глаз-**ищ-е**
eye-AUG.MASC.NOM.SG/‘big eye’
 - (c) больш-**уш-ий**
big-AUG.MASC.NOM.SG/‘very big’

The cross-linguistic tendency of derivational affixes to occur closer to the root than inflectional affixes is also captured by Greenberg's universal 28 and therefore sufficient to accept derivational nature of Russian evaluative suffixes with respect to their position.

Restrictions imposed by Russian evaluative suffixes

The selection of bases by evaluative suffixes in Russian is not free but ruled by specific morphological and semantic requirements. Frequently, particular Russian evaluative suffixes may attach only to particular bases. As can be seen in the examples below diminutive suffix in 2 (a) and augmentative suffix in 2 (c) attaches only to substantival bases, while diminutive suffix in 2 (b) only to adjectival bases.

(2)

- | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| (a) |]N-ик | корабл-ик
little boat DIM | < | корабль
boat |
| (b) |]A-юсеньк | мал-юсеньк-ий
very small DIM | < | малый
small |
| (c) |]N-ищ | дом-ищ-е
big house AUG | < | дом
house |

In addition, gender restrictions may be observed in substantival evaluative suffixes. Diminutive suffixes in 3 (a) attach only to masculine bases, in 3 (b) exclusively to feminine bases and in 3 (c) to neuter bases.

(3)

- | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------------------------------|---|--------------------|--------|
| (a) | -ек | человеч-ек
little man | < | человек
man | (MASC) |
| (b) | -очк | ям-очк-а
little hole | < | ям-а
hole | (FEM) |
| (c) | -ц | зеркаль-ц-е
little mirror | < | зеркал-о
mirror | (NEU) |

Last but not least, semantic restrictions are obviously imposed by certain evaluative suffixes in Russian. The diminutive suffix in 4 (a) selects only [+animate] bases while augmentative suffix in 4 (b) attaches only to [-animate] bases.

(4)

- | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----------------------------|---|----------------|
| (a) | -юшк | нян-юшк-а
dear nanny DIM | < | нян-я
nanny |
| (b) | -ин | дом-ин-а
big house AUG | < | дом
house |

Selectional restrictions of Russian evaluative suffixes exemplified above reasonably enough demonstrate their derivational status as opposed to inflectional suffixes, the distribution of which is not a subject to similar limitations. This conclusion allows us to turn to the investigation of headedness properties of evaluative suffixes in Russian.

Headedness of Russian evaluative suffixes

As Scalise [1984:133] claims with respect to Italian „evaluative suffixes do not change the syntactic category of the base” and therefore cannot function as heads. On the other hand, there are numerous examples of derivational category-preserving suffixes which change the meaning or more precisely morphosyntactic features of the base. This may be exemplified by English suffix *-ship* in nouns *friendship, membership, partnership* where it alters the features [-abstract] and [+countable] into [+abstract] and [-countable]. Similar modification of semantic properties of the base may be observed in certain Russian nominal diminutive suffixes.

(5)

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| (a) | кофе [-countable] | > | кофе-инк-а [+countable] |
|-----|-------------------|---|-------------------------|

	coffee	a grain of coffee
(b)	песок [-countable] > sand	песч- инок-а [+countable] a grain of sand
(c)	солома [-countable] > straw	СОЛОМ- инок-а [+countable] a straw/a piece of straw
(d)	чай [-countable] > tea	ча- инок-а [+countable] a tea-leaf

The data in (5) point to a semantic specialisation of a diminutive derivative as the base is a noun in its uncountable use while the diminutive is a countable noun. It is obvious that narrowing of meaning took place in all the examples above.

In addition, the examples in (b) and (d) demonstrate the change of gender value from masculine (a), (b), (d) to feminine. Russian differentiates between masculine, feminine and neuter. Russian evaluative suffixes tend to preserve the gender value of the base, i.e. they select the bases of a unique gender and the gender value of diminutive derivatives is identical with that of the base. Gender-preserving diminutive suffixes may be illustrated by the following examples (6):

(6)

Masculine diminutive suffixes forming masculine diminutives from masculine bases

(a)	лесØ > forest-MASC.SG	лес- ок forest-DIM.MASC.SG/‘little forest’
(b)	чемодан Ø > suitcase-MASC.SG	чемодан- чик suitcase-DIM.MASC.SG/‘little suitcase’

Feminine diminutive suffixes forming feminine diminutives from feminine bases

(a)	рук-а > hand-FEM.SG	руч- к-а hand-DIM.FEM.SG/‘little hand’
(b)	книг-а > book-FEM.SG	книж- ечк-а book-DIM.FEM.SG/‘little book’

Neuter diminutive suffixes forming neuter diminutives from neuter bases

(a)	озер-о > lake-NEU.SG	озер- к-о lake-DIM.NEU.SG/‘little lake’
(b)	зеркал-о > mirror-NEU.SG	зеркаль- ц-е mirror-DIM.NEU.SG/‘little mirror’
(c)	мест-о > place-NEU.SG	мест- ечк-о place-DIM.NEU.SG/‘little place’

On the other hand, there are some gender-changing diminutive suffixes characterised by the selection of the bases of masculine, feminine or neuter while the gender of diminutive derivatives is usually changed to masculine, rarely to feminine. The examples are provided below (7):

(7)

(a)	медведь Ø > bear-MASC.SG	медвеж- онок bear-DIM.MASC.SG/‘little bear’
(b)	мышь Ø > mouse-FEM.SG	мышь- онок mouse-DIM.MASC.SG/‘little mouse’
(c)	снег Ø > snow-MASC.SG	снеж- инок-а snow-DIM.FEM.SG/‘a snowflake’
(d)	зме-я >	змеё- ныш

Although the number of gender-changing evaluative suffixes is considerably lower than that of class-preserving ones, it is assumed that the gender of the derivatives is determined by the gender of the suffix which forms them. This means that in both cases the gender value is assigned to the diminutive formation by the diminutive suffix through feature percolation [Lieber 1989]. Obviously, this also implies that evaluative suffixes constitute the heads of their formations.

This paper aimed to point to derivational nature and headedness properties of evaluative suffixes in Russian. Their derivational character was proved based on the observations that evaluative suffixes in Russian are positioned before inflectional ones and their distribution is restricted by categorial and gender limitations. Semantic change and gender assignment by evaluative suffixes pointed to headedness properties of evaluative suffixes in Russian. Therefore it may be concluded that Russian evaluative suffixes are placed closer to a derivational end within a continuum model.

Literature

- Booij, G. (1996). Inherent vs. Contextual Inflection and the Split Morphology Hypothesis. In: G. Booij & J. van Marle (eds.) *Yearbook of Morphology*: pp. 1-16. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Bybee, J.: *Morphology. A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1985.
- Gregová, R.: On phonetic iconicity in evaluative morphology of West Slavonic languages. In *Sučasni dosliždennja z inozemnoj filologii : vypusk 7 : zbirnik naukovich prac*. Užgorod : Užgorodskij nacional'nyj universitet, 2009. s. 90-93.
- Körtvélyessy, L.: On the Place of Evaluative Morphology . In *Sučasni dosliždennja z inozemnoj filologii : vypusk 7 : zbirnik naukovich prac*. Užgorod : Užgorodskij nacional'nyj universitet, 2009. pp. 165-169.
- Grandi, N.: Restrictions on Italian verbal evaluative suffixes: The role of aspect and actionality, “York Papers in Linguistics Series 2 – Issue 10”, 2009a, pp. 46-66.
- Katamba, F.: *Morphology*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Lieber, R. (1989). On Percolation. In: G. Booij & J. van Marle (eds.) *Yearbook of Morphology*: pp. 95-138. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Melissaropoulou, D. & Ralli, A. (2007). Headedness in Diminutive Formation: Evidence from Modern Greek and its Dialectal Variation. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 2007.
- Scalise, S.: *Generative morphology*, Dordrecht, Foris, 1984.
- Vinogradov, V.V.: *Russkij jazyk. Grammatičeskoje učenije o slove*. Moskva, 1986

Summary

Evaluative suffixes in Russian have been traditionally considered inflectional (формообразующие) not derivational (словообразующие). Contrary to that standpoint, the present paper aimed to point to derivational nature and headedness properties of evaluative suffixes in Russian. Position of Russian evaluative suffixes and their selectional properties sufficiently demonstrated their derivational rather than inflectional nature. Headedness of evaluative suffixes in Russian was determined with respect to semantic change and gender assignment by evaluative markers.

УДК 81-115'161.2'111

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ВЕРБАЛІЗАЦІЇ КОНЦЕПТУ ЗРАДА / TREACHERY В УКРАЇНСЬКІЙ ТА АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВНИХ КАРТИНАХ СВІТУ

Панфілова Н.Ю.

*Кіровоградський державний педагогічний університет
імені Володимира Винниченка*

Центральним об'єктом дослідження сучасної лінгвістичної науки як універсальний механізм духовної адаптації етносу до навколишнього світу розглядається його вербальний образ, що існує у свідомості носіїв певної культури. Саме він стає одним із основних компонентів у культурі народу, оскільки представники певної національної спільноти діють у межах системи координат, яка задається мовною картиною світу (далі – МКС).

Спираючись на досвід своїх попередників (О.А. Потєбня, В. Гумбольдт, Е. Сепір, Б.Л. Уорф, М. Хайдеггер), вплив мови на пізнання і сприйняття навколишнього світу, проблеми мовної картини світу на сучасному етапі розглядаються у працях М.Ф. Алефіренка, Н.Д. Арутюнової, І.О. Голубовської, В.В. Жайворонка, Г.В. Колшанського, І.В. Кононенко, О.О. Корнилова, М.П. Кочергана, О.С. Кубрякової, Л.А. Лисиченко, О.О. Селіванової, М.В. Скаб, Ж.П. Соколовської та ін.

Дослідженням концептів присвячені праці С.Г. Воркачева, В.І. Карасика, Ю.С. Степанова, М.В. Скаб та ін. В останній час швидкий розвиток отримала галузь контрастивної лінгвістики, яка орієнтується на типологічно-зіставний аналіз лексичної семантики близькоспоріднених, віддаленоспоріднених та неспоріднених мов. Серед науковців, які зробили значний внесок у розвиток та становлення зіставного вивчення лексики варто згадати А. Вежбицьку, І.О. Голубовську, М.П. Кочергана, А.А. Лучик, В.М. Манакіна, О.В. Тищенко, М.П. Фабіан та інших.