

SUMMARY

SUBSTANTIVES WITH INTERNATIONAL SUFFIXES IN PRESENT-DAY RUSSIAN

The aim of the present monograph is to offer an analysis of a sufficiently representative number of substantives with international suffixes in Present-Day Russian and a structural description of such words on the morphematic and the semantic levels. Attention is further paid chiefly to the word-formative function of the examined suffixes, i. e. to the derivative procedures. In most chapters the examination of derivative morphemes is carried out from the functionalist and structuralist viewpoint, special attention being paid to the results of the word-formative procedure, the morphematic structure of words.

The present study deals with contemporary Russian. It does so on a contrastive basis, comparing Russian with Czech, and to a certain extent also with other languages. It is in fact an inquiry into a linguistic microsystem from the point of view of contrastive derivatology.

For technical reasons the offered explanations are considerably condensed and the number of adduced examples as a rule reduced to a minimum; all the excerpted nouns are listed at the end of this monograph, representing an abbreviated form of a much more extensive work.

All the Russified international suffixes of substantives have been examined. They are the morphemes: -аж, -анциј(а), -енциј(а), -ёр, -изатор, -изациј(а), -изм, -ист, -ит, -(и)фикатор and -(и)фикациј(а). All these suffixes have an undisputed word-formative function in Present-Day Russian, being added to at least one Russian base in the literary language. We have not examined such naming units as from the point of view of Russian — and analogically from that of Czech — have no word-formative structure.

The monograph consists of three principal parts. The first part (pp. 15—31) is general in character, the second (pp. 35—118) presents the main bulk of all the generalizing inquiries, the third (pp. 121—141) contains the 'Materials' — a whole series of stratificationally conceived exhaustive lists and tables.

The introductory paragraph (0.1) brings preliminary methodological and bibliographical information. By so-called internationalisms (0.2) mostly such words are meant as have been formed on the basis of Greek and Latin words, designate concepts of international character and exist in at least three unrelated or only distantly related languages. The concept of the international suffix having been defined (0.3), the etymology of individual suffixal formants is examined (0.4). The derivational morphemes -ист and -ит are genetically closely related (descending from the Greek agential suffix -της). The suffix -изм, descending from Greek -ισμός, is a morpheme genetically related to the suffix -ист. The suffix -аж descends from French *-age*, which in its turn descends from Latin *-aticum*. The suffixes -изатор and -(и)фикатор are complex variants of the morpheme (-т)ор, descending from the Latin suffix -(t)or. The suffixes -изациј(а) and -(и)фикациј(а) are of Latin origin, too. The suffixes -анциј(а) and -енциј(а) have also the same origin. The morpheme -ёр descends from French *-eur*.

The end of the introductory part contains a typological characterization (0.5) of the examined words. Nouns with international suffixes are to be found in all kinds of languages, in the first place in Indo-European languages. Their form, of course, depends on the phonematic system and the orthographic rules of individual languages. As to

the Slavonic languages, it can be stated that the East-Slavonic languages, as well as Polish and Lusatian, have the suffixal formant of abstract nouns of various doctrines or theories with a zero characteristic morphological feature, i. e. -изм, *-izm*, whereas Czech and Slovak add the Latin ending *-us* (*-ismus*, *-ismus*) in nom. sg. This formant with a zero inflexional ending also occurs in the South-Slavonic languages, but contains an inserted vowel (Serbo-Croatian *-izam*, Macedonian *-изам*, Slovenian *-izem*) or a semivowel (Bulgarian *-изъм*). The international formant -аж appears as *-aža* in Lusatian, and with the exception of Bulgarian also in the South-Slavonic languages, the international formant -енция corresponds to the formant *-enca* in Slovenian and Lusatian — owing to German or Czech. — The nouns of persons have the suffixes -ист, -ит in the East-Slavonic languages as well as in Bulgarian and Macedonian, while the West-Slavonic languages make these morphemes end in *-a* (*-ista*, *-ita*), due to the influence of Latin canonical and secular cultures. The languages of the smallest Slavonic nations, Lusatian and Slovenian, which have for centuries been exposed to assimilative Germanic influence, being at the most western outpost of Slavonic territory, have *-ist*, *-it* owing to German. Serbo-Croatian displays a variation of formants, *-ist(a)*, *-it(a)* to be accounted for by the influence of East, Byzantine Greek culture (the language of the orthodox Serbs) and of West, Catholic Latin culture (the language of the Catholic Croats).

The first chapter of the special part examines the ways Russian provides its substantives with international suffixes (1.1). The author has found altogether seven such ways. They can be listed under the following headings: borrowing from a foreign language (1.11), modelling words after foreign patterns, i. e. producing 'calques' (1.12), the so-called semantic formation (1.13), derivation from foreign stems (1.14), derivation from Russian stems (1.15), the modification of a formant (1.16) and the combination of suffixation and composition (1.17). The oldest of them is borrowing. By means of it unmotivated naming units with foreign morphemes have got into Russian — unmotivated, of course, from the point of view of the receiving language only. Production of 'calques', derivation from foreign stems, modification of a formant, combination of suffixation and composition, and especially derivation from Russian stems, are all processes yielding motivated words, i. e. such naming units whose word-formative structures point to other naming units as to their bases. As to frequency, the most common in Present-Day Russian is the process of borrowing, further that of derivation from foreign stems; in the sphere of nouns in -изм and -ист, hybrid formation is also comparatively frequent. Only four word-formative processes have a direct relation to the productivity of the examined word-formative means: derivation from foreign stems, modification of a formant, combination of suffixation and composition, and chiefly derivation from native stems. The first chapter — in contradistinction to the following ones — examines word-formation in the proper, procedural sense of the term.

The second chapter deals with the word-formative analysis of the examined naming units. Having defined the concept of word-formative analysis (2.1), the author examines the character of the word-formative base in regard to word classes (2.2). Most substantives with international suffixes constitute the level of denominatives, viz. names primarily derived from substantives (2.21). Naming units in -изм, -ист and -ит are often derived from proper names. Words in -ист can be motivated also by indeclinable substantives (таксист) and alphabetic acronyms (чексист). Ист-derivatives from initial words consisting of a part of one word and of the whole of another word (вруб-машинист) are characteristic of Present-Day Russian. Some naming units in -ист are motivated by substantive compounds (четвертьфиналист). — Names derived from ad-

jectives (2.22) are not very frequent (украинизм, ручнист). More numerous are names ending in the suffixes -изм and -ист, which are derived from adjectives in -альный, e. g., специализм, специалист. — Derivatives in -изм and -ист from verbal stems (2.23) are rare, e. g., отзовизм, отзовист.

In the following part (2.3) the relation of a derivative morpheme to the basic word is examined, chiefly in regard to possible changes affecting the morphemic suture.

The third chapter deals with the examined substantives as word-formative bases. Substantives with international suffixes take part in seven word-formative procedures in Present-Day Russian (3.1). The most frequent of them is suffixation (3.11). In the word class category of substantives there are secondary derivatives formed by means of various suffixes, especially -щик/-чик (рафинёрщик), -ик (телефонистик) and -ств- (дирижёрство). The starting-point of derivation are usually nouns in -ёр; word-formatively quite inert, however, are words in -изация and -(и)фикация. In the word class category of adjectives, a secondary derivation by the addition of the suffix -ск- (боксёрский), and a derivation from abstract nouns in -аж by means of the suffix -н- (массажный), have been established. To the bases of nouns in -изация and -(и)фикация -онн- is suffixed (канализационный). The suffixes -ск-, -н- and -ов- form adjectives from nouns in -ит-; the derivative morpheme -ск- is added to nouns of persons (бандитский), -ов- to mineralogical terms (кварцитовый), -н- to other nouns (колоритный). The formation of verbs is sporadic (марксистствовать).

Re-suffixation is discussed next (3.12). By means of it, adjectives from nouns in -изм and -ист are formed in that the complex suffixes -истск-, -истическ- and -истичн- are added. The most frequent is the derivation by means of the suffix -истск-, forming adjectives from Russian stems (русистский), from abbreviated stems (чекистский), from surnames (перонистский), from pejoratives (обскурантистский) and from substantives denoting phenomena pertaining to the spheres of religion, art and politics (исламистский, декоративистский, автономистский). The suffix -истическ- often appears in re-suffixed compounds, further in adjectives designating a symptom common to an entire category (индивидуалистическая философия), whereas adjectives in -истский and -истичный convey a non-categorical symptom (индивидуалистское поведение, индивидуалистичный взгляд на работу). The suffix -истичн- always forms adjectives parallelly with the suffix -истическ-. In contradistinction to adjectives in -истский and -истический an adjective in -истичный also has a short form, a simple comparative and yields an attributive substantive in -ость.

A naming unit with an international suffix often serves as a word-formative base for prefixation (3.13), cf. индетерминизм, or for quasi-prefixation (3.14), cf. неореализм, ультраколониалист. By 'quasi-prefixation' the author understands a border-line word-formative procedure occurring between prefixation and composition. It differs from prefixation proper in that a quasi-prefix (prefixoid) is genetically an auto-semantic word, and from composition in that a prefixoid naming unit has no connecting vowel.

The examined substantives occur also in compounds (3.15); their first part can be a foreign morpheme (гидромонтаж) or a native one; this accounts for the hybrid compounds of the звукомонтаж type.

Further, re-suffixed compounds formed from nouns with international suffixes have been ascertained (3.16). By re-suffixed composition the author understands such a word-formative procedure in which a word-formative structure of a new naming unit is

formed by composition and re-suffixation at the same time. It occurs in the word class of adjectives (частный капитализм → частнокапиталистический).

In some cases substantives with international suffixes participate also in the formation of abbreviated words, cf. литературный монтаж → литмонтаж (3.17).

The fourth chapter deals with accentuation. In Present-Day Literary Russian substantives ending in the examined polysyllabic suffixes have a fixed stress on the last but one syllable of the suffix (4.1). Substantives with monosyllabic international suffixes display two types of accent: fixed on the suffix, and terminal, on the ending (4.2). This oxytonic accent has been found in eight nouns with the suffix -аж and in compounds with the second part -монтаж.

By far the most extensive is the chapter dealing with the semantic analysis and classification of substantives with international suffixes in Present-Day Russian in analytical comparison with Czech (5.0), which consists of eight parts: nouns of agents (5.1), nouns of actors (5.2), nouns of means (5.3), nouns of results of actions (5.4), nouns of bearers of a substance relation (5.5), collective nouns (5.6), nouns of action (5.7) and nouns of qualities (5.8).

The author examined 2,187 Russian substantives, displaying in all eleven international suffixes. These naming units function most frequently in the word-formative category of nouns of qualities (677), further in that of nouns of actors (493) and in that of nouns of bearers of a substance relation (493, too). Significantly are also represented the categories of nouns of action (327) and of nouns of agents (137). In the other word-formative categories substantives with international suffixes are found comparatively seldom.

Confronting Russian with Czech, the author has ascertained that the examined Russian and Czech substantives correspond both in form and in function approximately in two thirds of cases only. The most Russian-Czech correspondences are in the sphere of nouns of qualities (83.6 %). This is because words in -изм/-ismus have reached a high degree of internationalization; very often they name various movements or doctrines or theories and are in this way semantically correlative with the corresponding names of persons in -ист/-ista. In both languages a mutually conditioned productiveness of these two correlative word-formative types exists. For this reason, both Russian and Czech show a considerable, almost equally high correspondence in form and function (79.5 %), also in the word-formative category of nouns of bearers of a substance relation; this category displays a prevalence over other types of nouns in -ист/-ista correlative with the corresponding abstracts in -изм/-ismus. — A much lower degree of correspondence (42.5 %) has been found in the sphere of nouns of actors, where ист-derivatives dominate too. The latter are, of course, not correlative with the substantives in -изм/-ismus. Differences in this word-formative category between Russian and Czech are caused partly by the semantic diapason of the formant -ista, which is slightly narrower, partly by the fact that this formant does not perform an equal function in some of the terminological systems in Russian and Czech. Other differences between Russian and Czech are a consequence of a wider derivative applicability of this suffix in Russian. The suffix -ист forms hybrid nouns much more often (связист). Typical of the Russian of the Soviet period is the ист-derivation from abbreviated bases (цекист).

Contrasting Russian with Czech, the author has established numerous differences also in the domain of slang expressions (шпаргалист), occasional and individual words (лозунгист, бакенбардист). — Substantives in -изм and -ист represent nearly three quarters (71.8 %) of the whole number of the examined nouns. That demonstrates the

extreme extension of these international suffixes in Present-Day Russian. Words in -изм and -ист reflect the changes in the political life of Russia occurring in the latter half, and especially since the end, of the 19th century. The increase in their number is also connected with the present stage of development of sciences and culture.

The author has ascertained twenty-three cases of the so-called Russian-Czech homonymy and paronymy, such as альтист = violista but *altista* = альт (6.0).

The last chapter (7.0) deals with the productiveness of examined morphemes. By the productiveness of a word-formative type the author understands its ability to serve as a model for the formation of new naming units. He considers the suffixes -изм and -ист (7.1) to be very productive; this is borne out by the words derived by means of these suffixes during the last 60 years. Exceedingly strong has been the Russification of the derivative morpheme -ист, which has become so domesticated in Russian as to constantly give rise to numerous ad hoc formations. The author has excerpted all the nouns with morphemes -изм and -ист from Ushakov's Dictionary and from the Shorter Academic Dictionary (7.11) and has found 41 substantives in -изм and 42 in -ист in the latter that are not recorded in the former. There is no doubt that the overwhelming majority of these words are neologisms of the thirties, forties and fifties. As to the degree of productiveness of the other international suffixes (7.2), the author considers the derivative morphemes -изациј(а) and -(и)фикациј(а) medially productive, -аж, -анциј(а), -енциј(а), -ёр, -ит, -изатор and -(и)фикатор little productive.