

© Olga A. PATSYUKOVA

olalpa@mail.ru

UDC 811.161.1

THE COMPLEX AFFIX AND RELATED PHENOMENA

SUMMARY. The morpheme boundaries in a polyaffixal word are historically variable. Complex morphemes are formed from simple morphemes (the sequence of affixes) in the process of metanalysis. The nature and peculiarities of the structure and semantics of the complex affix are ambiguous. Complex suffixes are formed from the morphs of one part of speech and of different parts of speech; from simple suffixes, non-identical in meaning, and synonymous suffixes; from simple morphemes, native Russian, foreign and mixed in origin. The secondary affix has a complex, extended form. The number of simple morphs determines its structural complexity. But the complex affix has simple semantics, because the primary morph of the sequence of affixes loses its meaning as a result of metanalysis. Comparative description of complex and simple affixes shows that their form is different, but their meaning, as a rule, is identical. Simple and complex suffixes often differ in their combinability.

KEY WORDS. Word structure, metanalysis, complex affix, submorph.

The linguistic law of “stem shortening in favour of inflections” discovered by J.A. Baudouin de Courtenay appears to be sufficient proof of the fact that the morphemic structure of words undergoes historical changes. Change in the morphological divisibility of words as a result of the shift of morpheme boundaries, which V.A. Bogoroditskiy called metanalysis, contributes to the appearance of new functional morphemes, such as complex affixes. The existence of simple affixes and complex affixes, derived from simple ones, raises a problem of their differentiation, for one and the same phonologically identical sequence of affixes can be interpreted differently in a word. The problem of word-forming and the morphemic structure of polyaffixal derivatives remains one of the most complicated and disputable issues; that is why the understanding and description of the nature of complex affixes is viewed as a very topical question.

The appearance of new structural formants — complex affixes — is a constant process in the history of language development, and came into existence a long time ago. According to Y.S. Azarkh, all Slavonic suffixes that have the “vowel + consonant” structure are complex; they appeared as a result of merging of monophonemic consonant suffixes with root determinatives of nominal stems [1; 22]. Z.A. Potikha also shares this point of view, saying that “the majority of modern productive suffixes for nouns and adjectives were historically formed from monophonemic suffixes by means of metanalysis” [2; 34]. Thus, according to their structure affixal word-forming morphs in the modern language are mostly derived. The most frequent way of forming

a complex element is the right-to-left spreading of suffixes, which means that “sounds before a suffix... can be either parts of old suffixes or sometimes sounds of the old root-morpheme” [3; 81].

Since complex affixal morphs appear as a result of joining two or more simple morphs into one formant, it is necessary to distinguish a complex affix from a phonologically identical sequence of affixes which is the result of a long word-forming process. That is why G.O. Vinokur states that each particular case should be analyzed individually “on the basis of a definite correlation, existing in the vocabulary of the language, that suits this particular case” [4; 430]. Thus, in the verbs *сотрудничать*, *мельничать* the element *-нича-* represents a sequence of two suffixes (*-нич-* + *-а-*), and each of these suffixes functions as a structural marker of a definite stage of word-formation and has its own word-forming meaning: *труд* → *со-труд-ник* (‘a person’) → *сотруднич-а/ть* (‘to be smb’) — ‘to be an employee of a company’ [5], *молоть* → *мель-ник* (‘a person’) → *мельнич-а/ть* (‘to be smb’) — ‘to be a miller’ [6]. In other words, the phonologically identical sequence *-нича-* functions as a complex suffix: *скряжничать* ‘to be a scrooge’ [5], *пекарничать* ‘to be a baker’ [5] (for more detail, see [7]).

G.O. Vinokur is absolutely right to note that “it would be a mistake to think that every time when we deal with a sound combination consisting of the initial suffix and sounds that may represent a root determinative we deal with a complex suffix” [4; 430].

The theory that the sequence of affixes was transformed into a complex morpheme can be proved by the fact that this element functions as an independent word-forming formant, that cannot be divided either semantically (the word-forming meaning “to be smb” is expressed by the whole combination of sounds) or structurally since the preceding affix cannot be a part of the productive stem (there are no such words in the language as *скряжник*, *пекарник*). We speak about a group of homogeneous morphemes (“divisible combinations of morphs”) if “each part of the complex combination possesses a meaning of its own which is realized in other word-forms” [8; 36].

A sequence of affixes that serves as a basis for complex elements can consist of morphs belonging to one part of speech, for example, noun (*-ин/а* + *-к/а/*, *-ник/Ø/+ -ств/о/*), adjective (*-ин/Ø/+ -ск/ий/*, *-ов/ый/+ -ат/ый/*), or to different parts of speech: adjective and noun (*-н/ый/+ -ость/Ø/*), noun and adjective (*-ист/Ø/+ -ск/ий/*), noun and verb (*-ств/о/+ -ова/ть/*), verb and adjective (*-ова/ть/+ -ни/ый/*), etc.

Affixal sequences within a word that have been formed by chaining several morphs together can consist not only of word-forming affixes with different meaning (see the examples above), but also of identical or, more frequently, synonymous affixes. The word-formation patterns with chains of semantically identical but formally different affixes are called *affixal reduplication*, which occurs only in words belonging to one and the same part of speech. A systematic description of this phenomenon is given by O.Y. Kryuchkova [9], who describes in detail the affixal reduplication patterns of the nominal parts of speech and verbs. Many of these patterns have become a source of formation of complex suffixal formants. Thus, the reduplication pattern of the abstract nominal suffixes *-ств/о/+ -уж/э/* served as a basis for a complex suffix *-ству/э/*

(*спокойстви́й/э/*, *равноден-стви́й/э/*); the regular word-formation pattern *-к/а/+-к/а/* became the basis for the formant *-очк/а/* (*звездочк/а/*, *тросточк/а/*), whose productivity is constantly increasing. Therefore, “suffixal reduplications acquire the functions of formants and are used in the act of word-formation as indivisible morphemic units” [9; 183].

Another tendency in the formation of new complex affixes (noticed by V.V. Lopatin and I.S. Ulukhanov) is the *contamination* of suffixal morphs. For example, the suffix *-ловк/а/* (*забегаловка*, *уравниловка*) appeared as a result of blending of two derivative suffixes — *-лк/а/* (*мигалка*, *зажигалка*) and *-овк/а/* (*листовка*, *голодовка*) [10; 198-199].

Not only native Russian elements become part of complex morphs. Since the structure of a foreign suffix is complicated by a Russian suffix assimilating the word into the language, we can observe the appearance of mixed (according to their origin) or hybrid suffixes (this process is thoroughly described by V.S. Gimpelevich). This is the case with the complex adjectival suffix *-арн/ый/* (*дисциплинарн/ый/*, *фрагментарн/ый/*); the complex verbal suffix *-ирова/ть/* (*баррикадирова/ть/*, *аргументирова/ть/*), in which the element *-ир-* corresponds to a French suffix *-er* (*barricad-er*) or a German suffix *-ier/en/* (*argument-ier/en/*); the complex nounal suffix *-этк/а/* (*вуалетк/а/*, *статуэтк/а/*) has a foreign element *-эт-* that corresponds with a French suffix *-ette* (*voil-ette*, *statu-ette*), etc [11; 209, 210]. The “foreign suffix + native suffix” combination, in which the foreign element always stands in preposition, has appeared as a source of formation of many complex suffixes and contributed to the increasing number of morphemes in the Russian language.

Finally, complex affixes can consist entirely of foreign elements. They are borrowed only as components of words and often undergo phonetic, graphic or structural modifications. Thus, in such words as *пенсионер*, *акционер*, *миссионер*, etc., we distinguish a suffix *-онер* instead of *-ер*, which is due to the process of metanalysis in the stems of borrowed words that can be explained by different phonetic and graphic forms of stems in source languages and in the Russian language (compare: English *pension-er*, German *Aktion-är*, French *mission-aire* and Russian *пенси-онер* ← *пенси/я/*, *акци-онер* ← *акци/я/*, *мисси-онер* ← *мисси/я/*) [11; 208].

Structural (formal) complexity of secondary affixes directly depends on the number of affixal morphs that constitute a phonologically identical sequence laying the basis of a new affix: compare, for example, the suffixal morphs of adjectives *-тельн-* (*-тель-+-н-*) and *-ительн-* (*-и-+-тель-+-н-*) in *извинительный* and *зрительный* (*нерв*), the verbal morphs *-ича-* (*-ич-+-а-*) and *-нича-* (*-н-+-ич-+-а-*) in *подличать* and *дерзничать*.

When speaking about complex affixes, linguists sometimes use the term “de-etymologization” which, we believe, is not entirely correct. Thus, A.A. Reformatский defines de-etymologization as “fusion of morphemes into one unit” [12; 213], G.A. Pastushenkov as “transformation of a combination of morphemes, that functions as a word-forming element, into one morpheme” [13; 60], and G.A. Gvozdyev treats de-etymologization as the “merging of two suffixes into one” [14; 124]. In linguistics

the term “de-etymologization” is traditionally applied to the stems which have lost their motivation and become morphologically indivisible, that is why by applying this term to affixal morphemes, we considerably extend its conceptual content. A successful explanation of this interpretation was given by I.A. Shirshov, who noticed that the growth of complex suffixes can be called “de-etymologization in metanalysis”, for they appear as a result of metanalysis, but the loss of meaning by a suffix preceding the last one is similar to de-etymologization [15; 21].

Thus, the complex suffix belongs to the word-formation level of language and is an element complex in form (because it consists of two or three morphemes), but simple in semantics (because the primary affix loses its meaning). Since one unit of meaning correlates with two (seldom three) units of form, the complex affix can be characterized by non-parallel relations between the signifier and the signified.

Variant forms of suffixes (the term G.O. Vinokur uses for complex suffixes) “fully coincide with the primary suffix in form, but differ in their sound composition, however a certain part of the sound composition remains unchanged” [4; 429]. Thus, being identical in meaning, simple and complex affixes differ in form. Speaking about such segments of a complex morph that have lost their semantics, V.V. Lopatin introduces the term “submorph”, which he defines as “certain parts of morphs that do not have their own function and only help express a particular meaning the morphs possess”, but at the same time “these parts have their own formal (morphologic) value” [16; 57].

The relations between simple and complex affixes are not so clear-cut as it may seem at first glance. V.V. Lopatin and I.S. Ulukhanov note that “we can observe different kinds of relations between primary morphs and secondary affixal morphs, consisting of submorphs that coincide with these independent primary morphs” [10; 192]. On the one hand, a complex affix can be identical with the corresponding simple affix, both in semantics and part-of-speech combinability with productive stems. This is the case, for example, with the suffixal morphs *-ова/-ирова-* in denominal verbs with the meaning “to give smb sth/ to endure”: *глазуровать, никелировать*; the suffixal morphs *-ск/-овск-* in denominal adjectives like *январский, мартовский*, etc. In this case, simple and complex affixes are the morphs of one morpheme and belong to one type of word-formation. On the other hand, complex and simple affixes “can have either different semantics (a complex suffix expresses, as a rule, narrower meaning) or different part-of-speech combinability, or they may differ in both these criteria” [10; 192]. In this case, they represent different morphemes and belong to different types of word-formation.

In linguistic literature, we can find examples of semantic differences between the diminutive-hypocoristic suffix *-к/а/* (*березка, рыбка*) and the exclusively hypocoristic suffix *-оньк/а/* (*березонька, рыбонька*), between the complex suffix *-няк*, expressing collective meaning (*ивняк, дубняк*), and the simple suffix *-ак(-як)*, expressing broader concrete meaning (*земляк, ветряк*), etc. It should however be mentioned that the complex suffix *-няк* does not have only collective meaning. For example, the noun *столбняк*, “the state of complete motionlessness”, [5] expresses abstract meaning, while the noun

стеняк, “a person living in the steppe”, [5] is concrete. Should we consider these examples as an exception, or admit the fact that the semantics of the complex suffix is not so narrow, and therefore it is not semantically isolated? At the same time, the simple suffix *-к/а/* can lack diminutive meaning, being purely hypocoristic (*ночка*) as is the complex suffix *-оньк/а/* (*ноченька*). Despite the semantic isolation of the complex suffix, there may be a point of intersection, where the semantics of simple and complex affixes appear identical. The ideas presented above allow us to conclude that semantic isolation of simple and complex affixes yet has to be studied thoroughly.

Unlike complex suffixal morphs, complex prefixal morphs have meaning different from that of simple prefixes. Thus, the meaning of the complex prefix *обез-* (*обезжирить*) consists of the meanings of prefixes the *о-* (“completeness”) and *без-* (“depriving of some quality”); in the prefixes *небез-* and *недо-* the meaning of negation of some quality (*не безвредный*) or action (*не доплатить*) is transformed into the meaning that expresses a small degree of a certain quality (*небезвредный*) or incompleteness of action (*недоплатить*).

Simple and complex affixes often differ in their part-of-speech combinability. As an example we can take the suffixes with abstract meaning *-ств/o/* and *-тельств/o/*. Since the suffix *-тельств/o/* was formed from nouns with the suffix *-тель* which are motivated only by verbs, therefore, the complex suffix *-тельств/o/* can be combined with verbal stems (*пресмыкаться — пресмыкательство*), whereas a simple suffix *-ств/o/* goes not only with verbal stems (*воровать — воровство*), but also with adjectival (*лукавый — лукавство*) and noun stems (*донор — донорство*). The complex morph, however, belongs to the same affix as the corresponding simple morph, but only in one type of word-formation (in our example, it is the type of verbal nouns), while the simple affix can be combined with stems of different parts of speech and appear in different types of word-formation.

Thus, a complex affix and a simple affix can be either identical or non-identical in their semantics and part-of-speech combinability, but they are always different in their form: a complex affix has a more extended form. And since the semantics of the so-called complex affix, as a rule, do not become more complicated but, on the contrary, remain simple, the term “complex affix”, in our opinion, is not entirely suitable for naming this element of the language. It would be more expedient to use the term “extended affix” introduced by I.A. Shirshov [15], because the attribute “extended” in this phrase emphasizes precisely the complexity of the form, not semantics.

To conclude the comparative study of the complex affix and its relation to the simple morph and combination of morphs, it should be noticed that a complex affix forms a binary opposition: on the one hand, it is opposed to a simple affix as the element more extended in form, on the other hand, being simple in its semantics, a complex affix is opposed to a combination of affixes which appear as a result of consecutive word-formation. At the same time, a complex affix is semantically identical to a simple affix, and phonologically it is identical to a sequence of affixes. The asymmetry of the signifier and the signified in a complex affix can be explained by a certain autonomy of the two components of the linguistic sign.

REFERENCES

1. Azarh, Ju.S. *Slovoobrazovanie i formoobrazovanie sushhestvitel'nyh v istorii russkogo jazyka* [Word-Formation and Change of Nouns in the History of the Russian language]. Moscow: Nauka publ., 1984. 248 p. (in Russian).
 2. Potiha, Z.A. *Sovremennoe russkoe slovoobrazovanie: Posobie dlja uchitelja* [Modern Russian Word-Formation: teacher's guide]. Moscow: Prosveshhenie publ., 1970. 384 p. (in Russian).
 3. Krushevskij, N.V. *Oчерк nauki o jazyke* [Outlines of Linguistic Science]. Kazan, 1883. 151 p. (in Russian).
 4. Vinokur, G.O. Russian word-formation outline. *Izbrannye raboty po russkomu jazyku — Selected Works on the Russian Language*. Moscow: Uchpedgiz publ., 1959. Pp. 419-442 (in Russian).
 5. *Slovar' russkogo jazyka* [Dictionary of the Russian Language in Four Volumes] Editor-in-chief A.P. Evgenieva. Moscow: Russkiy Yazyk publ., 1981-1985 (in Russian).
 6. *Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka* [The Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language in four volumes] Edited by D.N. Ushakov. II volume. Moscow: Russkiye Slovare publ., 1994. 523 p. (in Russian).
 7. Pacjukova, O.A. Semantic neutralization in verbs ending with “-нича/ть/” as a condition of extended morpheme forming. *Russkij jazyk v shkole — The Russian Language in School*. 2010. No. 12. Pp. 44-51 (in Russian).
 8. Uluhanov, I.S. *Edinicy slovoobrazovatel'noj sistemy russkogo jazyka i ih leksicheskaja realizacija* [Units of Word-Formation System of the Russian Language and Their Lexical Realization]. Moscow, 1996. 221 p. (in Russian).
 9. Krjuchkova O.Ju. *Reduplikacija kak javlenie russkogo slovoobrazovanija* [Reduplication as a Phenomenon of Russian Word-Formation] Edited by L.I. Barannikova. Saratov: Saratovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet publ., 2000. 264 p. (in Russian).
 10. Lopatin, V.V., Uluhanov I.S. Slavic morpheme structure in synchronic and diachronic aspects. *Sb. dokladov. X Mezhdunarodnyj s'ezd slavistov “Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie”*. [Collection of reports of X International Slavistic Convention “Slavic Linguistics”] editor-in-chief N.I. Tolstoy. Moscow: Nauka publ., 1988. Pp. 190-206.
 11. Gimpelevich, V.S. Structural modifications of borrowed suffixes in the Russian language. *Russkoe slovoobrazovanie — Russian Word-Formation*. Samarkand, 1971. No. 209. Pp. 206-213 (in Russian).
 12. Reformatskij, A.A. About word segmentation. *Razvitie sovremennogo russkogo jazyka — Modern Russian Language Development*, 1972. Moscow: Nauka publ., 1975. Pp. 5-13 (in Russian).
 13. Pastushenkov, G.A. So called “complicated” suffixes in modern Russian language. *Filologicheskie nauki — Philological Science*. 1974. No. 1. Pp. 53-64 (in Russian).
 14. Gvozdev, A.N. *Sovremennyj russkij literaturnyj jazyk* [Modern Russian Literary Language]. Part I. Phonetics and Morphology. Fourth edition. Moscow: Prosveschenie publ., 1973. 432 p. (in Russian)
 15. Shirshov, I.A. *Mnozhestvennost' slovoobrazovatel'noj motivacii v sovremennom russkom jazyke* [Plurality of Word-Forming Motivation in Modern Russian Language]. Rostov-on-Don: Rostov-on-Don State University publ., 1981. 118 p. (in Russian)
 16. Lopatin, V.V. *Russkaja slovoobrazovatel'naja morfemika: Problemy i principy opisanija* [Russian Word-Formational Morphemics: Problems and Principles of Description]. Moscow, Nauka publ., 1977. 316 p. (in Russian)
-