

WORD-FORMATION MEANS OF EXPRESSING SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION IN RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Makhsudova Fayzilat Shakhobovna

National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: maqsudovafayzilat@gmail.com

Abstract

The article is devoted to a comparative analysis of word-formation means of expressing subjective evaluation in Russian and Uzbek. Derivational mechanisms are considered, with the help of which evaluative meanings are formed (sweeping, neglecting, etc.), their connection with pragmatics and speech stylistics. The main word-formation models in both languages are analyzed, and both general trends and differences due to their structural and functional features are identified.

Keywords

subjective evaluation, word formation, derivation, evaluative suffixes, diminutive forms.

Subjective evaluation is an important semantic-pragmatic category that expresses the speaker's attitude toward the denoted object. One of the main means of its expression in language is word formation, primarily suffixation. In the Russian language, evaluative suffixes (-очк-, -оньк-, -ушк-, -ищ-, -ишк-, etc.) form meanings of affection, diminutiveness, contempt, and expressive intensification, combining derivational and pragmatic functions [1].

In the Uzbek language, subjective evaluation is also realized through affixes such as -cha, -gina(m), -jon, -voy, -isha, -lona, which, when attached to a stem, impart emotional-evaluative coloring reflecting sympathy, irony, or disapproval [3].

The comparison of these systems allows word-formation means of subjective evaluation to be regarded as a universal mechanism of linguistic expressiveness realized under different typological conditions.

A contrastive analysis of word-formation means of subjective evaluation in Russian and Uzbek shows that suffixation plays a leading role in both systems; however, typological differences (the inflectional nature of Russian and the agglutinative nature of Uzbek) determine different models and degrees of formalization of evaluative meaning. In both languages, evaluation is superimposed on denotative semantics and realizes the speaker's pragmatic attitude—sympathy, familiarity, irony, contempt, or intensification.

In Russian derivatology, evaluative suffixes are described as formants that “modify” the meaning of the base by adding an emotional-expressive component [1, 2].

The most productive groups include:

a) Diminutive-affectionate suffixes: -очк-, -оньк-, -еньк-, -ушк-, -юшк-, -ик-, -ок-. For example: *дом* → *домик* (house → little house); *дочь* → *доченька* (daughter → dear daughter); *солнце* → *солнышко* (sun → dear sun); *мама* → *маменька* (mother → dear mother). Here the suffix does not merely “reduce” the object but also expresses the speaker's positive attitude (affection, care). In literary discourse, such forms shape a character's speech portrait: *доченька*, *сыночек*, *солнышко* signal intimacy and emotional closeness [2].

b) Augmentative and intensifying suffixes: -ищ-, -ин-. For example: *дом* → *домище* (huge house), *рука* → *ручища* (big hand), *гора* → *громадина* (giant mountain). The evaluation is often ambivalent: *домище* may express admiration or irony; the final meaning is determined by context, which highlights the pragmatic nature of evaluative suffixes [1].

c) Pejorative / derogatory suffixes: -ишк-, -онк-, -уг-, -юг-. For example: *книга* → *книжонка* (worthless book), *дом* → *домишко* (poor little house), *врач* → *врачишка* (contemptible doctor), *вор* → *ворюга* (scoundrel thief). Such forms mark negative evaluation



and are actively used in colloquial and literary speech as a means of irony, criticism, or lowering the status of the object [2].

d) Evaluation of quality in adjectives and adverbs: -оват-, -еват-, -еньк-, -хоньк-. For example: *тёмный* → *темноватый* (somewhat dark); *рыжий* → *рыжеватый* (reddish); *плохой* → *плохонький* (rather poor). In this case, evaluation often softens or grades the feature, creating an effect of subjective measurement [1].

In the Uzbek language, evaluative meanings are expressed through the sequential attachment of affixes, each contributing its own semantic component [3].

a) Diminutive-affectionate affixes: -cha, -gina(m), -jon, -voy. For example: *qiz* → *qizcha* “little girl, dear girl”; *do ‘st* → *do ‘stimginam* “my dear friend”; *o ‘g ‘il* → *o ‘g ‘iljon* “dear boy”; *qizaloq* → *qizaloqvoy*. The affixes -jon and -gina(m) have a strongly expressed affective function of “appropriation” and emotional closeness, which brings them closer to Russian -еньк- and -очк- [3].

b) Ironical-pejorative affixes: -isha, -lona. For example: *yigit* → *yigitcha* “some fellow”; *bola* → *bolalona* “a rude, hooligan-like boy”. Here evaluation is embedded in morphology and does not require additional lexical markers: the affix itself encodes a negative or ironic attitude (Khudoyberdieva D., 2020).

c) Spatial-evaluative uses: -cha with concrete nouns. For example: *uy* → *uycha* “small house”; *odam* → *odamcha* “little man”. As in Russian, such forms combine diminutiveness and affection, but in Uzbek the affix is more formally stable and easily combines with a wide range of bases.

Both systems demonstrate a common regularity: evaluation is expressed derivationally, and its precise interpretation depends on context. In Russian, suffixes are often polysemous and stylistically flexible (*домике* may mean “magnificent house” or “clumsy house”), whereas in Uzbek evaluative affixes are generally more unambiguous and formally segmentable due to agglutinativity [3].

Typologically, this means that Russian more often realizes evaluation through stylistic variability of suffixes, while Uzbek does so through regular affixal chains. In both cases, word-formation means serve as a key mechanism of pragmatic interpretation of the utterance, ensuring compact and expressive transmission of the speaker’s subjective attitude.

The conducted analysis shows that word-formation means constitute one of the mechanisms for expressing subjective evaluation in both Russian and Uzbek. In both systems, suffixation acts as the main way of incorporating an emotional-evaluative component into the structure of the word, reflecting the speaker’s attitude toward the object of speech.

In Russian, evaluative suffixes are characterized by high semantic variability and stylistic flexibility: the same formants can express both positive and negative evaluation depending on context. This makes the Russian system more pragmatically mobile and context-dependent. In Uzbek, by contrast, due to its agglutinative structure, evaluative affixes demonstrate greater formal and semantic stability, clearly marking affection, irony, or contempt.

Thus, despite typological differences between the languages, their word-formation systems perform a similar communicative function: they allow for compact and expressive encoding of subjective evaluation, which confirms the universal character of derivational means in conveying expressiveness and pragmatic orientation in speech.

References

1. Веколова А. Ю. Система оценочных суффиксов субстантивного словообразования в русском языке XVIII-XXI вв. (на материале Национального корпуса русского языка) // Вопросы журналистики, педагогики, языкознания. – 2016. – № 28 (240). – С. 5-10.



2. Салимова Д. А., Ибрагимова Э. Р. Морфемика. Словообразование: Учебное пособие по русскому языку для студ. высш. учеб. заведений/ Д.А. Салимова, Э.Р. Ибрагимова. – Казань: Казан. Ун-т, 2021. – 164 с.

3. Худойбердиева Д. М. К вопросу о словообразовательных способах выражения субъективной оценки (на материале русской прозы) //Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование. – 2020. – №. 3 (76). – С. 57-62.

