

E.S.Patashkova 

Master, Senior Lecturer, Department of Journalism and Translation Studies,  
«Turan» University, Almaty, Kazakhstan  
e-mail: shikarnaya23@mail.ru

## ON THE QUESTION OF THE FUNCTIONAL AND GRAMMATICAL STATUS OF STATE CATEGORY WORDS IN THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

**Annotation.** The article considers various points of view of outstanding scientists on the problem of belonging of state category words to an independent part of speech. An attempt is made to determine the status of the words under consideration at the level of semantic syntax.

**Keywords:** state category words, predicatives, state semantics, stativity, perceptivity.

Е.С. Паташкова

Магистр, старший преподаватель, кафедры журналистики и переводческого дела, Университета «Туран», Алматы, Казахстан  
e-mail: shikarnaya23@mail.ru

## К ВОПРОСУ О ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНО-ГРАММАТИЧЕСКОМ СТАТУСЕ СЛОВ КАТЕГОРИИ СОСТОЯНИЯ В РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

**Аннотация.** В статье рассматриваются различные точки зрения выдающихся ученых на проблему принадлежности слов категории состояния к самостоятельной части речи. Предпринята попытка определить статус рассматриваемых слов на уровне семантического синтаксиса.

**Ключевые слова:** слова категории состояния, предикативы, семантика состояния, стивность, перцептивность.

Е.С. Паташкова

Туран университеті, Журналистика және аударма бөлімі  
аға оқытушы, магистр, Алматы, Қазақстан  
e-mail: shikarnaya23@mail.ru

## ОРЫС ТІЛІНДЕГІ КҮЙ КАТЕГОРИЯСЫНДАҒЫ СӨЗДЕРДІҢ ФУНКЦИОНАЛДЫ-ГРАММАТИКАЛЫҚ МӘРТЕБЕСІ ТУРАЛЫ МӘСЕЛЕ БОЙЫНША

**Аннотация.** Мақалада көрнекті ғалымдардың күй категориясындағы сөздердің сөйлеудің дербес бөлігіне жататындығы туралы әртүрлі көзқарастары қарастырылады. Қарастырылып отырған сөздердің мәртебесін мағыналық синтаксис деңгейінде анықтауға әрекет жасалды.

**Түйінді сөздер:** күй категориясының сөздері, предикативтер, күй семантикасы, тұрақтылық, байқағыштық.

For two hundred years in Russian studies a special group of words has been noted. These words are intermediate between names and verbs and express mainly the state of living

beings, nature, the environment, as well as various kinds of relations (modal, temporal, spatial), etc. Their use mainly in the function of the predicate, immutability in cases (when close to nouns and adjectives) and the meaning of time (N. Koshansky, A. Vostokov, F. Buslaev, A. A. Shakhmatov, L. V. Shcherba and etc.) were noted as grammatical features of this category of words. These words differed from adverbs by the presence of peculiar «nominatives» - sometimes with gender forms, the meaning of time, attitude to the face or shades of impersonality, and most importantly, all these words did not indicate a sign of quality and action (*становится холодно – холодает, морозно – морозит*, etc.).

However, until now, this group of words, in our opinion, does not have an established term in modern linguistics. There are various names for words of state, but each of them in its own way indicates the nature of these words and the composition of this group: impersonal-predicative words (I.P. Sapozhnikov, 2013; O.V. Ozarovskiy, 2018; V.P. Timofeev, 2019; T.A. Kozyreva, 2015), predicative words (V.I. Krasnykh, 2011; L.I. Eremina, 2019), «predicative adverbs» (L.M. Matveenkova, A.I. Valkova), instatives (Latin in - preposition, statio - state) (V.P. Timofeev, 2016).

The words of the category of state in all their various forms are still the subject of research by many linguists, but the general theoretical approach to them remains very vague. In syntactic science, two points of view have been noted regarding the categorial belonging of the analyzed words.

I. Some scientists have put forward the point of view according to which the words of the category of state represent a special independent part of speech.

For the first time in the article «On parts of speech in the Russian language» L.V. Shcherba singled out the category of the state into a special part of speech: «... these are words in conjunction with a ligament, which are neither full adjectives, nor the nominative case of a noun; they are expressed either by an unchangeable form, or by a form of a noun with a preposition, or by forms with generic endings, or by forms of the instrumental case of nouns, which then loses its usual, that is, instrumental meaning» ([1, p. 87]. In his opinion, grammatical categories should have «external spokesmen», the most diverse in nature, which A.A. Shakhmatov and A.M. Peshkovskiy spoke about: the combination of words is a substitute sign for establishing the belonging of a word to one or another part of speech in the absence of morphological indicators. In this regard, the composition of the category of state is grammatically heterogeneous: it also includes words *навеселе, на чеку, без памяти, в сюртуке, намерен, грустен, знаком* etc. [2, p. 87; 3, p. 124].

The most complete question about the category of state was developed by V.V. Vinogradov, the history of the development of which the author puts in connection with the history of the verb to be and with the history of the category of the verb, short forms of adjectives and adverbs, since «the category of state develops in modern language mainly due to adverbs and adjectives» and under the tremendous influence of the verb.

According to V.V. Vinogradov, non-segregated adjectives, having lost their declension forms, acquire a tinge of time and become predicates. He considers the grammatical core of the category of state to be the words glad, much, right, intent since in the short form of adjectives more meanings are developed that are not characteristic of full forms. However, «the lexical meanings of many short forms have not moved so far from the meanings of the correlative full forms that one could see them as independent words, torn away from the category of the adjective name [4, p. 323]. Therefore, the scientist considers it impossible to include them in the category of the state. That is, in the concept of V.V. Vinogradov, adjectives and impersonal-predicative forms are different words in modern Russian.

The ideas of L.V. Shcherba and V.V. Vinogradov were developed by I.I. Meshchaninov, who recognizes the category of state as a special part of speech, believing that «beyond the category of state, there are non-segregated adjectives that are not included in the verbal paradigm and cannot enter it and passive participles, which convey the state of the subject,

and not his actions«. At the same time, he notes: «In the impersonal-predicative words of the category of state, we have either a deep archaism that has lost its own grammatical categories, which has turned into common with a group of independent words called an adverb, or a new phenomenon that has not yet generated its own forms» [5, p.20].

One of the brightest adherents of this point of view was N.S. Pospelov. In his article «In Defense of the Category of State» he writes that the words of the category of state are a special part of speech, since they have specific analytical forms of expressing the grammatical categories of tense and mood. Moreover, the ligament or its significant absence is a necessary component of such analytic form. «It is thanks to the presence of a grammatical expression of the category of tense and mood that words from this category of states are combined with short adjectives and verbs and are opposed to other parts of speech that have no temporal meaning. Therefore, the analysis of grammatical features and constructive properties of words from the category of state on a specific linguistic material is a very urgent task of studying the grammatical structure of the Russian language» [6, p. 58].

A.V. Isachenko singled out a special group of words in Latin and Greek, noting the internal contradiction between their «nominal origin» and the new predicate function. He considers it legitimate to single out in a separate part of speech the words that form in our category a state. For the first time, he calls them «predicatives»: «In some Slavic languages, predicatives were formed into a special part of speech, not being characterized by special formal (morphological) indicators.» Although in Russian «and other Slavic languages, predicatives do not represent a formally sharply outlined class of words,« nevertheless, «for all their external heterogeneity, the given words are united by a common syntactic-semantic feature that allows us to single them out into a special, albeit small, group of predicatives» [7, p. 51].

II. Other scholars do not recognize the part-of-speech independence of this group of words, class them as different parts of speech.

In 1859 A.Kh. Vostokov classifies all words of state as a verb, including all short forms of adjectives, considering them «conjugated words». Following him, II Davydov notes: «Primitives, or conjugated, adjectives that differ from verbs in that they do not have mood, tenses, persons ... are mainly used in the meaning of predicates» [8, p. 183].

When analyzing impersonal sentences, A.A. Shakhmatov singles out into a special group conjugated-verb impersonal sentences, where the main term is expressed by an auxiliary verb in conjunction with an infinitive or an adverb. He wrote that «morphological signs by no means constitute in themselves the basis for distinguishing parts of speech,» pointing to deeper grounds for distinguishing semasiological. He comes to the conclusion that «it is necessary to determine the relationship of parts of speech to our psychological ideas«, without highlighting the «category of state» in a number of other parts of speech [2, p. 311].

In contrast to him, A.M. Peshkovsky considered it necessary to base the classification of words by parts of speech on the nature of the combination of words in a phrase. However, when analyzing an adjective and a verb, this feature cannot be used, since, according to the author, in these parts of speech, the formal features of the words themselves are sufficiently expressive so that, on their basis, belonging to the corresponding part of speech can be established. It was he who called the words of the category of state «the crystallized part of speech» [3, p. 402].

A.B. Shapiro opposed the allocation of the category of state into a separate part of speech, believing that since parts of speech are morphological classes of words, they cannot be distinguished either by lexical meaning or by function in a sentence, since in this case the parts of speech coincided would be with the members of the proposal. According to

AB Shapiro, the term «category of state» for naming a part of speech is unsuccessful, since it reflects the lexical meaning, and «predicatives» - only a syntactic function [9, p. 36]. A.B.Shapiro writes that «the refusal to recognize the category of state as a part of speech leads to the fact that a certain number of words usually included in it remains «homeless», since it cannot be included in any of the existing morphological classes (*жаль, надо, нельзя* etc.) [9, p. 37].

F. Travnichek also opposed the recognition of the category of state as a part of speech. The main argument against the allocation of these words in a special part of speech, he recognizes the absence of specific formal indicators in this group. He writes: «The nouns sin, hunting, pity began to be understood as adverbs, and therefore the ligaments of the feminine gender have changed into a ligament of the neuter gender» [10, p. 12]. But has an adverb ever been combined with a verb through a link? These words, according to F. Travnichek, when combined with the neuter *было*, they lose their generic meaning. Obviously, the scientist does not recognize the generalized meaning of «state». He is right that all these words do not even lexically form a single group. After all, changes in the lexical meaning by themselves can never be the cause of a change in the meaning of a word as a part of speech. Such a change, according to the author's conviction, can only be caused by grammatical features, syntactic changes in the structure of the sentence. He is also right that «... the link did not become a characteristic feature of the words of the category of state and a defended syntactic feature of predicative words, because the link is common in two-part constructions: *Он был здоров*» [10, p. 14]. This point of view was supported by M.V. Panov, V.V. Migirin, D.V. Utkin, L.I. Novikova and others.

Thus, the existence of two polar points of view on the categorial belonging of words to the category of state is explained by the complexity of the very nature of these words.

We adhere to the term «words of the category of state», since it most fully reflects the nature and essence of the words in question. «... The state is a special semantic structure, hierarchically organized, as a rule, closely connected with the objective situation (emotions, physiological symptoms, temperature, light, atmospheric signs of the environment); the state can be categorized in the language mainly lexically, mainly grammatically, in a complex manner and can be expressed at the level of word form, utterance and text» [11, p. 4].

A common feature of «state» predicates is that they describe not «properties» but «phenomena». In this case, a state can be considered as a structure, the organization of which is determined by the semantic characteristics of the subject and the predicted attribute, and in the designation of the state, the attribute and its subject are inextricably linked.

In modern Russian, there is a tendency for the transformation of high-quality lexemes into static ones: *Мне фиолетово; Было коричнево. Пахло корицей* (U. Gamayun). So, in the first case, the meaning of the state is associated with the semantics of the assessment; in the second, the semantic components «stativity» and «perceptivity» are actualized. Of particular note is the expansion of the group of words with the categorial semantics of the state in journalism and fictional speech: *Когда мы только встречались, например мне романтично было фотографироваться на прогулках* (from a blog, preserving punctuation); *На душе стало свободно, холодно, просторно* (B. Akunin); *Ему вдруг стало очень тепло и сонно, это, наверное, оттого, что заживает рана, подумал он...* (M. Galina). These tendencies, in our opinion, are primarily due to the process of transforming the meaning of lexical units with a qualitative meaning.

According to O.V. Tyukineeva, «Despite the fact that any grammatical form of a modern language is a product of a long historical development, in no case should one think that the development of this or that grammatical form has already been completed. The parts of speech, which are developing and interacting elements of a strictly organized grammatical system, are not separated by impenetrable partitions. Therefore, cases of transposition of words from one part of speech to another constantly occur in the language, there is a loss of

old and the acquisition of new qualities, which is undoubtedly associated with deep internal transformations of the lexical and grammatical characteristics of a word, with changes in the categorical status of a word, its structural and semantic characteristics in preservation of the external appearance of the word« [12, p. 135].

In general, we can say that the category of state is quite universal and finds its expression in multi-system languages. The establishment of general and specific features of their nominative semantics and means of its expression will allow qualifying the constructions they form in different types of languages as partial equivalents, the similarities between which will be more noticeable at the semantic-functional level than at the formal-grammatical level.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Shcherba, L.V. On the Parts of Speech in the Russian Language // Shcherba, L.V. Language System and Speech Activity.– Moscow: Science, 2015. – P. 77–100.
- [2] Shakhmatov, A.A Syntax of the Russian Language – Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2016. – 624 p.
- [3] Peshkovsky, A. M. The Russian Syntax in a Scientific Light: Educational Book / Klobukov E.V. Prolusion E.B. 9-th Edition. – Moscow: «LIBROKOM» Book House, 2019. – 432 p.
- [4] Vinogradov, V. V. The Russian Language.– Moscow: Higher School, 2018. – 720 p.
- [5] Meshchaninov, I.I. Conceptual Categories and Grammatical // Vestnik of Moscow State Institute. №1. – USSR Academy of Sciences, 2016, – P.7-24.
- [6] Pospelov, N.S. To Protect the Category of State // The Questions of Linguistics. №2. – USSR Academy of Sciences, 2018, – P. 55-65.
- [7] Isachenko, A.V. About the Appearance and Development of the Category of State in the Slavic Languages // The Questions of Linguistics. №6. – USSR Academy of Sciences, 1955, – P. 48-65.
- [8] Fortunatov, F.F. Selected Works. V.2. – Moscow, 2014. – 924 p.
- [9] Shapiro, A.B. Essays on the Russian Folk Dialects Syntax. – Moscow, 2017. – 318 p.
- [10] Travnichek, Fr. Notes about the Category of State // The Questions of Linguistics. №3. – USSR Academy of Sciences, 1955, – P. 46-53.
- [11] Matkhanova, I.P. Statements with the Category of State in Modern Russian Language: Author's abstract of Doctor of Philological Sciences Thesis (10.02.01). – St. Petersburg, 2001. – 48 p.
- [12] Tyukineyeva, O.V. The History of the Category of State Words Semantics Forming in the Russian Language of XI-XVII Centuries.: According to the Historical Dictionaries of the Russian Language Material. Candidate of Philological Sciences Thesis (10.02.01). – Irkutsk, 2005. – 225 p.