

EXPRESSIVE FORMS OF ADDRESS BASED ON THE FEATURE OF ACQUAINTANCE AND KINSHIP OF COMMUNICANTS IN RUSSIAN AND SPANISH (COLUMBIAN AND COSTA RICAN VARIETIES)

Oksana Glazova^{1*}, Ekaterina Davydova², Irina Budanova³, Marina Bulavina⁴

¹Assoc.Prof, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University), RUSSIA,
lovmarchenko@gmail.com

²Assoc.Prof, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University), RUSSIA,
davydova_ev@rudn.ru

³Assoc.Prof, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University), RUSSIA,
budanova_ib@pfur.ru

⁴Assoc.Prof, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University), RUSSIA,
bulavina_ma@pfur.ru

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

The article discusses expressive forms of address in Russian and Spanish (as exemplified by its Colombian and Costa Rican varieties) in view of the factors influencing their formation: national-cultural specificity and both inter- and extralinguistic factors associated with it, psychological factors (ways of creating and modelling reality in a number of communicative situations by persons belonging to various Hispanic cultural communities) as well as language nomination itself. Depending on the expression and the prevalence of evaluativity and affectability in expressive forms of address, they are divided into groups; methods for analysing them are also listed. Expressive forms of address based on the degree of acquaintance or kinship of communicants undergo a detailed comparative analysis. Based on the obtained results, conclusions are drawn about the differences in the specifics of their situational and stylistic implementation as well as in the way of rendering various tonalities that are influenced by the ethnopsychological factor. The materials of the article may be of interest both for specialists in Russian and Spanish linguistics and for students of linguistic specialties.

Keywords: expressive forms of address, national-cultural specificity, expression of evaluativity and affectability in forms of address, situational and stylistic implementations, ethnopsychological factor

1 INTRODUCTION

The need to analyse expressive forms of address (hereinafter referred to as EFAs) is dictated by the immeasurably increased interest in the problem of speech etiquette, colloquial language in general and the national-cultural specificity of behaviour, which is especially important for the Spanish language. EFAs are a huge layer of units of both usual and occasional nature. They most clearly reflect the whole complex of the social, psychological, ethnic, and national-cultural features that generate them. This fact involves the analysis of EFAs not only from the standpoint of linguistics itself but primarily in terms of pragma-, socio- and ethnopsycholinguistics, speech etiquette and the theory of speech acts. In addition, the implementation of EFAs depends to a large extent on the national-cultural specificity of the speech behaviour of communicants, which is clearly manifested in Spanish at an interviant level.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Speech etiquette in general and forms of address in particular were extensively considered in the works of Bañón, Antonio Miguel; Causse-Cathcart, Mercedes; Hasbún Hasbún, Leyla; Cuenca, Maria Josep y Torres Vilatarsana Marta; Firsova N. M., Formanovskaya N. I., Zvereva E. V. and others [Banon, 1993; Causse-Cathcart 2011; Cuenca 2008, Dolzhikova 2018, Hasbun 2003, Zvereva 2013, Noskova 2004, Firsova 2000; Formanovskaya 2005].

EFAs provide a direct link between the speaker's emotional state and the lexical and grammatical means of their expression as well as reveal the impact of the speaker's emotions on the listener's emotional sphere (Hasbún Hasbún, Leyla; Calderón Campos, Miguel y Medina Morales, Francisa; Regan, B. [Calderon 2005, Hasbun 2003, Regan, 2016]. Psychological factors are determined primarily by the addresser's psychological morphology: character, temperament, etc. Psychological characteristics also include intentions, volitions, opinions and emotional states. They are closely intertwined with social factors, which in some cases can act as constraints in the speaker's selection and implementation of EFAs. We associate them with the emotional state poles "good — bad" and the tonality of communication corresponding to each of them.

The psychological factors are considered in close connection with the national-cultural specifics of each language (Firsova N. M., Noskova A. I., Blas Arroyo, José Luis; Janson, Tore; Regan, B. [Firsova 2000, Noskova 2014, Blas Arroyo 2005, Janson 2013, Regan 2016]. The national-cultural specificity of EFAs is understood as the presence of specific features in them that can reflect (explicitly or implicitly) both interlinguistic (phonetic, lexical, grammatical, stylistic) and extralinguistic (social, historical, cultural, psychological, ethnic) factors inherent in Spanish speakers of a certain national-cultural community (Firsova N. M., Noskova A.I., Regan, B.; Calderón Campos, Miguel y Medina Morales, Francisa [Firsova 2000, Noskova 2014, Regan 2016, Calderon]. A fundamental point in the development of nationally specific features of EFAs is a peculiar way of perceiving and modelling reality in a number of communicative situations by persons belonging to various Hispanic cultural communities (Firsova N. M., Noskova A.I., Hasbún Hasbún, Leyla; Calderón Campos, Miguel y Medina Morales, Francisa).

The national-cultural specificity of the formation of EFAs is composed of systems that determine differences in the organisation, functions and methods of mediating communication processes characteristic of a given national-cultural community [Firsova 2000, Blas Arroyo 2005, Dolzhikova 2016].

3 METHODS

The main method of this study is comparison; the study also involves direct observation and description of the facts related to the formation and functioning of EFAs. The dual (linguistic and sociological) nature of EFAs raises the issue of an integrated approach to their study and the importance of applying the following analytical methods and techniques: (1) structural-semantic analysis (highlighting structural and semantic types of EFAs); (2) paraphrasing; (3) componental analysis (highlighting semantic components that act as semantics of EFAs); (4) identification (revealing the complex nature of EFAs by substituting a simple word corresponding to a representation or concept); and 5) interviewing informants (including collection of practical material and control procedure). The interview involved a total of 350 native Russian speakers, 47 native speakers of Colombian Spanish and 32 native speakers of Costa Rican Spanish.

The decisive factors in the functioning of EFAs are related to: (1) the cultural tradition; (2) the social situation and social functions of communication; (3) the history of the country's development; and (4) the ethnic composition of the population and the features of its territorial distribution. The last factor is especially important and relevant for the Spanish language.

In the linguistic aspect, it is of interest how the speaker selects linguistic means to express in EFAs his/her attitude to the addressee, that is, the nominative act itself (language nomination).

As such, language nomination in EFAs is widely understood as the ability to designate a person (appellative nomination).

In terms of the nominativity of language units, EFAs denote the ability to reproduce linguistic structures located in the subconscious of a person. Associated with it is the existence of usual EFAs.

In terms of the nominativity of speech units, EFAs determine the ability to reproduce themselves in speech; in this case, they are occasional (occasional EFAs can be taken into account only by means of compilation of models).

Articulated and non-articulated nominations are inherent in both usual and occasional forms of personal

nomination using EFAs. The articulated nominations are typical of word combinations, in which the meaning of the whole, as a rule, does not follow from the meaning of its individual components. The non-articulated nominations are characteristic of words and phraseological units functioning as EFAs, which in their semantics are a single whole.

The nominativity of words containing the expressive content of EFAs (their own lexical meaning) is conceptual. The nominativity of morphemes that render expressive content to a non-expressively coloured form of address is associative.

To name a person using EFAs, the addresser uses the nomination method, which, from his/her point of view, is best matched to the addressee's social and role status. However, this nomination is combined with predication, i.e. it not only names the addressee (noting his/her distinguishing features) but also appeals to him/her, which is manifested, as a rule, in phrases and phraseological units, since a single word most often only names a person but does not considerably reveal its contents. One of the mandatory points here is the presence in the predicative characteristics of the attribute seme (*старый друг* 'old friend', *старый козёл* 'old goat', *viejo amigo* 'old friend', *vieja cucaracha* 'old cockroach').

The predicativity allows EFAs expressed in the remaining words to expand into complete sentences possessing its main features, i.e. temporality and modality.

<i>— Слушай, идиот!</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>— Слушай, идиот ты самый настоящий!</i>
<i>— ¡Oiga, loco!</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>— ¡Oiga, loco que tu eres!</i>
<i>(— Listen, you idiot!)</i>		<i>(≈ Listen, you bumbling idiot!)</i>

For the convenience of analysing EFAs, it seems possible to identify their semantic types that are equally relevant to both Russian and Spanish. They represent a classification based on the analysis of practical material. As the following description of EFAs shows, each of them has its own corresponding peculiarities of the formation, situational functioning and also, to a large extent, features related to the national-cultural specificity: due to the uniqueness of the political, economic, historical, and social development of our country and these countries of Latin America.

The criterion for identifying the types of EFAs is the dominant way of rendering expression: the predominance of evaluativity and affectability when a person is characterised as well as a typical situation that causes a certain state of the addresser. Accordingly, there is a distinction between evaluative-characterising and affective-characterising EFAs.

The basis for generating the evaluative-characterising EFAs is the addresser's state of affect. It is caused by various factors: the communication environment, the addressee's behaviour (appearance, etc.), the speaker's psychological mood, temperament, and stratification qualities (educational level). The addresser evaluates the addressee according to the most striking, in his/her opinion, qualities (the predominance of the subjective factor in the evaluation) of the latter: physical, moral, intellectual, social, etc. The affective-characterising EFAs are more oriented towards status-role positions of communicants. The speaker only brings emotions into his/her speech, wanting to express a certain attitude to the addressee.

Within these types, we specified semantic subtypes (variants) of EFAs according to the most characteristic properties of the addressee, which form the basis of his/her identification.

It should be noted that both evaluativity and affectability are present in all EFAs, regardless of which of these expression elements is predominant. All of the above can be represented as the following scheme:

EXPRESSIVE FORMS OF ADDRESS

Evaluative-characterising	Affective-characterising
1) based on moral and intellectual qualities and character traits	1) affective proper
2) based on physical attributes	2) based on gender
3) based on professional affiliation	3) based on age
4) based on social affiliation	4) based on acquaintance of communicants

5) based on political affiliation	5) based on kinship
6) based on territorial-ethnic affiliation	6) proper names — expressive forms of address
7) nicknames and anthropomazias	

This article discusses groups of affective-characterising EFAs based on the degree of acquaintance or kinship of communicants in Russian and Spanish (as exemplified by the Colombian and Costa Rican dialects).

The EFAs based on the degree of acquaintance of communicants show significant resemblance in the Russian and Spanish languages in the sphere of their situational functioning. A comparative analysis clearly demonstrated that the Russian EFAs of non-articulated nomination have more opportunities for expressing different tonalities, which is primarily achieved through various suffixes, as compared to the Spanish language: *друг, дружочек, дружок, дружище, друже; кореш, корешан*, (various slangy variants of the word 'friend') which cannot be literally translated:

— *Отгуляю скоро, корешу. Коляску надо приглядывать.* (I'll have my fill soon, buddies. Need to keep an eye the stroller.)

Compare:

— *Pronto se me acabara la dicha, amiguitos. Tendre que buscar el coche para el chino.*

The following implementations of EFAs based on the degree of acquaintance of communicants are the most typical in the compared languages:

1) When a known addressee is identified (disapproving or friendly-familiar tonality):

A. — *Серёжа, друг, за доносы бьют и плакать не велят!* (≈ Serge, buddy, one gets beaten for squeals and one shouldn't weep!)

B. *¡Cuidado con mi orito, amigo!* — *exclamo mi compa Nicolas.*

2) When an unknown addressee is identified (unusual in Costa Rican Spanish), (disapproving or friendly-familiar tonality):

A. — *Как? Это, видать, дружочек, только ему ведомо.* (≈ How? It seems to me, my dear, that only he knows it.)

B. — *¡Eh, ayudame, amiguito, a traerlo!* (≈ Hey, help me, buddy, to carry this!)

In the compared languages, it is necessary to note the usuality of such EFAs based on the degree of acquaintance as *земляк (земеля) 'countryman'* in Russian and *paisano, montanero* in Spanish, both in the presupposition of acquaintance and non-acquaintance of communicants (friendly-familiar tonality).

Commonly used in Spanish, the EFAs of articulated nomination such as *(mi) amigo + proper name* are almost unusual in Russian (friendly-familiar tonality):

— *En verdad, mi amigo Julio, convengo con mis sencilleces del pueblo...*

The comparative analysis of EFAs based on the degree of kinship between communicants in the Russian and Spanish languages allowed us to identify the most common ways of expressing affectability with the direct identification of a person who is related to the speaker:

1) With unarticulated nomination and using suffixes. Noteworthy is that the Russian EFAs are distinguished by a wider variety of suffixal (especially occasional) forms than the Spanish ones. Let us compare, for example:

<i>Мать – мамка, мамочка, мамуля, мамулевка, мамуся, мамка, маман, маманец, мамаша, мамашка</i>	<i>Madre – mama, mami, mamita, mamatica, mamacita</i>
---	---

Бабушка – бабка, бабуля, бабулька, бабулечка, бабуся, бабуленция, бабанец, бабаня	Abuela – abuelita, abueli
--	---------------------------

2) With articulated nomination by attaching affective-evaluative determinants, such as дорогой, любимый, драгоценный, querido, amado, estimado, rendering to the EFAs both meliorative and, in some cases, pejorative connotations.

EFAs to a person who is related to the speaker, involving possessive constructions, are usual and widespread in Spanish but quite rare in Russian. Spanish EFAs with the possessive mi usually express:

A) Affectionate tonality:

— *¿Ah, mi hijito, donde sacaste este cochito? (Oh sonny, where did you get this piggy?)*

B) ironic tonality:

— *¿Sabia usted, mi señor primo, que en traje de baño me veo regia?*

C) disapproving tonality:

— *¡Hijo mio! — grito ella en medio de la algazara. (My son! — she cried out in the midst of the noise.)*

A number of discrepancies in the situational implementation of the Russian and Spanish EFAs based on the degree of kinship were found, first of all, in the case of desemantisation (loss of meaning) of the main feature of the kinship of communicants. The most typical cases of EFA desemantisation in Russian and Spanish are as follows:

1. Ascending relatives by consanguinity in the third degree (бабушка, дедушка, abuelo(a)). If the kinship feature loses its meaning, the sense of the addressee's age comes to the fore under the mandatory condition of age asymmetry between the communicants (the addressee must be older than the addresser). The Russian language is characterised by the widespread use of such EFAs as дедушка, бабушка, abuelo(a) to express: (a) familiar tonality to identify an unknown addressee; and (b) affectionate tonality when referring to a known interlocutor who is not related to the speaker. The similar functioning of these EFAs cannot be considered that common in Costa Rica, where the scope of their use is limited mainly to addressing elderly people in hospices, hospitals, etc.

2. Ascending relatives by consanguinity in the second degree (отец, мать, padre, madre). Desemantisation of the lineal consanguinity feature appears in the compared languages in the following cases:

1) In a family setting, when addressing a husband/wife or sometimes groom/bride in Russian: мать, отец (матушка, батюшка, padre, papito, mamita, mamacita) (affectionate tonality);

2) In the case of age asymmetry of communicants, when an unknown addressee is addressed, we believe that monosematisation of the age factor occurs. These situational implementations are widely used both in Russian and in Colombian Spanish. In Costa Rican Spanish, only the EFA padre (familiar tonality) is common. Compare with the Russian мать, мамаша (familiar), матушка (affectionate), отец, папаша (familiar), батюшка (affectionate).

It can be noted that, in Russian, the EFAs of articulated nomination in possessive constructions are not common, in contrast to Spanish, where these forms are usual. These EFAs in Russian often express a patronizing attitude to the addressee. Compare:

A. Ironic tonality in Russian:

— *Ах, как стыдно, батенька мой! (— Oh, what a shame, old chap!)*

B. Affectionate tonality in Spanish:

— *Mi mamita, yo no tengo sueño. (Mummy, I cannot sleep.)*

3. Peer consanguinity (брат, сестра, hermano(a)). Russian and Spanish (Colombian) EFAs of peer consanguinity show a certain similarity in their situational functioning with respect to both a known and unknown addressee to express familiar or affectionate tonalities. The form hermano is not very common in Costa Rican Spanish.

4. Descending relatives by consanguinity (сын, дочь, hijo(a)). The Spanish EFAs of the considered type are

generally implemented in the following cases, which are uncommon in the Russian language:

- 1) When a husband/wife is addressed: affectionate tonality;
- 2) When an uncle/aunt addresses nephews: affectionate tonality.

Similar in the compared languages is their predominant functioning in a situation of age asymmetry of the communicants (when the elder addresses the younger) both in the presupposition of their acquaintance (a family friend addressing children) and non-acquaintance (on the street, in transport, etc.).

5. Ascending legally based EFAs: (дядя, тётя, тío(a)). They are becoming widespread in Russian and Colombian Spanish to identify a person in the presupposition of non-acquaintance of communicants, usually among young people. In Costa Rican Spanish, this use is unusual and similar EFAs are often contemptuous.

In contrast to Spanish, the Russian EFA тётка is used in relation to a girl (a peer girl) and is characterised by a friendly-familiar tonality:

— *Здорово, тётка, как поживаешь? (Hi, old girl! How's it going?)*

6. Legally based EFAs: кум(a), cunado, compadre, comadre. Both in Russian and in Spanish, they are used in the appellative identification of a person who is not related to the speaker. These forms bear in this case a friendly-familiar or affectionate tonality. They are widespread in the Spanish language of Colombia and much less common in Costa Rica. Below is given an example of addressing a known addressee (age asymmetry of the communicants):

— *¡Que hubo, compaita!*

4 CONCLUSIONS

A comparative analysis of Russian and Spanish EFAs based on the degree of acquaintance and kinship of communicants revealed a number of discrepancies in the specifics of their situational and stylistic implementation as well as in the method of rendering various tonalities. These discrepancies are mainly influenced by the ethnopsychological factor: natural differences in the temperament of the speakers of Russian and Spanish. The ethnopsychological factor in the formation of EFAs is closely associated with the sociolinguistic one. These factors are reflected on the features of the associative perception of EFAs by native speakers, which largely affect their situational use.

The main ways of creating expression in the EFAs based on the acquaintance and kinship of communicants in Russian and Spanish are as follows:

- 1) The appellative functioning of expressive forms of personal identification;
- 2) Grammatical: associative nomination: Russian as a language of a predominantly synthetic type is characterized, in comparison with Spanish,

by a significantly greater variety of occasional means of associative nomination of a person formed by various suffixes. This fact, of course, affects certain difficulties in terms of their adequate perception as well as rendering of their tonalities in translation. In turn, Spanish EFAs reveal a wide variety of lexical forms for rendering various tonalities;

- 3) Stylistic: changes in stylistic colouring as well as functional and stylistic correlations of EFAs;
- 4) Sociolinguistic: compliance/non-compliance with status-role parameters. In addition, the desemantisation of the basic lexical meaning of EFAs in the compared languages becomes especially widespread. The analysis made it possible to identify the most typical cases of desemantisation in the Russian and Spanish languages. Thus, there is a similarity in transferring the feature of the degree of acquaintance or kinship of communicants to persons who do not belong to these groups.

REFERENCE LIST

- Bañón, Antonio Miguel El vocativo: propuestas para su análisis lingüístico, Barcelona: Octaedro 1993.
Blas Arroyo, José Luis. Sociolingüística del español, Madrid: Cátedra. 2005.
Calderón Campos, Miguel y Medina Morales, Francisca "Historia y situación actual de los pronombres de

tratamiento en el español peninsular”, en: Hummel, Martin; Kluge, Bettina y Vázquez Laslop, María Eugenia (coords.): *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico*, México D.F.: Colegio de México, 2010. pp. 195–222.

Causse-Cathcart, Mercedes. “Mi vida, mi amor, mi corazón... Formas de tratamiento en el habla de la ciudad de Santiago de Cuba”, en: Couto, Leticia R. y Lopes, Célia R. (coords.): *As formas de tratamento em português e em espanhol: variação, mudança e funções conversacionais*, Niterói: Universidade Federal Fluminense, 2011. pp.59–76.

Cuenca, María Josep y Torres Vilatarsana, Marta. “Usos de hombre/home y mujer/dona como marcadores del discurso en la conversación coloquial”, 2008. *Verba*, 35, 235.

Dolzhikova, A., Kurilenko, V., Biryukova, Yu., Pomortseva, N., Shcherbakova, O. Gender and ethnic factors in oral proficiency assessment; “can do” and “can’t do”. 3rd International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences And Arts. SGEM 2016 Conference Proceedings. Sofia: Alexander Malinov, 2016, pp. 371–379.

Dolzhikova A., Kurilenko V., Biryukova Yu., Rumyantseva N., Kulikova E., Tumakova E. Linguodidactic profiling in teaching Russian as a foreign language to labour migrants. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 19(1). 2018. –p.181-194

Hasbún Hasbún, Leyla “¿Qué le vendemos reina? El uso de los vocativos en la Feria del Agricultor”, *Revista de Filología y Lingüística de la Universidad de Costa Rica*/ 2003., 29, pp.201–220.

Janson, Tore. “Vocative and the grammar of calls”, en: Sonnenhauser, Barbara y Aziz Hanna, Patricia N. (eds.): *Vocative! Addressing between system and performance*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2013, pp.219–234.

Regan, B. “Prosody-pragmatics interface in the pragmaticalization of *¡Hombre!* as a discourse marker”, en: Cuza, A.; Czerwionka, L. y Olson, D. (eds.): *Inquiries in Hispanic Linguistics: From theory to empirical evidence (IHLL 12)*, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2016, pp. 211–239.

Telezhko I., Biryukova Yu., Kurilenko V. A model for forming tolerance in profession-oriented text translators as part of the process of developing their sociocultural competence. *Xlinguae*, Volume 12. Issue 1. 2019. Slovakia: Slovenska Vzdelavacia a Obstaravacia s.r.o, Pp.116-124

Zvereva E. V. The forms of address in compliments used in Spanish. *Gumanitarnye nauki [Humanitarian sciences]*, 2013, p. 2.

Noskova A. I. On the forms of address in the Spanish language of Spain and Latin America (with the focus on the Venezuelan dialect). *Istoricheskaya i sotsialno-obrazovatel'naya mysl [Historical and socio-educational thought]*, 2014, 2, 288–294.

Firsova N. M. *Language variability and national-cultural specificity of verbal communication in Spanish*. Moscow. 2000

Formanovskaya N. I. *Culture of communication and speech etiquette*. Moscow. 2005.