

SEMANTICS AND STRUCTURE OF WORD-FORMATION CHAINS IN THE RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Nurmuhamedova Maftuna

Teacher of Samarkand State University

ANNOTATION

The article deals with adverbial nests that have a formal and semantic structure, which are determined by the features of their structural elements - word-formation chains, as well as the specifics of word-formation types. Each chain is characterized by a certain set of derived words belonging to one or another word-formation types and in a relationship of sequential derivation. Therefore, a word-building chain is also a set of formations of certain word-building types in a certain sequence.

Key words: *synchronous word-formation, word-formation derivative, word-formation nest, typical chain, word-formation type*

FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

A word-building chain is a series (or set) of single-root words that are in a relationship of sequential synchronous word-building derivativeness. Compare: *соль* (non-derivative / producing) – *соль-* (*uzbek tuz*) salt (derivative / producing) - salt (derivative / producing) - salt (derivative / producing) - salt (derivative, since nothing is formed from the last verb, it is not producing); hole (non-derivative / producing) - holey (derivative / producing) - holed (derivative / producing) - holed (derivative / producing) - holed (derivative; does not participate in further word formation, is not producing).

In the chain, each derived word is motivated by the semantics of the generating or one of the cognate words: *дырявый* (*in Uzbek teshik*)- "*дырявить* (*in Uzbek teshmoq*)"; *продырявить* (*in Uzbek teshmoq*)- to make a hole - "make a hole *продырявливаются* (*in Uzbek teshilmoq*)- "nons. to make a hole"; to make holes - "suffering. to perforate."

For instance:

соль и солить (*in Uzbek tuz - tuzlamoq*)- "pour salt into some. or to some food, season with salt", salt - "make it slightly salty or more salty", add salt - "nesov. to salt"; add salt - "suffering, to add salt."

All nest components are semantically related, semantically and formally derivable from their producer.

According to the observations of K.Ya. Khuramshina, "the leading role in the semantics of the word-formation chain (SC) is played by its original word. The original word is the semantic core of the word-formation nest, from which various SPs grow, absorbing certain meanings" [1, p. 157].

In our opinion, the following conclusions of K.Ya. Khuramshina are of fundamental importance for studying the semantics of SC:

1) "The source word, as a rule, determines the general semantic load on the entire SC-The semantic sound of the main verb is inherited by all derivatives, regardless of their part affiliation" [1, p. 157]. Wed: *стрекотать* – *застрекотать* (*in Uzbek chiyillamoq*), *жуужжать* – *нажуужжаться* (*vizillamoq*), *пицать* – *попискивание*, chirp - chirp, chirp - waxwing, *пицать* – *пискливый* – *писливо*, (*in Uzbek g'ijirlamoq - g'ijirlamoq*) etc.

2) All the meanings of verbs of sound can pass through the entire chain - both direct and figurative. As an example, we can cite chains of the structural type Г and Сс (-НИИ-, -Н'И-), where the derivative denotes an action according to the meaning of the original verb, as well as the sounds of this action. Compare: 1) *Жук жуужжит*. *Пчела жуужжит* (*in Uzbek g'uvillamoq*). – Buzzing bees II The motors are buzzing. – Buzzing motors II The

Non-derivative words act as initial words of word-formation chains. These are non-derivative nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, category of state, interjections, onomatopoeia, for example: *два – двое – двоиться – двоичный*; *два – двое – двойка – двоичник – двоичница*; *два – двое – двоить – вздвоить – вздваивать – вздваивание*; *кто – никто – никого – никогошеньки*; *что – ничто – ничтожный – ничтожно*; *что – ни к чему – никчёмный – никчемность*; *иначе – иначить – переиначить – переиначивать – переиначивание*; *кукареку – кукарекать – кукарекнуть*; *кукареку – кукарекать – прокукарекать*; *мяу – мяукать*; *мяу – мяукать – замяукать*; *ой – ойкать – ойкнуть*; *хи-хи – хихикать – хихикнуть*; *хи-хи – хихикать – перехихикиваться – перехихикнуться*; *дать – передать – передача – передатчик – передатчица*; *дать – поддаться – поддаваться – поддающийся – неподдающийся*, etc.

Relevance. Word-building chains are clearly not well understood. Until now, only the SPs of one part of speech - adjectives - have been analyzed with exhaustive completeness. They are the subject of a Ph.D. thesis, as well as numerous works by B.B. Tajibaev. According to his calculations, “in the modern Russian language there are more than 11,200 adjective word-building chains. They are combined into types and make up more than 870 typical chains” [2]. B.B. Tajibaev gives a detailed definition of a typical word-formation chain: “One typical chain is made up of SCs formed on the basis of the original generating words related to the same part of speech, having the same number of links, the same sequence of derivatives, containing in all links, the same formants (generality of the method of word formation), expressing the same word-formation meanings. Such chains are combined into one type, forming type chains. The boundaries of a type are determined by the identity of all of its characteristics, a change in at least one of them leads to the emergence of another type” [2, p. 72].

Different types of figurative meanings play different roles in the structure of SC. As noted by A.K. Wed: fade away "weaken, wither" (powers go out) - fade out (powers faded) - extinction (fading of forces). Metonymic meanings are not transmitted along the word-formation chain” [2, p. 72].

In his opinion, “the third type of figurative meaning - synecdoche - occurs only in the original (non-derivative) word of the word-formation chain. Synecdoche, unlike metonymy, is transmitted along the word-formation chain, but much less frequently than metaphor. Compare: face 2 “человек как отдельная личность”; 2. “a person as a separate person” - facial I “located, located within a part of the head, on the face”; 2. phraseologist. connection personal account *is счет, открываемый на определенное лицо*” [3].

When studying the semantics of the SC, the problem arises of the extent to which the issues of structural and semantic complication of derivative words in the structure of the chain are interconnected. This was first noticed by O.P. Ermakov. She writes: “The successive increase in the structural complexity of derivatives from the beginning to the end of the chain does not always correspond to the same increase in semantic complexity. It is observed only in chains in which there are no syntactic derivatives. Wed: ready - prepare - prepare - preparatory. The presence of syntactic derivatives in the chain limits this increase, restrains it. And since in one derivational chain there is more often one syntactic derivative, the “number of complications” of the meaning, as a rule, is one less than the number of derivational steps. For instance: *учить – учитель – учительский – по-учительски* (*In uzbek o'qit - o'qituvchi - o'qituvchi kabi*);

Thus, there is a limit to the semantic load on a word with a complex derivational past” [3, p. 347].

The word-formation chain is a complex unit of the word-formation system. It is a set of word-building pairs, which are the smallest complex units of a word-building system. This means that the word-formation chain acts as a complicated complex unit. Being a complicated unit, the word-formation chain, in turn, is included in the structure of a larger unit of the word-formation system - the word-formation nest.

Word-building chains combine single-root words that are in a relationship of sequential motivation (derivativeness). Word-building chains have a different number of links. In modern Russian, the smallest chain in length consists of two links, the largest - of seven links. In Russian, chains of five or six links (members) are quite rare. Chains that include seven links are single. Most chains consist of three or four links.

As a unit of the word-formation system of a language, a word-formation chain consisting of two-sided units and, therefore, being such a unit itself, has not only a formal, but also a semantic structure.

The semantic structure of each SC is multi-layered, multi-component. The first - the base layer is made up of the lexical meanings of all the words of the word-building chain / The second semantic layer in the semantic structure of the word-building chain is part-speech (general grammatical, categorical, classifying) meanings of the words included in it. The third semantic layer of the semantic structure of the word-formation chain consists of spruce-forming meanings. From this point of view, the word-building chain is a set of word-building meanings of motivated words of all its links.

By combinations of word-formation meanings, word-formation chains are very diverse. The means of expressing derivational meanings in a chain are also diverse.

However, specific word-formation chains reveal a number of common features. They are characterized by associations based on the similarity of structure and semantics. At the same time, the methods of typological classification of SCs depend on the objectives of the study, based on which SCs can be described at different levels of generalization.

The most abstract is the part-speech (or grammatical) level. On it, each SP is a combination of parts of speech with a specific set of general grammatical meanings. SCs differ from each other in length, composition and a certain sequence of the words of different parts of speech included in them. SCs having the same part-of-speech structure are combined into part-of-speech models.

At another level of abstraction - word-formation - SPs are classified taking into account precisely word-formation relations. They are formed on the basis of derivational meanings and means {—1 of their formal expression (formants), i.e. at the level of word-formation types. SCs consisting of identical sequences of the same CTs form one typical SC (or SC-type).

Typical SCs, in turn, form larger associations - categorical SCs. They are based on the commonality (or identity) of the word-formation meanings of all links of typical chains, with the difference in specific formal means of expressing these meanings. Typical and categorical chains are included in part-river models.

Typical and categorical SCs, part-string models of chains have varying degrees of regularity.

In the word-formation system of the language, along with regular ones, there are irregular (most often single) SPs that have no analogues.

The structure and semantics of the SC are determined by the belonging of the original (non-derivative) words of the chains to certain LSGs. As the chains of verbs of creation and destruction studied in the work show, the SCs of different LSGs are different in structure.

On the basis of the LSG verbs of creation and destruction, 3805 STs were formed. Binary SCs make up about a fifth of the total number of chains. Binary chains are represented by three part-speech models, while polynary chains are represented by 61 part-speech models, outside of which there are single SCs.

Unlike binary ones, not all polynary part-speech models include categorical and typical SCs. Some varieties of them consist (within the limits of the studied LSGs) of single SCs in structure.

All binary part-speech models are found in both LSGs. Among the polynar models, there are those that are characteristic only of the LSG verbs of creation. At the same time, there are no part-speech models of SC, which are characteristic only for the verbs of destruction.

According to the degree of regularity, categorical and typical SCs also differ. Categorical SCs have the same tendency as part-speech models to decrease in regularity as the number of SC links increases. For typical SCs (compared to categorical ones), the degree of regularity is always low.

In the last links of the SC of the verbs of creation and destruction, all significant parts of speech are formed. Most often, nouns close the SC (1926), somewhat less often - verbs (1129), adjectives (700) and very poorly represented - adverbs (50).

Among the part-speech models of the LSG verbs of creation and destruction, transpositional and homogeneous part-speech models stand out.

Approximately a third of all chains are included in homogeneous part-speech models (and there are only 5 of them). Consequently, the regularity of the formation of homogeneous SCs (except for five-membered ones) is very high.

In LSG chains of creation and destruction verbs, voice and aspect correlations play an important role. Their interconnection and interdependence gives rise to a highly regular polymotivation, which is reflected in the peculiar variation of certain links of the SC. This variation is determined by the ability of reflexive verbs with secondary imperfective suffixes to be motivated simultaneously by both a perfective postfixal verb and a non-postfixal verb.

In Conclusion we should point according to O.P. Ermakova, "lexical ambiguity in the word-formation chain presents a special problem... In general, derivative words are less likely to be ambiguous than non-derivative ones. The more complex the word-formation structure of a word, the less complex its semantic structure... As the word-formation structure of a word becomes more complex, the number of its lexical meanings decreases, since the final links of a word-formation chain begun by a word with 8-10 meanings often turn out to be unambiguous and almost never do not have more than two lexical meanings" [4, p. 39].

These are the formal semantic features of SC as units of language, revealed on the material of the verbs of creation and destruction. Many of these features are characteristic of verbal SPs in general.

Among the part-speak models common to both LSGs categorical and typical chains related to only one of the LSGs were recorded (such chains make up about one third of the total number of the studied chains).

Partial-stream models of chains differ from each other by the degree of regularity. As a rule, a high degree of regularity is characteristic of two-, three-, and four-link models. Models with five, six and seven links have a lower (and many very low) degree of regularity.

REFERENCES

- [1] Хурамшина К.Я. Семантический анализ словообразовательных цепочек (на материале группы многозначных глаголов, обозначающих звуки, издаваемые насекомыми) // Актуальные проблемы русского словообразования. – Ташкент, 1985.
- [2] Таджибаев Б.Б. Пятизвеньевые типовые отадъективные словообразовательные цепочки в современном русском языке // Актуальные проблемы русского словообразования. – Ташкент, 1985.
- [3] Бирих А.К. Переносные значения слов в словообразовательных цепочках // Актуальные проблемы русского словообразования. – Ташкент, 1982. – С.245-346.

- [4] Ермакова О.П. Словообразовательная цепь в семантическом аспекте // Актуальные проблемы русского словообразования. – Ташкент,1982. – С.39.
- [5] Шмелёв Д.Н. Очерки по семасиологии русского языка. М.: Просвещение, 1964. 244 с.
- [6] Шмелёв Д.Н. Проблемы семантического анализа лексики. М.: Наука, 1973. 280 с.
- [7] Шмелёв Д.Н. Современный русский язык. Лексика. М.: Просвещение, 1977. 336 с.
- [8] Штерн И.Б. К понятию семантического гнезда. I. Семантическое гнездо как инструмент описания словообразовательного супплетивизма. В кн.: Структурная и математическая лингвистика. Киев, 1976. Вып.4, с.30-35.
- [9] Щеболева И.И. Принципы словообразовательного синтеза. -Изд-во Ростовского ун-та, 1980. 176 с.
- [10] Щур Г.С. Теории поля в лингвистике. М.: Наука, 1973. -280 с.
- [11] Яковлев Б.Н. Семантический объём локативных производных в структуре деривационного гнезда (Исходные слова деструктивные глаголы). - В кн.: МРС. Ташкент, 1982, с.328-330.
- [12] Янценецкая М.Н. Семантические вопросы теории словообразования. Томск, 1979. 242 с.
- [13] Эркинов, С. Э. (2019). ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ КУЛЬТУРНОГО ОБЩЕНИЯ НА ИНОСТРАННОМ ЯЗЫКЕ. *Актуальные научные исследования в современном мире*, (1-4), 140-143.
- [14] Эркинов, С. Э. (2019). ОСНОВЫ ТЕОРИИ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО ПОЛЯ ОТНОСИТЕЛЬНО ВОЕННО-ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНОЙ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ СФЕРЫ. *ХАБАРШЫСЫ*, 3, 164.
- [15] Эркинов, С. Э. ОСОБЕННОСТИ КЛАССИФИКАЦИИ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНЫХ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ ПО СОДЕРЖАТЕЛЬНЫМ ПРИЗНАКАМ. *ББК 74.48 Р 76*, 336.

