



DOI: **10.5958/2249-7137.2021.00651.0**

WORD-FORMATION SEMANTICS OF COMPOSITES

Ramazanova Shoira Ravshanovna*

*Associate Professor,
Candidate of Philology,
State Institute of Arts and Culture of UZBEKISTAN
Email id: shoira-ramazanov@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

Concepts and terms “Composite” and “Compound word” were separated. System description of ways of Russian synchronic composites-building with consideration of possibility of primary and secondary composites appearance was made, Specific, formal and semantic indications of different forms and types composites were found.

KEYWORDS: *Composites, Derivation, System In Word-Building, Word-Building Nest, Word-Building Chain, Word-Building Paradigm, Morphology, Primary Secondary Composite-Building, Composites-Additions, Composites-Joins, Composites-Abbreviations, Secondary Composites-Substantiates.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Considering the specifics of the formal structure and semantics of Russian composites, it is necessary to note their direct connection with the method of compositing. Thus, addition composites are characterized as multi-root derivatives of words, which certainly include an interfix (materially expressed or zero) in their morphemic composition. It is the interfix that expresses the “idea of connection” that is an indicator of the general derivational semantics of composites-additions, both primary and secondary. Fusion composites, which have arisen on the basis of “fused” phrases, retain the status of derivative affix elements in the morphemic composition of the derivative. The prefix, suffix and inflectional morphemes of the producing word forms are transformed into indicators of the “internal syntax” of fusion composites.

Abbreviation composites are a combination of truncated producing bases of different types, which is not related to their morphemic composition. The word-formation semantics of abbreviations-composites is specific: reflecting the compressive function of word formation, it consists in modifying the linguistic form of representation of the called reality.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Our analysis of scientific literature on the problem under study, the semantics of composites (compound words) are one of the most characteristic features of the Russian word-formation system that determine the national identity of the Russian language. Their study has a long tradition, however, questions of the formal structure and semantics of composites, their relationship with single-root derivatives and phrases, methods of compositing, morphological processes accompanying the formation of complex words, etc. until now have no unambiguous solution. The interest of researchers in Russian composites is also due to the fact that their characterization is impossible without solving a number of central problems not only of word formation, but also of lexicology, in particular, the problem of “word identity” and “word separation” [Smirnitsky. 1956. - P.114]. It is significant that there is still no single scientific definition of a compound word. Various approaches to the definition of a composite are associated with the fact that some researchers focus on the morphemic composition of the composite, emphasizing its multi-root morpheme structure, while others - on the derivational analysis of a complex word.

So, in the “Dictionary of linguistic terms” by O.S.Akhmanova “A compound word (of a composite).....a compound word that has at least two non-affix morphemes in its composition, i.e. morphemes that are not used as affixes and, naturally, acting as the basis (base) of the word”. [Akhmanova. 1966. - P.430]

According to E.A.Zemskoy, “A complex word is a combination of two or, less often, three bases, functioning as a whole and highlighted in the sentence as a special lexical unit”. [Zemskaya. 1973. -C.313]

In the encyclopedia “Russian language” a complex word is characterized as “a word that has more than one motivating basis” [Russian language. 1979. - P.313]. In his work “Basic concepts of word formation in terms” V.N.Nemchenko emphasizes that “a complex word is a derivative word, which includes at least two generating words or stems” [Nemchenko. 1985. - P.165].

E.A.Vasilevskaya in the monograph “Composition in the modern Russian language” offers the following definition: “...A compound word is a lexical unit consisting of two or more significant elements, characterized by the unity of meaning and correlated in the lexical-semantic system of the Russian language with one or another part of speech”. [Vasilevskaya. 1962. - C.22]

The Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary (edited by V.N.Yartseva) states that word composition is one of the ways of word-formation, consisting in the morphological combination of two or more roots (stems), as a result of the composition a complex word or composite is formed. Composition occupies an intermediate position between morphological and syntactic ways of combining language units, possessing the features of both.

We consider it important to distinguish between such concepts and terms as primary composites and secondary composites. Primary composites are the result of multi-root morphemic combining in the first step of derivation. Secondary composites are correlated with the idea of compound derivatives, or “false” compound words [Akhmanova. 1966. - C.431]

3. Research methods. The following research methods are used in the work: in general, the synchronous-descriptive method is used in the work. When analyzing the formal structure and

semantics of composites, the appositive and distributive methods were used. When characterizing the morphemic status of interfixes and structures in the composition of composites, the method of paradigmatic identification of linguistic objects by essential features was used. In the study of the semantics of composites, the elements of component analysis were used.

4. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

The relevance of this article is also due to the fact that in the modern scientific literature there is no systematic description of the methods of Russian compositional education. Secondary compositional formation, i.e. word formation based on complex words, remains poorly studied. Many controversial issues are related to the place and role of complex words of different types in complex units of word formation, and composites in the aspect of the typology of word-forming nests of the Russian language are practically not studied.

Russian language and literature in Uzbekistan were discussed at the meeting of the theoretical seminar of the Department of Russian Linguistics, at the Tashkent scientific and practical conference “Russian language and literature in Uzbekistan”.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Russian composites are considered to be a special subclass of Russian derived words with sufficiently clear formal and semantic features, as well as a systematic description of various ways of composing in the Russian language.

In theoretical terms, it is important to distinguish between primary and secondary composites, to identify the specifics of their formal structure and word-formation meaning.

We consider it appropriate in the article devoted to the word-forming semantics of composites to consider not only the specifics of the word-forming meaning of composites of different types, but also the nature of the syntactic relations between the components of complex words. According to the fair remark of E.S.Kubryakova, “the deep isomorphism of word formation and syntax is also manifested in the fact that word-formative meanings are constructed and organized rather exactly as syntactic ones are - by the name of relations, hierarchically, and not as morphological ones-by the name of individual entities” [Kubryakova, 1981. - p.141]. E.S.Kubryakova in the monograph “Types of language meanings. Semantics of a derived word” (Kubryakova E.S.-M., 1981) pays considerable attention to complex words. She emphasizes that “...on the scale of linguistic units, derived and complex names occupy a very specific place, being placed between simple words and phrases. On the one hand, they complete the series “morpheme-service word-simple full-valued word”, on the other-open such a series of units of non-elementary nomination as “derived word-complex words of different types-phrase-sentence”. [Kubryakova. 1981. - P.20] E.S.Kubryakova also points out, “...that syntactic constructions and complex words are different transformations of one deep essence, and in additions with a supporting verb component, the prepositive unit is considered as an object (vegetable storage)” [Kubryakova. 1981. -P.64-65] When forming a derivative, including a complex word, “...we observe the elimination of the means of the external syntax”: prepositions, conjunctions, inflectional indicators of syntactic relations and their replacement by means of “internal syntax”, where the center of gravity falls on the order of the elements. [Kubryakova. 1981. - P.72] At the same time, it emphasizes that in a complex word, syntactic relations are

eliminated, and the indicators of these relations are removed. “The only way to mark such latent predicates is to build a word-formation model itself. Establishing a connection between the components of a complex word-the interweaving of the linguistic and extralinguistic experience of a person” [Kubryakova. 1981. - P.63-64]

The problems of word-formation semantics of composites have been studied in studies on the “grammaticality” of a complex word (M.Stepanova, O.D.Lazerzon, etc.) in connection with the possible transformation of word combinations into complex words.

The work of E.A.Makukhina is devoted to the word-forming semantics of complex nouns, which introduces into the definition of a complex word its semantic connection with the meaning of the syntactic construction. [Makukhina. 1987. - P.7] E.A.Makukhina classifies complex words according to the types of motivating syntactic constructions (with attributive, attributive-object, subject-object relations, as well as circumstantial, comparative), “since the semantic relations between the elements of word combinations are transferred to the semantics of the corresponding composites, complex nouns are characterized by object, attribute-object, subject-object, attribute, quantitative-determinative, circumstantial, comparative-comparative relations between the components” [Makukhina. 1987. - P.17-18]

Altayeva considers the meaning of a complex word as based on the semantics of a motivating phrase, which together with the formant determines the motivated meaning.; we consider complex words, in which the meaning is reduced to the sum of the values of the motivating bases and the formant (**wood-melting, ship repair, film artist**), and complex words with semantic extensions (**carbon disulfide, forest tundra**), as well as composites whose meanings do not follow from the meaning of the motivating part and formant (**alumina, lobogreika**) [Altaeva. 1987. - P.11]

So, there is no doubt that “the semantic framework of complex words, the scheme of their semantic structure is the naming of two quantities, between which, due to their direct juxtaposition with each other, the presence of a certain connection is postulated” [Kubryakova. 1981. - C.66]

This “connection” of meanings is traditionally defined as a connective word-formative meaning. “The connective word-forming meaning is reduced to combining the meanings of two or more bases in one complex meaning (as part of a complex word, a fusion, and an abbreviation” [Grammar.1980. - P.296]

The abstract “idea of combining” several meanings into a single whole is most clearly manifested in the primary composites in the implementation of the act of composing itself:

белый и розовый → бело-розовый, долго играющий → долгоиграющий, Commonwealth of Independent States → CNG.

The idea of combining meanings is also “inherited” by secondary composites, in the formation of which it is supplemented by the derivational meaning of prefixes and suffixes: пешеход – н(ый) ← related to a “pedestrian” i.e. a person who “walks”; неморозостойк(ий) ← lack of frost-resistant trait i.e. “Hardy, frost-resistant”. The “connection of meanings” in the derivational meaning of composites is not, however, a simple sum of the meanings of the constituent elements. According to the E.U.Kubryakova: in “complex words, oddly enough, the

metaphorical nature of names is more clearly felt - not an identity, but a comparison of entities” [Kubryakova. 1981. - P.76] In the dictionary of O.S.Akhmanova, such complex words are recognized as indirect [Akhmanova. 1966. - P.430]

A.I.Smirnitsky believes that the greater semantic integrity of a complex word in comparison with a phrase is a consequence of the whole-formedness. “The wholeness of a word, naturally, in itself, expresses a certain semantic wholeness: it emphasizes that a given object or phenomenon is thought of primarily as one, a special whole, even if the complexity of its structure is noted for its individual features are highlighted. So, speaking shipwreck, we pay the main attention to the phenomenon designated by this word as a whole, although we mean its individual sides: (a) wreck, accident, and (b) attribution of the accident to the ship. On the contrary, if we say (the) wreck of (a) ship, the individual aspects of the designated phenomenon are brought to the fore, and already through the perception of the individual aspects of this phenomenon, the phenomenon as a whole is realized” [Smirnitsky, 1956.-p. 34] Considering idiomaticity as “the non-deducibility of the meaning of the whole language formation from the totality of the meanings of its parts”, A.I.Smirnitsky draws attention to the following: “...semantic wholeness, based on idiomaticity, and semantic wholeness, based on wholeness, are so different moments that they can exist separately. A variety of combinations are possible here” [Smirnitsky, 1956. - p. 34].

Much attention is paid to the semantics of complex words by V.V.Lopatin when considering metaphorical motivation in Russian word formation. He believes that the classical position of G.O.Vinokur “...the meaning of words with a derived basis is always determined by reference to the meaning of the primary basis” [Lopatin, 1975.- P. 53-57], requires clarification, taking into account the phenomenon that can be called metaphorical motivation.

“A typical illustration of this phenomenon can serve, for example, the word skyscraper. Its nominative meaning is “a very high multi-storey building”, but at the same time this word expresses in its word-educational structure a certain figurative expression – “scratching the sky”. Most often, such figurative content is found in expressive words-characteristics, especially in additions - such as heartbreaker, loafer, golovotyap, sycophant, fat cat, etc. Just as for “ordinary” motivated words (cf. at least guide, brakodel, etc.), such expressive formations are characterized by a connection with motivating words; however, this connection in them is not direct, but figurative, metaphorical, and the metaphorical meaning turns out to be the nominative meaning of these words, as a result of which only it is reflected in dictionary interpretations. But in addition to this metaphorical meaning, in the semantics of such words, due to the clarity of their morphemic structure, the compatibility of certain roots in them, there is also a second plan associated with the direct meanings of motivating words. The interaction of literal and figurative meanings creates an image that lives in the semantic structure of such words, and it is in this that their motivation is revealed” [Lopatin, 1975. - p.53] V.V.Lopatin examines in detail the figurative semantics of such complex words as lickspittle, golovotyap, heartbreaker, etc. and makes an important point about the semantics of complex words in terms of motivation: “It is clear that in the semantics of such formations, the “figurative plan” is felt to different degrees and, accordingly, different degrees of semantic convergence with the motivating word are possible. But it is important that the vividness of the figurative content of the word is preserved, contributes to the preservation of its motivation. It is no accident that complex words occupy

such a large place among metaphorically motivated words. The motivation of complex words, as we know, is generally much more specific, more definite than the motivation of affixal derivatives, and, consequently, the metaphorical image contained in such words is more specific and therefore easier to feel". [Lopatin, 1975. - p. 54]

The array of composites presented in the "Word-forming Dictionary of the Russian Language" by A.N.Tikhonov allows us to illustrate metaphorical motivation with the following examples: зубоскал, очковтира-тель, сорвиголова, вертишейка, вертихвостка, сердцеед, блюдолиз, скалолаз, толстосум, лобогрейка, лоботряс, меднолобый and etc.

Summarizing the consideration of the specifics of the word-formation meaning of composites, we emphasize the complexity of this problem in connection with the diversity of the composites themselves, on the one hand, and the relations between their constituent parts, on the other. We consider it possible to limit ourselves to the traditional scheme of defining these relations as compositional (for primary composites – additions) and subordinate (for primary composites-additions, abbreviations, and splices). In the terminology of O.S.Akhmanova, these are complex words of composition and subordination [Akhmanova. 1966.-C.431]

The specificity of composite abbreviations, which, according to E.S.Kubryakova, belong to the periphery of Russian word formation, makes it possible for them to deny the word-forming meaning in general. See, for example, the works of R.I.Mogilevsky. [Mogilevsky 1972. - P. 1-156]. During abbreviation, there is neither an "increment" of meaning in relation to the generating base, nor its semantic change. However, it is difficult-abbreviated words are undoubtedly "secondary and derived on the basis of expanded phrases. In this case, their semantics is characterized by the transition from the motivated to the demotivated". [Kubryakova. 1981.-C.79] It was the study of the word-formation semantics of abbreviations that allowed E.S.Kubryakova to make the most important conclusions about the specifics of derivational meanings in general: "The overall result of the study of complex abbreviated names is to derive an important rule that is relevant for the entire system of relations of word-formation production: the semantic shift between the generating and derived units can be reduced not only to the transfer of a new meaning, but also to transformations in the degree of dissection of the semantic representation of the same thing. As a result, strict correlations between derivatives and generating units can exist in the system of word formation as supported by the modeled difference in the degree of explicitness of the same features in the structure of names of different levels. So, the act of word formation takes place not only when the secondary unit of the nomination differs from the word that directly motivated it by its semantics, but also by the internal organization of this semantics and the measure of explicitness in the expression of individual components of meaning" [Kubryakova. 1981. - P.71-72]

LIST OF REFERENCES:

1. Altaeva A.Sh. Word-forming potential of complex words in the modern Russian language: Author's abstract. ... Candidate of philology. - T: Tashgu 1987. -29 p.
2. Akhmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. - M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1966. -607 p.
3. Kubryakova E.S. Types of language meanings. Semantics of a derived word. - M.: Nauka, 1981. - 98 p.

4. Lopatin V.V. Metaphorical motivation in Russian word formation // Actual problems of Russian word formation: Abstracts. Report Rep. scientific. Conf. September 16-19, 1975.- Tashkent, 1975. -P.53-57.
5. Makukhina E.A. Derivational semantics of complex nouns. Abstract of thesis. Dis ... Cand. philol. Sciences. - Kiev: KSU. 1987.-18 p.
6. Mogilevsky R.I. Is abbreviation a word formation? // Actual problems of Russian word formation: Abstracts. Report Rep. Scientific. Conf. September 12-15, 1972. - Samarkand, 1972. - P. 151-156.
7. Russian grammar. In 2 volumes - Moscow: Nauka, 1980.Vol. 1. – 783p.
8. Smirnitsky A.I. Lexicology of the English language. - M.: Foreign Literature, 1956. -- 260 p.